Glaring at Anti-Christ: Anti-Papal Images in Early Modern
England, c. 1530-1680

Volume 1 of 2

Adam Edward Morton

Ph.D Thesis

History

September, 2010

Abstract

This thesis examines images of the Papacy in Early Modern England, from the Reformation to the Exclusion Crisis. It asserts that book illustrations and single-sheet engravings played vital roles in Early Modern culture hitherto under-explored by historians, and argues that to grasp the importance of the visual attention must be paid to the ways in which images were used. Doing so makes for a more fruitful study of the visual than approaches which focus on audience, and images are seen to have been critical to Protestant memory, protest, political culture and piety. Challenging conceptions of 'propaganda', it is argued that satire existed as commentary which edified existing views rather than an attempt to persuade or win converts to confessional or political positions. Moreover, the historiographical commonplace that images existed as a means of reaching the semi-literate is challenged – conversely, in light of Renaissance rhetoric images are understood to have been ways of flattering the erudite and making an author's arguments more forcefully. Graphic satire is also located more widely within cultures of shame and ridicule, and laughter here is seen as a means of punishment – dishonouring the Pope's image was a means of revenge, and one which resolved anxieties caused by the presence of Catholics and Catholicism within Protestant England. It is ultimately argued that the Reformation was not a rejection of the sense of sight, but rather the replacement of one way of seeing with another. The central Anti-Catholic concept – Antichrist – was intensely visual, and interpreting scriptural emblems spawned a way of seeing that was interpretative. As a result, looking at Catholic images could prove edifying for Protestants: that they were not seduced by them existed as proof of their membership of the True Church.

Table of Contents
Volume 1

for many years of discussing the Reformation. I miss our chats greatly. Nick Tosney has always been a source of encouragement, and I have learned much from him. Thanks must also be given to Ruth Leach, Beth Hughes and Aleta Rozanski – a trio whose breath-taking ability to disturb even the most diligent of scholars with a perpetual tendency towards silliness made the early stages of research much more enjoyable. I would not have had it any other way. Additional thanks must go to Ruth for help with French translations; and Aleta and her fridge, for reminding me that they do things differently in America.

Scholars outside of York have also been immensely helpful. Anyone who works in the field of printed images will know Malcolm Jones to be a generous and kind scholar, and I thank him for providing access to unpublished material. Alec Ryrie, Bruce Gordon, Matthew Milner, Margaret Aston, Michael Hunter, Helen Pierce and Kevin Sharpe have been very kind with their comments and ideas, and David Davis has been a keen fellow scholar. Alexandra Walsham has been immensely generous with her time and thoughts.

Family and friends have been very important. I must thank Kieran Binnie for a steady diet of nihilism, laughter and curry. Mum has been unquenchable in her support, and proof-read all of my undergraduate essays with remarkable diligence; and Dad has always been supportive, curious and considerate. Most of all, I owe much to Kim, who had to live with me and this thesis for what I am sure feels like a life-time. The final year of study has been a taxing one, and has seen us move twice. I am sure that I have been unbearable, and thank her for her patience and love, and for reminding a man who spends too much of his time in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the pleasures of the twenty first should not be neglected.

It is one of the historian's hardest tasks to decide where, in the constant stream of the past, to begin his story. This is as true of our own histories as well as those of others. My own story begins with my teachers – Paula Mountford, Marie-Claire Diskin (as I knew her) and Ms. Sherwood. Memories of their lessons survive in me as a capsule of enthusiasm for the past, and I think of them with a warm fondness. It is to them that this thesis is dedicated – how very deeply the passions of others can shape us.

List of Figures

List of Abbreviations

BM Sat	F. G. Stevens & M. D. George (Eds.), *Catalogue of political and personal satires held in the British Museum*, 11 vols (London, 1870-1954).
CSPD	*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic.*
CSPDev	*Calendar of State Papers, Venetian.*
ODNB	*Dictionary of National Biography.*
HMC	Historical Manuscript Commission reports.
L&P	J. Gairdner (Ed.), *Letters and papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII: preserved in the Public Record Office*, 21 vols, (London, 1864-1932)

Introduction

It all began with a scribble on an inn wall.[1] Far from a great work of art, this doodle was an inauspicious start for a tradition of Anti-Papal iconography which would soon pock-mark the landscape of Early Modern English culture, but undistinguished art can make for revealing history [Fig. 1.] It is worth pausing over. The artist was Sir Thomas Wyatt, who, whilst journeying back to England in 1527 following a bout of unfruitful divorce negotiations at the Papal Court, drew Anti-Papal graffiti on the wall of his chamber.[2] The image was a variant on the legend of the Minotaur, rearing-up on its hind legs at the centre of a vast labyrinth, human arms aloft in rage as the triple crown of the Papacy tumbled from its head. Outside the maze lay broken shackles and chains and above the scene Psalm 124:7, "laqueus contritus est et nos liberat sumus" (the snare is broken and we are escaped), was inscribed. As one chronicler explained, this was surely the key to Wyatt's allusive slight:

> "[the picture] fitted to the afaiers of the kinge with the Bushop of Rome and his enterprise of deliveringe him self, and Realmes from the servitude of the Romish Minos and Minotaure Clement the 7th, composed of craftie subtiltise and vaine semblances of humanities, as also menasinge terror of rearinge Buls, wherewith he kept the world in awe, as he that by theis new practis of that Sea, of makinge it lawful to dispence with the unlawful mariages, therby to hold them and their Issue in the maze of his dilatory Courts....and holdinge them inwrpat to the upholdinge of his usurped authoritie."[3]

Evidently relieved to have escaped the procrastinations and legal stalling that had typified his stay at the Papal Court and its perceived disdain for the King's "Great Matter" it was clearly natural for Wyatt to express his Anti-Papal sentiments

---

[1] Figure 1 is a replication of Wyatt's image by Lucas Corneliz to partner his portrait of Wyatt in 1542, see M. Conway, "Portraits of the Wyatt Family", *Burlington Magazine,* XVI (1910), pp. 154-59

[2] D. M. Loades, *The Papers of George Wyatt, Esquire,* Royal Historical Society, 4th Series, 5 (London, 1968), pp. 27-29.

[3] Ibid, pp. 27-30, quotation at 28-29. The account was written by Sir Thomas Wyatt's grandson, George, circa 1603. However, George tells us that his evidence is based on men his grandfather knew, see pp. 21-28.

visually.[4] Yet his image is an anomaly. It is not Wyatt's choice of canvas that makes it unusual, for wall drawings were commonplace in this period;[5] nor is the use of iconography unique in the European Reformation what makes this image so remarkable, but the very fact that we know about it at all. By the very nature of its coming to be Wyatt's art was destined to be transitory: what prevented this ephemera from becoming ephemeral? Why, for all the brilliant insolence of Wyatt's doodled quip, has it survived? Jokes generally die with the laughter they elicit, but Wyatt's action was accorded the power of a legacy-enchancing victory, enshrined in a memorial portrait by Lucas Corneliuz some twenty years later.[6] It clearly possessed a power for contemporaries lost to us – Henry "is saide to have taken pleasur" in learning of the vandalism – an indication of the distance separating us from them.[7] Unlocking that power is a vital starting-point for understanding the resonances which much of the satire discussed in this thesis held for contemporaries, for as historians it is when we recognize that we are not 'getting' something particularly meaningful to peoples' past that we have stumbled close to the heart of assumptions central to their understanding of the world.

In this case, historians have missed something of the piquancy of the pictorial, the potency of the visual in a culture supposedly in an iconophobic straightjacket.[8] The power of graphic satire was rooted in an invitation to witness a persona damaged, an invitation to share in their humiliation and shame. In a society where reputation was the currency of status, authority and honour, this awarded such satire a sensationalism difficult to grasp at a distance of five centuries, but one attested to in the numerous contemporary diarists who felt the appearance of a nobleman in satire a noteworthy event worth recording in lavish detail. During 1628 the Suffolk clergyman John Rous gleefully described a satire lampooning the Duke of Buckingham's humiliating failure to besiege the Isle of Rhé – there had been much clamouring and scampering to witness the Duke's indecorous handling in this print, "to which", Rous

---

[4] For the delays and Henry's belief that Clement was deliberately stalling, see T. C. Price Zimmermann, "A note of Clement VII & the Divorce of Henry VIII", *English Historical Review,* 82, (1967), pp. 548-52; J. J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (London, 1968), pp. 203-216.

[5] For writing and drawing on walls, see J. Fleming, *Graffiti & the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (Kings Lynn, 2001).

[6] Conway, "Portraits of the Wyatt Family", pp. 154-59.

[7] Loades, *The Papers of George Wyatt, esquire,* p. 27; Conway, "Portraits of the Wyatt Family", pp. 154-59.

[8] P. Collinson, *From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: the cultural impact of the second English Reformation* (Reading, 1986); ibid, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England,* (New York, 1988), p. 118.

noted, there had been "much running."[9] Two generations earlier, during 1583, another chronicler had made a detailed record of the humiliation of the Queen's old flame, the Duc d'Alencon, in *The Flanders Cow*. An allegory of the Netherlands pivotal position in international politics, the recalcitrant cow was fed, ridden, and squabbled over by European powers. Its treatment of the Duc was messy: "monsieur d'Allanson...would have pulled her back by the tail, and she [de]filed his finger."[10] This scatological slur was undoubtedly a swipe at the humiliation he endured as the new governor of Antwerp that year – during his 'Joyous Entry' procession, the city gates were barred, and he and his party pelted with stones and filth by the Dutch, who subsequently massacred his troops. That this satire – like Wyatt's – was preserved in contemporary painting is indicative of the perverse pleasure one man of honour took in witnessing the humiliation of another [Fig. 2.][11]

Such 'dishonourary' pictures were more than titillation, such scenes beyond shocking. Humour's power here lay in shame, the heights from which a nobleman had fallen, and as such laughter had the agency to injure. Wyatt's gibe had obtained the status of victory by exposing the Pope to ignominy, a retributive slight for the pontiff's own dishonouring of the King by disparaging his 'Great Matter.' Such satire aimed to elicit laughter, but laughter was often no laughing matter. It could be illicit, even libellous. During the Civil Wars committees were formed to investigate offensive material. To defend the honour of Charles I an engraving (now lost) celebrating the effrontery of the parliamentary governor of Hull – Sir John Hotham – in his entry to the city was ordered to be destroyed. Like Wyatt's toppling tiara, the slight here was directed to the accessories of status. The King knelt debased before Hotham, who was mounted on the city walls, uncapped as though in the presence of a superior:

---

[9] J. Rous, *The Diary of John Rous* (Ed.) M. A. E. Green, Camden Society, 1st Series, 66, (London, 1856), p. 31. Simon D'Ewes similarly recounts in detail a discussion he had concerning a pictorial satire on the 'Spanish Match' between Prince Charles with the Infanta Maria, see E. Bourcier (Ed.), *The Diary of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, 1622-24: Journal d'un étudiant Londonien sous le regne de Jacques 1er* (Paris, 1974), p. 142.

[10] J. Harington, *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* (London, 1596). For details see M. Bath & M. Jones, "*Dirite Devises*: Thomas Combe and the Metamorphosis of Ajax (with an appendix on The Flanders Cow) in P. M. Daly & D. S. Russell (Eds.) *Emblematic Perceptions: Essays in Honor of William S. Heckscher on the Occasion of his Ninetieth Birthday* (Baden-Baden, 1997), pp. 7-32.

[11] K. Hearn, *Dynasties*, (London, 1995), p. 87.

"This scandalous Picture of Sir Jo. Hotham on Horseback upon the Walls of Hull, his Majesty on Foot before the Walls, shall be burnt by the Hands of the common Hangman, presently, in the Palace-yard; and the Vent or farther Publishing of them strictly forbidden and prohibited: And that it shall be referred to the Committee for Printing, to inquire who was the Inventor, and who the Printer and Publisher, that they may be brought to condign Punishment. The Members are straight charged to deliver all of these Pictures that they have, to the Hands of the Serjant, that they may be burnt."[12]

The nature of destruction was crucial, for it completed a circle of shame: a picture subjecting the monarchy to ignominy itself made ignominious by suffering public execution, a fate telling of the power which printed ridicule held. Deemed illicit, graphic satire was awarded agency to dent honour, an agency to debase which propelled Wyatt's dishonourary quip to the status of legend. Yet its execution tells us more – intimately tied to rites of humiliation and shame inherent in Early Modern justice, it will be argued in this thesis that by possessing the power to subvert reverence, graphic satire was itself a form of punishment. That power is revealed in the fate of another derogatory Papal depiction. Mary I destroyed a depiction of Henry VIII "painted in a table, like an antique...because it was the destruction of the Bishop of Rome" – Papal honour took precedent over that due her father and the Tudor dynasty.[13]

<u>The Power of Shame</u>

Much of the Anti-Papal imagery examined in this thesis had to do – in one way or another – with shame. Dishonouring the Pope was to exert a form of power or control over him, and shaming his persona served multiple ends for Protestants, assuaging anxieties in the face of Antichrist, shaping political protest and, in the case of the

---

[12] House of Commons Journal 10 June 1642. *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 2: 1640-1643* (1802), pp. 617-619. A similar account can be found in *Diurnall Occurrence in Parliament*, 6-13th June 1642. Despite the clamp down, it seems the print's illicitness kept the joke alive. Reports survive of its sale in London and appearance in the House of Commons during 1645. See *Mercurius Aulicus*, 12-19th January 1645, p. 1343. For an eighteenth century reproduction, see British Museum 1899, 0120.101.
[13] W. A. Shaw (Ed.), *Three Inventories of the years 1542, 1547 and 1549-50 of Pictures in the Collections of Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Courtauld Institute Texts for the Study of Art History, no, 1 1937), pp. 28, 30, 35; *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury*, Hist. MSS. Commission., pt. 1 (London, 1883), p. 130.

Tudor monarchy, glorifying the Crown. Their just arrogation of authority over the Church was propounded in an iconography resplendent with a 'Falling Pope' motif in which the pontiff became the monarch's footstool - representations of Elizabeth I and Henry VIII from John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1570) were typical [Figs 3 &4.][14] The glorification of one subject was closely interwoven with the shaming of another. The ultimate humiliation – "to be a footstole is over all the world a vyle and abiecte thing."[15] The bite of this scoffing humour was rooted in the appropriation of an ancient Imperial iconography. Foxe's representation of Henry was a monumental image announcing a monumental event.[16] Opening his work's second volume, this image was an allegory of the Royal Supremacy of 1534 by which the King arrogated authority over the Church as part of his 'imperial' Crown, severing England from Papal tyranny. Basing this new power on the position of Emperors in Church Councils, Henry was consequently presented with the trappings of Imperial dominion over realms temporal and spiritual, holding the Sword of State and Word of God which he, as Head of the Church, handed to Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury.[17] The stoic dominion of the Tudor regime in the top-half of the image contrasted starkly with the unsightly hysteria of Roman clerics in the bottom as they attempted to undo the dishonour done to Clement VII, lying unhorsed and vanquished as the King's footstool.[18] At once brutally simple and seductively complex, the image's bite passed far beyond what was presented before the eye, drawing its power from shaming centuries of iconography glorifying Papal power.

The slight was deepened by the weight of allusion. By tinkering with a template Foxe's artists presented the Royal Supremacy as a just shaming of the Papacy, a retributive counterpunch to its illicit humiliation of Princes encapsulated in Alexander III's granting absolution to Frederick Barbarossa at Vienna in 1177 only after he had trod on the Emperor's neck; and Gregory VII making Henry IV kiss his

---

[14] M. Aston, *The King's Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 135-167; J. Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, 2 vols (4th edition: London, 1583), I, dedication, II, p. 799. Re-used in G. Harvey, *Gratulationum Valdinensum* (London, 1578); J. Dee, *General and rare memorials* (London, 1577), pp. 47, 55. F. A. Yates, "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtould Institutes*, 10 (1947), p. 43.

[15] W. Lynne, *The beginning and endynge of all popery, or popishe kyngedome* (London, 1548), sig. Eiiii.

[16] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, II, p. 799.

[17] R. C. Strong, *Holbein and Henry VIII* (London,1967), p. 6.

[18] For considerations of this image see Aston, *King's Bedpost*, pp. 150-52; King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture*, pp. 114-5, 223.

toe as penance at Canossa in 1084 [Figs 5 & 6.][19] Yet the bite went deeper. Foxe's artists may have exaggerated the extent of the Papacy's pride in these scenes, but the footstool motif was commonplace in centuries of iconography glorifying Papal power. Consequently, depictions of the Tudor monarchy existed as clever parodies, pictorial slaps in the Roman face. A late sixteenth century sketch by Federico Zuccaci exists as a positive example of Gregory VII's triumph over Henry IV [Fig. 7.][20] The iconographic similarities with Foxe's image were startling: about to submit the Crown held by his son, Gregory kissed the Pope's feet as an act of homage. For Foxe the scene epitomized the Papacy's usurped authority to overrule Emperors in matters spiritual, but in Counter Reformation Rome it marked Papal glory.[21] Depictions of temporal rulers kissing the Pope's feet had a long history typified in the anonymous *Sixtus IV receiving Eleanor, Daughter of King Ferdinand of Naples* [Fig. 8];[22] and Spinello's fresco of Alexander III's humiliation of Frederick in the *Palazzo Publico* of Siena (1408), in which the Emperor, laid on his back at the Pope's feet, was berated before the Curia [Fig. 9.].[23] Depicting the Tudor monarchy as victorious Emperors, then, did not draw its power from novelty but rather by inverting recognizable visual patterns. Indeed, the image of Pope as victor had been adapted from depictions of Roman and Byzantine Emperors standing over their submissive victims – numerous 11th-and-12th century Popes were represented enthroned with the anti-pope over

---

[19] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, I, p. 205 (Alexander III). In 1158, Frederick invaded Italy, capturing Milan and thus beginning a struggle with Pope Alexander III, who excommunicated him in 1160. Frederick supported the Anti-popes Victor IV and Paschal III but was forced to reconcile with Alexander following a disastrous Italian campaign between 1174 and 1176, where he had lost the support of his allies. Ibid, I, p. 786. E. Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, (New Haven/London), pp. 121-26; H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Gregory VII and the German Kingdom*, (Oxford, 1998), pp. 154-66. Relations between King and Pope had become strained during 1075 following a disagreement over an Episcopal appointment at Milan. Henry's acceptance of the civic authority's invitation to appoint his own candidate was quickly rebuked by Gregory, who claimed the right to do so was the sole preserve of the Papacy and threatened the King with excommunication. Henry responded by labelling Gregory a 'false monk' and declaring him deposed at the Synod of Worms in 1076. Henry was forced to seek a resolution with the pontiff when rival German princes rose against him. Foxe's woodcut illustrated the cumulative scene of this quest for absolution, depicting Henry's three day penitential performance in the bitter winter conditions outside the gates of Canossa.

[20] Discussed in M. Walsh, *An Illustrated History of the Popes: Saint Peter to John Paul II* (London, 1980), p. 100.

[21] R. Parsons, *Treatise of Three Conversions*, (English Recusant Literature, 1976), I. pp. 548-50. Although deeply critical of the errors which he perceived in many of Foxe's woodcuts, Parsons saw the 'Proud Primacy' images as truly representative of Papal power. Its display of Papal pageants and victories a true and glorious representations of it's "dominion both spiritual and temporall."

[22] E. D. Howe, *Art and culture at the Sistine Court: Platina's 'Life of Sixtus IV' and the Frescos of the Hospital of Santa Spirito* (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 2005), p. 239 fig. 38. There are multiple frescos in the *Hospital* which could have been used to make the same point.

[23] Walsh, *An Illustrated History*, p. 108.

whom they had triumphed abased at their feet.[24] Protestant iconography was thus a joke which cut deeply – undermining the Papacy by re-ordering its symbols, it acted as a silent slight constructed from the Pope's vocabulary of power, an iconography of legitimacy was founded upon one of shame and dishonour.[25]

The 'Falling Pope' had origins in European evangelism. Foxe's depiction of Alexander III was lifted from *Bapistrew Hadriani III und Alex III gegen Kegsen Fridericks Barbarossa*, printed at Wittenberg in 1545, and numerous continental sources suggest that in order to ply their trade more easily Foxe's artists kept a store of European prints to work from [Fig. 10.][26] Indebtedness aside, that iconography was being put to a very different use in English culture. We see nothing akin to the extensive visual propaganda campaign of Lutheran Germany charted by Robert Scribner.[27] For Scribner the image was essential to making the Reformation a 'popular' movement during its first generation (c. 1520-1550) by a process of negative assimilation: hearts and minds were won to Luther's evangelism through a focussed propaganda campaign de-sacralizing the Roman Church, tainting it with rites of shame and ridicule drawn from 'popular' culture.[28] Dirtying was crucial. Ridicule knocked down the old order to make the land more fertile for the new – it was easier to embrace Luther if one felt that they were leaving a thoroughly de-based Church,

---

[24] C. Watter, "Papal Political Imagery in the Medieval Lateran Palace", in his *Prayer and Power in Byzantine and Papal Imagery* (Aldershot, 1993), pp. 110-76. They included Popes Alexander II (1061-73), Victor III (1086-7), Urban II (1088-94), Paachal II (1099-1118), Gelassuis II (1118-9) and Gregory VII.

[25] Other examples: frescos of processions featuring a blessing Pope on horseback surrounded by the Curia had been commissioned for centuries, with notable examples by Raphael in the *Stanza d'Ellodori* in the Vatican and Aretino Spinello in Siena's *Palazo Publica* [Walsh, *An Illustrated History of the Popes*, pp. 54-5, 105]. Cf. the anonymous *Sixtus IV in Procession to the Lateran* in Rome's *Hospital of Saita Spirito*, which, as with Foxe's illustrations, depicted the Pope carried aloft and blessing [Discussed in Howe, *Art and Culture at the Sistine Court,* Fig. 30.] Frescos depicting the stirrup service had been commissioned for centuries and were prominent in the medieval Lateran [See C. Watter, "Papal Political Imagery in the Medieval Lateran Palace", in his *Prayer and Power in Byzantine and Papal Imagery* (Aldershot, 1993), pp. 110-76]; Cf. the *Palazzo Publico* in Siena, which featured fifteenth century depictions of Frederick Barbarossa and the Venetian Doge as vassals to Alexander III [Discussed in Walsh, *An Illustrated History*, p. 108]. Foxe parodied such motifs in the 'Proud Primacy of Popes'. Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments* (1583), I, pp. 779-91. The image of an enthroned monarch with a debased Pope at its feet occurred in the text of Spenser's *Fairy Queene*, and that Marlowe plundered the iconography of 'Henry VIII' in his staging of the Turkish Sultan Bajazet's becoming Emperor Tamburline's footstool, but these were exceptions not rules. W. J. Brown, "Marlowe's Debasement of Bajazet: Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* and *Tamburlaine, Part I*", *Renaissance Quartrely*, 24 (1971), pp. 38-48; E. Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, 1.17/12 & 16.

[26] King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 128-29; M. Aston & E. Ingram "The Iconography of the *Acts and Monuments*", in D. Loades (Ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 1997), pp. 101-4, 108-12, 120.

[27] R. W. Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation* (Oxford, 1981).

[28] Ibid, pp. 37-59, 148-90 in particular.

and ridicule's taint thus served as a critical impetus to conversion.[29] This iconography was certainly known in England. In October 1523 Lord Morley reported that Lutheranism spread in Germany through "abominable pictures", sending the King an Anti-Papal depiction "which I think that your highness will laugh at";[30] Henry possessed an engraving of Protestant theologians;[31] and a surviving engraving of Luther battling the Pope with his quill – an allegory of the Word overpowering the sword of tyranny – hints that continental prints may have circulated in England more extensively than we can ever know [Fig. 11.][32] Yet surviving book illustrations demonstrate no complementary tradition in England – this was not the media through which Protestantism became 'popular'. Despite the prevalence of the royal iconography examined above, recent scholarship suggests that it barely passed beyond the confines of the court.[33] In a print landscape littered with a burgeoning Anti-Papal literature, and in a culture to which existing in opposition to the Papacy was crucial to the Protestant idea of self, this is an astonishing fact, and one worth consideration.[34]

The obvious explanation of absence lies in the immaturity of the English print-trade, which scholars depict limping behind the European front-runners of the 'print revolution' – the print market of sixteenth century Venice alone was around tenfold that of England.[35] Not only meagre, English printing was plagued with structural problems and reliant upon the expertise of continental craftsmen, illustrations and typefaces into the late sixteenth century.[36] However, whilst unquestionably hampered, the print-trade's insufficiencies offer us little assistance in explaining why only 47 of

---

[29] Ibid, pp. xxii-xxv. Scribner is considered in greater detail below, pp. 22-34.

[30] J. Gairdner (Ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign & Domestic in the reign of Henry VIII*, 21 vols (London, 1864-1932), III (2), no. 3390, p. 1417.

[31] "A folding Table with V Doctors, Luther being in the Middle of them." D. Starkey (Ed.), *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Society of Antiquaries MS 129 and British Library MS Harley 1419: The Transcript* (London, 1998), item 15417. Similar works would appear in London a century later – see Cornelis Danckertsz the Younger, *The candle is lighted, we cannot blow [it] out*. British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, XVII, Mounted Roy, 1907,0326.31.

[32] Pepys Library, Magdalene College, Cambridge.

[33] E. Evenden, *Patents, pictures, and patronage : John Day and the Tudor book trade* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 100-13.

[34] For the Anti-Papal culture, see C. Davies, *A religion of the Word : the defence of the Reformation in the reign of Edward VI* (Manchester, 2002), passim.

[35] A. Pettegree, "Printing & the Reformation: the English Exception", in P. Marshall, & A. Ryrie, (Eds), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 157-79; ibid, "Illustrating the Book: A Protestant Dilemma" in C. Highley & J. N. King, (Eds.), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 133-44. See also, J. N. King, "Freedom of the Press, Protestant Propaganda and Protector Somerset", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 40 (1976), pp. 1-9.

[36] Pettegree, "Printing & the Reformation: the English Exception", pp. 163-73. Indeed, the majority of large illustrated books were reliant on foreign assistance, with the production of the Matthew and Great Bibles being aided by French printers, and the illustrations in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* cut by Dutch exiles.

its *extant* 5,000 illustrations depicted the Papacy.[37] There were all sorts of new kinds of illustrated books in Tudor England, herbals, works of exploration, satires, emblems and guides to swimming, gardening, and navigation – in a period of "exponential growth" in woodcut illustration, Anti-Papal imagery was a slow developer.[38] When turning to the seventeenth century, however, the scene switches from spartan to abundance – having searched every book printed between 1530 and 1660 and worked systematically through collections of prints in the British Museum, Society of Antiquities and Pepys Library, this thesis asserts that there was a thriving Anti-Papal tradition of graphic satire in Early Modern England, but one which does not fit the timetable outlined by Scribner.[39] Ridicule here did not convince men to embrace the Word. This satirical tradition emerged after the fact of the Reformation, a mass of shame de-basing Rome long after Protestantism had become 'popular' and purchased by men whose eyes had long been Reformed – in short, Anti-Popery was a *product* of commitment to Protestantism rather than an attempt to *inculcate* it.[40] But denying the visual a causative role is not to denude it of importance. These were works of edification not conversion, purchased by those who shared the views they presented, findings that tell us much about the place of the visual in post-Reformation culture and the power of shame and ridicule in resolving anxieties and fear.[41]

The anxiety in question arose from Anti-Catholicism, a prejudice essential to the experience of Protestantism.[42] This was a world in which Professors routinely

---

[37] For the figure of 5,000 see R. S. Luborsky & E. M. Ingram, *A Guide To English Illustrated Books, 1586-1603*, 2 vols (Arizona, 1998), p. vii. For a list of sixteenth-century anti-papal illustrations see below, Appendix 1.

[38] Luborsky & Ingram, *A Guide To English Illustrated Books, 1586-1603*, pp. vii, 147-48, 153-54.

[39] A list of surviving book illustrations can be seen in Appendix 1. The prints have been catalogued in F. G. Stephens and M. D. George (Eds.), *Catalogue of political and personal satires preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, 11 volumes (London, 1870-1954). Michael Hunter's new website – the British Printed Image to 1700 – is a remarkable source of updated information. http://www.bpi1700.org.uk/jsp/. Scholars are beginning to realize that this century saw the emergence of a rich visual culture in England. See, M. Jones, *The Print In Early Modern England* (New Haven/London, 2010) surveys and catalogues the sheer variety of imagery circulating before 1700. H. Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures: Graphic Satire and Politics in Early Modern England* (New Haven/London, 2009) argues that prints were an important part of political propaganda and critique between 1620 and 1645. J. Monteyne, *The Printed Image In Early Modern London: urban space, visual representation and social exchange* (Aldershot, 2007) suggests that print and city were mutually reflective in a variety of spheres of early modern life. I am reviewing these works in a forthcoming article for the *Journal of Early Modern History*.

[40] See below, Chapter One, pp. 29-37, 60-70.

[41] See below, Chapter Two, pp. 71-79.

[42] A. Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 1-92 for an excellent overview, pp. 31-35 for the details here. F. E. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, & seventeenth-century Print Culture* 2nd edition (Notre Dam, 2005); R. D, Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination:*

'proved' the Pope Antichrist as a central tenant of Christianity.[43] It was a world in which parliamentary debates were punctuated by calls for an aggressive Anti-Catholic foreign policy, calls which banged heads with successive Stuart monarchs who proved reluctant patriarchs to Protestants wrecked in the Thirty Years War, a reluctance which - alongside the emergence of a more ornate 'Arminian' manner of worship – fed into escalating fears of a 'popish' conspiracy within Church and Court to undermine England's religion and liberties.[44] These fears have been offered as an explanation for the realm's descent into Civil War, and it is certainly true that during the early 1640s communities erupted in bouts of brutal violence against Catholic neighbours whom they were convinced conspired against their lives and their Church.[45] Such hatred had its roots in the zeal of Reformed theology, of which Anti-Catholicism was the most defining feature, an intellectual activity producing some 500 texts in the period 1605-1625 alone.[46] James I held a lifelong interest in the subject, entering polemical debates during the Oath of Allegiance controversy, and during the early part of his reign being a successful combatant of the Papacy was a fast-track to preferment.[47] It is not hyperbole to state that Protestantism was a religion forged from hatred. Born out of opposition, Protestant identity continued to be constructed against the shadow of Rome – having a view of the enemy was essential to projecting a vision of the self. As Peter Lake has shown, driven by a schema of binary opposition for Protestants: "Every negative characteristic imputed to Rome implied a positive cultural, political or religious value which Protestants claimed as their own exclusive property."[48] This was a polemical vision of the world, in which

Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745 (Cambridge, 1998); J. Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1660-88* (Cambridge, 1973).

[43] A. Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance: the Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism", in A. Marotti (Ed.), *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts* (Basingstoke, 1999), p. 85.

[44] T. Cogswell, "England and the Spanish Match" in R. Cust & A. Hughes (Eds.) *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (London/New York, 1988), pp. 107-33; ibid, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-24* (Cambridge, 1989), passim.

[45] C. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, 1983); A. J. Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London, 1981), pp. 407-19 in particular. J. Walter, "Anti-Popery and the Stour Valley Riots of 1642", in D. Chadd (Ed.), *Religious Dissent in East Anglia III: Proceedings of the Third Symposium* (Norwich, 1997), pp. 121-40; R. Clifton "The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution", *Past & Present* 52 (1971), pp. 23-55; ibid, "Fear of Popery" in C. Russell (Ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (London, 1973), pp. 144-67.

[46] Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, p. 32.

[47] Ibid, p. 32. T. H. Wadkins, "King James I meets John Percy, S. J.", *Recusant History*, 19 (1988-89), pp. 147-53.

[48] P. Lake, "Anti-Popery: the structure of a prejudice" in R. Cust & A. Hughes (Eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (London/New York, 1989), pp. 72-106.

history had unfolded as an incessant battle between True Church and False, with the Papacy acting throughout time as Christendom's great foil: Antichrist.[49] Rome was a foe both edifying and terrifying. Terrifying because of the superhuman scope of its malice, but edifying because by existing in opposition to it, Protestants proved themselves members of the Church of Christ. "The more we justify Christ" stated Richard Sibbes "the more we will be against Antichrist and his religion. We may know the owning of one truth by the vilifying of the other";[50] sentiments echoed with blunt simplicity by Robert Abbott: "the nearer the [Roman] Church, the farther from God."[51] As the great 'other', Rome defined Protestantism, and hatred brought the Godly nearer to Christ. Living under the shadow of Antichrist's attacks was a mandate for prejudice, and it was a minister's duty to weigh heavily against Rome, providing a diet of fear which instilled laymen with a keen awareness of Papal wiles, protecting them from succumbing to the Whore's temptations.[52] Prejudice was so integral to the Protestant sense-of-self that Anti-Catholicism became a political language, a solution to threats during times of crisis.[53]

Yet as Anthony Milton has shown, it is too simplistic to assume that this entrenched opposition stimulated an "allergic response" to all things Catholic.[54] Circumstance dictated that responses to Rome were multifaceted rather than monolithic: cross-confesssionalization was a norm of Early Modern England, a

---

[49] C. Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England* (2nd Edition: London/ New York, 1990); R. Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth century apocalypticism, millenarianism and the English Reformation: from John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman* (Oxford, 1978); S. A. Burrell, "The Apocalyptic Vision of the Early Covenanters", *Scottish Historical Review*, XLIII (1964), pp. 1-24; B. Capp, "Review: Godly Rule and the English Millenarianism", *Past & Present*, 52 (1971), pp. 106-17; S. Clark, *Vanities of the Eye: vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 161-203; K. Frith, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645* (Oxford, 1979); J. N. Hilgarth, "The Image of Alexander VI and Cesare Borgia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 59, (1996), pp. 19-29; W. M. Lamont, "Richard Baxter, the Apocalypse & the Mad Major", *Past & Present*, 55, (1972), pp. 68-90; ibid, *Godly Rule, Politics and Religion, 1603-60* (London, 1969).
[50] R. Sibbes, *Works*, ed. A. B. Grosart (7 vols, 1862-64), II, p. 164.
[51] R. Abbot, *The Third Part of the Defence of the Reformed Catholicke* (London, 1609), p. 99. See also W. Gouge, *Gods Three Arrows* (London, 1631), p. 188.
[52] Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, pp. 37-41.
[53] Lake, "Anti-Popery". On Anti-Catholicism as a powerful political language, see ibid, "Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match," *Historical Jounal*, vol. 25 (1982), pp. 805-826. M. Questier, "Practical Anti-papistry during the Reign of Elizabeth I", *Journal of British Studies*, 36, (1997), pp. 371–96. Anti-Catholic attitudes survived into the nineteenth century. See C. Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth-Century England* (Manchester, 1993); S. M. Griffith, *Anti-Catholicism and nineteenth century fiction* (Cambridge, 2004); W. L. Arnstein, *Protestant versus Catholic in Mid-Victorian England : Mr. Newdegate and the nuns* (Columbia, 1982); F. H. Wallis, *Popular anti-Catholicism in mid-Victorian Britain* (Lewiston, 1993).
[54] Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance", pp. 85-115. Quote at p. 86.

society littered with Catholic ideas and people.[55] Protestant scholars of logic, philosophy, philology, natural theology, ethics and biblical commentary were parasitic upon Roman thought.[56] More fundamentally, the faiths were not as compartmentalized in the clutter of everyday life as they were on the polemicist's page: even families of the staunchest Protestants contained a Catholic presence, and confessional plurality was an all too familiar feature of the Early Modern parish.[57] This Catholic presence was often an uncomfortable one, but the pragmatic demands of everyday life nevertheless necessitated a *de facto* toleration of the 'other' – the animus of Antichrist was blunted once it wore a human face, and relations between the two confessions were generally cool if not cordial.[58] Yet for Milton it was precisely this nearness which killed. Protestants were anxious that their polemical vision, their urge to distance themselves from Rome, had been diluted by the fudges of reality, an awareness which stimulated hatred: "violent Anti-Catholicism was intimately related to a policy of practical toleration: it was precisely because Roman Catholics were tolerated in practice that it was vital to attack their religion stridently on the level of theory."[59] Intolerance sprouted from tolerance – incendiary polemic was an outgrowth of confessional co-existence.[60]

In this thesis, however, polemic will be seen less as a *product* of anxiety than a means of *resolving* it. The emphasis of polemic was not wholly "theoretical": it was an *activity*, a manifestation of iconoclasm in another guise. Chapter Two demonstrates

---

[55] On the extent of Catholic books, see A. Walsham, "'Domme Books'? Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print" *Past & Present*, 168, (2000), pp. 72-123.

[56] Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance", pp. 92-99.

[57] Indeed, Catholicism was something on an invisible problem. 'Church Papists' – those who attended Church of England services but were suspected of being inwardly Catholic – were recognized as a common and unquantifiable problem. See A. Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woolbridge, 1993). Michael Questier has also highlighted how porous boundaries between confessions were in this period. M. C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: politics, aristocratic patronage and religion, c. 1550-1640* (Cambridge, 2006), passim.

[58] Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance", pp. 97-101. The thesis concerning the inter-relatedness of tolerance and intolerance was developed with characteristic subtlety by A. Walsham, *Charitable Hatred: tolerance and intolerance in England 1500-1700* (Manchester, 2005), passim. For a similar argument on European examples, see B. J. Kaplan, *Divided By Faith: religious conflict and the practice of faith in early modern Europe* (London, 2007). On the question of faiths co-existing see W. J. Sheils, "'Getting on' and 'getting along' in parish and town: English Catholics and their neighbours" in B. Kaplan, R. Moore & H. van Nierop , J. Pollman (Eds), *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands 1580-1720* (Manchester UP, 2009), pp. 67-83; ibid, "Catholics and their neighbours in a rural community: Egton Chapelry, 1590-1780", *Northern History*, 34 (1998), pp. 109-33.

[59] Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance", p. 98.

[60] On the importance of anxiety as a motor for Anti-Catholic activity, see also C. Z. Wiener, "The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism", *Past & Present*, 51, (1971), pp. 27-62.

that reading, writing and scoffing with polemic was a means of empowerment, a form of control over the enemy in print which belied the complexities of the 'real' world.[61] Like Wyatt's graffiti, the impetus of graphic satire was to subject the Pope to humiliation – doing so disparaged the enemy's doctrine, tainting the creed by besmirching its mouthpiece. Yet it was also to do more. Much polemical language, the agency which authors awarded their works, and the forms of shame levelled at the Pope in graphic satire, aped acts of punishment. This tied polemic to the power of laughter – scolding, mocking, hostile laughter – as a routine form of punishment in Early Modern society familiar in rites of shame. As with *charivari*, the imposition of stocks, or the intensely public abasement performed by penitents, graphic satire channelled shame and ridicule towards its victim as a punishment, a slight to reputation and honour by which a community exacted revenge upon transgressors. Anti-Papal satire, then, was not trifling but edifying and, like so many of the rites of shame in Early Modern society, a means of resolving anxieties.[62] Shaming cuckolds, husbands beaten by their wives and scolding or adulterous women was a means of re-asserting an ideal view of a patriarchal society in the face of anxieties caused by those who threatened to undermine it – similarly, shaming the Pope was an activity directed to resolving anxieties arising from another broken ideal, the presence of Catholics in the realm, and popish 'remnants' in its Church, both of which allowed Antichrist to squat in the New Jerusalem.[63]

The Pope was the Protestant hate figure *par excellence*, society's ultimate idolater. Idolatry was adultery against Christ, and it was consequently logical that the satirical punishments directed towards the Pope were indebted to the rites of shame unleashed upon sexual transgressors.[64] It is vital to understand that what occurred on the printed-page was indebted to the wider world – polemic was thus not concerned with the "theoretical" or abstract, but a continuation of iconoclasm in another form. Like the Pope's figure in print, punishments wrought upon Roman idols were shaped by judicial processes, fulfilling biblical sanctions against idolatry by inflicting capital punishment, or the smashing and cutting-off statues adulterous noses.[65] The

---

[61] See below, Chapter Two, pp. 79-103.
[62] Ibid, passim.
[63] K. Thomas, "The Place of Laughter in Tudor and Stuart England", *Times Literary supplement*, 21 Jan. 1977. pp. 77-81.
[64] For the links between idolatry and adultery, see below Chapter Two pp. 173-75
[65] V. Groebner, *Defaced: The Visual Culture of Violence in the Late Middle Ages,* trans. Pamela Selwyn (New York, 2004), pp. 67-86. For other manifestations of iconoclasm as punishment, see S.

coalescence of satire and punishment was exemplified in the treatment of illicit pictures during 1645, "burnt with the next Popish pictures by the hand of the hangmen": an iconoclastic satire burnt alongside idols, the one dishonouring the King, the other, Christ.[66] Laughter, then, was not frivolous but powerful, humour an essential part of political protest and polemical point-scoring. Indeed, Chapter Two suggests that graphic satire was an extension of libelling, shown by recent scholarship to have brought the rites of shame into texts as a means of treating politicians to indecorous handling in a nascent public sphere, punishing their transgressions and protesting against their policies.[67] The Pope was treated to a similar fate. Indeed, the urge to punish him was so entrenched in Protestant culture that during times of crisis political protest was galvinized behind an image of his mistreatment, Anti-Catholic ridicule a means of mobilizing support for agitationary movements.[68]

The Printed Image in Early Modern England

The printed image exists as a corner of the map of the post-Reformation world yet to be coloured in.[69] This is not because it delineates empty space. Indeed, notions of an

---

Michalski, *The Reformation & the Visual Arts* (London, 1993), pp. 76-77, 90-91 in particular; M. Warnke, "Durchbrochene Geschichte? Die Bildersturme der Wiedetaufer in Munster 1534-35" in ibid (Ed.) *Bildersturm. Die Zerstorung des Kunstwerkes* (Munich, 1973), pp. 65-98.

[66] *Arraignment, Conviction, and Imprisoning, of Christmas* (London, 1645), p. 6.

[67] P. Croft, "Libels, Popular Literacy and Public Opinion in Early Modern England", *Historical Research*, 68, (2007) pp. 266-85; A. Gordon, "The Act of Libel: Conscripting Civic Space in Early Modern England", *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 32, (2002), pp. 365-97; A. Bellany, "'Rayling Rymes and Vaunting Verse": Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603-1628', in K. Sharpe & P. Lake (Eds), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London & New York, 1994), pp. 285-310; ibid, "A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse: Puritanism, Libel, and Sedition After the Hampton Court Conference", *Journal of British Studies*, 34, (1995), pp. 137-64; ibid, "Singing Libel in Early Stuart England: The case of the Staines Fiddlers, 1627", *Huntington Library Quarterly* 69 (2006), pp. 177-93; ibid, "Libels in Action: Ritual, Subversion and the English Literary Underground, 1603–1642", in T. Harris (Ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, 1500-1850* (Basingstoke, 2001), pp. 99-124; T. Cogswell, "Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture", in S. Amussen & M. A. Kishlansky (Eds.), *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester, 1995), pp. 277-300; N. Cox, "Rumours and Risings: Plebeian Insurrection and the circulation of Subversive Discourse Around 1597", in D. Cavanagh & T. Kirk (Eds), *Subversion and Scurrility: Popular Discourse in Europe From 1500 to the Present* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 43-57; A. Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", *Past & Present* 145 (1994), pp. 47-83; ibid, "Popular Verses and Their Readership in the Early Seventeenth Century", in J. Raven, H. Small & N. Tadmor (Eds), *The Practice and Representation of Reading in England* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 125-37; A. McRae, "The Literary Culture of Early Stuart Libeling", *Modern Philology* 97 (2000), pp. 364-392; ibid, "The Verse Libel: Popular Satire in Early Modern England", in Cavanagh & Kirk (eds), *Subversion and Scurrility*, pp. 58-73.

[68] See below, Chapter Two pp. 71-79.

[69] Despite the calls of R. Porter, "Seeing the Past", *Past & Present*, 118 (1988), pp. 186-206. See also A. Walsham, "Impolitic Pictures: Providence, History and Iconography of Protestant Nationhood in

'iconophobic' culture are more the result of a paucity of scholarly interest than a scarcity of surviving materials – 5,000 largely unexamined book illustrations survive for the period 1534-1603 alone, and those of the seventeenth century, whilst more numerous, remain uncatalogued virgin territory.[70] The topography is beginning to be sketched in, however. The recent 'British Printed Image' digitization project has made the British Museum's rich holdings more readily viewable, and the accompanying volume edited by Michael Hunter has demonstrated that the virility of the visual in this period lay not only in the voluminous numbers of images, but also in the fecund nature of their employment – this collection of essays hammers-home the vitality of the visual to cultures religious, political and intellectual, and delicately amplifies the pivotal role it played in scientific advancement.[71] As one observer noted: "there is not any[thing] to be named, but you may not find it in Prints, if you go to a Shop that is well stored."[72] A rich visual culture clustered around printers' shops in the Royal Exchange at Cornhill and Pope's Head alley.[73] Here, during 1581, John Stow informs us, the public could satiate its curiosity regarding the appearance of the Queen's new beau, the Duc d'Alecon, whose "Picture, State & Titles, were advanced in every Stationers shop, and many other publique places."[74] Henry Peacham recommended those seeking the work of European masters look there – "for a bold touch, varietie of posture, curious and true shadow, emulate Goltzius, his prints are commonly to be had in Popeshead alley" – and Pepys recounted returning home via "the printed picture-seller's thence to the Exchange; and there did see great plenty of fine prints" after an evening spent admiring Peter Lely's portraits.[75] Fanning out from this cluster in a

---

Early Stuart England" in R. Swanson (Ed.), *The Church Retrospective: Studies in Church History*, 33, (1997), pp. 403-24; K. Sharpe, "So hard a text?": Images of Charles I, 1612-1700, *Historical Journal*, 43, (2000), pp. 383-406; ibid, "Representations and negotiations: texts, images, and authority in Early Modern England: a historiographical review", *Historical Journal*, 42, (1999), pp. 853-81.

[70] Luborsky & Ingram, *A Guide*, p. vii.. The exception is the work of E. Hodnett. See, *Five centuries of English Book Illustration* (Aldershot, 1988); *Francis Barlow* (London, 1978); ibid, *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustration of English Literature* (London, 1982); J. S. Purvis, "The use of continental woodcuts and prints by the 'Ripon School' of woodcarvers in the early sixteenth-century", *Society of Antiquaries of London* (Oxford, 1936), pp. 107-28.

[71] M. Hunter (Ed.), *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain* (Aldershot, 2010).

[72] H. Woolley, *Supplement to the Queen-like Closet*. In M. Jones, "How To Decorate A Room With Pictures, 1674", *Print Quarterly*, 20, (2003), pp. 247-49.

[73] A. Griffiths, *Print in Staurt Britain* (London, 1998), p. 14.

[74] Quoted in M. Jones, *The Print in Early Modern England* (New Haven/London, 2010), p. 2.

[75] H. Peacham, *The Compleat gentleman* (London, 1612), p. 108; R. C. Latham & W. Matthews (Eds.) *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, 11 vols (London, 1970-83), 8, p. 102. A. Munday, *Zelauto* (1580), a romance with 23 woodcuts, noted that "The Printer (you will say) hath printed it full of Pictures, to make it bought the better", 'to the reader' in Thomas Randolph's, *The Drinking Academy* (late 1620s), Simple keen to know if ballads sold by pedlar "Have they any fine pictures, I trow, at them?", T.

corner of London, the visual adorned the walls of every ale house in the city. As Swift noted: "ballads pasted on the wall/ Of Joan of France and English moll,/ Fair Rosamund and Robin Hood,/ The Little Children in the Wood."[76] Whilst the plural of anecdote is not data, the words of these contemporaries paint a picture of a culture that was far from visually aenaemic.

Scholarly myopia has resulted rather from the blinkers of assumption. Even those who have little knowledge of or interest in the period are aware of the 'Puritan Killjoy' tag which blights the legacy of the 'hotter sort' of Protestants. Puritan 'iconophobia' has been the focus of much scholarly attention in the wake of charges made by Patrick Collinson – the doyen of Early Modern Protestant historians – that the Reformation bequeathed a culture absolved of its imagery.[77] An element of logic underpins the assumption. At its most vengeful, Protestant iconoclasm seemed to have little inclination to discriminate in its destructiveness, ushering in a wave of purgation to which the entire material culture of late medieval Christianity fell victim. Beyond the purely pictorial all objects in Churches – monstrances, lamps, candlesticks, chalices, rood screens, and crucifixes – were 'idols', and it is not a huge leap of imagination to assume that this orgy of breaking and burning numbed aesthetic sensibilities, to imagine that the sparse nature of Protestant worship spawned an equally barren Protestant culture.[78] However, whilst Protestant attitudes were certainly iconosceptic, the case was not terminal – the Reformation may have severed imagery as a limb of religious devotion, but it did not render the death of art.

Iconoclasm was a righteous anger, a judicious punishment for idolatry. Violence meted out to images reprimanded their tricking laymen into a misdirection of attention, encouraging the bestowal of honour and reverence on men which rightly

---

Randolph, *The Drinking Academy*, (Ed.) S. A. Tannenbaum & H. E. Rollins (Cambridge, 1930), p. 22 lines 459-60.

[76] "ballads pasted on the wall/ Of Joan of France and English moll,/ Fair Rosamund and Robin Hood,/ The Little Children in the Wood." Swift, *Baucis and Philemon* (1709), cited in S. O'Connell, *The Popular Print in England, 1550-1850* (London, 1999), p. 18. For similar examples see T. Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety* (Cambridge 1991), p. 194. Interestingly, reports circulated of Catholic images being sold and displayed in households. R. Greene, *Menaphon* (1589), sigs, Aiii-Aiiii; T. Scott, *Second Part of Vox Populi* (1624), pp. 56-57; W. Burton, *Ten Sermons* (1602), p. 168; T. Fitzherberts, *A defence of the Catholyke cause* (Antwerp, 1602), p. 36; T. Taylor, *Christs combate and conquest* (1618), p. 298 .

[77] T. Watt, *Cheap Print & Popular Piety*, (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 134-39, 160-61; J. A. Knapp, *Illustrating the Past in Early Modern England: the Representation of History in Printed Books* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 17-19.

[78] Indeed, books and letters could also be treated as idols. G. Grote, "A Treatise on Four Classes of Subjects Suitable for Meditation" in J. Van Engen (Ed.) *Devotio Moderna* (Mahwah, NJ, 1988), p. 109; M. W. Cole & R. Zorach "Introduction" in ibid, (Eds), *The Idol in the Age of Art*, pp. 6-7.

belonged to God alone.[79] This vehemence was directly proportional to the visual's centrality in late medieval Christianity. Originally conceived as didactic tools, images quickly became pivotal devotional apparatus, passing beyond instructing the illiterate to become the crucial point of communion between worshipper and worshipped, the medium by which faith was experienced through veneration.[80] Depended upon, even loved, the multiplicity of image forms – paintings, stained glass, statues – and uses – on altars, in pilgrimages, processions, feast days and drama – attests to the primacy of the visual in the medieval experience of the divine: by the fifteenth century no portion of the Church was free from artistic embellishment.[81] Yet despite this prominence, images were never without their critics.[82] Rubbing against the grain of charity, offerings made to statues directed sustenance better distributed to the poor towards the inanimate, and as early as the 11th century Bernard of Clairvaux argued – in terms which Protestants would echo – that attention lavished on statues turned attention away from the realization of divine love in the community.[83] But imagery remained the primary medium of religious knowledge. For scholastics, all knowledge had its origins in the senses. Images not only provided models of instruction and emulation, but enraptured the memory with the Incarnation's mystery, awakening the 'mood' of devotion.[84] Spiritual ideas could be understood only by material manifestations – the origin of all spiritual thoughts in the believers' mind, imagery was the medium through which believers moved from the profane to the sacred, the material to the immaterial.[85] Carvings and statues were awarded such power because, in an age before Kepler, understandings of mankind's relation to the visible world were markedly different from our own. The world itself possessed agency, sight, tactility – emanating 'rays' or 'species' through space, objects touched the eye, and sight was a sense through which the world acted directly upon the viewer. Images were active, the eye passive; statues agents, eyes recipient.[86]

---

[79] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, p. 30.
[80] Ibid, p. 20.
[81] Ibid, p. 21.
[82] For medieval critics of the use of images, see Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, pp. 23, 25-26.
[83] Wandel, *Voracious Idols*, p. 38. See H. Latimer, *Sermons by Hugh Latimer*, ed. G. E. Currie (Cambridge, 1844) pp. 23-24; H. S. Darby, *Hugh Latimer* (London, 1953), pp. 45-47.
[84] Ibid, p. 38.
[85] J.H Van Der Veldt, "Imageless Thought", in *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. 7, pp. 369; J. Phillips, *The Reformation of Images* (London, 1973), p. 41.
[86] Ibid, p. 27.

It was precisely because of this agency that the Reformers feared idols. For when combined with mankind's predilection to sin, the evocative power of imagery's acting upon man could awaken in him the urge to idolatry, seducing him into endangering his soul.[87] This experience of the idols' power fired the urge to destroy them – as Karlstadt noted of his anxiety before statues: "I have in myself a harmful fear, which I would fain by rid of, but cannot."[88] Obliterating the object brought redress. Iconoclasm, then, was an act of self-preservation, a means of keeping men out of temptation's way. Idolatry consequently formed the locus of the Reformed assault upon Catholicism. Pruning idolatry from late medieval Christianity shaped the form which Protestant catechising took, the errors of the old way acting as a sounding-board against which Reformed doctrine was bounced-off in theological treatises.[89] Protestantism made Old Testament teachings against images more pronounced in the Christian faith than ever before, provoking a tampering with the Decalogue to give prohibitions against 'Graven Images' newfound pride-of-place.[90] In Catholicism – one primer declared – "every crime appertaineth to idolatry."[91] Protestant polemical caricatures posited that every Roman sin – every non-scriptural liturgical practice and doctrinal addition by which laymen's souls were ensnared – logically stemmed from the Pope's encampment as history's ultimate idol, usurping Christ's position as the sole avenue of grace. Playing the cruellest confidence trick in history, the Papacy headed a Church which fraudulently claimed to offer satisfaction for sins through a series of rites and devotions, causing men to trust in Rome over Christ. Luther's Faith Alone rejected this 'works' righteousness', spawning a severance from the imagery which had formed its focus. As salvation was a divine gift over which man had no influence, good works no longer earned laymen grace and

---

[87] Michalski, *Reformation & the Visual Arts*, p. 54.

[88] Quoted in ibid, p. 45. Medieval critics had noted that the quality of an image determined whether or not it became an idol – gold, decoration and preciousness were important to dazzling eyes. See G. Biel, *Canonis Misse Expositio*, ed H. A. Oberman & W. J. Courtenay (Wiesbaden, 1963-76) ii, 267.

[89] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, pp. 344-71.

[90] Beautifully charted in M. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, pp. 343-400. See T. Becon, *The Catechism of Thomas Becon*, ed. J. Ayre (Cambridge, 1844), pp. 59-60; E. Elton. *God's Holy Mind Touching Matters Moral* (London, 1625), p. 5; W. Perkins, *Warning Against Idolatry* (London, 1601), pp. 130-35 in particular for the distinction from Rome on the Decalogue; J. Seldon, *Table Talk*, (London, 1696), pp. 54-55. This must be seen as part of a fundamental shift in Christian ethics charted by John Bossy, "Moral Arithmetic: Seven Deadly Sins into Ten Commandments", E. Leites (ed.), *Conscience & Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*, (Cambridge/ New York, 1988), pp. 214-34. Whereas morality had previously been centred on good neighbourliness, it now became focussed on obligations to God.

[91] *A playne and godly exposition or declaration of the commune crede* (London, 1533), sig. Tiii.

consequently ceased to be the motor of devotion:[92] all prayers, pilgrimages, processions to saints, touching of relics and donations to images not only became useless to the believer, but were barred as an idolatrous offence to Christ, detracting from the significance of His crucifixion by suggesting that mankind's activities were meritous in obtaining salvation.[93] This great cull certainly left a Christianity that was visually barren, and the fear that any image in a religious setting could elicit idolatry has often been seen to have rendered artistic sensibilities outside the Church's walls equally quashed. 'Iconophobia' certainly became increasingly restrictive as the English Reformation progressed, with hostility towards the visual passing from images before eyes carnal to those in the mind.[94] For men like Edward Elton, even *imagining* an image of the divine endangered the soul by tempting illicit veneration, and triggered urgent reprimands against "inward idolatry of the heart, when men misconceiving God, do worship him according to the misconceit."[95]

Yet 'iconophobia' was as subtle as it was savage, an affliction tempered by considerations of subject and space. Prohibition did not fall upon 'art' as a category but specifically upon picturing the divine. Central here was a new understanding of God. Whilst for the scholastics all knowledge of the divine originated in the senses, for the Reformed God's essence was ultimately incomprehensible to mere man. Religious art was consequently a contradiction in terms: the notion that the infinite could be encapsulated in the finite absurd.[96] As Elton explained: "How is this God to be conceived by us? Not by framing any image: neither can we conceive him in his

[92] W. Lambarde, *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum & historicum. An alphabetical description of the Chief Places in England and Wales* (London, 1730). Original 1585, p. 88; Christensen, "Art", pp. 74-75; Davidson, & Eljenholm-Nichols, *Iconoclasm Vs Art & Drama*, pp. xii-xiv; Eire, *War Against the Idols*, p.1-2;Eire, "Iconoclasm", pp.305; Michalski, *The Reformation & The Visual Arts*, p. 40-64; Scribner, "Cult of the Saints", pp. 474-76.
[93] E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: traditional religion in England, c. 1400-1580* (New Haven/London, 1992), pp. 407, 488.
[94] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, passim. On the mind see pp. 452-66. See also, E. B. Gilman, *Iconoclasm & Poetry in the English Reformation* (London, 1986) for the effect of this mental iconoclasm on literature. J. Seldon, *Table Talk*, ed F. Pollock (London, 1927), p. 54.
[95] E. Elton, *Exposition of the Ten Commandments* (London, 1623), pp. 11-12. *Homilies. Certain Sermons of Homilies Appointed to be Reads in Churches in the Time of the late Queen Elizabeth* (Oxford, 1844), pp. 195, 202. See also J. Smyth, *The Works of John Smyth, Fellow of Christ's College, 1594-8*, ed. W. T. Whitley, 2 vols, (Cambridge, 1915), ii, p. 348; H. Wilkinson, *Babylon's Ruine, Jerusalems' Rising* (London, 1643), p. 31; J. Bradford, *Writings of John Bradford*, ed. A. Townsend (Cambridge, 1848), p. 153; *A bryefe and necessary Catechisme of Instruction* (London, 1577), sig. Aiii; *Short Catechism for Householders* (London, 1582), sig. Bvi.
[96] See the refutation of Catholic defences of representation. *A Godly and Necessary Admonition of the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent* (London, 1565), pp. 114-15. E. Cameron, "For Reasoned Faith of Embattled Creed? Religion for the people in Early Modern Europe" *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8, (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 173-74; Eire, "Iconoclasm", p .305; Michalski, *The Reformation & The Visual Arts*, pp. 47, 61-64.

glorious nature, but we are to conceive God, as he hath both revealed himself in his word, by his prospects and his works."[97] The most eloquent passages of the *Institutes* express Calvin's awe at God's omnipotence and His distance from man, a distance which medieval art misunderstood. For it was not purely that imagery was doomed to misrepresent the divine, but that attempting to do so dishonoured Him. "Too remote for people's gaze", God was imperceptible and indescribable – comparing Him to an object was effrontery of the highest order, impugning His glory and transcendence.[98] Yet despite this vehemence against depictions of divine *topos* Calvin stressed that God did not decree "all visible representations of every kind unlawful", reiterating continually that painting and sculpture were divine gifts, and encouraging the production of religious imagery "which can be presented to the eye" – that is, anything which did not impugn God's majesty.[99] It was the imaging of God, rather than imagery itself, which was illicit.

Bounds of subject were complemented by those of space. The problem here was mankind, not art; the misuse of the object, rather than the object itself. Given man's predilection to sin, it was specifically the presence of art in a religious environment which proved dangerous – he would undoubtedly venerate the visual within the temple, making an idol out of an image.[100] Matters were less urgent outside the Church's walls, however. Calvin noted that whilst God "wanted his temple to be free of images" he permitted a "liberal use of pictures" elsewhere, and both he and Zwingli encouraged the keeping of pictures, especially narrative scenes, within the home, the latter remarking "pretty pictures and statues give me so much pleasure."[101] There was thus no theological mandate for the death of art. 'Iconophobia' may have

---

[97] E. Elton, *Forme of Catechizing set downe by questions and answers* (London, 1616), sig, Aiiii.

[98] Quoted in Michalski, pp. 62-63. Cf. "We are similar to God only in our souls, and no image can represent him. That is why people who try to represent the essence of God are madmen. For even their souls of little worth cannot be represented. God is spirit – says the Scripture – and yet they want to give him a body...Since God has no similarity to those shapes by means of which people attempt to represent him, then all attempts to depict him are an impudent affront...to his majesty and glory."

[99] See J. Calvin, *Tracts & Treatises*, ed. H. Beaveridge, 3 Vols, (Edinburgh/ London, 1958), ii, pp. 58, 97-98; ibid, *Harmony of the Pentateuch* ed. C. William Bingham, 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1852), i, p. 388, ii, p.108; ibid, *Sermons on Deuteronomy*, (London, 1583), p. 138; ibid, *Commentary on the Acts*, ed. H. Beaveridge, 2 vols, (Edinburgh, 1966), ii, p. 10; ibid, *Commentaries on Isiah*, 2 vols, (Oregon, 1979), ii, pp. 25-27, 49; ibid, *Commentaries on the Book of Psalms*, ed. J. Anderson, 5 Vols, (Edinburgh, 1845), iv, pp. 347-48, 350; ibid, *Commentary on St. John*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1961), ii, p. 315; ibid, *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, p.114;Calvin, *Instructions in the Christian Faith*, p. 18; ibid, *Old Testament Commentaries: Ezekiel*, *Old Testament Commentaries: Ezekiel* ed. D. Foxgrover (Carlisle, 1994), pp. 151-52.

[100] See below, Chapter Two, pp. 127-28.

[101] Calvin, *Old Testament Commentaries: Ezekiel*, p. 203; Michalski, *The Reformation & The Visual Arts*, pp. 57, 70-71.

left the material culture of late medieval Christianity destitute, but it did not spawn an allergic reaction to all things visual. The Bremen Confession demonstrated that even an area as sternly Reformed as Calvinist North Germany permitted the keeping of images of Christ at home.[102] Similarly, as Tessa Watt demonstrated, for all the suspicion of imagery during England's long Reformation, religious depictions remained ubiquitous in the period's printed matter, typifying a culture not as "visually anorexic" as scholars would have us believe.[103]

Such work has been salutatory, but simply noting the *presence* of the visual in post-Reformation English culture does not get us very far in understanding its vitality. This thesis demonstrates that the story of the visual in this society was one of *development*, not mere *survival*. To tell this story, we must move beyond scholarship hampered by repetition. Work on the impact of the visual has been stuck in a groove, playing over and over the insoluable argument of audience. All scholars on the subject stand in Scribner's shadow. For Scribner the Reformers appropriated and ran with Gregory the Great's maxim that images were 'books for the illiterate'.[104] First uttered during the 6th century, this short-hand mantra for the place of the visual in Christianity – that in images even the unlearned could see models of 'Godly life' for emulation, even the unlettered could 'read' the fundamentals of faith – became a commonplace.[105] A fundamental part of the West's response to the Byzantine 'image crisis' of the 9th century, by the 12th it was imbued in Church writings at the point of assumption.[106] Its prevalence led Scribner to assume that in turning to the visual

---

[102] Michalski, *The Reformation & The Visual Arts*, pp. 70-71. For another continental example of the allowing of images, see B Heal, "Images of the Virgin Mary and Marian Devotion in Protestant Nuremburg", in H Parish, & W. G. Naphy (Eds.), *Religion and Superstition in Reformation Europe*, pp.25-46. Here the author shows that images continued to be used in churches and homes – she argues that idolatry ceased due to an education programme which instructed the laity that the images had no power and served as examples of virtue to be emulated.

[103] T. Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety*, pp. 134-39, 160-61. We must also remember that this was a period of much artistic patronage at the English court, with artists like Van Dyck, Hollar and Titian flourishing. O. Millar, Van Dyck & England (London, 1982); K. Hearn (ed.), *Van Dyck & Britain* (London, 2009); E. Griffey (ed.), *Henrietta Maria: piety, patronage and politics* (Aldershot, 2008); R. C. Strong, *Van Dyck: Charles I on Horseback* (London, 1972); G. Parry, *Hollar's England: a mid-seventeenth century view* (Salisbury, 1980); G. Tindall, *The Man Who drew London: Wenceslaus Hollar in Reality and Imagination* (London, 2002); R. T. Godfrey, *Wenceslaus Hollar: a Bohemian artist in London* (New Haven/London, 1994); A. M. Hind, *Wenceslaus Hollar and his views of London and Westminster in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1922).

[104] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. xxv, 18, 192, 213.

[105] Wandel, *Voracious Idols*, pp. 28-32, 40-41.

[106] *Patrologiae Latinae*, ed. J. P. Migne (Paris, 1860) vol. 77, col. 1128; G. B. Ladner, "Die Bilderstreit und die Kunst-Lehren der byzantinischen und Abendlandischen Theologie" in *Images and Ideas in the Middle Ages: Selected Studies in History and Art*, vol. 1, (Rome, 1983), pp. 26-32; Wandel, *Voracious Idols*, p. 28.

21

during the first generation of Protestantism, Lutheran reformers must have had the semi-literate in mind. For him the slew of propaganda which poured off the press was a means of politicization intended to incite action by eschewing complex theological problems and breaking the dispute between Luther and Rome down to the lowest common denominators – Good versus Evil, Christ versus Antichrist, Luther versus Pope – forcing the hesitant to take a side on ground that was heavily skewed in the evangelical's favour.[107] It was skewed by a repertoire of 'popular' cultural codes associating Lutherans with positive themes, tropes and values, and Rome with negative ones drawn from an iconography drenched in the bread and butter of popular parlance – carnival, festivity, scatology, astrology, parody – and consequently widening the numbers of people involved in the dispute: "If Reformation propaganda was highly successful it was because it relied so heavily on what was taken for granted in popular culture."[108] The clear, easily recognizable codes engaged those for whom the 'Religion of the Word' remained a closed book.

A classic of Reformation historiography, Scribner's thesis dominated scholarship on the question of imagery for a generation, with many scholars of the image outside Germany often assuming – uncritically – that they were equally fodder for the unlettered, a case recently questioned by Andrew Pettegree.[109] For Pettegree Lutheran Germany was the exception, not the rule, with the more iconoclastic – and ultimately decisive – 'Second Reformation' providing little evidence of a parallel 'popular' propagandist charge. In light of recent work criticizing Elizabeth Eisenstein's 'print revolution', Pettegree questioned the role of print as the pivot of the Reformation's "culture of persuasion" more generally, arguing against a mono-causal regimin of propaganda in favour of a multi-faceted and multi-media approach to the inculcation of Protestant doctrine, with music, drama and catechism all "elements of a complex programme."[110] This narrative downplays the image to the point of invisibility. Suggesting that Early Modern eyesight was too poor to delineate

---

[107] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: popular propaganda for the German Reformation* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. xiii-xxix, 37-59.
[108] Ibid, pp. 59-189 in particular. Quotation at p. 94.
[109] A. Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 102-27.
[110] Ibid, p. 2. E. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an agent of Change*, 2 vols, (Cambridge, 1979); A. Grafton, "The Importance of Being Printed", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 11, (1980), pp. 265-86; ibid, "How Revolutionary Was the Printing Revolution?", *American Historical Review*, 107, (2002), pp. 84-86; D. D. Hall, *Cultures of Print: Essays in the History of the Book* (Massachusetts, 1996); A. Johns, "How to Acknowledge A Revolution", *American Historical Review*, 107, (2002), pp. 106-25.

the fine details of engravings, Pettegree argued that even the lucky few capable of seeing prints clearly would have been unable to make much of what they saw – deeply allusive and reliant upon a convergence of complex visual vocabulary requiring a "freight of interpretation" to be unpicked, Early Modern satires were far beyond the capacity of Scribner's "simple folk."[111]

The debate is a hollow one. Questions of audience are frustratingly unsolvable: despite the vehemence of their assertion, arguments for 'popular' and 'elite' readership are built on only the slightest of edifices, for on the issue of viewership the archives treat us only to silence. Scholars of the book have presented swathes of work on marginalia in recent years, unpicking what readers made of their works, charting different reading practices and noting, above all, what people *used* their books for – the linear absorption of knowledge being far less common than an active and involved dialogue with the author, as books became something to think with as much as to learn from.[112] Image scholars are not so fortunate to have scraps of contemporary musings to work with – a handful of examples aside, surviving prints are largely devoid of their scribblings – but nonetheless a focus on the *use* of images is a more fruitful approach to the vitality of the visual in Early Modern culture, an argument made explicitly in Chapter One but implicit in the approach throughout this thesis.[113] Only when we consider the image's intrusion into so many areas of life and

---

[111] Pettegree, *Reformation*, p. 112. Other scholars who see as an elite medium, see K. Moxley, *Peasants, Warriors and Wives: Popular Imagery in the Reformation* (Chicago, 1989), passim.

[112] See W. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2007), passim; ibid, *John Dee: the politics of reading and writing in Early Modern England* (Amherst, 1995), passim; ibid, "The Marginal History of the Manicule," in R. Myers, M. Harris, and G. Mandelbrote (eds.), *Owners, Annotators and the Signs of Reading* (London, 2005), pp. 19-48 ; ibid, "On the Threshold: Architecture, Paratext, and Early Print Culture," in S. A. Baron, E. Lindquist, and E. Shevlin (eds.), *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies and the Legacy of Eisenstein* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), pp. 67-81; ibid, "'Rather soiled by use': Attitudes Towards Readers' Marks," *The Book Collector,* 52, (Winter 2003),pp. 471-90 ; ibid, "What Did Renaissance Readers Write in Their Books?" in J. Andersen and E. Sauer (eds.), *Books and Readers in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia, 2002), pp. 119-37 ; ibid, "'The Book thus put in every vulgar hand': Marking Readers in Early English Printed Bibles," in Paul Saenger and Kimberly Molanari (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The First Printed Editions* (London, 1999), pp. 125-33 ; N. S. Amos, A. Pettegree, & H. Van Nietrop, (eds), *The Education of a Chrisitan Society: Humanism & Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands* (Aldershot, 1999); G. Baumann, (Ed.), *The Written Word: Literacy in Transition* (Oxford, 1986); R. Chartier, *The Culture of Print in Early Modern France* (Princeton, 1987); J. Crick, & A. Walsham, (Eds), *The Uses of Script & Print, 1500-1700* (Cambridge, 2004); E. Duffy, "A Very Personal Possession", *History Today* (November, 2006), pp. 12-13; A. Grafton, & L. Jardine, "How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy", *Past and Present,* 129, (1990), pp. 30-78; J. N. King, "Guides to Reading Foxe's Book of Martyrs", *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 68 (2005), pp. 133-50; K. Loveman, *Reading, Fiction, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot, 2008); E. B. Tribble, *Margins and Marginality: the printed page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville/ London, 1993).

[113] There are a handful of exceptions in the British Musuem.

learning and consider how the image was deployed on the page by authors who turned to it, unlocking the ways in which it complemented and amplified the textual, do we grasp the vibrancy of the visual in a post-Reformation culture whose 'iconophobia' served as a stimulus not a terminus.[114]

This requires us to understand that a change occurred in the point of reference used when turning to the image. Despite the assumption of Scribner and his followers, the Reformed were deeply suspicious of claims that images were laymen's books. For Calvin, images of God deluded rather than informed - "Their final subterfuge is the statement that these are books for the poor in spirit...I do not see what advantage simpletons could derive from images" – sentiments echoed by John Hooper: "A man may learn more of a live ape than of a dead image, if both should be brought into the school to teach."[115] Rather than conceiving of them as 'books for the illiterate', in justifying images' deployment Protestant authors noted – almost without fail – that they were used to make a work's arguments "livelier" for readers.[116] This term forces us to understand that attitudes to images were conditioned as much by the verve of Renaissance rhetoric as the constraints of Reformed iconophobia. Chapter One demonstrates that images were intended to 'delight' viewers, a rhetorical concept which understood arguments to be made more forcefully and effectively when they stimulated the senses alongside invigorating the mind.[117] Richly allusive and emblematic, engravings were to be poured over, to be grappled with: far from being 'books for the illiterate', their intention was to obfuscate, not to clarify. This was a fundamental part of learning. By inviting viewers to unravel a puzzling web of allusions and intrigues an image imparted its truths with greater force. They flattered the viewer and edified their cleverness, as well as heightening the impact of a text through a series of rhetorical strategies – title-pages advertised the work's merits and summarized its arguments' in an emblematic fashion. Developing this, Chapter Four –

---

[114] See below, Chapter One. I have been influenced here by W. I. Homer, "Visual Culture: A new paradigm", *American Art* (1998), pp. 6-9; L. Jordanova, *Defining Features: Scientific and Medical Portraits, 1660-2000* (London, 2000); L. Jordanova, "The Portrait Transaction", *BBC History Magazine, 7*, number 9, pp. 26-28; M. R. Miles, *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity & Secular Culture* (Boston, 1995), passim.
[115] Quoted in Michalski, *Reformation & the Visual Arts*, p. 64; J. Hooper, *Early Writings*, (Parker Society:15, Cambridge, 1843), p. 322.
[116] The term was a commonplace. For some examples, see J. Bastwick, *The confession of the faithfull witness of Christ* (London, 1641), title-page; *Newes from Rome, Spaine, Palermo, Genevie and France* (London, 1590), sig. A2; T. L, *Babylon is fallen* (London, 1620), sig. A2; P. Forbes, *An Exquisite Commentary* (London, 1613), p. 69.
[117] See below, Chapter One, pp. 38-51.

a close reading of Stephen Bateman's *A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation* (1569) and Jan Van der Noot's *A Theatre of Volumptuous Worldlings* (1569) – highlights the critical role of the emblem.[118] If images no longer held a devotional role in Protestant liturgy, being no more a by-way to knowledge of the divine, in these emblem books they retained a place in Protestant piety. Here Anti-Catholic images made the brain tick rather than the blood boil, for grappling to understand these opague Anti-Papal representations of sin was to inspire in Protestant readers an urge to deny the flesh; musing on images of Rome, the great 'other', a means of driving pious viewers to repentance. Here both image and prejudice were being *used* – the picquancy of the visual putting hatred to work to inspire self-reformation.[119]

 . The power of images, then, was allusive rather than instantaneous, reliant upon interpretation to be effective. We must consequently question their utility as 'propaganda'. Indeed, prints rarely sought to inform. Recent scholarship on the impact of print in England has highlighted the wealth of printed genres as evidence of a burgeoning 'news' culture, part of a nascent 'public sphere' in which the populace was increasingly aware of and invested in the religio-political concerns of the day.[120] Chapters One and Three suggest that engravings must be understood as distinct from 'news.' Rarely imparting information to audiences, prints rather assumed a 'knowing viewer' – a viewer with a detailed awareness of contemporary politics – for their satirical bite to take hold. They consequently existed as *commentary* rather than

---

[118] A. Adams, & A. J. Harper, (Eds.), *The Emblem in Renaissance and Baroque Europe: Tradition and Vareity* (Leiden, New York, 1992); M. Corbett, & R. Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces* (London, 1979); P. M. Daly, (Ed.), *The European Emblem – Towards an Index Emblematicus* (Waterloo, 1980); P. M. Daly, & G. R. Dimler, (Eds.), *Corpus Emblematum – The Jesuit Series*, 4 vols (Toronto, 2000); H. Diehl, *An index of icons in English Emblem Books, 1500-1700* (Norman/ London, 1986); L. Grove, *Text/Image Mosaics in French Culture: Emblems and Comic Strips* (Ladershot, 2005); C. Moseley, *A Century of Emblems – An Introductory Anthology* (Aldershot, 1989); D. Russel, "The term 'Embleme in sixteenth century France", *Neophilologus*, 59, (1975), pp. 37-51; ibid, *The Emblem and Device in France* (Kentucky, 1985).
[119] See below, Chapter Four, passim.
[120] Watt, *Cheap Print*; J. Raymond, *News, newspapers and society in Early Modern England* (London, 1999); ibid, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003); ibid, *The invention of the newspaper: English newsbooks, 1641-49* (Oxford, 1996); J. Peacey, *Politician and Pamphleteers: propaganda during the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004); K. Sharpe, *Reading Revolutions: the politics of reading in Early Modern England* (New Haven, 2000); S. N. Zwicker, *Lines of Authority: politics and English literary culture, 1649-89* (Ithaca, 1993); K. M. Sharpe & S. N. Zwicker (Eds.), *Reading, Society and politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003); K. Loveman, *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: deception in English literary and political culture* (Aldershot, 2008); A. J. Bellany, *The politics of court scandal in Early Modern England: news culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1666* (Cambridge, 2002); K. Peters, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers* (Cambridge, 2004); A. Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print: pamphlets and the public sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1997); J. M Lander, *Inventing Polemic: religion, print and literary culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2006).

news.[121] This distinction forces us to move away from the shadow of Scribner in terming prints 'propaganda' – they rarely sought to convert our 'knowing viewer' to their position (indeed, we must assume that most seventeenth century Protestants shared their Anti-Catholic sentiments) but rather to edify views and positions already held, awakening zeal and galvinzing allegiance to Protestantism rather than *instilling* it. This had its own power. Engravings commonly adorned the walls of homes and ale houses – at times of crisis, this acted as a marker of affiliation. As Chapter Three demonstrates, printed images passed into tapestry, paintings, Church brass and, by the time of the Exclusion Crisis, a wealth of what is termed 'Protestant Kitsch', as the vehicle by which the 'hotter sort' of Protestants expressed commitment to Church reform and protested against the prevailing political winds of the day.[122] By the latter period this group – commonly seen a rootedly 'iconophobic' – utilized image-laden cards, tiles, daggers and engravings alongside the monumental Pope Burning Processions of 1678-81 as part of a culture of agitation, opposition uniting behind a common Anti-Catholic imagery.

The power of this imagery was once again indebted to the Renaissance, an expression of a concept of memory constructed around a striking image, its sensual power nudging the mind into remembering.[123] Chapter Three details the history of one such visual monument to England's Anti-Catholic past – Samuel Ward's *Double Deliverance* (1621) – to demonstrate the power which the visual retained as a silent emblem of protest, bequeathing Whigs and Tories a visual vocabulary through which to debate their conflicting visions of the past, present and future. Image here existed as a commonplace of Protestant political culture, and one which scholars have neglected.

None of this seeks to deny the primacy of the ear over the eye in Protestantism – hearing the Word was resolutely the way to salvation and knowledge of Christ, the means by which Faith was awakened in laymen. It asserts, rather, that this shift of emphasis did not cause the visual to expire as a powerful form of expression in post-Reformation culture. Whilst the Reformation refuted images as vehicles of devotion, Protestantism was not a rejection of the eye – rather, as Chapters Two and Five demonstrate, it was the replacement of one way of seeing with another, the casting out

---

[121] See below Chapter One, pp. 29-37, 60-70.
[122] See below, Chapter Three, pp. 230-39.
[123] Wandel, *Voracious Idols*, pp. 32-33.

of a devotional sight for an interpretative one. Chapter Five demonstrates that this found its major concern in unlocking the divine emblems of Revelation. The visual here proved critical for the Reformed, these visions central to their identity and sense of the past. Industries of interpretation were devoted to unravelling this series of mysterious allegories shown by Christ to St. John, in which history and the immediate future were mapped-out by God to comfort the Elect amidst the persecution they would endure during the Last Days, a painted promise of eternal salvation present in scripture. There were images through which Protestants forged their identity: unpicking the minutiae of these opaque emblems was a major theological concern, demarcating Rome the persecuting False Church, the great 'other' of history, essential to decking Protestants the persecuted members of Christ.[124] In this, the visible world became an emblem of history's 'truth' – the Pope's rites, dress and actions pointing beyond themselves as marks of Antichrist outlined in Revelations 13 and 17.[125]

In viewing Rome, then, it was vital to *look* rather than just to *see*. For all the extensiveness of Protestant iconoclasm, Rome's idols retained a prominence before Reformed eyes as a means of negative affirmation. Iconoclasm was concerned with more than oblivion, and the aim here is to inject its study with nuance. The mutlifarious nature of European iconoclasm – the speed at which destruction occurred, the legality of its proceedings, the status of the actors involved, and the plethora of ritual forms which desecration took – demonstrated that destruction was ultimately creative, that this was an activity which *meant* something.[126] Lee Palmer Wandel has posited iconoclasm as an act through which the laity at large entered the Reformation, an empowering activity which shaped the form of Christianity to which they wanted to belong.[127] For these Protestants iconoclasm was ultimately a means of control, a way of building their own Church – so on the page Protestant identity was constructed by controlling the idols of the enemy. Chapter Two demonstrates that nominally 'accurate' depictions of Roman rites were placed before Protestant viewers, a form of iconoclastic sight both reducing icons from sacred to Anti-Christian and

---

[124] Lake, "Anti-Popery", passim.

[125] See below, Chapter Five, pp. 337-45.

[126] On variety of acts of violence, see Michalski, pp. 75-98; N. Z. Davis "The Rites of Violence" in her *Society and Culture in Sixteenth Century France* (London, 1975), pp. 152-88. For a perceptive essay on the problems raised by the multiplicity of the practices of destruction, see McColl, "Ad Fontes: Iconoclasm by Water in the Reformation World", in Cole & Zorach (Eds), *The Idol in the Age of Art*, pp. 183-214.

[127] Wandel, *Voracious Idols*, pp. 1-25, 53-102 & 190-98 in particular.

constructing the 'Truth' of Protestantism against the 'other'.[128] Indeed, both actual acts of iconoclasm and those conducted on the polemicist's page shared the same purpose: winning the argument. As David Freeburg noted of Protestant Churches littered with scarred idols: "The aim was to render images powerless, to deprive them of those parts which may be considered to embody their effectiveness."[129] As monuments to their own profanity, they 'proved' Protestant claims to Truth. Printed idols were equally empowering. Far from a blunted sense, sight remained essential to the Protestant sense of self. It was a commonplace that Rome's followers saw incorrectly – dazzled by Antichrist's 'deluding shows' (2 Thessalonians 2) and blinded to follow the Papal Whore of Babylon to damnation, they had been conned by the greatest confidence trick of all time. That Protestants beheld Antichrist's idols and were not blinded, but rather saw them for what they truly were – base wood, stone and paint – was recognition of Election, a sign that they did not partake in the False Church.[130] As John Prideaux, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford, noted: "to hate the abomination of Popery....is an evidence of a soule prepared, for the entering and relishing" of the Word.[131] If sight was edifying, prejudice, it seems, was efficacious.

---

[128] See below, Chapter Two, pp. 103-28.

[129] D. Freedberg, "The Structure of Byzantine and European iconoclasm" in A. Bryer & J. Herrin (Ed.) *Iconoclasm* (Birmingham, 1977), p. 169.

[130] See below Chapter Two, pp. 103-28 & Chapter Five, pp. 337-45.

[131] J. Prideaux, *Ephesus Backsliding* (London, 1614), p. 38. Cf. T. Beard, *Antichrist the Pope of Rome* (London, 1625), sig *2: "The more wee know and detest Antichrist, the more enamored are we with Christ, and long for his coming, and desire the full revelation of his glory."

Chapter 1: Using Images

The dog which emptied its bladder on a monk's slipper stood as a fitting mascot of intention in a print which existed solely to piss on the papists [Fig.12.][1] Viewers were invited to bask in Rome's humiliation. Engraved by Thomas Cockson, the *Revels of Christendom* (1609) was modelled after a Dutch print of 1598 which had sought to steel Protestant resolve, bracing the Godly for renewed Habsburg hostility, yet providing a soothing re-assurance that as God's people they would inevitably prevail in a war of attrition between Good and Evil [Fig. 13.][2] Cockson's print, however, had no such lofty intentions – it did not intend to influence allegiances, edify resolves, or change opinions. It was simply an allegorical commentary upon the woes of international Catholicism, and one which sung ardently to the choir. On the far left, James I beat the Pope at backgammon. The pontiff – a sore loser – "frets and swears" as he gambled away various liturgical paraphernalia and a pax, which the King reached to claim. This pax was a pun on the print's real occasion: the Twelve Years Truce (1609) which ended over forty years of warfare between Spain and the United Provinces, celebrated here as an embarrassing blow to Catholic hegemony in Europe.[3] All but one of the cast of characters had been involved in brokering the Truce. Next to James sat Henry IV of France – who alongside the English King had been instrumental in the negotiations – and Christian IV of Denmark, James's brother-in-law and a celebrated Protestant champion.[4] They served defeats to the monks at cards and dice, respectively, as the Dutch Stadtholder Maurice of Nassau watched with

---

[1] F. G. Stevens & D. M. George, (Eds.), *Catalogue of political and personal satires preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, 11 vols, (London, 1874-1954), no. 81. Henceforth, BM Sat.

[2] BM 1871, 1209.970. c.1598-1600 (see W. Harms, *Deutsche Illustrierte Flugblätter des 16 und 17 Jahrhundets* (Tübingen, 1985), no. 340), the text refers to "broeder Franciscus", Francisco de Mendoza who led the Spanish troops in the Netherlands from 1598. A. M. Hind, *A History of Engraving & Etching from the 15th century to the year 1914* (3rd ed., New York, 1963), p. 458

[3] See G. Parker, *The Dutch Revolt* (London, 1970), pp. 231-40 for background.

[4] Parker, *Dutch Revolt*, p. 239; Peter Limm, *The Dutch Revolt, 1559-1648* (London/ New York, 1989), pp 64-67. Initial negotiations had stalled when the Provinces refused to grant Spain's calls for toleration of Catholics in Dutch lands and the ceasing of Dutch trade in the Indies. It seems that Henry IV was concerned about being dragged into a war, and in order to negotiate these kinks suggested a long truce rather than a Peace treaty. Christian IV had visited England in 1606, and as James I's brother in law was hailed as a Protestant Prince. See *The king of Denmarkes welcome* (London, 1606); John Davies, *Bien Venu, great Britanes welcome to hir greate freinds, and deere bretherne the Danes* (London, 1606); Henry Roberts, *The most royall and honourable entertainment, of the famous and renowned King, Christien the fourth, King of Denmarke* (London, 1606); ibid, *Englands farewell to Christian IV, famous king of Denmarke* (London, 1606). They have dedicatory maxims above their heads. For his role in the truce, Henry IV has 'Cor unum, ia una' (taking a single road together'); Christian IV has 'Et fortis & fidus' (strong and trusty).

glee.[5] The armoured Cardinal who used his spiked crozier in an attempt to prevent James from 'winning' the peace was the Archduke Albrecht of Austria, governor of the Netherlands and orchestrator of the wars which "trobleth all christendome."[6] The Truce – which had emerged from Spain's financial exhaustion - was a humiliation of the highest order. Not only had Spain failed to secure liberty for Catholics resident in the United Provinces, or safeguarded its trading posts, it had been forced to recognize heretical rebels as an independent state with religious freedoms, the ultimate affront to a sovereign nation.[7] It was thus mocked as a blow to the post-Tridentine Church. Maurice, who had 'laid a wager' on the outcome of the revels, took away:

> "So mutch, that Rome no more dare Bett or Play,
>
> Her Crosses, Crucifixes, Myters, Cowles,
>
> And all the Netts, she throwes out to catch sowles,
>
> Rome now hath lost, Shee, that did all desire,
>
> Is left more-bare, than a bald, shaven Frier."

Catholic assaults in the Netherlands were deemed over – Rome's impotence was akin to the humiliated monk who had gambled away his clothes.[8]

---

[5] Parker, *Dutch Revolt*, pp. 228-9. Maurice was the son of William of Orange, the Stadholder of Holland, Guelderland and Zeeland, and had been in charge of the Dutch army since 1591, recovering much of the North East between 1591-94. His maxim reads 'sic transit Gloria Romae' (so cross Rome's ambition.')

[6] The figure whom I have identified as Albrecht is simply labelled "Austria" and "Cadrinal" in the print. Stephens, *Catalogue of Prints*, pp. 42-4, suggested that he was the Cardinal Infante Ferdinand (the younger son of Philip III of Spain and Margaret of Austria) but he was not born until 1609. Albrecht von Austria (1559-1621) was the son of Emperor Maximilain II and the Infanta Maria of Spain and brother of the future Emperor Rudolf II. He became a Cardinal in 1577, was Apostolic Nuncio and Papal legate in Portugal (1580-85) and Viceroy of Portugal (1585-95). Philip II made him governor of the Netherlands in 1595. He gave up his role as Cardinal reluctantly in 1598 to marry the Infanta Isabella of Spain at Philip's bequest. The Spanish king allowed them to rule the Netherlands as 'Archdukes'. Under this role, he was involved in running Spannish military forces in the Netherlands – thus his maxim read 'per bellum, mihi pax' (through war I bring peace), a swipe at his role in initiating discussion for the Truce. Thus, although not a Cardinal at the time of Cockson's print it seems the clerical dress was erroneously included to keep in line with the theme of the Roman Church, whose team included monks and the Pope.

[7] Limm, *The Dutch Revolt*, pp. 64-67; Parker, *Dutch Revolt*, pp. 239-40; K. H. D. Haley, *The Dutch in the seventeenth century* (London, 1972), p. 102.

[8] See also BM Sat. 101 in which this print was reversed and re-printed. This print probably dates from the late 1620s. James I has been replaced by Charles I, Henry IV of France (d. 1610) by Christian IV of Denmark, and Christian IV by Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, and Maurice of Nassau by the Transylvanian military leader Bethlen Gabor (died 1629, so the print could have been no later than this.) A German version was printed in 1633, see R.J. Paas, *The German Political Broadsheet 1600-1700. Vol. 6 1633-1648* (Wiesbaden, 2002), P-1920.

This print, then, was pure titillation. It celebrated, rather than inculcated; mocked rather than informed. Indeed, it assumed a deeply knowledgeable readership – the character's names were not given, nor were the fact of the Truce or its significance directly mentioned. To pour scorn on Rome, Cockson had reduced very complex political affairs to a scabrous allegory which commented on the issues of the day rather than expounding them, striving for satire rather than pedagogy. The viewer's hostility to Rome here was *assumed*. Polemic it may have been, but rather than a decisive attempt to persuade or win readers over to a given position it engaged in a deliberate obfuscation which the *knowing* viewer was to revel in unravelling. Unlike a text, the engraving did not simply denote. There was no linear absorption of knowledge as viewers' eyes passed from left to right, but rather layers of allusion were revealed through a game with the artist, moving around the image and to-and-from the text below to unpick the scene. As viewers did so, humiliation was heaped upon humiliation, one burst of laughter echoed into another. The frustration of the monk who played maw with Henry IV was revealed slowly, and was not immediately apparent until stock is taken of the cards which they held. In this game the highest cards were the ace and knave of the trump suit (hearts in this case) respectively.[9] Holding the latter, the monk had a strong hand. Yet he managed to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory, finding himself doubly trumped: not only did the King hold the superior Ace in reserve, he had played the 'Five Finger' (Five of Hearts), a wild card which came up trumps in any hand. The friar lost all pluck:

"France sets gould,

& shuffles: the monk cutts: but France (being bould)

Deales freely: Rubs: and the first card hee shows

Is the Five Finger, which being tour'nd up, goes

Cold to the Moncks hart: the next card, France sees

In his owne hand, in the Ace of hartes, 'I leeze'

Cryes out the Monck: says France, 'show what you have'

---

[9] For the rules of maw (which are incomplete) see, *The groome-porters lawes at Mawe, to be obserued in fulfilling the due orders of the game* (London, 1600). The 'Five Finger' is not mentioned in these rules, but is discussed in Barnaby Rich's *Greene's News From Hell* (London, 1593), sig. Aiii: "although the knave of trumpes be the seconde carde at Mawe, yet the five-finger may commaunde both him and all the rest of the pack." Cf. J. Milton, *Newes from Hell, Rome and the Innes of Court* (London, 1642), p. 23.

The Monck could show France nothing but the knave."[10]

The subtlety of the joke was not immediately apparent - it had to be unravelled. Similarly, only upon reaching the end of the verse do readers learn that Rome had lost despite playing with loaded dice, causing them to stomp-off petulantly: "[Rome] swore/ Shee would with Thos 4 Gamsters play no more."[11] The effect of this array of puns, jokes and allusions was kaleidoscopic – as barbs were yielded up slowly, and scorn was poured upon scorn, the knowing viewer, like the dog, was to revel in their coalescent pissing on the papists.

But preaching to the converted did not make this print a trivial by-product of the age's prejudices. Just as sermons continually re-iterated themes to edify confessional positions, works like Cockson's renewed and rekindled binding values, validating a sense of Protestant superiority over Catholicism, in this case a deeply ridiculous foe. This forces us to re-evaluate the historiographical commonplace that image in Early Modern Europe served as 'propaganda.' Satires are often seen as the strongest string in the Protestant propagandist's bow, allowing them to impress views upon a (largely illiterate) audience, creating new ideologies and dismantling old ones.[12] But images were not formidable weapons of conversion, and, as this chapter argues, were rarely *intended* to be. They were rather objects marketed to a populace constructed not of empty vessels waiting to be filled, but of politically-minded people with religious views and prejudices. Here discussions of 'propaganda' have fallen down, occurring through the teleological lens of the twentieth century, and projecting the spectre of the all pervasive Big Brother onto the past, a spectre which would have

---

[10] BM Sat. 81.

[11] Ibid.

[12] See, R. W. Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda of the German Reformation* (2nd Edition: Oxford, 1994), pp. xiii-xxviii for a summary of the argument; ibid, "Incombustible Luther: The Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany", *Past and Present*, 110, (1986) pp. 38-68; ibid "The Reformation and the Image" in L. Roper & R. Samuel (Eds.), *Disciplines of Faith* (London/New York, 1987), pp. 139-49. Scribner was closely followed by C. Anderson, "Popular Imagery in German Reformation Broadsheets" in G. P. Tyson and S. S. Wagonheim, *Print and Culture in the Renaisance. Essays on the Advent of Printing in Europe* (Newark, 1986), pp. 120-50. His thesis determined the way in which images are seen as 'popular' in all parts of Reformation Europe, see A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), p. 36. See also, E. H. Gombrich, "The Cartoonist's Armoury" in his *Mediations on a Hobby Horse: and other essays on the theory of art* (London/New York, 1978); Sheila O'Connell, *The Popular Print in England* (London, 1999), pp. 129-38 (p. 129: "popular prints were perfect vehicles for propaganda. They were designed for wide distribution at low cost. Their images were simple and direct, and subjects were chosen to have wide appeal.") A. Walsham, *Charitable Hatred* (Manchester, 2006), p. 174: "in an age of limited literacy, pictures were particularly crucial in embedding martyrs in the popular memory."

been unfamiliar to Early Modern people. Moreover, it is a blanket term which robs the discussion of any specificity – 'propaganda' can persuade, or manipulate; communicate ideas, or indoctrinate; inform, or control.[13]

For R. W. Scriber visual 'propaganda' proved decisive in making the Reformation 'popular' – the vehicle of visual culture breaking barriers of literacy and orality, taking evangelical theology and Anti-Catholicism to broad swathes of the semi-literate population for whom the religion of the Word had remained a closed book.[14] For Scribner, the choice between Rome and Luther was reduced to the crudest terminology and stereotypes – God or devil, True Church or False, Christ or Pope – in what amounted to a processing of the indecisive, poking them to choose a pole to cling to.[15] Accepting the long-followed maxim of Gregory the Great that images were 'books for the unlettered', Scribner suggested that by deploying an immediately comprehensible iconography resplendent with images lifted from folklore, popular belief and culture, broadsides had an immeasurable effect in politicising the populace.[16] This visual strain worked in conjunction with a thriving oral culture, the texts which accompanied woodcuts being read aloud by one literate person to a group.[17] Here Scribner's biggest critic, Andrew Pettegree, took issue, highlighting that the prevalence of group reading has been asserted rather than proven and hangs from a labile thread of evidence.[18] Expressing scepticism about the iconography's immediacy, Pettegree noted that satires were often densely complex and obtuse, and at times entirely reliant upon the text to be unpacked. Furthermore, in the volume of images produced Germany was the exception rather than the rule - in other 'popular' Reformations like France and the Netherlands images were decidedly less visible.[19]

Such critique is prodding rather than probing. Tracing the spotlight over the holes in one thesis, Pettegree succeeded only in highlighting a series of insoluble problems, for the histories of oral culture and reading are recorded, for the most part,

---

[13] For an interesting discussion of the term see T. String, *Art and Communication in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 2-5, 14-16, 31-44.

[14] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. xiii-xxviii, 1-8.

[15] Ibid, pp. xxii-xxiii.

[16] Ibid, pp. xvi-vii. Thus Scribner noted the limitations of the methods of Panofsky in understanding Reformation iconography, for the study of 'iconography' pre-supposed that the icons had classical lineage, rarely the case in a tradition built on popular themes/motifs. For Gregory the Great see ibid, p. xxv.

[17] Ibid, pp. xiv-xv, 2-4, 132. For Scribner this was hardly surprising, given that the world of the sixteenth century was still a "profoundly oral" culture (p. xv).

[18] A. Pettegree, *Reformation and the culture of persuasion* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 102-27.

[19] A. Pettegree & M. Hall, "The Reformation & the Book: a reconsideration", *Historical Journal*, 47, (2004), pp. 785-808.

in silence. Rather than evaluating the importance of polemical imagery, as Pettegree does, on the grounds of circulation and audience – areas in which evidence is scant – we should rather examine how images were *used* in the works in which they appeared. Doing so allows us to understand that images were never *intended* to be pedagogic in the way that Scribner described – they were not tools of conversion or sources of information, but part of the chatter of political views expressing or edifing positions which already existed. In England this was shown most simply by the prevalence of Anti-Catholic imagery *after the fact* of the Reformation.[20] Only in the seventeenth century, once hostility was entrenched, did visual polemic become commonplace. These images were not produced as pap for the unlettered: there was not a separate category of 'print' existing independently of 'text', it was never images for the 'simple folk' and books for the educated, but always a coalescence of the two. In books, Anti-Catholic illustrations served not as the primary point of persuasion but as markers, tone-setters announcing significant events in the narrative and celebrating Protestant victories; or provoking emotional responses to Catholicism's evil, conditioning readers' reactions to what followed. Above all, images on the page invested the written word with authority, functioning like stamps and seals to provide a validation of a text's contents both cursory and crucial.

I: Anti-Popery for the Powerful

Gregory's mantra that images were 'books for the unlettered' has become less of a guide for approaching the subject matter than a cataract for the way in which images are viewed.[21] Undoubtedly true of much medieval Church art, it was not the dominant way in which images were used in this period.[22] Authors of much visual 'propaganda' did not set their sights upon the semi-literate at all. Dutch representations of Elizabeth I were aspirational, seeking to prompt the Queen to fulfil her role as Godly matriarch and champion the Protestant cause in her foreign policy. A medal of 1587 depicted the Queen trampling the seven-headed Roman Antichrist as the Earl of Leicester stood by in a protective stance, accompanied by five kneeling putti sporting the

---

[20] See Appendix 1.
[21] M. U. Edwards, *Printing, Propaganda, and Martin Luther* (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 83-84, 123-29, 139; C. Lindberg, *The European Reformations* (Oxford, 1996), p. 37; J. D. Tracy, *Europe's Reformations, 1450-1650* (Lanham, 1999), pp. 24-25.
[22] See above, Introduction, pp. 16-20.

shields of the United Provinces [Fig. 14.][23] The inscription presented Elizabeth as an agent of God's glory, and the medal was clearly produced in the hope that Leicester's recent intervention in the Netherlands was the beginning of a longer term commitment to the Reformed cause.[24] Celebrating the Queen's achievements simultaneously created an ideal for her to live up to, and this intervention was placed in the context of the final battle between True Church and False – on the medal's reverse the Pope, his crew of clerics, and a monstrance, chalice and host fall towards hell, destroyed by God's spirit as prophesised in 2 Thessalonians 2. Perhaps intended as a gift to be circulated at court, the medal beseeched the Queen to be the Protestant champion which the Dutch so longed for.[25]

Dutch prints displayed similar aspirations, keenly demonstrated by Pieter van Heyden's allegory of Elizabeth and Pope as Diana and Callisto (c. 1585) [Fig. 15.][26] This told of humiliation. Diana (Elizabeth) – the daughter of Jupiter – was an emblem of chastity, a virtue which all of her nymph-maidens had to uphold and one which ·Callisto had lost.[27] Callisto's pregnancy was discovered whilst she bathed, and the enraged Diana not only expelled her 'most beautiful' nymph but transformed her into a bear. Chastity here had become religious purity, with Diana-Elizabeth as the True Church's protectoress and her nymph-followers (the "pure flowers") as the four provinces of the Netherlands (Holland, Guelderland, Zeeland and Freisland). Similarly, the Pope-Callisto is the harlot of the Church, the Whore of Babylon, and purveyor of corrupt faith. Heyden displayed the moment of revelation, as two of Elizabeth's nymphs, Truth and Time, lifted Pope-Callisto's robe to reveal her pregnant belly. The child she bore in Ovid's tale was replaced by a "dangerous nest" of eggs which are beginning to hatch. Various elements of the Catholic Church were revealed, the Capuchins, a dragon (Satan), and one egg "full of venom" spewed forth a friar-headed cockatrice labelled "Inquisition". With this brood, the text tells us, the Pope-Callisto had committed atrocities against the Godly – the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in Paris during 1570 and the murder of the Prince of Orange in 1584 -

---

[23] For a brief discussion, see M. Aston, *The King's Bedpost: Reformation Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 142-48.
[24] 'Deo opt max lavs et honor in oe aevvm qvod'.
[25] The inscription on the reverse reads 'quem dues conficiet spiritu oris svi' [whom god defeats with the breath of his mouth] 2 Thessalonians 2: 8. Aston, *The King's Bedpost*, pp. 144-48.
[26] BM sat. 12. I assign it this date on the grounds that it mentions the murder of William of Orange in 1584.
[27] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, Bk II, 441-465. K. Wall, *The Callisto Myth from Ovid to Atwood* (Kingston, 1988)

presages of the horrendous consequences should England and the Netherlands not stand united:

"O noble princess who is here raised above pure flowers

By God chosen with your maidens very pretty

Be always careful or thy shalt come to die

That evil brood comes out of death to show

The eggs of Antichrist and his sons

Stand already kissed in the mother's heart

O god may the yong break the mother's heart

So stay these lands together out of greater troubles

That crowned beast practicing many evils

On the murder of Paris has one seen her beckoning

So many Christians their blood wasted

And want to commemorate the Prince of Orange's death."[28]

Flattering image and dire warning worked together, beseeching Elizabeth to become a more pro-active matriarch, a Diana who chastised Callisto.[29] Here, then, vehemently visual Anti-Catholicism was for the learned. Assuming fluent familiarity with classical literature – Ovid and Callisto are not labelled, the story not recounted, the context not explained – this image was a book for the very literate, Anti-Papal propaganda for the sake of the powerful, not for politicising the powerless. The knowingly-learned viewer would undoubtedly have raised a wry smile at Heyden's

---

[28] The text is predominantly Flemish, but with traces of Dutch and German: "O edele princesse [XX]baer die häer reijn bloen zyt verheuen/ Van got vercoeren met uwen m[X]erfiden seer schoone/ Zyt [X]ityt voerschtich ost ghij sust comen in sneuen/ Dat feuynich gebrotsel comt hem wt den doy velhone/ Dat eyeren van antechrijst en van velphegors sonen/ Staen schoen gekspt in des morders nijauh harten/ O gode mochten die iorigtie breeken haer morders crone/ So bleuen dese landen a semen wt grooter smarten/ Die gecroonde brest bedrijft veel bogselycke parten/ Aeu den moort van parys heestinen haer sun wencken/ Soo mennich christenen haer bloet verfingert/ En wist den prins van oraengens doot gedencken. The section in the bottom left (beneath Truth and Time) reads: "Daer den tyt metter waerheijt wort ons getoont - Den schaedelijcken nest ontdeckt met die brothen gecroont" - There the time and the truth are being us shown the damaging nest discovered with the brothen(?) crowned

[29] Given that Jove (God) transformed himself into Diana and seduced/raped the unknowing Callisto, one must question how successful a piece of anti-papal propaganda this was. The harmony between Ovid's tale and Pieter's print is clearly not meant to be rigid, and the Callisto/Pope here is surely not meant to be seen as victim in any way.

beautiful use of irony in modelling his work after Titian's *Diana and Callisto*, a gift to that great Antichristian champion, Philip II of Spain.[30]

Such militancy was un-known in English depictions of Elizabeth, who placed tight controls on her image. Vitriol, it seems, was out of favour, the Anti-Papal imagery of the Henrician and Edwardian courts absent.[31] Nonetheless, English representations could be aspirational in other ways, as John Dee's *General and Rare Memorials* (1577) demonstrated [Fig. 16.][32] Complex and learned, this image was deliberately obfuscatory, as indicated by its the motto: 'Plenci Patent quom patent' (more things are hidden than revealed.)[33] In true Renaissance style, delight and knowledge were mixed in equal measure. The viewer pitted their wits against Dee in unravelling his 'symbolic picture of Britain', the label accorded to the woodcut in its Greek borders. The *Memorials* was a plea to the Privy Council to beef-up England's naval forces to counter piracy and police the coastline more effectively, its image pointing to the realm's glory should its recommendations be headed. Under the cover of darkness we see the evils of piracy (on the left), the consequences of which are displayed through the inverted ear of corn and skull in the foreground, representing dearth and death. Britannia begged the Queen to grab Opportunity – represented pushing back the darkness overhead – and expand her naval forces. This was displayed by the ship, the soldiers who guard the shore and the fortress, which Dee saw as crucial, arguing that Elizabeth should emulate the Peloponnese who used fortresses to strengthen their borders. Consequently, the Queen would become the driving force of Europe, represented as a galleon. This puzzling image – clear only once readers had completed the text – employed a glorious allegory of an attainable future to flatter the monarch into acting upon the author's advice. Far from a pureed form of knowledge seeking to nourish the unlettered, then, images were often deliberately obtuse – whetting the appetite of the learned by arousing their curiosity.

---

[30] It was painted for Philip between 1556 and 1559.

[31] See above, Introduction pp. 4-5. Aston, *The King's Bedpost*, pp. 144-48; King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 116-81; R. Strong, *Holbein & Henry VIII* (London, 1967), pp. 9, 17.

[32] J. Dee, *General and Rare Memorials* (London, 1577)

[33] I am reliant upon M. Corbett, & R. Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces* (London, 1979), pp. 35-36 for translating the Greek here.

Indeed, in discussing the Reformation scholars have forgotten about the Renaissance. For the educated rhetoric was crucial to experience of texts, and shaped how images were *used* in them. Examining perhaps the most famous 'popular' images – two mis-births known as the Papal Ass and the Monk Calf – will show that their employment, far from targeting the 'simple folk', was governed by the precepts of rhetorical writing [Figs. 17 & 18.][34]

Monstrous births were interpreted as divine portents.[35] Nature reflected God's rule, and any perversion in the natural order was viewed as a sign of sin. Monstrous births were thus omens prescient of imminent political calamities, or dire warnings that, in the absence of widespread repentance, God would soon punish a nation for its sin.[36] The Papal Ass and Monk Calf were the subject of exposition by Luther and Melancthon in 1523, translated into many languages before finally being published in English in 1579.[37] For Scribner and his followers, they were typical examples of non-literate communication in evangelical propaganda, adapting thriving oral and visual traditions to the Reformer's purposes.[38] Interest in divine omens had grown during the late fifteenth century, with large volumes of literature discussing astrological signs and natural wonders, and a tradition of woodcuts depicting monstrous births had begun with Albrecht Dürer.[39] Evangelicals hijacked this tradition, painting monstrous births like the Papal Ass and Monk Calf as tangible signs of God's displeasure with Catholicism – the breadth of the Reformation's appeal was increased by harnessing it to a tradition already familiar, and which conferred divine authority on Protestant

---

[34] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. 127-33; Anderson, "Popular Imagery in German Reformation Broadsheets", pp. 122-29.

[35] Anderson, "Popular Imagery in German Reformation Broadsheets", pp. 122-29; Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. 123-33; A. Walsham, "Sermons in the Sky: Apparitions in Early Modern Europe", *History Today*, 51, (2001), pp. 56-63; ibid, *Providence in Early Modern England*, pp. 194-203; ibid, "Vox Piscis: Or the Book Fish: Providence and the Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline Cambridge", *English Historical Review*, 114, (1999), pp. 574-606; W. E. Burns, *An Age of Wonders* (Manchester/New York, 2002), pp. 14-15; L. Daston & K. Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150-1750* (New York, 1998); ibid, "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century France and England," *Past & Present*, 92, (1981), pp. 20-54.

[36] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. 123-33.

[37] Ibid, pp. 129-33. P. Melancthon, *Of two Wonderful Popsih Monsters* (London, 1579).

[38] Ibid, pp. 123-33. Anderson, "Popular Imagery in German Reformation Broadsheets", pp. 122-29, see p. 127: "by expressing their polemical message in terms of divine portents, Luther and Melanchthon in essence gave divine sanction to their theology." U. Rublack, *Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 1-4, 50-54.

[39] Anderson, "Popular Imagery in German Reformation Broadsheets", p. 122.

critiques of the Church. The Monk Calf was a real mis-birth which had occurred near Freidberg during 1522, taking its name from a cowl-like flap of skin on the back of its neck.[40] The Papal Ass, however, was fictitious. Allegedly found in the Tiber during 1496, it was presented as a token of divine displeasure with the sinful life of the great Papal philanderer Alexander VI, included in a pasquilade satirizing his pretensions as 'Christ's Vicar' in light of his recent impotence in the face of the French.[41] An engraving of the same year by the Bohemian artist Wunzel van Olmütz linked the beast to the Papacy by association – the buildings in the background were the *Castel Sant' Angelo*, which Alexander had recently refurbished, and the *Torre de Nono*, the Papal prison [Fig. 19.][42] Revived by Luther and Melanchthon a generation later this image, despite its coupling to a long textual exposition, has commonly been viewed as a central tool in engaging the 'simple folk' – an iconic, self-sufficient damnation of the Papacy to which textual amplification was largely unnecessary.[43] Thus twenty years later it appeared on the title-page of Luther's *Damnation of the Papacy* (1545) accompanied by the simplest of texts: "What God himself holds of the Papacy is shown by this terrible picture. Everyone should therefore shudder as he takes it to heart" [Fig. 20].[44] No further exposition was required – the image spoke for itself.

In the long-run this may have been the case. But Melanchthon did not use the Papal Ass as an icon to increase the breadth of the Reformation's appeal by cementing evangelical thought to 'popular' traits of culture; he employed it rather as an expositionary tool which tied many criticisms of Rome together in one metaphor, a donkey on which to pin much Anti-Papal critique. We must remember that for humanists form was as important as content.[45] Melanchthon was steeped in rhetorical learning and this impacted upon his treatment of the Papal Ass. Concurrent with acting as midwife to the Reformation, Melanchthon lectured on rhetoric and published

---

[40] Ibid, p. 122, Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, p. 130.

[41] Anderson, "Popular Imagery in German Reformation Broadsheets", p. 127.

[42] Ibid; Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, p. 131.

[43] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, p. 132. For him these woodcuts "show the importance of visual signs in Reformation propaganda. Both descriptions depend for their exposition on the printed word, but this is unthinkable without the visual representation of the two figures."

[44] Ibid, p. 132.

[45] H. Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence" in R. Black (Ed.) *Renaissance Thought: A Reader* (London/New York, 2001), pp. 60-7. M. Robson, *The Sense of Early Modern Writing: Rhetoric, poetics, aesthetics* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 15-29 in particular; L. D. Green, "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Renaissance Views of the Emotions", in P. Mack (Ed.), *Renaissance Rhetoric* (London, 1994) pp. 1-27; D. Knox, "Order, Reason & Oratory: Rhetoric in Protestant Latin Schools" in Mack (Ed.), *Renaissance Rhetoric*, pp. 63-80; P. Mack, *Renaissance Argument: Valla & Agricola in the Tradition of Rhetoric & Dialectic* (Leiden/New York, 1993).

on Cicero; would later develop a humanist curriculum at Wittenberg University; authored rhetorical textbooks, most famously the *Loci Communes*; and developed a teaching programme which held sway in German Protestant schools until the mid-seventeenth-century.[46] Rhetoric and dialectic, then, were crucial to his scholarly endeavours, and influenced how he wrote about, and understood, scripture. As a good humanist, he believed that Paul's sermons were so persuasive precisely because the Apostle was no cold logician but an effective orator whose words had an affective impact upon their hearers – the warmth gained from grasping *Sola fides* as much about style as it was substance.[47] For rhetoricians an argument's expression was as important as its thesis. Rhetoric was not intended to be needlessly showy, or indolently artificial. Eloquence was everything. Scholasticism had created hair-splitting squabbles over philological and logical minutiae, which, in the opinion of humanists, had led to a concern with knowledge as purely abstract and intellectual, rather than as the lifeblood of society.[48] For humanists, learning provided a guide to life, a stimulus in the pursuit of virtue. But this incentive only took force if knowledge was presented in a truly eloquent manner, for language gave argument the force to motivate readers to accept the principles it dressed.[49] Cicero's view that for a text to persuade effectively it must inform the intellect and delight the senses in equal measure formed the fulcrum of this thought – by stimulating the readers' emotions and their minds, an author's ideas were more likely to take root.[50] In this context Melanchthon exclaimed: "what subject can possibly be richer than that of the dignity and utility of eloquence?"[51]

---

[46] See K. Meerhoff, "The Significance of Philip Melanchthon's Rhetoric in the Renaissance" in Mack (Ed.), *Renaissance Rhetoric*, pp. 46-62; Knox, "Order, Reason & Oratory: Rhetoric in Protestant Latin Schools", p. 69.

[47] Meerhoff, "The Significance of Philip Melanchthon's Rhetoric in the Renaissance", pp. 52-55.

[48] Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence", pp. 63-65.

[49] Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence", pp. 63 quotes Petrarch: "they stamp and drive deep into the heart the sharpest and most ardent strings of speech, by which the lazy are startled, the ailing are kindled, and the sleepy aroused, the sick healed, and the prostrate raised, and those who stick to the ground lifted up to the highest thoughts and to honest desire. Then earthly things become vile; the aspect of vice stirs up an enormous hatred of vicious life; virtue and the shape, and as it were, the face of honesty, are beheld by the inmost eye and inspire miraculous love of wisdom and of themselves...". Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, pp. 4-5.

[50] Ibid; Robson, *The Sense of Early Modern Writing*, p. 19; Green, "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Renaissance Views of the Emotions", pp. 7-9.

[51] Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence", p. 67. Mack, *Renaissance Argument* quotes Melanchthon on the importance of rhetoric in his scriptural expositions: "I have used dialectic like a thread in explaining beliefs, not only because this form is more fluent, and because they are understood more easily when kept within these limits, but because things said properly and clearly are said in a most orderly way."

Eloquence was pursued through the amplification of a principle. Renaissance writing seems to say the same thing over and over – what to us appears verbose, tedious and repetitive was the high-point of persuasion in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Erasmus and Agricola followed classical scholars like Quintillian in stating that a basic point must be augmented and expounded to be made more forcefully.[52] A principle was thickened by being embellished with multiple proofs, examples, comparisons and vivid descriptions known as *Copia*:[53] "speaking copiously, which is when we say one and the same thing again and again in different words."[54] For Melanchthon, scripture had been written in adherence to these principles:

> "I might take the first Psalm, which has the following proposition: 'Those who govern themselves according to God's word, are blessed.' The author could have limited himself to this one line. But he has created a whole text in such a way, that it fits in with this proposition…[which] is amplified *a contrario* and then *ad affectibius*.[55]

This principle (he who adheres to the Word shall be saved) is expanded in the second verse – "But his delight is the Law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night" – and amplified through an image in the third and fourth:[56]

> "And he shall be like a tree planted by the river of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his sermon; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper. The ungodly are not so: but they are like chaff which the wind driveth away."[57]

The original proposition was finally augmented by stating its contrary: just as the Godly are saved by adherence to God's word, the ungodly were damned by disobeying it. This simple proposition has thus been made several times, and the Psalm's argument never moved on from the first verse. *Copia* had amplified the principle to make its point more forcefully.

---

[52] Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, pp. 305-22 in particular, 211 for amplification.
[53] Ibid. A pithy example is provided on p. 307 in relation to the first book of the *Aeneid*.
[54] Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, pp. 305-6, quoting Agricola.
[55] Quoted in Meerhoff, "The Significance of Philip Melanchthon's Rhetoric in the Renaissance", p. 47.
[56] Psalm 1:2, King James Bible.
[57] Psalm 1:3-4, King James Bible.

Melanchthon employed similar techniques in treating the Papal Ass. As the Roman Church was a perversion of God's Word so the Ass was a perversion of the natural order, each part of its body symbolic of a specific tyrannical trope or offence against scripture. The ass's head stood for the Pope, whose pretensions to rule the Church, which had no head but Christ, were ass-like;[58] the right hand – an elephant's foot – represented the Church's usurped spiritual power, which crushed Christian souls;[59] and the right foot, an ox's hoof, the clerics who carried out this oppression;[60] the human left hand referred to its secular power, which had been acquired by human means, the preserve of man's laws and not, as the Church claimed, God given;[61] and the left foot – a griffin's claw – the canon lawyers who protected this power, repressing the world.[62] Finally, the naked torso symbolized the whorish clergy who openly flaunted their lusts, revelling in gluttony and lasciviousness.[63] Yet simply listing the points of Melanchthon's argument hardly does his *exposition* – some twenty one pages – justice. *Copia* was paramount.[64] For example, Melanchthon informed us that the fish scales covering the Papal Ass's arms, feet and legs:

"Doe signify the Princes and secular lordes....[who] always cleved and stande-fast together, and are yet at this daye lynked and tyed unto the Pope and to hys barbarous, and tyrannical kingdome."[65]

The argument never moved beyond this point: the notion that the Princes propped-up the Pope's tyranny was simply repeated again and again through a number of examples embellishing and amplifying the point to make it more forcefully. Melanchthon explained that the scales left the beast's belly exposed because the Princes could not be seen to openly condone the clergy's fleshy lives – they clung rather to its limbs as protectors of the Pope's legal and spiritual privileges, "embrac[ing], defend[ing] and maintain[ing] his greatnesse and magnificence

---

[58] Melancthon, *Of two Wonderful Popsih Monsters*, p. 2.
[59] Ibid, p. 3.
[60] Ibid, p. 4.
[61] Ibid, p. 3.
[62] Ibid, pp. 4-5.
[63] Ibid, pp. 5-6.
[64] Meerhoff, "The Significance of Philip Melanchthon's Rhetoric in the Renaissance", p. 47: "Melancthon presents a scheme in which the figures, especially those which amplify discourse, all derive from the dialectical topics. For example, vivid description....has its source in the topic of circumstances."
[65] Melancthon, *Of two Wonderful Popsih Monsters*, p. 7.

and...estate" by conforming to his government and implementing his ordinances. He then showed how they facilitated the "spilling and marring of the celestial doctrine" by building the Pope's temples, ordaining his monasteries, and collecting taxes to support his clergy "to the ende that the ground and foundacion of the retrayt of Antechrist be more firm and sure and endure and continue the longer."[66] These were all *Copia*, variations on a single theme, and Melanchthon closed by re-iterating the principle – as fish scales protected the Papal Ass, so Princes defend the Papacy, sharing in its unholiness:

> "The great goods the riches and favourers of the world are so wel and so firmely and strongly tyed and fastened unto him, that there is neither wind nor blast, there is neither spiritual doctrine neither word of God, which can separate or plucked them from him."[67]

Melanchthon did not target this image at the unlettered, but used it as a rhetorical ploy, a series of metaphors with which to jump-start an argument. Indeed, the strictly *visual* element of the Papal Ass had a limited function, simply providing a skeleton upon which to hang the sinews of a more detailed exposition. Thus the fish scales provided an ordering motif on which a plethora of targets – Pope, nuns, monks, taxes, false doctrine, ill-living and usurped government – were hung together as a result of a princely collusion with Rome. For Melanchthon this image was a means of organizing his writing, not an icon to tap the Reformation into popular culture.

III: Emblems and Rhetoric

Eloquence was thus crucial to Reformation writers, and images often provided means of achieving it. Indeed, it was commonplace for authors to commission and design engravings to increase the rhetorical impact of their works, a trend often passed over in scholarly discussion of printed images in which too much emphasis is placed upon the role of the printer. Although printers were chiefly responsible for the commissioning and purchasing of woodblocks, and frequently inserted them into works without their writers' knowledge, we should not pronounce the death of the

---

[66] Ibid, pp. 7-8.
[67] Ibid, p. 7.

author prematurely.[68] Indeed their role in the creation of engraved emblematic title-pages was crucial.[69] Around two thousand survive in works printed between 1570 and 1640 and, because the production process required both title and illustration to be engraved on the same page, each was specifically tied to the book for which it was commissioned rather than being endlessly recyclable like a woodblock.[70] The title-page became a witty and ingenious way of epitomizing a work, providing an indication of its scope, contents and arguments through images. They were designed by the authors themselves in the form of a verse to which an artist gave visual form, illustrating the author's words.[71] This involved a complex iconography resplendent with classical and mythological figures which required a literary interpretation to be understood, sometimes in the form of an accompanying verse "mind of the frontispiece" or often through a complete reading of the text itself. Indeed, as famous examples like Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651) and Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (London, 1632) show, these were not straightforwardly comprehensible illustrations [Figs. 21 & 22.][72] Thus the predominant visual media in England before the rise of the single-sheet print in the mid-seventeenth century was not aimed at the semi-literate, but rather at excluding them.[73] These were pictures designed to arrest the attention of the educated – as the emblematist Achille Borchi commented, these images were "open to the sound part of mankind, but unknown to the ignorant."[74] Emblems were thus far from being 'books for the unlettered.'

---

[68] For the printer's responsibility for illustrations, see W. Fulke, *D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and M. Rastel, Accounted (among their factions) Three Pillars and Archpatriarchs of the Romish Synagogue* (London, 1579), p. 691. Fulke responded to criticisms of woodcuts used in Jewel's *Apology*, noting that this what not the author's fault as the printer inserted images at the final stage of production.

[69] Corbett, & Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces*, p. 2, 19. On emblems see M. Bath, *Speaking Pictures – English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture* (London/ New York, 1994), pp. 47-50, 71-3, 140-1; P. M. Daly, & G. R. Dimler, (Eds.), *Corpus Emblematum – The Jesuit Series*, 4 vols (Toronto, 2000), I, p. xi; P. M. Daly, (Ed.), *The European Emblem – Towards an Index Emblematicus* (Waterloo, 1980), pp. 7, 16-20; H. Diehl, *An index of icons in English Emblem Books, 1500-1700* (Norman/ London, 1986), p. xiii. C. Moseley, *A Century of Emblems* (Aldershot, 1989), pp. 3-20; A. Saunders, *The sixteenth century French Emblem Book – A decorative and Useful Genre* (Geneva, 1988), pp. 1-3, 6-8, 14-15.

[70] Corbett, & Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces*, pp. 1-6.

[71] Ibid, pp. 2, 19.

[72] Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (London, 1651); Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (London, 1632). Note how in Burton's piece the image is compartmentalised, with each section specific to a section of the text itself.

[73] On the rise in prominence of the print, S. O'Connell, *The Popular Print in England* (London, 1999), passim.

[74] Quoted in Corbett, & Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces*, p. 18, taken from his *Symbolicae Quaestiones* (Bologna, 1555).

If these images were not designed to include the illiterate, nor were they intended to make a work clearer. Quite the opposite, in fact. The viewer was to revel in playing a game with the author, gradually unravelling the mysteries of an obscure work.[75] As Hadrianus Junis explained, before viewers gained enlightenment from the image, they wanted to relish in its erudition, to be entertained by its allusions, and, above all, to enjoy solving the puzzle of its meaning:

"In writing of this kind we know that there is the greater addition of beauty and grace the more they sharpen the wit: that is to say, the longer they keep the reader's mind in suspense. Accordingly, after they are understood, they draw him to admiration with an increase of his delight, especially when they conceal in a pleasant obscurity, as if beneath a veil, something of solid excellence under apt and subtle invencion."[76]

There was a careful balance to maintain. The image was to be obscure enough to provoke viewers to engage their wits in battle, but not so obtuse that they failed in their tussle to make it submit its secrets.[77] Thus, the frontispiece to Philip Sydney's *Covntesse of Pembroke's Arcadia* (1593) depicted a pig recoiling from a majoram under the motto 'spira non tibi' (I breathe out [sweet scents] but not for thee) – the reader was to understand that just as pigs flee from majoram, good teaching was poison to a corrupt mind [Fig. 23.][78] The purpose was not to dumb-down the work's thesis, but rather to create a puzzle to unravel. Aristotelian thought asserted that ideas were more firmly embodied if they stimulated the senses – emblematic title-pages thus sought to delight and teach in equal measure, and by doing so their images implicitly advertised the merits of a work by expounding the ingenuity of its author.

There were certainly Anti-Catholic works of this type, as William Marshall's deeply mysterious frontispiece to Francis Potter's *An interpretation of the number 666*

---

[75] Corbett, & Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces*, pp. 34-40, 46-7 in particular. Emblems signified one thing through the means of another.

[76] Hadrianus Junius, *Emblemata* (Antwerp, 1565), p. 65. See also Geoffrey Whitney, *A Choice of Emblemes* (Leyden, 1586) 'To the Reader': "something obscure to be perceiued at the first, whereby, when with further consideration it is understood, it maie the greater delight the behoulder."

[77] Cf. Paolo Giovio: "not so obscure that it neede a Sibiila to interprete it, nor so apparent that every rusticke may understand it", quoted in Corbett, & Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces*, p. 11.

[78] P. Sidney, *Countesse of Pembrokes Arcadia* (London, 1593), title-page.

(1642) shows [Fig. 24.][79] Upon first glance viewers would most probably have understood the image's oppositional composition – with the Church of Christ on the left, and that of Antichrist on the right – for it was commonplace in this period.[80] They would also have recognized Christ and his Disciples, and the Pope with his clergy, and may have guessed that the two cities were Jerusalem and Rome. But at this point, their piecing together of the scene would have become unglued. What of the blocks inscribed 144 and 666? Or the scales weighing two blocks of 25 as God's hand wrote 'Mene mene Teke'? This required a little thought. Learned viewers would recall Daniel 5 and the final days at the court of Belshazzar. Unaware of an advancing Persian army Belshazzar feasted in celebration of idol deities, festivities which were interrupted as God's hand wrote the words 'mene, mene, tekel, upharzin' on the wall of the Great Hall, words which were in the process of being written on Marshall's frontispiece. Perturbed, Belshazzar beseeched Daniel to interpret what this message, which translated to 'count, count, weigh, divide', meant. Upon recalling them, viewers would have begun to understand the scales' significance on Potter's frontispiece, for as Daniel explained:

"Mene: God has numbered thy kingdom, and finished it

Tekkel: Thou art weighed in the balance, and art found wanting;

[Upharsin] thy kingdom is divided and given to the Mede and Persian"[81]

The latter conquered the realm that night. This was a clever glorification of Potter's work.[82] As Daniel expounded the meaning of God's words, Potter exposed the significance of the number which He accorded to Antichrist. In light of this arithmetical exposition, his use of words which proclaimed the downfall of a heathen kingdom was thus an elaborate pun – Rome's days had *literally* been numbered by Potter.

To unpick the remainder of the frontispiece, however, viewers would have to read the book. Potter's thesis provided mathematical 'proof' that Rome was

---

[79] F. Potter, *An interpretation of the number 666* (London, 1642). Marshall's inscription is on the columns, but the quality of the illustration itself is poor, and may not have been completed by him.
[80] Obvious examples include the title-page of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (all editions between 1563 and 1640); *Truth flatters not plaine dealing* (1647).
[81] Daniel 5: 26-28 (King James Bible).
[82] Interestingly, it is not explained anywhere in the text and the reader was clearly expected to be able to unravel it themselves.

Antichrist. He followed the Protestant commonplace that Antichrist was not a person tied to a historically specific time or place, but a spiritual presence within the Roman Church's hierarchy and doctrine.[83] He began with a numerical contrast: the number of Antichrist was 666 (Rev 21) and that of Christ 144 (Rev 7 and 14).[84] The square-root of each number was the basis of each Church's government, its essence or foundation.[85] For the Church of Christ this was twelve, which scripture clearly demonstrated to be the building block of the Church: there were twelve gates to the celestial Jerusalem;[86] whose walls were twelve thousand furlongs in length;[87] and guarded by twelve angels.[88] There were twelve decrees of the Holy Ghost;[89] twelve patriarchs;[90] and twelve Apostles who founded twelve churches, each of whom would contribute twelve thousand members to the 144,000 who would enter heaven.[91] Similarly, the root of 666 was 25, a number which Potter argued (somewhat less accurately) ran throughout the body of the Roman Church: there were twenty-five prelates at the Council of Trent;[92] which had twenty-five sessions;[93] and produced twenty-five articles.[94] There were twenty-five parish priests when the Church was founded at Rome;[95] which has twenty-five gates;[96] and held many of its Holy Days on the 25th of the month.[97] Rome, then, undoubtedly possessed the number of the Beast. The title-page represented this numerical stand-off. On the left we see Christ and his twelve disciples, the root of the 144,000 which would enter Jerusalem; and on the right the Pope with twenty five clerics, the root of 666 and weighed in the balance by God. Imagery thus gave visual form to the abstract thesis, and became a fitting emblem of the work.

---

[83] Potter, *An interpretation of the number 666*, p. 4.

[84] Revelation 7:4: "And I heard the number of them which were sealed: and there were sealed an hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel", 12,000 from each tribe founded by an Apostle. Revelation 14:1: "And I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads."

[85] Potter, *An interpretation of the number 666*, 'Address to the Reader', pp. 4-9, 44-7, 63-77.

[86] Ibid, pp. 7-8.

[87] Ibid, pp. 13-18.

[88] Ibid, pp. 98-106.

[89] Ibid, pp. 7-8.

[90] Ibid, p. 41.

[91] Ibid, p. 41.

[92] Ibid, p. 41.

[93] Ibid, p. 121.

[94] Ibid, p. 121.

[95] Ibid, p. 121.

[96] Ibid, pp. 125-40.

[97] Ibid, p. 175. For other examples of 25 and the Roman Church, see pp. 106-17, 140-76.

Such title-pages were not the preserve of elite works, however, a point ignored by book historians.[98] The techniques passed into cheaper print in a more direct manner, summarizing works in a less obtuse manner, with a closer expositionary relationship between image and text. Thus the title-page to *Five lookes over the proffessors of the English Bible* (1642) by Henry Walker [Fig. 25.][99] Walker tells us that his image "very fitly represents" the troubles of the times and, like the *Revels of Christendome*, it functioned as a comment on the political climate rather than an attempt to win viewers over to a party-position – his work made no attempt to buttress support for any denominational group, but called for an end to the turmoil in the Church.[100] The image depicted a five-way tug of war. An enthroned Pope attempted to wrest a veiled Bible from an Arminian, a Protestant, a Brownist and an Anabaptist. This was a suitable emblem for the tract's argument – that disunity and denominational dispute in the Church weakened its defences against Popery – neatly summarized in the inscription: "while we about nice poynts of scripture strive/ The Pope us quit of the scripture shrive."[101] The woodcut was the tract's keystone, and the text was organised around it, simply expounding the epigrammatic nature of each character. The Brownist held a club, representative of his belligerant independence and lobbying for liberty of conscience and independent disciplinary controls.[102] The Arminian wielded a sword, a token of his delight in spilling blood to uphold non-scriptural doctrines and clerical status.[103] Wrested and bent to support this plethora of positions the bible was veiled, the clear word of God clouded by the black mist of dispute.[104] This caused the "honest hearted" Protestant to weep. Unlike the other figures, he was un-selfish and did not approach scripture with an agenda to support, seeking simply to remove the veil and set Truth free, an intention which formed the tone of the tract.[105] The image was thus a terminus through which all routes of discussion began and ended – like the scriptural verses printed at the beginning of so

---

[98] Corbett, & Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces*, is expressly concerned with elite works.

[99] H. Walker, *Five lookes over the proffessors of the English Bible* (London, 1642).

[100] Ibid, title-page for quotation. Whilst the work is deeply hostile to the Laudian Church, which accussed of persecution and smacking of 'popery', it makes no party-stance. The reader is none the wiser as to which group to 'honest hearted Protestant' represented (episcopelian, presbyterian, etc). The 'Protestant' who desires a Church founded on scripture is a generic ideal, rather than akin to a real lobbying group.

[101] Ibid. 'Strive was a witty pun, meaning both to rob and remove, but also having connotation specific to Rome's act of confessing and absolving sin.

[102] Ibid, sig, Aii.

[103] Ibid, sigs. Aii-Aiii.

[104] Ibid, sigs. Aii.

[105] Ibid, sigs. Aiii.

many sermons, it formed the framework for all subsequent commentary, the template for all parameters of the text.

To understand Walker's and Potter's images fully, the viewer had to read their texts. Often however, emblems were accompanied with explanatory verses and functioned as self-contained wholes. Historians have failed to notice that aside from title-pages, emblems worked *within* texts, providing epigrams of chapters and sections. Thus an exposition of Rome as Antichrist, *The sword of the spirit to smite in piece that Antichristian Goliath* (1613) by the London alderman Thomas Williamson, contained emblematic woodcuts and verses at the beginning of each of its chapters.[106] These announced a change in tone and subject from the previous section, and provided a pithy taster of the new chapter's tone and substance. For example chapter IV, *The Life of Rome detestable, and her religion execrable*, was introduced by a cut of Pope Joan holding her baby.[107] Joan – a thirteenth century legend – had supposedly reigned for three years c.850 [Fig. 26.] As a girl in Athens she had become a monk's lover and in order to be with him had dressed like a man and entered his monastery. Ascending through the Church's hierarchy, she became one of the most learned and prominent scholars in Rome and was consequently elected Pope. Falling pregnant, the whole sham was brutally exposed as she gave birth during a procession *en route* from St. Peter's to the Lateran.[108] Williamson deemed this tale of fornication and deceit representative of Papal living:

> "Loe here the life of all the Popes in one
>
> That boast so much of workes and godly life:
>
> For true it is a bastard had Pope Joane
>
> The Papists husband and the devils wife:
>
> But that their seate they may keepe ever faire

---

[106] T. Williamson, *The sword of the spirit to smite in piece that Antichristian Goliath* (London, 1613). There were eleven images in all.

[107] Ibid, p. 37.

