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Introduction.

As the first in-depth evaluation of its type since the research of Dickens and McGrath during the 1960s, this dissertation will compare printed portrayals of 16th-century English Catholic and Protestant martyrs, (derived from the Greek word for early Christian witnesses to the truth) who allegedly “died for their confession of Christ.”\(^1\) Although not interdisciplinary, my research will synthesise select concepts from other disciplines, especially gender studies; death studies; and post-structuralist discussions regarding the use of fear in maintaining order. Besides the comparative evaluation, I will discuss allegorical, politicised depictions of Catholic or Protestant martyrs and their persecutors: especially the heroic masculinised woman; the inferior feminised man; and the empowered or dehumanised animal. Novel contributions to the historiography include my proposal in Chapter 1 that Catholic and Protestant depictions of martyrdom generally represented adaptation and evolution (also revisited in parts of Chapters 2 and 6); and the use of opposite, negative gender based characteristics to attack rival sects in Chapters 2-4. Most importantly, however, I will discuss the importance of fear (if not of punishment, then of chaos, or for the reputation of one’s religious group) in shaping the perceptions of post-1558 Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrologists who wrote not only the so-called apologies that countered criticisms of their own group, but also propaganda intended to discredit their rivals.\(^2\) This is particularly evident in Chapters 4-6 where Protestants adapted Scripture to equate the post-schism Tudor monarchy with a vengeful and omnipotent God (and vice-versa), because not only was the ruler believed to be a mirror image of God (as Derrida claimed); but God himself was depicted as a terrifying king, judge and patriarch.\(^3\)

The study of martyrdom during the English Reformation is important, because memories of earlier persecutions formulated post-1558 efforts to create a unique Anglican identity underpinned by the representation of England as the new Israel; and rejection of superfluous Roman Catholic rituals as alien idolatry.\(^4\) As part of this xenophobic English Protestant identity, Elizabethan reformers believed the Antichrist represented not one man, but the institution of the Papacy itself, whose interference threatened official efforts to create an independent godly state with Bible-based secular laws. [fig.5] Henry VIII’s schism from Pope Clement VII translated into Edwardian and Elizabethan fear of later Bishops of Rome, especially Julius III who sent Cardinal Pole to oversee the Marian persecutions; Pius V who excommunicated Elizabeth; and Sixtus V who financed the Spanish Armada and allegedly encouraged fugitive English priests to write propaganda endorsing rebellion against the monarch. According to Whiting, popular responses to the Tudor Reformation varied, depending on individual interpretations of loyalty; Catholics, distrustful of innovation, longed to re-establish their forefathers’ religion, while Protestants believed Elizabethan Anglicanism restored uncorrupted early Christian values.\(^5\) Long after physical remnants of pre-Reformation worship were abandoned or defaced, Catholics and Protestants executed by previous regimes were posthumously honoured as martyrs for their Christ-like self-sacrifice.\(^6\) The books chronicling martyrs’ lives, known as martyrologies, were written to confirm a religious group’s collective claim to be God’s chosen elect, which, depending on confessional identity, could be defined as Puritan Israelites; mainstream Anglicans seeking to restore the uncorrupted early church; or Catholics
who believed the Pope’s jurisdiction over religious matters overruled the secular monarch. In a post-structuralist historiography, the definition of a Catholic or Protestant can be problematic, especially since Puritanism, or hotter Protestantism, initially represented not a religious group, but a mind-set within the Anglican Church. Conformist Puritans called themselves “the godly” and demanded further internal church reforms to remove surviving pre-Reformation rituals equated with so-called popish superstition, including clerical vestments; transubstantiation; religious images; Latin prayers, and the church hierarchy dominated by bishops. For the reader’s benefit, I will loosely categorise martyrologists under the following definitions of my own construction depending on the degree of radicalism or conservatism:

I. In Tudor times, Roman Catholics were known as papists for continuing to pledge allegiance to the Pope rather than acknowledge the monarch as head of the church. Under Queen Mary, conservatives who had outwardly conformed to the Henrician Church of England eagerly reconciled with Rome, and deemed the burning of heretics a spiritual cleansing vital for England’s long-term survival.

II. The second type of Catholic, active after Mary’s 1558 death, comprised lay-recusants who rejected the restored Church of England, and exiled Marian priests including Cardinal Allen, Thomas Harding, Nicholas Sander, or Thomas Darbishire. From the 1570s-1600s, younger priests, born after the Marian persecutions and trained in foreign seminaries, infiltrated England to re-convert the laity. These Counter-Reformation missionaries included moderate secular priests unaffiliated with a religious order, and radical Jesuits from the Society of Jesus.

III. The word Anglican was originally derived from “Ecclesia Anglicana:” the Latin name for the pre-Reformation branch of the Church in England. Later historians applied this term to the post-schism Church of England, although the contemporaries of Henry, Edward and Elizabeth generally called their church the Established Church; or the true, uncorrupted Catholic Church distinct from both foreign Protestantism and so-called popish idolatry. Within this thesis, Anglicans are categorised as moderate, conforming members of the independent post-1533 Church of England who accepted royal church supremacy. These included Protestant reformers influenced by Luther or Zwingli; and conservative High Church clergy who envisioned a form of Catholicism without the Pope. The latter concept was implemented by Henry VIII and, initially, Elizabeth, before her advisers persuaded her to impose increasingly Protestant reforms during the 1560s as a means of centralisation and social control. Conservative Anglicans were distinct from church-papists: Elizabethan lay-Catholics who attended both Latin Mass and Anglican services, and deemed Queen and Pope equally important leaders with separate functions.

IV. Radical Elizabethan Calvinists, known as Puritans because of their desire to purify church and secular society, included the enthusiastic godly faction of the Anglican
Church embodied by Lincolnshire preacher John Foxe; conforming Presbyterians opposed to the bishops but fearful of government retribution; and the small, persecuted separatist flocks of Henry Barrow, Robert Browne or John Penry. Conformist Puritans often co-opted, and allegorically repurposed, familiar concepts associated with the theatre; deference to the monarch; and pre-Reformation mysticism, to promote Old Testament values for a mass audience.

Regarding depictions of martyrdom in England, the recent historical debate, or historiography, encompasses a division: older historians argued that the Henrician and Edwardian church reforms signified not an “act of state imposed upon a hitherto contented Catholic people,” but a progressive, inevitable break with the past involving reformist officials imposing change from above, and lower-ranking religious radicals infiltrating the breakaway church to advance their own agenda. Dickens believed the volume of entries in Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* confirmed that many formerly Lollard commoners willingly converted to proto-Protestantism due to the pre-Reformation church’s apparent stagnation. The prevalent school of thought, however, suggests the English Reformation was primarily a period of continuity; O’Day, Rosendale and Duffy argued that Catholic and Protestant martyrologists co-opted pre-Reformation accounts of the early Christians’ austere lives firstly to legitimise recent martyrs as defenders of the current status quo; and secondly to demonise prohibited religious groups or sects (as they were termed in government proclamations) as disorderly. These historians deem the Tudor Reformation a “difficult, drawn out process” because, despite resenting clergymen’s abuse of power, Henrician laypeople were generally conservative and feared upheaval. Scarisbrick, one of the leading historians of his time, compared the Elizabethan recusant household’s secret masses and family prayers with the Marian Protestant goal of a “lay dominated, de-institutionalised church of the Diaspora” operating in defiance of Papal agents by preserving religious observances, education and culture. My research expands upon Scarisbrick, Duffy and Pettigrew’s work by discussing not only female activism, but also the exclusively male teacher-student relationships, where younger missionary priests or Protestants were depicted as the apprentices of earlier martyrs. These scholars were at a transitional stage between boy and man because they had not yet established themselves in what Habermas calls the public sphere (church, economy or politics), where a man was defined by his employment, marital status, age, respectability, social class, and credibility among his peers.

Before the rise of science, religion was used to justify secular laws; explain unexpected phenomena; and portray the monarch not as a puppet of self-serving advisers, but as a rational and powerful representative of God. Although Tudor policy was formulated and implemented by Privy Councillors responding to petitions from Parliament, there was a need to credit the ruler as the omnipotent driving force behind reform. My definition of Government includes Lords serving as royal advisers; MPs in the House of Commons with regional power; and bishops charged with church governance, all of whom deemed themselves “tireless servants of the public interest” defending royal authority from malevolent conspiracies by “rebellious and profane” Protestants, or stubborn papists. In my own reinterpretation
of Freud’s Oedipus Complex, the persecutions can be represented as an allegorical conflict for dominance between older patriarchs and the younger generation. The Marian and Elizabethan regimes represented austere father figures dominating the mother figures of church and country; 2. The prohibited sects collectively represented dangerous youthful and virile usurpers; and 3. The commoners represented innocent children whom martyr and persecutor sought to convert. Walter argued that Tudor governments were terrified of criminals who failed to admit their guilt and appear humble at their execution, because such insolence challenged the wisdom of elders, masters and local officials enforcing the authority of an allegedly infallible monarchy. In a general early modern European context, French philosopher Foucault suggested that rulers maintained order by exploiting existing divisions in society, because their own grip on power was comparatively weak. Gatrell’s research focused upon the decline of public executions due to their degradation into entertainment. He argued that before the 18th-century, English lawmakers relied upon terrifying subjects into compliance with gruesome, exemplary ritualised punishments intended to demonstrate the state’s power over a dehumanised criminal’s body. By applying Foucault and Gatrell’s concepts to Tudor England, I will discuss official efforts to formulate approved social norms by centralising secular and church hierarchy around the monarch; and by using printed texts and physical coercion to literally (and allegorically) emasculate and undermine dissidents. Although it may be tempting for modern readers to draw superficial parallels between the Tudor persecutions; 20th-century dictatorships; and 21st-century fear of terrorism, it must be remembered that the past represented a different culture, with no separation between Church and State. Although modern and early modern zealots (Islamist suicide bombers and Jesuits actively seeking execution) used their final moments to attest “not only to the depth of their own religious convictions, but these convictions’ absolute truth,” the official response differed due to the Tudor government’s willingness to indiscriminately punish entire religious minorities for the actions of a few extremists. Unlike modern totalitarian dictatorships, Tudor England lacked a secret police, and instead relied upon its monopoly over education and its ability to convince commoners to outwardly accept propagandistic claims that the regime passed laws primarily to protect the people from real or imagined conspiracies by internal foes. Sharpe attributes the theatrical spectacle of public executions to a centralising government’s desire to formulate sentiments of civic duty, by providing the people with examples of behaviour to avoid; and by using prisoners’ forced recantations to reassert royal prestige. Lake suggests the mixed response from Tudor gallows crowds reflected a divided society with three factions: the “Catholic, Protestant, and popular,” the third group being interested primarily in the executions’ entertainment potential. Regardless of whether the crowd responded to the executions with sympathy or hostility, their reactions were useful for Catholic and Protestant martyrologists seeking either to prove the beliefs of the rightful church were already widespread under the previous regime; or, alternatively, exalt a martyr’s triumph over adversity. Death Studies is an emerging historical discipline that studies Medieval and early modern attitudes to the physical corpse; the supernatural; representations of funerary monuments; and the posthumous commemoration of deceased individuals. In my own interpretation of this new research
field, I will propose that Jesuit, Anglican and Puritan representations of persecutors being tormented by
disease or madness attributed to a wrathful God are analogous to Gatrell and Foucault’s models of the
government restoring normality by breaking criminals’ bodies to deprive them of an afterlife; destroy any
remnants of their earthly presence; and hold them accountable for their earlier transgressions.

Unlike modern historians who treat the past as a different culture, Elizabethan Catholic, Anglican and
Puritan martyrologists actively linked their own ideology with the personal beliefs of martyred pre-
Reformation forebears, in order to gain reassurance from familiar historical patterns; justify seemingly
new doctrine as the restoration of ancient, uncorrupted beliefs; and prove the collective post-persecution
congregation’s worthiness. Influenced by Walsham’s discussion of the repurposing of sacred inanimate
objects by later generations, I will propose that post-1558 Anglican depictions of martyrdom generally
represented adaptation, intended to unify readers around the Trinity of God, monarch and country.30

Concurrent with Plank’s research on the late 17th-century conquest of the New World, younger Puritans
and Anglicans found solidarity in their pledge of allegiance to the monarch, and subscription to a
“broadly defined”31 concept of Bible-based Protestantism centred on rejecting foreign beliefs and cultures
as uncivilised or unchristian. Elizabethan Protestant depictions of martyrs as saints could be literal,
incorporating mystical Catholic style prophesies and miracles; or allegorical, where returning exiles
discouraged the veneration of any being apart from God, and focused primarily upon the virtuous lives of
pre-Reformation saints, Old Testament prophets, and contemporary martyrs. Woolf suggests Catholics
were constrained by regulations from Rome because rejection of the church’s mystical Medieval past
risked discrediting Papal claims of infallibility.32 Nevertheless, this does not mean that Catholicism was
backward, reactionary and anachronistic: conversely, I will propose that Henrician Humanists and
Elizabethan Jesuits prized textual evidence to support their views, and frequently reinterpreted extracts
from rival martyrlogies to brand the Church of England weak and disorderly. For example, Jesuits
countered Puritan concepts of an Elizabethan Protestant Zion, by equating England with a declining and
corrupted Israel for missionary priests to re-convert and civilise in imitation of the original saints.

The language of inversion, or opposites, was used by martyrlogists to not only divert readers’ attention
from earlier martyrs’ alleged shortcomings, but also to define the contemporary Catholic or Protestant
religious identity in gender based terms of “diametrically opposed extremes.”33 This entailed the
 contrasting of one’s own heroic and humble martyrs with rival claimants’ reputed bestial or feminised
sexual depravity, cruelty and treachery that rendered them out-of-place in a society that favoured “age
over youth, master over servant and man over woman.”34 By applying negative character traits to other
religious groups, Catholic and Protestant martyrlogists could not only brand earlier persecutors unfit to
rule; but also claim that God continued to smite the wicked enemies of his chosen people as he did on
behalf of their Israelite or early Christian forebears.35 Feminist historian Macek deems Puritan
martyrologists like Foxe misogynistic for depicting women as dependent on an unseen male God, if not
on earthly patriarchs, in order to deter contemporary female preaching.36 Harrison also suggests that post-
Reformation gender roles remained unchanged; when speaking at their trial Protestant women, separated
from their patriarch, sought not to challenge the hierarchy, but to defend their faith from an “undesired public audience.” Expanding upon these historians’ initial work on motivations for religious conformity, the third and fourth chapters will discuss an entirely new research field: individuals I term failed martyrs or non-martyrs, who were forced to choose between the two objectionable acts of betraying their faith, or disobeying their monarch. I will argue that two distinct types of non-martyr existed in martyrologies; some were viewed sympathetically, as powerless, weak prisoners deprived of a glorious end. Others were branded willing, mercenary collaborators whose alleged criminality made them the antithesis of the ideal Christian, and highlighted the inferiority of Elizabethan Anglicanism or Marian popery (the supposed idolatrous worship of the Bishop of Rome and powerless images of the saints in place of Christ).

One important theme discussed throughout this thesis is the representation of the persecutions as a spiritual war or test of faith, where the deaths of early martyrs were retrospectively interpreted by later generations as confirmation of the Catholic or Anglican Church’s inherent truth, and other sects’ error. In his early Catholic-Protestant comparison, McGrath proposed that recusants and Puritans comprised a small minority of the population: 5% for Catholics and 2% for Puritans, further complicated by widespread outward conformity, and by local officials’ inability to enforce Elizabeth’s church reforms in remote areas. Dickens drew many parallels between Puritan ministers and Jesuits: both were self-educated, preached openly, and prepared themselves for death through prayer, meditation and fasting. Both relied on converting conformist lay-Anglicans, and both groups desired to become closer to God by overcoming adversity. Marshall, Monta and Green suggest that popular perceptions of martyrdom were shaped by pre-Reformation notions of religious space: just as the church was a sacred liminal area separate from everyday life, death represented not the end, but a journey into a “strange country” where the dead would regenerate into heavenly beings. Expanding upon these existing concepts, I will argue that there was much adaptation in Protestant depictions of martyrdom, where the fire, dark smoke and sulphurous fumes from the gunpowder kegs were deemed not hellish, but holy flames purifying a sacrificial lamb. This opens a new field of comparative study: the repurposing of empowering and dehumanising animalistic depictions by English Catholic and Protestant martyrologists.

Taking an objective, religiously neutral viewpoint, the following chapter will discuss evolving perceptions of martyrdom among literate Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans who deemed the Tudor period a battle for England’s salvation, between God’s chosen elect, and deviant members of the wicked “apostate church.” My primary sources comprise mostly narrative printed texts from the years preceding the Henrician Reformation until the 1600s, written by Catholics attacking the post-schism Anglican regime’s legitimacy, and by Protestants seeking to justify further church reform under Elizabeth’s successor, King James. Due to my linguistic limitations, I am restricted mostly to English documents, including microfilms; 16th-century printed transcripts of martyrs’ letters; and modern translations of foreign language sources, including the Catholic Record Society’s publications of Elizabethan priests’ Latin letters stored overseas, or privately. When available, however, I have used handwritten manuscripts held at Norwich Record Office; the University of East Anglia; British Library; Early English Books Online; and
the National Archives’ Tudor State Papers. Post-1558 Anglican and Puritan books were generally printed in London by licensed artisans approved by the central government: John Day alias Michael Wood (1522-84), Henry Bynneman (fl.1566-83), Henry Denham (fl.1566-90), Joseph Barnes (1549-1618), Dutch-born Reginald Wolfe (fl.1542-73), Christopher Barker (1529-99), former Edwardian royal printer Richard Grafton (1511-72), and John Cawood (1514-72). For Elizabethan Catholics, exiled Marian Protestants, and 1590s Puritan separatists, however, propaganda had to be smuggled in from overseas or produced in covert, unauthorised presses in England for distribution among the underground congregations. Every martyrrologist was under pressure to prove to the population the infallibility and antiquity of his own beliefs with quotations from saints, prophets, contemporary Humanist philosophers, Bible scholars, and Christ himself. In a post-schism and post-persecution landscape, Catholic and Protestant propagandists equated their group with stability, order, and familiar routines, in order to maintain the support of older conservatives; the more literate younger generation; low-status English readers unskilled in Latin; and women who learned to read and recite prayers without “opportunity or need to wield a pen.” As martyrlogies were frequently embellished with “amendments, abridgements and alterations,” I will treat them not as unbiased historical accounts, but as propagandistic polemical texts produced as part of a longstanding debate between Catholics and Protestants over the definition of “true and false martyrs.” Unsurprisingly, Catholic books were frequently acquired and read by educated Protestants, and vice-versa, to attack weaknesses in their rivals’ arguments, or publish selected extracts from these texts which seemingly confirmed official fears that the underground congregations were traitors or criminals.

[Fig.6]: Image from Richard Verstegen’s 1604 Theatrum Crudelitatum Haereticorum depicting the fate of captured Jesuits at the hands of reputed Calvinist Puritan officials: being drawn to Tyburn on a sledge, hanged on the gallows, then taken down and disembowelled while conscious. In the background, a priest’s body parts are boiled in a cauldron for preservation, and public display on the city walls. Although the Anglican regime intended to use this gruesome retribution as a visual deterrent confirming royal claims of God-like omnipotence, Catholics believed the recusant community’s survival, despite such adversity, verified the Counter-Reformation mission’s efficacy.

[Fig.7]: Illustration of the Henrician Catholic martyr Sir Thomas More, from a 1620s reprint of his philosophical book Utopia. The Latin epitaph contains a pun praising the “more learned and faithful More.”
Introduction.

2. In Tudor times, an apology was not a retraction of one’s earlier remarks, but a written justification of one’s actions.
45. As noted by Duff, London Protestants Grafton and Day (publisher for John Foxe, Bishop Bale and Puritan minister Crowley) had both been jailed by Mary for printing forbidden books and supporting Jane Grey; while Yorkshireman Cawood (a Catholic during Mary’s reign) later accepted Elizabeth’s church supremacy to retain his position as royal printer.
47. Such publications are cited S.N. (Sine Nomine) in my bibliography, because the name of the printer is unknown. Anonymous authors are listed as Anon., in order to avoid confusion with the initials of Jesuit Sylvester Norris.
51. Protestant examples include Bishop Jewel’s Reply unto Mr Hardings Answer; Welshman Meredith Hanmer’s response to Edmund Campion’s Great Bog and Challenge; and John Foxe’s transcription of many Marian trial-documents. Catholic instances comprise Jesuit Robert Parsons’ Examen of the calendar of protestant saints; Henry Fitzsimon’s Catholic refutation of John Rider’s claim of antiquity; John Ainsworth’s written debate with his Puritan brother Henry; and Sir Thomas More’s attacks on early Protestants Tindal and Luther.
Chapter 1: Sainthood and the Elect

Traditionally, Henry VIII (1491-1547) is credited as the founder of the Anglican Church in response to the Pope’s 1533 refusal to grant the King a divorce from Catherine of Aragon (1485-1536). Contrary to later Elizabethan efforts to depict Henry as a proto-Protestant reformer, the King envisioned an exclusive English Catholic Church under his personal control rather than the Pope’s, with the intent of centralising royal authority over religious and secular institutions alike, and seizing the Church’s wealth for himself under the pretext of tackling pre-Reformation corruption. Subsequently, Henry’s supporters hanged or beheaded so-called papist recusants who rejected royal church supremacy; and burned Protestant heretics whose contradiction of official doctrine risked sowing confusion among the people. The regime feared Papal agents would stir rebellions by disgruntled conservative commoners, while radical Protestants’ opposition to pre-Reformation traditions threatened early Anglicanism’s largely Catholic structure.

The persecution of religious minorities continued under Henry’s children; from 1553-1558 Queen Mary and her husband Philip II of Spain burned Protestants for opposing Papal authority, and Elizabeth hanged Catholic priests as traitors from the 1560s-1603. Additionally, Elizabeth continued burning heretics, including Arians, Anabaptists, and radical Puritan separatists, because nonconformity undermined Anglican efforts to centralise religious devotion around the monarchy.

In an allegorical reinterpretation of Freud’s argument that every male youth fantasised about usurping a “disturbing rival” patriarch and sexually dominating a mother figure, I will propose that the relationship between 16th-century persecutor and martyr was shaped by deep psychological insecurities. Tudor officials, comprising older married laymen and senior clergy, defended their own privilege and dominance over the proverbial English MOTHER Church by emasculating and destroying the bodies of Jesuits or heretics collectively representing virile, malevolent young sects. Martyrologists’ subsequent adaptation, reinterpretation and repurposing of older beliefs was motivated primarily by fear of being unable to counter their rivals’ criticisms; if Catholicism or Protestantism was proven to be disorderly and dangerous, it could spark future persecutions by the current regime, and the rejection of earlier martyred clergymen by the people.