[108] For Pope Joan, see A. Boureau, *The Myth of Pope Joan*, (Chicago, 2000), the most historical account. P. Stanford, *The She-Pope: a quest for the truth behind the mystery of Pope Joan* (London, 1998); and R. A & D. Pardoe, *The Female Pope: the mystery of Pope Joan* (Wellingborough, 1988) are also useful. For contemporary accounts and plays see *Historia de donne famose. Or The Romaine iubile which happened in the yeare 855. Disputed lately, that there vvas a woman pope named Ione the eight, against all the Iesuites, by a Germaine, but especially against Rob. Bellarmine father of all controuersies, his treatise De Romano pontifico. lib. 3. cap. 24* (London, 1599); A. Cooke, *Pope Joane* (London, 1610); ibid, *The Present for a Papist, The life and death of Pope Joan* (London, 1675); J. Mayo, *The anatomie of Pope Joan* (London, 1624); E. Settle, *The Female Prelate* (London, 1689)

They search their Popes under the parph'ry chaire."[109]

The closing lines formed a crude joke revelling in the ridiculous, recounting the legend that all subsequent Popes had their testicles checked by a cardinal upon election to avoid repetition of Joan's scandal. Joan was thus emblematic of the chapter, which relished in the sensational and lauded the licentious behaviour of pontiffs past and present, descending into a long list of Papal murders, butchering, fornication, plots, sorcery and a host of other evils inspired in equal parts by vengeance, pride and the devil.[110] The biting irony was, of course, that such actions could hardly come from men who were truly Christ's vicars. The tree had revealed its fruits:

> "By all this it doth manifestly appeare that the papisticall crue is a serpentine generation, wholly made of fraudulent policie, and wicked practice, men bred of the world, haters of trueth, fighters against the light, and defenders of the works of darknesse."[111]

Ill-living was tangible proof that Rome was of Antichrist, for where the Gospel lived reformed manners flourished. A mascot for the lives of the Papacy, Joan's depiction functioned as an emblem for the contents of the chapter – the tone had been set, the subject introduced, before a single word of the exposition had been read.

This was true of the emblem which graced the beginning of Chapter VII, *Of the slanderous lyes which the Church of Rome hath and daily devise against the true professors of the word of Christ*, depicting a devil escaping from a man's mouth [Fig. 27.][112] This represented slander:

> "Marke well this emblem, ponder it in heart
>
> A picture fit for each detracting wight:
>
> Out of his mouth the Devell seems to start
>
> Who by reproach God's children doth despight:
>
> The whorish city labours of this sinne

---

[109] Williamson, *The sword of the spirit*, p. 37.
[110] Ibid, pp. 38-49.
[111] Ibid, p. 44.
[112] Ibid, p. 71.

I meane the place that Antichrist dwells in."[113]

Because Protestants had revealed the frauds in Rome's doctrine, they could no longer use it to entrap souls and had no resort but to slander the Godly. Protestants were erroneously accused of being heretics, sexual libertines, cannibals, antinominarians and pervertors of scripture. But rather than scuppering the cause of the Gospel papists had sunk their own ship, for resort to slander was proof-positive that the devil possessed them – their words sprung from his malice.[114] Of course, readers would not have understood all of this from looking at the emblem, but that was not its point. The intention was not to provide an abstract, a 'Reader's Digest' account of the argument. Rather, the emblem provided a pithy and entertaining trailer of the chapter, announcing its vitriolic and scabrous tone – it was a bite-size sample of the whole, an entree to whet the readers' palette before attempting to digest the text.

Images, then, were tools of rhetoric. They provided pithy and entertaining blurbs of a text, announcing its tone and hinting at its content; or functioned as frontispieces providing abstract visual summarizes of a complex thesis. Tokens of the Renaissance, they added delight to the process of informing. In doing so they worked alongside the texts in which they appeared, complementing the words on the printed page, but rarely denoting them – they were not a means of simplifying tenets, a dumbed-down means of communication aimed at politicising the populace, but were often oblique and erudite puzzles intended to flatter the egos of the educated.

IV: Cheap Print

But what of genuine cheap print? What roles did images play there? In the litter and clutter of black-letter ballads, woodcuts were recycled – one image appeared again and again in a variety of different contexts, representing an array of different things.[115] The end result was that the specificity of what a woodcut depicted was not inherent in the image but anchored by the text around it and the context in which it appeared. Repeated re-usage was perfectly understandable. Given the financial outlay involved in making and purchasing of woodblocks it made sound economic sense for

---

[113] Ibid, p. 71.

[114] Ibid, pp. 72-75 .

[115] T. Watt, "Piety in the Pedlar's pack: continuity and change, 1578-1630" in P. Marshall (Ed.), *The Impact of the English Reformation: 1500-1640* (London, 1997), pp. 322-23 n. 82-85

51

the printers who bore the burden to get as much use out of their investment of possible, even if the end result was that a significant proportion of woodcuts became generic and inter-changeable.[116] Crucially though, it assigned images a secondary role in the process of communication and they often appeared as little more than decoration. Blocks were often used inappropriately, bearing little relevance to the subject of the ballad in which they appeared.[117]

This was certainly the case with some Anti-Catholic images. If in their initial usage woodcuts amplified the communicative impact of their works, this function was lost in their re-cycling, where they simply drew the viewer's eye. For example, the title-page to *The petitions and articles exhibited in Parliament against Iohn Pocklington* (1641) had originally been designed for Henry Burton's *Baiting of the Pope's Bull* (1627) some fourteen years earlier [Figs. 28 & 29.][118] This latter work was written on the occasion of a Bull of 1626 supposedly sent to encourage Englishmen to renounce obedience to Charles I. As a bishop unsuccessfully attempted to wean the English away from devotion to their monarch, the King smites the Pope, depicted as the Two-Horned Beast of Revelations 13. The image was emblematic of Burton's tract: as a man who spoke blasphemy, the Pope was Antichrist, and loyal Englishmen would not fall prey to his machinations. But at its re-use in *The Petition* the image bore no relation to the text, a list of articles accusing Pocklington of authoring the 'popish innovations' which had crept into the English Church of the Laudian-era, barely under way when the block was designed.[119] Although it may convey the tone of the work – that England was engaged in a fight against Popery – in a general way, as Charles I was not mentioned, and Pocklington was not a bishop, the image was decidedly out of place.

Similar cases occurred in the slap-dash application of the blocks originally published in Walter Lynne's *The Beginning and Endying of All Popery* (1548 and 1588), a pictorial prophecy of eighteen images narrating the declining spiritual status of the Papacy over centuries.[120] A sense of progression was crucial to the

---

[116] E. Hodnett, *English Woodcuts 1480-1535* (Ocford, 1973), no. 477, a cut of Christ and his disciples which was re-used by Richard Harper in the 1640s; M. Driver, *The Image in Print: Book Illustration in Late Medieval England & its sources* (London, 2004), passim.

[117] Watt, "Piety in the Pedlar's pack: continuity and change, 1578-1630", pp. 322-23.

[118] J. Pocklington, *The petition and articles exhibited in Parliament against Iohn Pocklington doctor in divinity, parson of Yeldon in Belfordshire* (London, 1641), title-page; H. Burton, *The baiting of the Popes bull. Or An unmasking of the mystery of iniquity* (London, 1627), title-page.

[119] Pocklington, *The petition and articles.*

[120] W. Lynne's *The Beginning and Endying of All Popery* (London, 1548/1588).

effectiveness of these images, and when only a handful were re-used they were not only divorced from their chain of context, but their peculiar iconography – specific to the prophecy – was not clarified for the viewer.[121] Thus the unicorn which knocked the tiara from the Pope's head in the *Lineage of Locusts*, a ballad charting the origins of Rome's doctrine in hell, ignorance, and error [Fig. 30.][122] The image let the reader know that the ballad was about the Pope in some way, but communicated no sense of the demonic concerns in the text – the other of Lynne's images on this ballad, the Pope surrounded by penitents, was similarly out-of-step with the work's tone, and by itself was not decidedly Anti-Papal [Fig. 31.][123] A similarly poor correlation between a text and Lynne's images occurred in *The Popes Pedigree, or, the twinneing of a wheelband* which leaves viewers wondering what the Pope was doing with dog and a knife [Fig. 32.][124] Here, the application was further skewed by the fact that the text itself was not primarily Anti-Papal, with the Pope mentioned only in the first stanza. The ballad was a comic treatment of a stock theme, the wheel of fortune, charting how a family-line originating in the bastard love-child of a Pope and a nun ascended through all ranks of society in succeeding generations, terminating with a General before tumbling down to the level of a pauper: "from the lowest to the highest/ And then back again."[125] The Anti-Papal lineage of Lynne's cuts had little relevance beyond decoration here. This was equally the case in a woodcut after the Monk Calf which appeared on the title-page of *The Ruinate Fall of the Pope Vsury* (1580), which appeared on the cover of a work discussing the disastrous impact of greed and usury upon the commonwealth but did not mention the Pope in any way [Fig. 33.][126] An Anti-Papal title and image had been used to dress-up a rather standard treatment of a Protestant commonplace.

One Anti-Catholic image, however, appeared inappropriately on a frequent basis. The moderately scatological 'Cardinal Owl', a printers' ornament set along the tops of pages in over one hundred works between 1590 and 1640, existed in three variants [Figs. 34, 35 & 36.][127] Figure 34 was owned by the printer Richard Tottel

---

[121] Appendix 1.

[122] *The lineage of locusts or the Popes pedegre* (London, 1641).

[123] Ibid.

[124] *The Popes Pedigree, Or, the twineing of a Wheelbrand* (Undated.)

[125] Ibid.

[126] *The ruinate fall of the Pope Vsury, derived from the Pope Idolatrie, revealed by a Saxon of antiquitie* (London, 1580).

[127] For a full list of works, see Appendix 2. See also J. A. Lavin, "Three 'Owl' Blocks", *The Library*, 5, (1967), pp. 136-42.

before passing to Peter Short in 1590, John Windlet by 1610, William Stansby by 1620, and Richard Bishop by 1640.[128] Figures 35 and 36 first occurred together in works printed by John Danter, were passed to Simon Stafford in 1599, and used most heavily by George Purslowe between 1615 and 1631, passing to his wife Elizabeth, before finally resting with Richard Oulton by 1639.[129] An owl sporting a cardinal's *galero*, a wide-brimmed hat with four tassles, perched on a candlestick and was flanked by two locust-like figures swaying thuribles and breaking wind (the one on the left appears to be tonsured.) Adolescent puerility and hellish humour aside, the joke was that like the nocturnal owl, Cardinals thrive in spiritual darkness.

Several printers employed this cut rather clumsily. The image was employed for entirely comedic purposes, a joke in the margins, but was used to decorate books to which it had not the least suitability, works which were devoid of anti-Catholic sentiment. Thus Simon Stafford (who used the 'Cardinal Owl' in seven works) printed it on the title-page to the play, *Rainge of King Edward the Third* (1599) [Fig. 37];[130] and Thomas Nash's comedy, *Simms last Will and Testament* (1600).[131] Conversely, when he did print Anti-Catholic works such as Samuel Hieron's *An answere to a popish rhyme* (1604), Stafford failed to employ the block – for him, it

---

[128] The image first appeared in Tottel's *Symbolaiographia Symbolaeographia. Which may be termed the art, description, or image of instruments, couenants, contracts* (London, 1590), along the top of section 1, but obviously passed to Peter Short in the same year, being included in his edition of T. Beze's *The Psalmes of Dauid truly opened and explaned by paraphrasis, according to the right sense of euerie Psalme* (London, 1590), sig. Aii. It remained with Short before appearing in John Windet's edition of S. Jourdain's *A discovery of the Barmudas, otherwise called the Ile of Diuels by Sir Thomas Gates, Sir George Sommers, and Captayne Newport, with diuers others* (London, 1610), title-page; and passed to William Stansby by 1620, first appearing in his edition of J. Hall, *The honor of the married clergie, maintayned against the malicious challenges of C.E. Masse-priest* (London, 1620), p. 255; and ended up with Richard Bishop by 1640, appearing in his edition of R. Brathwait, *Ar't asleepe husband?* (London, 1640), sig. Aii.

[129] B and C first appeared together in a work printed by John Danter, R. Barnfield's *The affectionate shepheard* (London, 1594), title-page; passed to Simon Stafford and appeared in his edition of *The raigne of King Edward the third* (London, 1599), title-page; and had passed to George Purslowe by 1615, appearing in his R. A, *The valiant Welshman* (London, 1615), sigs, Aii-Aiii. Purslowe's wife Elizabeth continued to use the cuts after his death, and C first appeared in her edition of F. Greville's *Certain learned and elegant works* (London, 1633), p. 245; before finally passing to R. Oulton by 1639, appearing in his T. Nabbes, *Playes* (London, 1639), sig. Aiii of 'Totenham Court, a pleasant comedy'.

[130] *The raigne of King Edward the third* (London, 1599), title-page.

[131] T. Nash, *Simms last Will and Testament* (London, 1600), sig. B. Equally odd were its appearances in other works by Stafford: A. Arnauld, *A true discourse of the whole occurrences in the Queens voyage from her departure from Florence, until her arrival at the city of Marseilles* (London, 1611), sig. Cii, at which point the French king's right to more land (in Savoy) is expounded; R. Greene, *A pleasant conceyted comedie of George a Greene, the pinner of Wakefield* (London, 1599), title-page; G. Markham, *The tears of the beloued* (London, 1600), sig. A2; J. Terxeira, *The true historie of the late and lamentable adventures of Don Sebastian King of Portugal* (London, 1602), sig. Aiii.

seems, images were not an important part of a work's communicative impact.[132] John Danter (who used the block in ten works) was equally ambivalent. He used the cut in a medley of works in which anti-Papal sentiment was absent, including *The Affectionate Shepherd* (1594), a romance poem expounding the virtues of chastity and love; Anthony Munday's *The second book of Primaleon of Greece* (1596), detailing the exploits of various Emperors of Constantinople;[133] and Christopher Middleton's account of Arthurian assaults upon the pagans, *History of Chinion of England* (1597).[134] Most oddly, Danter used the image in an edition of *Romeo & Juliet* (1597) [Fig. 38.][135] Indeed, the only work with Anti-Catholic merit in which Danter deployed the image was a translation of Juevenal Borget's *The divels legend* (1595), a comedic dialogue between Dr. Pantabus and his pupil Zanie, who expounded the merits of the Catholic League and used warped logic to conclude that it was better to consent to the teachings of the Pope than to follow God like English Protestants – here finally, then, was a work in which the Cardinal Owl's humorous, mocking tone was appropriate.[136] Overall however, to these printers images had a minimal, almost frivolous, role on the page.

V: Stamps & Markers

But for other printers the 'Cardinal Owl' played important roles. Peter Short not only employed the cut more appropriately – including it in Anti-Catholic works – but also more thoughtfully.[137] In his edition of Thomas Beze's *Psalms* (1590), the image appeared at the top of Anthony Gilby's dedication, announcing the Anti-Catholic tone of the work [Fig. 39.] Gilby lamented that after thirty years of Elizabeth's reign the

---

[132] S. Hieron's *An answere to a popish rhyme* (London, 1604); see also the equally Anti-Catholic E. Hawes, *Trayterous Percyes & Catesbyes prosopopeia* (London, 1606). Stafford did include it in one Anti-Papal dialogue though, R. M, *A profitable Dialogue for a perverted Papist* (London, 1609), sig. B
[133] R. Barnfield's *The affectionate shepheard* (London, 1594), title-page; Anthony Munday *The second book of Primaleon of Greece* (London, 1596), sigs Aiii, Bi.
[134] C. Middleton, *History of Chinion of England* (London, 1597), sigs. Aii, B, and the tops of Chapters One and five. Equally odd were its inclusion in T. Nashe, *The terrors of the night* (London, 1594), sig. Aii, which was about dreams; ibid, *Have with you Saffron Walden* (London, 1596), title-page, sig. Aii; T. Johnson, *Cornucopiae* (London, 1595), sig. Aiii, concerning the wonders of nature; *News from Rome, Venice, and Vienna toching the present proceding of the Turks* (London, 1595), sig. Aii.
[135] *Romeo & Juliet* (London, 1597), title-page and the top of Act One.
[136] J. Borget's *The divels legend* (London, 1595). It appeared twice on the title-page.
[137] This is not to state that Short never used the image in a slap-dash manner, for it appeared in his *Copie of a letter sent by the French King to the people or Artoys and Henault* (London, 1595), p. 6. This was purely matter-of-fact in tone, and although presenting the Spanish as war-mongers can hardly be said to be viciously Anti-Catholic.

Reformation was "yet [to be] brought to ful perfection" – many still clung silently to idolatry in their hearts, the sins of Mary's reign had not being fully repented.[138] This would undoubtedly provoke God's wrath. England was akin to Juddeah during the reign of Josiah who, despite having smashed the idols of a previous king's (Manasses) Church, could not save his people from divine chastisement because their hearts still pined for its errors.[139] The Word exfoliated sin, and meditation on Beze's Psalms would quash the remnants of Catholicism which clung to English souls. Image and text worked together to colour the Psalms Anti-Popish.[140] Perched at the top of the first page, the 'Cardinal Owl' set the tone of what was to follow, conditioning the reader's reaction to the text.

As this example shows, this image did not work denotively. Scholars like Charles Talbot who claim that woodcuts served to "give a sense of immediacy to the words" of a text, and Christine Anderson, who argued that they "hammered the point home" for the unlettered, overstate the visual's explicatory function.[141] Woodcuts were not a reinforcement or exposition of the text for the semi-literate, an 'illustrated guide' to its content. Their relationship to the subject and argument was not *specific* but *tonal*. The 'Cardinal Owl' provided a badge or marker, instantly setting the tone for the reader before a single word had been read. This could award illustrations a celebratory role. In William Camden's *Annals, the true and royal history of famous Impresses Elizabeth* (1625) it marked the beginning of 1559, a fittingly cheeky Anti-Catholic gloss to open an account of Protestantism's Restoration in England and the final subversion of the "romish religion" [Fig. 40.][142] It was an announcement, marking an important point in Camden's narrative, and conditioning how readers experienced the text. A similar use of a woodcut can be seen at the opening of the second volume of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1570), in which the *Allegory of the Reformation* sets an equally celebratory tone [Fig. 41.] This image of Henry VIII triumphant over a vanquished Pope was placed directly before the 1534 Act Of

---

[138] T. Beze's *The Psalmes of Dauid truly opened and explaned by paraphrasis, according to the right sense of euerie Psalme* (London, 1590), sig. Aiii.

[139] 2 Kings 23-24.

[140] Beze's *The Psalmes of Dauid*, sigs. Aii-Aiii.

[141] C. Talbot, "Prints and the Definitive Image" in G. P. Tyson and S. S. Wagonheim, *Print and Culture in the Renaisance. Essays on the Advent of Printing in Europe* (Newark, 1986), pp. 189-208 at 199; Anderson, "Popular Imagery in German Reformation Broadsheets", p. 121.

[142] W. Camden's *Annals, the true and royal history of famous Impresses Elizabeth* (London, 1625), p. 12. The account of the Religious Settlement occurred on pp. 13-17. Printed by George Purslowe.

Supremacy, and after the first volume's account of the Papacy's incessant ascendancy of evil, immediately announced a change of tone to the viewer.[143]

If the 'Cardinal Owl' shaped the tone and connoted the significance of a text, it also provided an instant validation of its content. Anti-Catholicism became a stamp of purity for the Protestant reader. This was especially the case in translations of Catholic works, in which it acted to re-assure prospective readers. Thus Peter Short deployed the 'Cardinal Owl' in Gasparde Loarte's *The exercise of a Christian Life* (1594), placing it at the top of the 'Address to the reader' as a pre-emptive stamp of quality [Fig. 42.][144] Short asserted that although this was the work of an Italian Jesuit and the basis of Robert Person's *A Christian Exercise*, the text's instructions on overcoming the devil, the world and sin had nonetheless "reaped Christian profit" for many. He went on to re-assure readers that the text had been suitably censored:

> "Divers learned men have had the perusing of it, and have left no matter in it
> to vrge thy dislike: then thankfully accept of their pains that would gladly do
> any thing for thy profit."[145]

The 'Cardinal Owl' worked in a similar way, but provided a more immediate seal of approval – marking a Jesuit text with a scatological Anti-Catholic image signified to the reader that the printer was re-assuringly prejudiced. The image worked in a similar manner in Gonzalo De Céspedes y Menises *Patterne for lascivious lovers* (1622), appearing once again as a valedictory seal of approval at the top of the 'Address to the Reader' in this guide to resisting the temptations of the flesh [Fig. 43.][146] The translator, Leon Digges, asserted the usefulness of the work to all Christians and assured them that it had been pruned of popery: "One by-discourse I have left wholly out, as superstitiously smelling of papisticall miracles, in which I have no belief."[147] Once again, the 'Cardinal Owl' was a stamp that ensured the work had been properly cleansed.

---

[143] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, II, p. 799 (1583). Cf. R. S. Luborsky, "The Illustrations: Their Pattern and Plan" in D. Loades (Ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 67-84.
[144] G. Loarte's *The exercise of a Christian Life* (London, 1594), sig. Aiii. Printed by Peter Short.
[145] Ibid, sig. Aiii.
[146] G. De Céspedes y Menises *Gerard the Unfortunate Spaniard, or, a patterne for lascivious lovers* (London, 1622), sig. Aiii. Printed by George Purslowe.
[147] Ibid, sig. Aiii.

Other Anti-Catholic images also became stamps. This can be seen in figure 44, an epigrammatic image of Protestant stoicism in the face of a supernatural Catholic threat, in which the Pope, a Devil, a Cardinal, a Bishop and several friars blew on the world, which stood defiantly unmoved by their evil labours.[148] However, the image was commonly tagged onto works which did not expound this theme. Once again it was not denotative of a book's arguments but stood apart from the text, as an independent seal of approval. It thus endorsed the title-page of a recantation, *Texeda retextus: or, The Spanish Monke his bull of divorce against the Church of Rome* (1623) by Fernando de Tejeda. Anti-Catholicism was central to recantation [Fig. 45.][149] In the bi-polar world-view of Protestantism Truth and hatred were bedfellows – repenting idolatry was not enough, only fully-fledged vitriol was proof of loyalty to the Word. The image displaying the fruitlessness of Rome's labours was thus not only mockingly celebratory, but acted as back-handed proof of the text's orthodoxy. This image endorsed Protestant works too, advertising the merits of a work even if the texts it decorated were not -explicitly concerned with Anti-Catholicism. It thus appeared on the title-page of Samuel Ward's *Balme from Gilead to Recover Conscience* (1622), a work urging Christians to rekindle their consciences and live a Christian life, the flag of true saints [Fig. 46.][150] The Pope's role in all of this was brief and anecdotal, an extra rather than part of the cast. The Anti-Catholic image was a valedictory stamp of the text's worth, not as a tool of exposition for its subject-matter. Proof that they were seen this way comes in a 1638 *Confession of Faith* from the Scottish Kirk, which sported an emblem of the Reformation [Fig. 47.][151] In a much repeated image originating on Andreas Osiander's *Wondrous Prophecy of the Papacy* (1527) a unicorn (an image of Christ from Psalm 92) knocked the tiara from the Pope's head.[152] This paralleled the process of the Reformation, for vanquishing

---

[148] See R. B. Mckerrow, *Printers & Publishers Devices in England & Scotland, 1485-1640* (London, 1949), no. 391. It seems doubtful that this was actually a printers' device as it appeared in only a handful of works by the printer who owned it, Thomas Snodham.

[149] F. de. Tejeda, *Texeda retextus: or The Spanish monke his bill of divorce against the Church of Rome with other remarkable occurrences* (London, 1623), title-page; see also, ibid, *Hispanus conuersus* (London, 1623), title-page.

[150] S. Ward's *Balme from Gilead to Recover Conscience* (London, 1622), title-page. See also ibid, *Iethro's iustice of peace* (London, 1621) title-page; ibid, *The sermons and treatises which have beene heretofore seuerally published: and are now newly reuised, corrected and augmented* (London, 1623).

[151] *The confession of the faith, and doctrine believed and professed by the Protestants of Scotland exhibited to the estates of the first Parliament of King James the sixt: holden at Edinburgh, the 25 day of December, 1568, and authorized there.* (Edinburgh, 1638), title-page. Printed by George Anderson

[152] Scribner, *Simple Folk*, pp. 142-43; M. Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study of Joachinism* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 58, 420 n.1.

the Pope was the unofficial fourth mark of the True Church – Protestantism was a faith in which building the New Jerusalem was continually entwined with labouring to tear down Babylon. Once again, the woodcut was tonal not explicatory. Anti-Catholicism was invoked as a token of the Church's doctrinal purity, conferring authority on the *Confession's* contents, rather than expounding them.

Of course there were other ways of advertising a work's merits. In William Lilly's *A short Introduction of grammar* the fly-leaf sported a woodcut of people reaping the fruits of the Tree of Knowledge, a witty synopsis of the benefits which awaited readers inside [Fig. 48.][153] Clearly, Anti-Catholicism was not the only means of conferring authority on the printed page. Thus the tetragrammaton, a non-visual representation of God through the Hebrew letters for Adonai (Jehovah), was frequently placed at the beginning of sermons: the divine eye cast over the printed page.[154] Once again, this image was not illustrative. It did not relate to the specifics of a text's contents, but rather authorized its *quality*. Thus the *Five Sermons* (1637) of Humphrey Sydenham, a pro-Laudian minister [Fig. 49.][155] As viewers cast their eyes down the page a process of authorization occurred: God over-looked the page/sermon; which was constructed on His Word (the scriptural verses to be expounded); the foundation of all subsequent text. Syndenham's thoughts had been built upon solid ground, and his work stood in the highest lineage. The page's very structure was thus deeply visual, and paralleled the process of the construction of the Church as represented in Biblical frontispieces. Thus in the Coverdale Bible (1535), God overlooked the construction of the Church; which was based upon the dissemination of His Law (on the left) and Word (on the right) by Moses, Esdra and the Apostles; a process which Henry VIII, by circulating vernacular scriptures, replicated [Fig. 50.][156] The authority of Henry's Church was conferred by its position in the divine hierarchy above it, just like Sydenham's text.

---

[153] W. Lilly's *A short Introduction of grammar* (London, 1634/1638/1641/1645/1657). The image also appeared in W. Camden's, *Institutio graecae grammatices compendiaria, in usum regiae scholae Westmonasteriensis* (London, 1632/1633/1634/1640/1643).

[154] Corbett, & Lightbourn, *Comely Frontispieces*, p. 39.

[155] H. Sydenham, *Five Sermons* (London, 1637) pp. 1, 89, 129, 161. For similar examples, see J. Pigot, *Hierusalem bedewed with tears* (London, 1642), p. 1; T. Gataker, *A sparke tovvard the kindling of sorrow for Sion* (London, 1621), sig. B; G. Hughes, *The art of embalming dead saints* (London, 1642), p. 1.

[156] M. Coverdale, *The Byble, that is, the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully translated in to Englyshe* (Antwerp, 1535), title-page.

The tetragrammaton also conditioned viewer's reaction to the page, working as a spur to divine contemplation, a visual trigger to change the way in which readers used the text, and marking out parts of work as distinct from the rest. Richard West's *The schoole of virtue* (1619) provided a pertinent example [Fig. 51.] As a handbook instructing children how to behave throughout the day – how to dress, set a table, go to and from school, conduct themselves and what to eat and wear – this was a book to be *used*. The tetragammaton marked off one section as a different sort of practice, appearing in a cloud before the section on daily prayers. As in the pre-Reformation period, divine images called God to mind, focussing reader's attention upon the spiritual – as such, this image separated the section on prayer from that on conduct and household chores, a very visual mark distinguishing it as a different type of activity.[157]

VI: Images as Authority

Images conferred authority in other ways too. Ancient prophetic pictures became crucial *documents* supporting the Protestant charge that the Papacy was Antichrist. The 'official' theological line may have deemed prophecy a preserve of early Christianity which God had ended once the Church reached maturity, but even the most zealous Protestants could not dampen interest in astrology, prodigious births and omens, or quell interpretations of the Delphic Oracles, Merlin and the Galfridian prophecies which continued to thrive much as they had before the Reformation.[158] Post-Reformation culture was a landscape painted with a blend of Protestant and traditional hues.[159] The boundary between sacred and profane remained porous, and despite the very best efforts of the 'hotter sort' of Protestants to assert otherwise, the

---

[157] R. West's *The schoole of virtue, the second part, or, The young schollers paradice* (London, 1619), sig. C. Although the child was to learn how to say graces at the dinner table, prayer was a separate, more meditative, activity (sigs Avii-Aviii, Bvii-Bviii.) Cf. R. Brathwaite, *The English Gentleman* (London, 1633), in which a tetragrammaton is placed at the top of the first six sections (pp. 1, 2, 51, 75, 103, 165, 457.) The young gentleman was to keep God in mind as a means of avoiding sin, the devil and to pray regularly (p. 2.) For example p. 457: a gentlemen is to "scorn pride, as a derogation to Gentry; and walks with so pure a soule...he admires nothing more than a content spirit." The image not only confers authority on the page, but was to put the reader in mind of God as they read.

[158] Walsham, *Providence*, pp. 167-76, 203-09. K. Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 128-50, 389-96, 415-18.

[159] Alexandra Walsham and Tessa Watt have demonstrated homogeneity in the major themes and preoccupations of medieval and Reformation literature, and a re-casting of new theology in traditional motifs and means of expression: A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999); A. Walsham, "Vox Pscis: Or the Book-Fish: Providence & The Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline England", *Englsih Historical Review*, 114, (1999), pp. 574-606; T. Watt, *Cheap Print & Popular Piety*, (Cambridge, 1991).

divine was still seen to be active in the world – the trend was not for Protestants to efface belief in its manifestation, but to control understanding of such occurrences.[160] Indeed, many ministers steered interest in the prophetic to buttress support for their Church and its theology, publishing distinctly Protestant interpretations of such prophecies as they related to the day's political turmoil. At pertinent political moments prophetic images and texts were discovered stowed away in formally holy places such as monasteries and heralded as oblique allusions to current domestic or international crisis, obscure signs that divine support was firmly on the side of the Godly.[161] Pictures were particularly prescient. Thus Paul Graebner, a German Lutheran minister, showed Elizabeth I a pictorial prophecy deemed to relate to religious affairs in England, with the Pope, Jesuits and Catholic monarchs presaged in demonic creatures such as serpents and frogs, and in later to generations his image was reinterpreted to relate both to the Thirty Years War and the execution of Charles I.[162] These obscure prophecies confered ancient wisdom on current political problems. Much work has been done to unpick how they were read, *understood* and *used* in the confessional controversies of the day, but the more fundamental point that their very *existence* added to the documentary proof that Rome was Antichrist has eluded historians.[163]

Francis Bacon may have winced at their employment, lamenting that they perpetuated the notion that monks and nuns had special divine powers, but ancient clerical prophecies proved extremely useful to Protestants.[164] That Anti-Papal prophecies has been authored by clerical hands served to turn Rome's chorus against it, providing crucial snippets of information, a knowing wink from the past which confirmed the suspicions of the present – the pictures were thus key *documents* in what was akin to undercover policing; key witnesses from one of Rome's own that the Pope was Antichrist. Walter Lynne's *The Beginning and Endying of All Popery*

[160] Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, pp. 167-68, 175-76

[161] Ibid, p. 176, discussed documents found in earthenware pots in Derbyshire and East Anglican monasteries which "alluded obliquely to current domestic and dynastic developments; others were vehicles for moral exhortation of an entirely uncontroversial kind." See also, *A prophesie of the judgment day. Being lately found in Saint Denis church in France, and wrapped in leade in the forme of a heart* (London, 1620).

[162] J. Maxwell, *Admirable and notable prophecies* (London, 1615), pp. 87-88 for a description of this figure. See Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England*, p. 175.

[163] See, for example Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, pp. 463-4, 466-68.

[164] F. Bacon, *The essays or counsels, civill and morall* (London, 1625), p. 216.

(1548) provided a fitting example.[165] An allusive and elusive collection of eighteen prophetic images of the Pope and a variety of animals as an allegory of "the estate, that this Antichrist is in, hath bene in, or shall be in" until the Last Judgement, this related to specific events in Rome's past as a history of the Papacy's over lordship of Emperors and tyrannous subjection of the Gospel, ultimately predicting its immediate downfall at the hands of Protestants. Lynne stressed the image's antiquity, noting that "these figures are not of the author's owne invencion, ore of late daies invented: but they were found in auncient libraries about. CCC. Yeres sence" and could still be seen in a painting hanging in St. Laurence's Abbey in Luycke.[166] This, then, was not a Protestant author harnessing a pre-Reformation visual language to address the 'simple folk', but one gathering evidence against Rome. These pictures witnessed against the papacy:

> "Whereby it is manifest that the fathers of auncient tyme, sawe in the papacie, the thynge that they durst not utter, eyther by wordes or writinge, but trustinge that the time wolde come when men might be able to speake it: they dyd in the meane tyme kepe it in painting and portraiture, that such as could conjecture, might gather knowledge thereby, & that thynge might remayne tyll such tyme as god had appointed it to be declared both in writing and wordes."[167]

The monks knew the Papacy to be Antichrist, and the pictures were an expression of that knowledge. Not pap for the unlettered, they were important documents in the case against Rome. Indeed, that they were visual was not especially important. They were used like other texts which Protestants called as witnesses to turn Rome's own members against it: for example, Gregory the Great's statement that whoever shall call himself universal Priest "in the pride of his heart is the forerunner of Antichrist" was frequently cited as a 'proof' that as 'Universal Head' the Papacy was the arch-nemesis;[168] and quotations from Joachim of Fiorre, Irenaeus, the Sibyline Chronicles,

---

[165] Lynne, *The Beginning and Endying of All Popery*.
[166] Lynne *The Beginning and Endying of All Popery*, sig. Aiii.
[167] Ibid, sig. Aiii.
[168] Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel*, ed. J. Ayre, 4 vols, (Parker Society 24: Cambridge, 1845-50), ii, p. 914. Jewel used the former quotation frequently in his works, see ibid, i, p. 109; ii, p. 992; iv, p. 743. It was also common amongst other Reformers, see T. Becon, *The Reliques of Rome*, (London, 1563), sigs. Cviii-Di; H. Bullinger, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s*, (London, 1538), sig. Ciii; B. Ochino, *A tragoedie or dialoge of the unjuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome*, (London, 1548), sig. Dii; J. Sturm, *The epistle that John Sturminus, a man of great*

Augustine, Hilary and Jierome stating that Antichrist would appear within the Church were similarly stock-piled by Protestant authors as witnesses to this 'Truth'.[169] As key documents, Lynne's images conferred authority on the Protestant case.

Lynne's images were adapted from a prominent medieval prophetic text, the *Vaticina*, but authority could be conferred in a similar manner through images whose antiquity was more dubious.[170] Thus the "Advised prophecy" depicting the Papacy as Antichrist which appeared in Stephen Bateman's *Arrival of Three Graces in Anglia* (1580) [Fig. 52.][171] This depicted the Protestant view that the Papacy as an institution, rather than any individual Pope, was Antichrist and parodied the succession of pontiffs by depicting the process of Pope-making. Two eager demons gleefully stoked the fire as Antichrist – the Seven-Headed Beast of Revelation 13 – threw one recently deceased Pope, denuded of all his proud regalia, into hell's fires, and simultaneously excreted his successor in a filthy parody of birth. Another past incumbent of the seat of Rome popped his head up from hell to view the scene. Thus all Popes were created and crushed by Antichrist, and their consignment to hell was a fitting punishment from God:

> "The mighty Iove, the iudge of all, which settles in the thrown above
>
> Shall iudge ech Papall dignitie, the rable whole remove
>
> Such as the one the other is, and Cardinals likewise
>
> For the deformed flattery, the Lord will thus dispise
>
> And judge of all, both quick and dead
>
> Where[in] Popes shall boyle in bulles of lead."[172]

According to Bateman this picture dated from 1041 and had been discovered tucked away in a Jacobin monastery in Geneva during 1548, although I have found no evidence to support this claim. Nonetheless for Bateman this image, like Lynne's, was

---

lerninge and jugement, sent to the Cardyalles and prelates that were chosen and appointed by the Bysshop of Rome, to serche out the abuses of the churche, (London, 1538), sig. Bi.

[169] Jewel, *Works*, ii, pp. 912-17

[170] For the *Vaticina*, see Scribner, *Simple Folk*, pp. 142-43; Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy*, p. 58. Although originally a mid-thirteenth century text, multiple manuscript copies circulated in the following centuries, see p. 420, n.1.

[171] S. Bateman, *Arrival of Three Graces in Anglia* (1580), sig. Giii; ibid, *The doome warning all men to the iudgemente* (London, 1581), p. 261. Note that even in his decent to hell the Pope still clutches a bag on money.

[172] Ibid, sig. Giiii.

a surviving piece of the past which supported the views of the present, documentary proof that members of the Roman Church knew it to be Antichrist. Such was its importance as a piece of evidence that Bateman, a manuscript limner, inserted a hand-painted version into his own manuscript copy of that great record of the ages, the Nurnberg Chronicle [Fig. 53.][173] And yet he made very little of this sensational image. It was not expounded in any way, nor was it used to incite Anti-Catholicism or instil Anti-Roman tenets and had little to do with the main sway of Bateman's work, a long verse piece which called Englishmen to repent their sins, mortify their flesh, and live the life of charity which the Gospel called them to for, as the Bible showed, God would punish sin in this world and the next.[174] Rome was used as an example of what befell the worldly who did not repent and placed "the glory of this world...before God, [for] he must be worshipped in spirit and veritie."[175] That Popes were damned would have been self-evident to the majority of Elizabethan Protestants, and Bateman's eleventh-century prophecy undoubtedly had an aura of truth about it. This prophecy was one of many in the work's concluding section, all of which were included to confer authority on Bateman's view that sinners would reap their just reward and be punished, each recorded in detail as a catalyst urging men to repentence.[176] This image became Anti-Popery as parable.

A similar example can be seen in an equally oblique image simply entitled 'The Pope' (1621) [Fig. 54.][177] Originally a Dutch print c.1570 predicting that the final downfall of the Roman Church would occur in 1622-23 at the hands of a mighty king, it was perhaps published in England to complement calls for James I to take up

---

[173] Trinity College, Cambridge, Neveille bequeathment VI. 17.6, sig. CCLXII. There are some differences between the images: the Pope who pops his head up from hell had replaced three members of the Curia in a cauldron from the illustration; and there are three demons in the manuscript, only one of whom has bellows.

[174] Bateman, *Arrival of Three Graces in Anglia*, sigs. Giiii-Hi.

[175] Ibid, sig. Giiii. See also, "all these [prophecies] suffiseth to be fore warning to ye most part of the world, for the which cause, as the end of these few insamples, so shalbe the end of such indolent persons be."

[176] The prophecies concerned Popes, the Roman empire and the Sibiline Chronicles.

[177] John of Capistrano, *The Pope, translated out of an Old Dutch copye* (London, 1621). The prophecy is very vague, and all references in my text to Burgundy, Philip II and Charles V have been filled in – they are not stated explicitly in the original text. Information concerning the Habsburg house has been taken from R. A. Kann, *History of the Habsburg Empire* (Berkeley, 1980); C. W. Ingrao, *The Habsburg Monarchy, 1618-1815* (Cambridge, 2000) ; H. Kamen, *Empire: How Spain Became a world power 1492-1763* (London, 2004); A. W. Lovett, *Early Habsburg Spain, 1517-1598* (Oxford, 1986); M. J Rodriguez-Salgado, *The Changing Face of Empire: Charles V, Phillip II, and Habsburg authority 1551-9* (Cambridge, 1998). For Charles the Bold, I have drawn on R. Vaughan, *Charles the Bold: the last Valois Duke of Burgundy* (London, 1973); E. Tabri, *Political culture in the early Northern Renaissance: the court of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy (1467-1477)* (New York, 2004).

that mantle against the Catholic powers during the early stages of the Thirty Years War [Fig. 55.][178] Supposedly a copy of a fourteenth-century prophecy which predicted the dreaded emergence of the Habsburgs as dominant European power, the print served to edify Dutch Protestants who, although persecuted at the hands of the Habsburgs, could be assured of the Gospel's ultimate triumph and the subsequent downfall of Rome and all her princely supporters. Charles V (Carolus) supports himself by standing on Burgundy (a lion), a springboard for Habsburg rule. The 'ancient' text lamented the fate of Charles the Bold (1433-77), the last Valois Duke of Burgundy, who would "prepare for his yong a strong and everlasting nest, but none of the same shall possess it."[179] This related to the Duke's bulking-up of his power and landbase through war and diplomacy, endeavours which, given his untimely death in battle and the subsequent division of his lands between the French and the Habsburgs, proved fruitless. The Duke's misfortune would be the Habsburg's profit, and spawned the birth of a Dutch tragedy: "then shall there forthwith be elected in his place a zealous person by the name of Ferdinand...whose offspring [will] stretch itself to the end of the world."[180] Upon his death the Duke's daughter, Mary, was married to the Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor's son Maximilian, and his lands, including the Dutch provinces, thus fell under their control. Maximilian was the grandfather of Charles V who stood on Burgundy. The text predicted that Charles would persecute the gospel: "in 1547 a bitter enemy of the word [will] arise, which pretend to be a defender."[181] The formal union of the Netherlands and Austria occurred in 1547, and the region was unified with Spain two years later as the persecution of Protestantism intensified.[182] The prophecy was thus a bitter Dutch lament for the bad hand which history had dealt them.

And yet it was also humorous. The central scene was farcical. The Pope attempted to steer the ship of Christ, an increasingly difficult task now that the Gospel had *revealed* his true nature, and he was consequently depicted naked and vulnerable. Whilst attempting to peddle the wheel which controlled the ship's oars he relied upon

---

[178] W. L. Strauss, *The German Single Leaf Woodcut, 1550-1600: a pictorial guide*, 3 vols (New York, 1975), iii, p 1345. I must confess that some elements of this print elude me: the heraldry of the shields of the houses of Europe are for the most part in the dark simply because we do not have the colours to match them up. The star-shaped symbol on the Pope's right is a comet that appeared in 1460.
[179] Capistrano, *The Pope*.
[180] Ibid.
[181] Ibid.
[182] Ibid.

Charles V to "ballaunce" him, a metaphor for the fact that only the Emperor's wars propped up the Roman Church: "I am quit without your help."[183] The result was a humiliating, homo-erotic pose mocking them both vehemently. Indeed, the prophecy assured Protestant readers that these Catholic wars would prove fruitless because the Gospel would inevitably be victorious. In pursuing them, therefore, the Pope had employed feminine, or illogical, reason, the world turned upside down, and wars begun to enhance the Church's position would ultimately destroy it:

> "O Pope, O Duke of Millyane, howe feminine is thy warre, how woman like are they that depend on thee, wher as al warre bends it selfe against thee, to the ende that thou mayst fall."[184]

The "Duke of Millyane" was Charles V's son, Phillip II of Spain, who was awarded the Duchy as a fief by his father in 1540 following the death of Francesco II Sforza. As King of Spain he was the protagonist of wars against Protestant provinces in the Netherlands which erupted at the time the Dutch original of the print was issued. He was depicted in a demonic, monstrous manner as a dragon draped around the Pope's neck and providing him with a "Hellish Counsel", recognizable as Phillip only through the Millanese coat of arm (a snake eating a child) dangling from its tail.[185] Rome's precarious control over the Church was further mocked towards the bottom of the print through ironic use of the phrase "all the Emperors of the world shalbe cast under our feete." In Protestant literature events such as Pope Alexander III standing on the neck of Emperor Frederick II, and the Donation of Constantine's call for Emperor's to kiss the Pope's feet, were signs of the Pope's ravenous hunger for power, synonyms of its intent to subjugate secular rulers, the source of its power in history.[186] Yet the oars at the Pope's feet were merely "scraes", skinny and weak, lacking the necessary power to fulfil the Pope's intention to control the Church and losing ground to the "trustie oars of the ship" of Christ – the Protestant houses of

---

[183] Ibid.

[184] Ibid.

[185] See, A. C. Fox-Davies, *A complete guide to heraldry* (London, 1949), pp. 258-59, fig. 484.

[186] J. Frith, *A pistle to the Christian reader. The revelation of Antichrist* (Antwerp, 1529), sigs. civ-cv, cvii, gvii; W. Tyndale, *The practise of prelates* (Antwerp, 1530), sig. di; H. Parker, *The Exposition and declaration of the Psalme* (London, 1539), sigs. cii-ciii; M. Flacus Illtricus, *Wonderful newes of the deathe of Paul the III last byshop of Rome* (London, 1552), sig. Ci; T. Swinerton, *A Muster of Scismatyke bysshops* (London, 1534), sig. bii.

Europe. On the top right sat two lions of the House of Orange, and on the lower case the Protestant provinces of Germany: from the left, Trier, Cologne, Mainz, the Palatinate, and Brandenburg on the far right.[187] The Protestants inevitably held sway.

The text was equally prophetic of Protestant victory, noting that those who survived the great "slaughter and bloodshed" would do so because "they shall see and have God aid them."[188] The prophecy's successful prediction of the demise of Burgundy and the ascendancy of the Habsburgs would perhaps have invested its claims about the immediate future of Europe with a note of verity. It presaged that along with the Habsburgs, Catholic Bishops would fall and be replaced by men who displayed the "fruits of Godliness and lesse pride than Rome." More specifically, the French King – depicted as a rooster on the Pope's arm – "shalbe drawn out of his lands by his own subjects for he shal exercise tyranny against the Gospel."[189] The scales implied that in the face of a resurgent gospel the French monarch's position, like the Pope's, lay precariously in the balance. This prophecy was galvanized by its correlation to another, the Book of Revelations, which had predicted Antichrist's reign would span 1260 years. This pin-pointed the beginning of its demise to 1555, the "time that Charles V must give liberty of conscience" in the Peace of Augsburg, in which the Emperor effectively recognized Protestant presence in Europe as indelible.[190] It was confidently predicted that Rome would give up the ghost in 1622 or 1623.

This was a print which asked a lot of its viewers. It assumed recognition of the coats of arms of prominent noble houses; an awareness of the ins and outs of the doctrine of Antichrist and the Book of Revelations; and a familiarity with a century-and-a-half of European political history, for none of this information – the Peace of Augsburg, the life of Charles the Bold, the wars of Phillip II – was identified, listed, or spelled out *in* the image or text – viewers were expected to be able to unpack the opaque prophetic references and hang them on the narrative of the recent past. That it was targeted at an educated audience goes without saying. That it was not a crude piece of 'propaganda' seeking to convert readers to the Protestant cause should also be evident. Indeed, like the *Revels of Christendom* this print was a comment upon the

---

[187] T. Woodock & J. M. Robinson, *The Oxford Guide to Heraldry* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 15-19; A. C. Fox-Davies, *A complete guide to heraldry* (London, 1949), pp. 258-59, fig. 484.
[188] Capistrano, *The Pope.*
[189] Ibid.
[190] Ibid.

political circumstances of the day, and like that print it was not a means of communicating information about the events and processes it described, bur rather assumed a *knowing* viewer. Like the *Revels of Christendom* it also preached to the converted, its arcane wisdom edifying Protestant's resolve by re-assuring them that they not only had the Gospel on their side, but that victory was pre-ordained. But it did not do this by pissing on the papists. This image's very existence conferred authority. Like Lynne's *Beginning and Endying of All Popery*, this image served as a witness to an evangelical view of history – proof that the Protestants were correct, evidence that long before their protest men *knew* Rome to be Antichrist. "This strange figure hath been drawne and paynted out two hundred years before the birth of Christ" the print proclaimed. Its origins were not discussed, but it had been unpicked by John of Capistrano, who had laboured for a decade to "discover the mysterys thereof and by all means to make knowe the secrets of the same", a feat finally achieved with the aid of God. Upon understanding, he hid the image and his prophecy in a wall "whereby it might after hys death be found out and dispersed".[191] For all its humour and scabrous tone, this image was evidence, a means of validation, a star witness in the Protestants' case.

VII: Conclusion

Printed images served many purposes. They were documents (both fraudulent and real) in the case against Rome; quips in the margins; stamps which conferred authority on a printed text; witty commentaries on the political affairs of the day; and oblique puzzles intended to challenge the minds of the educated, serving to illustrate an author's ingenuity, to enrich the experience of reading his work and enhance its value as an object. In subsequent chapters, we shall see that images were also used to pull heart-strings, displaying Catholic cruelties to the reader in a more immediate manner and consequently making them more pliant to accept the author's case – hatred sprouted deeper roots when it gripped the emotions as well as the intellect.[192] Faced with such a fecundity of employment, it would be fruitless to attempt to summarize the services of imagery on the printed-page under a 'catch-all' mantle. It is

---

[191] To date I have been unable to discover any information which supports this claim, as accounts of John of Capistrano are silent on the issue.
[192] See below, Chapter Three, pp. 232-33.

far easier to move discussion forward with the negative: images did not politicize the semi-literate, and they were not 'books for the unlettered'. Due to the expense of their production, images were largely the preserve of expensive works, but their absence from the eyes of the least educated was more than simply a case of opportunity – a significant proportion of images were designed to be *exclusive* not *inclusive*, puzzles to flatter and delight the erudite rather than road-signs to dumb-down principles and positions to the lowest-common-denominator.[193] Their impact came not from an immediately felt polemical slap, but the delight gained from un-wrapping the curious iconography which teased the eye.

Indeed, picturing the Pope was rarely a crude attempt to spark Anti-Catholicism but rather to poke a fire which was already raging. More often than not, Anti-Papal images were witty satires on the politics of the day, the intention being not to plant seeds of hatred but to water those already planted by provoking the sort of laughter which can only spring from entrenched hostility to an established enemy. Thus the image of a proud Pope in full regalia held-up by a gunman who exclaimed, mockingly, 'Redde Ratione Vilicationis tuae' (deliver the robber his reckoning) – the joke was surely that through robbery Fortune had brought the prince of purgatory, the thief of soul and coin alike, to a fitting punishment [Fig. 56.][194] The image was included in a translation of a French work written before Henry IV converted to Catholicism which celebrated the imminent ascendency of a Protestant King in France. The tract recounted the arrival of Henry's servant at the Papal court to inform the pontiff rather brashly that Henry would not submit to popery and would be king whether the Pope liked it or not – any resistance would only lead to embarrassment of Catholic forces on the battlefield. The image seconded this royal slap in the face, and was (allegedly) part of a *pasquinade* displayed in public at Rome. Its appearance apparently caused much chatter: "which being seene to the commen people made them greatly to murmur and bee of sundry imaginations."[195] What did the image *mean*, they asked? For some it foreshadowed the Pope's murder. Others took it to be an allegory of Catholicism's imminent downfall. Most people, however, believed that it served simply to deride. The text left this interpretative quandary unresolved:

---

[193] M. Jones, *The Print in England* (New Haven/London, 2010), pp. 1-2.
[194] *Newes from Rome, Spaine, Palermo, Geneuae and France. With the miserable state of the City of Paris, and the late yielding uppe of sundrie Townes of great strength unto the king* (London, 1590), sig. Aiii. Note the empty banderole in the woodcut – in the original the exclamation was most probably included with the image itself. Perhaps the English printer did not have the skill to do this.
[195] Ibid, sig. Aii.

laughter, it seems, was 'meaning' enough. In this regard the image was typical of so many other satires. This *pasquinade* was intended as a discussion piece, a means of grabbing the public's eye and directing their attention towards the verse pinned below which satirized the Pope's ill-living, his idolatry and his humiliation by the French king.[196] Once again, through laughter the viewer joined a collective pissing on the papists, and the image 'meant' little more than this invitation to ridicule. Indeed, the Pope was humiliated in much the same manner as the Duke of Savoy who, in a bout of Divine Justice for his recent embargo of Geneva, had been reduced to a ridiculous figure, fleeing a battle naked save for his crown – although commonly resorting to the gavel of wrathful vengeance, it seems that the Protestant God was occasionally the broker of practical jokes too [Fig. 57.][197] Much Anti-Papal satire was indebted to the tradition of *pasquinades* – satirical writings attached to the mutilated statue of the *campidoglio* in Rome – a tradition well known in England through translations of the Italian Protestant Celia Secondo Currione's collection *Pasquillorum Tomi Duo*, which included a woodcut depiction of the *campidoglio* draped in invective [Fig. 58.][198] But to provoke laughter was not to be trite, and printed images should not be de-graded to the status of historical fluff, the kitsch of a bygone era. They were not merely concerned with amusement. Beyond mere jest they had a darker purpose, seeking to taunt rather than to tease: although they played little part in the creation of Anti-Catholic feeling in England they were a product of it, and their circulation confirmed and perpetuated prejudices that simultaneously cemented a sense of Protestant

---

[196] Ibid, sig. Aiiii for the verses.

[197] Ibid, sig. Av. I have not been able to find any evidence that this was true. The struggle over the Duke's of Savoy's overlordship of Geneva dated to the late 15th century, and sieges had occurred in the 1530s. Charles Emmanuel I (Duke 1580-1630) was far more aggressive than previous Dukes and warred with Henry IV of France over Saluzzo in the late 1580s. Between 1586 and 1589 he blockaded Geneva (this is clearly what the text refers to), and war with him would outlast the Spainish-French conflict ended at Vervins in 1598. Indeed, Geneva's defeat of Savoy and Spain in a siege of 1602 (the escalade) is still celebrated today.

[198] Celia Secondo Currione *Pasquine in a traunce a Christian and learned dialogue. Turned but lately out of the Italian into this tongue, by W.P. Seene* (London, 1566). The 1584 edition was printed by Thomas East, and contained the pull out image of the campidoglio depicted here. This was clearly a continental image. Currione's work was originally published in Basel in 1544 had been translated by Bernadino Occhino *Pasquino in Estasis* (Rome, 1545). The Latin inscription on the base of the statue reads 'vivere qui sancte cuptis, discedite Roma:/ Omnia cum liceant, non licet esse bonus'. The pasquinades on the side are mainly Italian and lampoon the Papacy's behaviour. They translate roughly as follows (top to bottom): "The wisdom of insanity; Others know I say this; Not even sober; You never live badly if you live at court; 'see how I am, singing/chanting a little of the truth."

superiority and punished the enemy – the identity of the victor depended upon the humiliation of the vanquished, and laughter was its source of nourishment.[199]

[199] For the power of laughter and ridicule see A. Fox, "Religious Satire in English Towns" in P. Collinson & J. Craig (eds.), *The Reformation in English Towns* (Basingstoke, 1998); and P. Collinson "Ecclesiastical vitriol: religious satire in the 1590s and the invention of Puritanism" in J. Guy (ed.) *Reign of Elizabeth I* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 150-70.

Chapter 2: Doing Damage From a Distance: Anti-Catholicism, Shame & Iconoclasm on the Printed Page

The Pope's embarrassed smile betrayed art articulating a fantasy [Fig. 59.] The *Third New Years Gift to the Pope*'s (1576) author awarded his text a punitive function, envisaging its doctrinal polemic as a public shaming of the Roman Church, a thunderous trumpet blast so loud as to arrest the attention of all Protestants, causing them to down tools and to point and jeer at the papists openly humiliated in the finger pillory.[1] The joke underpinning his woodcut was clear. The pillory – an L-shaped hole which painfully bent the finger in the middle – was employed to punish offenders with public humiliation: the Pope, of course, was Christendom's ultimate transgressor.[2] Its particular crime here, however, was silence. Our author constructed a fantasy of himself as victor and the Roman Church as vanquished, shamed by its inability to answer the charges he had levelled against them in his previous *New Years Gift* twelve months earlier.[3] This tacit expression of guilt was enough to brand the Roman Church outlaw:

> "This whole year the papists have stood printed (at John Allde's stall in the Paltrie) with their finger in a hole without making answere: And therefore their silence giveth authorite to the same bil [the second *New Years Gift*].... they are therefore authorized to stand with one finger in a hole with one hand, and with the other hand holding up the Pope with fire, sword, gun and spear, w[ith]out any other answer to be obtained."[4]

At this point joke piled upon joke, shame heaped upon shame, for this image of punishment was a spectacular inversion of Papal triumph. Raised on a platform, the pontiff was depicted in a parody of Papal *possesso* in which he was customarily carried aloft in a Chair of State, his *sedia gestatora*, vaunted above all [Figs. 60 & 61.] Throughout Protestant literature this rite was deemed emblematic of the pride of

---

[1] *The Third newyeerers gift and the second protest against all the learned papists* (London, 1576), sig. Aii.

[2] E. W. Pettifer, *Punishments of Former Days* (Hampshire, 1992), p. 96. An example still survives at the Parish Church of Ashby-de-la-Zouche, Leicestershire.

[3] *Third newyeers gift*, sigs. Aii-Aiii, Bi. I have been unable to locate a copy of the author's previous new years gift.

[4] Ibid, sig. Aii.

Antichrist encapsulating the Papacy's illicit desire to be worshipped as God on earth.[5] Here however, pomposity had been punctured by polemic - the glorious procession rendered ingloriously static.

Viewers were invited to jeer at this Roman impotence by the herald on the opposite page, to heap scorn upon the pillory's victim and simultaneously glorify the *New Years Gift*'s author: "if one Trumpet this yere will not make you learned papists to answere, the next yeere looke from these two trumpets" [Fig. 62.][6] Indeed, our author felt that his exposure had made the Papist's position perilous. That it now supported its throne by force – guns, swords and the fires of Inquisition – rather than theology was a recognition that it had come unstuck, that even learned papists could not match our unlearned Protestant. Outwitted, it had taken to persecuting its Truer opponents in order to cover its exposed flank.[7] Here our author expressed a current trend of Antichristian theology. Unmasked in the Last Times, divines noted, Antichrist put-off cunning and turned to bloodshed, a reality to which recent slaughters in the Netherlands, France and Marian England bore witness.[8] Our author's employment of the pillory was to see this Antichristian rage routed, the Beast of Babylon rendered toothless by the potent combination of wit and polemic - Rome reduced to ridicule.

The laughter he envisaged the Papists being subjected to was not of jest but of derision. It was a guttural, mocking and hostile laughter which was the product of a scoff or jeer rather than a wry smile, a laughter employed routinely in early modern society as a means of enforcing social morés and censuring illicit behaviour.[9] In short,

---

[5] See below, Chapter Five, pp. 342-45.; J. Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, 2 vols, (4t[h] edition: London, 1583), i pp. 779-91.

[6] *Third newyeers gift*, sig. A.

[7] Ibid, sig. Aiii.

[8] See below, Chapter Five, pp. 287-97.

[9] A. Bellany, "Railing Rhymes Revisited: Libels, Scandals, and Early Stuart Politics", *History Compass* (2007), pp. 1136–1179; ibid, "'Raylinge Rymes and Vaunting Verse': Libellous Politics in Early Stuart England, 1603–1628", in P. Lake & K. Sharpe (Eds.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Stanford, 1994), pp. 285-310; ibid, "A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse: Puritanism, Libel and Sedition after the Hampton Court Conference", *Journal of British Studies*, 34, (1995), pp. 137–64; ibid, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 97-111; T. Cogswell, "Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture", in M. Kishlansky & S. Amussen (Eds.), *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern* England (Manchester, 1995), pp. 277-300; P. Collinson, "Ecclesiastical vitriol: religious satire in the 1590s and the invention of puritanism", in J. Guy (Ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 150-70; P. Croft, "The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* Sixth Series 1 (1991), pp. 43-69; J. Eckhardt, "'Love-Song Weeds and Satyrique

it was a laughter that was punitive. In a world where reputation mattered, such laughter was savagely destructive – not just humiliating, but obliterating. Indeed, there was something almost somatic about the impact of a libel. Satirists often compared their practice to that of Barber Surgeons, a violent purgation which accompanied the revelation of moral defects.[10] Thus the royalist poet John Taylor attacked the sectarian ironmonger Henry Walker during the early 1640s:

> "I could write lines (thou fowle ill looking elfe)
>
> Should make thee (in Iambicks) hang thy selfe,
>
> Th'art fowle within, and my pen a sharpe lancing quill
>
> Can make Incision, and with Art and skill
>
> Search deep for dead flesh and corroded Cores
>
> And fore corruption cleare and clense thy sores,
>
> Th'art almost Gangreen'd, and I surely think
>
> No Ballum's better than a proper Ink."[11]

Public satire was destructive – Taylor invited his reader to ponder Walker's corroded core, his suicide for shame. But if satire was cutting, it was also punitive. The *New Yeers Gift's* author fantasized that the laughter his work provoked would subject the Pope to a dissipation of reverence akin to that of the chanting of taunting rhymes, public posting of derogatory drawings and hanging of horns at the door of a cuckolded man, humorous displays of public disapproval of his failure to fulfil his role as patriarch and reign-in his lusty wife; or derision sanctioned by ecclesiastical courts when causing penitents to publicly don a white sheet, or the Star Chamber's imposition of the stocks to subject its victims to the jeers and gibes of onlookers, the

---

Thorns': Anti-Courtly Love Poetry and Somerset Libels", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 69 (2006), pp. 47-66; A. Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", *Past and Present* 145 (1994), pp. 47-83; M. Ingram "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture' in early modern England", *Past and Present* 105 (1984), 79-113; ibid, "Charivari and Shame Punishments: Folk Justice and State Justice in Early Modern England", in H. Roodenburg and P. Spierenburg (Eds.), *Social Control in Europe: 1500-1800* (Ohio, 2004), pp. 288-308; A. McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, 2004), *passim*; K. Thomas, "The Place of Laughter in Tudor and Stuart England", TLS (Jan. 21, 1977).

[10] M. C. Randolph, "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: its possible relationships and implications", *Studies in Philology*, 38 (1941), pp. 127-59.

[11] J. Taylor, *A Reply as true as Steele* (London, 1641), p. 7.

cackles of scorn which accompanied a reputation's fall.[12] Such events could be utterly destructive in a society where a good name was a form of cultural credit steering a man's ability to function in the community. There was often little redress from the exposure to public infamy and shame, blots which could ruin a business and break households as generations of work invested in a name unravelled in the passage from respectable to ridiculous.[13] By pillorying the Pope our author tapped into a fear which resonated with early modern people – a fear of being 'balladed', the object of a derisive depiction in word or image.[14] His polemic intended to expose the Roman Church to the destructive effects of shame, for it to lose all 'credit' in the world.

He was not alone in fantasizing of Antichrist's demise in curiously punitive terms, of employing a macabre humour to rout Rome. Over a century later one author conceived of his ridiculing Rome's spurious miracles as the execution of a heretic, the shame of revealing its frauds casting Antichrist to annihilation:

> "Yet, let me say, Though I am still obscure,
>
> My hearts on fire to burn the ROMISH WHORE
>
> 'Bove all, to keep her from the British Strand:
>
> And Crush her PIMPS already in the land."[15]

Encouraging his readers to laugh at Rome's ridicule, this author conceived of the shame of exposure in terms akin to crowds jeering at a heretic's execution. Other works collapsed ridicule and punishment more explicitly. William Winstanley's *The Protestant Almanack* (1682) presented viewers with "An Infallible Dial to find the true hour of the Day", an image of a Jesuit on the gallows [Fig. 63]:

> "Take a Jesuit, and Hang him upon a Gibbet, in a perpendicular line without motion: then turn him gingerly towards the Sun, with his mouth open; and observe where the shadow of his Roman nose falls up upon the bear-lines, and then you will see the true time of the day in England."[16]

---

[12] Thomas, "The Place of Laughter", pp. 77-8; Ingram "Ridings, Rough Music ", *passim*; ibid, "Charivari and Shame Punishments", pp. 288-308.

[13] Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", p. 56.

[14] See below, pp. 79-103.

[15] Hibernicus Mercurius, *A pacquet of popish delusions, false miracles, and lying wonders* (London, 1681), sig. A2.

[16] W. Winstanley, *The Protestant Almanack* (1682), sig. A3.

Not only satisfying an urge to punish their enemy, the cruel laughter here came from dishonour, the image inviting readers to imagine a cleric's gauping corpse dangling from a gibbet in lieux of their "wishing for the same to be tried" with a real Jesuit.[17] The humour here was one of scorn, and by eliciting it Protestant polemic was tied to public punishment. Indeed, Anti-Catholic texts revelled in expounding the details of the death befalling traitors, languishing on the process of being hung, drawn and quartered, of bowels being burnt in the flames and "severed Heads lifted up as high in shame, as e'r before in Ambition";[18] an invitation to cackle paralleled in polemic's equally public display of Rome's ridiculous doctrine and fraudulent miracles – "the simplest Protestant, as well as the most intelligent, will not only laugh at them but utterly scorn and detest them."[19] Such scorn was more important in winning polemical battles than righteous indignation alone, and authors understood that dishonour was often more impactful than anger: "[many] rebuke them for their Crimes, while that I do but laugh at them. But with the good leave of those Gentlemen, that are so easily scandalized, I will say that there is sometime made a greater impression of the horror of the Vice in dexterously scoffing at it, than in down right railing after it."[20]

Inviting their readers to join in the collective scoffing, authors imagined their audiences' reactions to print to be akin to the jeers elicited from spectators of executions or shaming of social transgressors. Polemic was thus often conceived of as a form of punishment. Shame in print acted as a means of retribution upon Christendom's ultimate transgressor, dishonour serving to rob it of any claim to sanctity and respect in the world. Understanding print to be indebted to the rituals of shame and justice in early modern culture forces us to push over current conceptions of polemic as articulated by Patrick Collinson:

"What matters is not what people were in themselves, but what they were doing to each other and saying about each other and against each other...what

---

[17] Ibid, sig. A3.
[18] E. Sparke, *Thysiasteron, vel, Santilla altaris primate devotion, in the feats and fasts of the Church of England* (London, 1679), p. 589. See also BM Sat 12; S. Clark, *The history of the glorious life, reign, and death of the illustrious Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1682), pp. 105-07.
[19] Mercurius, *A pacquet*, sig. A3.
[20] G. de Bremond, *The pilgrim, a pleasant piece of gallantry* (London, 1680), sig. A4.

matters is not what was thought (and most thoughts are hidden from us) but what it was politically advantageous to alledge."[21]

That not every word on a polemicist's page provided a bee-line to their minds has long been recognized, for rhetoric and the distortion of their opponent's position to buttress their own were essential components of a polemicist's armoury.[22] However, such conceptions of polemic see it as being concerned with winning an argument, of entering into a hostile exchange of ideas. Yet often, it was an attempt to do much, much more - to rout and vanquish an opponent. Many polemicists did not imagine themselves in dialogue with Rome – they saw themselves annihilating its honour, opening it to shame by exposing its frauds and errors. What was important was not so much what was said – for much Anti-Catholic polemic was repetitive to the point of being generic – but the fact that such exposures was stated over and over.[23] Antichrist's continual revelation was a means of re-affirming Protestant's verity in the face of such a daunting foe. Revelation was a form of shame, a means of vanquishing the enemy.[24] In this society, punishment through derogatory laughter alleviated anxiety. Shaming whores, scolding women and cuckolded husbands was a means of kicking out kinks in the ideal order, of re-affirming the ideal patriarchal society which dominating women and dominated men threatened to subvert.[25] Polemic's shame was response to another soiled ideal: the perpetual presence of Antichrist in Jerusalem. For all the success of the Protestant Reformation, a resurgent post-Tridentine Catholicism increasingly dominated European politics and geography and England's Church looked increasingly isolated in the House of God. Antichrist, then, was remarkably resilient. But if its was a daunting enemy in the world, it could at least be controlled and routed upon the page – polemic's punishment galvanized Protestant resolve in the verity of their Church, reminding the Godly that, however awe-inspiring was their

---

[21] P. Collinson, *The Puritan Character. Polemic and Polemicists in Early Seventeenth Century English Culture* (Los Angeles, 1989), pp. 16-17.
[22] For the importance of rhetoric, see M. Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Late Stuart Britain: partisanship and political culture* (Oxford, 2005), part II.
[23] On repetition, see below pp. 115-20.
[24] On anxieties concerning Antichrist see below, Chapter Five, pp; C. Z. Wiener, "The Beleagured Isle: A study of Elizabethan and Jacobean Anti-Catholicism", *Past & Present*, 51, (1971), pp. 27-62. On the importance of revelation in Anti-Catholic polemic, see A. Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy & The English Literary Imagination* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 24-38.
[25] Thomas, "Place of Laughter", pp. 74-79.

adversary, it was they who resided in Jerusalem. Scorn was thus empowering, a means of control diminishing the scope of the enemy through dishonour.

It will be argued here that polemic was often less an intellectual practice and more often than not a punitive one. Anti-Catholic writers and readers were not concerned with debating Rome but wounding it – their invitation to derogatory laughter and scorn indebted to cultural practices of ridicule, a means of dishonouring from a distance. The printed-page was an extension of the culture of shame. The yearning to ridicule Rome was expressed most directly through the image. Prints not only replicated derisive acts but amplified them through dissemination – the more eyes that gazed upon the shamed, the greater their disgrace. This was an echo of libelling prevalent throughout early modern society, in which hand-written doggerel was displayed in public areas to shame a transgressor.[26] Adam Fox has shown that these often included crudely drawn portraits representing their targets. Such doodles pinned the effects of shame more keenly on the subject of ridicule.[27] A man's visage encapsulated his reputation and honour – thus the bite of the cuckold's horns or the scars imposed for sedition – and to target it was to attack him more sharply. The printed page extended this *ad hoc* practice.[28] Employing strategies that were deeply familiar to their intended audiences made the satirical bite of Anti-Catholic imagery cut more deeply, and fulfilled a fundamentally punitive yearning for English Protestants convinced that Antichrist raged continuously against them – the display, ridicule, punishment and shaming of society's chief enemy. Punitive laughter confronted the anxieties of early modern society – ridiculing a man who could not control his wife was a means of resolving tensions about the failing of patriarchal ideals, about the threat of unruly women to the social order. And just as the traitor, whore, adulterer or cuckold threatened order, so did Catholicism – polemic filled the void created by the absence of revenge in the form of *actual* punishment, acting as a substitute shaming and articulating a Protestant fantasy of obliterating the honour of Rome.

---

[26] Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", passim; Bellany, "Railing Rhymes Revisited", pp. 1136–1179; ibid, "'Raylinge Rymes and Vaunting Verse", passim; ibid, "A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse", pp. 137–64.

[27] Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", pp. 49-51, 56, 62.

[28] See ibid, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", pp. 69-71 for an example of a libel passing into print. Indeed, the *New Yeers Gift's* author's claims that Papists had stood "printed (at John Allde's stall in the Paultrie) with their finger in a hole" may have been more than bravado – perhaps the woodcut was a replication of a drawing actually displayed at that stall.

If the printed page replicated strategies of shame, it also aped practices of iconoclasm endemic in early modern society. In appropriating and inverting Rome's own imagery (the Papal *possesso*) the *New Yeers Gift*'s woodcut echoed *actual* moments of iconoclasm during the period [Figs. 60 & 61.] Idols were held aloft for defamation, not deference. As its militancy ascended English Protestantism became increasingly iconoclastic.[29] But whilst increased opposition to Rome undoubtedly cemented the call to expunge any remnants of its 'idolatry' as a permanent and often unsettling presence within the English Church, we most reject the assumption that iconoclasm was simply a rejection or destruction. Paradoxically, it increased the focus upon illicit objects. Acts of iconoclasm often involved the *display* of Catholic paraphernalia to weaken belief in the doctrine and practices that it represented.[30] It was deemed necessary for the laity to *see* that icons and relics were not holy – that they were mere wood and stone – in order to de-mystify the idol and de-stabilize their relationship to the belief system it underpinned.[31] It will be argued that illustrations replicated this de-mystifying display on the printed page as part of the process of demonstrating True worship. Defining Catholicism as the religion of falsehood served as much to buttress Protestant claims to be persecuted witnesses of Truth as it did to weaken allegiance to the Roman faith.[32] Consequently it was necessary for Protestants to engage with and re-define Roman symbolism, to replace one way of seeing with another.

That these urges were inherent in English Protestantism can be seen in their co-option for political ends. Studies from either end of our period – a libellous Marian satire of 1555 and the Pope Burning Processions which engulfed celebrations of Elizabeth I's accession day in London annually between 1679 and 1681 – will demonstrate that ridiculing the Roman Church proved a powerful means of agitation at times of crisis, a means by which opposition to the regime was performed. If

---

[29] M. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts: volume 1, Laws against Images* (Oxford, 1988), *passim*; D. MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant* (London, 1999), pp. 5, 9-14, 20, 134-36; J. Phillips, *The Reformation of Images* (London, 1973), passim.

[30] H. Diehl, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism & popular theater in Early Modern England* (Ithaca/ London, 1997), pp. 40-49; A. Kemp, *The Estrangement of the Past* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 85-95; J. N King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, 1989), pp. 122-3, 171; J. N. King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture,* (Cambridge, 2006) pp. 162-67.

[31] R. W. Scribner, "Ritual and Reformation" in his *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (London, 1987), pp. 103-122.

[32] P. Lake, "Anti-popery: The structure of a prejudice", in R. Cust, & A. Hughes, (Eds.), *Conflict In stuart England: studies in Religion & Politics, 1603-1642* (Harlow, 1989), pp. 72-106.

printed images were indebted to the wider culture of shame, in the Pope Burning Processions graphic satire fed back into that culture, for these events were essentially an elaborate *charivari* of the Papacy in which laughter exorcised anxiety about the status of Catholicism in England when the prospect of a popish Succession loomed large. Here punishment, ridicule and iconoclasm combined in a riotous bout of humour which served to score the fulfilment of the fantasy of honour turned to humiliation, of reverence routed – the threat of popery diminished by laughter.

II: Images and the Cult of Shame

'Image' is often approached as a discrete category by scholars. In truth, however, the visual worked alongside other media, both informing and being informed by pamphlets, plays and songs to form part of a much wider palette of satire and polemic. Indeed, graphic satirists employed tropes of culture that were deeply familiar to their viewers.[33] They did so not out of a desire to reach those disenfranchised by text but because often a barb's sting was sharper, a joke's punch-line more poignant, if it was comprehended with relative speed.[34] Iconography collected connotations: to appropriate and inject a familiar motif into a new context was often to unleash a wealth of accrued meanings and communicate by association.

This becomes apparent in the use of *Tempora Filia Veritatis* (Truth, the daughter of Time) as the central motif in, *The Travels of Time: loaden with Popish Trumperies; from Great Britain to Rome* (c. 1624), part of the vociferous Anti-Catholic celebrations which engulfed London following the collapse of the proposed 'Spanish Match' between the future Charles I and the Spanish Infanta [Fig. 64.][35] This celebration of the 'Blessed Revolution' in Foreign Policy during 1623-24, in which England's Crown became belligerently Anti-Catholic, was drenched in familiar resonances. *Tempora Filia Veritatis* had been embedded in Western culture for

---

[33] In broadsides and book illustrations print and text worked together.

[34] Images were not pap for the unlettered, but sophisticated and complex satires aimed at the politically aware. See above, Chapter One, pp. 29-37, 60-70.

[35] For earlier work on this print see R. Lemon, (Ed.), *Catalogue of a Collection of Printed Broadsides in the Possession of The Society of Antiquaries in London* (London, 1866), pp. 67-68; H. Pierce, "'Unseemly Pictures': political graphic satire in 1620s England", *The British Art Journal*, 6, (2005), pp. 56-61. Although Pierce's piece misses the apocalyptic reference, I am indebted to it for iconographic detail.

millennia.[36] The rejuvenative significance of Time overturning his hourglass to usher-in a new beginning was surely familiar to the mass of early modern Londoners who witnessed his appearance in the annual Lord Mayor's pageants.[37] Prevalent in Greek drama, the Latin poetry of Seneca, scholarship of Church Fathers like Tertullian and the Byzantine Church, and celebrated during the Renaissance in the work of Lucien, the proverbs of Erasmus, and Petrach's *Triumphs*, the notion that Time would restore Truth or rescue it from Falsehood could evoke moods of joy or melancholy, growth or destruction, restoration of chastisement.[38] In England such associations had been brought to bear in the celebration of the overthrowal of Rome since the reign of Henry VIII, and the motif became something of a watchword of legitimacy which successive regimes draped themselves in. Mary I had taken the motif as the motto which dressed her coins, seals and crest, a fact which viewers of Elizabeth I's coronation revels must have been aware of.[39] The new Queen was involved in a performance of delicious inversion. Truth handed Elizabeth the *Verbum Dei* (Protestant Bible) to prodigious cheers.[40] This amounted to a rejoinder to the Christmas Revels of 1553, in which Truth had handed (Protestant) malefactors of the previous reign over to Mary; and the marriage revels of 1554, during which Truth had appeared before the Queen "with a

---

[36] F. Kiefer, "The Iconography of Time in The Winter's Tale", *Renaissance and Reformation*, 23, (1999), pp. 49-64; E. Panofsky, "Father Time" in his *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (Oxford/ New York, 1939), pp. 70-93; F. Saxl, "Veritas Filia Temporis" in R. Kilbansky and H. J. Paton (eds.) *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernest Cassirer* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 197-222.

[37] T. Dekker, *Dramatic Works*, (Ed.) F. Bowers, 4 volumes (Cambridge, 1980), III, p. 235; A. Munday, *Chruso-Thriambos: The triumphes of Gold* (London, 1611). For an additional example, see *The Triumphs of Truth*, in A. H. Bullen (Ed.) *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, 8 vols (London, 1885), VII, p. 250. This was the Lord Mayor's show from 1613. Cf. Shakespeare's *A Winter's Tale*, in which Time's moment on stage served as a lynch-pin balancing the action and its resolution. Cf. *Love's Labour's Lost* (1.1:4); *Measure for Measure* (5. 1:12).

[38] The motif appears to have originated in Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, xii. 11, 7. See also Tertullian, *Apolog.* 7; Erasmus, *Adagiorum opus* (Basel, 1526), p. 436; Cicero, *De natura deorum*, book 2 chap. 25, trans. H. Rackham (New York, 1933), p. 185. The conflicting positive and negative connotations can be seen in the motif's use in ancient Greece. Aescheyles employed Time to reveal guilt and usher in its punishment, whilst in the poetry of Pinder it restored valour and gave true honour its due (Saxl, "Veritas Filia Temporis", p. 200. n.1)

[39] J. G. Nichols (Ed.), *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary*, Camden Society Publications No. 48 (1850), p. 157; F. Sandford, *Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England* (London, 1707), pp. 499-500.

[40] J. G. Nichols (Ed.), *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (New York, 1823), I, p. 50: "Between...hylles was made artificiallye one hollowe place or cave, with doore and loke enclosedl oute of the whiche...raised one personage, whose name was Tyme, apperylled as an olde man, with a syhte in his hande, havynge winges artificiallye made, leadinge a personage of lesser stature than himselfe,....all cladde in white silke, and directly over her head was set her name and tytle, in Latin and Englishe 'Tempora filia, The Daughter of Time'... And on her head was written *Verbum Veritum*." Saxl, "Veritas Filia Temporis", p. 207.

boke in her hand, wherein was written *Verbum Dei*".[41] This glorious act of subversion was something which subsequent artists and playwrights were keen to play with in their depictions of Elizabeth.[42] As we shall see throughout this chapter, legitimizing and celebrating the Reformation often involved actively appropriating the iconography of Rome.

The Travels of Time thus employed a motif long associated with celebratory routing and revelation of Rome to harness the weight of a Tudor past behind the glories of a Stuart present.[43] Connotations of triumphalism were prevalent in the central scene of Time lugging the Pope on his back, removing him from England and carting him back to Rome. This was an allegory of recent events. Next to Time stood Truth magnifying the light of the Gospel to ignite a fire at the foot of the tree of True Religion.[44] When copies of a recent Proclamation expelling Jesuits from the realm were placed on this fire by Father Time, they created smoke which drove Jesuitical-locusts from the tree's branches. These were the locusts of Revelation 9, the beasts released from the Bottomless Pit to delude the reprobate into following the False Church, and part of the "scrives...engines...[and] tonckes [of] Machiavellian policies" with which Don Diego Samiento de Acuma Gondomar – the Spanish Ambassador to England between 1613 and 1622 seen using his buttocks to incubate further locust eggs – had employed in the hope that the "Cause Catholik [would be] advanc'd."[45]

[41] W. W. Greg (Ed.), *Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas 1553*, Early English Text Society, no. 226 (London, 1952).

[42] Pieter van der Heyden's *Dianna and Callisto*, BM Sat. 12. Thomas Dekker essentially paraphrased Elizabeth's Coronation revels in the opening of his *Whore of Babylon* (1607). See Dekker, *Works*, II, p. 500. A curtain was drawn to reveal: "*Truth* in sad abilements, uncrowned: her hair disheveld, and sleeping on a rock: *Time* (her father) attired likewise in black, and all his propertys (as sithe, houreglass, and wings) of the same culler, using all means to waken *Truth*, but being able to doe it, he sits by her and mourns." A procession signalling the funeral of Mary Tudor passes, and Elizabeth's reign begins: "*Truth* suddenly awakens, and behold the sight, shews (with her father) arguments of joy, an Exuent, returning presently: They being shaped into light cullor, his prospects likewise altered into silver, and *Truth* crowned."

[43] For the use of *Tempora Filia Veritatis* in imagery glorifying Henry VIII's Reformation, see W. Marshall, *A goodlye prymer in englyshe, newly corrected and printed* (London, 1535), sig. Aii.

[44] *The Travels of Time: loaden with Popish Trumperies; from Great Britain to Rome*. The locusts escape from the bottomless pit to punish the ungodly. Revelations 9: 3: "And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth: and unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power." J. F. Larkin & P. L. Hughes (Eds.), *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1973), I, p. 592. The Proclamation had been passed on the 6th May 1624 expelling all Jesuits from the kingdom by the 14th June – thus Truth exclaimed: "The foureteenth day of June in full of feare/ For then a Proclamation doth take force/ To Hang you all."

[45] T. Cogswell , "England and the Spanish Match ", in R. Cust and A. Hughes (eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics 1603-1642* (Harlow, 1989), pp. 107-33.

Widely suspected as the 'popish' architect of James I's ecumenical policy towards the Catholic jewel of Europe - Spain - by the 'hotter sort' of Protestants, Gondomar had been the victim of incessant vitriol and required a Royal guard to ensure is safety.[46] But to expose Gondomar's buttocks was to do more than subject him to ordinary embarrassment. This was a deeply personal, and therefore all the more devastating, slight, for the Ambassador was a renowned sufferer of an anal fistula – if English Protestants were concerned that Gondomar plotted against their realm, they could at least take comfort in the fact that nature has conspired against him.[47] Indeed, his ailment had been the butt of a slew of ridicule within Protestant polemic, perhaps most cuttingly in Thomas Middleton's *A Game At Chess* (1624) where his allegory – the Black Knight – was unceremoniously described as the "fistula of Europe" who possessed a "leaky bottom."[48] Similarly, the frontispiece of Thomas Scott's *Second Part of Vox Populi* (1624) deflated a rather deferential depiction of the ambassador through the inclusion of a close stool, a poignant reminder of his scatological affliction [Fig. 65.] Consequently, *The Travels of Time* must be situated alongside a thriving satirical tradition directed against Gondomar.

And yet the print rejoiced as much as it ridiculed. Although a Royal Proclamation was the cause of the Jesuit's expulsion, it was Parliament whom Gondomar awarded the blame for unleashing the forces of Truth and Time:

"Then came a Parliament, whose weighty strocke,

Found out my nest, and all my Eggs they broke,

Thus (Father) all our pains and labours lost,

And you and I must needs depart this Coast...

And thus on TIME and TRUTH have given such light

That Catholicks themselves disdain us quite

Then let's be iogging here's no staying here.."[49]

---

[46] P. Lake, "Constitutional Consenus & Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott & The Spanish Match", *Historical Journal,* 25, (1982), pp. 805-25; Sir Simond d'Ewes, *Autobiography and Correspondence,* J. O. Halliwell (Ed.), 2 vols (London, 1845), I, pp. 159-60.

[47] T. Scott, *The Second Part of Vox Populi,or Gondomar appearing in the likeness of Machiavell in a Spanish parliament* (London, 1624), passim.

[48] T. Middleton, *A Game at Chaes,* T. H. Howard-Hill ed. (Manchester, 1993), II, iv, 46; II, i, 172; IV, ii, 3. See also Ben Jonson, *The Staple News,* A. Parr (Ed.), (Manchester, 1988), III, ii, 208-13.

[49] *The Travels of Time.*

Thus, just as *Tempora Filia Veritatis* had been utilized by Mary, Elizabeth, and James, it now served Parliament, a motif of just authority used by its supporters to glorify the Commons as the real bulwarks of Protestantism in England. The resonance of legitimation accumulated through their employment in a slew of media – revels, processions, coins, crests, plays and prints – was released here to glorify a new host.[50] It certainly had staying-power. Thus during Parliament's ascendancy in the early 1640s Wendscellus Hollar utilized the central motif of *The Travels of Time* in a print lampooning another man suspected of being the Pope's agent in Britain, William Laud [Fig. 66.][51]

The *Travels of Time* then was designed for an audience of politically aware 'knowing' viewers outlined in the previous chapter.[52] In order to 'get' many of its references one would have to be informed about contemporary politics – the Spanish Match, Gondomar's ailment, or the Proclamation – knowledge of which was assumed rather than explicitly outlined in a piece which sought to commentate upon widely held information rather than impart it. Yet the print relied on other of the viewer's assumptions too. Indeed, its presentation of Gondomar raised an important issue: shame. To grasp fully the impact which such a print must have had upon viewers, we must situate it not only within wider iconographical and satirical contexts, but also appreciate that it worked within a wider culture of honour. Ridiculing Gondomar's rump was not mere titillation, for casting light upon his fistula was suggestive of inner corruption, and the print thus lampooned his honour, his worth as a nobleman. Directing viewers' attention to a body's lack of grace was to highlight a grave sin for noblemen trapped in the courtly ideal that had enraptured aristocratic Europe in the wake of Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier* (1528) and its mantra of elegance.[53] Appearance was everything. An honourable man was nonchalantly to exude refined

---

[50] For the employment of *Tempora Fillia Veritas* in a more personal libellous dispute, see S. Chidley, *The dissembling Scot set forth in his colours, or, a vindication of Lieu. Col. John Lilburn and others* (London, 1652).

[51] BM Sat 300. That Time had a mitre strapped to his back and a Cardinal's cap dangling from his wrist suggests that the real objects of disdainful laughter here was Archbishop William Laud – who was rumoured to have been offered a Cardinalship by the Poe in exchange for subverting the English Church back to the Roman fold, W. Laud, *Works*, (Ed.) J. Parker, 7 vols, (Oxford, 1847-60), III, p. 239. Laud reported that a mysterious figure had approached him on the street with such an offer. For a similar example see R. Braithwaite, *The devils white boyes: or, a mixture of malicious malignants* (London, 1644), title-page.

[52] See above, Chapter One, pp. 29-43; below Chapter Three, pp. 221-30.

[53] Baldassare Castiglione, *The book of the courtier*, trans. by Sir Thomas Hoby (London, 1994). Originally published in English in 1561 by William Seres.

manners, displaying a controlled body with cultivated effortlessness.[54] A "leaky bottom" soiled this picture. But it tarnished honour further by questioning truthfulness. In satires which targeted a victim's disease, moral worth and corporeal corruption coalesced.[55] Disease was a mark of something more malevolent, for a man could appear fair and wholesome, but be rotten within. Catholics were commonly depicted as 'diseased', frequently lambasted for their slovenly worship of a 'surface' religion of idols which, whilst beautiful without, were putrefied of the spirit within.[56] Raising the issue of his fistula then was not a jest merely to embarrass Gondomar, but was to be taken as symptomatic of deeper corruption which impugned his trustworthiness as a man of honour. One libel was explicit: just as the ambassador's "cleare forepart" masked "a sting in his taile", so his sueing for peace with the king belied malevolent "papist" designs for England.[57] Placing a close-stool behind a remarkably refined depiction of Gondomar's genteel personage was to implode a glorious self-image, to impugn honour [Fig. 65.] As with many anti-Catholic images, the laughter produced was one of defamation.

Honour was a deeply personal facet of a nobleman's identity.[58] Possessed from birth, it was a mark of deference which separated him from a commoner, a passport entitling him to claims of privilege, distinction, political power, and that most essential prerogative of all, the right of violence. Honour, then, was a privilege which demanded to be recognized.[59] As such, it was continually performed in the conventions of public life. Pride was a pillow in need of continual fluffing and far from being obsequious flattery, the exchange of courtesies, conversational pleasantries, and rituals of court were an invitation to reciprocity by which nobles mutually reinforced one another's status. That the 'great' events in a nobleman's

---

[54] It must be stressed that this was an *ideal*, not necessarily a reflection of an actually change in noble behaviour. N. Elias, *The Civilizing Process*, trans. E. Jebcott (Oxford, 2000). For criticism see S. Carroll, *Blood and Violence in Early Modern France* (Oxford, 2006), passim; J. F. J. Duindem, *Myths of Power: Norbert Elias and the early modern European Court*, trans. L. S. Granger and G. T. Moran (Amsterdam, 1994).

[55] Randolph, "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory", pp. 127-59.

[56] See below, section III pp. 103-28

[57] McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State*, p. 62.

[58] R. G. Asch, *Nobilities in Transition, 1500-1700: courtiers and rebels in Britain and Europe* (London, 2003), pp. 9-10, 82-87; S. Carroll, *Noble power during the French wars of religion : the Guise affinity and the Catholic cause in Normandy* (Cambridge, 1998), *passim*; D. M. Posner, *The performance of nobility in early modern European literature* (Cambridge, 1999), *passim*; M. Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour* (London, 2003), pp. 2-5, 35-49 in particular; K. B. Neuschel, *Word of Honour: interpreting noble culture in sixteenth century France* (Ithaca, 1989), pp. 5-7, 74-77 in particular.

[59] Neuschel, *Word of Honour*, pp. 65-77; Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England*, pp. 35-49.

account of his own life might be moments of self aggrandizement or personal insult, glory or ruin, demonstrated that despite seeming impossibly trivial at a distance of four centuries, these incidents of honour and shame were the building-blocks of politics. If nobleman were highly sensitive to the status-symbols of power which were the motors of public life, it was only because their sense-of-self was so heavily invested in the performance.[60] That investment was best conveyed by the expression of a slight as an 'injury', a somatic term suggesting that the distance between a man and his honour was exceptionally narrow.

But being dependent upon public recognition made honour desperately delicate.[61] The slightest break in convention inferred the questioning of worth, and outright ridicule could be annihilative, the withdrawal by the community of that which made a man noble.[62] The perilous effects of laughter to a persona are captured by an incident in Leeds during 1667: unable to bear it any longer, a man opened fire, killing two of his crowd of tormentors.[63] To ridicule was to remove acknowledgment of distinction for, put simply, noble status depended upon "a common opinion, that he [who was] honoured hath never failed in justice nor valour."[64] Yet opinion was a perilous repository of honour. As *The Civill Conversation*, a work by the Italian Stefano Gurzo published in England during 1586, warned: "our name...dependeth of the general opinion, which hath such force, that reason is of no force against them."[65] Such opinion could be withdrawn at any time, and ridicule tolled its death-knell for "bad men...are pointed at with finger and holden for infamy."[66] It was precisely this destructive pointing and laughing that pictorial satire aimed to replicate. That this destructive shaming was the intention of Richard Braithwaite's depiction of the Pope being carted-off by Time [Fig. 67] is hinted at in a comment made in one of his subsequent publications: "is there any punishment so graven as shame? Yea were it

[60] See S. Robson, *The courte of civill courtesies* (London, 1577). Nobility existed "to purchase worthy prayse of their inferiours and estimation and credit amongst their betters" (title-page.)
[61] Peltonen, *The Duel in Early Modern England*, pp. 35-44; Neuschel, *Word of Honour*, p. 101.
[62] See W. Martyn, *Youths Instruction* (London, 1612), pp. 101-02: "as one mad-dog, biting another dog, maketh him that is bitten mad too. So a slanderer in his mad folly, skandalizing another mans name and good report, maketh him angry, discontented and furious, and in the occasion of great discord, and iniquitous amongst men." E. Sutton, *The serpent anatomized. A Morall discourse* (London, 1626), pp. 18-19: honour could not "endure the smarte werke of the tongue...he that hath an ill name...is halfe hanged, for when a mans good name is done, himselfe is vndone." See also *The book of honour* (London, 1590), sig. Aii; H. Peacham, *The compleat gentleman* (London, 1622), p. 189.
[63] Ingram, "Rough Ridings", pp. 102, n. 103.
[64] *The courtiers academie* (London, 1598), pp. 78-80. Cf p. 82: noble men "preserveth it [their reputation] unspotted, except through some grievous offence or suspicion, he looseth good opinion."
[65] S. Gurzzo, *The civile conversation* (London, 1586), pp. 24-25.
[66] Ibid, p. 72: "good men" are "wel reported and reputed in the worlde."

not better for a man who is eminent in the eye of the world, to die right out, than still live in reproach and shame?"[67] To subject Catholic figures to the display of satire was to dream of their ruin by ridicule.

Satirical images, then, straddled a divide. They were not exactly serious, but not quite pure entertainment either. Their purpose lay somewhere in between: to provoke punitive laughter, to display their subjects for ridicule, and impugn their status by exposing them to the cackles of shame. They must be viewed alongside other forms of satire which scholars are beginning to unearth. Songs and libellous poems played an important part in the rites with which a local community punished transgressors.[68] Illicit poems and manuscript ballads displayed in public also had a more political function, expressing criticism of the established order in late Tudor and Stuart England.[69] Acerbic verses wounded personal or political enemies by subjecting them – and by default the positions for which they stood – to ridicule. Such 'libelling' had a long history. During the 1530s heretics sung ballads in London lampooning the established Church;[70] conversely poems and songs were vehicles used to express hostility to the Henrician Reformation by its conservative opponents;[71] and later sixteenth-century examples survive berating the Earl of Essex and the London officials deemed responsible for the ever-escalating grain prices.[72] Illicit verses became a more commonplace form of protest in the early seventeenth century as the Bishops Ban (1599) on satire forced criticism into the uncensored realm of the underground.[73] The early years of James I's reign saw viciously xenophobic libels concerning the appointment of Scotsmen in English government, tirades against those involved in the Overbury Affair, and a heightened invective castigating prominent

---

[67] R. Brathwaite, *The English gentleman* (London, 1630), p. 421 and title-page.

[68] See above, pp. 71-79

[69] Bellany, *Court Scandal*, pp. 97-111; ibid, "Railing Rhymes Revisited", pp. 1136–1179; ibid, "A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse", pp. 137–64; Croft, "The Reputation of Robert Cecil", *passim*; Eckhardt, "'Love-Song Weeds and Satyrique Thorns", *passim*; Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England"; McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State, passim*; Ibid, "The Literary Culture of Early Stuart Libeling", pp. 364-392.

[70] S. Brigden, *London & The Reformation* (Oxford, 1991), p. 120; G. R. Elton, *Policy & Police* (Cambridge, 1972), p. 7; C. H. Firth, "The Ballad History of the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd Series, 2 (London, 1908), pp. 21-50

[71] Bellany, *Court Scandal*, p. 99.

[72] C. H. Firth, "The Ballad History of the Reign's of the Later Tudors", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd Series, 3 (London, 1909), pp. 64-9, 82, 92, 116-17.

[73] T. Cogswell, "Underground Verse and the Transformation of Early Stuart Political Culture", *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No. 3, The Remapping of English Political History, 1500-1640 (1997), pp. 303-326.

Privy Counsellors upon their deaths.[74] Most roughly handled was Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, who died in 1612. One contemporary solemnly epitomized the novelty of such extensive outpouring of vitriol: "I never knew so great a man so soon and so greatly censured."[75]

James I's concerns about "railing rhymes and vaunting verses" were thus grounded upon a changing reality of ridicule. From the late sixteenth century increasing amounts of literature drew real persons into print for indecorous handling and defamatory ridicule.[76] Whilst much of the scholarship on libels thus far has focussed upon verses, printed images served to lampoon through laughter in much the same way. Indeed, legal treatments of 'libels' posited a multi-media definition which held a prominent place for images:

"Either by scoffing at the persona of another in rhyme or prose, or by personating of him, thereby to make him ridiculous; or by setting up horns at his gate, or *picturing of drawing him*; or by writing of some base or deficient letters and publishing the same to others..."[77]

Moreover, broadsides and printed ballads, with their images at the top and verses underneath, parroted the format of illustrated manuscript libels. An example of December 1605 from Evesham in Worcestershire is poignant. Here the local squire and attorney George Hawkins was "balladed" by the community for his transgressions, chiefly for conceiving a bastard. Court records from Hawkins' prosecution for slander revealed that these men:

"Dyd in paper drawe...three several pictures or images, decyferinge and notifying one of them to be the picture of [George Hawkins]; one other to be

---

[74] Bellany, *Court Scandal*, pp. 97-105.

[75] Quoted in ibid, p. 100. The evidence of such libels as a prominent outlet for critique has been viewed as evidence that opposition to the Stuart regime was in fact more burgeoning than the cult of consensus propounded by revisionist historians has allowed. This may be overstating the case as criticisms in libels rarely showed any consistent ideological ruptures. Argued most forcefully by McRae, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State, passim*. See also Bellany, "Railing Rhymes Revisited", pp. 1136–1179.

[76] J. Craigie (Ed.), *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, 2 vols (Edinburgh/London, 1955-8), II, p. 182.

[77] W. Hudson, "A Treatise of the Court of Star Chamber" in *Collectanea Juridica: Consisting of Tracts Relative to the Law and Constitution*, ed. F. Hargrave, 2 vols. (London, 1791-92), ii, p. 100 [my italics.] See also *The Report of Sir Edward Coke*, 13 parts, (Dublin, 1793), v, fos 125a-126a.

the picture of one who was supposed to be a whore and...the third...to be the picture of the bastard ytself."[78]

Below these pictures was written "a most false, filthy, slanderous and defaming lybell" which mocked Hawkins' lust, a format followed by numerous prints throughout the century. Copies were plastered upon walls, posts and doors "to the intente that the same might be made knowne unto all manner of persons whatsoever, to [Hawkins'] utter infamye, scandale and disgrace."[79] The tale was a familiar one. Display had rendered honour humiliated, respect ridiculed. Did not the *Travels of Time* employ the same format, with the same intentions, for the shame of Pope and Gondomar? Fear of the humiliation of one's picture was endemic in early modern England. Thus the venom of Charmont's threat to Lamira in Philip Massinger's *The Parliament of Love* (1624) that he would have her:

> "Pictured as thou are now, and thie whole story
> Sunge to some villainous tune in a lewd ballet
> And make thee notorious to the world,
> That boyes in the streets shall hoot at thee."[80]

For all the power of verse, the pang of humiliation was amplified by being pictured. There was something more immediate about an image. Hawkins' mockers "did laugh and jest at the said pictures" and encouraged others in the street to follow suit.[81] Similarly a Sussex libel of 1608 prominently displayed images so that viewers could "better remember and take greater apprehension of the shame and reproach."[82] The explanation for pictures' magnification of humiliation lies within the vibrant popular traditions of English culture which visited upon images the punishments deserved by those they depicted. During *charivari* an image of the ridiculed was often substituted for their person, an effigy dressed to resemble them was paraded backwards on an ass. Similarly in the mock trials which formed part of public protests against officials the

---

[78] Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", pp. 49-53 for the Hawkins case.
[79] Ibid, p. 50.
[80] P. Edwards & C. Gibson (Eds.), *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976), ii, p. 158 (Act IV, scene V.)
[81] Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", p. 50.
[82] Quoted in ibid, p. 62.

subject of defamation was hanged or burnt in effigy.[83] In such instances, resemblance led to a collapse between image and the person represented as the effigy became a focal point for discontent. The signifier almost became the signified, and whilst the victim's *person* remained unharmed, their *persona* was shattered.

Indeed, images were the repository of honour. Such was the fear of the slight to reputation that merely threatening to circulate depictions like that of the Landgrave of Hesse and his heraldry inverted on a gibbet (1438) was enough to provoke a loan's repayment or ensure the righting of a wrong [Fig. 68.][84] This image is striking precisely because it is *not* a caricature – shame was not imparted through distortion of the Landgrave's physiognomy. The same technique was employed in libels attacking the Papal tiara, inverting its meaning from a token of Christ's Vicar to a manifestation of Antichrist [Figs. 69 & 70.][85] As with Gondomar's depiction in *The Second Part of Vox Populi* and Hollar's Pope, the nominally 'accurate' depiction was more poignantly defamatory, for 'realistic' representation brought infamy closer to the person pictured [Figs. 65-66] Ridiculing a man's visage, his coat of arms, or regalia injured his honour more closely. Thus one particularly malevolent seventeenth-century satire exclaimed, in a deliciously witty inversion of the kiss of peace in the Mass: "Away with the Pope, a pax on his picture!"[86]

Scoffing at the Pope's picture was certainly the intention behind plastering many scurrilous satires with a woodcut depiction. Thus the English translation of the Italian satirist Gregori Letti's *Il Nipotismo de Roma* (1673) – a work satirising nepotism at the Papal court – sported a cartouche of Pope Alexander VI [Fig. 71][87] Or, more accurately, it included a cartouche *supposedly* depicting Alexander – the woodcut bore no resemblance to any official portrait of the Pope. The work's English audience was probably unaware of this fact, however, and pretence was paramount. For the viewer humour was surely located in the defamatory intention of pasting a seemingly honorary Papal depiction onto a work lampooning his corrupt court, in

---

[83] Ingram "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture", pp. 86-87, 91.

[84] This example is included in E. H. Gombrich, *The Uses of Images: Studies in the Social Function of Art and Visual Communication* (London, 2000), p. 191.

[85] W. Barlow, *The boke Reade me frynde and be not wrothe, for I saye nothynge but the trothe* (Antwerp, 1546), flyleaf; J. Milton, *Nevvs from hell, Rome and the Innes of Court* (London, 1642), p. 23.

[86] BM Sat 1077. Cf. BM Sat 1091.

[87] G. Leti, *Il Nipostismo di Roma: or, The History of the Popes Nephews* (London, 1673), title-page

what amounted to a parodic seal of authority.[88] The urge to display and dishonour the Pope's image was indebted to wider cultural practices of public shaming – it is as though the title-page displayed his face to be laughed at.

The same urge may be detected in the apparently honorary image of a Cardinal on the title-page of another Italian translation, *The Scarlet Gown* (1653) [Fig. 72.][89] This was a scurrilous exposé, a gossip column detailing the consistory's inner-workings and recounting the life, character and respective virtues and vices of each current member of the curia. Hacking away at honour was clearly the intention. Readers thus learnt that Franco Barberini had an appearance unworthy of honour, ignobly resembling an artisan's son "which one would hardly have vouchsafed to salute if he had met him on the streets of Rome";[90] and that Giovani Carlo De Medici was impious, a man "who loved women a little too much...is by nature covetous, nothing bountiful, but rather niggardly."[91] The work's lavish portrayals of pomp, factional wrangling, fumbled attempts at seduction, and humiliation at the hands of the day's prominent courtesans was heavily indebted to the *pasquilade* tradition of publicly displaying vitriolic verse and images.[92] This work deflated deference. Attaching an image of "A Cardinal in his HABIT as hee sits in the CONSISTORY" focussed the dishonour more keenly, serving as a reminder of the ecclesia's pious ideal which had been tarnished by ridicule.[93] The generic Cardinal was a repository of the honour of the collective, a metonym for the Curia as a whole – Rome's pious image was subjected to a shaming. Perhaps the most clear expression of how deeply indebted printed images were to the popular practices of ridicule can be seen in *Papa Patens, or The Pope In His True Colours* (1652) – a potted history of Papal plots. This title-page could almost be a parchment plastered on a tavern wall lampooning a local dignitary [Fig. 73.][94] One thinks of *charivari* in which an effigy was dressed as the transgressor before a drama acted out their crime, or the libels directed at Hawkins, which consisted of a crude image surrounded by visceral texts detailing his ills. Similarly, here a crude depiction of the Pope was displayed for defamation, and

---

[88] Ibid, sig. Aiiii. The preface to the reader adds to the mock affront by claiming that the Pope had seen the work and threatened to excommunicate anyone who read it.
[89] N.N, *The Scarlet Gown* (London, 1653), title-page.
[90] Ibid, p. 41.
[91] Ibid, pp. 1-2.
[92] Ibid, pp. 41-2, 105-6.
[93] *The Scarlet Gown*, title-page.
[94] *Papa patens, or, The pope in his colours* (London, 1652), title-page.

surrounded – we might say *dominated* – by details of his "bloody designs and practices against the kingdoms of England, Scotland, France and Ireland since the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth." The punishment of display and shame was as much the preserve of the printed-page as it was the local tavern: polemic was punitive.

Many Anti-Catholic images employed nominal neutrality to ensure defamation cut more deeply. The subject of jeers was depicted neither as ridiculous nor demonic. Rather, an apparently objective image was shamed with words. Such 'accuracy' made satire more acerbic, for portraits took the scoffs and jeers of hatred closer to its subject's persona than parody – one almost laughed in a man's face. As with *charivari* and mock trials which defamed effigies, in such instances a portrait substituted the person it depicted in prints which, when displayed publicly, extended the shame of the pillory. Such strategies were seen in a series of seven prints depicting the thirteen Gunpowder Plotters: *Princeps Proditorum: The Popes Darling: Or, A Guide to His Twelve Apostles.* With the exception of the opening depiction of Henry Garnet [Fig. 74] the original prints are now lost, but their contents are preserved in beautifully hand coloured replications in the commonplace book of a seventeenth-century gentleman, Thomas Trevelyan [Figs. 75-77.][95] Upon first glance there is nothing polemical – or even overtly hostile – about the plotters' depiction. All thirteen images could be commemorative. Indeed the subjects appear decidedly friendly – Everard Digby and Francis Treacham embrace, Ambrose Rookewood and Thomas Venter shake hands, and John Wright places his hand on Christopher Wright's shoulder. Moreover the bust depiction, nonchalant holding of gloves, and slightly sideways stance were nuances which dressed the plotters in trappings of gentility prevalent in the portraiture of the period.[96] Consequently, when told that Robert Keyes is a "Cerebus" and that Fawkes had been "fostered by some strange Beast/ So farre from human nature he digrest", readers were forced to stare and puzzle, to remark how difficult it is to define what amounts to monstrosity in these very ordinary depictions.[97] The accompanying text advertised these prints as "True pictures of false traitors, having faces seemly, personage comely, But their lives heathen, their deeds

---

[95] British Museum OD'3, British Satires Undescribed. See N. Barker (ed.), *The Great Book of Sir Thomas Trevilian* (2 vols., London, 2000), pp. 265-72 for copies of the whole series. Trevilian copied the series in both his 1608 and 1616 manuscripts. The prints must be dated c. 1607-08 because they refer to Garnet's execution, which had taken place on the 3rd May 1607.
[96] *The Great Book*, pp. 267, 268, 270.
[97] Ibid, p. 271.

damnable, And their ends miserable" and it was clearly the artist's intention to highlight the discrepancy between appearance and reality, for Antichristian deception and masking of inner corruption were themes which shot through the period's Anti-Catholic polemic, with papists commonly outed as demons dressed as angels of light.[98] Yet these "True Pictures of False Traitors" served to do more than simply reveal. They extended the action of the gibbet, passing the destructive act of defamation beyond the moment of punishment itself to display their person to jeers and scorn for time immemorial – portrait substituted person as the vehicle of shame.

They did so by aping acts of punishment. Just as theatre involved in *charivari* often involved acting out the victim's transgression, so Garnett was shown holding his "Popish Pardon", commonly portrayed in Protestant polemic as a 'Holy' permit of regicide, the motor which set all plots in motion.[99] Moreover, with the details of his crime plastered above his head – "*For* the most Trayterous and bloody intended massacre by Gunpowder the fyfth day of November: in the year of our Lord: 1605" – Garnett might *be* in the pillory.[100] Readers were informed that "he hath defamed his shame/ By changing off his *habit* and his *name*" but the print displayed both name and face, and his 'objective' portrait depiction here was a means of replicating the punitive acts of publicly shaming a criminal, of publicising guilt for all to see.[101] Each successive portrait pilloried its subject, structuring shame around the detailing of their role in the plot. Thus Catesbie "was the first, this Treason did begin/ To his prescription all the rest agreed"; Percy found the cellar and "Thirty Six Barrels [of Gunpowder]...conveid by night"; and Faux "plaid the dead man's part/ The cruel executioner." Honour had become infamy, and by proclaiming their transgression to the world the gentility of the plotter's portraits was subverted, bringing dishonour closer to their persona.[102] This punitive function was continued in lampooning the traitors' dishonourable deaths. Thus apparently honourable men like Robert Catesbie "Esquire" and Robert Percy "Gentleman" suffered the most ignoble of ends: "at

---

[98] Ibid, p. 272. For Antichrist, see below Chapter Five, pp..... With frequent references to the greatest of Jesuit tools – equivocation – the verses of this print made numerous references to the lies and deceptions which were Roman stock-in-trade, ibid, pp. 272, 265, 266.

[99] Ingram "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture", pp. 86-87.

[100] My italics. Criminals had the details of their crime pasted onto the pillory. BM Sat 1134; BM Sat 1135; BM Sat 1136; BM Sat 1137; BM Sat 1090; BM Sat 1088; BM Sat 429. British Museum, 1953, 0411.61.

[101] *The Great Book*, p. 265.

[102] Ibid, p. 266; 271.

Holheath they were slayne/ Bothe with one shot: nowe food for fowle remaine."[103]

Finally, it was fitting that this character assassination should conclude – just like a public execution – with a sermon. Once again the print parroted actual acts of punishment by depicting these men as cautionary tales.[104] Like other criminals, their lives were warnings of the perils awaiting those who trod the path of sin, in this case the monstrosity which could befall those who succumbed to the temptations of Popery. Furthermore, their deaths were brutal proof of Rome's fruitlessness. In a cackling piece of gallows humour, Garnett's execution was both punishment and a refutation of the power of Papal indulgences:

> "For all his Bulls, and pardons from the Pope
>
> Which he hath had for other sinns in store,
>
> Would not prevail to save him from the Rope
>
> To breath out poyson amongst we cry more
>
> Derrick that trimmer trimed his head full grey
>
> By cutting it off the third day of Maye."[105]

One can almost hear the jeers. We see then that these prints were heavily indebted to the culture of shame, and that they extended the act of displaying a criminal, inherent in the judicial process, to a wider audience. In a manner similar to shaming performed upon effigies, display caused the boundary between signifier and signified to become porous, as a portrait became the site at which a man was publicly punished with the dishonour of defamation.

The nominally 'accurate' became a prominent feature of Anti-Catholic imagery. There is much subversive potential in imitation, and such 'mock' imagery raised its subject to ridicule more viciously than parody. An inverted honorary image of the Jesuits commonplace in the later-seventeenth century Anti-Catholic works is poignant [Fig. 79.] Comparisons with 'official' Catholic imagery glorifying the Order, such as the frontispiece to Mikaly Lecezycki's *The glory of the Blessed Father Saint Ignatius Loyolla* (1623) [Fig. 80], demonstrate that the English engraving's cartouche

---

[103] Ibid, p. 266.

[104] Ibid, p. 272. J. A. Sharpe, "'Last dying speeches:' religion, ideology and public execution in seventeenth-century England", *Past and Present*, 107, (1985), pp. 144-67. *Princeps Proditorum* differes somewhat from such speeches and sermons in that the traitors were not depicted as contrite.

[105] Ibid, p. 265.

of the founder holding the rule of order and imbued with holy light was an appropriation of Jesuit iconography.[106] Rome's image was to be undermined, its self-fashioning ridiculed and subverted.

The engraving originally appeared in the second English edition of Blaise Pascal's *Letters Provincial* (1658), a series of mock letters which became a *cause celebre* of seventeenth-century literature.[107] Pascal was no Protestant. Yet anything lampooning the champions of post-Tridentine Catholicism was good fodder for the English market. His work was written in the context of French heresy trials against Jansenist's leaders during 1656 as a protest against the largely Jesuit-staffed Sorbonne, whose trial proceedings did not permit the accused to defend themselves or to debate the theological points in question.[108] These centred round the ability of man to procure the Grace of God.[109] Pascal employed wit to undermine the Jesuit's position. His fictitious letters between a Parisian gentleman and his provincial friend lampooned the Society's self-proclaimed position as champions of moral theology. His attack was focussed upon the Order's speciality, casuistry, the application of ethical rules to cases of conscience.[110] These rules governed the confessor's role in directing the penitent's atonement for sin and thus touched upon the core of Christian experience. Pascal characterised their position on sin as ridiculously illogical and unscriptural, an affront to God which diminished His role in the process of salvation. Far from upholding the true role of confessor – uplifting and directing sinners – Jesuit casuistry was a morally vacuous system in which ethics took a back-seat to desire for political influence by flattering consciences of the powerful. Consequently the champions of this moral theology were displayed for ridicule on the English frontispiece. On Loyola's left stood two chief proponents of casuistry, Leonard Lessius (1554-1623) and Luis Molina (1536-1607) – during debates with the

---

[106] M. Lecezycki, *The glory of the Blessed Father Saint Ignatius Loyolla* (1623), title-page.

[107] To my knowledge this image has not been studied previously. It originally appeared in the second English edition of Blaise Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales* (London, 1658). It appears to be an English invention and is not in the earlier French editions. For treatments of the *Letters* see W. E. Rex, *Pascal's Provincial Letters: An Introduction* (London, 1977); A Sedgwick, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France: Voices from the Wilderness* (Virginia, 1977), pp. 79-92; H. M. Davidson, *Blaise Pascal* (Boston, 1983); W. Doyle, *Jansenism: Catholic resistance to authority from the Reformation to the French revolution* (Basingstoke, 2000), pp. 28-31, 35-38, 53-56; D Adamson, *Blaise Pascal: mathematician, physicist, and thinker about God* (Basingstoke, 1995), pp. 85-114.

[108] Rex, *Pascal's Provincial Letters*, pp. 27-43 for the background.

[109] The Jansenists had re-asserted Augustine's pessimistically predestinarian position against the semi-Pelagian line adopted by the Jesuits, which afforded mankind a greater amount of scope in his ability to provide satisfaction for his sins. Adamson, *Blaise Pascal*, pp. 85-87; Davidson, *Blaise Pascal*, pp. 71-74; Rex, *Pascal's Provincial Letters*, pp. 11-12; Sedgwick, *Jansenism*, 81-82.

[110] Rex, *Pascal's Provincial Letters*, pp. 57-59.

Jansenists, the former had re-asserted the theological positions of the latter.[111] Similarly, on Loyola's right stood Gabriel Vasquez and Antonio de Escobar, two men who had recently published handbooks for confessors. The latter's *Liber theologiae moralis* (1644) provided a wealth of material which Pascal placed in the mouth of his fictitious and bumbling confessor as 'proof' of the ridiculous inconsistencies which characterized his presentation of Jesuit theology.[112] On Pascal's page then, scholars became fools. This was equally the case in the engraving – thus they stand in a library, the champions of Jesuit theology, the glorious self-image of the Order appropriated for ridicule. As with the Ignatian cartouche, self-fashioning was to be ruptured by display.

That being said, the 'self fashioning' here was partly fictitious. The cartouche aside, this was a wholly invented image not based on a Catholic original, and featuring four generic Jesuits bearing little resemblance to their namesakes.[113] Designed for a Protestant audience, the bite of ridicule here rested on the pretence that the scurrilous surrounding text besmirched an original depiction, that this was how Jesuit scholars presented themselves to the world. Once again, this engraving was structured in a manner akin to popular forms of shaming – on thinks of George Hawkins' image being "balladed" – in which vitriolic text surrounded a representative image or effigy was to more keenly subvert the honour of the men depicted.

Taken from 2 Timothy 3, the quotation at the top glorified Pascal's puncturing the pride underpinning Jesuit claims to piety, presenting them as "Jannes and Jambres... men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the Faith" who "resist the Truth" of God. In Pascal's satire "their *folly* shall be manifest unto all men".[114] The other two damning texts tagged onto this image were more indebted to Anti-Catholic clichés than Pascal's specific charges against the society. The first expressed the view that Jesuits existed solely to enter realms and plot against the monarchy; whilst the second gave voice to Protestant commonplaces charging Rome with theft in selling Church rites, and lies in peddling fraudulent doctrine to its deluded its followers,

---

[111] Ibid, pp. 14-18.

[112] Doyle, *Jansenism*, p. 29; Sedgwick, *Jansenism*, pp. 79-80; Adamson, *Blaise Pascal*, pp. 88-90

[113] The names of the Jesuits depicted were thus easily changed. In the Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales* (London, 1679) they were Suarez, Mariana, Garnet and Parsons; as they were when the image reappeared in T. Barlow's *Papismus regiae ptestatus eversoc* (London, 1682).

[114] 2 Timothy 3. The full quotation is as follows: "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the Truth: men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the Faith. But they shall proceed no further: for their *folly* shall be manifest unto all men..."

casting their souls to hell.[115] Yet this engraving was more than just a scurrilous libel –

it imploded honour by inverting it. The combination of image and text was an

imitation of a commemorative image, a means of imparting honour widespread in the

Roman Church.[116] Rather than applauding the virtues of 'saint' Ignatius, the

scurrilous texts transformed the saintly and learned presentation of the Jesuits into a

monument of iniquity – a holy self-image defused by bile and ridicule.[117] One

seventeenth-century reader grasped the intention, adding his own defamatory

contribution: "insatiable Avarice, and Boundless liberty, hath set the pack unto the

worst idolatry" [Fig. 81.][118] Morally bankrupt, Jesuit reverence of St. Ignatius here

was presented by this reader as little more than heathen idolatry. Like a cuckold's

horns placed on an effigy, the effect of this graffiti was to taint the honour of the man

depicted, leaving his halo considerably dirtied.[119]

The appropriation of an apparently 'accurate' portrayal or 'neutral' depiction

served to amplify satire's magnitude, to make ridicule cut more keenly by imploding

what the viewer took to be a realistic representation of Rome's self-image. But Rome

was not the sole victim of this practice. Dishonouring a man through the appropriation

of his visage was a commonplace of graphic satire intended to bring its subject into

closer contact with the destructive effects of defamation. Nothing demonstrated this

more than the shaming which Archbishop Laud's official portrait was subjected to

following his spectacular fall from grace during 1640.[120] Painted by Anthony van

Dyck during 1636 Laud stood in convocational robes dominating the canvas and

---

[115] The First runs as follows: "Let kings take notice of them, that the Pope and their followers make it their business, to lessen the authority of Princes, and to make them as weak and contemptible as they can." The second stated that: "A Thief is better than a man that is accustomed to lie; But they both shall destruction to heritage".Ecclo 20:25.

[116] See below, Chapter Three, pp. 190-95.

[117] Cf. *The Popes Pyramides* (London, 1624); G. C, *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercie* (London, 1625), Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Sutherland Collection, Lar, vol. iii. Hind, *Engraving*, ii. p. 299. BM Sat 13

[118] *The Jesuits Morals* (1680), Folger Shakespeare Library.

[119] The image was included in numerous seventeenth century works divorced of its associations with Pascal, with the names of the Jesuits associated with the Jansenist controversy replaced with those more familiar to English audiences like Garnet and Parsons. See *The Jesuits Morals Condemned* (London, 1680), p. 70. Here, its parodied form of a reverential depiction added to the satirical bite of several works. This was a collection of fictitious Papal decrees (although the author, Israel Tonge, later an advocate of the Popish Plot, seems to have accepted them at face value) presenting the ethical code of the Roman Church s one of pure worldliness, its followers actively encouraged to succumb to the mantras of avarice and self-interest.

[120] See H. Pierce, "Anti-episcopacy and graphic satire in England, 1640-1645", *Historical Journal*, 47, (2004), pp. 809-47. I am indebted to this piece for source material, but the argument about 'accurate' likeness being the crux of satire's effect is my own.

displaying a steadfast expression and solid demeanour [Fig. 82.][121] As Helen Pierce has noted, the absence of paraphernalia so ubiquitous in earlier English Episcopal portraiture was crucial in presenting the Archbishop as an image of authority demanding due reverence: "Laud himself stands for the authority of the Church of England, rather than the Bibles and heraldry adopted in previous Episcopal portraits."[122] That fifty-three painted reproductions and countless etched and engraved copies survive demonstrate how imbued with the stamp of officialdom this representation had become during the late 1630s. As Wendceslaus Hollar's etching of 1640 shows, the central attraction was reproducing Laud's likeness, for much of Van Dyck's composition – the columns and background – were absent [Fig. 83.][123] It was this likeness which caused this official image to be ridiculed so vociferously by Laud's enemies following the collapse of censorship in 1641. Thus the comments of the anonymous Anti-Laudian author in a rejoinder to Thomas Herbert's *An answer to The Most envious, scandalous, libellous pamphlet, entitled Mercuries Message*, a defence of Laud containing a woodcut reproduction after the Van Dyck portrait [Fig. 84.][124] Our author dishonoured Laud through his portrait, beginning by laughing in his face as he envisaged the Archbishop, ridiculously, falling through the frame:

"Ha – what's here? A flat cap, narrow ruffle, and lawne sleeves, sure it stands for the Bishop of *Canterbury*; But I hope his sorrows have not so strangely metamorphos'd him; Do's he learne to tumble in a hoope too? Perhaps he intends to shew tricks in *Bartholomew* Faire; I remember there was a sight last

[121] O. Millar, *Van Dyck in England* (London, National Portrait Gallery, 1982), no. 14; M. Jaffe, "Van Dyck studies I: the portrait of Archbishop Laud", *The Burlington Magazine*, 124, (1982), pp. 600-07; J. Ingramells, *The English Episcopal portrait, 1559-1835* (London, 1981), pp. 17-21.

[122] Pierce, "Anti-episcopacy", p. 815.

[123] Twenty seventeenth-century etchings after the Van Dyck original survive in the British Museum alone, F. O'Donoghue, *Catalogue of engraved British portraits preserved in the department of prints and drawings in the British Museum*, 6 vols (London, 1908-25), III, pp. 19-21. Small engraved portraits were commonplace during this period: H. Barkley, *Likeness in line: an anthology of Tudor and Stuart engraved portraits* (London, 1982). For the Hollar engraving, see R. Pennington, *Descriptive catalogue of the etched works of Wenceslaus Hollar* (Cambridge, 1982), p. 252 – a copy of this engraving survives with the imprint of Peter Stent, a major printer at the time.

[124] For full details of the exchange, see: J. Taylor, *Mercuries message, or, The coppy of a letter sent to William Laud, late Archbishop of Canterbury, now prisoner in the Tower* (London, 1641); T. Herbert, *An answer to The Most envious, scandalous, libellous pamphlet, entitled Mercuries Message* (London, 1641); J. Taylor, *Mercuries Message defended against the vain, foolish, simple and absurd cavils of Thomas Herbert* (London, 1641); ibid, *A Second message to Mr. Willam Lavd late Archbishop of Canterbury, now prisoner in the Tower, in the behalfe of Mercurie together with a postscript to the author of that foolish and ridiculous answer to Mercury* (London, 1641).

year called, the decollation of *John* the *baptist*, wherein a boyes head was cut off through a table."[125]

The portrait did not command reverence but ridicule. Far from imbuing its subject with honour it inspired our author to imagine a series of farcical situations in which Laud was made even more ridiculous, the glorious head of the English Church reduced to performing in bawdy marketplace entertainments.[126] The image provided an effective site to subject its subject to destructive laughter.

Once again, shame conveyed by the press had extended the culture of ridicule inherent in the punitive process. Laud was a moral transgressor like any other, and was increasingly styled as a 'popish' malefactor guilty of corrupting the Church of England in the hope of procuring its return to the Roman fold.[127] As a keen likeness and a repository of his Episcopal honour, the official image became a fitting substitute for punishments which many would gladly have subjected his person to. A plethora of satire subjected reproductions after Van Dyck to a series of imaginary punishments – vomiting up unpopular canons and legislation, being confronted by the ghosts of men he had executed, and, in a presage of his actual fate, taunted on the scaffold [Fig. 85.][128] Thus the title-page of *The bishops potion* (1641) – a satirical dialogue purging Laud of many objects associated with his downfall – exploded his persona by lampooning the shame of his residence in the Tower [Fig. 86.][129] Closeness to his honorary image was the key to this humiliation. Indeed, were it not for the shackle

---

[125] Taylor, *Mercuries Message defended*, p. 9.

[126] For similar treatments of the bishops as market or fair attractions during the early 1640s, see: *Lambeth faire wherein you have all the bishops trinkets set to sell* (London, 1641); *Bartholomew faire or variety of fancies, where you may find a faire of wares all to please your mind* (London, 1641)

[127] W. M. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne: 1600-1669* (London/Toronto, 1963), pp. 28-48, 119-148; N. Tyacke, "William Laud" in K Fincham (Ed.), *The early Stuart church* (Basingstoke, 1993), pp. 51-70; K. Sharpe, "Archbishop Laud" in M. Todd (Ed.), *Reformation to revolution: politics and religion in early modern England* (London/ New York, 1995), pp. 71-77; *The passionate remonstrance made by His Holiness in the conclave at Rome* (Edinborough, 1641), passim; *Hell's hurlie-burlie* (London, 1644); *Englands petition, to her gratious king, that the Arminians, would to ruine bring, also, by his doctrine, privie plots, and hate to verity, doth ruine church and state* (Amsterdam, 1641); *A disputation betwixt the Devill and the Pope* (London, 1642); *A charme for Canterburian spirits, which (since the death of the arch-prelate) have appeared in sundry shapes, and haunted divers houses in the city of London* (London, 1645); *The bishops last good-night* (London, 1642); *The black box of Roome opened* (London, 1641); J. Milton, *Nevvs from hell, Rome and the Innes of Court* (London, 1642); J. Taylor, *The Decoy duck: together with the discovery of the knot in the dragons tale* (London, 1642).

[128] See *Canterburies dreame* (London, 1641), title-page; *The deputies ghost* (London, 1641); *Canterburies amazement: or, the ghost of the young fellow Thomas Bensted* (London, 1641); BM Sat 412; BM Sat 148.

[129] *The bishop potion, or, a dialogue between the bishop of Canterbury and his phisition* (London, 1641).

99

this image conveyed exactly "the gravity and officious solemnity expected of the head of the Anglican Church."[130] The public laughter provoked here was an extension of acts of popular shaming. The Archbishop understood the connection well, for he complained from the Tower of his pain in hearing "libels and ballads against me" with which "made men sport in taverns and alehouses; where too many were as drunk with malice, as with the liquor they sucked in."[131]

But the fact that Laud reacted puts us in a quandary. For neither the Pope – who would never see himself carted-off by Time, plastered on a scurrilous account of Nepotism, or lampooned for demonic intrigue against England – nor Gondomar – who had left the realm two years before *The Travels of Time* surfaced – would ever be victim to ridicule in the manner that Laud was here. Unlike the Archbishop, or the unfortunate George Hawkins, they would never be forced to bear witness to their own tarnishing, to have to *feel* the shame which their tormentors longed for them to endure. In a sense then, shaming the Pope was an incomplete trick, a joke with only half a punch-line, for the retributive element of punitive shame was surely only completed in the reddened cheeks and flustered face of a victim undergoing the distress of dishonour. This was a void which polemic filled by invention. We have seen that *The Travels of Time* fantasized about Gondomar's distress in humiliation and defeat.[132] We must understand that dishonouring Catholics served as much to edify Protestant resolve as to have retribution on Rome. Polemicists engaged in a fiction in which they longed to wreak annihilation on Antichrist through the reductive impact of ridicule, and they consequently fantasized that their shaming had had the desired effect. When Titus Oates sought to convince Israel Tongue of the reality of his fictitious Popish Plot account, he flattered his perspective advocate, telling the vehemently Anti-Catholic Tongue that his polemic had so enraged the Papacy that his assassination was a Roman priority – an unusual compliment, but one which takes us to the heart of what polemicists fantasized their works could achieve.[133]

---

[130] Pierce, "Anti-episcopacy", p. 828.

[131] W. Laud, *The history of the troubles and tryal of that reverend father in God archbishop Laud* (London, 1695), pp. 179-80. See also Laud, *Works,* III, pp. 228-9 where he laments one of his speeches being pilloried and ridiculed; ibid, VI, p. 497. Laud clearly felt that 'likeness' had the potential for mimetic magic. Entering his study on 27th October 1640, he recorded: "in that study hung my picture, taken by the life. And coming in, I found it fallen down upon the face, and lying on the floor. The string being broken, by which it hanged against the wall. I am almost every day threatened with my ruin in parliament. God grant this be no omen." See, *Works,* III, p. 237.

[132] See above, pp. 79-82.

[133] R. Greene, *Diaries of the Popish Plot,* (New York, 1977), p. 191.

Consequently, each bout of Anti-Catholic legislation, or celebration of a 'victory' over Rome was accompanied by an outpouring of fictitious comical first-person responses from the Pope which showed him to have been pricked by polemic and humiliated by the distress of shame. These purely fantastic narratives were substitutes designed to provide satisfaction in lieu of actually *witnessing* the reaction of the ridiculed pontiff.[134]

For example, after the execution of John Felton in 1571 for importing Pius V's bull of excommunication against Elizabeth I, a single-sheet ballad – *The Pope in his fury doth answere returne, to a letter ye which to Rome is late come* – circulated in which a distraught pontiff lamented the tainting of his Church with the brand of treason.[135] Cutting a decidedly ridiculous figure, the Pope was both angered and saddened by news that the offensive begun by the excommunication had been deflated, his servant slain. This had:

"..*r* much appal[led] my spirite

And makes me swear and makes me teare

To pull and hale and rend my haire

And bugges me daily in despaire

To thinke on this despite..."

Beyond providing satisfaction that the execution of Felton had suitably wounded the Pope, the ballad edified Protestant fantasies of the pontiff's frustration at his impotence to revenge himself upon the English church:

"...mine obedient chylde

---

[134] For some examples, see BM Sat 1091; BM Sat 1077; *Rome's hunting-match for III kingdoms; or, The papists last run for the Protestants life and estates too, because this place has e'en beggar[e]d them* (London, 1680); *The Pope burnt to ashes, or, Definace of Rome* (London, 1676); *The Papists Lamentation for the loss of their agent William Viscount Stafford, together with the dread they are possessed with, fearing that more will quickly follow him the same way* (London, 1680); *News from Rome being a dialogue between the Pope and the Devil at a late conference* (London, 1677); *The friendly conference: or, An hue and cry after the Popes Holiness* (London, 1673); *The Dreadful Apparition; or, The Pope Haunted with Ghosts* (London, 1680); *The Burning of the whore of Babylon as it was acted with great applause, in the poultry, London* (London, 1673); *The passionate remonstrance made by His Holiness in the conclave at Rome* (Edinborough, 1641); *The tears of Rome: or the despair of the Pope for the ill success of the Plot* (London, 1680); *Rome's rarities, or, The Pope's Cabinet unlock't and exposed to view* (London, 1684).
[135] S. Peele, *The Pope in his fury doth answere returne, to a letter ye which to Rome is late come* (London, 1571).

101

Is hanged up upon a tree

And is so much revylde:

What should I doe

But curse and ban

And hurte them doe the work I can..?"

The thought of Felton's dangling carcass enduring the shame of ignominy had sparked a distraught reaction comforted by musing upon the contrasting fate of his body should it be at Rome. Here monks with censures would prevent the devil detecting the scent of his decaying flesh and the continual Masses said for his soul would enshrine Felton as a saint. Such a ghoulish image of monstrosity tainted Rome's claim to Truth, for what Church would make a saint out of a traitor? Above all else, however, the Pope raged at being ridiculed by polemic. Revenge expressed the desire to defend his honour:

"...glad wolde I be revenged

On England....

Because they have too much abusd

My Bulls with great despyght:

And make therat a laughing game

And set but little by my name

And much my holiness defame

And dayle me dispyse

Their Queen hast chast the rebels all

That loved to bow their knees to Baal

And hanged their quarters on the wall

As meet for Crows and Pyes."[136]

---

[136] Peele, *The Pope in his fury.* Cf. B. G, *A newyeares gifte dedicated to the Popes Holinesse, and all Catholikes addicted to the Sea of Rome* (London, 1579). The author mused at length about his satire being a 'gift' in return for Catholic activity in England, see the title-page and address to the reader in particular. S. Peele, *A letter to Rome, to declare to ye Pope, J. Felton his freend is hangd in a rope: And Farther, a right his graces to enflame. He dyed a Papist, and seemd not to turn* (London, 1571); *The Shameful downefall of the popes Kingdom, Contaynging the life and legend of Steven Gardiner* (London, 1606); J. Cornel, *An Admonition to Doctor Story being condemned to by treasonous* (London, 1571).

This image of the Pope recognizing his own defamation by Protestant pens and expressing his anger at the shame wrought by execution upon his Church was polemical fantasy, an imagined reaction to the very public tarnishing of the Roman Church by Protestant scribblers. Such Protestant bravado aimed to bolster resolve in the face of tensions heightened by an increasingly aggressive late-sixteenth century European Catholicism.[137] This was a cruel laughter, but one which solidified and soothed the tormentors.

Similar fictitious narratives accompanied every bout of Anti-Catholic activity in the period, providing invented commentary upon tightened legislation, commemorations of 'victories' over Rome, or providential interpretations of political events swaying in Britain's favour as a sign of God's unbridled protection of the realm. Indeed, the final section of this chapter will demonstrate that such fictitious Papal responses complemented the Pope Burning Processions of 1679 to 1681, over a century after the ballad satirizing Felton's execution.[138] These processions were heavily indebted to rituals of ridicule and their purpose was to subject the Pope – society's ultimate moral transgressor – to the justice of shame endured by commonplace offenders. Fictitious Papal responses fulfilled the Protestant fantasy of subjecting the pontiff to destructive laughter, expressing the frustration and humiliation which polemicists longed for him to feel. In this way satire completed the cycle of shame by which transgressors witnessed their own reputation annihilated. Protestants could never see their attempts to dishonour the Pope take effect. But they could imagine it, an activity which strengthened their resolve, mustered morale and solidified the belief that, as members of the True Church, they held the moral high-ground.

This section has demonstrated that satire was indebted to rituals of ridicule endemic in the system of early modern justice and, like these rituals, had a punitive purpose. Shaming the moral transgressors of village and town resolved tensions in the community. The punitive process confronted anxieties about dominant women, whose presence in a society equated to an anomaly within an ideal. Subjecting cuckolded husbands, men who failed to control their wives and scolding women to *charivari* was a means of punishing those threatening the workings of a supposedly patriarchal

---

[137] J. Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 3-12, 28-30, 67-68, 76-80.
[138] See below, pp. 152-85.

order, confronting anxieties about the failure of reality to live up to its ideal and acting as a cohesive force which re-affirmed the patriarchal value system.[139] Similarly, publicly ridiculing the Roman Church was a punitive activity which served to resolve anxieties concerning another unfulfilled ideal - the unsettling presence of Catholics within the realm, and remnants of 'popery' within its Church, permanent blemishes of Antichrist on the face of the New Jerusalem. Graphic satire displayed transgressors for ridicule and must be seen as an extension of punitive practices encouraging the populace to point and jeer. Polemic and punishment were closely related. Thus the frontispiece to *Rome rhym'd to death* (1683) in which the Pope – tottering on a throne balanced between a Catholic and Protestant tug-of-war – was finally overpowered by the author's verse, and lay dead at the foot of the scene in the arms of a helpless devil and Jesuit – an enemy vanquished by verse, shamed into oblivion by ridicule [Fig. 87.][140]

III: Broken Idols - Iconoclasm On The Printed Page

Catholic persons were not alone in being subjected to punitive shaming. Rome's icons were equally objects of ridicule, shamed to become inverted parodies of themselves. Thus the libel attached to a Roman mitre in *The Passionate remonstrance made by His Holinesse* (1641) [Fig. 88]:

> "The Daughter of Mystery, the child of Error,
>
> Mother of Tyranny, of wars, of Terrour,
>
> The Idol Reproach, Rocke of offence
>
> To Jew and Gentile, Source of Indulgence
>
> Forced Impiety, and th'usurping crest
>
> 'Bowe Diademe, the State, the Chruches past
>
> Is now discov'red, and all the world awake
>
> Make proud Rome, and the 'approbious Myter shake."[141]

---

[139] Ingram "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture", pp. 95-99; N. Zemon-Davis, "Women on Top" in her *Society and Culture in early modern France* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 124-52; Thomas, "The Place of Laughter", pp. 77-78 in particular.

[140] *Rome rhym'd to death* (London, 1683), title-page.

[141] *The Passionate remonstrance made by His Holinesse in the conclave at Rome* (London, 1641), sig. Miii.

The mitre was no longer a token of Christ but Antichrist; no more the good shepherd's mark, but epigrammatic of warlike tyranny - ridicule had reduced the sacred to the satanic.[142] As chapter one demonstrated, images on flyleaves were often emblematic of the work's contents.[143] Detailing Rome's destruction through the revelation of its true nature, the verses summarized the tone of the text in which a hysterical Pope bewailed the actions of the Scottish Covenanters. Alongside the Laudian Bishop's downfall, the Covenanters' resistance of 'Popish' changes to their Church de-railed plots to capture Britain for Rome by exposing the Papacy's evil ploys to all.[144] The shamed mitre glorified this routing. Throughout the text, destruction of its imagery announced Protestant wounding of the Papacy, imposing: "shame [upon your] Holiness's high calling, that all the resplendent keys of our dazzling pomp...must bee drowned for sooth in the smoke of an utter ruine, and endless confusion."[145] Fantasizing of Rome's annihilation, our author envisaged the effect his work and other polemic as punitive retribution. A bishop feared Protestants tearing:

"Us to pieces, and make Banners out of oure Catholik skinne, and scratch[ing] your Myter...to very contemptible and forgotten Atoms, and powder your supreme selfe in a lutteral barrel; They will sacke your citie, the Queene of the Earthe, treade upon the world's Trophee..."[146]

Shaming the mitre was a morsel of this destructive fantasy placed before Protestant eyes [Fig. 88.] It was also savagely ironic - Rome's own image had become emblematic of the work's Anti-Popery, one act of inversion representing an entire Church's revelation.

Here print once again aped *actual* practices of retribution. In bouts of iconoclasm the Reformers' divine mandate to purge the idols of the mind coalesced with the human urge to punish the images which had facilitated Rome's conning

---

[142] On the mitre as a symbol of the Bishops pastoral office, see *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, 17 vols (Columbia, 1981), IX, pp. 981-82.
[143] See above, Chapter One pp. 55-60.
[144] *Passionate remonstrance*, sigs. Bii-Div, in particular.
[145] Ibid, sig. Giiii.
[146] Ibid, sig. G.

laymen to jeopardize their souls.[147] This penal itch manifested itself in shaming. The fate of St. Dderfel of Llanderfel in North Wales encapsulated the connection. On his saints day (5th April) during 1538 some six hundred pilgrims brought kin, oxen and horses to he healed by the ornate statue of Dderfel, which sported a sword and shield.[148] Given that so many people had "ben sore aleiyed and enticed to worship the saide image", it presented an ideal stooge for a Henrician propaganda coup against the Rome's 'superstition', for it was commonly believed that offers made to the image brokered a divine insurance-bond, a promise that should damnation be their fate Dderfel would fetch their souls from hell.[149] Consequently, Thomas Cromwell ordered the idol removed to London. Here it was involved in an extraordinary piece of political theatre, taking a leading role in the execution of Friar Forrest – a persistent opponent of Royal Supremacy – for treason. The spectacle was one of punitive symbiosis. Before ten thousand spectators, Forrest was placed chest-down in a nest of chains suspended above a fire fuelled by Dderfel's shattered image - heresy and treason were intertwined in the brutal spectacle of Rome's idol consuming its traitor.[150] The message was clear: as worshipping a Roman idol betrayed Christ, so upholding Papal authority betrayed the King. Ridicule sound-tracked Dderfel's passage from sacred to profane in a malicious piece of gallows-humour which formed the spectacle's tag-line: "the Welshman had a prophecy that this image should set a whole Forrest a-fire, which prophecy now took effect, for he sett this friar Forrest on fire and consumed him to nothing."[151] Circulating this mock-prophecy which inverted the culture of veneration so integral to late-medieval Catholicism undoubtedly

---

[147] See D. MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London, 2004), pp. 155-59, 172, 193-94, 308, 323-25, 558-63, 613. H. Robinson (ed.),*Original letters relative to the English Reformation* (Parker Society no. 26: Cambridge, 1846), p. 606: "the trickery of the wicked knavery was so publicly exposed in the image of the crucifix, that everyone was indignant against the monks and impositions of that kind, and executed both the idols and those who worshipped them."

[148] T. Wright (ed.), *Three chapters of letters relating to the suppression of the monasteries* (Camden Society old ser, 26, 1843), pp. 190-1; J. G. Nichols (Ed.), *A chronicle of England during the regings of the Tudors, from A.D 1485 to 1559 by Charles Wriothesely* 2 vols, (Camden Society no. 20, London, 1877), i, p. 80; E. Hall, *Hall's chronicle; containing the history of England, during the reign of Henry the Fourth, and the succeeding monarchs, to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the manners and customs of those periods* (London, 1809), pp. 825-26; H. Ellis, (ed.), *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, 2 vols, (London, 1846), ii, p. 195. For previously scholarly treatments, see P. Marshall, "Papist as Heretic: The Burning of John Forrest, 1538", *Historical Journal,* 41, (1998), pp. 351-74; E. Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars: traditional religion in England c. 1400-1580* (New Haven/London, 1992), p. 404.

[149] T. Wright (ed.), *Three chapters of letters relating to the Suppression of the Monasteries* (Camden Society no. 26, London, 1843), p. 191.

[150] The scene is described most clearly in *Hall's chronicle*, pp. 825-26; *Wriothesley's Chronicle* i, p. 80

[151] *Three chapters of letters*, p. 190.

provoked a cruel laughter, a desecration of honour extended in verses detailing the crimes of Dderfel and Forrest which were pinned to the scaffold like libels on a cuckold's door.[152] Image and friar were equally criminal, the details of their transgressions published for all to see. Iconoclasm merged with punitive shaming, ridicule sparking de-mystification alongside destruction.

The link between ridicule and iconoclasm in Dderfel and the *Passionate Remonstrance* is telling, for it demonstrates once more ` the printed-page's indebtedness to *actual* retributive strategies employed against Catholicism - that polemic was a form of punishment as much as an intellectual endeavour. This section will focus on the aping of actual acts of iconoclasm in print. We have seen that nominally neutral depictions of Catholic figures subjected those depicted to public defamation in much the same way as acts of judicial shaming inherent in the treatment of transgressors commonplace within early modern culture. Similarly, printing apparently un-altered reproductions of imagery central to Catholic worship replicated the public display, critique and refutation of idols which accompanied official acts of iconoclasm in England. Before the event of these very public destructions, it was deemed necessary for the laity to *see* that the images which they had worshipped for so long were not holy. Consequently famous images were de-mystified through a series of public demonstrations serving to de-stabilize the laity's relationship to them. Idols displayed on the printed page echoed this exposure to a critical sight. Illustrations, texts and acts of iconoclasm were all part of an engagement with and re-definition of Roman iconography symptomatic of Protestant denigration of Catholicism to the status of 'Anti-Religion', a symmetrical inverse of the True Church. In this radical re-styling of Rome, each negative trait of Catholicism mirrored a conversely positive attribute of Protestantism: to define one's enemy was to fashion one's self.[153] Old images consequently had a place in the Reformed Church as something to kick against, and the idols of the enemy buttressed the new order. Both before the eyes of readers and the smoke of iconoclasts' fire, Rome's imagery was subjected to a display in which the legitimacy of the new faith's triumph over the lies

---

[152] Ibid & *Hall's chronicle*, p. 826. "David Darvel Gatteran/ As saith the Welshman/ Fetched outlaws out of hell/ Now is he come with speare and shield/ In harness to burn in Smithfielde,/ For in Wales he may not dwell/ And Forrest the Friar,/ That obstinate lyer,/That willfully.shalbe dead,/In his contumacie./ The Gospel doth deny/The King to be supreme head."

[153] Lake, "Anti-popery: The structure of a prejudice", pp. 72-106; Erikson, *Wayward Puritans*, p. 64; Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, pp. 8-10; King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 153-54.

of the old was made manifest, the frauds of Roman icons providing tactile and tangible 'proof' of Protestant claims to witness Truth.

Protestantism was intrinsically iconoclastic. When taken at their most idealistic the religious changes which swept Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries might better be characterized 'The Reduction' than 'The Reformation', such was their attempt to forcibly oust the divine's presence in the world by curbing the number of ways and places in which men could commune with the sacred.[154] Iconoclasm marked this trimming. As the new faith spread outside of Germany and Switzerland to the Netherlands, France, England and Scotland, the very public destruction of images became the standard rite of purification - white-washed walls and empty niches symbolizing the exorcism of Rome's Antichrist from parishes all over Europe. These destructive bursts were the means by which newly converted laymen vented their anger at having being duped by a Papal confidence trick, a brutal revenge upon a system of prayers to saints and Masses for the dead which they had accepted as vehicles for grace but now saw to be fraudulent.[155]

---

[154] I am arguing here that this was the aim or desire of the Reformers, not a statement of their ultimate effect. The 'reduction' thesis was argued most strongly by E Troeltsch in his *Protestantism and progress; a historical study of the relation of protestantism to the modern world*. Transl. by W. Montgomery (London, 1912). For the failure of the 'disenchantment of the world' to reach its ultimate goal, see R. W. Scribner, "The Reformation, Popular Magic, and the ' Disenchantment of the World ,'" *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 23, (1993), pp. 475–494; A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), *passim*; ibid, "Reforming the Waters: Holy Wells and Healing Springs in Protestant England", in D.Wood (Ed), *Life and Thought in the Northern Church,c.1100-1700, Studies in Church History Subsidia* 12 (1999) pp. 227-255; ibid, "The Reformation and 'the disenchantment of the world' reassessed", *Historical Journal*, 51, (2008), pp. 497-528.

[155] For literature on iconoclasm, see M. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts: volume 1, Laws against Images* (Oxford, 1988); C. C. Christensen, *Princes & Propaganda: Electoral Saxon Art of the Reformation* (Kirksville, 1992); S. Clark, *Vanities of the Eye: vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 162-83; P. M. Crew, *Calvinist Preaching & Iconoclasm in The Netherlands, 1544-6 9* (London, 1978); C. Davidson, & A. Eljenholm-Nichols, (Eds.), *Iconoclasm Vs Art & Drama* (Michigan, 1989); H. Diehl, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism & popular theater in Early Modern England* (Ithaca/ London, 1997); W. A. Dyrness, *Reformed Theology & Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination From Calvin to Edwards* (Calvin, 2004); Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*; C. M. Eire, *War Against the Idols* (Cambridge, 1986); R Hutton, "Local Impact of the Tudor Reformations", in C. Haigh (Ed), The English Reformation Revised (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 115-20; S Michalski, *The Reformation & The Visual Arts: The Protestant image Question in Western & Eastern Europe* (London/ New York, 1993). On iconoclasm and 'iconophobia' in the English Reformation, see P. Collinson, *The Birthpangs of English Protestantism* (New York, 1998), pp. 110-120; J. A. Knapp, *Illustrating the Past in Early Modern England: the Representation of History in Printed Books* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 13-18; T. Watt, *Cheap Print & Popular Piety*, (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 132-39, 159-62. For a view of similar trends in Reformation Germany, see R. W Scribner, "Popular Piety & Modes of Visual Perception", in ibid, *Religion & Culture in Early Modern Germany* (1400-1800) (Boston, 2001), pp. 123-26.

But whilst it may have been distasteful iconoclasm was certainly not wanton.[156] More than merely destructive, smashing was spiritually efficacious. To break a statue was to shatter the system of beliefs which it underpinned, and consequently cleansing churches of their imagery served to effect the eradication of idols in the minds of their congregations. Purgation was as much internal as external – mankind, so irredeemably sinful, had a predilection to idolatry, and any image in a religious setting could lead to his corruption. Destroying statues and paintings effected what Margaret Aston has called "the damage to the seen as a way of hurting the unseen":[157] the pagan Gods of Rome suffocated by quashing the points at which they were venerated.

Yet this was not a rejection of the sense of sight. The Protestant fetish for bare church walls denuded of the icons of the past was itself an idealization of something inherently visual.[158] Nor was iconoclasm simply concerned with obliteration – paradoxically, it increased focus upon illicit objects.[159] The laity was being asked to *look* more closely. Their eyes, dazzled by Antichrist into seeing God in an image, were forced to stare intensely upon an idol in order that they might recognize what it had been all along: naught but wood and stone, and nothing holy. Protestantism, then, was the triumph of one way of seeing over another.[160] Display proved crucial to victory. Thus in France and Germany iconoclastic bouts were preceded with images being subjected to parodies of consecration and Mass, rites of desecration which amounted to a trial by ordeal goading an image to prove its efficacy. Hung, whipped and shat upon, statues were taunted to demonstrate their sanctity by provoking a divine defence – that one was not forthcoming smacked of God's tacit approval of the Reformer's mandate.[161] Breaking the image was not enough. To quash a belief system, these elaborate displays were necessary to show idols for what they actually were - a statue was shown to be nothing more than wood or stone, a consecrated host

---

[156] What separated the Reformation from the iconoclasm in the Church's past was its turning of a sporadic activity into a system of purgation. Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, pp. 1-15 in particular.

[157] Ibid, p. 4.

[158] See, for example, the comments of Ulrich Zwingli upon seeing the bare Zurich Grossmunster cleansed of its images and newly whitewashed: "It is positively luminous; the walls are beautifully white!" Quoted in M. R. Miles, *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity & Secular Culture* (Boston, 1995), p. 102. The 'fetishization' argument is my own, however.

[159] Diehl, *Staging Reform*, pp. 41-45.

[160] See below, Chapter Five pp. 337-45.

[161] N. Zemon-Davis, "The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in Sixteenth-Century France", *Past & Present*, 59, (May 1973), pp. 53-91; M. Aston, "Rites of Destruction by Fire" in her *Faith & Fire: popular and unpopular religion, 1350-1600* (London, 1993), pp. 175-195; Scribner, "Reformation and Ritual", passim.

not the body of Christ due reverence, but merely bread which even the Lord himself would not act from on high to protect. By asking a brutally simple question, desecrating displays validated the verity of Protestantism: if this object was truly due veneration would God permit such horrendous defilement?[162]

Thus when addressing the crowd before the destruction of one of England's most popular idols, John Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester, "besought God he might be damned if [the image] were not as he had said."[163] Although far less indebted to scatology or parody, display was equally essential to English iconoclasm.[164] Clinical exposés of frauds behind "miraculous" images preceded their destruction in carefully stage-managed public occasions elaborately contrived to maximize the effect of revelation in weakening adherence to Papal doctrine. Frauds like the Boxley Rood (a crucified Christ) from Maidstone in Kent were typical.[165] A pilgrimage hot-spot famed for performing miracles, the statue was rumoured to house the divine and seen to move its eyes and lips in the presence of pilgrims.[166] Once removed from the wall however, rods and wires revealed its divine residence to be a priestly fraud. Accusations circulated that the Rood turned Christ into a clerical puppet which performed impromptu miracles to swindle simple pilgrims out of their donations. The image was removed to London during 1538, but before leaving, its miraculous capabilities were publicly dispelled before Maidstone's populace:

---

[162] Davis, "The Rites of Violence", pp. 156-64.

[163] *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, ii, p. 76.

[164] The only example of European style scatology I can find employed against the papacy in a print aimed at an English audience is *A Pass for the Romish Rabble to the Pope of Rome through the Divils [sic] Arse of Peake* (1624) discussed by H. Pierce "A Dutch Devil in Derbyshire: Adaptation and Appropriation in a 1624 Broadside", in T. Hamling & R. L. Williams (Eds.), *Art re-formed: re-assessing the impact of the Reformation on the visual arts* (Newcastle, 2007), pp. 215-23. Scatology was certainly used in images against other targets. See R. Shorelyter, The *armes of the tobachonists* (London, 1630); D. F, *The Dutch-mens pedigree or A relation, shewing how they were first bred, and descended from a horse-turd, which was enclosed in a butter-box* (London, 1653); J. Taylor, *The Devil turn'd round-head: or, Pluto become a Brownist* (London, 1642); *A Letter to Mr Marriot* (London, 1652).

[165] The image had been installed at some point before 1432. See P. Marshall, "The Rood of Boxley, The Blood of Hailes and the Defence of the Henrician Church", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 46, (1995), pp. 689-96. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 403-4. For contemporary accounts, see G. H. Cook, (Ed.) *Letters to Thomas Cromwell and others on the suppression of the Monasteries* (London, 1965), p. 144; *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, ii, pp. 74-5; Robinson (Ed.), *Original letters relative to the English Reformation*, p. 606; J. M. Cowper (Ed.), *Four supplications 1529-52* (Early English Texts Society, 1871), pp. 74-75; J. G. Nichols (Ed.), *Narratives of the days of the Reformation* (Camden Society, 1859), p. 256. For similar iconoclastic displays, see: Our Lady's Milk, *Wriothesley's Chronicle,*, ii, p. 30; for The Blood of Hailes see *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, ii, p. 90.

[166] *Original letters*, p. 604. See also p. 606, "by means of some person pulling a cord, most artfully contrived and ingenuously inserted at the back, the image rolled about its eyes just like a living creature....[and] gave a nod of assent or dissent according to occaision."

"The roode was sett in the market place....and there *shewed* openlye to the people the craft of moveinge the eyes and lipps, that all the people there might *see* the illusions that had bene used by the moncks of manye years...whereby they had gotten great riches in deceavygne the people thinckynge that the sayde image had moved by the power of God, which nowe *playnlye appeared* to the contraye."[167]

This demonstration was repeated upon the Rood's arrival in London during Hilsey's sermon presenting it as typical of Roman deception. The fraudulent rods were again "exhibited", "publicly exposed" and "made known to everyone" before its destruction.[168] Display was crucial in replacing one way of seeing with another. The act of looking dispelled the legend, and the image became for the populace what it had actually being all along: wood and paint. Breaking the image broke attachment to the belief system in which it sat.

If there was fraud within the Boxley Rood however, it was more probably Henrician than Roman. Given that the wires were not visible until the image was taken from the wall the monks complicity seems doubtful.[169] As Peter Marshall noted, the fraud was probably an invention designed by Henry's Church to garner much needed support in the face of increasing unpopularity.[170] Opposition to the Royal Supremacy increased in London during the late 1530s, and evidence which 'proved' Rome's corruption served to justify the King's proceedings, returning to him the moral high-ground in acting to overthrow such an 'illicit' Church. It also bolstered justification for the unpopular campaign against the monasteries, reflecting hostility towards the policy back onto the religious houses.[171] Appropriation here served political ends, with Rome's own image acting to undermine it.

But for all the novelty of an invented fraud, the Rood was typical in being treated to a very public display. Hilsey subjected more legitimate deceptions to

---

[167] *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, ii, p. 74.

[168] Ibid, pp. 74-76. The image was typical of "other images in the Church, used for great pilgrimages, hath caused great idolatrie to be used in this realme, and shewed how he thincketh that the idolatrie will never be left till the said image be taken away." See also *Original letters*, pp. 604-06: the "imposture is now notorious to every person in England."

[169] The wires were not visible until the image was prized from the wall and increasingly elaborate stories of priests concealed nearby to operate its features, smack of the fantastic. See *Original letters*, pp. 604-06, which details the priests "standing out of sight" and awaiting pilgrims. *LP* xiii (I), p. 348.

[170] Marshall, "The Rood of Boxley, The Blood of Hailes", pp. 691-95.

[171] Ibid.

similar demonstrations, showing a relic of Christ's blood from Hailes in Gloucestershire to be duck's blood and honey.[172] Hugh Latimer engaged in a similar piece of political theatre, carrying an idol along the nave of St. Paul's and throwing it "out of the church, though the inhabitants of the county whence it came continually affirmed that eight oxe[n] would be unable to remove it from its place."[173] Such displays attempted to corrode attachment to the old faith, for appropriation ultimately re-described what was taken: relics were no longer tactile objects of the divine but tokens of Antichristian deception; images were no more imbued with the holy, but brutally base wood and stone. Upon ending his sermon Hilsey passed the Rood to boys in the crowd, who trampled it with glee. Congregants scrambled to obtain a broken fragment in what amounted to a perverse inversion of relic veneration.[174] Such splinters became totemic of the Rood's mundaneness. One witness envisaged people re-creating the day's iconoclasm in the fires of their homes, or keeping the memento as a trump-card "of reproof of such kind of imposture" in future debates on the nature of divine presence in this world.[175] Rome's icon had been appropriated, displayed, and subverted to the status of anti-relic.

The page re-created such subversive appropriation. Iconoclastic display was as much the preserve of authors refuting Roman writing as it was preachers actively purging churches. Thus John Jewel's *A viewe of a seditious bul sent into England from Pious Quntus Bishop of Rome* (1582) printed and critiqued the bull excommunicating Elizabeth I.[176] Although certainly a display of intellectual pyrotechnics, the refutation was also inherently visual – the very *layout* of the page showed Jewel's indebtedness to iconoclastic display. One did not have to *read* his commentary to understand that Rome was suitably routed, for the page presented the bull *swamped* with critique – the viewer knew the document to be illicit because of

---

[172] *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, ii, p. 76; Marshall, "The Rood of Boxley, The Blood of Hailes", p. 692. Cf.*Wriothesley's Chronicle* ii, p. 30.

[173] Robinson (Ed.), *Original letters relative to the English Reformation*, p. 606.

[174] *Wriothesley's Chronicle*, ii, pp. 74-76.

[175] "It was a great delight to any one who could obtain a single fragment, either...to put in the fire of their own houses, or else to keep by them by way of reproof of such kind of imposture." *Original letters*, p. 606.

[176] J. Jewel, *A viewe of a seditious bul sent unto England from Pius Quintus Bishop of Rome* (London, 1582), pp. 4-5.

this display preceding the absorption of the text's arguments at any cognitive level [Fig. 89.][177]

Iconoclasm was similarly re-created by printing Roman idols. For example, the foldout plate enclosed in *A newyeares gifte dedicated to the Pope's Holiness* (1579) displayed "true figures and representations" of a prayer-beads, images, bulls, a crucifix, and an Agnus Dei "of late sent by the Popes holiness into England" [Fig. 90.][178] On first inspection, it appears that Antichrist had defiled the temple of the Protestant page.[179] Yet displaying the idols was the work's *raison d'etre*. Their supposed "discovery" in England had occasioned the author's refutation of Rome, and he envisaged this *Newyeres gifte* sardonically as a "recompense of divers singular and inestimable reliques, of late sent by the said Pope's holiness into England."[180] The opening address lavished satirical platitudes of feigned gratitude on the Pope, mockingly conceiving of the work as a reciprocal gift:

"Why should we then forget ourselves, to him that is so kinde?

Awake for shame, and at the least returne a thankfull minde

It is not much, that he should that to raise thee from thy fall

And have a care to see thee safe, which is the lord of all?

Oh humble then, that haughtie harte, cut out they crooked scope,

Returne again, and yeelde thy selfe unto the holy Pope....

Who spareth neither day nor night, nor any worldly cost

To sendeth heap of heavenly things from Royal Rome to thee

Do turne the book, peruse them wel, and marke the[m] what they be"[181]

The closing couplet commanded the reader to *look* – the work mimicked acts of iconoclastic display, raising Rome's iconography to re-definition through ridicule. Such was the power of appropriation.

---

[177] Cf. H. Burton, *The baiting of the Popes bull. Or An unmasking of the mystery of iniquity* (London, 1627) in which the document is equally surrounded by text.

[178] B. G, *A newyeares gifte dedicated to the Popes Holinesse, and all Catholikes addicted to the Sea of Rome* (London, 1579), title-page.

[179] However, this appropriation occurred within a specific context. Just as demonstrating the 'fraud' of the Boxley Rood had buttressed the Henrician Reformation during heightened critique, so discovering these objects "of late sent by the Pope's holiness" legitimated recent tightened legislation against Roman missionaries - which many believed tantamount to persecution - as a necessary defensive measure. Ibid, 'Preface' and 'Address to the Reader'.

[180] Ibid, title-page.

[181] Ibid, 'Address To The Reader.'

113

Once again, display re-defined. Our author printed an indulgence attached to a crucifix, a Papal gift claiming to protect its recipient from death by iron, fire or water.[182] As with other iconoclastic displays the text demanded that the reader recognize the crucified Christ for what was: wood. Despite human inclinations to revere representations of Christ, notions of this object possessing holy power must be resisted:[183]

"...what is meant? His doome, his death and smarte...

Know mortal man, the Crosse be made of wood,

The like whereof is yet upon the ground:

But our safe post, consummate in the blood

Of Jesus Christ, the meane which God hath found,

Again to get which Adams fall had lost,

Not else to winne for any worldly cost

If so, then take these trifling toyes as vaine,-

And trust to Christ which lord then come to call."[184]

Contrasting so starkly the base value of the wooden cross with the immense significance of the crucifixion which it sought to represent ruptured any notion that the signifier could be imbued with morsels of the divine power possessed by the signified. Here text echoed sermons during acts of iconoclasm by re-defining the icon, commanding readers to see as profane what had been presented as sacred. The objects on the foldout cut were similarly displayed for re-description [Fig. 90.] Thus the depiction of a saint praying to both Christ and the Virgin (labelled 11) was no longer a template to inspire devotion but an image through which Rome descended into self-criticism, an emblem of the turmoil caused by idolatrous worship of creature alongside Creator:

"This figure describeth it selfe: for he knoweth not whether Christ or Mary be of greater power, and therefore stands in doubt which way to turn..."[185]

---

[182] Ibid, sigs. Fiiii-Gii.
[183] ibid, sig. Gi: "...there is no man I trow/ The Crosse of Christ that will or maye resest."
[184] Ibid, sig. Gi.
[185] Ibid, sig. Hii.

Presenting the enemies' theology as flawed in this way shored-up resolve in one's own Faith. Ultimately, such Protestant appropriations of Catholic iconography galvanized the Godly by displaying their opponents as the Anti-Religion, the foil of their own true worship of Christ. Thus the critique of "a crucifix with Mary and John, under which are written the words: *hecte mihi spiri*. These are their hopes, as if Christ alone were not of sufficient value."[186]

The concern of iconoclasm, then, was as much to buttress the new faith as to destroy the old. Engaging with the icons of the enemy was a critical facet of Protestant identity, and in a sense the Reformation was the replacement of one way of seeing with another. The final chapter of this thesis will demonstrate that the ability to *see through* Rome's Antichrist was deemed a sign of election by Protestants, and this edifying act of sight was certainly the purpose of displaying idols here.[187] The foldout was part of a larger section comparing Christ and Pope as binary opposites, its "trinkets" displayed as proof that Papacy was Antichrist fraudulently selling baubles to lure believers away from faith in Christ Alone.[188] Through iconoclastic display, objects previously imbued with holy power or used as vehicles for directing one's devotion to Christ had become tokens of precisely the opposite – monuments of Rome's idolatrous worship, the "trashe" by which Antichrist distracted eyes away from following Christ.

But viewing the idols of Rome was about more than edification. It belonged to a conception of the Roman Church essential to Protestant self-definition. Anti-Catholicism centred upon binary opposition – inversion or an argument constructed from contraries – at the nub of much thought in early modern Europe.[189] A symmetrical inversion of the True Church, in painting a picture of Catholicism Protestants simultaneously coloured an image of themselves. Building New Jerusalem was forever entwined with Babylon's destruction, the image of the True Church always constructed in the shadow cast by the False.[190] This interlaced mental-process

---

[186] Ibid, sig, Hii.

[187] See below, Chapter Five pp. 337-45.

[188] Ibid, sigs. Fii-Hiiii in particular. See sig. Hiiii "Christ with his bloode hath bought us, not with golde:/ The Pope for gaine both Christe and us doth sell/ My life (saith Christ) to save your lives was solde:/ My trashe (saith Pope) will keep you all from Hell/ Lament your sins (saith Christ) and follow mee/ My pardons (saith the Pope) must set you free"

[189] Lake "Anti-Popery", pp. 72-106; S. Clark, "Inversion, Misrule and the Meaning of Witchcraft", *Past and Present*, 87, (1980), pp. 98-127; Erikson, *Wayward Puritans*, p. 64; Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*, pp. 8-10; King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. 153-54.

[190] See above, Chapter Five, pp. 287-97.

grew out of Augustinian views of history as the continual and incessant battle between good and evil. In this paradigm history was driven and punctuated by the perpetual collision of these forces, and consequently Protestant definition of themselves as persecuted martyrs of the True Church *required* an enemy to play the part of the incessantly persecuting False Church. Rome was cast in this role.[191] What strikes the modern reader of sixteenth-and-seventeenth-century polemic most is how massively repetitive it was – the same arguments, doctrinal disputes and historical treatments parroted over and over by author after author and for generation after generation. Only by comprehending the logic of binary opposition do we unlock the force behind this monotony. Controlling the definition of the enemy was crucial to creating a heroic vision of the self. For Protestants to be in the camp of Christ at Jerusalem, it was necessary that Rome be pinned in the den of Antichrist at Babylon, and polemic secured its confinement. Rome became the great stooge which made Protestant halos' shine more brightly – re-colouring its doctrines, documents, and history before Protestant eyes' was thus essential to ensuring that the image of the enemy was continually projected.

Rome's idols, then, did not just *find* a place in the new Church, they *demanded* it. Thus the frontispiece to John Spittlewood's *Rome ruin'd by Whitehall* (1649), in which Popery was revealed as Antichrist, proudly displayed Catholic emblems broken and soiled on the ground [Fig. 91.][192] A commonplace of Anti-Catholic iconography, this was more than bravado glorifying the author's polemic - icons of false worship became trophies of victory demonstrating the True Church's routing of the False through controlling the definition of its rites. Plainly dressed and reliant only upon the Word, Spittlewood stood as a metonym for the depth of Protestantism's contrast with the ornate human traditions upon which Antichrist relied: his 'Truth' made all-the-more apparent through presentation of Catholicism's idolatrous falseness.[193] Historians too often view Anti-Catholicism as an 'irrational' or unfortunate cloud of prejudice distorting contemporary understandings of the 'real' circumstances of the situations which they faced.[194] Such views are paralleled in equally apologetic attitudes to iconoclasm as an exercise in wanton destruction making Protestantism

---

[191] Lake "Anti-Popery", pp. 72-106.
[192] J. Spittlewood *Rome ruin'd by Whitehall* (London, 1649), title-page.
[193] For a more detailed discussion of Spittlewood's image, see below Chapter Five pp. 311-12.
[194] See J. Champion, "Popes and guys and anti-Catholicism" in B. Buchanan (Ed.), *Gunpowder Plots* (London, 2005), pp. 80-117.

noticeably unattractive from a distance of three centuries.[195] What must be understood, however, is that when intertwined iconoclasm and Anti-Catholicism spawned a creative negativity – that the iconoclastic display and re-definition of Rome was integral to the way in which Protestants forged their own faith.

But in displaying Rome, Protestants also re-coloured it. Continental propaganda styled Rome sacrilegious through an extensive pictorial campaign resplendent with tropes often exceptionally crude - papal tiaras, bulls, and Mass paraphernalia were commonly receptacles for excrement, or the product of monstrous demonic births.[196] Surviving English materials demonstrate subtler re-fashioning. Yet, for all their ostensible impartiality, depictions of Rome in Protestant texts were far from accurate. Polemicists were not engaged in a dispassionate comparative study of religions - but it made their arguments more persuasive if audiences took their presentations of Catholicism to be realistic. In the marked absence of outright vitriol, woodcut depictions often possessed a seductive objectivity, being commonly tagged as 'True Images'.[197] The apparently non-partisan representation of Mass in Thomas Williamson's *Sword of the Spirit* (1613) is poignant [Fig. 92.] The rite appears decidedly un-coloured.[198] Crammed with idolatrous ways of seeing, much here was illicit to Protestant eyes. Monks knelt in veneration of an elevated host; the altar was decked with ornate trappings; and the Rood featured idolatrous presentations of the Virgin, John the Baptist and Christ which, by representing God in human form, diminished His majesty. Yet nothing in the engraving explicitly *commanded* viewers to *condemn* it. Indeed, Williamson's image echoed contemporary Catholic representations of Mass [Figs. 93 & 94.][199] Apeing the congregational perspective of Catholic engravings, Williamson took his Protestant viewers on a tour of idolatry, seducing them into believing that they witnessed the critical point of the Roman rite – the Elevation of the Host – from the point of view of a papist, that they viewed the ceremony as it *actually* occurred.

---

[195] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, pp. 9-10.

[196] R. W. Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda of the German Reformation* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 80-92 in particular.

[197] This tactic was originally employed on the continent. See the discussion of "The True Image of the Ancient, Apostolic Evangelical Church" and "The True Image of the Papist Church" in J. Koerner, *Reformation of the Image* (London, 2004), pp. 52-57, 104-36, 252-281, 340-61, 326-36.

[198] T. Williamson, *The sword of the spirit to smite in pieces that antichristian Goliath, who daily defieth the Lords people the host of Israel* (London, 1613), p. 17.

[199] *Ma[n]ual of prayers ... very aptly distributed for ye dayes of the weke and for all other our comon necessities* (Doway, 1604), sig. C2; R. Whitford, *A manual of prayers gathered out of many famous and godly authours* (Douai, 1613) , p. 118.

Which, of course, they did not. Closer examination reveals that the image presented a picture of Catholicism as a religion devoid of spirituality, concerned only with the material.[200] Protestants commonly presented Roman worship operating by rote, claiming that in the Catholicism simple presence at Church rites, rather than any spiritual contemplation, was deemed adequate to receive Grace. This was complete nonsense – interiority was as much a concern of Rome as it was Canterbury.[201] But in order to position themselves as the Church of the Holy Spirit, Protestants presented Rome as concerned only with the show of religion. Thus in this image the participants are not concentrating fully on the service. Several pray on beads at the point of Elevation – an act surely requiring private contemplation – a dissipation of attention intended to mock Catholicism as solely concerned with the performance of religion rather than contemplation or reverence of the divine.

The image also displayed a confusion of sight. For Protestants, Rome had supplanted God by worshipping creature instead of Creator, manifested in reverence for idols, saints as intercessors and the near placement of the Virgin in the Godhead. But this heinous propensity for idolatry was encapsulated most aptly in the doctrine of transubstantiation – that during Elevation Mass's bread and wine *became* Christ's body and blood – which for Protestants was not only impossible but an act of abhorrent insolence to God, the worship of bread, not Christ, as sacred.[202] Confused idolatry was pictured here in a subtle manner. The Elevated Host was placed perfectly in-line with the base of the crucifixion above the altar, a blurring which highlighted the cluttering of creature and Creator in Roman thought by raising the question of what, precisely, was being venerated here – bread, image, or Christ? This action was amplified in the displaced points of worship which subtly rebuked Rome's confusion at where to place its faith. Verses expounded the point - although the woodcut was saturated with sight, this multiplicity of focal-points demonstrated that Catholics knew not where to see God:

"Loe here thou seest the blindnesse of the Pope

That worship God in sacrifice of Masse:

---

[200] Koerner, *Reformation and the Image,* pp. 252-81

[201] See the point made by Eamon Duffy in his penetrating review of Koerner's work – he found Koerner to have been seduced by Protestant propaganda, taking their presentation of the late medieval Catholicism to be 'accurate'. E. Duffy, "Brush For Hire", *London Review of Books,* 12/01/2004, passim.

[202] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts,* pp. 7-8; Clark, *Vanities of the Eye,* pp. 161-68 in particular.

So dimn'd in mind, that at noone day hee grope

Than Pagan worse, that knew not where God was:

The'd lights, crosse and abhomination

Are foes to Christ his death and passion."[203]

For all its acts of seeing, this engraving was actually a display of spiritual blindness. Crosses, beads, candles and images distracted attention from true worship in the spirit. Williamson used the image to introduce a chapter on Antichrist, presenting Catholicism as a show of holiness whose rites enchanted its members slavishly to follow the Whore of Babylon away from the Word.[204] Eyes overawed by bread and rosaries were a fitting encapsulation. But by picturing something so *routine* it was also persuasively deceptive, presenting fabrications as genuine articles – this was parody posing as portrait.

It is ironic, then, that in this scene of Antichristian delusion, it was Protestant viewers who were actually being conned. Yet the con had to be believed. This display of Mass not only attacked Antichrist's habitat, but also prepared the ground for the seeds of Truth to blossom, serving as a counterpoint to one of True Worship, a Protestant preacher expounding from the pulpit [Fig. 95.][205] Self-definition occurred through glaringly apparent contrasts. Only clerics were present at Mass service, whereas under Protestants Christ was presented to a Church crammed with laymen old and young, male and female. Whilst Mass participants were distracted by a multiplicity of focal points, here congregants sat unified in rapturous reception of the Word. This purposeful captivation made the Truth of Protestantism startlingly apparent. Their worship succeeded where transubstantiation failed – in making Christ present:

"Loe here with joy the messenger of God

That breaks the bread of life to hungry souls:

In which true Christians doe, and have abode

Though that the Pope this holy course controule:

Hee hates the Word and Preaching of the same,

---

[203] Williamson, *The sword of the spirit*, p. 17.
[204] Ibid, pp. 17-29. See pp. 19-21 for the Whore of Babylon.
[205] Ibid, p. 61.

119

But each Believer houses it with fame."[206]

The image pictured the Body of Christ, a congregation. For Protestants hearing was the byway for Truth, the avenue by which Christ awakened Faith. This reception of the Word – which "each believer houses with fame" – was presented in the unison of an attentive audience. All crane their necks upward, staring not at the minister but at the space before him - what was presented here was a concentrated act of hearing.[207] This redundancy of sight was a rejoinder to the idolatrous gaze of Catholicism: whilst Mass was presented as muddled veneration, True Worship occurred in the act of focussed instruction. In picturing Truth juxtaposition was paramount. Understanding the error of one Church was necessary to recognizing the Truth of another, and the religion of the Word thus retained a dependence upon the idols which it had purged.[208]

Williamson's images were engraved after two scenes on the title-page of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* [Fig. 96.][209] Although not in a church setting, depictions of a priest Elevating the Host before a handful of adoring monks and a minister preaching to an audience rapt in attention served as templates for Williamson's piece [detail Fig. 38.] The presence of the tetragammaton – a non-representational symbol of God – amongst the congregation marked divine assent, thrusting home the point that only in the preaching of His Word was Christ truly worshipped in the Church.[210] Foxe's title-page extended the scope of comparison, injecting eschatological significance into contrasts between Protestant and Catholic.[211] The very status of the two Churches as Elect and Reprobate was intertwined, the achievements of each awarded their ultimate judgment at the Second Coming. Contrast was achieved through a conflict of movement overseen by Christ in Judgement, commanding

---

[206] Ibid, p. 61. My italics.

[207] Cf European images of Protestant worship Koerner, *Reformation of the Image*, pp. 42-50, 55-61.

[208] Cf. J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (London, 1583), ii, p. 1578 – "A description of M. Latimer, preaching before K. Edward the 6, in the preaching place at Westminster."

[209] This frontispiece first appeared in the 1570 edition.

[210] Our trail does not end here, however. As Aston has demonstrated, Foxe's title-page were themselves indebted to continental woodcuts such as George Pencz's *The Content of Two Sermons*, printed a Nuremburg during 1529. M. Aston and E. Ingram, "The Iconography of the Acts and Monuments", in D. Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 1997), pp. pp. 101-12, 120-23. Scribner, *Simple Folk*, pp. 30-31, 45-46, 197-206, 216-228; Koerner, *Reformation of the Image*, pp. 255-56, 270-71.

[211] For previous treatments of Foxe's title-page see Aston & Ingram "The Iconography of the Acts and Monuments" pp. 74-77 ; King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 180-81.

"Come Ye" to Protestants and "Goe Ye" to Rome – one Church ascends as the other falls. The left-side depicted the fate of the persecuted martyr-Church. As predicted in Revelation, the Godly had been victims of Antichrist's wrath throughout history, their earthly suffering a sign of the succour awaiting them in heaven. Their movement is consequently all upwards towards Christ. In the bottom scene they received Christ's Word and are martyred at the stake by Antichrist for doing so in the next panel. Crowned Elect in the scene above as a result of their steadfast endurance of suffering, they sat in heaven's clouds below the angels on Christ's left. Their depiction before Christ in Judgement acted to reinforce the verity of their worship of Him in the bottom panel – veneration of Christ in heaven mirroring worship of Him Alone on earth. Conversely, the persecuting False Church of Rome moved downwards away from Christ.[212] Whereas simple worship in the Word procured the True Church salvation, Rome's attempts to obtain transcendence through a clutter of deeds are brutally exposed as fruitless. The sheer number of religious activities – Mass, prayer beads, saint's processions and sermons – condemns them as valueless and void of content. Lightning and fire announced the failure of these Roman rites, as Christ rejected demonic monks from heaven. Their bodies are wrestled earthward by devils in a plummet which negated the verity of Mass as a vehicle of grace in the scene below, a downward thrust continued as a devil overhung from Mass to the sermon in the bottom panel. Once again the Protestant image of themselves could only be created through contrast and conflict. Heaven and Hell, Elect and Reprobate, True Church and False were all intermeshed – imaging one Church necessarily involved conceiving the other.

As Thomas Betteridge noted, Foxe's vision of two churches was the product of an Augustinian conception of history.[213] For Foxe events formed on the crest of waves driven by the forces of good and evil – conflict was thus the motor of history, an unfolding of the perpetual antagonism between True Church and False. Augustine's ideas were paramount in the engraving's characterization of these Churches, most noticeably in Rome's absorption by confusion. Just as devils hung down from Mass to view the sermon, so the Elevated Host juts into the depiction of falling demons above, making it unclear whether clerics engaged in an act of devil-

---

[212] Rome is the Church of Antichrist as pre-figured in Revelation.
[213] T. Betteridge, "Visibility, Truth and History in *Acts and Monuments*", in C. Highley & J. N. King (Eds.) *John Foxe and his World*, (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 145-159.

worship. The key point, however, is how *porous* the scenes of Rome were, contrasting starkly with the ordered and compartmentalized depiction of Protestant worship which facilitated a controlled upward movement. This was indebted to the Augustinian view of the Truth and Falsehood. Although ultimately invisible (as knowledge of salvific status could not be known on earth) actions and practices in this life pointed towards which Church one belonged to in the next. Truth, like Christ, was un-changing and a-temporal.[214] Thus the martyrs' display of their constancy on earth signified membership of the True Church in heaven, membership explicit in Foxe's controlled symmetry. The circular grouping of the martyrs at the stake whilst performing the steadfast permanence of their faith was echoed in the circular composition of their presence before Christ – Truth is the same on earth as it is in heaven.[215] By way of contrast, the False Church was changeable and confused, and known by violence, chaos and disorder – the attributes awarded to Rome here. Order marked Truth, whilst chaos betokened error.

Mocking Roman impotence before the justice of God, the retributive fantasy of Foxe's title-page undoubtedly warmed the martyred hearts of the True Church. Indeed, iconoclasm and punitive ridicule converged throughout the *Actes and Monuments*. The large tripartite image announcing Edward VI's ascendency served as an emblem of the systematic purgation characterizing the religious policy of the six short years of the boy-King's reign [Fig. 97.][216] This image visualized the attack against the visual. A ship sat perilously on rough waters overhung with stormy skies. Ubiquitous in religious art as a symbol of the Church, this ship served here as an emblem of Rome, terminally threatened by the iconoclastic regime of the new Josiah.[217] Rome's buoyancy was further endangered by its clerics, who overloaded their ship with idols frantically raided from their own temple – safe from the cleansing hands of the Edwardian regime, the idols now threatened Roman lives as they had previously the souls of laymen encouraged to worship them. Thus a series of "Papists packinge away their paultrye" scuttled past an iconoclast's bonfire and the wrenching

---

[214] Ibid, pp. 148-51 in particular.
[215] As seen in the middle and top panels on the left-side.
[216] Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, (1583) ii, p. 1294.
[217] Mark 4: 37-40. The use of the ship symbol dates from the early Church. See Apostolic Constitutions (II, xlvii); Tertullian ,*De bap.*, xii; P.L., 1, 1214; Clement of Alexandria *The Pedagogue,* III.2. Crucially, St. Peter was the helmsman of this ship. See *Catholic Encyclopaedia,* "Symbolism", XIII, p. 867. The central part of the Church building – the 'nave' – is also Latin for 'ship'. N. T. Whitman, "The 1st Papal Medal: Sources & Meaning", *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs,* 133, (1991), pp. 820-24.

of an idol from a niche, hurrying away with sacks stuffed full to overflowing with their liturgical paraphernalia [detail Fig. 97.] This walk of shame was embellished by jeers surely meant to express the vaunting humour which Foxe's Protestant readers were to feel upon viewing this scene of victory: "shippe over your trinckets and be packinge ye Papistes."

Such iconoclastic ridicule was the vaunting of victor over vanquished. This scene, awash with violence and frenetic energy, contrasted markèdly with the serene stillness below. The culmination of Edwardian iconoclasm - "The Temple well purged" - a bare, blank-walled interior was epigrammatic of Edward's Church [detail Fig. 97.]. This sparse interior housed an equally pruned sacramental system of baptism and the Lord's Supper, denoted by a simple cup and a simple table. At the remove of four centuries, this seems a curiously mundane way to commemorate one's arrival in the Church of God. But it was precisely the *routine* nature of the practices depicted – hearing, reading, preaching – that enabled Protestants to depict their religion as *normal* rather than *novel*. There were no additions here, only the pure celebration of Christ. Verity occurred in the ordinary worship of congregations imbued with the Word, but that verity was again established through contrast. Whist papists clung so desperately to a clutter of mere things, Protestants clung attentively to the Word received in the ear through the sermon, and followed with the eyes in their books. Purity's value was plainer by its standing alongside the clutter of the past, serenity more evident through juxtaposition with confusion – contrast made a self-image fuller. But this was a contrast wrought not through disinterested comparison but exaggerated caricature of Catholic materiality. The sheer number of objects groped by clerics here deemed them valueless "paulterye" – what could be sacred about something so common? The swollen sacks of idols paralleled the bulbous bellies of the monks who carried them, their corporeality symptomatic of spiritual emptiness.

As a source of negative affirmation, then, Roman imagery remained critically important to Protestants. Hatred had a purpose. What had been tokens of devotion for late-medieval Catholics were retained as objects of scorn upon which Protestants vented spleen, bashing Antichrist's "trash" to permit the unadorned simplicity of their own adherence to the Word to shine more brightly. This engagement with Rome's iconography was not a purely pictorial obsession. It is impossible to convey in a few pages or handful of citations how thoroughly works of Protestant theology, doctrinal

123

dispute and lower-level doggerel were committed to re-imagining the liturgy and iconography of Rome, how continuously the visual idiom was adopted in Protestant literature, and how pervasively words like "trumpery", "toyes", "paultery" and "trinkets" were used to project Rome as a flimsy and easily dispatched foil to Protestantism. Bulls, pardons and relics were frequently called upon as ammunition with which to disparage the enemy and it was consequently it was a commonplace of Anti-Catholic literature to envisage papists as lowly market sellers flogging junk to the credulous.[218]

Catholic miracles were also appropriated as emblems validating Protestant charges against Rome. Robert Prickett's *The Jesuit Miracles, or New Popish Wonders* (1607) displayed 'Garnet's Straw', an image prominent on the Catholic underground [Fig. 98 & 99.][219] This blood-stained ear of wheat taken from the site of Henry Garnet's execution had proven itself miraculous several months later by sprouting a perfect image of the martyr's face. Prickett's reproduction was noticeably non-hostile. It even sported a Latin epigram proclaiming its official miraculous status.[220] This appears a strange tactic for a Protestant work at a time when discussion of the straw engulfed England. As recent scholarship has shown 'miracles' possessed a liminal status in early modern culture as events upon which Protestant and Catholics competed to impose a 'correct' interpretation.[221] Catholics circulated stories of wells and springs which ceased to flow near the sites of martyr's deaths as tokens of divine favour for their faith, galvanizing signs which, despite English persecution, demonstrated that they held the moral high-ground as members of the True Church.[222]

---

[218] See *Lambeth faire, wherein you have all the bishops trinkets to sell* (1641), a ballad lampooning the demise of the English episcopacy. Vanquished by Parliament, in order to earn a crust the Bishops are seen peddling the unpopular 'popish' wares with which they have polluted the Church of England – how the mighty fall. Setting up shops and stalls piled high "with all things fitting for their holy Trade" they touted for business like market criers "come customers, see what you lack and buy!", sigs. Aii-Aiiii. Indeed presenting Britain as a realm in which no one was gullible enough to be taken in by such trash was commonplace, 'popish' peddlers having to return to Rome for want of business and amidst jeers of shame were ubiquitous in the polemic of the period. *A discovery of the Iesuit trumpery, newly packed out of England* (1641), a facetious ballad upon a pack of Roman "trinckets" supposedly abandoned by a frustrated peddler. BM Sat 230.

[219] R. Prickett, *The Iesuites Miracles, or new popish wonders* (London, 1607), title-page. It also appeared on the title-page to R. Abbot, *Antilogica* (London, 1613.) For a discussion of this affair, see A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 242-43.

[220] The epigram read: soc Jesu Martyr Anglia 3 May 1606. Miraclus Effigium R. F. Henrici Garnett. See Clark, *Vanities of the Eye*, pp. 172-77.

[221] P. Lake, & M. Questier, "Agency, Appropriation & Rhetoric Under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England", *Past & Present*, 153, (1996), pp. 64-107

[222] Prickett, *The Iesuites Miracles*, sig. B; J. Gerard, *The autobiography of an Elizabethan* trans. by Philip Caraman.(London, 1951), p. 202, 301-05; Walsham, *Providence*, pp. 242-43 also notes accounts

For them only God's hand could create as vivid a likeness of Garnett, and the straw existed as a divine acquittal of his condemnation as 'traitor.' Protestants did not accept the validity of such experiences. The question then arose about what witnesses of 'miracles' had actually *seen*.[223] Two explanations were offered. Firstly, that the miracle had been simulated by necromancy, satanic craft, or the "lying signs and wonders" by which Antichrist deluded its followers;[224] and secondly, that they were the product of outright popish fraud, an entirely invented façade. Prickett opted for the latter. A clever papist had visited the home where Garnett's relic was kept and, undetected, painted the traitor's face on the ear of wheat. Its safe-keepers - credulous peasants - had not suspected foul play.[225]

Prickett employed an objective depiction of the straw because he wanted his Protestant readers to view what the Papists viewed. Doing so made his ridicule more biting. Thus in his opening address Prickett lampooned Catholics, claiming that only a fool, animal or child would accept this image as a miracle:

> "Here, in this booke,
>
> Do for Papal wonders looke
>
> A flock of Dawes
>
> Gaping skip, at painted straws,
>
> And Aesops Asse,
>
> Creatures great, wondrous Grosse
>
> A little child
>
> With wonders great foole beguiled
>
> These, thousand more
>
> Are the rages of Popish store...."[226]

Whilst these monstrous depictions made monsters out of those who gawped at them, Protestants possessed of Christ's love and "Good mind" saw through the fraudulent

---

of a patch of grass upon which Father Oldcorne walked growing in the shape of Imperial Crown. Walsham notes that TNA SP 14/21/5 is a narrative by a Catholic witness which contains a drawing of the straw.

[223] See Clark, *Vanities of the Eye*, pp. 173-82.

[224] 2 Thessalonians 2.

[225] Prickett, *The Iesuites Miracles*, sig. Bii.

[226] Ibid, 'Address to the Reader'.

image to the Truth.[227] As with *A newyeres gifte* looking upon Rome's idols edified Protestant's confidence in their own salvation, proving that they could see *through* Antichrist's attempts to delude them. *Commanding* readers "for Popish wonders *looke*", to gaze upon the idol in order to laugh at Rome's pathetic attempt to shore-up its supporters, Garnett's straw was no longer symbolic of God's favour, but became totemic of Antichrist's desperation in the Last Days:[228]

> "Such honest minds as do desire to laugh,
>
> When idle fools their foolish parts do play:
>
> Let them herein peruse that broken staffe,
>
> Where on proud *Rome*, her shortened hope doth lay
>
> And smiling then say this tyme happen shall,
>
> And that ere by when *Dagon* downe must fall..."[229]

Seeing through Antichrist neutered its chief weapon – deception - and once again, gazing upon Rome's idols bolstered Protestant resolve. But in the act of looking, the image became much more than itself. In reference to Matthew 3 Prickett presented Garnett's straw as part of the chaff (reprobate) which Christ would separate from the wheat (Elect) during the Second Coming. The "fruitless strawe" thus became a symbol of a fruitless religion: "Their painted straw may for Rome Emblem serve/ On painted fruit who feeding shall feeding starve."[230] Rome's own image encapsulated its redundancy, and a relic originally conceived as a means of galvanizing Roman resolve in its status as the True Church became little more than a sounding-board for defamatory laughter: "painting a fruitless straw, the worst of things/Derisive scorne, such painted wonder brings."[231] An icon of the enemy became a straw in the Protestant's cap.

To ridicule was thus to control. It was this control which the invitation to defamatory laughter at the heart of the Anti-Catholic works examined in this chapter ultimately sought to achieve. More than merely something to kick against, controlling

---

[227] Ibid, 'Address to the Reader': "Gentle Reader,/A good mind be thy leader:/And then so led,/ Be thee with contentment fed/And honest love/ Doth me, thee to writing move:/Accept, and thee/ Were rewarded in my pen".

[228] Ibid, p. 1.

[229] Ibid, p. 1.

[230] Ibid, sigs. Biii, D-Dii.

[231] Ibid, sig. Biii.

the definition of Rome as Antichrist cemented Protestant identity as the True Church. Scoffs not only boosted morale in the confidence of their own verity but served to diminish the magnitude of the enemy, easing anxiety at the threat posed by Antichrist by painting it ridiculous. Defamatory laughter then was not mere fluff – whilst such works were certainly *entertaining*, they were not purely *entertainment*. Rather, defamatory laughter lay at the heart of Anti-Catholic urges by which Protestants defined themselves through expressing hatred at another, and ridicule sat at the centre of the conflict between two Churches in a world which could only conceive of their being One Truth.

Indeed, having connotation of punitive retribution, defamatory laughter settled theological arguments. Anthony Wotton's defence of William Perkins' *A Reformed Catholicke* (1597) contained a lavish reproduction of a Spanish image of Virgin and Child alongside a measure of the Virgin's foot and the accompanying Papal indulgence, stating that anyone who kissed this relic would gain 700 years pardon from purgatory [Fig. 100 & 101.][232] Presented in a matter-of-fact manner, the image dominated two pages of Wotton's text. Why did he soil his work with an idol? And what benefit were Protestant eyes to receive from gazing upon it? The image appeared as a trump-card at the close of some forty pages of intractable debate on Satisfaction – essentially a wrangle over whether Church rites had any efficacy in helping man atone for sins, or if Faith Alone was satisfactory.[233] For page after page the positions of Perkins, then his Catholic critic, and finally Wotton's defences, were put forward on each point in a laboriously cyclical format of doctrinal minutiae. Answering each chink in Perkins' position soon left Wotton struggling for fresh defences. He consequently switched to the attack centred upon ridicule, presenting Catholic practices of penance as mechanical and void of contrition, questioning how such activities provided satisfaction to God. The Spanish relic was emblematic of the system - Rome's image was employed to silence pronouncements for the system of Satisfaction which it had been designed to underpin.[234] Listing the other penances

---

[232] W. Perkins, *A reformed Catholike, or, A declaration shewing how neere we may come to the present Church of Rome in sundrie points of religion* (London, 1607); A. Wotton, *A defence of M. Perkins booke, called a reformed Catholike* (London, 1606): "Pope John the 22 granted to every one, that shal kisse the measure three times, and shall say three Ave Maries devoted to her honour…seven hundred years of pardon, and to be free from any danger…", pp. 388-90.
[233] Ibid, pp. 350-92.
[234] Ibid, p. 388: "I will adde here in the end of this discussion, a few of many means, for the procuring of pardons [which the Roman Church] thinke the fittest means for satisfaction by."

advertised within the accompanying Bull, Wotton became exasperated with the ease of procuring grace in the Roman Church, a massive affront to Christ's sacrificial gift to mankind. He concluded:

> "That I may not tire the reader, and make him cast his gorge at such abomination, which are Popes satisfaction for sins, I will give you a viewe of the number of years for which a pardon [from purgatory] is granted in this one indulgence....1076832."[235]

The absence of logic was self-evident in the size of the figure. Wotton's mathematics was the blow which drew blood, that number the indefensible truth of Rome's ridiculous penitential system. That a single indulgence allowed one to accrue so much credit surely indicated its emptiness of contrition. Moreover, Wotton's mental arithmetic had produced a figure which demolished the pillar underpinning the whole edifice of the Catholic system of works – Purgatory – as illogical. Such a vast number of years showed its existence to be impossible. Concluding his treatment of the relic, Wotton vaunted his calculation as a trump-card in a snipe which has become unintentionally ironic to the post-Darwinian mind-set of the modern reader: "1076832 years.....yet [we are told] purgatory is to last no longer than the world!"[236]

Printing idols reflected the preposterousness of Catholicism back in its face. But given human predilection to idolatry, was there not a danger in garnishing Protestant woks with the dressing of the enemy? How could something prohibited from Protestant churches be permissible for inclusion in their texts? Relics could be viewed safely on the page because idolatry was conditioned by space. Images were not inherently bad – man's inclination to idolatry led to illicit veneration, an inclination most acute when encountering images in a consecrated space. As Calvin recognized:

> "If we see a picture in some un-consecrated place, *no religious feeling affects our souls*. Everyone acknowledges it to be a picture. *Even idols themselves are not worshipped as long as they are in workshops*. If a painter's studio is filled with images, everyone walks by [and] shows no sign of reverence...[BUT] as

---

[235] Ibid, p. 392.
[236] Ibid, p. 392.

soon as a picture is moved into a *sacred place*, its *sacredness* blinds people and transports their minds into a stupour. They do not stop to think that they just saw the picture in an ordinary studio..."[237]

The object's status was tempered by the space which it inhabited - image only became idol once planted in consecrated ground. Printing Roman imagery reversed the process of idol formation described by Calvin, removing them from the consecrated space they inhabited as icons and displaying them on the sterility of the page. Surrounded with critique, print became a medium in which it was safe to view an idol. As graphic satire was indebted to culture of shame, so the printed page aped iconoclastic practices of Protestant culture, subjecting Rome's iconography to displays which re-categorized what it appropriated, forcing viewers to see what had previously been sacred as profane. This denigrated the Roman faith, but was much more than Anti-Catholicism for its own sake. Far from mere obliteration, iconoclastic display bolstered Protestant resolve in their status as True Church possessed of the ability to see through Antichrist's tricks. Viewing the icons of the enemy was essential to fashioning one's self, and these acts of victimization wrought on idols were thus parades of the victor over vanquished, celebrative taunts of the new faith over the old. The appearance of Roman idols in Protestant books ultimately echoed the presence of its damaged effigies still standing in their churches – chipped statues whose deformed faces stared back at viewers to provide tactile proof of their own profanity, broken idols surviving as monuments to their own emptiness.

IV: The Rites of Violence

Thus far it has been shown that the printed-page was indebted to rites of ridicule and shame endemic in English culture. We have seen that the derogatory laughter polemic elicited was a means of punishing Rome as society's ultimate transgressor. Moreover, it has been argued that as graphic satire was indebted to the display and dishonour of a man's image crucial to practices of shame, so the page extended the iconoclastic display inherent in the purgation of Antichrist's idols across Europe. In this way the Reformers did not simply remove Rome's images from the eyes of the laity, but

---

[237] J Calvin, *Old Testament Commentaries: Ezekiel* (Carlisle, 1994), p. 203 (my italics.)

forced them to look more closely, replacing one way of seeing with another to confirm the Truth of Protestantism. Indeed, the shame and iconoclasm of the page were essential to Protestant identity – defining themselves against a perverted vision of the Roman Church; and easing anxiety in the face of the threat of Antichrist by diminishing it through scorn, polemic was a means of galvinizing resolves through the collective laughter elicited from dishonouring the enemy.

Displaying Rome was thus a means of control – derogatory laughter both punishing it and solidifying Protestant zeal. Indeed, viewing polemic as shame-punishment was so entrenched it became utilized as a powerful means of political agitation, the immediacy of the practice enhancing the bite of satire as an effective means of protest. This section will focus on a Marian graphic satire essential in the polemical battles between Protestants and Catholics concerning the verity of Protestant executions. Once again, ridicule was not fluff – it lay at the heart of theological wrangling by which Protestants denigrated Catholicism to assert their own verity. Each side competed to control definitions of the burnings: for Catholics, they were righteous punishments of heretics; for Protestants, an illicit persecution of the Godly. Not only did this satire hold up the central Roman rite – the Mass – for iconoclastic display, it did so through eliciting derogatory laughter. This polemic was thus much more than the hostile exchange of ideas: the Reformers dark humour, as well as their intellect, was crucial to its effectiveness. Shaming the central figures of the Marian Church – Stephen Gardiner and Edmund Bonner – by puncturing personas which they had fostered over a generation, derogatory laughter was essential here to constructing the martyrs vision of the burnings as illicitly Antichristian, winning a polemical battle by shaming their opponents. Ridicule thus sat at the heart of theological disputes.

Our subject is an exquisitely German-crafted engraving, *The Lambe Speaketh*, which circulated in England during the Marian burnings [Fig. 102.][238] A sophisticated piece of political commentary, the print demonstrated a cartoon-like ability to smash several stories into one conceit. It critiqued Catholic doctrine rejuvenated under the Marian regime, inverted and refuted the language that regime used to justify Protestant executions, and defamed Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, the

---

[238] BM Sat 10. All scholars of this print, myself included, are indebted to R. J. Smith, "*The Lambe Speaketh*...An English Protestant Satire", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 61 (1998), pp. 261-67; M. Jones, "*The Lambe Speaketh*...An Addendum", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 63, (2000), pp. 287-89.

wolf-bishop at the centre of the print's cruel scene of sacrifice. Tying together many of the disputes occasioned during the doctrinal histrionics between Gardiner and prominent evangelicals depicted as the martyred lambs at the foot of the scene, the engraving stood on the crest of a polemical wave reaching back over a generation. As such, it amplified many of this chapter's themes. A Catholic rite was appropriated and savagely re-described; Rome was made synonymous with violence; and a prominent politician and, to the evangelicals at least, moral transgressor, was subjected to a punitive shaming. We shall see that by appropriating the regime's language the evangelicals sought to characterize the executions – the legitimacy of which was bitterly contested – as persecution and style themselves as Antichrist's martyred victims. Identity was once again solidified by controlling the image of the enemy. This was achieved through a sacrilegious synergy of political commentary and doctrinal rebuke. Rome's lust for the flesh of illicit sacrifice was manifested in the combination of a desire to execute martyrs and a hunger to taste the blood of the Eucharist, the re-enactment of Christ's crucifixion which made the rite little more than a disturbing act of cannibalism – murder and Mass were two sides of the same coin.

Violence painted Rome as the False Church. The cumulative impact of images of torture and death confronting readers who leafed through the *Actes and Monuments* could only leave an impression of Catholics as inherently cruel.[239] Their activities expressed something immediately and decidedly un-Christian. The jeering, screwed-up faces of monks who berated their martyred victims even at the moment of their deaths [Fig. 103 & 104];[240] broke up worship in Christ by violently removing ministers from preaching the Word [Fig. 105 & 106];[241] or ghoulishly burnt the exhumed bones of the dead [Fig. 107] all triggered un-nerving emotional responses, a repugnance at the victor distastefully vaunting over the weak and powerless.[242] This was a strategy repeated in images of Protestants massacred at the hands of Irish Catholics following the rebellion of 1641 [Figs 108-111].[243] In such depictions

---

[239] See Aston & Ingram, "The Iconography of the Actes and Monuments", passim.
[240] Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1583), ii, p. 1366 – "The order and manner of the cruell handlinge of William Gardiner, an English Merchant, tormented and burned in Portugall, in the cause of God and of his truthe."
[241] Foxe *Actes and Monuments* (1583), ii, p. 1001; ii, p. 1713.
[242] Foxe *Actes and Monuments* (1583), ii, p. 427 – "The Order and manner of takeing up the body of John Wickliffe, and buring his bones 41. years after his death."
[243] See for example the illustrations in, Philopatris *The plot in a dream: or, The discoverer in masquerade In a succinct discourse and narrative of the late and present designs of the papists against*

Catholics were foils for the martyrs with whom they shared the page, and who patiently bore Antichrist's persecution safe in the knowledge of their Election. Stillness trumped movement, harmony conquered confusion.

Violence was not a slur hurled at *Catholics* alone, however, but a stain upon *Catholicism*. Subtle strategies were used to stigmatize the rites of Rome by association with savagery. Foxe's depiction of the posthumous burning of Martin Bucer and Paul Fageus in Cambridge during 1557 was typical [Fig. 112.][244] A series of rites performed by the Marian regime purged the University of its recent heretical past: after Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln concluded a long sermon damning their errors the Protestant's books were burnt with their bones and churches sullied by their burial were re-consecrated by a procession of the host under a veil blessed personally by Pope Paul IV.[245] Compressing several days' events into a single scene, Foxe's artist undermined the Mass by directly associating it with the act of grizzly posthumous persecution at the centre of the woodcut, disrupting the holy status of the rite keystone of the Catholic faith. The scope of inversion was delicious. Catholicism presented the Mass as the well-spring of communal unity, a buffer of peace ensuring the foreclosure of feuds by compelling congregations to restore charity before its reception.[246] There was little charity in a church which burnt a man's bones. Similarly, throughout this period rites became satanic props occasioning plots and acts of regicide. Consecrated assassins' knives substituted consecrated hosts, leading eyes deluded by Antichrist to acts of monstrosity [Figs 113-115.][247] Foxe's narrative of the papal plot to poison King John I for resisting Rome's tyranny was accompanied by an elaborate foldout engraving [Fig. 116.][248] Appearing somewhat like a storyboard, the monk-assassin was deceived into undertaking the wicked act as a means of attaining

---

the King and government (London, 1682). *Ireland. Or a booke : together with an exact mappe of the most principall townes, great and small, in the said kingdome* (London, 1647), unpaginated. *The Barbarous & inhumane proceedings against the professors of the reformed religion within the dominion of the Duke of Savoy, Aprill the 27th, 1655* (London, 1655), pp. 13, 21.

[244] J. Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments* (London, 1570), p. 2151. Cf. R. Gonsalvius Montanus, A *discovery and playne declaration of sundry subtill practices of the holy inquisition* (London, 1569), sig. Eiii. The scene combines a rite of purification and holy procession (which circles an execution fire) with various images of torture. Like the Foxe cut, this was also printed by John Day – perhaps it formed an inspiration for his own piece?

[245] Ibid, pp. 2146-53. J. Foxe, *The Actes and Monuments*, ed. J. Stoughton, 8 vols, (London, 1877), viii, pp. 268-87.

[246] For more detail on this, see below pp. 133-38.

[247] *The black box of Roome opened* (London, 1641), title-page; A. Ross, *The Black Box of Rome, or, A true and Short Discourse* (1641), title-page; J. Milton, *Nevvs from hell, Rome and the Innes of Court* (London, 1642), title-page.

[248] Foxe (1596), vol. 1, p. 233.

salvation. Not only absolved of murder by a Priest, Masses were said for his soul after his death in the act – a painful pastiche of the Roman system of satisfaction, the doctrine that the Church provided avenues which allowed man to atone for his sins was depicted as a licence to commit deeds of exceptional cruelty.

In *The Lambe Speaketh* the Mass was both an obvious and timely motif. It was the fault-line upon which clashing Marian and evangelical visions of Christianity met, providing a devotional and doctrinal centre-piece for re-invigorated Marian Catholicism, and acting as the quintessential idolatry for its Protestant opponents.[249] For Catholics the Mass displayed the divine's miraculous power by embodying the centrepiece of salvation - for Protestants allowing Priests the power to re-create the Crucifixion in order to procure Grace offended against Christ's majesty, diminishing the significance of His sacrifice on the Cross in atoning for mankind's sins.[250] Suggesting that it could be re-enacted was both offensive and presumptuous, implying that Christ's salvation was insufficient payment for mankind's sins, and that human activity carried weight in procuring salvation from God.

The Mass consequently became a rite upon which a host of conflicting symbols were imposed. Even before Mary's coronation its celebration (still technically illegal) was used to symbolically endorse her reign, as parishes throughout England enthusiastically dusted-off trappings of the old liturgy during the summer of 1553.[251] Conversely, the rite formed the focal-point of Protestant attacks – both literal and polemical – on restored Catholicism. Thus Mary's first Proclamation, issued on

---

[249] See D. M. Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-55* (London, 1979), pp. 154-56; L. Wooding, "The Marian Restoration and the Mass" in E. Duffy & D. M. Loades (Eds.), *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 227-57; E. Duffy, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Marry Tudor* (New Haven/London, 2009), pp. 66-68, 75-77, 90-94. A slew of Marian writings, sermons, and pastoral activity ensured that the Mass was re-instated as the focal point of communal worship, embodying the central means of salvation of Christ on the Cross and serving as a vehicle for grace which allowed the congregation to commune with God: *A plaine and godlye treatise* (London, 1555); *An exclamation upon the erroneous and fantastical spirite of heresy* (London, 1555); *A notable Oration made by John Venaeus a Parisien in the defence of the Sacrament of the aultare* (London, 1554); J. Dudley, *The sayng of John late Duke of Northumberland upon the scafolde* (London, 1553), sig. fii; T. Watson, *Two Notable Sermons* (London, 1554); ibid, *Holsome and catholyke doctrine* (London, 1558), fol. Lxxv-lxxvii E. Bonner, *A profitable and necessarye doctrine* (London, 1554), sig. T and passim; M. Huggarde, *The assault of the sacrame[n]t of the altar containyng aswell sixe seuerall assaultes made from tyme to tyme against the sayd blessed sacrament: as also the names [et] opinions of all the heretical captaines of the same assaultes* (London, 1554).

[250] See the agitations around the Mass cited by Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, pp. 151-52, 154-56, 162-65, 167.

[251] Wriothesley, *Chronicle*, i, p. 101; A. G. Dickens (Ed.), "Robert Parkyn's Narrative of the Reformation", *English Historical Review*, 62 (1947), pp. 80-81; J. G. Nichols (Ed.), *The Diary of Henry Machyn* (London, 1848), p. 42; Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, pp. 99-102, 151.

the 28th August 1553, condemned those of "evil zeal or lucre and covetous of vile gain" who disseminated "false fond books, ballads, rhymes and other lewd tracts" against the Mass.[252] Similarly, in January 1554 sheriffs were ordered to arrest those who behaved "lewdly" during the service, and a year later Injunctions re-iterated Royal displeasure at the agitations, of which *The Lambe Speaketh* must be seen as a part.[253] As Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, noted the authorities were driven to defend the rite so vigorously precisely because of this activity: "of late yeres it hath most of all others bene assaulted, and impugnded, and yet of no good manne, but of the wretched sort alone."[254] The Mass had become a battleground for the two faiths and a blunt marker of difference. In the Orders and Examinations issued to ferret-out heretics, asking whether suspects assented to the doctrine of transubstantiation was understood to be the most effective demarcation of 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' in a period where positions on many points of theology were still fluid.[255] Little wriggle room existed on the issue of whether one believed Christ to *be* the bread and wine of the service.

The Lambe Speaketh rubbed on a sore-point, defaming the centre-piece of Catholic identity to construct the evangelicals own case. Its ridicule was once more an act of re-definition and control. Indeed, the Mass became a multi-faceted symbol employed to buttress the legitimacy of the Marian regime's overthrowal of the Edwardian religious order.[256] It tied Mary's Church to her father's, and bound them both to an Apostolic succession, inverting Edwardian polemic by presenting Edward's Church, not Mary's, as an historical aberration breaking the line of the True Church.[257] It was also positioned as the symbol of concord and unity which established the Marian Church as decidedly more Christian than its Protestant predecessor. Abandonment of the Mass had been disastrous for the social order. Without the kiss of peace, and the requirement that charity be restored before its reception, society had descended into disharmony, ubiquitous 'lewd' behaviour, and moral lawlessness un-becoming of a Christian community. Only now that the Mass

---

[252] Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, p. 57.

[253] Ibid, pp. 57, 90-92, 104-05; Loades, *Reign of Mary Tudor*, p. 162 notes the punishing of transgressors.

[254] Bonner, *A profitable and necessarye doctrine*, sig. T.

[255] Wooding, "The Marian Restoration and the Mass", p. 233; J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, S. R. Cattley & G. Townsend (Eds), 8 vols, (London, 1837), vii, p 104.

[256] Wooding, "The Marian Restoration and the Mass", pp. 227-57.

[257] Ibid, pp. 229-35.

was restored could peace, neighbourliness, charity and Christian love rule as they should, for the Mass was the rite in which all laymen were joined in oneness with Christ.[258] Just as individual grains of wheat enmeshed to form bread, and individual grapes co-joined to make wine, "so many dystincte persons of Christen men and womenne aryseth and made one mystycal body and Church of Christ" during the Communion.[259] The Mass was both an emblem of a charitable Christian society, and the mechanism which ensured that the ideal was brought to life. The violence of Catholicism in *The Lambe Speaketh* attacked this language of legitimacy by subverting its image of the Mass. To do so was more than a scurrilous slight: re-definition struck at the heart of arguments underpinning the Marian order and revered its presentation of Protestants an uncharitably Antichristian. This was not fluff, for the engraving disputed who had the right to be called 'True' Christians. It was the Catholic Bishops, not Protestant martyrs, who acted "lewdly", for the Mass was an act driven by savagery, not charity - it acted to rupture society, not cement it. Once again, to ridicule and to scoff was to control.

The inversion was achieved through a series of macabre parodies. Overseen by Satan the Mass was no rite of peace but an act of brutal savagery. Transubstantiation was deemed paradoxical, seeking to elicit veneration for Christ through the worship of His body and blood, yet simultaneously subjecting Him to a cruel re-enactment of His sacrifice with every performance. This juxtaposition was created by contrasting Gardiner's arms, raised and open-handed in the conventional gesture of adoration, with the savagery of his wolf jaw's tearing the lamb-Christ's jugular. He both worshipped and killed.

This was not the engraving's only dark inversion. Traditional Catholic art was satirized. Suspended above the altar to recall the crucifixion, the blood spurting from the lamb's neck into the wolf-clerics' chalices not only mocked Communion in One

---

[258] Watson, *Two Notable Sermons*, fol. Lxiii: "nothing dothe more increase oure charitie and hope in the mercye of God"; Bonner, *A profitable and necessarye doctrine*, sigs. T, fol. 74; *A plaine and godlye treatise*, sigs. Aii-Avi: under Edward "no man durst trust hys nexte neyghboure....amitie and frendshyp was fled the realme...and as our master Christie saythe: where wyckednesse wexed plentyfull, there charitye wexed colde"; *An exclamation upon the erroneous and fantasticall spirite of heresy; A notable Oration*, sigs Fviii-Gi – Mass ensured "sweetness of spirite, peace, and ioye....humylytye, chastity, temperaunce, verute, and to use fewe wordes all kyndes of goodnesse" whilst its absence under Edward had caused "all things are foule disordered, nothing quiete and peasable: that charity is exiled and banished."

[259] *A plaine and godlye treatise*, sig. Evii. Lucy Wooding notes that the metaphor dates to St. Paul, and had been employed by Augustine and Cyprian. See her "The Marian Restoration and the Mass" p. 231, n.14. For further discussion of this rhetoric of charity, see pp. 237-39.

Kind as "bloodsupping" but parodied late medieval altar-pieces in which blood gushing from Christ's wounds washed sinner clean [Fig. 117.][260] Here, however, the storm of flesh and blood was equated with an urge towards cannibalism, not salvation. Hunger for flesh could only be satiated through sacrifice. The cruelty meted out to Christ was thus replicated in the treatment of His sheep, the six Protestant martyrs (Cranmer, Hooper, Ridley, Latimer, Bradford and Rogers) awaiting an equally illicit sacrifice at the foot of the scene. Irreligion spawned iniquity: idolatry and murder were inseparable, as False Religion could only lead to a cruel society in which the wolves devoured both shepherd and sheep. Christ's plea reflected this symbiosis of heresy and persecution: "why do you Crucify me agen. For with one oblation have I for ever made perfect those that are sanctified." A cry for mercy and an affirmation of Faith Alone which made the Mass both idolatrous and redundant.

These words echoed Hebrews 10:10-14, a conventional evangelical foundation of Faith Alone. But only when recalling the chapter's details did the viewer understand how deeply sardonic the print's conceit of sacrificing seven lambs (Christ and the six martyrs) was in tying together both the burnings and the Mass as direct contravention of Christ's instructions. Christ informed the disciples that whilst God had required the sacrifice of seven lambs under the Old Law, His coming had made such satisfactions for sin redundant.[261] There was an immensely sophisticated swipe of political commentary in this reference – the Marian Church may have presented its theology and prosecution of Protestants as God's work, but both centred round Anti-Christian sacrifice.

Nothing in the print forced recognition of this allusion. There was something of an artistic nod-and-wink to the knowing viewer edifying their cleverness in understanding the conceit's significance, an 'in joke' which cut deeply in scoring points for the Protestant party. Such inclusiveness intended to shore-up resolve in the face of persecution – this was an object to be perused and absorbed. Deliciously subtle layers of allusion continued to unfold as viewers moved around the print, as Rome repeatedly broke the command of Hebrews 10 not to commit sacrifice for

---

[260] Simone Martini, *Crucifixion* (1333), Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp.

[261] "Now where remission of these [iniquities] is, there is no more offering of sin": Hebrews 10:18. The chapter is littered with references to Christ's coming making sacrifices superfluous, upon which Protestants built the charge of Faith Alone. See verses 4-11 in particular. Verses 10 to 11 note: "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all; And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins."

salvation. Thus the book upon the altar proclaimed "Christ alone is not sufficient with sacrifice" and Gardiner stated "without shedding of bludde is no remission of synne". This was further back-handed affirmation of Faith Alone. But acting against Christ's words also positioned the Roman clerics as the False Prophets predicted in Deuteronomy 18 at the print's top left — "the prophete that presume to speak in my name the woord which I commanded in not....that prophete shall dye" — an identity re-enforced by their donning sheep skins in reference to Matthew 7:15: "beware False Prophets, which come to you in sheep clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves."[262] The print thus required unpicking. As the eye navigated the scene and digested its text, combinations of biblical imagery and verses, doctrinal rebuke and polemical scorn were pinned upon the Marian Bishops - barb slowly piled upon barb, allusion smashed into allusion in what must have elicited a cacophony of laughter. But whilst its cleverness was *entertaining*, it was too destructive to be purely *entertainment* — ridicule here effectively coalesced critique of the political *cause célèbre* of the moment with a rebuttal of the entire Roman Faith.

Indeed, scores were being settled through defamation. A history lay behind this print's very specific lampooning of Gardiner. A prolific defender of Catholic orthodoxy since the later days of the Henrician Church, the Bishop had sparred several of the martyrs depicted here on the issue at the satire's heart: transubstantiation. Presenting him as chief celebrant in a satanic and cannibalistic Mass then was no mere joke but the implosion of a self-image. Gardiner had presented himself as the champion of the Real Presence in *A Detection of the Devils Sophistry* (1546), and the issue continued to preoccupy him throughout Edward's reign.[263] Indeed, he became something of a barb in the Protestant regime's side. To prove himself obedient, Gardiner was ordered to preach against Papal authority and in favour of the Royal Supremacy and Edwardian doctrine before the King at St. Peters

---

[262] Matthew 7:15.

[263] S. Gardiner, *A detection of the deuils sophistrie, wherwith he robbeth the unlearned people, of the true byleef, in the most blessed sacrament of the aulter* (London, 1546). This met with some embittered responses, see A. Gilby, *An answver to the deuillish detection of Stephane Gardiner, Bishoppe of Wynchester published to the intent that such as be desirous of the truth should not be seduced by hys errours, nor the blind [et] obstinate excused by ignorance* (London, 1547). One of our lambs, John Hooper, also engaged in the controversy. See his *An answer vnto my lord of wynthesters [sic] booke intytlyd a detection of the deuyls sophistrye wherwith he robith the vnlernyd people of the trew byleef in the moost blessyd sacrament of the aulter* (Zurich, 1547).

during June 1548.[264] In the event Gardiner overstepped his remit, displaying effrontery by damning preachers who condemned the Mass and, most horrifyingly, defending the "very presence of Christ's most precious body and blood in the sacrament, which is the Catholic faith, and no doubtful matter."[265] Zeal earnt him a place in the Tower, but the experience failed to dissuade him from flaunting his self-appointed position as standard-bearer for the Mass, and he published a slew of doctrinal treatises refuting Edwardian champions on the Lords Supper – such as Peter Martyr, John Hooper and Thomas Cranmer (two of our sheep).[266] The latter came in for the staunchest criticism, his *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine* (1550) and *An Answere unto Crafts* (1551) being greeted with hostile polemic from the imprisoned Gardiner.[267] Only once we understand that a generation of tussles over transubstantiation lay behind *The Lambe Speaketh*'s inversion of the Mass do we fully grasp its poignant dishonouring of Gardiner's persona. This was a bitterly personal portrayal: a piece of agitation in a continual and hostile dispute, its employment of defamatory ridicule smacked of one-upmanship. This polemic certainly involved a witty and hostile exchange of ideas, but it possessed agency beyond intellectual pretentions, being an act of retribution settling scores.

Indeed, the print contained a swirl of allusions to Gardiner's past. In responding to Christ's cry of "why do you Crucify me agen?" the Bishop presented a puzzling link between the sacrifice of the Mass and clerical celibacy. He claimed, rather ridiculously, that:

"Hole men that eate much and drinke much, have much bludde and much seede. We are hole men eating much and drinkynge much, ergo we have much bludde and much seede. But suche as have much bludde and much seede if they lacke wyves of there owne, and are destitute of the gyfte of chastity, do and must often grevoushlie synne in adulterous fornication, and pollutions of

[264] The precise date was the 21st June. J. Foxe, *The Actes and Monuments*, S. R. Cattley & G. Townsend (Eds.), 8 vols (London, 1837), vi, pp. 68-72, 89-93.
[265] Ibid, p. 70.
[266] He critiqued P. Martyr's *De sacramenta eucharistia* (London, 1549). S. Gardiner, *In Petrum Martynem Florentum malae tractatious...sanctissema ecclesiastica* (London, 1549). See also S. Gardiner, *Confutatio cavillationum quibus sacrosanctum ... Eucharistiæ Sacramentum ab impiis Capernaitis impeti solet, authore A. Constantio, theologo Lovaniensi* (Louvain, 1554).
[267] T. Cranmer, *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine* (London, 1550); ibid *An Answere unto Crafts and Sophisitcall* (London, 1551); S. Gardiner, *An explicatiõ and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the most blessed Sacrament of the aulter with a confutation of a booke written agaynst the same* (London, 1551).

the nyght. But we are destitute of charity and have no wyves of oure owne, ergo we synne much and often. And whereas without sheddynge of bludde is no remisson of synne, therefore syth we synne so grievously none ought to marvale that dayle shedde so heynously."[268]

A self-confessed villain, Gardiner's words presented his faith as contradictory and irreligious. Bishops were slaves to their flesh trapped in a cycle of sin which their own doctrine perpetuated. Following Galenic theory their ample diet of the flesh and blood of Christ caused them to produce surplus blood and become lusty.[269] In the absence of wives, lust led to "grevious synne in adulterous fornication" atoned for with the flesh and blood of the Mass, thus restarting the cycle. This ridicule implied that it was surely better to have a lawful wife like Protestant ministers than to commit such sinful fornication. But why make reference to clerical marriage here at all? It marred Gardiner's persona further.[270] Having printed rebuttals of Martin Bucer's treatises on clerical marriage at Louvain and Cologne frequently cited by Catholic apologists, Gardiner possessed international repute as a defender of clerical celibacy. There was certainly an element of retribution in such dishonour, but it also served to be deflective, winning the argument by skewering the ground of debate and diminishing the voice of Catholicism's champions. Ridiculed here as a man whose faith caused him to leak sinful "pollutions of the nyght" - a slur aimed to prick his theological reputation – Gardiner became representative of the Marian Church, driven by illogical doctrine to be shot through with sin.[271] The barb's sting did not end there. "Hole" was a slippery pun lampooning the Bishop's worth as clerics. It could be both "Holy" and "whole." The latter was an ironic reference to Leviticus 21, where "wholeness" was required of a priest under Mosaic Law. Holy men should be without blemish, being neither blind, lame or, crucially for our purpose, to have shed blood ¯ as such the very

---

[268] BM Sat 10.

[269] See A. Boorde, *The Breviarie of Health* (London, 1575), facs (Amsterdamn, 1971), fol. 118, cap. 312: "Bloud is ingendred of flume, and flume is ingendred of good meats and drynkes." I am indebted to Smith, "*Lambe Speaketh…*", p. 262 for this reference, but the notion of Gallenic medical theory is my own.

[270] Additionally, marriage of clerics had been outlawed during Mary's first Parliament. See Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, pp. 156-58.

[271] S. Gardiner, *Stephani Winton episcope Angli ad Martinium Bucercim, de impumdentia eiurdem pseidologia conquestio* (Louvain, 1549); ibid, *Stephani Winton episcope Angli ad Martinium Bucerim epistola, qua cessantem bactenus et clinctantem or frustratoria responsionus pollcitatione* (Louvain, 1546); ibid, A *Traictise declaryng that the Marriage of Priestes. is no Mariage* (published under the name T. Martin.)

acts of executing Protestants and celebrating the Mass showed the Bishops to be unsuitable clerics, "destitute of [the] charity" of which they claimed to be the standard-bearers.[272]

This pun on "hole" was amplified by the deluded group of men on the left whom Gardiner led by the nose. Failing to recognize Gardiner as a False Prophet they worshipped him as a true Bishop, citing words from 1 Timothy 3: "Thou only art hole, thoe only arte leanred & thou only irreprehensible."[273] Assent to the martyrdoms identified them as members of the House of Commons. Indeed, the left-hand side of the engraving formed an allegory of Mary's second Parliament of 1554. On the 9th April Gardiner had introduced a Bill seeking to reinstate Roman heresy law, thus paving the way for the prosecution and execution of the evangelicals, many of whom already languished in prison.[274] The Bill was passed by the Commons - consequently led by the nose - but rejected by the Lords on the 1st May.[275] Represented here in the top-left of the scene the Lords exclaimed defiantly "we will not this felowe to raigne over us" whilst tugging upon a halter around Gardiner's neck in an attempt to stop the sacrifice. Their actions were not indicative of Protestant conviction – indeed this Parliament was stuffed with religious conservatives.[276] Recalcitrance was rooted in motivations more mundane than principled. The Lords were reticent to permit any steps towards a return to Papal sovereignty over the Church before lands accrued from the dissolution of the monasteries and chantries had been safeguarded. Their fears were harnessed by courtiers who opposed Gardiner's pace of reform to effectively block the bill.[277] Whilst historians may know that England's evangelical community at this time was negligible, historical actors did not share the luxury of distance. For many heresy remained an unknown quantity. Most notably, Lord Paget feared that imposing execution in the wake of Wyatt's recent rebellion would further de-stabilize the realm, and under his leadership the Privy Councillors distanced themselves from

---

[272] Leviticus 21.

[273] 1 Timothy 3. The irony is, of course, that these Bishops were not fitted to the station. 'Blameless' is a backhanded joke linked into several of the prints other motifs, that the bishops are un-charitable, behave lewdly, and have sinned against the words of Christ by forbidding clerical marrage. See verse 2: "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach….."; verse 8 "likewise must the deacons be grave, not doubletongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre" (the reference to wine could be read in this context as a jibe at communion in one kind.)

[274] J. Loach, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 91-104, esp. p. 97.

[275] Ibid, p. 99.

[276] Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, pp. 83, 169-70.

[277] Ibid, pp. 99.

Gardiner, consequently depicted here as he architect of persecution.[278] Furious at the Bill's failure, the Queen prorogued Parliament. Her frustration was recognition of the quandary which her regime faced – the scene was set for the trial of prominent evangelicals, but no laws existed to enforce its judgments.[279] In one sense, this engraved libel against Gardiner could be read as a celebration of the Lord's actions.

This was the view of older scholarship, which dated the print to May 1554.[280] But whilst there is no doubt that it alluded to the events of the second Parliament, details hint that the engraving was produced in the subsequent year. That the Lord's were unsuccessful in preventing the sacrifice suggests that executions had already begun, a suggestion corroborated by the Devil's encouragement of the Bishops: "You are my very children...in that you *have* slayne the prophets." This dates the print after the execution of the first martyr, John Bradford, on 4th February 1555.[281] The print consequently did not serve to celebrate the Lords - rather they served as an artistic device deflecting blame for persecution onto Gardiner and the accompanying Bishops, Edmund Bonner and Cuthbert Tunstall. The later date is affirmed by the discovery of an original of this engraving – with Latin text rather than English – in William Turner's *The Hunting of the romyshe wolfe*, printed at Emden during 1555 [Fig. 118], a work which – like *The Lambe Speaketh* – deemed "the romyshe wolfe" to be Gardiner, the protagonist of Antichristian persecution of Protestantism in England.[282] The book certainly succeeded in antagonising the regime, which issued a proclamation against all Turner's works on 13th June 1555.[283] This was at the height of the burnings, and it seems that *The Lambe Speaketh*'s derogatory ridicule played a significant role in the evangelical agitation.

The summer date is interesting. The proclamation was concurrent with publication of an uncompromising defence of the burnings, *A Plaine and Godlye Treatise Concerning the Masse*.[284] Re-printed four times that year, and included in the

---

[278] Ibid, pp. 91-92, 99-104; Loades, *The Reign of Mary Tudor*, p. 169.

[279] Ibid, pp. 102-03.

[280] Smith, "*Lambe Speaketh*...", p. 264. Jones is reticent to date the print. The print could certainly not be any earlier than May 1554 as Cuthbert Tunstall is depicted here as a Bishop, and he was not reinstated until April 1554.

[281] D. A. Penny, 'John Bradford', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

[282] See Aston & Ingram "The Iconography of the Acts and Monument", p. 79, n. 23. Oxford, Bodleian Library shelfmark 8 A122 Linc. The illustration is inserted after sig. Aviii.

[283] P. L. Hughes & J. F. Larkin (Eds.), *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols (New Haven/London, 1964-9), ii, no. 422. This was a restatement of a proclamation from the 8th July 1546. Ibid, i, no. 272.

[284] *A Plaine and Godlye Treatise Concerning the Masse, for the Instruction of the Simple and Unlearned People* (London, 1555).

Marian Church's primer, this text served as the regime's official legitimation of the prosecutions.[285] It is starkly co-incidental that both *The Lambe Speaketh* and the *Treatise* were constructed around the rather odd coupling of piety and prosecution, forging treatments of the Mass and the burnings together. Consequently, it was surely this work which our engraving sought to attack and subvert: the savage synergy of its central scene of sacrifice forming a brutal rebuttal to the regime's rhetoric of defence, inverting the Marian co-joining of doctrine, liturgy and treatment of heresy to critique the Church with its own language. A culture of agitation existed around the persecutions, and the trials of martyrs could be gladiatorial. Often lasting for months, they became a platform upon which Protestants and the regime wrestled to impose conflicting interpretations.[286] There was something decidedly liminal about the process, which existed amidst a chorus of voices: Catholic examiners, priests in the pulpit, martyrs at the stake, and evangelicals who wrote from prison, all competed to project their narrative onto the action, to control the 'meaning' of the events as they unfolded.[287] As Eamon Duffy has noted, the Marian authorities were more aware of the need to refute Protestant protest, and more astute in their response, than has previously been recognized. Charges of bloodthirstiness were refuted by making every effort to convert the evangelicals, affording them multiple opportunities to recant in order to appear as compassionate as possible. Similarly, a wealth of propaganda, from pulpit to print, theology to apology, hammered-home the dangers of heresy to society, presenting Protestants as seditious criminals to counter-balance their claims of martyrdom.[288] *The Treatise Concerning the Masse* was the lynchpin of this activity. Consequently, it provided the obvious target to attack.

The *Lambe Speaketh* essentially inverted *The Treatise*'s language. This was a battle over the correct placement of labels - martyrs versus heretics, True Church versus False - a contest over whose faith safeguarded charitable behaviour and whose stimulated disorder and 'lewdness'.[289] Once more, polemical ridicule sought to

---

[285] Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, pp. 73-77.

[286] Ibid, pp. 107-123 in particular.

[287] Lake & Questier, "Agency, Appropriation & Rhetoric Under the Gallows", pp. 64-107.

[288] Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, pp. 7-8, 15-18, 20-21, 57-62, 75-77, 80-81, 97-99, 102. At p. 75: "the force of Marian polemic was not derived from an isolated pamphlet here or a sermon there. Instead, it worked as a form of carpet bombing, driving its message home in many forms...."

[289] John Bale had accused most of the Catholic Bishops here of being 'lewd' – the term related as much to disorder as any sexual misdemeanour. See his *A Declaration of Edmonde Bonner's articles concerning the cleargye of London Dyocese* (London, 1561), fols 5, 82, 90-91. Written in 1554. See also W. Turner, *The huntyng of the romyshe wolfe* (Emden, 1555), sigs. Eiii-Eiiii, "they are mocked in

control through redefinition. *The Treatise* employed standard justifications for punishing heretics. Contrary to their claims, evangelicals were no persecuted lambs martyred by Antichrist but criminals "by juste laws cast out and condemned to burne for this obstinate heresie."[290] The almost superhuman courage displayed in enduring pain at the stake was no genuine profession of fidelity to the Truth of Christ but feigned steadfastness either conjured by the devil or caused by drugging or other trickery.[291] Most crucially, however, *The Treatise* argued that those executed could resolutely not be true martyrs because they had not led holy lives. Their sinful behaviour was caused by an absence of charity, itself the result of abandonment of True communal worship of Christ in the Mass.[292] Without Mass's requirement that peace reign and feuds end before its celebration, the Protestant rule of the previous reign had triggered a breakdown of the social fabric:

> "Settyng the world at such looseness and leude liberty that no lawe could let ·lust, all good order broken, the magistrates contempened, and the people so farr divided that the father dread the childe, the merchant hys prentyse...no man durst trust hys next neighbour...the very honoure of chasteness in mayds cast of cleare..."[293]

The Lambe Speaketh inverted this picture. Mass was no safeguard of communal charity, but a stimulus for sin. As we have seen, the wolf-bishops, convinced they could atone for sin by partaking of the rite, were slaves to lust guilty of "looseness and leud liberty" and "adulterous fornication" with other men's wives, thus endangering patriarchal order and social stability. Imbued with sin through the central rites of their Church, the Bishops were driven to murder the martyrs. Moreover, *The Lambe Speaketh* served as a witty riposte reflecting the regime's defence back onto it, colouring its own ecclesia with the sins in which they attempted to paint the

---

their dreames, and defile their fleshe", "wiveless sacrificers, are defiled in their dreames...the bois that maketh their beddes, the prestes that hear their confessions, and the launderers that wash their shetes, can beare witness against them." This was obviously a reference to the 'pollutions of the night' mentioned in *The Lambe Speaketh*. See Jones, *"The Lambe Speaketh..."*, p. 292; Smith, *"The Lambe Speaketh..."*, p. 262.

[290] *Plaine and Godlye Treatise*, sigs. Zii-Ziv.

[291] *Plaine and Godlye Treatise*, sigs. Yi-Yiv.

[292] *Plaine and Godlye Treatise*, sig. Ai-Av; Bonner, *A profitable and necessarye doctrine*, fol. 74

[293] *Plaine and Godlye Treatise*, Sig. Ziii. The quotation continues: "so that what each man liked and lusted, that he thought sinful."

Protestants. Indeed, digging a little deeper into *The Treatise*'s charges against the martyrs revealed a striking image, and one which *The Lambe Speaketh* appropriated and thrust back into the regime's face. For the Catholic order, the vehement language with which Protestants attacked the Marian Church demonstrated a void of charity at their root, and revealed them as heretics: "And no marvelle. For when the wolves arse is on fyre and beginneth to smarte, then doth he wolvishly bark and bite against the shepherd and sheepe."[294]

The Lambe Speaketh, then, was antagonistic, a subversive annotation on the prosecutions which sat alongside a jumble of evangelical libels, tracts and dying speeches, complementing the competition of voices attempting to wrest interpretation of events from Marian hands. Its agitation was effective precisely because it contested the language employed by the regime, reflecting charges that the abandonment of The Mass led to a void of charity in society back upon the Church. Targeting *The Treatise* so specifically was a back-handed compliment to the Catholic propaganda's effectiveness, and supports Duffy's contention that the Marian regime was more sensitive to public perception than previously recognized.[295] As a work of polemic *The Lambe Speaketh* was certainly involved in a hostile exchange of ideas, but also strove to have agency, to do damage and wreck retribution. This was punitive shame. Exposing the Bishops as the greatest of moral transgressors, False Prophets, it defamed them as idolaters, murderers and – in reference to the largest pre-occupation of the rites of shame in early modern culture – hurled charges of adultery and fornication at them. Skewering Gardiner's persona, the print impugned honour, provoking a guttural laughter rising out of a generation of bitter theological disputes around one issue: the Mass. The rite was raised for an iconoclastic display and radical re-definition. Colouring transubstantiation with such a savage sacrifice, and positioning the violence inflicted upon the bodies of martyrs as replicated upon the person of Christ, effectively de-stabilized claims that the Mass was a rite of peace. Painting it in thus ultimately served to reify evangelical claims that it was they who constituted the True Church – ridicule cemented one's own position as much as to destroying the honour of the enemy, and more than an ephemeral pursuit, defamatory

---

[294] *Plaine and Godlye Treatise,* Sig, Yiv-Zii; the Convocation of 1558 also referred to the "heretical wolves have ravaged the flock by false teaching." See Duffy, *Fires of Faith,* p. 18.
[295] Duffy, *Fires of Faith,* pp. 7-8, 15-18, 20-21, 57-62, 75-77, 80-81, 97-99, 102.

laughter must be positioned as central to the theological tumults by which different groups of Christians grappled to stake a foothold in the True Church.

One image achieved a lot. Upon a single conceit hung critiques of the Mass, clerical celibacy, the persecutions, Gardiner's theological reputation and the Parliament of 1554. *The Lambe Speaketh* then had to be *perused* and *digested* - the connectedness of its rich allusions unfolded gradually as the print slowly yielded its barrage of gibes.[296] But in another sense its impact was startlingly immediate. Depicting Bishops as 'bite-sheeps', clerics who spiritually murdered the sheep they were obligated to tender, became a Reformation commonplace, but it was indebted to popular medieval anti-clerical iconography.[297] This was important. During the Reformation's early years Protestants worked with the past as much as they did against it. Reform occurring during the 1530s and 1540s emerged from a late-medieval mindset:[298] evangelical models of conversion developed from late-medieval practices, and late-medieval Christocentric devotion shaped Reformation liturgy.[299] Continuity was crucial. In cheap print too no stern break occurred: Alexandra Walsham and Tessa Watt point to homogeneity in the preoccupations of medieval and Reformation literature, a dressing-up of new theology in traditional means of expression.[300] This was precisely the case with *The Lambe Speaketh*: a traditional trope employed in the service of the new faith.

Drama provided the clearest example of a traditional medium being harnessed to implement change. Both enemies and proponents of Reform quickly recognized the stage's propaganda and playwrights' extension of medieval religious drama made a

---

[296] On the exclusivity of prints to a 'knowing audience' see above Chapter One, pp...

[297] See below, pp. 146-50.

[298] A Ryrie, *The Gospel & Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 3-10, 248-56 For Ryrie, describing religious identities as 'Protestant' and 'Catholic' during these decades is anachronistic, for in reality convictions were more fluid than these teleological impositions suggest. See also the introduction to P. Marshall, & A. Ryrie, (Eds), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge, 2002); T. Betteridge, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformation, 1530-83* (Aldershot, 1999), in particular pp. 216-18.

[299] P. Marshall, *Religious Identity in Henry VIII's England* (Aldershot, 2006) p. 6. For similar findings see T. Freeman, "Dissenters from a dissenting Church: the Freewillers, 1550-58", in Marshall, & Ryrie, (Eds), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, pp. 129-56; E. Shagan, "Clement Armstrong & the Godly Commonwealth: radical religion in Early Tudor England", in ibid, pp. 60-83; S. Wabuda, *Preaching During the English Reformation*, (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 147-77.

[300] A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 330-31, 354; A. Walsham, "Vox Pscis: Or the Book-Fish: Providence & The Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline England", *English Historical Review*, 114 (1999), pp. 574-606; T. Watt, *Cheap Print & Popular Piety*, (Cambridge, 1991). See also, Ryrie, *The Gospel & Henry VIII*, pp. 128-34.

major contribution to emerging Protestant culture.[301] Although no 'professional' dramatic industry existed until the early seventeenth century, existing systems of noble patronage complemented the 'top down' nature of the Henrician regimes' propaganda.[302] Thus before his employment as a dramatist of the Royal Supremacy, John Bale had already performed fourteen plays at Court under the Earl of Oxford's patronage.[303] Bale's *King John* is one of a few plays surviving from the 1530s, and the only one we know to have toured nationally.[304] Consequently, it provides a useful case-study in analyzing the indebtedness of Reformation imagery to earlier tropes.

The plot placed an evangelical slant upon the Supremacy.[305] Recognising England was tormented by the Papacy King John musters Clergy and Nobility to the cause of Reform. However, ignorance of scripture and the historical subjection of the English allowed the pontiff to maintain his authority and, aided by Sedycyon and Dyssymulacyon, to secure the help of Clergy and Nobility in a plot for France to invade and overthrow John. Fearing the suffering such events would inflict upon his subjects, John overturns Reform and submits to Rome. Not only humiliated by having to hand his crown to a Papal legate, the King is betrayed by the Pope, who sends a monk to poison him. In the final scene Veritas shows Clergy and Nobility that Truth was on the King's side: each monarch was head of the Church in his realm, and the Pope's power is nothing but fraudulent usurpation which "for three hundred years all

---

[301] Cattley & Townsend (Eds.), Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, vi, p. 57; a Marian proclamation of August 1553 singled out plays as disseminators of heresy (P. W. White, *Theatre & Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage & Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 44); J. A Muller, (Ed), *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 129-140, 267-84. White, *Theatre & Reformation*, pp. xiii, 2-15. Some seventy texts survive for the period 1530-80, and this is only a fraction of a far wider phenomenon.

[302] White, *Theatre & Reformation*, pp. 6-7, 12-13 42-43, 67-68; *L&P*, Addenda (1) no. 1360 & 1362: here we see nobles frantically searching to locate the correct ecclesiastical garments for a players company.

[303] White, *Theatre & Reformation*, pp. 19-20.

[304] Ibid, pp. 18-25. During 1537-40 we have records of thirteen performances in ten locations, including Cambridge, York, Canterbury, and Shrewsbury, but it is probable that performances occurred far more widely, with a midlands tour during 1538-40 seeming likely. The play also reached a diverse audience: those who attended a public performance at Cranmer's house in 1538 included local artisans, and people between the ages of eighteen and fifty. Ibid, p. 20 For Cranmer, see J. E. Cox, (Ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings of Thomas Cranmer*, (Parker Society no. 18, Cambridge, 1844), pp. 387-88.

[305] Quotations from the play are taken from P. Happe, (Ed.), *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, 2 vols (Woolbridge, 1985). Although Happe uses the 1560 manuscript for his text, quotations have been checked with the manuscript of a play in an earlier hand, probably 1538-40, in W. W. Greg, (Ed.) *King Johan, by John Bale* (Malone Society: Oxford, 1931). For other Reformation references to King John, see T. Swinerton, *A muster of scismatyke bysshopes of Rome otherwise naming them sleves popes, much necessary to be redde of al the kynges true subjects* (London, 1534), pp. Bvii-Bviii, Dvi-Dviii.

146

England shall yt rewe" – a prophecy that England's ills would only end with Henry's glorious lifting of the Papal yoke.[306]

Despite presenting something as novel as Royal Supremacy, Bale's dramatic techniques were rigidly traditional. The new order was expressed in instantly recognizable tropes.[307] Employing Vices (Sedycyon, Dysymulacion and Usurpid Power) and other medieval dramatic conventions like parody and disguise dressed the unfamiliar tenets of the Supremacy in familiar forms.[308] The re-appearance of Sedycyon and Dysymulacion throughout the play disguised as different Roman clerics was a simple way of expressing Papal corruption, and one Bale employed in another play, *The Three Laws*, in which the Pope was advised by Infidelity and Ambition.[309] The single recorded reaction to *King John* suggests that the strategy was effective: Bale had convinced Thomas Brown, who recalled "it ys a petie that the Bisshop of Rome should reign any longer, for if he should, the said Bisshop wold do with our king as he did with King John."[310] Other dramatists followed Bale's lead. Thomas Wylly, the Vicar of Yoxford in Suffolk, informed Cromwell that he had written and staged a play "against the Pope's counsellors, Error, Colle Clogger of Conscince, and Incredulity."[311] The path of change followed tried and tested routes.

The propagandists adopted one medieval motif in particular. It first appeared in *The Three Laws* (c.1538), when the Vice Infidelity and Bishop Ambition plotted to suppress the Bible readers threatening Papal authority in England:[312]

"Infidelity: Ye never spare them, [Bible readers] but evermore playe the bytar,

Expressynge always the tropes and types of thy mytar

Ambition: Why, what dost thou thynke my mytar to signify?

Infidelity: The mouth of a wolfe, and that I shall prove by and by –

---

[306] Ibid, I, p. 49, lines. 775-76. The resonance with Henry's Supremacy is clear: the Pope's power is fabricated, the product of subterfuge and a hunger for wealth, and a desire to usurp the true authority of Princes. Following Royal propaganda, Bale demonstrated that it was Papal authority, not Royal Supremacy, which was novel and breaks the natural order, for it is by forcing King John to submit that the Papacy gained permanent control of the English Church. Cf. *A treatise provynge by the kynges lawes, that the byshopes of Rome, had never right to any supremitie within this realme* (London, 1538).
[307] White, *Theatre & Reformation*, p. 31: Bale used "indigenous conventions of form and presentation familiar to his audience and by which he could most effectively impose his views on them.
[308] Ibid, pp. 1-2, 30-32.
[309] See Happe, *Bale*, II, pp. 66-123.
[310] Cox, (ed.), *Miscellaneous Writings of Thomas Cranmer*, pp. 387-88.
[311] *L&P*, XII, i, no. 529.
[312] White has dated this play c. 1535, but I would argue that, because if deals so explicitly with the theme of bible reading, it probably coincided with Henry's Second Royal Injunctions of 1538 which began the process of implementing the vernacular bible.

If thou stoupe downwarde,

Loo, se how the wolfe doth gape?

Ready to devoure the lambes, lest any escpae."[313]

When positioned horizontally Bishop's mitres resembled wolf's jaws. Beyond humorous, this visual pun positioned Bishops as the wolves in sheep's clothing of John 10:12 and Matthew 7:15, deceptive False Prophets causing the spiritual death of Christians they were entrusted to nourish.[314] The works of Bale and other evangelical polemicists were littered with references to episcopal 'bitesheeps', and *The Three Laws'* pun was borrowed by the artist of *The Lambe Speaketh*. It was an old joke. Foxy-Bishops had been common in carvings and illustrations since the fourteenth-century.[315] Surviving examples include a late fourteenth-century stained glass from Holy Cross Church in Byfield [Fig. 119]; and a manuscript decoration from the early part of that century [Fig. 120] - preaching to an unsuspecting flock of birds, the fox's mitre mirrored the menace of its jaws.[316]

Bale tapped into a thriving tradition. Stories of foxes disguising themselves as clerics in order to feed on unsuspecting birds were a common anti-clerical trope of medieval art and literature employed to criticize all levels of ecclesia over a variety of abuses.[317] Representations could criticize burdens imposed by clerical taxation, as demonstrated by a fifteenth-century carving of a plump fox-bishop preaching to a flock of emaciated geese [Fig. 121]; or convey the spiritual ravishing of false preachers, as the fox was a popular synonym of the devil.[318] The list of surviving fifteenth-and-sixteenth-century carvings of foxes is a long one, and literary

---

[313] Happe, *Bale,* II, p. 99.

[314] Matt 7:15.

[315] K. Varty, *Raynard the Fox: A study of the Fox in Medieval English Art* (New York, 1967); ibid, *Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England: the iconographic evidence* (Amsterdam, 1999); ibid (ed.), *Raynard the Fox: Social Engagement and Cultural Metamorphoses in the Beast Epic from the Middle Ages to the present* (New York/ Oxford, 2000). See also M. Jones, & C. Tracy, "A Medieval Choirstall Desk-End at Haddon Hall: the fox Bishop and the Geese Hangmen", *Journal of the British Archaelogical Association,* 144 (1994), pp. 107-15.

[316] The specific use against Bishops was unique to England. See Jones & Tracy, "A Medieval Choirstall Desk-End at Haddon Hall: the fox Bishop and the Geese Hangmen", pp. 107-15; Varty, *Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England: the iconographic evidence,* pp. 66-67.

[317] See Varty, *Raynard the Fox,* pp. 51-59; Varty, *Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England,* pp. 55-78.

[318] St Lawrence Church in Ludlow. This echoes proverbs about clerics such as "I will tell you many stories, enough to fill my stomach", see Varty, *Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England,* p. 57. Varty, *Raynard the Fox,* pp. 21, 26, 42, 91, 94, 102.

expressions were equally common by medieval standards.[319] A poem entitled *The Fox & the Wolf* circulated in manuscript from 1290, French editions followed by the early fourteenth century, Chaucer's *The Cok and the Fox* after 1390, and two generations before Henry's Reformation William Caxton published a best-selling edition, which was re-printed in 1495, 1498, 1500 and 1515.[320] Ultimately, the coining of proverbs like "when the fox preaches, beware your geese" leaves no doubt that Bale had co-opted a burgeoning anticlerical tradition for the cause of Reformation.[321]

Bale began a tradition in Reformation polemic. But if the motif was stolen to buttress Henry's regime, it quickly became totemic of cries against it. Bale returned to it in order to attack Edmund Bonner, the Bishop of London, one of the wolf-bishops in *The Lambe Speaketh*.[322] Readers were expected to understand the significance of his title, *Yet a Course at the Romyshe Foxe*, for the work referred explicitly to the motif only once: "when the wylye foxe fawneth, beware your chyckens."[323] Bonner, a disguised "foxe" of the Church of Rome uncovered by his defense of Henry's Six Articles - which upheld much that evangelicals considered "Popish" man-made tradition – was Satan's minister not God's.[324] William Turner echoed these sentiments in *The resuynge of the romishe fox* (1545), berating Bishops who held "all the popis doctrine still, savinge the supremacy."[325] Turner expanded the adaptation. In medieval representations, the fox was commonly routed by a hunter and his hounds, roles which Turner assigned himself and his books, whose scriptural exposition chased

---

[319] Varty, *Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England*, p. 71.

[320] Ibid, p. 27; K. Varty, "Reynard in England: From Caxton to the Present", in Varty (ed.), *Raynard the Fox: Social Engagement and Cultural Metamorphoses,* p. 164. Re-printed in 1495, 1498, 1500 and 1515.

[321] Varty, *Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England*, p. 57. Cf King John, the line spoken by Sedycyon: "thowgh I seme a shepe, I can play the suttle foxe" (Happe, *Bale,* II, pp. 47, line. 714.)

[322] J. Bale, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe. A dysclosynge or openynge of the Manne of Synne, contained in the late declaration of the Popes olde faythe made by Edmonde Boner byshopp of London, whereby Wyllyam Tolwyn was then newlye professed at paules crosse openly into Antichrist Romyshe reylgyon agayne by a newe solempne othe of obedience, notwythsta[n]dynge the othe made to hys prince afore to the contrayre* (Antwerp, 1543.)

[323] Ibid, sig. Fiv.

[324] Ibid, see sigs. Aii-Aiv, Aviii-Bv, Cvii, Kii-Kvii.

[325] W. Turner, *The recuynge of the romishe fox other wyse called the examination of the hunter devised by steven sgardiner. The seconde course of the hunter out the romishe fox and hys advocate & sworne patrone steven gardiner doctor & defender of the popis canon law and hys ceremonies* (Bonn, 1545), sig. Bvi. Turner had begun this discussion two years earlier in *The hunting and fyndyng out of the romishe foxe which more than seven yeares hath been hyd amonge the byshoppes of Englande after the kynges hyghnes after the kynges highness had commanded hym to be driven out of this realme* (Basel, 1543).

"romish" doctrine out of England – ridicule was once more central to polemic, and awarded a punitive function.[326]

The resuynge also included a woodcut depicting a Foxy-Bishop with clipped ears [Fig. 122]. This was an old joke told in a fresh context. Although displaying similarities with previous anti-clerical illustrations, viewers were required to turn to the verses below to grasp its new significance:

"My son stephen gardiner with wepyng teares

Hath cut away the toppes of myn eares

But the rest of my body abydeth hole still

With ale my ceremonies even at my will

I trust myn eares shall growe ageyn

When all the gospelles ar ones slayn

Whiche steven my son both strecht and stout

Doth now right earnestly go about

If he can bring thy mater to pass

He schal be cardinal as fisher was."[327]

This was emblematic of the book's argument. Following medieval representations in which a tonsured fox represented *all* friars, and a fox-bishop represented *all* bishops, Turner's fox symbolized *all* Roman doctrine, only a snippet of which has been curtailed in England.[328] A disguised papist, Gardiner was the architect of its perseverance. The Henrician church's conservative stance illustrated his desire to prosecute the Word and "the gospellers" that clung to it, many of whom, like Turner and Bale, had fled England in the face of the regime's increasing intolerance. *The Lambe Speaketh* was a continuation of this story. A great deal stood behind its imagery, which brought a wealth of accrued connotations to bear in a new context. In the dark humour of his ongoing joke, there was an element of retributive one-

---

[326] Turner, *The recuynge of the romishe fox*, The whole work is a continuation of this theme, but see sig. Aiii-Av in particular. Cf. Varty, *Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England*, pp. 25-27. Depictions of the fox hunting occurred in a quarter of all fox carvings in medieval England.

[327] Turner, *The recuynge of the romishe fox*, sig. Aii.

[328] Ibid, sigs. Aii-Aiv, Av-Bviii, Cvi-Cvii in particular. In the text, Turner alternated its use between Roman doctrines in general, clerics who followed Rome and, more specifically, Bishop Gardiner. See also the later work which refers to Gardiner as the "romish fox", W. Turner, *The hunting of the fox and the wolfe* (London, 1565), sigs. Aiv, Bv-Bvi, Dii.

upmanship. Employing a motif resonant with anti-clerical nuances and around which polemical tussles with its subjects, particularly Gardiner and Bonner, had been organized for a decade, it was the latest assault in a drawn-out war. This was not the Reformation quashing the image, but organizing its protest around one.

Was this an attempt to increase the breadth of the polemic's appeal, tapping into pre-existing 'popular' iconography and tropes in order to canvas the semi-literate and un-lettered? It would seem not. Conversely, employing the wolf-bishop motif sought to make *The Lambe Speaketh* more exclusive than inclusive. We have noted that the original was in Latin, and have explored the raft of theological references and allusions to the recent political past which made the engraving such a richly scabrous commentary upon the Marian regime. Such commentary assumed a knowing viewer, for these references were implicit and not explicated. The wolf-bishop motif was similarly an in-joke for a select clique, for *The Lambe Speaketh* referred back to Turner's *Rescuying of the Romish foxe* of some ten years earlier. Gardiner stated:

> "....in youth a foxe that have byn
>
> In age am a woolfe more valliant in synne
>
> A foxe whe[n] I was the spehen & the henne
>
> Dyd the[n] me co[n]tent, but now I feede on men."[329]

There was an expectation of familiarity here. Turner continued to address his clique in the body of his text:

> "[the Romish Foxe's] eldest sonne whyche was a foxe....is nowe changed into a grevious Wolfe [Gardiner]. For he leaving his olde foxye subtylties, playeth now the playne Tyran[t], as more than CCCCC in Englande wyll beare wytnesse, besides those that are in the Tower, and them that for feare of worrying, are fled out of the realme."[330]

Mary's accession permitted Gardiner to openly profess his Catholicism – no longer the crafty fox subversively upholding Roman doctrine in England, but a wolf openly

---

[329] BM Sat 10.

[330] Turner, *The hunting of the romyshe wolfe*, sig. Aiii.

"valiant in sin" and slaughter.[331] A parallel verse depiction also referred back to his Henrician work:

> "Gardiner my Sonne which with wepyng teares,
>
> Cut ones awaye quyte the toppes of myne eares,
>
> Hathe take for me, of late suche payne,
>
> That they are growen and healed agayne."[332]

Such a familiar trope then intended to target a specific evangelical audience within Turner's 'loop', an organizing conceit of invective which had steered their polemical darts against conservative Bishops for over a decade. This only strengthens our argument that such works served to galvanize party resolve rather than proselytize to the floating opinion.[333] That the 'wolf-bishop' motif made the joke more immediate was not to make it increasingly palatable. Immediacy served not to make the joke more accessible to the everyman but to heighten the laughter of those who understood the engraving's web of allusions - to make the satire, dare we say it, more biting.[334]

Polemic, then, was *effectual* as much as *intellectual*. In *The Lambe Speaketh* Protestants sought to defame the Marian Church alongside winning their argument with it, punishing their opponents as well as defeating them. This darkly humorous in-joke served to galvinize the Godly in the face of the ordeal they faced. This satire certainly engaged in the theological disputes of the mid-1550s, entering the public forum to present the Protestant's case for the illicit nature of the regime's actions. It was so effective in its agitation precisely because it did so through practices of shame and iconoclasm inherent in Protestant polemic – making their points by controlling definitions of Roman rites to reflect their own verity; and shaming the architects of the Marian Church in order to present their own sanctity. The derogatory laughter

---

[331] For similar references, see Turner, *The hunting of the fox and the wolfe*, sigs. Aii-Av, Biii, Bvii.

[332] *The hunting of the romyshe wolfe* (Emden, 1555), p. Aiv, see also Aii for an explicit reference of Gardiner as the fox.

[333] See above, Chapter One, pp. 29-37, 60-70.

[334] But in its afterlife, the image was not so stringently controlled. Employed with increased flexibility in both image and text, it was a trope which became emblematic of resistance to Rome. T. Bright, *Abridgement of the Acts and Monuments* (1589), title-page. Turner returned to the image in his 1565 work, *The hunting of the fox and the wolfe*, which was essentially a reprint of the 1555 book with a preface geared toward the Vestarian Controversy, W. Turner, *The hunting of the fox and the wolfe*, (London, 1565). Preachers who wore garments initially instituted by Rome committed idolatry, and were consequently the "false prophets", and "ravenous wolves" who killed their flocks rather than nourishing them in the true worship of Christ, ibid, p. Aii-Aiv, Bv-Bvi, Dii.

elicited by these practices was not merely destructive, but solidified Protestant resolve and became an ensign of agitation against the regime. In this way ridicule and punishment were essential to Protestant graphic satire. We will now move forward over a century to the end of our period to demonstrate that it remained so, examining the Pope Burning Processions of the Exclusion Crisis to see how important shame and iconoclasm continued to be in political agitation. We have argued throughout this chapter that the page was an extension of the culture of shame and iconoclasm, but in these viscous performances of Anti-Catholicism the indebtedness of print to the culture of shame was reversed – a century of graphic satire fed back into the culture of ridicule in a very public shaming which amounted to a quotation of imagery.

V: A Death-Dealing Spirit? Burning the Pope, 1679-81

At 3am on 17th November 1679 London was woken abruptly by prodigious bell-ringing.[335] The practice was customary, a cacophony of sound marking this day, the anniversary of Elizabeth I's accession, as one of celebration, a momentous thanksgiving commemorating the point at which England had been ruptured from the darkness and tyranny of Popery forever.[336] Or so it had long seemed. Six years earlier Charles II's brother James, Duke of York, had converted to Rome and, given that the King had no legitimate heir, the spectre of a popish Succession hung over the realm.[337] Fear drove heightened celebration of the Protestant past, and whilst ringing bells and lighting bonfires were far from novel, their vociferous performance in recent years certainly had been. In 1675 one diarist noted plainly – "extraordinary much Bell-ringing."[338] A year later the sheer volume of revelers was described as "incredible";[339] and in 1673 "the broad streets of London [were] so thick with Bonfires as if they had been but one Hearthe", with two hundred raging between

---

[335] H. M. C. Ormonde, (London, 1906), 4 vols, iv, pp. 472, 561.
[336] D. Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: national memory and Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1989), pp. xi-xii, 50-67, 69-83, 137-47, 171-83.
[337] *An account of the burning of the Pope at Temple-Bar in London, Nov. 17 1769* (London, 1680), pp. 2-6; J. Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1660-88* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 121-23, 128-29, 130-35, 147-53, 154-88; S. Williams, "The Pope-burning processions of 1679, 1680 and 1681", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* (1958), pp. 104-18; 0. W. Furley, "The pope - burning processions of the late seventeenth century", *History*, XLIV (1959), pp. 16-23.
[338] R. Hooke, *Diary, 1672-80* (ed.) H. W. Robinson & W. Adams (London, 1968), p. 191.
[339] H. M. C. Ormonde, iv, p. 561.

Temple Bar and Aldgate alone.[340] Yet every spectacle paled in comparison to 1679.[341] At sunset an extraordinary procession of performers and effigies paraded around much of the city. It was a punitive parody, at once deeply macabre and bitterly funny - celebratory, commemorative and evoking defamatory and destructive ridicule. Six men in pioneer caps and red waistcoats cleared the streets, blowing whistles to announce its coming. A bellman crying "Remember Justice Godfrey" announced the arrival of the gaunt-faced effigy of the murdered magistrate, who sported the blood-soaked neckerchief with which he was strangled. Re-enacting the masking of their villainy, Godfrey sat propped-up on horseback by a Jesuit secret conveying him around London. This maudlin scene was followed by another, a Priest dressed in skull-embossed cope and surplice attempting to sell the crowd indulgences, a parody of the spiritual death which Rome peddled and complemented by another cleric carrying a large silver cross in an ironic display of holiness. The procession then turned to a series of large and lavish effigies carried aloft on stands raised above the heads of spectators. Following the hierarchy of the Roman Church from the bottom up, this amounted to a parody of the Papal *processio*, or entrance procession.[342] First came six friars - two white-robbed Dominicans, black-robbed Benedictines and grey-robbed Franciscans - followed by six Jesuits sporting bloody daggers. Next were four purple and lawn-sleeved bishops, four patriarchs adorned with richly embroidered copes and golden mitres, two Cardinals in scarlet gowns, and the "Pope's Physician" George Wakeman, the Queen's doctor recently accused of plotting to poison the King.[343] Finally, and most spectacularly, came the "Glorious Pageant" of "a huge

---

[340] *The Burning of the whore of Babylon as it was acted with great applause, in the poultry, London* (London, 1673), p. 2; T. Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 93; W. D. Christie (ed.), *Letters Addressed from London to Sir John Williams* 2 vols (Camden Society, 1874), ii, p. 63.

[341] For contemporary accounts see BM Sat 1085; BM Sat 1086; *An account*, pp. 2-6; H.M.C, *Seventh Report* (London, 1879), p. 477; W. Goble, *The Procession: or, the Burning of the Pope in Effigie* (London, 1681); *London's Defiance to Rome* (London, 1679); *London's Drollery: or, The Love and kindness between the Pope and the Devil* (London, 1680); *The Solemn Mock Procession of the Pope* (London, 1679); *Domestick Intelligence, or News Both from City and Country*, no. 39, 18th November, 1679; ibid, no. 40, 21/11/1679; *True Protestant Mercury*, no. 91;*Mercurius Anglicus or The Weekly Occurences Faithfully Transmitted*, no. 1, 13/11/1679; M. Verney, *Memoirs of the Verney Family from the Restoration to the Revolution 1660 to 1696* (London, 1899), vol. 4, pp. 599-600; R. North, *Examen; or, an enquiry into the credit and veracity of a pretended complete history* (London, 1740), pp. 570-80. The information pertaining to the procession detailed below is drawn from these accounts.

[342] M. Fagiolo Dell' Arco, *La festa barocca* (Rome, 1997).

[343] Wakeman holds a urinal, in reference to his profession, and bag of gunpowder in reference to his suspected treason. BM Sat 1095; *An account of the burning*. For Wakeman's role in Oates' fictitious plot, see below Chapter Three, pp. 209-21.

Pope in Pontificalibus in his chair, with reasonable Attendance for State."[344] Costing over £100, the effigy was lavishly decked with the splendor synonymous with the pride of Antichrist in Protestant minds. Sat in a Chair of State with cushions and King's crowns at his feet, the Pope was dressed in robes of scarlet and gold and lined with ermine, and boasted a bulbous golden, jewel-encrusted tiara upon his head. Upon this throne plots against England had been hatched at the inspiration of the Papal prime-minister - the devil - played by a boy, "a nimble little Fellow....that had a strange Dexterity, in climbing and winding about the chair from one of the Pope's ears to the other" whispering and "often instructing him allowd to destroy his majesty, his country [and]...to fire the city again" as he had ordered in 1666.[345] The procession was attended by some two hundred porters – hired at two shillings a man – and one thousand volunteers carrying torches to illuminate the streets in a suitably hellish light.[346] When sat alongside the sounding of thousands of squibs and the countless bonfires which raged throughout the city we grasp how dramatic the scene viewed by some two hundred thousand spectators – "the like [of which] hath not been seen in a night season in the memory of man, on any occasion whatsoever" – was as the procession circulated London.[347] Culminating at Temple Bar before a statue of Queen Elizabeth holding a shield emblazoned with "Protestant Religion", each effigy was disrobed and cast one by one into a gigantic bonfire amidst "prodigious shouts of [the] joyous spectators" of "No Popery", and topped-off with plentiful fireworks, one of which, rather fittingly, was shaped like a Cardinal's hat.[348] The Pope was last, pleading for mercy as the devil led him to Hell's flames by pincers on his nose. Upon

---

[344] Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 106; J. Monteyne, *The printed image in early modern London: urban space, visual representation and social exchange* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 166-68; *An account of the burning*, p. 4; *Domestick Intelligence, or News Both from City and Country*, no. 35, 36, 39, 40; H.M.C, *Seventh Report*, p. 477.

[345] North, *Examen*, p. 578; *An account of the burning*, p. 4.

[346] *An account of the burning*, p. 4; Verney, *Memoirs*, pp. 599-600; BM Sat 1084; BM Sat 1085; H.M.C *Ormonde*, p. 561; H. M. C, *Seventh Report*, p. 477; *The Solemn Mock Procession*.

[347] North, *Examen*, p. 577; *Mercurius Anglicus*, 13/11, 1679, no. 1. It passed from George's Yard through White-Chappel Bar, Aldgate, Leaden Hall Street, and Fleet Street, before culminating at Temple Bar. *An Account*; *Solemn Mock Procession*; BM Sat 1084. By 1681 the route had changed, as the Law Temples no longer supported the cause of Exclusion. That year, the procession ended at an equally symbolic place, however, burning the Pope where Catholic authorities had made martyrs of Protestants, at Smithfield. See BM Sat 1085; BM Sat 1086; *The True Domestick Intelligence*, 19/11/1681; Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 121.

[348] *Mercurius Anglicus or The Weekly Occurences Faithfullt Transmitted*, no. 113/11/1679; Williams, "The Pope-burning processions", p. 107; Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 123 for other toasts.

tumbling into the fire "mighty shouts" of defiance sounded "as might have been a cry of deafness itself."[349] The devil fled, laughing.[350]

Spawning imitators in Salisbury, Taunton, Oxford, Edinburgh and Lewes this 'Solemn Mock Procession of the Pope' was repeated in 1680 and 1681, resplendent with an iconography laced with details of the unfolding 'Popish Plot'.[351] This was the culmination of approaches to Roman imagery examined throughout this chapter - a coalescence of the iconoclastic display of Rome as Antichristian, and the fantasy of subjecting the Pope to a punitive shaming, this was diminution through laughter and punishment through defamation, for nothing more deserved to be "as shamefully baffled or more deserved Triumph over than Popery."[352] This penal desire found expression in the use of the Procession in graphic satire, where the Pope was shackled and led to hell by Satan, bed-ridden by the guilt of having plotted against England and chastised by an entourage of clerics for having done so [Figs. 123-125.][353] The retributive urge underpinning polemic was displayed here in a brutal display, a performance which once again eased anxieties by the shaming of images. On this day celebrating their past, Protestant re-affirmation of identity was intimately linked to an engagement with the Church which they loathed so vehemently. Indeed, this appropriation of the Papal *possesso* had so much potential for dishonour precisely because of its nearness to the original form – noticeably, the engravings which celebrated the events of 1679-81 seemed consciously to ape the format of those commemorating *actual* Papal entrances [Figs. 126-129.][354] The narrowness of the line between signifier and signified permitted the punishment meted-out upon these effigies to be substitutes for real acts of retribution. In essence a counter-liturgy had been enacted: desecration took the same form as consecration, defamation occurred in

---

[349] North, *Examen*, p. 578.

[350] *Domestick Intelligence or News for City*, no. 40, 21/11 1679.

[351] The processions of 1680 and 1681 became more topical, satirising opponents of the Exclusion Bills as Protestants disguised as Papists (see below pp. 171-2) and included references to the farcical 'Meal Tub Plot', an alleged attempt by Catholics to 'discover' a fraudulent presybyterian plot, thus discrediting the idea that popery was the real threat to the realm – the processions of these years thus included references to Elizabeth Cellier, (see below, Chapter Three, pp. 209-20.) Secondly, the processions increasingly referred to the realm's martyrs, included pageants of Protestants tied to the stake and being terrorized by the Inquisition. See BM Sat 1085; BM Sat 1086; Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, p. 179.

[352] *The Pope burnt to ashes, or, Defiance of Rome* (London, 1676), p. 2.

[353] BM Sat. 1068; BM Sat 1079; *The Pope Haunted With Ghosts* (1680).

[354] BM Sat 1094; BM Sat 1095; A. Rocco, *De Sacrosancto Christi corpore romanio pontificibus iter confirientibus praerferento commentarus* (Rome, 1599). On the procession, see Dell' Arco, *La festa barocca, passim*; R. M. San Juan, *Rome: A City Out of Print* (London, 2001).

the dress of honour.[355] Ownership of these images was just as important to the Protestant sense of self as it had been to Rome.[356]

As with *The Lambe Speaketh*, the end of this iconoclastic ridicule was a very specific moment of political agitation. London was gripped with the 'Exclusion Crisis.'[357] The heir to the throne, the Duke of York, had proclaimed himself Catholic in 1673 and his marrying an Italian papist, the Duchess of Modena, meant that Britain faced the prospect of not only a single Catholic succession (which it had escaped for 120 years) but a Catholic dynasty.[358] Excessive celebration of Elizabeth I, the matriarch of English Protestantism, was a protest at this prospect. That this protest took the form of Pope-Burning was a visceral totem of popular feeling, the punishment of polemic easing tensions as fear of Popery became more deeply pronounced. John Evelyn understood the connection. Upon witnessing a group of apprentices performing a small-scale procession on November 5th 1673, the diarist noted: "This nyght the youths of the City burnt the *Pope* in *Effigy* after they had made procession with it in greate triumph; displeased at the D[uke] for altering his Religion and now marrying an Italian Lady!"[359] This combined with the King's decision to surround himself not only with a Catholic wife but two Catholic mistresses, to permit his Queen two priests at Court, and pursuit of an increasingly pro-France and anti-Dutch foreign policy, crystallized fears that Britain had begun back-sliding towards Rome.[360]

Under this looming Roman shadow the Whigs lobbied to exclude James from the succession, claiming that this was the only way to safeguard the King's life and the liberties of Church and realm. Their calls gained credence upon disclosure of the

---

[355] R. W. Scribner has noted a similar phenomenon in Reformation Germany, see his "Reformation and Ritual", pp. 104-15.

[356] The Papal Procession had a long history as a polemical vehicle. *Treves endt, The Funeral of the Netherlands* (1621) used a Catholic funeral procession to satirize the ending of the Twelve Years' True. The origins of such works perhaps stem from the Pope's role in the Dance of Death. See *A Treatise excellent, shewing and declaring in meanes of Tragedie, the follies of Sundry most notable Princes* (London, 1554), fol. 220-224; W. Dugdale, *The history of St. Paul's Cathedral in London* (1658).

[357] Harris, *London Crowds*, pp. 2-6, 93-129.

[358] Harris, *London Crowds*, pp. 96-97.

[359] J. Evelyn, *Diary*, (ed.) E. S. De Beer (Oxford, 1955), 5/11/1673, p. 26.

[360] T. Oates, *A true narrative of the horrid plot and conspiracy of the Popish party against the life of his sacred Majesty, the Government and the Protestant religion* (London, 1679); W. Bedloe, *A narrative and impartial discovery of the horrid Popish plot* (London, 1679); T. Dangerfield, *Mr. Tho. Dangerfields particular narrative of the late popish design to charge those of the Presbyterian party with a pretended conspiracy against His Majesties person and government* (London, 1679); T. Dangerfield, *Mr. Tho. Dangerfeild's [sic] second narrative: wherein is contained a faithful charge against the Lady Powis, Mr. Stamford* (London, 1679).