Historiographical Definitions of Martyrdom

Before introducing the subject of martyrdom, it is first necessary to define a martyr: an individual with a reputation for godliness, whose execution was depicted by sympathetic contemporaries (or later generations with hindsight) primarily as a selfless defence of true Christianity. These martyrs were generally portrayed as exceptionally brave, godly individuals who, to paraphrase Smith, sought identity through “collective self-destruction,” with the role of persecutor and persecuted being interchangeable depending on political climate. Self-sacrifice, however, did not always make a martyr; besides piety, a brave death, or a miracle, martyrs had to be posthumously legitimised in print, so knowledge of their deeds would spread among members of the restored post-persecution church. Throughout the Tudor period, Catholic and Protestant clergymen were under constant pressure not only to reassure the existing congregation, but also to attack rival sects as fraudulent and lawless. Ultimately, these propagandists
hoped to convince the regime and religiously neutral laypeople to reject competing martyrologies. Influenced by Tait’s argument that stone funerary monuments provided a “socially acceptable identity” for deceased patrons, my research suggests that printed martyrologies were substitutes for physical memorials, to honour Catholic and Protestant martyrs denied interment on consecrated ground due to the desecration of their remains. Some martyrs, especially Marian Protestant and Elizabethan Catholic clergymen, were aware of their deaths’ long-term significance, and actively drew parallels with ancient forebears in the hope of gaining posthumous vindication by later generations. Others, especially low-status laypeople, failed to recognise the religious significance of their deaths, but nevertheless were commemorated posthumously due to their link with an earlier time. Concurrent with Scruton’s more general argument that nations and religious groups looked to the past (and especially dead forebears) for a “sense of identity and proof of duration across generations,” I will argue that 16th-century English martyrologists had a common desire to retrospectively prove that the post-schism Catholic or Protestant elect (as they termed themselves) had ancient origins, and were thus superior to their persecutors.

One major issue with defining martyrdom was the divergence between Catholic and Protestant martyrologists’ methodologies: before and after the 1545-63 Counter Reformation Council of Trent, the Pope and his Cardinals oversaw the rigid, straightforward process of identifying, beatifying and canonising martyrs, to ultimately legitimise their veneration as “living members of Christ and temples of the Holy Spirit.” Strict rules and criteria existed for approved Catholic saints: a godly and austere life; endurance of death or hardship during persecution; and the ability to perform a miracle either during one’s lifetime or posthumously. Conversely, Elizabethan Anglican perceptions of martyrdom were much less straightforward; although ancient Christians and early Protestants continued to be considered virtuous men, bishops answering to the Queen generally discouraged the worship of martyrs as saints and depicted them allegorically, as teachers and “interpreters of the Word of God.” Protestant martyrologists Foxe, Brice, Bale and Coverdale were not appointed by senior churchmen to create an official calendar of saints, but took it upon themselves to honour their friends and interview surviving eyewitnesses in order to prove that, statistically, the Anglican Church was superior because more Englishmen died in its defence than contemporary Catholic priests and recusants. Foxe’s book was later made semi-official by Elizabethan bishops who had themselves endured persecution, although royal proclamations and state papers suggest there was little interest in replacing pre-Reformation saints with a standardised veneration of Protestant martyrs. Instead, Foxe’s Acts and Monuments was used to uphold the royal personality cult, attack Papal agents as an “ungodly foreign force polluting the spiritual development of Christendom,” and prove Anglicanism’s ancient, inherently English origins by retrospectively portraying pre-1533 heretics (such as the Lollards) as proto-Protestants whose beliefs supposedly mirrored or inspired those of the contemporary Elizabethan elect. Due to the declining numbers of laypeople who remembered pre-schism Catholic Mass, the existing calendar of saints’ days became secularised by the end of Elizabeth’s reign. The names of former Medieval festivals like Michaelmas were primarily used, for example, not to honour the day a saint or proto-Protestant martyr was executed, but to mark quarterly court proceedings.
As proposed by Duffy and Milton, saints and Israelite prophets remained role models for Catholics and Anglicans alike due to their presence both in the Bible, and the Medieval Catholic Church in which the first Tudor martyrs were raised. This chapter will investigate the extent to which later models of martyrdom, especially the Old Testament based Puritan construct of a divinely chosen nation of the elect, evolved from the existing ritual based Catholic cult of saints, where long-dead martyrs were venerated in the hope they would aid the congregation. During the transitional, unstable period known as the English Reformation, Henry, Edward and Elizabeth’s initial policy of creating a reformed, independent Catholic Church resulted in the unwitting adoption of increasingly Protestant ideas. In Haigh’s words, “the Reformation brought Protestantism, not Protestantism the Reformation,” with influential reformers in church and secular government exploiting the power vacuum to portray spontaneous lower level church reform as patriotic duty vital for strengthening royal authority over every civic institution. By utilising the language of continuity while reinterpreting earlier depictions of martyrdom allegorically, clergymen sought to emphasise the Anglican Church’s exclusivity; calm a population fearful of radical change; and mobilise readers against rival sects. New contributions to the existing historiography include my analysis of martyrs being portrayed as scholars, and the exaltation of royal women, a group frequently overlooked by social historians in favour of the artisan forerunners to the working class.

Who were the Martyrologists?

The men who recorded the lives of executed heretics or recusants for posterity, known as martyrologists, were mostly well-educated clergymen or respectable laymen exiled under Mary, or her Anglican successor Elizabeth. There was regional variation in both the readership and general origin of the martyrologists; Anglicans and early Puritans generally came from the Protestant strongholds of Southern England and East Anglia, including Lincolnshire minister John Foxe; Essex deacon Thomas Brice; London Puritan Francis Burton; Norfolk-born Bishop Parker; and Suffolk-born John Bale. Although high status recusant households existed as far south as London and Essex, the Catholic mission focused primarily upon establishing a foothold in Northern England due to its higher concentration of conservative gentry and low-status laypeople. Many priests came from respectable Northern middling-sort and gentry families, including Lancashire-born Cardinal Allen, Jesuit John Gerard, and John Ainsworth; Yorkshireman John Mush; and Staffordshire priests Thomas Fitzherbert and John Geninges (also known as Jennings). However, this was by no means the rule among Elizabethan Jesuits: Edmund Campion was a Londoner; Robert Parsons and Sylvester Norris came from Somerset; and Robert Southwell hailed from Norfolk.

Martyrologists from every sect, especially the radical Puritans and Jesuits, took it upon themselves to commemorate their forebears’ self-sacrifice not as an irrational, reckless or vainglorious act, but as a selfless, charitable deed intended to save England from damnation. Although these extensive lists were often written spontaneously by former exiles seeking to honour their dead friends, or feeling guilt over their own failure to attain martyrdom, Protestant martyrologies could be co-opted and disseminated by Elizabethan Anglican clergymen as semi-official propaganda justifying England’s continued independence.
from Rome and war against Spain. By placing a copy of Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* within the church alongside the vernacular Bible and prayer-book, Anglicans and conformist Puritans hoped to spur later generations into defending reputed Protestant progress from foreign popish religious practises associated with the Spanish-backed Marian regime. In her study of the underground Catholic networks, Walsham suggests that devotional books and martyrologies containing “self-regulated spiritual exercises” gradually supplanted destroyed physical objects of worship, besides the rites and regular prayers directed by clergymen. Although my printed primary sources are propagandistic and thus heavily biased, they provide insight into the attitudes of martyrologists seeking to exert control over the popular memory by equating recent martyrs with an earlier time of economic or spiritual prosperity and stability.

As argued by Duffy, Wallace, and Haigh, the English Reformation was more complex than a conflict between Catholics seeking to reconcile England with Rome, and Protestants broadly opposed to pre-Reformation corruption associated with a foreign, distant and tyrannical Pope. Further divisions existed between radical anti-clericalist Puritans and conservative Anglicans, including Queen Elizabeth herself, who envisioned an independent English Church which maintained familiar pre-Reformation rituals; an episcopal structure under royal control; and an ambiguous interpretation of transubstantiation that could be interpreted either figuratively (for continental inspired evangelicals), or literally (for conservatives). Between these extremes can be found radical Anglican Bishops Bale, Coverdale and Grindal, who opposed vestments and excessive rituals; and moderate Puritans like Foxe who accepted Elizabeth’s bishops, and feared both papist priests and extremist Protestant separatists. Seeking to unify Anglican and Puritan readers without undermining royal proclamations, Foxe portrayed the Bible-based Elizabethan Church of England, and not the Roman Papacy, as the true Catholic, or universal, church established by Christ. Countering criticisms from rival sects, later martyrologies, including the 1583 *Acts and Monuments*, became more detailed as propagandists amassed facts, statistics and transcripts of original texts to appear more credible. This resulted in a race as Catholics, Puritans and Anglicans compiled as many verifiable martyrs as possible to prove their own superiority over rival groups associated with fraud, superstition and immorality. This thesis will discuss why some martyrs gained recognition while other executed religious dissidents did not; and why certain literal pre-Reformation rituals and depictions continued throughout the period, while others were portrayed symbolically or totally abolished.

**Martyrdom and Sainthood.**

The prevailing view, as expressed by social historians such as Rosman, is that the Marian and Elizabethan eras were a transitional, unstable time, with a regime seeking to centralise its authority by equating criticisms of religious uniformity with treasonous contempt for the monarch. Preliminary reading suggests Catholic and early Protestant martyrologists equated executed religious dissidents with saints, defined as holy men and women who willingly suffered for a greater good. The last Englishman to gain official Papal recognition as a martyr was 11th-century Archbishop Beckett, prompting later post-schism Catholics to look to earlier Medieval martyrologies for reassuring historical patterns reflecting current
events. Vorraigne’s Golden Legend, for example, justified vocal resistance to ancient tyrants who had lost their legitimacy by persecuting God’s chosen people, but emphasised the strict division between passively defending one’s beliefs, and unlawfully challenging the secular hierarchy.\textsuperscript{15} Walsham theorised that post-schism Anglican doctrine signified adaptation, where the sacred space of the church, and pre-Reformation rituals like consecration, were given new meanings by reformers seeking to explain contemporary religious innovations, in terms familiar to the collective laity.\textsuperscript{16} Applying a variant of Walsham’s methodology to my analysis of martyrologies, I will propose that Puritan attitudes to sainthood underwent an evolution from literal to allegorical depictions, as Elizabethan martyrologists like Foxe portrayed ancient saints as ordinary people to distance the Church of England from Medieval corruptions. Allegedly papist practises included idolatry – prayers to the saints, transubstantiation and the supposed worship of the Pope rather than Jesus; avarice – the hoarding of tithes or donations; and fornication – the implication that celibacy was a cover for philandering.

Seeking to establish continuity between pre-Reformation Catholicism and the Counter-Reformation mission to re-convert England, Catholic priests claimed a brave death combined with strong faith vindicated Henrician officials who had failed their mission of stopping England’s contamination with barbarous heresy.\textsuperscript{20} As a servant of God and the King, Lord Chancellor More could justifiably execute “thieves, murderers and heretics;”\textsuperscript{21} relinquish authority to patiently endure beheading; and finally leave a reassuring, self-fulfilling prediction of Catholicism’s ultimate survival.\textsuperscript{22} Cardinal Pole, royal chaplain Cancellor, and Worcestershire clerk Pollard attributed Henry VIII’s execution of the “holy men”\textsuperscript{23} More and Cardinal Fisher to insanity. Unwilling to alienate Henry’s devout Catholic daughter Mary, priests initially claimed the late King was no murderer or heretic, but a sick man misled and exploited by Lord Cromwell, Archbishop Cranmer, and Queen Anne.\textsuperscript{24} This changed after Mary’s death when Jesuits Wilson, Rastell, Bailey, and Thomas More’s great grandson Cresacre, depicted both Henry and Elizabeth as heretics, because of their alleged cruelty, unjust execution of innocents, and unlawful usurpation of Papal supremacy. Although these priests equated heresy with deviant behaviour (besides erroneous beliefs), they initially sought Elizabeth’s re-conversion rather than her overthrow, because the open backing of a foreign ruler like Philip of Spain or Mary Stuart risked undermining the Catholic Church’s claim of impartial political neutrality; and priests’ own claim to be concerned solely with spiritual matters.

Deeming Cardinals the earthly successors of Christ’s apostles due to their ability to choose the next Pope, Jesuits equated the aged John Fisher with Archbishop Beckett, murdered on the orders of Henry II for opposing royal attempts to usurp the powers of Catholic church courts.\textsuperscript{25} Cardinal Fisher could not prevent the 1533 schism, but gained redemption through beheading alongside More, thus cleansing England’s sins, and inspiring future generations to resist errors spread by Elizabethan Puritan successors to the treacherous heretical advisers Cromwell and Cranmer.\textsuperscript{26} By comparing Fisher to John the Baptist, priests could retrospectively demonise Henry and Anne Boleyn as contemporary counterparts to the Jewish tyrant Herod and promiscuous princess Salome, and persuade recusants that it was more virtuous to die for one’s beliefs rather than abjure and live with the guilt of dishonouring one’s saintly namesake.\textsuperscript{27}
Unlike moderate lay-Catholics who had martyrdom thrust upon them, Elizabethan Jesuits actively sought death in imitation of Christ dying for humanity’s sins; the patriarchs of the “primitive church” facing Caesar’s lions; and Spanish priests risking death to convert the pagans in the New World. Counter-Reformation martyrologists generally wrote in the third person to appear authoritative speakers of the truth rather than polemicists, although they often left a personal message in their preface to thank influential patrons or reassure England’s recusants. Thomas Alfield, a Gloucestershire convert to Catholicism later hanged for distributing forbidden books, deemed the relationship between martyrrologist, missionary priest, and lay-Catholics analogous to the Gospel writers, ancient martyrs, and the wider early Christian elect enduring persecution. Just as the roles of persecutor and persecuted were interchangeable, so too were the roles of martyr and martyrologist; by returning to England from exile and challenging disorderly, deviant Anglican heresy, priests could portray themselves as superior patriarchs to the reputedly cowardly or hypocritical Marian Protestants who fled overseas. Arguing that a worthy cause made a martyr, not a valiant death, Robert Parsons (or Persons) deemed “Foxian saints” (dead Marian heretics) traitors like their lawless Calvinist successors, and accused Anglicans of plagiarism for co-opting saints’ days and festivals. Catholic priests, conversely, were considered successors to the “glorious saints themselves” whose good works were perpetually set in printed texts approved by the Pope: the infallible earthly successor to Christ and St. Peter. Counter to Puritans depicting pre-Reformation saints as ordinary people, Jesuits claimed martyred priests’ ability to perform the miracles of consecration and transubstantiation highlighted the pre-Reformation church’s authenticity and exclusivity, while their spilled blood on the gallows appeased God and cleansed England of blasphemous ignorance. Aware of the female congregation’s importance, priests portrayed the abstract ancient Mother Church in feminine terms, to encourage contemporary recusant women to fulfill the vocation of sheltering priests; attending Mass; and producing the next generation of missionaries. Jesuits adapted the pre-Reformation cult of the Virgin Mary to exert greater control over Catholic women, encouraging celibacy to prevent widows living “licentiously and riotously” and instead become models for their dependents by devoting themselves to religious contemplation. Mass, with its rituals and prayers to the saints, was a useful tool for priests seeking to portray themselves as superior teachers to Anglican authority figures, and depict the contemporary underground church not as the kingdom of the foreign Pope, but as an inherently English institution whose appeal to mothers confirmed its association with order, stability, and family values. Although several recusant women died in jail during Elizabeth’s persecutions, only three were executed, and gained legitimisation in print due to their respectability, piety, and veneration by lay-Catholics. Like the Virgin Mary, two of these martyrs were widows: Cheshire gentlewoman Margaret Ward was hanged in London in 1588, and Essex convert Anne Line in 1601. The women’s admission of guilt before their captors may have been intended to uphold the hierarchy (and thus prove Catholicism’s political neutrality), but Irish priest Fitzherbert deemed it a gesture of defiance and distress at the torture of innocent priests; and proof that honest Catholic women were unafraid of the consequences of serving the true church. Despite their sensitivity and godliness however, women continued to be considered
inferior martyrs to priests who possessed the masculine virtues of preaching; self-control; and preference for hardship and patriarchal leadership roles over sensual, short-term feminine pleasures and comforts associated with the domestic sphere of the household.

Literal Catholic style representations of sainthood were also perpetuated by older Marian Protestant martyrs, who opposed not the veneration of saints, but popish priests’ prolonged abuse of power that allegedly rendered the pre-Reformation church beyond reform.40 Believing the Edwardian Church of England was the only uncorrupted offshoot of ancient, universal Catholicism, many exiled Protestants drew parallels between contemporary preachers translating Scripture into English, and Christ’s apostles converting the pagans by verbally spreading the Gospel in foreign tongues.41 Deeming Elizabeth’s 1560s religious settlement the culmination of Edward’s church reforms, Anglican deacon Brice and ex-Bishop Coverdale supplanted the old calendar of saints with Marian Protestants burned on the same day, while exalting the Queen as the infallible authority on English religious affairs.42 Unlike Foxe, who extensively described martyrs’ graphic deaths as a means to highlight Marian papists’ injustice and inhumanity, Brice used vague, poetic language focusing upon martyrs from high-status and clerical backgrounds.43 The concept of a divinely favoured church of the elect was well established by the 1555 burning of London preacher John Bradford, who believed only Protestant “children of God”44 would be reborn. Other older Anglicans, including martyred Bishop Hooper and John Philpot, identified with ancient leaders like St. Peter and Christ, whose crucifixion on the “Mount of Calvary”45 not only saved sinners, but liberated his own soul from inferior earthly bonds.46

Elizabethan Puritan martyrologists initially took a haphazard approach to martyrs and included several pre-Reformation Lollards: anti-clericalist laymen who, influenced by the teachings of renegade priests like John Wycliffe, secretly met to discuss Scripture and criticise papists’ alleged corruption. By the 1500s, Lollard (derived from Medieval slang for an idle person) became synonymous with heretic, regardless of whether the individual considered himself a member of one of the new breakaway Protestant sects, or a Catholic seeking to reform the church internally. Deeming the Tudor Reformation a conflict between the enlightened English elect and the damned “shavelings”47 of the popish antichrist, the Marian exiles Foxe and Crowley included both clergy and laypeople, whose iconoclasm was equated with the Twelve Apostles testing and defacing powerless pagan idols, and with early Christians defying Roman incitements to worship the tyrants Nero and Diocletian instead of God.48 Eager to appease a conservative readership seeking familiar structures and patterns, Foxe acknowledged the early Christians’ godliness and utility as role models, but branded prayers to the saints idolatrous because dead men were in heaven and unable to interfere with the temporal world.49 Foxe, and later preachers like Andrew Willet, depicted anti-clericalist commoners as more rational than supposedly educated pre-Reformation priests, to discredit contemporary Catholic clergy as lazy, deceitful friars who exploited the people; and portray Henrician proto-Protestants as forerunners to Elizabethan Anglicans resisting popish tyranny.50 Thus, low-status martyrs were typically represented with a simple godliness, spurning Marian priests’ bribes and threats due
to internalisation of Edwardian Protestant sermons that portrayed lingering remnants of ritual based popery as devilish, unpatriotic, and alien anachronisms.  

After the 1569 Northern Catholic Rebellion, Elizabethan Anglican doctrine became increasingly Protestant, and prominent Puritan preachers adapted Foxe’s martyrology to equate saints with ordinary people in an effort to exalt martyred heretics, and discredit pre-Reformation mysticism. Yorkshireman Simon Birkbeck, and Londoner Giles Fletcher, deemed these allegorical depictions a means to assert Old Testament inspired monotheism’s superiority over the allegedly polytheistic popish practise of venerating dead saints as lesser gods. Writing to prove Protestantism’s continued relevance and exclusivity under King James, Fletcher contrasted popish priests’ reputed gluttony, sloth, and drunkenness with Marian martyrs imitating Christ’s original instruction to patiently suffer for righteousness and exhibit rational, masculine self-control. In a society that valued puns and allegories, Foxe himself implied that Protestant women were more similar to the Virgin Mary than Queen Mary was, because the previous papist regime failed to serve England’s best interests. Norfolk weaver Cecilia Ormes’ quoting of the Magnificat: “my soul doth magnify the Lord” was interpreted not as a pledge of allegiance to the pre-Reformation church, but as a reminder that even the purest and godliest individuals had to remain submissive to God when discrediting popish superstition. Puritan martyrrologist Burton and moderate Anglican minister Wright believed every subject was duty bound to challenge “traitors, rebels and anti-Christians” and spontaneously enforce official church reforms, because these laws were not the whims of an earthly monarch, but derived directly from the Ten Commandments. The aim was to maintain the support of an increasingly anti-clericalist younger generation who admired early Protestants bravely challenging popery, but feared foreign papist invasion, and internal religious schism after Elizabeth’s death.  

Lastly, mention must be made of Protestant martyrrologists’ reinterpretation of sainthood to portray papists not as zealous defenders of Christianity, but as antichristian inversions of the idealised English subject whose obedience of the monarch was not only patriotic, but a “Commandment of God.” Edwardian and Elizabethan Anglicans feared that recusants idolatrously worshipped dead saints rather than God, and used the words of pre-Reformation martyrs to criticise the post-schism regime. When previous monarchs quarrelled with the Papacy, Marian exiles Bale and Foxe used hindsight to depict pre-Reformation saints as villains; Archbishop Beckett, for example, was branded a “thief and murderer in hell” who earned a violent death in 1170 for spreading lies about Henry II on Satan’s behalf. These anti-clericalist depictions were useful for later Puritans like Lawrence Humphrey or lawyer Thomas Norton seeking to supplant discredited popish martyrs with outspoken Protestant “soldiers of Christ” whose beliefs were not heresy, but Scripture based truths. Posthumously, Norton compared Pole to Archbishop Beckett for both his zeal and his treachery, arrogantly dabbling in politics and posthumously betraying Henry by helping the Spanish enemy take over. In a radical continental inspired rejection of pre-Reformation saints, Bishops Mey and Bilson responded to papist veneration of executed priests by claiming Catholic angels were demons, and Catholic rituals were irrational, superstitious delusions lacking scriptural basis. Eager to discredit Catholic bishops like Bonner as demonic agents, Protestant
pamphleteers sarcastically claimed Spanish-backed papist efforts to transform England into a “noble Kingdom” rendered it abhorrent to God, because the Pope was actually the Antichrist of Babylon whose deity was Satan, and whose church elders included devils and evil men like the murderer Cain. These depictions were related to later Puritan efforts to highlight the superiority of abstract faith over idolatrous rituals, confirm Elizabeth’s claim of infallibility, and portray Henry’s schism as a prelude to the golden age predicted to follow Satan’s final defeat in the Battle of Armageddon.

My source analysis suggests that martyrrologists’ efforts to create an illusion of continuity with ancient saints was intended to reassure an audience fearful of religious upheaval and nostalgic for a time of apparent stability. To achieve this, Anglicans, Puritans, and Catholics claimed their goal was not religious change, but restoration of uncorrupted early Christian ideals. The suffering of early martyrs was intended to imply that the Marian or Elizabethan regime was unjust, although martyrrologists lacking hindsight often left the monarch’s ultimate fate and culpability ambiguous through fear of compromising Catholic or Protestant claims of political neutrality. Under Elizabeth, a division emerged not only between Catholics and Protestants, or rulers and subjects, but also between radical and moderate martyrrologists within the English Church. Although every religious group valued self-control, acceptance of one’s fate, and the power of prayer, Puritans generally put greater emphasis on verbal resistance to unjust commands believed to emanate not from the monarch, but from Rome. Catholic martyrrologies were intended to establish continuity with traditional depictions of sainthood, but Anglican and Puritan models were more complex: not perpetuating, but reinterpreting and adapting models of sainthood as a unifying factor, by exalting loyal subjects while discrediting disobedient papists as villains undeserving of commemoration. Concurrent with Walsham’s argument that the Reformation represented neither unbroken continuity nor radical change, but transition and adaptation, Puritans combined sainthood with Calvinist doctrine not only to discredit Catholic mysticism, but also to highlight early martyrs’ exceptional godliness and thus maintain the support of traditionalists. Subsequently, saints and proto-Puritan martyrs were portrayed allegorically: not as supernatural miracle workers, but as ordinary people unable to betray their conscience by submitting to an out-of-touch, reactionary tyrant.