(fictitious) 'Popish Plot' by Titus Oates and Israel Tongue.[361] Voicing terror of Rome's monstrous designs, they claimed to have caught wind of a plot to assassinate the King, place James on his thrown and burn London in a repeat of 1666. Finally, 100,000 Protestants were to be slaughtered.[362] Whether or not people ever fully believed Oates was not crucial. The salacious swirl of details and debate which churned-off the press was enough to agitate fears of popery, and the mysterious murder of Edmund Godfrey – who had taken Oates' deposition – only heightened the plot's legend, proof that more often than not history resolves around coincidence than conspiracy.[363] This animated popular calls for Exclusion. 'The Solemn Mock Procession' must be seen as a form of protest that the Crown should "compel the People of England ever again to submit to the Yoke of Popery and Slavery", a performance in which the Pope was a metonym of 'popery', his torching expressing the people's will to purge England of Catholicism.[364] The performance was such an effective means of voicing agitation precisely because retributive shame and iconoclasm were at the heart of Anti-Catholic prejudice. Indeed, the powerful parody of the *processio* was almost a form of mimetic magic, a ritualistic exorcism cleansing the realm: "Let Popery (that painted Religion) perish with this Picture-Pope, and not so much its Ghost remain to Haunt and Distress us."[365]

Choosing Elizabeth's Accession Day made this all the more potent. The mixture of bonfires, bells, and alcohol had long been a vocabulary of thanksgiving commemorating England's deliverance from the darkness of Rome.[366] But celebration was ambivalent. Parishes often voiced opposition by celebrating the accession of the dead Queen more vociferously than they had the current monarch – Charles I, for example, was forever doomed to compete with Elizabeth's ghost.[367] In the heightened fear of Popery after 1673, the Queen's memory was once again felt more acutely: "It

[361] On the 'Popish Plot' see J. P. Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (London, 1972), *passim*; J. Miller, *Popery and Politics in England* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 153-62; R. L. Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-89* (Standford, 1992); Hinds, *The Horrid Popish Plot*; M. Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 3-4, 16-19, 30-35, 126-27, 187-94, 221-23; G. de Krey, "London Radicals and Revolutionary Politics" in J. Scott, "England's Troubles: Exhuming the Popish Plot" in T. Harris, P. Seawood, & M. Goldie (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 107-31.
[362] For details, see below Chapter Three, pp. 209-21.
[363] On Godfrey, whose murder remains unsolved, see A. Marshall, *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey* (Sutton, 1999); S. Knight, *The Murder of Sir Edmund Godfrey* (London, 1986); J. Dickinson Carr, *The Murder of Sir Edmund Godfrey* (London, 1936).
[364] *Domestick Intelligence or News for City*, no. 40, 21/11/1679.
[365] *The Pope burnt to ashes*, p. 5.
[366] Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, passim.
[367] Ibid, p. 59.

may not be unfit for us to reflect on this with Gratitude upon the Blessing, which though long since bestow'd, yet we to this day injoye" proclaimed one pamphlet commemorating the Pope Burning of 1673. A host of literature noted the need for a fitting memorial to Elizabeth to ensure that her memory would be deeply etched in the minds of their children to safeguard England from popery forever – that burning the Pope was deemed the most effective measure speaks volumes of the indebtedness of Protestant identity to iconoclastic display and retributive defamation, the need to mark their own identity by controlling Rome's.[368]

The Whigs thus harnessed a day traditionally used to voice opposition, and which had become an increasingly fraught site of Anti-Catholic feeling in recent years. Moreover, November 17th traditionally fostered communal solidarity. Each household contributed to the bonfire, and parish funds provided ale and bell-ringing.[369] Celebration was thus part of the 'will' of the community. In burning the Pope the Whigs extrapolated out from this tradition, creating an 'England' opposed to Popery. Pamphlets abounded with the rhetoric of unity. "Oh! Let not Protestants devour one another, when the Papist Adversary would devour all", "When the subjects of England shall be as one/ Then Popery out of the Nation shall run."[370] This was expressed most forcefully in the Pope's mock trial. Made to sit before Elizabeth, a chorus representing "the people of England" castigated the pontiff:

> "Cease, cease…
>
> See Yonder stands Queen Bess,
>
> Who sav'd your souls from Popish threat
>
> O Queen Bess, Queen Bess, Queen Bess
>
> Your Popish Plot, Smithfield Threat
>
> We do not fear at all
>
> For lo! Before Queen Bess Feet

---

[368] *The Burning of the whore of Babylon as it was acted with great applause, in the poultry, London* (London, 1673).

[369] Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, pp. 67-69, 83-85. John Stow described the communal harmony: "after the sun setting there were usually made bonfires in the streets, every man bestowing wood and labour towards them. The wealthier sort also before their doors near to the said bonfires would set out tables on the vigils, furnished with sweet bread and good drink, and on the festival day with meat and drinks plentifully, whereunto they would invite their neighbours and passengers also to sit and be merry with them in great familiarity, praising God or his benefit bestowed on them. These were called bonfires as well on good amity amongst neighbours…" (Quoted in Cressy, p. 83.)

[370] Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 123.

You fall, you fall, you fall.

Now God preserve Great Charles our King

And eke all honest men

And Traytors all to Justice bring

Amen, Amen, Amen."[371]

In the long-run, the burnings failed to represent the 'will of England' and were vociferously contested.[372] But, initially at least, cries of opposition were drowned out by shouts of acclamation. The rhetoric of unity was essential to their potency. It permitted the Whigs to claim that such vehement commemoration was demonstrative of popular opposition to the Succession and Popish Plot which had "raised such a just indignation in the brest of every good Christian and True Englishmen, That the People of this Nation have upon all occasions endeavored to display the great Detestation of that cursed invaders of their Religion and Civil liberty."[373]

Commemoration and agitation converged here. The Whigs attempted to stage-manage fear of popery in order to pressure Royal and Parliamentary assent for Exclusion. One hostile Tory, Roger North, thought such incitement of "the Rabble" tantamount to the "monstrous Havock" of rebellion, positioning the Whigs as "mob masters" acting to inflame the crowd to oppose the Crown in scenes emulating treasonous opposition to Charles I.[374] He interpreted their fermenting of Anti-Catholic feeling throughout November as an intimidation of the Crown through hinting at rebellion, seeking to: "strike a Terror in People's spirits...inviting the willing, frightening the fearful, deterring the wise and cautious, but, above all, teaching the king his lesson, which was to compass his quiet and safety."[375] The processions were certainly meant to intimidate Parliament by claiming to voice the 'will of the people' – indeed the procession of 1680 occurred two days after a Bill of Exclusion had been submitted for consideration to the Commons.[376] Historians have generally followed

---

[371] BM Sat 1085.

[372] See below, pp. 235-40.

[373] *An account of the burning*, p. 1.

[374] He noted coyly that had commemoration and thanksgiving been the Whigs real purpose, November 5th would have been an adequate date, North, *Examen*, pp. 570-72.

[375] Ibid, p. 575.

[376] Monteyne, *The printed image*, p. 156.

North's opinion – when not dismissing the processions as "fun", they have interpreted them as "brutally simple" political agitation.[377]

That they were agitation cannot be denied - but there was little "brutally simple" about the processions. Examining the symbolism and rituals of shame employed more fully demonstrates just how effective a focus of intimidation they were. Coming at the end of a century of graphic satire subjecting Catholics to defamatory ridicule endemic in wider culture, 'The Solemn Mock Procession' was the culmination of the Protestant fantasy of shaming the Pope. Contemporaries understood this as an elaborate *charivari* by which London purged itself of society's ultimate transgressor – popery.[378] A hugely flexible rite, *charivari* might involve a handful of people or whole parishes and could be employed against a host of different targets - a malleable activity morphed here into something far more elaborate.[379] We shall see that whilst *charivari* were generally performed on sexual transgressors, Protestant theology amalgamated idolatry, adultery and fornication, inter-relations that were reflected in the processions' iconography. Moreover, historians have been guilty of following commentators like North in seeing the processions as something which happened *to* the 'mob.'[380] Despite taking a pivotal role, the Whigs did not ordain a top-down demonstration and the crowd was considerably involved in the shaming. As Natalie Zemon-Davis and Keith Thomas have demonstrated, *charivari* had a quasi-legal status in early modern Europe and acted to supplement the legal system. That communities co-opted the rite to implement justice reflected belief that the authorities were inadequate.[381] This was precisely what happened between 1679 and 1681. London engaged in a purgation of popery from England where Parliament and Crown had failed them – it was this appropriation of authority which North saw as rebellion. Indeed, choosing Temple Bar for the procession's terminus was cuttingly symbolic. The barrier of Royal and Civic authority, the place where civic rights were

---

[377] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 182-88: "these were obviously intended to be offensive to James and to pander to, and show the strength of, Anti-Catholic feeling. But for all that they remained a festival, a pageant, a ritual, entertainment." ; Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 187-89: "Another Opposition device was the Pope-Burning Procession, on which great deal of time was wasted, and has been wasted since by historians....This was fine public entertainment; clean, and curiously naïve."
[378] Ingram, "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture.'"
[379] Ingram, "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture'", pp. 81-82.
[380] The view of Williams, "The Pope-burning processions", passim; Cressy, *Bonfires and Belles*, pp. 175, 179-82; Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 187-89; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, p. 182.
[381] Davis, "Rites of Violence", pp. 163-69; Ingram, "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture'", *passim*.

161

traditionally asserted and identity marked, burning the Pope there was an explicit manifestation of the city's will to cast popery from its midst.[382]

'The Solemn Mock Procession's' power was rooted in its potential for ambiguity. It was this which made it a magnet of hatred, allowing spectators to read what they desired in its images. Dissenters could quite easily see the lawn and purple-sleeved bishops as Church of England men rather than Rome;[383] and the increasingly complex figures of later years were easily misconstrued, becoming "what everybody pleased to have" of them.[384] North noted discussion in the crowd concerning one "Figure of a Man in an ordinary gentile Dress, to gratify the Fancy; for, if you would have it the King of France, or any other King...it would not scruple; everyone had an Account in it, being a Supple Representation, conforming to all."[385] Many saw burnt what they wanted to see – believing the spectacle treasonous, North claimed to have seen an effigy of the Duke of York cast into the flames, but no other witness corroborates him.[386] The procession's patchwork of imagery and rites of shame-punishment amounted to a synergy of symbolism in which images collapsed into one-another to ensure that as much ridicule as possible was hung upon the Roman Church and opponents of Exclusion. Indeed, the very notion of *burning* lacked precision, tainting Catholicism as treasonous, heretical and a political pollutant in need of purgation, alongside providing a fittingly ironic end to a Papacy that had repeatedly cast martyrs to the flames.[387] The inversion here, then, was richly spiced: a Papal entrance procession was co-opted to expel popery; a rite of consecration hi-jacked to desecrate; pardons for Purgatory sold *en route* to hell; "Christ's Vicar on Earth" paraded with Antichristian pride; and the Pope, that arch-deceptor, was duped by Satan to march towards a hellish fate. Irony piled upon irony, gibe collapsed into jeer in a mosaic of ridicule which caused onlookers to laugh "'till their hearts ache."[388]

As with Anti-Catholic portraiture examined earlier, defamatory laughter here was all the more destructive because of the participants belief in the depiction's 'accuracy' - taking derision levelled at the signifier closer to the signified.[389]

---

[382] Monteyne, *The printed image*, p. 164; H. Johnson, *Temple Bar and State Pagenats: An Historical Record of the State Processions to the City of London* (London, 1897), p. 4.

[383] Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 124.

[384] North, *Examen*, p. 578.

[385] Ibid, p. 574.

[386] Ibid, p. 578.

[387] *Mercurius Infernus, or News from the Other World*, 11/3/1680, no. 2; Harris, *Burning*, pp. 4-6.

[388] W. Goble, *The Procession: or, the Burning of the Pope in Effigie* (London, 1681), p. 4.

[389] See above, pp. 79-103.

Accounts reveled in the lavish nature of the scarlet and purple of the cloth and the sparkle of golden and silver crosses, and the mockers became seduced by the accuracy of their artifice.[390] Readers were proudly and repeatedly told that the procession appeared "according to the ceremony of the Church of Rome", that the effigies were "richly habited in all points, as to manner and form, as used at *Rome* in Processions" and claims that "proper habits" and "pontificalibus" were desecrated abounded.[391] There was some truth in this. Roman paraphernalia had been donated by Sir William Waller, a Justice of the Peace whose recent raids upon Catholic households had yielded a haul of beads, crosses and "richly embroidered" gowns.[392] Performance consequently made this shaming more cutting than graphic satire ever could – voicing the retributive urge underwriting Protestant polemic so powerfully, the effigies and actors did not just *resemble* the idols of Rome, they were *decked* with them and engaged in their *actual* desecration.

Understanding the punitive power of the Procession's accuracy unlocks the root of its darkly penal humour. Indeed, one fictitious Papal report ironically mistook the procession as honourary:

> "Never has his Holiness had so much respect shown him in London, since our *Queen Maries* Golden dayes. To see in what *state* his glorious Effigy was carried along the streets, and how universally followed and admired, seemed a good omen; and had not *Misera ista Faemina*, the wretched *Queen Bess* unhappily stopt his Procession, he might [have] been justly received in his further progress."[393]

---

[390] See *An Account*, p. 3 "glorous pageant", "richly bedecked"; *Mercurius Anglicus*, 13/11/1679; BM Sat 1085; Harris, *The Pope Burnt To Ashes* notes that "an exact image of His Holiness was solemnly carried in procession" (title-page) and describes a "very magnificent Effigy of a Pope, properly habited in all his pontificalibus, so curiously done..." featuring "all the necessary lustre" with a "Triple Crown very huge and fair, being guilded over with fine Gold", pp. 2-3; N Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from Sept 1678 to April 1714* (Oxford, 1857), p. 144 in describing the 1681 procession notes that the Pope and clergy were decked "in their proper habits" with the Pope "in all his pontificalibus"; Goble, *The Procession*, p. 2 "according to the Ceremony of the Church of Rome"; BM Sat 1084; BM Sat 1086.

[391] *Mercurius Anglicus*, 13/11/1679, no. 1.

[392] Monteyne, *The printed image*, pp. 168-70; *Domestick Intelligence, or News Both From City and Country*, no. 36, 7/11/1679; ibid, no. 41, 23/11/1679.

[393] *The Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome: or the History of Popery, with the Popish Courant*, 21/11/1679, no. 20.

In a typically carnivalesque manner, one cultural form had been co-opted and inverted. It was this closeness, down to the destruction of *actual* Roman vestments, which gave the parody its power.[394]Closeness led to a satisfaction of retributive urges, making the Procession such a magnetic motor of protest. Yet closeness was also the target of Tory attacks, noting the uncomfortable irony of Whigs being reliant upon 'Pope Making' to achieve their political ends, and detecting superstition in their proud parody of Rome's idols.[395]

Other carnivalesque elements have passed unnoticed. Misunderstanding the accompanying engravings has led scholars to assume that the procession was distinct from the London crowd, something which happened *to* them rather than something which they were *involved* in [Figs. 126-128.][396] These images certainly commemorated the event and explained in detail what spectators had seen, but they were far from accurate depictions or 'as it happened' replications. Viewing the engravings and witnessing the processions were very different experiences. Engravings allowed viewers to see the entire procession as a *whole*, whereas in reality the event was more fractured. Spectators saw only one platform at a time, often with significant intervals.[397] The result was a confused experience, a confusion amplified by the fact that this was an *event*, something in which senses were distracted by fireworks, squibs, the noise of the crowd, smell of fire, and, most importantly, the consumption of alcohol. Many remembered, incorrectly, that the Pope led the procession.[398] Moreover, the procession was not *distinct* from the throbbing crowd, but emerged *from* it. A hum of anticipation rose amongst bystanders as it could be heard approaching, the flames glowing through the pitch darkness. Players had to barge through the crowd, led by a row of "stout fellows" who cut across the street shoulder to shoulder: "They went along like a wire, and it was wonderful to see how the crowd made way" before closing behind each successive float.[399] Indeed, one year the Pope had immense difficulty approaching Temple Bar for the swathes of people in his way.[400] The procession, then, was a form of the carnivalesque, a festival in which

---

[394] For this element of the carnivalesque, see P. Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1978), p. 123.

[395] *The Whiggs Lamentation, For the Death of their Dear Brother Colledge* (London, 1681)

[396] BM Sat 1084; BM Sat 1085.

[397] North, *Examen*, pp. 570-80.

[398] E. Settle, *London's drollery: or, The love and Kindness between Pope and the Devil* (London, 1680).

[399] North, *Examen*, p. 578.

[400] *Mercurius Anglicus*, 13/11/1679, no. 1.

the barriers between actor and spectator was porous and concepts of space were ruptured, with revelry often spilling over into nearby houses.[401] In 1679 "houses seemed converted into heaps of men, women and children" by "innumerable swarms....never were the Balconies, windows and Houses more filled, nor the streets more thronged with multitudes of people."[402] The populace was intimately involved in this protest of purgative shame – it did not happen *to* them. Whilst the Whigs were certainly its protagonists this propaganda was not top-down or uni-directional.[403] Stephen College, the carpenter who made the Popes, and Elkannah Settle, who designed many of the pageants, were not members of the organizing committee, nor were the men who commissioned the engravings.[404] Most importantly, as Tim Harris has shown, Londoners were not easily manipulated to support things to which they did not consent.[405]

Indeed, the Whigs harnessed an activity endemic in celebrations of November 5th and 17th during the 1670s. Countless episodes demonstrate Anti-Catholicism's indebtedness to the culture of retributive shaming. Smaller-scale burnings occurred throughout London and apprentices armed with effigies frequently stopped carriages and called at the homes of wealthier citizens demanding contributions to the festivities.[406] Similarly, on 5th November 1679 a porter dressed in Catholic paraphernalia seized by William Waller was paraded around part of the city in a cart.[407] A burgeoning tradition had begun – records of modest Pope burning processions survive for almost every year from 1673.[408] That year an event which clearly influenced 'The Solemn Mock Procession' occurred in the Poultry. One witness gleefully recounted its carnivalesque cruelty:

---

[401] For comparisons see Burke, *Popular Culture*, p. 182.

[402] *An Account*, p. 4.

[403] Members of the Whigs' Green Ribbon Club contributed 10l per head to fund the display – North, *Examen*, p. 578.

[404] *Whiggs Lamentation.*

[405] Harris, *London Crowds*, passim.

[406] *Domestick Intelligence, or news both from City and Country*, no. 36, 7/11/1679: "in several places of London there were divers Images or Figures of the Pope, and the Devil whispering his Intreaties in his ear, carried about the Houses of several Eminent Persons, who were pleased to grafitfy the young men conceiving them, for their Zeal and forwardness in appearing against the Cursed Popish Intent." These were later burnt.

[407] Ibid; see also no. 41 23/11/1679.

[408] Evelyn, *Diary*, 5/11/1673, p. 26; Hooke, *Diary, 1672-80*, p. 191; *The Burning of the whore of Babylon*(1673); *The Pope burnt to ashes, or, Defiance of Rome* (1676).

"The coronation of Queene Elizabeth was solemnized in the city with many bonfires and burning of a most costly Pope, carried by four persons in devils habit, and the effigy of two devils whispered in his ears, his belly filled with live cats who squealed most hideously as they felt the fire; the common saying all…it was the laughter of Pope and devil in dialogue between them."[409]

This feline pontiff perished amidst the jeers and swigs of some thousand spectators, who polished off forty-two gallons of claret. 'The Solemn Mock Procession' was no top-down imposition upon London's citizens, but rather extended a tradition burgeoning amongst the populace. Barriers between 'elite' and 'popular' forms collapsed as they had in other appropriations of popular shame culture by educated audiences as a form of political satire. Samuel Butler's *Hubidras* (1664) detailed a *charivari*;[410] and in 1667 Andrew Marvel similarly employed a Skimmington Ride in satirizing Royal pursuit of a second Dutch War.[411]

    It was remarkably easy for seventeenth-century agitators to mobilize Anti-Catholic feeling towards a given target.[412] In this event, that target was Exclusion; and the hostility was channeled effectively through a rite resplendent with symbolism indebted to *charivari*, and a wider shame culture to make it more potent. On these nights, the French Ambassador's house was heavily guarded, Catholic homes were attacked, and those foolish enough not to make a contribution to apprentices effigy-makers had their windows smashed as punishment.[413] Londoners needed little encouragement to partake in the destructive fury of the procession. In the wake of James' marriage to the Duchess of Modena, one commentator noted the embittered tension amongst Londoners awaiting her arrival:

---

[409] E. M. Thompson (ed.), *Correspondence of the Family Hatton, 1601-1704* (London, 1878), p. 157.
[410] Interestingly, Hubidras interprets the Skimmington ride as popish: "What means, quoth he, this Devil's Procession/ With Men of Orthodox Profession,/'Tis Ethnic and idolatrous/ From heathenism derived to us./ Does not the Whore of Babylon ride/ Upon her horned beast astride/Like this proud dame, who either is/ A type of her, or she is his/ Are things of Superstitious Function, /Fit to be us'd in Gospel Sun-Shine:/It is an Antichirstian Opera,/Much us'd in Midnight times of Popery/ Of running after self inventions/ Of wicked and profance intentions;/ To scandalize a sex for scolding/ To whom the Saints are so beholding" (lines 759-70.) S. Butler, *Hudibras*, (London, 1810), p. 284. The link between popery and whoredom discussed below (pp….) is clearly implicit in Butler's thought here.
[411] A. Marvel, "The Last Instructions to a Painter" in *A. Marvell: The Complete Poems*, ed. E. Story Donno (Hammondsworth, 1978).
[412] Lake, "Anti-Popery", pp. 93-96; A. Walsham, "'The Fatall Vesper': Providentialism & Anti-Popery in late Jacobean London", *Past & Present*, 144 (1994), pp. 36-87.
[413] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, p. 182; HMC 7th Report, Appendix, p. 472; CSPD 1679-80, p. 177; HMC Ormonde, IV, p. 514.

"Great preparations...they are making to receive the Duchess, who, should she come tonight [November 5th] that madness hath a license, she would certainly bee martyred, because the people here...believe she is the Pope's eldest daughter."[414]

Similarly, a celebratory account of the 1681 burning advised the Pope, with considerable bravado, to stay firmly put at Rome: "lest if he fall into the hands of those that burn him in Effigy, they serve him to the same fate, and it turns into a real Tragedy!"[415] Such exclamations were not flippant. Although admittedly a hostile commentator, North noted that there was something riotous about this laughter: "so minatory were the Agitators. But the English are, in that, singular from all other Nations...where men seldom tumultuate without Blood."[416] This protest was not just distasteful but disturbing. The glee which accompanied the torching of these effigies hinted that they provided a substitute to satiate partially a murderous retributive desire. As Martin Luther had noted upon witnessing image-breakers in 1525, iconoclasm contained a darkly malevolent potential:

> "No on who sees the iconoclasts raging thus against wood and stone should doubt that there is a spirit in them which is death dealing, not life giving, and which at the first opportunity will also kill men."[417]

Luther's discomfort at seeing representations brutally destroyed with such elation was echoed by witnesses of the Pope Burnings. As we have seen with other Anti-Catholic representations in graphic satire, these were not gratuitous acts of rage but had a judicial purpose, aping punitive acts of shame. Protestants visited upon the image the punishment held to be deserved by the depicted.[418] The barrier between signifier and signified consequently became porous and the presence of the subject was enacted through performance, *vero imago*. Accounts frequently forgot the conceit and referred to effigy as person, recalling how the Pope begged for mercy before the flames,

---

[414] W. D. Christie (Ed.), *Letters Addressed from London to Sir John Williams* 2 vols (Camden Society, 1874), ii, p. 63. Letter from Thomas Becham dated 5/11/1673.
[415] Goble, *The Procession*, p. 4.
[416] North, *Examen*, p. 571.
[417] Quoted in Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, p. 6.
[418] For an example of this spirit in the Reformation from the earliest stages see Scribner "Reformation & Ritual", pp. 104-15.

offering pardons to all involved: "His Holiness after some complaints and Reluctancees was decently tumbled into the flames."[419]

There was something mimetic about this iconoclasm then, a sense that the burnings made effectual what they symbolized. The performance thus provided a vent for communal anxiety. It: "justly satisfied the Fury of the People, who had destroyed the principle of mankind", enacting death by ridicule.[420] That an *effigy* had this effect upon Protestants is deeply ironic. The iconoclastic urge in Protestantism arose from an entrenched suspicion of animate realism in statues, a potential tangibly to effect human presence which was believed to have caused effigies to attract idolatrous veneration. This potential was now inverted to make effigies the perfect magnet for hatred, an ideal vehicle to fulfill Protestant desires of shaming the Pope.[421] As Margaret Aston noted: "The human statue, probably more than any other art-form....pleases and perplexes us with the potential and limitation of representation. We allow it a life of its own whilst we perceive it is only an imitation."[422] Statues in the late-medieval Church displayed a heightened realism. As an Elizabethan Homily warned: "men are not so ready to worship a picture on a wall, or in a window, as an embossed and guilded image, set with pearl and stone."[423] They were adorned, and the sparkle of light as it grazed the gold and silver with which they were decorated not only hinted at the possibilities of animation, but covered them with an air of transcendence. Statues aped the human by inviting viewers to meet their gaze and were consequently dressed, carried in procession and awarded roles in drama.[424] It is hardly surprising that so many accounts survive of communities becoming so emotionally invested in statues as to almost accord them life.[425] As countless

---

[419] *An Account*, p. 6.

[420] *Domestick Intelligence, or News Both from City and Country*, no. 39, 18/11/1679.

[421] Aston, *England's Iconoclast's*, pp. 401-08

[422] Ibid, p. 401. See also, M. Baxandall, *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany* (London/New Haven, 1980), pp. 18, 42, 48, 70, 92, 166-70, 186-89; E. H. Gombrich, *Symbolic Images: studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (Oxford, 1978), p. 176; *Certain sermons or homilies, appointed to be read in churches, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory*, (London, 1864) pp. 234-35: gold and precious stones made images life-like, "fingers shine with rings" and bodies were "stiff with gold."

[423] *The Two Books of Homilies appointed to be read in the Churches* (Oxford, 1859), p. 178.

[424] N. C. Brooks, *The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy ivith Special Refer- ence to the Liturgie Drama*, (Illinois, 1921) pp. 38-9; W. L. Hildburgh, "English Alabaster Carvings", *Archaeologia*, 93 (1949), pp, 60-64; I. H. Forsyth, *The Throne of Wisdom : wood sculptures of the madonna in Romanesque France* (Princeton, 1972), pp. 5, 7, 31 40-45, 48-60; Ibid, "Magi and Majesty", *Art Bulletin*, 50 (1968), pp. 215-22; V. A. Kolve, *The Play called Corpus Christi* (London, 1966), pp. 7-12.

[425] As one reformer noted, images were valued so highly by parishioners because they permitted people to "have a God they might sensually see with their bodily and carnal eyes", Philip Nichols quoted in, R. Whiting, *The Blind Devotion of the People*, (Cambridge, 1989), p.55. See also, E. Rhys, (ed.), *Sermons*

Protestant texts warned, the greater the realism, the greater the object's potential to elicit idolatry: "the livelier the counterfeit is, the greater error is engenedered."[426]

Precisely the same strategies were employed in creating the Pope. Efforts were taken to ensure the effigy looked as animate as possible, some forty-five shillings alone was spent on a carefully crafted wax face to confer it a tactile sensibility.[427] This certainly closed the distance between *image* and the *Pope* represented, imitating the effect of his presence. Accounts imagined the effigy as an "infallible old gentleman" or "His Holiness" who upon inspection of the bonfire "ready to entertain him" "did several times start and much implore his Associate Devil to preserve him" and made "a thousand wary faces at the sight of the pillory."[428]Art here facilitated the willingness to imagine the polemic taking effect, making effigies effective substitutes for the Pope by collapsing the distance between signifier and signified and engaging Protestant spectators in he punitvee desire behind their polemic. Similarly, the bewitching beauty of the Pope's "pontificalibus", the guilded tiara set with precious stones and scarlet robes laced with ermine were closely aped. For Protestants, Antichrist radiated a dazzling beauty which seduced and bewildered men to worship it. The passage of a Pope's procession was said to be over-powering, "the very blast of his Body but passing by, Blew off all their Hats and bore so hard upon them, as to blow them over", forcing crowds to devotion.[429] Heightened regality and beautiful transcendence triggered idolatrous worship. But here the effect was a catalyst to desecration not veneration. Strategies of adornment were co-opted and inverted; alluring practices of representation which turned statues into idols now forged an effigy which channeled their hatred behind a political lobby. In this, it presented a magnetic target - often literally. In 1677 a Pope was suspended above a bonfire from chains dangling across the streets and pelted with a barrage of pistol fire, dirt and

---

By Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worchester (London, 1906), p. 33, "dead images (which at first, as I think, were set up only to represent things absent) were treated as real." Cf. *Homilies*, p. 175; Collinson, *The Birthpangs of English Protestantism*, pp. 50-51.

[426] R. Gibbings (Ed.), *An answer to John Martiall's treatise of the cross, by James Calfhill* (Parker Society 28, Cambridge, 1848), p. 187; *Homilies*, pp. 234-38; Aston, *England's Iconoclast's*, p. 408

[427] *The True Domestick Intelligence, or News both from City and Country*, no. 39, 18/11/1679; H.M.C, *Seventh Report*, p. 477 (John Verney to Sir Ralph Verney); Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 104

[428] *The Pope burnt to ashes*, p. 4; Goble, *The Procession*, p. 2; *An Account*, p. 6; *The Burning of The Whore of Babylon*, passim; *Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome*, no. 18, 7/11/1679, which imagined the Pope barbequed. See also *The Impartial Protestant Mecury*, 15-18 November 1681, which claimed that during the Procession of that year the Pope stopped at Newgate to bless the papists imprisoned there. We must imagine that the Pope was quite animate in these processions, frequently having dialogue with the crowd. See also BM Sat 1091; BM Sat 1068; BM Sat 1079.

[429] C. Ness, *The Devils patriarck, or, A full an impartial account of the notorious life of this present Pope of Rome Innocent 11ᵗʰ* (London, 1683), p. 16.

excrement until the flames "spoiled their sport, by burning the mark."[430] There was much of Luther's 'Death Dealing Spirit' here, and several commentators found the effigies' potential to enact presence through imitation disturbing, even monstrous. In 1682 – despite the Procession being banned - effigies were still in preparation. Discovered by magistrates in Bishopgate at 3am, these half-formed representations were quickly shamed in the streets, causing one witness to baulk at the grotesqueness of their artifice:

> "Woeful was the case; for these mangled Beginnings of human Representations, being hauled forth unto the street, made no small sport amongst the very same Rable, as were to have been diverted with them living in more Perfection."[431]

Our witnesses' discomfort increased in seeing these effigies kicked in the mud until "legs and Arms lay scattered about, Heads undressed, and Bodys unheaded" was rooted in his equation of these mannequins with the humans which they were meant to represent.[432] Pre-Reformation strategies of representation had closed the distance between signifier and signified, but for negative rather than positive ends. Through a mimetic substitution, the effigy of the Pope enacted his presence, and it is small wonder that one Tory opponent saw something of the "Black Art" in the spectacle.[433]

There was much common to *charivari* here. Victims were frequently carried in effigy and pelted with filth, and lobbies against local authorities were structured around their mock execution.[434] Indeed, *charivari* was often used as a form of political protest in early modern England - as with practices and graphic satire, to shame his image was to shame the man.[435] But 'The Solemn Mock Procession' was more than a crude protest. Its ridicule had a deeper, intensely punitive, function. As Christopher Ness noted of his own satire on Innocent XI, shaming punished the Pope for planning the Popish Plot. Polemic ensured that not only those under inspection in England were reprimanded: "my Design here is to set the saddle upon the Right

---

[430] *Burning of the Whore of Babylon*, p. 3.
[431] North, *Examen*, p. 580.
[432] Ibid.
[433] *Observator in Dialogure*, no. 74, 23/11/1680; ibid, no. 110, 11/3/1681.
[434] Ingram, "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture'", pp. 86-87.
[435] As Henry Peacham noted: "jokes and scoffs do lesson majesty and greatness and should be far from great personage." Quoted in Thomas, "Place of Laughter", p. 79.

170

Horse. Tis a Thousand pities, that the *petty larceners* should be *Hanged* and *Beheaded* and the grand Thief (that set them all to work) escape scot-free."[436] The processions had the same function, for laughter was devastating: "Erasmus's satirical Drollery prevailed against the Pope, as well as Luthers Argumentative Gravitas."[437]Once again, to ridicule the enemy was ultimately to control it, easing anxiety through diminution. Polemic surrounding the event was remarkably self-congratulatory, fantasizing that shame inflicted upon the effigy had struck home. Before the event reports claimed that the Pope planned to stop the occasion;[438] and after that the boy who played the devil had been kidnapped, sent to France and "barbarously murdered" for castigating the Pope's honour.[439] *Mercurious Infernus, or, News from the Other World* envisaged Sixtus V in hell petulantly complaining to Satan: "in Behalf of himself and his Brethern, of the rudeness of the people for Burning the Pope in Effigy every fifth of November: Adding withal, the great contumely and scandal which they threw upon him" rendering his person "more ridiculous" "as if he were no more than one of the pitiful monkey- Devils of Bartholomew Fair." Unsympathetic, Satan was more concerned that the arsonists associated him with one so evil as the Pope.[440] Equally, *News from Rome* fantasized of the Pope lamenting his vanquishing by ridicule:

> "Behold, an un-happy Providence dampen the progress and Alarm taken through the City, as fast as our Train of wildfire in Sixty-Six...the Pulpit Rings, and the Press Groans, with Invective against our Doctrine; All our Follies are unraveled, and our sacred person exposed to contempt, and Burnt by the Heretikes in Effigy."[441]

---

[436] Ness claimed he had done this during a meeting of the *Congregation Propaganda de Fide* in December 1677. Ness, *Devil's Patriarch*, p. 107.

[437] Ibid, p. 134. The same quotation was employed in *The Solemn Mock-Procession: or The Tryal and Execution of the Pope and his Ministers* (London, 1680), p. 2.

[438] Goble, *Procession*, p. 4.

[439] *Domestick Intelligence, or News Both from City and Country*, no. 119.

[440] *Mercurius Infernus, or News from the Other World*, no. 2, 11/3/1680. For a similar example, see *The Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome: or the History of Popery, with the Popish Courant*, no. 118, 7/11/1679. A Papal envoy lamented that: "His Holiness smells somewhat strong, and endeavoured to have quenched the *Purgatory flames* prepared for him, by pissing *Holy Water*; but it must be acknowledged, *our cause stink much more abominably*; and if all his processed, or more dangerous SECRET votaries, had been hang'd like *Sawsedges* about him, and roasted with their *Ghostly Father* 'tis here universally believed, there had not been an honest man the less in these Three Nations."

[441] *News from Rome being a dialogue between the Pope and the Devil at a late conference* (London, 1677), p. 5.

"Contempt", "Scandal", "Ridicule": as with the humiliated victims of *charivari*, the polemists fantasized that the annihilative impact of their shame had found its mark – a moral transgressor who threatened the bonds of society had been punished.

But if the urge here was to ease anxiety by controlling a threat, ridicule also sought to win a political contest by tarnishing the positions of those who favoured the Succession. During 1680 and 1681 the iconography became increasingly topical as the farcical 'Popish Plot' unravelled. Alongside the Roman hierarchy the processions of these years turned to an elaborate shaming of those who opposed the Exclusion Bill.[442] They were depicted as "Protestants in Masquerade", subversive Papal supporters and moral transgressors endangering the realm by opening the door to Catholic Succession. Particularly culpable was Roger L'Estrange, chief protagonist of the anti-Exclusion cause whose *Observator* had continually cast doubt upon the credibility of Oates and the 'Popish Plot.'[443] L'Estrange was lampooned as a crypto-papist, a supporter of the plot whose doubts betrayed his harbouring desire for its success. One Whig newsletter depicted him lamenting the burning, "'Tis a scandalous business: His Holiness as a Temporal Prince...ought to be treated with more respect", and representations of him as the Pope's lapdog "Towzer" was a frequent motif of graphic satire.[444] Thus in the 1680 procession he was "Towzer, old Noll's Fiddler", a reference to his entertaining the arch-traitor Oliver Cromwell with a viola in 1655 - a rather embarrassing skeleton during the Restoration.[445] In 1681 he was the Pope's lapdog, "a fine, fawning spaniel, called Towzer, with an Observator in his mouth" "to defend him from all that do but open against the Trayterous Faction" - the joke, was that a spaniel, like the *Observator*, was a decidedly useless protector.[446] Defamatory

---

[442] See BM Sat 1085; BM Sat 1086; B. W, *An additional discovery of Mr. Roger L'Estrange his further discovery of the Popish plot* (London, 1680); Luttrell, *A Brief Historical Relation*, p. 144; *Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome* no. 76, 18/11/1681.

[443] On L'Estrange see, P. Hinds, *The horrid Popish plot*, passim; ibid, "'A Vast Ill Nature': Roger L'Estrange, Reputation, and the Credibility of Political Discourse in the Late Seventeenth Century", *The Seventeenth Century*, XXI, (2006), pp. 335-363; ibid, "'Tales and Romantick Stories': 'Impostures', Trustworthiness, and the Credibility of Information in the Late Seventeenth Century", in B. Lynch and A. Dunan-Page (eds.), *Sir Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture*, (Ashgate, 2008), pp. 89-108. For satires against L'Estrange see BM Sat 1110; BM Sat 1083; BM Sat 1096. For L'Estrange lampooning of the plot see R. L'Estrange, *History of the Plot, or, A brief and historical account of the charge and defence of Edward Coleman, Esq., William Ireland, Thomas Pickering, John Grove : Robert Greene, Henry Berry* (London, 1679), passim; ibid, *A further discovery of the plot dedicated to Dr. Titus Oates* (London, 1680); ibid, *Discovery upon discovery in defence of Doctor Oates against B.W.'s libellous vindication of him, in his additional discovery, and in justification of L'Estrange against the same libel* (London, 1680).

[444] *Pacquet of Advice from Rome*, no. 3, 18/11/1681.

[445] BM Sat 1085.

[446] *The Observator, in Dialogue*, no. 74, 23/11/1681.

iconoclasm was thus employed in the service of a current political tumult - the point of shaming the opponents of Exclusion in this way dented their credibility, and that of their publications, in the eyes of tens of thousand of spectators. Thus in that year various Anti-Exclusion writings were pinned on and about the Pope, a trait borrowed from the pinning of libellous verses on effigies during *charivari*.[447]

Lewd pictures similarly detailed the crimes of those subjected to this *charivari*. The 1679 procession at Lewes in Essex featured painted banners depicting Rome's sins. Indebted to over a century of graphic satire, depictions of two devils crowning the Pope and a friar "wantonly dallying with a Nun" not only provoked laughter but detailed what the Pope was being burned *for*.[448] The Skimmington Ride was similarly co-opted. A quasi-legal punishment of moral transgressors common in enforcing cultural norms, riding victims backwards on an ass was adopted in the 1680 procession to shame those "Abhorers of Petitions and Parliament" who opposed Exclusion.[449] Ridicule made a political point. Unlike *charivari* performed in villages the punishment here was not leveled at an *individual* but a political stance, a symbolic purgation tagging those loyal to James as equally malevolent plotters, another batch of 'papists' to be punished. *Charivari* was a fecund practice, not a set-piece performance, a bricolage of symbols powerful precisely because of their maleability, taking connotations of shame into ever new contexts to punish transgressors social, religious and political.[450] 1679 to 1681 marked the apex of its adaptability. A popular form was harnessed to enhance political lobbying, the rites of shame employed as a protest against the blocking of Exclusion. Yet the processions were not simply a political demonstration of the will to eradicate popery from England. The cacophony of laughter which their shaming of Rome elicited served both to release tension and ferment pressure: easing anxieties aroused by the spectre of a Popish Successor; and, by steering popular Anti-Catholic feeling, pressing the Government to enact legislation for Exclusion. Shaming those who resisted that legislation was a political *coup d'etat*, an appropriation of the moral high-ground by punishing those who

---

[447] Ibid; BM Sat 1085; BM Sat 1086.

[448] The full quotation: "wantonly dallying with a Nun, the devil looking from behind a curtain and saying. It will not spoil my dear children". *Domestick Intelligence, or News Both from City and Country*, no. 39 18/11/1679.

[449] Ingram, "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture'", *passim*; BM Sat 1085.

[450] Ingram, "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture'", pp. 81-82; Fox, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule", pp. 62-63.

rejected the safeguarding of the realm and its Protestant religion. Political stance, as well as illicit behaviour, could be morally transgressive.

Satire acted as salve. This protest was so effective because of its indebtness to tropes of shaming employed to ease anxieties and tensions – it spoke to practices which people used to maintain order and control their communities. It performed a similar social function to the humiliation of cuckolded husbands and shrewish women employed routinely in village life. Ridicule had a conservative function, buttressing communal conventions centered upon patriarchal marriage - humiliating transgressors of the 'natural' order served to reinforce it. Derisive laughter reacted against a kink in the ideal, a result of tensions produced by a piece of the jigsaw which sat unevenly in the perfect picture of things – the presence of insubordinate female behaviour in a society nominally dominated by men. *Charivari* attempted to control that anomaly by punishing offenders and dissuading others from following suit.[451] But laughter - scolding laughter - was also a means of re-applying the glue to the social fabric – the community shamed transgressors to re-effect the 'natural order' that had been broken. A parallel function was performed by shaming the Pope, the product of another creased ideal. The processions were a re-affirmation of the Protestant society in the face of a perceived popish threat from within, the existence, however small in number, of Roman Catholicism in the Protestant nation. Thus triumphalist ridicule not only ameliorated social bonds by serving as a stop-tap on the tensions which had brewed since James's conversion but channelled those anxieties behind legislation which resolve them: Exclusion. They were thus a symbolic means of protest by which crowds of Londoners sought to vent their frustration and protect their vision of the realm in which they wanted to live.[452]

There is an obvious objection to equating the functions of *charivari* and 'Solemn Mock Procession.' *Charivari* mostly shamed sexual offenders – adulterers, cuckolds, dominated husbands – and we might question how natural the equation of such transgression with popery is.[453] Despite clear crossovers between rites and iconography, it could be argued that any suggestion that spectators would have understood the processions to perform an equivalent *social function* to the *charivari* is forced. However, the connectedness of Catholicism and fornication was well

---

[451] Ibid, pp. 96-98.
[452] Ibid, pp. 96-98; Thomas "Place of Laughter", pp. 77-79.
[453] Ibid, *passim*. Davis, "Women on Top", passim.

174

entrenched in a century-and-a-half of Protestant thought. The relationship was qualitative. Rome's idolatrous worship of saints and images, its illicit reverence of the bread of the Mass and turning to the Pope rather than the Word for a route to heaven, betrayed the spouse of the Church – Christ. Idolatry was understood as 'spiritual whoredom', what Calvin termed: "That vilest species of adultery, the worship of images."[454] Withdrawing minds from the true worship of God, to venerate idols was to commit spiritual fornication with the Whore of Babylon, to drink from her cup of abominations (Mass) as Revelations 17 had prophesized of the False Church.[455] As the bride of Christ, the Church was a wife as entitled to retribution on whores and adulterers as any other in early modern England.

That the relationship passed beyond analogy to something more intrinsic was demonstrated in the ubiquitous depictions of those temples of idolatry, the monasteries, as houses of fornication, a charge which re-occurred indefinitely in Protestant polemic. Indeed, the association was biblical. Both adultery and idolatry contravened the Ten Commandments, breaking man's covenant with God.[456]. Consequently, the Reformations in Britain had ushered in calls amongst precision Protestants for both crimes – alongside another breaking of the commandments, murder – to be punishable by death as scripture commanded.[457] We return here to iconoclasm's 'Death Dealing Spirit' as men like Hugh Latimer and John Knox lobbied for the death penalty, cries eventually fulfilled (for adultery at least) in laws enacted by the Rump Parliament.[458] In 'The Solemn Mock Procession' the intertwined

---

[454] J. Calvin, *Theological Treatises*, J. K. S. Reid (ed.) (London, 1954), p. 255. For a similar example, see pp. 31-32. See also J. Knewstubs, *Lectures of John Knewstub, vpon the twentith chapter of Exodus, and certeine other places of Scripture Seene and allowed according to the Queenes maiesties iniunctions* (London, 1577), p. 34.

[455] Revelations 17: 4. See also Ezekiel 16:17: "Thou hast also taken thy fair jewels of myself and of my silver, which I gave thee, and madst thyself images of men, and didst commit whoredom with them."

[456] Exodus 20. Verses 3-4 (for idolatry) and verse 14 (for adultery). For the breaking of the covenant and punishment by death, see Aston, *England's Iconoclast's*, pp. 468-70.

[457] Aston, *England's Iconoclast's*, pp. 466-97 gives examples from both sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I am indebted to this work for references.

[458] G. Joye, *A contrarye consultacion* (London, 1549), sigs. Cvii, Dii; H. Latimer, *Sermons of Hugh Latimer, sometime Bishop of Worcester, Marytr, 1555*, George Elwes Corrie (ed), (Parker Society: 22, Cambridge, 1844), p. 244. Cf. the treatment of Deuteronomy 17:2 Deut 13 and Deut 16 in the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible fos. 86, 87, 88; in 1581 Thomas Lupton made similar claims, see E. Rose "Too Good To Be True" in J. Guth & J. W. Mckenna, *Tudor rule and revolution : essays for G. R. Elton from his American friends* (Cambridge, 1982); T. Cartwright, *Second Replie against Whitgifte*, (London, 1575) p. cxv; L. Andrews, *Works*, J. Bliss & J. P. Wilson (eds), 11 vols (Oxford, 1851), vi, pp. 233-5, 243-6; W. Prynne, *Histrio-mastix The players scourge, or, actors tragœdie, divided into two parts,* (London, 1633), pp. 382-83; C. H. Firth & R. S. Rait (eds.), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum,* 3 vols, (London, 1911) ii, 387-9. Philip Stubbes called for death by stoning for swearers, P. Stubbes, *Anatomy of Abuses* (London, 1583), fo. 82. Executions for blasphemy occurred in Scotland

relationship of these crimes was expressed in the Pope's execution for all three – the canopy covering the great idolater during the 1681 procession emblazoned the list of his transgressions in red letters: "Murder, Treason, Massacre, Assassination, *Adultery.*"[459]

The processions, then, were a *charivari* performed to shame spiritual whoredom. The association was developed in their iconography, chronically understudied by previous scholars. The Pope was depicted as the Scarlet Whore, an association well understood by contemporaries, as was demonstrated by an account of a 1673 procession *The Burning of the Whore of Babylon.*[460] Effigies were modeled after Antichristian descriptions in Revelations 17, styled in a feminine manner with "Artificial locks, finely coloured and powdered, with a Tower of Frieze on his Forehead (the very Dress of the Mystical Whore)" and dressed in scarlet robes and a richly bejeweled tiara to echo the Whore "arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stone and pearls."[461] Moreover, the depiction of Kings kissing the Pope's feat was an emblem of the Whore of Babylon ubiquitous in both text and image for a century and a half.[462] Clearly a swipe at James, this portrayal invoked Revelation's prophecy that Antichrist would delude the Kings of the Earth who would worship her as a God. Drinking from her "cup...full of abomination and [the] filthiness of her fornication", they would commit spiritual adultery with her, permitting Antichrist to rule the globe.[463] The very source of popery's power was fornication, and 'The Solemn Mock Procession's' *charivari* was thus a fitting means of shaming it.

Indeed, alongside plots and idolatry, whoredom loomed large in the Papal parade of crimes. The 1680 procession featured a pageant after the Pope depicting a seated noblewoman and four nuns labeled "courtesans in ordinary".[464] This displayed: "Donna Olympia, and poor deluded Nuns, as Whores by Dispensation or Necessity,

---

in 1656 and 1696, see C. Larner, *Witchcraft and Religion* (New York, 1984), pp. 115-16; J. Knox, *Works*, D. Laing (ed.), 6 vols (Edinburgh, 1846-64), iv. 224: "The word of God which pronounceth death perpetual to idolaters is irrevocalble, and cannot be false", see also iv, pp. 506-07, 515. For other references on calls for death for idolaters in the Scottish Reformation, see Aston, *England's Iconoclasts,* pp. 469- 71. n. 47. Ignatius Jordan of Exeter (1561-1640) pushed to have the death penalty enacted, W. T. MacCaffrey, *Exeter 1540-1640,* (Cambridge, 1975), pp. 199, 223, 234, 272.

[459] BM Sat 1085; BM Sat 1086.

[460] *The Burning of the Whore of Babylon.*

[461] Rev 17: 4. For recognition of such tropes, see E. Settle, *London's drollery: or, The love and Kindness between Pope and the Devil* (London, 1680)

[462] See below Chapter Five pp. 342-45.

[463] Rev 17: 2-4.

[464] BM Sat 1086.

following the Popes Camp."[465] Whoredom was a particularly juicy polemical charge levelled at a clergy for whom celibacy marked the role of mediation with the divine. But this depiction also had a specific point of reference critical to understanding how contemporary spectators read the procession, for the Pope was depicted here as a dominated husband. 'Donna Olympia' was Olympia Maidalchini, sister-in-law to Pope Innocent X (1644-55) who possessed infamous repute for her domineering hold over him.[466] Nepotism was accepted as a facet essential to the running of the Papal Court. Not only was it a duty of honour for a newly elected pontiff to share the benefits of his promotion with his kin, it made good sense in a world in which politics was deeply personal to surround oneself with staff who could (hopefully) be depended upon. That a 'Cardinal Nephew' would run affairs of state was standard practice and a profitable one unless, as was the case for Innocent X, these nephews proved inept.[467] Olympia filled the power-vacuum. This made her not only a figure of hostility but a scapegoat upon which successive blunders of the pontificate were hung. Her dominance was infamous. A slew of *pasquinades* in Italy and polemic in France — shunned by Innocent's Papacy in favour of Spain — suggested that this stemmed from her position as his concubine, the "Pope's Whore" as the procession labeled her.[468] This 'relationship' was satirized most cuttingly in Gregori Leti's *Vita de Don Olimpia Maidachini* of 1666, translated into English a year later and re-printed, crucially, in 1678.[469] Indeed, one English polemicist noted wryly that upon Innocent's ascension the rite of the porphyry chair — a mythical close-stool upon which every Pope had his genitals checked in order to avoid a repetition of the unfortunate case of Pope Joan — could be eschewed for Olympia "hath had Express knowledge of his manhood and Gallantry."[470]

But in truth, satirical accounts of whoredom were symptomatic of deeper concerns about their relationship which went to the heart of ideal relations between

---

[465] BM Sat 1086.

[466] P. Levillain (ed.), *The Papacy: an encyclopaedia*, 3 vols (New York, 1994), ii, pp. 381-83; O. Chadwick, *The Popes and the European Revolution* (Oxford, 1981), pp. 301-03; A. D. Wright, *The Early Modern Papacy: from the Council of Trent to the French Revolution, 1564-1789* (Harlow, 2000), p. 41.

[467] Chadwick, *The Popes*, pp. 301-03.

[468] BM Sat 1086.

[469] G. Leti, *The life of Donna Olimpia Maldachini : who governed the church during the time of Innocent the X, which was from the year 1644 to the year 1655* (London, 1666); The original Italian was first published, supposedly at Geneva, with imprint: Cosmopoll, Appresso Eugenio Migani, 1666. For subsequent English editions, see Wing L1332-34.

[470] Ness, *Devil's Patriarch*, p. 57.

the genders – the relationship of power. The scandal here was not that a woman had *accessed* the Papal Court – for that was commonplace – but rather, that she *controlled* it. Not only did Olympia police access to the Pope and the strings of his patronage, Innocent would not act without her advice.[471] This was the world turned upside down, the classic case of a man dominated by a woman, and one hammered-home in verse explanations of Olympia's role in the procession:

> "For ten years I was holy Father Miss
>
> He was the Church head, & I was his
>
> I was a cursed strapping Female Princess
>
> By mee ye Catholic world was rul'd, & since
>
> Access to Chair has been to the Pox
>
> For the Most part by Peticoats & Smocks."[472]

Fornication; a scolding, domineering woman; an emasculated man – this was classic *charivari*. Indeed, it was a commonplace of *charivari* for villagers to act out a performance through effigy the crime or transgression of which the victim was guilty. The procession did just that, vaunting Olympia over the 'Supreme Vicar', taking pride of place at the head of the procession.[473]

That the processions were understood as *charivari*, employing laughter to punish a fornicator, re-assert social bonds and unite anxieties behind a protest, is ultimately demonstrated by John Dryden's parody of their punitive pretensions:

> "As long e're their Subjects please
>
> And that would be till next Queen Besses night:
>
> What the game penny Chroniclers erudite
>
> Sir Edmund-Berry, first, a woefull wise
>
> Leads up the Show, and milks their mauden eyes
>
> There's not a Butcher's wife but Dribs her part,
>
> And pities the poor pageant form her heart;
>
> Who, to provoke revenge, rides round the fire,

---

[471] Wright, *Early Modern Papacy*, p. 41.
[472] BM Sat 1086.
[473] BM Sat 1084.

And, with civil congee, doth retire

But guiltless blood to ground must never fall:

There's Antichrist behind, to pray for all

The Pink of Babylon in Pride appears

A lewd old Gentlemen of Seventy Years

Whose age in vain and mercy would implore;

For few take pity on an old cast Whore.

The Devil, who brought him *to the shame*, takes part;

Setting cheek by jowl, in blackening to cheer his heart:

Like Theef and Parson in a Tyburn Cart

The word is giv'n, and with sound Huzzar

The mitr'd moppet from his Chair being drawne

On the slain corpse contumely Nations fall

Alas, what's one poor Pope amongst 'em all

He burning, now all true hearts your Triumph ring

And next (for fashion) cry, God save the king."[474]

In Dryden's pastiche the correlation with *charivari* was clear - a fornicator was punished by shame amidst a carnivalesque scene of triumph which united elite and "butcher's wife" alike in the face of a threat to the social fabric. This unity was achieved through the annihilative effects of derisive laughter, a laughter edifying the joker and crushing the butt, reducing "Antichrist" to naught but a "mitred moppet."

The processions ultimately failed in their purpose. Not only in achieving legal status for successive Bills of Exclusion, but in solidifying the 'Nation' behind them.[475] Attempts to re-assert the values of the 'community' failed precisely because that community was divided over what those values were.[476] There was a fundamental

---

[474] He described the procession in a prologue to Southern's play *The Loyal Brother* (1682): J. Dryden, *A prologue written by Mr. Dryden, to a new play, call'd, The loyal brother (London, 1682), broadside*; T. Southerne, *The loyal brother, or, The Persian prince a tragedy, as it is acted at the Theatre Royal by Their Majesties servants* (London, 1682).

[475] For this criticism see North, *Examen*, p. 577.

[476] See the words of Oliver Heywood: "spectacles, shows, bonfires, squibs in London and other places that are very expensive and not very useful; that papists deride and serious Protestants lament, especially at what sin is there committed; it bodes no good, especially by what preceded the French massacre." O. Turner, *The Rev. Oliver Heywood, B.A., 1630-1702: his autobiography,diaries, anecdote and event books, illustrating the general and family history of Yorkshire and Lancashire.* (ed.) J. Horsfall Turner, 4 vols, (Brighouse, 1882-85), ii, p. 218. Cf. Sir. G. Talbot: "on the 5th of November the Pope was with great solemnity burnt in several places in London (a barbarism which I thought noe

179

disagreement over what posed the biggest threat to England – 'Popery' or tampering wih the Succession. The Whigs felt that the realm should be protected from Popery at all costs, whilst the Tories were deeply suspicious of anything which smacked of resistance to the monarchy.[477] To them altering the Succession conjured up uncomfortable memories of the Civil Wars and execution of Charles I and the painful disorder of the subsequent Interregnum. They consequently matched Whig protests for Exclusion with their own, burning effigies of 'Jack Presbyter' and Oliver Cromwell as metonyms of rebellion to just authority.[478] Shame was certainly part of the political vocabulary, but instead of cementing the social fabric, the processions had ruptured it.

During these years November 5th and 17th became nights increasingly fraught with tension. Charles II was unhappy about the extent of 'celebratory' agitation from 1680, as scuffles between the two sides became more common.[479] Scuffles soon turned into near riots and in 1682 – when the Tories had regained control of the positions of Lord Mayor and Sheriffs – Charles ordered the banning of celebration: "preventing Tumultuous Discord which may happen hereafter upon pretence of assembly to make Bonfires... disappointing the evil designs of persons disaffected to the Government, who commonly use such occasions to turn the meeting into Riots."[480] They happened nonetheless.[481] On 9th November 1682 a group of fifty pro-Exclusionist marched along Butcherhead Lane chanting "a York, a York" to lure supporters of the Duke to follow suit before attacking them, leaving several men – including one "Tory Tom" – severely wounded.[482] The tumult was rounded off with a rousing speech by a porter, who boldly proclaimed that he would "kick [the Duke of York's] Arse!" Equally, four days earlier on November 5th a Pope burning had been

---

nation but the Hollander could have been guilty of); yet, I assure you, some of your brother members assented to it...but whether it proceeded from waye of zeale I am yet to learn." *Letters Address from London to Sir John Williams*, p. 71.

[477] For references, and great detail, see below Chapter Three pp....

[478] *The Loyal Protestant and True Domestick Intelligence*, no. 232, 11/11/1681.

[479] *Mercurius Publicus, Beign a Summary of the whole Weeks Intelligence*, no. 21, 18/3/1680. Cressy, *Bonfires and Bellles*, pp. 181-84.

[480] *London Gazette*, 9/11/1682.

[481] The celebrations of November 5th and 17th continued to be fraught during the troubles of the Jacobite-era. *The Protestant Post-Boy*, no. 24, 17/11/1711 for the banning of celebrations to prevent disorder.

[482] *The Loyal Protestant and True Domestick Intelligence*, no. 231. 7/11/1682. See also issue 230.

interrupted by a mob of Torries who beat the participants and made off with the effigy.[483]

This rescue of the Pope by men who no doubt considered themselves committed Protestants is a fitting place to end, for it tells us much about the place of shaming the Papal image in English culture. That image was *contested*. This *charivari* may have been unsuccessful, but that did not make its symbolism any the less potent - what mattered here was who had the right to use the Pope's image, and to what *end*. Possessing a weight of associations with England's past, to which it was intrinsic, to appropriate the Papal image was to claim ownership of the collective memory. As Cressy noted, during tense times the celebrants of November 17th were as important as the celebrations themselves, and parishes baulked at the appropriation of the communal for private ends.[484] Although initially hugely successful in mobilizing the crowd, once the hoopla caused by the fraudulent 'Popish Plot' began to die and the Tory propaganda began to sway the tide of opinion, the processions spoke less and less for the populace, being a *charivari* which did not articulate the will of the community but attempted to impose upon it a view of Exclusion which increasing numbers did not share. However, during 1679 and 1680 it *had* been successful in rallying the crowd precisely because it extended tropes and practices endemic in graphic satire – namely, the extension of a culture of ridicule and iconoclastic display. As we have seen throughout this chapter, engaging with Rome's image was a potent means of agitation, and here it became a necessary means of defining the Whig's vision of Britain, asserting themselves by kicking against it. Punishing the Pope was so intrinsic to Protestant identity that here protest was constructed around it and lobbing conducted through it – an image of England's past and a call to safeguard its future articulated through shame. Such was the impact which polemic and graphic satire had taken upon Protestants sense-of-self.

Conclusion

Shame was at the heart of Anti-Catholic urges. What occurred on the printed-page was heavily indebted to a wider culture of ridicule: both punishing a man through the shaming of his image; and the iconoclastic display of Rome's icons to

---

[483] *Impartial Protestant Mercury*, no. 58. November 4th- 8th 1682.
[484] Cressy, *Bonfires and Belles*, pp. 171-89 in particular.

replace one way of seeing with another. For all of the destructiveness of iconoclasm and Anti-Catholicism, Viewing the Roman Church was essential to Protestant's self-definition, their own sanctity glistening more brightly in the presence of Antichristian filth. Punishing that filth through derogatory laughter not only galvinized faith but eased anxieties caused by the continuous assaults of Antichrist on the True Church, anxieties exacerbated by the presence of papists in the realm and remnants of 'popery' in its Church. Such presence polluted an ideal. The punishment of Anti-Catholic polemic existed as a continual activity convincing Protestants that they were casting Popery from their midst. In this way, the function of print aped the culture of shame and retribution – as shaming social transgressors upheld patriarchal ideals; so shaming the Whore of Babylon galvinized the verity of Protestantism.

That iconoclastic display and ridicule were essential to Anti-Catholic polemic and graphic satire in particular was demonstrated most powerfully in the Pope Burning Processions, the ultimate manifestation of both urges. Here Anti-Catholic activity revolved around derogatory laughter and punishment through an elaborate protest hoping to safeguard the realm from Rome through Exclusion. Shame and ridicule stood at the heart of politics and the relationship between Crown and people – such was the emotive power of shaming the Pope as a vehicle to mobilize support. The ultimate expressing of Protestant's fantasy of shaming the Pope – here Whore of Babylon, cuckolded husband, and ultimate social transgressor – made the impact of these processions as an expression of hatred and a powerful piece of political protest all the more effective. Such effectiveness was owed to the fact that the Processions built upon over a century of shame in print – as graphic satire was indebted to the culture of shame and ridicule, here its agitation fed back into that culture.

In returning to this judicial purpose of polemic we end whence we began, with the *Third New Yeres Gift*'s punishing of the Pope. Believing his text to have routed Rome, rendering Antichrist toothless, his image encapsulated the effect which Protestants deemed polemic to have in shaming their foes, wrenching honour from Rome through exposure of its sins and errors.[485] Our author clearly thought very highly of his work. Such a collection of largely unremarkable doggerel was unlikely to have concerned the Roman Church too deeply, however. Despite his gusto the *Third New Yeres Gift* was wholly devoid of originality – if its polemical pangs had

---

[485] See above, p. 71.

182

not routed Rome in the countless other times which they had been stated, they were unlikely to now. Why, then, award such agency to repetition? We strike here upon an untold story of Anti-Catholicism. Recent scholars – most notably Peter Lake, Michael Questier and Anthony Milton – have stressed that far from a guide to an author's prejudice, Anti-Popery was employed as a language. A rhetorical flush played to mask a work's real agenda, Anti-Popery became a trapping which dressed calls for ecclesiastical or political reforms to prey on audience sympathies. Such work has been salutary, and it is not my intention to disparage scholarly sensitivity to rhetoric.[486] Yet prioritizing the 'language' of popery amongst political activists distracts our attention from what we might call 'lowest-common-denominator' Anti-Catholicism, those works of generic prejudice which betoken a society both incessant and insistent in its perpetual restatement of polemical platitudes.[487] The Papacy's rise as Antichrist, its incessant intrigues against monarchy, and revelation of its Church as a satanic confidence-trick coined to defraud laymen of both their purses and their souls, were stories which the press never tired of telling in sermons, theological tomes and ballads. Such works have fallen victim to the invisibility which couples ubiquity - everyone can see that such Anti-Catholicism was there, but assumes that the obvious can contain little mystery to explore or significance to expound. And yet the *fact* of this repetition requires explanation. What demand were these works seeking to meet, and, given the stock nature of their contents, why were they often argued with a zeal more akin to a fresh discovery rather than yesterday's news? Moreover, given that

---

[486] P. Lake, "Constitutional Consenus & Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott & The Spanish Match", *Historical Journal*, 25, (1982), pp. 805-25; Lake & Questier, "Agency, Appropriation & Rhetoric Under the Gallows" pp. 64-107; ibid, *The Antichrist's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven/London, 2002), pp. 187-228, 229-280; M. Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in Late Stuart Britain: partisanship and political culture* (Oxford, 2005), Part II.

[487] For example, see: *A true and plaine genealogy or pedigree of Antichrist* (London, 1634); *Prayer for assistance against the Armada* (London, 1588);*The Plucking Down of the romish Church* (London, 1566); T. Symmes, *An invective against such runningate papists that greedily go about to disturb the concord of the Church* (London, 2584); W. Whitaker, *Antichrist. We will not have thee to rule over us* (Cambridge, 1589); T. Preston, *A lamentation from Rome, how the Pope, doth bewalye, hat the rebellion in England an not prevaile* (London, 1570); W. Elderton, *A ballad intituled, A review well a daye, as playne, master-papist* (London, 1570); *A ballad of a Priest that loste his nose, For saying Masse, as I suppose* (London, 1570); *A monument of God's most gracious preservation of England from Spanish union, 1588, and popish treason, 1605* (London, 1635): *The Pope's eschudeon, or coate of armes* (London, 1606); *The dismall day, at the Black-fryers. Or, a deplorable elegie, on the death of almost an hundred persons, slaine by the fall of a house in the Black Fryers* (London, 1623); T. Knell, *An answer to a papisticall byll, cast in the streets of Northampton, and brought before the judge at the last session* (London, 1570); *A balad intituled, A cold purge for he papist* (London, 1570); W. Birch, *A free Admonition without any fees, To wane he papists to beware of three trees* (London, 1571); *A New-yeers gifte for the Pope: come see he difference plainly declared, between truth and falsehood* (London, 1625).

they told the populace stories with which they were deeply familiar, why were they purchased and read? What motor drove this endless cycle of hatred?[488]

Grasping their purpose requires altering the scope of our enquiry. Polemic must be seen not as a wholly intellectual endeavour – the circulation of knowledge or the hostile exchange of ideas – but as an *activity* in itself. Put simply, this repetition was the product of the desire to punish a transgressor – whether fresh or old, mud besmirched effectively when it struck its target. Conceived of in this light, we understand why works like the *Third New Yeres Gift*, so unremarkable to us, were awarded such agency by contemporaries. Their fantasy was retributive, for polemic was punishment. Indeed, authors conceived of their works in terms that were judicial. Pamphlets were *An hue and crye after the Pope*; *The tryal and condemnation of Popery*; and *The arraignement, and execution of Antichrist*.[489] Some presented extended musings on this judicial purpose. Thus Thomas Brightman's conception of his exposure of Papacy as Antichrist:

> "I bring thee matter of most glorious triumph....For what can be more joyfull to a most chaste spouse [the Protestant Church], that is thrust out of doors by the *whore of Rome*... for so many ages vexed with all manner of injuryes and reproaches by her, then to see this harlot at length slit in the nostrils, stript of her garments and tires, besmirched with dirt and rotten egges and at last brought up and consumed with fire?"[490]

The impact of his 800 pages of polemic was not so much intellectual as retributive – the True Church's victory over False a parallel of vindicated wife over shamed whore. Brightman envisaged his text rendering a whore incapable of whoring. As the bride of

---

[488] Considering that the population of seventeenth-century England was broadly Protestant in colour, these works could not have been conceived as tools of conversion or of inculcation.

[489] *A gagge for the Pope, and the Iesuits: or The arraignement, and execution of Antichrist Shevving plainely, that Antichrist shall be discouered, and punished in this vvorld: to the amasement of all obstinate papists* (London, 1624); *The friendly conference; or, A hue and cry after the Popes Holiness* (London, 1673); *The Morning-Star out of the North, or The ruine and destruction of the pope* (London, 1680); *Rome in an uproar; or, The Pope's balls brough to the balls stake* (London, 1689); R. Pennington, *The Root of Popery Struck at* (London, 1660); *The tryal and condemnation of Popery* (London, 1691); Thomas Bell, *The Woefull Crie of Rome. Containing a defamation of Popery* (London, 1605); *Tears, tears, tears, or, Rome is ashes* (London, 1680); *Battering rams against Rome's gates, made to be the remark of her character* (London, 168). These examples only scratch the surface.

[490] T. Brightman, *The Revelation of S. John illustrated with an analysis and scholions* (Leyden, 1616), sig. Aiii. See also, J. Jewel, *A viewe of a seditious bul sent unto England from Pius Quintus Bishop of Rome* (London, 1582), sig. Aii.

Christ, the Protestant Church was as entitled to see the Whore of Babylon subjected to *charivari* as any other wife and Brightman's text facilitated the "glorious triumph" of that shaming. Polemic, then, was *effectual* as well as *intellectual* – a *practice* or *activity* as much as a forum for ideas. Vanquished by shame, exposure as Antichrist was an indelible scar on the False Church's face, a somatic bar against subsequent spiritual whoredom. To expose the iniquities of Rome was to mark it as a shameful, common transgressor, and Brightman's judicial explication of his work's effects invited readers to respond to Rome's humiliation as they would a criminal's, evoking the macabre cackles of defamation. Such invitation to scorn was the purpose underwriting our lowest-common-denominator Anti-Catholicism. One ballad thus sung for custom:

"This pious poeme buy and read

For the Pope it knocks [upon] the head."[491]

Ultimately, such invitations to laughter were not flippant, for scoffs were the best defence against Antichrist. One wonders if the relentless invective of early modern polemic was ever effective upon those Protestants who tempered the zeal of their faith with an inclination for equanimity, whether the callous laughter of their brethren left anything but a pang of distaste upon their palate. Whether many baulked or not, painting Antichrist as ridiculous had the unavoidable consequence of skewing the grounds of debate, outlining the contest in decidedly Protestant terms. The average Protestant met Rome through glasses which were markedly tinted. The Earl of Shaftesbury noted that the ridicule met by Dissenters at the Restoration served to laugh-off new ideas rather than discuss them, affirming one's own position without the inconvenience of having to engage in serious debate.[492] Anti-Catholic polemic was equally deflective. In the presence of an insipid Antichrist incessant in its attacking of Protestant souls, provoking defamatory laughter was a fitting means of ensuring it would find few converts, for ridicule ultimately diminished potency. Thus *The Monk Unveil'd* (1678) - an anonymous and well-nigh pornographic portrayal of monasteries populated by randy old goats hankering after honourable maidens -

---

[491] *Papa patens, or, The pope in his colours* (London, 1652), title-page.
[492] Thomas, "The Place of Laughter", p. 78.

sported a frontispiece of a peasant pedlar [Fig. 130.][493] Roman rites were sold alongside old shoes. The image was a wonderfully acerbic piece of inversion. Like Rome, the pedlar engaged in an unfair sale: exchanging copper for silver, old money for new, just as Catholicism sold valueless rites for perfectly good coins. Anticipating criticism for descending into ridicule, for presenting an issue as solemn as the merits of monasticism in terms that in no way approached objective, our author noted that, paradoxically, ridicule was the only accurate treatment of Rome:[494]

> "I imitate the limner, who drawing a Picture, aims naturally to represent, and who would offend the Rule of his Art, and of true resemblance, if he caused us to behold a Hector in a serious countenance."[495]

In the parlance of the period, a 'Hector' was a bully, someone who dominated, intimidated or disturbed order.[496] A true picture of such a person would not depict the "serious countenance" of an honourable man and, consequently, perhaps the greatest Hector of them all, the Roman Church, must be presented dishonourably. "True resemblance" could only be seen in ridicule; the bully was beaten by laughter.

---

[493] *The Monk Unveil'd* (London, 1678), title-page. The author was Jean Barrin. The work was originally printed in the Netherlands in French as *Le Moine Sécularisé* (1675) – the engraving on the English version was after the original Dutch piece. See. M. C. Jacob, *The Enlightenment: A Brief History With Documents* (Boston, 2001), pp. 38-40.

[494] Ibid, "To The Reader" (unpaginated.) "In case what it contains be untrue (as they will not fail to say) they ought to rejoice, by having occasion to suffer that being ill-spoken of and calumniated, and to exercise that Patience which they Preach unto us with so fair a zeal."

[495] Ibid.

[496] N. Luttrell, *A brief historical relation of state affairs* 1678–1714 (1857), III, p. 2; G. F. Warner (Ed.), *The Nicholas papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas*, 3 vols, (Camden Society: New York, 1886-97), II, p. 256; O . Walker, *Of Education* (London, 1677), p. 82; A. Napier (ed.), *The Works of Isaac Barrow*, 9 vols (Cambridge, 1859), III, p. 336.

Chapter Three: Papal Plotters: Cabal, Conspiracy & the Politics of Commemoration in Seventeenth Century England

The most common representation of the Papacy in early modern England was oddly innocuous. There seems little Antichristian rage in a handful of old men simply sat at a table [Fig. 131.][1] Forming the frontispiece to *The Passionate Remonstrance of the Pope's Holiness* (1646) and re-used soon after in *The Plots of Jesuits* (1653) this image most frequently adorned seventeenth-century Anti-Catholic works [Figs. 132-136.][2] It is apparently unremarkable. We might even say that it presented the Beast of Babylon as something of a damp squib. Yet the inanimate here belied the menacing, for this cabal image articulated the greatest fear of seventeenth-century society – Catholic conspiracy.[3] Becoming denser and denser the more we learn about Anti-

---

[1] *The Passionate Remonstrance of the Pope's Holiness* (London, 1646), title-page.

[2] *The Plots of Jesuits* (London, 1653), The names on the background change in this text. They are Tommaso Campanella, Robert Persons, Adam Contzen – whose texts make up the work – and Cardinal Richeleau. Two books sit on the table. F. Parsons *A Memoriall for Reformation of England* (1596) and Thomas Campanella *De Monarchia Hispanica*. Campanella's work advisesd the Spanish King on raising Universal Monarchy, urging him to foster discord between England's King and Parliament to allow Spain free run in the New World. The Civil War was thus a Catholic plot – there is much irony in the use of Campanella as a Roman champion, as he spent much of his time imprisoned and in trouble with orthodox authorities. For the other images, see BM Sat 785; BM Sat 1067, *A Representation of the Popish Plot in 29 Figures* (1679); Philopatris *The Plot in Dream* (1682), BM Sat 1090; *A Plot Without Powder*, BM Sat 87.

[3] On fear of Catholicism in the seventeenth century see: J. Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1660-88* (Cambridge, 1973); A. Milton, *Catholic & Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Chruches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-40* (Cambridge, 1995), part 1; C. Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England* (2nd Edition: London/ New York, 1990), chapters 1 & 2 in particular; B. W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden, 1975); D. Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: national memory and Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1989); F. E. Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, & seventeenth-century Print Culture* (2nd Edition, Notre Damn, 2005), passim; M. Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge, 1994); T. Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 2-3, 91-95, 109-113, 177-80, 227; W. M. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne: 1600-1669* (London/Toronto, 1963), pp. 119-48; R. Clifton, "The Popular Fear of Catholics During the English Revolution", *Past & Present*, 52 (1971), pp. 23-55; R. D. Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745* (Cambridge, 1998), passim; A. Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy & The English Literary Imagination* (Cambridge, 1999); A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 225-80; ibid, "'The Fatall Vesper': Providentialism & Anti-Popery in late Jacobean London", *Past & Present*, 144, (1994), pp. 36-87; C. Z.Wiener, "The Beleagured Isle: A study of Elizabethan and Jacobean Anti-Catholicism", *Past & Present*, 51, (1971), pp. 27-62; M. Todd, "'All One with Tom-Thumb': Armianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge", *Church History*, 64 (1995), pp. 563-79; M. C. Questier, " Loyalty, Religion & State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism & The Jacobean Oath of Allegiance", *Historical Journal*, 40, (1997), pp. 311-29; M. S. Betteridge, "The Bitter Notes: The Geneva Bible and its Annotations", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 14, (1983), pp. 41-62; M. R. Thorp, "Catholic Conspiracy in Early Elizabethan Foreign Policy", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15 (1984), pp. 431-48; J. Sharpe, *Remember, remember the fifth of November: Guy Fawkes and the Gun Powder Plot* (London, 2005),

Catholic fears, much was unspoken here – a mundane scene which masked implied malevolence. The clutter of papers strewn about the table revealed that the clerics were plotting, and a crucifix blessed the sordid intrigue with an air of sanctity – a black rite of the devil's Church.[4] It was consequently a fitting embellishment for *The Passionate Remonstrance*, a comical papal lament at the Solemn League and Covenant having routed plans for Roman dominion in England which closed with the rapid construction of another vicious intrigue.[5] *The Passionate Remonstrance* was representative of contemporary attitudes to history which presented the unflinching 'Popish Plot' as a hydra – cutting-down one of its conspiracies caused two to spawn in its place. Whilst modern historians view the Northern Rising, Bull of Excommunication, Throckmorton Plot, Spanish Armada, Gunpowder Plot, and Irish Rebellion as *separate incidents* driven by specific historical actors and unique circumstances, for contemporary Protestants they were successive scenes in the same play, various guises of an unquenchable conspiracy to forcibly return England to the Roman fold.[6] .

Splinters of truth lay in such perversion. Mary Tudor *had* burnt hundreds of English Protestants; Mary Stuart *had* conspired against the English Crown; Catholics *had* plotted against Elizabeth I and *had* attempted to blow-up Parliament in 1605; and Jesuits and Seminary Priests *had* maintained a Roman hierarchy in Ireland and England. Yet the Protestant narrative of history made these exceptions the rule, terming the extraordinary as commonplace and skewing the locus of the centre-ground to the position of the fanatics. The stereotype of Catholicism as a perpetual enemy to the liberties of England's subjects and government grew out of the apocalyptical concepts of history examined earlier, preserving Antichrist's rage in another dress. The Babylonian persecution of the Godly which had driven history since Constantine's conversion became a narrative of conspiracies whose concerns

passim. See also, C. Haydon, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth Century England* (Manchester, 1993), pp. 1-20.

[4] See 1660 edition of Thomas Campanella *De Monarchia Hispanica*, intro by W. Prynne and trans by Edward Chilmead.

[5] *Passionate Remonstrance*. The new plot is detailed by a Cardinal 'Barbirin' a pun on a champion of post-tridentine Catholicism, Barberinni. See from sig. F.

[6] Thus one account of the Popish Plot of 1678 termed it: "this lately discovered New Branch of the Old Plot". *The Protestants vade mecum, or, Popery display'd in its proper colours, in thirty emblems, lively representing all the Jesuitical plots against this nation* (London, 1680), sig. A3, pp. 38-40; S. Clarke, *England's remembrancer, a true and full narrative of those two never to be forgotten deliverances* (London, 1679), appendix, unpaginated. Although admitting that the full details of the plot were yet to come to light, Clarke readily categorized it as an extension of 1588/1605. See also R. Greene, *Diaries of the Popish Plot* (New York, 1977), pp. 166-67.

were as much political as religious, desiring to impose arbitrary government upon Protestant realms in addition to silencing their pulpits.[7] That the Pope existed to extirpate Protestant government was Truth, and distorted readings of Roman moral theology which typified a Catholic Creed ruled by equivocation and lying in order to bring this Papal conspiracy to fruition were a commonplace of Protestant literature.[8] The Counter Reformation had certainly revived the highest claims of medieval papal authority, propounding its right to depose Princes and absolve their subjects from allegiance, providing almost a mandate for regicide. Realistically, however, few writers outside of Spain and Italy entertained the idea.[9] Indeed, by the ascension of Charles II Counter Reformation zeal had cooled and the papacy viewed English Protestantism with a begrudging acceptance.[10]

It is ironic, then, that fear of 'popery' reached its apogee at that point.[11] Stereotypes thrive upon a scant regard for accuracy. Every schoolboy used to know that the Northern Rising (1569) preceded Elizabeth I's Excommunication (1570) but in contemporary histories the ordering was quickly reversed to accommodate cliché – the papal Bull sparking Catholic disobedience.[12] Similarly, the *Spanish* Armada was commonly blamed upon Papal ingenuity, and one history even had Guy Fawkes meeting with the Pope prior to the Gunpowder Plot.[13] Evidence was ordered to fit pre-existing theory, and during tense times of tension even everyday incidents betokened conspiracy. Thus between 1640 and 1642 simple gatherings of Catholics were soon twisted into reports of nascent uprisings.[14] It was this story of relentless European-wide conspiracy, not the anguish of Foxe's martyrs, which gripped seventeenth-century imaginations. The martyrs' screams were drowned-out amidst the many – the

---

[7] T. Barlow, *Popery* (London 1679), passim; A. Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* (London, 1677), p. 11; *A Word in Season, or the Great Plot for Restoring Popery* (London, 1663), pp. 48-50. See below, pp. 209-15.

[8] Miller, *Popery and Politics* pp. 29-31, 79; W. Cobbett & T. B. Howell (eds.), *State Trials*, 33 vols, (London, 1809-26), vii, pp. 133, 1517-18; J. Tillotson, *A Sermon Preached November 5 1678 at St Margaret's Westminster* (London, 1678), p. 24.

[9] English Catholics denials of deposing power: E. Cary, *The Catechist Catechised* (London, 1681), pp. 89-91, 129; W. H. *English loyalty Vindicated by the Freed Divine* (Lonfon, 1681), preface; *Reflections upon the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance* (1661), pp. 61-62.

[10] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 29-31, 79.

[11] Ibid, pp. 154-88.

[12] See for example, BM Sat 13; H. Robinson (ed.,) *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*, 2 vols (Parker Society 7-8, Cambridge, 1842), I, p. 238. See also pp. 218-225. The Latin edition of a text by Henrich Bullinger, *Bullae Papisticae ante biennium...promulgatae* written in 1571 actually dated the Bull, incorrectly, at 1569.

[13] J. Vicars, *The Quintessence of Cruelty*, (London, 1641), p. 21.

[14] Clifton, "Popular Fear of Catholics", pp. 27-33, 39-47, 52.

Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre, Irish Rebellion, and activities of Louis XIV in France and Piedmont were equally impressive 'proofs' of Catholic cruelty's relentlessness.[15]

Two events became key scenes in this drama: the Armada and Gunpowder Plot. Their rootedness in popular memory was the result of a providential view of history, placing England's escape from the jaws of such peril in divine hands proof of the realm's heavenly favour. Their commemoration consequently took pride-of-place in the Reformed calendar, replacing saints' days and conferring a new sense of the miraculous on the Protestant past.[16] Legislated to be kept in "perpetual Rememberance" 1588 and 1605 betokened the realm's status as part of the persecuted 'True Church', proof both of its victimization by Antichrist and Election by divine safeguarding.[17] But in awakening a dramatic sense-of-self these events were more indebted to *memory* than *history*: human frailty, freak weather conditions and clever detective work were side-tracked as explanations of their routing in favour of divine providence precisely because these events remained emotional experiences for contemporaries – even for those born long after their occurrence. They were totemic of Papal conspiracies which loomed over their realm, and celebrating such past deliverances soothed present fears.

This chapter examines the place of the image in this collective memory. A rich iconography of remembrance existed and, put simply, Protestants displayed their identity through its imagery. It not only served as a monument in public places, but lavished in the luxuries of the domestic sphere, in tapestries, playing cards, medals and tiles, as tokens of their belonging to the True Church. It was not so much the ubiquity of this imagery in Protestant culture which forces us to marvel, but the sheer variety of ways in which it was put to use. From memory, to political agitation, to devotion, to salves against sin, or to personal *memento mori*, the absorption of this iconography into the contemporary mindset betrayed an emotional investment in it. This investment made the iconography amenable to political manipulation, and iconic representation of the Protestant past became a form of cultural currency used to steer

---

[15] *A Brief Relation of the Persecution and Sufferings of the Reformed Churches of France* (London, 1668); *Popery and Tyranny, or the Present State of France* (London, 1679), pp. 5-6 in particular.

[16] The keys works for exploring issues of Protestant commemoration are Walsham, *Providence*, pp. 243-280, 310-15; D. Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: national memory and Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1989), pp. 110-56, in particular.

[17] *The Statutes of the Realm*, ed. T. E. Tomlins (London, 1819), 3 Jac. I. c. 1. D. Cressy, "The Fifth of November remembered" in R. Porter (ed.) *Myths of the English* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 68-90.

the course of the present. Such manipulation occurred most prominently during the Exclusion Crisis of 1678 to 1682, where the Whigs harnessed it to foster their own 'invented tradition'. Employed most readily by those commonly assumed to be 'iconophobic', such imagery was cemented in the 1620s by the 'hotter sort' of Protestants and attached to the puritanical throughout the century, before becoming a badge of the dissenters during the Exclusion Crisis. In this way an image became an icon for the iconophobic. More than simply *present* in English society, controlling this iconography of remembrance became a matter of political expediency. By the close of the century different sets of Protestants were debating their differences *through* it – the visual had retained its power in the Reformed Tradition.

I: *The Double Deliverance* and the Cultural Furniture of Protestantism

There was a Protestant image: seventeenth-century society was saturated with it.[18] Our story begins with *The Double Deliverance* (1621), a triptych of providential history in which God made a mockery of Catholicism's might [Fig. 137.][19] Emblazoned along the top ran the print's mantra: "To God in memorye of his double deliverance from ye invincible Navie and ye unmatchable powder Treason, 1588: 1605." The genesis of an iconography of remembrance, this engraving set the tone for future works by intertwining memory and mockery. On the left the Armada's formidable crescent was dispersed by a fire ship propelled by heavenly winds. On the right God's "never slumbering EYE" revealed the Gunpowder Plot, taunting the plotters huddled in the print's centre – "Video Rideo: I See and Smile."[20] This central scene depicted a cabal. The Pope, cardinal and Jesuit "strayne[d] their wits" to

---

[18] I am heavily indebted to the work of Alexandra Walsham for unearthing many of the references in this section and the next, and any scholar of this material stands upon her shoulders. The argument, however, remains my own. See Walsham's "Impolitic Pictures: Providence, History and Iconography of Protestant Nationhood in Early Stuart England" in R. Swanson (ed.), *The Church Retrospective: Studies in Church History*, 33 (1997), pp. 403-24; and *Providence in Early Modern England*, pp. 250-80. For other works on visual satire, see A. Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain* (London, 1998), pp. 152-54; J. Miller, *The English Satirical Print 1600-1832: Religion in the Popular Prints 1600-1832* (Cambridge, 1986); D. Kunzle, *The Early Comic Strip: Narrative Strips and Picture Stories in the European Broadsheet from 1450 to 1825* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973); M. Dorothy George, *English Political Caricatures to 1792: A study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Oxford, 1959), introduction and chapter 1.

[19] BM Sat. 41.

[20] God is represented as the tetragrammatron, only acceptable form for Protestants acutely sensitive to the perils of idolatry, see Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, pp. 452-57; ibid, "The Bishops' Bible Illustrations" in D. Wood (ed.), *The Church and the Arts, Studies in Church History*, 28, (Oxford, 1992), pp. 267-85.

compose "some rare stratagem" for England's destruction, assisted by a devil and Philip IV, the King of Spain. This elaborate mnemonic scene was "invented" by Samuel Ward, a Puritan preacher from Ipswich, and engraved by Dutch craftsmen like so many prints on the English market.[21] By far the most heavily documented print of the century, scholars are still to grasp the extent of the iconographic tradition it spawned.

This was the origin of our cabal. Previous scholarship suggested that Ward co-opted an existing iconography, but I have been not found any evidence to support the claim.[22] He certainly lifted the two other scenes, however. The Armada's vanquishing by divine wind had appeared in a medal struck at Middelburg during 1588, and in H. G's *Mirrour* (1618) a ship wracked by storm winds was already emblematic of Rome's downfall as the False Church [Fig. 138.][23] Similarly, the figure of a booted-and-spurred Fawkes about to commit his dark deed featured in two engravings of the previous decade: Richard Smith's *The Powder Treason* (c. 1615) and *The Papists Powder Treason* (c.1612) [Figs. 139-140.][24] Fawkes' failed ignition would become one of the most recognizable tableaux in British history – the moment of dark drama deepening its stain upon popular memory. That this iconic image had origins amongst Protestants of a puritanical bent may be surprising, but it is not a surprise for which Ward can take credit.

We should not chastise Ward's lack of originality. He cemented an emerging iconographic tradition epigrammatic of conventional providential Anti-Catholicism. This image was commemorative, but even at its first striking memory was political, for Ward harnessed England's past to oppose the direction of the present. Context was all - appearing at the height of negotiations for marriage between Prince Charles and the Habsburg Infanta, the print's depiction of her father consulting with Satan to destroy his prospective son-in-law's realm was bound to be offensive.[25] Here this

---

[21] See M. Jones, *The Print in Early Modern England: An Historical Oversight* (New Haven, 2010), Appendix III, pp. 399-400.

[22] Walsham, "Impolitic Pictures", pp. 312-13.

[23] National Maritime Museum, A2251, reproduced in M. J. Rodriquez-Salgada, *Armada 1588-1988* (London, 1988), fig. 16.12; H. G, (1618), p. 43 – emblem 22.

[24] BM Sat. 67; San Marino, California, Huntington Library, RB 28300 IV:21; A.M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*, 3 vols, (Cambridge, 1952-640) II, pp. 342, 394-95.

[25] For the Spanish Match see, T. Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-24* (Cambridge, 1989), passim; ibid, "England and the Spanish Match" in A. Hughes & R. Cust (Eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart Britain* (London/ New York, 1989), pp. 107-33; P. Lake, "Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match", *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), pp. 805-25.

'Spanish Match' was the latest unfolding of a conspiracy already attempted in 1588 and 1605. It says something of the pictorial's piquancy that despite having a diminutive – almost unnoticeable – presence, Philip IV's association with English history became such a poignant diplomatic *faux pas*. John Chamberlain remarked in March 1621 that it was "not good rubbing upon that sore", and the Spanish Ambassador, Gondomar, complained to the King.[26] Consequently, the *Double Deliverance* became one of two engravings that were suppressed.[27] The other depicted the King holding the Pope's nose to a grindstone – a means of punishing the Pope through dishonour which we have seen to be the bread-and-butter of Anti-Catholic imagery [Fig. 141 & 142.][28] When touching upon matters of Royal Prerogative, however, the conventional became dangerous. Ward was imprisoned, and many preachers in these years were censured for inveighing against a marriage which they, like him, saw imperilling the realm's safety.[29]

Yet Ward had chosen to voice his protest through an image because of the potential of the pictorial for vagueness – an attack allusive rather than acerbic, and conducted through a conceit open to multiple readings. Defending himself in prison, Ward claimed that the image had never been intended as a savage lampooning of the King's dynastic policy but rather as a monument honouring God:

"This embleme was by him composed, the English verse excepted….the five yeeres since, *in imitacion of auncient rites gratefully preserving the memories of extraordinarie favours and deliverances in coins, arches, and such like monuments*…without anie outher sinister intencion, especialle of meddling in any of your Majesties secret affaires: of which at the tyme of the publishing your petitioner was altogether ignorant."[30]

---

[26] *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 12, 2 vols, (Philadelphia, 1939), 2, p. 349; T. Middleton, *A Game at Chess*, ed. J. W. Harper (London, 1966), III. i. 102-03. Gondomar's character (The Black Knight) exclaims: "Who….Made pictures that were dumbe enough before, Poor sufferers in that politics restraint?"

[27] See Thomas Scott, *Boanerges* (London, 1624), p. 25, which describes the print as one of "two facete and befitting pictures" which the authorities suppressed; ibid, *The Second Part of Vox Populi* (London, 1624), p. 17.

[28] This image survives on the base on a early seventeenth century Scottish clock, c. 1610-15. See Victoria & Albert Museum M. 7-1931. The motif survived in print, however. BM Sat 1255 is an etching of William III holding the Pope's nose to the grindstone in celebration of the Glorious Revolution.

[29] Cogswell, *The Blessed Revolution*, pp. 27-34.

[30] TNA, SP 15/42/76. Quoted in Walsham, *Providence*, p. 256; ibid, "Impolitic Pictures", p. 310; J. Bruce, "The Caricatures of Samuel Ward of Ipswich", *Notes and Queries*, 4th Series, 1, (1868), pp. 1-2.

An advertisement towed a similar line as a pre-emptive defence several months earlier. *The Double Deliverance* was a: "most Remarkale Monument....Necessary to be had in the House of every good Christian, to shew God's loving and wonderful providence, over this Kingdom."[31] Ward had clearly anticipated trouble. The Council was not sold on this attempt to mask his impudence, but Ward put forward a defence which he hoped to be deemed credible and which revealed much about the role of imagery in society.[32] He was not clutching at straws. "Monuments" like the *Double Deliverance* were part of the cultural furniture of Protestantism, prints displayed proudly in Protestant households as tokens marking and celebrating identity.[33] The image was thus part of a much wider industry of commemoration in which God's miraculous providences were revisited. Indeed, survivals from the period's printed produce suggest that prejudice was a valuable commodity.[34] As Ben Jonson noted in Bartholomew Fayre: "The Gunpowder Plot, there was a get-penny/ I have presented that to an eighteen-or-twenty-pence audience, nine times in an afternoon."[35] This was hinted at by the prevalence of an international market for imagery. Dutch works were often conceived for an English clientele. Thus a series of ten engravings illustrating the Armada's failure;[36] a medal of its wreckage Armada [Fig. 143];[37] and another lampooning Philip II. [38]

---

[31] Samuel Ward, *The Life of Faith*, 2nd edn (London, 1621), p. 117.

[32] Ward was released from prison, but the affair cast a light over his subsequent career. He was simultaneously prosecuted for nonconformity by Bishop Harsnet of Norwich. See P. Collinson, "Lectures by combination: structures and characteristics of church life in seventeenth century England" in his *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983), pp. 488-89.

[33] Watt, *Cheap Print*, chapter 5; A. Wells-Cole, *Art and Decoration in Elizabethan and Jacobean England* (New Haven, 1997) .

[34] Sermons, ballads, poems and chapbooks helped to ingrain 1588 and 1605 in the national consciousness and authors often styled their acts of remembering as "monuments" essential to bequeath to posterity, in addition to lining their own pockets. Daniel Dyke, *Certaine Comfortable Sermons upon the 124. Psalme: tending to stirre up to Thankefulnesse for our Deliverance from the Late Gunpowder-Treason* (London, 1616); Samuel Garey, *Great Britain's Little Calendar: or, Triple Diarie. In Remembrance of Three Daies* (London, 1618); Francis Herring, *Popish Pietie, or the First Part of the Historie of that Horrible and Barbarous Conspiracie, commonly called the Powder-Treason*, trans. A. P. (London, 1610); John Rhodes, *The Country Mans Comfort* (London, 1637); T. S., *A Song of Psalme of Thanksgiving, in Remembrance of our Great Deliverance from the Gun-powder Treason* (London, 1625).

[35] Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fayre* in *Three Comedies* (ed.) Michael Jamieson (Hammondsworth, 1966), V.i. 11-14.

[36] British Museum Department of Prints and Drawings, 1854,0614.235-247, 249-50. These prints were made by Hendrik Cornelisz. Vroom and sold by Claes Jansz Visscher.

[37] The Armada was flanked by the shield of Zealand .British Museum Department of Coins and Medals, MB1p146.114. See also MB1p144.111; MB1p183.187; MB1p154.129. Although lacking an illustration of the event MB1p154.130 & MB1p155.132 are images of Elizabeth as Gloriana issued to commemorate the event. See also, E. Hawkins, A. W. Franks, & H. A Grueber, (ed.), *Medallic*

Protestants invested heavily in this cultural furniture – imagery was a means of displaying identity in the home. Thus the *Papists Powder Treason*, another two-dimensional memorial [Fig. 140.][39] As Alexandra Walsham noted, this was "a triumphal arch recording on paper rather than in marble a signal victory won solely through the goodness of God."[40] Bonita Divina sat upon "Jacob's Stone Erected in aeternal memorie" of England's deliverance from the schemes of its Catholic enemies, crushed beneath Justice's chariot in the central arch-way. Below, James I and the royal family knelt in prayer whilst receiving Lord Mounteagle's letter concerning November 5th, the action of which was seen in the left-side niche as Fawkes approached the barrels, lantern in hand, only to be foiled by Nemesis' all-seeing eye. Ten verses explicated the lavish iconography littered over every part of this print. Such rich detail suggests that this was an image designed to be *used*, to be unpacked and unpicked. Indeed, cherubim in each corner hold four-part scores to assist the Protestant household in their November 5th commemoration. Almost an object of devotion, pouring over this engraving was certainly meant to spark in the viewer both thankfulness to God and hatred of Rome in equal measure. Creation of such engraved memorials was indebted to a conceptualization of memory as dependent upon images either real or imagined – the 'monumental' image was the surest means of securing permanence, and it followed that memory of deliverances so central to Protestants identity should be constructed around them. Divines railed that witnesses of such providences should engrave them with "a Penne of Iron, with the Point of a Diamond, on the Tables of our heads, on the Postes of Houses, on the Hornes of Altars" in "capital letters" and "characters indelible."[41] Men were to erect "eternal Trophees" in their souls and "everlasting records" in their books, and

---

illustrations of the history of Great Britain and Ireland to the death of George II, vol.I, (London, BMP, 1885), p. 154. Modern copy of a medal dated 1589.

[38] MB1p148.118.

[39] San Marino, California, Huntington Library, RB 28300 IV:21; Hind, *Engraving in England*, 2, pp. 342, 394-5. This was produced and sold by Richard Northcott, active between 1677 and 1691. However, the original – now lost – was c. 1612. It can be dated by the 'Palatina' above Princess Elizabeth, who was engaged to the Elector Palatine in May 1612 and married him a year later. See Hind, *Engraving*, ii, pp. 394-95.

[40] Walsham, *Providence*, p. 255. I am heavily indebted to Professor Walsham's reading of this print, as I have not seen the original.

[41] Herring, *Triumph*, 'To The Reader'; Dyke, *Certaine Comfortable Sermons*, p. 9; Thomas Taylor, *An Everlasting Record of Utter Ruine of Romish Amaleck* in *Two Sermons* (London, 1624), p. 24; Herring, *Popish Pietie*, sig, A3. Other anti-Catholic works also conceived of themselves as memorial. See *The Protestants vade mecum, or, Popery display'd in its proper colours, in thirty emblems, lively representing all the Jesuitical plots against this nation* (London, 1680), sig. A4. See Walsham, *Providence*, p. 251.

thankfulness for God's favouring England should be preserved in the collective memory through "a Monument of Marble."[42]

This was an ancient form of remembering. Constructing mnemonic images – impressing elaborate 'places' or 'images' on the mind and ordering bodies of knowledge around them – had been fundamental to the art of rhetoric from ancient Greece.[43] Using imagery in this way was tied to classical understandings of the relationship between emotion and intellect. Arousing the former stimulated the latter, and consequently all forms of knowledge – whether literature, philosophy or theology – had to *delight* and to *inform* to be remembered.[44] The effectiveness of memory was thus enhanced by its construction around an emotionally striking image, an image which scored details of its subject onto the brain. Protestants' enthusiastic employment of such an inherently visual technique forces a re-assessment of the strictures which 'iconophobia' placed upon aesthetic sensibilities.

Indeed, according to Frances Yates the 'artificial memory' was quashed in England under the influence of Peter Ramus.[45] Memory passed from the art of rhetoric to the practice of logic, no longer ordered around emotionally exciting imagery, mnemonic techniques centred upon tabulation and schematic order [Fig. 144.][46] Calvinist theology was imbued with Ramism, a complement to Reformed iconoclasm which stimulated inward purgation of imagery to match the outward expulsion of idols. Tracts on memory were certainly hostile to imagined imagery. William Perkins asserted the supremacy of Ramus, claiming that his cold logic was a more effective way of memorizing sermons than 'monumental' imagery.[47] Perkins did not find artificial memory to be impractical or ineffectual – far from it – but rather thought it morally reprehensible. Stirring imagery aroused illicit passions. Perkins condemned Peter of Ravenna's work on memory for the young. Ravenna segmented knowledge around parts of the body of a girl with whom he had had a dalliance – an

---

[42] As Geroge Carlton, Bishop of Chichester, noted in 1624 forgetting these "monstrous births of the Romish harlot" conceived in the "dark pit of oblivion" was unforgivable. Walsham, *Providence*, p. 251.

[43] See F. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London, 2008), passim.

[44] For the interrelatedness of emotion and intellect during the Renaissance, and its relationship to satire, see above, Chaper One, pp. 38-51.

[45] Yates, *Memory*, pp. 228-37, 256-70.

[46] Ibid, pp. 228-37, 256-60.

[47] W. Perkins, *Antidisconius* (London, 1584), p. 45. See also, ibid, *Prophetica* (London, 1592), sig. Fviii: "The animation of the images which is the key of memory in impious: because it calls up absurd thoughts, insolent, prodigious and the like which stimulate and light up depraved carnal affections." See also, W. Perkins, *Works* (London, 1603), pp. 830-42.

image too horrifyingly carnal for the mind of the prudish Perkins. Such imagery was ultimately deemed impious and affiliated to Romish iconophilia: "A thing feigned in the mind by imagination is an idol."[48] For Yates, such views forged an "emotionally aseptic" memory causing Protestants to "smash images within and without."[49]

This may have occurred in the circles of divinity populated by Perkins and Ramus, but the *Double Deliverance* and *Papists Powder Treason* demonstrate that an "emotionally aseptic" Protestant memory did not travel far from their ivory tower. This divergence of theory and practice is accounted for in the necessity of providential memory as a perpetual guardian of the Church. There was nothing morally reprehensible in learning to hate the schemes of Antichrist and, put simply, it *mattered* that Protestants invested themselves emotionally in their past – these memorials sought to fire passions not cool heads, emotionally striking icons designed to inspire heartfelt thanks to God and bitter loathing of Rome in equal measure. Such zeal was the Church's kernel, safeguarding it from Antichrist's ravages, and consequently the collective memory was more indebted to Ravenna than Ramus. Thus *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy* (1625), a pedagogic polemic for children [Figs. 145 & 146.][50] Intended to assist inculcation of Protestant history, this striking obelisk recounted divine deliverance from sixteen Catholic conspiracies from the Northern Rising to the Gunpowder Plot, adjoining each scene of terror with a banner displaying the ensuing retribution – a series of bite-sized chunks making history more digestable.[51]

This dramatic engraving advertised George Carleton's book of the same name published a year earlier and sporting a title-page similarly embellished with the maternal figure of "Ecclesia Vera". Elizabeth I and James I were glorified as Deborah and Solomon, respectively, unfolding banners behind the True Church proudly

---

[48] This girl in question was Juniper of Pistoia. W. Perkins, *Works*, p. 841.

[49] Yates, *Memory*, pp. 267, 271.

[50] G. C, *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercie* (London, 1625), Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Sutherland Collection, Lar, vol. iii. This was sold by Thomas Jenner and engraved by Cornelius Danckersz. Hind, *Engraving*, ii. p. 299. It was also reprinted during the Popish Plot of 1679, BM Sat 13. Sold by John Garrett, who was Jenner's successor. See Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, pp. 154-56.

[51] This piece took the form of a mock papal Bull, and was clearly part of the culture of ridicule and shame detailed above, Chapter Two pp. 79-103. Other Anti-Catholic work swere aimed at children: B. Harris, *The Protestant tutor instructing children to spel and read English, and ground them in the true Protestant religion and the discovery of error and deceit* (London, 1679); E. Clark, *The Protestant school-master* (London, 1680).

displaying the *Double Deliverance*'s emblems [Fig. 147.][52] Ward's motifs were repeated within the work's engravings [Fig. 148 & 149] and also appeared in Christopher Lever's *The History of the Defenders of the Catholique Faith* (1627), a work urging Charles I to emulate the celebrated Protestant monarchs of England's past [Fig. 150.][53] Despite its lack of originality, the *Double Deliverance* had quickly become established as shorthand for Protestant history – for all Reformed theology's iconoclastic zeal, Protestants created new icons alongside smashing the old, harnessing pre-Reformation forms of memory centred upon emotional attachment to imagery. Moreover, this iconography was as devotional as it was garish. Far from mere public duty, Anti-Catholic memory fostered resilience in each believer, galvanizing resolve amidst tribulation. As Carleton noted, icons would "strengthen our hearts when wee shall be called to the late trials: For in these dayes of peace it is good to prepare against a storm."[54] Image became salve: contemplating providences of the past bolstered the faith of Protestants against Antichristian ravages in the present.

This oscillation between public and private attachment to the *Double Deliverance* continued in its subsequent absorption into seventeenth-century culture. Painted reproductions acted as commemorative sites in public spaces, and by the late 1620s churches displayed the imagery prominently.[55] During 1628 one Captain Nicholas Crispe commissioned a stained-glass window for St. Mildred in Bread Street, London, which featured deliverance from Armada, Powder Plot and recent plague alongside glorification of the donor's pious family.[56] Similarly, a *Double Deliverance* church brass survives at Preston St. Mary near Lavenham in Suffolk.[57] Such survivals are not surprising, for engravings had provided church and household decoration throughout our period – collections of emblems, in particular, became

---

[52] George Carleton, *A Thankfull Remembrance of Gods Mercy* (London, 1627), title-page.

[53] Ibid, pp. 144, 248; Christopher Lever's *The History of the Defenders of the Catholique Faith* (London, 1627); BM Sat. no. 9. Hind, *Engraving*, III p. 214.

[54] Ashmolean Museum, Sutherland Collection, Lar, vol. iii.

[55] See Walsham, *Providence*, p. 265. A painted version of *The Papists Powder Treason* was commissioned by Richard Haydocke for New College, Oxford for the silver jubilee of the conspiracy in 1630, see L. G. Wickham Legg, "On a Picture Commemorative of the Gunpowder Plot, Recently Discovered at New College, Oxford", *Archaeologia*, 84, (1934), pp. 27-39; K. J. Holtgen, "Richard Haydocke: Translator, Engraver, Physician", *The Library*, 5th Series, 33 (1978), pp. 15-32. Two paintings after the *Double Deliverance* were bequeathed to St. Faith's, Gaywood, near King's Lynn, by the rector Thomas Hares in 1634. This is reproduced in Rodriguez-Salgado, *Armada*, fig. 16.30.

[56] John Stow, *A Survey of London* (London, 1633), pp. 859-60. The window was in the Chancel.

[57] Robert Reyce, *Suffolk in the XVIIth Century: The Breviary of Suffolk*, ed. Francis Hervey (London, 1902), pp. 201-04.

Protestant pattern-books.[58] The Strode family in Somerset commissioned a *Double Deliverance* brass, complementing the divine eye's "I See and Smile" with a godly ear exclaiming "I Heare and Laugh," an addition typical of personal investment in the collective memory.[59] Thus the weaver of a cushion-cover embellished the scene with a mermaid, a lamb and a lion. We must distinguish here between an image *purchased* and an image *created* – a labour of love, this piece betokened attachment to and investment in the Church's past alongside a willingness to parade one's Protestantism through an image displayed in the domestic sphere [Fig. 151.][60] Indeed, this very public memorial could become deeply personal. Thus Dame Dorothy Selby, another godly weaver, had a slate of the *Double Deliverance* embossed on her tombstone at her death in 1641 - no longer simply a monument commemorating the nation's Protestant past, the image had become a site at which to remember individual Protestants.[61] Such was the malleability of Protestantism's cultural furniture. Patrick Collinson once asked if the term 'Puritan Culture' was an oxymoron.[62] It certainly was not: remnants of the *Double Deliverance*'s absorption into seventeenth-century culture hints at a society drenched in the image.

---

[58] A. Wells-Cole, *Art and decoration in Elizabethan and Jacobean England : the influence of continental prints, 1558-1625* (New Haven, 1997); ibid, *Historic paper hangings from Temple Newsam and other English houses* (Leeds, 1983), passim; J. S. Purvis, "The use of continental woodcuts and prints by the 'Ripon School' of woodcarvers in the early sixteenth-century", *Society of Antiquaries of London* (Oxford, 1936); M. Jourdain, "Sixteenth Century embroidery with emblems", *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, 11, (1907), pp. 326-28; S. Foister, "Pictures in Early Modern Household Inventories", *Burlington Magazine*, 123, (1981), pp. 273-82.

[59] Philip Whittemore, 'A brass plate commemorating the defeat of the Gunpowder Plot' and John Blatchly 'The "Gunpowder Plot" plate: a postscript', *Transactions of the Monumental Brass Society*, 13 (1985), pp. 549-57 and 14 (1986), pp. 68-69.

[60] Cushion cover post 1621. Lady Lever Art Gallery, Port Sunlight, LL5292. See X. Brooke, *The Lady Lever Art Gallery Catalogue of Embroideries* (Stroud, 1992), pp. 18-20.

[61] J. L. Nevinson, "English Domestic Embroidery Patterns of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", *Walpole Society*, 28, (1939-40), p. 10 and pl VI (b).Edward. R. Harrison, *The History and Record of Ightham Church* (Oxford, 1932), pp. 16-18. Walsham, *Providence*, p. 261 cites another mention of a needlework reproduction (n.140) TNA PROB 11/182/f5. Dame Selby also produced a needlework after Richard Smith's *The Powder Treason*, see K. A. Esdaile, "Gunpowder Plot in Needlework: Dame Dorothy Selby 'Whose Arte Discols'd that Plot'" *Country Life*, 93, (1943), pp. 1094-96.

[62] P. Collinson, "Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture", in C. Durston & J. Eales (Eds.), *The Culture of English Puritanism* (London, 1996), pp. 32-57. Collinson concludes that this culture revolved around prayer and fasting as forms of sociability.

Indeed, this emblem appealed most strongly to men who might otherwise be labelled 'iconomach.' Leaver was a moderate Puritan.[63] Ward – a vehemently Calvinistic preacher – believed that as guardians of the populace all magistrates and ministers should be Puritan, and interfered in Ipswich elections to make that ideal a reality.[64] A vocal opponent of Laudianism, he was incessant in calling for further Church reform, and when this was not forthcoming encouraged the Godly to look elsewhere for their New Jerusalem – after two ships had left for America in February 1634 the High Commission heard that "of the breeders of these persons Mr. Ward is chief."[65] Yet railing against such 'popish idolatry' did not walk hand-in-hand with an utter rejection of the pictorial. Ward designed title-pages for his works [Figs. 152 & 153.][66] Similarly Michael Sparke, a printer who displayed an attachment to the *Double Deliverance* and a verve for imagery, was a man whose "life and work were characterized by his maniacal devotion to the Protestant religion."[67] During 1633 this devotion caused him to be fined £500 and pilloried for published works opposed to Laudianism.[68] Resisting those guilty of imbuing the Church with a 'popish' 'Beauty of Holiness' did not trigger in such men a neurotic aversion to imagery outside the Church's walls.[69]

'Iconophobia', then, was a nuanced malady. There was certainly a pathological loathing of human representations of Christ or God the Father, a temptation to idolatry which could lead to illicit veneration of the image rather than

---

[63] V. Larmine, "Christopher Lever", in the *DNB*.

[64] J. M. Blatchly, "Samuel Ward" in the *DNB*.

[65] 43 articles were submitted to the High Commission against him in November 1634, *CSP Dom*, 1635-36, lii. He was against set prayers, bowing at the name of Christ, and the Real Presence, and had reportedly claimed that the gospel in England "stood on tiptoes ready to be gone"; *CSP Dom* 1633-34, p. 450.

[66] S. Ward, *Woe to Drunkards* (1622); ibid, *Balme from Gilead to recouer conscience* (London, 1617), title-page. .See also Ward's *All in All* (London, 1622).

[67] S. A. Baron, "Michael Sparke", in the *ODNB*.

[68] L. Rostenberg, 'Michael Sparke', *The British Literary Book Trade, 1475-1700*, ed. J. K. Bricken (1996), p. 261; T. Vere, *To the never dying memory of his ever honor'd friend Mr Michael Sparke jun.* (London, 1645). Sparke had printed W. Prynne's *Histriomastrix* (London, 1633). He continued to print Prynne's work throughout the 1640s.

[69] See also John Vicars, another man of fervent Calvinist faith. His works positioned England as an Elect nation which must fulfill its confessional mandate as the champion of international Protestantism. See *England's Hallelujah* (London, 1631) and *England's Remembrancer* (London, 1641) which expressed solidarity with the Huguenots of La Rochelle and urged Charles I to intervene in the Thirty Years War.

the divine which it represented.[70] But this did not cause a stunting of aesthetic impulses elsewhere. Idolatry was variable not monolithic. Thus Samuel Clarke a staunch Presbyterian ejected at the Restoration, found his conscience troubled during the 1620s by the 'idolatry' of the surplice and ceremony of the Church but had no qualms about glorifying God through commemoration of His providences in the *Double Deliverance*, an image prominent in his works [Fig. 154.][71] Moreover, scriptural scenes hung in many Protestant households, a trend towards adornment over adoration actively encouraged by Calvinist ministers and typified by John Vicars: "[It] ever hath been a lawful and civill use of Pictures...both for adornation of houses and convenient places, and for commemoration of persons and things."[72] Stressing adornment over adoration did not cause such imagery to become sterile. Protestantism retained the use of icons as devotional tools, but this was a devotion centred not upon venerating the divine's *image*, but on heartfelt commemoration of its *actions*. Emotive 'monuments' pricked viewers to praise God's safeguarding of their realm.

This emotive impact caused the *Double Deliverance* to be imbued with the weight of collective memory. Controversial at the outset, Ward's emblem was soon rendered commonplace, becoming a centre-piece of orthodox commemorative works. Its illicitness was sanitized by the fizzling-out of Anglo-Spanish flirtation, collapsing marriage negotiations in Madrid during October 1623 and subsequent 'Blessed Revolution' in foreign policy the following February – in which James finally fulfilled his mantle of Protestant patriarch by intervening in the Thirty Years War – causing the houses of Stuart and Habsburg to be engaged in combat rather than courtship.[73] But implantation in the collective memory did not render the image static, for emotional investment in its providential iconography saw it blossom with unfolding political affairs, serving to support the Crown rather than antagonize it. Thus Carleton's *Thankfull Remembrance* depicted Prince Charles' bride-less homecoming as another victory of providential patriotism over Antichrist [Fig. 146.][74] Just four years earlier Ward's engraving had been censured for touching upon

---

[70] Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, pp. 44-46, 241, 431-32, 447-48, 452-57. See above, Chapter Two, pp. 103-110.

[71] A. Hughes, "Samuel Clarke", in the *DNB*; S. Clarke, *England's remembrancer, a true and full narrative of those two never to be forgotten deliverances* (London, 1679), pp. 110-11.

[72] Watt, *Cheap Print*, pp. 154-55; J. Vicars, *The Sinfulness and Unlawfulness, of Having or Making the Picture of Christs Humanity* (London, 1641), sig. B1; W. Perkins, *A Warning against the Idolatry of the Last Time* in his *Works*, I, p. 670.

[73] Cogswell, *Blessed Revolution*, passim.

[74] BM Sat. no. 9.

Charles' marriage, but now a Bishop of the English Church utilized his iconography to glorify its failure.[75]

This orthodoxy did not cause inertia. Far from possessing a fixed 'meaning', Ward's iconography accrued a multiplicity of resonances as it entered the bricolage of the 'hotter sort' of Protestant culture, the emotive weight of collective memory which stood behind it harnessed to divergent causes. We can assume a passing familiarity with this iconography through its inclusion in Michael Sparke's *Crumms of Comfort* (1627), a hugely popular work running to forty-two editions by 1656 [Figs 155-158.][76] Sparke turned Ward's diptych into a triptych, adding cessation of the recent plague in 1625 as another bout of divine mercy for which England should pay collective thanks. The iconography was also embellished. For the first time Fawkes was urged on by a devil, a trope commonplace later in the century.[77] Drama was similarly heightened by stressing the fortuitousness of England's preservation in 1588. Including a fact-sheet obsessively detailing the Armada's impressively impregnable vital statistics – 150 ships, 65 galleons, 8650 mariners, 57868 tons, and so on – stressed that this was an Anti-Christian, almost superhuman, foe which had somehow snatched defeat from the jaws of victory, an anomaly which could only betoken divine intervention for England.[78] Such details were designed to jolt the conscience. Thus each macabre threat – the Armada's looming crescent, the Gunpowder Plot's near ignition, and the plague's ravages – was coupled with a scene of heartfelt thanks and collective humiliation from the populace. Guiding viewers' reactions to God's providences, Sparke offered both a memorial and a manual.

Such pulling of heart-strings was symptomatic of Sparke's putting Ward's iconography to a very different end than its original inception, prodding souls rather than poking authority. Sparke's "Crumms" were prayers regulating Protestant devotions. If Ward's *Double Deliverance* had employed memory as a protest against

---

[75] That his wooing was doomed by divine hands rather than his own shortcomings was perhaps of some comfort to the deflated lothario. Employing the *Double Deliverance* to support the Crown rather than antagonize it was continued in Lever's *History of the Defenders*, which we have already discussed. Lever's *History of the Defenders*, title-page.

[76] These were engraved by Frederick Van Hulsen. Michael Sparke, *Crumms of Comfort* (London, 1627), sigs. A8 and A9. Hind, *Engraving*, iii, p. 215. This work also appeared as a single sheet engraving. Michael Sparke, *To the Glory of God in Thankefull Remembrance of our Three Great Deliverances unto Etern[al] Memory* (London, 1627) [London, Society of Antiquaries, Lemon Collection, no. 266] Hind, *Engraving*, 3, p. 101. Walsham, *Providence*, p. 246, n. 98.

[77] See BM Sat 1114; 1068; 43; 1090; 1077. This list is by no means exhaustive.

[78] Society of Antiquaries, Lemon Collection, no. 266; Cf Edward Sparke's *Thysiasterion, vel, Scintilla altaris primitive devotion, in the feasts and fasts of the Church of England* (London, 1678), p. 580.

the King's dynastic policy, Sparke utilized its iconography as a lament at the prevalence of sin in society. Warning of the "crying sinnes" that would spark "the fourth Judgement, that is likely to fall upon us by the sword", Sparke coupled thanksgiving with anxiety.[79] Remembering divine deliverances from Antichrist raised the question of whether contemporary society merited such safeguarding.[80] Abuse of God's mercies had created a nation no more a "spectacle" of His "ineffable Goodnesse" but rather one awaiting His "unsupportable wrath."[81] Emotive Anti-Catholic memory was thus employed here to inspire viewers to purge themselves of sin, and Sparke consequently called Protestants to wake thinking of God's mercies and "with voice and hearts to call on Him" for protection from Satan's ravages.[82] Memory inspired present action, and thanksgiving here was as much about celebrating the nation as it was chastising its inhabitants. Easily the most common appearance of Ward's iconography, most seventeenth-century readers encountered the *Double Deliverance* not only as an invitation to stir hatred towards Rome, but as a warning from the past to prod their souls in the present.

Such a piece of purgative devotion highlights that memory pulled in many ways. Yet we should not assume that *Double Deliverance* became increasingly politically sanitized the further it travelled from the Spanish Match. Its protest credentials were enduring in popular memory, allowing it to become an ensign of opposition to the Laudian Church in the next generation. Thus images after Sparke appeared in the *Quintessence of Cruelty* (1641) by the London schoolmaster John Vicars [Fig 159.][83] This verse celebration of deliverance appeared to be part of Protestant's cultural furniture – indeed, Vicar's characterization of his text as a "perpetual *monument* of God's mercy in our manifold and miraculous Deliverances from Popish machinations" described the standard, not the seditious.[84] But memory was suddenly political. As part of a drive to foster closer relationships with Europe's big players the Laudian Church dampened Anti-Catholic zeal, eschewing the

---

[79] Sparke, *Crumms*, sig. L7.
[80] For a similar use of Anti-Catholicism as a purgation, see below Chapter Four, pp....
[81] Society of Antiquaries, Lemon Collection, no. 266.
[82] Sparke, *Crumms*, sigs. L7-L8.
[83] Verses recounted: "Heavens *All-Seeing-Eye*, which *deepest-pits* espies:/ This desperate *Work of Darkness* sees most cleare,/ And, *timely*, makes the mischiefe *All* appeare." John Vicars, *November the 5. 1605. The Quintessence of Cruelty, or Master-peece of Treacherym the Popish Powder-Plot* (London, 1641), sig. sig, A. This works was littered with other images after Sparke, see p. 76.
[84] Vicars, *Quintessence*, sig. A4. The laudatory verses of his friends on this and the following pages repeatedly see the text as a lasting "monument."

apocalyptic template of history – in which God had continually delivered England from Rome's ravages – and re-colouring the Church's past. This struck at the heart of Protestant identity. No more a severance from Antichrist, Laudian divines stressed the English Church's jurisdictional continuity with its medieval forebearer, terming the English Reformation a political rupture, not a flight from Babylon. Rome was no longer the 'False Church' – it was *erring* rather than *evil*.[85] Re-writing history was coupled with curtailing its expression. As embarrassing over-hangs of zealous Anti-Catholicism, the 'never-to-be-forgotten' deliverances of 1588 and 1605 became victims of forced amnesia, as the Caroline authorities demonstrated distaste for the bonfires and bells which had celebrated these pivotal days in the Protestant calendar for generations.[86] The *Double Deliverance* was intimately tied to Laudian purgation. Michael Sparke was one of the 'hotter sort' prosecuted, and many churches were pruned of the iconography.[87] The Archbishop thus ordered William Kingsley, Archdeacon of Canterbury, to remove a tablet of the Armada and Gunpowder Plot in 1636: "put out of the Monument, all that concerns the Fleet in 88 because that belonges to a Forreign Nation."[88] Calvinists were not the only ones guilty of iconoclastic ravages.

Vicars' "Monument" was equally their victim. Originally attempting to publish the work during 1637, he was blocked by Laud's chaplain, Samuel Butler, who had claimed: "we are not so angry with the Papists now, as we were about 20 years since, and that there was no need of any such Bookes as these to exasperate them, there being now an endeavour to winne them to us by fairnesse and mildnesse."[89] Published after the fall of the Laudian Bishops, and adorned with the *Double Deliverance* and a cabal image, the *Quintessence* was more than a work of

---

[85] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pt. 1, esp. ch. 6. See below, Chapter Five, pp. 317-18; Walsham, *Providence*, p. 264.

[86] Providence was downplayed in commemoration – the Armada and Gunpowder Plot were routed by circumstance rather than divine rescue. See, William Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father In God, William Laud*, 7 vols (Oxford, 1847-60), 4, p. 406; 6, p. 52. These dates consequently became days of protest increasingly tainted with Calvinist hostility to the regime, Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, pp. 171-90.

[87] W. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (London, 1646), p. 185.

[88] Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 91-3. The painted was inscribed "In perpetuam Papistarum infamiam", and there seems little doubt another version of the *Double Deliverance* motif. Walsham, *Providence*, p. 265.

[89] Vicars, *The quintessence of cruelty*, sig. A3.

generic memorial Anti-Catholicism – it was a piece of one-upmanship. Indeed, Vicars interpreted the *act* of publication as a work of deliverance:[90]

> "Which, now, at last (though, with many struggles) I,
>
> (By Gods aid, in our pious Parliament)
>
> Have brought to public view, thus to prevent
>
> Our time dough – Bakers base malignancy
>
> Who, heated had their Oven, extremely hot;
>
> To burn-up Oblivions smoking-flame,
>
> The memory (to our eternall shame)
>
> Of this nefarious Popish Poweder Plot."[91]

The Long Parliament's overthrowal of the Laudian regime was another victory inspired by divine intervention – Samuel Baker's cruel censorship against memorial Anti-Catholicism routed. A celebratory tone can be seen in the embellishments of Ward's imagery. The Gunpowder Plot was depicted as a battle between heaven and hell: an unholy trinity of devil, priest and Pope exclaiming "I Plott", "I'lle act ye" and "I owne" were routed by their divine counterparts, who cried "I see", "I've blast ye" and "I smile." This was a celebrative re-packaging of iconography synonymous with opposition to the Caroline regime in the wake of its crumbling. Ward was a champion to Protestants who opposed Charles' court and Church.[92] He was certainly something of a hero to Vicars, who demonstrated a keen familiarity with his work – his image of the world unmoved by a popish "cloud of ignorance and error" had first appeared in Ward's *Balme from Gilead* [Figs. 160 & 153.][93]

Viewing the fall of Laud as an act of deliverance was more than a rhetorical flourish. The contestation over the place of Anti-Catholicism in the English Church had become embroiled in two clashing conspiracy theories competing to make sense of the political wrangling of late-Caroline culture. Firstly, Laudians viewed the vehement Anti-Catholicism of their opponents as part of a 'Puritan' plot against monarchy. Because Presbyterianism allowed congregants to elect the government of

---

[90] Ibid, sigs, A1, A3, B3.

[91] Vicars, *Quintessence*, sig. A3.

[92] A writer of chronicle poems, Vicar's attraction to the *Double Deliverance* may have stemmed from a mutual interest in opposing the Spanish Match, for Vicars had written verses commemorating public jubilation at its failure, see J. Gasper, "John Vicars", in the *DNB*.

[93] Vicars, *The quintessence of cruelty*, sig. B3; Ward, *Balme from Gilead*, title-page.

their Church it was typified as a subversively popularist movement, inviting the populace to consider matters above them. Using 'popery' as an emotive language to garner support for their questioning of 'Romish' elements in the hierarchy of the Church of England – such as Bishops and clerical ordination – Presbyterianism would soon turn that language against the hierarchical imperative underpinning monarchy. Anti-Catholic posturing thus masked plots to undermine Church and State.[94] Conversely, for 'hotter' Protestants the Laudian quashing of providential history and Anti-Catholic commemoration were manifestations of a conspiracy to return England to the Roman fold.[95] It was the routing of this plot which works like Vicars celebrated after Laud's fall. Thus *Novembris Monstrum* (1641), another memorial of England's deliverance from gunpowder, trumpeted its own Anti-Catholic licence as much as it did divine safeguarding of the realm. Packed with laudatory verses and dedications to its author's "monument" this work was another victim of Laudian censorship.[96] Implying that Laud's Church was a Romish plot revenging the damage done to Catholicism by Elizabeth, it once again sported an image after the *Double Deliverance* [Fig. 161.][97]

It is not surprising that the *Double Deliverance* became a badge of antagonism for this camp of Protestants. Its subject – November 5th – had increasingly become a day of protest, a vicious performance of Anti-Catholic sentiment levelled at Canterbury as much at Rome.[98] Such protests grew out of the belief that under the Stuarts England had ebbed away from the high-water mark of Protestantism attained

---

[94] James I's strife with Parliament over foreign policy was equated with 'Puritan' opposition in the Commons. P. Lake, "Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice" in Hughes & Cust (eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* pp. 84-97; ibid "Anti-Puritanism: The Structure of a Prejudice" in K. Fincham & P. Lake (Eds.,) *Religious Politics in Post Reformation England* (Cambridge, 2006). R. Montagu, *A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: a New Gagg for an Old Goose* (London, 1624); ibid, *Apello Caesarem* (London, 1625), pp. 7, 23, 39, 42-43, 114-118; Laud, *Works*, I, pp. 63-89; M. Wren, *A sermon preached before the king's majesty on Sunday 17 February last at Whitehall* (Cambridge, 1627).
[95] Henry Burton, *For God, and the King. The Summe of Two Sermons Preached on the Fifth of November last in St. Matthews Friday-Streete* (Amsterdam, 1636), pp. 130-38; W. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 246-47; ibid, *A Quenche-Coale* (Amsterdam, 1637), pp. 12-18.
[96] *Novembris monstrum, or, Rome brovght to bed in England with the whores miscarrying* (London, 1641): Made "long since" it was "now by conquering importunity made publique, for a small memorial of England's deliverance from the powder treason." pp. 1-4. See also pp. 55-56 where the ecumenical position of the Laudian Church is quashed in favour of anti-popish vitriol, deemed to be useful to society. Popery and censorship are equated, clearly relating to the recent episodes of forced amnesia.
[97] *Novembris Montrum*, title-page, pp. 85-87, 91-92. Elizabeth and James are seen to be God's guardians from popery, but Charles is not mentioned. Memorial remained an important part of verse and image into the later seventeenth century. See also S. Crossman, *The young man's calling, or The Whole duty of Youth* (London, 1678), pp. 415-16.
[97] Lake, "Anti-Popery", pp. 84-97.
[98] Cressy, *Bonfires & Bells*, pp. 171-90.

under Elizabeth I. This was pure myth: in reality, for much of Elizabeth's reign the position of English Protestantism was precarious and by no means as Reformed as subsequent agitators remembered.[99] Yet there was power in distortion. Elizabeth's ghost haunted the Stuarts, her presidency over a Golden Age of Protestantism a mythical bar against which succeeding monarchs were judged and found wanting.[100] One Exclusion Crisis libel expressed the power of protest contained in this yearning for a mythical monarch: "A Tudor! A Tudor! We've had Stuarts enough,/ None ever reign'd like old Bess in her ruff."[101] Because of its malleability, manipulating myths effectively challenged and berated the establishment. At a distance of three centuries it is easy to view such manipulation of prejudice and levelling of false accusation at the Laudian Church with distaste, but the vociferousness of the Anti-Catholicism directed against it emphasized how violently wrenched the identity of the 'hotter sort' had been by its toying with the founding myth underpinning their apocalyptical view of history.

In the first twenty years of its existence, then, the *Double Deliverance* had been smoked in the fumes of opposition, losing none of the taint of antagonism with which it was imbued at its first striking, but accruing more resonances of resistance to the Stuarts as time passed, an implicit protest taunting the Caroline Church. But Ward's iconography was also employed to taint Laudians more directly, taking this one-upmanship to the next level by according them a place at the Pope's cabal. Thus the *Pimpes Prerogative*, a broadside from 1641 [Fig. 162.] This lampooned the High Commission and Star Chamber, courts used to enforce 'popish' Laudian changes upon the English Church recently abolished by the Long Parliament, much to the dismay of the Papal cabal – "What, no Commission!" "Then wo to Rome and us!"[102] The image re-appeared on the frontispiece to *A Conspiracy Discovered* (1641) [Fig. 163.] This 'conspiracy' was the alleged 'Army Plot' of spring 1641 to impose arbitrary government, employing the military to coerce Parliament to the King's will. The arrival of Father Time, who "brings all to light", celebrated Parliament's investigation, and the cabal lamented the plot's uncovering in phrases which made

---

[99] See A. Walsham, "The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch" in T. Freeman and S. Doran (Eds.,) *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Houndmills, 2003), pp. 143-68.
[100] Cressy, *Bonfires & Bells*, pp. 130-41, 171-90.
[101] G. de Forest Lord, *Poems On Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse 1660-1714*, 5 vols, (New Haven, 1963), i, p. 281; cf. ibid, ii, pp. 157-58.
[102] *The Pimpes Prerogative* (London, 1641). The other quotations are: "I feare no summons, from Doctor Commons"; "I care not a straw, for the Baudy law."

direct reference to Ward's iconography: "The eye of heaven sees all."[103] Viewers who laughed at such celebrative routing were expected to understand the unspoken connection to the *Double Deliverance*'s iconography – it had earned a place in Protestant culture at the point of assumption. Thus the subtlety of the jibe in Prynne's frontispiece to *Canterburies Doom*, portraying Laud on trial before the House of Lords [Fig. 164.] The key informed readers that the tapestries behind Laud were "Hangings of '88" – something of a pictorial poke in the eye.[104]

There was a curious irony about all of this. Ward's image had been quashed by those associated with the 'Beautification of Holiness' and celebrated by those of an iconophobic bent. This tells us something about attitudes to imagery in Protestant culture. Strife around this icon had little to do with concerns about idolatry or considerations of the merits of religious art, but everything to do with power. Power to control interpretations of England's past, and power to utilize that interpretation in the affairs of the present. Contestation over Ward's image centred upon its suitability as an act of memory, not on the appropriateness of an image in collective devotion. For this was a devotional image, albeit one which honoured God not through inviting veneration of His image but through an emotive appeal to commemorate His mercies. Suspicions of art in a religious setting may have been rife in seventeenth-century culture, but this did not lead to a numbing of aesthetic sensibilities in society as a whole. The *Double Deliverance* had served many masters – an ensign of opposition, or a devotional memorial both in public and private; a piece of political agitation, or an act of memory steered to purge the Calvinist soul of sin. The vibrancy of the employment of this image hints at the power which the visual retained in Protestant culture.

This power ensured that the *Double Deliverance* remained an indelible part of the English visual imagination well into the Victorian era. Passing far beyond its original context, the motif was used in 1740 against the Jacobites, and later in the eighteenth century to satirize the politician Henry Fox.[105] At these moments, the iconography was employed *against* the opposition – it had accrued a stamp of orthodoxy far removed from its origins in a Puritan culture of agitation. Familiarity

---

[103] *A Conspiracy Discovered* (London, 1641); C. Russell, "The First Army Plot of 1641", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, 38, (1988), pp. 85-106.
[104] Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, frontispiece. An engraved reproduction of one of these tapestries – dating from 1739 – can be seen in the British Musuem, 1861,0518.305-327.
[105] BM Sat. nos. 1223, 2456, 3439.

had not bred contempt but acceptance – the motif, if originally illicit, was sanitized of its oppositional credentials through frequent reprinting in the later half of the seventeenth century. Remaining part of printer's stock throughout the century Ward's print re-appeared to celebrate the Glorious Revolution of 1688 [Fig. 165.][106] We have here the construction of social memory around an image – the visual idiom had even passed into written accounts of the Gunpowder Plot. But if becoming commonplace robbed the image of its power as a political agitator, it was invested with the authority of a cliché instantly totemic of the events it depicted. Thus its inclusion during 1678 in a calendar of the Church of England by Edward Spark, chaplain to Charles II, as part of the imagery styled: "as Pourtraits of particular Relations are to Houses....having here the just Apology of Antiquity, useful as to History and Illustration."[107] The image used to lampoon the Church of Charles I sat in that of his son as part of the décor, an "antique" memorial equally as iconic as the traditional emblems of saints and apostles which littered this work [Fig. 166.][108] The Restoration Church, then, had co-opted the Puritan's icon. Re-appearing in octavo editions of Charles II's Prayer Book alongside that of the martyred Charles I, the engraving existed as an Anglican icon – an image of orthodoxy embellishing a calendar aimed to celebrate England's monarch and Church, not oppose them [Figs. 167 & 168.][109] Sanitation had become the last vestige of the illicit – the *Double Deliverance* belonged to the Anglicans, not the Dissenters; the Tories, not the Whigs. It was for this reason that during the next bout of Anti-Catholic histrionics – the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis – the opposition would largely have to invent its own iconography. But whilst this iconography left 1588 and 1605 largely alone, it remained heavily

---

[106] BM Sat. no. 42-44. The print remained part of Peter Stent and John Overton's stock in the 1650s and 1660s, see A. Globe, *Peter Stent: London Print-seller, c. 1624-1665* (Columbia, 1985), pp. 135-36, 174-77; Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, pp. 152-54. For other appearances of the image, see, S. Clarke, *England's remembrancer, a true and full narrative of those two never to be forgotten deliverances* (London, 1679), pp. 110-11 for the foldout of Blackfriars. This work even contains some of Ward's verse. See p. 67. Ibid, *The History of the glorious Life, Reign and Death of the illustrious monarch Elizabeth I* (London, 1682), features images of both the Armada fleet and Gunpowder Plot, pp. 105 & 192. The former bears little resemblance to the *Double Deliverance*, however.

[107] Edward Sparke's *Thysiasterion, vel, Scintilla altaris primitive devotion, in the feasts and fasts of the Church of England* (London, 1678), p. 575. This was a work dedicated to Charles II and the Church of England. Sigs A4-A8. This work also featured images of martyrdom of Charles I and Restoration of Charles II, pp. 600 and 623 respectively. The quotation at sig. a2.

[108] Ibid, sig. a2. Moreover, Spark intended his collection of devotions as a form of respiratory incense designed to re-kindle the Church, and clearly saw November 5th celebrations – far from the vestige of Calvinist opposition – as an important part of this piety aimed to stoke the zeal fuelling Christians.

[109] *The Book of Common Prayer* 8th edn (London, 1676); *The Holy Bible* (London, 1669), plate facing Pss 10-14. See also *The Protestants vade mecum, or, Popery display'd in its proper colours, in thirty emblems, lively representing all the Jesuitical plots against this nation* (London, 1680), pp. 14, 26

indebted to the tropes which Ward had employed, manipulating providential memory in new ways to steer the politics of the present.[110]

III: The Popish Plot & the Manipulation of Memory

That the 'Popish Plot' did not exist did not make it feel any the less real.[111] Titus Oates' invented European-wide conspiracy articulated the paranoid fantasies which Protestants held of Rome.[112] A seasoned liar and chancer, Oates befriended the Catholic hierarchy in London in the hope of living-off their Church. Sent abroad to a Jesuit college, the Order soon became frustrated by his behaviour and lack of either drive or intelligence, before severing its ties with him. Oates thus changed tack, using his knowledge of the personalities and organization of English Catholicism to invent an elaborate and richly detailed plot in the hope to accruing both reputation and wealth.[113] Claiming to have infiltrated the Jesuits to serve England, Oates reported how he had read letters detailing a plot to kill Charles II and re-impose Roman dominion on England.[114] The King was to be shot in St. James Park by a Jesuit John Grove and Benedictine lay brother, Thomas Pickering.[115] Should they fail the Queen's physician, George Wakeman, would poison him, and regicide would be followed by

---

[110] There are exceptions. Works for children which leaned heavily to the Whig's pro-Exclusion position contained the Gunpowder Plot part of the Double Deliverance. See Clark, *The Protestant school-master*, opposite p. 173; B. Harris, *The Protestant Tutor* (London, 1679), pp. 52, 62.