**Martyrs as Israelites.**

Closely linked with the previously discussed de-mystification of the saints was the Protestant depiction of Marian martyrs as Israelites, intended to exalt abstract faith and Bible quotations over ritualised image worship, and confirm England’s exclusivity as the new Promised Land. Brigden and Simpson proposed that early Protestants were motivated by civic duty to challenge ignorance and idolatry, just as later Puritans voluntarily cleansed the Elizabethan church of lingering superstition through a combination of direct action, and dissemination of propaganda exalting the Queen’s superiority over the Pope. By implying Catholicism was not an infallible or universal religion due to its decadence, corruption, and restriction of access to the Bible, Elizabethan Puritans could portray the Reformation as the fundamentalist restoration of ancient patriarchal values pre-dating the popish church. As the old mystical
cult of saints no longer sufficed as proof of divine favour due to its association with foreign popery, Anglicans and Puritans allegorically compared not only contemporary martyrs, but also the Tudor monarchy, with Israelite prophets. McCulloch deems Foxe’s martyrology an Old Testament analogy: Henry, as Moses, led England into a bountiful Promised Land; Edward, as Joshua, completed the job before Israel’s backsliding under Mary; and Elizabeth, as “gracious Deborah,” restored England’s prosperity by supplanting the cult of saints with Biblical analogies. Unlike the Jews allegedly forsaken by God, however, the exiled Anglican elect triumphed over their Babylonian papist captors, and were thus worthy to reclaim the Land of Canaan under Elizabeth’s leadership. Besides Protestant efforts to supplant sainthood with older, allegedly superior, models of martyrdom, this section will also analyse the evolving Catholic response to allegations of pagan idolatry. Seeking to highlight the continued relevance of New Testament based Mass, priests adapted negative Jewish stereotypes not only to brand Elizabethan England wicked and godforsaken; but also to exalt martyred missionaries as successors to the original saints correcting the Old Testament errors unwittingly restored by Elizabeth’s late father and brother.

After the 1533 schism, Henry VIII portrayed himself as King David [fig.9], a righteous “prince of justice” resisting a pagan papist church equated with the terrifying giant warrior Goliath and the barbarian Philistine army. Government propagandists argued that Henry’s restoration of the English Church’s autonomy stabilised the realm, because the King was the only authority figure capable of preventing corrupt priests from robbing and exploiting the poor. To avoid allegations of heresy, Henry proclaimed himself a reforming Catholic seeking to supplant foreign popish tyranny with a rational Bible-based form of Christianity focusing upon duty to “one God and one King.” Henry, Lord Chancellor Cromwell and royal printer Swinnerton justified the execution of papists opposed to royal church supremacy by depicting the Pope not as Christ’s infallible representative, but the sinful “earthly usurper of God’s law” associated with treachery and chaos. Later Elizabethan Puritans like Adams and Bateman adapted Henrician propaganda to argue that Elizabethan efforts to create an Anglican confessional state (in which church and secular government were under royal control) were allegedly derived from policies formulated in ancient Zion: God’s original chosen nation. Due to their supposed wickedness, the Jews had been abandoned by God after their conquest by Babylon and later by Rome, but England’s return to greatness heralded an end to centuries of captivity and confirmed that God had chosen a new Israel. Henry Ainsworth, a Puritan involved in a series of debates with his exiled Jesuit brother John, claimed early Protestants were dutiful subjects who shared Henry’s desire to create a church independent from Roman popery, because the latter’s episcopal hierarchy enabled wicked men to seize power and exploit the pre-Reformation flock. Lord Treasurer Burghley and Norfolk Puritan Garey adapted this construct of an exclusive, monotheistic Tudor Zion to include neighbouring Protestant nations, especially the Calvinist Scots. With hindsight, Garey could portray James VI as a new David, Jacob or godly “Augustus for these latter times” destined to succeed his cousin Elizabeth and reunify ancient English Israel with virile Scottish Judah.

Concurrent with McCulloch’s theory that the Tudor Reformation was analogous to the Israelites’ exodus from Egypt, my analysis of Protestant texts suggests that the Elizabethan and Edwardian periods represented a transition, where the Anglican clergy gradually supplanted Medieval saints’ days with sermons describing Israelite prophets spontaneously challenging pagan idolatry. However, the two constructs were not incompatible; Marian martyrs could be compared to both saints and prophets not only to discredit Catholic mysticism, but also to exalt Henry and Edward as receptors of divine power.

Henrician priest and Bible translator William Tindal (or Tyndale) utilised abstract notions of faith to highlight early Protestant martyrs’ humanity, and focus readers’ devotions not on idolatrous images or the physical remains of men, but solely upon God. Influenced by these early criticisms of idolatry, Marian exiles Foxe, Jewel and Coverdale portrayed Protestant readers in both England and on the continent as an international “elect of God” that pre-dated the popish church. The Old Testament inspired dying speeches of Bishop Ridley and Parson Sanders were interpreted as proof that respectable reformist courtiers were prophets who foresaw the Anglican Church’s restoration under Elizabeth as part of God’s pre-ordained plan. Being already familiar with Catholic doctrine, Bishop Jewel retrospectively argued that early Protestants were able to identify flaws within the church, and convince Henry and his son Edward to begin implementing the reforms necessary for England’s long-term transition into the new Israel.

Despite regaining its independence after almost five years of papist Babylonian captivity, however, the post-Marian English Zion remained vulnerable and needed further reforms under Elizabeth to become truly Protestant. In particular, the contemporary Anglican confessional state’s enduring prosperity depended upon the willingness of Queen Elizabeth and her heirs to listen to the advice of high-ranking clergymen represented as Tudor-era counterparts to ancient prophets like Samuel.

Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans often depicted the restored English Church as an Ark: a protective object similar to Noah’s gigantic ship or the golden casket containing the stone tablets inscribed with the Ten Commandments. John Weever, a traditionalist Anglican poet from Lancashire known for his opposition to iconoclasm, deemed martyrdom a “virtue gaining voyage” where the martyr ignored his apostatising friends’ advice, and persecutors’ threats and bribes, in order to follow his own conscience and find Christ. Using similar allegories, Puritan ministers Foxe, Bunny, and Oxford scholar Bisse attributed the Anglican Church’s ultimate dominance to divine favour, unlike popish idolatry which was seemingly retreating due to the efficacy of Elizabeth’s increasingly Protestant church reforms. Before his 1555 burning, London preacher Bradford depicted fellow martyrs as “chief captains of Christ’s church” guiding it, like a ship, away from the obstacles of idolatry and superstition and risking their lives to save its passengers: common English laymen. Former Marian exile Bunny retrospectively claimed Bradford’s prediction was fulfilled when the Ark of the elect safely traversed the chaotic tempest of persecution and re-entered Canaan like the Twelve Israelite Tribes returning from Egyptian slavery. The Anglican Church’s restoration represented a new Abrahamic covenant, where the English were allegorically circumcised; cleansed of the taint of Marian popish idolatry; and spiritually reborn through their proclamation of allegiance to Elizabeth and God.
Protestants also used Old Testament analogies to equate the Catholic Church with Babylon and Sodom: decadent, sinful and disobedient cities facing divine retribution for their idolatry, cruelty and promiscuity.  

Although the Papacy was once pure and godly, by the 1500s it had become a power-hungry and decadent institution, resulting in divine favour being transferred to the Anglican elect. Queen Mary was compared to "ungodly Jezebel;" a tyrant, idolatress and puppet of her hated husband Philip and the Pope, whose unjust persecutions of the righteous elect undermined Henrician and Edwardian efforts to create an Anglican confessional state under direct royal control. Seeking to discredit priestly celibacy as corrupting, Puritans retrospectively exaggerated early heretics’ anti-Catholicism to establish common ground with the Elizabethan church and demonise Marian bishops as “bloodsuckers," whose initial lust for women inevitably resulted in worse depravities like buggery, murder or treason.

Rejecting Catholic claims that commoners were ignorant and disorderly, Foxe, Dean of Exeter Sutcliffe, and younger Jacobean preachers like Burton, claimed that many English laypeople knew the Marian persecutions were unjust but were too terrified to speak out without a martyr's leadership, comparable to the enslaved Biblical contemporaries of Daniel or Moses. If persecutors felt merciful, early Protestants condemned to burn were provided with a keg of gunpowder, but this frequently misfired, resulting in a slow and agonising death which Foxe equated with Elijah's triumphant ascent to heaven in a “fiery chariot.”

Unlike surviving papists, whose terror or despair at their own later arrest implied guilt, Marian Protestants were equated with prophets like Job, whose patience and quiet suffering eventually brought heavenly rewards. Due to the availability of vernacular print, laymen no longer needed priests to interpret the Bible, weakening papist control over the population and enabling literate men to challenge rituals lacking scriptural proof.

Counter to Anglican depictions of England as Israel, Catholics adapted negative Jewish stereotypes to portray contemporary authority figures not as virtuous prophets, but successors to Christ’s accuser Caiaphas, or (in the case of Henry VIII) an older, crueler David whose soul was tainted by many murders, adulteries, and other “horrible crimes.” By merging lingering pre-Reformation suspicion of contemporary Jews with Humanist efforts to verify the rituals of transubstantiation and sacred space with scriptural proof, Marian Bishop Tunstall and later missionary priests could brand Protestants ignorant for relying upon English Bibles rather than the civilised languages of Latin or Greek. Exiled Doctor of Divinity Richard Bristow and Jesuit John Floyd claimed that if Elizabethan Puritan iconoclasts were Israelites, then they were inherently inferior to the Catholic elect for spurning genuine priests and profaning ancient churches. Recusant scholar Stapleton and Catholic priest Norris (or Newton) equated Elizabethan hanging judges with Roman governor Pilate and the “wicked Jews” who demanded Christ's crucifixion, unlike martyred priests who followed the example of Christ’s apostles by charitably enlightening backward England on the meaning of true religion. These post-Marian Catholics rebuked Puritan Pharisees in full knowledge that such criticisms could result in being drawn on a sledge to Tyburn or Smithfield gallows; hanged until half-dead; then disembowelled and cut into quarters. [Fig.6]
Some of the more radical Elizabethan missionaries (especially leading Jesuits and supporters of Philip of Spain’s claim to the English throne) reinterpreted Puritan texts to claim the Anglican Church represented pagan Babylon, while Catholicism was the successor to philosophical, enlightened civilisations like Ancient Greece or Rome. Priests feared that the generation of English laypeople raised on Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* would maintain a lingering anti-clericalist mind-set, potentially complicating their reconversion unless such Protestant texts were convincingly debunked. Robert Parsons and John Brierley (possibly a pseudonym used by Jesuit Laurence Anderton) equated Anglican Bible translators with the arrogant builders of the Tower of Babel, needlessly meddling with Scripture by supplanting the universal language of Latin with an inferior, divisive vernacular tongue. Additionally, Parsons compared Elizabeth’s heresy to Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar’s reversion to bestial paganism, contrary to virtuous Gentile Kings (including Darius of Persia) who protected God’s people from spiteful heathens. By accusing contemporary Protestants of barbarism, Catholics could draw parallels with the chaotic horde of pagan Goths who ended the Roman Empire; with the Huguenots who rebelled against the French King; and with the German Lutheran mercenaries who defied their commander, Emperor Charles V, by sacking the Papal States in 1527. Cardinal Allen, a Marian priest from Lancashire banished for rejecting Elizabeth’s church supremacy, associated Henry’s chaotic despoliation of the abbeys with cruel Assyrian invaders pillaging sacred Jerusalem, and the warlike Turks forcibly converting Christians to Islam. By contrast, the Catholic priesthood represented the legitimate successor to Moses, Abraham, the priestly Levite tribe, and Jebusite King Melchizedek, whose consecration of bread and wine to honour God was deemed proof that a form of “un-bloody and mystical Catholic Mass pre-dated Israel’s establishment. As a member of the monotheistic Canaanite tribe that founded Jerusalem (alias Jebus or Salem), exiled priests Reynolds (or Rainolds) and Harding argued that Melchizedek outranked the nomadic proto-Israelite chieftain Abraham; indeed, the latter’s humble homage to the priest-king implied that secular rulers were compelled to obey the “everlasting priesthood” in religious affairs.

My reading suggests that the representation of martyrs as Israelites was most prevalent among Protestants, seeking to prove their own trustworthiness by proclaiming the entire English nation God’s chosen elect. However, this did not necessarily translate into admiration of contemporary Jews, who continued to be considered a sinful and inferior group forsaken by God just as the corrupted Papacy was supplanted by the post-1533 Anglican Church. Puritan allegorical depictions of early martyrs as outspoken prophets empowered by God to resist backward Babylonian tyranny were intended to reconcile Marian Protestant clergymen’s defiance with their patriarchal duty to safeguard the congregation, and uphold laws grounded in Scripture pre-dating Medieval popery. Contrary to Foxe’s criticisms, however, Catholic doctrine was by no means rigid and unchanging; when facing seemingly new Bible-based criticisms, priests re-interpreted Protestant arguments to not only exalt Catholicism as the early church’s successor, but also to equate Anglicans and Puritans with wicked apostatising Jews who supposedly killed Christ and rejected his divinity. By portraying the Elizabethan Catholic mission as a conflict between a corrupted Anglican Israel, and saint-like Jesuit missionaries imitating Christ’s disciples
correcting Old Testament error, priests could brand government efforts to force conformity to an inferior church unlawful and irrational. The following section will analyse another model of martyrdom focusing upon educated natural leaders whose ability to teach others indirectly safeguarded the survival of the Catholic or Anglican churches, as later generations internalised their teachers’ beliefs, and subsequently instructed their own dependents.

**The Scholar as a Model of Martyrdom.**

The term scholar is a vague definition, particularly appealing to youths seeking to prove their learning, but also relevant for older clergymen and teachers who interpreted Scripture for the congregation’s benefit. As discussed by Dillon, a new post-Reformation concept of martyrdom gained acceptance among early Protestants and educated Catholics like Sir Thomas More, where a martyr was primarily defined not by his control over the supernatural, but by his effort to live and die as “one who witnessed the true church.”118 This section categorises scholars as those who fulfilled models of learned behaviour rather than coming from a certain class background; while all clergymen were well-educated, not every scholar was a priest or preacher, nor a dynamic catalyst of Reformation, despite sharing a common interest in religion. Expanding upon Raynor’s case study of proto-Protestant martyr John Frith, my own source analysis suggests Jesuits, Puritans and Anglicans all deemed educated men the vanguard of a conflict between the elect and unjust authority figures representing ignorance, cruelty and irrationality.119 Shell suggests that Elizabethan Catholic propagandists were aware of the need to “win over children and young people,”120 to prove Catholicism’s continued relevance, and train future priests. Within the context of the English Reformation, I will argue that educated Catholics and Protestants alike were driven by what Gregory calls the “duty of intolerance”:121 a Humanist idea inspired by the arguments of Classical philosophers like Socrates that it was better to die for one’s beliefs rather than live in error.

Humanism, a Renaissance ideology that prized the use of credible evidence to confirm beliefs lacking scriptural verification, was closely linked with the desire of Catholic scholars, including Dutch priest Erasmus and royal adviser More, [fig.7] to create a perfect, orderly society where every subject had an important function.122 Although the Tudor government valued education, it feared contradiction and error; before the 1533 schism, Henry VIII outlawed English Bibles and burned critics who refused to recant or surrender forbidden books, to ensure nothing remained for posterity.123 Strict criteria were required for officially approved scholars: positions of power; a university education; and the ability to convincingly counter heretical texts.124 Fearing the similarities between continental Lutheran Protestantism and low-status Medieval Lollards unlawfully meeting to discuss Scripture, educated officials like Sir Thomas More, London sheriff Fabian, and the King himself, took it upon themselves to read, and discredit, prohibited Protestant books.125 Due to Henry’s defence of Catholic doctrine, Pope Leo X awarded him the title of “Fidei Defensor”126 (Defender of the Faith) a rank which, after the schism from Leo’s successor Clement VII, the Anglican regime interpreted as a God-given right to punish anyone who questioned royal jurisdiction over local religious affairs. If left unchecked, the Tudor government feared
chaotic heresy would infect an increasingly literate populace with sedition (the spreading of false rumours about the government), and rioting under pretended religious reform. Commoners were expected to show gratitude for the monarch’s forgiveness of remorseful prisoners; and respect all officials and clergymen by obeying and internalising their commands or sermons.

Later Anglicans adapted More’s concept of a Catholic Utopia, into an Old Testament inspired vision of a Godly Commonwealth where every law, ritual and religious article had Biblical verification; idolatrous popish superstition was prohibited as unpatriotic; and every subject answered to a higher power: the terrifying but benevolent monarch. Aware of the importance of competent, exemplary teachers in instilling sentiments of loyalty, duty and obedience among the people, Edward VI [fig.2] passed laws giving academics special privileges while threatening those who assaulted them with “imprisonment or corporal pain.” By placing church and secular hierarchies directly under royal authority, suppressing heresy or popery (worship of the Pope rather than Christ), and spying on untrustworthy minorities, the Anglican government hoped to exert greater control over the population and prevent foreign backed rebellions. Edwardian legislation against “the Bishop of Rome’s usurped power” was reinterpreted by Elizabethan Bishop Jewel and Puritan minister William Ames to proclaim the Marian persecutions not only irrational, but also unjust and unlawful for burning men who served the people by disseminating God-given vernacular knowledge. Seeking to introduce more Protestant reforms to the Anglican Church, and verify royal claims of infallibility with textual evidence, the government instructed learned men to free England from “darkness and blindness” by leading through example, and plainly explaining God’s commands to the multitude. Besides their gowns and caps, Edward’s definition of a scholar remained vague, enabling Elizabethan Puritans Ames and Haddon to define any respectable learned Protestant interested in the Bible as a scholar. Surviving Marian exiles like Bishop Grindal deemed martyrdom a lecture, where grave, wise clerics used the pyre or scaffold as a pulpit to win over the crowd by portraying the Anglican Church as more Catholic than popery due to the universal appeal of English services, and the incorporation of both Latin and Hebrew Scripture into the Great Bible. In a direct challenge to Marian papists, martyrs like elderly Bible translator John Rogers proclaimed themselves superior scholars because they drew knowledge not only from approved Latin religious texts and pre-Reformation Humanist writings, but also from banned Protestant books. Other older Anglicans, including Canterbury prebend Peter Alexander (imprisoned for heresy under Mary), depicted martyrs as prophets, saints and scholars, whose patience, bravery and learning highlighted their exceptional godliness, and bridged the gap between Medieval mysticism and Protestant Bible study.

Foxe, himself an Oxford graduate, deemed learned Protestants latter-day apostles who cleansed their souls through fire in an earthly purgatory: the culmination of their vocation to seek the truth. These older teachers were deemed the first wave of warriors resisting Satan with a powerful new weapon: vernacular Bibles that enabled Englishmen to realise that artificial popish image worship was incompatible with God’s commands. Far from harbouring malice against King Henry, pre-Reformation martyrs William Tindal and 55-year-old Norfolk theologian Robert Barnes were depicted as acolytes of a
“higher schoolmaster.” the Holy Ghost, which compelled them to supplant rituals with credible texts. Foxe deemed these academics avowed Protestants because extracts from their texts were incorporated into the official Anglican prayer-book. In reality, however, these Henrician scholars initially considered themselves reforming Catholics who opposed not the existence of the Papacy, but individual priests’ abuse of power. These men did not subvert Scripture, but spread it among the people by translating Latin to the vernacular, while exposing and ridiculing bad papist teachers like Cardinal Wolsey who meddled in politics and hoarded wealth rather than using it to help the poor. Foxe highlighted the close relationship between female Marian martyrs and educated preachers to imply that Anglican doctrine was so pure that even a simple woman could understand it. Although women's physical weakness and emotional instability left them confined to the household or domestic sphere, with proper guidance from ministers, even labouring-class women like Kentish widow Margaret Polley or Isabel Foster could gain the confidence to challenge false religion. One example was London scold Margaret Mearing, whose obstinacy and feminine lust for married Scotsman John Rough transformed into humility and docility, as Margaret internalised the ex-friar’s sermons and assumed a productive, supportive role by collecting alms for her fellow prisoners.

In a key argument by Foxe, younger scholars were praised for their strong mental discipline and mastery of Classical languages, in order to inspire contemporary Elizabethan readers to study hard and continue reforming the Anglican Church internally in defiance of foolish, mercenary, childish, and spiteful papists. Seeking to prove Protestant youths were not a threat to the established elite, Foxe highlighted young martyrs’ humility and acceptance of a secular hierarchy favouring older married men, especially the King. These scholars were retrospectively depicted not as delinquents, but godly men predestined to learn, translate and disseminate scripture as part of God's long-term plan to create a strong, unified English Israel. Foxe compared Cambridge graduate John Frith with Hercules not only because of his mental strength, but also because he triumphed over cruel, idolatrous pagan gods: the powerless statues of saints irrationally worshipped by priests. Frith’s patriarchal wisdom, humility and meaningful debates contrasted with immature papist bishops’ greed, spitefulness, and childish vanity; their donations to the pre-Reformation church were allegedly motivated not by charity, but by selfish desire to leave a name for posterity. Foxe claimed Frith’s books, which used Scripture and natural philosophy to attack Catholics as hypocritical idolaters, were so convincing that one of his critics, John Rastell, was converted. However, this is inaccurate; despite printing Cromwell's anti-Catholic propaganda, Rastell perpetuated belief in Purgatory, while his son William was a notable recusant who eulogised Thomas More. Protestant depictions of female scholars were motivated primarily by fear, because Bale and Foxe were under pressure to differentiate the gossip and clamour of low-ranking women from respectable, approved female gospellers whose deaths could be used to highlight both the appeal of Anglican education, and the incompetence and arrogance of priests unable to debate or acknowledge their error. Henrician gentlewoman-poet Anne Askew’s educated background enabled her to debate with her interrogators and record her beliefs for posterity, proclaiming herself a self-sacrificing prophet protecting proto-Protestants.
from Henry’s conservative religious policies (including members of Queen Catherine Parr’s network of friends), and translating Scripture not out of vanity, but duty to save other laywomen. Bale, and martyred Marian gentleman Robert Glover, proclaimed Askew a “saint crushing the head of the Papal beast,” whose beauty reflected her soul’s inner state. [fig.8] Foxe and Bale’s claim that Anne’s high pain tolerance was miraculous appealed to traditionalist Anglicans, while her outspoken denunciation of idolatry and prediction of popery’s ultimate defeat appealed to contemporary Puritans who envisioned a more Protestant Anglican Church. These reformers sought pre-Reformation precedents for their own rejection of Catholic religious images, and were eager to justify further iconoclasm by claiming the late Henrician and contemporary Elizabethan churches were only partially reformed. Anne’s open preaching challenged priests’ competence and patriarchal function, while her translations of the Psalms into English suggested desire to compensate for her feminine physical weakness by dedicating her life to Christ, as pre-Reformation monks and nuns did before they became wicked and corrupt. By comparing Anne to Christ’s disciples condemned to “die in innocence” at the hands of irrational pagans, Foxe and Bale could discredit Papal infallibility by claiming the English Protestant flock, not the papist church hierarchy, defined saints and sinners.