[111] For literature on the Popish Plot, see J. Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (London, 1972); J. Pollock, *The Popish Plot: a study in the history of the reign of Charles II* (London, 1903); A. Marshall, *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey: plots and politics in Restoration London* (Stroud, 1999); J. Lane, *Titus Oates* (London, 1949); Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 147-53, 154-88; T. Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, 1987) pp. 93-188; G. S. de Krey, *Restoration and revolution in Britain : a political history of the era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2007), pp. 140-43, 145-96

[112] Oates original account was: *A true narrative of the horrid plot and conspiracy of the popish party: against the life of His Sacred Majesty, the government and the Protestant religion* (London, 1679), re-printed in R. Greene, *Diaries of the Popish Plot* (New York, 1977), pp. 162-240. This was updated asevnts unfolded, *The discovery of the Popish Plot : being the several examinations of Titus Oates, D.D., before the High Court of Parliament, the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Edmund-Bury Godfry, and several other of His Majesty's justices of the peace* (London, 1679) T. Oates, *A sermon preached at St. Michaels Wood-street at the request of some friends* (London, 1679); ibid, *The King's evidence justifi'd, or, Doctor Oates's vindication of himself* (London, 1679); R. White, *A Poem upon Mr. Tytus Oates : the first discoverer of the late popish plot* (London, 1679).

[113] The crucial element of Oates' accounts was how peppered with circumstantial details they are, allowing readers to imagine the Plot's hatching at various parts of London. This attention to minutiae and rather prosaic, matter-of-fact style was critical in making the account seem feasible. See, for example Greene, *Diaries*, pp. 177, 188, 190, 222-223.

[114] Greene, *Diaries*, pp. 165, 168-69, 174-75.

[115] Ibid, pp. 175-78, 184-85, 189, 194, 202-04, 209, 213-214, 217, 227, 231.

Catholic invasion, repeating the burning London in 1666, and slaughtering Protestants.[116]

This would be co-ordinated by Catholic peers (Oates accused six in total), one of whom, William Howard, Viscount Stafford, was eventually executed for his part in this non-existent conspiracy.[117] But at the Plot's first hatching in 1678 such executions were a long way off. Oates' lies were not initially well received. Given short-shrift by Charles II, Oates found a more receptive audience in the Privy Council, but even they realized that his account - "a loose and tottering fabric which would easily tumble if stood alone" – did not amount to much in any legal sense.[118] Two co-incidences added credence to his story. Firstly, the discovery of letters between one of the accused, Edmund Coleman, secretary to the Duke of York's wife, and Father Ferrier, confessor to Louis XIV, which spoke of re-converting England.[119] Secondly, the mysterious murder of Edmund Godfrey, the magistrate who had taken Oates' depositions.[120] This was soon spun into proof of conspiracy, an attempt by Catholics to prevent the plot's revelation. A £500 reward for information enticed the opportunists William Bedlow and Miles Prance to invent tales of a Jesuit plot to strangle Godfrey and run him through with his own sword, and the Plot now had its first martyr.[121] Farce was erected upon Farce. Another unsavoury criminal, Thomas Dangerfield, turned the charity of one Catholic woman, Elizabeth Cellier, against her and her mistress, Lady Powris, accusing them of inventing a fictitious 'Presbyterian Plot' against the government. Dangerfield claimed that this was another branch of the Popish Plot – by accusing prominent Whigs of sedition Rome discrediting calls of Exclusion, thus ensuring Catholic Succession. Planting fraudulent papers in a Meal

---

[116] Ibid, pp. 196, 198-99, 202, 207, 211, 215, 231, 234, 237.

[117] Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 200-02.

[118] HMC Ormonde, 462; Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 59, 66-69, 75.

[119] Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, p. 70; Greene, *Diaries*, pp. 202, 215, 231-33, 236-37, 239.

[120] Greene, *Diaries*, pp. 35-39, 47, 53-55, 112, 167, 171, 232; Marshall, *Strange Death*, passim; Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 77-131, 264-70.

[121] W. Bedlow, *A narrative and impartial discovery of the horrid Popish plot* (London, 1679); J. Bury, *A true narrative of the late design of the papists to charge their horrid plot upon the Protestants by endeavouring to corrupt Captain Bury and Alderman Brooks of Dublin* (London, 1679); *A True and perfect relation of the wicked and bloody plot that was conspired against His Majesty, and the alteration of the Protestant religion* (London, 1679); *The righteous evidence, witnessing the truth. Being an account of the sickness, and death-bed expressions, of Mr. VVilliam Bedlow* (London, 1680); M. Prance, *A true narrative and discovery of several very remarkable passages relating to the horrid popish plot* (London, 1679) See Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 100-116, 122-28, 132-38, 140-78, 199-220, 266-70; Greene, *Diaries*, pp. 29, 38-40, 88, 93-94.

Tub in Cellier's quarters, Dangerfield manufactured evidence for his lies, further 'proof' of the reality of Oates' plot. One man's lies thus legitimized another's.[122]

Oates was not the first to attempt to garner reputation – and wealth – by peddling probable lies: in 1674 a thirteen-year-old boy had told Parliament of a Catholic plot, and reports of treasonous intrigues were endemic during that decade.[123] Timing, however, was everything. Oates' 'Popish Plot' took-off because its narrative provided a solution to the matrix of being both 'pro-Exclusion' and 'loyal' in the late 1670s – in light of such a conspiracy, to oppose his brother's Succession was the surest way of safeguarding the King, for the prospect of a Catholic Successor had emboldened Roman intrigues. James' conversion in 1673 set the agenda of English politics for the next decade. His subsequent marriage to a Catholic – Mary of Modena – handed England the prospect of not one Catholic monarchy, which it had escaped for 120 years, but a Popish Dynasty.[124] This 'James Problem' was intellectual as well as emotional. Monarchy was the lynchpin of a Confessional State, and for the King not to belong to the Church of which he was head was paradoxical, violating the homology of Church and Crown at the heart of English politics, and undermining the symmetry of royal and clerical power which underpinned Anglican enthusiasm for the Restoration. England would be placed in an unheralded position whereby the monarch

---

[122] See. T. Dangerfield, *Mr. Tho. Dangerfields particular narration of the late popish design to charge those of the Presbyterian party with a pretended conspiracy against His Majesties person and government* (London,, 1679); ibid, *Mr. Tho. Dangerfield's second narrative: wherein is contained a faithful charge against the Lady Powis, Mr. Stamford, (the Duke of Newburghs resident) and Mrs. Cellier relating to the murther of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey and the late plot made by the papists, to be cast upon the Protestants* (London, 1680); ibid, *The information of Thomas Dangerfield, Gent : delivered at the bar of the Hovse of Commons, Tuesday the twentieth day of October in the year of Our Lord 1680* (London, 1680); ibid, *The case of Tho. Dangerfield: with some remarkable passages that happened at the tryals of Elizabeth Cellier, the popish midwife, and the Earl of Castlemain, at the Kings-bench bar at Westminster, before Sir Will. Scroggs Kt, Lord Chief Justice, &c. in the month of June, 1680* (London, 1680); ibid, *More shams still, or, A further discovery of the designs of the Papists to impose upon the nation the belief of their feigned Protestant or Presbyterian plot* (London, 1681) Cellier responded to Dangerfield in print, leaving him to reply: T. Dangerfield, *Tho. Dangerfield's answer to a certain scandalous lying pamphlet entituled, Malice defeated, or, The deliverance of Elizabeth Cellier* (London, 1680). See also, M. Prance, *Mr. Prance's answer to Mrs. Cellier's libel, and divers other false aspersions cast upon him* (London, 1680) See Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 189-95, 199-202, 256-59; Greene, *Diaries*, pp. 100-02.

[123] Miller, *Popery and Politics* p. 133; HMC 9th Report, Appendix 2, p, 37; *CSPD* 1673-75, pp. 95-96, 128-32; *CSPVen* 1673-75, p. 201. Lack of originality was actually the Plot's strength. As one cynic noted: "it was the preparation of some men's minds and not the witnesses that gave it entertainment", quoted in Miller, p. 158. Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, p. 54.

[124] Tumbleson, *Catholicism*, pp. 69-71, 74-76 in particular; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 128-32

was no longer its best defense against Popery. The Catholic challenge, then, was as much constitutional as religious.[125]

Much trauma was thus caused by the fantastic. Indeed, given the determinative effect upon politics of events which existed only in lies, we must recognize that the Exclusion Crisis was a largely textual tumult, driven by events which had no reality beyond texts, whether spoken, written or visual. Oates was not the only man who imagined intrigues – the conspiratorial mindset governed party-politics and controlled the explanatory frameworks presented to make sense of these traumatic times. Far from a purely religious fear 'Popery' held a wider, political remit. Due to alarmingly Absolutist tendencies in Louis XIV's France, 'Popery' became synonymous with 'Arbitrary Government' – a tyrannical monarchy with no respect for Parliamentary liberties so fundamental to English identity. The presence of a Catholic Queen, Catholic mistress, and Catholic heir at Court, combined with the pursuit of a pro-Catholic France and anti-Protestant Dutch Foreign Policy and the heavy-handedness of Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, Lord Treasurer from 1674, in constraining Parliament was constructed by the Whigs into a 'Court Conspiracy' to impose 'Popery and Arbitrary Government' in England after Louis XIV's France.[126] Excluding James was the surest means of scuppering this plot. The Tories, however, believed that a rather different conspiracy was at work. Mindful of the anarchy of the Civil Wars and Interregnum which had ensued when Parliament had previously tampered with the Crown, they were fearful of any alteration to the Succession, suspecting that the Anti-Catholic posturing motivating the Exclusion lobby masked a malevolent plot by the 'hotter sort' of Protestants to undermine Church and Crown in a re-enactment of 1641.[127] Propaganda wars between pro and anti Exclusionist were essentially battles between these two conflicting conspiracies.[128]

---

[125] In the words of one critic: "The Protestant religion is so intermixed with the civil interests of the nation that it is not possible to preserve them if a popish successor comes." Quoted in Miller, *Popery and Politics* p. 174.

[126] Tumbleson, *Catholicism*, pp. 69-97; Krey, *Restoration and revolution*, pp. 56-63, 74-76, 92-96, 99-105, 110-117, 127-34, 150-55; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 121-53.

[127] M. Knights, "Faults on Both Sides: The Conspiracies of Party Politics under the Later Stuarts", and P. Lake "The Monarchical Republic of Elizabeth I Revisited (by its Victims)" in B. Coward and J. Swann (eds.), *Conspiracies and Conspiracy theory in early modern Europe: from the Waldensians to the French Revolution* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 87-111, 153-72; M. Knights, *Representation and Misrepresentation in late Stuart Britain: partisanship and political culture* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 238-48; ibid, *Politics and Opinion*, pp. 184-90; Harris, *London Crowds*, pp. 133-45; Tumbleson, *Catholicism*, chapters 3 & 4, pp. 82-85 in particular; Krey, *Restoration and revolution*, pp. 134-40 147-49, 156-59, 165-67, 174-76; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 169-82; *A Dialogue Between the Pope and a Phanatick, Concerning Affairs in England* (1680), p. 12; BM Sat 1080; BM Sat 1122; *Foxes and Fire-*

213

How, then, did one judge truth in a politics that was both factious and fractious? Mark Knights has demonstrated that both parties harboured acute anxieties concerning the potential of the press for mendacity.[129] Politics was increasingly representational. Appealing to the public both through the heightened frequency of elections and petitions and the informal politicalization of the press, each party repeatedly addressed the populace and furthered their claims to best represent its interests. Such appeals contained a paradox, however. Growing deference to the 'public' as umpire was accompanied by unease at the 'rabble's' involvement in the political process, the growing importance of popular opinion undercut by fears about men's ability to judge rationally, an anxiety heightened by awareness of the presses' capacity to mislead through artifice and outright lying.[130] Such fears grew out of party politics, which lent itself to a conspiratorial mindset. Each side believed that the other went out of its way to deceive, tricking the public to support positions which were manifestly not in its interest. Such linguistic pyrotechnics allowed 'The Truth' to be maliciously manipulated to party positions.[131]

It was not simply that lies became increasingly prevalent. Rather, the sheer volume of rhetoric pouring from the press made it extremely difficult to judge where 'Truth' lay. Evaluating one party's truth-claims against another's meant that 'Truth' was both contested and constructed, resting upon collective judgement and the validation of men of credit.[132] Party politics thus spawned a rivalry of truths. What each man held to be 'true' became related to partisan conviction, party allegiances conferring credit on positions – the existence of a 'Popish Plot', Court conspiracy to impose arbitrary government, or a dissenting plot to subvert Church and Crown -

---

Brands; or, A specimen of the Danger and Harmony of Popery and Separation (1680); E. Pelling, *A Sermon Preached On the Anniversary of that Most Execrable Murder of K. Charles the First, Royal Martyr* (1682).

[128] For discussion of fear and memory in this period, see L. K. J. Glassey (ed.), *The Reign of Charles II and James VII & II* (New York, 1997), chapters 4, 7, 9.

[129] Knights, *Representation*, passim.

[130] Ibid, pp. 3-4, 28-33, 209-10, 218-19, 236-48, 272-89, 298-302.

[131] Ibid, pp. 5-6, 9-10, 210-18; Knights, "Faults on Both Sides", pp. 153-72; B. Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, 1967); G. Wood, "Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: The American Revolution as a psychological phenomenon. Casality and deceit in the eighteenth century", *William and Mary Quarterly*, 39, (1982), pp. 401-41. See the comments of the 1st Earl of Halifax: "the best party is but a kind of conspiracy against the rest of the nation", W. Raleigh (ed.), *The Complete Work of George Savile, First Marquess of Halifax* (Oxford, 1912), p. 225.

[132] This work on the social construction of Truth builds on the work of Steve Shapin and Simon Schaffer concerning scientific 'fact' S. Shapin, *A social history of truth : civility and science in seventeenth-century England* (Chicago/London, 1994); S. Shapin & S. Schaffer, *Leviathan and the air-pump : Hobbes, Boyle, and the experimental life* (Princeton, 1985); Knights, *Representation*, pp. 57-62, 272-75.

which rivals viewed as lies. What was important was what each man could be made to *accept* as true, and rhetoric thus became increasingly crucial to politicians. As Dr. Robert South complained in May 1686: "words are able to persuade men out of what they find and feel, to reverse the impression of sense…the greatest affairs and most important interests of the world, are carried on by things not as they *are*, but as they are *called*."[133] Slogans proved to be emotive linguistic ploys. "Liberty", "Arbitrary Government", "'41 is come again" and "Popery" reduced complex issues to the basest of impulses.[134] Playing on audiences' anxieties and pricking emotions in order to bypass reason, such linguistic dressings hampered the ability to judge clearly, harnessing zeal behind a given position.[135]

Thus far scholarship has focused exclusively on the power of slogans to focus zeal.[136] One commentator's characterization of the periods as "never without some extra word to furnish the coffee houses and fill the pamphlets" certainly contained much truth.[137] Yet images were an equally powerful political dress. Politics was the clash of rival rhetorical constructs, and the Whig's placement of the Popish Plot and Exclusion in a grander emotive narrative of England's providential past was intensely visual. Manipulating tropes of emotive memorial imagery after the *Double Deliverance* was a ploy harnessing memory of the past behind the politics of the present, and in this way iconography became the opposition's political badge.

---

[133] R. South, *Twelve Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions* (London, 1697), sermon ix, 'The Fatal Imposture and Force of Words'. Quoted in Knights, *Representation*, p. 211.

[134] Knights, *Representation*, pp. 3-12, 211, 245-48, 274-79, 284-89. As Viscount Bolingbroke noted in 1709 "No man looks on things as they really are, but sees them through the glass which party hold up to him". *Camden Miscellany*, 26, Camden Society, 4th Ser, 14 (1975), p. 147.

[135] It is thus argued that this period saw the birth of a reading public skilled at interpreting narratives. Although Steven Zwicker argued that the sheer volume of print available at the end of the seventeenth century spurred a shift from a more 'active' form of Renaissance reading to a more 'passive' form, recent critics have found the need to engage with texts and unpick the trickery which they imposed upon readers to have been at the heart of the period's concerns. See K. Loveman, *Reading Fictions, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 2-3, 6-7, 8-17, 86-87, a critique of S. N. Zwicker, "The Constitution of Opinion and the Pacification of Reading" K. Sharpe and S. N. Zwicker (eds) *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003). For earlier forms of more active reading, see A. Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford, 1996); W. H. Shermon, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst, 1995); L. Jardine & W. H. Sherman, "Pragmatic Readers: Knowledge Transactions and Scholarly Services in Late Elizabethan England", in A. Fletcher and P. Roberts (eds.), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 102-24. The example of William Benett is useful. A series of letters from London to his mother during the Popish Plot years show his evaluating the evidence and rumour placed before him, letting his mother know what was credible and what was not. V. F. Benett-Stanford & W. Ansell-Day (eds.) *Pythouse Papers* (London, 1879), pp. 72-77 in particular.

[136] Knights, *Representation*, pp. 6-9, 30-35, 41-47.

[137] Raleigh (ed.), *The Complete Works*, p. 104.

Thus *The Happy Instruments of England's Preservation* (1681), an engraving which sought to legitimate a farce [Fig. 169.][138] Glorifying the Plot's 'revelation', this variation on the cabal image combatted one popular fear (alteration of the monarchy) with another (the prospect of Catholic Succession) by collapsing the events of two-and-a-half years into one conceit. Jesuits held instructions for various parts of the Plot, whilst on the far right Wakeman left with a "bill for £15000 to Poison the K[ing.]" Behind him, Stafford was executed, whilst on the far left Cellier stood by her Meal Tub. Amidst heaven's clouds sat the four witnesses whose lies has collectively 'uncovered' the plot – Oates, Prance, Dugdale and Bedlow – crowned with laurel wreaths and flanked by two angels holding a Church and the English Crown, the two institutions safeguarded by their revelations. A ray of light descended from the heavens through the witnesses to uncover the clutter of Cardinals and Jesuits at the Pope's "Infernal Conclave" below. A variation on "Video Rideo: I see and smile", this marked the plot's uncovering as yet another glorious manifestation of England's deliverance from the forces of Rome:

"But he that sits enthron'd, in mercy chose,

Those instruments, that did the whole disclose.

And thus to Oates, and the rest wee owe,

The Kingdom's Peace, if we can keep it so."

Demonstrating perfectly the power which iconography accrued as a vestige of memory, the engraving skillfully manipulated England's providential past to enhance the political lobbying of the present. The implication was that as God, through these four instruments, had safeguarded England from Papal intrigue, it would be effrontery of the highest order to allow New Jerusalem to be headed by a Catholic monarchy – a slap in the face of Providence.

In the arts of deception subtlety was seductive. Indeed, propaganda which stretched credulity – like reports of Godfrey's ghost espousing incendiary invective – were least effective in winning support for Exclusion, sparking discussion of the probability of their occurrence rather than the political issues raised.[139] The apparently

---

[138] BM Sat. 1114. For details, see Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain* cat no. 200.
[139] Loveman, *Reading Fictions*, pp. 93-95, 100-01. For diaries and reading journals, see P. Hopkins, "The Verney Collection of Popish Plot Pamphlets", *Bulletin of the Friends of Cambridge University*

unremarkable proved most effective. Take, for example, Robert White's engraved portrait of Oates, such a generic representation of gentility it leaves viewers grasping for comment [Figs. 170-172.][140] The ornate border, pose and expression carefully parroted the language of nobility commonplace in the period's portraiture from Royalty to gentility [Figs. 173-175.][141] But precisely by being so unassuming, Oates' portrait masked its novelty. Glancing at White's work viewers would not see a man who had fled one curate-ship on a charge of perjury, narrowly escaped execution for sodomy, and was prone to lying and paedophilic urges.[142] The engraving washed clean the stains of Oates' past but it did not present him as a saint. Honour was whispered rather than shouted, Oates more prosaic than paragon. Understatement lent itself to acceptance, and presenting Oates as a stoic curate of the English Church, a Dr. nonetheless, dressed his evidence with an air of credibility. That both his status as an Anglican cleric and a 'DD' were equally the product of tall tales was beside the point.[143]

Library, 9, (1988), pp. 5-15; N. K. Kiessling, "The Library of Anthony Wood", *Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications*, third series, V, (Oxford, 2002), xxxix-xl. F. C. Frances (ed.), *Narcissus Luttrell's Popish Plot Catalogues* (Oxford, 1956). Luttrell carefully catalogue deceptions. He noted of *A Further discovery of the Plot, drawn from the Narrative and Deposition of Dr. Oates* "it pretends to be a further discovery but is rather a great abuse and affrot to ye Dr" (p. 7); of *A full and final proof of the Plot from the Revelation, proving Dr. Oates and Mr. Bedlow to be the two witnesses therein mentioned* that it was "A roguish piece, done to railing with eye witnesses" (p. 8); and of *An Additional Discovery of Mr. L'Estrange's further Discovery of the Popish Plot, where Dr. Oates and the rest of the King's Evidences are vindicated* "A piece yt is far from vindicating ye witnesses, but putt a further abuse on them" (p. 8) Other examples: *An Abstract of the Accounts of Rob Baldcross, & Lawrence Mowby...for High Treason* "A popish piece, done to villifye & aspeisce Baldwin & Mowbrey", Ibid, p. 8; *Some of the Most Material Errors, and Omissions in the late printed Tryals of the Romish Priest at the Old Bailey* "This is a popish thing, & pretendeth many things to belittle and was make for ye priests"; *Magna Veritas, or John Gadbury not a Papist, but a Protestant of the Church of England* "Put out by himself, but whilst a papist or no he appear'd to be a great rogue in the tryal of Mrs Cellier....".
Examples of such detection run throughout the catalogues.
[140] BM Sat 1073/ BM Sat 1078 and British Museum Department of Prints and Drawing, O'D4 & O'D1
[141]These figures depict Charles II, Prince Rupert or Edward Spark. See British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings. BM P.1-50. Cracherode bequest 1799; BM 1902-10-11-4646. Cheylesmore bequest.; BM 1864-6-11-82; 1863,0214.570. Examples of this kind are numerous, but see BM P.5-244. Cracherode bequest 1799. See also Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, pp. 217-43.
[142] Kenyon claims that Oates had sexual relations with some of the boys in the Catholic schools he was sent too during his Jesuit training. On Oates' past, see Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, pp. 192, 45-76; Marshall, *Strange Death*, pp. 57-73.
[143] White made a similar engraving of Miles Prance. See British Museum, Departments of Prints and Drawings, O'D 1 (F. O'Donoghue; H. M Hake, *Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits preserved in the Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum*, 6 vols, London, 1908). 1857,0308.520 ; 1925,0615.124 This was used in M. Prance, *True narrative and discovery of several very remarkable passages relating to the horrid Popish Plot* (London, 1679). He also made an equally honourable engraving of Stephen Dugdale. See O'D1.

Similar polishing lay behind portraits of 'Captain' William Bedlow, a career-criminal, charlatan and con-man recently imprisoned for horse-stealing.[144] In *England's Obligation to Captain William Bedlow* (1679) the dress of gentility was mixed with the language of providence [Fig. 176]. Tropes indebted to the *Double Deliverance* draped present events in the myth of the realm's past. In the background God's eye sees the firing set to befall London were it not for the:

> "Instrument in Great JEHOVA's Hand,
>
> To Save the King, and his Besieged *Land*:
>
> Had not this Providence, dropt on our Shore,
>
> *Magna Brittanie*, now, had been no more."[145]

An instrument of God's providence, Bedlow held a book inscribed with verses from 1 John 9 referring to embracing Christ's light. Accepting this calling, he was seen below putting it to work by overhearing a variety of plots which were to befall the nation – the murders of Charles II and Godfrey, a French invasion and various Jesuit machinations which he had reported. Alongside drenching him in the conventions of gentility, the engraving's plotting of his revelations in the national myth of deliverance garnered his evidence credence. As God's eye saw plots, so his instruments overheard them.[146]

Such embellishments were employed most graphically in the posthumous life of Edmund Godfrey, whose mysterious death was quickly spun to make him an instrument of providence 'murdered' to safeguard the realm by uncovering the brutal reality of the plot.[147] On 12th October, sixteen days after taking Oates' depositions, Godfrey disappeared. His corpse was found on Primrose Hill five days later,

---

[144] *England's Obligations to Captain William Bedlowe* (London, 1679).
[145] Ibid. Also printed by Thomas Dawks without the image – Lutt. III. 112. Cf. Wing E3007.
[146] An engraving of Oates as a gentleman and instrument of Providence (in this case receiving his calling from an angel) was also produced. See BM Sat 1078.
[147] All scholars of Godfrey are indebted to Alan Marshall's *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey* (Sutton, 1999). I am indebted to this work for references and information concerning the investigation into his death and events around his funeral. The death remains a mystery. There are four basic theories: 1) Catholic conspirators killed to keep silent/revenge for taking Oates' deposition. 2) Oates' backers killed him to lend credence to their 'popish plot' story. 3) Godfrey committed suicide, but his corpse was tampered with to cover this up and blame the Catholics. 4) The death was the result of enemies spawned from his work as a magistrate, and unconnected to the plot.

apparently strangled, with a broken neck and run-through with his sword.[148] Money about his person ruled robbery out as a motive and the rumour ran that he had being murdered by Catholics both to silence his mouth and to revenge his taking of Oates' depositions. Exclusionists happily manipulated this rumour, positioning the 'murder' as cold 'proof' of the verity of Plot's existence - indeed, Godfrey's brother had many ties with the Whigs and willingly consented to the peddling of his sibling's reputation.[149] A substantial reward for information was quickly collected by Bedlow and Miles Prance, whose disturbing tales of Godfrey's murder and the gory display of his corpse before London's most prominent Catholics led to the execution of three men – Robert Green, Henry Berry and Lawrence Hill – for his murder.

Godfrey was nonetheless an unlikely Anti-Catholic hero. Polemical depiction of a courageous investigator of the plot and a Protestant paragon were far removed from the man hesitant to either take or believe Oates' depositions, a liberal magistrate both lenient toward and friendly with Catholics.[150] From the very moment of his death Godfrey's body and reputation ceased to be his own. Leaving instructions for a funeral devoid of "pomp and pageantry" and burial in a pauper's grave, Godfrey would have resented the garish public-mourning of his send-off.[151] Held in state to whip-up Anti-Catholic feeling, many who viewed Godfrey's body left distressed and "inflamed" – hardly surprising given his wounds – and an Anti-Catholic riot was feared.[152] This presaged his funeral, an even grander spectacle of pure political theatre. A procession of 72 divines and 1000 gentleman mourners marched from Fleet Street to the Church of St. Martins-in-the-fields in the Strand. Here Dr. William Lloyd thundered from the pulpit whilst guarded by two burly clerics, a spectacle calculated

---

[148] Marhsall, *Strange Death* pp. 83-85. It is not clear whether these wounds were inflicted posthumously to heighten tales of 'popish' cruelty For details of the post-mortem and inquest, see pp. 105-113.

[149] Marshall, *Strange Death* pp. 38-41.

[150] For liberality to Catholics including those in the entourage of the Duke of York such as Edward Coleman, implicated by Oates and executed, see Marhsall, *Strange Death* pp. 33, 88, depression, pp. 36-39, 86-88. Under English Law, failure to help uncover a conspiracy made one equally culpable – consequently, we should not read Godfrey taking Oates' depositions as 'belief' in them, but rather simply hedging his bets: should they be true, and he found not to have acted, he left himself open to prosecution. His eccentricities and depression are explained in his relationship with the Irish healer Valentine Greatrakes. See A. Marhsall, "The Westminster Magistrate and the Irish Stroker:Sir Edmund Godfrey and Valentine Greatrakes, Some Unpublished Correspondence", *Historical Journal*, 39, (1997), pp. 499-505.

[151] Marhsall, *Strange Death* pp. 114-15, 119; *Reflections upon the murder of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey* (London, 1682), pp. 17-18; R. North, *Examen: or, an enquiry into the credit and veracity of a pretended complete history shewing the perverse and wicked design of it, and the many falsities and abuses of truth contained in it*, (London, 1740), p. 202.

[152] G. Burnet, *History of his Own Times*, 2 vols, (London, 1897) II, pp. 164-65.

to highlight Popery's imminent danger.[153] Lloyd set the template for the official edit of Godfrey's life: a diligent magistrate and charitable Christian, Godfrey had given his life to his country, the manifestation of the ideal Protestant's shunning of worldly pleasures in favour of duty. If further proof that Godfrey was an instrument of providence was required, Lloyd preached on 2 Samuel 3, implying that he had a biblical precursor in Abner, a man who similarly dedicated his life to serving his King and dispensing justice with mercy.[154]

This narrative soon became multi-media. Coins were produced sporting Godfrey's image and the motto "the Christian Atlas sustained the Faith with a broken neck" and "Edmund Godfrey by his death re-established the state" [Figs. 177 & 178.][155] Similarly, Thomas Dawks' *England's Grand Memorial* (1679) placed Godfrey, "The first martyr of this Damnable and Horrid Plot", at its centre [Fig. 179.].[156] His death held equal weight with attempts to assassinate the King, seen flanked with the multiple means of regicide which Oates had reported. On the left the "Hellish" cabal invented the Plot, and were overheard by witnesses Oates, Bedlow, Prance and Dugdale, prompting Oates and Tongue to inform Godfrey, who is murdered in the bottom scene. The right-hand storyboard was dedicated entirely to the martyr, detailing Bedlow's account of his corpse's display; Jesuits conveying it to Primrose Hill; and its' lying there, run-through with Godfrey's sword. Appearing on prints, playing cards, coins and medals, icons of Godfrey's brutal murder become emblematic of the 'fear of popery' through which Whigs lobbied for Exclusion. They were so successful that one opportunist, Justice Arnold, courted fame by parroting

---

[153] John Evelyn, *Diary*, ed. E. S. De. Beer, 4 vols, (Oxford, 1955) IV, p. 107; Burnet, *History*, I, p. 337; North, *Examen* pp. 204-05; L. Echard, *The history of the Revolution and the establishment of England, in the year, 1688*, 3 vols (Dublin, 1740), III, p. 474.

[154] W. Lloyd, *A sermon at the funeral of Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey, one of His Majesties justices of the peace, who was barbarously murthered* (London, 1678), pp. 1-4, 11-15. *England's Grand Memorial: The Unparalled'd Plot to destroy his Majesty, and Subvert the Protestant Religion* (London, 1679). For other examples of Godfrey being called into the press, see *An elergie sacred to the memory of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey, knight, 30 October 1678* (London, 1678); *To the right honourable the lord mayor at the anniversary entertainment in Guildhall* (London, 1680); *The solemn mock procession of the Pope, Cardinals, Jesuits....through the city of London November 17th 1679* (London, 1679); *The proclamation promoted or a hue and cry and inquisition after treason and blood upon the inhumane and Horrid murder of that late noble knight, impartial justice of the peace and zealous protestant sir Edmund berry Godfrey* (London, 1678).

[155] J. Pinkerton, *The Medallic History of England to the Restoration* (London, 1790), fol. Xxxv. 3. The Latin mottos read "Cervice Fracta Fidem Sustulit Atlas" (on the edge) and "Moriendo Restituit Rem Edmund-Berry Godfrey" respectively.

[156] Thomas Dawks' *England's Grand Memorial* (London, 1679).

their depiction, claiming to have been set upon by Catholics in the street in a manner akin to Godfrey's murder [Fig. 180.][157]

Dawks' "memorial" was styled as a monumental tablet after the providential iconography produced half-a-century earlier. Although not resembling the *Double Deliverance*, it was firmly in the same genre – a 'monument' sparking the conscience through emotive imagery, this was to be a site of commemoration. *A Poem of the effigies of Sir Edmnund-Berry Godfrey* (1678) contained similar images to Dawks' print and equally styled itself "A lasting Monument Erected/ To the Memory of Sir Edmund/ Berry Godfrey", inviting viewers to weep: "Let no bold Eye approach the Reverend Shade,/ Till first a Tribute of Just *Tears* be paid" [Fig. 181.][158] Licensed three weeks after Godfrey's funeral, this printer clearly recognized the money in grief, and competitors entered the market with comparable paper monuments. Thus Benjamin Harris *An Elergie on the Right Worshipful Edmund-Berry Godfrey* (1678), another household memorial:

> "Beneath this weeping Marble lyes
>
> The Peoples hero, the Nations Sacrifice:
>
> A Modern Martyr...
>
> Approach his Tomb with Reverence, for he
>
> Whilst Living, was Rome's dread Enemy...."[159]

Techniques of remembering embedded in Protestant culture were co-opted to the cause of political agitation. This was emotional blackmail. Forgetting was heinous: "But there be some wou'd have it now forgot,/ There was Godfrey kill'd, nor any Plot: so impudent in lies, with perjur'd Breasts,/ They do deny the *Plot* and *Godfrey's* death."[160] Conversely, remembering Godfrey would safeguard the realm from Popery:

---

[157] Israel Tonge's *The Popish damnable plot against our religion and liberties* (1681) – image nine. See also Hibernicus Mercurius, *A pacquet of popish delusions, false miracles, and lying wonders* (London, 1681), pp. 50-51.

[158] *A Poem of the effigies of Sir Edmnund-Berry Godfrey* (1678). Works invited readers to meditate on his wounds as Christ-like: "which called for Woe/ And horse Revenge, on those who made them so;/ With bruised Neck, and Cheek, with batter'd Chin;/ And brest as black, as his vile Butchers sin:/ But with a Sould most innocent and gay,/ This new-born lilies in the midst of May." Ben Harris' *An Elegie on the Right Worshipful Sir Edmund-Berry Godfrey* (1678).

[159] Harris' *An Elegie*, see also: "This mean Plate,/ Which to a Greater work we Dedicate,/ Shall all their Glorious *Monuments* out-date,/ And last till Bankrupt-Time's swallow'd by Fate."

[160] *England's Obligations to Captain William Bedlowe*; Dawks; *England's Grand Memorial: The Unparalled'd Plot to destroy his Majesty, and Subvert the Protestant Religion.*

"In th' Dust his deeds shall blossome: Time (that brings

A Change on other sublumary things)

Will keep these fresh, this Patriots renown

Shall ne'er be strangled by the Triple Crown"[161]

This appeal to Protestant patriotism hinted at Exclusion. Manipulating the techniques of iconographic 'monuments' – so essential to Protestant providential Anti-Catholic memory – added weight to a new cause. These engravings did not depict 1588 and 1605, but the techniques used to spark memory were heavily indebted to the monumental imagery spawned by Ward's *Double Deliverance*. Heavily invested with the Protestant past, such images were equally effective at rousing zeal and reducing complex issues to the basest of emotions as any slogan or text.[162]

IV: Discussion Pieces – The Politics of Chatter in Late Stuart Britain

The Happy Instruments, then, neatly summarized the events of two-and-a-half years around a providential conceit indebted to the *Double Deliverance*, a manipulation of memory stoking the Exclusionist lobby [Fig. 169.] Indeed, dating from late April 1681, a month after Charles had scuppered Exclusion by dissolving the Oxford Parliament, this emotive image belonged to a press-campaign which fostered popular pressure and steered it towards the government. Yet another technique was equally important in enchancing its antagonism: wit. Playing for laughs as much as pulling memory's heart-strings, astute viewers would have understood that this darkly elaborate conceit inverted Raphael's *Disputa* (1509-10), a fresco in the Vatican's *Stanza della Segnatura* [Fig. 182.][163] Dishonouring a glorification of the Roman Church, the effrontery in parodying frescoes in the private Papal library was delicious. Like *The Happy Instruments*, the *Disputa*'s composition portrayed a downward movement from heaven to earth. Descending from God the Father through Christ and

---

[161] Ibid; see also *New Verse Concerning the Plot* (London, 1679): "The king is safe, but Godfrey's slain, now traytors look about yee; you are afraid of every Bush, the truth of God will rout yee"

[162] For more Godfrey kitsch, see BM Sat 1057-63; B. Harris, *The Protestant Tutor* (London, 1679), p. 80.

[163] On the *Disputa*, see J. Pope-Hennessy, *Raphael* (London/ New York, 1970), pp. 59-75; A. P. Oppe, *Raphael* (London, 1970), pp. 73-76; L. D & H. S. Ettlinger, *Raphael* (Oxford, 1987), p. 86; H. Chapman, T. Henry & C. Plazzotta, *Raphael: From Urbino to Rome* (London, 2004), p. 288.

the Holy Spirit, the Trinity passed into the profane through manifestation in the Eucharist, depicted atop an altar at the scene's centre. A wonder, transubstantiation inspired the *Disputa*. This was not a debate, but rather a non-hostile discussion involving the Church Fathers and prominent theologians, who engaged in a glorious contemplation of the divine, an orchestra of praise unfolding outwards from the scene's centre.[164] The Church was glorified here as the institution facilitating man's communing with God and honouring His magnificence. Conversely, in *The Happy Instruments*, Rome's central activity was inspired not by transubstantiation but by treachery. Whilst the Holy Spirit's inspiration stimulated the Roman Church to great acts of theology and devotion in the *Disputa*, the actions unfolding from the inspiration of Satan in *The Happy Instruments* are perfidious and seditious. In this scene the Papacy strained its wits not to understand the divine but to undermine monarchy; they did not reveal the glory of the Trinity, but had their malevolence revealed by it.

More than placing the Plot in a providential narrative, *The Happy Instruments* dishonoured art at the heart of the Vatican, acting as a darkly humorous slap in Rome's face. Using laughter to unite audiences behind Exclusion, it was a witty talking-piece designed for display in coffee houses, both delighting and provoking its audiences.[165] Humour was critical, for nothing was new here: the anxieties spoken to and plots detailed had been recycled in print for two years – this was old news. Wit freshened an increasingly stale story; laughter injected it with resucitating vibrancy.[166] For ultimately, one thing above all else kept Popish Plot anxieties alive – chatter. The story tended to die a death, ebbing and flowing over time. During autumn 1678 rumour of local Catholics gathering to prepare slaughter were rife, one Yorkshireman

---

[164] Oppe, *Raphael*, pp. 73-74. Some of the notable figures in the scene are as follows: around the altar are the four Church Fathers, on the left Pope Gregory the Great and St Jerome (holding a Bible), and on the right St. Ambrose and Augustine (holding his City of God). Behind Augustine are scholastic theologians, Thomas Aquinas (Dominican) and Cardinal St. Bonaventura (Franciscan). Dressed in gold Pope Sixtus IV (the uncle of Julius II, the current Pope who commissioned Raphael) stands next to Bonaventura, a man who had written a prominent treatise on Christ's Holy Blood, and behind him stood Dante (wearing red.) Duns Scotus and Albertus Magnus (who had taught Aquinas) is also in scene, as is Savanorolla.

[165] Cf. above Chapter One, pp. 29-37, 60-70.

[166] On wit in Restoration culture see J. Spurr, *England in the 1670s: this masquerading age* (Malden, 2000), pp. 102-116, 161-63. The words of one critic of the polemic, Sir Peter Pett, aptly characterize the effect of wit in keeping a story alive: "There is no doubt but that these foolish Shammers......humours incline them....to abuse the belief of the unthinking Vulgar with their *romantic stories* concerning those Religions, helps to Convey them into the Press which gives wings to these *Shams* presently to fly." *The Happy Future State of England* (1688), p. 60. Quoted in Loveman, *Reading Fictions*, p. 85.

detailing how "the crack and noise filled us with great visions and the apparitions of armed men assembled and riding by night."[167] Similarly, when a ship ran ashore at Yarmouth, rumours of thirty Jesuits infiltrating the land circulated, matched by reports of Spaniards landing in Ireland and Wales, and Frenchmen in Scotland.[168] When massacres had failed to materialize by mid-December, however, fear waned.[169] An equally irregular pulse beat in London. When news of the Plot broke families armed themselves, chains were drawn across the streets, and 2000 trained militia were placed on guard.[170] A fire at Temple Bar in January 1679 was attributed to Catholics, and when James tried to assist its containment, he was forced to flee amidst cries of "Popish Dog".[171] Yet by May anxiety was subsiding, and by September many soldiers failed to turn out.[172] Fear naturally fluctuated – print kept the plot alive in popular parlance, spawning the chatter on which anxiety fed. Pouring over each witness's revelations and trial proceedings, the press sparked discussion – whipping up fresh bouts of anxiety to bolster support for Exclusion.[173]

Chatter was crucial because the plot held a liminal status in the popular mindset. Anxiety was bred by doubt as much as certainty. Historians state that 'belief' in the Plot was widespread, but that is a misnomer – too monolithic, 'belief' does not allow for nuance.[174] As Gilbert Burnet remembered: "There are seasons of belief as well as of disbelief; and believing was then [1678] so much in season that improbabilities were little considered."[175] This season of acceptance withered quickly. The King dismissed the plot out-of-hand.[176] Although impressed with Oates' account, secretary Coventry was reluctant to take the word of one man in such a weighty matter, taking until January 1679 to conquer his scruples.[177] Evelyn accepted that Catholics had murdered Godfrey but could not believe Wakeman guilty of regicide. By Stafford's trial in 1680 he doubted the Plot's verity, but could not find the

---

[167] *CSPD* 1678, pp. 557-58, 562-63.
[168] *CSPD* 1678, pp. 462, 480, 517-18, 521, 558.
[169] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, p. 161.
[170] HMC Ormond, N. S, iv, 473; J. T. Rutt (ed.), *Life of Edmund Calamy* (2 vols, London, 1829), i, pp. 83-84.
[171] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 157-161.
[172] CSPD, 1679-80, p. 253; D. Allen, "The Role of the London trained bands in the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-81", *English Historical Review*, 87, (1972), p. 297.
[173] On the importance of chatter, see also the quotations in Krey, *Restoration and revolution*, pp. 74-75.
[174] Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 164; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 154, 161; Tumbleson, *Catholicism*, pp. 74-75.
[175] Burnett, *History*, II, p. 186.
[176] Kenyon, *Popish Plot*, p. 70.
[177] HMC Ormonde, New Series, iv, pp. 207, 303; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, p. 157.

confidence to dismiss it outright.[178] The fact is, however, that these people *discussed* it – wholehearted *belief* was not the issue, countenancing the possibility was key. Causing anxieties to accrue and reverberate, discussion was the base upon which a politics of fear was built and, as enemies of Exclusion realized, chatter was consequently the motor driving the opposition's lobby.[179] As witty discussion pieces, graphic satire added another chorus to this politics of chatter.

The importance of the press to Exclusion has long been recognized.[180] The Licensing Act collapsed in 1679, spawning a wave of print unprecedented in the seventeenth century, with somewhere between 5 and 10 million pamphlets printed.[181] For those opposed to Exclusion the presses' liberty was disturbingly reminiscent of events prior to the last alteration of monarchy – the fall of Charles I – and its liberty was consequently feared as a presage of rebellion.[182] Tories saw print not as a *symptom* of the crisis but its *cause*. "Libells were not only Forerunners, but in high Degree, the causes of our late Troubles" quipped Roger L'Estrange, tying the Whigs to the regicides: "How many libels has your Faction Publish'd from One and Forty...against all sorts of Persons that....Excercise and acknowledge the Duties both to Church and State?"[183] Many historians have followed suit, awarding the press inordinate amount of agency in politicising the people. The appetite for news was certainly great. According to Lord Chief Justice Scrogs, feeding its hunger exacerbated another: "So fond are men...that they will deny their children a penny for bread, [but] will lay it out for a pamphlet...the temptations so great, that no man could keep two-pence in his pocket because of the news."[184] Narcissus Luttrell was equally concerned by the potential for disorder contained in the mass of invective: "the press sounds with all sorts of pamphlets; one side running down the papists and upholding

[178] Evelyn, 21 Oct, 24 Nov 1678, 18 July 1679, 6-7 Dec 1680; Diary, iv, pp. 155, 158, 174-75, 230-34; J. Reresby, *The memoirs of the honourable Sir John Reresby, bart. and late governor of York* (London, 1734), pp. 153-54, 203-09.
[179] R. L'Estrange, *L'Estrange's narrative of the plot : set forth for the edification of His Majesties liege-people* (London, 1680), pp. 24-28.
[180] H. Weber, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Kentucky, 1996), passim; Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, pp. 165-70; Knights, *Representation*, pp. 211-48; ibid, *Politics and Opinion*, pp. 153-91; Krey, *Restoration and revolution*, pp. 164-76.
[181] These figures as for 1678-82. Knights, *Opinion*, pp. 156-57, 168-69; W. G. Mason, "The Annual Output of Wing-Listed Titles 1649-1684", *The Library*, 39 (1974), pp. 219-20.
[182] See below, pp...
[183] Roger L'Estrange, *A Momento, Treating the Rise, Progress and Demands of seditions* (London, 1682), pp. 6-7; *Observator*, 48 31/8/1681. See also *The Character of Those True Protestants in Masquerade, Heraclitus and The Observator* (London, 1681), p. 1.
[184] W. Cobbett (ed.,), *A Complete Collection of State Trials*, 31 volumes (London, 1809-23), vol. 7 cols 1127-28.

the dissenters; the other side crying down both, aspersing the last two houses of commons and ridiculing their proceedings, and sounding nothing but '41: public intelligences or pamphlets of news abounding....filling town and country with falsehoods."[185]

Whilst much credit has been awarded to newspapers, pamphlets and sermons during these years, imagery has been chronically understudied. This is a surprise. Not only did graphic satire blossom, it found pride-of-place in coffee house parlance.[186] The venues where print was sold and discussed, these shops were the centre-piece of the public sphere and engravings formed their "Cumber and Pest" – in their absence, one pamphlet recounted, these businesses "would have no trade."[187] Qualitatively different from other categories of print, engravings were sources of *commentary* not *news*, witty discussion-pieces which, like *The Happy Instruments*, re-told familiar stories in a fresh dressing. Londoners may have been hungry for news, but they would find little new in engravings. Why, then, were they purchased? Answering this question leads us to cast doubt upon the press's role in 'politicising' the populace – far from spawning pieces created to lead Londoners by the nose, the press created products designed to meet a demand, pieces which edified existing prejudices rather than instilling new ones.

Cursory examination of four images produced in 1680 will make the point. *The Nest of Nunnes Egges* told old jokes for a new crowd [Fig. 183.][188] The garden conceit mused upon the deceptive beauty of the Rome's empty religion:

"So faire, so even, well fram'd, so order-like,

Which doth content to blinded sences strike,

Yet who so view it well, shall in conclusion,

Find no way in or out, but all confusion."

---

[185] N. Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation* (1857). Reprinted 1969. 1: 76 (20th august 1681). See, ibid, 1:36: "about this time many libels are thrown about to disaffect the king and his people, and turn all to '41" (Feb 1680). See also N. Thompson, *A Choice Collection of 120 Loyal Songs* (London, 1684) sig. A2.

[186] Described as, "The Great Pond or Puddle of News, the Coffee Houses" in *The Snotty Nose Gazette*, no. 1, 24 November 1679.

[187] *News From Colchester* (1681), p. 2; *A Pleasant Discourse Between Two Sea Men* (1681), p. 1.

[188] *Nest of Nunnes Egges strangely hatched, with the description of a worthy feast for joy of the brood* (1680); BM Sat 1101. Stereotypical reports of Catholic lechery were common at this time. See *Domestick Intelligence*, No. 1.

Each figure hopped from tree to tree to echo Rome's changing doctrine, and the maze of entwined branches proved emblematic of Catholic religion, which even the Pope required a lantern to navigate: "A laborinth, a Turning winding maze,/ Religion's Ape, and Follies onely Gaze." Such a confused and vapid religion spawned nought but evil fruits, and at the centre of this garden of delights a lecherous cleric was seduced by nuns brooding upon a basket of eggs, a cliché of hatching plots for over a century.[189] As little good comes from sinners, when hatched their offspring were cockatrices – monk's heads upon snakes bodies – a display of Roman deceit, appearing pious but masking monstrous intent.

Deceit was equally the theme of *A Jesuit Displaid*, an arcimboldo print representing a Jesuit compositely both through emblems of sins which drove his villainies, and tools of the trade in which he disguised himself: "Gardener, Groome, Cooke, he's everything to all,/ So his Laborourers Zeal may drown a Soul" [Fig. 184.][190] As with the *Nest of Nunnes Egges* this cleric was the product of a baseless religion. Possessing faith as "unsound" in its defence against sin as his "basket shield and hat" were against steel and rain, he was easily recruited by Satan as an instrument of evil. The winged horns above his head symbolized the "swift Lusts and Rapine in Adulterous sheets" he committed with Englishmen's wives, and his keys were epigrammatic of his ability to open hearts, driving out good conscience and replacing it with the Papal creed of regicide. He was consequently dressed in the clothes of Popish Plot and Gunpowder Treason, doning "Coleman's Flying Crest", "Green's Cravat" and sporting Fawke's lantern as an ear-ring.

The disguised Jesuit held a prominent place in the pack of Papal hounds at the heart of *Rome's Hunting Match for III Kingdoms*, an allegory of the Popish Plot [Fig. 185.][191] Riding side-saddle as the Babylonian Whore, the Pope's hunting call centred round now familiar themes of deceit, regicide, and tyranny:

"The Gospel is an empty Cheat,
All our Aim is to be great,

[189] Our cleric foolishly "expects much good/ From His faire Nunnes that sweetly sit abrood". For other satirical uses of Catholics 'hatching' plots, see BM Sat 12.
[190] BM Satires, British XVIIc Mounted Roy. 1983,1001.11v. Published by Arthur Tooker. Oates had claimed that Jesuits hid as tradesmen. See Greene, *Diaries*, p. 202. Many others followed suit, see W. Lloyd, *The Late Apology In behalf of the Papists, Reprinted and Answered In behalf of the Royalists*, 4th edn (London, 1675), p. 46.
[191] *Rome's Huinting Match for III kingdoms; or, The Papists last run for the Protestants* (1680).

The Moral Man's a Wigeon:[192]

Come let us mount on Eagle wings

Above all Emperors and Kings,

State-Policy is our Religion."

As with the two previous prints such villainy was driven by sin and deception. Clothed in white to mask their black intent, the papal hounds are Lust, Ambition, Adultery, Ignorance, Idolatry and Hypocrisy. Together with traditional emblems of vice – a pig (gluttony), elephant (pride) and ass (folly) - these Roman agents lusted for blood and "lost Game" in Britain, chasing charity, Christianity, and love from the realm whilst striving to implement murder and idolatry to every home. But the hunt was a humiliating failure.[193] Overseen by God's providential eye ("video rideo") the lamb of Christian religion was protected by a wall of holy fire on the scene's right, England had been delivered again. Ridiculing the revelation of the plot as a failed sport was similarly expressed in another print of that year, the *Catholique Gamesters*, which presented the fall-out of the plot as a pitiful game of bowls [Fig. 186.][194]

Despite appearing unique, each of these engravings told essentially the same story through a different conceit – sin and irreligion drove the Roman Church to horrendous acts of treason. In each the Popish Plot's revelation was celebrated through Rome's ridicule, the same joke peddled in a different setting. What does this repetition tell us? There was certainly a buoyant market for prints – but these engravings were no source of news, nor a means of politicizing the populace.[195] They were certainly *political* – their witty re-dressing of Anti-Catholicism clearly intended to kindle Popish Plot anxieties amidst coffee house parlance, and although none explicitly mentioned Exclusion, it was an unspoken agenda of their ridicule. But no attempt was made to *persuade* audiences or to *inform* them – expecting familiarity with the Plot's details, these engravings did not explain their jokes. Such satire served a very different function from papers and pamphlets, existing not as a primary source of information but as a secondary phenomenon, *commentary* rather than *news*. Not

---

[192] Ibid. According to the OED, a 'wigeon' is a fool or simpleton.

[193] Ibid: "On these rich unvalued Grounds/She uncompanions all her Hounds,/Ambitions deep mouth'd Jowles/ Self Interest, A Beagle fierce/ His thunderous cry he heaven did pierce." Oates had claimed that Catholics would bring murder to every home.

[194] BM Sat. 1077.

[195] For an argument that commentary was a more general function of prints dating back to the sixteenth century see above, Chapter One, pp. 60-70

'propaganda' in the sense of influencing allegiances, there was something of the political poster about such engravings, whose jokes sung ardently to the chorus of support for Exclusion. Celebrating inventive wit, such engravings were *products* purchased by those seeking entertainment rather than information and provoking laughter which solidified positions already held by viewers rather than imparting new ones.

Recognising that these engravings were produced because demand existed for them is important. Party politics responded to attitudes, it did not dictate them – the populace did not respond to prompts from above; rather, political writers reacted to expectations from below. As Tim Harris has noted, people were not suddenly politicized as a result of rampant exposure to news.[196] Although scholars have depicted the press facilitating the expansion of the political sphere and controlling the expectations and language through which people organized their world, 'public opinion' was not conceived and spawned by the press – Londoners were not empty vessels waiting to be filled with views.[197] For Harris the formation of opinions was more social than textual – views were forged as much by peoples' experience of and treatment by government as by news, politics something intruding into their lives rather than a solely textual event. People approached print in dialogue – they were consumers who hunted authors and texts which confirmed their views and spoke to their prejudices, not passive recipients of other parties' politics. Moreover, this was a culture which oscillated between oral and textual – coffee houses were sources of discussion, of rumour, and it was this endless political chatter which Tories saw as disorderly.[198] It was this discussion which graphic satire endeavoured to provoke – chatter pieces playing to anxieties, and keeping old stories from turning stale.

Such engravings, then, were works of edification, products marketed to those who shared the Anti-Catholic sentiments of Exclusion. Printers were acutely aware of

---

[196] T. Harris, "Understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain", in A Houston & S. Pincus (eds,) *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 125-53.

[197] For those who award a causative role to the press see J. Sommerville, *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information* (Oxford, 1996), passim; K. Wilson, *The Sense of the People: politics, culture and imperialism in England, 1715-85* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 129, 153-57; Webber, *Paper Bullets*, passim; Knights, *Politics and Opinion*, pp. 153-91.

[198] S. Pincus, "'Coffee Politicians Does Create:' Coffeehouses and Restoration Political Culture", *Journal of Modern History*, 67 (1995); L. Klein, "Coffeehouse Civility: 1660-1714: An Aspect of Post-Courtly Civility in England", *Huntingdon Quarterly Review*, 59, (1997), pp. 30-51; Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, pp. 165-67. *The Carman's Poem; or, Advice to a Nest of Scribblers* (1680) in N. Thompson (ed.), *A Collection of Eighty-Six Loyal Poems* (1685), pp. 192-93; E. Bohum, *The Third and Last Part of the address to the Free-Men* (1683), dedication.

the money in prejudice. Much of the Anti-Catholic literature produced in the wake of James' conversion was an opportune re-packaging of old stock;[199] and including advertisements to other items which specific audiences might be interested in purchasing was commonplace. This market for prejudice spawned posters which made storyboards of the unfolding Popish Plot [Fig. 187 & 188.][200] Once again, there was nothing 'new' here – these sheet re-capped the story so far, condensing the mass of testimony from Oates, Bedlow and Prance into visual sound-bites, forging narratives out of swathes of information. That a market existed for such abridgments can be seen by the appearance of updated versions – Israel Tonge's *The Popish Damnable plot against our religion and liberty* (1681) included the Meal Tub Plot and execution of Stafford [Fig. 180.][201] The absorption of such 'flagship' events as emblems of the Plot was a testament to the popularity of the image amongst Protestant audiences. But terming such sheets 'products' is not to demote them to the status of frivolity. Not only did the laughter they provoked solidify resolves, such posters became a means of displaying one's Exclusion sentiments to the world – as we shall now see, the pro-Exclusion lobby ultimately gravitated to the image as a means of expressing its political identity.

---

[199] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, p. 124. *A Few Words Among Many* (1679) was reprinted in 1681 as *A Moderate Decision on the Point of the Succession*; *A Plea for Limited Monarchy* (1660) was reprinted twenty years later as *The State and Interest of the Nation*. Many also contained old stories/clichés trotted out for a new market. R. B, *Wonderful prodigies of judgement and mercy* (London, 1681) contained crude woodcuts of Papal history lifted from Foxe, the *Proud Primacy of Popes* analysed in chapter 5. Oates certainly milked his Anti-Catholic reputation by littering the market with sensational pamphlets, see his *An exact discovery of the mystery of iniquity as it is now in practice amongst the Jesuits and other their emissarie* (London, 1679), a translation of an Italian work, *Instruttione a' prencipi della maniera con la quale si governano li padri giesuiti*; and *The popes ware-house, or, The merchandise of the whore of Rome* (London, 1679), a work of generic Anti-Catholicism. Ibid, *A balm presented to these nations, England, Scotland, and Ireland: to cure the wounds of the bleeding Protestants, and open the eyes of the deluded papists, that are ignorant of the truth ... or, A seasonable antidote against the errors of popery and pernitious doctrines of the Church of Rome* (London, 1680). Bedlow was similarly resourceful, publishing *The excommunicated prince, or, The false relique : a tragedy, as it was acted by His Holiness's servants, being the Popish plot in a play by Capt. William Bedloe* (London, 1679). This tragedy had nothing to do with the Plot, but was an account of Theimuraz, King of Georgia (1629-1634) who was excommunicated by the Pope.
[200] BM Sat. 1064, 1088.
[201] Israel Tonge's *The Popish damnable plot against our religion and liberties* (London, 1681). The scenes are: the great fire of 1666; the murder of Godfrey; the day of humiliation ordered by Charles, imploring God to protect the king; the execution of the plotters (Coleman, Ireland, Grove, Pickering, Whitebread etc); the formation of the Meal Tub Plot; the discovery of the Meal Tub Plot; Elizabeth Cellier in the pillory; assault on Justice Arnold; the Pope receiving letters from Jesuits; and the execution of Stafford. Hibernicus Mercurius, *A Pacquet of popish delusions, false miracles, and lying wonders* (London, 1681), pp. 50-51.

V: Protestant Kitsch – Buying Into an Image

Stating that images became a commodity is not enough. Prints were as much *objects* as images – items which were *used* as well as viewed, displayed as well as read. This distinction is important. Much has been made of politics travelling 'out of doors' at the Restoration, of a news-hungry populace becoming increasingly invested in the system, of heightened appeals to 'the crowd' as judge of policies and personalities, and of increasingly frequent elections appointing the public as political umpire.[202] Playing to 'the people' in a public forum was undoubtedly a critical means by which parties sustained support, and such scholarship has transformed conceptions of politics at the dawn of the eighteenth century as a product of the public sphere. Yet this 'out of doors' expansion was coupled with a movement of political expression 'in doors.' We have seen that cushion covers and memorial brasses were objects through which Ward's *Double Deliverance* was absorbed into wider culture, allowing Protestants to express confessional identities and political affiliations. During the Exclusion Crisis such techniques were amplified. Objects took politics into the domestic sphere, with iconography becoming a way of expressing and performing political stance.[203] The formation of a Protestant kitsch unified the pro-Exclusion lobby, permitting Protestants to buy into an image.

How else do we explain the production of sets of tiles narrating the Plot [Figs. 189-92]?[204] Comprising of around fifty images, such tiles were complemented by other novelty items like Popish Plot playing cards as Anti-Catholic objects which coloured domestic settings to express political stance [Figs. 193-196.][205] Playing cards have been characterized 'propaganda', a crude Whig attempt to influence public

[202] Harris, *London Crowds, passim*; Knghts, *Representation and Misrepresentation*, part 1, in particular; ibid, *Politics and Opinion in crisis 1678-81* (Cambridge/ New York, 1994), passim.
[203] See above, pp. 197-98.
[204] British Museum, Grigsby 2000, D16, D417, D418, catalogued in L. B. Grigsby, *The Longridge Collection of English Slipware and Delftware*, 2, (Jonathan Horne Publications, 2000). See also British Museum, Department of Prehistory and Europe, 2009,8014.10 – a set bequeathed by Dr William Lindsay Gordon.
[205] There were multiple sets of such cards. See BM 1066, Ace of Hearts. F. Onoghue, *Catalogue of the collection of playing cards bequeathed to the British Museum by Lady Charlotte Schreiber*, (London, 1901), English, 59; Schreiber English, 56; Schreiber English, 58 (a coloured pack); W. H. Willshire, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Playing and other Cards in the British Museum*, (London, 1876), English 186, also discussed in L. Fagan, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the engraved works of William Faithorne*, (London, 1888), pp. 83-84; British Museum Wiltshire 188. Frances Barlow's designs for a pack of cards can be seen in the British Museum, see Edward Croft-Murray, P.Hulton, *Catalogue of British Drawings in the British Museum, XVI and XVII centuries*, (London, 1960). BM Sat 1067 is an engraving featuring 29 of these designs.

opinion.[206] This seems an unlikely strategy. Cards were 'novelty' items, with packs frequently designed after the cause célèbre of the day. The expanding empire and subsequent boom in trade fostered a vogue for cartography and London was consequently flooded with atlases, maps, globes and books of charts.[207] This thirst for maps also spawned two packs of cards in 1676 alone, packs which were proficiently "geographical, chronological, and historiographical...showing the commodities and varieties of each county."[208] Very similar imagery appeared across a host of media in a short time – but each item was not designed for the same purpose. Some were practical, some decorative, and others were curiosities. However accurate, one would not turn to playing cards for geographical guidance, and we can assume that printers and potters were similarly distinguished between the applicability of different media and were consequently unlikely to view cards and tiles as fitting means of inculcating pro-Exclusion sentiment.

Such imagery clearly served to *express* views rather than *impress* them. More a statement than a means of persuasion, images became ensigns, a brand of Anti-Catholicism. Depictions of Godfrey taking Oates' depositions [Figs 197-199];[209] his subsequent murder [Figs 200-202];[210] and funeral [Figs 203-205] were virtually identical across print, card, and tile [see also Figs. 206-207.][211] These images consequently accrued a power beyond themselves. Existing independently from textual explication, they became synonymous with the Exclusion lobby - the Pope Burning Processions of 1678-1680 were a citation of imagery: Godfrey's corpse being conveyed on horseback by his Jesuit assassins had become totemic of the Whig's cause by this point [Figs. 208-212.][212] Purchasing objects stamped with this brand was a means of buying into Exclusion and displaying one's support for it – party resolve was solidified through collective investment in a common imagery.

This branding grew out of the utilization of Anti-Catholicism as a language, an emotive veil which dressed political agitation displayed most powerfully in *An*

---

[206] Harris, *London Crowds*, p. 102, 108.
[207] See S. Tyacke, *London Map-sellers, 1660-1720* (Tring, 1978), pp. 8-12; P. Barber, "Necessary and Ornament: Map Use in England under the late Stuarts, 1660-1720", *Eighteenth Century Life*, 14 (1990); Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, pp. 146-50.
[208] R. A. Skelton, *County Atlases of the British Isles 1579-80* (London, 1970), pp. 151-54. *The 52 counties of England and Wales Geographically described*, and a pack by William Redmayne.
[209] *The Protestants vade mecum*, p. 50; Schreiber, English 59, 2 of Hearts.
[210] *The Protestants vade mecum*, p. 54; Schreiber, English 59, 9 of Spades.
[211] *The Protestants vade mecum*, p. 114.
[212] *The Protestants vade mecum*, pp. 58, 114; Schreiber, English 59, 5 of Spades.

account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government (1677) by Andrew Marvell, poet and MP for Hull.[213] A product of the Crown's constraint of Parliament during the 1670s, Marvell's 'Popery' had little to do with the Catholic religion, but rather a Court conspiracy to impose arbitrary government on England in the 'popish' manner of Louis XIV's France.[214] Giving voice to suspicions of country MPs concerning Danby's attempts to diminish Parliamentary liberties by weakening its capacity to advise the King and supply him with finance, 'Popery' was employed here an alarmist tactic, an incitement. Rallying all Protestants by depicting Catholicism as the threat facing the realm in the first few pages of his tract, Marvell drew readers onto his account of Parliamentary wrangling sympathetically. Styling Catholicism as "such a thing that cannot, but for want of a word to express it, be called a Religion" being rather "a bold imposture of Priests under the name of curiosity", and detailing how the accession of a Catholic would lead to Rome re-couping its pre-Reformation landholdings, strangling the livelihoods of every English gentleman by causing every estate to have "a piece torn out of it upon the title of piety" was purely a rhetorical flourish with which to enflame a secular dispute concerning the liberty of Parliament.[215] Indeed, this invective was followed by 150 pages of minutiae concerning recent parliamentary troubles, a tedious trawl through bills and speeches seeking to 'prove' that the Crown conspired against it. 'Popery' was an emotive ploy. Prodding popular prejudice made it hard to dispute the body of Marvell's text, for questioning the threat of 'popery' tainted one's allegiance to Protestantism.

Much pro-Exclusion graphic satire similarly employed rhetorical Anti-Catholicism to win readers over to its camp. Images of visceral Catholic violence weighed upon the heart strings, consequently positioning Exclusion tenets as central to the concerns of any Protestant both sensible and loyal. Thus *A Scheme of Popish Cruelties, or, What we might Expect Under A Popish Successor* (1681), a collection of incendiary depictions of Catholics raping Protestants' wives and daughters, spearing babies and tearing men apart with horses [Fig. 213.][216] Such sensationalism appealed

---

[213] A. Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery, and Arbitrary Government in England*, in A. B. Grosart (ed.), *The Complete Works in Verse and Prose of Andrew Marvell* (London, 1872), 4 vols.
[214] See Tumbleson, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination*, pp. 6-8, 46-49; C. Condren, "Andrew Marvell as Polemicist: His Account of the Growth of Popery, and Arbitrary Government" and W. M. Lamont "The Religion of Andrew Marvell: Locating the 'Bloody Horse'" in C. Condren & A. D. Cousins (eds.) *The Political Idenitiy of Andrew Marvell* (Aldershot, 1990).
[215] Marvel, *An Account*, IV, pp. 248-52, 256-62.
[216] *A Scheme of Popish Cruelties, or, What We Might Expect Under A popish Successor* (London, 1681). The other scenes were: shattering London with canon fire; killing wives and daughters after

to the most elementary of human emotions – love of one's family – to foster resistance to James. Urging viewers to prevent its presage becoming reality, this print ended with a clarion call for Exclusion: "every man that has any sense of Religion, any regard to...the welfare of his country, or the Just liberty of humanity...[should] by all lawful ways and means he can, oppose the ascent of Popery."[217]

Polemic against James thus brought stereotypical Anti-Catholicism to bear in a new political climate. Like all prejudice, Anti-Catholicism was deeply tendentious – fear of James centred not so much on what he had *done* as on what he would inevitably *do*. As Mary I and Louis XIV demonstrated, persecution was what Papists did. James could not escape it.[218] Even if he did not want persecution, popery was so corrosive that he would be hapless to prevent it: "As Popery and Treachery go hand in hand, while Popery is kept under; so Popery and Tyranny are inseparable Companions, when Popery gets the upper hand."[219] During crisis blind-fear awarded stereotypes a ring of truth. Depictions of barbarous violence had been endemic in Anti-Catholic culture since reports of the 1641 Irish massacres [Figs. 214 & 215] and works of an oppositional bent were littered with them during the Exclusion Crisis [Figs. 216 & 217.][220] These illustrations of persecution were markedly different from those found in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* a century earlier. The 'martyrs' here

---

raping them; a Roman procession through London as the Protestant church is overthrown; burning the city. On the far left stands the monument to the Great Fire of 1666. See also BM Sat 1110. Such rhetoric was almost a century old. See *A Tragicall Historie of the Warres in the Low Countries* (London, 1583); *The Spanish Colonie, or Brief Chronicle of the Actes and Gestures of the Spanish in the West Indies* (London, 1578). The latter was a translation of a work by Bartolome de las Casas originally published in 1551. Cf Lord, *Poems On Affairs of State*, ii, pp. 27, 31-32, 300-01: "Yourselves forced to fly destitute of bread and harbour, your wives prostituted to the lust of every savage bog-trotter, your daughters ravished by goatish monks, your small children tossed upon pikes, or torn limb from limb, whilst your have your bowels ripped up....or else murdered with some exquisite tortures and holy candles made of your grease (which was done within our memory in Ireland), your dearest friends flaming in Smithfield, foreigners rendering your poor babes that can escape everlasting slaves, never more to see a Bible, nor hear again the joyful sounds of Liberty and Property. This, this gentlemen is Popery."

[217] *A Scheme of Popish Cruelties.*
[218] See *Vox Populi, Vox Dei* (London, 1681), *A collection of scarce and valuable tracts, on the most interesting and entertaining subjects: but chiefly such as relate to the history and constitution of these kingdoms; selected from an infinite number in print and manuscript, in the Royal, Cotton, Sion and other libraries; particularly that of the late Lord Somers*, 13 volumes (London, 1809-15) viii, p. 302, which described James as: "Queen Mary in Breeches." *Popery and Tyranny or the Present State of France* (London, 1679), passim.
[219] G. S, *A Brief Declaration of the Barbarous And inhumane dealings of the Northern Irish Rebels* (London, 1641), n.p.
[220] Edward Clark, *The Protestant School-Master* pp. 52, 60, 86, 111, 140, 158, 172; B. Harris, *The Protestant Tutor* (London, 1679), pp. 52, 62, 72, . See also, S. Crossman, *The Young man's calling, or, The Whole Duty of Youth* (London, 1678), pp. 286, 415-16. For Catholicism and monstrosity, see Tumbleson, *Catholicism*, pp. 88-90.

were faceless and nameless, the emphasis was no longer on the steadfastness of Protestants' faith in the endurance of Antichristian torment but squarely on the monstrous savagery of Rome. This barbarity certainly marked Protestantism as a distinctly more Christian religion, but harnessing such powerfully stereotypical violence behind Exclusion gave its appeal more immediate poignancy. There was something qualitatively different about an image – exchanging and discussing ideas might edify supporters, but images fired the imagination, giving abstract notions like 'Popery', 'Arbitrary Government' and 'Exclusion' an emotive urgency. It was urgency which caused people to invest in rather ghoulish images of violence, displaying emblems of the murder of Godfrey as badges of political conviction.

The dress of Anti-Popery was thus critical in branding oneself – investing oneself in scenes of emotive power a means of displaying political affinities. Such performance began with MPs. Thus before the Oxford Parliament of 1681 – Exclusion's last stand – Shaftesbury entered the city amidst a huge train "with holsters and pistols before him, attended with a great many horsemen well armed and [with] coaches".[221] This was gesture politics, a performance underlining the danger posed by Popery to Parliamentary liberties. Similarly, many MPs arrived armed and sporting ribbons proclaiming "No Popery, No Slavery" in their hats.[222] Anti-Catholic performance thus displayed affinity to the cause of Exclusion. Following the MPs example, Anti-Catholicism was a political currency in London. Daggers with blades emblazoned 'Remember Justice Godfrey' were a popular commodity.[223] Similarly, silver medals embossed with Oates' face on one side and Providence foiling the attempt to assassinate Charles II in James' Park on the other were commonplace;[224] as were those depicting busts of Godfrey as a martyr struck down by the demonic religion of popery [Figs. 177 & 218.][225] Alongside similar medals depicting the Pope overseeing Godfrey's murder, such objects must be viewed as personal tokens of commemoration – stamps expressing political identity through which purchasers invested themselves in the political lobby, proudly displaying ensigns which

[221] See Spurr, *England in the 1670s*, p. 296; K. H. D. Haley, *The First Earl of Shaftesbury* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 624-32.

[222] W. Cobbett (ed.) *The Parliamentary History of England*, 36 vols (1806-20), i, col. 1303-05; M. F. Bond (ed.) *The Diaries and Papers of Sir Edward Dering, Second Baronet, 1644-1684* (London, 1976), pp. 122-25.

[223] Miller, *Popery and Politics*, p. 161.

[224] J. Pinkerton, *The Medallic History of England to the Restoration* (London, 1790), fol. Xxxv. 8.

[225] Ibid, fol. Xxxv. 3. The motto reads: "Ecclesia Perversa Tenet Faciem Diaboli".

betokened their belonging to something bigger than themselves.[226] Appearing across a host of kitsch to facilitate the performance of political affiliation, this was a post-Reformation Protestant culture shot-through with imagery.[227]

VI: Image Wars

That this imagery was effective can be gauged through a backhanded compliment. The Tories fought like with like. There was urgency in the clarion call which launched Roger L'Estrange's *Observator* in 1681, recognition that print had proven critical in exacerbating lobbying for Exclusion: "'Tis the press that has made them mad, and the press must set them right again...There is no way...but by printing to convey the remedy of the disease."[228] By 1682 the Tories were winning the clashes of propaganda, their fear of alteration to the Succession triggering a sequel to the Civil Wars outweighing anxieties around the coming of a Catholic monarch.[229] But in treatments of the Tories' press campaign, scholars have focused rigidly on the importance of texts. Yet imagery played an important role too.

Thus *A True Narrative of the Horrid Hellish Popish-Plot*, issued in two parts between May and June 1682 [Figs. 219 & 220.][230] These huge engravings initially appeared to be brethren of oppositional plot narratives like Figs. 187 & 188.[231] This was part of the artist's strategy in producing "burlesques on the Popish Plot."[232] Parodying earlier Whig propaganda served to trick supporters of Exclusion into

---

[226] British Museum Department of Coins and Medals, O'D 6. One face of Godfrey "Moriendo Restituit Rem Edmund-Bury Godfrey"; strangled and run through, overseen by the Pope "Tantum Religio Poterat Suadere Malorum ." For a later example, a fan satirising the Saheverall impeachment of 1711, BM Sat 1525.

[227] Medals, daggers, playing cards and tiles were expensive items, and it might be objected that such unity was limited to those of a genteel disposition. There was a downward percolation of imagery, something which all elements of London could partake in to a limited extent, North, *Examen*, pp. 101-02. Engravings of *The Solemn Mock Procession* were undoubtedly the preserve of the 'better sort', but cruder copies appeared in cheaper works like Benjamin Harris' *The Protestant Tutor*, frontispiece' See *London's Drollery: or, the Love and Kindness between the Pope and the Devil* (London, 1680) Anti-Catholic imagery after Foxe can also be found in R. B, *Wonderful prodigies of judgement and mercy* (London, 1681), pp. 87-88, 112; Ibid, *Historical remarques and observations of the ancient and present state of London and Westminster* (London, 1681), pp. 114, 99, 79; *The Jesuits Character* (London, 1679); *The ballads of the Cloak; or, the Cloak's Knavery* (London, 1680); *The Dead Man's song whose dwelling is near Bassy Hall in the City of London* (London, 1680); *The Papists lamentation for the loss of their agent Viscount William Stafford* (London, 1680); *The great assize; or, Christs certain and sudden appearance to Judgement* (London, 1680).

[228] *Observator*, vol. 1 (13/4/1681).

[229] Harris, *London Crowds*, pp. 130-88.

[230] BM Sat 1092 & BM Sat 1093.

[231] BM Sat BM 1067; BM Sat 1064. See also BM 1090; BM Sat 1088.

[232] Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, p. 290.

reading these engravings.[233] Initially seeming to detail Catholic perfidy by promising to tell how "the *Jesuit, Devil* and *Pope* did agree,/ Our *State* to destroy" was an elaborate ploy encouraging readers to agree with the work before reversing the message, for it was the witnesses who were ultimately deemed dishonest here. Thus Prance's tale of Jesuits moving Godfrey's body was mocked as farce: "His Body they toss'd,/ From pillar to Post,/ And shifted so often, 'thad like t'have been lost." Drawing out other unfeasible elements of their depositions highlighted that the Plot demanded belief in the incredible at the expense of scrutinizing detail. Hence Bedlow's claimed invasion of Spanish militia disguised as pilgrims; accounts of wealthy Catholic nobles nonchalantly hazarding all for rebellion; and Oates' detailing of the plotters preparing multiple acts of regicide (suggesting that the plotters either planned to fail or hoped to kill Charles more than once) were all raised for ridicule. Each scene of mockery was set against a repetitive refrain – "the truth of my Story if any man doubt,/ W'have Witnesses ready to swear it all out" – and footnotes directing viewers to the witnesses accounts.[234] Parodying the scaffold of academia lampooned the speciousness of the witnesses' claims, highlighting that the case for the plot rested upon an edifice which could not bear its weight.[235]

The witnesses' reliability was lampooned. Depicting Oates at Mass pointed to how easily a man styled as a 'Protestant Doctor' had imperilled his soul by joining the Jesuits; and his account of being beaten for uncovering the plot was styled as a scene of homo-eroticism, reminding viewers of dishonourable homosexual interludes in the good Doctor's past.[236] Furthermore, by pointing to his substantial pension, the purity of his motives was questioned:

> "Witnesses I bring, and produce the record
>
> D'ye think th'are perfur'd? 'Tis false and absurd,

---

[233] The ballad version (without images) is analyzed in Loveman, *Reading Fictions*, pp. 99-100.

[234] BM Sat 1092 & 1093.

[235] Such trickery was important. Because people hunted out print which agreed with their own views, Tories readily complained that their own polemic was being ignored and was ineffective. E. Bohun, *The Third and Last Part of the Address to the Freemen* (London, 1683), p. vii. Knights, *Politics and Opinion*, p. 166. Parroting Whig propaganda, then, was the only means to voice their own views.

[236] The image recalls that of Edmund Bonner thrashing the buttocks of a Protestant in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*. On Oates' reputation see T. Oates, *An exact and faithful narrative of the horrid conspiracy of Thomas Knox, William Osborne, and John Lane, to invalidate the testimonies of Dr. Titus Oates, and Mr. William Bedlow by charging them with a malicious contrivance against the E. of Danby, and the said Dr. Oates with an attempt of sodomy : wherein are exemplified from the originals* (London, 1680).

237

Wou'd th' Godly hang Papists for interest of picque?

Wou'd a doctor swear false for ten pounds a week?"[237]

The plot had become liminal, with both sides competing to control its interpretation. This quotation's rampant questioning ultimately exposed the intention behind these engraved parodies – to prod at doubts. No attempt was made here to assert an anti-Exclusion or pro-York stance, nor to *convince* viewers of anything. Rather, by resembling the opposition's propaganda these prints shammed supporters of Exclusion, forcing them to question the 'evidence' upon which their position was based, heightening awareness of the strategies of oppositional works by parodying them. Like pro-Exclusion prints these engravings were 'chatter pieces', but ones castigating the viewers' credulity rather uniting them behind the opposition's lobby, weakening resolve by casting doubt upon the verity of the plot to which the Whigs had bolted their cart. Yet such inversion also highlighted the success of the original, marking Whig imagery as something which *had* to be contended.[238]

Indeed, iconography's importance to political agitation is ultimately demonstrated by the sophistication of graphic satire during these years. Works like *The Solemn Mock Procession* or *The Committee, or Popery in Masquerade* were more complex than anything the English press had previously produced, and their inventiveness indicated the heightened value placed upon imagery [Figs. 221 & 208.][239] *The Committee* was a deliciously witty synopsis of polemic penned by L'Estrange, the chief Tory propagandist.[240] L'Estrange never denied the Popish Plot's

[237] BM Sat 1092 & 1093. Oates' perjury was hotly debated by 1682. See A. Elliot, *A modest vindication of Titus Oates, the Salamanca-doctor from perjury, or, An essay to demonstrate him only forsworn in several instances* (London, 1682); *Titus tell-troth, or, The Plot-founder confounded* (London, 1682); E. Hickeringill, *The character of a sham-plotter or man-catcher* (London, 1681); *The Character of an ignoramus doctor* (London, 1681); *More last words and sayings of the True Protestant Elm-board, or, A Full answer to a late pretended sober vindication of the Dr. and the Board* (London, 1682); *A letter from a friend in London, to another at Salamanca* (London, 1681); *The Compleat swearing master: a rare new Salamanca ballad, to the tune of Now now the fight's done* (London, 1682); T. Oates, *A vindication of Dr. Titus Oates : from two late scurrilous libels written to create a dis-belief of the Popish plot : the one entituled A narrative by E. Settle : the other a modest vindication of Titus Oates, the Salamanca doctor, from perjury by A. Elliot* (London, 1683).

[238] This image was obviously very popular, as they were still being sold in 1685. Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, p. 290. Advertised in the Term Catalogue in May 1685. Sold for M. Turner.

[239] BM Sat. 1072, 1084, 1080, 1081. Monteyne has argued that the Pope Burning Processions stimulated an increase in the sophistication of graphic satire during these years. J. Monteyne, *The printed image in early modern London : urban space, visual representation, and social exchange* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 153-214; Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, pp. 286-87.

[240] On L'Estrange's effectiveness as a propagandist, see P. Hinds, *'The Horrid Popish Plot': Roger L'Estrange and the Circulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth-Century London* (Oxford,

existence, but argued that it had quickly been contained. This permitted him the moral authority to expose flaws in the evidence of witnesses championed by the Whigs, exposures which deflated the momentum of anxiety which they hoped to drum-up.[241] For L'Estrange a more significant conspiracy was a work than that 'discovered' by Oates.[242] Ironically, the vehemence of Whig Anti-Catholicism betrayed that party as malevolent conspirators seeking the realm's subversion, churning up Anti-Catholic feeling to undermine both the English Church and Crown by securing Exclusion:

"A legal provision against the danger of Romish practices will never serve their turn, whose quarrel is barely to the name of Popery without understanding the thing itself.... if there were not a Roman Catholic left in these three kingdoms they would never the better satisfied, for where they cannot find Popery they will make it, and be troubled to that they could not find it....The first late clamour was against downright Popery and then came the Popishly affected [then]...the order of the bishops and the discipline of the church... and the next blow was at the crown itself; when everyman was made a papist that would not play the knave and the fool....."[243]

2010), passim; ibid, "Roger L'Estrange, the Rye House Plot, and the Regulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth Century London", *The Library*, 3, (2002), pp. 3-31; ibid, "'A Vast Ill Nature': Roger L'Estrange, Reputation, and the Credibility of Political Discourse in the Late Seventeenth Century", *The Seventeenth Century*, XXI, (2006), pp. 335-363. For an example of L'Estrange's strategies see *A Full and Final Proof of the Plot from the Revelations, Whereby the Testimony of Dr. Titus Oates and Mr. Will. Bedloe is Demonstrated to be Juro Divino* (London, 1680). Like *The True Narrative*, this began as Anti-Catholic invective but switched to satire, mocking Oates and Bedloe as the Two Witnesses of Revelations. On the basis of their evidence, there was no need to consider "the Probabilities of Mens Innocence, or Guilt, by weighing Circumstances and Matters in a Humane Method" (p. 6.) Men must be prepared to believe all rather than doubt them.
[241] During the summer of 1679 L'Estrange published account of trials making inconsistencies prominent. During 1680, his publications expressed sardonic deference to the unimpeachable verity expressed towards Oates. *Discovery upon Discovery* (London, 1680), passim; L'Estrange's *Narrative of the Plot* (London, 1680); *A Further Discovery of the Plot* (London, 1680).
[242] See also Lord, *Poems On Affairs of State*, i, p. 315; T. Bruce, *Memoirs*, ed. W. E. Buckley (2 vols, Cambridge, 1890), i, pp. 26-27. L'Estrange was not alone in this accusation – this was had been a jibe at 'Puritans' and 'Dissenters' since the Restoration. A. Egan, *The Romanists Designs Detected* (London, 1674), passim; W. Lloyd, *The Late Apology in Behalf of the Papists* (London, 1667), p. 46; *The Jesuite and Priest Discovered* (London, 1663), pp. 5-15.
[243] *A Further Discovery*, p. 8.

A renewal of the 'Puritan' conspiracy posited by Laud sixty years earlier, radical Protestants utilized Anti-Catholicism to mask their desire to quash the institutions at the bedrock of the English State.[244]

This conspiracy was captured in *The Committee*.[245] Characters representing various dissenting sects formed a cabal hearing petitions from barking dogs and braying horses. On the left the Civil Wars' martyrs were led in chains, linking the Whigs to Charles I's antagonists of some forty years earlier and suggesting an ongoing dissenting plot waged under the pretence of rooting-out Popery. Verses informed readers that advocates of a "thorough Reformation" set "the pulpits, and presses...ring[ing] of popery...plots of all sorts, invasions [and] massacres" to mask their conspiracy to "change the government" and Church. Over-seeing proceedings, the Pope steered the Popish Plot's discovery to his advantage, directing the anxieties it unleashed towards weakening political institutions, making the realm easy prey for Roman dominion. *The Committee* thus countered one conspiracy with another. Re-claiming Anti-Catholicism, loyalists harnessed it to rebuff Whig charges of a Court conspiracy to shackle England under 'Popery and Arbitrary Government', reflecting these charges back onto the opposition as evidence of an equally 'Popish' plot to subvert the monarchy.[246]

But only by understanding *how* the print achieved this do we grasp the importance of imagery to seventeenth-century politics. Unlocking anxieties around satanic intrigue accrued over three generations, the unspoken resonances radiated by the cabal conceit were crucial in inverting the momentum of Whig propaganda. Whigs and Tories did not just *turn* to satire here – they were in *dialogue* with it. *The Committee*'s cabal scene was another variation on Ward's *Double Deliverance*, a scene which had become a silent emblem of conspiracy – an unremarkable depiction of men huddled around a table had become invested with the weight of collective

---

[244] *An Answer to the Appeal from the Country to the City* (London, 1679), pp. 9-13, 16-24;
L'Estrange's Narrative, pp. 4-9, 29-30; *A Further Discovery*, pp. 12-13, 25-32. See above, pp. 204-8.
[245] For previous work on this print, see Griffiths, *Print in Stuart Britain*, pp. 286-87.
[246] This image sparked a furious response from the Whigs, which launched an extensive graphic satire campaign painting L'Estrange as a papist. Space does not permit analysis, but see Stephen College, *Strange's Case, Strangely Altered* (1680) (BM Sat 1083). In reference to L'Estrange's flight from London, College depicted him being urged on by the devil as he evades hangman and deserts patrons Devil and Duke of York. This was a means of mocking and scoffing at one who was doing most to taint credibility of Whigs and 'Popish Plot' in public forum – boundaries were pushed, and this may be the first time that a controversy conducted primarily in the visual form. See also *The Contents (Hats for Caps) Contented* (BM Sat 1087). Other satirists also attacked L'Estrange. See *The Fetter Lane Loyalist, or, A description of true sonne of Rome* (London, 1681). BM Sat 1110; *Roome's trechery and hell bred cruelty* (London, 1680); *A Tale of the tubs, or Rome's master piece defeated* (London, 1679).

Anti-Catholic memory, memory which L'Estrange unleashed here. Struck some sixty years earlier, Ward's emblem was so entrenched in English culture that clashing factions of Protestants now debated their political differences *through* it. Harnessing an emotive 'monument' to award his satire added immediacy, L'Estrange was the latest in a long line of agitators employing this iconography to bring the weight of collective memory to bear in a new context. This was purely the manipulation of a template. Indeed, the Pope's overseeing conspiracy echoed earlier cabal prints such as *A Plot Without Powder* (c.1623) in which Satan was voyeur [Fig. 135.] Pope supplanted devil as conspiracy's muse, the bogeyman with which to taint one's political opponents through association.[247] Beyond a repository of popular prejudice, this ensign of England's Anti-Catholic past had become a framework upon which political debates were constructed.

Conclusion: An Icon for the Iconophobic

To say that such images 'influenced' people is to be too blunt. By jabbing at memory they did something else, encapsulating and expressing something already known but in a form that was both novel and readily available, tinkering with a template to simplify very complex political issues to the lowest common denominator of fear. The image was a prevalent part of post-Reformation society – as a vestige of memory, a political agitator, an object of devotion, and both public memorial and personal *memento mori*, it was lodged in the age's kitsch. What strikes us is that Protestantism, whilst certainly iconophobic, was specific in its aesthetic trimming – outside of religious spaces, visual impulses were not stunted, but blossomed.

Works after the *Double Deliverance* were entrenched in post-Reformation culture because they were more than mere images – as receptacles of memory and emotion, they became iconic. But all icons possess meanings more porous than permanent, more malleable than monolithic. This one split the truth into factions who competed to control it. By its close seventeenth century society had mastered the art of walking backward into the future, its past in permanent and painful view. But, lacking distinction from the present, understandings of that past were more indebted to *memory* than *history*, both mythical and disputed. To remember is to place a part of

---

[247] BM Sat. 87.

the past in the service of present concerns, and what gives myth operational value is a pattern of timelessness – it explains the present and the past as well as the future. Seventeenth-century Protestants posited competing myths and conspiracies – whether of a Crown imposing 'Popish' arbitrary government, or 'Puritans' equally 'popish' in their subversion of Church and Crown – detecting in history a rhythm, a predictable pattern, a plot. That both tried to express their imagined intrigues through the *Double Deliverance* encapsulated the power that the visual had retained in post-Reformation Protestantism, and its importance as a vestige of memory. In this, image was both a shackle and a garland.

Chapter Four: Popery as Purgative – Putting hatred to work in Stephen Bateman's *A Christall glasse of Christian reformation* (1569) & Jan van der Noot's *Theatre of Worldlings* (1569)

Prejudice is seen to be stifling: a belief without basis, a reflexive anger existing as the repository of men void of their own opinions, it is commonly deemed the enemy of thought. But narrow minds can be fecund, hatred purposeful. Indeed, thus far we have seen Anti-Catholicism to be much more than a blanket enmity existing solely to vent spleen at its object, but rather as an animus of action, whether political protest, the glorification of God, or release of anxiety. Hatred could be creative, but by being responsible for so many moments in which our ancestors embarrass us, Anti-Catholicism has been written-off as a blunt trauma rather than understood as a tool put to work, inspiring and effecting change. Apology has robbed historical understanding of nuance – far from blinkering Protestant minds, hatred became a tool to enlighten them, something which was *used*.

An example will prove salutatory. Upon first glance, the illustration of the Sermon on the Mount's lesson concerning the houses of the wise and foolish men – the former built on rock and surviving rain, wind and storm, the latter erected on sand and being washed away – is obviously Anti-Papal. Glaringly so [Fig. 222.][1] Taken from *A Christall Glass of Christian Reformation* (1569) by the minister and antiquarian Stephen Bateman, the biblical parable had become an allegory of a Protestant cliché: Catholicism was built upon the shaky edifice of human traditions rather than the firm foundation of God's Word. The fate of Rome's house was emblematic of that awaiting its Church, the frantic gesticulations of its inhabitants (the Pope, a Cardinal and a friar) as a river peeled away their home a fitting punishment for those deluded enough to trust in human pride over divine Truth. The explanatory 'signification' hammered the message home:

---

[1] Matt. 7. S. Bateman, *A Christall glasse of christian reformation, wherein the godly maye beholde the coloured abuses of this our present tyme* (London, 1569), sig. Sii. Margaret Aston claims that the lesson has been made "anti-papal." *The King's Bedpost: Reformation Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 165-66.

"The house which standeth on the rocke, signifieth the steadfast belief of the faythfull: The other which standeth in the valley on sandy ground, is the church of Antichrist and all popishe preaching."[2]

The image's 'meaning' then was bluntly straightforward – a witty and pithy attack on Rome it was, as one scholar suggested, simply an icon "indicative of the anti-papalism of the time."[3]

Not quite. Hatred manifested itself here as metaphor not mantra. The image was certainly Anti-Papal, but denigrating Rome was not its primary purpose. Rather, this Anti-Catholic gibe was a gloss employed to amplify Bateman's message – the importance of obeying the law of God to the prosperity of a realm, and the well-being of its inhabitants.[4] The accompanying exposition presented Rome as a cautionary tale, its fate intended as an allegory of the necessity of building a realm's laws upon the Word. Charting the reigns of David and Solomon, who had executed God's law, Bateman noted that:

"By these examples, it is manifest that God hath always...preserved, not onely those rulers and maiestrates, the which have kept hys precepts, with wisdome and iust dealing, but also the poore and simple."[5]

The inhabitants of such realms benefited from plentitude and justice in this world and salvation in the next, whilst conversely those who lived under law-breakers profited nought but punishment. Catholicism epitomized the latter, its recent decline demonstrating:[6]

"What a horrible thing it is...to pervert the scriptures...with men's laws and inventions...what a haynous offence it is before God [if] the subject shall

---

[2] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. sii.
[3] Aston, *The King's Bedpost*, p. 165.
[4] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sigs. si-siii.
[5] Ibid, sigs. si-sii. Bateman cited 3 Kings. He described the advice given by David to Solomon, detailing how a wiser ruler should keep God's statutes, precepts, and commandments. He also recounted how impressed the Queen of Sheba was with the order of Solomon's kingdom, and how happy his people were, signs of a just ruler.
[6] Ibid, sigs. siii-siiii.

wilfully or co[n]tempuosuly make lawes contrary to the precepts and commandments of that the which the Prince has determined...."[7]

Rome's fate was thus a metaphor expressive of a more fundamental lesson, a warning to obey just authorities and true laws. Bateman tied image to lesson explicitly, noting that magistrates who tried to be wiser than God built a house of clay on dust foundations, and would be smitted by the Lord in this world, and damned in the next.[8] Consequently, scholars who have termed his illustrations 'Anti-Papal' have somewhat missed the point – their purpose was not simply to *express* Anti-Papal sentiment, but rather to *use* Anti-Catholicism as a hook to arrest readers' attention, a garnish with which to dress the lesson of obedience.[9]

Bateman, then, was putting hatred to work and employed Catholic figures in this way throughout his text. Indeed, that Anti-Catholicism was not the book's central theme was shown by the appearance of Catholic figures in only seventeen of its thirty-nine woodcuts:[10] they were simply part of a larger cast of figures – devils, whores, animals and angels – with which Bateman constructed his moralized pictures, part of his visual vocabulary. *A Christall Glass* was a compilation of allegorical representations of virtues and vices through which Bateman induced readers to purge themselves of sin, to live the life of a true Christians, doing deeds inspired by Love, Faith and Charity.[11] In turning to the visual to inspire action, Bateman's work was a token of the potency which the image retained in an iconosceptic age. Existing in parity with the word, an essential adjunct to the verbal element of his work, Bateman turned to the visual because of its pervasive effect of signification, the power of its direct appeal. Intended to startle the reader into action, his images were not decorative

---

[7] Ibid, sig. siii

[8] Ibid, sig. siiii. "Should a man be wiser than his maker? [IF GOD] found no truth in his servantes, and his angells there was much folly, how much more in them that dwell in houses of clay, and whose foundation is but dust, which shall be consumed as it were such a moth..."

[9] For scholars who have misunderstood this, see Aston, *The King's Bedpost*, pp. 164-66; J. N. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, 1989), p. 120; ibid, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 175, 178; D. Oldridge, *The Devil In Early Modern England* (Guildford, 2000), pp. 72-74.

[10] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*. There were 25 Catholic figures in 17 separate images. The Pope appeared in 5 images: 'Of Wrath' (Cii & Di), 'Of Verity' (Qii), 'Of Wisdom' (Sii), 'Of Purgatory' (Uiii); friars appeared in 9 images: 'Of Wrath' (Ciii & Ciiii), 'Of Lechery' (Div), 'Of Gluttony' (Fii), 'Of Sloth' (Gii), 'Of Envie' (Giiii & Hii), 'Of Wisdom' (Sii), 'Of Purgatory' (Uiii). Priests appeared in 2 images: 'Of Gluttony' (Fi & Fii). Nuns appear in two images: 'Of Lechery' (Div), 'Of Gluttony' (Fi). Cardinals appeared in 5 images: 'On Covetousness' (Biii) 'On Envie' (Hii), 'Of Verity' (Qii) 'On Wisdom' (Sii), 'On Purgatory' (Uiii). Another figure, 'Popish Spirituality' appeared in Ci.

[11] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sigs Aii-Aiii, Kii-Liii, Mii-Miv, Nii-Oi in particular.

245

but – like the hatred they deployed - were to be *used*. Consequently, scholars who have labelled *A Christall Glass*'s images 'Anti-Papal' on the basis of familial resemblances with other sixteenth century Anti-Catholic woodcuts have entirely missed the point, for the mere *existence* of iconographic similarities was far less important than the way in which this iconography was *used*. In Bateman's case, what these images *actually* displayed – the persons and items depicted – were only of secondary importance, a gloss or metaphor symbolizing the vice which readers were to reflect upon more deeply: one was not meant to focus upon the insecurity of Rome's sandy foundation, but to learn and remember the importance of obeying the law of God. Anti-popery here was the means, not the end.

We have here an aesthetics of hate: the use of prejudice – through the medium of the image – to inspire Protestant readers, to teach them. Alongside *A Christall glasse* this chapter will examine another work which employed popery to effect the purgation of sin, Jan van der Noot's *Theatre of Worldlings* (1569).[12] Appearing in the same year and being intimately tied to the print-shop of John Day, these works have much in common: both were products of figures chronically understudied by literature scholars; and what little attention they have received has been marred by teleology, by allowing these works importance only in so far as they were sources and inspiration for Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene* (1590.)[13] Yet they are both important and revealing in their own right. Demonstrative both of the malleability of Anti-Catholicism as a prejudice and the attachment of even Reformed Protestants to the visual arts, these works show us that both image and hatred were marked not just by their *presence* in Protestant society, but by the readiness of Protestant's to *use* them as spurs to action. That the emotive piquancy of Anti-Catholicism was heightened by its appearance in the visual made Bateman and Van der Noot's emblems poignant vehicles to inspire – *affective* images were employed to *effect* change in their viewers. That change was a reformation, a purgation of the flesh. Reminding viewers that to be worldly was to be 'Romish' served as a rhetorical tool driving them towards repentance. Hatred here was utilized as the by-way to faith, to inspire in the viewer, in the words of Van der Noot, a "quietnesse of mind."[14]

---

[12] J. Van der Noot, *Theatre of Worldlings* (London, 1569)
[13] For Van der Noot, see below note 1173. For Bateman, see A. L. Prescott, "Spenser's Chivalric Restoration: From Bateman's *Travayled Pylgrme* to the Redcrosse Knight", *Studies in Philology*, 86, (1989), pp. 184-85.
[14] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, sig. Ei.

I: Stephen Bateman and the Aesthetics of Hate

Stephen Bateman (1543-84) is difficult to pin down.[15] A son of Dutch immigrants, this minister, author, antiquarian and translator was an eccentric whose book collections hint at a man who pursued his interests voraciously to a fault, a man who balanced a vehement Protestant fervour with an insatiable hunger for – and respect of – learning from the eras of "popish" darkness.[16] This appetite found its outlet in the employment of Archbishop Parker, who had been granted permission during 1568 to hunt down ancient manuscripts, and for whom Bateman collected some 6,700 volumes of medieval texts.[17] Spanning theology, astrology, medicine, natural philosophy, history and literature, Bateman annotated his books heavily, seeking to apply the knowledge of the ancients to the problems of the present. Such eclecticism passed into his published output, *Batman uppon Bartholomew* (1582), an encyclopaedia, a translation of Conrad Lykosthenes's collection of portents, prophecies and wonders, *The doome warning all men to the judgment* (1582), and his *Golden booke of ledden Goddes* (1577), a handbook of iconography.[18] The latter highlighted his aesthetic sensibilities. A keen manuscript limner, Bateman's commonplace books and manuscripts were littered with illustrations, a taste he carried into print – this was a Reformed Protestant who had no qualms in showering his works with images, monuments of past superstition or not.[19]

---

[15] For biographical details, see M. B. Parkes "Stephan Bateman's Manuscripts" in M. Kanno, H. Yamashita, M. Kawasaki, J. Asakawa, and N. Shira (Eds.) *Medieval Heritage: Essays in Honour of Tadahiro Ikegami*, (Tokyo, 1997), pp. 125-56; Rivkah Zim's article in the ODNB; and D. Galbraith "Stephen Bateman (1510-84)" in D. A. Richardson (Ed.) *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Sixteenth Century British Nondramatic Writers* (1994), vol. 136, pp. 12-16.

[16] See Parkes "Stephen Bateman's Manuscripts", pp. 125-35. For the use of 'Popish' learning, see pp. 135-36. W. H. Frere (Ed.), *Registrum Matthei Parker dioceses Canturiensi AD 1559-1579*, Canterbury and York Society, 35, 36, 39 (1928-33), 2, p. 859; S. Bateman, *The doome warning all men to the judgment* (London, 1582), pp. 357, 407, 410-11.

[17] Bateman, *The doome*, pp. 399-400; C. E. Wright, "The dispersal of the monastic libraries and the beginning of Anglo-Saxon Studies", *Transaction of the Cambridge Bibliographic Society*, 1, (1949-53), pp. 208-37.

[18] S. Bateman, *Batman uppon Bartholomew* (London, 1582); ibid, *Golden booke of ledden Goddes* (London, 1577); ibid, *The doome*.

[19] Bateman, *The doome*; ibid, *Golden booke of ledden Goddes*; and ibid, *Travayled Pylgrme* are all heavily illustrated. For his hand illustrated manuscripts, see Cambridge, Trinity College MS. B. 14. 15 (flyleaf); Cambridge, Trinity College, MS. B. 2. 7 (50); Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B. 15. 33 (368); Glasgow University Library, MS. U. 2.6 (215); Oxford, Bodleian Library. MS Bodley 155 (SC 1974); Oxford, Bodleian Library. MS Bodley 416 (SC231); Oxford Bodleian Library, MS Digby 171; Oxford Bodleian, MS Douce 363, fol. 48-98r; Harvard University Library, Houghton Library, Eng MS

This verve for the image found its greatest expression in Bateman's *A Christall glasse of Christian reformation* published by John Day in 1569, a work constructed around thirty-nine illustrations. Representative of Bateman's patchwork of learning this was a staunchly Protestant work, but one which balanced scriptural exegesis and Calvinist theology with Greek philosophy and Latin learning. This is revealing. For all his strident hostility to Roman idolatry Bateman's attitude to the visual was shaped by influences far wider than his Protestantism – images here were didactic rhetorical tools, and Bateman invited his readers to *study* them, to *engage* in and think *with* his illustrations.[20] The work was divided into sections, one each for the Seven Deadly Sins and Eight Virtues and a concluding lament, "Of the day of doome, And the coming of the Lord."[21] This urgent apocalyptic finality revealed what Bateman intended to achieve: to move the reader from vanity to spiritual knowledge, safeguarding their salvation and protecting the realm from God's wrath. Wrestling to unlock his mysterious allegories of virtue and vice was to inspire readers, his emblem's delicate interaction of reader, image and text stimulated both mind and eye in classical Renaissance manner, conveying moral truths more forcefully. Emblems were necessarily abstract for, as Cesare Ripa noted, "the things which they signify are the symbols of our thoughts."[22] Accompanied by a quotation (usually classical) above and "signification" below, which identified the figures and features of the pictures [Figs 223 & 224], each was followed by several pages of prose explicating these pictorial allegories of sin, amplifying them through allusion to classical and biblical exempla, and hammering-home their moral application to the reader.[23] The didactic imperative was critical, for readers were to leave the work inspired to be virtuous. As Francis Quarles noted, "An Embleme is but a silent parable" – unlocking its succession of allegories and metaphors illustrated a moral truth more powerfully, and the image here was awarded a causative effect "pertaining to the verute and instruction of life."[24]

---

f1015. On his work as a manuscript limner see J. Bruce (ed.), *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, (Cambrdge, 1853), pp. 424-26.

[20] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Kii on the horrors of Papal image worship.

[21] Ibid, sigs. Xii-Xiiii.

[22] Quoted in M. Anne Trep, "The Emblematics of Free Will in *Paradise Lost*", *Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, 31, (1991), p. 147.

[23] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sigs. Cii, Bii, Biiii.

[24] F. Quarles, *Emblemes* (London, 1633), Sig. Aiii; G. Whitney, *Choice of Emblems* (London, 1586), Sig. **3.

For Bateman, then, images were a means of modulating behavior. His strategy was typical of emblem books, in which images pointed to an abstract or lesson or truth. Before 1700 only fifty such works were printed in England, but traces in household plasterwork, tapestry, heraldry, and poetry testify both to the 'source book' status which the one thousand or so European emblem books attained for craftsmen, and to the popularity of continental works in England.[25] Emblem books comprised of a series of intentionally obtuse illustrations representing ideas epigrammatically, symbols which used things themselves (rather than words) to signify abstraction - images were employed not for their value as pictures but to point to deeper moral truths. The aim was to teach. Renaissance thought posited that ideas were more firmly embodied if they stimulated the senses – musing upon a striking image, and grappling to unpick it, imbued the moral lesson which it embodied more deeply in the viewer's mind. As Henri Estienne noted:

"The Embleme is a sweet and morall Symbole, which consists of picture and words, by which some weighty sentence is declared....The chiefe aime of is to instruct us, by subjecting the figure to our view, and the sense to our understanding: therefore they must be somewhat covert, subtille, pleasant.... hav[ing] a mysticall sense."[26]

Provoking the curiosity of the eye arrested the attention of the mind. The experience of unravelling the emblem as the surrounding text was read led the viewer, in theory at least, to a deeper experience of the Truth for which it was a metaphor – solving a puzzle made the moral more memorable.[27]

---

[25] M. Bath, *Speaking Pictures – English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture* (London/New York, 1994), p. 7 for the number of works, 2-10, 37-38; C. Moseley, *A Century of Emblems – An Introductory Anthology* (Aldershot, 1989), pp. 1-3; R. Freeman, *English Emblem Books* (London, 1948), passim; B. Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth Century religious lyric* (Princeton, 1979), pp. 179-212.

[26] H. Estienne, *The Art of Making Devices*, trans Thomas. Blount (London, 1646), pp. 7-8.

[27] Bath, *Speaking Pictures*, pp. 47-50, 71-73, 140-41; P. M. Daly, & G. R. Dimler, (eds.), *Corpus Emblematum – The Jesuit Series*, 4 vols (Toronto, 2000), I, p. xi; P. M. Daly, (ed.), *The European Emblem – Towards an Index Emblematicus* (Waterloo, 1980), pp. 7, 16-20; H. Diehl, *An index of icons in English Emblem Books, 1500-1700* (Norman/ London, 1986), p. xiii; Moseley, *A Century of Emblems*, pp. 3-20; A. Saunders, *The sixteenth century French Emblem Book – A decorative and Useful Genre* (Geneva, 1988), pp. 1-3, 6-8, 14-15. On the circulation of emblems in other art forms, and of continental emblems in England, see Saunders, *The sixteenth century French Emblem Book*, pp. 27, 29, 57-58; Moseley, *A Century of Emblems*, pp. 20-3; Diehl, *An index*, pp. xiii, 3-4; Bath, *Speaking Pictures*, pp. 8-17, 21-22.

Emblems generally had a tripartite structure, consisting of motto (a principle to be expounded), picture (a symbolic expression of the principle), and epigram (which explained the relationship between picture and motto, and revealed the moral lesson.)[28] The form was interdependent. Figure 225, taken from George Whitney's *Choice of Emblems* (1586), demonstrates an emblem's working upon the viewer.[29] A motto, "love, the most powerful of emotions", accompanied a depiction of a winged figure driving a chariot harnessed by two lions controlled with reins in her left hand, and urged on with a whip in her right. We have a puzzle: we want to know who the winged figure is, why lions pull her chariot and, most importantly, how this represents love as the "the most powerful of emotions." The epigram solved the mystery, informing us what we are meant to see, and revealing its moral significance: love is so powerful that even lions, the fiercest of beasts, are tamed by it. The initial slippage between motif and picture has thus been resolved, and the conceit's cleverness makes the principle more memorable. Reading emblems involved a process of revelation, of mystification was followed by clarification – the reader initially marvelled, but was left with a maxim to remember.

Cliché was crucial to this revelation. Readers must recognize the *conventional* attributes of figures in order for them to function effectively as metaphors.[30] Put simply, for this emblem to resonate with readers, they must understand and accept that cupid signified love, and that lions were fierce – only then do the analogies work and the emblem make sense. Clichés were the building-blocks of the emblematist's vocabulary. Readers' recognition of attributes (snake = deceitful, pig = greedy) allowed figures to point beyond themselves to moral lessons, permitting them to become visual metaphors. Bateman employed Popery in this way. Just as he used

---

[28] Bateman does not fit this normative model: most of his emblems consisted of a motif, picture and signification (which explains what each part of the picture represented.) This was then followed by a prose exposition on the theme, which generally did not refer to the picture explicitly but without which the picture would fail to make its point. Mary V Silcox has argued that despite the slightly unconventional nature of its structure, Bateman's was nonetheless an emblem book. See her "'A manifest shew of all coloured abuses': Stephen Bateman's *A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation* as an Emblem Book" in P. M. Daly (Ed.), *Emblem Scholarship Directions and Developments: A tribute of Gabrield Hornstein* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 211-227. To my knowledge, this is the only study of *A Christall Glasse*. I am deeply grateful to Prof Silcox and Peter Daly for discussion the work with me at the 8th International Conference of the Society of Emblem Studies, Winchester College July 28th-August 1st 2008.

[29] George Whitney, *Choice of Emblems* (Leyden, 1585), p. 63. I am have heavily dependent upon the exposition of Bath, *Speaking Pictures*, pp. 71-73.

[30] The emblem is dependent upon the shared belief between the author and reader in the reality of the symbolic object and its properties: if a stag stands for swiftness, we must belief that it is fleet-footed. See Bath *Speaking Pictures*, pp. 4-5.

commonplace synonyms such as an ass to symbolize folly, devils to represent deceit, Bateman utilized a tapestry of Anti-Catholic clichés to create a symbolic vocabulary with which to construct his epigrammatic representations of vice.[31] Thus in figure 1, readers must *know* that Catholicism had no scriptural foundation in order to 'get' the adaptation of the Sermon on the Mount. Similarly, Bateman employed clichés of Catholicism's propensity for violence and treason to construct his emblematic condemnation of wrath [Figs. 226 & 227];[32] and stereotypes of monastic worldliness in representing gluttony and covetousness [Figs 228-230.][33]

For Margaret Aston and John N. King, Bateman's images were simply representative snapshots of popular prejudice.[34] Their claims contain a double misunderstanding: both of the role of Anti-Catholicism in Bateman's text; and the workings of emblematic imagery. Given their iconographic relationship to the second edition of John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1570) it has been assumed that Bateman's illustrations were straightforwardly polemical, seeking, like Foxe's typification of Catholicism as a timeless and tyrannous persecutor of the Godly, to vilify Rome and provoke a visceral reaction in the viewer.[35] There is good reason to make this assumption. Both works were produced in a climate of increased Anti-Catholic hostility following rising Papal aggression.[36] More importantly the texts shared a lineage, being produced in John Day's print-shop, the source of their iconographic points of contact. The chief connoisseur of woodcut art in late-sixteenth-century England, Day had both taken charge of the expanded, more conspicuously Anti-Papal illustration programme in the second edition of Foxe's tome, and, upon discovering that the exiled Dutch artist Marcus Gheeraerts possessed the illustrations, had commissioned Bateman to write the *Christall Glass*.[37] The reflection of the printer's tastes in both works, then, is not a surprising find.

The iconographic echoes were loud and clear. Bateman's 'Of Envie' depicted a minister being removed from the pulpit by two "enemies of Gods word" [Fig.

---

[31] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sigs. Bi, Biii, Ci, Miiii (devils), Ciii, Gii (Ass) Fi (Bacchus.)
[32] Ibid, sig. Di; Cf, sig. Ciiii 'On Wrath'.
[33] Ibid, sigs, Div, Fi, Fii, Di.
[34] See above, note 1082
[35] Aston, *The King's Bedpost*, pp. 161-66; King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, pp. 175, 178.
[36] This is Aston's argument, see *The King's Bedpost*, pp. 135-66.
[37] King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, pp. 166-76; E. Evenden, *Patents, pictures, and patronage : John Day and the Tudor book trade* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 100-15; E. Hodnett, *Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder of Bruges, London & Antwerp* (Utrecht, 1971), pp. 6-8.

231.][38] Clerics grabbed the minister by his beard and gestured towards the fire outside the church, his punishment for preaching the Gospel. This echoed Foxe's depiction of Thomas Bilney's removal from the pulpit in 1527 [Fig. 232.] That Foxe's text informed readers of Bilney's subsequent burning in 1531 made the ties between the works more apparent, and we can see how the case for Bateman and Foxe sharing a viscerally Anti-Catholic intention might be a strong one.[39]

Other illustrations provided a strong supporting chorus for this view. Bateman's 'Of Wrath' depicted an enthroned Pope cruelly treading one victim down whilst his associate executed another, a scene of proud oppression contrasted with one of piety in the background, where the godly humbly prayed to alleviate persecution [Fig. 233.][40] For Aston, this cut was "as vivid in its denigration of the Papacy as those that were added to Foxe's first volume of 1570."[41] Representing Papacy as oppressor was a shared concern, and the motif of the Pope using his victims as footstools provided an iconographic tie between the two works, most noticeably in the illustration of Frederick Barbarossa's plea for absolution before Alexander III at Vienna in 1185 [Fig. 234.][42] Similar iconographic continuities occurred in Bateman's 'Of Verity' [Fig. 235.][43] Here, Christ sat enthroned at the world's end judging a Pope, Cardinal and devil whose vain attempts to ascend in the world prove fruitless, causing them to plummet into hell's jaws. Christ in Judgment provided the centerpiece of the *Acts and Monument*'s title-page [Fig. 236], where He once again presided over Rome's fall, witnessing Papal clerics being transported to hell by demons.[44]

Christ in Judgment was a commonplace of medieval Church art. As we have seen throughout this thesis, Protestant iconography was a bricolage of older representations appropriated for polemical purposes.[45] Indeed, Foxean representations

---

[38] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Giiii

[39] J. Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments* (2 vols) (London, 1563), p. 474. Bilney was removed from the pulpit in Ipswich during 1527 for preaching against the spiritual value of being buried in a friar's habit. He was burned in 1531.

[40] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Di

[41] Aston, see *The King's Bedpost*, p. 165. The link should not be overstated. At no point in the *Acts and Monuments* was the Pope directly depicted oppressing the Godly – rather, he was always tied to the subjugation of rightful Emperors, a visual representation of the Papacy's timeless desire for usurped dominion over monarchs which had been an English pre-occupation since Henry VIII's Royal Supremacy.

[42] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, (London, 1583) I, p. 205. For other examples see below, 'Chapter Five', pp. 342-45 and above 'Introduction', pp. 4-7.

[43] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Qii.

[44] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, frontispiece.

[45] On appropriation, see above Chapter Two, pp. 103-20. King, *Tudor Royal Iconography*, pp. xv-xviii, 3-19.

of the Pope trampling upon Kings, and in turn becoming a footstool of the Tudor monarchy, were simple celebratory expressions of victor and vanquished ubiquitous in traditional glorifications of Papal power which had origins in the art of the Roman Empire.[46] English Protestantism turned Papal art against itself – what for Rome had symbolized glory and power became an icon of pride and oppression. Classical motifs were also employed in support of the new order. Virtue (Protestant) trampling down Vice (Catholic) shaped the imagery in civic pageantry, court revels and Anti-Catholic drama. Bateman employed this iconography in 'On Faith' [Fig. 237.] This Pauline triumph of faith over the devil's temptation - the "steadfast believers...being armed with constant zeale... and weaponed with the shielde of lively faith, the spere of continuancie, and the sworde of the word of God" - echoed a depiction in another work printed by Day, [Fig. 238.][47] It is undeniable, then, that Bateman's images were in-line with the broad swathes of contemporary Protestant iconography.

Yet a continuation of tropes was not a continuation of meanings. What mattered was not repetition of this Anti-Catholic iconography, but the way in which this iconography was *used*. Unlike Foxe's images, Bateman's pictures did not chronicle *actual* events but were rather allegories of sins. Foxe's display of Rome as Anti-Christian persecutor was intended to take bellows to embers of Anti-Catholic sentiment – by seeing the atrocities of the Roman Church, the viewer remembered the martyrs who had endured them. Bateman's employment of the iconography, however, hoped to engage the mind rather than simply enrage the eye. Connotations were everything. He used familiar iconography to construct epigrams of sin which required unraveling. Deeming his work a "Glass", a mirror held up to reveal dangers posed by vice to the soul, Bateman's representation of the invisible through the visible relied upon a poetics of correspondence. Our familiar Anti-Catholic iconography proved crucial here. We have seen that an emblem's symbolic code only worked by harnessing conventional attributes which resonated with viewers – by harnessing an Anti-Catholic iconography shot-through with resonances to pride, oppression and persecution Bateman was able to construct his allegorical tapestries of vice. This was a creative use of hatred which already

---

[46] See above, Introduction, pp. 4-7.
[47] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Miiii; R. Day, *A Booke of Christian Prayers* (London, 1578), sig. Ni. Cf sigs Fii, lviii.

253

existed. For Bateman hostility to Rome was a *given*, and one which he put to work to repulse his viewers from the errors which his Catholic figures depicted.

It was precisely because this iconography was so familiar, so deeply embedded in the Protestant lexicon, that Bateman could use it as a visual vocabulary. The minister's ejection from the pulpit is poignant [Figs 231 and 232.] For Foxe, this chronicled an event representative of Catholic cruelty during English evangelism's early years.[48] For Bateman however, the same scene provided an allegory of Envy. The accompanying "signification" explained that the preacher represented "Godly zeal" and his clerical bully-boys "the enemies of God's word." The congregants who failed to assist the minister were "Nulfidians", those void of zeal living only to follow their own wills.[49] At this point, readers wonder how this represented 'Envy'. Bateman explained that as a "maladie" against nature envy threatened both Church and Commonwealth:

> "For nature desireth good, and every creature naturally taketh pleasure in good thinges: But envie tormenth himself when he seeth any good thing happen unto an other."[50]

Disturbing hearts and minds, envy sought the destruction of goodness. Having caused the Jews to kill Christ and stone St. Stephen, it equally drove the clerics in the image to silence the Gospel. The image was thus metaphorical, a specific instance of a wider malady: just as it drove Catholic persecution, envy sought always and only to destroy goodness in the commonwealth. Employing a familiar iconography, the memory of the Roman persecution of English Protestantism was thus utilized to put hatred to work, effecting change in Bateman's viewers through a powerful allegory of the ravages which vice could wreck. The image's point was not to be 'Anti-Catholic' but to use Anti-Catholic motifs to encourage Protestants to both loath sin and avoid it all the more stringently.[51]

This metaphor was developed with Catholicism being depicted more savagely as the Envy it symbolized became increasingly destructive. Thus figure 239. On the left, a Cardinal (persecution) rode a dragon (the enemy of all who professed the

---

[48] Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1563), pp. 472-76.
[49] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Giiii.
[50] Ibid, sig. Giiii.
[51] Ibid, sig. Giiii.

Word) which crushed the lamb (the godly); whilst on the right another lamb (all Christians from the beginning of time) was slaughtered by a friar (murder.)[52] This vicious scene of Anti-Catholic violence encapsulated envy's destructive tendencies:

"To serpent like I may compare: those greedy wolves that lambes devoure:

Awaytyng still to catch in snare: all such as gette they may by power."[53]

Wolves devouring sheep was a motif employed ubiquitously by early English Protestants to condemn Catholicism's persecuting tendencies.[54] At first glance this is what Bateman seemed to refer to. Given that his motif referred to the present he could not have intended to warn of Roman oppression, for this had ceased in England some ten years earlier. Musing upon an image of Catholic savagery made the danger of vice all the more poignant for Protestant readers, the memory of persecution connoting the permanently antagonistic relationship between envy and virtue - just as Rome had continually oppressed the Godly so envy, which "can doe noting but dispraise virtue" sought always to destroy the good.[55] Indeed, Bateman bewailed the "miserable condition" of the envious population at large, amongst whom:

"Dilligence is hated, negligence is reproved, sharpness is perilous, liberalitie tha[n]kless, co[m]munication deceitfull, pernicious flattery...familiar, many minds offended, waite to hurte privily, faire wordes openly, when officers be co[m]ming they tary for the[m] while they be present...being out of authoritie, al do forsake the[m]..."[56]

Describing a society in which deception and conflict ran freely and virtue was loathed Bateman bewailed the envious who sought the destruction of good magistrates through deceit and flattery.[57] Just as the envious Roman Church had persecuted the

---

[52] Ibid, sig. Hii.
[53] Ibid, sig. Hii (my italics).
[54] Matthew 7:15: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves". Cf John 10:12. For detail, see above Chapter Two, pp. 128-52. For images, see W. Turner, *The recuynge of the romishe fox* (Bonn, 1545), frontispiece; ibid, W. Turner, *The hunting of the romyshe wolfe* (Emden, 1555), frontispiece; ibid, *The hunting of the fox and the wolfe*, (London, 1565); BM Sat 12.
[55] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Hii.
[56] Ibid, sig. Hii.
[57] Ibid. The envious sit "awatyng still to catch in snare: all such as getter they may by power"

Godly, so envy now wrought destruction upon all of society's virtues. This was popery as purgative, the language of prejudice colouring sin more heinous.

Unlike Foxe's woodcuts, then, Bateman did not communicate Anti-Catholicism *to* the reader. Rather, in order for his emblems to take effect they were dependent upon the reader understanding the Anti-Catholic assumptions which they employed. Indeed, *A Christall glasse*'s Anti-Catholicism was confined to its pictures – Bateman's text avoided extended discussions of Rome. Thus in expounding his emblem 'On Wrath' [Fig. 233] - a vehemently hostile depiction - Bateman spent little time upon Catholicism, stating: "concerning a further setting forth of the Romish Church and crueltye, I refer it to other authors which speake therof sufficiently."[58] Popery was rather a rhetorical tool. Wrath was irrational, unruly, and ultimately unfruitful. The wrathful: "Are lyke such dogges in fury/ That at stones doe barke and bite."[59] How did this relate to the image? Roman ills were a particular manifestation of a universal vice: "The Pope is oppression: the ma[n] which killeth is crueltie: those which are a killing constant religion." Clichés of the Papacy as timeless persecutor of the Godly were a device amplifying wrath's "vain glory", which the exposition likened to "the Popes superbious crueltie."[60] Wrath was a form of folly, its exponents engaged in "an unfruitful labour...a dangerous advancement, a beginning without providence, and an end without repentance" which God would punish. Bateman noted:

"There is not so much ioye in climbing upward, as there is sorow in falling hard downward: not so much roume after victory, and after ruine reproach follie."[61]

The wrathful would undoubtedly fall, and the Anti-Papal image rebuked their folly. Behaving foolishly like dogs which barked at and bit immoveable stones, the actions of the wrathful were as unfruitful as the Papacy's foolish attempts to quash the Elect,

---

[58] Ibid, sig. Dii.
[59] Ibid, sig. Di.
[60] Ibid, sigs Di for the signification, Dii for the exposition.
[61] Ibid, sig. Dii: "Therefore bee sure with what measure is mette to others, the same be measured again."

whom every Protestant knew God would preserve.[62] The folly of wrath was epitomized by the folly of Anti-Christ, for divine punishment was its ultimate reward. Grasping the power of this analogy was ultimately to inspire action in the reader. The relationship between mysterious motif and puzzling picture was a conundrum to think with – emblem books may have required their readers to do a lot of the work, but this mental labour was integral to imparting their moral lessons. Musing upon the relationship between Catholicism and wrath here was to repel men of authority from vice, for to be a cruel magistrate was to be "popish": "Amongst men of authority there can be no greater terror, than to the subjecte to shewe crueltie."[63]

For Bateman, then, images had impact, and could inspire. This causes us to qualify scholarship which deems that the effect of Protestantism was to emaciate art of its spiritual potential, precipating the divorce of the religious and the visual – the images here may not have been objects of veneration, but that is not to say that they existed outside the sphere of devotion.[64] This was no dry aesthetic. Indeed, like the Anti-Catholic tropes they deployed, *A Christall glasse*'s images were being *used* as a spur to action. Studying them was ultimately to inspire God's glorification, a thanksgiving for the defeat of Popery:

> "Delivered us from the cruel malice of Sathan, and al papistical doctrine. Whereby now having not let, nor foes to disturbe us, may diligently shew ourselves in ech vocation, that Gods name may be glorified, and our soules refreshed, with the heavenly food of immortal joyes...."[65]

Glorification was achieved through a reformed life, a living faith expressed through deeds which ultimately showed thanks to Christ by fulfilling the Ten Commandments.[66] Just as a body was dead in the absence of spirit, so Faith was dead if it lacked works - "faith not exercised, soon waxeth sicke, and beinge unoccupied is

---

[62] Wrath only caused men to be punished: "if these sentences had bene, and were, of the enemies of Gods Gospell well co[n]sidered, truly they would not have shewed so much cruelty in shedding so much innocent blood as they have done" (Dii.)

[63] Ibid, sig. Dii.

[64] For the older view see K. V. Thomas, "Art & Iconoclasm in Early Modern England", in K. Fincham & P. Lake (Eds.), *Religious Politics in Post Reformation England: Essays in honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woolbrdige, 2006), pp. 16-40.

[65] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Rii. This was to escape God's wrath, see Ibid, sigs Aii-Aiii, Xii-Xiv.

[66] Ibid, sigs Aii-Aiii, Kii-Liii, Mii-iv, Nii-Oi, Qii-Qiv, Ri.

257

assaulted with sundry displeasures."[67] Bateman consequently urged men to shun worldly desires and follow the rule of Christ's spirit, to exercise their belief through faith, hope and charity: readers were to love their enemies, not hate them, bless those that cursed them, and overcome the world's evil with goodness.[68] Bateman showed at great length how faith could inspire avoidance of fleshy desires including pride, covetousness, fornication, idolatry, sedition, envy, drunkenness, hatred, wrath, strife, murder and gluttony.[69] Faith dressed Christians in charity, love, peace, gentleness, temperance, meekness and sufferance and was the armour used to resist worldly temptations. This faith would be awakened by musing on Bateman's emblems, by gazing into "the perfect glasse of godly reformation, beautified with the christall light of all celestal vertues, right fruitful for every man to carry, and most needful for this present time."[70]

For Bateman, then, images had the capacity to purge. Awarding the visual such an inordinate amount of agency may seem out-of-place in a figure gripped by such staunch Protestantism, but Bateman was as much a man of the Renaissance as he was the Reformation - his attitudes to the image were as indebted to concepts of rhetoric and delight as they were idolatry and iconoclasm. In Renaissance learning, emotion and intellect, entertainment and information, were not mutually distinct – ideas were understood more completely, and lodged in the mind more deeply, if the process of comprehension stimulated the senses.[71] By combining didacticism and delight, the emblem was thus the perfect vehicle of moral instruction. Its sensuous power engaged readers in a totalizing experience: stimulating their eyes through a startling picture, ears through reading the verse signification, and mind by unravelling the complex inter-relationship between the two, caused the moral truth represented to be imparted to memory with added weight.[72] As Henry Peacham explained, emblems sought: "to feede at once both the minde, and eie, by expressing mystically and doubtfully, our disposition, either to Love, Hatred, Clemencie, Justice....and the

---

[67] Ibid, sig. Nii.

[68] Ibid, sig. Miv.

[69] Ibid, sig. Liii. The second half of the work is concerned with virtues: Love (sigs Ki-Miii), Faith (Miiii-Niii), Hope (Niii-Oii), Charity (Oii-Pi), Justice (Pi-Qi), Verity (Qi-Si), Wisdom (Si-Ti), Peace (Tii-Ui).

[70] Ibid, sig. Aiii. Faith's power was captured in the emblem 'On Hope', sig. Niii.

[71] See above, Chapter One, pp. 38-51.

[72] For the impact of imagery in poetry, see L. Barkan, "Making Pictures Speak: Renaisance Art, Elizabethan Literature, Modern Scholarship", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 48 (1995), pp. 327-29; F. Robinson (Ed.), *Sidney: An Anthology* (Indianapolis, 1970), p. 18.

like."[73] That moral enlightenment was the end of this didacticism was a view shared by Bateman, who awarded his Anti-Catholic parables a similarly reforming impetus:

"Herein is plainely shewed unto all, the estate of every degree by order of picture and signification, to the intent, that thereby every Christian Reader may better see the disordered abuses which daiy raveth amongst us....that thereby every Christian may the better beware the deceivable suggestions of Satan...."[74]

Pictures, then, spoke to the soul. Images may no longer have been devotional tools, but they remained didactic ones. Yet to postulate a distinction between didacticism and devotion is not to chart a division of head and heart. For despite no longer being vehicles through which to worship God, imagery retained a sensuous power for Reformed Protestants. As much Erasmus's children as Calvin's, these men's understanding of the affective power of the visual was indebted to Renaissance belief in the essential role of the senses to effective learning.[75] As George Wither noted of his emblems:

"I doe not arrogate so much unto my Illustrations, as to thinke, they will be able to teach any thing to the Learned; yet if they cast their eyes upon them, perhaps, these Emblem, and their Morals, may remember them, either of some Dutie...or mind them to beware of some Danger, which they might otherwise be unheedful to prevent. But....the Vulgar Capacitie, may be many ways both Instructed and Remembered [and] informed of their Dangers, or Duties, by the way of an honest Recreation."[76]

Delighting the senses and stimulating the mind, a striking image rendered moral instruction more memorable.

Indeed, memory was essentially a store-room of images. As John Hoskins noted, "the concepts of the minde are pictures of thinges, and the tongue is interpretor

---

[73] H. Peacham, *Minerva Britanna* (London, 1612), sig. Aiii.
[74] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Aii.
[75] See above, Chapter One pp. 38-51.
[76] G. Wither, *A Choice of Emblems* (London, 1635), sig. Aii; Silcox "A Manifest Shew", p. 214. Cf. H. Hawkins, *Parthena Sacra* (Rome, 1635), p. 3; G. Puttenham, *Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589) Sigs. i-iii; Peacham, *Minerva*, sig. Aiii.

of these pictures" – image existed before language at an idea's conception.[77] Rhetoricians believed that the mind could not directly grasp moral truths abstractly and consequently, images, similes and metaphors were necessary to raise perception to the levels required for comprehension.[78] Such tools did not *prove* a truth, but *amplified* it, the mental efforts required to unravel a slippery analogy making the truth it illustrated more profoundly powerful. Bateman consequently intended readers to pore over his emblems:

> "Applying our mindes to the study of verture, may be rich and plentifull in righteousness.... And for that your myndes among many and earnest pensive and sorrowful studies might be revived also in virtue..."[79]

Labour was paramount. The interest supplied by the element of riddle in emblem art was invaluable both for the intellectual puzzle it afforded in itself and for didactic emphasis. Unlocking the mysterious relationship between image, motif, and exposition was a process of self-reform for the reader, impressing the desire to be virtuous more deeply.[80]

This was not the image subject to reform but inspiring it – not a Protestant mind cleansed of images but inoculated against sin by them. Bateman's Anti-Catholic allegories - his "manifest shew of coloured abuses" – were more mnemonic images to be stored in the memory.[81] Readers were to imagine what it would *look* like, and often, the "shew" of vice was Popery, the trope which depicted it most heinously. Making vices "popish", synonymous with the anti-religion, provided a powerful incentive for the Protestant viewer to avoid them. Thus, a lazy friar spurning his God-given gift of learning was a fitting metonym 'Of Sloth', warning readers that God's punishments might fall at any time [Fig. 240.][82] Similarly, an image 'Of Covetousness' featuring a member of the "popish spirituality" warned viewers from worldliness [Fig. 241]:

---

[77] Bath, *Speaking Pictures*, p. 51.
[78] Ibid, pp. 36-7, 47-55; Moseley, *A Century of Emblems*, pp. 2-3, 6-8, 13-23.
[79] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Aiii.
[80] Ibid, sig. Aiii.
[81] Ibid, sig. Aiii.
[82] Ibid, sig. Eii: Therefore "we ought always to live, even as though we should depart presently."

"Deride not that which is for thy health, lest haply in thend thou decrease they welth. Where welth doth decrease there sorowes doth grow, therefore do in time the truth learne to know."[83]

Bateman had fostered a creative form of hatred, utilizing prejudice to repulse readers into action.

But to say that Anti-Catholicism was a rhetorical tool for Bateman was not to relegate its importance. Fear of Rome was not excluded from his mind. Ultimately, to purge the realm of vice was to safeguard it against the return of Popery, ensuring: "That popishe Antichrist, nor any false usurped powers shall once be albe to spurre or kicke against the veritie and true professorss..."[84] Popery and sin were intertwined. A commonwealth whose populace was weakened by worldliness was easy prey for Catholicism, for every Protestant knew Rome's ornate show of religion spoke only to man's fallen nature rather than communing with his inward, spiritual state like the Word.[85] Vice was the arsenal used by Satan to weaken Protestant resolve against the religion of the flesh.[86] Protestant literature continually asserted that despite Rome's revelation as Antichrist Satan would not cease in attempting to re-forge its dominion, whether by raising wars or the deployment of subtle crafts and temptations. For Bateman, the latter were crucial: by grappling with his emblems of vice – "the disordered abuses which daily raveth amongst us" – the viewer understood them more fully, loathed them more deeply, and consequently found themselves "better beware of the deceivable suggestions of Satan."[87] Safeguarding against sin was to prevent

---

[83] Ibid, sig. Cii. See also 'On Wrath' featuring a monk poisoning a prophet (Di): "therefore in time beware and consider, and remember ech estate, that Sathan the author of all evil do not entise thee: but in all temptations call God he will helpe thee." Non-anti-Catholic emblems also aimed to cause the reader to leave off sin: 'On Covetousness' (Bii), "Take this for example beware in tyme, from Sathan's driftes do thous decline"; 'On Covetousness (Biii), "In time to beware I think it best/ For that shall bring thy soul to rest"; 'On Lechery' (Eii), "Let these few examples guide thee from all such mischiefe."

[84] Bateman, A Christall glasse, sig. Aii.

[85] See above, Introduction, pp. 16-20. H. L. Parish, Monks, Miracles and Magic: Reformation representations of the Medieval Church (London/New York, 2005), pp. 45-70, 71-91; A. Milton, Catholic & Reformed (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 187-208 (189-96 in particular), 197, 199, 202. For an example see, A short treatise of certayne things abused in the Popys Church long used (London, 1548), passim.

[86] Bateman would use the motif of the 'glass' being a mirror to the soul in The Travayled Pylgrime (London, 1569), sig. Gii which contains a woodcut of one figure holding a glass to the author. For a discussion of this work see, Prescott, "Spenser's Chivalric Restoration", pp. 184-85.

[87] Bateman, A Christall glasse, sigs. Aii-Aiii.

against Popery, and reading inspiring images was consequently to kill two birds with one stone.

Indeed, cliché allowed Bateman to deflect discussion of vice back onto Rome. 'On Lechery' was deliciously witty [Fig. 242.][88] A typically 'popish' vice, the motif warned against those holding marriage lightly:

"Worse than a Pharesite I may them call: which lawfull marriage doth disdane: And seeketh the truth to bring in thrall: all such doth Sata[n] quit their paine."

Watched over by a devil, a monk and a nun embraced whilst being absolved of their lechery by a claw-handed demonic friar. A fittingly repellant scene urged readers to heed Bateman's blunt warning: "fornication ought to be eschewed."[89] Monastic fornication was a Protestant commonplace. The vow of celibacy was deemed a hypocritical mockery of lived reality, and Roman lust consequently legitimizing marriage as the natural levy against lechery.[90] Clerical fornication here reinforced Bateman's exposition of marriage as the ideal for ministers and laity alike:[91]

"Consider[ing] the excellencie of mans nature...we shall well perceive how foule and dishonest a thing it is to bee resolved in fornication, and to live wantonly. Contrarywyse, how honest and fayre a thyng it is to live temperately, continently, and soberly."[92]

Cliché was crucial. For the emblem to display lechery suitably, and effectively deter against it, viewers must *know* that monks were fleshy fornicators, just as they must know that devils were synonymous with sin. But beyond this, cliché humorously reflected back upon Catholicism, ridiculing Roman condemnation of clerical marriage as ungodly as deeply ironic. The demonic friar, a "rayler against the veritie" (marriage), foolishly "reproved wickedness" by absolving the cloistered lovers of

---

[88] Ibid, sig. Diiii.
[89] Ibid, sig. Ei.
[90] BM Sat. 12.
[91] Bateman quoted from 1 Corinthians 5, 6, 7 and 10 and Hebrews 13.
[92] This was after Tulius. Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Ei.

their sin, an action made doubly fruitless because he, a devil, was damned.[93] Edifying the reader's cleverness in recognizing the web of unspoken allusions by which this emblem worked, humour was another tool of 'delight' adding extra force to Bateman's warning against sin.

For all the eccentricities of his work, Bateman was reluctant to parade its originality. Expressing a curious sense of gathering together what already existed, his title-page proclaimed, oddly, that these emblems had been "*collected* by Stephen Bateman, Minister."[94] This betrays a conception of the text as a commonplace book or collection of adages, a repository of wisdom to learn from and inspire.[95] And despite the novelty of his illustrations in a sense they had 'collected' Anti-Catholic clichés, employing a well known iconography with connotations to the sins he bewailed as a visual vocabulary with which to construct allegories of vice. This was putting prejudice to work, harnessing fear of Catholicism and using it pro-actively as an incentive for the Godly. Catholic figures ultimately became the poster-boys of precisely the opposite of what an English Protestant should be.

This only worked because Catholicism and vice were synonymous. This was logical, for both sat on the same ends of parallel spectrums: virtue being the polar opposite of vice, Protestantism the binary opposite of Popery. In Protestant histories, the two had long swayed to the same rhythm. The Bishops of Rome had fallen from the state of perfection in the early Church because they had not curtailed their worldliness, their rising wealth and power evidence of their revels in the flesh and shutting-out of Christ.[96] Given this intertwining, that vice had caused the Catholic Church's manifestation as Antichrist, it was only natural that Rome's fall should become a powerful cautionary tale for Protestants, a clarion call to "be strong in the lord, and in the power of his might, put on the armour of God, that ye may stand stedfast against to crafty assaults of the devil."[97] One was not only to loathe Rome, but to learn from it.

---

[93] Ibid. Bateman informs readers of the fate of clerics who label ministerial marriage illicit: "such chaste and maidenly prelates of their doinges, shall be shewed as followeth in the fourth part of this treatise at lecherie", in which all lecherous sinners are damned (Eii.)
[94] Ibid, title-page.
[95] See Silcox, 'A manifest shew ", pp. 221-22.
[96] See below, Chapter Five, pp. .
[97] Bateman, *A Christall glasse*, sig. Nii. Cf Ephesians 6.

II: "The whole world uppon the little foote :" Jan Van der Noot and the Language of
Popery

Bateman was not alone in creating an aesthetics of hate, of employing popery as purgative and image as a means of inspiration.[98] Similar strategies were adopted in another emblem book, Jan Van der Noot's *Theatre of Worldlings* (1569).[99] Like *A Christall glasse* scholars have missed the subtleties of this work's Anti-Catholicism, equally dismissing it as totemic of contemporary prejudice.[100] We are told that Van der Noot's "excessive concern [was] to damn the Roman hierarchy for its lusts of wealth and power" and that his work "fit[ted] with other violently anti-Catholic books printed around the same time by London publishers."[101] This was no generic spleen-venting, however. Van der Noot did not seek to increase the violence of Anti-Catholicism in his viewers but rather harnessed their hatred to inspire faith, to awaken in them tranquility, "a quietnesse of mind."[102] Describing his Anti-Catholic emblems as "pilgrimages" towards God, the *Theatre* moved readers to spiritual knowledge by confronting them with the horrors of worldliness, of which Rome took pride of place.[103] His Anti-Catholicism was preventative – recounting Rome's descent into the

---

[98] Upon revising this thesis, I came across an article by Carl J. Rasmussen "'Quietnesse of Mind': A *Theatre for Worldlings* as a Protestant Poetics", *Spenser Studies*, 1, (1980), pp. 3-27, the arguments of which I was unaware at the time that this section was written. As a non-literature specialist it is comforting to recognize that one's own thoughts are reflected by a work by a specialist in that field. Whilst Rasmussen's emphasis is not on Anti-Catholicism, he recognized that Van der Noot used prejudice as rhetoric (pp. 15-16). Although I believe that Rasmussen places undue emphasis on Van der Noot's indebtedness to Calvin (Bale is far more important), his article is richly illuminative of Van der Noot's obtuse work, but at the time of submission I was unable to absorb all of its thinking fully into my thesis.

[99] There were earlier editions in French and Dutch. J. Van der Noot, *Het theatre oft Toon-neel waer in ter eender de ongelucken ende elenden die den werelts gesinden ende boosen menschen toecomen* (London, 1568); ibid, *Le theatre anquel sont exposés & monstrés les inconueniens & miseres qui suiuent les mondains & vicieux, ensemble les plaisirs & contentements dont les fideles ioüissent* (London, 1568).

[100] For scholarship on Van der Noot see K. Bostoen "Van der Noot's Apocalyptic Visions: Do you 'see' what you read?" & W. Waterschast, "An Author's Strategy: Jan Van der Noot's *Het Theatre*" in B. Westerweel, *Anglo-Dutch relations in the field on the emblem* (Leiden, 1997); Daly, *English Emblem Tradition*, p. 5; E. C. Brown, "The Allegory of Small Things: Insect Eschatology in Spenser's Maiospotomo", *Studies in Philology*, 99 (2002), pp. 248-49; N. Shaheen, *Biblical References in 'The Faerie Queen'* (Memphis, 1976), pp. 215-17; R. Mallette, "Book Five of The Faerie Queen: An Elizabethan Apocalypse", *Spenser Studies*, 11. (1994), pp. 129-59; J. Erskin-Hankins, *Source and Meaning in Spenser's Allegory: A Study of 'The Faerie Queene* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 99-118; L. S. Friedland, "The Illustration in Van der Noot's Het Theatre", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 19, (1956), pp. 107-20; Freeman, *English Emblem Books*, p. 32; Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics*, pp. 184-85; J. A. Van Dorsten, *The Radical Arts: First Decade of an Elizabethan Renaissance* (Leiden, 1970), p. 84.

[101] Waterschast, "An Author's Strategy", p. 42.

[102] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, sig. Ei.

[103] Ibid, pp. 3-4.

perils of the flesh was a cautionary tale, an admonishment for Protestant readers to avoid placing their trust in the world and cleave to God alone.[104]

Van der Noot certainly had good cause to vent hostility towards Rome.[105] Having witnessed the crucible of war first-hand, this former alderman was implicated in the violent Protestant revolt against Habsburg repression in the Netherlands and, like thousands of others, exiled himself from Antwerp to London during 1567.[106] Unlike many of his brethren, however, Van der Noot was a wealthy man able to trade off his literary talents. He became a prominent member of the Huguenot Church near Billingsgate Market, moved in the circles of the Lord Mayor, Roger Martin, and later became a client of Northampton.[107] An ambitious man, Van der Noot was relentless in publicizing his career to a Protestant internationalle.[108] Indeed, the *Theatre* was originally published by John Day in 1568 as *Het Theatre oft Toon-neel* in Dutch, and *Le Theatre* in French, and translated into English a year later for the press of Henry Bynneman, presumably because Day's printers were too involved in the monumental edition of the *Actes and Monuments* to handle another intricately-illustrated volume.[109] He clearly believed that a market existed for his talents and the *Theatre* was certainly a remarkable work, riddled with firsts for English literature as the earliest English emblem book and sonnet sequence. Yet it was another point of origin – the first appearance of Edmund Spenser, who translated the sonnets from French – which has dominated the text's treatment by literature scholars. Viewed as little more than a colourful pit-stop *en route* to the *Faerie Queene*, critical discussion has stalled upon the issue of whether Van der Noot's apocalyptic Anti-Catholicism had a formative influence on the teenaged Spenser.[110] Such narrow gaze has lost sight of the fact that this was more than a crude polemic, or merely another Protestant treatment of Revelations, and stands on its own merits as an inventive piece of didactic rhetoric.

In turning to Revelations, Van der Noot had certainly made a stock choice of subject, versifying passages from Revelations which Protestants regarded as

---

[104] Ibid, pp. 17-20, 22-26 in particular.
[105] For his castigating European Catholicism, see ibid, sigs. Avi-Viii, pp. 71-72.
[106] Bostoen "Van der Noot's Apocalyptic Visions", p. 49.
[107] Waterschast, "An Author's Strategy", p. 35; J. A. Fletcher, "The Puritan Argument in Spenser", *PMLA*, 58, (1943), p. 642. Perhaps it was this courtly connection which resulted in the passage of his works to William Cecil.
[108] Waterschast, "An Author's Strategy", p. 36.
[109] Hodnet, *Marcus Gheeraerts*, p. 45.
[110] See above, n. 99. J. Crewe, *Hidden Designs: the critical profession and Renaissance Literature* (New York/London, 1986), pp. 93-117; Dorsten, *The Radical Arts*, pp. 75-77, 86-88.

emblematic of their movement [Figs. 243-246]: 1) the Seven-Headed Beast (traditionally interpreted as a divine presage of Rome's rise as Antichrist), 2) the Whore of Babylon (who persecuted the Godly), 3) the heavenly avenger who slew Antichrist (the Reformation's triumphant ushering in of the Last Days) and 4) the rise of New Jerusalem (the eternal salvation of the Elect.)[111] Repeatedly interpreted as divine portents of the fate of the martyr Church, prophetic of the horrendous persecution at the hands of Rome and their ultimate triumph at the apocalypse, these visions were the genesis of Protestant identifications of the Papacy as Antichrist and consequently provided the root of the period's Anti-Catholicism.[112]

Whilst Van der Noot's exegesis certainly recounted Rome's rise and fall as Antichrist, his interpretation of these visions was not limited to the straightforwardly historical.[113] He saw in them multiple allegories. Just as Revelations charted the crushing of vanity before Christ at the culmination of time, so it was emblematic of the quashing of vanity in the believer's soul as he was awakened in Faith. Rome was metonymic of the spiritual condition of vanity, a vanity defeated by the Word both in the heart of the Elect and at the world's end;[114] Christ's trouncing of vanity in the soul of Christians was a microcosm of His crushing the Papacy at the apocalypse. The *Theatre* hoped to elicit the former.[115] Illustrating the world's capricious nature, its emblematic depiction of destruction demonstrated starkly how indolent energies invested in the pursuit of earthly goods and fortunes were, urging men to live a fruitful life in the unchanging promise of Christ by marking: "howe vaine, transistorie, deceitful, unprofitable, and uncertaine worldy things be."[116] Positing a binary oppositional relationship between world and spirit, Van der Noot noted that "worldly thinges...commonly withdrawe us from heavenly and spiritual matters", provoking the pride which caused "miserable calamities" in the world – robbery, murder, war – and anguish for individual "worldings", whose hearts "are never at rest, have never inough, but be driven by the meanes of concupiscene, which reigneth in them, always to be careful, to watche, to toyle and moyle, to wishe, to mistrust, to sue

---

[111] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, sigs. Dii-Dvi.
[112] On Protestant use of Revelations, see below Chapter Five pp. 291-94.
[113] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, pp. 17-32 (Rise), 60-74 (Fall).
[114] Ibid, p. 17 in particular.
[115] Ibid, pp. 84-89, 90-97. Rasmussen comes to a similar conclusion. See his "'Quietneese of Mind'", pp. 15-21.
[116] Ibid, pp. 3 & 4.

and busily to be occupied", driving them to madness.[117] The *Theatre*, then, argued from a negative: demonstrating that "nought in this world but grief endures" it hoped to convince readers that faith in Christ was the surer bet.[118] The 'stock' account of the lusts driving Rome's craving for power, the tale of pride causing it to reject Christ's route to salvation but reaping only damnation, was actually a lesson to learn from, the ultimate example of the fruitlessness of worldliness. The 'Theatre' was just that, a display in which emblems were spectacles giving a view of a subject, *metaphors* of a deeper point.[119]

Indeed, Van der Noot was a magpie. Each collection of emblematic visionary sonnets which he borrowed to construct his *Theatre* had been chosen not on its own merits but "because they serve our purpose well" – they were tools which amplified his argument.[120] The first grouping contained six sonnets from Petrarch's *Rime* 323, allegorical visions of the death of his lover, Laura [Figs. 246-252.] Next followed eleven visions on the Roman Empire's ruins from Joachim Du Bellay's *Songe*, emblematic of providential judgments on vanity [Figs. 253 & 254.] Finally came Van der Noot's own sonnets on four of John's visions from Revleations, followed by an extensive prose commentary on all three sections.[121] Each was a rhetorical thinking-point on Van der Noot's wider theme. These examples of worldly concupiscence – the fruitlessness of love, downfall of imperial power, and overthrowal of pride – demonstrated forcefully time's mutability, comparing the passing of earthly vanity unfavourably with the unchanging nature of Christ's Truth. Knowledge of Faith's power was thus awakened by the force of contrast:

"Thys little Treatyse...sette[s] forth the vilenesse of worldely things, whiche commonly withdrawe vs from heavenly and spirituall matters. To the end that vnderstanding the vanitie of the same, and therewithal considering the miserable calamities that ensue thereupon, we might be moved rather to

---

[117] Ibid, sig. Aiiir, 2, pp. 10-11.
[118] Ibid, sigs. CIv-CIIr.
[119] Cf. P. Boaysthau, *Theatrum Mundi, the Theatre or rule of the world, wherein may be sene the running race and course of veryre man's life* (London, 1566); Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, II, vii, 136: "This wide and universal Theater Presents more wofull Pageants then the scence Wherein we play."
[120] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, pp. 10, 13-14.
[121] Ibid, sigs. Bi-Bviii, Bviii-Di, Dii-Dvi.

forsake them, and gyve oure selues to the knowledge of Heavuenly and eternall things, whence all true happinesse doth procede."[122]

Truth appeared more starkly in relief, and each emblem was a rhetorical ploy sparking a heightening of faith by forcing readers to choose: "shew[ing] how vaine, transitory, deceitful…and uncertain wordly things be, and that heavenly things onely everlastingly immortal…even as God himself in the fountain of all goodnesse…that man converting into the Lorde, in hym onely seeking their whose salvation and perfect blysse, might lead their life paciently with a good conscience in all quietnesse of minde and spirite, [enjoying] the true Christian liberties and spiritual gladness…of the everlasting ioyes in eternall glorie."[123] As in *A Christall glasse*, the image here passed far beyond the decorative, being rather a means of inspiration, prodding and stirring faith. As one commentator noted, the *Theatre* was "a garden with medicine for all the illnesses of the mind, a garden which holds ready delight for the eyes and ears of intelligent men."[124]

Delight was critical. Rote learning, merely listing propositions or divine laws, was not enough: readers must be *affected*.[125] This was because the "worldliness" which Van der Noot castigated was not 'out there' in the world, or in the clutter and glisten of riches, but was a predisposition of human will: "when I speake of substances, riches, estates…I mean not in respect of the thing it selfe, nor yet the good use of the same….but onely I meane the great abuse which commonly is seene in the unnatural and unbridled desire, wherewith rich and worldly men ar inclined."[126] Worldliness was a spiritual sickness, and to *effect* change in mind or soul one must *affect* it, stimulating the senses alongside the intellect, delighting alongside informing.[127] Emblems did so through analogy and metaphor, existing as an artful persuasion in which Van der Noot positioned himself as much rhetorician as reformer:

---

[122] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, sig. Aiii.

[123] Ibid, sig. Ei.

[124] Waterschast, "An Author's Strategy", p. 45.

[125] Rasmussen, "'Quitenesse of Minde'" p. 5. Rasmussen suggests that because the 'knowledge' which Van der Noot wished to bring his readers too was of faith – a sense of God, rather than the ability to 'comprehend' Him, something which mankind was incapable of achieving. This impression of God, this 'knowledge' of Him through Faith was achieved through allusion. He quotes Calvin's *Institutes* 3.2.14 to support the point.

[126] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, sig. Ei.

[127] See above, pp. 38-51.

"To sette the vanitie of worldy and transistories things, the livelier before youre eyes, I have brought in here twentie sights of visions, & caused them to be graven, to the ende al men may see that with their eyes, which I go aboute to expresse by writing, to the delight and pleasure of the eye and eares, according unto Horace.....'He that teacheth plessantly and well/Doth in eche point all others exell."[128]

Yet this was more than accessing the mind by flattering the eye. Aesthetic impact was to make readers *feel*. Illustrating a beautiful object and its destruction in the same woodcut heightened the world's cruelty more immediately than words alone, and by seeing what the narrator saw readers empathized more powerfully with his lamentation. They pity Petrarch's grief at a laurel tree's destruction - "ever to complaine/ For no such shadow shal be had againe" [Fig. 249] - [129] and empathize with his exclamation at a cedar-scented flame's extinction - "O grievious change!/ That whiche erstwhile so pleasant scent did yielde".[130] Marking the transitory essence of nature in a "livelier" fashion, the image made it more keenly felt and consequently more fully understood. Emblem here was the route to empathy.

But empathy was not agreement. This was pure rhetoric, teaching readers by showing then the errors of others. In Petrarch's and Du Bellay's laments Van der Noot set a series of 'worldly' responses to life before his readers. Their sorrow – whilst heartfelt – was indicative of their misplaced affections in this world rather than in the True, unchanging happiness which stemmed from a life in Christ. Ultimately comprised of a sequence of monologues, the *Theatre* allowed readers to experience "the miseries and calamities that follow the volumptuous Worldling" and "the greate ioyes and pleasures which the faithful do enjoy" through the words of others.[131] Unlike *A Christall glasse*, these emblems were not objective. They were rather a series of voices – Petrach, Du Bellay, St. John – subjective responses to the capricious nature of the world which reflected the speaker's spiritual state.[132] This was a show in which emblems made these spiritual states "livelier", allowing readers to experience them vicariously. Such experience prodded at souls. Musing upon the world's

---

[128] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, pp. 12-13.

[129] Ibid, sigs. BIIIV-BIIIIr.

[130] Ibid, sigs. CVIIIv-Dir.

[131] Ibid, sig. Ai.

[132] Ibid, sig. Bi. Readers see what Petrarch saw: "Being one day at my window all alone,/ So many strange things happened me to see...."

transience was ultimately to accept its futility, and by providing a series of clashing response to the mutability of time Van der Noot took his readers upon a spiritual journey from vanity to truth. Their faith would be awakened through recognition of the despair in which vanity had left Petrarch and Du Belly; and solidified by the contrasting example of the tranquility which St. John found through Christ.[133]

An aesthetic ploy, emblems allowed readers to see as a 'worldling' saw. They were meant to feel for Petrarch. One of the Reniassance's most famous lovers was used here as a rhetorical tool illustrative of the flesh's folly. The verses concerned Laura, his lover of two decades whose death had triggered in Petrarch ten years of despair, pushing him to the point of suicide. The beauty of his visions and lyric power of his poetry – in which he contemplated the destruction of a beautiful object and laments its passing as a painful expression of the love he had lost – tweaked readers' heart-strings. Pitying Petrarch was essential, for only by understanding the depths of his anguish did readers grasp the ultimate futility of love in the pursuit of happiness. Upon seeing, with Petrarch, the slaughter of a "faire hinde" [Fig. 247];[134] the death of a beautiful woman by snake's bite [Fig. 252];[135] and lightning's destruction of a "heavenly" garden, whose bird-song had soothed his spirits, we comprehend the scale of his grief and empathize with his lament that nothing in the world endures "but miseries, sorrows, afflictions and calamities", "bitter griefs that doth our hearts anoy" [Fig. 250.][136] But this *empathy* was not to provoke *sympathy*, but rather to powerfully illustrate for readers the folly of a "worldling." Petrarch railed against the world because he, a man devoid of faith, did not trust in God's providential plan. Trusting instead in earthly vanity, he had placed his hopes of happiness on the wrong horse, for fleshy love led only to madness: "these things following, procede from carnal love....sorrows and griefes, weakness of the braynes....madnesse, thoughts and sighings, calamities, anguish, unquietnesse, trouble, foolishnesse, wantonness, mystrustfulnesse, jealousies...Love maketh a man oute of hys wyttes, and cleare beside hym selfe."[137] Petrarch was a case in point – a token of a wider malady, and feeling with him was ultimately to avoid repeating his mistakes. Readers were to

---

[133] Cf. Rasmussen, "'Quitenesse of Minde'" pp. 9-11, 18-20.
[134] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, sigs. Bi-Bii.
[135] Ibid, sigs. Bvi-Bvii.
[136] Ibid, sigs. Biii-iiii. Quote, sig. Bvii, pp. 13-14.
[137] Ibid. p. 11.

learn, as Petrarch did, that placing ones' trust in God over the flesh's pleasures was more conducive to a calm conscience:

> "Thus he hadde passed ouer many a yeare in greate and vnfayned loue towards hir....[which] caused him vpon a sodaine change after hir departure so long a time to mourne...but considering with him self, that there was no comfort, hope of saluation in worldely love to be loked for, turned himselfe to Godwarde, lamenting and sorrowing the rest of hys lyfe, and repented hym of his former lyfe so ydlely and vndecently spent."[138]

Seeing through the eyes of a 'worldling' was ultimately to be propelled towards faith. As in *A Christall glasse*, the aesthetic inspired Protestants – in the space of six emblems the reader had been moved to recoil from earthly love and dedicate themselves to serving Christ.

The Anti-Catholic Revelations emblems were equally a rhetorical strategy geared to inspire a quashing of the flesh. The battle between two cities – Rome and New Jerusalem – described by St. John was emblematic of the clash between vanity and Word in a believer's soul: the triumphant, violent smiting of Antichrist epigrammatic of each soul's journey from worldliness to faith in Christ. For Van der Noot, these richly allusive visions were doubly allegorical. Prophetic of events both temporal and atemporal, they presaged both Christ's victory over Rome during the Last Days; *and* His quashing of vanity in the souls of the Elect as they were awakened in faith. Rome's defeat was a metonym of the defeat of worldliness - once again we have popery as purgative. That Antichrist was potentially lodged both in their own hearts *and* the Roman Church, that their souls were a microcosm of the clash between Christ and Satan, was to repulse readers, inspiring them to overcome the flesh by dedicating themselves to the Word.

This was not a tension in Van der Noot's thought. Seeing Antichrist as both the Roman Church *and* an aggregate of the world's evil was a critical part of theological treatments of Revelations, and a central tenet of John Bale's *Image of Both Churches* (1548), upon which Van der Noot based his exposition.[139] As Christ's

---

[138] Ibid, p. 14.
[139] J. Bale, *Image of Both Churches* (London, 1548). For a discussion of the theory of Antichrist in this work, see below Chapter Five pp. 320-22. Bostoen "Van der Noot's Apocalyptic Visions", pp. 53, 59.

Church was a mystical body co-joined by the presence of the Word, so Antichrist was a spiritual entity, a collective of Satan's members. It consequently transcended identification with one institution or figure. Rome was just one manifestation of the mystery of iniquity – albeit the final and most brutal one – and Antichrist was as present in it as it had been in all oppressors of the Word, from Herod to Nero to the Turk. For Van der Noot, then, Antichrist was all worldly vanity, of which Rome was the most fitting metonym.[140]

Thus whilst its manifestation in the first beast of Revelations 13 [Fig. 243] Antichrist was the embodiment of Satan's mystical body – "the congregation of the wicked and proude hypocrites" – it was also symbolic of Rome in the monstrous beast of Revelations 17 [Fig. 244]: "Antechrist....contanyng within him the Pope, Cardinals, bishops, doctors, abbots....monks, friars, priests, indulgences, bulles."[141] The intention of the *Theatre* then was not to *denigrate* Rome but *demonstrate* through it the perils of worldliness, to utilize it as the most horrifying example of the author's *real* concern. Anti-Catholicism was the medium, not the message:

"Sathan is only of abilitie and power to blowe into their eares the thing whiche they with violence and by force maintayne: as he is able by fansies and inspiration, there are they his meete instruments to perfourme it & put it in execution by violence....When he hath only engendered any error or false doctrine, they with al diligence, as an unfallible truth, allow, confirme and stablishe it, and make of it a neccesarie article to believe on....As he hath founde out any lye....so may they holde it for a perfecte written verities."[142]

Rome was Antichrist's host, the body through which it assaulted the world. As such it was not the mainstay of Van der Noot's attack but rather emblematic of the vanity which he wished to inspire readers to quash in themselves. A powerful parable of the perils which worldliness inspired if not curtailed, Rome warned "they that dwell upon

Van der Noot had used a Dutch edition of Bale, *Den Standt ende de bilde de benyder ghemagneten* (1555).
[140] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, p. 26: "even as in the body of Christ dwelleth fulnesse of the whole Deitie: Even so in this body of Sathan dwelth the whole masse of impiety, subtiltie, fraud, and malice with power to worke all manner of mischiefe...". Cf p. 40, where Antichrist is a way of acting.
[141] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, pp. 20, 43. Cf. p. 21: "beast, meaninge the false & damnabl errors & pestiferous inspiration of the divel, which at this time reign in the beastly me[m]bers...bishops, priests, hypocrites and false magistrates..."
[142] Ibid, p. 21 cf. p. 24. I am indebted to Rasmussen "Quietnesse of Minde'", p. 16.

earth, are such as doe love themselves more than God, their owne affections more than Gods' truthe."[143] Rome's beastly persecutions, subjugation of Christ through the invention of non-biblical doctrines, and peddling of wares to fulfill a lust for wealth were daunting examples of the evils which vanity could wreak if unchecked.[144] This was the antithesis of the workings of faith, and that their own souls might be a microcosm of such vanity was to inspire in readers purgation. Anti-Catholicism was the motor driving out worldliness.

Van der Noot ultimately hoped to inspire a living faith. Like *A Christall glasse*, the *Theatre* was a call to action. Superficially, these Revelations emblems depicted the triumph of Christ over Antichrist, at the apocalypse, but Van der Noot was clearly concerned to inspire the Word's triumph over vanity in the here and now in his readers' conscience.[145] In the third and fourth emblems Antichrist's overpowering was an allegory inspiring readers to self-reformation [Figs. 245 & 246.][146] John's visions of the heavenly avenger slaying Antichrist – traditionally prophetic of Christ's final smiting of Rome – was equally emblematic of the Word's destruction of sin in a believer's soul. Indeed, Rome was barely considered in the exegesis. John's gazing at heaven's opening to witness Christ at work was interpreted as the revelation of Truth through reading the Gospel – this was how believer's 'saw' Christ, and the battle-scene provided an allegory of the Word's breaking vanity's hold, the avenger's sword epigrammatic of scripture's freeing the faithful from the bondage of sin.[147]

Similarly, New Jerusalem was more than an allegory of heaven's triumph, being rather an emblem of the condition of faith [Fig. 246.] That St. John "saw a newe heaven and a *new earth*" demonstrated that this vision spoke not only of a future state of salvation, but of faith's action in reforming this life:[148]

"S. Peter sayth…that every thing (going before the iudge) shalbe clensed and purified…for al things must be changed and made clere of all

---

[143] Van der Noot, *Theatre*, p. 32.
[144] Ibid, pp. 17-20, 23-26, 29-31 in particular. P. 19: "So that by the mcanes of covetousness, ambition and carnall concupiscene, the truth is decked & the Church of Christ most miserably scattered and dispersed."
[145] Ibid, p. 47.
[146] Ibid, pp. 64-95.
[147] Ibid, pp. 64, 65-75. Sword at p. 66. See also the comments about the Word in the sonnet on sigs. Diiii-Dv. Mviii-Ni, Oii-Oiii. Cf. Rasmussen "Quietnesse of Minde'", pp. 17-19.
[148] Ibid, pp. 78-81.

273

corruptiblesnesse. He meaneth not that the creatures shoulde consume away...but onely yt they...should be renewed, so the godly and chosen shall be delivered two meane of wayes, that is to say: *Here* in this worlde from sin, & hereafter of death and damnation, & so shall be led & conducted vnto the true libeties ioyfull inheritance of ye children of God."[149]

The glorious triumph of New Jerusalem was emblematic of the bliss experienced by a reformed soul's victory over vanity, and the *Theatre* detailed how each of the city's riches described by John was epigrammatic of the fruits of faith. Thus the tree of life at the city's centre – "Christ Jesus....the saviour of the worlde" – represented the joyful enrichment of the life of the faithful: "All they which are thys congregation & people have continually so long as they lyve, greate consolation in their assaults and traivelles, and in all kinde of adversitie both spirituall and temporall."[150] Musing on this emblem was to convince readers that it was in this shield of faith that they would find the "quietnesse of minde" which the *Theatre* had promised to show them. .

Van der Noot's revelation emblems had thus taken readers on a "pilgrimage" of enlightenment – as Rome would to be defeated by Christ at the world's end, so they were to triumph over worldly instincts upon completing his emblems:[151]

"...bridle thy lust, and refrain thy heart from al worldly, carnal, and transitorie riches, and be lifted up in mynde and spirite to heavenly and vncorruptible treasures: so shalte thou be regenerate of the holy ghoste and being confirmed by the Worde of God, may well be called *Microcosme*....the whole world uppon the little foote."[152]

Man as 'microcosm' – a scaled-down version of the universe – was a Renaissance commonplace, and for Van der Noot the soul was an epitome of the universal battle of Christ and Antichrist. He hoped to have inspired readers to "frame [y]our lyfe to the doctrine and example of our master and Lord Jesus Christ" to be a microcosm of the

---

[149] Ibid, sigs. Oiii-Oiiii (my italics).
[150] Ibid, p. 89.
[151] Ibid, p. 3.
[152] Ibid, sigs. Rviii-Si. Rasmussen compares this 'microcosm' to Calvin's *Institutes* 1.15.3, in which man is deemed a 'microcosm' of Christ; His image, if his life is regenerated through faith. "'Quietnesse of Mind'" p. 21.

Word.[153] Like *A Christall Glasse*, the *Theatre* was thus a call to action. Van der Noot closed by arguing that it was not enough to know of sin abstractly - one must beware Satan's continual assaults and strike pre-emptively against them by living a life imbued with God's love. As in *A Christall Glasse*, readers were urged to live soberly, to commit acts of love, neighbourliness, forgiveness and gentleness - actions which were the fruits of faith.[154] Pursuit of this living faith purged the commonwealth of fornication, gluttony, uncleanliness, envy, hatred andother traits of Catholicism.[155] Once again, to be "worldly" was to be Romish. The denunciation of the Papacy consequently ended with a salutatory lesson:

> "Ye have now (gentle reader) sufficiently herd, what wickednesse, thraldome, laboure, paine, and trouble, covetousnesse, concupiscence, and ambition bringeth to them that love it, wishe for it, and seeke after it. Lykewise ye may consider here, howe and after what sort they drawe man from God, from natural reason, from all goodnesse, and mutual brotherly love, unto all kind on iniquitie, cruelty, and unnatural vices: and oftentime come so farre, that they not onlye brygne other men in grievous danger to attaine to their purpose, but they themselves also body and soul."[156]

Like Bateman's, Van der Noot's Anti-Catholicism repelled viewers from the flesh. The quintessence of worldliness, Rome provided the extreme example both of the ultimate fruitlessness of fleshy pursuits to the individual soul – which, like Rome, could only be damned – and to society at large, which was left to absorb the consequence of worldliness, however messily.[157] That the conflagration which the Whore of Babylon had unleashed upon the world in recent times had resulted from kernels of pride in the early Church over a millennia previously served to warn Protestants, calling them to expunge desire – "let not sinne reigne in youre mortal bodye."[158]

---

[153] Ibid, p. 94.
[154] Ibid, pp. 90-95.
[155] Ibid, pp. 95-96.
[156] Ibid, p. 90.
[157] Ibid, pp. 4-5.
[158] Ibid, p. 94. On the inter-connectedness of Rome and Vice in Antichrist, see also the books end section: "The booke of the Generation of Antichrist, the desolator & child of desolation", p. 91. This is a list of parts of the Roman Church and vice as a satirical lineage of Antichrist.

Conclusion

Anger can no more bear to lose sight of its object than love. Yet its obsession can be manifested in novel ways. Despite the iconoclastic rage levelled at Antichrist, Protestants needed to retain a view of the object of their protest as a lighthouse flagging the wreckage of sin which awaited on the shoes of Babylon. For all the efforts of their Church to distance itself from Antichrist both doctrinally and historically, Rome remained at the heart of concerns of English Protestants as something to think with. As Anthony Milton has demonstrated, Rome became the great 'other' with which all groups of Protestants thought through their differences: existing as the antithesis against which to style themselves and the great bogey with which to damn opponents both religious and political.[159] Hatred was a powerful rhetorical and conceptual tool in the Protestant imagination, and Catholicism inspired a creative form of negation. 'Popery' became increasingly protean, having connotations far beyond the disciples of Rome or the practice of 'superstition'. Thus Thomas Scott's *Vox Populi* (1620) charted England's embroilment in the Spanish Match negotiations from 'popish' corruption a court – but this 'popery' consisted not of Catholicism, nor of Catholics, but moderate attitudes in foreign policy, moderate Protestantism and Laudianism.[160] Similarly, late sixteenth-century officials referred to any form of corruption – whether in Church, tax collection, or lax fulfilment of duties – as 'popish', the term existing as a synonym for vice.[161] Bateman and Van der Noot similarly employed popery as a language of critique – but their object of reform was not the Church or the government but the minds of their Protestant readers. Thinking with Rome here existed as a means to inspire acts of Faith, and at the very point of conception popery and sin were entwined.

Given that Bateman's and Van der Noot's works were not reprinted, we might relegate their importance to small, if interesting, blips upon the face of late sixteenth-century literature.[162] Yet they tell us a great deal about the place of the visual in post-

---

[159] Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, passim

[160] P. Lake, "Constitutional Consensus & Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott & the Spanish Match", *Historical Journal*, 25, (1982), pp. 805-25.

[161] M. C. Questier, "Practical Antipapistry during the reign of Elizabeth I", *Journal of British Studies*, 36, (1997), pp. 371-96.

[162] Other emblem books also employed popery as a language. See T. Jenner's *The Soules Solace, or thirtie and one spiritual emblems* (London, 1626); Peacham, *Minerva Britannia*, Sig. Biii. Here 'Hypocrisy' is represented as a Roman cleric.

Reformation culture. That culture retained use of the image as a way to the divine, but that way became internalized. Rejecting Thomist employment of images as sensuous aids to devotion, the vehicle through which to negotiate the Incarnation's mystery, Protestants mistrusted the physical and emphasized instead the image as metaphor, a sign pointing beyond itself to inspire contemplation of the divinity which it signified. For the Reformed, one did not venerate or trust in images but interpret them, an act of interpretation expressed most powerfully at the centre of Protestant faith – the Lord's Supper. Here the bread and wine acted not as sacrifice but memorial, not as repository of the divine but as tokens of its gift, a reminder of the unseen and the spiritual. In the words of Tyndale, they served not as objects of devotion, but "remind us of heavenly things" and to "put us in remembrance that there is a Father in heaven."[163] It was as the by-way of recollection that the image became the point at which Renaissance and Reformation converged. Although metaphors of spiritual truths, striking images were also a vestige of the art of memory, and the Reformed mind, like the Rhetorician's, was to be a warehouse of the visual. As Donne note, images formed the "gallery of the soul.....hang'd with so many, and so lively pictures of the goodness and mercies of thy God to thee, as that everyone shall be a cathechism to thee."[164] The Anti-Catholic parables of *A Christall glasse* and the *Theatre* were equally mnemonic parables, purgative pictures of hatred with which to inspire self-reformation.

That the impetus of Renaissance didacticism and humanist rhetoric tempered reformed iconophobia qualifies recent scholarship which has written off the role of the image in post-Reformation culture. Images in the most heavily illustrated book of the period – Foxe's *Actes and Monuments* – are no longer viewed as a means of graphically inculcating the text's meaning amidst the unlettered, but rather as a means of marketing this expensive work as a luxury item for elites.[165] We should not be so quick to relegate the visual to the status of decoration, however. Emblem books were also expensive works, but in analyzing them we realize quickly that sophisticated meanings were not incommensurate with luxury tastes – in 'delighting' the eye, images reminded viewers how clever and pious they were as well as how wealthy,

[163] Quoted in J. Phillips, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660* (Berkeley, 1973), pp. 45, 56, 57.

[164] G. R. Potter & E. M. Simpson (eds.) *The Sermons of John Donne* (Berkeley, 1955), 2: sermon 11, 237. Quoted in H. Diehl, "Graven Images: Protestant Emblem Books in England", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 39, (1986) pp. 49-66.

[165] Evenden, *Patents, Pictures and Patronage*, pp. 100-115. T. Freeman & E. Evenden, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: the Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge, 2011)

and in unwrapping a moral allegory Protestants were to add to the "catechism" of the mind.[166] Image here acted as a salve against sin rather than encouragement to idolatry.

---

[166] The Diehl article cited above (chronically overlooked by scholars) suggested ways in which emblem books employed Reformed theology. For a very interesting examination both of Calvinist theology on emblem books, and emblem books on English poetry, see Lewalski, *Protestant Poetics*, pp. 185-200 in particular. Jenner's *The Soules Solace*; Peacham's *Minerva Britannia*; Theodore Beza's *Icones* (1580); Wither's *Collection of Emblemes*; and Christopher Harvey's *Schola cordis or the heart of it selfe* (London, 1647) all merit further research in this regard.

Chapter Five: Seeing Through Antichrist – A Very Protestant Image

A Mappe of the Man of Sin (1623) forces us to question our assumptions about who and what Early Modern Protestants understood their nemesis to be [Fig. 255.][1] Two figures are less prominent than expected. The Pope – lost in a fray of bishops, kings and priests beneath the Tower of Babel in the engraving's centre-right – plays only a bit-part. So too does the Whore of Babylon – presented by historians as the primary Antichristian image – but here a diminutive figure, tumbling headlong after her toppling tiara in the sheet's top-right.[2] Rather, the nub of the matter is the ogre-like bishop. Like several other figures he carried a church on each shoulder, one in each pocket, and had another, larger church beneath his robes, revealed by God's avenging sword.[3] Emblematic of simony, this motif contrasted starkly with his crozier, a shepherd's crook symbolic of a bishop's duty to tend to his flock, to present this bishop as an idol shepherd seeking, so the accompanying verse informs us, "his flocks fleece, not their benefit." A clerk more interested in accruing the revenues of multiple sees rather than saving his parishioners from drowning in sin, this bishop epitomized the whole. Rome has shunned Christ and embraced the devil, neglecting its spiritual duties to indulge in the banquet of sin which the world offered and, moreover, deliberately polluted the Word with a litter of lies and inventions, illicit practices which the laity were forced to pay for and partake in – souls were endangered to line pockets and fatten bellies.[4] Trickery was their ultimate sin, and our oversized bishop was its culmination.

---

[1] *A Mappe of the Man of Sinne* (London, 1622), Princeton University Library. This most probably descended from a foreign engraving. An unknown 'W.G.' translated the verses – perhaps this was William Gouge, recent author of the vehemently anti-Catholic *Fatal Vespers*. I am indebted to Malcolm Jones for sharing information about this print before the publication of his *Print in Early Modern England*.

[2] Figures R and P.

[3] This motif re-appeared in the frontispiece to *A Purge for Pluralities, shewing the unlawfulnesse of men to have two Livings. Or The Downe-fall of Double Benefices* (London, 1642); J. Blaxton, *A remonstrance against the non-residents of Great Brittaine, or, Non-residency condemned by Scripture* (London, 1642); S. Hieron, *The Protestant mirrour, in proper postures and principles: or, The careful resident, and the careless non-resident* (London, 1681). Cf. 'Doctor Panurgus', BM Sat 82 God's avenging sword is a reference to the punishment of the wicked in Psalm 37:15.

[4] Rome has polluted Mount Sion with "Humane Doctrine vile,Cast to bseure the Gospels light; which done, His Rule ore all the Vniverse might run"; figure D pollutes the Word; Figure E forces a layman to drink the polluted doctrine; figure F is greedy, "Whos Lucer lets him not Christs Church vp-build,/ Busied to reape the Gaines his churches yeild." Figure H grants abolution to all of these sins for money. Rome has polluted God's temple (figure L) "hauing made this Hallowed House of prayer/ A Theuish Den, by lawlesse actions there."

Yet despite his apparent dominance, he was no more the 'Man of Sin' than any other of the twenty lettered components in this busy, kaleidoscopic image. Antichrist did not begin and end with him. Indeed, the twenty four scriptural banderols and accompanying verses labelled many figures 'Antichrist' interchangeably, presenting an image of the arch foe which was decidedly protean – Antichrist was simultaneously everywhere on the page and nowhere specifically.[5] Faced with this, it is apparent that the formula historians normally apply to express Early Modern understandings of the arch foe – 'Pope = Antichrist' – does not adequately solve the problem of identification. The terms in which the equation is posited are inappropriate: *who* was Antichrist is a question *mal posée – what* should be our watchword. The print's full title was illuminating:

> "A Mappe of the Man of Sin: wherein is most lively delineated the Rising Raigning and Ruine of the kingdome of Antichrist. Rising by Pride shutting the Book of God and imposing Huma[n]e tradition in Man's Consciences. Raigning in Avarice, Simony, Superstition, Plague and Hipocrisie...."

Two points are notable. Firstly, Antichrist could be 'mapped'. This broadside imaged an abstraction, the figures were the embodiment and incarnation of a quality – particular vestiges of the universal. Secondly, and inter-relatedly, Antichrist was a 'kingdom' – not historically specific, but existing concurrently throughout time. It was as much process as personality.[6] In this regard, the print mapped the totality of Rome's history: beginning on the left with its origins in the corruptions of the Gospel, ascending to the heights of sin and avarice in its centre, and culminating in God's destruction of Babylon in the top-right, leaving the Papal throne toppled, croziers broken and a gaggle of clerics rejected from heaven on Judgement Day at the top of the print.[7] Antichrist, then, was an undercurrent throughout this Church, surfacing in

---

[5] Figures A, D and G are spoken of as one and the same – they are each a manifestation of the Man of Sin. Figure A is littered with references to Antichrist. He is a "sly imposter" who wears the menstruous rags of the Whore of Babylon.

[6] "From auntient dayes Sins Misterie gan worke/ Which did in Error-led Professors lurke./ Faind Faith, hells instrument, sins proper cell,/ This Babels ground work laid". The Mystery of Iniquity was present in all Roman clerics.

[7] On the left, figure A attempts to pollute Mount Sion, whilst figures D and E are more successful in corrupting the pure waters of the Church. On the right, figure I is punished for his sins as a simoniac (forced to vomit the riches he has consumed), figure K (the Vatican) is accompanied by a reference to Job 20:5 ("the triumphing of the wick[ed] is short, and the ioy of Hypocrits is but for a moment") and,

280

illicit practices and actions – 'marks' revealing its presence. Thus on the left bishop [A], who unsuccessfully attempted to tread on Mount Sion in the clotted "monstrous rags" of the Whore, epigrammatic of his deceptive desires; and, at the bottom of the Mount, the more successful bishop [D] who muddied its pure waters with his crozier whilst his companion [E] forced laymen to drink the dirtied Word – "wilul to hurt his own and others woe."[8] Guilty of ambition, the simonical priest [G] secures a more profitable parish with a swollen bag of money, whilst to the right his peer was punished by God for his greed, forced to vomit the riches he had consumed and churches that his worldly appetites had devoured.[9] All were notable features on the map of the Man of Sin.[10] Antichrist was thus diffuse: as much priest and curia as Papacy, but present also in their followers – the Emperors and Kings who toppled alongside the Pope.[11]

In light of this, we must re-consider commonplaces concerning Early Modern understandings of Antichrist, commonplaces aptly articulated by Christopher Hill: "For many centuries Antichrist seemed an intensely real and very important person".[12] Like most historical generalizations, Hill's statement has the paradoxical honour of being both fundamentally right, and fundamentally wrong. Right in the sense that - if the amount of ink spilt and sermons preached is an accurate yardstick of interest - Antichrist *was* a fundamental concern for English people.[13] Between the twilight

---

ironically, 1 Peter 1:24 ("There all must passe/ Like flower of Grasse") warning of imminent destruction. This occurred in the top-right of the print as the Tower of Babylon (figure O) falls along with the Whore of Babylon (figure P). The Bishops, Pope and clerics at the bottom of the Tower are depicted as the followers of Babylon who lament her fall in Revelation 14. Heaven's gate (figure S) is guarded by symbols of the Four Evangelists in the centre of the print, and is closed to the Roman clergy who attempt to enter.

[8] Figure D is "that Vnerring Man" (a swipe at Papal infallibility). Figure E forced a laymen to drink the Whore of Babylon's "stir'd dregs".

[9] G is labelled "Gold-linde Simony". I is a simoniacal priest, the reference to vomiting comes from Job 20:15.

[10] In the engraving, each Roman figure and the illicit practice they commit was accompanied by a verse caption referring to Antichrist or idol shepherd. Similarly, each punishment of the Roman Church was tied to divine punishment of the wicked or fall of Babylon. Thus, the action of the Roman Church in this world are firmly in a Revelationary schema – they point beyond themselves to show Rome to be the False Church, they are 'marks' which reveal Antichrist. See below....

[11] The "Rich lovers" of Babylon.

[12] C. Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England* (2nd Edition: London/ New York, 1990), p. 2.

[13] S. J. Barnett, "Where was your Church Before Luther? Claims for the antiquity of Protestantism examined", *Church History*, 68 (1999), pp. 15-23; J. Champion, "Popes, Guys & Anti-Catholicism" in Buchanan, B et al, *Gunpowder Plots* (London, 2005), pp. 80-118; P. Collinson, *The Birthpangs of English Protestantism* (New York, 1998), pp. 12-13, 131-33, 147-48; C. M. Hibbard, "Early Stuart Catholicism: Revisions & Re-revisions", *Journal of Modern History*, 51, (1980), pp. 31-34; P. Lake, "Constitutional Consenus & Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott & The Spanish Match", *Historical Journal*, 25 (1982), pp. 806-25; C. M. Rutici, "Gender, Disguise & Usurpation: 'The Feminine Prelate' & the Popish Successor", *Modern Philology*, 98, (2000), pp. 271-77; E. Shagan,

years of Henry VIII's reign and the dawning of Charles II's discussion of Antichrist was ubiquitous, intense, and public.[14] The Last Days were nigh, the Reformation itself having ushered in the end stages of God's cosmic drama, presaging the final, cumulative battle between Good and Evil in which Antichrist was protagonist.[15] Such

---

"Introduction" in E. Shagan, (Ed.), *Catholics & the 'Protestant Nation'* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 10-11; A. Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy & The English Literary Imagination*, (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 23-36; M. Todd, "'All One with Tom-Thumb': Arminianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge", *Church History*, 64, (1995), pp. 563-79; T. H. Wadkins, "The Percy-'Fisher' Controversies & the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism", *Church History*, 57 (1988), pp. 153-69; A. Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 228, 249; C. Z. Wiener, "The Beleagured Isle: A study of Elizabethan and Jacobean Anti-Catholicism", *Past & Present*, 51, (1971), pp. 27-62. For a questioning of this thesis see M. C. Questier, "Elizabeth & the Catholics" in Shagan, (Ed), *Catholics & the 'Protestant Nation'*, p. 70.

[14] The Restoration is generally seen as the cut off. See. K. Frith, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645* (Oxford, 1979), p. 245. This occurred as part of a wider decline in the role of God's providence in nature, see W. E. Burns, *An Age of Wonders*, (Manchester, 2002), pp. 1-10 in particular; K. Park & L. Daston, "Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in sixteenth-century France & England", *Past & Present*, 92, (1981), pp. 20-54. Bernard Capp sees 1700 as the beginning of the decline, see his "Review: Godly Rule and the English Millenarianism", *Past & Present*, 52, (1971), pp. 106-17; Hill is more general, claiming the Antichrist had declined in importance 150 years after the Reformation, Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 3. For the continued belief in the Papal Antichrist even after it had declined as an issue of public discourse, see P. Misner, "Newman and the Tradition Concerning the Papal Antichrist", *Church History*, 42, (1973), pp. 377-95; G. F. A. Best, "The Whigs & The Church Establishment in the Age of Grey and Holland", *History*, 45 (1960), p. 110; U. Henriques, *Religious Toleration in England, 1787-1833* (Toronto, 1961), p. 143; G. I. T, Machin, *The Catholic Question in English Politics, 1820-30* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 1-8, 145; D. F. Wells, "The Pope as Antichrist: the Substance of George Tyrell's Polemic", *Harvard Theological Review*, 65, (1972), pp. 271-83.

[15] In the 1960s, apocalypticism was generally seen as the preserve of the lunatic fringe, coupled to social radicalism. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millenium* (London, 1962.) For a critique of Cohn, see B. Mcguinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1979), pp. 29-35. However, recent work has placed eschatological expectation firmly within the mainstream of contemporary thought. See, B. W. Ball, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden, 1975), pp. 1-12, 229-35; Capp, "Review: Godly Rule and the English Millenarianism", pp. 106-111 in particular; ibid, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in seventeenth century English Millenarianism* (London, 1972), pp. 20-37; Collinson, *The Birthpangs of English Protestantism*, pp. 1-27; Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 1-40 in particular; Frith, *The Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 1-25, 242-54 in particular; also 34-38, 54-68; R. Kyle, "John Knox and Apocalyptic Tradition", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 4, (1984), pp. 449-69; W. M. Lamont, *Godly Rule, Politics and Religion, 1603-60* (London, 1969), pp. 7-14, 19-69 in particular; J. T. McNeil, "John Foxe: Historiogrpaher, Disciplinarian, Tolerationist", *Church History*, 43, (1974), pp. 223-25; V. N. Olsen, *John Foxe & The Elizabethan Church* (Berkely/ Los Angeles/ London, 1973), pp. 20-22; J. Pelican, "Some use of Apocalypse in the Magisterial Reformers", in C. A Patrides, & J. Wittereichm (eds.), *The Apocalypse In English Renaissance thought and Literature, patterns, antecedents and repercussions* (Manchester, 1984), pp. 74-92; L. Piepho, "Mantuan's Ecologus in the English Reformation", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25 (1994), pp. 623-32; M. Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore & The Prophetic Future: a Medieval Study in Historical Thinking* (Glousesthire, 1999), pp. 152-65; ibid, "The development of apocalyptic thought: medieval attitudes", in Patrides, & Wittereichm (Ed.), *The Apocalypse In English Renaissance thought*, pp. 41-42, 49. M. R. Thorp, "Catholic Conspiracy in Early Elizabethan Foreign Policy", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15 (1984), pp. 431-48; Todd, "'All One with Tom-Thumb'", pp. 563-79; Walsham, *Providence*, pp.120-40. For contemporary works which explicitly proclaim the Last Days are nigh, see A. Alesius, *A treatise concernygne generall councelles, the byshoppes of Rome, and the clergy* (London, 1538), sig. Dviii; T. Becon, *Prayers & Other Pieces of Thomas Becon, S.T.P, Chaplain to Archbishop Crnamer, Prebenary of Canterbury* J. Ayre (ed.), (Parker Society 12: Cambridge, 1844), pp. 286, 624; J. Bradford, *The hurte of hering masse* (London, 1561), sig. Ei; J. Bradford, *Sermons,*(Parker Society: Cambridge, 1848), p. 13; M. Coverdale, *Certain*

was its importance that the English Church styled itself as the inverse of the arch foe: the ideal of being Antichrist's binary-opposite in every way, and existing in opposition to its evil, became the epicentre of the Church's identity.[16]

But Hill is wrong in the sense that Antichrist was never a *person*. That is altogether too solid a term for the shifting entity with which we are dealing. The singular term referred to a body of wickedness – whether Church or another institution – but never an historical individual. For most thinkers Antichrist was the Papal *institution*, the illicit laws and doctrines presided over by an historical line of Popes, some of whom were more representative of its evil than others, but none of whom themselves were *the* Antichrist. Yet although this view met with general agreement, the line towed was by no means a straight one, and this position was often employed with considerable revisions. For some Antichrist was more expansive, incorporating the Curia, all Roman clerics, or even all Roman Catholics.[17] Others saw Antichrist as an amalgamation of Papacy and Turk, both of whom persecuted Christians during these final days.[18] For others, however, Antichrist was closer to home. As time progressed many detected its presence within England's Church as much as Rome's, and the rabble of post Civil War sects subsequently identified it with one another. Antichrist, then, was not a *person* – but it was almost always

most godly, fruitful, and comfortable letters of such true saintes and holy martyrs of God (London, 1564), pp. 348, 415; H. Bullinger, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s* (London, 1538), sigs. Avi-Aviii; L. Carslon, (Ed,), *The Writings of Henry Barlow, 1587-90* (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, 3: London, 1962), pp. 271-72, 277-78; L. Carlson, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1590-91* (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, V: London, 1966), pp. 34-40; J. Frith, *A pistle to the Cristen reader. The revelation of Antichrist,* (Antwerp, 1529), sigs. ciii, Liv-Lvii; N. Ridley, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D, sometime Lord Bishop of London*, H. Christmas (ed.) (Parker Society, 1: Cambridge, 1843), pp. 57, 414; E. Sandys, *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, successively Bishop of Worcester and London, and Archbishop of York*, John Ayre (Ed,) (Parker Society, 2: Cambridge, 1842), pp. 364-69, 387-89.

[16] Collinson, *The Birthpangs of English Protestantism*, pp.10-25; F. E Dolan, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, & seventeenth-century Print Culture* (2nd Edition, Notre Damn, 2005), pp. 1-10

[17] See below, pp. 318-30.

[18] Bullinger, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s*, sigs. Biv-Bviii, Cii-Ciii, Dvi-Dviii, Eii-Eviii; and J. Sleidanus, *A briefe chronicle of the foure principall empires to witte, of Babilonm, Persia, Grecia and Rome* (London, 1563), in particular pp. 100-04. See Olsen, *John Foxe & The Elizabethan Church* , pp. 63, 95-96. Luther denied that the Turk had anything to do with the Antichrist, see Frith, *A pistle to the Cristen reader*, sigs. Bviii & M. Luther, *The Last wil and last confession of Martin Luther's faith* (Wesel, 1543), sigs. Dviii-Ci; Jewel also denies it in Jewel, *Works*, iv, p. 727; as does J. Veron, *A stronge defence of the maryage of pryestes agaynste the Pope Eustachius, and Tatunites of our time*, (London, 1562), pp. 7-8; Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 388 claims that the Turk is the Papal Antichrist's "brother", as does L. Shepherd, *Pathose, or an inward passion of the pope for the losse of hys daughter the masse* (London, 1548), sig. Aiv. The Turk is used as an analogy to describe the Papacy in *A Treatise wherein Christe and his techynges, are compared with the pope and his doings* (London, 1534), p. 7; J. Bale, *The epistle exhoratorye of an Englyshe Christine into his derely beloued contreye of Englande, against the pompousse popyshe Bysshoppes therol as yet the true members of theyr flylthye father the great Antichrist of Rome* (Antwerp, 1544), sigs. Avi, Bi, Bviii, Dii.

personified. The ensuing pile-up of imagery only exacerbated the concept's confusion. For Antichrist could be male: the 'Man of Sin' or the 'Son of Perdition' of 2 Thessalonians 2, or the Antiochus, the persecutor of the Israelites in Daniel 11.[19] But it could equally be the female Whore of Babylon in Revelations.[20] Moreover, its bestial nature had been presaged by God in a series of monstrous scriptural allegories. Rome was pre-figured in either the Beast of the Sea, or the Beast of the Earth of Revelations 13;[21] for others it was an amalgamation of both;[22] whilst for many it was merely the Little Horn upon the beast of Daniel 7.[23] Ultimately little consistency existed in either image or concept – frequently, authors alternated Antichrist's scope, its gender, and the beast to which they were referring within a single passage.[24]

Antichrist, then, was a collage with no discernable focal point. This contrasted starkly with the image of Christ which – in the sixteenth century as today – was both vivid and instantly recognizable despite the New Testament containing no physical description of Him.[25] This is ironic given that the concept was rooted in two of the most visually-laden books of scripture, Daniel and Revelations: how could something

---

[19] For Antiochus, see Bale, *The epistle exhoratorye of an Enlyshe Christine*, sig. Biv; Frith, *A pistle to the Cristen reader*, sig. kvi; Melancthon's preface in J. Gropper, *The actes of the disputacio[n]n in the councell of the Empryre holden at Regensberg* (Antwerp, 1542), sigs. Avii-Aaiv.

[20] T. Cranmer, *Writings & Disputations of Thomas Cranmer*, ed. J. Edmund Cox (Parker Society, 17: Cambridge, 1844), pp. 6-7; M. Flacus Illyricus, *Wonderful newes of the deathe of Paul the iii last byshop of Rome [and] of diverse thynges that after his death have happened, wherein is tryle set the abominable actes of his most mischievous life* (London, 1552), sigs. Avi-Biii; T. Gybson, *The sum of the actes & decrees made by dyvers byshopes of Rome* (London, 1538), p. 26; J. Hooper, *Later Writings*, ed. C. Nevinson (Parker Society, 16: Cambridge, 1852), p. 554; G. Joye, *Jeremy the prophete, translated into Englisshe* (Antwerp, 1534), sigs. Aiv-Avi; N. Ridley, *Works*, ed. H. Christmas (Parker Society, 1: Cambridge 1841), p. 415. For Thomas Becon, Antichrist was born of the Whore of Babylon, see T. Becon, *The Reliques of Rome's* (London, 1563), "A prophecy of Antichrist."

[21] For the beast of the sea, see Ridley, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley*, p. 53. For the beast of the earth see, Olsen, *John Foxe*, p. 236.

[22] J. Bale, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe. A dysclosynge or openynge of the Manne of Synne, contained in the late declaration of the Popes olde faythe made by Edmonde Boner byshopp of London* (Antwerp, 1543), sigs. Biv-Bviii uses the two beasts interchangeably.

[23] See Bullinger, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s*, sigs. Biv-Ci, Ciii, Dvi-Dviii, Eviii-Fiv; Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel*, ii, p. 918.

[24] For example, see T. Cranmer, *Writings & Disputations*, pp. 5-7. Here the Antichrist changes gender in the space of a page; cf Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 389; for a change of beast, see Jewel, *Works*, ii, pp. 915-19. See also B. Ochino, *A tragoedie or dialoge of the unjuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome*, sigs. Oi, Sii-Ti where the Church of Rome changes from the Whore Of Babylon (referred to in the feminine) to the beast (masculine.) The shifting of gender had occurred as early as 1537 in *A Protestation made for the most mighty and most redoubted kynge of Englande and his hole counsel and clergie wherein is declared, that neyther his highness, nor his prelates, neyther any other prynce, or prelate, is bound to come or sende, to the pretended councell, that Paule byshoppe of Rome, first by a bul indicted at Mantua, a citie in Italy, and nowe a late by an other bull, hath prorogued to a place, no man can tell where* (London, 1537), sigs. Aviii-Bii, although here the reference ti Antichrist is implicit rather than explicit.

[25] D. Morgan, *Visual Piety: A History & Theory of Popular Religious Images* (London, 1999), pp. 31-40.

so iconic fail to produce an icon? The disparity resulted from differing levels of consistency. Iconic images of Christ are the product of collective memory, an ongoing and largely consistent interpretative tradition centred round crucial points of perhaps the most famous life-story in history.[26] Imaging Christ, then, contained a large degree of fixity. Conversely, competing concepts of Antichrist existed since the early Church. Due to confusion in 1 John as to the precise nature and chronology of Antichrist's presence on earth, who or what Antichrist was, when it would appear, and its role in God's unfolding plan were matters upon which little consensus existed.[27] Protestants thus inherited a broad spectrum of opinions, ranging from the excessively narrow – that Antichrist would be an historical individual reigning for three-and-a-half years at the world's end – to the impossibly disparate – that it was an aggregate of *all* men's evil, beginning with Cain's act of homicide and culminating at the Last Judgement – and a wealth of positions in-between.[28] These tensions remained unresolved in Reformed thought, and interpretative conundrums which had stumped theologians for centuries were thrown back at Protestants by champions of Rome. There was thus no dominant image of Antichrist because there could not be – the interpretative quagmire was too great for a precise agreement to emerge. However, this void of specificity was no irredeemable weakness, but rather a powerful polemical tool. The evasive nature of Revelation's images allowed for their flexible application, keeping Antichrist alive in the changing political climates of a century-and-a-half, legitimating the positions of a host of groups - at some point everything from Papacy, episcopacy, presbyterianism, sectarians and monarchy were 'proven' to be Antichrist.[29]

Moreover, imagery was crucial to expressing Antichrist's deceptive nature. That its image was in flux, attached to a plethora of beasts, persons and genders only amplified the power of the mystery of iniquity by which Antichrist traded, the very opaque nature of its imagery complimenting the constantly expanding and shifting

---

[26] Ibid, pp. 31-40. See also pp. 2-8.
[27] The term 'Antichrist' appears only 4 times in scripture - 1 John 2:18, 1 John 2:22, 1 John 4:3, and 2 John 7. Although only one of these references, 1 John 2:18, links the term explicitly to the Last Days, the concept of the final Antichrist appears in several other biblical texts: Daniel, Revelations, and 2 Thessalonians 2 all contain the concept of a great persecutor of the faithful depicted as a blasphemous parody of the true Church, and who will ultimately be overthrown by God. In 1 John 4:3 Antichrist was present in the world at the time of John's writing, whilst in 1 John 2:18, it was yet to come. These texts also confused *the* Antichrist with many plural Antichrists.
[28] See below, pp. 318-22.
[29] See Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, passim.

parameters of its body. Neither imaged or conceptualized coherently, the very imprecision in the imagery through which Antichrist was imagined added to the sense that this was a foe which operated by mystery and deceit. Something to be *revealed* in the Last Days.

Revelation relied upon an interpretative way of seeing essential to Protestants. John's visions were critical to Reformed understanding of history. Interpreting these allegories was to understand divine purpose – as Thomas Cartwright noted, they were the means by which God had chosen to "shew unto his servants things which must shortly be done."[30] Accessing Truth was dependent upon visual interpretation. Only those enlightened by God saw His Truth in these mysterious visions – for others scripture's images remained sealed, the key of Faith necessary to unlock their code.[31] Christ spoke to His Church through visions, promising eternal peace and consoling His followers whilst they endured the persecution that would be their lot in this world. Patrick Forbes explained:

> "The wise in each time, had not onely enough wheron to stay their hearts, in the midst of most grievous calamities; but, being placed in the light of divine revelation, they might clearly perceive the course and reign of God his wise dispensation, and reioice in the assured expectation of such events."[32]

This was a Protestant way of seeing. Perceiving the course of history in these opaque images was the preserve of the 'wise', the ability to do so a sign of Election. Conversely, those unable to see that Rome corresponded with images of the False Church were ensnared by Antichrist's deception, blinded by the smoke of the

---

[30] T. Cartwright, *A plaine explanation of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1622), pp. 1-2. See also p. 23, for Cartwright's interpretation of Revelation 4, the Door of Heaven opening and the trumpet sounding – unless God opened the door, the meaning was sealed.

[31] *Antichrist unhooded, or, An Explanation of the names and titles by which the scripture exhibits Antichrist to the world* (London, 1664); T. Brightman, *The Revelation of S. John illustrated with an analysis and scholions* (Leyden, 1616), sig. A5; F. E, *Christian information concerning these last times* (London, 1664), p. 3; R. Abbot, *The Danger of popery* (London, 1625), pp. 10-14. See p. 10: "shall wee not rather labour by the benefit of those gifts which God hath given (not to the Pope and his adherents) but to the Church of God, to wit, the gift of interpretation, tongues, wisedome, knowledge, prayer, and the like, to cleare the imposture of falsehood and the glory of truth." *Oath of Christ and the age of Antichrist, or, Daniels diurnall* (London, 1641), p. 4; J. Michael, *The spouse rejoicing over antichrist, and triumphing over he devil, in the day of the lord, when God alone shal bee exalted* (London, 1654), passim; J. Rainolds, *The discovery of the man of sinne* (London, 1614), p. 22/

[32] P. Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1613), p. 1.

286

Bottomless Pit (Rev 9:2).[33] Visual capacity was consequently crucial to the Protestant experience, and central to Anti-Catholicism. Practising by deceiving the eyes of the worldly, one must *see through* Rome's Antichrist:

> "Of Holiness thus does she beare a show
>
> And the Church title masked goe
>
> Depainted outward glorious to the eye
>
> When her devotion but Hypocrisie?"[34]

Being a good Protestant was not to be distracted by these "outward glories". The icing covering a rotten cake, Rome's lavish imagery and miracles masked spiritual bankruptcy. Concerned to go beyond the show of religion to the corruption behind it, Protestantism rejected what appeared beautiful in this world for the Truth of the next. This was an emblematic way of seeing. Seeing here was more involved than immediate, revealing Antichrist more dependent upon eye-strain than instant recognition. It was an interpretative endeavour:

> "Unveiling of Antichrist. Or, Antichrist stript-naked out of all his scripture-attire, by which he hath deceived the Christian world; so that we may the more clearly see the very bottomless-root from whence he sprang, and the very basis and foundation upon which he erected, and set up his kingdome."[35]

One did not *see* Antichrist, one saw *through* it, and recognition was an active and ongoing process requiring scriptural study and daily prayer to penetrate its mysteries.[36] Protestantism rejected what appeared before the eye in favour of what it pointed to.

This view of the world and its history was emblematic. Thus, compiling incessant lists of the Papacy's heinous lives, actions and doctrines was to do far more than crudely show that next to Christ Rome came up short in the pageant of piety.

---

[33] Ibid, p. 2.

[34] *The popes pyramides* (London, 1624).

[35] J. Pope, *The unveiling of Antichrist* (London, 1646), title-page.

[36] *Oath of Christ and the age of Antichrist*, p. 1; Brightman, *The Revelation of S. John illustrated*, sig. A2. Cf. Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1613), p. 3; Pope, *The unveiling of Antichrist*, sig. A2. See also, R. Franklin, *A disourse on Antichrist, and the Apocalypse* (London, 1675), p. 2; I. P, *Romes Ruin* (London, 1629), sig A2.

Rather these iniquities pointed to the Papacy's inner spiritual status as 'marks' of Antichrist, footprints demonstrating that Rome marched to the scheme of Revelation's False Church. This conception of the world mirrored Reformed attitudes to the image. Just as in Protestant services images were tokens putting laymen in memory of an invisible spiritual truth, signs pointing to something else, so the actions of Rome's history and qualities of its doctrines were signs 'marking' its true identity, allusions to scriptural prophecies of Antichrist.[37] Engravings echoed this subtlety, involving readers in the act of revelation. Suggesting that the Pope was the Whore of Babylon or Man of sin without actually depicting it, woodcuts employed a series of visual triggers and allusions to ensure that depictions of Rome pointed beyond themselves to another, spiritual reality. Recognizing the allusion not only edified the viewers' cleverness − seeing through Antichrist was to vanquish it, a comforting sign for the viewer that they were not deluded congregants of the False Church. Glaring at Antichrist here served to remind Protestants of their triumph over it.

I: The Importance of Antichrist

Antichrist was part of the plasma in the Early Modern bloodstream. Beyond important, it was an *essential* part of a Christian's understanding: "next unto our Lord and saviour Jesus Christ, there is nothing so necessary as the true and solid knowledge of Antichrist."[38] Identifying the Papacy as Antichrist was not the preserve of the Church's left-wing, nor was it the calling-card of those of a millenarist bent − not all of its advocates were trying to usher-in the Last Days.[39] A generalized Protestant position, the plaster masking cracks in the Church's walls, men of all views found a point of unity in opposition to Antichrist - men as diverse as radicals like John Field

---

[37] See below, pp. 337-45.

[38] T. Beard, *Antichrist the Pope of Rome* (London, 1625), preface.

[39] Ball, *A Great Expectation*, pp. 1-12, 229-35; Capp, "Review: Godly Rule and the English Millenarianism", pp. 106-111 in particular; ibid, *The Fifth Monarchy Men*, pp. 20-37; Collinson, *The Birthpangs of English Protestantism*, pp. 1-27; Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 1-40, 25, 31-33 in particular; Frith, *The Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 1-25, 242-54 in particular; also 34-38, 54-68; Kyle, "John Knox and Apocalyptic Tradition", pp. 449-69; Lamont, *Godly Rule*, pp. 7-14, 19-69 in particular. For example, p. 32 "it is easy to forget how very respectable the Book of Revelation had become in England in the early years of the seventeenth century"; McNeil, "John Foxe: Historiogrpaher, Disciplinarian, Tolerationist", pp. 223-25; Olsen, *John Foxe*, pp. 20-22.

and John Cartwright;[40] separatists like Henry Brown and Henry Barrow;[41] puritans such as Andrew Willet, John Rainolds, Patrick Forbes and Thomas Taylor;[42] and moderates like Richard Hooker all wrote on the issue.[43] For all of the internal wrangling about what the Church of England stood for, these men were at least agreed on what it stood *against*. Knowledge of Revelations was essential to Protestant sense-of-self - "He that knoweth not this boke, knoweth not what the Church is whereof he is a member"[44] - and all laymen were encouraged to pore over its opaque imagery: "The shell is thicke, and hard to breake: but being broke, the kernel is most sweete and pleasante."[45] Knowledge of victory over Antichrist became a salve, a fundamental part of Protestant identity. That the English Church existed in opposition to that of Rome was a common vision masking splintered viewpoints, what Patrick Collinson termed the "sheet anchor" of Tudor Protestantism.[46]

Bringing about its downfall was a by-way to glory, and one which monarchs went to great lengths to associate themselves with. Thus the Christmas Revels of 1547 included a giant Tower of Babylon.[47] Costing some £80, its journey across London — from its construction North of the Thames at Blackfriars to Hampton Court in the South West of the City - must have provided an odd spectacle, but one dwarfed by its

---

[40] T. Cartwright, *A plaine explanation of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1622); for Field see Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 18-19; Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", p. 161.

[41] Included in L. Carlson, & A. Peel, (Eds.), *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne* (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, 2: London, 1953), pp. 150-70. The treatise was entitled, *Of the Reformation without Tarrying for One*, p. 152.

[42] A. Willet, *Synopsis Papismi* (3rd Edition: London, 1600), pp. 188-220; J. Rainolds, *The discovery of the man of sinne* (London, 1614); T. Taylor, *Two Sermons* (London, 1624), dedicatory epistle, pp. 3-11; ibid, *Christs Victorie over the Dragon* (London, 1633), pp. 693-742. See also, P. Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1613); J. Van der Noot, *A theatre wherein be represented as wel the miseries & calamities that follow the voluptuous worldings as also the greate joys and plesures which the faithful do enjoy* (London, 1569); T. Tymme, *The Figure of Antichrist* (London, 1586), sigs L8-M4 in particular. For more on moderate Puritans, see Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", pp. 161-62.

[43] For Hooker see Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 33; A. Milton, *Catholic & Reformed: the Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 106. Thomas Jackson also gave much thought to the issue, see *Works* (Oxford, 1844), ii, pp. 266, 303-9, 471-75.

[44] J. Bale, *Image of Bothe Chruches* (London, 1548), sig. Aiii; J. Bedell, *An Examination of Certaine Motives to Recusancy* (London, 1628), pp. 13-14.

[45] A. Dent, *The Ruine of Rome* (London, 1603), sig. B3.

[46] Collinson, *The Birthpangs*, p. 10. Any denial that the Pope was Antichrist was met with consternation, as the case of John Normanton in Cambridge during 1636 demonstrated, see. Todd, "'All One with Tom-Thumb'", pp. 563-79.

[47] A. Feuillerat, *Documents relating to the Revels at Court in the time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary: the Loseley Manuscripts* (Vaduz, 1965), pp. 26, 269. The exact date of its journey is not recorded.

destruction during the Revels by the force of God's mighty wind.[48] What did this lavish display of destructiveness signify? In Genesis the Tower was a product of mankind's presumptuousness, constructed in a vain attempt to reach heaven – in Protestant eyes it was consequently a fitting symbol of the Roman Church, which presumed to offer mankind a route to salvation beyond Christ. Babylon was emblematic of Rome: scriptural accounts of God's vanquishing of the former a presage for His inevitable destruction of the latter.

English Kings were often the tools extending from God's hands. Paintings of Henry VIII trampling a seven-headed Papal Antichrist were displayed prominently at Hampton Court. In Bernadino Occhino's *A tragoeide of the injuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome*, performed at Court in 1549, Antichrist was smited by Henry and Edward VI, possessed of both the foresight to see through its fraudulent religion and fortitude to break its hold on England.[49] Great efforts were taken to produce a detailed visual repertoire linking Rome and Apocalypse: the Shrovetide Revels of 1549 included a Seven-Headed apocalyptic beast;[50] a skinner mocked-up six caps to resemble monks' shaven-heads, and clerical garments were cut from scratch.[51] Edward's Coronation Revels featured a replica of the Pope's triple-crown; and in 1552 a fire-breathing dragon was produced.[52] Triumph over Antichrist celebrated the monarchy, and apocalyptic imagery was employed as a means of its self-glorification. Scholars similarly constructed emblems glorifying their work's achievements. Daniel Featley's *Raoma ruens = Romes ruine* (1644) sported a burning Tower of Babel mourned by a Jesuit [Fig. 256.] The intention was clear: Featley's dismantling of Rome's foundation – that the Papacy had succeeded Peter – was so complete, that like the Tower, it could only tumble.[53]

---

[48] Ibid, p. 26. The exact cost was 79li 17s 8d. That a similar Tower was built for two subsequent Christmas and Shrovetide Revels suggests that the spectacle was well received. Ibid, p. 269. There is no account of its destruction but it seems probable given both the Tower's fate in the chronicles and an oddity in the Revels accounts. An account from January 1549 has 218li, 18s, 6d outstanding to the same craftsmen as 1547, roughly three times the original charge of 79li, 17s, 8d of that year. I deduce from this that Tower was destroyed each year (1547, 1548, 1549.) God's destruction of the Tower through a mighty wind is not contained in Genesis book was a frequent tale in the chronicles. See The Book of Jubilees; The Sibyline Orracles (iii, 117-129); Cornelius Alexander (fragment 10); Abydennus (fragments 5 & 6).

[49] B. Ochino, *A tragoedie or dialoge of the unjuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome, and of the just abolishing of the same* (London, 1549), sigs Y2-Z2, Bb2-Dd.

[50] This cost 30 shillings. Feuillerat, *Documents*, p. 39.

[51] Ibid. p. 39.

[52] Ibid, p. 108. The accounts paid seven shillings "For a dragons head and a dragons mowthe of plate with stoppes to burne like fier. Vs. for trymmyng of iiii boxes with plate for the same. IIs."

[53] D. Featley, *Roma ruens, = Romes ruine* (London, 1644), title-page.

John Spittlehouse's *Rome ruin'd by White Hall* (1649) employed Antichristian imagery in a more explicit emblem of authorial self-aggrandizement, a pictorial representation of Spittlehouse's achievements [Fig. 257]:

> "That Embleme whereon thou didst looke,
>
> Is but the *Shadow* of the Booke;
>
> By reading which though maist behold
>
> That in *expresse* which here is told
>
> By *Figures*....."[54]

The 'Emblem of Antichrist' depicted a three-headed Pope flanked by a prelate and a Presbyterian who cried "we are all lost and broken to peeces" and "Thei reiect our church & calling from thee" respectively, lamentations underpinned by 'popish' emblems – triple tiara, crozier, chalice, bell and decretal – lying shattered upon the ground.[55] Their sorrows result from the fourth figure, Spittlehouse, "a Champion stout", who disputed "to the life" with the others. Destroying each of Popery's three prongs with Christ's doctrine, he was surely worth celebrating:

> "His head with Bayes
>
> I have adorn'd, dou thou the like by praise."[56]

Reference to 1 Kings 18 at his feet painted the author's achievements alongside those of Elijah on Mount Carmel, who, by proving the idol of Baal to be a fraud, brought the Israelites back into the Lord's fold.[57] Spittlehouse, it seems, had overthrown Antichrist's doctrine, but not the devil's pride.

Vanquishing Antichrist, then, was a fast-track to glory. William Turner's epitaph proclaimed that he had: "fought to the bitter end as a solider of Christ....against the Roman Antichrist."[58] Every Archbishop of Canterbury from Cranmer to Abbot wrote on the subject, and men as diverse as Milton, the anatomist

---

[54] J. Spittlehouse, *Rome ruin'd by White Hall, or, The papal crown demolisht* (London, 1649), title-page.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid.
[57] 1 Kings 18.
[58] W. Turner, *Libellus de Re Herbaria*, B. Daydon Jackson & W. T. Stearn (Ed.), (London, 1965), pp. 23-24.

Robert Burton and future secretary of the Royal Society Henry Oldenburg agreed with the identification. Moreover, labouring to unravel the mysteries of God's timetable in Revelations pushed mathematical boundaries forward, leading to advancements in logarithms.[59] Exposing Antichrist accrued glory. John Brammall completed his doctoral thesis on the subject, as did John Whitgift, who returned to it during his Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity lectures at Cambridge.[60] Dedicating such volumes to Crown or nobility, placing them Protestant champions, was a by-way to patronage. Thus George Gifford's dedication to Essex urging him - in an echo of the returning Christ of Revelation - to don white linen, mount a white steed and take the field against the Antichristian Beast of Spain.[61] That such honour was accorded to its routing is indicative of the Beast's importance to Early Modern people.

Revealing the Catholic Church as Antichrist was not empty rhetoric or polemical point-scoring, but a blow struck squarely on the Roman chin. The fulcrum of the Protestant case against Catholicism, Antichrist parried Papal claims to sole authority in mediating the Word - to be Christ's Vicar on Earth - by which it claimed universal over-lordship of the Church.[62] Doing so justified the Reformation, spinning what could have been termed a schism into a capturing of the moral high-ground.[63] As William Fulke explained in 1570:

"The greater controversy that this day troubleth the world, is where the true Church of God should be: the Papist making great brags that it is on theyr side, and we affirming that it is on ours. This controversy will soon be cut off....if it

[59] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 1, 30; R. Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (1932), iii, pp. 364-66; J. Napier, *Plain Discoverie of the Whole Revelation of St. John* (London, 1593). Napier's predictions were reprinted in the seventeenth century, see *Napiers Narration* (London, 1641), sig. A3-4, B-B2, C; J. Booker, *The Bloody Almanack* (London, 1643), pp. 3-4; *The bloudy almanack for this present jubilee* (London, 1647); *The bloody almanack: or An astrologicall prediction of the most remarkable accidents which shall happen to the King, Parliament and city* (London, 1648); J. Mede, *Key of the Revelation* (London, 1643).

[60] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 12; J. Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1822), i, p. 15. The position was regularly debated in Universities, see N. Bernard, *The Judgement of the Late Arch-Bishop of Amraugh* (London, 1659), ii, pp. 139-42.

[61] G. Gifford, *Sermons Upon the Whole Book of Revelation* (London ,1599), dedicatory epistle.

[62] Featley, *Roma ruens*, preface. R. Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth century apocalypticism, millenarianism and the English Reformation: from John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 13, 60-62, 68-71, 91-107 in particular; Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, p. 98

[63] Beard, *Antichrist*, sig. A3; R. Bernard, *Looke beyond Luther* (London, 1623), p. 45; Jackson, *Works*, i, p. 296.

may be shewed that Babilon is Rome: For then cannot Rome be the true Church of Christ, but [only] Antichrist."[64]

The collective brow-furrowing and head-scratching caused by wrestling Rome into Antichrist's imagery was thus much more than exegetical extravagance – it was a hammer blow dislodging the keystone of Papal authority, and one which *had* to be delivered to justify Protestants' membership of the True Church. Colouring oneself Godly was inter-twined with painting the Papacy Antichrist[65] - "it is impossible to preach Christ...except thou preach against Antichrist."[66] Far from the sign of divine favour it appeared, Revelations explained away Rome's prominence in centuries of Church history as indicative of entirely the opposite. As prophesied, Rome had usurped Christ's position and persecuted Christians throughout history – its stumble at the Reformation fulfilling its pre-ordained revelation and downfall during the Last Days. Antichrist was thus a teleological organizing principle with which to dispatch medieval Church history – everything between the Apostles and Reformation was a precursor to the False Church's inevitable demise, fifteen hundred years of history locked into a relentless narrative charting Antichrist's gradual ascent and subversion of the Gospel. Belief in this pre-ordained process was a lens darkening Rome's past. Protestant histories chronicled Antichrist's unrelenting rise in the increasingly iniquitous lives of successive Popes and the wave of heretical doctrine which mounted in the Church over the centuries.[67] This wave had peaked in the recent past. On the Reformation's eve the Papacy possessed such formidable reserves of power that no allegiance of earthly Princes could overthrow it – despite its bruising by Protestant hands, obliteration required otherworldly help and would have to wait until Christ's return on Judgment Day.[68]

---

[64] W. Fulke, *A Sermon preached at Hampton Court* (London, 1570), sigs. B1- B2. See also G. Downame, *A Treatise Concerning Antichrist* (London, 1603), sig. A2, p. 2; R. Bernard, *A key of knowledge for the opening of the secret mysteries of St. John's mysticall Revelation* (London, 1617), pp. 33-34; H. Burton, *The baiting of the Popes bull. Or An unmasking of the mystery of iniquity* (London, 1627), p. 94; Willet, *Synopsis Papismi*, p. 211

[65] P. Lake, "Antipopery : the structure of a prejudice", in R. P. Cust & A. Hughes, (eds.), *Conflict In Early Stuart England: studies in religion and policits 1603-42* (Harlow, 1989), pp. 72-106

[66] W. Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises*, ed. H. Walter (Parker Society, 32 : Cambridge, 1848), pp. 232-52.

[67] P. Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31, (1980), pp. 165-67.

[68] Jewel, *Works*, ii, pp. 896-929; E. Sandys, *Sermons*, (London, 1585), p. 322; W. Fulke, *A Retentive* (London, 1580), pp. 125-26; J. Dyos, *A Sermon Preached at Paules Crosse* (London, 1579), fol. 61-62.

293

Chronicling the rise of Antichrist was to chart a paradox in which Rome simultaneously ascended and declined – its rising in worldly power and wealth spawning a fall in adherence to Christ's spirit. This paradox drove history. For three centuries after Christ the Church consisted of Godly bishops who studied, preached, and led lives of sobriety dedicated to the Word. Rejection by the world spawned devotion to God, and during this time of persecution the Church displayed no fleshy desires or lusts for power. Yet the spirit waned once persecution ended, and as bishops were enriched by Roman Emperors their zeal diminished - as one Reformer quipped: "rest breeds rust".[69] Indeed, the binding of Satan for 1000 years (Rev 20) coincided with Constantine's conversion to Christianity in 312. During this incarceration Satan - the cause of persecution - could no longer rage against Christians, but instead corrupted their Church from within, imbuing clerics with an unquenchable ambition, and providing them with the demonic subtlety to satisfy it.[70]

Rome's bishops soon displayed what Thomas Becon termed an insatiable "ambition and Lucifer-like pride in exalting and lifting up themself" above their peers.[71] The Apostolic ideal of all Churches being equal was dashed as the non-scriptural, and therefore Antichristian, idea of 'Head' bishop entered the Church and the episcopacy of Rome and Constantinople wrestled to be recognized as 'Universal' patriarch, chief above the rest. The tumult was settled after Boniface III of Rome persuaded Emperor Phocus to grant him the non-scriptural title 'Pope' in 607, making him (illicitly) Christ's representative on earth. The fulcrum of Antichristian pride, and the beginning of the Papal stranglehold on Christendom, that this title had been granted by a man who had himself usurped his predecessor, Emperor Maurice, and butchered his family, showed its true value in the Reformer's eyes.[72] Nonetheless,

[69] R. W, *A Looking-Glass For Papists: To see their owne Deformities in matters of Faith and Religion* (London, 1621), p. 12.

[70] L. Hughes, *A looking-glasse for all true hearted Christians wherein they may see the true goodness of God in giving deliverance unto them form their popish cruell and bloodie enemies by rendring vengeance upon them* (London, 1642), p. 7; R. W, *A Looking-Glass For Papists*, p. 65. Chronicles informed Reformers that when Emperor Constantine crowned Silvester I in 314, heaven was heard to say "this day is much poison powered into the Church." Ibid, p. 7. Chronicles like Platina's *Life of Popes* were a well-mired source.

[71] T. Becon, *The Reliques of Rome's* (London, 1563), sig. C2.

[72] R. W, *A Looking-Glass*, pp. 13-16; Becon, *The Reliques*, sig. C2; Bullinger, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s*, sigs. C4-C5; Ochino, *A tragoedie*, sigs. C3, Aa1 in particular; Sleidanus, *A briefe chronicle*, p. 60; H. Burton, *The baiting of the Popes bull. Or An unmasking of the mystery of iniquity* (London, 1627), pp. 3, 87; W. Ramsay, *Maromah, the Lord of Rome the Antichrist, finally and fully discovered his name the number of his name* (London, 1680), p. 25 J. Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments* (London, 1583), 2 volumes, i, pp. 780-99; ; I. P, *Romes Ruin* (London, 1629), pp. 3, 8-12.

from Boniface forward Papal power increased incrementally, the Mystery of Iniquity rising little by little as successive pontiffs aggregated increasingly absolutist power over Church government, gaining access to Christians' purse-strings to sustain their power and wealth. Coupled with a steady flow of illicit doctrine by which it usurped Christ's position as the bringer of grace, the Papacy substituted itself as the by-way to salvation, performing Antichrist's great confidence trick by conning Christians to follow its fraudulent path.[73]

God had pre-figured these centuries of conflict and spiritual degeneration in a series of allegorical figures, "folded up in a mysterious & darke discourse, a living representation of a long time" in the Beasts of Revelation.[74] For Sleidanus the Beast of Daniel 8 was "a thing worthy to be perfectly printed in memorye, for as much as in a fewe words it comprehendeth the history of all tymes, even until the end of the world."[75] Shot-through with meaning, each part of these opaque visions was laboriously unpicked to unravel the divine ground-plan of history, the specific actions which the False Church would undertake until the world's end. Revelation 13 was the most powerful emblem. This contained two Beasts - the Seven Headed Beast of the Sea, composed of a leopard's body, bear's feet, and lion's mouth and, following in its wake, the lamb-like Two Horned Beast of the Earth - which from the mid-sixteenth century were deemed representative of the Roman Empire and Papacy, respectively. Successive in nature, these Beasts were linked to 2 Thessalonions 2's prophecy that Antichrist would only emerge after a 'falling away', generally interpreted as the decline of the Roman Empire. A divine pre-figurement of the Empire's removal to Constantinople, which in the Reformer's eyes had allowed the Papacy to swell in power at Rome, history demonstrated that successive Popes had arrogated the lands and power of the dying Empire to satisfy their worldly lusts.[76] This emblem foretold how the Beast of the Land would appear in the 'image' of that of the Sea and "exerciseth all the power [there]of", and was taken to presage Papal pretence to temporal power.[77] As Emperors had persecuted Christians in the Early Church, so the

---

[73] Alesius, *A treatise concernygne generall councelles*, sigs. C2-D8; Becon, *The Reliques*, sigs. C2-E1; Bullinger, *A Commentary*, sigs. B4-G; Ochino, *A tragoedie*, sigs. C1-D3 in particular; Sleidanus, *A briefe chronicle*, pp. 13-102; Burton, *The baiting*, pp. 86-93; R. W, *A Looking-Glass*, pp. 12-20, 34-64, 68-78.

[74] T. L, *Babilon is fallen* (London, 1620), sig. A2.

[75] Sleidanus, *A briefe chronicle*, sig. C1.

[76] Burton, *The Baiting*, p. 88; *Oath of Christ*, p. 6; Becon, *Reliques*, sigs. Cii-Civ; Bullinger, *A Commentary*, sigs Cvi, Dv-Dvi.

[77] Rev. 13; *Oath of Christ*, pp. 4-5; Forbes, *An exquisite Commentary*, pp. 112-15.

Papacy had done after their fall; as Emperors had embraced heresy, so the Papacy had imbued the Church with iniquity; and as Emperors had aimed to rule the world under their Imperial mantle, so history had shown that Pope's desired tyranny over temporal powers. Dominion begun by Ceasar was appropriated under the mantle of Christ.

Historians' caricatures of attitudes towards the Papacy as a "fairytale monster of depravity" thus miss the mark.[78] Antichrist was no trite personification, nor a horror story with which to entertain the ghoulish and frighten the timid, but a very real and intensely active force in history.[79] Yet despite its magnitude, Protestants were ultimately assured victory: if not in their lifetime, at history's end.[80] Antichrist could only harm the Elect's bodies, never their souls - it was they who would enter Jerusalem, and Rome who would be crushed by divine wrath.[81] The Beast was kept on a tight leash, the scope of its evil ring-fenced by divine schema – the time of its persecution during the Last Days was short, a last-gasp before an inevitable downfall. We have a paradox. Although terrifying, revealing the Papacy as Antichrist also sounded its death knell, pointing to the unfolding of divine will during the Last Days: horrors endured during the Marian burnings, French Wars of Religion and Thirty Years Wars edified, even comforted, Protestants as signs that they truly were Christ's persecuted victims of the Beast.[82] Ironically, facing a superhuman foe permitted Protestants supreme confidence. Scripture revealed Rome as Antichrist to bring comfort to the Church during their hardships under the cross, proving Revelation's allegories to be a map of divine will in history, which would consequently culminate in Christ's triumph.

This pre-ordained victory did not afford the luxury of complacency. Protestant attitudes to Antichrist were bi-polar, a pendulum swinging ceaselessly between anxiety and assurance.[83] This paralleled attitudes toward predestined Election. Believers alternated between despair at their inability to obey God's will, and the certainty gained through clinging to His promise of salvation. The anxiety triggered

[78] E. Cameron "The Turmoil of Faith" in ibid, (ed.), *The Sixteenth Century* (Oxford, 2006), p. 161.
[79] Indeed, many deemed it demonic. As Christ was both God and man, so Antichrist was both man and devil. A. Marlorat, *A Catholike exposition upon the Revelation of sainct John* (London, 1574), fol. 154; E. Hellwis, *A Marvell, deciphered* (London, 1589), sig. B2; W. Fulke, *Praelections upon the sacred and holy Revelation of St. John* (London, 1573), fol. 107.
[80] Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", pp. 165-67.
[81] Ridley, *Works*, p. 404.
[82] Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", p. 166; Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, p. 107.
[83] Wiener, "The Beleagured Isle", pp. 27-62. See also Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", pp. 168-69.

by this emotional see-saw fuelled a life driven by good works which, although fruitless in procuring Election, shored up confidence that a spark of Grace resided within them.[84] Attitudes to Antichrist rested upon an equivalent dialectic, alternating between panic at the magnitude of the foe, and assurance in the promise of its over-throwal. The resulting anxiety spawned a hive of activity against Antichrist, a geyser of polemical histrionics warning men of popery's danger.[85] Although revealed, Antichrist would not rest in its crafty attempts to subvert the True Church, and continual exposition of its deceits became something of a chanted mantra driving men away from the nemesis. A nebulas of evil, Popery was insidious and ever-present, continually preying upon the Godly in to secure a foothold in the English Church.[86] Propounding Antichrist was therefore *necessary*, the Beast a scarecrow to prevent men picking the fruits of Rome; the Papacy a cautionary tale of the perils that sin led to if unrestrained.[87] This anxiety was the motor driving Elizabethan and Jacobean Protestantism, stimulating a perpetual desire to reform the Church to prevent it becoming porous to popery. A ship in constant need of tarring lest the rot of Rome set in, purity was her best protection. Any non-scriptural addition opened the door to Rome, popery's insidious threat a real and present danger. For the 'hotter sort' this popish threat justified Puritan policies, and popery soon became a political language, a means of galvanizing opinion behind calls for an English Church wholly exorcised of its Roman past doctrinally, liturgically, and hierarchically, calls which proved a de-stabilizing presence during the late sixteenth century.[88] Forces garnered against Antichrist had initially been centrifugal: as the Jacobean-era approached they became increasingly centripetal, wrenching the Church apart from within.

II: Doctored Visions – Images in Bibles

Although unnoticed by scholars, images were crucial in forging Antichrist's position as the great 'other.' Woodcuts placed in Bibles played a vital role in glossing John's

---

[84] Lake, "The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", pp. 168-9
[85] Ibid, pp. 168-78.
[86] For Popery as insidious, see below, pp. 308-15.
[87] Bernard, *A Key*, sigs. C3-C6; Bedell, *An Examination*, pp. 13-14. W. Perkins, *A Reformed Catholic* (London, 1634), sigs. A2-A3; Downame, *Treatise*, i, sig. A3, ii, pp. 190-92.
[88] See Lake, "Antipopery : the structure of a prejudice", pp. 72-106; ibid, "Constitutional Consenus & Puritan Opposition in the 1620s", pp. 805-25. Lake's ideas were expanded by Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, pp. 98-106; S. Adams, "Foreign Policy and the parliaments of 1621 and 1624" in K. Sharpe (ed.), *Faction and Parliament* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 146-47.

visions of Revelation in decidedly Protestant colours. Fixing readers' interpretations of scripture, woodcuts presented doctored versions of these visions, contorted representations of the Word in which the Papacy *was* the Beast of Antichrist, and Revelation presaged Rome's inevitable demise at God's hands. Their inclusion in authorized translations of the New Testament branded scripture inherently Anti-Papal, presenting the Word itself as the crucial prop to a polemical position increasingly necessary to the English Church. These were more than 'illustrations' - that term will not do. Beyond a mere illumination or description of scripture, these representations added meaning to it, controlling how readers understood and reacted to what was written upon the page.

Woodcut series were ubiquitous in sixteenth-century bibles, with Revelations being one of a cluster of familiar pictorial subjects including Genesis, Exodus, the Nativity and Crucifixion, and the Evangelists writing the Gospels. The composition of these images was highly consistent. Like the majority of sixteenth-century woodcut representations of. Revelation woodcuts they were. heavily indebted to Lucas Cranach's Anti-Papal images created for Luther's German New Testament of 1522. All images in English Bibles were either variations of this series or that included in the 1530 New Testament, which was closely reliant upon them.[89] Stability, however, should not be confused with stasis: over time revealing alterations occurred in the woodcuts sourced for English bibles. As Antichrist became the fulcrum of assaults upon Rome during Edward's reign, the images and their accompanying notes became increasingly visceral, fixing Antichrist as an inherently Anti-Papal entity.

In early English bibles, however, Antichrist whimpered rather than roared. Polemical positions common on the continent were not pushed, and Henrician bibles sported Revelation woodcuts shorn of Anti-Popery.[90] Comparing the Coverdale bible's representation of the witnesses of the temple about to be devoured by the Beast (Rev 11) with the original Lutheran image makes for an easy game of spot the difference – the absence of the tiara is stark [Figs 258 & 259.] The original block had its tiara trimmed, a strategy repeated in the Whore of Babylon [Fig. 260.][91] Other

---

[89] R. S. Luborsky & E. M. Ingram, *A guide to English illustrated books, 1534-1603* (Arizona, 1998), i, pp. 83, 94-100; Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. 170-77.
[90] T. String, "Politics and Polemics in English and German Bible Illustrations" in O. O'Sullivan (ed.), *The Bible as Book: The Reformation* (British Library, 2000), pp. 137-43.
[91] Coverdale Bible (1538), Rev. 11 & 17; Scriber, *Simple Folk*, pp. 170-71.

editions of Coverdale and Tyndale were littered with similar woodcuts.[92] This was not censorship. Cranach's cuts were used in Catholic Bibles as well as Protestant, and it seems unlikely that the tiaras were removed for the English market. Rather, the absence of visual tradition akin to Lutheran Germany was evidence of the relative unimportance of Antichrist at this stage of the English Reformation.[93] Indeed, the oppositional nature of Antichrist – True Church (Protestant) versus False (Rome) – was out-of-step with conciliar positions underpinning the Royal Supremacy, in which Rome and England, like *all* the world's Chruches, were equals, partners unified in Christ.[94]

Reticence existed around Revelation, for labeling the Pope Antichrist had been the preserve of medieval sects, and the early English Reformers' caution is understandable, not wanting to taint the novelty of the Royal Supremacy with the colours of heresy.[95] Indeed, Cranach had been uncomfortable with his commission, his un-obtrusive Anti-Papal additions causing Luther to complain that the Papacy was not depicted in a demonic enough manner – the more bulbous tiaras in the 1534 Wittenburg New Testament suggest that by this time continental Reformers had overcome their bashfulness [Figs 261 & 262.][96] The English, however, were more reserved. Tyndale, like Calvin, was hesitant to comment upon Revelation – making him unlikely to push for an aggressive illustrative programme in his New Testament -[97] and it was not until reign of Edward VI, with the return of exiles steeped in aggressively Anti-Papal European scholarship, that Antichrist fully fired the imagination of English Protestants.

---

[92] Cf. editions of Coverdale printed at Antwerp (1537 and 1539) and editions of Tyndale printed in France (1536) and Antwerp (1536 and 1542.)

[93] For Tatiana String, the failure of Henrician bibles to illuminate the Papal antichrist is evidence of opportunism on the behalf of printers, who simply used what images they could lay hands on. But she has assumed – mistakenly – that Antichrist was at the forefront of the Henrician Church. This was not the case. Although Cranmer preached a sermon labeling the Papacy Antichrist in 1536, and two years later Bullinger printed a large historical exegesis on the subject, these were merely sprouting green shoots in a largely barren garden. String, "Politics and Polemics in English and German Bible Illustrations", pp. 137-43. Bullinger, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s; L&P*, X, no. 283.

[94] See P. Marshall "Is the Pope Catholic? Henry VIII and the semantics of schism" in E. Shagan (ed.), *Catholics and the Protestant Nation: Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 22-48.

[95] See G. Leff, *Heresy in the Later Middle ages: the relation of heterodox to dissent, c. 1250-c.1450* (Manchester, 1967), pp. 2-3, 72-78, 224-28; B. McGinn, *Visions of the End: apocalyptic traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1998), pp. 147-48, 161-62, 187-89, 205-39; M. Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1969), pp. 401-15; M. Reeves, *Joachim of Fiore & The Prophetic Future* (Stroud, 1999), pp. 59-83.

[96] Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. 170-77.

[97] Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, pp. 33-37.

Henrician Protestants, then, had to be cautious. Anti-Papal images became rhetorical rebukes passing beyond the text. Thus the first appearance of Papal Antichrist in an English work, the Whore of Babylon in *The Sum of the actes made by diverse byshopes of Rome* (1538) by the physician Thomas Gybson [Fig. 263.][98] Although listing doctrines 'invented' by Rome in contravention of the Word, this work stopped short of labelling the Papacy 'Antichrist'.[99] The image took the argument to its logical conclusion, implying what could not be stated, and understanding the allusion won viewers to Gybson's position by edifying their cleverness.[100] A representation of clerics amongst the weeping followers of fallen Babylon (Rev 18) common to editions of Tyndale (1536) and Coverdale (1538 and 1539) was similarly a vestige of the unspoken [Fig. 264.][101] We cannot prove that its inclusion was intentionally polemical, but its appearance during the Dissolution of the Monasteries was deliciously co-incidental – moreover, we know that Henry's regime utilized vehemently Anti-Papal language and intense iconoclastic display as propaganda coups which legitimized unpopular elements of the new order. Darkly humorous, this was imagery as implication: the followers of Babylon weeping as their temples were justly pulled down. Using images as witty flourishes beyond the text, quips on the printed-page, continued in Holbein's illustrations to Cranmers' *Catechism* (1548), which depicted clerics as pharisees. Cranmer's commentary on the Lord's Prayer featured a woodcut accompanying "deliver us from evil" in which Christ cast out Pharisees dressed in tonsures and cowls [Fig. 265.][102] Similarly, in a lecture on the parable of the Pharisee and publican monastic dress was adopted by the proud and idolatrous who cast his eyes toward heaven [Fig. 266.][103] Given the recent Dissolution of the Chantries, the intended target was probably a little closer to home than Rome.

---

[98] T. Gybson, *The sum of the actes & decrees made by dyvers byshopes of Rome*, (London, 1538), p. 26. The 1539 edition was printed by R. Lant; the 1552 by W. Copland. Both kept the inscription but removed the woodcut.

[99] However, on pp. 1-2 he does call the Papacy angels of Satan.

[100] It also worked alongside a celebratory text to celebrate the Reformation: "The lorde of glory hath sent his ministers to plague the beast, with her adherents which hath her marker, and upon al them which worshipped her ymage that she nore her children should no more shedde the bloude of the children of salvation with her great burden and tradicion." Gybson, *The sum of the actes*, pp. 26-27.

[101] Rev. 18 Coverdale Bible (1537).

[102] T. Cranmer, *Catechismus, that is to say, a shorte instruction unto Christian religion* (London, 1548), fol. Cl.

[103] Ibid, fol CCl.

More visceral – and certainly more surprising – was an Anti-Papal woodcut in the *Kings' Book* (1543.)[104] This conservative statement of the English Church's doctrine, which remained largely Catholic, seems an unlikely place to find such vehement Anti-Papalism [Fig. 267.] Yet the *use* of the image is revealing. It illustrated the 'The Holy Catholic Church' which posited that the Church was Catholic not on the basis of unity under the Pope, but through headship in Christ and practice of His sacraments – as the Apostles formed Churches which were distinct but nonetheless united in Christ, so all contemporary Churches were unified by Him alone.[105] Rome's great crime was to usurp Christ by arrogating supremacy against scripture and apostolic practice.[106] This was – literally – an *anti*-Christian practice. Beneath the Whore the text stated:

"The Byshop of Rome, dothe contrayre to godds lawe, in challenging supremacie... by a cloke of godds lawe: And tomake an apperaunce, that it shuld be soo he hath... wreste[d] scripture for that purpose, contrayre both to the true meaning of the same, and the interpreations of ancient doctours of the church."[107]

There is no explicit charge of 'Antichrist' here. Yet accusations of disguise, deceit, and usurpation skirted the issue, and when coupled with the woodcut, the implication is equally present and open. Image went beyond word to form a para-textual slur, a macabre joke seeking to win readers over. Yet the Anti-Popery here was strutting rather than systematic: a deeply controversial work whose doctrinal conservatism disappointed evangelicals dearly, techniques of Protestant propaganda were harnessed to dress a faith which was essentially Catholic in doctrine. The rhetoric of Antichrist created distance where in actual fact little existed – working by inference and suggestion this was a long way from the routine and measured application of Papal Antichrist that would become a sustained note of the English Church. Antichrist here was subtle, not shouted.

---

[104] *A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man sette for the by the kinges maiestie of England* (London, 1543), sig. D7.
[105] *A necessary doctrine,* sigs. D3-D8.
[106] Ibid, sigs D6-D8.
[107] Ibid, sig. D7.

This all changed with Edward VI. Under the new Josiah England's Reformation shifted from conservative to fervent, the gaggle of reform-minded patrons which collected around the boy-King eschewing the middle way in favour of a vigorous drive towards perfecting his father's Reformation.[108] Cranmer's coronation sermon stated that Edwardian Protestantism would assault the Papacy, quash idolatry and assert the Word – this was a regime concerned with Antichrist.[109] Indeed, following Charles V's routing of German Protestantism at Muhlberg in 1547 Cranmer sought to make England the Protestant jewel of Europe, an international commune for the great minds who influenced the Church he constructed, and Protector Somerset kick-started a tidal wave of celebratory Anti-Papal polemic presenting Edward's Church as Antichrist's vanquisher.[110] Reprints of Tyndale's New Testament must be considered in this context. Chronically understudied, they were central to this campaign: in 1551 Richard Jugge received an exclusive license to print the Bible, the 1552 edition sporting a woodcut of the King.[111] Images constricted interpretation of Revelations, fixing its opaque prophecies as a divine Anti-Catholic invective.

Comparing depictions of Revelation 13 with those of Henrician bibles highlights the shift. In figure 269, the lamb-like Beast wore a cowl and is worshipped by clerics, features absent from the earlier cut.[112] Similarly, the Whore now sported a large Papal tiara [Fig. 269.][113] These were Anti-Papal stamps upon scripture. John Day's 1548 edition of Tyndale's New Testament included clerics amongst the wicked

---

[108] W, K. Jordan, *Edward VI: The Young King* (London, 1968), p. 69; D. Hoak, *The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge, 1976), pp. 165-66; J. Murphy, "The illusion of decline: the Provy Chambre, 1547-58" in D. Starkey (ed.), *The English Court from the wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London, 1987).

[109] J. Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, 2 vols, (Oxford, 1840), i, pp. 203-07. D. MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer* (New Haven/London, 1996), pp. 365-66; ibid, *Tudor Church Militant: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (London, 1999), passim.

[110] See J. N. King, "Freedom of the Press, Protestant Propaganda and Protector Somerset", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 40, (1976), pp. 1-9. The coupling of the removal of restraint from the press with the influx of expertise from foreign printers allowed the English book trade to begin its long sprint to catch up its European counterparts. This found expression at court, with the performance of Bernadino Occhino's *A tragoedie* was performed in 1549, and the prominent depiction of Rome as Babylon in numerous Edwardian revels.

[111] *ODNB*; *The Newe Testament of our Sauiour Jesu Christe faythfully translated out of the Greke ; wyth the notes and expositions of the darke places therein* (London, 1552) STC: 2867. Henceforth Tyndale (1552).

[112] Tyndale (1552), sig. Qq2; *The Newe Testament of our sauiour Christ, newly set forth after the beste copie of Wyllyam Tindales translation* (London, 1548) STC 2853. Henceforth Tyndale (1548), sig. Ccvi. Neither this image nor that of the Whore of Babylon with a tiara occurred in the other editon of Tyndale printed that year (STC 2852).

[113] Tyndale (1552), sig. Qq5; Tyndale (1548), sig. Ddiii.

who would perish under the Four Horsemen (Rev 6) [Fig. 270.][114] Clerics were equally recipients of punishments wrought by the angels' vials (Rev 8), scorned in their attempts to profer salvation and watching helplessly as a believer was clothed in grace [Fig. 271.] The accompanying verse reinforced Protestant doctrine, with Rome's saints amongst the spiritually dead beneath the altar:

> "The saints we prayed to, lo where they lye
>
> And they that were our spokes men, herke how they crye."[115]

Not only condemning Catholicism, this image cast authority on the Reformation in light of divine wisdom – those who practised Roman ways would find them wanting on Judgment Day. The association was sustained, and Papal condemnation was presented as scripturally explicit. The image of Christ smiting Babylon's Beast, served once again by clerics, was expounded thus [Fig. 272]:

> "The white horse, and he that sat upon hym, betokeneth Christ, which is here described after the majestie of empereurs, and high powers, with his honour, land & name. The other... calleth the devils, with all that beare the marke of the dragon, and of the beast, which is infidelitie and misbelief in Christ, into an everlastying supper of.... unblessedness."[116]

Readers were left in no doubt whose side Rome was on – the contrast of True Church and False, Catholic and Protestant, was hammered home. John's visions had become polemic.

As this example demonstrated, images were part of a two-pronged strategy, working with extensive notes to contort readers' reactions to scripture by fixing what was flexible, painting John's visions with an Anti-Papal gloss to restrict the 'Truth' which they revealed. More than 'illustrating' what the text described, these images added to it, doctoring John's visions to fit a Protestant view of history: adding a tonsure to the Beast of Revelation 13, which the text does nothing more than describe as lamb-like; and placing a tiara on the Whore, when no crown was mentioned in

---

[114] Tyndale (1548), sig. Bbiiii. This was accompanied by the verse couplet: "Pale hypocrites, enemies of Goddes gospel/ brynge deathe in theyr doctrine and dryve us to hell."

[115] Tyndale (1548), sig Bbiiiiv.

[116] Tyndale (1552), sig. Qqviii.

scripture. This visual tagging pinned Antichrist to Rome.[117] Once the tag was in place, the notes amplified the significance of the vision's component parts, strengthening the identification:

> "The womans variable garments, betokeneth divers livers of religious orders, or the rose colour maye sygnyfie a rediness to shed Christian bloude. The cup ful of abhominations & the Pope decrees, decretible, bulle, dispentation, suspentions, and synges: the beast she syteth on, the papal seat."[118]

Spelling out the emblematic significance of each part of the Beast, the note amounted to a Creed-like checklist of what readers should understand this vision to 'mean'. Reading scripture through Anti-Catholic spectacles, such an extensive para-textual endeavour restricted interpretation of visions which were inherently opaque. Not only unpicked in the margins, each chapter closed with an abstract propounding its relationship to the Roman Church, often directing readers to Bale's *Image of Bothe Churches* should they desire to learn more.[119] The preface explained that this served in "helpynge verie much to the understandynge of the text....not so large as the matter requireth (for the volume would not bear it) but sufficient to leade the diligent reader to the understanding of the whole Revelatio[n]."[120] It was critical that readers of the Word understood Revelations in the same manner as the regime, and images were central to the process by which English Protestants conferred authority on the printed-page. Many depictions - like the clerics lamenting Babylon's fall – were even surrounded by a mnemonic verse to hammer scripture's 'meaning' home: "the Romish marchants, the priests of Ball/ Do wepe, howle, and crye, at Babillons fall" [Fig. 273.][121]

During Elizabeth's reign such commentaries fell from favour, taking these doctored visions with them. Despite the presence of a Cranachean Revelation series

[117] Revelation 17 makes no mention of the Whore having a crown. Her head is only described in verse 5, and is deemed to have 'Mystery' written upon it.
[118] Tyndale (1552), sig. Qqviii.
[119] See for example, Tyndale (1548) sig. Diiii.
[120] Tyndale (1548), printer to the reader. See also *The Geneva Bible*, (1560) fo. xxx. v. r.
[121] Tyndale (1548), sig. Dv. For other Anti-Catholic illutrations, see Tyndale (1552) Rev 19 (sig. Qqviii) in which the enemies of the gospel perishing in flames wore clerical garb. Tyndale (1548) Rev 11 the Beast in the temple with the two prophets, which features a Roman altar (sig. Cciii) features the following couplet "When the church is measured with Goddes worde/ The Popes parte is caste out, and given to the sword."

(Anti-Papal or not) in all Henrician and Edwardian editions of Tyndale and Coverdale they failed to find their way into the Geneva bible, or the first edition of the Bishop's.[122] This cannot be attributed to growing Calvinist 'iconophobia', for both of those bibles were heavily illustrated. Rather, commentaries were deemed to make the Word hazy not clear, marring its visage with the scaffolding of contemporary factional agendas.[123] This shift grew out of a feud imported into England from rival congregations of Marian exiles. Frankfurt men like Matthew Parker, Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury, believed that the Geneva bible's extensive annotations muddied scripture with prejudices threatening the English Church's stability. To their minds scripture had been wrested in support of positions which were anti-episcopalian, and potentially anti-monarchical.[124] Consequently, when instructing translators of the first Elizabethan bible, Parker dealt with the issue firmly and bluntly - "Item: to make not bitter notis uppon any text, or yet to set downe any determination in place of controversies" - setting the tone for succeeding editions, in which commentaries were increasingly pruned.[125] By the King James, notes comprised almost wholly of philological minutae. Steering readers' interpretations had become less and less acceptable.

Despite this, some impurities remained essential. Thus, in the second edition of the Bishop's bible (1572) Revelations was prefaced with eighteen of its visions, resplendent with Anti-Papal additions: a cowl-wearing Beast of the Earth and tiara-adorned Whore of Babylon [Fig. 274.][126] Although more diminutive than in earlier bibles, and, being devoid of commentary clearly not intended to steer readers' reaction quite so closely, this Papal Antichrist hints that even whilst trying to present scripture objectively Anti-Catholicism was deemed inherent in the Word. Such muted Anti-Papal tagging continued into the seventeenth century, embellishing the Whore of Babylon on the frontispiece to William Forbes' *An exquisite commentarie* (1613), Thomas Brightman's *Revelation of St. John* (1616) and William Cowper's *Works*

---

[122] For later Elizabethan bible illustration, see M. Aston, "The Bishops ' Bible Illustrations," *Studies in Church History*, 28, (1992), pp. 267-85.

[123] D. MacCulloch, *The Later Reformation in England: 1547-1603* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 43, 75; M. S. Betteridge, "The Bitter Notes: The Genevan Bible and its Annotations", *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 14 (1983), pp. 41-62.

[124] A. W. Pollard, *Records of the English Bible : the documents relating to the translation and publication of the Bible in English, 1525-1611* (Oxford, 1911), pp. 29-33, 41, 43, 44

[125] Ibid, p. 297.

[126] *The. holie. Bible* (London, 1572), sig. Ri. Henceforth Parker (1572). This series also occurred in the editions of this bible printed in 1574 (STC 2109); 1578 (STC 2124).

(1623) [Figs 275-277.][127] Engraved into artistic imagination at the level of assumption, the doctored vision had supplanted the original. Even scholars as precise as Hugh Broughton – who dedicated a career to pruning scripture of impurities through exacting Hebrew philology – saw no contradiction in lavishing his works with image colouring the Word with extra-scriptural glossing [Fig. 278.][128]

III: Sanctioning Mystery – The Weight of Allusion

Imagery in Tudor bibles may have painted the Word Anti-Papal, but the application of its imagery was not fixed. There was no dominant symbol of Antichrist. Ardent purchasers of Reformation literature possessed book shelves filled with a diversity of understandings. The images were always understood to be allegories, but what they were allegories for was subject to sustained change. Thus the 1548 Tyndale Bible saw Rome in the Beast of the Sea and Whore of Babylon, "The Church of Antichrist";[129] whilst conversely that of 1552 confidently proclaimed the Roman Church to be pre-figured in the Two Horned Beasts of the Land – the Whore was now simply an additional explication of the Beast's character, an allegory.[130] Tying Antichrist to a host of emblems expressed its essence, the muddle of imagery characterizing the nemesis as insidious, diffuse and working through mystery and disguise – God acted here as rhetorician, describing Antichrist in a *copia* of imagery to amplify the extent of its evil and characterize forcefully the magnitude of the iniquity facing the Protestant Church.

It is often thought that the Whore of Babylon held sway amongst Protestants as the emblem of Papal Antichrist, but this was not so.[131] Whilst many scholars viewed her as the False Church, the nemesis of the Woman Clothed in the Sun, for others she stood distinct from Antichrist as its "paramour" or "concubine". Other

---

[127] Brightman, *The Revelation of St. John illustrated*, title-page; ibid, *A reuelation of the reuelation that is, the reuelation of St. Iohn opened clearely With a logicall resolution and exposition*(Amsterdam, 1615), title-page; W. Cowper, *The works of Mr. William Cowper late Bishop of Galloway* (London, 1623), title-page.

[128] H. Broughton, *A Concent of Scripture* (London, 1590), sig. Iviii. There was a very similar image in the 1588 edition of this book, but significant changes were made by the time of 1590 edition.

[129] Tyndale Bible (London, 1548), margin notes to Revelation 13 & 17: "The whore is the church of Antichrist which Bale declareth to be the Church of Rome."

[130] Tyndale Bible (London, 1552), margin notes to Revelation 13 & 17. For the Whore of Babylon: "here is declared at large ye jurisdiction of the beast with ten hornes, which is the seconde kingdome of Rome."

[131] Shell, *Catholicism*, p. 31.

writers pushed the remove further, seeing the Whore as emblematic of Rome in all ages, and not specific to Papacy or Antichrist.[132] In truth, the preferred image of Antichrist (in Revelations at least) were the two Beasts of Revelation 13 – the Seven Headed Beast of the Sea, and Two Horned, Lamb-Like Beast of the Earth which the worldly worshipped. Despite Foxe's insistence that the latter pre-figured the Papal Church "so graphically portrayed that it should be easy for all to see what is intended by this beast" many disagreed.[133] Foxe's view – that the Seven Headed Beast represented the Roman Empire, and the Two Horned Beast the Roman Church – was certainly prevalent in Anti-Papal exegesis, but never dominant. Many saw the Papacy in the Beast of the Sea.[134] Others, like Forbes, saw distinction between the two as redundant. For Forbes, these two Beasts had been mistaken as allegories of two distinct periods and institutions (Rome's Empire and Church) when in reality they were two emblems of the same thing – Papal Antichrist.[135] The fierceness of the first Beast's Seven Heads, bear's feet and lion's mouth encapsulated the Papacy's savage persecuting cruelty, whilst conversely its transformation into the meek, lamb-like beast aptly characterized its deceitful cunning in pretending to be with Christ.[136] Forbes may have viewed his understanding as definitive, but others discussed Antichrist with little reference to Revelation. Many saw the Papacy in the Man of Sin (2 Thessalonians 2), the Little Horn (Daniel 8) or, more rarely, in Esdra's Three-Headed Eagle and the "deceitful witness" of Proverbs 14.[137] What is striking about the

---

[132] R. Franklin, *A disourse on Antichrist, and the Apocalypse* (London, 1675), p. 5. The Whore stood for Rome, but not Antichrist. *The Camp of Christ, and the camp of Antichrist, all troopers after the Lambe* (London, 1642), p. 15, in which the Whore and Antichrist are seen to be distinct. F. E, *Christian information concerning these last times* (London, 1664), p. 10. See, W. Fulke, *Fulke's answers to Stapleton, Martiall, and Sanders* R. Gibbings (Ed.), (Parker society 14: Cambridge, 1848), pp. 233-34, "the purple whore of Babylon is fallen, and Antichrist shall at length be thrown into the lake..."; and Carslon, (Ed,), *The Writings of Henry Barlow, 1587-90*, p. 275, where Barlow describes the Antichrist "bringing forth *his* harlot upon the stage of the world, stately mounted upon his beastly power..." (my italics.) The distinction was also made by Ulrich Zwingli in his *The accompte and rekening and declaracio[n] of the faith and belief of Huldrik Zwinigly* (Geneva, 1555), pp. 5-7.

[133] Quoted in Olsen, *John Foxe*, p. 236. Bale had associated this beast with Bishop Edmond Bonner, see Bale, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe*, sig. Bv; Bale had associated the Papal Antichrist and his Bishops with this beast twenty years before Foxe, but the next year decided it signified the Papal Antichrist and all his bishops, Bale, *The epistle exhoratorye of an Enlyshe Christine*, sig. Bii. For Bullinger this Two-Horned Beast represented the Papacy and the Turk, Bullinger, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s*, sig. Dvi-Dviii.

[134] I. P, *Romes Ruin* (London, 1629), p. 51 in particular.

[135] Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie*, pp.112-19 in particular.

[136] Ibid, pp. 113-15 in particular.

[137] The Man of Sin and Little Horn were very common images. For the Eagle from Esdra, see T. L, *Babilon is fallen* (London, 1620). For Proverbs XIV, see W. Ramsay, *Maromah, the Lord of Rome the Antichrist, finally and fully discovered his name the number of his name* (London, 1680). For Antiohus, see *Oath of Christ and the age of Antichrist, or, Daniels diurnall* (London, 1641), p. 2; R. W, *A*

incessant grappling over what, precisely, God had intended to prophesy in these scriptural emblems is that by and large they all pointed to the same conclusion. All agreed that the Papacy was Antichrist: they simply failed to agree which biblical image best fitted it. The equation's answer remained unchanged, it was merely the working which varied.

Yet these exegetical efforts were not wanton. Reformers read divine allegories through the eyes of Renaissance rhetoricians. Whilst for modern readers attaching a plethora of imagery to one target appears confused, for contemporaries it was the height of elegance.[138] Cumulative imagery ultimately magnified the extent of Antichrist's evil. In the school of rhetoric, arguments were only persuasive if presented eloquently, and in humanist eyes eloquence and exhuberence walked the same path. A principle should be amplified to the point of exuberance, a technique known as *Copia*.[139] Here a basic principle was embellished through a series of vivid descriptions and analogies, the weight of allusion powerfully and persuasively animating the point.[140] This was precisely what God had achieved by tying Rome to a host of richly bestial allegories: the Holy Spirit had employed cumulative imagery "for clearness of explication of his end and manner...."[141]

Focussing on the amplification of one image – the locusts released from the Bottomless Pit to punish the world (Rev 9) – is poignant. Representing the swarms of Roman clerics who feasted on the reprobate's blindness, these locust-like creatures were an amalgamation of all kinds of animals. As William Cowper explained:

Looking-Glass For Papists: To see their owne Deformities in matters of Faith and Religion (London, 1621), p. 102.

[138] H. Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence" in R. Black (ed.) *Renaissance Thought: A Reader* (London/New York, 2001), pp. 60-67. See also, M. Robson, *The Sense of Early Modern Writing: Rhetoric, poetics, aesthetics* (Manchester, 2006), pp. 15-29 in particular; L. D. Green, "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Renaissance Views of the Emotions", in P. Mack (ed.), *Renaissance Rhetoric* (London, 1994) pp. 1-27; D. Knox, "Order, Reason & Oratory: Rhetoric in Protestant Latin Schools" in Mack (Ed.) *Renaissance Rhetoric*, pp. 63-80; P. Mack, *Renaissance Argument: Valla & Agricola in the Tradition of Rhetoric & Dialectic* (Leiden/New York, 1993).

[139] Gray, "Renaissance Humanism: The Pursuit of Eloquence", pp. 63-65; Robson, *The Sense of Early Modern Writing*, p. 19; Green, "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and Renaissance Views of the Emotions", pp. 7-9; Mack, *Renaissance Argument*, pp. 305-22 in particular, 211 for amplification.

[140] For more on the importance of Renaissance rhetoric to printed images, see above chapter 1, 'Using Images', pp. 38-51.

[141] Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation* p. 121. See also p. 119: the second Beast was figured by the Holy Spirit "put onely for cleare explication of the condition, nature, quality and working" of the first Beast.

"The Antichristian Clergy is represented to us like a Monster, manifold, composed of sundry kinds of creatures. In the body they seem to be horses, on the heads they have crowns, their faces are like the faces of men, thei hair is like the haire of women, they have Iacks of iron, and rattling wings, their tails of scorpions. Thus from head to foot they are all monstrous, marvelous, and most perfectly agreeth to the Roman Church."[142]

Like all Revelation's imagery, these beasts were emblematic – their features symbolic of Roman characteristics. Each part was laboriously amplified to wring as much bile out of the analogy as possible. For example, papists were compared to horses: not work horses, however, but idle, well-fed horses fat on the spoils of absolution; horses which tore around with blind zeal, carelessly trampling the Elect underfoot; and like horses, clerics were ruled by the will of their rider – the devil.[143] And so on. Each animal attribute was subjected to the same tedious process to 'prove' the verse's prefigurement of Rome. The cumulative effect was to amplify, by weight of iniquity, Rome's evil. The Holy Spirit had employed *Copia* to express Rome's depth of sin:

"Not unto one beast, but to all evil beasts doth the spirit of God resemble him; he is a sow, for his wallowing in the filthy puddle of sin; he is a dog for his returning to his own vomit; he is a lyon and Tyger for his cruelty; he is a viper for his venomesse hatred....."[144]

Presenting Antichrist as Whore, Seven Headed Beast, or Man of Sin served the same effect – amplifying Antichrist's iniquity by presenting it as an aggregate of evil. In detailing the nemesis in a compound of imagery, its mystery and magnitude were made to walk hand-in-hand.

Coupling magnitude and mystery was echoed in prints. *A Mappe of the Man of Sin* presented Antichrist's diffuseness through a swathe of figures to stress the magnitude of its evil.[145] The mosaic of interlocking snakes forming the many-headed

---

[142] Cowper, *Works*, p. 967. See also Cartwright, *A plaine explanation of the whole Revelation of Saint John*, pp. 47-50.
[143] Ibid, pp. 967-69.
[144] Ibid, p. 967.
[145] See above, pp. 278-80.

Antichrist in *The Popes Pyramid* (1624) achieved a similar effect [Fig. 279.][146] Antichrist was once again present throughout the Catholic Church. The largest head sported the Papal crown, and the Roman hierarchy was revealed as readers scaled down the image, with successive snakes donning cardinal's hats, bishop's mitres, and friar's cowls. Epigrammatic of sin, each snake's head uttered a 'mark' of Antichrist, a vice – blasphemy, idolatry, superstition, persecution, – by which it was known:[147] "The fruits of Rome thou here portrat'd seest/ And sinnes begotten by her Antichristes."[148] Antichrist was once again an aggregate of evil, a point encapsulated in the print's deeply satirical title. For contemporaries 'Pyramid' was a public monument of glory, a grand token celebrating achievement[149] - this serpentine mound presented the Roman Church as an anti-monument, a testament to the gravity, scope and extent of Antichrist's iniquity.[150]

A darkly humorous slur, this tapestry of sin hung as much dishonor upon Rome as possible. In this the compound of snakes was crucial. Reformed theology stressed the distinction between Satan and Antichrist – the former being the source of the latter's power – but here the two were confused: snakes were emblematic of Satan and absent from scriptural descriptions of Antichrist. In employing symbols connotation trumped specificity. What mattered was what an image *inferred* rather than what it *stood for*. Symbols are arbitrary by their nature, yet society possessed a codex of images so familiar that their 'meaning' assumed the illusion of being natural, an illusion which belied the lack of specificity with which they were actually applied. Feminine beauty has embodied goodness throughout Art History, a pedigree masking her interchangeable application as a symbol of seemingly contradictory ideals –

---

[146] *The Popes Pyramid* (London, 1624). This was based on a Dutch engraving of 1599 by Hendrick Hondius (BM 1992-1-25-16). The verse appear to have been translated too – they mention God's avenging sword returning to smite this serpentine Antichrist, a prominent feature in the Dutch image, but not included here.

[147] These are: blasphemy, profaneness, heresy, covetousness, envy, cruelty, rebelliousness, sodomy, hypocrisy, ignorance, cruelty.

[148] Ibid.

[149] For example, see T. Barlow, *Brutus fulmen: or, The bull of Pope Pius V. concerning the damnation, excommunication, and deposition of Q. Elizabeth* (London, 1681), p. 249; E. Benoit, *History of the famous Edict of Nantes* (London, 1694), pp. 156, 402. Both of these works discuss a 'pyramid' erected in France in the reign of Henry IV as an anti-Jesuit monument. See also, A. Brome, *Rump, or, An exact collection of the choycest poems and songs relating to the late times* (London, 1662), pp. 25, 145; R. Carpenter, *A New play call'd The Pragmatical Jesuit* (London, 1665), p. 42; J Howell, *A German Diet,* (London, 1653), p. 19; A. Ross, *History of the World, the second part* (London, 1652), p. 510; E. Settle, *The Female Prelate* (London, 1681), pp. 38, 41; ibid, *The triumph of London* (London, 1671), p. 6; J. Evans, *Some thoughts on the character of Solomon's vertuous woman* (London, 1695), p. 16.

[150] *The Popes Pyramid*. See the verse: "Where once thy glory stood/ Sad Monument of they Impieitie".

Religion, Reason, Liberty, Science – in successive centuries: the subjects may have changed, but the image's power as an instantly recognizable motif remained.[151] Possessed of no clearly defined 'meaning', she was used for the innate goodness which she appeared to resonate, and in which each successive concept that she represented was subsequently basked.[152]

In *The Pope's Pyramids* Antichrist basked in the devil's sin. Applied in a new context, a conventional image carried over the evil with which it was synonymous, radiating sin crucial to dishonouring Rome. Although un-related to biblical descriptions, the allusive effect still depicted the Papacy as demonically anti-Christian. The weight of allusion was equally powerful in the frontispiece to John Bale's *Examinacion of Anne Askewe* (1547) three generations earlier [Fig. 280.][153] That Truth sided with Askew was unspoken, amplified by her depiction as a beautiful women radiating divine light. The Papacy's ill was equally a clutter of allusions emanating from a non-descript monster which corresponded to no scriptural description - being bestial was enough to betoken Antichrist.[154] This image worked not through specificity of meaning but rather by its absence, the weight of connotation that each part resonated – beauty versus beast equaled good versus bad, true versus false, Askew versus Antichrist, in equal measure. In imaging dishonour, allusion outweighed accuracy.

Spittlehouse's Antichrist was equally a clutter of *copia* with monstrous connotations [Fig. 257.][155] The multiple-headed motif was a recognizable symbol of Antichrist even when – as was the case here – the image did not strictly adhere to biblical descriptions in having either two or seven heads.[156] This Antichrist was thus a halfway-house between accuracy and inventiveness, resonating with biblical depictions, but being infused with connotations from other imagery. We return to Antichrist's protean nature: as the concept had changed, so had its depiction. Not the Papacy alone, Spittlehouse's Antichrist combined Rome, Prelate and Presbyterian,

---

[151] E. H. Gombrich, *The Uses of Images: Studies in the Social Function of Art and Visual Communication* (London, 2000), pp. 163, 166-68 in particular.

[152] Ibid, p. 166. Similarly, in the early modern engravings the good so often soared to heaven and the angels, whilst the bad plummeted to monsters and devils with equal ubiquity.

[153] J. Bale, *The lattre examinacyon of Anne Askewe* (Wessel, 1547). Title-page.

[154] The verse around Askew supports this point. Psalm 116 in which the righteous maintain faith despite the hardships of the world. Bale's commentary stated: "Anne Askew stode fast by thys veyte of God to the ende".

[155] J. Spittlehouse *Rome Ruin'd by Whitehall, or, The Papall Crown Demolisht* (London, 1649). Titlepage. BM Sat. 766.

[156] Cf. *The kingdoms monster vncloaked from heaven* (London, 1643).

with each awarded a head on the frontispiece as a part of evil's inverted Trinity, described sardonically as a "Trentatie in unitie, & unitie in Trentatie", a pun on the Council of Trent.[157] Allusion crashed into allusion, and Spittlehouse's Antichrist was a conglomerate of negative images. The verses proclaimed him devil and Baal, and the tail protruding from the Papal robes amidst the clutter of Catholic paraphernalia at Antichrist's feet revealed him as Cerebus, the canine guardian of hell.[158] The *Pope's Pyramids* verses were equally conglomerative. Its snakes were at once imps, villainous Greek Gods, the Beast of Revelation 13, and Cerastes, the sand serpent which displayed only two harmless-looking horns to entrap its curious prey – tagging this *copia* of imagery onto its primary identification as Antichrist amplified the Papacy's evil.[159] Mingling loosely under the umbrella of 'Antichrist', an exuberance of symbols and analogies co-joined into one ungodly mass, with the weight of which rested firmly upon the Papacy.[160]

Imagery also captured the diffuse essence of the Mystery of Iniquity, a principle of evil coursing through all Catholics. Antichrist commonly possessed a 'brood' of bestial followers, a nest of eggs or hatchlings – "the dragon stretch out their breast, and give suck to their young ones."[161] Iniquity was cancerous or insidious, a poison or infection which needed to be purged or, in John Bastwick's words, "spewed out of the Church."[162] So diffuse as to be figured in the very *smoke* of the Bottomless Pit which blinded the ungodly (Rev 9:2) or the spiritual darkness which descended over the world (Rev 8: 12), for men like Thomas Cartwright Antichrist was a spiritual flood sent by God to punish the reprobate – as in Noah's time only the Elect, sealed

---

[157] Spittlehouse, *Roma Ruin'd* title-page. The accompanying 'Printer to the Spectator' continued the joke.

[158] Image and verse contain references to: Cerebus, the Man of Sin, Baal, the Seven Headed Beast of the Sea, and Babylon.

[159] Ibid: "Like Cerastes, threatening speedy death,/If unawares we come within her breath."

[160] Popular ballads used the same tactic. Satirical family trees of the Papacy took the form of a long list of sin and iniquity which were compiled in little logical order – simply associating a wealth of wickedness with Rome was enough. See *The lineage of locusts or the Popes pedegre* (London, 1641); *The Pedigree of Popery; or, The Genealogie of Antichrist* (London, 1688); *A True and plaine genealogy or pedigree of Antichrist, wherein is cleerly discovered that hee is lineally descend from the divell* (London, 1634).

[161] *The Popes Pyramid*; Rainolds, *The discovery of the man of sinne*, p. 17; Pope, *The unveiling of Antichrist*, p. 12 for eggs and brood. The metaphor throughout this work is of Antichrist as an ever branching tree.

[162] J. Bastwick, *The confession of the faithfull witnesses of Christ, Mr. John Bastwick* (London, 1641), sig. A3. See also Brightman, *The Revelation of S. John illustrated*, sig. A5 where the Mystery is seen to be something belched out of the Pope.

on Mount Sion, would survive.[163] Most ubiquitous, however, were characterizations of the Mystery of Iniquity as a venom which the Pope "hath poured into" his "unnatural children", consuming Catholic hearts.[164] In calling for stricter laws against Catholics, one writer stated that outward conformity merely veiled Roman iniquity: "shake a perfect Papist out of their masking weed of his pretended conformity, and...you finde an hearte devoutly affected to the Roman Religion, as deeply infected with the venom of treason."[165] Imagery amplified Antichrist's insipidity.

Turning to Antichrist's explication in exegesis, we see how important imagery was in driving mystery home. A handful of pages from John Bale's, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe* (1543) are poignant.[166] This was a response to a defence of "Romish" liturgy and doctrine within the English Church by Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London. Beginning with the premise that Bonner was the 'Man of Sin' (2 Thessalonians 2) Bale's allocation of imagery was far from rigid – Antichrist became increasingly diffuse, and what it signified increasingly mysterious.[167] No longer the final Antichrist, Bonner soon became "one shaken from the antichrists nest", one of many "antichrists" serving the Papal Antichrist prophesied in the King of Fierce Countenance (Dan 8.)[168] Contradicting himself again, Bale refuted his characterization of Papacy as Antichrist, including everyone within Bonner's diocese under the mantle. All who partook in "Romish" rites were part of "ther whoreishe mother the churche of a[n]tichrist the strumpet of Babylon, the rose coloured harlott": Antichrist was thus no longer the Papacy, but the entire Roman Church; and was no longer the King of Faces, but Babylon's Whore.[169]

Scripture amplified the scope of Bonner's evil. Prophesying his coming, it stated that the "Man of Sin" would seduce many into following his ways, and in Bale's eyes this was precisely what Bonner had done.[170] The Man of Sin

---

[163] Cartwright, *A plaine explanation of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1622), pp. 45-46; Abbot, *The Danger of popery*, p. 21; Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie*, pp. 69, 77.

[164] *Seven arguments plainly proving that papists are trayterous subjects to all true Christian princes with a touch of Jesuites treacherie* (London, 1641), pp. 4, 6; Abbot, *The Danger of popery*, pp. 21-22, 28; *The Popes Pyramid*, Antichrist "breaths out the venome of a severall sin", and is also termed as an infection; Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation*, p. 79 (a poison or disease); J. Pope, *The unveiling of Antichrist* (London, 1646), p. 25 (a poison in the hearts of its followers); W. Whitaker, *A Disputation of Holy Scripture*, (Parker Society, 35: Cambridge, 1849), pp. 16-17.

[165] *Seven arguments*, p. 6.

[166] Bale, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe.*

[167] Ibid, pp. 1-7, 8-16 in particular.

[168] Ibid, pp. 10, 12.

[169] Ibid, p. 16.

[170] Ibid, pp. 8-10, 13-14; 2 Thess 2: 3-11.

corresponded to the Beast of the Earth (Rev 13.) Like this Beast, Bonner preached perverse error, and the two "prycketes of hys myter" were clearly the Beast's two horns, a point which "manifestly proveth" them to be one and the same.[171] Yet Antichrist resisted being nailed down. Bonner:

> "Be not the whole beast (for that it vniversallye extendeth to all the sp[irit]uall promoters of idolatrye in the popes kyngedome) yet hath a great portion therein."[172]

In one paragraph, the Beast of the Earth shifted from being "a right description of Bonner out of the apocalypse" to all "promoters of idolatrye in the popes kyngedome", that is, all Roman Catholics.[173] The over-arching effect of all this chopping and changing was not that great: Bonner, the Papacy and Roman Church all shared in the disgrace of Antichrist's taint regardless of the shifting application of scriptural imagery to them. But the very malleability of that imagery's allocation showed Antichrist as something diffuse, insidious, and mysterious.