Moderate Elizabethan Anglicans deemed Lord Chancellor Cromwell an ideal role model, because unlike contemporaries born into privilege, he rose to the top through hard work, and persuaded Henry VIII to introduce an official English Bible and vernacular church services that would instil Christian virtues of obedience among low-status subjects. Like Foxe, Anglican playwrights Shakespeare and Wentworth Smith (a possible pseudonym or ghost-writer for the latter) retrospectively used militaristic language to depict Cromwell as a Protestant “valiant standard bearer” whose diplomatic skills, honesty and zeal restored England’s independence. Thomas Smith, a royal servant and supporter of Henry’s fifth wife Catherine Howard, defended Cromwell’s reputation with a ballad blaming malicious slanderers for Cromwell’s 1540 beheading, and claiming the late chancellor gained immortality through the good works of encouraging modest dress, banning idolatry, and suppressing lewd, idle monks. Anglican chronicler Holinshed and Bishop Cowper deemed Cromwell’s humility and longstanding service virtues for lower-ranking readers to aspire to, until they themselves earned official positions and were able to lawfully complete Henry’s earlier crusade against popery. Cromwell’s claim that he “died in the Catholic faith” was interpreted not as a renunciation of his beliefs or desire for burial on consecrated ground; but as confirmation that the Church of England was the universal successor to the early church due to its perpetuation of pre-schism Catholic doctrine regarding the Trinity and the sacraments of baptism or marriage. Due to his friendship with Elizabeth’s mother Anne Boleyn, Cromwell was depicted not as a heretic or traitor, but as an English patriot who allegedly formulated the post-schism centralisation of royal authority over church and state through selfless desire to protect his King, and the English popular consciousness, from the malevolent Papacy.

The historiography of Gregory and Parish suggests Elizabethan Catholics deemed celibacy proof of the priesthood’s exclusivity and superiority over Anglicanism, because martyred priests would not leave
behind widows and orphaned children. As martyrs-in-training, younger priests were praised for rejecting seduction by women and focusing solely upon their studies, to gain useful tools for instructing the people rather than the vain, useless “bragging knowledge” of married Protestant ministers. The ideal of the chaste Counter-Reformation scholar was particularly appealing to missionary priests based at Rome, Louvain, Douay and St. Omer seminaries, who deemed death by hanging an acceptable price for correcting Anglican error. Cardinal Allen left it to the reader to draw conclusions on who was the real traitor and heretic, contrasting recusant passivity with blasphemous Puritan fanatics rejecting the church founded by Christ’s apostles. The motive behind Jesuit scholars’ aspiration of martyrdom can be summarised in their motto “Ad Maiorem Dei Gloriam” (AMDG): Geninges, Campion, Ainsworth and Johnson believed they were working for the greater glory of God, and any pain or hardship incurred while preaching to literal pagans in the New World or Asia, and allegorical pagans in England, would be rewarded in heaven. Latin sermons allegedly highlighted Catholicism’s superiority as a purer, older form of Christianity, because it perpetuated an ancient language intelligible only to learned, civilised men. Although later Jesuits would use the 1582 Douay-Rheims English Bible as a reference tool, throughout the period priests deemed Anglicans foolish for basing their worship upon an inferior vernacular translation: Robert Johnson, for example, mocked his Anglican interrogators by asking “do you think Christ taught in English?” These priests claimed to be serving England’s interests by participating in a “special kind of warfare under the banner of obedience” as missionary warriors motivated by patriarchal concern for the Queen’s soul. In secular affairs, Elizabeth was as legitimate as Mary was, but her church supremacy was unlawful because only priests were qualified to interpret God’s word. The passive silence of Elizabethan Jesuits was shaped by Sir Thomas More’s conduct before his 1535 beheading; equating excessively eager efforts to seek martyrdom with suicide, More refused to confess to his captors and face damnation for lying; or deny the charges and face being held in contempt of court for insolence. More proclaimed allegiance to the institution of the Papacy, not the Pope, declaring “Christendom was one corps” and deeming Henry’s schism rash; a Pope could easily die, or be replaced if he abused his power. As an advocate of man’s right to charitably correct the errors of a superior, More’s silence during the interrogations implied he considered Henry a tyrant to be feared rather than a benign father figure to be loved, because the King no longer held himself accountable to God or the Pope. Inspired by More’s example, and eager to subvert traditional stereotypes that young men were inherently disorderly and violent, Jesuits Sherwin and Anderton utilised ambiguous testimonies, vague prayers that “right might take place,” and passive non-cooperation to avoid incriminating their friends. By neither agreeing nor disagreeing with their interrogators, priests could proclaim their political neutrality and allegiance solely to God, while stressing the limits of royal power; Elizabeth could legally punish secular criminals, but her hanging of priests violated divine law. Finally, this section will discuss Catholic representations of the bad scholar who, as the wicked antithesis of the idealised, respectful martyr, allegedly supplanted celibacy with promiscuity; truth with falsehood; and remorse with arrogant bravado. Although Marian Protestants claimed popery represented
ignorance and stagnation, Catholic priest Morris, and Bishops Brookes and Bonner, deemed Rome the cradle of civilisation, and opposed not innovation or orderly debate, but unauthorised conventicles or “schools of heresy” where renegade ministers secretly gathered to plot rebellion against God and monarch. Marian lay-Catholic Mason branded Archbishop Cranmer a bad, stubborn and deluded old man who died “standing obstinately in his opinions” in defiance of Mary’s restoration of ancient Catholicism and prohibition of Lutheran books. Differentiating learning from wisdom, Catholics branded later Elizabethan Anglicans misguided and arrogant for plagiarising pre-Reformation books, and equated them with Wycliffe’s Medieval Lollards; Egyptian Arians who rejected Christ’s divinity; and violent Donatist separatists who broke from the fourth-century church. Harding, an old Devonshire priest exiled for rejecting Elizabeth’s church supremacy, argued that all the pious, honest pre-Reformation priests had died or fled overseas; the only clergy in the post-1558 Anglican Church were intemperate, mercenary renegade friars and corrupt schoolmasters willing to renounce the Pope in return for sex and money. Later Jesuits Parsons, Anderson and former Anglican minister Leech (alias Eccles) applied similar concepts to their Puritan rivals to counter Protestant puns ridiculing the pre-Reformation clergy; and discredit “vain and impertinent” heretics who misquoted scripture and foolishly argued for the sake of argument, rather than through charitable desire to correct error. Anderson branded Puritan preacher Goodman a “bad man for England,” who twisted Calvinist predestination to justify rebellions against Mary Tudor, and later imposed unwanted church reforms under Elizabeth.

The prototype for Anglican and Puritan depictions of the bad scholar can be found in Henrician propaganda equating Cardinal Fisher’s age not with wisdom, but with senility; and implying Lord Chancellor More’s outward piety in jail concealed his earlier cruelty and dereliction of duty to the King. Unlike the married Protestant scholar, who devoted an equal amount of time to his wife and his books, papist “false teachers and preachers” were infantilised as irreverent, disruptive schoolboys because unnatural celibacy caused them to fornicate with many women and deliberately spread falsehood. These included Bishops Gardiner and Tunstall, whose heckling of ex-monk John Lambert implied jealousy, incompetence, and inability to rationally debate. By comparing the bishops to corrupt Jewish priests persecuting the righteous and “robbing people of the Lord’s cup” (vernacular Scripture), Foxe could question their rationality, while justifying Elizabethan Anglicanism as the logical outcome of Henrician efforts to create a truly universal church. Throughout the Tudor period, the stubborn refusal of priests (including “unhappy foolish friar” Anthony Brown) to accept royal supremacy rendered them culpable for their own deaths, just as the Pope’s irrational refusal to reform the pre-Reformation church caused the Henrician schism. The insulting language used during John Fisher’s interrogation is interesting: he was referred to as “Mr Fisher” rather than Doctor or Bishop, suggesting his appointment as Cardinal was unrecognised by the English Church because of his rejection of royal authority over the clergy, and alleged ingratitude towards Archbishop Cranmer’s attempt to secure leniency for the prisoners. Elizabethan Puritans Humphrey and Bunny retrospectively deemed Fisher the real heretic for wasting his God-given gifts, and needlessly antagonising the late King by choosing beheading for personal,
posthumous glory. Using puns derived from Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, Yorkshire priest-turned-Puritan Thomas Bell claimed Fisher had failed his vocation as a Fisher of Men, in favour of teaching false doctrine that put the distant, foreign Pope before one’s natural-born ruler. Harsher criticisms were directed against More due to his active burning of heretics, as Foxe, Humphrey and Edwardian gentleman Hall claimed the ex-Chancellor’s “malicious silence” during his trial made a mockery of royal authority, and was evidence enough for his execution for treason.

Having witnessed a Northern rebellion in 1569; regicide conspiracies by Mary Stuart’s supporters during the 1580s; and the prospect of conflict with Spain, Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans attacked contemporary Jesuits as hypocrites because, despite their education, these priests did nothing to avert their own damnation and furthermore withheld true scripture from the people. Seeking to reclaim control of England’s universities, and thus portray the Anglican Church as progressive and rational, Bishop Jewel accused papist priests of abandoning the ideals of Catholic theologians like St. Augustine, necessitating the post-schism English Church’s takeover by a monarchy that had, for centuries, competently overseen England’s secular affairs. After Elizabeth’s 1571 excommunication, Anglican clergymen like Jewel and Baker refused to recognise Jesuits as legitimate priests and undermined their scholarly credentials by comparing them to the idle, itinerant criminal underclass. Lawyer Thomas Mynatt branded Campion an insolent vagrant and “ruffian-like sort” who wandered the realm disguised as a servant to stir conservative commoners into lawlessness and rebellion. Countering Campion’s claim that by denouncing popery, Anglican ministers were condemning Elizabeth’s Catholic ancestors, the authorities declared that papists were executed for treason, not religion, and contrasted law abiding, Medieval priests with wicked Jesuits who distributed forbidden books and “popish trash” that plagiarised and misquoted Scripture to challenge Elizabeth’s infallibility. Using translations of Jesuit texts, Calvinist theologian Alexander Nowell, and Devonshire merchant William Stallenge, claimed Counter-Reformation papists’ obedience to Spanish ex-soldier Ignatius Loyola was proof enough that they were traitors and murderers allied with King Philip against the church and Kingdom of England.

This depiction was motivated by a innate fear of youths as disorderly usurpers; even if executed Jesuits did not personally resent Elizabeth, the regime feared that printed criticisms of Anglicanism could be used by lay-recusants to justify disobeying and ultimately overthrowing established patriarchal officials.

In sum, two specific Humanist influenced constructs were applied to martyred scholars by Catholic, Puritan and Anglican martyrologists. The first, associated with older martyrs, utilised existing patriarchal ideals of the learned, mature teacher who instructed his dependents and treated execution as a final test of faith, where the flames purified his soul in preparation for heaven. The second type of scholar was the humble, powerless youth, whose virginal purity and devotion to study implied closeness to God, and greater rationality than the unjust authority figures believed to have failed their pastoral obligations. Throughout the Tudor period, scholars of all ages were depicted as law abiding, upholding the secular social contract of obedience to one’s superiors, and portraying themselves as defenders of an earlier Golden Age: pre-Reformation Catholicism or Edwardian Anglicanism. Fearing allegations of insolence,

Catholics often resorted to silence in defiance of their right to speak, passively implying their ruler was a tyrant incapable of rational debate and thus unable to serve England's spiritual interests. By drawing parallels between humble Tudor saintly scholars, and early Christians converting ignorant pagans, Catholics could assert their own sect's claims of antiquity, and discredit heretics as barbarous, illiterate, and incompetent. Regarding the construct of the bad scholar, Puritans, Anglicans and Jesuits all exalted their own martyrs by depicting rival clergymen as the antithesis of the ideal Christian, whose greed, cruelty, cowardice, or treachery provided readers with examples of behaviour to avoid. During the English Reformation, martyrdom was deemed an allegorical battle between godly learning and devilish ignorance: martyred scholars were warriors, and their arms were the books and pamphlets they wrote to convert laypeople to their cause. As in earthly warfare, victory came to the side with the most advanced weapons, greatest supply of resources, and most effective tactics: namely the ability to overcome rival sects with innovative arguments and credible statistics.

Royal Women.

As theorised by Duffy, post-schism England was centred on a type of royal personality cult, where the monarch was revered in place of long-dead saints.\footnote{Duffy} Due to his position of power and responsibility, the King was considered analogous to God: a terrifying but benevolent figure “above the law and above humanity”\footnote{Derrida} who, to paraphrase Derrida, was empowered to spare or take life if such actions served the country’s interests. As no male claimants to the English throne were recognised as martyrs, I will analyse representations of three Queens rendered powerless through imprisonment and beheading for treason: Anne Boleyn, Jane Grey and Mary Stuart. Contrary to the Victorian Great Man Theory, where Kings, statesmen or clergymen were credited as the sole dynamic force for major historical events, this section will argue that the bravery of these women at their beheading was a response to being robbed of their autonomy and identity; by sacrificing themselves for their beliefs, these women sought to regain a degree of control over their fate. As argued by Klenke, martyrologists from every religious group posthumously rehabilitated these women as heroic role models, “exceptional by men’s standards,”\footnote{Klenke} who overcame stereotypical feminine weakness by choosing to die not for a political cause, but for religion. In her case study of Henry’s second wife Anne Boleyn, Warnicke proposes that the posthumous representation of high-status women as martyrs resulted in a conflict between Catholics, Puritans and Anglicans, all of whom sought to exalt the virtues of the Queens they had claimed as their own, while denouncing rival claimants as wicked, perverse criminals or usurpers deserving of execution.\footnote{Warnicke} This raises the question: what motivated Catholic and Protestant martyrologists to include these Queens, and to what extent were the women aware of their deaths’ long-term significance?

Anne Boleyn (1501-36) was unpopular in life, but posthumously she was praised by Protestants seeking to portray her as a figurative prophet or saint, and dehumanise Catholics for their violence and cruelty to women.\footnote{Warnicke} By depicting Anne as both a passive conduit for divine energy, and a dynamic force for Protestant reform in a church that King Henry initially envisioned as Catholicism without the Pope, later
Anglicans and Puritans could exalt Anne’s daughter Elizabeth as equally virtuous. Foxe praised Anne’s charity, godliness and rationality, to portray her as the ideal wife who, besides excelling in her domestic duties, had God-given strength to denounce papist superstitions, protect reformist clergy, and raise Elizabeth Protestant. Anne’s failures as Queen were retrospectively supplanted by later Protestant efforts to rehabilitate her as a model wife, scholar, and patron of clerics of “right good learning” including several future Edwardian bishops and Bible translators. William Latimer, Anne’s former chaplain, depicted her as a “gracious, virtuous Lady” moved by divine intervention and love for Henry to reform the Church to the point of self-sacrifice. Although Anne never produced the “son of King’s blood” anticipated by the reformist faction, the adult Elizabeth was masculinised as a great prince who led England into a Golden Age. By posthumously exalting Anne as both a queen and “saint in heaven” like the Virgin Mary, Anglicans could claim she overcame her feminine inferiority and became a catalyst for Reformation, thus synthesising allegorical portrayals of sainthood, Renaissance Humanism, and continental inspired Protestantism into an exclusive English identity superior to alien popery.

Anne’s opponents exploited traditionally negative feminine stereotypes to depict her as an ungrateful, devious adulteress who dishonoured the legitimate Queen Catherine and abused Henry’s goodwill to steal the Catholic Church’s wealth. Thomas Lanquet, a young Henrician gentleman and Oxford scholar, portrayed the ex-queen as a harlot, to imply she was guilty of the perverse, unnatural crimes of treason and witchcraft, and thus discredit her as the unclean, irrational and promiscuous inversion of the ideal Tudor wife. Friar Peyto, future chaplain to Queen Mary, also branded Anne a domineering “whore queen” who, aided by Satan, usurped Queen Catherine’s rightful position and almost corrupted Henry into heresy, as Jezebel did to Israelite King Ahab. By damaging Anne’s posthumous reputation and blaming her for causing the Northern rebellions of 1536, Marian priests Edgeworth and Sander could undermine the Protestantism she championed as inherently divisive, seditious, and a threat to the orderly patriarchal household. Writing from exile after Elizabeth’s accession, Sander questioned the legitimacy, rationality and justness of both Anne and her daughter Elizabeth, by implying the latter had been a heretic and schismatic decades before her excommunication. Conservative nobleman Wriothesley blamed Lord Chancellor Cromwell for Anne’s demise: by (falsely) accusing Anne of poisoning Queen Catherine and the King’s son Henry Fitzroy. This accusation of murder, complete with allegations of sexual misconduct to attack Anne’s femininity, is comparable to 17th-century witch trials, when vengeful neighbours deliberately denounced marginalised rivals through fear or greed.

Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans posthumously rehabilitated Anne Boleyn and Jane Grey (1536-54), by omitting their less appropriate character traits, especially their alleged desire for power; and contrasted the women’s physical frailty with their learning, rationality and acceptance of death. Anglican translator Holinshied and Bishop Abbot rejected the veneration of the deceased Jane, and instead depicted her as a tragic victim to stir hatred for the current Spanish enemy. Jane’s vulnerability at her beheading contrasted with Queen Elizabeth’s later decisiveness and defiance of the Pope, consistent with Klenke’s argument that 16th-century Queens were expected to possess qualities unattainable for the average man.
Due to her stronger royal bloodline, Elizabeth was portrayed as both compassionate like Jane and rational like Edward, thus completing her forebears’ initial attempts to establish an environment free from papist tyranny. Countering Catholic claims that Jane was unpopular, Marian exiles Foxe and Banks proclaimed her a weak, sensitive woman who wrung her hands and clutched her prayer-book to gain comfort from its words. However, these Protestants provided a message of hope by claiming Jane’s soul was saved through the potency of Edward’s earlier reforms, which equipped her with the courage to reject meaningless Latin invocations in favour of English prayers. Foxe depicted Jane not as a usurper, but a reluctant martyr who humbly, but firmly, defied Marian demands to recant in favour of fulfilling her own vocation to “follow God in faith” by defending the uncorrupted, universal Edwardian Anglican Church from idolatrous popish heresy. Besides highlighting Marian papist cruelty and vindictiveness, Jane’s courage was alluded to by later Protestants seeking to confirm that the young pretender was aware of the long-term implications of her death, and took the throne not out of misguided loyalty to her self-serving and ambitious father, but because she felt compelled to honour her dead cousin Edward and temporarily defend his church reforms to the best of her own abilities.

Catholic horror at the beheading of Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury (1473-1541), suggested that executing old or terminally ill people was considered taboo because it deprived them of a dignified, quiet death in bed. According to Cardinal Allen, Margaret was falsely accused of treason by Henry VIII to entrap her absent son Reginald, empty the Tower of prisoners, and blackmail other noble families into accepting royal supremacy with the threat of expropriation. The aged Margaret was unaware of her death’s religious significance, but exiled Elizabethan priests Allen and Lessius deemed her a living link to Medieval Catholicism and the House of Plantagenet. This made Margaret an alternative heir to the English throne and called into question the Tudor dynasty’s legitimacy. Margaret’s alleged attempt to run away at the scaffold may suggest senility, terror or defiance, but to Catholics this disruption of the ritual based hierarchy demonstrated the tyrant Henry had lost touch with his subjects. Exiled Scottish Bishop Leslie praised Margaret’s qualities as a mother, because she produced many sons to honour her family name, unlike Henry VIII’s heretical bastard offspring who died childless as punishment for their father’s illegal schism. Margaret’s prolonged, brutal beheading by a clumsy boy-executioner shaped Cardinal Pole’s role in the Marian persecutions; he proudly proclaimed himself the “son of a martyr” willing to follow his mother’s example by dying for Catholicism. Likewise, later Elizabethan Jesuits used Margaret’s beheading to shame Anglicans as cruel and merciless, besides challenging Elizabeth’s competence because she was born of an unlawful union between the selfish, mad Henry and the wicked harlot Anne Boleyn.

Counter to Catholic efforts to transform Margaret into a political tool justifying the Marian persecutions, Elizabethan Anglican chroniclers denied a religious angle to her beheading, and instead proclaimed the Countess a usurper justly executed for treason. The self-censorship in official chronicles implied unease at Margaret’s messy, botched beheading, with writers like Baker and Holinshed instead focusing on Henry’s wars, Parliament sittings and other political events. Instead, Margaret was described simply as “last of the right line and name of Plantagenet:” descendants of the old monarchy Henry’s father.
Sainthood and the Elect.

defeated in 1485, and potential rebels that had to be removed as a matter of national security. By contrast, more radical Anglicans like John Stow and Edmund Hall considered the manner of Margaret’s death (being slowly hacked to death by an incompetent executioner) comeuppance for her own malice, and her ancestors’ treachery during the Wars of the Roses.241 Eager to justify the punishment of Elizabethan recusants as lawless traitors, Anglicans emphasised Margaret’s powerlessness and inferiority before the Tudor justice system, and symbolically portrayed her beheading as Henry’s ultimate victory over the old Yorkist enemy. Stow deemed the aged Countess of Salisbury a foolish and ungrateful old woman, whose age represented childish irrationality, and whose contempt for the divinely appointed ruler was attributed to the sermons of renegade priests, and the post-schism recusant elite’s inherent untrustworthiness.242

The last Catholic royal martyr was Mary, Queen of Scots (1542-87), who, unlike her older kinswoman Margaret Pole, actively portrayed herself as a martyr to counter accusations of involvement in a treasonous, regicidal conspiracy with young recusant nobleman Anthony Babington and Jesuit John Ballard.243 Posthumous representations of Mary Stuart’s beheading demonstrated a battle of wills between Catholics and Anglicans seeking, respectively, to depict Mary or Elizabeth as the sole legitimate queen.244 Exiled Jesuit Wilson proclaimed the late Scottish Queen a latter-day Virgin Mary who, despite being robbed of her earthly dignity, remained pious and patient in the hope her martyrdom would bring divine intervention to save her son James from heresy.245 In her letters, Mary adapted Catholic love for one’s enemies to portray herself as a rational scholar, physically weak woman, decisive political leader and pious saint: fully aware that her beheading would damage her cousin Elizabeth’s reputation among the international Catholic community.246 By praying in Latin at her execution, Mary challenged Protestant rejection of Purgatory and prayers for the dead, not only to establish continuity with England’s ancient Catholic rulers, but also to whitewash her own crimes, including the murder of her husband Lord Darnley. Low-born criminals could be compelled to submit to the monarch, but, being a foreign Queen, Mary was Elizabeth’s equal, and thus above the “inferior judgments”247 of lesser men.

Catholic claims that Mary Stuart died bravely were corroborated by Anglican sources although, like earlier accounts of Margaret Pole, these denied a religious angle to her beheading and instead depicted Mary as a pawn of treacherous papist priests.248 Royal advisers Hatton and Walsingham deemed Mary the antithesis of a saint because her adultery, tyranny, plotting, and expulsion by her own Scottish subjects contrasted with Elizabeth’s stable, prosperous reign.249 By branding Mary a failed ruler due to her unnatural murder of her husband and foolish submission to the foreign Pope, Anglican courtiers could imply popery was a corrupting and chaotic ideology, which spread contradictions to weaken royal authority.250 Mary’s capture and execution highlighted the powerlessness of her Papal patron, her Spanish allies, and the dead saints that she idolatrously invoked in a futile challenge to the Tudor monarchy that answered directly to God.251 Bishop Parkhurst portrayed Mary as Jezebel, “defiled and overwhelmed by many great crimes”252 that caused her downfall, thus implying that popish idolatry brought the destruction of body and soul alike. Anglican schoolmaster William Camden, a supporter of both Elizabeth and her successor King James, deemed Mary Stuart’s Latin prayers a gesture of defiance, unlike martyred Protestant Queens Anne
Boleyn and Jane Grey whose vernacular prayers confirmed their allegiance to England rather than Rome.\textsuperscript{255} Elizabeth’s successful beheading of Mary as a traitor seemingly confirmed England’s pre-eminence over Scotland, but this was counterbalanced when God chose Mary’s Calvinist son James to inherit the English throne, and ultimately unify the two British Protestant nations.