We have a paradox in which mystery and certainty went hand-in-hand. Readers could have little doubt that the Rome was Antichrist, but equally, given the sheer volume of conflicting interpretations of scriptural imagery, they could have little doubt that Antichrist was ever mysterious. The opaque imagery communicated Antichrist's insidious essence – commonly, a given author harnessed a compound of imagery. Edwin Sandys, Archbishop of York, was typical:

> "We have left that man of sin, that rose coloured harlot with whom the kings of the earth have commited fornication, that triple-crowned beast..."[174]

In one sentence, Antichrist was man, whore and Beast as Sandys referred to 2 Thessalonions 2, Revelation 17 and 13 successively. The *meaning* of these texts – that Papacy was Antichrist – was not in question, but the mis-mash of imagery used to assert it confused the picture of the nemesis. Yet this was the power of imagery. That

---

[171] Ibid, p. 13; Rev 13:11-16.
[172] Ibid, p. 13.
[173] Ibid, p. 13, marginalia.
[174] Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 389; Rainolds, *The discovery of the man of sinne*, p. 3 (Man of Sin, Son of Perdition, Whore of Babylon, Dragon.)

God had painted Antichrist in multiple visions was an accepted commonplace which did not smack of contradiction.[175] Image collapsed into image:

> "… Antichrist…Babilon the Great;
>
> Whose magnitude is founded on a Cheat;
>
> Thou Armed Beast, whose Horns no Lesse than Ten,
>
> Whereunto thou ruinest the sons of men:
>
> Thou whom scripture calls a Mystery
>
> (Not Truth, but) of Iniquity
>
> Thou scarlet Whore, thou wicked Man of Sin
>
> Thou think the Judgment never will begin."[176]

This mosaic of monstrosity sanctioned mystery. Considering "the names and titles by which the scripture exhibit[ed] Antichrist" our author concluded that so many images existed because for Antichrist mystery "'is somewhat like a Trade."[177] Its diffuse nature was mirrored in the multiplicity of forms it assumed: confusion was the only fitting way to describe the Mystery of Iniquity, and in detailing it thus God acted a rhetorician.

IV: Boxing Shadows

Yet in painting so powerfully the scope of Antichrist's mystery, and in elaborating so extensively the essence of its insipidity, God had also handed Protestants a concept which was inherently unstable. Antichrist was a de-stabilizing presence.[178] If in the late sixteenth century Antichrist was the 'sheet anchor' of the English Church, it was soon to become the saw that would rend that Church in pieces, becoming increasingly boundless as the period progressed, so malleable as to become almost intangible.

---

[175] Thus in 1621 R.W. confidently claimed in the space of two pages that "the Pope is figured" in Antiochus (Daniel 8) and that the Man of Sin (2 Thessalonians 2) "in every point is verified in the Pope."R. W, *A Looking-Glass For Papists*, pp. 102-03. See also *Oath of Christ*. Here Antichrist is Antiochus (p. 2), the Beast of Daniel 7 and Revelation 13 (p. 3), and a combination of the two Beasts in Revelation 13 (p. 4). Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie*. Papal Antichrist is both Angel of the Bottomless Pit and Seven Headed Beast of Revelation 13 (p. 79) and a combination of the two Beasts in Revelation 13 (pp. 112-21).

[176] *Antichrist unhooded, or, An Explanation of the names and titles by which the scripture exhibits Antichrist to the world* (London, 1664), p. 2 The poem goes on to contradict itself, stating that Babylon is distinct from Antichrist, see p. 4.

[177] Ibid, p. 5 and title.

[178] Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, pp. 112-20.

Despite efforts to plant it safely at Rome, its head continually sprouted up closer to home. Dissatisfaction with the pace of reform after the Religious Settlement caused the English Church to be viewed as a member of the Beast.[179] Structured on a Roman model, much of its liturgy and vestments smacked of being unscripturally 'popish', and the Church's persecution of those who felt it an unsuitable home for the Elect led to the victims viewing it as increasingly Antichristian. Archbishop Whitgift was denounced as the Man of Sin; and later Archbishop Laud was deemed as much Antichrist as the Pope.[180] Laud's downplaying the importance of Rome's identification as Antichrist led to charges of crypto-popery at his trial and accusations that he had plotted to forge a reunion with Rome.[181] Separatists soon saw the entire Church as the Beast, and in the increasingly splintered landscape of the mid-seventeenth century Antichrist became the clarion call of any who felt their consciences persecuted by successive Civil War and Interregnum governments.[182] The failure of Monarchy, Parliament, and Protectorate to grant liberty of conscience caused the state itself to be viewed as the great persecutor – the devil's minder.[183] In the one hundred years since English Protestants first musings on Revelation, Antichrist was in a perpetual state of oscillation. Associations with the Papacy were commonplace, but it resisted being nailed-down in Rome and the view was never dominant or fixed.

Even at the high-point of Elizabethan scholarly assaults, one factor de-stabilized its identity: the place of the Turk.[184] Islam had a great heritage as a centerpiece of Antichristian thought.[185] For Edwardian Reformers viewing Antichrist as essentially two-headed, split between Pope and Mahommet, was commonplace: its

---

[179] See Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 42-57.

[180] H. Barrow, *Writings of Henry Barrow, 1587-1590* (ed.) L. H. Carson (London, 1962), p. 188; W. Laud, *Works*, W. Scott & J. Bliss (Ed.) (London, 1847-60), iv, pp. 308-15; W. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (London, 1644), dedication; W. Prynne, *Lord Bishops none of the Lords Bishops* (London, 1640), sigs. L1-L3 in particular; J. Lilburne, *A Worke of the Beast*, (Amsterdam, 1638), pp. 15-22, 25-29, 32-37 in particular; ibid, *Innocency and Truth Justified* (London, 1646), pp. 13-15; *A charme for Canterburian spirits* (London, 1645), passim; *A disputation betwixt the Devill and the Pope* (London, 1642), passim; *Hell's hurlie-burlie* (London, 1644); *Lambeth faire wherein you have all the bishops trinkets set to sell* (London, 1641), passim.

[181] Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 260-64, 269-81, 548-56 in particular.

[182] See Capp, "The Political Dimension of Apocalyptic Thought", pp. 165-89.

[183] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 157-59, 169-73.

[184] See M. Dimmock, *New Turks* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 16, 50-51, 58-61, 76-80, 143-45 in particular; Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 93-94, 96-98; Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, pp. 112-18.

[185] Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 93-94.

'marks' – idolatry, heresy and savage persecution – fitted both equally.[186] Polemical necessity proved the turning point. As Catholics increasingly used medieval identifications of Turk as Antichrist to de-throne Reformed locations of it in the Papacy, Protestants dismissed their earlier views - [187] John Jewel labelled its identification with the Turk a myth.[188] This shift involved a renewed stress on 2 Thessalonians 2's claim that Antichrist would emerge from within the Church – he must consequently be born in Israel, not Babylon, a Christian, not a Turk – and would not be an open opponent or denier of Christ, but would mask his nature in a show of feigned holiness (like Rome.)

But the Turk could not be thrown off entirely. If, as Protestants claimed, Revelation was a Divine guide to the Last Days unfolding before their eyes, the harrowing advances made by the Turkish Empire into Christendom since Constantinople's fall in 1453 would surely be mentioned. Many assigned Gog and Magog (Rev 20) to these events, depicting the Turk as Antichrist's final persecuting instrument. Others, however, were less clear of its relationship to the Papacy, vaguely describing the Turk as the Pope's 'brother' or kin, and its position remained a de-stabilizing presence in Reformation attempts to locate Antichrist solely within Rome.[189] Foxe typified the tension.[190] Throughout his great tome Foxe painted the battle of True Church and False in the continual persecution of Protestants by Rome – logically, then, the Papacy was Antichrist. He undercut his efforts, however, by failing to resolve the relationship of Turk and Pope to Antichrist, assigning various apocalyptic images to each.[191] Interrupting his account of the Papacy's rise as Antichrist with a description of the Turkish threat, Foxe recounted the cruelty inflicted by it upon Christians in the previous century. Vacillating between labelling Turk or Pope the final Antichrist, Foxe masked his indecision by declaring that they, along with the heathen Emperors of antiquity, formed the three "principal enemies" of

---

[186] Ibid, pp. 50-51; MacCulloch, *Tudor Church Militant*, p. 26. Bullinger, *A Commentary*, see in particular sigs. Cii-Ciii. Biv-Bviii, Cii-Ciii, Dvi-Dviii, Eii-Eviii.
[187] Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 96-99; Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, p. 95.
[188] Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, p. 96.
[189] H. Bullinger, *A hundred Sermons* (London, 1561), pp. 269-71, 281-84; Gifford, *Revelation*, pp. 172-78; Sandys, *Sermons*, p. 346; the annotation to Rev 9:14 in the 1560 edition of the Geneva Bible; Dent, *The ruine of Rome*, pp. 104-20.
[190] Dimmock, *New Turks*, pp. 50-51, 75-80.
[191] J. Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (London, 1566), pp. 93-123. The Turk depicted in Daniel 2, 2 Thess 2, the sixth vile and trumpet of Revelation, and Gog and Magog.

317

Christendom.[192] What followed was an apocalyptic cop-out. Asking who Antichrist was, Foxe dodged his own question. Stating that it was no "light matter " and adding "neither is it my part here to discerne, which do but merely write the history, and the actes of them both", he left the readers to decide which of these 'acts' best marked Antichrist.[193]

Foxe continued to muddle the issue.[194] Similarly, other Elizabethan scholars struggled to wrestle the Turk into a Revelationary schema without diminishing the force behind Papal Antichrist. Dormant and unresolved, Islam remained a thorn pricking the side of polemical attempts to paint Revelation's images Anti-Catholic, a tension which allowed Papal Antichrist to be undermined from *within* the English Church.[195] The doctrine became a casualty of factional wars at the centre of the Jacobean Church between the 'hotter sort' and the ascendant 'anti-Calvinists' centered round Laud.[196] Viewing radical Anti-Popery as indolent, 'anti-Calvinists' downplayed Antichrist's centrality to the Church's identity, and used the Turk as a stumbling block with which to stall it. Richard Montagu's controversial *New Gagg* (1624) cast doubt upon the consensus.[197] Stressing the difficulty of forming concrete interpretations of Revelation's obscure imagery, he highlighted gaps in Protestant understanding, stating that some divines thought Antichrist an individual man, not the Papal institution, views corresponding with many Church Fathers. He then played his Turkish trump card, asserting that Islam better fitted scripture's descriptions than the Papacy.[198] This was far from Edwardian views of Antichrist being equally Turk and Pope – indeed, Montagu used the Turk to *downplay* Antichrist's association with Rome, the Papacy was *an* antichrist, the Turk the final nemesis. Despite the accusations of crypto-Papistry which Montagu was subject to, other men soon followed his lead with more stringent denials of the Papal Antichrist.[199] Employing Rome's defences on the issue, Peter Heylyn stated that Antichrist would not emulate Christ – as the Protestants charged the Papacy – but oppose him. On these grounds,

---

[192] J. Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, 2 volumes, (London, 1570), pp. 709-51.

[193] Ibid, p. 749.

[194] J. Foxe, *A Sermon of Christ crucified* (London, 1570), sigs. T2-T4.

[195] I would argue that Anthony Milton fails to stress this point adequately – the issue of the Turk did not re-appear in the 1620s, it had simply never been resolved and remained a chink in the Protestants armour even at the high point of polemical onslaught against Antichrist.

[196] Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, pp. 112-20.

[197] R. Montagu, *New Gagg* (London, 1624), pp. 73-76, 289-90.

[198] Ibid, pp. 73-76, in particular.

[199] For backlash against those who argued that the Turk better fitted Antichrist, see Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, pp. 116-19.

the Turk better fitted the charge than the Papacy by denying Christ to be the son of God, as 1 John 2 proclaimed Antichrist would.[200] Most controversially, by placing Antichrist's arrival firmly in the future, Robert Shelford undercut the 'Martyr Church' identity essential to the English Church – even when it did emerge, Shelford argued, Revelation's images prophesied Antichrist's coming from Islam, not Rome.[201] Even at the English Church's centre, then, Antichrist was not fixed. The Turk proved the loose thread which unraveled the whole Protestant design of Papal activity in history. It is curiously ironic that a tradition which had depicted the Papal Antichrist's attempts to undermine Christ by raging within His Church was itself undermined by the unresolved position of the Turkish Antichrist within Protestant thought.

Attitudes to Revelation, then, were ever-changing. Scholars were well aware of gaps in their understanding. John Selden doubted man's ability to extract precise predictions from Revelation's images, and even vehement Anti-Papalists like William Fulke and Thomas Taylor argued against exact readings of some passages.[202] Confusion's root lay in the Reformers' inheritance of conflicting and competing interpretations of Antichrist's nature. The foundations on which they built were far from even. The Church Fathers bequeathed a plethora of interpretations to subsequent generations, views which splintered further during the Middle Ages. At the Reformation's dawn little consensus existed as to when Antichrist would come and whether it would be a single person or a multitude, a confusion which grew out of 1 John 2, where the relationship between final Antichrist and multiple antichrists was imprecise.[203] The upshot of this unstable heritage was that Protestant views of Antichrist as a collective were counterbalanced by competing interpretations of it as an individual. During the Middle Ages, official scholarship blended with folklore to form the 'Antichrist Legend', first set down in Adso's *Libellus de Antichristo* during the late tenth century.[204] This placed Antichrist's coming in the future, and prophesied that his life would be a demonic parody of the incarnation.[205] Catholic polemicists employed this interpretative tradition to rebut Protestant identification of Antichrist in

---

[200] P. Heylyn, *A Briefe and Moderate Answer* (London, 1637), pp. 127-29.
[201] R. Shelford, *Five Pious and learned discourses* (London, 1635), pp. 281-85, 290-97.
[202] Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 96; T. Taylor, *Christ's Victorie over the Dragon* (London, 1633), p. 790-91; ibid, *The Principles of Christian Practice* (London, 1635), pp. 249-50; R. B, *A Key of knowledge for the opening of the secret mysteries of St. Johns mystical Revelation* (London, 1617), sigs C7-8, pp. 90-91.
[203] See above, note 1266.
[204] Ibid, p. 19.
[205] See Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk*, pp. 140-42; Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 91-93.

the Papacy: whilst for Protestants Antichrist had reigned in the Papacy since Constantine ended Christian persecution, Catholics argued that he would be one man and reign at Babylon, not Rome; and whilst Protestants argued that the Pope emulated Christ to conceal his wickedness, Catholics asserted that Antichrist would openly denounce the Lord.[206]

The Protestant-Roman dispute, then, was simply another manifestation of a perennial interpretative battle between Antichrist as individual and collective. Early thinkers like Pelagius and Ambrossier viewed Antichrist as an historical person, whilst later scholars like Origen imagined it as a spiritual entity.[207] This later view gained prominence during the Middle Ages due to Tyconius's *Liber Regularum* (c. 382)[208] which posited that Revelation's images applied not to historical personages or a series of specific events but to universal principles present throughout the ages – Babylon's battle with Jerusalem symbolizing the ceaseless struggle between Good and Evil, Church and world, throughout time. Following Augustine's *Two Cities*, for Tyconius history was an endless war between True Church and False. A slippage was present in these terms: the 'False Church' could be specifically embodied in a social form – a visible Church – or an aggregate of the totality of the damned in history – the invisible Church. Although membership of the invisible False Church was ultimately known only to God, it could be discerned in *any* opposition to Christ and His followers in this world. Antichrist was thus not restricted to an historical actor. It was more diffuse, a timeless spiritual principle of opposition to Christ present in *all* sinners from Cain until the Last Days – every persecutor of the Elect was simply another of its manifestations.[209]

The Tyconian tradition proved hugely influential on early English Protestant thought. Because the concept of False Church related to an invisible Church – a body of the damned – not a visible one, the relationship of 'False Church' to 'Roman Church' was not hard-and-fast. Antichrist was not fenced into the Papal pen – undoubtedly the worst historical manifestation of Antichrist's spirit, the Papacy remained *one* form only.[210] The Tyconian position was expressed most dramatically in John Bale's *The Image of Bothe Churches*, the first extensive commentary on

---

[206] Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, p. 93.
[207] Ibid, p. 18.
[208] This influenced Bede in the eigth century, and Hamo of Habeto and Walafrid Strabo in the ninth, amongst others.
[209] Ibid, pp. 18-19, 54-59.
[210] Ibid, pp. 60-69.

Revelation in English and one endorsed by the Edwardian government.[211] For Tyconius, the whole company of the Elect, Christ's mystical body, was figured in the Woman Clothed in the Sun (Rev 12) - conversely, her eternal enemy, the Whore of Babylon, symbolized the entire Reprobate, the mystical body of Satan. For Bale Revelation's figures similarly painted with broad brush strokes, and represented the entire company of the wicked in history. Thus the Beast of Revelation 13 embodied "so well Mahomette as the Pope, so well the raging tyrant as the still hypocrite, and all that wicked worketh are of the same body".[212] Antichrist as an aggregate of wickedness was equally posited by John Frith in 1529, seeing the image of Antichrist in Daniel 8 – 'the king of fierce countence' – as symbolic of all evil: "Antichriste shuld meanynde the hole bodie and multitude of wicked me[n] with all their succession and imperye'".[213] The Papacy was *a* manifestation of Antichrist's wickedness. Its persecution of Christians demonstrated its standing with Satan in history, that it was *an* embodiment of the great company of the reprobate, *a* part of the False Church, but not its *exclusive* member. Revelations did not apply to it solely and directly.

For Bale, all men stood after Cain or Abel at the entrance of the two Churches – Jerusalem or Babylon.[214] The second Beast of Revelation 13 – applied exclusively to the Papacy in later works – thus represented:

"From the wordless beginnyge hath this beast risen in Cayn the first murtherer, in the fleshye children of men, in Chem the shameless child of Noe, in Ismael and Esau, in Jannet and Jambres, in Balaham and Baall prophets, in the Benjamites and Bels Chapalynes, in Phosa and Seres, in Judas, Anno and Cyus, in Barichu and Diotcephes. And now sense this tyme most all in Mahomets doctors and the Pope's quersters."[215]

---

[211] J. Bale, *The image of bothe churches* (London, 1548). There were subsequent editions in 1550 (STC 1298 & 1299) and 1570 (STC 1301.)

[212] Bale, *The image*, sig. g.vi. See also sigs. f.vii (Antichrist as the company of the wicked throughout history), i.iii (the bestial body of Satan), and i.vii.

[213] Frith, *A pistle to the Cristen reader. The revelation of Antichrist*, sigs. Bvi-vii. A translation of Luther's *Die Antichristie*.

[214] Bale, *The image*, sig. Aii.

[215] Bale, *The image*, sig. i.i. See also sigs e. I, k. vii, r.vi, Ll.ii, Rr.viii.

Antichrist was a spiritual force manifested in the evil men of history – spectacular instances of a universal principle. Antichrist was Papacy and Turk without contradiction, the Beast from the Bottomless Pit (Rev 11) symmbolizing: "the cruel, craftye and cursed generation of Antichrist, the Pope with his bishoppes, prelates, priests and religion in Europe, Mahomete with his dotterynge disciples in Africa and so forth in Asia and India."[216] A spirit of opposition to Christ, for Bale Antichrist had many forms, and had previously been manifested in the Henrician Bishops who had resisted reform and persecuted the Elect.[217] Holding sway amongst the early English Reformers, the Tyconnian view was prevalent in the works of Tyndale, John Old, John Philpot, Becon, and Ridley.[218] For John Hooper Antichrist was a 'property', a spiritual essence.[219] Just as Christ governed His Church spiritually by binding His members in the Word, so Antichrist was spiritually present in its members, reigning "in the conscience above the law of God." Antichrist was a force, a spirit not to be found "in one person, as the dream hitherto has been, but in multitudes".[220] At this stage Reformation thought did not connect Antichrist to specific historical institutions, persons or place.

But as the sixteenth century progressed, Antichrist became smaller and more manageable. Whilst never an individual, later exegesis understood Antichrist to be an historically specific entity rather than an abstract spiritual force, replacing the Tyconion conception with a one-to-one correlation between Revelations' images and Papal history: no longer *an* instance of Antichrist, Rome was *the* Antichrist, the Beast's entire bound and scope, and countless divines saw Revelation's images as a prophecy of the Papacy's rise and imminent Fall, charting Church history in the progress of John's visions.[221] This position had become a necessity for Protestants, the hard graft of polemical sparring with Rome boiling Antichrist down to its fighting weight. Indeed, it was precisely Bale's characterization of Antichrist as a body of the wicked that Catholics used to downplay Protestant attempts to identify it with Rome –

---

[216] Ibid, sig. b. vii.

[217] See for example, J. Bale, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe* (Antwerp, 1543), passim. This was written against Bishop Edmund Bonner. Ibid, *The epistle exhoratorye of an Enlyshe Christine.*

[218] J. Old, *A short description of Antichrist vnto the nobilitie of Englande*(Emden, 1555), fol. 7; J. Philpot, *The Examinations and Writings* (Parker Society, 5: Cambridge, 1842), pp. 105-06; Hooper, *Early Writings*, pp. 23-24.

[219] Hooper, *Early Writings*, pp. 23-24. Anitchrist was a spiritual presence which "reigneth in the conscience above the law of God."

[220] Becon, *Prayers & Other Pieces of Thomas Becon*, p. 503.

[221] Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 99.

the Protestants' own view that Antichrist was as much Turk and historical tyrants rebounded against their intended demonization of the Papacy. Consequently, divines routinely refuted notions of Antichrist as a spiritual principle before stressing the exclusive application of Revelations' images to Rome.[222] Richard Bauckham and Anthony Milton have shown that, in official writing at least, this rigid identification of Papacy as Antichrist held sway at the high-watermark of apocalyptic activity in the English Church during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[223]

But they have tidied up the past a little too neatly. In reality, the idea of Antichrist as an historical entity continued to compete and mingle with the Tyconian conception, just as it had in centuries of scholarship. The Beast did not want to stay at Rome, and the picture of Antichrist's relation to the Papacy remained confused.[224] In seeking to answer: "who is the first borne of Satan, in whom dwelleth the fullness of wickednesse?" John Rainolds pointed, with some confidence, to the Papacy:

"What state this is, which commeth nearest unto this description, whereunto the properties of Antichrist here set down do most properly belong...so farre as I can judge the Bishop of Rome with that state is he. And hereby I meane not the Bishop alone, but the whole government: not the head only, but the whole body, armes and leggs."[225]

Yet he was quick to display ambivalence. The Papacy was not solely Antichrist: "Neither mean I, that always the Pope is the great...enemy & wicked one, but that sometimes some that are under him are the special instrument...in the kyngedome of wickedness."[226] Antichrist's presence in multitudes, in any opponent to Christ, was excepted: "For who so breaketh the unity of the Church by schism or heresy is such a one."[227] The diffuse continued as an unresolved presence in the modified account, and the grip of the idea that Antichrist resided exclusively in the Papacy was not as tight as presumed. Even as vehement an Anti-Papalist as William Fulke conceded that

---

[222] Beard, *Antichrist the Pope of Rome*, pp. 2-3; G. Downame, *A treatise concering antichrist* (London, 1603), p. 8; W. Fulke, *A Rejoynder to Bristow* (London, 1581), p. 122.

[223] Bauckham, *Tudor Apocalypse*, pp. 97-100; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 104-05.

[224] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 14-15. During hostilities with the Habsburgs in the late sixteenth century, Spain was posited to be as much Antichrist as was Rome.

[225] Rainolds, *The discovery of the man of sinne*, pp. 7-8.

[226] Ibid, p. 9.

[227] Ibid, p. 7; See also the note to 2 Thess. 2:3 in the *Geneva Bible* (1560) in which the Man of Sin is not the Papacy alone but "the whole succession of persecutors of the Church."

"there are more Antichrists than the Pope, although he be the chiefe that siteth in the temple of God."[228]

The continued vibrancy of concepts of Antichrist as a spiritual essence was destabilizing, allowing the Beast to rebound against the English Church. Just as firm Tyconians like Tyndale and Bale saw Antichrist manifested in England's Bishops, Church courts, and non-scriptural apparel, so a generation later the 'hotter sort' saw it manifested closer to home than Rome.[229] The metaphor of 'mystical body' – so prominent to Tyconion understanding – remained ever-present in English thought during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. In ending Papal dominion the Royal Supremacy had severed Antichrist's head, but its body remained in the structure of England's Church: Bishops were "limbs" of Antichrist, its "toes" or, the "tail" which connected England to Rome.[230] In his *A viewe of Antichrist his law and ceremony in our English Church unreformed* (1570) Anthony Gilby noted one hundred points of popery still present in England.[231] The Genevan bible similarly detected Antichrist in ordinances;[232] for Cartwright it was in the use of the Cross during baptism;[233] and the *First Admonition to Parliament* saw Antichrist in the cap, gown and tippet of the vestments.[234] Parts of the Church were vessels of Antichrist. Indeed, in his Anti-Puritan *Dangerous Positions* (1593) Richard Bancroft

---

[228] See the frontispiece to Philips van Marnix, *The bee hive of the Romishe Church* (London, 1579); BM Sat. 12; Fulke, *A Rejoynder to Bristow*, p. 343.

[229] W. Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises* (Parker Society, 32: London, 1848), pp. 41-4, 232-52; Bale, *The epistle exhoratorye of an Enlyshe Christine*; and against Bonner specifically, ibid, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe* (Antwerp, 1543). See also Hooper's comments in H. Robinson (ed.), *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation* (Parker Society, 26: London, 1846), pp. 80-81. For Antichrist during the Civil War, see Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*, pp. 41-78, 83-97 in particular.

[230] W. Whitgift, *Works* (Parker Society, 40: London, 1851-53), iii, pp. 458-69; *A Scholasticall Discourse against Symbolizing with Antichrist in Ceremonies* (London, 1607), pp. 134-7; J. Strype, *Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion*, 7 volumes (Oxford, 1824), III, i, p. 178; H. Clapham, *Errour on the Right Hand* (London, 1608), pp. 1-3. Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth Century England*, p. 43; *The Works of Mr. John Cleveland* (1687), pp. 213, 363; H. Burton, *The Protestant Protested* (London, 1641), sig. B2; ibid, *Babel no Bethel* (London, 1629), sig. xx4, xxx2; ibid, *The Sounding of the Two Last Trumpets* (London, 1641).

[231] A. Gilby, *A viewe of Antichrist his law and ceremony in our English Church unreformed* (London, 1570).

[232] See the notes to Revelation 13: 12, 16-18.

[233] Strype, *Annals*, I, i, p. 176-77; G. Gillespie, *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies* (Leiden, 1637), III, p. 43.

[234] W. H. Frere & C. H. Douglas (eds.), *Puritan Manifestoes* (London, 1607), pp 12-14, 17-20, 32-35, 37-39.

demonstrated that the 'hotter sort' viewed the entire structure of the Church as Antichristian.[235]

The spirit continued to find fresh hosts, its presence becoming evermore widespread and diffuse – in 1652 Nathaniel Homes claimed that Antichrist incarnate was far more than Papacy and Episcopate.[236] For Milton the Presbyterian government was Antichrist with a new face – Protestants believed the Pope Antichrist because he constrained their conscience, and Presbyterian compulsory Church attendance was consequently another form of 'popish' spiritual tyranny.[237] Similarly, in 1646 one defender of Parilament, James Pope, saw Antichrist's spirit in any who constrained another's conscience: the desire to persecute was "from the dark spirit of Antichrist and not from the spirit of love, and light, which is from Jesus Christ."[238] In this vein Henry Denne, a New Model Army preacher, commented that earlier attempts to limit Antichrist to the Papacy were misguided: "to tie the name of Antichrist to a particular man or to any particular succession of men, is to confine him to too narrow a bound."[239] Following the Tyconian view, Denne noted that Antichrist worked through the Mystery of Iniquity, a spirit of opposition to Christ and England was consequently as full of its members as Rome.[240] As mounting numbers of sects felt their consciences persecuted every successive Civil War government was identified with the Beast.[241] More than a scurrilous slinging of insults, Antichrist downgraded to partake in a verbal slanging match, this incessant malleability resulted from continued Baleite understanding of Antichrist as a spirit of opposition to Christ repeatedly manifesting itself in difference forms.[242] As William Hickman noted whilst

---

[235] R. Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions* (London, 1593), pp. 46-48. See also A. M. Charles (Ed.), *The Shorter Poems of Ralph Knevet* (Ohio, 1966), p. 334. Quoted in Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 76. See also H. Burton, *Englands Bondage and Hope of Deliverance* (London, 1641), pp. 24-25.

[236] N. Homes, *Works* (London, 1652), pp. 607-08.

[237] See Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 94.

[238] Pope, *The unveiling of Antichrist*, pp. 11, 18. For a similar example, see *The Camp of Christ, and the camp of Antichrist, all troopers after the Lambe* (London, 1642), p. 4

[239] H. Denne, *Antichrist unmasked in Two Treatises* (London, 1646), p. 15. Denne described the spiritual conception of Antichrist: "I will no deny but that the Pope is a principall member of Antichrist, of the Man of Sinne, the head if you please. But I do believe the Pope and Antichrist to differ, as the part, and the whole, as the head, and the body: And I conceive the great Antichrist, to be that mysticall body of iniquity, which opposeth Christ, Antichrist is as much as to say, against Christ." This is the same view as Bale a century earlier.

[240] Ibid, pp. 15-19.

[241] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 126-29 in particular.

[242] Ibid, pp. 44-45, 85-86, 91, 122, and 78-79 in particular.

lampooning the 'Antichristian' congregational ministry during November 1650: "Antichrist is putting himself into another form...".[243]

Antichrist, then, was ever-changing. Shifting almost perpetually over the course of the century, at several points multiple bodies simultaneously vied for the mantle. We have argued that this was the result of the Reformers' inheriting conflicting understandings of Antichrist's nature. It could be restricted to an historically contingent body, or be a timeless spirit of opposition to Christ, a notion which allowed Antichrist to morph in reaction to political events – each new persecutor was merely another host body of the virus – and which awarded this concept, so integral to Protestant identity, an inherent instability, causing it to destabilize and rupture the Church. The pnenumbra of vagueness, then, had made for success – Antichrist may have been as protean as a rope of sand, but was made all the stronger for it. The imprecision of Revelation's imagery made it a powerful polemical tool, allowing multiple interpretations to be rested upon it and providing a buffer between the author and object of their attack – one did not attack bishops, King or government, but the 'Beast'. From Tyndale's levelling episcopacy alongside Papacy, through the Genevan Bible's damnation of elements of the English Church alongside Rome, Antichrist's image was an effective scapegoat with which to rally support. As Christopher Hill noted: "like sin, everyone was against him."[244] Like Popery itself, Antichrist became part of a language of opposition, endemic in political rhetoric. A pictograph of evil with which to taint one's opponents by association, it was powerful way of discrediting one's enemy as demonically 'other.'

Such a malleability was not an intellectual contradiction-in-terms. Antichrist may have been in the eye of the beholder, but all beholders were agreed on its most defining feature – mystery. Seeking to remain unknown, Antichrist practised by deceit and disguise. At a philological level 'Babylon' meant confusion and its Whore had

---

[243] J. Nickolls, *Original Letters and papers of State, addressed to Oliver Cromwell* (London, 1743), p. 30. Quoted in Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 126 The continual presence of this spiritual understanding of Antichrist found its culmination in the thought of the Quakers – for them, the 'Man of Sin' was the aggregate of *all* sin in the world, and consequently Antichrist was a presence in every man until revealed by the awakened light of Christ. For the Quaker view, see F. E, *Christian information concerning these last times*, pp. 3-4; J. Michael,, *The spouse rejoicing over antichrist, and triumphing over he devil, in the day of the lord, when God alone shal bee exalted* (London, 1654); J. Naylor, *The power and glory of the Lord shining out of the North* (London, 1653), pp. 2, 4, 8, 12-13; R. F, *A brief discovery of the kingdome of Antichrist* (London, 1653), pp. 2-5 especially.
[244] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 45.

'mystery' emblazoned on her forehead (Rev 17:5).[245] Taking stock of the assortment of Antichrisrian identifications bandied around, one post-Restoration ballad – *Antichrist Unhooded* – noted the fruitlessness of attempting to isolate its boundaries. Mocking the confidence of all parties, the ascerbicity with which their 'discoveries' were asserted had left Antichrist in danger of passing from the sublime to the ridiculous:

> "Antichrists' Church mysterious was of old;
>
> 'Tis still a Doubt his doctors can't unfold:
>
> Some say the Pope, with Cardinals say others
>
> Who are the Conclave, and conjunct as brothers:
>
> Some say the Counsel if ever sulie she,
>
> Others the Church total it must be
>
> The Church institutional another sayes?
>
> The Roman Catholic will swear he lies
>
> Well shot of all, yet all mark do miss
>
> To seek it any where, but where it is:
>
> And till the Church is known, he's very quick
>
> That can tell who is the true schismatick."[246]

Coy in giving his own thoughts about Antichrist's parameters, our author alluded to Rome, the English Church, the Ranters and Anabaptists in turn.[247] All were united by the practice of mystery:

> "And like her self, in Mystery she is drest
>
> (A fashion of a general request,
>
> With all the kindred of the Roman Whore,
>
> By which you'll know them if I say no more.")[248]

---

[245] Shell, *Catholicism*, p. 24; Occhino, *A Tragedie*, sig, Uiv.

[246] *Antichrist unhooded, or, An Explanation of the names and titles by which the scripture exhibits Antichrist to the world* (London, 1664), p. 7.

[247] Ibid, pp. 2, 4, 8.

[248] Ibid, p. 7. See also, p. 5 in particular.

Antichrist had been 'unhooded' but no face was revealed. What linked these manifestations was the practice of deception – the dress of mystery – deluding followers to accept an outward display of piety as the true faith.

Authors of exegesis walked a tightrope, balancing awareness that Revelation might never be fully disclosed in their lifetimes with a dogmatic awareness that Antichrist was manifested in their chosen target. As something inherently confused and mysterious, unlocking Revelation was a continual and involved process.[249] It was commonplace for authors to admit that the apocalypse had not been fully understood: as Thomas Brightman recognized in an apology for his own weighty addition to the required reading, "it is a matter with one constant acknowledgment that the Revelation itself doth still require a necessary revelation" remaining the "most serious and solemn secret in the Bible, and continues these great mysteries that the very angels inquire after."[250] The key was deception.[251] Scripture had figured Antichrist in images associated with cunning and deceit – a beast disguised as a lamb, a whore holding a cup of enchantments.[252] The very term *Anti*-Christ implied disguise. In Greek *anti* did not mean opposed or against but rather pseudo or pretended – the Papacy did not openly oppose Christ, but rather fraudulently assumed His powers by claiming to hold the keys of Heaven and Hell.[253] Fooling men to follow these heretical ways relied upon disguise – what Cranmer called the "devil's sophistry."[254] For Thomas Becon this was pivotal, for if Antichrist's followers came:

---

[249] Proud proclamations that Antichrist had been "unhooded", "unfolded", "unveiled" or "stript-naked out of all his scripture attire by which he hath deceived the Christian world" were thus not illogical when one considered the terms of the problem. *Antichrist unhooded, or, An Explanation of the names and titles by which the scripture exhibits Antichrist to the world* (London, 1664); J. Pope, *The unveiling of Antichrist* (London, 1646); W. Ramsay, *Maromah, the Lord of Rome the Antichrist, finally and fully discovered his name the number of his name* (London, 1680), the subtitle claims that Antichrist has been "finally and fully discovered his name and the number o his name"; T. L, *Babilon is fallen* (London, 1620 – original 1595), titlepage

[250] Brightman, *The Revelation of S. John illustrated*, sig. A2. See also Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie*, p. 3; *Oath of Christ and the age of Antichrist, or, Daniels diurnall* (London, 1641), p. 1.

[251] Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie*, p. 1; F. E, *Christian information*, p. 3.

[252] Cowper, *Works*, p. 1057.

[253] I. P, *Romes Ruin* (London, 1629), p. 51.

[254] Cranmer, *Writings & Disputations*, p. 380. Cf. pp. 49-55; For other claims that the Antichrist works by deceit, see J. Bale, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe*, pp. 5, 21 in particular; Becon, *Prayers & Other Pieces*, pp. 501-03; Becon, *The Reliques of Rome*, preface; Bullinger, *A Commentary*, sigs. Biv-Bv; M. Coverdale, *Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter* (Ed.) G Pearson, (Parker Society, 2: Cambridge, 1846), pp. 5, 8; Frith, *A pistle to the Cristen reader*, sigs. Bi-Cv, Cvii-Diii, Ev-Fv, Fvi-Fviii, Hvi-Ivii; Fulke, *Fulke's answers*, p. 216; Hooper, *Early Writings*, p. 325; Gybson, *The sum of the actes & decrees made by dyvers byshopes of Rome*, p. 1; Hooper, *Later Writings of John Hooper*, pp. 44-45, 551-556, 559-563; Jewel, *Works*, ii, pp. 909-13, 922-24; iv, pp. 689, 743, 847; H. Latimer, *Hugh, Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555* George Elwes Corrie (ed), (Parker Society: 23, Cambridge, 1845), pp. 306-7; H. Latimer, *Sermons of Hugh*

"In their own...wolfish apparel, openly defying God, manifestly denying Christ.....and deriding or laughing to scorn the mysteries of Christ's religion; so could they never be received, but rather rejected as extreme enemies of God and of all godliness..."[255]

Antichrist was not an enemy one *saw*, but rather which one saw *through*. Like Satan, who "seldom sheweth his horns, but rather changeth himself into an angel of light", Antichrist veiled itself in a pretence of godliness caricatured by Jewel:[256]

"Antichrist shall [not] come as a robber by the high-ways...or like a tyrant that burneth our houses...or destroyeth our fields, or pulleth down all that is before him. We may not look that he should say, I am antichrist, I am the man of sin, I am the son of perdition, I am the adversary, and am contrary to Christ. He shall not shew forth himself in such a sort..... He is subtle and cunning: he shall deceive the learned and the wise: he shall cast himself into a colour of holiness: he shall fast, he shall pray, he shall gives alms and shew mercy: he shall walk as if he were a disciple of Christ....and the world shall follow him...His life, his religion, his doctrine, shall be close and hid and secret. Antichrist works in mystery."[257]

Antichrist's "outward glittering pomp" of counterfeit piety deceived the eye, seemlessly mingling falsehood with truth "so closely that it shall hardly be espied."[258]

Latimer, sometime Bishop of Worcester, Marytr, 1555, George Elwes Corrie (ed), (Parker Society: 22, Cambridge, 1844), pp. 66-77, 205-08, 314-15; I. P, *Romes Ruin* (London, 1629), pp. 33-5; Ochino, *A tragoedie,* sigs. Bii-Biv, Ci-Cii, Div-Eiv; Ridley, *Works,* pp. 50, 59-60, 62, 114-16, 150, 401; Sandys, *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys,* pp. 130, 389.

[255] Becon, *Prayers & Other Pieces,* p. 501.

[256] Jewel, *The Works of John Jewel,* ii, p. 909.

[257] Jewel, *Works,* ii, p. 909. See also R. Abbot, *The Danger of popery* (London, 1625), p. 21: "if a Traytor carry the colurs of a Prince in warre, all the common souldiers doe flock unto him, guard him, & fight under his Banner, till the Traitor be knowne and the Treason be discovered." W. Whitaker, *A Disputation of Holy Scripture,* (Parker Society, 35: Cambridge, 1849), pp. 20-21.

[258] Jewel, *Works,* iv, p. 847. The notion of a cloak also occurred earlier, in Bradford, *The hurte of hering masse,* sig. Bviii; Carlson, & Peel (Eds.), *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne,* pp. 244, 250, 252. This intertwined nature of Christ and Antichrist was a frequent concern of the Reformers. See, Becon, *Prayers & Other Pieces,* pp. 501-03 for a summary and the first 122 comparisons for more detail; Frith, *A pistle to the Cristen reader,* sigs. Bviii-Ciii in particular; Hooper, *Early Writings,* p. 325; Hooper, *Later Writings,* p. 910-13. Jewel used the parable of Matthew 13 to illustrate the problem: one man sowed seeds during the day, but at night his enemy sowed tares in the same field. Both grew together, and because they looked alike "and had both one like colour" could not

2 Thessalonians 2 prophesied that Antichrist would practise lying wonders and false miracles, associated by Protestants with the fraudulent 'miracles' of Papal relics, and the Mass, deceits which existed to "abuse the creulous" who "swallowed [them] up without examination".[259] The beauty of Rome's ceremonious liturgy - "gorgeous show....beautiful to behold, but ful of uncleanliness" – fooled men to accept it as holy.[260] Beauty disguised, and the carnally-minded saw only "souls fixt in a heavenly sphere" which masked "ther earthy, dirty dealing."[261] One had to see *beyond* the image Antichrist presented to the world – mystery had to be revealed, deceit removed.

To do so relied upon a way of seeing privy only to the Elect who "cleerely perceive the concourse and reign of God his will, dispensation and reioce in the assured expectation of such events."[262] To console the Elect God hid the Truth of history in Revelation's opaque images – a coded message to the persecuted which remained closed to their persecutors.[263] It was only they who saw Antichrist for what it was, they who had seen through Rome's show of religion to the corruption at its heart. This edifying entitlement to penetrative sight was appropriated by each subsequent Protestant sect against their persecutors. Thus for a Quaker writing in 1654, peeling away Antichrist's mystery was equally dependent upon Election:

> "And the people cannot see
>
> 'Tis darkness to them and a mystery,
>
> The mystery that you shall know
>
> The light of God will truly show
>
> And the people they shall see."[264]

Seeing Antichrist relied upon de-mystification, unmasking deception to see the fraud beneath. Representing Antichrist in engravings and upon the stage aped this de-

---

be separated until the harvest. In the same way, the churches of Christ and Antichrist could only be separated at the final harvest, Judgement Day; Jewel, *Works*, iv, p. 910.

[259] Abbot, *The Danger of popery*, pp. 12-13, see also p. 2; *The fierie tryall of Gods saints as a counter-poyze to I. W. priest his English Martyrologie and he Detestable ends of Popish Traytors* (London, 1611), sig. B2; *Oath of Christ and the age of Antichrist*, p. 5; Naylor, *The power and glory*, p. 21; Rainolds, *The discovery*, p. 21; Cowper, *Works*, p. 1057.

[260] T. Cartwright, *A plaine explanation of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1622), p. 105.

[261] *Antichrist unhooded*, p. 5; Brightman, *The Revelation of S. John*, sig A5.

[262] Forbes, *An exquisite commentarie*, p. 1.

[263] *The Camp of Christ, and the camp of Antichrist, all troopers after the Lambe* (London, 1642), p. 2; Ramsay, *Maromah, the Lord of Rome the Antichrist*, pp. 6-7.

[264] J. Michael, *The spouse rejoicing over antichrist, and triumphing over he devil, in the day of the lord, when God alone shal bee exalted* (London, 1654), pp. 18-19.

mystification, forcing viewers to see beyond what was before their eyes. This was a subtle interpretative act of sight in which the Papacy was a sign marking or pointing to a scriptural image of Antichrist. To recognize this was to experience edification, to share in the glory of Antichrist's Revelation and downfall – sight remained a vibrant sense for Protestants, a tangible facet of their existence outside the False Church looking in: "antichrist.....is so openly known to all men that are not blinded with the smoke of Rome, that they know him to be the beast..."[265]

V: A Living Image – Deception on the Stage

"The wise see further, then with eyes" proclaimed *The arch-cheate* (1644) – to disclose the Mystery of Iniquity one must *look* rather than simply *see*, to search *beyond* or *through* the events of this world and discover the forces driving them [Fig. 281.][266] Thus the frontispiece's satirical Civil War allegory. In the centre-right Charles - I and his nobility mistook a puppet show, in which two swordsmen "seemingly do brawle", for truth. The puppets represented the sects on whom the war was blamed, when in reality the whole affair was a ploy by the prelacy, guiding the show with a rope, to advance its own power. On the centre-left the people, for whom "understanding reach not things, things out reach them", were blind to the prelacy's "ordering all" – pointing at the puppets, they stood distracted and blissfully unaware.[267] They failed to *see* correctly. The "popishly effected" Antichristian prelacy had deluded the kingdom, persuading Charles to wage war under the misconception that he would enhance his power, when in reality only the Church's authority over the Godly that would increase.[268] Like a puppet show, or magic trick, their deceits were the invisible motions setting " all together by the ears":

> "they must not appear in the action, but lie close snugge, and close hid as doth
> in shewes the lurking spirit that guideth ocular motions, which are merely seen

---

[265] Hooper, *Early Writings*, pp. 23-24. Anitchrist was a spiritual presence which "reigneth in the conscience above the law of God."

[266] S. H, *The arch-cheate, or the cheate of cheats: or a notable discovery of some parts of the mystery of iniquitie* (London, 1644), title-page and key.

[267] Ibid, title-page.

[268] Ibid, pp. 2-3 , 7-8 especially. See p. 3: "the Popish government under the cheating name of Religion they mainly ayme at, but mumble not a word of either not intentions but pranct up pretensions."

331

to act all, and to them is attributed, but cunning Hocus play his pranks under board."[269]

Unlike the characters in the image, viewers saw through the display to the nub of the matter. Not deluded by the Hocus, they partook in Antichrist's revelation. Grasping the satire, theirs was an edifying sight.

Central to Antichrist's power, then, was that its followers did not see correctly – they were spiritually blind. Not enlightened by Truth, they were easily enchanted by Rome's counterfeit piety - the Kings of the Earth were so enraptured by the Whore's beauty, and overawed by her Beast's power that they were easily persuaded to drink from her cup of abomination.[270] Carnal eyes were similarly seduced by statues, paintings, processions, and the Mass which, by focusing on an outward image, enticed men illicitly to worship wood, stone or bread rather than the spiritual entity which it represented. For Protestants, seeing Antichrist was as edifying as it was terrifying, recognition suggesting that one had been enlightened. Just as deception was dependent upon spiritual blindness, revelation was predicated upon a specific way of seeing.[271] The puppet show was a fitting motif through which to capture this duality, for deception and revelation were represented powerfully upon the stage. Richard Bernard understood Revelation's allegories to be God's drama, the means by which he communicated history's Truth to His Elect:

"Here are manifold visions and similitudes; the lord by certain formes, shapes, and figures, as it were Images and pictures, did lively represent the whole comical tragedie, or tragicall comedie, that was from the time of the revealing of the Revelation, to be acted upon the stage of the world."[272]

Facilitating a more "lively" or animated image of Antichrist, the stage presented the actions of Popes through which its 'marks' were manifested. Audiences were placed

---

[269] Ibid, p. 3. See also, p. 5: "I the throne conquer, yet Hocus is victor, who sliely conveys away the throne and sets his tressells in the place nimbly over laying them with a watethet covering imbroidered with goulden Floure deutes, and as nimbly claps a Miter theron instead of a Crown also dexterously handled as unespiesd of any but the wife of Sophia whose intentions discovers the cloven head of the mitre just like that of the Divels foote."

[270] Revelation 17: 5-18.

[271] For examples, see above Chapter Two, pp. 103-28.

[272] R. Bernard, *A Key of Knowledge for the Opening of the Secret Mysteries of St. Johns Mysticall Revelation* (London, 1617), p. 130.

at a vantage point from which they saw the two prongs steering the drama's action: as they watched characters on stage being taken in by the veneer of holiness, they were simultaneously privy to the lies, plots, and licentiousness driving the play forward. Like the *Arch-Cheate*, the stage created a knowing viewer who saw through Antichrist's mask to the corruption beneath – this was Anti-Catholicism as edification, the audience involved in the act of Revelation.

Although familiar in all forms of Anti-Catholic polemic, disclosure and concealment were concepts which dramatists were keen to play with throughout the period.[273] Often, a literal unveiling was deployed: in the final scene of Barnabe Barnes' *The Divils Charter* (1607), Alexander VI drew back the curtains of his library to reveal Satan decked in Papal dress.[274] Similarly, Thomas Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon* (1607), opened with a curtain drawn to reveal Truth driving Friars and Cardinals from the stage, and Time lifting the veils from the eyes of English Councilors, allowing them to recognize Catholicism's evil.[275] In the final scene a Roman assassin who had tricked his way into Elizabeth's presence has his cloak pulled back to reveal his "naked truth" – a concealed dagger.[276] Soliloquies and asides made audiences privy to Papal duality, whilst many of the characters onstage remained ignorant of the fact. Costume was also important. In John Bale's *King John* the character first depicted as "Dissimulation" later re-appeared as the Pope before ultimately being revealed as Antichrist; and in seventeenth century plays devils were commonly disguised as Jesuits and Popes.[277] More than superficial, disguise was often fundamental to a character's being. Thus Alexander VI's distraught reaction to the loss of his garb in *The Divil's Charter*:

> "My robes, my robes, he robs me of my robes!
>
> Bring me my robes or take away my life.

---

[273] See B. Barnes, *The Divils Charter* (London, 1607), sigs. B-Bii, Biii-Biv, Gii-Giv; *The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth; or, The downfall of the Pope* (London, 1680), sigs. Aii-Aiii, pp. 12-13, 17-19; N. Lee, *Caesar Borgia, Son of Pope Alexander the Sixth: A Tragedy* (London, 1680), p. 51; Shell, Catholicism, *Controversy & The English Literary Imagination*, pp. 24-32.

[274] Barnes, *The Divils Charter*, sig. L4: "Alexander draweth the Curtaine of his studie where hee discovereth the divill sitting in his pontificals..."

[275] T. Dekker, *Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, (Ed.), F. Bowers, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1955), II, p. 500.

[276] Ibid, p. 574.

[277] *The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 6; E. Settle, *The Female Prelate: Being the History of the Life and Death of Pope Joan: A Tragedy* (London, 1689), p. 3.

333

My robes, my life, my soul and all is gone!"[278]

The veneer of holiness was so fundamental to his nature that Alexander, unable to function without them, subsequently fell "in ecstasy upon the ground." Once the veil was lifted Antichrist was powerless: to reveal was to vanquish.

Crucial to this endeavour were the "Dumb Shews" which occurred intermittently in both plays, parts of the action where dialogue was absent and the narrative was mimed. In Dekker's play, these ranged from the very simple – the pompous entrance of the Whore in procession, or ridding her Beast – to the fairly complex – the depiction of Falsehood, a "bawd" and Muse to the great Whore, disguized as Truth whilst bewitching Edmund Campion to commit her evil deeds.[279] The "Dumb Shews" capacity for movement and narration permitted them to express the attributes of deception more fully than a static image.

Thus before the *Divil's Charter* started proper the audience was privy to a demonic masque in which viewers *see* the Pope's manifestation as Antichrist through a pact with Satan. A cardinal was seated upon the stage. A monk appeared before him carrying "a magical book and rod", drew a circle on the floor and cast a spell, which triggered a hellish procession inaugurated by thunder and lightning. Two devils appeared in rapid succession, and proceeded to circle the Cardinal. Two more followed. The first was Satan, dressed as the Pope "in robes pontifical with a triple crown on his head and cross keys in his hand." The second presented a pact to the Cardinal, who signed it with his own blood. Satan drank the surplus before being disrobed by devils who subsequently dressed the Cardinal in "the rich cap, the tunicle, [and] the triple crown", and placed the Papal Keys into his hands, before promptly disappearing – Alexander VI, Antichrist, was thus born by the act of dressing, a literal veiling.[280] This perverse ritual involved audiences in the act of revelation: from the very outset of the play they are privy to what the characters onstage remain ignorant of - the Pope is Antichrist. Consequently, all of the Pope's shows of piety are more clearly seen as pretence, and are thinly veiled as a result.[281] Becoming Antichrist's confessor, the audience heard how Alexander possessed a conscience void of faith,

---

[278] B. Barnes, *The Devil's Charter*, ed. N. Somogyi (London, 1999), p. 112.

[279] Dekker, *Dramatic Works*, II, pp. 500, 501, 551, 561.

[280] Barnes, *The Divils Charter*, sigs. Aii-Aiii.

[281] Barnes, *The Devil's Charter*, ed. Somogyi (London, 1999), p. 45 3:2 where one character asks: "Is it possible that the devil can be so sweet a dissembler?"

hope and charity and used the feigned holiness of the Papal chair to further his own ambition:

> "Using the name of Christ as a stale
>
> For arcane plots and intricate designs
>
> That all my misty machinations
>
> And counsels held with black Tartuan fiends
>
> Were for the glorious sunshine of my sons:
>
> That they might mount in equal parallel
>
> With golden majesty, like Saturn's son
>
> To dart down fire and thunder on their foes
>
> That, that was it, which I so much desir'd
>
> To see my sons through all the world admir'd."[282]

This prior knowledge placed audiences in a unique position. In one sense they were forced into collusion with Antichrist, yet in another they had been handed the power to see through it, a power which proved edifying in light of characters on stage continually being duped by Antichrist's deception. The nobleman Gismond di Viselli was incredulous at libels charging Alexander with licentiousness, murder and blasphemy, his defence of the Pope unwittingly validating Antichrist's disguise.[283] Dekker developed the motif.[284] In the opening scene Protestant claims that the Whore was an irreligious, seditious usurper with only "counterfeit" claims to Universal Priesthood meet with outraged horror by her followers, who dismissed them as "unheard of prophanation" and "Adders Hisses."[285] They were so enraptured by her that their world was shaken:

> "Can yonder roofe, that's nailed so fast with stars
>
> Cover a head so impious, and not cracke?
>
> That sulphur boyls o're celestial fires
>
> May drop in whirling flakes (with scalding vengeance)

---

[282] Ibid, 1:4, lines 12-23. See also pp. 18-21. In light of this "Dumb Shew", the irony of the unrelenting references to Alexander as "his Holiness" were made all the more savage, and served as a frequent reminder of his duality, of the veiled Antichrist.

[283] Barnes, *The Divil's Charter* ed. Somogyi (1999), pp. 12-15.

[284] Dekker, *Dramatic Works*, II, pp. 501-04 (quote 503) cf. pp. 512-15, 535, 560-65.

[285] Ibid, pp. 502-03, 562.

On such broad sinne."[286]

The play's action arose from this erroneous sense of injustice towards Antichrist: their blind rage allowed the Whore to convince them to overthrow Titania (Elizabeth I) and return her realm to Babylonian tyranny.[287]

Indeed, the whole plot was reliant upon the Whore's ability to convince Europe's Kings to accept an inverted picture of reality. Enchanted by Rome's lavish show of holiness, they were duped into believing that the Whore and Titania were exact opposites of their true selves.[288] Unable to see Truth, they accepted the verity of its mirror image. With considerable irony, the Whore informed the Kings that Truth, Titiania's muse, was a cleverly disguised imposter:

> "That strumpet, that inchantresse, (who, in robes
>
> White as is innocence, and with an eye
>
> Able to tempt sterne murther to her bed)   .   .
>
> Calles her selfe Truth, has stolen faire Truth's attire,
>
> Her crowne, her sweet songs, counterfeits her voice,
>
> And by prestigious tricks in sorcerie,
>
> Ha's raiz'd a base imposter...."[289]

It is ultimately revealed that precisely the opposite was true, that the Whore's muse, Falsehood, had disguised herself as Truth to deceive all who saw her.[290] Dekker hammered the point. Truth proclaimed that men must embrace her before the spell of Rome's beauty could be cast from their eyes: "fairness it selfe doth clothe her/ In mens eyes, till they see me, and then they loath her."[291] Revealing Antichrist was to search with more than carnal eyes, a way of seeing possessed only by those who clung to the Gospel. Like *The Arch-Cheate,* only those with Truth in their hearts saw

---

[286] Ibid, p. 502. See also ibid, p. 535 (Act 3 scene 1). The King's of Europe claimed that Protestant words sat "too neare the heart".

[287] Ibid, pp. 504-09.

[288] Ibid, pp. 501-04: In the opening scene the Whore inverts the truth by playing victim and claiming to have been greatly injured by Titania (Elizabeth I) and her vassals, who "in publick scorne/ Defame me" - Babylon's churches have been greatly damaged by Titania, and her reputation much defamed.

[289] Ibid, pp. 502-03.

[290] Ibid, pp. 551-53 (Act 4 Scene 1).

[291] Ibid, pp. 552-53. Plaine Dealing, the active agent of Reform throughout the play, agrees with Truth, noting that "she [the Whore of Babylon] was then in mine eye, the goodliest woman that ever wore faire part of Sattin...now she is more ugly than a bawd."

through the veil, recognizing the Antichristian spirit which animated the world's affairs.

Being imbued with Truth, the audience saw that the Pope on stage was a sign pointing beyond himself to God's prophetic emblems in Revelation. Barnes' Alexander VI betokened the Whore, a living emblem of a scriptural image which audiences were to see through.[292] Barnes paraded the Pope's impiety – his conspiracy to murder, attempts to sodomize a courtier, incestuous romps with and subsequent murder of his daughter and recourse to the black arts as 'marks' of Antichrist.[293] Based on Francesco Guicciardini's history, Barnes' play was typical of the depth of interest in the lives of Popes throughout Early Modern polemic. From the Henrician-era a genre emerged which might be termed the 'Potted Papal History', the result of plundering hostile histories in search of sensational tidbits of Papal iniquities.[294] To know Antichrist was to trace its marks through history, and the play thus opened with Alexander as a 'mark' of the Whore:

> "Gracious spectators, do not here expect
>
> Visions of pleasure, amorous discourse
>
> Our subject is blood and tragedy,
>
> Murder, foul incest and hypocrisy.
>
> Behold the strumpet of proud Babylon,
>
> Her cup with fornication foaming, full
>
> Of God's high wrath and vengeance for the evil,
>
> Which was imposed upon her by the Devil."[295]

The play's action presented Alexander as an emblem of Antichrist. Hints alluding to the Whore were to be pieced together by the audience in an act of Revelation. Like

---

[292] The figure of Alexander VI had to be given life by "the visible and speaking shows" of the stage, which had crucial communicative value: "the life and action shall explain the rest" (Barnes, *The Divil's Charter* (Ed) N. de Somogyi, p. 6). Cf. Dekker, *Dramatic Works*, II, p. 497.

[293] Barnes, *The Divil's Charter* (Ed) Somogyi, (1999), 2:1 in which the Pope gleefully overseas military preparations; 3:1 his homosexual lusts for a prisoner Astor Manfredi; 1:4 bribing the Curia for positions; 4:1 the use of necromancy and conjuring of the devil. "Death and blood only lengthen out our scene/ That be the visible and speaking shows/That bring vice into detestation/ Unnatural murders, cursed poisonings/ Horrible exorcism and invocation:/In them examine the reward of sin." Barnes, *The Divels Charter*, 3:3, p. 59.

[294] See J. Bale, *The Pageant of Popes* (London, 1574), passim; R. W, *A looking glass*; Flacus Illyricus, *Wonderful Newes of the Death of Paul III*.

[295] Prologue. This occurs before the 'Dumb Shew' turning Alexander into Antichrist.

her, Alexander wore purple robes whilst signing the devil's charter – at the very moment of becoming Antichrist he already resembled it.[296] Similarly, the enchantments with which the Whore deluded the world is suggested were the "menstruous poison of his breath [which] might choke the whole conclave" to his will;[297] and the horse-saddles decked in gold, jewels and precious stones sent to befriend the Ambassadors of Naples, distracting them from Alexander's plots, echoed the richly bejeweled garments which the Whore used to dazzle the world's powers to her will.[298] History was shot through with echoes of Revelation. Papal actions pointed beyond themselves, mimicking an image of Antichrist.

<u>VI: Pointing Beyond – The Edifying Act of Sight</u>

Woodcuts similarly enticed viewers into an interpretative act of sight. Thus the generic Pope in *The Sword of the spirit to smite in piece that Antichristian Goliath* (1613) by the Puritan gentlemen Thomas Williamson is curiously unworthy of the title 'Antichrist' [Fig. 282.] The image is not polemical – it does not paint the Pope in a hostile or even overtly negative light. Not doing anything mischievous, he is simply decked in full pontificals. Nor, unlike many images, is he explicitly associated with the demonic. Yet tagged onto this rather muted depiction is a sensational, and decidedly out-of-step, caption: "The Man of Sin. The Son of perdition." Here, viewers were meant to see Antichrist.[299]

Or rather, they were meant to see *through* it. This Pope pointed beyond himself towards biblical images of Antichrist. The verse *commanded* readers to see something beyond what was *actually* on the page, something monstrous in this unobtrusive image:

"Behold & see a *monster* in his kinde

One *wretched* head, adorn'd with triple crowne

In hand a globe, on backe a cope wee finde.

---

[296] Prologue.

[297] Act 1 scene 3, p. 13.

[298] Act 1 scene 4, p. 21. Cf. Revelation 17 – both are decked with 'precious jewels' to distract and seduce followers from its real intentions.

[299] T. Williamson, *The sword of the spirit to smite in pieces that antichristian Goliath, who daily defieth the Lords people the host of Israel* (London, 1613), p. 31. For more on how images in Williamson's work served as emblematic summaries of each chapter. 2 Thessalonions 2.

Richly bedecky with perle & precious stone."[300]

The gorgeousness of Papal apparel linked this Pope to Babylon's Whore – "arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls" – and this Pope was thus a sign pointing to another, apocalyptic image.[301] A deceptive show of holiness, the Whore's pomp seduced men to worship her, as a God.[302] The Antichristian pride which they betokened was sustained in the top-right of the image by bluntly stated proofs – "Is called God. Is Worshipped" – which tied this Pope to the attributes of another Antichristian, the Man of Sin (2 Thessalonions 2.)[303] These 'marks' forced viewers to link this pontiff to biblical depictions: to understand that the Pope's status in this world pointed to a universal apocalyptic Truth. The image was something with which viewers had to grapple, the subtlety of its depiction mirroring that of Antichrist, the very act of reading the image echoing its subject's deceptive nature. Recognition was not instantaneous but interpretative – deceptively unassuming, its truths were revealed only once its allusions had been processed, the initial tension between mundane image and monstrous caption resolved as viewers worked through the emblem, led to the solution at the verse's close: "now let all judge whom this should represent/ But Antichrist himself by all consent."[304] Involved in the process of revelation, the viewer had exposed the Beast.

A long tradition of Papal depiction de-stabilized the relationship between image and the reality which it represented. Continental artists had revelled in visual trickery, expressing demonic deceptiveness in a series of images as acerbic as they were amusing. Imported into England, sixteenth-century German medallions such as the Pope-Devil/Cardinal-Fool were replicated in Stephen Bateman's providential *Doome, Warning all men of Judgement* (1581) [Fig. 283.][305] This was elaborate masking. The Pope-Devil, and Cardinal-Fool shared co-joined heads in a crude yet comedic demonstration of Rome's veneer of holiness – simply turning the image

---

[300] Ibid, p. 31.
[301] Revelations 17:4.
[302] Revelations 17: 8-18.
[303] Williamson, *The sword of the spirit*, p. 31. 2 Thessalonions 2: 4 – "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God."
[304] Ibid, p. 31.
[305] K. Lykosthenes, *The doome warning all men to the judgement* (London, 1581), p. 268. This coin was originally produced in Germany during the sixteenth century, see Scribner, *Simple Folk*, p. 166 illustration 134.

upside-down revealed that the Papacy's appearance inverted reality for, as the motto hammered-home, Pope and devil were one: *Ecclesia Perverso tenet faciem Diaboli.*[306] Becoming commonplace, this image appeared in broadsides, medals and pottery.[307] Accompanied by six explanatory verses labouring the mutual concerns of Pope and Devil with power and sin, a broadside of 1689 heightened the reader's involvement in the process of the revelation. Positioned around the medal, readers had to turn the page a little more with each subsequent stanza before the devil was finally seen, the trick revealed: "Hence Nature's mirror you this changeling see/ So well the Devil, Pope and Fool agree" [Fig. 284.][308] Anti-papal images which masked their truth, and which were interpretative rather than instantaneous, were thus nothing new.

But Williamson's image required more than this from its viewer. Whilst in the German medallion the devil – although hidden – was present on the page, in Williamson's work Antichrist was absent, suggested only by allusion. His Pope was emblematic, pointing to what it represented rather than denoting it. Recognizing Antichrist was thus dependent upon a way of seeing, and one indebted to Calvinist liturgy. Images acted as memorials, signs putting congregants in memory of what they represented and demanding interpretation not devotion. In contrast to Catholicism, the sensuousness of imagery was rejected – not to inspire veneration but contemplation, images were not important things of themselves but rather commemorative aids pointing to heavenly affairs, putting the laity in mind of invisible truths.[309] For Protestants the image was emblematic: a metaphor by which a truth could better be remembered.[310] This conception was expressed at the heart of Reformed liturgy. For

---

[306] In the face of the perverse church one sees the devil.

[307] BM Sat 1230. Cf. an emblematic frontispiece to P. Berault, *The church of rome evidently proved heretick* (London, 1680) and J. Salgado, *Symbiosis, or, The intimate converse of Pope and Devil attended by a cardinal and buffoon* (London, 1681) although with different accompanying verses. See BM O'D 6; BM Sat 1057.

[308] BM Sat 1230.

[309] J. Phillips, *The Reformation of Images* (London, 1973), pp. 44-48.

[310] It was with this aim that images were utilized by emblem writers.. See H. Diehl, "Graven Images: Protestant Emblem Books In England", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 39, (1986), pp. 49-66. George Wither viewed his emblems as "teachers and Remembrances of profitable things" which would "help the memory" by "bringing [truth]....into remembrance" (G. Wither, *A Collection of Emblemes, both morall and divine* (London, 1635), sigs A2, K, K2); for E. M. emblems served as aids to "call to mind", "remember" and would "revive and rub up the memory" (E. M. *Ashrea : or, The grove of beatitudes, represented in emblemes* (London, 1665), sig. b2); and Christopher Harvey closed his emblem book with a call for its truths to be lodged in the reader's mind – "Therefore I rest/ From taking out new Reasons, till I see/ How I retrieve the old in memory" (C. Harvey, *Schola cordie or the heart of it selfe* (London, 1647), sig. K. See also P. S. *The Heroicall Devises of M. Claudius Paradin* (London, 1591), pp. 5, 6.

Calvin, during the Last Supper Christ had employed images as signs to put his Church in remembrance of His promise of salvation:

> "From the physical things set forth in the sacrament...we ought to be led by a sort of analogy to spiritual things. Thus, when we see bread set forth to us as a sign of Christ's body, we must at once grasp this comparison: as bread nourishes, sustains, and keeps the life of our body, so Christ's body was the food and protector of our spiritual life."[311]

The images' power was not instantaneous but interpretative – by grasping the analogy, congregants moved from seeing the visible sign (bread) to contemplating the invisible spirit which it represented (Christ). Earthly signs manifested universal truths. And just as the bread pointed towards Christ, so Williamson's Pope – by comparison and analogy – stood as an emblem of Antichrist, a sign pointing beyond itself to a universal foe. This decidedly Protestant way of seeing images was employed in many Antichristian representations. Including minor details as 'marks', they beseeched viewers to see beyond the page – in this way, the invisible was made manifest, the Papacy's duality envisaged more powerfully, and readers were edified by uncloaking the arch-deceptor.

The frontispiece to Thomas Burton's *Baiting of the Pope's Bull* (1629) provides a choice example [Fig. 285.][312] Here a somewhat damp Antichrist was humbled by an uncharateristically macho Charles I. The King had more supporters than Rome, a bishop of whom attempted to provoke regicide by offering absolution to laymen who renounced monarchical obedience. As with Williamson, there was an apparent disparity in a rather toothless pontiff being labelled "monster." He was noticeably unferocious. The enigma of monstrosity appears to have been broken when viewers noticed two horns on the Pope's head. Yet these triggered a greater interpretative endeavour pointing to meekness not malevolence. This "Triple Crownd Vicar, horn'd Lamb-Like" signified a specific "monster", the Beast of Revelation 13 who "had two horns like a lamb, and spake like a dragon."[313] Indeed, it is the Pope's

---

[311] J. Calvin, *Institution of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Atlanta, 1975), pp. 118, 140. See also, pp. 123-25.
[312] H. Burton, *The baiting of the Popes bull. Or An unmasking of the mystery of iniquity* (London, 1627), frontispiece.
[313] Revelation 13:11.

words in the bull renouncing monarchical obedience which betrayed the Antichristian nature behind his apparent feebleness, they were "like the Dragon's who…durst say/ All worldly power is myne, I rule, I rayse/ Whom pleaseth mee, and my behest obey."[314] A visual trigger, the horns suggested that the image stood for more than what was actually present on the page. Pointing to the Pope's feigned humility, not his brutishness, they highlighted that his lamb-like display of sheepishness masked Antichristian malevolence. That Antichrist was not seen instantly, but uncovered, was recognized in the verse:

"How comes it then, that sith the Papal power

Is from the *Dragon*, all men doe not see

The Pope is Antichrist, to over tower

All that is called God? By reason, hee

   Maketh showes, by Lambes hornes seeming innocent

   His power is from divine omnipotent."[315]

Antichrist was not depicted visually, but only through allusion. Viewers thus engaged in an interpretative process, working through the image to unravel the Beast and by doing so were placed alongside the "wiser, truer Englishmen" of the image who shun him in favour of Charles. To reveal was to empower – an active sight proving readers not to be deluded by the Beast.[316]

Similar techniques were employed in *The Proud Primacy of Popes*, included in the Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (1570).[317] A series of stills depicting critical events in the turbulent struggle between Papal and temporal powers, its inclusion was surely intended to coincide with Pius V's excommunication of Elizabeth I. This portrait gallery of specific moments of Papal tyranny, excommunication and repression highlighting Pious's act of aggression as yet another example of the Papacy's propensity to lust for dominion over secular rulers [Figs 286-297.] Its twelve images chronicled the growth of Papal dominion, familiar episodes in medieval history serving as snapshots of Rome's simultaneous ascent in the world and decline in

---

[314] This also implies another image of Antichrist, the Beast of the Sea in Revelations 13. See verse 4-5: "And they worshipped the power which gave power unto the beast.....And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies."

[315] Burton, *baiting of the Popes bull*, frontispiece.

[316] Ibid.

[317] J. Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments* (London, 1583), 2 volumes, i, pp. 780-91.

Christ. The series began with the 'Image of the true Catholic Church of Christ' during the first three centuries after the Ascension [Fig. 286.][318] Here, a Roman Emperor oversaw the martyrdom of idealized Bishops, the true professors of the Gospel. The world/spirit dichotomy is expressed in their appearance, for it is their patient endurance of torment which marked these men as Christians, not lavish 'popish' Episcopal trappings such as mitres, crosiers and robes. Zeal soon cooled. Once Constantine ended persecution the spirit declined, worldly wealth birthing ambition at Rome. Separated from his brethren in the third image by donning a mitre, the Bishop of Rome's worldly preferment is encapsulated by his sharing power with the Emperor [Fig. 288.][319] From this point, the persecuted became the persecutors. The remaining illustrations depicted critical moments of Papal tyranny gleaned from medieval history in which the Pope is lauded above the Emperor. For Protestants these acts of Papal presumption and pride contrasted starkly with Christ's example, calling Rome's sanctity into question by demonstrating that the Papacy had usurped its headship of the Church. The theme of unjust humiliation was carried to the end of *The Proud Primacy*, where Emperors perform acts of vassalage to the Pope, who now towers over them, ceremonies culminating in an entrance procession in which the Pope was carried aloft on men's shoulders [Figs 295 & 296.][320]

Yet *The Proud Primacy* was more than a catalogue of evil. Its images were not merely sensational swipes at the Papacy decorating the page: they pictured the invisible. Although not directly associating the Papacy with any Antichristian figure, these images of historical acts of cruelty were 'marks' of the arch foe, signs that Antichrist's spirit had manifested itself at Rome. As Thomas Betteridge has noted, a fundamental tension existed within Foxe's work: it was both an historical record of Marian persecution, and an a-historical account of martyrdom's relationship to the universal True Church.[321] Scenes of martyrdom both recorded the historically specific moment of corporeal burning; and pointed towards the a-historical Truth which that moment represented, testifying to the martyr's membership of the invisible Church. History contained moments of Revelation, events pointing to a-temporal truthfulness.

---

[318] Ibid, p. 780.
[319] Ibid, p. 782.
[320] Ibid, pp. 789-90.
[321] T. Betteridge, "Visibility, Truth and History in Acts and Monuments", in C. Highley and J. N. King (Eds.), *John Foxe and his World*, (Aldershot, 2002), pp. 145-59.

Consequently, the boundaries between visible world and invisible spirit were not hard and fast. Foxe explained:

"Although the right Church of God be not so invisible in this world, that none can see it: yet neither is it so visible that everye worldlye eye may perceive it. For like as it the nature of truth: so is the proper condition of the true church, that commonly none seeth it, but such as be members and partakers thereof."[322]

Understanding was dependent upon a correct interpretation, a way of seeing. The martyrs' status as members of the invisible Elect Church was dependent upon their experience of bodily suffering, which the woodcuts made extremely visible, pointing beyond literal representation to the 'Truth' of their subjects' status. This was equally true of *The Proud Primacy*.[323] These Popes' membership of the False Church was perceivable. in moments of Antichristian persecution. Slipping between universal principle and particular manifestation, each woodcut depicted a specific historical action of *a* Pope as a 'mark' representative of the *Papacy's* a-historical status as Antichrist. Each historical incident perpetrated by individual *Popes* – Celestine III uncrowning Henry VI with his feet in 1190 [Fig. 290]; Gregory VII making Emperor Henry IV stand barefoot and penitent in the freezing Canossa cold of 1077 [Fig. 291]; a Papal legate forcing John I of England to surrender his crown – was a stereotype representative of the *Papacy* as Antichrist [Fig. 293][324] With this in mind, the series culminated with the Papacy pointing towards the ultimate expression of iniquity – the Whore of Babylon [Fig. 297.][325]

The composition echoed contemporary Bible illustrations of Revelation 17, in which the Kings of the Earth submitted themselves before the Whore – towering above them, Papal triumph over Princes aped Antichrist's [Figs 298-299.][326] Allusion had once again made the invisible manifest, allowing the image to point beyond itself.

---

[322] Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (1570), I, iii.
[323] Betteridge, "Visibility, Truth and History in Acts and Monuments", pp. 152-53. See n. 25. Betteridge does not believe that the images of the Papacy in the *Acts and Monuments* point to a Universal Truth in history, unlike those of the martyrs. However, he seems to have ignored the *Proud Primacy of Popes* in making these assertions.
[324] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, i, pp. 784, 785, 787.
[325] Ibid, p. 791.
[326] Revelation 17: 10-18. Bale, *The image of both Churches*, 2 volumes, (London, 1570), ii, p. 52; ibid, *The image of both churches* (London, 1550), ii, sig. Bvii.

Detailing the 'stirrup service', a ritual originating in the Donation of Constantine which the Emperor performed on the Pope at their first meeting, the scene 'marked' Antichrist at a specific moment in Papal history.[327] The ceremony resonated with symbolic significance. Illustrating the Pope's claim to spiritual and earthly supremacy over the Emperor, the latter held the Pope's stirrup whilst he mounted, and subsequently led his horse in procession. For Protestants, this ritual epitomized the depths of Antichrist's pride, flagging Rome as a servant of the False Church. Unlike previous examples, neither this image nor that of Emperor Henry IV surrendering his crown to Pope Gregory VII at Canossa in 1077 relied upon words to urge viewers to look beyond [Fig. 292.] The clues were in the images. Canossa symbolized the Papacy's usurped and non-doctrinal authority to interfere in Princely affairs, an example of an evil Pope unjustly humiliating an Emperor to increase his own power.[328] But this was more than just a vivid portrait of the depth of Papal iniquity. It betokened Antichrist. The image hinted at this, the leg of the Pope's chair made of a devil's foot.[329] The 'seat' of Rome was thus demonic, and the image subtly 'marking' the Papal throne Antichristian.

Expecting viewers to look beyond the page was a convergence of two types of seeing intrinsic to Protestantism explored throughout this chapter. Firstly, attitudes to signs typical of Reformed theology, in which the liturgical role of images became analogical, putting the mind in remembrance of the divine – the Pope's picture, like the Lord's bread, was an emblem pointing to a Universal spiritual Truth. Emblematic vision was related to our second type of sight, the interpretation of Revelation unfolding in history. The preserve of the Elect, this existed to justify God's encasement of history's Truth in Revelation's images – only they could unravel the mystery, and could see Antichrist. Recognition was to invigorate and affirm one's own Faith, for it suggested that one was possessed of grace and did not belong to the deluded followers of the False Church. By allowing them to see through Antichrist, images of the Papacy stirred readers' resolve, involving them in the process of Revelation. The sense of sight remained vibrant in Protestant culture, and in this way these dishonourary images of Papal iniquity edified and terrified in equal measure.

---

[327] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, i, p. 790; E. Duffy, *Saints and Sinners: A history of the Popes* (2nd Edition: New Haven/ London, 2002), pp. 88-89.
[328] Duffy, *Saints and Sinners*, pp. 224-226.
[329] Foxe, *The Acts & Monuments*, i, p. 786.

Antichrist is commonly seen to have died at the Restoration – but the obituary may have been pronounced prematurely.[330] In truth, it simply underwent another shift, descending from reality to rhetoric, from a sign of divine schema to simile. No longer a keenly felt and intensely active force in the world and its history, Antichrist became a slur used interchangeably with other slanders – a synonym of the devil. This was noticeable in the period's Anti-Catholic imagery – no longer systematically exposed, imagery ceased to point beyond itself to biblical descriptions of Antichrist. Comparison of the frontispiece to William Prynne's *Exact Chronological Vindication* (1666) and an image indebted to it, *Babel and Bethel: or, the Pope in his Colours* (1679) exemplified this shift [Figs 300 & 301.][331]

Prynne's image was emblematic of his work. A product of his new position as Keeper of Records in the Tower of London, the *Vindication* was a documentary chronicle underpinning Charles II's authority.[332] Commissioned by Chancellor Clarendon to weigh-in on a dispute between Church and Crown which threatened the stability of Restored Monarchy, Prynne 'vindicated' the Royal Supremacy against resurgent *jure divino* claims of 'popish' bishops. Refuting such claims through legal history, Prynne argued that episcopal authority was not divinely sanctioned but stemmed from the monarchy, the font of all ecclesiastical power in the realm.[333] As much a subtle critique of the episcopacy as an overt attack on the Papacy, Antichrist here damned *jure divino* through association with the Pope's usurped power. Contrasting the fraudulent power of the Pope – sat on a tottering throne propped-up only by the efforts of his Curia –with the steadfast authority of Charles II's divinely sanctioned monarchy reflected Clarendon's ideal, depicting Church and Parliament as extensions of the King's court rather than independent bodies. The temporal hierarchy – from Lords and Commons down to sheriffs and Justices of the Peace – stood on Charles' right, each group proclaiming an act of Parliament denying Papal power and

---

[330] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 146-77 at p. 148.

[331] W. Prynne, *An exact chronological vindication and historical demonstration of our British, Roman, Saxon, Danish, Norman, English Kings supremacy ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all prelates, persons, causes within their kingdoms and dominions from the first year of the reign of King John, Anno Dom. 1199 to Henry III. 1273* (London, 1666); *Babel and Bethel: or, the Pope in his Colours* (London, 1679), BM Sat. 1076.

[332] W. M. Lamont, *Marginal Prynne: 1600-1669* (London/Toronto, 1963), p. 205.

[333] J. R. Collins, "The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy", *Church History*, 68 (1999), pp. 549-80, especially p. 576; Lamont, *Marginal Prynne*, pp. 209-11, 219-28.

testifiying to the King's authority as Supreme Governor.[334] Similarly, on the King's left a dour collection of clerics representing the ideal English Church uttered obedience to Charles through biblical texts refuting *jure divino* and expressing commitment to monarchical ecclesiastical supremacy.[335] Royal Supremacy was sanctioned on scriptural grounds.

Conversely, the Pope was 'anti' (against) Christ, holding the keys to heaven and hell which usurped His position as sole route to salvation. On the Pope's left each section of the Roman hierarchy dishonoured Christ by misrepresenting the Word as supportive of Papal power – scripture was "abused", "wrested", "misapplied", "perverted" and "appropriated" to uphold the shaking Papal throne, and the pontiff was thus literally the Beast in the Temple worshipped as God.[336] Descriptions of Antichrist were systematically pinned on the Pope. As the Beast of the Sea (Rev 13) the Pope received his power from the Dragon (Satan), which enthused him with its essence in the engraving's top-right. Furthermore, the Kings who kissed his feet, and nobility knelt before him were tagged as the worldly worshippers of the Beast - "And all the world wandered after the Beast...and worshipped the Beast saying, who is like unto the Beast?"[337] The Pope here pointed beyond himself. Thus Peter and Paul - authors of two of the key biblical descriptions of Antichrist – unmasked his true identity. Depicted between the two thrones, Peter labelled the Pope as the False Prophet (2 Peter 2), whilst Paul pointed:[338]

---

[334] This proclamations were keyed to an accompanying sheet. Prynne, *An exact chronological vindication*, key, letters A-H.

[335] Ibid, letters L-O. Texts include Proverbs 24, Tit 3, 2 Chron 8, Acts 25.

[336] For example, the following texts have been appropriated by the Pope: Luke 22:38: "Behold here are two swords"; Revelation 1:18: "I have the keyes of Hell and Death"; Matt 28:18: "All power is given to me in Heaven and Earth"; Heb 2:8: "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet"; Psalm 72:11: "All Kings shall fall down before him, all nations shall serve him"; Daniel 2:21: "He removeth Kings, and setteth up Kings"; Psalm 110:5-6: "He shall strike through Kings in the day of his wrath, he shall judge among the Nations"; Isa 49:23: "Kings shall bow down to thee with their faces towards the earth, and shall lick up the dust of thy feet".

[337] Rev 13: 4: "And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?" Incorrectly labelled verse 2 by Prynne.

[338] Prynne, *An exact chronological vindication* – key: 2 Peter 2: 9-10: "they walke after the flesh in the lust of uncleanliness, and despise dominion, presumptuous are they, self-willed; they are not afraid to speak evil of dignitaries."

"Towards the Pope, using these words: That Man of Sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth & exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that he as God, sitteth in the Temple of God."[339]

The identification was once again systematic – the Pope's action 'marking' him as the Beast.

Babel and Bethel appeared to do the same.[340] Although labelled Antichrist – "Rome's scarlet whore doth here in Triumph Ride" – much was lost in the tracing. Part of the Whig agitation for Exclusion, this print celebrated the routing of the 'Popish Plotters', the scenes of their 'just' execution contrasted with images of unjust cruelty behind the Pope – Jesuits burning London in 1666, the murder of Edmund Godfrey, and, finally, the Marian martyrdoms. Alongside forced humiliation of Kings, these were emblems of the cruelties which would befall England if God and Charles II had not prevented Papal plots coming to fruition. Accordingly the Church of England, personified as a woman, thanked the King for her deliverance from Popery and beseeched him to continue to be her champion. This was part of an emotive lobby for Exclusion. Locked in battle with Rome since 1588, the monarchy had always protected the English Church from Papal subversion. An Antichristian metaphor seemed appropriate:

"...this Figure courts your welcome Eye,

Where first you may that Man of Sin descry

Rome's mighty mufti, who in Pomp doth sit

And runs no Rule (but lust) or Just, or fit."[341]

But the application was not consistent – the Pope was the Man of Sin in one line, and Turkish high priest ('mufti') in the next. Moreover, as the verse continued he was Pharoah, Moloch, Lucifer, Swine and Romulus and Remus - Antichrist was one analogy amongst many as metaphor was heaped upon metaphor. In contrast to the *Vindication*, Antichrist was not the mainstay of the attack: it was an insult leveled at the Papacy, not its identity. The same occurred in other satires, in which 'Antichrist'

---

[339] Prynne, *An exact chronological vindication.*

[340] *Babel and Bethel: or, the Pope in his Colours* (London, 1679), BM Sat. 1076.

[341] Ibid.

was simply one slur among many.[342] No more than a witty comment upon the day's events, 'Antichrist' had merit only in its aptness as a metaphor, and no longer provided an explanatory exegetical framework into which that event was deemed to fit.

What had changed? When Hobbes proclaimed the case against the Pope unproven and declared Antichrist was yet to come, we understand that Revelations was no longer the currency through which ideas were exchanged – no more the key unlocking history's divine plan, nor an essential grip on Protestant identity.[343] Snobbery was largely to blame. Associated with "enthusiastic" post Civil War sects, Antichrist had lost respect as a serious intellectual position, by being tied to a host of views which made the Restoration order blush.[344] Antichrist had been applied to positions which had torn the very seams of society apart.[345] The King was identified as Antichrist by Colonel Goffe during the Putney Debates of 1647;[346] by the Fifth Monarchists;[347] and John Owen, who in a Parliamentary address during April 1649 labelled all government Antichristian. For him King, Parliament and Magistrate must be removed before the True Church could be erected.[348] Most radically of all, Diggers declared Antichrist to be in the hearts of all the propertied – royal licenses and land privileges were marks of the Beast, for the poor were as entitled as the rich.[349] At some point, all sects, and all vestiges of state were 'proven' to be Antichrist – even

---

[342] *The Solemn mock procession of the Pope, Cardinalls, Iesuits, fryers &c. through ye city of London, Nouember ye 17th, 1679* (London, 1679), BM Sat. 1072; *The Solemn mock procession of the Pope, cardinalls, Jesuits, fryers &c. through the city of London, November the 17th, 1680* (London, 1680) BM Sat. 1084; *The Solemn mock procession of the Pope, cardinals, Jesuits, fryars, nuns, exactly taken as they marcht through the citty of London 17 November 1680* (London, 1680), BM Sat 1084.

[343] T. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, (London, 1968), pp. 580-82. B. Capp, "Review: Godly Rule and English Millenium", *Past & Present*, 52, (1971), pp. 112-13.

[344] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 146-50 in particular.

[345] See the positions discussed in ibid, pp. 104-15, 125-48 in particular.

[346] Ibid, p. 104.

[347] W. Aspinwall, *An Explication or Application Of the Seventh Chapter of Daniel* (London, 1654), sigs. A2-A3, pp. 4-7, 12-16, 24-31; E. Haughton, *The Rise, Growth and Fall of Antichrist* (London, 1652), sig. A5, pp. 91-96 .

[348] J. Owen, *Works* (1850-53), viii, pp. 263-67. For changes in Owen's view during the Restoration see Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 105 n. 2. The Levellers were equally scathing about Parliament as a law-making institution – under their egalitarianism, no law existed beside God's. A. Evans, *A Voice From Heaven to the Common Wealth of England* (London, 1652), pp. 63-70; G. Foster, *The Sounding of the Last Trumpet* (London, 1650), pp. 29-47; *The Bloudy Vision of John Farley* (London, 1653), pp. 49-60; *The Pouring Forth of the Seventh and Last Viall Upon All Flesh* (London, 1650), pp. 64-65.

[349] *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, ed. G. H. Sabine (Cornell, 1941), pp. 88-91, 230-32, 248, 383-95, 530-3; Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 116-17.

Universities were deemed to be its seat.[350] The Beast was well and truly out of the bag, the broad consensus – or containment – of Papal Antichrist long gone. Restoration censorship curtailed such positions, but failed to limit the scope of Antichrist's mantle. In between throwing the term at one another radicals continued to level the Anglican Church – which demanded compulsory attendance – with the charge, and by being so deeply entrenched amidst Dissenters the concept lost its grip upon the centre-ground. Popularity was the enemy of respectability.[351] Once a staple of doctoral theses, it was ironic that Antichrist's life as an issue of national importance had been shortened by exposure to the flurry of chatter it provoked upon leaving the ivory tower. Merely entertaining its discussion required an apology. In 1664 Henry More declared that "ignoble, inglorious and ungenteel men" had "fouled" the concept, with the result that the learned were not prepared to soil their "pens with name of Antichrist and antichristianism, or which the breath of the rude and ignorant vulgar usually smelt as of onion and garlic."[352] That same year one Quaker was equally frustrated by the widespread reticence to discuss the issue - men had Revelation before them but "yet you will not believe, but set yourselves, with all your power, against the Lord."[353] Ignoble chatter spawned frustrating silence, and by 1670 the Beast of the Temple had become the elephant in the room.[354]

The English Church continued the abandonment of the position which had begun under Laud. Gilbert Sheldon, the man who had outraged Oxford Calvinists during the 1630s by denying the Papal Antichrist, became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1663, an ascent signaling the end of the concept as a fundamental part of Anglican

---

[350] See Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 78-145 in particular. For Universities, see pp. 137-42.

[351] J. Bunyan, *Works* (1860), i, p.lxxi; ii, pp. 58-62, 72-79; iii, pp. 521-24; Owen, *Works*, iii, p. 63; xiv, pp. 544-57; G. Wither, *Meditations Upon the Lords Prayer* (London, 1665), pp. 178-80.

[352] H. More, *A Modest Enquiry into the Mystery of Iniquity* (London, 1664), sigs A3.

[353] F. E, *Christian information*, pp. 3-4.

[354] A handful of stock identifications of Antichrist continued to be published, and radicals like Hansered Knolly attempted to keep the sense of contemporary events unfolding as part of an apocalyptic schema alive by interpreting the Glorious Revolution as Protestantism's final victory over Rome. But these were hangovers of a previous age. S. Lee, *Antichrist Excidium* (London, 1664); Ibid, *Israel Redux, or, the Reducion of Israel* (London, 1677). Hanserd Knollys, *Exposition of the Whole Book of the Revelation* (London, 1689); ibid, *Apocalyptical mysteries, touching the two witnesses, the seven vials, and the two kingdoms, to wit, of Christ, and of Antichrist, expounded* (London, 1667); Ibid, *An exposition of the 11th Chapter of Revelation* (London, 1679) Benjamin Keach, *Antichrist Stormed*, (London, 1689). A novel take on proving the Pope Antichrist can be found in W. Ramsay, *Maromah, the Lord of Rome the Antichrist, finally and fully discovered his name the number of his name* (London, 1680).

identity.[355] Prominent Churchmen like Henry Hammond deemed the Pope's identification to be untested and Richard Baxter declared himself "neutral" on the issue.[356] Once deemed an essential part of a Protestant's knowledge, Baxter saw no shame in composing his *Paraphrase of the New Testament* (1685) despite his general ignorance on Revelation, and proclaimed that men of a millenarist bent, far from being truer 'Protestants', were of a melancholic disposition and consequently more prone to the devil's temptations.[357] Ultimately, the line on the Papal Antichrist shifted from dogmatic to agnostic. John Bramhall, who in 1630 had defended his doctoral thesis on the subject, had lost his fervor by 1649, claiming that Antichrist's 'marks' were equally evident in Pope and Turk, and that Protestants had proven little on the matter.[358] No longer the standard-bearer leading attacks on Rome, Antichrist was never used with any gusto in the cloud of collective anxirty which gathered around James II.[359] Rather than revealing the Pope to be Satan's deadly instrument, post-Restoration Protestantism presented an Anti-Catholicism de-nuded of its Antichristian gloss.

In truth, the charge had lost much of its potency. From an identification of eschatological significance, Antichrist became a label; no longer a sign-post of the Last Days, it was simply a term of abuse. As Richard Franklin explained in 1675 this was a result of the plethora of prophecies and targets to which it had been pinned – diffusion had caused it to diminish:

> "The name Antichrist is commonly used as an ugly Bear Skin vizard; that one
>
> party puts on the face of another party, to render it the more odious; and every
>
> party, right or wrong, is sure to be branded with the nick-name of

---

[355] Ibid, p. 153; A. Milton, *Catholic & Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Chruches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-40* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 117.

[356] W. M. Lamont, "Richard Baxter, the Apocalypse & the Mad Major", *Past & Present*, 55 (1972), p. 75.

[357] R. Baxter, *Paraphrase of the New Testament* (London, 1685); Lamont, "Richard Baxter, the Apocalypse & the Mad Major", pp. 76-7. Griffith Williams, bishop of Ossory between 1641 and 1672 declared it to be neither Pope nor Turk, but the Westminster Assembly of Divines; G. Williams, *The Great Antichrist Revealed* (1660), passim.

[358] J. Brammall, *A Fair Warning to take Head of the Scottish Discipline* (1649), in *Works* (1842-5), iii, p. 286-87. See also Christopher Ness, *A distinct discourse and discovery of the person and period of Antichrist* (London, 1679). The title-piece proclaimed, somewhat apologetically, that "wherein a diligent enquiry is made concerning the time of his rise, reign, and ruine, the answer whereunto is not peremptorily imposed, but modestly proposed."

[359] Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, p. 159.

Antichristian, as every oppressed or conquered party comforts themselves of persecuted and martyred."[360]

By being everything to everyone, Antichrist was in danger of becoming nothing. Franklin believed that past generations had engaged in "strange phansees of Antichrist."[361] Disparaging the Papal Antichrist Franklin lamented that it had been based upon a confused understanding of 'Anti' as *emulator* – rather than *opposer* – of Christ, one who masked its evil under a pretence of piety.[362] For Franklin, 'Anti' should be understood literally "as any rational man would interpret Anti-Moses, Anti-Mahomet....for a Man or Generation of men of contrary religion to either of them."[363] *Anti*-Christ was consequently the greatest denier of Christ: the Turk. It was Turk who had denied Jesus to be the Son of God, propounding its own prophets as superior – whilst it had raised its own religion above Christ, the Pope, in contrast, had only raised himself above Kings and bishops.[364] Half a century earlier when Richard Montagu had similarly proclaimed that scripture's descriptions of Antichrist better fitted the Turk than the Pope, his conclusions were met with consternation – sparking a tirade of printed refutation, Montagu was critiqued by John Pym in the Commons, his tract was debated at the York House Conference of 1626, and he was slighted as a 'papist in disguise.'[365] Franklin's work met with a far greater academic insult: it was ignored. The Papal Antichrist was no longer a lynchpin of Protestant identity, an icon worth defending at all costs. Its importance was so minimal that the end came not with a bang but a whimper.

This is not to say that attitudes to Catholicism became any less vitriolic. Franklin noted that there were many reasons to hate the Roman Church – its heresy,

---

[360] R. Franklin, *A disourse on Antichrist, and the Apocalypse* (London, 1675), p. 1.

[361] Ibid, p. 1. Moreover, he clearly had the Quakers in mind when criticizing those who had stretched the distinction between great Antichrist and multiple *antichrists* in 1 John 2 to the point of indolence, using it to support the belief that the Man of Sin was an aggregate of *all* sin in the hearts of men. Ibid, p. 2. Understanding Antichrist to equal sin was a deeply flawed premise: "If every final degree of sinning did formally denominate and constitute any person of Antichrist, then the greatest degree or kind of wickednesse would render a person the grand Antichrist." Logically, this would render Antichrist and Satan one and the same, which was unscriptural (pp. 2-4). For Quaker positions see F. E, *Christian information concerning these last times*, pp. 3-4; J. Michael,, *The spouse rejoicing over antichrist*; J. Naylor, *The power and glory of the Lord shining out of the North* (London, 1653), pp. 2, 4, 8, 12-13; R. F, *A brief discovery of the kingdome of Antichrist* (London, 1653), pp. 2-5 especially.

[362] Ibid, p. 3.

[363] Ibid, pp. 3, 16-7.

[364] Ibid, pp. 3-4, 8-10, 14-19.

[365] See Hill, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England*, pp. 35-7; Milton, *Catholic & Reformed*, pp. 113-19.

usurpation, cruelty – the point was simply that one did not need to root this hatred in Revelations.[366] Indeed, Franklin rejected the notion – commonplace fifty years earlier – that the Papacy had risen to power as a result of Satanic subtlety, accruing wealth and influence by bewitching Princes to do its bidding.[367] Its rise to power had more to do with luck than Lucifer:

> "The Pope has had more wit and better luck to keep what he had gotten... by donation of Romes Emperours, and by his...taking advantage of the negligence and weakness of other Emperours, the Pope is now become the richest, the most powerful Bishop in Christendom...[his] earthly supremacy ought not to be accounted any matter of conscience, or party of religion, but only a thing of Fortune and Favour."[368]

The product of caprice rather than other-worldly callousness, the Papacy's rise was no longer that of the False Church in Revelation. Yet this was no vindication of the Papacy. Whilst it may not have *been* Antichrist, it was certainly *analogous* with it. For all his critique of the misapplication of the identity, Franklin thought 'Antichrist' apt to be applied "by way of similitude to Papal Rome and Pope" – no longer the Beast in reality, the Papacy continued to be so in rhetoric.[369] 'Antichrist' was now an *insult* not an *identity*. The framework was removed, but the label remained as a slur with which to vilify.

But this did not make it any less important. Even as a metaphor 'Antichrist' was a banner which united the laity in opposition to Rome, a pictograph of evil steering repugnance towards the Pope. A mantra commonplace in the period's print, 'Antichrist' remained ingrained within the populace at the point of assumption, even if the theological wiring behind that assumption – what it actually *meant* to be Antichrist – was no longer a live feed. It was a term accepted if not entirely understood. And for Richard Baxter, acceptance was a boat not worth rocking.[370] Concerned that Jesuits would exploit Protestant disputes on the issue in order to win minds back to Rome, Baxter hoped the issue would remain dead:

---

[366] Franklin, *A disourse on Antichrist, and the Apocalypse*, pp. 19-25.
[367] See above, pp. 279-310.
[368] Franklin, *A disourse on Antichrist, and the Apocalypse*, p. 25.
[369] Ibid, p. 19.
[370] For Baxter's views on the subject, see Lamont, "Richard Baxter, the Apocalypse & the Mad Major", pp. 68-90.

"The Jesuits well know that if they could roote the opinion from the minds of the people, the day was halfe won. It is not the clear Evidence and Reason of the matter that so much take the Vulgar minds, even in best causes, as the Reputation of the matter with those whom they honour. The common opinion that the Pope is Antichrist doth prevale more with the vulgar that can't dispute against particular doctrines of Rome, than all direct arguments that are used."[371]

A critical watchword against Popery, the very ubiquity of the belief rather than the theology which underpinned it, was crucial to its continued acceptance. Further theological tomes could only make a controversy out of a commonplace, weakening lay resolve against Rome by causing confusion and doubt. Silence was thus the best means of solidarity. This marked a change. Denying that publication of "cleare Evidence and Reaons of the matter" benefitted the laity placed Baxter a long way from John Bale and Thomas Beard, for whom labouring to understand expositions of Revelation was a fundamental part of Christian identity: "next unto out Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, there is nothing so necessary as the true and solid knowledge of Antichrist."[372] For these men, the acquisition of knowledge involved sermons, study and scholarship: for Baxter, the opposite was true – Antichrist was a moot point, a barb better accepted than explored.

---

[371] Ibid, p. 80. This is quoted from manuscript materials held in the Dr. Williams Library. Baxter never published his thoughts on the issue.
[372] Beard, *Antichrist the Pope of Rome* (London, 1625), preface.

Conclusion: The Cruelty of Children

"O Father, Our King shall cut off the Pope's head: it must be so, it must be so:"[1] the excited exclamations of Henry Burton's young daughter upon seeing the frontispiece to his *Baiting of the Pope's Bull* (1638) [Fig. 285] are as revealing as they are disturbing.[2] As they so often do, the words of a child cut to the nub of the matter, standing as a testament to the power of images to fire Protestant imaginations. This young girl saw violence in Burton's image far beyond what was *actually* represented on the page – merely tipping off the Pope's tiara to reveal him as the horned Antichrist, there is no sense here that Charles is about to be the excommunicator's executioner. Nonetheless, this child's hunger for gore speak of the power of the Anti-Papal satire analysed throughout this thesis – its invitation to viewers to invest themselves in the Pope's abasement.

This invitation to witness, and to share in, the Pope's vanquishing gave Anti-Papal ridicule its totemic power – the illusion that satire's sting had an impact on the Pope's persona the heart of its humour. Polemic simultaneously created and released tension: created by forging stereotypes of the great 'other', fostering and channelling anxieties towards persons and objects; and offering release by ear-marking the cause of that anxiety, providing an explanation for it, and offering a solution. In the case of Anti-Catholic satire, that solution was laughter – scolding, mocking laughter – a form of retributive dishonour, and an invitation for audiences to partake in the debasing of their nemesis' persona. In this way, we have suggested, polemic was a form of iconoclastic punishment. In contrast to Scribner's findings for Lutheran Germany, Anti-Catholic ridicule occurred 'after the fact' of the Reformation in England, a product of Protestantism, not a means of engendering it. Rooting graphic satire in a culture of shame and libelling, we have suggested that Anti-Catholic polemic was a means of resolving tensions Protestants felt in the face of confessional co-existence, an active punishment of the 'other' which faced them. As such, polemic was both liberating and exacting: easing anxieties through the release of hatred, but intensifying attachment to a Protestant identity which was intrinsically Anti-Catholic. For this reason, Anti-Catholic iconography proved such a powerful point of unity at times of

---

[1] H. Burton, *The Sounding of the Two Last Trumpets the Sixth and Seventh* (London, 1641), p. 42.
[2] For a discussion of this image, see above pp. 341-2.

355

political crisis, galvinizing oppositional energy behind an imagery which debased the Pope."

For all the short-term impact of 'popular' propaganda, for Scribner the story of the image in Protestantism was ultimately one of failure.[3] Scribner argued that the Reformation, like all ideological movements, was a struggle over the past, over the appropriation of traditional iconography – if Protestants were successful in reformulating that iconography to produce images that were polemical, they were less successful in producing those that were pedagogic. Awarding itself the mandate of 'instructing the common man' "Reformation popular propaganda did not measure up to its own ideals of effectiveness", failing to produce "the powerful symbols of allegiance which might have created a new 'symbolic universe' distinctly different from the old faith" – demolishing Babylon was one thing, building Jerusalem quite another.[4] Yet it was because he judged images against the standard of 'laymen's books' that Scribner arrived at this conclusion – once we step out of that paradigm, once we realize that the intention was never to speak to the unlettered nor to impart the tenets of theology, the story becomes one of success.[5] Turning to prints like *The Double Deliverance* and the extensive legacy it carved in the Reformed psyche, we realize that the Pope *was* the "powerful symbol of allegiance" which galvanized Protestants – an image grappled over by rival sects of Protestants, an image around which memory was constructed and disputed, and through which the souls of pious laymen were chastised to repentance. Protestantism certainly developed its own iconography, its own visual vocabulary: in this sense visual culture was not an appendix to the post-Reformation world, but a crucial part of it. Indeed, what strikes us most about the place of Anti-Catholic imagery was the number of purposes to which it was put, from protestant to piety, memory to monarchical address. As such, this thesis has demonstrated that Anti-Popery loomed large in England for centuries not as a result of the systematic repetition of a monolithic prejudice, but because its forms were varied, flexible and fecund.

Yet constraints of time and space have rendered its findings selective rather than schematic, and further research is necessary to flesh the picture out. Most

---

[3] R. W. Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda for the German Reformation* (Oxford, 1981). See pp. 190-250 for a pessimistic appraisal of the images' impact.

[4] Ibid, pp. 244-250, quotations at 244 & 248.

[5] Ibid, pp. 244, 228: "That pedagogic propaganda produced so little that was positive, compared to the undeniable success of its anti-papal features, is significant for our overall assessment of visual propaganda."

significantly, the Pope played a prominent part in the plethora of political prints which emerged during the Civil Wars, existing as a pictograph of evil dirtying rival sects and authorities by association.[6] Not only a testimony to the importance of visual vocabulary in that period, understanding his use in this forum of public politics is essential to grasping the vestiges of resonances which he undoubtedly held when employed by both Whigs and Tories a generation later to taint their opponents. Future research must also look forward as well as back. Scholars are beginning to recognize that the size of the market for graphic satire increased significantly during and after the Exclusion Crisis.[7] Much of that satire, as we have seen, was Anti-Catholic, and examining the deployment of the Pope in the increasingly incestuous wars between printers in the years of James II's reign, and those immediately after the Revolution of 1688, is necessary to understanding the development of our 'Protestant Kitsch' and to grasp the importance which Anti-Catholicism retained as a language of politics during turbulent times.[8] Might we speculate that, like Antichrist, the Pope lost some of his menace in these years due to the familiarity which the ubiquity of his depiction bred?

Another trope has been omitted not for lack of space but for want of understanding. Licentiousness was a familiar theme of the period's Anti-Catholic satire. An age-old means of debasing the enemy, its bite pricked more deeply when the subject in question held celibacy as a central tenet of their identity – the root of humour being the height from which honour fell.[9] Thomas Robinson's *The Anatomie of the English Nunnery at Lisbon* (1623) was typical in presenting confessors as predatory [Fig. 302.][10] Glorifying the might of the author's exposé, the image was emblematic of the work's contents. A nun confessed her sins, separated from her lecherous priest by a metal grille. He invited her into the cloister, and they walked arm-in-arm towards the chamber where she will pay her penance, revealed there in all of their shame by the author. The tropes of shame here are obvious, and such seedy and sensational scenes were understandably popular – prints depicting a friar thrashing the bare buttocks of a nun and Corneliuz of Dort, a confessor infamous for

---

[6] BM Sat 144; BM Sat 148; BM Sat 159; BM Sat 272; BM Sat 319; BM Sat 373; BM Sat 382; BM Sat 412; BM Sat 413; BM Sat 416; BM Sat 429; BM Sat 660; BM Sat 766. British Museum, 1857, 0606. 216.13. *The Kingdomes Monster Uncloaked from Heaven* (1643).

[7] J. Monteyne, *The printed image in early modern London: urban space, visual representation, and social exchange* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 155-214.

[8] BM Sat 1186; BM Sat 1296. British Musuem, 1894, 1211,3

[9] Such material is chronicled in M. Jones, *The Print in Early Modern England* (New Haven/London, 2010), pp. 146-55.

[10] T. Robinson, *The Anatomie of the English Nunnery at Lisbon* (London, 1623), title-page.

357

his lascivious chastising of female penitents only whilst they were naked, indicative of a much wider genre [Figs 303 & 304].[11] But as humorous and as risqué as these well-nigh pornographic scenes were, might there be more in them? Or were the thrills viewers elicited from these prints as cheap as those of the friars they depicted? *Converte Anglican*, a mezzotint of the 1680s, reveals the ambivalence [Fig. 305.][12] A biting satire on Catholic 'celibacy' it may have been, but it also seemed to prod at anxieties concerning the frailty of women. Issued as the height of fears concerning Roman dominion in England which had, in James II, a Catholic King, a Catholic Queen, and a Catholic heir, it was not simply the chastity of this fair penitent which was at risk from this wolfish-cleric, but the fate of the realm. The dead lambs on the cleric's table warn of the soul's mortal danger – "it is a foolish sheep that makes the wolf her confessor" – and the print's title, *Converte Anglican*, demonstrated that it spoke of desires far greater than the flesh's lust, suggesting that the real concern here was not the predatory nature of priests, but female susceptibility to their advances – a weakness which threatened the security of the nation.[13]

Might these sensational scenes have served to teach as much as to titillate? Might Anti-Catholicism have been used here as a moral buffer? A print known to us only by the draftsmanship of Thomas Trevilian is frustratingly suggestive [Fig. 306.][14] The scene depicts a shepherd in a quandary: able to fend-off only one of the two predators he faced, he must decide which of his cares of sacrifice – his flock to a hungry wolf; or his wife and, by virtue of being cuckolded, his reputation, to a lecherous friar. Following the words of John 10 he chose to save his flock, this laymen a 'good shepherd' in contrast to the iniquitous friar. And yet it is the wife, not the friar, who drew the moralist's venom. Oblivious in the clutches of lust, she allows the house to burn behind her, and is chastised by verses from Ecclesiasticus 26:

---

[11] Douce Collection, Bodleian Library; *A frier nam'd Cornelius dwelt in Dort*, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. I am indebted to Jones, *The Print in England* for these references.
[12] BM Sat 1146. Jones suggests that the print refers to Mary of Modena (*The Print in England*, p. 155.) The print, however, bears no resemblance to her.
[13] See also *Which of these fower* (London, 1623). For contemporary references to such prints, see L. Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty The Queen* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 4; A. C. Moule (Ed.), *The Cambridge Journal of William Dowsing* (Cambridge, 1926), p. 2.
[14] T. Trevilian, *The Great Book*, pp. 424-25. J. Paul Getty Collection, Wormsley Library, Buckinghamshire. I am indebted to Jones for this reference.

"Blessed is the man that hath a vertuous wife: for the number of his years shall be double: But the sorow and grefe of the heart if a yeoman that is iealous over an other: and she that communeth with all, is a scourge of the tongue: an evill wife is a yoke of oxen that draw divers waies: he that hath her, is as though he held a scorpion."[15]

It is the undutiful and weak wife that has left the husband in this catch-22 situation, forcing him to emasculate himself to save the family's livelihood. Is it too much to suggest that this print treated female and Catholic weakness as one? That, like Bateman's *Christall Glasse*, Anti-Catholicism was being used here to demarcate a barrier of impropriety that was unacceptable, deployed the 'other' to disgust women into action, to chastise them to be obedient and virtuous wives? Or is that a hapless over-reading of ambivalence?

The recognition that we are 'missing' something brings us full circle: by introducing readers to Wyatt's graffiti this thesis opened with a quandary, and I must beg their indulgence by closing it with another. If we opened with a tumbling Pope, it seems fitting to sign-off with one too. The frontispiece to Walter Lynne's *The Beginning and Endyng of All Popery* (1548) depicting a Pope at the head of a *processio*, struck down at the height of his pride by divine vengeance, is an image at which many of the themes discussed in this thesis converge [Fig. 307]:[16] the Pope has been debased and punished; a Catholic rite appropriated and re-described; Protestants confidence reified; the achievements of Lynne's work – a prophecy of the False Church's demise – glorified; and, in recognizing the reference to 2 Thessalonians 2's prophecy that God would "consume [Antichrist] by the spirit of his mouthe", viewers have seen through Papal pride as a 'mark' of the Beast.[17] Yet it is in recognizing this link to Thessalonians that we grasp that this image was more than simply a fantasy of divine retribution levelled at Rome – indeed, this image encapsulated how the satirical flavour of imagery was very different from that of texts, possessing an unspoken power which left a much stronger – and perhaps lasting – aftertaste. In Thessalonians, we hear the words of Paul. In light of Lynne's iconography, this was a very subtle joke – comparison with works by Durer and Caravaggio reveals the scene as a parody

---

[15] This is from the Apocrypha, Sirach ch. 26.
[16] Walter Lynne's *The Beginning and Endyng of All Popery* (1548), title-page. Reprinted in 1588.
[17] 2 Thessalonians 2:8-9: "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirite of his mouth, and will destroy with the appearance of his comyng, even hym whose comyng is under the workyng of Sathan."

of the Conversion of St. Paul, blinded by the Lord's power on the Road to Damascus and chosen to be the instrument of the Word's propagation.[18] Before this moment of Revelation, Paul had been Christ's enemy – like the Pope, he persecuted Christians, had participated in the stoning of Stephen, and was en route to arrest Christ's followers when God struck him. One of scripture's most famous episodes, Paul's conversion was emblematic of the power of grace, proof that no fall was so deep, no person so consumed with iniquity that grace could not reform him utterly. The Pope, it seems, was the exception. In inverting the iconography as a vehicle of divine retribution, rather than conversion, the joke here was that even God had given up on him. Nothing in the image forced viewers to 'get' this. Painted in bitter hues and drenched in unspoken resonances, the engraving's associations were nonetheless whispered, even teasing – pulsating with ambiguities, the scene sought to make brains tick and bellies chuckle, leaving souls warmed through with the edifying glow of macabre laughter.

---

[18] See Galatians 1:13-14; Corinthians 1: 9:1, 15:3-8, Acts 9.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

Trinity College, Cambridge   MS. B. 15. 33

                                       MS. B. 2. 7

                                       MS. B. 1. 38

                                       MS. B. 14. 15

Glasgow University Library   MS U 2.6 (215)

Oxford, Bodleian   MS Bodley 155 (SC 1974)

Oxford, Bod.   MS Bodley 416 (SC231)

Oxford Bod,   MS Digby 171

Oxford Bod,   MS Douce 363

British Library   Harl. 5936(305)

British Museum: Department of Print and Drawings

Catalogue of Political Prints & Personal Satires (6 vols) (London, 1873)

Catalogue of Drawings by British artists in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (London, 1960)

Hulton, P, *Catalogue of British Drawings in the British Museum, XVI and XVII centuries,* (London, 1960)

O'Donoghue, F, *Catalogue of engraved British portraits preserved in the department of prints and drawings in the British Museum,* 6 vols (London, 1908-25)

Stevens, F. G & George, D. M, *Catalogue of personal and political satires held in the British Museum,* 11 vols, (London, 1870-1954)

Willshire, W. H, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Playing and other Cards in the British Museum,* (London, 1876)

British Museum: Department of Coins and Medals

Hawkins, E, Franks, A. W. & Grueber, H. A, (ed.), *Medallic illustrations of the history of Great Britain and Ireland to the death of George II*, vol.I, (London, BMP, 1885)

Pinkerton, J, *The Medallic History of England to the Restoration* (London, 1790)

Society of Antiquaries

Lemon, R (Ed.), *Catalogue of a Collection of Printed Broadsides in the Possession of The Society of Antiquaries in London* (London, 1866)

Printed Records

Gilbert, J. T, *Report on the manuscripts of the Marquis of Ormonde, preserved at the castle, Kilkenny* (Historical Manuscripts Commission, London, 1906)

Gairdner, J (Ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign & Domestic in the reign of Henry VIII*, 21 vols (London, 1864-1932)

Luborsky, R. S & Ingram, E. M, *A Guide To English Illustrated Books, 1586-1603*, 2 vols (Arizona, 1998)

Newspapers

Impartial Protestant Mercury, 31/5/1681 – 26/5/1682

London Gazette, 4/11/1678 – 30/11/1682

The Loyal Protestant and True Domestick Intelligence, 9/3/1681 – 20/3/1682

Mercurius Anglicus, 24/12/1679 – 12/5/1680

Mercurius Infernus, or News from the Other World, 4/3/1680 – 8/4/1680

Mercurius Publicus, Beign a Summary of the whole Weeks Intelligence, 21/2/1680 – 18/3/1680

The Observator, in Dialogue, 13/4/1681 – 28/1/1682

The Protestant Post-Boy, 15/11/1711 – 21/6/1712

The True Domestick Intelligence; or News both from City and Country, 9/4/1679 –
11/5/1680

The True Protestant Mercury, or Occurances Foreign and Domestick, 28/12/1680 –
21/10/1681

*The Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome: or the History of Popery, with the Popish
Courant*, 3/12/1678 – 26/12/1678

Printed Primary Sources

An account of the burning of the Pope at Temple-Bar in London, Nov. 17 1769
(London, 1680)

*The acts of the ambassage passed at the meetinge of the lordees and princes of
Germany at Nauberg in Thuringe concerninge the matters there moved by pope Pius
IV in the year of our lord 1561 and the fyth day of February, item, the answer of the
same lords and princes, even to the popes nuncio upon the eigth day* (London, 1561)

*The answer of Carolus the fyfte Emperoure ever more august, into the letters
convoctorye of Paul the third Bysshope of Rome concerninge [the] generall co[ncell]
to be celebrated at Trident* (Antwerp, 1543)

An Answer to the Appeal from the Country to the City (London, 1679)

*An Elegie on the Right Worshipful Sir Edmund-Berry Godfrey, knight one of His
Majesties justices of the peace who was found murthered on Thursday the 17th of this
instance October, 1679* (London, 1678)

*Antichrist unhooded, or, An Explanation of the names and titles by which the
scripture exhibits Antichrist to the world* (London, 1664)

The armes of the tobachonists (London, 1630)

*Articles Devisid By the holle consent of the Kynges moste honourable counsayle, his
Gracis licence opteined therto, not only to exhorte but also to enforme his luvyne
subjects of the truthe* (London, 1533)

Babel and Bethel: or, the Pope in his Colours (London, 1679)

The ballad of the Cloak: or, the Cloaks Knavery (London, 1680)

*Bartholomew faire or variety of fancies, where you may find a faire of wares all to
please your mind* (London, 1641)

Be it knowen to all trewe Cristen people we have received a commandment from out Holy Father Pope Leo X (London, 1517)

The birth, purpose, and mortall wound of the Romish holie League (London, 1589)

The bishops last good-night (London, 1642)

The bishop's potion, or, a dialogue between the bishop of Canterbury and his phisition (London, 1641)

The black box of Roome opened (London, 1641)

The Bloudy Vision of John Farley (London, 1653)

The Book of Common Prayer (8th edn: London, 1676)

A Book of the continuation of foreign passages (London, 1657)

A bryefe and necessary Catechisme of Instruction (London, 1577)

A Brief Relation of the Persecution and Sufferings of the Reformed Churches of France (London, 1668)

The Burning of the whore of Babylon as it was acted with great applause, in the poultry, London (London, 1673)

By the Queene. A proclamation against the bringing in, dispersing, uttering and keeping of bulles from the sea of Rome, and other traitorous and sedicious libels, books and pamphlets (London, 1588)

The Camp of Christ, and the camp of Antichrist, all troopers after the Lambe (London, 1642)

Canterburies amazement: or, the ghost of the young fellow Thomas Bensted (London, 1641)

Canterburies dreame (London, 1641)

Certain sermons or homilies, appointed to be read in churches, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory, (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge: London, 1864)

The Character of an ignoramus doctor (London, 1681)

The Character of Those True Protestants in Masquerade, Heractlitus and The Observator (London, 1681)

A charme for Canterburian spirits, which (since the death of the arch-prelate) have appeared in sundry shapes, and haunted divers houses in the city of London (London, 1645)

A collection of scarce and valuable tracts, on the most interesting and entertaining subjects: but chiefly such as relate to the history and constitution of these kingdoms; selected from an infinite number in print and manuscript, in the Royal, Cotton, Sion and other libraries; particularly that of the late Lord Somers, 13 volumes, (London, 1809-15)

The Compleat swearing master: a rare new Salamanca ballad, to the tune of Now now the fight's done (London, 1682)

The confession of the faith, and doctrine believed and professed by the Protestants of Scotland exhibited to the estates of the first Parliament of King James the sixt: holden at Edinburgh, the 25 day of December, 1568, and authorized their (Edinburgh, 1638)

A Conspiracy discovered, or, The report of a committee to the house of Commons in Parliament of the examination of divers of the conspirators and others in the late treason, June 17 1641 (London, 1641)

Copie of a letter sent by the French King to the people or Artoys and Henault (London, 1595)

The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth; or, The downfall of the Pope (London, 1680)

The Dead man's song whose dwelling was near Basing-Hall in the city of London (London, 1680)

The deputies ghost (London, 1641)

A Dialogue Between the Pope and a Phanatick, Concerning Affairs in England (1680)

Dictated thoughts upon the Presbyterinas late petitions for compleat and universal power (in divine ordinaces) to be conferred upon the presbyters by humane authority (London, 1646)

A discovery of the Iesuites trumpery, newly packed out of England (London, 1641)

The discripcion, and foundacion of the holy apostolyke hospital, and confraternitie of the holy Goost in Rome, and by whome was first found and edified (London, 1520)

A disputation betwixt the Devill and the Pope (London, 1642)

The Dreadful Apparition; or, The Pope Haunted with Ghosts (London, 1680)

The Earl of Shaftsbury's loyalty revived: or, The Papists damnable plot against our religion and liberties, lively delineated in several of its branches, with an account of the manner of William Viscount Stafford on Tower Hill (London, 1681)

An elergie sacred to the memory of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey, knight, 30 October 1678 (London, 1678)

England's Grand Memorial: The Unparalled'd Plot to destroy his Majesty, and Subvert the Protestant Religion (London, 1679)

England's obligation to Captain William Bedloe, the grand discoverer of this most horrid plot (London, 1679)

England's petition, to her gratious king, that the Arminians, would to ruine bring, also, by his doctrine, privie plots, and hate to verity, doth ruine church and state (Amsterdam, 1641)

An exact discovery of the mystery of iniquity as it is now in practice amongst the Jesuits and other their emissarie: with a particular account of their antichristian and devillish policy (London, 1679)

An exclamation upon the erroneous and fantastical spirite of heresy (London, 1555)

The Fetter Lane Loyalist, or, A description of a true sonne of Rome (London, 1681)

The fierie tryall of Gods saints as a counter-poyze to I. W. priest his English Martyrologie and the Detestable ends of Popish Traytors (London, 1611)

Foxes and Fire-Brands; or, A specimen of the Danger and Harmony of Popery and Separation (1680)

The friendly conference: or, An hue and cry after the Popes Holiness (London, 1673)

A glasse of the truthe (London, 1532)

A Godly and Necessary Admonition of the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent (London, 1565)

The great assize: or, Christ's certain and sudden appearance to judgement (London, 1680)

The groome-porters lawes at Mawe, to be observed in fulfilling the due orders of the game (London, 1600)

The Happy Future State of England (London, 1688)

The happy instruments of England's preservation (London, 1681)

Hell's hurlie-burlie (London, 1644)

Here after foloweth the newe pryvylegs and indulgences graunted by our holy Father the Pope Leo X, to the house of seynt Thomas of Acres in London (London, 1517)

Historia de donne famose. Or The Romaine iubile which happened in the yeare 855. Disputed lately, that there vvas a woman pope named Ione the eight, against all the Iesuites, by a Germaine, but especially against Rob. Bellarmine father of all controuersies, his treatise De Romano pontifico. lib. 3. cap. 24 (London, 1599)

Historical remarques and observations of the ancient and present state of London and Westminster (London, 1681)

The history of Frier Rush (London, 1659)

The Holy Bible (London, 1669)

The Holy & great indulgence & pardon of plenary remission a pena et culpra graunted by diverse popes, & newly confirmed with many of our most holy father godes vicar upon erth pope leo the x (London, 1517)

The holy bull, and crusades of Rome first published by the holy father Gregory xiii, and after-wards renewed and ratified by Sixtus the V: for all those which desire full pardon and indulgences of their sinnes: and that for a little money, to weete, for two Spanishe recalls, vz thirteen pence (London, 1588)

Indulgences in English in favour of the Hospital of the Holy ghost (London, 1520)

The Jesuite and Priest Discovered (London, 1663)

The Jesuit's Character (London, 1679)

The Jesuit's Morals Condemned (London, 1680)

The king of Denmarkes vvelcome (London, 1606)

The kingdoms monster vncloaked from heaven (1643)

Lambeth faire wherein you have all the bishops trinkets set to sell (London, 1641)

A letter to Mr. Marriot (London, 1652)

A letter from a friend in London, to another at Salamanca (London, 1681)

A letter written by a French gentleman to a friend of his at Rome conteyning a true report of the late treaty betweene the Queene Mother of France and the King of Navarre (London, 1587)

The lineage of locusts, or, the Popes pedegre (London, 1641)

London's Drollery: or, The Love and kindness between the Pope and the Devil (London, 1680)

A Mappe of the Man of Sinne (London, 1622)

A Moderate Decision on the Point of the Succession; A Plea for Limited Monarchy (1660)

The Monk Unvail'd: or, A Facetious Dialogue (London, 1678)

More last words and sayings of the True Protestant Elm-board, or, A Full answer to a late pretended sober vindication of the Dr. and the Board (London, 1682)

Most fearefull and strange nevves from the bishoppricke of Dvrham (London, 1641)

Napiers Narration (London, 1641)

A necessary doctrine and erudition for any Christian man sette for the by the kinges maiestie of England (London, 1543)

A nest of nunnes egges strangely hatched, with the description of a worthy feast for joy of the brood (London, 1680)

New Verse Concerning the Plot (London, 1679)

News From Colchester (1681)

News from Rome being a dialogue between the Pope and the Devil at a late conference (London, 1677)

Newes from Rome, Spaine, Palermo, Geneuae and France (London, 1590)

News from Rome, Venice, and Vienna toching the present proceding of the Turks (London, 1595)

A notable Oration made by John Venaeus a Parisien in the defence of the Sacrament of the aultare (London, 1554)

Novembris monstrum, or, Rome brovght to bed in England with the whores miscarrying (London, 1641)

A nunnes prophesie, or, The fall of friers (London, 1615)

Oath of Christ and the age of Antichrist, or, Daniels diurnall (London, 1641)

Papa patens, or, The pope in his colours (London, 1652)

The Papists Lamentation for the loss of their agent William Viscount Stafford, together with the dread they are possessed with, fearing that more will quickly follow him the same way (London, 1680)

The passionate remonstrance made by His Holiness in the conclave at Rome (Edinburgh, 1641)

A peece of ordinance invented by a Jesuite for cowards that fight by whisperings, and raise jealousies to overthrow both church and state (London, 1644)

The Pedigree of Popery; or, The Genealogie of Antichrist (London, 1688)

The pimpes prerogative exactly and compendiously deciphered in a dialogue between Pimp-Major Pig, and Ancient Whiskin, two most eminent in that faculty, with their exultation at the downfall of Doctor Commons (London, 1641)

A plaine and godlye treatise (London, 1555)

A playne and godly exposition or declaration of the commune crede (London, 1533)

A Pleasant Discourse Between Two Sea Men (1681)

The plots of Jesuites (London, 1653)

A Poem of the effigies of Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey, who was barbarously murthered November the 20th, 1678 (London, 1678)

The Pope burnt to ashes, or, Definace of Rome (London, 1676)

Popery and Tyranny, or the Present State of France (London, 1679)

The popes pyramides (London, 1624)

The popes ware-house, or, The merchandise of the whore of Rome (London, 1679)

The Pouring Forth of the Seventh and Last Viall Upon All Flesh (London, 1650)

The proclamation promoted or a hue and cry and inquisition after treason and blood upon the inhumane and Horrid murder of that late noble knight, impartial justice of the peace and zealous protestant sir Edmund berry Godfrey (London, 1678)

A proper dialogue between a gentillman and a husbandman (Antwerp, 1530)

A prophesie of the judgment day. Being lately found in Saint Denis church in France, and wrapped in leade in the forme of a heart (London, 1620)

Protestant unity, the best policy to defeat Popery, and all its bloody practices (London, 1678)

The Protestants Vade Mecum, or, Popery display'd in its proper colours, in thirty emblems, lively representing all the Jesuitical plots against this nation, and more fully the hellish designe against His sacred Majesty, curiously engraven in copper-plate (London, 1680)

A Protestation made for the most mighty and most redoubted kynge of Englande and his hole counsel and clergie wherein is declared, that neyther his highness, nor his prelates, neyther any other prynce, or prelate, is bound to come or sende, to the pretended councell, that Paule byshoppe of Rome, first by a bul indicted at Mantua, a citie in Italy, and nowe a late by an other bull, hath prorogued to a place, no man can tell where (London, 1537)

A Purge for Pluralities, shewing the unlawfulnesse of men to have two Livings. Or The Downe-fall of Double Benefices (London, 1642)

The raigne of King Edward the third (London, 1599)

The recantacio[n] of Jacke lent vicare generall to the moore cruell Antichriste of Rome (London, 1548)

Reflections upon the murder of Sir Edmund Bury Godfrey (London, 1682)

Reflections upon the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance (1661)

A reply to dictated thoughtes by a more proper emblem (London, 1646)

A Representation of the Popish Plot in 29 Figures (1679)

The righteous evidence, witnessing the truth. Being an account of the sickness, and death-bed expressions, of Mr. VVilliam Bedlow : vvho deceased at Bristol, the 20th. of August, 1680. With his attestations which he left in writing, for the good of this nation, concerning the late damnable plot, contrived by the papists. With his two last prayers (London, 1680)

Rome's hunting-match for III kingdoms; or, The papists last run for the Protestants life and estates too, because this place has e'en beggar[e]d them (London, 1680)

Rome's treachery & hell bred cruelty (London, 1680)

The ruinate fall of the Pope Vsury, derived from the Pope Idolatrie, revealed by a Saxon of antiquitie (London, 1580)

Ruperts Simpery and private cabinet rifled. And a Dscovery of a pack of his Jewels (London, 1644)

A scheme of Popish cruelties, or. A prospect of what wee must expect under a Papist (London, 1681)

A Scholasticall Discourse against Symbolizing with Antichrist in Ceremonies (London, 1607)

Seven arguments plainly proving that papists are trayterous subjects to all true Christian princes with a touch of Jesuites treacherie (London, 1641)

Severall votes of Tender Conscience (London, 1646)

The Solemn mock procession of the Pope, Cardinalls, Jesuits, Friars...17 Nov 1679 (London, 1680)

The Solemn Mock Procession of the Pope (London, 1679)

The Solemn mock-procession, or, The Tryal & execution of the Pope and his ministers on 17 Nov at Temple Bar (London, 1680)

The Solemn mock procession of the Pope, Cardinalls, Jesuits, Friars...17 Nov 1680 (London, 1680)

The Spanish Colonie, or Brief Chronicle of the Actes and Gestures of the Spanish in the West Indies (London, 1578)

The subjects thankfulnesse: or, God-a-mercie good Scot (London, 1640)

A summe of the Guisan ambassage to the Bishop of Rome, found lately amongst the writings of one David an advocate of Paris (London, 1579)

A Tale of the tubs or Romes maister peice defeated (London, 1679)

The tender conscience religiously affected (London, 1646)

The theatre of Gods judgments, or, vials of rath poured out upon obstinate and resolute sinners, in 18 remarkable examples (London, 1680)

The Third newyeerers gift and the second protest against all the learned papists (London, 1576)

Titus tell-troth, or, The Plot-founder confounded (London, 1682)

To the right honourable the lord mayor at the anniversary entertainment in Guildhall (London, 1680)

A Tragicall Historie of the Warres in the Low Countries (London, 1583)

Treason justly punished: or, A full relation of the condemnation and execution of Mr. William Stayley (London, 1679)

A Treatise concernynge generall councilles, The Byshoppes of Rome and the Clergy (London, 1538)

A treatise provynge by the kynges lawes, that the byshopes of Rome, had never right to any supremitie within this realme (London, 1538)

A Treatise wherein Christe and his techynges, are compared with the pope and his doings (London, 1534)

Treves Endt: The Fvnerall of the Netherlands Peace (London, 1621)

A True and perfect relation of the wicked and bloody plot that was conspired against His Majesty, and the alteration of the Protestant religion : with the names of those persons that has suffer'd already about the plot : also the murder of that never to be forgotten marter Sr. Edmund Bury Godfrey (London, 1679)

A True and plaine genealogy or pedigree of Antichrist, wherein is cleerly discovered that hee is lineally descend from the divell (London, 1634)

A true and wonderful relation of a whale (London, 1645)

Vox Populi, Vox Dei (London, 1681)

The Whiggs Lamentation, For the Death of their Dear Brother Colledge (London, 1681)

A Whip for the Devil; or, the Roman Conjurer (London, 1683)

A Word in Season, or the Great Plot for Restoring Popery (London, 1663)

The worst is past, or, A merry new song that lately was pend which when these things alter, the times will amend: its merry and harmless, free of all distaste, and when the changes come, the worst is past (London, 1640)

Yet Once Agayne by the Kynge to the Shyryes (London, 1535)

I.A, *The great wonders that are chaunced in the realme of Naples with a great misfortune happened at Rome and in other places, by an earth quake in the month of December last past* (London, 1566)

R. A, *The valiant Welshman* (London, 1615)

Abbott, R, *Antichrists Demon strategy* (London, 1603)

_____, *The Third Part of the Defence of the Reformed Catholicke* (London, 1609)

_____, *The Danger of popery* (London, 1625)

Alesius, A, *A treatise concernygne generall councelles, the byshoppes of Rome, and the clergy* (London, 1538)

Allen, W, *An apologie and true declaration of the institution and endeavours of the two English colleges, the one in Rome, the other nowe resident in Rheims against certaine sinister information given up against the same* (Rheims, 1581)

Andrews, L *Works*, ed. J. Bliss & J. P. Wilson, 11 vols, (Oxford, 1851)

Ariosto, L, *Orlando Furioso translated into English heroical verse by Sir Jon Harrington* (Ed.) R. McNulty (Oxford, 1972)

Arnauld, A, *A true discourse of the whole occurrences in the Queens voyage from her departure from Florence, until her arrival at the city of Marseilles* (London, 1611)

Askew, A *The lattre examinacyon of Anne Askew* (Wesel, 1547)

Aspinwall, W, *An Explication or Application Of the Seventh Chapter of Daniel* (London, 1654)

Avila y Cuniga, Luis de, *The commentaries of Don Luis de Avella, and Sunriga, great master of Arunter which threaten of the great wars in Germany made by Charles the fifth Maxamus Emperoure of Roma, King of Spain, against John Frederike Duke of Saxony, and Philip the Landgrave of Hesson with other gret Princes and cities of the Lutherans, wherein you may see how God hath preserved this worthy and victorious emperour, in all his affayres, against his enemies* (London, 1555)

R. B, *Wonderful prodigees of judgment and mercy* (London, 1681)

___, *Historical remarques and observation of the ancient & present state of London and Westminster* (London, 1681)

T. B, *Newes from Rome. Or a relation of the Pope and his patentees pilgrimage unto hell* (London, 1641)

Bacon, N, *A Relation of the fearful Estate of Francis Spira, In the Year 1548* (London, 1678)

Bale, J, *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, ed. P. Happe, 2 vols (Woolbridge, 1985)

_____, *King Johan, by John Bale*, ed. G. Greg (Malone Society: Oxford, 1931)

_____, *A Declaration of E. Bonners Articles Concerning the clergye of London dyoces* (London, 1561)

_____, *The first two parts of the actes or unchaste examples of the English votaryes* (London, 1551)

_____, *The Image of Bothe Churches* (London, 1548)

_____, *The epistle exhoratorye of an Enlyshe Christine into his derely beloued contreye of Englande, against the pompousse popyshe Bysshoppes therol as yet the true members of theyr flylthye father the great Antichrist of Rome* (Antwerp, 1544)

_____, *Yet a course at the Romyshe foxe. A dysclosynge or openynge of the Manne of Synne, contained in the late declaration of the Popes olde faythe made by Edmonde Boner byshopp of London, whereby Wyllyam Tolwyn was then newlye professed at paules crosse openly into Antichrist Romyshe reylgyon agayne by a newe solempne othe of obedience, notwythsta[n]dynge the othe made to hys prince afore to the contrayre* (Antwerp, 1543)

Bancroft, R, *Dangerous Positions* (London, 1593)

Bancroft, T, *The Glvtton Fever* (London, 1633)

Barber, E, *A true discovery of the ministry of the Gospell, or, Those gifts which Christ gave at his Ascension* (London, 1645)

Barlow, H, *The Writings of Henry Barlow, 1587-90*, ed. L. Carlson (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, 3: London, 1962)

Barlow, T, *Papismus regiae ptestatus eversoc* (London, 1682)

_____, *Brutus fulmen: or, The bull of Pope Pius V. concerning the damnation, excommunication, and deposition of Q. Elizabeth* (London, 1681)

_____, *Popery* (London, 1679)

Barlow, W, *The booke Reade me frynde and be not wrothe, for I saye nothing but the trothe* (Antwerp, 1546)

Barnadiston, G, *A testimony against Jeffrey Bullock, his antichristian and foolish pamphlet stiled Antichrist's transformation within discovered by the light wherein the perverse spirit, darknesse and whimsical conceits are reprehended by the true light* (London, 1676)

Barnes, B, *The Divils Charter* (London, 1607)

_____, *The Divil's Charter* (Ed) N. de Somogyi (London, 1999)

Barnes, Robert, *The supplication of doctour Barnes vnto the moost gracyous kynge Henrye the eyght* (London, 1531)

Barnfield, R, *The affectionate shepheard* (London, 1594)

Barrow, H, *The Writings of Henry Barrow, 1590-91*, ed. L Carslon (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, V: London, 1966)

Barrow, I, *The Works of Isaac Barrow*, ed. A. Napier, 9 vols, (Cambridge, 1859)

Bartholome, Clere-Ville de, *The copye of the letter folowynge specfyett of ye greatest and mervelous visyoned batayle that ever was sene or herde of and also the letter yt was sent from the great Turke unto our holy fader ye pope of Rome* (Antwerp, 1518)

Bastwick, J, *The confession of the faithfull witnesses of Christ, Mr. John Bastwick* (London, 1641)

Bateman, S, *The doome warning all men to the judgment* (London, 1582)

_____, *Batman uppon Bartholomew* (London, 1582)

_____, *The new arrival of the three gracis into Anglia. Lamenting the abusis of this present age* (London, 1580)

_____, *The Golden Book of Leaden Goddes* (London, 1577)

_____ ,*A Christall glasse of christian reformation, wherein the godly maye beholde the coloured abuses of this our present tyme* (London, 1569)

_____ ,*The Travayled Pilgrime* (London, 1569)

Baynes, P, *Christian Letters* (London, 1628)

Beard, T, *Antichrist the Pope of Rome* (London, 1625)

Becon, Thomas, *The Reliques of Rome's* (London, 1563)

_____ , *Prayers & Other Pieces of Thomas Becon, S.T.P, Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, Prebendary of Canterbury* ed. J. Ayre, (Parker Society 12: Cambridge, 1844)

Bedell, W, *An Examination of Certaine Motives to Recusansie* (London, 1624)

Bedford, T, *Treatise of the Sacraments* (London, 1639)

Bedlow, W, *A narrative and impartial discovery of the horrid Popish plot* (London, 1679)

_____ ,*The excommunicated prince, or, The false relique: a tragedy, as it was acted by His Holiness's servants, being the Popish plot in a play by Capt. William Bedloe* (London, 1679)

Benett-Stanford, V. F, & Ansell-Day, W (Eds.), *Pythouse Papers* (London, 1879)

Benoist, E, *History of the Famous Edict of Nantes* (London, 1694)

Bernard, R, *Contemplative Pictures with Wholesome Precepts* (London, 1610)

_____ , *A Key of Knowledge for the Opening of the Secret Mysteries of St. Johns Mysticall Revelation* (London, 1617)

_____ , *Looke beyond Luther* (London, 1623)

Beze, T, *The Psalmes of Dauid truly opened and explaned by paraphrasis, according to the right sense of euerie Psalme* (London, 1590)

Blaxton, J, *A remonstrance against the non-residents of Great Brittaine, or, Non-residency condemned by Scripture* (London, 1642)

Bohum, E, *The Third and Last Part of the address to the Free-Men* (London, 1683)

Boaisthau, P, *Theatrum Mundi, the Theatre or rule of the world, wherein may be sene the running race and course of veryre man's life* (London, 1566)

Bonner, E, *A profitable and necessarye doctrine* (London, 1554)

Booker, J, *The Bloody almanack* (London, 1643)

Boorde, A, *The Breviarie of Health* (London, 1575)

Bradford, J, *The hurte of hering masse, set forth by the faithfull servant of god and constant master of Christ John Bradforth, when he was prisoner in the Tower of London* (London, 1561)

Bradford, J, *Sermons*, ed. A Townsend (Parker Society 31: Cambridge, 1848)

Brathwait, R, *The devils white boyes: or, a mixture of malicious malignants* (London, 1644)

_____, *Ar't asleepe husband?* (London, 1640)

_____, *The English Gentleman* (London, 1633)

Bray, G, *Documents of the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 1994)

Bremend, G de, *The pilgrim, a pleasant piece of gallantry* (London, 1680)

Brice, G, *Ane description of Paris* (London, 1687)

Brightman, T, *The Revelation of S. John illustrated with an analysis and scholions* (Leyden, 1616)

_____, *A reuelation of the reuelation that is, the reuelation of St. Iohn opened clearely With a logicall resolution and exposition*(Amsterdam, 1615)

Brome, A, *Rump, or, An exact collection of the choycest poems and songs relating to the late times* (London, 1662)

Broughton, H, *A concent of Scripture* (London, 1590)

Browne, A, *Rump* (London, 1662)

Browne, J, An historical account of Mr. Rogers three years travels over England (???)