My reading suggests royal women, executed for secular crimes, were posthumously rehabilitated as martyrs, because Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans all had a common fear of allegations of lawlessness, and sought proof that their beliefs appealed to the most influential and respectable members of society. In life, royal women like Anne Boleyn, Jane Grey, or Mary Stuart were unpopular, but they were also kin to the monarch, and thus important members of international ancient Catholicism or Anglican Israel. Seeking to unify their readers against popish acolytes, Puritans portrayed martyred Queens not as helpless victims reacting to uncontrollable circumstances, but as dutiful subjects and dynamic forces of religious reform. The Protestant Queens Anne and Jane had little royal blood, suggesting their submissiveness was motivated by hope for a pardon, fear of the authorities, or concern for their families. Conversely, Catholics like Margaret Pole or Mary Stuart appeared defiant and unrepentant, rejecting the trial’s legitimacy, resorting to deception, or questioning the ruler’s legitimacy, because heresy allegedly endangered ordinary subjects. The use of Latin or English prayers represented a proclamation either to Roman Catholicism or English Protestantism, while the women’s humility and dignified behaviour signified their superiority to the existing monarch. These queens were depicted as using religion to regain some control over their posthumous reputation, because Catholic and Protestant martyrrologists sought to draw parallels with meek ancient saints (especially the Virgin Mary), and portray the women as godly zealots resisting a regime that had lost its legitimacy by implementing unlawful church reforms.

**Conclusion.**

My research so far suggests that Tudor perceptions of martyrdom primarily represented neither unbroken continuity with the past, nor change and innovation; but evolution, adaptation and transition, concurrent with Walsham’s related research on the reinterpretation of sacred space. The widespread acceptance of post-Reformation models of martyrdom, including Humanist scholars or the Puritan concept of the English Israelite elect, did not necessarily mean that Duffy’s concept of the cult of saints immediately became obsolete. There was often overlap between old and new depictions, especially in Counter-Reformation Jesuit sources that exalted saintly scholars, who were not only rational, well-educated, and attuned to the latest Humanist ideas, but also mystical, humble, and pious servants of God duty bound not only to challenge injustice, but also to submit to a trial by secular law courts. Unlike their Elizabethan Protestant contemporaries, missionary priests were impeded by centuries of pre-Reformation tradition which, if dismissed as false, endangered Catholicism’s credibility and infallibility. However, post-Reformation Catholicism was far from backward or inflexible; Elizabethan priests proclaimed New Testament based Mass superior to Old Testament based vernacular Protestant services, because Latin was spoken in Christ’s time, and the associated rituals of consecration pre-dated Israel’s establishment.
Although Jesuits occasionally utilised Old Testament analogies, they generally equated themselves with the early Christians to assert sainthood’s superiority over selfish, promiscuous and mercenary Anglican scholars; or Puritan Israelites deemed wicked Christ killers forsaken by God. The allusion to ancient forebears served the same purpose for Catholics and Protestants alike: portraying their specific sect as the true representative of rational and orderly patriarchal values in response to persecutors’ efforts to infantilise priests and heretics as dangerous youths. Expanding upon the aforementioned general theme of adaptation, the following chapter will provide a more in-depth examination regarding the use of allegory in gendered representations of martyrdom, and will explore martyrologists’ use of inversion, or opposites. This concept was used by Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans alike to define the idealised Christian subject by providing examples of behaviour to avoid, and assigning these negative characteristics to rival sects.

Anglican and Puritan martyrologies were generally more adaptable than their Catholic rivals, rejecting the worship of saints as superstitious, but using early Christians’ humility, piety and charity to attack popish corruption. Under Elizabeth, returning Protestant exiles reinterpreted perceptions of hell by viewing the martyr sympathetically as a triumphant, heroic sacrifice rather than a traitor to God burning in the inferno. [fig.3] Before Elizabeth’s 1571 excommunication, older literal Catholic-style mysticism and veneration coexisted with more abstract Protestant representations, hence the possibility that a Marian martyr could be an educated prophet, a saintly scholar, or even an old fashioned Henrician Anglican Catholic opposed to chaotic German heresy and Roman popery prejudicial to the post-schism English Church’s universal ideals. However, conformist Puritans generally portrayed every early martyr as a Protestant, because they themselves were under pressure to prove their trustworthiness to the Queen; identify pre-Henrician origins for contemporary Anglicanism; and render post-Marian England fit for Christ’s return. Unlike Henrician papists and Elizabethan Jesuits who identified with mystical pre-Reformation saints, Protestant ministers were depicted as scholars or teachers whose posthumous representation as saints was primarily allegorical. By proclaiming saints and Israelites mortal historical role models rather than supernatural beings capable of intervening on behalf the elect, Foxe could reassert the Church of England’s monotheistic identity, and demystify pre-Reformation superstitions for an anti-clericalist audience that allegedly prized learning, rationality, and civic duty.

To conclude, concepts of the elect represented a divide between not only Catholics and Protestants, but also between moderates and radicals, with the former preferring literal depictions in order to draw parallels with their early Christian namesakes resisting pagan error. Catholics generally had stricter criteria and focused upon missionary priests, whose learning, virginal purity and leadership skills made them better role models. Conversely, Elizabethan Anglicans took a more haphazard approach, boosting their statistics by incorporating individuals not traditionally recognised as martyrs (including condemned traitors Anne Boleyn and Thomas Cromwell), to equate rejection of the Pope with patriotic duty to the monarchy. Among both sects, however, the roles of persecutor and persecuted remained interchangeable; concurrent with Smith and Gregory’s arguments, Catholics and Protestants took it upon themselves not
only to suppress contradiction, but also to die for their beliefs rather than live as a coward or hypocrite. This theme of civic duty was particularly influential among Elizabethan Puritans who commemorated their martyred forebears and attacked lingering Catholic influences within the Anglican Church, in preparation for the ultimate apocalyptic conflict with malevolent Papal agents.

[Fig. 8]: In Bale’s 1546 *Latter Examination of Anne Askew*, the heroine is represented as an angelic martyr in Classical garb crushing a serpent-like Antichrist Pope. The palm of victory and halo were commonly seen in images of pre-Reformation saints, but Anne’s Bible confirmed her credentials as both a Protestant, and a scholar.

[Fig. 9]: Illustration from Foxe’s 1583 *Acts and Monuments* depicting Henry VIII as a stern, physically imposing and decisive warrior king symbolically trampling his internal enemies: Cardinals Fisher, Pole, and Pope Clement VII. Lord Cromwell and Archbishop Cranmer present Henry with an English Bible, while on the right, hysterical priests and monks flee in terror, or weep at the Medieval Church’s conquest and domination by Henry.
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Chapter 2: Gender and Martyrdom.

As mentioned previously, the Tudor persecutions were more complex than a conflict between Catholics and Protestants, because every religious group had a radical faction, i.e. Puritans and Jesuits, seeking to depict itself as exceptionally godly. Ryken proposed that most Puritans actively involved themselves in the post-Marian religious debate, cooperating with the moderate Anglican majority and denouncing Elizabeth’s Catholic enemies in the belief that royal consent was vital for the ultimate creation of a godly state with Bible-based laws. Houlston suggests Jesuits, too, deemed attack the best form of defence: unlike moderate secular priests whose vocation primarily involved ministering to the existing recusant community, Parsons and his contemporaries sought to prove Anglican doctrine was erroneous and incompatible with early Christian belief. By convincing insincere conformists to become active and avowed recusants, Jesuits sought to prove that England’s Catholic community remained strong in defiance of the minority of spiteful, arrogant and wicked persecutors. Incorporating elements of Walsham’s research, I will propose that the concept of adaptation was also relevant for more general gendered representations of martyrdom. Anglican, Puritan and Catholic martyrrologists creatively modified existing pre-Reformation constructs of gender roles as a means to collectively attack entire sects as irrational, un-masculine inversions of the ideal Christian subject. Two important new areas of my research include the evolution of animalistic representations from dehumanisation to empowerment; and the use of the language of inversion, or opposites, to either exalt female martyrs as exceptional, or discredit rival clergymen as inept. If, as Wizeman claims, Tudor martyrs were spiritual warriors, then depictions of their behaviour in Catholic, Anglican or Puritan martyrrologies were weapons for propagandists seeking to portray themselves as members of the collective elect resisting devilish error and injustice. This chapter will discuss five gendered depictions of martyrdom, including (1.) feminisation and (2.) animalistic portrayals largely applicable to men; (3.) female spousal disobedience, (4.) masculinisation, and (5.) weeping as a propaganda tool to justify women’s involvement in the political sphere.

Women and Age.

In Tudor England, a woman’s place in the patriarchal hierarchy was characterised by her age, fertility, and confinement to the domestic sphere of the household; trials and executions often represented the only opportunity for women’s views to be projected publicly and recorded for posterity. This section will treat female religious agency as a prescriptive model, where Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrrologists used accounts of earlier female martyrs not only to identify acceptable methods for resisting unwelcome religious change, but also to counter critics’ allegations that the persecuted recusant or Protestant congregations were lawless. Although Wiesner-Hanks and Crawford deem the Reformation a “protest of youth against age” by young iconoclasts rebelling against conservative parents, I will argue that defiant behaviour and direct action were most prevalent among respectable older women, especially in Protestant martyrrologies. Influenced by Ginzburg’s methodology on localised individual responses to European Counter-Reformation persecutions, this section will incorporate elements of the micro-historical
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approach by analysing several case studies of female East Anglian Marian Protestants reacting to the unfamiliar environment of the courtroom. Like the Italian miller in Ginzburg’s book, semi-literate low-status English Protestants utilised vernacular print to confront Latin religious texts and an allegedly erroneous oral tradition. The latter allegedly focused on repetitive ritual and the absolute word of the priests, rather than interpretations of textual evidence to draw one’s own conclusions. There are limitations to my research, because contrary to the 50 female martyrs approved by the Anglican Church, only three Elizabethan recusant women were recognised as Catholic martyrs. To rectify this imbalance, I will also utilise Catholic representations of unofficial second-class martyrs not approved by the Papacy, and restrict my analysis of Foxe to the aforementioned regional case studies.

The Catholic ideal of the perfect woman was the Virgin Mary, whose chastity and maternal love for Christ transformed her from a feeble, low-status girl into an ageless Queen of heaven. Priests were aware of the need to convince mothers and virgins alike to reject married Protestant preachers as harmful to true patriarchy: the ancient Catholic Church centred on the infallible Pope. For laywomen, virginity was not necessarily a lifetime commitment; it was possible for spinsters to marry, and also for old widows to return to their chaste, virginal state after their husbands’ death. Erasmus deemed virginity and marriage equally important career paths, if the women involved upheld Catholic morality. As a spinster, Thomas More’s daughter Margaret wrote several books on religion, but after her marriage to William Roper, and the beheading of her father, she transformed into a mother instructing the next generation of Catholics: More’s grandchildren who, deprived of their patriarch, needed a decisive role-model to take his place.

This combination of virgin-mother with the Humanist model of the scholar, protector, and spiritual teacher suggests that, far from being reactionary and unchanging, Catholic models of martyrdom could also evolve and incorporate allegorical elements, especially the belief that the pain of childbirth was analogous to martyrdom because it produced something beneficial: the next generation of Christians. Seeking to exert greater control over the English recusant community, Elizabethan Jesuits encouraged older, wealthy widows to take vows of chastity and transform from bereaved post-menopausal wives to pure, born-again virgins similar to Christ’s mother Mary. For exiled priests Lessius, Parsons, Sir Toby Matthew (son of Anglican Archbishop Matthew), and the writer who used the pseudonym I.C. (probably secular priest John Colleton or Coppinger), older Northern recusant women were a link to the past, preserving the pre-Reformation cult of saints for their children and grandchildren. Parsons claimed women’s self-imposed celibacy provided a respectable alternative to martyrdom on the scaffold, while their charitable bequests ensured that more spiritual warriors could be trained at the overseas seminaries. Besides reducing the time spent in Purgatory, the aforementioned vows increased the likelihood that “chaste widows” would die childless, and the church would inherit their wealth.

Contrary to Crawford’s theory that older women were more conservative, Foxe frequently depicted aged pre-Reformation Lollards as avowed Protestants, to imply Puritan ideals were widespread among the people because the papist church was beyond internal reform. Subverting Catholic claims that heresy represented youthful disorder and insolence, Foxe depicted older women as the wisest, most zealous
members of the proto-Anglican congregation resisting feminised and corrupt popish heresy, including extortionate tithes to Rome and idolatrous prayers to the saints. Foxe aimed to portray these laywomen as channels of divine favour, because due to their age and physical frailty they would soon be called back to heaven. These widows were poor and accustomed to hardship, but possessed a simple wisdom capable of overcoming persecutors’ threats and bribes; Catherine Knight, for example, claimed communion-bread only transformed for the godly and rejected prayers to the Virgin Mary as ineffective, to ambiguously imply that the papist Queen Mary had lost her legitimacy for perpetuating superstition.\textsuperscript{18} In her foreign-born husband’s absence, Londoner Gertrude Crokhay refused the Last Rites on her deathbed and branded priests Satanic, declaring she “would not rise with them but against them”\textsuperscript{19} to ensure she would be remembered not as a feeble object of sympathy, but a decisive defender of Edwardian Protestantism.\textsuperscript{20} This depiction is comparable to Roberts’ research on the “deathbed struggle”\textsuperscript{21} between Catholic and Protestant ministers over the souls of the dying, with each side proclaiming themselves the true elect, and rejecting rival sects as illegitimate deceivers.\textsuperscript{22}

Elizabethan Protestant sources represented a cultural shift, with clergymen ordained after 1558 supplanting traditional reverence for wise old women with Humanist influenced depictions, where age did not necessarily mean knowledge or mystical powers. By denouncing recusant women as weak-minded and foolish, Puritans like Fulke could praise the virtues and patriarchal credentials of the learned, male preacher, and assert Bible-based Protestantism’s superiority over ritualised popery.\textsuperscript{23} Late in Elizabeth’s reign, a conflict emerged between literate Anglican scholars, and old low-status recusant women who perpetuated rituals learned from their own mothers through misguided fear that a future King would restore Catholicism.\textsuperscript{24} These sources, intended to discredit rituals lacking scriptural verification, were written to unify anti-clericalist readers by exploiting their fears that internal divisions within the Anglican Church would leave England vulnerable to invasion, and ignorance would bring complacency, apathy, and ultimately the return of Papal tyranny. Bishops Cooper, Bridges, Abbot, and younger laypeople like 17th-century physician Thomas Ady, subverted the traditionalist equation of age with wisdom by accusing old recusants of inadvertently legitimising fraudulent white magic, and meaningless “great and small superstitions”\textsuperscript{25} including idolatry. During his childhood, Ady recalled rural Essex women invoking the saints and Latin prayers or charms to cure ailments, churn butter, or bake bread. He mocked these old women as deluded, unlearned and superstitious, blaming “popish clergy, the witches of these latter times”\textsuperscript{26} for deceiving, exploiting and corrupting these aged peasants, as Lucifer did to Eve.

Catholic depictions of young women also represented evolution, as Jesuit Rastell and Welsh recusant Evans adapted Erasmus’ earlier Humanist arguments to proclaim virginity not equal, but superior, to marriage. Young female recusants were depicted not as rebels or troublemakers, but as traditionalists and dependents of the priests, to deter marriages between Catholics and tainted heretics.\textsuperscript{27} Besides reasserting celibacy’s relevance, these depictions served to restore discipline to the underground recusant community; discredit married Anglican ministers as promiscuous; and provide an unofficial substitute for the long-abolished convents.\textsuperscript{28} Unlike chaste Catholic virgins, the wives of Protestant ministers were branded
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concubines and “open harlots” who arrogantly proclaimed themselves better-educated than their own husbands, and threatened Christianity’s existence by undermining the vows of celibacy that had traditionally separated studious tonsured clergymen from laypeople. Conversely, the pious recusant spinster devoted her life to sheltering fugitive missionaries, attending Mass, financing the training of future priests, and avoiding contamination from sexually aggressive Protestants who had failed their patriarchal obligation of self-control. The exaltation of virginity served a practical purpose: praising the chastity not only of recusants, but also of the unmarried Queen Elizabeth, whose alleged distrust of the Puritans made her a possible candidate for re-conversion.

Foxe often depicted Marian Protestant girls as humble, passive and submissive to their male guardians, to provide benchmarks of expected behaviour for Elizabethan female readers, and differentiate committed Anglicans from insincere conformists. Young maidens like Derbyshire barber’s daughter Joan Waste were generally portrayed as hardworking, humble and passive, internalising Protestant ministers’ sermons and deeming Sunday services not a menial chore, but a vital facet of their lives. Countering Jesuit claims that Catholicism was stronger in the North, Foxe portrayed Waste’s blindness allegorically, contrasting her simple godliness and wisdom to educated papists’ spiritual blindness and pride. Although Puritans expected youths to be humble and submissive, however, they also included exceptions to the rule, including Stoke-by-Nayland maidservant Elizabeth Folkes who openly denounced transubstantiation just days after recanting. Norfolk Puritan Samuel Ward, and Bible scholar Clement Cotton, claimed that Folkes did not seek death, but was unable to lie when compelled, under oath, to testify before her betters. On one level, Folkes’ brazen confession suggested ingratitude towards the Catholic uncle who tried to secure her release, but Puritans deemed her burning a parable highlighting the importance of honesty. Unlike amoral papist bishops who often shifted religious allegiance to maintain royal favour, Folkes put her conscience first, seemingly concerned by Mary’s reversal of simplified Edwardian vernacular worship deemed accessible to all.

Following on from depictions of young low-ranking maidens, the final part of this section will analyse representations of mothers as martyrs in post-1558 Puritan propaganda. As the diary of Catholic merchant Henry Machyn demonstrates, expectant mothers were usually reprieved and, if a pardon was not forthcoming, the child would be spared and raised by his closest relatives. However, Foxe accused surviving Marian priests of deliberately burning pregnant women like Essex weaver Elizabeth Pepper, in order to contrast Marian instability and cruelty with Elizabethan godliness and order. The figurative burning of Jersey maiden Perotine Massey was repeated as fact by later martyrologists, including Heylyn and Puritan minister Burton, to demonise papists as petty, cruel and jealous. Perotine, burned with her mother Catherine Cawches and sister Guillermine Gilbert, reputedly gave birth at the stake to a child who was thrown into the flames in a display of “Herodian cruelty” comparable to the Massacre of the Innocents; or Canaanite idolaters burning child sacrifices to Baal and Molech. [fig.11] This depiction satirised Counter-Reformation priests’ excessive outward piety, by implying their fanaticism had rendered them so blind and paranoid they mistook innocent churchgoers for heretics, and slandered dead King
Edward in return for short-term advancement. Although Perotine considered herself a Catholic, Foxe and Burton declared her a Protestant to claim that Edwardian Anglicanism was true universal Catholicism, while papist judges were depraved and unchristian for releasing “wilful murderer” Nicholas Norman, as Pilate did to Barabbas. Later editions of Foxe’s account added a husband for Perotine to debunk Catholic priest Harding’s speculation that she was a harlot or single mother executed for infanticide. Foxe attributed the women’s conformity under Edward and Mary not to fearfulness or religious indifference, but civic duty, respect for the monarch’s secular powers, and awareness of their subordinate positions in the patriarchal hierarchy. However, the veracity of these sources, including a letter attributed to Catherine’s brother Matthew, are questionable, because Foxe probably acquired fabricated documents to counter Catholic scepticism, and justify the imprisonment of surviving Marian priests.

In response, Catholic priests used the deaths of recusant mothers to demonise Puritans as spiteful, cruel and barbaric for terrorising the weak, suppressing Catholic education, and forcibly baptising recusant children Protestant. By portraying heretical officials as misguided fanatics who hijacked Elizabeth’s church to settle old grudges, exiled priests Holtby, Allen and ex-monk Frarinus, could justify the earlier Marian persecutions as a safeguard against chaotic heresy. Deeming Elizabeth’s 1580s anti-recusancy laws an indiscriminate attack on Christianity, Allen (a supporter of Philip II’s claim to the English throne) hoped to stir the people into rejecting the representatives of an unjust government, and instead align with the Pope in the event of the aged Elizabeth’s death by natural causes, or even her overthrow by a Catholic invasion force. Like Foxe, Yorkshire priest Holtby’s sole evidence came from his own book, which was repeated as fact by later Jesuits seeking to discredit Puritans as lawbreakers and oppressors. One young recusant mother, gentlewoman Mrs Foulthorpe, reputedly died of shock as priest hunters “thrust swords into her very bed: a barbaric act comparable to the crimes of Israelite tyrant Menahem who supposedly murdered pregnant women so their offspring would not grow up and seek revenge for his idolatry. The persecutors’ violence, insolence and disorderliness made them the inversion of the ideal English subject, and reflected the alleged depravity of monk-turned-schismatic John Calvin, deemed the “father of lies” for promoting a violent ideology grounded in bigotry, division and unchristian hatred.

My observations suggest that Catholic and Protestant martyrologists alike utilised age-specific models of female religious agency to highlight their sect’s superiority over its rivals. Both sects depicted women as upholders of stability, because lower-ranking subjects were accustomed to order and routine in a hierarchy where everyone knew their place and function. Contrary to Crawford’s theory that the Reformation represented a conflict between the progressive Protestant youth and ageing Catholic reactionaries, my research within the context of Marian and Elizabethan England suggests that older women were generally more defiant. As living links to an earlier religious movement (e.g. pre-Reformation Lollardry, Edwardian Anglicanism or Marian Catholicism), old widows could justifiably defend true religion from unwelcome interference, and transmit their beliefs to their children. Although some young women were defiant, most Elizabethan recusants and Marian Protestants were portrayed passively, drawing attention to their physical weakness, childlike purity and obedience, in imitation of
early Christian girls choosing spiritual development over feminine lust for men or selfish desire for worldly comfort. The pointless deaths of young female martyrs had shock value, and implied that even lowly subjects were entitled to speak their mind. Embellishments, and even fabrications, were widespread in Jesuit and Puritan depictions, where the primary intent was not to exalt the women as contemporary saints, but use their suffering to simultaneously horrify readers while denouncing unjust persecutors.

Female Spousal Disobedience.

The existing historiography suggests that married women generally accepted their subservient positions within the patriarchal hierarchy, but, on rare occasions, intervened in the male dominated economic, political and religious spheres in place of an incompetent or absent husband. As Monta proposed, Elizabethan Puritans feared disorderly female preaching, and retrospectively depicted outspoken martyred women as dependent upon God: a heavenly patriarch who temporarily allowed earthly disobedience as part of his long-term plan to rectify papist misrule. Wabuda suggested that many early English Protestant women deemed spousal disobedience necessary for a greater good: charitably correcting their husband and children’s error with Biblical quotations, to prevent the family’s damnation. I will argue that Catholic and Protestant depictions of spousal disobedience were primarily intended not to exalt the women, but attack the competence of Elizabethan preachers or Marian priests, whose exposure to deviant beliefs robbed them of their rationality and patriarchal authority. Blackwood’s statistical analysis suggests most of Foxe’s female martyrs were married women, as were the three approved Catholic saints: the widows Margaret Ward and Anne Line, and Yorkshire butcher’s wife Margaret Clitheroe. Lindberg deemed post-Reformation Europe both beneficial and inconvenient for laywomen; although the Dissolution of nunneries closed one opportunity for female education, the creation of vernacular Protestant Bibles enabled literate married women to interpret Scripture not only to instruct their own children, but also to challenge the allegorical “Babylonian captivity” embodied by pre-Reformation priests’ monopoly over religious affairs. Within the context of Tudor England, I will propose that spousal disobedience represented a conflict of allegiance and duty to two opposing patriarchal institutions: the ancient international Papacy, and an Anglican Church answering to the monarch.

Anglican and Puritan depictions of female religious activism were motivated not only by anti-clericalist desire to undermine conservative priests, but also fear that the legitimisation of unauthorised female preaching would inspire contemporary Protestant separatist radicals to challenge the Elizabethan or Edwardian secular hierarchy. Hence, the Marian exiles Foxe and Bale, and young Puritan lawyer Bentley, strove to emphasise the exceptional nature of the earlier persecutions; and distinguish between lawful resistance of the Pope, and the need for every subject to obey and respect senior Anglican clergymen, whose own earlier exile confirmed their imperviousness to papist seductions. Bale deemed Henrician gentlewoman Anne Askew’s departure from her abusive Catholic husband not un-motherly behaviour, but a higher calling befitting a physically weak woman seeking to honour God, the ultimate patriarch. Anne was no outcast, but a travelling scholar who, unconcerned by her public reputation, spontaneously...
challenged transubstantiation and idolatry in anticipation of the Edwardian reforms. Bale’s biography of Askew shaped Foxe’s perception of Marian Protestants like illiterate Cornish labourer Elizabeth Prest, another battered wife who abandoned her papist husband to follow a new vocation of iconoclasm. The persecutors’ violence in both household and courtroom implied desperation and inability to rationally counter the anti-clericalist arguments of even simple paupers. Besides having a surname derived from Priest, Prest’s claim to be a receptor of God was akin to the words of preachers in church. Her religious awareness, rejection of idolatry, and anti-clericalism distinguished her from the majority of indifferent conformists in the Henrician church, and hinted at residual Lollard beliefs among the lower orders. In a post-persecution landscape, however, such defiance was neither necessary nor desirable due to its disorderly connotations, prompting later Puritans to depict martyrs like Askew as weak women possessing “little knowledge” whose defiance and inner strength originated not from self-instruction, but divine intervention and possession by the Holy Ghost. Concerned by the similarities between unauthorised female preachers, gossips and scolds, Hampshire gentleman Kingsmill excised all mention of Anne abandoning her family and instead portrayed her outspokenness allegorically, to denounce priests who concealed malice with outward piety.

Writing from overseas seminaries, Jesuits Laurence Anderton and Oliver Almond (kinsman to executed missionary John Almond) argued that duty to God outweighed obedience to tyrannical earthly patriarchs who had unlawfully chosen chaotic heresy over universal Catholic rationality. By equating recusant women with early Christian converts resisting their pagan Roman husbands, priests could brand Anglican patriarchy a failure because the men relied solely upon threats and violence. The beatings pregnant Yorkshire carpenter’s wife Anne Kinchinman allegedly endured at the hands of her church-papist husband were deemed “spiritual murder” by priests seeking to contrast recusant purity with heretics’ brutality, and thus verify contemporary Catholic claims that England was a corrupted, stagnating Israel inferior to the beliefs of Christ’s original apostles. Having renounced Christ’s teachings and ancient rituals as “popish superstition,” Protestant patriarchs ceased to be Christians and could justifiably be disobeyed by their dependents. Since the family unit represented a microcosm of the greater Kingdom, the implication was that the same domestic non-cooperation could justifiably be utilised in the public sphere when facing Anglican ministers rendered unfit to preach for breaking pre-Reformation vows of celibacy.

Fearing recusant wives’ disobedience would destabilise the entire patriarchal hierarchy, Elizabethan Anglicans utilised Old Testament inspired language to equate Catholic women with malevolent pagan idolatresses who corrupted their Israelite husbands into rebelling against God. By portraying recusant households as a reversal of existing gender roles, Bishop Abbot, Lord Burghley, and Dean of Gloucester Richard Field could brand popery a contradictory, feminine sect that rendered its male adherents irrational, foolish and sinful. Seeking to increase government control over Northern England, Field and Abbot claimed papists committed a form of spiritual adultery by blackmailing their husbands to join them in idolatrous Mass allegedly venerating the Pope as an alternative monarch and deity. Having defied both God’s chosen Queen, and their lawful husbands, recusant women were suspected of sexual
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depravity, and plotting to “horribly murder”\textsuperscript{70} their kinsmen, comparable to the massacre of French Protestants by their Catholic neighbours on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572.\textsuperscript{71} In all these sources, the government questioned Catholic women's domesticity, and argued that a disorderly household produced immoral, lawless subjects whose refusal to attend church would plunge England into chaos.

My research indicates that women’s defiance of their irrational, religiously indifferent husbands represented a minor pre-ordained skirmish in the spiritual war between the elect and the damned over England’s religious identity. Catholic representations were more adaptable than their Protestant critics claimed, with priests allegorically incorporating Humanist models to equate disobedient wives with conscientious but politically neutral early Christians resisting unjust tyrants who rejected God’s word. Concurrent with Douglass and Monta’s arguments, however, Jesuit and Puritan martyrologists feared uncontrolled female activism and usurpation of clergymen’s positions, because it left the sect vulnerable to allegations of disorderliness. Hence, martyrologists from every sect made great efforts to highlight the exceptional nature of the persecutions, and justify spousal disobedience as a last-ditch, charitable act only under the most extreme circumstances: namely a husband’s dereliction of his vocation to instruct the family in true religion. If the household, as a microcosm of society, no longer functioned properly, the implication was that more senior patriarchs in church and government were equally illegitimate due to their alleged corruption and lack of impartiality, thus highlighting the urgency of the Protestant or Counter-Reformation mission as a means to prevent England’s total damnation.

Gender and Weeping.

As Kesselring proposed, weeping and acknowledgement of one’s guilt confirmed a prisoner’s inferiority within the patriarchal hierarchy, potentially moving authority figures, or God himself, to leniency.\textsuperscript{72} Besides being associated with the traditionally feminine element of water, tears evoked comparisons to spilled blood, the implication being that weeping was an acceptable means for women to mourn the martyrdom of their male superiors, purify the ground where they fell, and nourish “choirs of angels”\textsuperscript{73} that would intervene on behalf of the elect. Although Medieval and 16th-century men could justifiably weep silently on behalf of others, uncontrolled “loud and violent sobbing, shouting and screaming”\textsuperscript{74} was equated with feminine irrationality, despair, and the pains of childbirth. In this section, I will argue that post-Marian attitudes to weeping represented evolution and transition: these depictions could perpetuate existing notions of female subordination, but additionally they could be reinterpreted to exalt and empower Catholic or Protestant women who, in death, overcame their stereotypical emotional and physical weakness. For example, if a woman maintained her composure at her execution (in contrast to the despair, wrath, arrogance or deceit of the guilty), later martyrologists could attribute her stoicism to innocence, and argue that she had undergone an instantaneous physical transformation brought about by divine intervention. Conversely, portrayals of grieving female bystanders and low-status onlookers could be used by later martyrologies to move readers to sympathy for the embattled elect; complement a
martyr's silent endurance; attack the masculinity and rationality of claimants from rival sects; or horrify readers with accounts of earlier persecutors’ callous cruelty.

Catholics widely disapproved of male weeping due to its association with childish ingratitude, despair, self-pity, or the arrogant rage of guilty criminals. Henrician Humanists, who prized critical analysis of evidence over emotion and blind faith, instead valued priests’ exceptional courage and ability to lead through example in defiance of personal tragedy. Simon the Anchorite, a London monk, associated grieving with desperation and justified it only in unique circumstances, to persuade God to spare the lives of imperilled, sick, or forsaken men.75 This view was shared by Erasmus and London printer John Rastell, who suspected individuals who wept too readily of being tricksters and manipulators.76 Seeking to justify women’s confinement to the domestic sphere, Rastell contrasted the emotional instability of subordinate, lowly persons against the masculine stoicism of educated priests and gentlemen who imitated ancient warriors and saints by ignoring pain and fear of death. While recognising mourning as a natural part of coping with the loss of one’s friends, Erasmus deemed it ineffective, because tears would not revive dead men.77 Deeming death a reminder that earthly life was short and temporal, Erasmus and More instead encouraged fasting, prayer and flagellation to overcome despair and shorten one’s time in Purgatory.78

Elizabethan Protestants used unflattering depictions of male weeping to posthumously undermine persecutors like Cardinal Wolsey (1473-1530): a man allegedly reviled for his corruption, disobedience, and failure to secure an Anglo-French alliance. Wolsey’s alleged dishonesty, and despair before his banishment to York, were used by Foxe, Throckmorton, and Marian exile Bullen, to depict the Cardinal as both a cruel persecutor, and an ungrateful child rendered unfit to preach due to the corrupting, perverse nature of celibacy.79 By attacking Wolsey’s masculinity, self-control and rationality, Puritans could contrast the contemporary Catholic priesthood’s deceit and incompetence with the stoicism and bravery of proto-Protestants the “cankered Cardinal”80 who had burned. Due to his alleged untrustworthiness and vanity, Wolsey ceased to be a true man, and died un-mourned on his way to prison as punishment for his supposed treachery, greed and political meddling.81 For radicals like Throckmorton, the implication was that contemporary Anglican bishops were equally inept and self-serving, thus rendering them inferior men to the austere, self-disciplined Presbyterian ministers. As discussed by Anglo, the “proud, ambitious”82 Wolsey’s own propaganda was used against him; once respected as a Humanist light bringer, he became associated with “Lucifer the doomed archangel”83 whose downfall was caused by ambition and pride. The imprisoned Cardinal’s tearful pleading for mercy was attributed not to remorse or concern for his flock, but arrogance, feminine deceit, and fear of losing the earthly wealth he had amassed contrary to priests’ traditional vow of poverty.84 For Puritans, the state’s successful seizure of Wolsey’s property highlighted royal prestige, while Wolsey’s pathetic tears during his house arrest foreshadowed the church’s later powerlessness and subjugation by King Henry’s heirs.

Protestant attitudes to female weeping underwent a divergence between traditionalists extolling feminine weakness or sensitivity, and radical Puritans seeking to legitimise female martyrs as exceptional. Moderate
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Anglicans like Archbishop Cranmer and Elizabethan tailor John Stow (or Stowe) used Anne Boleyn’s weeping to highlight her humanity, and remind readers that even after the Henrician schism, the Anglican Church was not fully Protestant. After her arrest for witchcraft and adultery, Anne exploited stereotypical feminine weakness by tearfully begging Henry for mercy while proclaiming her innocence and ignorance of the allegations. By placing her fate in her husband’s hands, and thus holding herself accountable to a higher power, Anne seemingly upheld the patriarchal hierarchy, while portraying her proto-Anglican beliefs not as disorderly or heretical, but identical to Henry’s own long-term goal of purging the English Church of Medieval corruption. Anne’s captor, Lieutenant of the Tower William Kingston (1476–1540), also confirmed that the Queen initially wept at her arrest, but quickly regained her composure upon learning that her death sentence had been reduced from undignified, slow burning at the stake to honourable beheading. Ambiguously deeming tears a sign of either remorse or innocence, later Protestants, including Anglican schoolmaster Ockland and Puritan translator Sharrock, used Anne’s emotional instability to exalt Elizabeth as the perfect Queen who overcame her mother’s feminine weakness, and her father’s wrathfulness and cruelty, to complete the Reformation.

Elizabethan martyrrologists Foxe, Brice, and Ipswich Puritan preacher Ward, preferred to highlight early martyrs’ self-control at their execution, through desire to prove that Anglican teaching successfully transformed stereotypically weak women into zealous defenders of true Christianity. By extension, Foxe could imply that every aspect of the post-1558 church was the culmination of God’s long-term plan: those predestined for heaven included not only the martyrs, but contemporary female members of the Elizabethan Puritan elect who purified their souls by living austere lives of discipline and self-denial. Seeking to highlight both the glory and tragedy of martyrdom, Protestants contrasted the dignified end of respectable Marian martyrs with the undignified weeping of their lower ranking female friends. Countering allegations that Anne Boleyn was unpopular in life, Elizabethan playwright Fulwell deemed her composure a parable: the tears the late Queen denied herself at her beheading would be shed by later generations collectively mourning her loss. Foxe and Holinshed claimed the people’s collective weeping represented outrage at the injustice of the persecutions, and gratitude for the charitable almsgiving of high status martyrs. While it was acceptable for low status women to mourn dead friends, however, when it was their turn to become martyrs, Foxe claimed the women calmly quoted Scripture, which they either learned themselves or memorised from preachers’ sermons. One example was Essex maid Rose Allen, who refused to cry when tortured with a candle, and forgave her tormentors with the words “Lord mend you” to not only show self-control, but also accept her death as pre-ordained.

For Catholic women, weeping was a form of emotional blackmail intended to instil feelings of guilt and unease among persecutors, establish continuity with female mourners at pre-Reformation funerals, and highlight the self-control of the grave, dignified martyr patently enduring execution. By claiming recusant women were motivated not by pretentious, insincere zeal, but love for their fellow Christians, priests could discredit Foxe’s defiant heretics, and remind readers that martyrdom was a tragedy, albeit a glorious one. Inspired by the Virgin Mary’s example, Jesuits Lessius, Fitzherbert and Wilson claimed
that Elizabethan recusant widows did not weep when they themselves were jailed, because they had already spent time mourning their dead kinsmen. Gentlewoman Margaret Ward’s high pain endurance when chained and scourged served as the spiritual equivalent of a mother in childbirth; the pain of torture enabled Margaret to reach a higher state of consciousness and achieve the “glorious crown of martyrdom.”99 Ancient rituals like flagellation, meditation and fasting gave recusant women the self-control and confidence to endure torture and hardship, convinced that their deeds brought divine rewards.100 The non-cooperation of Margaret Clitheroe (or Clitherow) during her interrogation at York Castle represented neither insolence nor contempt of court, but the selfless concerns of a good Catholic wife for her children’s welfare. Clitheroe attended Mass in defiance of her husband John’s conformity to the Church of England, and was ultimately pressed to death with weights after refusing to plead innocent or guilty to accusations of sheltering priests. Although Margaret’s church-papist husband outlived her, Lessius deemed Margaret a spiritual widow because John had become tainted by heretical Anglican services.101 Margaret was represented as a model wife, but John wept “like a man out of his wits,” whose despair reflected powerlessness before the state; failure as a patriarch to instruct his children in Catholic doctrine; and guilt over his inability to save his wife from execution by crushing. [fig.10]

Self-control and weeping were not necessarily incompatible, however; fearing Mary Stuart’s foreign Catholic allies would use her beheading as an excuse for invasion, Anglicans equated her tears with insincerity, cynicism and malice.103 Like Anne Boleyn, Mary played the vulnerable, weeping woman at her trial, but at her 1587 execution, she appeared calm and dignified by praying in Latin and actively associating herself with ancient martyrs.104 Essex Puritan James Aske and courtier Henry Grey believed Mary’s earlier weeping signified guilt and ingratitude, and contrasted the Scottish Queen’s powerlessness with Elizabeth’s king-like rationality.105 If Elizabeth was an infallible, just Israelite judge putting the good of her subjects first, than Mary was the inversion of the idealised ruler: a vicious and cunning regicidal schemer whose refusal to repent was considered proof that she was guilty as charged, and thus deserving of execution.106 Although impressed by the Scottish Queen’s refusal to cry when struck with the axe, Anglican official Richard Weaver attributed Mary’s bravado not to godliness, but to pride and jealousy.107 Mary’s execution, analogous to the killing of an enemy leader in battle, represented a decisive victory in the spiritual war against the Pope, and highlighted not only the prestige of the Anglican monarchy, but also the total destruction of pagan popery and the reunification of the English and Scottish Israelites.

Later Elizabethan Anglican attitudes to weeping Catholic women changed from fear to ridicule, where young recusants like Welsh serving girl Elizabeth Orton were infantilised to imply they had been deserted by an omnipotent God who endorsed Elizabeth’s dominance over subjects’ minds and bodies.108 In this subversion of the recusant community’s family based structure, Protestants equated women’s sensitivity and dependence upon the priests with foolishness and weakness, in order to highlight the superiority of Protestant education over obsolete rituals, and make a mockery of Catholic martyrologists’ efforts to instil feelings of horror and unease over female weeping among conformist readers. By equating weeping recusant girls not with the Virgin Mary, but with childish irrationality and ingratitude, Bishops Abbot,
Andrewes and gentleman Barnaby Rich could draw parallels between papists’ insincere recantations, and conquered idolaters deceiving the Israelites. At Roger Dickenson’s 1591 trial in Winchester, nine recusant gentlewomen wept when their death sentence was commuted and begged to be hanged alongside the priest, prompting Anglican officials to imply that popery was in terminal decline, if it fell to irrational girls to defend the prisoners. According to Worcester-born priest-turned-spy John Snowden or Cecil (no relation to his employer, spymaster Sir Robert Cecil), the judge spared the maidens out of pity, or fear that they might use their hanging to subvert the social order by criticising the verdicts of officials representing the Queen. In this Biblical allegory, the figure of the wrathful, but benevolent monarch was at the centre, serving as the earthly analogy to a terrifying, but forgiving God choosing to show restraint rather than cast vanquished enemies into hell.

My source analysis suggests the portrayal of male weeping was almost universally negative, due to its incompatibility with the heroic, masculine ideals of the Catholic or Protestant spiritual warrior enduring pain and hardship. Such depictions were intended primarily to attack the credibility and masculinity of rival clergymen, and contrast the strong faith of God’s elect with lawfully executed papist traitors or Protestant heretics’ apparent fear or ingratitude. Representations of weeping women highlighted a division between Protestant emphasis on female stoicism; and Catholic efforts to instil feelings of guilt among their opponents by portraying weeping women as neither malevolent, nor contemptuous of secular authority. Elizabethan Puritans and radical Jesuits preferred to focus upon women’s refusal to weep, and instead use their sensitivity to internalise the words of clergymen; or directly channel the Holy Ghost to die honourably. Fearing Catholics would attack Elizabeth’s rationality and competence, Puritans sought examples of exceptionally pious and calm pre-Reformation martyrs, to prove that proto-Protestant laywomen could overcome their despair and die with a clear conscience in confirmation of their innocence. However, weeping and stoicism were not necessarily incompatible; before her own execution, an Anglican or Catholic woman could easily mourn her martyred friends because she was not weeping for herself, but for others. This construct was adapted from pre-Reformation veneration of the Virgin Mary, whose self-control was linked to her chastity and endurance of the pains of childbirth. These symbolic reinterpretations of earlier depictions associated with sainthood could serve the purpose of either confirming the post-Marian recusant community’s closeness to God; or, for Elizabethan Protestants, de-mystifying lingering pre-Reformation rituals deemed prejudicial to Anglicanism’s monotheistic character.

Masculinisation of Women.

In Tudor times, it was believed that human bodies comprised the four humours of blood, phlegm, black bile and yellow bile: analogous to the elements Air, Water, Earth and Fire. As discussed by Gowing, the body was originally believed to be asexual, and attained its male or female gender through the dominance of either hot or cold humours. Men were deemed hot and dry (choleric) due to a higher proportion of blood and yellow bile, which allegedly gave them the bravery, rationality, and self-control required of leaders and teachers within the household and public sphere. Women were considered colder and wetter

(melancholic) due to a greater amount of phlegm, which supposedly made them childlike, impulsive, submissive, deceitful; and dependent upon male protection, instruction, and sexual intercourse. However, even in adulthood one's gender identity remained changeable; Flather and Hickerson argue that women whose behaviour subverted the cold, lustful, devious, impulsive and irrational female stereotype were often depicted with hot masculine humours that made them courageous, aggressive, analytical and decisive.114 Thus, a normally subservient woman could potentially gain the confidence to challenge injustice through a combination of strong faith, and her own body being instantly altered by God: a depiction particularly appealing for Protestants seeking to supplant prayers to the saints with emphasis upon a martyr's own godliness.115 My own contribution to this research field will propose that within the context of martyrdom and the English Reformation, the masculinisation of women could be positive, where Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrlogists praised women's stoicism and self-control; or negative, where outspoken female martyrs were attacked as scolds violating the social order.116 Additionally, I will analyse the relationship between masculinisation and the royal personality cult, where Anglicans assigned king-like attributes to the Virgin Queen Elizabeth in order to verify her right to inherit Henry VIII’s patriarchal responsibilities, and thus lawfully command older married men.

Seeking to mobilise female readers against the spread of heresy, Elizabethan Jesuits Lessius, Parsons and Wilson retrospectively claimed influential recusant women were endowed with masculine courage in response to male church-papists’ weakness, cowardice and apathy.117 Unlike the married Mary Stuart, who heeded priests’ advice by honouring the saints, Elizabeth represented the dangers of the uncontrolled female body, as her tolerance of feminised heresy risked confusion, war, and the destruction of patriarchy itself. High-status recusant widows were not held accountable to an earthly patriarch, and were thus entitled to supplant the Anglican royal personality cult with older representations of Papal infallibility.118 As an example, Elizabethan Catholic plotter Babington masculinised Mary Stuart as his “most excellent dread sovereign”119 while belittling Elizabeth as an indecisive virgin girl incapable of regulating England’s religious and political affairs. As a descendent of ancient French and Scottish warrior-kings, Mary was proclaimed an honorary man, worthy of commemoration after being “unworthily murdered”120 for protecting English lay-Catholics from spiteful, devious Puritans. By contrast, radical Jesuits like Parsons questioned not only Elizabeth’s virginity and femininity, but also her competence, in the hope of shocking the Queen into reconciling with Rome; hastening her death from stress or natural causes; or, as a last resort, causing her overthrow and replacement by a neighbouring Catholic monarch.121

In Foxe’s Acts and Monuments, the masculinisation of female Protestants was usually positive, because Puritans sought to legitimise Elizabeth’s contemporary religious centralisation by claiming that similar agency existed among early female martyrs forced to assume leadership roles after the burning of their male superiors.122 To Foxe and Puritan gentleman Hales, proto-Protestant women’s self-sacrifice and “manly courage”123 brought the Elizabethan Golden Age, where rational Edwardian Old Testament values supplanted Marian papists’ feminised worship of the dead Virgin Mary, and obsolete, inanimate Baalist images of powerless saints.124 By portraying Marian women as more knowledgeable of Scripture
than Catholic priests who “whored after strange gods.” Foxe could claim that vernacular Bibles had triumphed over outdated popish rituals, and that early Protestant ministers were superior teachers due to the universal appeal of English services. Quoting Tindal and Latimer, Foxe retrospectively proclaimed the brave deaths of low-status female heretics proof of their godliness, as “weak vessels” like Prest or Potton overcame fear, imprisonment, and torture from corrupt Catholic bishops. Eager to link Elizabeth with earlier Protestant martyrs, and thus confirm her piety and fitness to rule, advisers like Lord Burghley and Lord Dudley portrayed the Virgin Queen as a perpetually youthful, superhuman representative of God who was not only sensitive and benevolent, but also decisive, valiant, and rational due to her prosperous reign and pursuit of Protestant education. Aware of the similarities between warfare and religious persecution, Foxe, and later Anglicans like the poet Barnes, depicted Elizabeth not as a stereotypically “weak and feeble woman,” but as a military leader and figurehead of the English Church following her father’s example of resisting the depraved, feminised Papal underlings. Although Elizabeth’s body remained physically weak, later Anglicans retrospectively claimed the Queen’s suppression of feminine lust in favour of masculine Protestant learning elevated her mind to the level of a decisive, infallible and divinely approved King.