Bull, H, *Christian Prayers and Holie medtations* (London, 1568)

Bullinger, H, *A Hundred Sermons on the Apocalypse* (London, 1561)

_____, *A brief and compendiouse table, in a maner of a concordance opening the waye to the principalle histories of the whole Bible* (London, 1550)

_____, *A Treatise or Sermon* (London, 1549)

_____, *A Commentary upon the seconde epistle of S Paul to the Thessalonia[n]s In the whixhe heads the summe of oure faythe, ther is syncerele*

handled [and] set forth at large, not only first coming up and rysyng with the full propery and dominion, but also the fall and utter confucion of the kyngdome of Antichriste: that is to say of Mahomet [and] the bysshop of Rome (London, 1538)

Bunyon, J, *Works* 3 vols, (Glasgow, 1860)

Burnet, G, *History of his Own Times*, 2 vols, (London, 1897)

_____, *The history of the reformation of the Church of England* (London, 1679)

Burton, H, *The Sounding of the Two Last Trumpets* (London, 1641)

_____, *The Protestant Protested* (London, 1641)

_____, *For God, and the King. The Summe of Two Sermons Preached on the Fifth of November last in St. Matthews Friday-Streete* (Amsterdam, 1636)

_____, *Babel no Bethel* (London, 1629)

The baiting of the Popes bull. Or An unmasking of the mystery of iniquity (London, 1627)

Burton, R, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (London, 1932)

Burton, W, *Ten Sermons* (1602)

Bury, J, *A true narrative of the late design of the papists to charge their horrid plot upon the Protestants by endeavouring to corrupt Captain Bury and Alderman Brooks of Dublin, and to take off the evidence of Mr. Oats and Mr. Bedlow* (London, 1679)

Butler, S, *Hudibras*, (London, 1810)

Calfhill, J, *An answer to John Martiall's treatise of the cross, by James Calfhill* ed. R. Gibbings (Parker Society 28, Cambridge, 1848)

Calvin, J, *Commentaries on the Book of Psalms*, ed. J. Anderson, 5 Vols, (Edinburgh, 1845)

_____, *Commentaries on the Book of Joshua*, ed. H. Beaveridge (Edinburgh, 1854)

_____, *Commentaries on thee 12 Minor Prophets: Joel, Amos & Obadiah* ed. J. Owen (Edinburgh, 1986)

_____, *Commentary on the Acts*, ed. H. Beaveridge, 2 vols, (Edinburgh, 1966)

_____, *Commentary on Daniel* ed. T. Myers (London, 1966)

_____, *Commentary on the Epistle of St. James* (Aberdeen, 1797)

_____, *Commentary on Genesis* ed. J. King (London, 1965)

_____, *Commentaries on Isiah*, 2 Vols, (Oregon, 1979)

_____, *Commentary on St. John*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1961)

_____, *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God* ed. J. K. S. Reid (London, 1961)

_____, *Concerning the 12 Minor Prophets: Jonas, Michah & Nahim* ed. J. Owen (Edinburgh, 1986)

_____, *Concerning the 12 Minor Prophets: Zechariah & Malachi* ed. J. Owen (Edinburgh, 1986)

_____, *Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews & Epistles of Peter* ed. W. B. Johnston (Edinburgh, 1963)

_____, *Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Phillipians & Colossians* ed. T. H. L. Parker (Edinburgh, 1965)

_____, *Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans & to the Thessalonians* ed. R. A. Mackenzie (Edinburgh, 1972)

_____, *First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* ed. J. W. Foster (Edinburgh, 1960)

_____, *Harmony of the Gospels: Matthew, Mark, Luke,* ed. A. W. Morrison, 3 Vols (Edinburgh, 1972)

_____, *Harmony of the Pentateuch,* ed. C. William Bingham, 4 vols (Edinburgh, 1852)

_____, *Institution of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (Atlanta, 1975)

_____, *Old Testament Commentaries: Ezekiel* ed. D. Foxgrover (Carlisle, 1994)

_____, *On the Christian Faith*, ed J. T Mcneil, (New York, 1957)

_____, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians & Timothy, Titus and Philemon* ed. T. A. Smail (Edinburgh, 1964)

_____, *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (London, 1583)

_____, *Sermons on Timothy & Titus* (London, 1579)

_____, *Theological Treatises*, ed. J. K. S. Reid (London, 1954)

_____, *Tracts & Treatises*, ed. H. Beaveridge, 3 Vols, (Edinburgh/ London, 1958)

Camden, W *Annals, the true and royal history of famous Impresses Elizabeth* (London, 1625)

_____ , *Institutio graecae grammatices compendiaria, in usum regiae scholae Westmonasteriensis* (London, 1632)

Capistraus, John, *The Pope* (London, 1621)

Carleton, G, *A thankfull remembrance of Gods mercy* (London, 1624)

Carlson, L & Peel, A (eds.), *The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne* (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts, 2: London, 1953)

_____*Cartwrightiana* (Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts: London, 1951)

Carpenter, R, *A new play call'd The Pragmatical Jesuit* (London, 1665)

_____,*The Anabaptist washt and washt, and shrunk in the washing: or, A schollasticall discussion of the much agitated controversie concerning infant-baptism* (London, 1653)

_____,*The Downfall of Anti-Christ* (London, 1644)

Cartwright, T, *A plaine explanation of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1622)

_____ , *Second Replie against Whitgifte*, (London, 1575)

Cary, E, *The Catechist Catechised* (London, 1681)

Castiglione, B, *The book of the courtier*, trans. by Sir Thomas Hoby (London, 1994)

Chamberlayne, W, *Pharonnical a heroic poem* (London, 1659)

Chidley, S, *The dissembling Scot set forth in his colours, or, a vindication of Lieu. Col. John Lilburn and others* (London, 1652)

Christie, W. D, (ed.), *Letters Addressed from London to Sir John Williams* 2 vols (Camden Society, 1874)

Cicero, *De natura deorum*, trans. H. Rackham (New York, 1933)

Clapham, H, *Errour on the Right Hand* (London, 1608)

Clark, E, *The Protestant school-master* (London, 1680)

Clarke, S, *The history of the glorious life, reign, and death of the illustrious Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1682)

_____, *England's remembrancer a true and full narrative of those two never forgotten deliverances* (London, 1679)

_____, *A collection of the live of ten eminent divines* (London, 1662)

Cobbett, W, (Ed.), *A Complete Collection of State Trials*, 31 volumes (London, 1809-23

_____ *The Parliamentary History of England*, 36 vols (1806-20),

Cole, R T, *Church Plate of the city of Bristol* (Bristol, 1932)

College, S, *A ra-ree show* (London, 1681)

Collier, J (Ed.), *An Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain,* 2 vols (London, 1708)

Cook, G. H (Ed), *Letters to Thomas Cromwell and others on the suppression of the Monasteries* (London, 1965)

Cooke, A, *The Present for a Papist, The life and death of Pope Joan* (London, 1675)

Coverdale, M, *Remains of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter* ed. G Pearson, (Parker Society 2: Cambridge, 1846)

_____ *Certain most godly, fruitful, and comfortable letters of such true saintes and holy martyrs of God, as in the late bloddye persecution here within this realme, gave their lyves for the defence of Christes holy gospel written in the tyme of their affliction and cruell imprisonment* (London, 1564)

Cowper, W, *The works of Mr William Cowper late Bishop of Galloway* (London, 1623)

Craigie (Ed.), J, *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, 2 vols (Edinburgh/London, 1955-8

Cranmer, T, *Miscellaneous Writings of Thomas Cranmer* ed. J. E. Cox (Parker Society, 17: Cambridge, 1846)

_____, *Writings & Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,* (Ed), J. Edmund Cox, Parker Society, 17 (Cambridge, 1844)

_____, *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer,* H. Jenkyns (Ed.), 4 vols (London, 1833)

_____, *An Answere unto Crafts and Sophisitcall* (London, 1551)

_____, *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine* (London, 1550)

Cressy, S, *The Church History of Brittany* (London, 1668)

Crossman, S, *The young man's calling, or, The Whole duty of youth* (London, 1678)

Cunningham, W, *The cosmographical glass* (London, 1559)

Celia Secondo Currione, *Pasquine in a traunce a Christian and learned dialogue (contayning wonderfull and most strange newes out of heauen, purgatorie, and hell) wherein besydes Christes truth playnely set forth, ye shall also finde a numbre of pleasaunt hystories, discouering all the crafty conueyaunces of Antechrist. Turned but lately out of the Italian into this tongue, by W.P. Seene* (London, 1566)

Daly, P. M, (ed.) *The English Emblem Tradition: Index Emlematicus*, 5 Vols (Toronto, 1998)

_____*Emblem Scholarship Directions and Developments: A tribute to Gabriel Hornstein* (Turnhout, 2005)

Davies, J, *Bien Venu, great Britanes welcome to hir greate freidns, and deere bretherne the Danes* (London, 1606)

Dangerfield, T, *More shams still, or, A further discovery of the designs of the Papists to impose upon the nation the belief of their feigned Protestant or Presbyterian plot* (London, 1681)

_____, *Tho. Dangerfield's answer to a certain scandalous lying pamphlet entituled, Malice defeated, or, The deliverance of Elizabeth Cellier together with some particular remarks made from her own words, an acknowledgment of matter of fact, and a short compendium of the principal transactions of her life and conversation* (London, 1680)

_____, *Information of Thomas Dangerfield, Gent : delivered at the bar of the Hovse of Commons, Tuesday the twentieth day of October in the year of Our Lord 1680* (London, 1680)

_____, *The case of Tho. Dangerfield: with some remarkable passages that happened at the tryals of Elizabeth Cellier, the popish midwife, and the Earl of Castlemain, at the Kings-bench bar at Westminster, before Sir Will. Scroggs Kt, Lord Chief Justice, &c. in the month of June, 1680* (London, 1680)

_____, *Mr. Tho. Dangerfields particular narrative of the late popish design to charge those of the Presbyterian party with a pretended conspiracy against His Majesties person and government* (London, 1679)

_____, *Mr. Tho. Dangerfeild's [sic] second narrative: wherein is contained a faithful charge against the Lady Powis, Mr. Stamford* (London, 1679)

Dawks, T, *England's Grand Memorial* (London, 1679)

Day, R, *Christian Prayers & Meditations in English, French, Italian, Spanish, Greek and Latin* (London, 1569)

Dee, J, *General and rare memorials* (London, 1577)

Dekker, T, *Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. F. Bowers, 4 vols, (Cambridge, 1980)

Denakol, *Den sack met die stucken voor den Paus van Roomen* (London, 1568)

Denne, H, *Antichrist unmasked in Two Treatises* (London, 1646)

Dent, A, *The Ruine of Rome* (London, 1603)

Dering, E, *Diaries and Papers of Sir Edward Dering, Second Baronet, 1644-1684* ed. M. F. Bond (London, 1976)

Dodgson, C, *Catalogue of Early German and Flemish Woodcuts in the British Museum* (London, 1903)

Donne, J, *The Sermons of John Donne* ed. G. R. Potter & E. M. Simpson (Berkeley, 1955)

Downame, G, *A Treatise Concerning Antichrist* (London, 1603)

Dryden, J, *A prologue written by Mr. Dryden, to a new play, call'd, The loyal brother* (London, 1682)

Dudley, J, *The sayng of John late Duke of Northumberland upon the scafolde* (London, 1553)

Dudley, R, *Correspondance of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leycester, During His Governemnt of the Low Countries, In the Years 1585 and 1586* ed. J. Bruce (Camden Society, Old Series, 27: Cambridge, 1844)

Dugdale, W, *The history of St. Pauls Cathedral in London from its foundation until these times* (London, 1658)

Dyke, D, *Certaine Comfortable Sermons upon the 124. Psalme: tending to stirre up to Thankefulnesse for our Deliverance from the Late Gunpowder-Treason* (London, 1616)

Echard, L, *The history of the Revolution and the establishment of England, in the year, 1688*, 3 vols, (Dublin, 1740)

Egan, A, *The Book of rates now used in the sin custom-house of the church and court of Rome* (London, 1678)

_____, *The Romanists Designs Detected* (London, 1674)

Elliot, A, *A modest vindication of Titus Oates, the Salamanca-doctor from perjury, or, An essay to demonstrate him only forsworn in several instances* (London, 1682)

Ellis, H (Ed.), *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, 2 vols, (London, 1846)

Elton, E, *God's Holy Mind Touching Matters Moral* (London, 1625)

_____, *Exposition of the Ten Commandments* (London, 1623)

_____, *Forme of Catechizing set downe by questions and answers* (London, 1616)

Estienne, H, *The Art of Making Devices*, trans Thomas Blount (London, 1646)

L'Estrange, *A Momento, Treating the Rise, Progress and Demands of seditions* (London, 1682)

_____, *The character of a papist in masquerade* (London, 1681)

_____, *The Committee, or, Popery in Masquerade* (London, 1681)

_____ *L'Estrange's narrative of the plot : set forth for the edification of His Majesties liege-people* (London, 1680)

_____, *Discovery upon discovery in defence of Doctor Oates against B.W.'s libellous vindication of him, in his additional discovery, and in justification of L'Estrange against the same libel* (London, 1680)

_____, *A further discovery of the plot dedicated to Dr. Titus Oates* (London, 1680)

_____ *A Full and Final Proof of the Plot from the Revelations, Whereby the Testimony of Dr. Titus Oates and Mr. Will. Bedloe is Demonstrated to be Juro Divino* (London, 1680)

_____, *A Further Discovery of the Plot* (London, 1680)

_____, *History of the Plot, or, A brief and historical account of the charge and defence of Edward Coleman, Esq., William Ireland, Thomas Pickering, John Grove : Robert Greene, Henry Berry* (London, 1679)

Evans, A, *A Voice From Heaven to the Common Wealth of England* (London, 1652)

Evans, J, *Some thoughts on the character of Solomon's virtuous woman* (London, 1695)

Evans, L, *The Castle of Christianitie detecting the long erring estate, as well of the Romaine Church as of the Byshop of Rome: together with the defence of the Catholique faith* (London, 1568)

Evelyn, J *Diary*, ed. E. S. De Beer (Oxford, 1955)

d'Ewes, S, *Autobiography and Correspondence*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, 2 vols (London, 1845)

_____, *The Diary of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, 1622-24: Journal d'un étudiant Londonien sous le regne de Jacques 1er*, ed. E. Bourcier, (Paris, 1974)

F. E, *Christian information concerning these last times* (London, 1664)

D. F. *The Dutch-mens pedigree or A relation, shewing how they were first bred, and descended from a horse-turd, which was enclosed in a butter-box* (London, 1653)

R. F, *A brief discovery of the kingdome of Antichrist* (London, 1653)

Featley, D, *Roma ruens, = Romes ruine* (London, 1644)

Ferrar, N, *Two Lives*, ed. J. E. B. Major (Cambridge, 1855)

Feuillerat, A, *Documents relating to the Revels at Court in the time of King Edward VI and Queen Mary (the Loseley Manuscripts)* (Vaduz, 1965)

_____ *Documents relating to the Revels at Court in the time of Queen Elizabeth* (Vaduz, 1963)

Firth, C. H, & Rait, R. S, eds, *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum*, 3 vols, (London, 1911)

Fish, S, *The very beggars petition against popery* (London, 1680)

Fisher, J, *A sermon had at Paulis bythe Commandment of the most reverend Father in God my Lord Legate...concerynge certayne heretickes* (London, 1526)

_____ *The sermon of Johan the bysshop of Rochester made against the pernicious doctrines of Martin Luther* (London, 1521)

Fitzherbert, T, *A defence of the Catholyke cause* (Antwerp, 1602)

Flacus Illyricus, M, *A godly and necessarye admonition of the decrees & canons of the Councel of Trent, celebrated under Pius the fourth, Byshop of Rome, in the years of our Lord M.D.L.X.II and M.D.LXIII* (London, 1564)

_____, *Wonderful newes of the deathe of Paul the iii last byshop of Rome [and] of diverse thynges that after his death have happened, wherein is tryle set the abominable actes of his most mischievous life* (London, 1552)

Forbes, P, *An exquisite commentarie upon the Revelation of Saint John* (London, 1613)

Forest Lord, G de, *Poems On Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse 1660-1714*, 5 volumes, (New Haven, 1963)

Foster, G, *The Sounding of the Last Trumpet* (London, 1650)

Fox, Edward, *The determination of the moste famous & mooste excellent universities of Italy and France, that it is so unlawfull for a man to marrie hus brothers wife, that the pope hath no power to dispense therewith* (London, 1531)

Foxe, J, *The Acts & Monuments*, 8 vols, (London, 1877)

_____(ed.), S.R Catley & G Townsend, (8vols) (London, 1837-41)

_____(London, 1684)

_____(London, 1641)

_____(London, 1632)

_____(London, 1610)

_____(London, 1570)

_____, *A Sermon of Christ crucified* (London, 1570)

Francis, F. C (ed.), *Narcissus Luttrell's Popish Plot Catalogues* (Oxford, 1956)

Franklin, R, *A discourse on Antichrist, and the Apocalypse* (London, 1675)

Frere, W. H, *Registrum Matthei Parker Diocesio Cantuariensum, AD 1559-75* (Oxford, 1928-33)

_____, *Puritan Manifestoes* (London, 1907)

Frith, J, *A pistle to the Cristen reader. The revelation of Antichrist,* (Antwerp, 1529)

Fulke, W, *Fulke's answers to Stapleton, Martiall, and Sanders* ed. R. Gibbings (Parker society 14: Cambridge, 1848)

_____, *A Rejoynder to Bristow* (London, 1581)

_____,*D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and M. Rastel, Accounted (Among their factions) Three Pillars and Archpatriaches of the Popish Synagogue* (London, 1579)

_____, *Praelections upon the sacred and holy Revelation of St. John* (London, 1573)

_____A sermon preached at Hampton Court on Sonday being the 12 day of Nouember, in the year of our Lord 1570. Wherein is plainely proved Babylon to be Rome, both by Scriptures and doctors_ (London, 1570)

B. G, _A newyeares gifte dedicated to the Popes Holinesse, and all Catholikes addicted to the Sea of Rome: preferred the first day of Ianuarie, in the reare of our Lorde God, after the course and computation of the Romantes, one thousand, five hundred, seventie and nine, by B. G citizen of London: in recompense of divers singular and inestimable reliques, of late sent by the said Popes holiness unto England, the true figures and representations wherof, are hereafter in their places dilated_ (London, 1579)

G. G, _A briefe treatise against the priesthood & sacrifice of the Church of Rome_ (London, 1584)

Gardiner, S, _The Letters of Stephen Gardiner_ ed. J. A. Muller, (Cambridge, 1933)

_____,Confutatio cavillationum quibus sacrosanctum ... Eucharistiæ Sacramentum ab impiis Capernaitis impeti solet, authore A. Constantio, theologo Lovaniensi_ (Louvain, 1554)

_____,De Vera Obedientia_ (Rome, 1553)

_____, An explicatiõ and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the most blessed Sacrament of the aulter with a confutation of a booke written agaynst the same_ (London, 1551)

_____, Stephani Winton episcope Angli ad Martinium Bucercim, de impumdentia eiurdem pseidologia conquestio_ (Louvain, 1549)

_____, In Petrum Martynem Florentum malae tractatious...sanctissema ecclesiastica_ (London, 1549)

_____, Stephani Winton episcope Angli ad Martinium Bucerim epistola, qua cessantem bactenus et clinctantem or frustratoria responsionus pollcitatione_ (Louvain, 1546)

_____, A detection of the deuils sophistrie, wherwith he robbeth the unlearned people, of the true byleef, in the most blessed sacrament of the aulter_ (London, 1546)

Garey, S _Great Britain's Little Calendar: or, Triple Diarie. In Remembrance of Three Daies_ (London, 1618)

Gataker, T, _A sparke tovvard the kindling of sorrow for Sion_ (London, 1621)

Gaunt, J, _Truths Victory Against Heresie_ (London, 1645)

Gifford, G, _Sermons Upon the Whole Book of Revelation_ (London, 1599)

Gilby, A, *A viewe of Antichrist his law and ceremony in our English Church unreformed* (London, 1570)

_____, *An ansvver to the deuillish detection of Stephane Gardiner, Bishoppe of Wynchester published to the intent that such as be desirous of the truth should not be seduced by hys errours, nor the blind [et] obstinate excused by ignorance* (London, 1547)

Gillespie, G, *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies* (Leiden, 1637)

Glasgow Art Gallery, *Silver in the Burrell Collection*

Goble, W, *The Procession: or, the Burning of the Pope in Effigie* (London, 1681)

Goodwin, F, *Catalogue of the Bishops of England* (London, 1601)

Gouge, W, *Gods Three Arrows* (London, 1631)

Greene, R, *A pleasant conceyted comedie of George a Greene, the pinner of Wakefield* (London, 1599)

_____, *The Triumph of Time* (1592)

_____, *An oration or funeral sermon uttuered at Roome, at the buriell of the holy father Gregory the 13* (London, 1585)

Greene, R, *Diaries of the Popish Plot* (New York, 1977)

Greene, R, *Menaphon* (1589)

Greg, W. W, (Ed.), *Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas 1553*, Early English Text Society, no. 226 (London, 1952)

Greville, F, G, *Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke*, ed. G. Bullough, 2 vols, (Edinburgh/London, 1939)

_____, *Certain learned and elegant works* (London, 1633)

Guevara, A de, *A chronicle, conteyning the lives of tenne emperours of Rome. Wherein are discovered, their beginnings, proceedings, and endings, worthie to be read, marked, and remembered. Wherein are also conteyned lawes of special profite and policie* (London, 1577)

_____, *The dial of princes* (London, 1557)

Gurzzo, S *The civile conversation* (London, 1586)

Gybson, Thomas, *The sum of the actes & decrees made by dyvers byshopes of Rome* (London, 1538)

B. H, *The Pope Burnt to Ashes: or Defiance to Rome* (London, 1676)

S. H, *The arch-cheate, or the cheate of cheats: or a notable discovery of some parts of the mystery of iniquitie* (London, 1644)

W. H. *English loyalty Vindicated by the Freed Divine* (Lonfon, 1681)

Hadley, G, *A New & complete History of the town of Kingston-Upon-Hull* (Hull, 1788)

Hall, E, *Hall's chronicle; containing the history of England, during the reign of Henry the Fourth, and the succeeding monarchs, to the end of the reign of Henry the Eighth, in which are particularly described the manners and customs of those periods* (London, 1809)

Hall, J, *Emblems with Elegant Figures, 1658* ed. J. Horden (Menston, 1970)

Hall, J, *The honor of the married clergie, maintayned against the malicious challenges of C.E. Masse-priest* (London, 1620)

_____ *The Great Imposter* (London, 1623)

Hargrave, F (ed.), *Collectanea Juridica: Consisting of Tracts Relative to the Law and Constitution*, 2 vols. (London, 1791-92)

Harington, J, *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* (London, 1596)

Harris, B, *The Protestant tutor instructing children to spel and read English, and ground them in the true Protestant religion and the discovery of error and deceit* (London, 1679)

_____, *An Elegie on the Right Worshipful Sir Edmund-Berry Godfrey* (1678)

Harvey, G, *Gratulationum Valdinensum* (London, 1578)

Harwood, J, *A Description of the true temple and worship of God* (London, 1658)

Haughton, E, *The Rise, Growth and Fall of Antichrist* (London, 1652)

Hawes, E, *Trayterous Percyes & Catesbyes prosopopeia* (London, 1606)

Hawkins, H, *Parthena Sacra* (Rome, 1635)

Hellwis, E, *A Marvell, deciphered* (London, 1589)

Hemmingsen, N, *The epistle of the blessed Saint Paule which he, in the time of his trouble and imprisonment, sent in writing from Rome to the Ephesians* (London, 1580)

Herbert, T, *Newes Newley Discovered, In a pleasant Dialogue betwixt Papa the false Pope, and Benedict an honest Fryer* (London, 1641)

_____, *An answer to The Most envious, scandalous, libellous pamphlet, entitled Mercuries Message* (London, 1641)

Herring, F, *Popish Pietie, or the First Part of the Historie of that Horrible and Barbarous Conspiracie, commonly called the Powder-Treason*, trans. A. P. (London, 1610)

Heylyn, P, *A Briefe and Moderate Answer* (London, 1637)

Heywood, T, *The Famous and Remarkable History of Sir Richard Whittington* (London, 1678)

Hickeringill, E, *The character of a sham-plotter or man-catcher* (London, 1681)

Hieron, S, *An answere to a popish rhyme* (London, 1604)

Hieron, S, *The Protestant mirrour, in proper postures and principles: or, The careful resident, and the careless non-resident* (London, 1681).

Hobbes, T, *Leviathan* (Cambridge, 1996)

Hodnett, G, *English Woodcuts – 1480-1535* (London, 1935)

Hollybush, J, *Newes concernynge the general cou[n]cell, holden at Trydent by the emperoure and the Germaynes wyeth all the nobles of Hungarye, Constantinople and Rome Translated out of the Germayne into Englysh by John Holibush* (London, 1549)

Holmes, N, *Works* (London, 1652)

Hooke, R, *Diary, 1672-80* ed. H. W. Robinson & W. Adams (London, 1968)

Hooper, J, *Early Writings of John Hooper, D.D, Lord Bishop of Glocester & Worcester, Martyr, 1555* (Parker Society:15, Cambridge, 1843)

_____*Later Writings of John Hooper, D.D, Lord Bishop of Glocester & Worcester, Martyr, 1555* (Parker Society:16, Cambridge, 1852)

_____*An answer vnto my lord of wynthesters [sic] booke intytlyd a detection of the deuyls sophistrye wherwith he robith the vnlernyd people of the trew byleef in the moost blessyd sacrament of the aulter* (Zurich, 1547)

Howell, J, *A German diet* (London, 1653)

Hozjusz, S, *Of the Expresse word of God. A shorte, but a most excellent treayise and most excellent for the tyme* (Louvain, 1567)

Hubberton, R, *A true separation between the power of the spirit, and the imitation of Antichrist* (London, 1654)

Huggarde, M, *The assault of the sacrame[n]t of the altar containyng aswell sixe seuerall assaultes made from tyme to tyme against the sayd blessed sacrament: as also the names [et] opinions of all the heretical captaines of the same assaultes* (London, 1554)

Hughes, G, *The art of embalming dead saints* (London, 1642)

Hughes, L, *A looking-glasse for all true hearted Christians wherein they may see the true goodness of God in giving deliverance unto them form their popish cruell and bloodie enemies by rendring vengeance upon them* (London, 1642)

Hughes, P. L, & Larkin, J. F, (eds.), *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols (New Haven/London, 1964-69)

Jackson, T, *Works* 12 vols, (Oxford, 1844)

Jenner, T *The Soules Solace, or thirtie and one spiritual emblems* (London, 1626)

Jewel, J, *The Works of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury*, 4 vols, John Ayre (Ed,) (Parker, Society, 24: Cambridge, 1850)

_____, *A viewe of a seditious bul sent unto England from Pius Quintus Bishop of Rome* (London, 1582)

_____, *Apology for the Church of England* (London, 1562)

Jonson, B, *Bartholomew Fayre* in *Three Comedies* ed. M. Jamieson (Hammondsworth, 1966)

Johnson, T, *Cornucopiae* (London, 1595)

Johnston, A F & Rogerson, M (eds.), *Records of Early English Drama: York*, 2 Vols, (Toronto, 1979)

Joye, G, *A contrarye consultacion* (London, 1549)

_____, *Jeremy the prophete, translated into Englisshe: by George Joyce: some tyme felowe of Peter College Cambridge* (Antwerp, 1534)

Keach, B, *Antichrist Stormed*, (London, 1689)

Knewstubs, J, *An aunswere unto certain assertions, tending to maintane the Church of Rome to bee the true and catholique church* (London, 1579)

_____, *Lectures of John Knewstub, vpon the twentith chapter of Exodus, and certeine other places of Scripture Seene and allowed according to the Queenes maiesties iniunctions* (London, 1577)

Knollys, H, *Exposition of the Whole Book of the Revelation* (London, 1689)

_____ *An exposition of the 11th Chapter of Revelation* (London, 1679)

_____ *Apocalyptical mysteries, touching the two witnesses, the seven vials, and the two kingdoms, to wit, of Christ, and of Antichrist, expounded* (London, 1667)

Knox, J, *Works*, ed. D. Laing, 6 vols, (Edinburgh, 1846-64)

T. L, *Babilon is fallen* (London, 1620 – original 1595)

T. L, *The Life and reign of Innocent XI, late Pope of Rome* (London, 1690)

Larkin, J. F. & Hughes, P. L. (eds.), *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, 2 vols, (Oxford, 1973)

Latimer, H, *Sermons By Hugh Latimer, Sometime Bishop of Worchester* ed. R. Rhyss (London, 1906)

_____ *,Sermons and Remains of Hugh Latimer, sometime Bishop of Worcester, Martyr, 1555* ed. G. Elwes Corrie (Parker Society 23: Cambridge, 1845)

_____ *Sermons of Hugh Latimer, sometime Bishop of Worcester, Marytr, 1555*, George Elwes Corrie (ed), (Parker Society: 22, Cambridge, 1844)

_____ *Certanye Godly Sermons* (London, 1562)

W. Laud, *Works*, ed. J. Parker, 7 vols, (Oxford, 1847-60)

_____ *,The history of the troubles and tryal of that reverend father in God archbishop Laud* (London, 1695)

Lecezycki, M *The glory of the Blessed Father Saint Ignatius Loyolla* (1623)

Lee, S, *Antichrist Excidium* (London, 1664)

_____ *, Israel Redux, or, the Reducion of Israel* (London, 1677)

Lee, N, *Caesar Borgia, Son of Pope Alexander the Sixth: A Tragedy* (London, 1680)

Leti, G, *Il Nipostismo di Roma: or, The History of the Popes Nephews* (London, 1673)

_____ *, Il putanismo Di Roma, Or the History of the Whores And Whoredom of the Popes, Cardinals and Clergy of Rome* (London, 1670)

_____ *, The life of Donna Olimpia Maldachini : who governed the church during the time of Innocent the X, which was from the year 1644 to the year 1655* (London, 1666)

Lever, C, *The History of the Defenders of the Catholique Faith* (London, 1627)

Lilburne, J, *Innocency and Truth Justified* (London, 1646)

_____,*A Worke of the Beast*, (Amsterdam, 1638)

Lilly, W *A short Introduction of grammar* (London, 1634)

Lloyd, W, *A sermon at the funeral of Sir Edmund-Bury Godfrey, one of His Majesties justices of the peace, who was barbarously murthered* (London, 1678)

_____,*The Late Apology In behalf of the Papists, Reprinted and Answered In behalf of the Royalists*, 4th edn (London, 1675)

Loades, D. M, *The Papers of George Wyatt, esquire* Royal Historical Society, 4th Series, 5 (London, 1968)

Loarte, G, *The exercise of a Christian Life* (London, 1594)

Longland, J, *A Sermon made before the Kynge his maiestye at grenewiche, upon good frydaye, The yere of our Lord God M.D. XXXVIII* (London, 1538)

Luther, Martin, *The Last wil and last confession of Martin Luther's faith* (Wesel, 1543)

_____,*The chiefe & pryncypall articles of the Christian faythe to holde agaynste the Pope, and al papists* (London, 1548)

Luttrell, N, *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs from Sept 1678 to April 1714* (Oxford, 1857)

Lykosthenes, K *The doome warning all men to the judgement* (London, 1581)

Lynne, W, *The beginning and endynge of all popery, or popishe kyngedome* (London, 1548)

_____,*A Brief collection of all such texts of the scripture as do declare the moste blessed and happie estate of them that be byseted with sycknes* (London, 1549)

_____,*A most necessarie Treatise, declaring the beginning and ending of all Poperie, or the popish kingedome. Drawne out of certain old prophery above three hundred years since: and nowe newly set forth with the ancient pictures thereunto belonging* (London, 1588)

_____,*The virtuous scholehous of ungracious women* (London, 1548)

M, I, *A breife recantacion of maystres Missa and howe she accueseth the slothfulnesse of her chapleyns, with the lamentable departing unto her father the Pope. 1.5 4.8* (London, 1548)

M, R, *A profitable Dialogue for a perverted Papist* (London, 1609)

Marnix, Philips van, *The bee hive of the Romishe Church* (London, 1579)

_____(London, 1580)

_____(London, 1623)

_____(London, 1636)

Marlorat, A, *A Catholike exposition upon the Revelation of sainct John* (London, 1574)

Marshall, W, *A goodlye prymer in englyshe, newly corrected and printed* (London, 1535)

Martyn, W, *Youths Instruction* (London, 1612)

Martyr, P, *The Common Places of the Most Famous and Renowned Divine Doctor Peter Martyr Divided into Foure Principal Parts* (London, 1583)

_____ , *De sacramenta eucharistia* (London, 1549)

Marvell, A *The Complete Poems*, ed. E. Story Donno (Hammondsworth, 1978)

_____ *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government* (London, 1677)

Massinger, P, *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, ed. P. Edwards & C. Gibson, 5 vols (Oxford, 1976)

Matthew, S, *A Sermon made in the Cathedral Churche of Seynt Paule at London, the XXVII day of June, anon 1535, by Simon Matthewe* (London, 1535)

Maxwell, J, *Admirable and notable prophecies* (London, 1615)

McClure, N. E. (ed.) *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, 12, 2 vols (Philadelphia, 1939),

Mede, J, *Key of the Revelation* (London, 1643)

Melancthon, P, *Of two Wonderful Popsih Monsters* (London, 1579)

Mercurius, H, *A pacquet of popish delusions, false miracles, and lying wonders* (London, 1681)

De Céspedes y Menises, G *Gerard the Unfortunate Spaniard, or, a patterne for lascivious lovers* (London, 1622)

Michael, J, *The spouse rejoicing over antichrist, and triumphing over he devil, in the day of the lord, when God alone shal bee exalted* (London, 1654)

Middleton, C, *History of Chinion of England* (London, 1597)

_____, *A Game at Chaes*, ed. T. H. Howard-Hill (Manchester, 1993)

_____, *A Game at Chess*, ed. J. W. Harper (London, 1966)

_____, *The Works of Thomas Middleton*, ed. A. H. Bullen, 8 vols (London, 1885)

Milton, J, *Nevvs from hell, Rome and the Innes of Court* (London, 1642)

Montagu, R, *Apello Caesarem* (London, 1625)

_____, *A Gagg for the New Gospel? No: a New Gagg for an Old Goose* (London, 1624)

More, H, *A Modest Enquiry into the Mystery of Iniquity* (London, 1664)

Munday, A, *Chruso-Thriambos: The triumphes of Gold* (London, 1611)

_____, *The second book of Primaleon of Greece* (London, 1596)

_____, *A Watchword to England to beware of traytours* (London, 1584)

_____, *Zelauto* (1580)

The English Romayne Lyfe (London, 1582)

N.N, *The Scarlet Gown* (London, 1653)

Nabbes, T, *Playes* (London, 1639)

Napier, J, *Plain Discoverie of the Whole Revelation of St. John* (London, 1593)

Nash, T, *Simms last Will and Testament* (London, 1600)

Nashe, T, *The terrors of the night* (London, 1594)

_____, *Have with you Saffron Walden* (London, 1596)

Naylor, J, *The power and glory of the Lord shining out of the North* (London, 1653)

Ness, C, *The Devils patriarck, or, A full an impartial account of the notorious life of this present Pope of Rome Innocent 11th* (London, 1683)

_____, *A distinct discourse and discovery of the person and period of Antichrist* (London, 1679)

Nichols, J. G (Ed.), *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation*, Camden Society, 77 (London, 1877)

_____(Ed.), *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (New York, 1823)

_____(Ed.), *The Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary*, Camden Society Publications No. 48 (1850)

_____(Ed.), *The Diary of Henry Machyn* (London, 1848)

Noot, J. Van Der, *A theatre wherein be represented as wel the miseries & calamities that follow the voluptuous worldings as also the greate joys and plesures which the faithful do enjoy* (London, 1569)

North, R, *Examen; or, an enquiry into the credit and veracity of a pretended complete history* (London, 1740)

Oates, T, *The discovery of the Popish Plot : being the several examinations of Titus Oates, D.D., before the High Court of Parliament, the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Edmund-Bury Godfry, and several other of His Majesty's justices of the peace* (London, 1679)

_____ *A sermon preached at St. Michaels Wood-street at the request of some friends* (London, 1679)

_____ *The King's evidence justifi'd, or, Doctor Oates's vindication of himself and the reality of the plot against a traiterous libel called The compendium: contrived by the Jesuits, to the dishonour of the King and kingdom* (London, 1679)

_____,*A true narrative of the horrid plot and conspiracy of the Popish party against the life of his sacred Majesty, the Government and the Protestant religion* (London, 1679)

_____ *An exact and faithful narrative of the horrid conspiracy of Thomas Knox, William Osborne, and John Lane, to invalidate the testimonies of Dr. Titus Oates, and Mr. William Bedlow by charging them with a malicious contrivance against the E. of Danby, and the said Dr. Oates with an attempt of sodomy : wherein are exemplified from the originals* (London, 1680)

_____ *A vindication of Dr. Titus Oates : from two late scurrilous libels written to create a dis-belief of the Popish plot : the one entituled A narrative by E. Settle : the other a modest vindication of Titus Oates, the Salamanca doctor, from perjury by A. Elliot* (London, 1683)

Ochino, B, *A tragoedie or dialoge of the unjuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome, and of the just abolishing of the same* (London, 1549)

Ocland, C, *The fountaine and wellspring of all variance, seditionm and deadlie hate* (London, 1589)

Old, J, *A short description of Antichrist vnto the nobilitie of Englande, and to all my brethren and contreymen borne and dwelling therin, with a warnynge to see to, that they be not deceaued by the hypocrisie and crafty conueyaunce of the clergie* (Emden, 1555)

Owen, J, *Works*, ed. W. H. Goold, 24 Volumes, (Edinburgh, 1850-53)

I P, *Romes Ruin* (London, 1629)

L.P. *The Quakers fear, or, Wonderfull strange and true news from the famous towne of Colchester in Essex* (London, 1655-58)

T. P, *Truth flatters not plaine dealing the best* (London, 1647)

Parker, M, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, ed. J. Bruce (Cambrdge, 1853)

_____, *A defence of prests marriages stablyssed by the imperiall lawes of the realmee of Englande, against a civilian, naming hym delfe Thomas Martin doctour of the civile lawes, goyng about to disprove the saide marriages, lawfull by the eternall worde of God, by the high court of parliament, only forbidden by foragne lawes and canons of the Pope, coloured with the visour of the Churche* (London, 1567)

Parsons, R, *The copie of a double letter sent by an English gentleman from beyond the seas, to his frende in London containing the true advises of the cause, and maner of the death, of one Richard Atkins, executed by fire in Rome, the seconde of August 1581* (Rheims, 1581)

Pascal, B, *Lettres Provinciales* (London, 1658)

_____, *Lettres Provinciales* (London, 1679)

Peacham, H, *The compleat gentleman* (London, 1622)

_____, *Minerva Britanna, or A garden of heroical devises* (London, 1612)

Peele, S, *The Pope in his fury doth answer returne, to a letter ye which to Rome is late come* (London, 1571)

Pelling, E, *A Sermon Preached On the Anniversary of that Most Execrable Murder of K. Charles the First, Royal Martyr* (1682)

Pemble, W, *An Introduction to the Worthy Receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (London, 1629)

Pennington, R, *Descriptive catalogue of the etched works of Wenceslaus Hollar* (Cambridge, 1982)

Perkins, W, *Works of William Perkins* ed. I Breward (Cambridge, 1969)

_____, *A Reformed Catholic* (London, 1634)

_____ , *A reformed Catholike, or, A declaration shewing how neere we may come to the present Church of Rome in sundrie points of religion* (London, 1607)

_____, *Works* (London, 1603)

_____, *A Warning Against the Idolatry of the Last Times* (London, 1601)

_____, *Prophetica* (London, 1592)

Philopatris, *The plot in a dream: or, The discoverer in masquerade In a succinct discourse and narrative of the late and present designs of the papists against the King and government* (London, 1682)

Philpot, J, *The Examinations and Writings* ed. R. Eden (Parker Society 5, Cambridge, 1842)

Pigot, J, *Hierusalem bedewed with tears* (London, 1642)

Pocklington, J, *The petition and articles exhibited in Parliament against Iohn Pocklington doctor in divinity, parson of Yeldon in Belfordshire* (London, 1641)

Pope, J, *The unveiling of Antichrist* (London, 1646)

Pope, W, *Room for a ballad, or, A ballad for Rome* (London, 1675)

Potter, F, *An interpretation of the number 666* (London, 1642)

Prance, M, *Mr. Prance's answer to Mrs. Cellier's libel, and divers other false aspersions cast upon him* (London, 1680)

_____, *A true narrative and discovery of several very remarkable passages relating to the horrid popish plot* (London, 1679)

Prickett, R, *The Iesuites Mirales, or new popish wonders* (London, 1607)

Prynne, W, *An exact chronological vindication and historical demonstration of our British, Roman, Saxon, Danish, Norman, English Kings supremacy ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all prelates, persons, causes within their kingdoms and dominions from the first year of the reign of King John, Anno Dom. 1199 to Henry III. 1273* (London, 1666)

_____, *Canterburies Doome* (London, 1646)

_____, *Histrio-mastix The players scourge, or, actors tragœdie, divided into two parts. Wherein it is largely evidenced, by divers arguments, by the concurring*

authorities and resolutions of sundry texts of Scripture. That popular stage-playes are sinfull, heathenish, lewde, ungodly spectacles, and most pernicious corruptions (London, 1633)

_____,*Lord Bishops none of the Lords Bishops* (London, 1640)

_____,*A Quenche-Coale* (Amsterdam, 1637)

_____, *Rome for Canterbury, or, A true relation of the birth and life of William Laud arch-bishop of Canterbury* (London, 1641)

Puller, T, *The moderation of the Church of England considered as useful for allowing the present distempers which the indisposition of time hath contracted* (London, 1679)

Puttenham, G, *Arte of English Poesie* (London, 1589)

Quarles, F, *Emblemes* (London, 1633)

T. R, *The royall subjects, or, Joyfull news to all that faithfull be* (London, 1660)

Rainolds, J, *The discovery of the man of sinne* (London, 1614)

Raleigh, W (ed.), *The Complete Work of George Savile, First Marquess of Halifax* (Oxford, 1912)

Ramsay, W, *Maromah, the Lord of Rome the Antichrist, finally and fully discovered his name the number of his name* (London, 1680)

_____,*The Julian ship, or, Paul's transportation to Rome* (London, 1681)

Randolph, T, *The Drinking Academy*, (Ed.) S. A. Tannenbaum & H. E. Rollins (Cambridge, 1930)

Reresby, J, *The memoirs of the honourable Sir John Reresby, bart. and late governor of York* (London, 1734)

Reyce, R, *Suffolk in the XVIIth Century: The Breviary of Suffolk*, ed. Francis Hervey (London, 1902)

Rhegius, U, *A declaration of twelve articles of the Christian faith* (London, 1548)

Rhodes, J, *The Country Mans Comfort* (London, 1637)

Rich, B, *Greene's News From Hell* (London, 1593)

Ridley, N, *The Works of Nicholas Ridley, D.D, sometime Lord Bishop of London*, ed. H. Christmas (Parker Society, 1: Cambridge, 1843)

Rigge, A, *Of Perfection. The great ministry of Antichrist unfolded, by the rising of the sin of righteousness; or, The difference between the work and ministry of the*

messengers of God and the work and ministry of the messengers of Antichrist (London, 1657)

Roberts, H, *The most royall and honourable entertainment, of the famous and renowned King, Christien the fourth, King of Denmarke* (London, 1606)

_____, *Englands farewell to Christian IV, famous king of Denmarke* (London, 1606)

Robinson, T, *The Anatomie of the English Nunery at Lisbon* (London, 1630)

Robinson, H (ed.), *Original letters relative to the English Reformation, chiefly from the archives of Zurich, Parker Society*, 26 (Cambridge, 1846-47)

Robinson, H (ed.,) *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*, 2 vols (Parker Society 7-8, Cambridge, 1842)

Robson, S *The courte of civill courtesies* (London, 1577)

Rocco, A *De Sacrosancto Christi corpore romanio pontificibus iter confirientibus praerferento commentarus* (Rome, 1599)

Romei, A, *The courtiers academie* (London, 1598)

Ross, A, *The History of the World, the second part* (London, 1652)

_____, *The Black Box of Rome, or, A true and Short Discourse* (1641)

Rous, J, *The Diary of John Rous* (Ed.) M. A. E. Green, Camden Society, 1st Series, 66, (London, 1856)

Rutt, J. T, (ed.), *Life of Edmund Calamy* (2 vols, London, 1829)

S, G, *A Brief Declaration of the Barbarous And inhumane dealings of the Northern Irish Rebels* (London, 1641)

S, T, *A Song of Psalme of Thanksgiving, in Remembrance of our Great Deliverance from the Gun-powder Treason* (London, 1625)

Salgado, J, *Symbiosis, or, The intimate converse of Pope and Devil attended by a cardinal and buffoon* (London, 1681)

Sander, Nicolas, *The rock of the Churche wherein the primacy of S Peter and his successours the Bishops of Rome is proued by Gods worde* (London, 1567)

Sandys, E, *The Sermons of Edwin Sandys, successively Bishop of Worcester and London, and Archbishop of York*, ed. J. Ayre (Parker Society, 2: Cambridge, 1842)

Scott, T, *The Second Part of Vox Populi,or Gondomar appearing in the likeness of Machiavell in a Spanish parliament* (London, 1624)

_____ , *Boanerges* (London, 1624)

Selden, J, *Table Talk*, ed F. Pollock (London, 1927)

Sempill, J, *A pick-tooth for the Pope, or, The pack-mans Pater Noster* (Edinburgh, 1669)

Settle, E, *The triumph of London* (London, 1691)

_____ ,*The Female Prelate: Being the History of the Life and Death of Pope Joan: A Tragedy* (London, 1689)

_____ *London's drollery: or, The love and Kindness between Pope and the Devil* (London, 1680)

Shelford, R, *Five Pious and Learned Discourses* (Cambridge, 1635)

Shepherd, L, *Pathose, or an inward passion of the pope for the losse of hys daughter the masse* (London, 1548) .

Shorelyter, *The armes of the tobachonists* (London, 1630)

Sibbes, R, *Works*, ed. A. B. Grosart (7 vols, 1862-64)

Sidney, P, *Sidney: An Anthology* ed. F. Robinson (Indianapolis, 1970)

Sleidanus, Johannes, *A briefe chronicle of the foure principall empires to witte, of Babilonm, Persia, Grecia and Rome. Wherein, very compendoudly, the whole course of histories are conteined* (London, 1563)

Smyth, J, *The Works of John Smyth, Fellow of Christ's College, 1594-8*, ed. W. T. Whitley, 2 vols, (Cambridge, 1915)

South, R, *Twelve Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions* (London, 1697)

Southerne, T, *The loyal brother, or, The Persian prince a tragedy, as it is acted at the Theatre Royal by Their Majesties servants* (London, 1682)

Southwell, R, *A Short Rule of a Good Lyfe* (1971)

Sparke, E, *Thysiasterion, vell, Santilla altaris primitive devotion, in the feasts and fasts of the Church of England* (London, 1678)

Sparke, M, *Crumms of Comfort* (London, 1627)

_____ , *To the Glory of God in Thankefull Remembrance of our Three Great Deliverances unto Etern[al] Memory* (London, 1627)

Spittlehouse, J, *Rome ruin'd by White Hall, or, The papal crown demolisht* (London, 1649)

Starbuck, W, *A briefe exposition, paraphrase, or interpretation, upon the lord of Canterburies sermon or speech upon the last pulpit that ever he preached, which was the scaffold on Tower-hill* (London, 1645)

Starkey, D (ed.), *The Inventory of King Henry VIII* (London, 1998)

Stow, J, *A Survey of London* (London, 1633)

Strauss, G, *The German Single Leaf Woodcut 1500-50* (New York, 1974)

_____, *The German Single Leaf Woodcut 1550-1600* (New York, 1975)

Strype, J, *The Life and Acts of John Whitgift*, 3 Vols (Oxford, 1822)

_____,*Annals of the Reformation and establishment of religion, and other various occurrences in the Church of England, during Queen Elizabeth's happy reign*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1824)

_____, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, 2 vols, (Oxford, 1840)

Stubbes, P, *Anatomy of Abuses* (London, 1583)

Sturm, J, *The epistle that John Sturminus, a man of great lerninge and jugement, sent to the Cardyalles and prelates that were chosen and appointed by the Bysshop of Rome, to serche out the abuses of the churche* (London, 1538)

Sutton, E, *The serpent anatomized. A Morall discourse* (London, 1626),

Swinburn, Thomas, *A Litek treatise ageynste the mutterynge of some papists in corners* (London, 1534)

Swinerton, Thomas, *A muster of scismatyke bysshopes of Rome otherwise naming them sleves popes, much necessary to be redde of al the kynges true subjects* (London, 1534)

Sydenham, H, *Five Sermons* (London, 1637)

Syms, C, *The swords apology and necessity in the act of reformation* (London, 1644)

Taisnier, J, *A very necessarie and profitable book concerning navigation, compiled in Latin by Ioannes Taisnierius, a publice professor in Rome, Ferraria, & other universities in Italie of the mathematicalles, named a treatise of continual motions* (London, 1575)

Taylor, J, *The Decoy duck: together with the discovery of the knot in the dragons tale* (London, 1642)

_____, *The Devil turn'd round head: or, Pluto become a Brownist* (London, 1653)

_____,*I marry sir, Heere is newes indeed* (London, 1642)

_____ ,*Mercuries Message defended against the vain, foolish, simple and absurd cavils of Thomas Herbert* (London, 1641)

_____ ,*A Reply as true as Steele* (1641)

_____, *A Second message to Mr. Willam Lavd late Archbishop of Canterbury, now prisoner in the Tower, in the behalfe of Mercurie together with a postscript to the author of that foolish and ridiculous answer to Mercury* (London, 1641)

Taylor, T, *The Principles of Christian Practice* (London, 1635)

_____, *Christ's Victorie over the Dragon* (London, 1633)

_____,*An Everlasting Record of Utter Ruine of Romish Amaleck in Two Sermons* (London, 1624)

_____, *Christs combate and conquest* (1618)

Tedder, W, *The recantation made at Paules Crosse, by William Tedder seminarie priest the first of December, anno. 1588. Whereunto is adjoined: The recantation or abiuration of Anthony Tyrell (sometime prieste of the Englishe College in Rome) prounced by himselfe at APule Crosse the nexte Sunday following, in the same yeare and allowed according to the order appointed* (London, 1588)

_____,*The recantations as they were severallie pronounced by William Tedder and Anthony Tyrell (sometime two seminarie Priests of the English College in Rome and nowe by the great mercie of almightie God converted, unto the profession of the Gospell of Iesus Christ) at Paules Crosse* (London, 1588)

Tejeda, Francis de, *Texeda retextus: or The Spanish monke his bill of divorce against the Church of Rome with other remarkable occurrences* (London, 1623)

Terxeira, J, *The true historie of the late and lamentable adventures of Don Sebastian King of Portugal* (London, 1602)

The Two Books of Homilies appointed to be read in the Churches (Oxford, 1859)

Thompson (ed.), E. M, *Correspondence of the Family Hatton, 1601-1704* (London, 1878)

Thompson, N, *A Choice Collection of 120 Loyal Songs* (London, 1684)

Tillotson, J, *A Sermon Preached November 5 1678 at St Margaret's Westminster* (London, 1678)

Tomlins, T. E. (Ed.), *The Statutes of the Realm*, (London, 1819)

Tonge, E, *The Popish damnable plot against our religion and liberties, lively delineated in several of its branches, with an account of the execution of William Viscount Stafford on Tower-Hill* (London, 1681)

Tortello, A, *The Pope's Cabinet Unlocked, or, A catalogue of all the popes indulgences belonging to the order of S. Mary* (London, 1680)

Turner, H (Ed.), *The Rev. Oliver Heywood, B.A., 1630-1702: his autobiography,diaries, anecdote and event books, illustrating the general and family history of Yorkshire and Lancashire*, 4 vols (Brighouse, 1882-5)

Turner, W, *Avium praecipuacum, quarann apud plinium et Aristotelem mention est, brevis & succinta historia Ex opimis quibusque secipto nibus contexta, scholio illustrate & aucta* (Cologne, 1544)

_____,*The first and seconde partes of the herbal of Willaim Turner Doctor in Physik, lately oversene, corrected and enlarged with the thride parte, lately gathered, and nowe set oute with the names of the herbes, in Greke, Latin, English, Duche, Frenche, and in the apothecaries and hervaries Latin, with the properties, degrees, and naturall places of the same* (Cologne, 1568)

_____,*The hunting and fyndyng out of the romishe foxe which more than seven yeares hath been hyd amonge the byshoppes of Englande after the kynges hyghnes after the kynges highness had commanded hym to be driven out of this realme* (Basel, 1543)

_____,*The hunting of the fox and the wolfe* (London, 1565)

_____,*The hunting of the romyshe wolfe* (Emden, 1555)

_____, *Libellus de Re Herbaria*, B Daydon Jackson & W. T. Stearn (eds.), (London, 1965)

_____, *The names of herbes in Greke, Latin, Englyshe, Duche, Frenche with the commune names the herbaries and apothecaries use* (London, 1548)

_____ ,*A newe book of spiritual physic for diverse diseases of the nobilitie and gentleman of Englande* (Rome, 1555)

_____, *A newe dialogue, wherein is conteyned the examination of the messe and of that kinde of priesthode, whyche is ordeyned to saye messe: and to offer up for remission of synne the body and bloud of Christ agen* (London, 1548)

_____, *A newe herbal wherein are conteyned the names of herbes in Greke, Latin, Englishe, Dutch, Frenche, and in the pothecaries and hervales Latin, with the propertys degrees and natural places of the same* (London, 1551)

_____, *The recuynge of the romishe fox other wyse called the examination of the hunter devised by steven sgardiner. The seconde course of the hunter out the romishe fox and hys advocate & sworne patrone steven gardiner doctor & defender of the popis canon law and hys ceremonies* (Bonn, 1545)

_____, *The seconde part of William Turners herbal wherein are contenyned the names of herbs in Greeke, Latin, Duche, Frenche, and in the apothecaries Latin, and somtyme in Italian* (Cologne, 1562)

Tyacke, S, *London Map-sellers, 1660-1720* (Tring, 1978)

Tymme, T, *The Figure of Antichrist* (London, 1586)

Tyndale, W, *Doctrinal Treatises*, ed. H. Walter (Parker Society 32, Cambridge, 1848)

_____, *Exposition Upon the fifth, Sixth and Seventh Chapter of Matthew* (1533)

_____*The vvhole workes of W. Tyndall, Iohn Frith, and Doct. Barnes, three worthy martyrs, and principall teachers of this Churche of England collected and compiled in one tome togither, beyng before scattered, [and] now in print here exhibited to the Church. To the prayse of God, and profite of all good Christian readers* (London, 1572)

_____, *The Newe Testament of our Sauiour Jesu Christe faythfully translated out of the Greke ; wyth the notes and expositions of the darke places therein* (London, 1552)

_____, *The Newe Testament of our sauiour Christ, newly set forth after the beste copie of Wyllyam Tindales translation* (London, 1548)

_____, *Obedience of a Christian Man* (London, 1528)

_____, *The practyse of prelates. Whither the kinges grace maye be separated from hys queen, be cause she was his brothers wife* (Antwerp, 1530)

_____, *The vvhole workes of W. Tyndall, Iohn Frith, and Doct. Barnes, three worthy martyrs, and principall teachers of this Churche of England collected and compiled in one tome togither, beyng before scattered, [and] now in print here exhibited to the Church. To the prayse of God, and profite of all good Christian readers* (London, 1572)

Ussher, J, *The Protestant School, or, A method, containing several forms of prayer, psalms, lessons, thanksgivings, and graces for the bringing up and well grounding childrend and elder persons in the Protestant religion* (London, 1681)

Valla, L, *A treatyse of the donation or gyfte and endowment of possessions, giyven and graunted unto Sylvester pope of Rome by Constantine emperour of Rome...* (London, 1534)

Vaux, L, *A Catechism or a Christian Doctrine,* (1580)

Vere, T, *To the never dying memory of his ever honor'd friend Mr Michael Sparke jun.* (London, 1645)

Verney, M (ed.), *Memoirs of the Verney Family from the Restoration to the Revolution 1660 to 1696* (London, 1899)

Vicars, J, *England's Hallelujah* (London, 1631)

_____ ,*England's Remembrancer* (London, 1641)

_____ ,*The Quintessence of Cruelty*, (London, 1641)

_____ ,*The Sinfulness and Unlawfulness, of Having or Making the Picture of Christs Humanity* (London, 1641)

Victoria & Albert Museum, *English Caricatures: 1620 to present* (London, 1984)

B. W, *An additional discovery of Mr. Roger L'Estrange his further discovery of the Popish plot* (London, 1680)

R. W, *A Looking-Glass For Papists: To see their owne Deformities in matters of Faith and Religion* (London, 1621)

Walker, Henry, *Five looken over the professors of the English bible* (London, 1642)

Walker, O, *Of Education* (London, 1677)

Ward, S, *All in All* (London, 1622)

_____ , *Balme from Gilead to Recover Conscience* (London, 1617)

_____ , *Jethro's iustice of peace* (London, 1621)

_____ , *The sermons and treatises which have beene heretofore seuerally published: and are now newly reuised, corrected and augmented* (London, 1623)

_____ ,*Woe to Drunkards* (London, 1622)

Warner, G. F, (ed.), *The Nicholas papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas*, 3 vols, (Camden Society: New York, 1886-97)

Watson, T, *Two Notable Sermons* (London, 1554)

_____ , *Holsome and catholyke doctrine* (London, 1558)

West, R, *The schoole of virtue, the second part, or, The young schollers paradice* (London, 1619)

Whetstone, G, *A mirour for magistrates of cities Representing the ordinaces, policies, and diligence, of the noble emperour, Alexander (surnamed) Severus, to suppresse and chastise the notourious vices nourished in Rome, by the superfluous number of dicing houses, tauerns, and common stews: suffred and cherished, by his beastlye predecessor, Helyogabalus, with sundrie grave orations: by the said noble emperous, co[n]cerning reformation* (London, 1584)

_____*The enemie to un? Publishing, by lawes, documents and disciplines. A right rule, for reformation of pride, and other prodigall and riotous disorders, in a common wealth: for the worthiness of direction, a perfect mirrour for all maiestrates: (especially) of cities. And for sound counsels, and admonition, a carde to compasses, of every young gentleman, honourable and profitably to governe his actions* (London, 1586)

Whitaker, W, *A Disputation on Holy Scripture* (London, 1588)

White, R, *A Poem upon Mr. Tytus Oates : the first discoverer of the late popish plot* (London, 1679)

Whitgift, W *Works* ed. J. Ayre, 3 vols (Parker Society 40 Cambridge, 1851-53)

Whitney, G, *Choice of Emblems* (London, 1586)

Wilkinson, H, *Babylon's Ruine, Jerusalems' Rising* (London, 1643)

Willet, A, *Synopsis Papismi* (3rd Edition: London, 1600)

Williamson, T, *The sword of the spirit to smite in pieces that antichristian Goliath, who daily defieth the Lords people the host of Israel* (London, 1613)

Winn, H. E, *Wycliff: Select English Writings* (London, 1929)

Winstanley, G, *The Works of Gerrard Winstanley*, ed. G. H. Sabine (Cornell, 1941)

Winstanley, W, *The Protestant almanack for the year from the incarnation of Jesus Christ 1682* (London, 1682)

Wither, G, *Meditations Upon the Lords Prayer* (London, 1665)

Womack, L, *Sober Sadness: or Historical observations upon the proceedings, pretences and designs of a prevailing party in both Houses of Parliament* (Oxford, 1643)

Wood, T, *The protestants and Iesuits up in armes in Guilcke-land. Also, a true and wonderull relaion of a Dutch maiden (called Euie Flegan of Meurs in the County of Meurs) who being now (this present yeare) 36 years of age, hath fasted for the space of 14 years* (London, 1611)

Wotton, A, *A defence of M. Perkins booke, called a reformed Catholike* (London, 1606)

Wren, M, *A sermon preached before the king's majesty on Sunday 17 February last at Whitehall* (Cambridge, 1627)

Wright, T (ed.), *Letters Relating to the Suppression of the Monasteries* (Camden Society, London, 1843)

Wriothesley's Chronicle, 2 vols (Camden Society, 1875-77)

Zwingli, U, *The accompte and rekening and declaracio[n] of the faith and belief of Huldrik Zwinigly bisshope of Zuryk the chief town of Helvetia, sent to Chalres V that nowe is Emprour of Rome: holdinge a perlemente or cownsaill at Ausbrough with the chiefe loris (et) lerned men of Germany* (Geneva, 1555)

_____, *The rekening and declaracio[n] of the faith and belief of Huldrik Zwinigly bisshope of Zuryk the chief town of Helvetia, sent to Chalres V that nowe is Emprour of Rome: holdinge a perlemente or cownsaill at Ausbrough with the chiefe loris (et) lerned men of Germany* (Antwerp, 1543)

Secondary Sources

The French Renaissance in Prints from the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Paris, 1994)

Adams, A & Harper, A. J (Eds.), *The Emblem in Renaissance and Baroque Europe: Tradition and Vareity* (Leiden, New York, 1992)

Adams, R. P, "Despotism, Censorship, and Mirrors of Power Politics in Late Elizabethan Times", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 10, (1979), pp. 5-16

Adams, S "Foreign Policy and the parliaments of 1621 and 1624" in K. Sharpe (ed.), *Faction and Parliament* (Oxford, 1978)

Adamson, D, *Blaise Pascal : mathematician, physicist, and thinker about God* (Basingstoke, 1995)

Adler, K & Pointon, M (eds.), *The Body Imaged: The Human Form and Visual Culture since the Renaissance* (Cambridge, 1994)

Alford, S, "Politics & Political History in the Tudor Century", *Historical Journal*, 42, (1999), pp.535-48

Allen, D, "The Role of the London trained bands in the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-81", *English Historical Review*, 87, (1972), pp. 287-303

Allen, D. F, "Attempts to Revive the Order of Malta in Stuart England", *Historical Journal*, 33, (1990), pp. 939-52

Amos, N. S, Pettegree, A & Van Nietrop, H (eds), *The Education of a Chrisitan Society: Humanism & Reformation in Britain and the Netherlands* (Aldershot, 1999)

Arnstein, W. L, *Protestant versus Catholic in Mid-Victorian England : Mr. Newdegate and the nuns* (Columbia, 1982)

Anglo, S, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London, 1992)

_____*Spectacle, Pageantry & Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford, 1969)

_____"An Early Tudor Programme for Plays & other Demonstrations Against the Pope", *Journal of the Warburg & Courtauld Institutes,* 20, (1957), pp. 176-79

Armytage, W. H. G, *Heavens Below: Utopian Experiences in England, 1560-1960* (London, 1961)

Asch, R. G, *Nobilities in Transition, 1500-1700: courtiers and rebels in Britain and Europe* (London, 2003)

Aston, M, *The King's Bedpost: Reformation Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge, 1993)

_____*Faith & Fire: popular and unpopular religion, 1350-1600* (London, 1993)

_____"The Bishops' Bible Illustrations" in D. Wood (ed.), *The Church and the Arts, Studies in Church History,* 28, (Oxford, 1992), pp. 267-85

_____*England's Iconoclasts: volume 1, Laws against Images* (Oxford, 1988)

_____*Lollards & Reformers: Imagees & Literacy in Late-medieval religion* (London, 1984)

_____"Lollards & Literacy", *History* 62, (1977), pp. 347-71

Backscheider, P. R, *Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Basingstoke, 1993)

Bailyn, B, *The Ideological Origins o the American Revolution* (Cambridge, 1967)

Bainton, R H, *Luther's Meditations on the Gospels* (Philadelphia, 1962)

Ball, B. W, *A Great Expectation: Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (Leiden, 1975)

Barber, P, "Necessary and Ornament: Map Use in England under the late Stuarts, 1660-1720", *Eighteenth Century Life,* 14, (1990), pp. 1-28

Barkan, L, "Making Pictures Speak: Renaisance Art, Elizabethan Literature, Modern Scholarship", *Renaissance Quarterly,* 48, (1995), pp. 326-51

Barnard, M, *Approaches to Understanding Visual Culture* (Hampshire, 2001)

Barnett, S. J, "Where was your Church Before Luther? Claims for the antiquity of Protestantism examined", *Church History,* 68, (1999), pp.14-41

Bath, M, *Speaking Pictures – English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture* (London/New York, 1994)

Bath, M, & Russell, D (ed.), *Deviceful Settings: the English Renaissance Emblem & its Contexts* (New York, 1999)

Bauckham, R, *Tudor Apocalypse: Sixteenth century apocalypticism, millenarianism and the English Reformation: from John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman* (Oxford, 1978)

Baumann, G (ed.), *The Written Word: Literacy in Transition* (Oxford, 1986)

Baxandall, M, *The Limewood Sculptors of Renaissance Germany* (London/New Haven, 1980)

Bellany, A, "A Poem on the Archbishop's Hearse: Puritanism, Libel and Sedition after the Hampton Court Conference", *Journal of British Studies*, 34, (1995), pp. 137–64

_____, *The Politics of Court Scandal in Early Modern England: News Culture and the Overbury Affair, 1603-1660* (Cambridge, 2002)

"Railing Rhymes Revisited: Libels, Scandals, and Early Stuart Politics", *History Compass*, 5, (2007), pp. 1136–1179

Berger, J, *Ways of Seeing* (London, 1977)

Bergerson, D. M, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642* (London, 1971)

Bertonasco, M. F, *Crashaw & the Baroque* (Alabama, 1971)

Best, G. F. A, "The Whigs & The Church Establishment in the Age of Grey and Holland", *History,* 45, (1960), pp. 103-18

Betteridge, M. S, "The Bitter Notes: The Geneva Bible and its Annotations", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 14, (1983), pp. 41-62

Betteridge, T, *Tudor Histories of the English Reformation, 1530-83* (Aldershot, 1999)

Black, R (Ed.), *Renaissance Thought: A Reader* (London/New York, 2001)

Blatchly, J, "The "Gunpowder Plot" plate: a postscript", *Transactions of the Monumental Brass Society*, 14, (1986), pp. 68-69

Boase, T. S. R, *Boniface VIII* (London, 1933)

Bolton, B, *Innocent III: studies on Papal Authority and Pastoral Care* (Aldershot, 1995)

Bossy, J, "The Character of English Catholicism", *Past & Present,* 21, (1962), pp. 37-69

_____, *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1985)

_____, "English Catholics & the French Marriage, 1577-81", *Recusant History,* 5, (1959-60), pp. 2-16

_____, *The English Catholic Community* (London, 1975)

_____, "Review: Holiness & Society", *Past & Present* , 75, (1977), pp. 119-37

_____, "Rome & The Elizabethan Catholics: A Question of Geography", *Historical Journal,* 7, (1964), pp. 135-42

_____, "Some Elementary forms of Durkheim", *Past & Present,* 95, (1982), pp. 3-18

Bouchard, L. D, "The Arts & the Knowledge of Religion", *Journal of Religion,* (1990), pp. 353-67

Boureau, A, *The Myth of Pope Joan,* (Chicago, 2000)

Braddick, M, *State Formation in Early Modern England, 1550-1700* (Cambridge, 2000)

Brayman-Hackel, H, *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2005)

Brooks, N. C, *The Sepulchre of Christ in Art and Liturgy ivith Special Refer- ence to the Liturgie Drama,* (Illinois, 1921)

Brooks, P, *Reading for the Plot: Design & Intention in Narrative* (London, 1992)

Brooks, P, & P Gewirtz, *Law's Stories: Narrative and Rhetoric in the Law* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996)

Brooke, X, *The Lady Lever Art Gallery Catalogue of Embroideries* (Stroud, 1992)

Brown, E. C, "The Allegory of Small Things: Insect Eschatology in Spenser's Maiospotomo", *Studies in Philology,* 99, (2002), pp. 247-67

Brown, W. J, "Marlowe's Debasement of Bajazet: Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* and *Tamburlaine, Part I*", Renaissance Quartrely, 24, (1971), pp. 38-48

Brown, L. F, *The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum* (Washington, 1912)

Bruner, J, *Making Stories: Law, Literature, Life* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2002)

J. Bruce, "The Caricatures of Samuel Ward of Ipswich", *Notes and Queries*, 4th Series. 1 (1868), pp. 1-2

Buchanan, B, *Gunpowder Plots* (London, 2005)

Buck, S & Sander, J (eds), *Hans Holbein the Younger: Painter at the Court of Henry VIII* (London, 2003)

Burke, P, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1978)

Burke, P (ed), *New Perspectives in Historical Writing* (London, 2001)

Burne, R. V. H, *Chester Cathedral – From its Founding by Henry VIII to the Accession of Queen Victoria* (London, 1958)

Burns, W. E *An Age of Wonders*, (Manchester, 2002)

Burrell, S. A, "The Apocalyptic Vision of the Early Covenanters", *Scottish Historical Review*, XLIII (1964)

Burt, R, *Licensed By Authority: Ben Jonson and the Discourses of Censorship* (New York, 1993)

Cabot, N, "Pattern Sources of scriptural subjects in Tudor and Stuart embroideries", *Bulletin of the Needle and Bobbin Club*, 30, (1946), pp. 3-57

Cameron, E, *The Sixteenth Century* (Oxford, 2006)

_____,"For Reasoned Faith of Embattled Creed? Religion for the people in Early Modern Europe" *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8, (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 165-87

Camille, M, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge/New York, 1989)

_____,"The Book of Signs: Writing and Visual Difference in Gothic Manuscript Illumination", *Word and Image*, 1, (1985), pp. 133-48

Capp, B, *The Fifth Monarchy Men: A Study in seventeenth century English Millenarianism* (London, 1972)

_____, "Review: Godly Rule and the English Millenarianism", *Past & Present*, 52, (1971), pp. 106-17

Caraman, P, *Henry Garnet (1555-1606) and the Gunpowder Plot* (London, 1964)

Carrafiello, M. L, "English Catholicism & the Jesuit Mission of 1580-81", *Historical Journal,* 37, (1994), pp. 761-74

Carey, F (Ed.), *The Apocalypse and the Shape of things to Come* (London, 1999)

Carroll, S *Blood and Violence* (Oxford, 2006)

_____, *Noble power during the French wars of religion : the Guise affinity and the Catholic cause in Normandy* (Cambridge, 1998)

Carter, P, "Clerical Polemic in Defence of Minister's Maintenance During the English Reformation", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 49, (1998), pp. 236-56

Cartwright, L & Sturken, M (eds.) *Practices of Looking: an Introduction to Visual Culture* (Oxford, 2002)

Cavallo, G & Chartier, R (eds.) *History of Reading in the West* (Cambridge, 1999)

Chadwick, O, *The Popes and the European Revolution* (Oxford, 1981)

Chambers, G. R, *The Bad Popes* (London, 1969)

Chapman, H & Plazzotta, C, *Raphael: From Urbino to Rome* (London, 2004)

Cherry, D (ed.), *Art: History: Visual: Culture* (Oxford, 2005)

Chartier, R, *The Culture of Print in Early Modern France* (Princeton, 1987)

_____ (Ed.), *The Culture of Print* (Oxford, 1989)

Cheetham, N, *Keepers of the Keys – The Pope in History* (London, 1982)

Chichester, D, "Word against Light: Perception and the Conflict of Symbols", *Journal of Religion,* 65, (1985), pp. 46-62

Christensen, C C, *Princes & Propaganda: Electoral Saxon Art of the Reformation* (Kirksville, 1992)

Christopher Warner, J, "'A dyaloge between Clement & Bernarde', c.1532: a Neglected Tract Belonging to the Last Period of John Rastell's Career", *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 29, (1998), pp. 55-65

Clare, J, *"Art made tongue-tied by authority": Elizabethan and Jacobean Dramatic Censorship,* (Manchester/ New York, 1990)

Clark, J. C. D, *The Language of Liberty 1660-1832* (Cambridge, 1994)

Clark, S, *Vanities of the Eye: vision in Early Modern European Culture* (Oxford, 2007)

_____, "Inversion, Misrule and the Meaning of Witchcraft", *Past and Present*, 87 (1980), pp. 98-127

Clebsch, W. A, "The Earliest Translations of Luther into English", *Harvard Theological Review,* 56, (1963), pp. 75-86

_____, *England's Earliest Protestants - 1520-1535* (New Haven/ London, 1964)

Clegg, C. S, *Press censorship in Jacobean England* (Cambridge, 2001)

_____ "History of the Book: An Undisciplined Discipline", *Renaissance Quarterly,* 54, (2001), pp. 221-45

_____ "'By the Choise and Invitation of al the Realme': Richard II and Elizabethan Press Censorship", *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 48, (1997), pp. 432-48

_____ ,*Press censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge/ New York, 1997)

Clifton, R, "The Popular Fear of Catholics During the English Revolution", *Past & Present,* 52, (1971), pp. 23-55

Climo, J. J, & Cattell, M. G (Eds) *Social Memory and History: Anthropologial Perspectives* (New York/ Oxford, 2002)

Cogswell, T, *The Blessed Revolution: English Politics and the Coming of War, 1621-24* (Cambridge, 1989)

_____ "England and the Spanish Match" in A. Hughes & R. Cust (Eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart Britain* (London/ New York, 1989), pp. 107-33

Cohn, N, *The Pursuit of the Millenium* (London, 1962)

Cole, M. W, & Zorach, R (Eds), *The Idol in the Age of Art* (Aldershot, 2008)

Colley, L, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven, 1992)

Collins, J. R, "The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy", *Church History*, 68, (1999), pp. 549-80

Collinson, P, *The Birthpangs of English Protestantism* (New York, 1998)

_____, "Elizabethan and Jacobean Puritanism as Forms of Popular Religious Culture", in C. Durston & J. Eales (Eds.), *The Culture of English Puritanism* (London, 1996), pp. 32-57

_____, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (London, 1983)
_____, *The Religion of the Protestants* (Oxford, 1992)

Condren, C & Cousins, A. D, (eds.) *The Political Identity of Andrew Marvell* (Aldershot, 1990)

Conway, M, "Portraits of the Wyatt Family", *Burlington Magazine,* XVI (1910), pp. 154-59

Corbett, M, & Lightbourn, R, *Comely Frontispieces* (London, 1979)

Cort, J. E, "Art, Religion and Material Culture: some reflections on method", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion,* 64, (1996), pp. 613-32

Coster, W & Spicer, A (Eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005)

Courtwright, N, *The Papacy and the Art of Reform in 11th century Rome* (Cambridge, 2003)

Cowdrey, H. E. J, *Gregory VII and the German Kingdom and Empire* (Oxford, 1998)

_____*Popes and Church Reform in the 11th century* (Aldershot, 2000)

Cressy, D, *Bonfires and Bells: national memory and Protestant calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1989)

_____,"The Fifth of November remembered" in R. Porter (ed.) *Myths of the English* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 68-90

Travesties & Transgressions in Tudor & Stuart England (Oxford, 2000)

Crew, P M, *Calvinist Preaching & Iconoclasm in The Netherlands, 1544-69* (London, 1978)

Crick, J & Walsham, A (eds), *The Uses of Script & Print, 1500-1700* (Cambridge, 2004)

Croft, P "The Reputation of Robert Cecil: Libels, Political Opinion and Popular Awareness in the Early Seventeenth Century", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 6th Series 1 (1991), pp. 43-69

Courtwright, N, *The Papacy & the art of Reform in sixteenth century Rome* (Cambridge, 2003)

Cummings, B, *The literary Culture of the Reformation: Grammar and Grace* (Oxford, 2002)

Cust, R & Hughes, Ann (eds), *Conflict in Stuart England: studies in Religion & Politics, 1603-1642* (Harlow, 1989)

Daly, P. M (ed.), *The European Emblem – Towards an Index Emblematicus* (Waterloo, 1980)

Daly, P. M, & Dimler, G. R, (eds.), *Corpus Emblematum – The Jesuit Series*, 4 vols (Toronto, 2000)

L. Daston & K. Park, *Wonders and the Order of Nature 1150-1750* (New York, 1998)

_____,"Unnatural Conceptions: The Study of Monsters in Sixteenth-and Seventeenth-Century France and England," *Past & Present*, 92, (1981), pp. 20-54

Davidson, H. M, *Blaise Pascal* (Boston, 1983)

Davis, N Z, *Society & Culture in Early Modern France* (Cambridge, 1987)

_____"Holbein's Pictures of Death & The Reformation at Lyons", *Studies in Renaissance*, 3, (1956), pp. 97-130

Davidson, C & Eljenholm-Nichols, A (eds.), *Iconoclasm Vs Art & Drama* (Michigan, 1989)

Davidson, C,"Doctor Faustus at Rome", *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 9, (1969), pp. 231-39

Davies, C, *A religion of the Word : the defence of the Reformation in the reign of Edward VI* (Manchester, 2002)

De Krey, G. S, *Restoration and Revolution in Britain* (Basingstoke, 2007)

Dickinson Carr, J, *The Murder of Sir Edmund Godfrey* (London, 1936)

Diehl, H, *An index of icons in English Emblem Books, 1500-1700* (Norman/ London, 1986)

_____, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism & popular theater in Early Modern England* (Ithaca/ London, 1997)

Dillon, A, *The Construction of Martyrdom in the English Catholic Community, 1535-1607* (Aldershot, 2002)

Dimmock, M, *New Turks* (Aldershot, 2005)

Ditchfield, S (ed), *Christianity & Community in the West* (Aldershot, 2001)

Dodds, M. H, "Political Prophecy in the Reign of Henry VIII", *Modern Language Review*, XI, (1916), pp. 276-84

Dolan, F. E, *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, & seventeenth-century Print Culture* (2nd Edition, Notre Damn, 2005)

Dorothy George, M, *English Political Caricatures to 1792: A study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Oxford, 1959)

Doyle, W, *Jansenism: Catholic resistance to authority from the Reformation to the French revolution* (Basingstoke, 2000)

Driver, M, *The Image in Print: Book Illustration in Late Medieval England & its sources* (London, 2004)

_____ "The Illustrated de Worde: An Overview", *Studies in Iconography*, 17, (1996), pp, 349-403

Duff, E. G, *A century of the English Book Trade* (London, 1905)

Drury, M. A, "Anti-Catholicism in Germany, Britain and the U.S: A Review of Recent Literature", *Church History*, 70, (2001), pp. 98-131

Duffy, E, "Brush For Hire", *London Review of Books*, 12/01/2004

_____, *Fires of Faith: Catholic England Under Marry Tudor* (New Haven/London, 2009)

_____, *Saints and Sinners: A history of the Popes* (2nd Edition: New Haven/ London, 2002)

_____, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580* (London, 1992)

_____, "A Very Personal Possession", *History Today* (November, 2006)

Duffy, E & Loades, D. M (eds), *The Church of Mary Tudor* (Aldershot, 2006)

Duindem, J. F. J, *Myths of Power: Norbert Elias and the early modern European Court*, trans. L. S. Granger and G. T. Moran (Amsterdam, 1994)

Dutton, R, *Licensing, Censorship and Authorship in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke/New York, 2000)

Durston, C & Eales, J (eds.), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (London, 1996)

Dyrness, W. A, *Reformed Theology & Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination From Calvin to Edwards* (Calvin, 2004)

Eck, C Van & Winters, B (eds.), *Dealing with the Visual: Art History, Aesthetics & Visual Culture* (Aldershot, 2005)

Eckhardt, J "'Love-Song Weeds and Satyrique Thorns": Anti-Courtly Love Poetry and Somerset Libels', HLQ, 69, (2006), pp. 47-66

Edwards, M U, *Printing, Propaganda & Martin Luther* (California, 1984)

Eire, C M, *War Against the Idols* (Cambridge, 1986)

Eisenstein, E, "Unacknowledged Revolution revisited", *American Historical Review,* 107, 2002), pp. 87-105

The Printing Press as an agent of Change, 2 vols, (Cambridge, 1979)

_____ *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1979)

Elias, N *The Civilizing Process*, trans. Edmund Jebcott (Oxford, 2000)

Engel, W. E, *Death & Drama in Renaissance England: shades of memory* (Oxford, 2002)

Erikson, K, *Wayward Puritans: A study of the sociology of Deviance* (New York, 1966)

Erickson, P & Hulse, C, *Early Modern Visual Culture: Representation, Race, & Empire in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2000)

Erskin-Hankins, J, *Source and Meaning in Spenser's Allegory: A Study of 'The Faerie Queene* (Oxford, 1971)

Esdaile, K. A, "Gunpowder Plot in Needlework: Dame Dorothy Selby 'Whose Arte Discols'd that Plot'" *Country Life*, 93, (1943)

Ettlinger, L. D & H. S, *Raphael* (Oxford, 1987)

Evans, J & Hall, S (eds.), *Visual Culture: The Reader* (London, 1999)

Fagiolo Dell' Arco, M, *La festa barocca* (Rome, 1997)

Field, J, "Devotion, Discontent & the Henrician Reformation: The Evidence of Robin Hood Stories", *Journal of British Studies,* 41, (2002), pp. 6-22

Fincham, K (Ed.), *The early Stuart church* (Basingstoke, 1993)

Fincham, K & Lake, P (eds.), *Religion & Politics in Post-Reformation England* (Woolbridge, 2006)

_____,"The Ecclesiastical Policy of King James I", *Journal of British Studies,* 24, (1985), pp.169-207

Firth, C.H, "The Ballad History of the Reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd Series, 2 (London, 1908), pp. 21-50

_____,"The Ballad History of the Reign's of the Later Tudors", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 3rd Series, 3 (London, 1909), pp. 51-124

Flanagan, K, *Seen & Unseen: Visual Culture, Sociology & Theology* (Basingstoke, 2004)

Fleming, G, "On the origin of the Passional Christi and Antichristi and Luca Cranach the Elder's Contribution to Reformation Polemics in the Iconography of the Passional", *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* (1973), pp. 351-67

Fleming, J *Graffiti & the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (Kings Lynn, 2001)

Fletcher, A. J, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London, 1981)

Fletcher, J. A "The Puritan Argument in Spenser", *PMLA,* 58, (1943), p. 642.

Foister, S, "Pictures in Early Modern Household Inventories", *Burlington Magazine,* 123, (1981), pp. 273-82

_____ "Magi and Majesty", *Art Bulletin,* 50, (1968), pp. 215-22

Fosi, I. P, "Justice & It's Images: Political Propaganda & Judicial Reality in the Pontificate of Sixtus V", *Sixteenth-Century Journal,* 24, (1993), pp.75-95

Fox, A, "Ballads, Libels and Popular Ridicule in Jacobean England", *Past and Present,*145, (1994)

Fox-Davies, A. C, *A complete guide to heraldry* (London, 1949)

Freeman, R, *English Emblem Books* (London, 1948)

Freeman, T & Evenden, E, *Religion and the Book in Early Modern England: the Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (Cambridge, 2007)

Freeman, T, "Texts, Lies and Microfilm: Reading & Misreading Foxes' 'Book of Martys'", *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 30, (1999), pp. 23-46

_____, *"A Solemne Contestation of Diverse Popes:*A Work by John Foxe?", *English Language Notes,* 31, (1994), pp. 35-42

Freiberg, J, *The Lateran in 1600: Christian Concord in Counter Reformation Rome* (London, 1995)

Friedland, L. S, "The Illustration in Van der Noot's He Theatre", *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 19, (1956), pp. 107-20

Frith, K, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645* (Oxford, 1979)

Furley, O. W, "The pope - burning processions of the late seventeenth century", *History,* XLIV (1959), pp. 16-23

Ganz, P, "Holbein", *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs,* 47, (1925), pp. 231-33

Gill, J. E, *Cutting Edges: Postmodern critical essays on eighteenth satire* (Knoxville, 1997)

Gilman, E B, *Iconoclasm & Poetry in the English Reformation* (London, 1986)

Gilmont, Jean-Francois (eds.), *The Reformation & the Book* (Aldershot, 1998)

Glassey, L. K. J (ed.), *The Reigns of Charles II & James VI & II* (New York, 1997)

Globe, A, *Peter Stent: London Print-seller, c. 1624-1665* (Columbia, 1985)

Gombrich, E. H, *Mediations on a Hobby Horse: and other essays on the theory of art* (London/New York, 1978)

_____, *Symbolic Images: studies in the Art of the Renaissance* (Oxford, 1978)

_____, *The Uses of Images: Studies in the Social Function of Art and Visual Communication* (London, 2000)

Grafton, "How Revolutionary Was the Printing Revolution?", *American Historical Review,* 107, (2002), pp. 84-86

"The Importance of Being Printed", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 11, (1980), pp. 265-86

Grafton, A & Jardine, L, "Structured for Action: How Gabriel Harvey Read his Livy", *Past and Present,* 129, (1990), pp. 3-51

Greaves, R. L, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-89* (Standford, 1992)

Green, I, *Print & Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2000)

Greenslade, S. L (ed.), *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 3 vols, (Cambridge, 1963)

Gregerson, L, *Reformation of the Subject: Spencer, Milton and the English Protestant Epic* (Cambridge, 1995)

Gregory, B S, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1999)

Griffiths, A, *The Print in Stuart Britain* (London, 1998)

Griffith, S. M, *Anti-Catholicism and nineteenth century fiction* (Cambridge, 2004)

Groebner, V, *Defaced: The Visual Culture of Violence in the Late Middle Ages*, trans. Pamela Selwyn (New York, 2004)

Grove, L, *Text/Image Mosaics in French Culture: Emblems and Comic Strips* (Ladershot, 2005)

Guy, J. A, (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge, 1995)

Hadfield, A (ed.), *Literature and Censorship in Renaissance England* (Basingstoke, 2001)

Hageman, E. H, "John Foxe's Henry VIII as *Justicia*", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 10, (1979), pp. 35-43

Halasz, A, *The Marketplace of Print: Pamphlets & The Public Sphere in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1997)

_____,"Review Article: Censorship", *Renaissance Quarterly*, 56, (2003), pp. 888-94

Hall, D. D, *Cultures of Print: Essays in the History of the Book* (Massachusetts, 1996)

Haller, W, *Foxe's Book of Martyr's and the Elect Nation* (London, 1963)

Hamburger, J. F, *Nuns as Artists: the visual culture of a medieval convent* (Berkeley/London, 1997)

Hamilton, D. B, *Anthony Munday & The Catholics, 1560-1633* (Aldershot, 2005)

Hamling, T & Williams, R. L, (ed.), *Art Re-formed: Re-assessing the Impact of the Reformation on the Visual arts* (Cambridge, 2007)

Hargrave, O. T, "The doctrine of Predestination in the English Reformation", *Church History*, 36, (1987), pp. 210-11

Harris, F & Hunter, M, *John Evelyn: his Milieu* (London, 2003)

Harris, T, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge, 1987)

_____,(ed) *Popular Culture in England c. 1500-1850* (London, 1995)

"Understanding popular politics in Restoration Britain", in A Houston & S. Pincus (eds,) *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 125-53

Harris, T, Seawood, P & Goldie, M (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England* (Oxford, 1990)

Haskell, F, *History & Its Images: Art & The Interpretation of the Past* (New Haven/London, 1993)

Haydon, C, *Anti-Catholicism in Eighteenth Century England* (Manchester, 1993)

Haynes, C, "The Culture of Judgement: art and anti-Catholicism in England 1660-1760", *Historical Research*, 78, (2005), pp. 483-505

_____, "A 'natural' exhibitioner: Sir Ashton Lever and his Holophusikon", *British Journal for Eighteenth Century Studies*, 24, (2001), pp. 1-13

Pictures and Popery: Art and Religion in England, 1660-1760 (Aldershot, 2006)

Hearn, K, *Dynasties*, (London, 1995)

Helgerson, N, *Forms of Nationhood* (Chicago/ London, 1994)

Henriques, U, *Religious Toleration in England, 1787-1833* (Toronto, 1961)

Heywood, I & Sandywell, B (eds.), *Interpreting Visual Culture: Explorations in the Hermeneutic of the Visual* (London/New York, 1999)

Hibbard, C, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill, 1983)

_____, "Early Stuart Catholicism: Revisions & Re-revisions", *Journal of Modern History*, 51, (1980), pp. 31-34

Hildburgh, W. L, "English Alabaster Carvings", *Archaeologia*, 93, (1949), pp. 60-64

Highley, C & King, J. N (Eds.), *John Foxe and his World* (Aldershot, 2002)

Hilgarth, J. N, "The Image of Alexander VI and Cesare Borgia in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth centuries", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 59, (1996), pp. 19-29

Hill, C, *Antichrist in seventeenth century England* (2nd Edition: London/New York, 1990)

_____,*Puritanism and Revolution* (London, 1962)

Hind, A. M, *A History of Engraving & Etching from the 15th century to the year 1914* (3rd ed., New York, 1963)

_____*Engraving in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1952-64)

Hinds, P *The horrid Popish plot : Roger L'Estrange and the circulation of political discourse in late seventeenth-century London* (Oxford, 2009)

_____,"Roger L'Estrange, the Rye House Plot, and the Regulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth Century London", *The Library*, 3, (2002), pp. 3-31

_____,"'Tales and Romantick Stories': 'Impostures', Trustworthiness, and the Credibility of Information in the Late Seventeenth Century", in ed. Beth Lynch and Anne Dunan-Page (eds.), *Sir Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture,* (Ashgate, 2008)

_____,"'A Vast Ill Nature': Roger L'Estrange, Reputation, and the Credibility of Political Discourse in the Late Seventeenth Century", *The Seventeenth Century,* XXI, (2006): 335-363

Hodnett, E, *Five centuries of English Book Illustration* (Aldershot, 1988)

_____, *Francis Barlow* (London, 1978)

_____, *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustration of English Literature* (London, 1982)

_____, *Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder of Bruges, London & Antwerp* (Utrecht, 1971)

Hofele, A & Koppenfels, W. V (eds), *Renaissance Go-Between: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe* (New York, 2005)

Holmes, G, *The Making of a Great Power...Britian 1660-1722* (London, 1993)

Homer, W. I, "Visual Culture: A new paradigm", *American Art,* 12, (1998), pp. 6-9

Hopkins, P, "The Verney Collection of Popish Plot Pamphlets", *Bulletin of the Friends of Cambridge University Library,* 9, (1988), pp. 5-15

Hopper, H. R, "John Wolfe, Printer & Publisher, 1579-1601", *The Library,* 4th series, 14, (1933), pp. 241-89

Houston, R. A, *Literacy In Early Modern Europe* (London, 2002)

Howe, E. D, *Art and Culture at the Sistine Court: Platina's 'Life of Sixtus IV' and the Frescos of the Hospital of Santa Spirito* (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticina, 2005)

Howells, R, *Visual Culture* (Cambridge, 2003)

Hudson, A, *The Premature Reformation* (Oxford, 1988)

_____,*Lollards & Their Books* (London/ Ronceverte, 1985)

Hughes, K. L, *Constructing Antichrist: Paul, Biblical Commentary, and the Development of Doctrine in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington, 2005)

Hume, A, "William Royse's 'Briefe Dialogue' (1527): An English version of a Strassbourg Catechism", *Harvard Theological Review,* 60, (1967), pp. 307-21

Hunt, L, (ed.) *The New Cultural History* (Berkley, 1989)

Hutton, P. H, *History as an Art of Memory* (Hanover/London, 1993)

Hutton, R, "The English Reformation and the Evidence of Folklore", *Past & Present*, 148, (1995) pp. 89-114

_____,*The Rise and Fall of Merry England* (Oxford, 1994)

Ingramells, J *The English Episcopal portrait, 1559-1835* (London, 1981)

Ingram, M, "Ridings, Rough Music and the 'Reform of Popular Culture' in early modern England", *Past and Present*, 105, (1984), pp. 79-113

Ivic, C & Williams, G (ed), *Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacy* (London, 2004)

Jacobs, M. C, *The Enlightenment: A Brief History With Documents* (Boston, 2001)

Jaffe, M "Van Dyck studies I: the portrait of Archbishop Laud", *The Burlington Magazine*, 124, (1982), pp. 600-07

Janelle, P, *L'Angleterre Catholique a la vielle du schisme* (Paris, 1935)

Jardine, L, *Defining Features: Scientific and Medical Portraits, 1660-2000* (London, 2000)

Jenks, C (ed.), *Visual Culture* (London, 1995)

Jenner, M. S. R, "The Roasting of the Rump; Scatology and the body Politic in Restoration England", *Past and Present*, 177, (2002), pp. 85-120

John, E, *The Popes: A concise biographical History* (London, 1964)

Johns, A, "How to Acknowledge A Revolution", *American Historical Review*, 107, (2002), pp. 106-25

Johns, C.M.S, *Papal Art & Cultural Politics: Rome in the Age of Clement XI* (Cambridge, 1993)

Johnson, O, *Rehearsing the Revolution: Radical Performance, Radical Politics in the English Restoration* (Newark/London, 2000)

Jones, J. R, *Country and Court: England 1658-1714* (London, 1978)

M. Jones, "Engraved Works Recorded in the Stationers' Registers, 1562-1656," *Walpole Society*, 64, (2002), pp. 1-68

_____, "The Lambe Speaketh...An addendum", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 43, (2000), pp. 287-94

_____, *The Print in Early Modern England: An Historical Oversight* (New Haven, 2010)

Jones, M & Tracy, C, "A Medieval Choirstall Desk-End at Haddon Hall: the fox Bishop and the Geese Hangmen", *Journal of the British Archaelogical Association*, 144, (1994), pp. 107-15

Jones, P. M & Worcester, T (eds), *From Rome to Eternity: Catholicism and the arts in Italy, 1550-1650* (Brill, 2002)

Jordanova, L, "The Portrait Transaction", *BBC History Magazine,* Vol 7, number 9, pp. 26-28

Jourdain, M, *English Interior Decoration, 1500-1830* (London, 1950)

_____,"Sixteenth Century embroidery with emblems", *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs,* 11, (1907), pp. 326-8

Kanno, M et al (Eds.), *Medieval Heritage: Essays in Honour of Tadahiro Ikegami* Tokyo, 1997)

Kelen, S. A, "'It is Dangerous (Gentle Reader)': Censorship, Holinshead's Chronicles, and the Politics of Control", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 27, (1996), pp. 705-20

Kenyon, J, *The Popish Plot* (London, 1972)

Kiefer, F, "The Iconography of Time in The Winter's Tale", *Renaissance and Reformation*, 23 (1999), pp. 49-64

Kiessling, N. K. "The Library of Anthony Wood", *Oxford Bibliographical Society Publications*, third series, V (Oxford, 2002), pp. 39-40

King, J. N, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, 2006)

_____,"Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the History of the Book", *Explorations in Renaissance Culture*, 30, (2004), pp. 171-96

_____,"Freedom of the Press, Protestant Propaganda and Protector Somerset", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 40, (1976), pp. 1-9

_____,"Guides to Reading Foxe's Book of Martyrs", *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68, (2005), pp. 133-50

_____, *Spenser Poetry and the Reformation Tradition* (Princeton, 1990)

_____, *Tudor Royal Iconography: Literature and art in an Age of Religious Crisis* (Princeton, 1989)

Kishlansky, M and Amussen, S (eds.), *Political Culture and Cultural Politics in Early Modern* England (Manchester, 1995)

Klein, K, "Coffehouse Civility: 1660-1714: An Aspect of Post-Courtly Civility in England", *Huntingdon Quarterly Review*, 59, (1997), pp. 30-51

Knapp, J A, *Illustrating the Past in Early Modern England: the Representation of History in Printed Books* (Aldershot, 2003)

Knights, M, *Representation and Misrepresentation in late Stuart Britain: partisanship and political culture* (Oxford, 2005)

_____,"Faults on Both Sides: The Conspiracies of Party Politics under the Later Stuarts" in B. Coward and J. Swann (eds), *Conspiracies and Conspiracy theory in early modern Europe: from the Waldensians to the French Revolution* (Aldershot, 2004), pp. 87-111

_____, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge, 1994)

Koerner, J, *Reformation of the Image* (London, 2004)

Kunzle, D, *The Early Comic Strip: Narrative Strips and Picture Stories in the European Broadsheet from 1450 to 1825* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973)

Kyle, R, "John Knox and Apocalyptic Tradition", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 4, (1984), pp. 449-69

Lake, P, "Constitutional Consenus & Puritan Opposition in the 1620s: Thomas Scott & The Spanish Match", *Historical Journal,* 25, (1982), pp. 805-25

_____,"The Impact of Early Modern Protestantism", *Journal of British Studies,* 28, (1989)

_____, "Matthew Hutton – A Puritan Bishop?", *History,* 64, (1979), pp. 182-104

_____,"The significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31, (1980), pp. 161-78

Lake, P & Questier, M, "Agency, Appropriation & Rhetoric Under the Gallows: Puritans, Romanists and the State in Early Modern England", *Past & Present*, 153, (1996), pp. 64-107

_____, (eds.), *Conformity & Orthodoxy in England, 1560-1660* (Woolbridge, 2000)

_____,"Puritans, Papists, and the 'Public Sphere' in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion affair in context." *Journal of Modern History,* 72, (2000), pp. 587-627

Lake, P & Dowling, M (eds.) *Protestants & The National Church in sixteenth century England* (New York, 1987)

Lake, P and Sharpe, K (eds.), *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (Stanford, 1994)

Lamont, W. M, *Godly Rule, Politics and Religion, 1603-60* (London, 1969)

_____,*Marginal Prynne: 1600-1669* (London/Toronto, 1963)

_____,"Prynne, Burton, and the Puritan Triumph", *Huntington Quarterly Review*, 27, (1964), pp. 103-13

_____,"Puritanism as History and Historiography", *Past & Present,* 44, (1969), pp. 133-46

_____, "Richard Baxter, the Apocalypse & the Mad Major", *Past & Present*, 55, (1972), pp. 68-90

Lambert, S, "Richard Montagu, Arminism and Censorship", *Past & Present*, 124, (1989), pp. 36-68

Lander, J. M, *Inventing Polemic: religion, print and literary culture in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2006)

Lane, J, *Titus Oates* (London, 1949)

Lavin, J. A, "Three 'Owl' Blocks: 1590-1640", *The Library*, 22, (1967), pp. 143-47

Le Goff, J, *History and Memory* (New York, 1992)

Leff, G, *Heresy in the Later Middle ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy to Dissent, c. 1250 – c. 1450*, 2 vols, (Manchester/ New York, 1967)

Leites, E (ed.), *Conscience & Casuistry in Early Modern Europe,* (Cambridge/ New York, 1988)

P. Levillain (ed.), *The Papacy: an encyclopaedia,* 3 vols, (New York, 1994)

Levin, C, *Propaganda in the English Reformation: Heroic and Villainous Images of King John* (Lewiston/ Queenston, 1988)

Levy, A, *Widowhood & Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2003)

Lewalski, B, *Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth Century religious lyric* (Princeton, 1979)

Limm, P, *The Dutch Revolt, 1559-1648* (London/New York, 1989)

Liu, Tai, *Discord in Zion: Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague, 1973)

Loach, J, *Parliament and the Crown in the Reign of Mary Tudor* (Oxford, 1986)

Loades, J, (ed.), *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Aldershot, 1999)

_____,(ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 1997)

_____,(ed.), *Monastic Studies: The Continuity of Tradition* (Bangor, 1990)

_____,*The Reign of Mary Tudor: Politics, Government, and Religion in England, 1553-55* (London, 1979)

Lohse-Belkin, K, "Ruben's Latin Inscriptions on His copies after Holbein's *Dance of Death*", *Journal of the Warburg & Courtalies Institute*, 52, (1984), pp. 245-50

Loveman, K, *Reading, Fiction, 1660-1740: Deception in English Literary and Political Culture* (Aldershot, 2008)

Luebke, D. M (ed.) *The Counter Reformation*, (Oxford, 1999)

MacCulloch, D, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London, 2004)

_____, *Tudor Church Militant* (London, 1999)

_____, *Thomas Cranmer: A life* (New Haven/ London, 1996)

MacGregor-Hastie, R, *The Throne of Peter: A history of the Papacy* (London, 1966)

MacCaffrey, W. T, *Exeter 1540-1640*, (Cambridge, 1975)

Mack, P (Ed.), *Renaissance Rhetoric* (London, 1994)

_____,*Renaissance Argument: Valla & Agricola in the Tradition of Rhetoric & Dialectic* (Leiden/ New York, 1993)

Mali, J, *Mythistory* (Chicago/London, 2003)

Mallette, R, "Book Five of The Faerie Queen: An Elizabethan Apocalypse", *Spenser Studies*, 11, (1994), pp. 129-59

Mallett, M , *The Borgias, The Rise and Fall of a Renaissance Dynasty* (London, 1971)

Marcombe, D & Knighton, C. S (ed.), *Close Encounters: English Cathedrals & Society Since 1540* (Nottingham, 1991)

Marotti, A. F. & Bristol, M. D, (eds.) *Print Manuscript And Performance* (Ohio, 2000)

Marshall, A, *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey* (Sutton, 1999)

_____ "The Westminster Magistrate and the Irish Stroker:Sir Edmund Godfrey and Valentine Greatrakes, Some Unpublished Correspondence", *Historical Journal,* 39, (1997), pp. 499-505

Marshall, P,*The Impact of the English Reformation: 1500-1640* (London, 1997)

_____, "Papist as Heretic: The Burning of John Forrest, 1538", *Historical Journal,* 41, (1998), pp. 351-74

Religious Identity in Henry VIII's England (Aldershot, 2006)

_____,"Review: The Antichrist and the Lollard's Apocalypticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England", *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 30, (1999), pp. 499-501

_____, "The Rood of Boxley, The Blood of Hailes and the Defence of the Henrician Church", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 46, (1995)

Marshall, P & Ryrie, A (eds), *The Beginnings of English Protestantism* (Cambridge, 2002)

Mason, W. G, "The Annual Output of Wing-Listed Titles 1649-1684", *The Library,* 39, (1974), pp. 210-20

McAleer, J. P, *The Romanesque Church Façade in Britain* (New York/ London, 1984)

Mckitterick, D, *Print Manuscript and the Search for Order, 1450-1830* (Cambridge, 2003)

McClain, L, *Lest We Be Damned: Practical Innovation & Lived Experience of Catholics in Protestant England, 1559-1642* (New York/ London, 2004)

_____, "Without Church, Cathedral, or Shrine: The Search for Religious Space Among Catholics in England, 1559-1625", *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 33, (2002)

McGinn, B (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism,* 3 vols, (New York, 2000)

_____, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1979)

_____,"Angel Pope & Papal Antichrist", *Church History,* 47, (1978), pp.155-73

McKerrow, R. B, *Printers & Publishers Devices in England & Scotland, 1485-1640* (London, 1949)

McNeil, J. T, "John Foxe: Historiogrpaher, Disciplinarian, Tolerationist", *Church History*, 43, (1974), pp. 216-29

McRae, A, *Literature, Satire and the Early Stuart State* (Cambridge, 2004)

_____,"The Literary Culture of Early Stuart Libeling", *Modern Philology*, 97, (2000), pp. 364-392

Milburn, R. L. P, *Saints and their Emblems in English Churches* (2nd Edition Oxford, 1957)

Michalski, S, *The Reformation & The Visual Arts: The Protestant image Question in Western & Eastern Europe* (London/ New York, 1993)

Miles, M. R, *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity & Secular Culture* (Boston, 1995)

Miller, J,*The Stuarts* (London, 2006)

_____ ,*The English Satirical Print 1600-1832: Religion in the Popular Prints 1600-1832* (Cambridge, 1986)

_____,*Popery and Politics in England 1660-88* (Cambridge, 1973)

Millar, O, *Van Dyck in England* (London, National Portrait Gallery, 1982)

Milton, A, "Licensing, Censorship, and Religious Orthodoxy in Early Stuart England", *Historical Journal*, 41, (1998), pp. 625-51

_____, *Catholic & Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Chruches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-40* (Cambridge, 1995)

Mitchell, M, "Works of Art from Rome to Henry VIII. A study of Anglo-Papal relations as reflected in Papal gifts to the English King", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 34, (1971), pp. 178-203

Mirzoeff, N, *An Introduction to Visual Culture* (London, 1999)

_____, *The Visual Culture Reader* (2nd Edition: Cornwall, 2002)

Misner, P, "Newman and the Tradition Concerning the Papal Antichrist", *Church History*, 42, (1973), pp. 377-95

Monod, P. K, *The Power of Kings: Monarchy & Religion in Europe, 1589-1715* (New Haven/ London, 1999)

Monteyne, J, *The printed image in early modern London: urban space, visual representation and social exchange* (Aldershot, 2007)

Morgan, D, "Imaging Protestant Piety: The icons of Warner Sallman", *Religion & American Culture,* 3, (1992), pp. 29-47

_____, *The Sacred Gaze: Religious Visual Culture in theory and practice* (London, 2005)

_____,*Visual Piety: A History & Theory of Popular Religious Images* (London, 1999)

_____,"Imaging Protestant Piety: The icons of Warner Sallman", *Religion & American Culture,* 3, (1992), pp. 29-47

Moseley, C, *A Century of Emblems – An Introductory Anthology* (Aldershot, 1989)

Moss, A, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford, 1996)

Moxey, K P F, *Peasants Warriors & Wives: Popular Images* (Chicago, 1989)

Mozley, J. F, *John Foxe and his Book* (New York, 1970)

Mullett, M, *James II and English Politics 1678-1688* (London, 1994)

Murdock, G, "The Importance of being Josiah: an Image of Calvinist Identity", *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 29, (1998), pp.1043-59

Myers, R & Harris, M (eds.), *Censorship and the Control of Print in England & Frnace 1600-1910* (Winchester, 1992)

_____, *Aspects of Printing from 1600* (Oxford, 1987)

Naphy, W. G, *Calvin & the Consolidation of the Genevan Reformation* (Manchester, 1994)

Neuschel, K. B, *Word of Honour: interpreting noble culture in sixteenth century France* (Ithaca, 1989)

Nevinson, J. L, "English Domestic Embroidery Patterns of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", *Walpole Society,* 28, (1939-40)

Nussdorfer, L, "Print & Pageantry in Baroque Rome", *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 29, (1998), pp. 439-64

_____, "The Vacant See: Ritual and Protest in Early Modern Rome", *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 18, (1987), pp. 173-89

Nuttall, G. F, *The Holy Spirit in Puritan Faith and Experience* (Oxford, 1946)

O'Connell, S, *The Popular Print in England* (London, 1999)

O'Sullivan, O (ed.), *The Bible as a Book: The Reformation* (London, 2000)

Oberman, H. K & Dykema, P. A, *Anticlericalism in Late-Medieval Europe* (Leiden, 1993)

Oldridge, D, *The Devil In Early Modern England* (Guildford, 2000)

Olsen, V. N, *John Foxe & The Elizabethan Church* (Berkely/ Los Angeles/ London, 1973)

Ong, W, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology: Studies in the Interaction of Expression and Culture* (Ithaca, 1971)

Oppé, A. P, *Raphael* (London, 1970)

Ostrow, S F, *Art & Spirituality in Counter-Reformation Rome: The Sistine and Pauline Chapels in S. Maria Maggiore* (Cambridge, 1996)

Paas, R. J, *The German Political Broadsheet 1600-1700. Vol. 6 1633-1648* (Wiesbaden, 2002)

Parish, H & Naphy W G (eds), *Religion and Superstition in Reformation Europe* (Manchester, 2002)

Parish, L, *Monks, Miracles and Magic: Reformation representations of the Medieval Church* (London/New York, 2005)

Parker, G, *The Dutch Revolt* (London, 1970)

Parkes, M. B, "Stephan Bateman's Manuscripts" in M. Kanno, H. Yamashita, M. Kawasaki, J. Asakawa, and N. Shira (eds.) *Medieval Heritage: Essays in Honour of Tadahiro Ikegami*, (Tokyo, 1997)

Parry, G, *The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation: Glory, Laud and Honour* (Woolbridge, 2006)

Pater, C. A, *Karlstadt as the Father of the Baptist Movements: the emergence of lay Protestantism* (Lewiston, 1993)

Patrides, C. A & Wittereichm J (ed.), *The Apocalypse In English Renaissance thought and Literature, patterns, antecedents and repercussions* (Manchester, 1984)

Patterson, A, *Censorship and interpretation: the conditions of writing and reading in early modern England* (Madison, 1984)

Paulson, R, *Emblem and Expression – meaning in the English Art of the eighteenth century* (London, 1975)

Peacey, J, *Politician and Pamphleteers: propaganda during the Civil Wars and Interregnum* (Aldershot, 2004)

Peltonen, M, *The Duel in Early Modern England: Civility, Politeness and Honour* (London, 2003)

Pendergast, J. S, *Religion, Allegory, and Literacy in Early Modern England, 1560-1640: The Control of the Word* (Aldershot, 2006)

Penny, D. A, " John Foxe's Victorian Reception", *Historical Journal*, 40, (1997), pp. 111-42

Penze-Frantz, N, "Material Culture, Understanding, & Meaning: writing and Picturing", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 66, (1998), pp. 791-815

Peters, K, *Print Culture and the Early Quakers* (Cambridge, 2004)

Pettegree, A & Hall, M, "The Reformation & the book: a reconsideration", *Historical Journal,* 47, (2004), pp. 785-808

Pettegree, A, *Reformation and the culture of persuasion* (Cambridge, 2005)

Phillips, J, *The Reformation of Images* (London, 1973)

Piepho, L, "Mantuan's Ecologus in the English Reformation", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 25, (1994), pp. 623-32

Pierce, H, *Unseemly Pictures: Graphic Satire & Politics in Early Modern England* (New Haven/London, 2009)

_____ "'Unseemly Pictures': political graphic satire in 1620s England", *The British Art Journal*, 6, (2005), pp. 56-61

_____, "Anti-episcopacy and graphic satire in England, 1640-1645", *Historical Journal*, 47, (2004), pp. 809-47

Pincus, S, "'Coffee Politicians Does Create:' Coffehouses and Restoration Political Culture", *Journal of Modern History*, 67, (1995), pp. 807-34

Pollard, A. W, *Records of the English Bible* (London/New York, 1910)

Pollock, J, *The Popish Plot: a study in the history of the reign of Charles II* (London, 1903)

Pope-Hennessy, J, *Raphael* (London/ New York, 1970)

Popkin, J. D, *History, Historians & Autobiography* (London, 2005)

Porter, R & Teich, M (eds), *Revolution In History* (Cambridge, 1986)

Porter, R, "Seeing the Past", *Past & Present,* 118, (1988), pp. 186-206

Posner, D. M, *The performance of nobility in early modern European literature* (Cambridge, 1999)

Pouncey, P, "Girolamo dei Treviso in the Service of Henry VIII", *Burlington Magazine*, 95, (1953), pp. 208-11

Powell, J, "Marlowe's Spectacle", *The Tulane Drama Review*, 8, (1964), pp. 195-210

Powell, J. M, *Innocent III – Vicar of Christ or Lord of the world?* (Boston, 1963)

Prescott, A. L, "Spenser's Chivalric Restoration: From Bateman's *Travayled Pylgrme* to the Redcrosse Knight", *Studies in Philology*, 86, (1989), pp. 166-97

_____, *French Poets and the English Renaissance* (New Haven, 1978)

Prodi, P, *The Papal Prince. One Body, Two Souls: The papal monarchy in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987)

Purvis, J. S, "The use of continental woodcuts and prints by the 'Ripon School' of woodcarvers in the early sixteenth-century", *Archaeologia*, 85, (1935), pp. 107-28

Questier, M. C, "Loyalty, Religion & State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism & the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance", *Historical Journal*, 40, (1997), pp. 311-29

_____, "Practical Antipapistry during the reign of Elizabeth I", *Journal of British Studies*, 36, (1997), pp. 371-96

Rabb, T. K, *The Struggle for Stability in seventeenth-century Europe* (New York, 1975)

Randolph, M. C. "The Medical Concept in English Renaissance Satiric Theory: its possible relationships and implications" *Studies in Philology*, 38, (1941), pp. 127-59

Rasmussen, C. J, "'Quietnesse of Mind': A theatre for Worldlings as a Protestant Poetics", *Spenser Studies*, 1, (1980), pp. 3-27

Raymond, J, *News, newspapers and society in Early Modern England* (London, 1999)

_____, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge, 2003)

Reeves, M, *Joachim of Fiore & The Prophetic Future: a Medieval Study in Historical Thinking* (Glousesthire, 1999)

_____, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study of Joachimism* (Oxford, 1969)

Reeves, M & Hirsch-Reich, B (eds.), *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore* (Oxford, 1972)

Resnick, D. P. (ed.) *Literacy in Historical Perspective* (Washington, 1983)

Rex, W. E, *Pascal's Provincial Letters: An Introduction* (London, 1977)

Robinson, B. S, "'Drake Speech': Matthew Parker and the Reforming of History", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 29, (1998), pp. 1061-83

Robson, M, *The sense of early modern writing: rhetoric, poetics, aesthetics* (Manchester, 2006)

Rodriquez-Salgada, M. J, *Armada 1588-1988* (London, 1988)

Roodenburg, H and Spierenburg, P (eds), *Social Control in Europe: 1500-1800* (Ohio, 2004)

Roper, L & Samuel, R (eds.), *Disciplines of Faith* (London/New York, 1987)

Roskill, M & Hand, J. D, *Hans Holbein: Paintings, Prints, & Reception* (New Haven/ London, 2001)

Rostenberg, L, 'Michael Sparke', *The British Literary Book Trade, 1475-1700*, ed. J. K. Bricken (London, 1996)

Rowlands, J, *Holbein: The Paintings of Hans Holbein the Younger* – (Oxford, 1988)

Russell, C, "The First Army Plot of 1641", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, 38, (1988), pp. 85-106

Russel, D, *The Emblem and Device in France* (Kentucky, 1985)

_____,"The term 'Embleme in sixteenth century France", *Neophilologus*, 59, (1975), pp. 37-51

Rutici, C. M, "Gender, Disguise & Usurpation: 'The Feminine Prelate' & the Popish Successor", *Modern Philology*, 98, (2000), pp. 271-98

Ryrie, A, *The Gospel & Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2003)

Saenger, P & Van Kampen, K, *The Bible As Book: The First Printed Editions* (London, 1999)

San Juan, R. M, *Rome: A City Out of Print* (London, 2001)

Sauer, E, *'Paper-Contestations' and Textual Communities in England, 1640-75* (London, 2005)

Saunders, A, *A bibliography of French emblem books*, 3 vols, (Geneva, 1999-2002)

_____,*The sixteenth century French Emblem Book – A decorative and Useful Genre* (Geneva, 1988)

Sawada, P. A, "Two Anonymous Tudor Treatises on the General Council", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 12, (1961), pp. 197-214

Saxl, F, "Veritas Filia Temporis" in R. Kilbansky and H. J. Paton (eds.) *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernest Cassirer* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 197-222

Schwyzer, P, *Literature, Nationalism, and Memory in Early Modern England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2004)

Scott-Pearson, F, *Thomas Cartwright and Eilzabethan Puritansim, 1535-1603* (Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1966)

Scribner, R. W, *For the Sake of Simple Folk: Popular Propaganda of the German Reformation* (Oxford, 1981)

_____, "Incombustible Luther: The Image of the Reformer in Early Modern Germany", *Past and Present,* 110, pp. 36-38

_____, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany* (London, 1987)

_____, "The Reformation, Popular Magic and the Disenchantment of the World", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* 23, (1993), pp. 475-94

_____, *Religion & Culture in Early Modern Germany (1400-1800)* (Boston, 2001)

Sedgwick, A, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France: Voices from the Wilderness* (Virginia, 1977)

Shagan, E (ed), *Catholics & the 'Protestant Nation'* (Manchester, 2005)

Shaheen, N, *Biblical References in 'The Faerie Queen'* (Memphis, 1976)

Shapin, S, *A social history of truth : civility and science in seventeenth-century England* (Chicago/London, 1994)

Shapin, S & Schaffer, S, *Leviathan and the air-pump : Hobbes, Boyle, and the experimental life* (Princeton, 1985)

Sharpe, J. A, *Crime & Law in English Satirical Prints, 1600-1832* (Cambridge, 1986)

_____, "Last Dying Speeches: Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in the Seventeenth Century", *Past & Present,* 107, (1985), pp.144-67

_____, *Remember, remember the fifth of November: Guy Fawkes and the Gun Powder Plot* (London, 2005)

Sharpe, K, *Reading Revolutions: the politics of reading in Early Modern England,* (New Haven/London, 2000)

_____, "Religion, Rhetoric and Revolution in seventeenth century England", *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 57, (1999), pp. 255-99

_____, "Representations and negotiations: texts, images, and authority in Early Modern England: a historiographical review", *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999), pp. 853-81

_____, "The Royal Image: an afterward", in T. N. Corns ed. *The royal Image: representations of Charles I* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 288-309

_____, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: authority & images in sixteenth century England* (New Haven/London, 2009)

_____, "So hard a text?": Images of Charles I, 1612-1700, *Historical Journal*, 43, (2000), pp. 383-406

Sharpe, K & Zwicker, S. N (eds.), *Reading, Society & Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003)

_____, (eds.), *Refiguring Revolutions: aesthetics & politics from the English revolution to the Romantic revolution* (Berkley, 1998)

Sheehan, J, "Sacred & Profane: Idolatry, Antiquarianism & the Polemics of Distinction in the seventeenth-century", *Past & Present,* 192, (2006) pp. 35-66

Sheehan, P, *Modernism, Narrative & Humanism* (Cambridge, 2002)

Sheils, W. J, "Catholics and their neighbours in a rural community: Egton Chapelry, 1590-1780", *Northern History*, 34 (1998), pp. 109-33

_____, "'Getting on' and 'getting along' in parish and town: English Catholics and their neighbours" in B. Kaplan, R. Moore & H. van Neirop , J. Pollman (Eds), *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands 1580-1720* (Manchester UP, 2009), pp. 67-83

Shell, A, *Catholicism, Controversy & The English Literary Imagination* (Cambridge, 1999)

Sherman, W. H, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading & Writing in the English Renaissance*, (Massachusetts, 1995)

_____,"The Marginal History of the Manicule," in R. Myers, M. Harris, and G. Mandelbrote (eds.), *Owners, Annotators and the Signs of Reading* (London, 2005), pp. 19-48

_____, "On the Threshold: Architecture, Paratext, and Early Print Culture," in S. A. Baron, E. Lindquist, and E. Shevlin (eds.), *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies and the Legacy of Eisenstein* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), pp. 67-81

_____,"'Rather soiled by use': Attitudes Towards Readers' Marks," *The Book Collector,* 52, (Winter 2003), pp. 471-90

_____, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2007)

Sherman, W. H. & Jardine, L, "Pragmatic Readers: Knowledge Transactions and Scholarly Services in Late Elizabethan England", in A Fletcher and P. Roberts (eds.), *Religion, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Honour of Patrick Collinson* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 102-24

Siebert, F. S, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776: the rise and decline of government control* (Illinois, 1965)

Silcox, M. V, "'A manifest shew of all coloured abuses': Stephen Bateman's A Christall Glasse of Christian Reformation as an Emblem Book" in P. M. Daly (Ed.), *Emblem Scholarship Directions and Developments: A tribute of Gabrield Hornstein* (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 211-227

Simons, H. W & Melia, T (eds.), *The Legacy of K. Burke* (Madison, 1988)

Skelton, R. A, *County Atlases of the British Isles 1579-80* (London, 1970)

Smith, R. J, "*The Lambe Speaketh....*An English Protestant Satire", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*, 61, (1998), pp. 261-66

Snow, V. F, "Pictorial Representation & Conciliar Management during the reign of Henry VIII", *Historical Journal,* 9 (1966), pp.1-22

Soergeal, P M, *Wondrous in His Saints: Counter-Reformation Propaganda in Bavaria* (Cambridge, 1993)

Solt, L. F, "The Fifth Monarchy Men: Politics and the Millennium", *Church History,* 30, (1961)

Sommerville, J, *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information* (Oxford, 1996)

Spragaon, J, *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War* (Woolbridge, 2003)

Spufford, M, *The world of rural Dissenters* (Cambridge, 1995)

Spurr, J. *England in the 1670s: this masquerading age* (Malden, 2000)

Stanford, P, *The She-Pope: a quest for the truth behind the mystery of Pope Joan* (London, 1998)

Steinmetz, D, *Calvin in Context* (Oxford, 1995)

String, T. C, *Art and Communication in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot, 2008)

_____,"Henry VIII's Illuminated 'Great Bible'", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 59, (1996), pp.315-24

Strong, R, *Holbein and Henry VIII* (London,1967)

Strong, R, "Holbein in England, I & II", *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, 109, (1967), pp. 276-78

_____,"Holbein in England, III & V", *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, 109, (1967), pp. 698-703

_____,"Edward VI & the Pope", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 23, (1960), pp. 311-13

_____,"The Accession Day of Elizabeth I", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 21, (1958)

Strongman, S, "John Parker's Manuscripts: an edition of the lists in Lambeth Palace MS737", *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliogrpahic Society*, 7, (1977)

Tasker, E. G, *Encyclopaedia of Medieval Church Art* (London, 1993)

Thomas, G, "Review: Visual Culture", *Journal of Religion*, 83, (2003), pp. 510-12

Thomas, K, "Art & Iconoclasm in Early Modern England", in K. Fincham & P. Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post Reformation England: Essays in honour of Nicholas Tyacke* (Woolbridge, 2006)

_____,"The Place of Laughter in Tudor and Stuart England", *TLS* (Jan. 21, 1977)

_____,*Religion & the Decline of Magic*, (London, 1971)

Thomson, J. A. F, *Popes & Princes, 1417-1517: Politics and Polity in the Late Medieval Church* (Glasgow, 1980)

Tribble, E. B, *Margins and Marginality: the printed page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville/ London, 1993)

Thorp, M. R, "Catholic Conspiracy in Early Elizabethan Foreign Policy", *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 15, (1984), pp. 431-48

Thrupp, S. L (ed.), *Millennial Dreams in Action* (Mouton, 1962)

Tighe, W. J, "William Laud & The Reunion of the Churches: Some Evidence from 1637 & 1638", *Historical Journal,* 30, (1987), pp. 717-27

Todd, M, "'All One with Tom-Thumb': Armianism, Popery, and the Story of the Reformation in Early Stuart Cambridge", *Church History,* 64, (1995), pp. 563-79

Todd, M (Ed.), *Reformation to revolution: politics and religion in early modern England* (London/New York, 1995)

Toon, P, (Ed.), *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel* (Cambridge, 2002)

Towers, S M, *Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England* (Oxford, 2003)

Troeltsch, E, *Protestantism and progress; a historical study of the relation of protestantism to the modern world.* Transl. by W. Montgomery (London, 1912)

Tumbleson, R. D, *Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745* (Cambridge, 1998)

Tuveson, E. L, *Millennium and Utopia* (Berkely/Los Angeles, 1949)

Tyacke, N, *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530-1700* (Manchester/New York, 2001)

_____,*Anti-Calvinists* (Oxford, 1990)

Tyson, G. P, & Wagonheim, S. S (eds.), *Print and Culture in the Renaissance* (London, New Jersey, 1986)

Ullmann, W, "This Realm of England is An Empire", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* 30, (1979), pp. 175-203

Van Dorsten, J. A, *The Radical Arts* (Oxford, 1970)

Van Engen, J, (ed.) *Devotio Moderna* (Mahwah, NJ, 1988)

Varty, K, (ed.) *Raynard the Fox: Social Engagement and Cultural Metamorphoses in the Beast Epic from the Middle Ages to the present* (New York/ Oxford, 2000)

_____, *Raynard the Fox: A study of the Fox in Medieval English Art* (New York, 1967)

_____,*Reynard, Renart, Reinaert and other foxes in Medieval England: the iconographic evidence* (Amsterdam, 1999)

Wabuda, S, *Preaching During the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2004)

_____, "Review: Revising the Reformation", *Journal of British Studies,* 35, (1996), pp. 257-62

Wabuda, S & Litzenberger, C (eds.), *Belief & Practice in Reformation England* (London, 1998)

Wadkins, T. H, "King James I meets John Percy, S. J.", *Recusant History*, 19 (1988-89), pp. 147-53

Walker, J. A & Chaplin, S, *Visual Culture: An Introduction* (Manchester/ New York, 1997)

Wall, K, *The Callisto Myth from Ovid to Atwood* (Kingston, 1988)

Wallis, F. H, *Popular anti-Catholicism in mid-Victorian Britain* (Lewiston, 1993)

Walsh, M, *An Illustrated History of the Popes: Saint Peter to John Paul II* (London, 1980)

Walsham, A, *Charitable Hatred: Tolerance & Intolerance in England, 1500-1700* (Manchester, 2005)

_____, *Church Papists* (Gateshead, 1999)

_____, "'Domme Preachers?' Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the Culture of Print", *Past and Present*, 144, (2000), pp. 72-123

_____, "'The Fatall Vesper': Providentialism & Anti-Popery in late Jacobean London", *Past & Present,* 144 (1994), pp. 36-87

_____, "Impolitic Pictures: Providence, History and Iconography of Protestant Nationhood in Early Stuart England" in R. Swanson (ed.), *The Church Retrospective: Studies in Church History*, 33, (1997), pp. 403-24

_____, "The Myth of Elizabeth I as a Providential Monarch" in T. Freeman and S. Doran (Eds.,) *The Myth of Elizabeth* (Houndmills, 2003)

_____, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999)

_____, "The Reformation and 'the disenchantment of the world' reassessed", *Historical Journal*, 51, (2008), pp. 497-528

_____, 'Reforming the Waters: Holy Wells and Healing Springs in Protestant England", in D.Wood (ed), *Life and Thought in the Northern Church,c. 1100-1700, Studies in Church History Subsidia*, 12, (1999) pp. 227-255.

_____, "Sermons in the Sky: Apparitions in Early Modern Europe", *History Today*, 51, (2001) pp. 56-63

_____, "Vox Piscis: Or the Book-Fish: Providence & The Uses of the Reformation Past in Caroline England", *English Historical Review*, 114, (1999), pp. 574-606

Walter, J, "'Abolishing Superstition with Sedition'? The Politics of Popular Iconoclasm in England, 1640-42", *Past & Present,* 183, (2004) pp. 79-124

Wamke, M (ed.) *Bildersturm. Die Zerstorung des Kunstwerkes* (Munich, 1973)

Washington University, *New Catholic Encyclopaedia,* 17 vols (Washington, 1967)

Watt, T, *Cheap Print & Popular Piety,* (Cambridge, 1991)

Watter, C, *Prayer and Power in Byzantine and Papal Imagery* (Aldershot, 1993)

Weber, H, *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II* (Kentucky, 1996)

Wells, D. F, "The Pope as Antichrist: the Substance of George Tyrell's Polemic", *Harvard Theological Review,* 65, (1972), pp. 271-83

Wells-Cole, A, *Art and Decoration in Elizabethan and Jacobean England* (New Haven, 1997)

_____, *Historic paper hangings from Temple Newsam and other English houses* (Leeds, 1983)

Westerweel, B, *Anglo-Dutch relations in the field on the emblem* (Leiden, 1997)

White, P, *Predestination, policy and polemic: conflict and consensus in the English Church from the Reformation to the Civil War* (Cambridge, 1992)

White, P. W, *Theatre & Reformation: Protestantism, Patronage & Playing in Tudor England* (Cambridge, 1993)

Whiting, G. W, "Political satire in London Stage Plays, 1680-83", *Modern Philology,* 28, (1930) pp. 29-43

_____, "The Condition of London Theatres, 1679-83: A reflection of the Political Situation", *Modern Philology,* 25, (1927), pp.195-206

Whitman, N. T, "The 1st Papal Medal: Sources & Meaning", *Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs,* 133, (1991), pp. 820-24

Whittemore, P, "A brass plate commemorating the defeat of the Gunpowder Plot" *Transactions of the Monumental Brass Society,* 13, (1985), pp. 549-57

Wickham Legg, L. G, "On a Picture Commemorative of the Gunpowder Plot, Recently Discovered at New College, Oxford", *Archaeologia,* 84, (1934), pp. 27-39

Wiener, C. Z, "The Beleaguered Isle: A study of Elizabethan and Jacobean Anti-Catholicism", *Past & Present,* 51, (1971), pp. 27-62

Williams, S, "The Pope-burning processions of 1679, 1680 and 1681", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 21, (1958), pp. 104-18

Wilson, J. F, *Pulpit in Parliament: Puritanism during the English Civil wars, 1640-48* (Princeton, 1969)

Wilson, K, *The Sense of the People: politics, culture and imperialism in England, 1715-85* (Cambridge, 1995)

Witter, C, *Prayer and Power in Byzantine and Papal Imagery* (Aldershot, 1993)

Wood, G, "Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: The American Revolution as a psychological phenomenon. Causality and deceit in the eighteenth century", *William and Mary Quarterly*, 39, (1982), pp. 401-41

Woodock, T, & Robinson, J. M, *The Oxford Guide to Heraldry* (Oxford, 1988)

Worman, G. J, *Alien members of the book trade during the Tudor period* (London, 1906)

Wright, A. D, *The Early Modern Papacy: from the Council of Trent to the French Revolution, 1564-1789* (Harlow, 2000)

Wright, C. E, "The dispersal of the monastic libraries and the beginning of Anglo-Saxon Studies", *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographic Society*, 1, (1949-53), pp. 208-37

Wright, E, *Narrative, Perception, Language & Faith* (New York, 2005)

Wyatt, M, *The Italian Encounter With Tudor England: A Cultural Politics of Translation* (Cambridge, 2005)

Yates, F, *The Art of Memory* (London, 2008: original, 1966)

Yates, F. A, "Queen Elizabeth as Astraea", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtould Institutes*, 10, (1947), pp. 27-82

Zagorin, P, *A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution* (London, 1954)

Zakai, A, "Reformation, History, and Eschatology in English Protestantism", *History & Theory*, 26, (1981), pp. 300-18

Zaller, R, "The Figure of the Tyrant in English Revolutionary Thought", *Journal of the History of Ideas,* (1993), pp. 585-610

Zapalac, K E S, *In His Image & Likeness: Political Iconography & Religious Change in Regensburg, 1500-1600* (London, 1990)

Zika, C, *The Appearance of Witchcraft: print and visual culture in sixteenth century Europe* (London, 2009)

S. N. Zwicker, "'What every literate man once knew:' Tracing readers in early modern England", in R. Myers (ed.), *Owners, Annotations and signs of reading* (London, 2005), pp. 75-90

_____,"The Constitution of Opinion and the Pacification of Reading" K. Sharpe and S. N. Zwicker (ed.), *Reading, Society and Politics in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2003)

_____, "Habits of reading and early modern literary culture" in D. Loewenstein, J. M. Muller (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Early Modern Literature* (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 170-98

Unpublished Theses

Brockhurst, E. J, "The Life and Works of Stephan Bateman", M.A Dissertation, University of London, 1947