The combination of masculinised, nagging wife and infantilised, cuckolded husband is an example of the language of inversion or opposites used by Catholics to portray post-schism Tudor England as a world turned upside-down, where women seduced formerly decisive patriarchs and transformed them into lustful, weak subordinates. After emasculating and dominating their husbands, these women became more aggressive and outspoken, but lacked masculine self-control or foresight and continued to base their decisions on selfish childish impulses rather than long-term plans. Catholic judge Roper and Marian priest Sander blamed Anne Boleyn for More’s beheading by “exasperating the King against him through her importunate clamour,” as a deceptive whore queen, slanderous gossip, and manipulative scold. Such unflattering depictions were intended to perpetuate the longstanding belief that Anne’s unfeminine pride, and alleged deformity in the form of a supernumerary finger on her right hand, reflected her soul’s corruption and proved her to be a malicious and promiscuous witch. Later Elizabethan priests Parsons and Allen claimed Anne Boleyn’s “incestuous copulation” with Henry VIII resulted in corruption filtering down to the lowest levels of society, as pious pre-Reformation priests were replaced by ungodly heretics. Jesuits punned the surnames of prominent Puritans to ridicule official Elizabethan iconoclasm; the wife of Judge Killcross, for example, was branded a belligerent and unfeminine scold, beating her weak husband until he agreed to steal church silver and “maintain their beggarly estate.” The anonymous writer implied the woman’s failure as a housewife caused the household’s poverty, just as heresy caused England’s instability, spiritual bankruptcy, and vulnerability to Satan’s seductions.

Protestants also negatively masculinised recusant women, to question the sexuality and courage of Catholic patriarchs, and imply popery was a feminine, pagan sect incompatible with Bible-based services. In this instance, the persecutions represented a battle between two distinct types of masculinised women: the wise, rational and courageous military leader Elizabeth upholding order; and irrational, aggressive and
chaotic recusant women controlled by the Pope.\textsuperscript{140} Male lay-Catholics were reputedly dominated and assaulted by their belligerent wives, just as the formerly virtuous Israelite King Ahab was corrupted and exploited by the idolatrous harlot Jezebel.\textsuperscript{141} Puritan ministers Roberts, Dering and Perkins exploited the traditional concept of the woman on top to discredit assertive female recusants as scolds, gossips, or whores who allegedly remained single to enjoy sexual favours from the harem of intemperate priests sheltering in the house. Drawing upon the popular myth of Pope Joan,\textsuperscript{142} Dering argued that papists of both sexes were genderless and claimed that aggressive “filthy strumpets,”\textsuperscript{143} and weak, effeminate priests were equally suited for the position of Pope, because the job allegedly entailed both figuratively and literally whoring oneself out to Satan. This portrayal was intended to undermine celibacy as antithetical to natural patriarchal family values due to priests’ rejection of marriage, and the greater presence of women in the underground recusant congregation.\textsuperscript{144} John Byrde, an agent of Lord Burghley, claimed unmarried papist women were the Jesuits’ concubines who turned their houses into brothels for priests, and allegedly fornicated with their lodgers under the pretext of performing domestic tasks such as cooking or candle making.\textsuperscript{145} By equating contemporary recusants with pagan Roman or Babylonian women having extramarital sex with eunuchs, Puritans could not only highlight the consequences of uncontrolled feminine lusts, but also attack priests’ virility, responsibility, rationality and competence due to their alleged inability or unwillingness to start a family.

In sum, Tudor representations of the masculinisation of women were more complex than Hickerson’s view that the language of inversion was generally empowering. Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans all depicted female martyrs as heroic, learned and rational agents who overcame temptation, weakness, and feminine passions to challenge bad clergymen. Anglican portrayals of Elizabeth as a decisive, rational King seemingly corroborated Derrida’s historiographical claim that royal authority depended upon the ability to protect the people from real and imaginary internal enemies, by identifying and punishing criminals. Female proto-Protestants’ defiance provided a useful parallel for Elizabeth’s later denunciation of the Pope; due to the grave danger England faced, any subject could be commanded by God to verbally defend the church from hostile foreign invaders. Conversely, negative masculinisation challenged recusant or Puritan women’s domesticity and femininity by portraying them as chaotic whores, scolds and usurpers of their husbands’ dominant position. Concurrent with Macek’s theory that this misogynistic depiction was motivated primarily by fear of the uncontrolled female body, martyrologists from every sect implied that, like a mismanaged home, England’s collective salvation was endangered by the lack of competent local leaders willing to enforce God’s laws.

**Feminisation of Men.**

As argued by Zemon-Davis in her analysis of 16th-century France, the universally negative feminisation of men was the counterpart to traditional depictions of the domineering, uncontrolled “woman on top”\textsuperscript{146} who could be either praised as exceptionally rational, or denounced as a disorderly scold, whore or gossip. The resultant emasculated man lost his identity, and was deemed neither male nor female, but a disgrace
for failing to fulfil his patriarchal functions. Rowlands proposes that Catholic masculinisation of high-status women as equally “rational creatures of God” was intended to compensate for male Catholics’ outward conformity to the Anglican Church. Within the context of the Tudor Reformation, I will argue that feminisation was used to discredit entire sects as morally deficient; if ignorance and sinfulness originated from nurture (wrong instruction), rather than nature (inherent wickedness), the implication was that papist or heretical clergymen were unfit teachers. The sensuous greed and corruption of older Elizabethan or Marian bishops subverted traditional gender expectations, and vindicated young Jesuits or proto-Protestants as superior patriarchs due to their education, self-control, maturity and compassion.

During the Dissolution of the Abbeys, Lord Cromwell’s commissioners adapted existing anti-clericalist criticisms of Medieval corruption to feminise monks as lazy, stubborn, disobedient and irrational due to their confined lifestyles. As Blackwood argued, the regime deemed the arrest of monks not a religious affair, but one of national security due to the abbeys’ links to continental parent houses answering to the Pope. Deeming monasteries the inversion of the orderly patriarchal family-unit, Bishop Lee, royal official Barthlett, and future Edwardian Bishop Barlow claimed lower-ranking monks were forced into lesser, feminine roles. Subsequently, this rendered them arrogant, perverse, lustful and scornful of Henry’s divinely ordained laws. Officials sent to inspect the abbeys embellished their reports with allegations of widespread immorality by the monks, including the prior of Crossed Friars who was accused of whoring and bribery. Cromwell’s representatives, including lawyer Sir Thomas Legh and Bible translator George Joye (a friend of recently burned heretic William Tindal), alleged that papist clergymen lost their virility, self-control, and hot-blooded rationality because they lacked wives to satisfy their needs. Unlike real men, who laboured hard to advance in society, monks were equated with idle housewives profiting from their husbands’ toil. Their alleged promiscuity risked England’s moral decline, as men forsook familial duties in favour of drinking excessively and impulsively pursuing women. These portrayals of corrupt, lazy monks and friars shaped later Edwardian and Elizabethan Protestant efforts to discredit tonsured priests as anachronisms, whose hooded cowls and shaven heads marked them out as the “lance-knights and soldiers of Lucifer;” and whose arrogant or cowardly refusal to correct pre-Reformation error confirmed that contemporary papists were powerless, mindless and indecisive tools of the Pope.

The application of negative feminine traits to jailed heretics, especially bitterness and ingratitude, enabled Marian Catholics, and later Jesuits like Anderson and Almond, to brand the entire Edwardian Anglican Church irrational, divisive and decadent. Believing every action had a consequence, Catholics warned against excessively educating women, because Protestant ministers’ wives could become arrogant and domineering, thus plunging England into turmoil as Eve did when she consumed the forbidden apple from the Tree of Knowledge. Marian Bishop Watson, London artisan Huggard, and Welsh clerk Gwyneth blamed women for undermining the rationality of the Edwardian clergy, and leading them into “incestuous lechery,” because priests were expected to be exemplary fathers to their congregation, not impulsive fornicators. The implication was that heresy was a feminine crime: a form of adultery against God, because married Anglican ministers violated their sacred vow of chastity in favour of inferior carnal

relations with women. Elizabethan Jesuits’ aspirations for martyrdom rendered them superior to selfish Anglican “fleshy ministers” who languished in exile until Elizabeth’s 1558 accession, then behaved like figurative harlots by surrendering their consciences and identity to the restored Anglican Church hierarchy in return for advancement. Having lost their virginal purity, Protestant preachers became whores who craved worldly pleasures over study; seduced and corrupted their superiors; and infected their congregations with heresy like a prostitute spreading venereal diseases. By associating heresy with sexual immorality, unchristian disorderliness and gossip, priests could portray Elizabethan Protestants as the real traitors whose allegedly feminised lust reflected their malice, impulsiveness and contempt for their natural leaders: Pope, monarch, priests, secular officials, and God.

Elizabethan Protestants drew parallels between contemporary young missionary priests and old Marian persecutors, to contrast popish depravity with the steadfastness of martyred Protestants spurning irrational idolatry. Foxe and Bale were eager to portray popery as the disorderly antithesis of Anglican patriarchy, because celibate “whorish priests” were allegedly ignorant of family life, and selfishly put carnal needs before their congregation’s spiritual welfare. Bale described the corrupted Catholic Church as the pagan Whore of Babylon ruled by a depraved Antichrist Pope: the ultimate false prophet and seducer who sold his soul to Satan for worldly gain and arrayed himself in expensive gowns like a “minion mincing mistress.” Catholic bishops Pole, Tunstall and Gardiner also decked themselves out in gold jewellery like women and impulsively committed perversions like adultery, fornication or rape, thus transforming themselves into mirror images of their wicked master, the “purple whore” of the Vatican. Seeking to assert the superiority of predestination, Elizabethan Puritans claimed Jesuits abused the sacrament of confession as a license to fornicate and get drunk, the implication being that if priests broke their vows to God, they were incapable of fulfilling the same duties to his earthly representatives. By equating Jesuits with stereotypically greedy, lazy and promiscuous pre-Reformation friars, Puritans argued that celibacy warped priests’ minds, stripped them of their masculine independence, and moved them to commit spiritual adultery against both God and the Queen by allegedly worshipping their founder Ignatius Loyola. London ministers Fulke, Bateman, and ex-separatist Clapham, argued celibate priests became lustful and stubborn, visiting prostitutes to satisfy their bestial urges, and corrupting recusant households into unnatural hatred of the Queen. As female bodily discharges were traditionally deemed unclean, Puritans could brand popery a contagion that caused promiscuity, and rendered recusant men a “monstrous, menstruous breed” who, like ungrateful wives, outwardly obeyed their patriarchal prince Elizabeth not through love or duty, but fear of punishment.

The only example of positive feminisation can be found in Elizabethan Protestant books derived from Foxe’s Acts and Monuments, exalting Thomas Cromwell’s rise from lowly servant to royal adviser. Unlike traditional depictions focusing on the bond between servants and masters, Foxe highlighted Cromwell’s participation in the typically feminine task of preparing food for King Henry, Cardinal Wolsey and the Pope. This unusual portrayal, perpetuated by Bishop Bilson, Puritan minister Becon, and gentleman Bedford, was intended to prove that every subject, no matter how insignificant, could participate in
England’s transformation into Zion. By extolling Cromwell’s success through hard work, Puritans could distance the late Chancellor from allegations of deceit and treachery; discredit frivolous papist prayers to the saints for earthly rewards; and instead argue that direct action was the best way of gaining divine favour. Believing church reform (especially iconoclasm and the abolition of transubstantiation) could only be imposed with royal consent, Becon and Foxe praised Cromwell’s obedience to the patriarchal hierarchy, affection for his masters, and humility for willingly performing domestic chores, in imitation of Christ preparing food for his disciples and washing their feet. This positive feminisation counterbalanced Cromwell’s outspokenness at his execution, and reminded contemporary Puritans to be “servants of Christ” honouring God by serving his earthly deputy Elizabeth.

In sum, the feminisation of men was generally negative and served a political end: challenging rival clergymen’s rationality, sexuality and self-control by branding them selfish, devious, lustful, and dishonourable threats to the male dominated public sphere. By questioning priests’ competence, Protestants could discredit popery itself as immoral, pagan and feminine due to married Protestant ministers’ ability to dominate a family unit associated with order and godliness. The punishment of Jesuits was itself a form of feminisation: after being emasculated, and slit open, the offender’s heart and entrails were plucked out in a gruesome mockery of childbirth, and burned before him as a statement that treason brought not life, but total destruction of body and soul in hellfire. The Catholic response, to feminise heretics as corrupters and fornicators, suggests an effort to restore priests’ traditional claim of self control and purity by arguing that married Protestants’ lust for women rendered them irrational and prone to spreading error. Concurrent with Flather’s research into more general secularised representations, women and feminised men were deemed inherently imperfect and susceptible to corruption, due to their alleged humoral imbalance and inability to manage their households without male supervision. This reflected an effort by Jesuits and Puritans to discredit, respectively, Calvinist predestination and Catholic confession, as licenses to sin that rendered rival clergymen opportunistic, devious, and irresponsible. Further efforts to infantilise or feminise Catholic and Protestant prisoners will be discussed in the chapters on non-martyrs, including low-status youths rendered powerless by being whipped like disobedient schoolboys, rather than being executed alongside older malefactors.

**Animalistic representations of martyrdom**

Finally, this chapter will discuss a new research field never before analysed in-depth within an English context: the association of martyrs with animals representing one’s supposed personality traits. As argued by Scribner, 16th-century German Protestants frequently punned the names of leading Catholic clergymen to dehumanise them as savage bears or lions; foolish asses; pestilential rats; “ignoble birds” feeding on carrion; or cunning foxes masquerading as humans. Browne’s research into the behaviour of English congregations suggests that animalistic language was generally dehumanising when applied to criminals and other disruptive individuals, with noise and disorder being associated with dumb, irrational beasts. To Henrician Catholic Humanists, disease-bearing birds, pigs, snakes and dogs represented threats to
subjects’ physical and spiritual health, while their destruction alluded to rational man’s triumph over nature. Unlike previous historians, however, I will propose that although dehumanising animalistic depictions were prevalent, these could be reinterpreted positively to exalt earlier martyrs, especially among Puritans seeking to draw parallels between executed heretics and the animal sacrifices or holocausts burned by the ancient Israelites to appease an angry God.

Puritan symbolic representations of martyrs as “sheep appointed to be slain” were adapted not only from the Old Testament, but also from Catholic Mass: Christ, the Lamb of God, continued to be revered by early Protestants, including Martin Luther, John Calvin, and martyred Henrician scholar John Frith. Combining Bible quotations with Humanist representations of the dutiful scholar, older ministers like Foxe and Crome depicted their martyred friends as both pure lambs, and courageous shepherds defending the sheep-like laity from papist “hirelings, thieves and murderers.” Crome, an ally of Anne Boleyn ordained before the Henrician Schism, had been imprisoned alongside Marian martyrs Hooper and Rogers, and believed that a minister was not fit to call himself a shepherd unless he had confirmed his own meekness and humility. Foxe frequently punned martyrs’ names, to highlight a pious man’s simple godliness and trustworthiness, or equate persecutors with cruel and bestial butchers at nearby Smithfield Market. This wordplay, intended to amuse and instruct lower-ranking readers, was exemplified in Foxe’s depiction of ex-monk John Lambert as a humble, “meek lamb of Christ” whose burning represented a joyous occasion that strengthened the church of the elect. The reputedly sweet scent of burned Protestants contrasted with the stench of brimstone (sulphur) and scorched flesh normally associated with executions, enabling Foxe to depict early martyrs not as hell bound criminals, but as innocent, voluntary sacrificial lambs roasted to provide spiritual nourishment.

Countering Foxe’s depiction of Protestants as God’s flock, Elizabethan Jesuits portrayed Catholics as the true devotees of the Lamb of God, by drawing parallels between sheep being patiently shorn of their wool; and priests willingly casting aside their earthly bodies. Seeking to prove something beneficial resulted from Elizabeth’s persecutions, Fitzsimon, Parsons and ex-Puritan Wadsworth claimed martyrs’ blood strengthened the church, similar to the meat from livestock satisfying earthly needs. In a variant of Foxe’s puns, secular priest Mush reversed Yorkshire recusant Margaret Clitheroe’s occupational background by depicting her as a sacrificial sheep, and the persecutors as butchers and “bloody tormenters” who exploited Elizabeth’s paranoia to kill innocents. Conversely, heretics’ blood was deemed impure, because Protestant ministers were supposedly infected with venereal diseases due to their promiscuity, and numerous blasphemies. Adapting Christ’s parable of God setting his chosen unblemished flock apart from “scabbed sheep” and wicked goats, Catholic priests branded Protestant martyrs inferior beasts that yielded poor quality meat, and thus gained no merit. By equating heresy with contagion, and attacking individual Anglican clergymen rather than the entire secular hierarchy, priests could portray themselves as the only true, rational men, because their duty of care towards the entire congregation outweighed heretics’ individualist concerns for their own families.
Throughout the Tudor period, Protestants viewed the bull and goat negatively due to their association with the Golden Calf of Exodus, and worship of Baal, Ammon, and Molech. According to Jeremiah 7:31, children were incinerated for these pagan gods inside a bull-shaped furnace at Topheth: a place of human sacrifice in the Valley of Himmon, near Jerusalem. Adapting the texts of Henrician Protestants Barnes and Joye, Elizabethan Puritans depicted the Canaanite Brazen Bull as a reminder not only of the senseless burning of innocents, but as a warning that popish idolatry was an “abomination of the Lord” that brought damnation.192 London preachers Hake, Top and Broughton compared the Marian persecutions to Israel’s Babylonian captivity, and equated Mary Tudor with wicked Queen Jezebel corrupting her subjects into unnatural idolatry.193 Daniel’s ancient prophesy of the kingly Israelite ram defeating the pagan goat was used to imply England, as Zion, was destined to vanquish the Antichrist Pope associated with wicked Rome and Babylon.194 Such depictions highlighted the superiority of the obedient, meek Protestant flock over the irrational, dangerous and malevolent papist herd who had surrendered their consciences and rationality to Rome. Other Puritans, including Burton, dehumanised the Pope himself as a stubborn, dangerous and destructive “roaring bull,” in a perpetuation of Foxe’s use of puns to mock Papal Bulls. These parchments, bearing the Pope’s lead seal (bulla), were sent from Rome to allegedly instruct priests and recusants in their mission to destabilise English Israel, and turn the godly Anglican elect into mindless, irrational cattle.196

One of the oldest negative animalistic depictions was the Catholic dehumanisation of Lollards as greedy, dirty “swinish adversaries” who wallowed in the proverbial dung of continental heresy, and subsequently became possessed by the same legion of evil spirits that Christ exorcised from the demoniac of Gerasene. By branding proto-Protestants unclean and destructive, priests could imply contemporary Anglicanism was inherently feminine and disorderly, due to its acolytes’ rejection of confession and Papal infallibility excluded them from both heaven, and the sacred space of the church.202 Anglicans and Puritans reinterpreted the Catholic dehumanisation of heretics to attack Marian bishops as a dirty, depraved, greedy and impure “herd of swine,” gorged on earthly luxuries in imitation of the selfish, greedy inhabitants of Sodom.204 By equating ancient Israelites’ literal disgust over eating pork with contemporary English lay-Protestants’ rejection of executed papists as inferior and unclean, Elizabethan propagandists could portray humble, lamb-like Anglican preachers as superior men due to their charitable

desire to satisfy and instruct the ignorant. The preachers Fearley, Achelly and Albott equated Latin Mass with the chaotic din of squealing pigs, and branded papists selfish and ungrateful for dishonouring royal supremacy. Consecrations were deemed ineffectual because, despite appearing outwardly virtuous, priests allegedly retained their impure, feminine “swinish nature” and secretly lusted after both men and women. Achelly and Foxe claimed Henrician martyr Thomas Benet of Cambridge called the Pope a destructive “boar out of the wood destroying the hedges of God’s church” in an inversion of persecutors’ dehumanising sermons. Eager to portray priests as the real heretics and criminals, these martyrlogists argued that pre-Reformation persecutors’ un-masculine slander of virtuous Protestants was meaningless, and invocations of the saints were ineffective, due to popery’s alleged corruption, polytheistic idolatry, and incompatibility with Scripture.

Traditionally, snakes were deemed feminine animals due to their treachery, cold-bloodedness and spite, enabling Catholic Humanists to portray priests as dutiful servants of God expelling devilish, seductive and deceitful heretics. Henrician Cardinal Fisher believed he had a purpose, being made man by God rather than a “foul, horrible and ungodly” serpent, toad, owl, ape, or stone. Like these unclean, irrational and venomous animals, Protestants unwittingly forsook Christ and lost not only their rationality and humanity, but also their chance at rebirth in heaven. Adapting Classical myth, Miles Huggard and Marian priest Edgeworth abstractly compared the many Protestant sects to a many-headed “serpent hydra” whose diverse and contradictory opinions endangered church and Kingdom. The proverbial eggs of these snake-like heretics (forbidden books) brought not spiritual nourishment, but death and destruction because false doctrine poisoned neighbours with irrational hatred, quarrelsomeness, and arrogance. Retrospectively, Catholics could equate prominent Protestants with the serpent that tricked Adam and Eve into eating forbidden fruit, while Henry’s excommunication reflected mankind’s expulsion from the Garden of Eden. The burning of heretics and the crushing of snakes alluded not only to humanity’s triumph over adversity, but also to God’s own casting of Lucifer into hell as punishment for his malice.

Elizabethan Anglican texts, coinciding with the Spanish Armada, rebellions in Ireland, and Mary Stuart’s execution for treason, promoted a concept of patriotic anti-clericalism centred on rejection of the Pope as a “cankered serpent” threatening God’s bountiful English vineyard with poisonous superstition. Adapting early Protestant efforts to equate popery with the serpent Antichrist of Revelation, Elizabeth’s supporters branded the Bishop of Rome a murderous trickster and liar, who arrayed himself in fine jewelled silks and other “precious garments” to conceal his inherent malice with an air of false respectability. Bishops Bancroft and James compared priests to devious, unclean snakes that crawled on their belly, because the dehumanisation of prisoners enabled Anglican officials to overcome their initial apprehensions over taking human lives. Besides enabling Protestants to attack pre-Reformation gestures and rituals like kneeling in church as obsolete, priests’ closeness to the ground highlighted their depravity and questionable parentage. Although the government’s dehumanisation of Catholics as serpents was traditionally applied to a collective group, Puritans like Becon and Foxe also depicted individual papists as hateful, coldblooded vipers that bit the hand that nourished them by conspiring to
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sabotage Anglican Church reforms. More virulent depictions existed in an anonymous 1570s Puritan petition, where the imprisoned Mary Stuart was branded a vicious “snake or mad dog” unworthy of mercy for her plotting, dishonesty, jealousy and longstanding grudges against her cousin.

Protestants considered monkeys otherworldly, grotesque and frightening creatures whose chaotic chattering was analogous to feminine irrationality, rioting crowds, and the insolent “scoffs and jests” of Catholic pamphleteers. Like Satan the “Ape of God,” priests may have been intelligent but they were not wise; they were deemed inferior imitations of men just as popery was a false, Satanic copy of ancient rational Christianity. Eager to discredit the Counter-Reformation as a deceitful Catholic corruption of Protestantism, Puritan ministers Crowley, Covell, Dering and Bulkeley claimed Catholic priests paradoxically used Latin Bibles rather than Greek or Hebrew, while hypocritically denouncing early Protestants for translating the aforesaid Hebrew books into English. Anglican yeoman and scholar Gabriel Harvey attacked Puritan separatists and Jesuits as foolish apes and stubborn asses, whose criticisms of Elizabeth were motivated not by genuine concerns for England’s welfare, but by pride, malice and jealousy of her successful restoration of Edward’s church reforms. Priests allegedly corrupted English laypeople into idolatry through their own bad example, and brought not spiritual rebirth, but chaos, death and destruction in the name of the Pope: an “ill-favoured ape in a purple garment.” Just as Mary Tudor lost her credibility by collaborating with the Bishop of Rome, so too had contemporary Jesuit false prophets lost their rationality through exposure to idolatry and sorcery intended to weaken England in anticipation of its re-conquest by the Pope’s antichristian forces.

Another negative depiction with pre-Reformation origins was the Catholic dehumanisation of heretics as birds: greedy, destructive and dirty spreaders of disease that fed on the fruit of other men’s labour. Lord Chancellor More, and later Marian priests like Gwyneth, represented the Kingdom of England as a bountiful and fertile land belonging to God, while heretics were thieves stealing the souls of the metaphorical crop of English lay-Catholics. If heresy was a spiritual sickness, then self-serving Edwardian Anglican ministers were the unclean crows and sparrows that spread it by misquoting Scripture to justify lawlessness. Later Elizabethan Catholics Stapleton and Fitzsimon branded Puritans “unnatural filthy fowl” gorged on innocent blood, to justify the Marian persecutions as a form of pest control against evildoers who invaded and contaminated the sacred space of the church. By claiming pre-Reformation heretics and Elizabethan persecutors were malevolent birds from the same nest, priests could appeal to conservatives resentful of heretical ministers occupying the pulpits, while reinterpreting Anglican depictions of England as God’s orchard to imply the current government, or tenant-farmers, were inept patriarchs unable to regulate religious affairs.

Protestant exiles reinterpreted and expanded upon the traditionally negative depiction of birds, to equate vain Marian bishops with insolent roosters, arrogant popinjays or parrots, and pheasants or peacocks strutting in their fine plumage. Like ravens, blackbirds, parrots and magpies, papist clergymen could form words, but their Latin sermons were meaningless and shallow because they originated from Satan,
the father of lies. Eager to portray the Marian era as a devilish world turned upside-down, where bad clergymen misruled and corrupted England, Bale branded Bishops Gardiner and Bonner weathercocks who shifted their allegiances and religious beliefs to maintain power and continue living their wicked, decadent lives. Their corpulence and vulgar display of wealth reflected inner corruption, vice, and proud ambition to rule England under their puppet Queen Mary in contempt of divine law. These depictions continued under Elizabeth, with Bale, Jewel and Abbot depicting Jesuits as “hateful birds” to portray the anti-Catholic persecutions not as the execution of men, but the hunting of game. Loyal Protestant hounds took it upon themselves to flush fugitive priests from the undergrowth so the government, representing the hunter, could capture the papists before they could corrupt lay-Anglicans.

Eager to link traditionalist animalistic depictions with Bible-based allegories of a spiritual conflict, Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans portrayed themselves as peaceful flock of small Christian birds distinct from the tyrannical papist hawks greedily rending the flesh of their powerless victims. Deeming the sky a gateway to heaven, Adams equated the collective Protestant elect with the dove: a gentle bird deemed nobler than the eagle because of its purity, docility, and longstanding representation as Christ’s Holy Spirit. Quoting the Book of Psalms and Aesop’s Fables, Anglican gentleman Breton and Bishop Pilkington depicted Elizabeth as a maternal bird whose lifetime marriage to her country, and dissemination of vernacular scripture, was comparable to a pelican selflessly feeding its young with its own blood. Besides confirming the unmarried Elizabeth’s patriarchal credentials and similarity to the Virgin Mary, it was implied that her endurance of hardship during the 1550s rendered her an equal of the martyred bishops, whose ultimate fate diverged due to God’s decision that Elizabeth should remain alive to serve her country. Conversely, contemporary papists represented buzzards and “church-owls” soulless predatory birds associated with death and darkness whose flocking around corpses to pick off the remaining flesh was equated with Marian persecutors’ clamorous collective denunciation of heretics. Jesuits were also equated with bats and vultures, the familiars of an Antichrist Pope said to gorge himself on innocent blood, prey upon the ignorant, and send demonic minions to spread strife and spiritual sickness. Punning Robert Parsons’ pseudonym John Howlet, Puritans equated Catholic prayers with the unpleasant screeching of an owl, and claimed that dishonourable Jesuits fled back to the continent through fear of the “clear light of the gospel” which exposed and discredited priests’ false rituals and arrogant claims of wisdom. By highlighting Jesuits’ uncleanness and wickedness, Puritans like Field and Bisse could justify further purging the Elizabethan church of internal error, and punishing missionary priests whose popery brought oppression, destruction and damnation, not eternal life.

In Tudor times, being called a dog was traditionally considered insulting, because these unclean scavengers devoured refuse and carrion in the same way Protestants filled their minds with the discredited books and ideologies of dead heretics. Thomas More and Bishop Gardiner compared the contagion of heresy to the bite of a rabid dog, to brand Protestants soulless and unworthy of prayer, and equate their irrational blasphemies with a badly trained hound’s insolent barking. Countering Marian Protestant exile Turner’s attacks on priests as cunning foxes and fierce lions, Gardiner denounced continental
reformers Luther and Bucer as “knavish hounds” who destroyed not only foxes (corrupt friars), but also the King’s deer: innocent law-abiding Catholic subjects. Such depictions could also be applied more abstractly; in Catholic merchant Machyn’s diary, a London servant was buried by a doghouse not only because Protestants polluted consecrated ground, but also because uncivilised heresy transformed once rational men into vicious brutes. The disciplining of disobedient dogs and low-status heretics with “whips and bats” reflected ruler and schoolmaster’s dependence upon physical punishment to ensure infantilised subjects internalised their elders’ teachings, and became obedient servants of God and the King. Henrician martyr Cardinal Fisher compared the “painful, laborious” life of hunters to that of clergymen as they cared for their respective dogs and congregation, and willingly underwent hardship for a pleasant end: meat for the hunter and heaven for the priest. In this Humanist representation, the transformation of the vicious wild dog into a useful pet was an allegory for pre-Reformation England’s conversion from pagan ignorance to Catholic rationality, and a warning for rulers to be firm but fair to prevent subjects’ reversion to bestial depravity.

Anglicans responded to Catholic dehumanisation of early heretics by claiming Queen Mary was driven insane by her abusive husband, who allegedly called her an “old bitch” and forced her subordination to papist priests. In a mocking eulogy celebrating the Church of England’s triumph over popish savagery, mercenary Catholic bishops were branded cunning “popish wolves” masquerading as dogs, whose Latin prayers were equated with unpleasant barking, and whose loyalty to Henry, Edward and Mary was motivated not by duty, but fear. Foxe and Camden depicted Gardiner, Bonner and Wolsey as shameless “butcher’s curs,” who degraded dead Protestants by figuratively gnawing their bones while fawning over their monarch for further reward. Such depictions undermined the credibility of contemporary Catholic priests, and furthermore obscured the fact that Wolsey not only burned comparatively few heretics, but also served as a patron to the future Lord Chancellor Cromwell. After Elizabeth’s excommunication, papists were equated with Classical hellhounds to imply that due to the innate depravity of the act of betrayal, convicted traitors lost their rationality and humanity, and subsequently transformed into dangerous, devilish beasts awaiting consignment to hell. Sutcliffe, Bell and Byrde branded Robert Parsons the Pope’s attack-dog whose “barking against the reading of Scripture” was a far worse heresy than Marian Protestants’ possession of vernacular Bibles. Seeking to portray priests as the real heretics, these Anglicans claimed papists worshipped the Pope as a “three-headed Cerberus,” spread falsehood, and conspired to undermine Elizabeth and Christ’s authority. Former Marian persecutor John Story’s howling and cursing at his 1571 hanging were equated with demonic possession and attributed directly to his unnatural plotting against Elizabeth, enabling Anglicans to imply the papist minority were inherently untrustworthy; and encourage common people to report internal dissent.

Representations of courageous Protestant hounds hunting elusive Catholic foxes and wolves were used by Elizabethan Anglicans seeking to assimilate Puritans into the established church by proving their usefulness and trustworthiness; posthumously, Foxe’s own name was punned to depict him not as a vicious beast, but as a loyal dog protecting the Queen’s flock. By assuming all papists were guilty of
some crime – if not treason, then theft, fraud or sedition – the regime could dehumanise Jesuits as deceitful and malevolent predators; exalt its own mastery over nature; and demonstrate the consequences of treachery. \textsuperscript{264} Puritan naturalist and Marian exile William Turner deemed the pre-schism English the “foxy generation” \textsuperscript{265} for their misguided affection towards the Pope as their spiritual father, unaware that the Bishop of Rome was a bestial, bloodthirsty tyrant like Nero, who preyed upon the sheep-like populace. \textsuperscript{266} Adapting Turner’s portrayals, Thomas Bell, Calvinist minister Willett, and Anglican poet Lyly branded fugitive Jesuits Romish foxes, and claimed the Pope himself “came into his Popedom as a Foxe, reigned in it as a wolf, and died out of it as a dog.” \textsuperscript{267} Jesuits might have appeared benevolent before their execution but, just as the “wolf weareth a fair face to devour the lamb,” \textsuperscript{268} priests used their meek, pious façade to conceal treachery. Like vicious wolves that terrorised God’s sheep, however, priests ultimately received their comeuppance when they were captured, killed, and their remains publicly displayed to warn other would-be martyrs that Jesuits’ suicidal desire for death brought only damnation. \textsuperscript{269}

Counter-Reformation Catholics feared that Protestants had undergone a transformation after Mary’s death, from skulking “wily foxes,” \textsuperscript{270} to vicious Elizabethan wolves that not only preyed upon the sheep-like laity, but also brazenly attacked priestly shepherds. \textsuperscript{271} As a bloodthirsty pack, Puritans were accused of undermining the impartial Tudor justice system, by shouting down the arguments of humble Catholic scholars through a combination of jealousy, insolence, and fear of criticism. \textsuperscript{272} By appealing to recusants’ fear of disorder, priests could equate themselves with masculine Biblical figures triumphing over the irrational forces of nature, while implying Puritans’ blasphemous sermons inciting vengeance upon Catholic fugitives would cause further violence, conflict and betrayal. \textsuperscript{273} Like wolves in sheepskins, preachers might have appeared humble in their simple black attire, but Jesuits deemed this an illusion concealing depravity. \textsuperscript{274} By depicting Puritans as fierce wolves, bears and lions associated with the Beast of Revelation, Jesuits Parsons, Alfield and Fraser hoped to divide the Church of England, so Elizabeth and her moderate Anglican subjects would reconcile with Rome. \textsuperscript{275} In a subversion of Puritan puns, jailed ex-persecutor Harpsfield equated Foxe with his animal namesake the “vulpes,” \textsuperscript{276} to imply heretics were vicious, bestial, devious, and deserving of punishment under the previous Marian regime. Fellow priests Parsons, Broughton, and exiled recusant Bristow denounced Protestants as foolish, irrational “Samson’s foxes;” \textsuperscript{277} a reference not only to the notable Puritan ministers Foxe and Thomas Sampson, but also to the Old Testament hero Samson. By alluding to the famous Israelite strongman’s feat of tying foxes’ tails together and setting them alight, Broughton and Parsons could reassert Counter-Reformation priests’ superhuman mental strength and potency in debunking Protestant arguments that threatened the whole of Christendom. \textsuperscript{278} If Puritans represented an evil, hateful and chaotic cult that venerated not God, but Satan, priests could argue that these heretics were entangled by their heresies, and dragged each other into hellfire through stubborn refusal to admit wrongdoing. \textsuperscript{279} 

Facing persecution by the 1590s Anglican regime, younger Puritan separatists adapted Foxe’s Acts and Monuments to attack Bishop Aylmer as a “wolf, bloody persecutor and apostate” \textsuperscript{280} who burned radicals in imitation of his papist predecessor Bonner. These Puritan radicals (many of whom were later exiled to
Holland) were the precursors to the Pilgrims who colonised the New World in the 1620s, being motivated by desire to create a new Israel to replace a declining English Zion deemed beyond internal reform. London separatist preacher Henry Barrow and Welshman John Penry (both hanged 1593), were motivated by anti-clericalist desire to depict themselves not as heretics, traitors or recusants, but the heirs of early Protestants, in order to justify schism from an irrevocably corrupted Anglican Church through fear that the doctrine of royal supremacy risked rendering Elizabeth more tyrrannical than the Pope. Like Balaam, a wicked false prophet paid by the pagan Canaanites to curse the Israelites, Anglican bishops had become corrupt, mercenary and predatory because they lusted after material wealth, and tricked the Queen into burning innocent Puritans. Conservative pseudo-Protestant prelates reputedly spurned God-given wisdom and transformed from shepherds into vicious beasts: an analogy for the Pope’s own corruption from St. Peter’s virtuous successor, to depraved Babylonian antichrist. Using allegorical language to rank the varying animalistic depictions by the degree of culpability, Penry represented the bishops as malevolent wolves; conforming Puritans as foolish, degraded dogs; and separatists as the only shepherds capable of protecting irrational, sheep-like laypeople.

Government representations of the monarch as a lion were generally positive, but tinged with fear and reverence because lions were deemed fearsome instruments of God’s vengeance capable of rending the flesh of anyone who threatened their cubs. Henry VIII proclaimed himself a latter-day King David, the courageous Lion of Judah who suppressed Philistine idolatry. As the coat-of-arms of both the Tudor monarchy and Israel was a lion, Elizabethan Puritans Foxe and King (future Bishop of London) could claim that God had chosen England to replace the wicked Jews and decadent Romans who, like contemporary papists, killed gratuitously and dishonoured God. Foxe deemed Elizabeth’s post-1563 self-identification as a Protestant the fulfilment of God’s long-term plan to create a new Zion; formerly intolerant authority figures regained their humanity and transformed from terrifying lions to gentle lambs upon learning that Protestantism was not heresy, but identical to universal early Christian beliefs. Bishop Andrews proclaimed the English Reformation a battle for dominance over the sacred space of the church, where the Pope’s irrational, destructive and bestial “roaring lion” was challenged by the virile, courageous Lion of Judah representing the Tudor dynasty. The triumph of the noble, benevolent Anglican lion seemingly fulfilled Old Testament prophecies that the monarchy and sheep-like elect would peacefully coexist in the prosperous new Zion, and alluded to Christ’s own anticipated victory over the devilish Beast of Revelation associated with the Papacy. [fig.5]

Rejecting Elizabethan claims that Henry VIII was the dynamic force behind the creation of the Anglican Church, Catholics highlighted the King’s promiscuity, wrathfulness, and cruelty to portray England as a declining weakened Israel punished by God for rejecting Christ’s successor, the Pope. Proclaiming the monarch not a parental figure to be loved, but a terrifying “tyrant tiger and a fierce lion,” Allen and Parsons claimed that, like King David, Henry’s merciless killing of rivals, and usurpation of the church, caused wars, uprisings, and the untimely deaths of his wife Jane Seymour and his sons Henry Fitzroy and Edward VI. Before his execution, Thomas More compared Henry VIII to a strong, young lion that
needed to be controlled, and warned that once Henry “knew his own strength”292. Cromwell and Anne Boleyn would be discarded. Later Jesuits believed More’s prediction confirmed his sainthood, although the Chancellor may have, in fact, simply made a few logical assumptions regarding the excesses of royal power. However, this dehumanising use of animalistic language was problematic if used excessively, because it enabled Elizabethan Anglicans to depict contemporary papists as disrespectful traitors and blind fanatics. According to government spy Anthony Munday, Catholic priest Payne supported the assassination of Elizabeth in 1581 and called her an irrational, destructive “brute beast”293 who had lost her remaining humanity and right to exert authority, because she allegedly tolerated heresy and allowed herself to be unlawfully venerated like the Beast of Revelation.

In sum, animalistic depictions were relevant for Catholics and Protestants alike, because these served the dual purpose of undermining rival sects, and exalting contemporary martyrs as the only true men resisting bestial ignorance and bloodthirstiness. While confirming Browne and Scribner’s theory that animalistic representations were generally unflattering, these could be combined with more positive depictions to contrast the Christian flock with persecutors’ ungodliness and criminality. A gendered element is evident, with positive Catholic and Protestant depictions exalting masculine creatures like the courageous lion, the loyal dog or the virile but mild sheep whose blood nourished the nation. Conversely, negative representations often focused upon feminised beasts including cold-blooded, devious snakes; unclean, destructive herds of pigs; promiscuous, stubborn goats; lazy parasitical birds; and irrational chattering apes. However, these established depictions could easily be repurposed by radical Puritans or Jesuits; a benevolent authority figure could potentially revert to his bestial nature and transform from a meek lamb into a predatory wolf in sheepskin. Similarly, a dog-like subject could potentially be tamed and transformed from a dirty, vicious scavenger into a loyal hound defending the patriarchal hierarchy. Subsequently, depictions shifted from persecuted to persecutor, with traditionally unclean animals being re-interpreted positively to thwart elite efforts to dehumanise Marian Protestants or Elizabethan priests as unworthy of sympathy, and thus deserving of punishment. Such portrayals suggested an attempt to project an illusion of humility; post-Marian Protestants in particular acknowledged their inferiority as dogs or sheep, but nevertheless expressed willingness to defend the collective English flock from dangerous predatory persecutors through a combination of duty and affection for the patriarchal Tudor monarchy.

Conclusion.

It can be said that all these gender based depictions of martyrdom represented a parallelism between Catholics and Protestants, where martyrrologists as a group asserted their sect’s exclusivity, legitimacy and docility by attacking opponents’ objectivity, rationality and competence: as dumb beasts or feminised, lustful and cowardly men put to shame by stereotypically weak women. The implication was that rival clergy were unfit to preach due to their bestial bloodlust and feminine promiscuity, associated with the depraved, unnatural crimes of treason and heretical spiritual adultery. In a society where a man’s credibility depended upon his reputation among his peers, Catholic and Protestant martyrrologists aimed
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to discredit their rivals as deviant liars and slanderers, whose entire doctrine was as flawed and meaningless as their unfounded attacks on the elect. Although constrained by the need to avoid contradicting pre-Reformation doctrine, Jesuits and Catholic Humanists were far from backward, reinterpreting new Protestant concepts to both verify beliefs lacking scriptural verification, and question rival sects’ credibility. Likewise, Puritans were no killjoys, and utilised puns not only to entertain their readers, but also to imply that the name of a martyr somehow reflected his or her godliness. Examples included Foxe’s representation of early reformer John Lambert as a sacrificial lamb; Marian labourer Elizabeth Prest being depicted as better qualified to preach than Catholic priests; and Foxe’s posthumous depiction as a courageous dog protecting Queen Elizabeth’s sheep from destructive popish wolves. The following two chapters will further explore themes of the language of inversion briefly touched in my cursory analysis of masculinisation, feminisation and animalistic depictions: firstly by introducing the new concept of the non-martyr, and secondly by explaining the aforementioned ignoble and dehumanised non-martyr’s relevance in defining the collective Elizabethan Catholic or Anglican identity.

[Fig.10]: Illustration by Verstegen (also known as Verstegan) portrays the crushing of Margaret Clitheroe for contempt of court (refusing to enter a plea of innocent or guilty). One prisoner is suspended in leg-irons, and others await interrogation in an overcrowded cell.

[Fig.11]: Woodcut from Foxe’s 1583 Acts and Monuments depicting the (probably fictionalised) burning of pregnant Perotine Massey, her mother and sister before a jeering mob of so-called papists.
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Chapter 3: An Introduction to Non-Martyrs.

Elizabethan England witnessed a division between Catholics and Protestants over the acceptable approach to attaining martyrdom; as discussed by Filippi and Tutino, Jesuit missionaries primarily sought a glorious death by execution to achieve the “happy ending” of Paradise. Conversely, Anglicans, Puritans and moderate Catholics deemed death by execution a last resort when all other resolutions and compromises with the secular earthly authorities had failed. This chapter, a new research field never before studied, will expand upon the previously discussed language of inversion as a tool for martyrologists, as a group, to contrast rival sects’ alleged wickedness and falsehood with the godliness of martyrs from the Catholic or Protestant elect. Due to the inherent bias of surviving primary materials, I will take a qualitative rather than a quantitative approach; these sources will be used not as statistics, but as a means to identify criteria for individuals I term failed martyrs or non-martyrs. Although no official procedure existed for defining these individuals, they are often found in Catholic and Protestant martyrologies either playing a supporting role to approved martyrs; or, in the more negative portrayals discussed in the next chapter, serving as foes for the embattled church of the elect to overcome. Applying Scribner’s prior research on German popular culture to the context of Tudor England, I will argue that Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans all sought to define a martyr by explaining what he was not: selfish, cowardly, or dishonest men were deemed unfit patriarchs, because they no longer lived in accordance with Scripture. My analysis suggests three distinct constructs of non-martyr existed in official and unofficial martyrrologies, as Catholic, Puritan and Anglican writers created a hierarchy where individuals were ranked according to the severity of their reputed transgressions, and the amount of disruption their behaviour inflicted upon the underground congregation, established church or secular hierarchy.

1. Catholics and Protestants who, despite being convicted, failed to gain full recognition in martyrrologies, because they were released by the government, exiled, or died in prison as martyrs of chains. This group, considered the least blameworthy, was often depicted sympathetically: as tragic victims robbed of their dignity, or fortunate survivors spared by God. This chapter will focus primarily upon this group, together with individuals eager to aid the elect but unqualified for martyrdom due to low birth, youth, or gender.

2. Individuals who were executed but not recognised as martyrs due to alleged criminality; beliefs that contradicted official doctrine; or because their methods undermined the Catholic, Anglican or Puritan community’s efforts to appear law abiding. As discussed in the next chapter, they could be branded either foolish, misguided children in need of instruction; or malevolent conspirators undermining both Catholic and Anglican Churches for a third party.

3. Heretics and recusants who willingly renounced their faith, or betrayed their friends to the authorities, were deemed the selfish antithesis to the humble, pious martyr patiently enduring indignity. Unlike the two previously mentioned groups, these apostates, especially Elizabethan
church-papists who attended both Anglican services and Catholic Mass, were mistrusted as faithless, dishonest and treacherous individuals whose true allegiance was unknown.

**Not executed: Laypeople who assisted prisoners and fugitives.**

Throughout the period, Catholic recusants and lay-Protestants played an important behind-the-scenes role by transmitting messages, sheltering fugitives, relieving prisoners, passively delaying persecutors, and hoarding objects needed for prayer, especially books. Adapting Scarisbrick’s argument that Catholics of all classes were involved in an “impressive network” pre-dating Elizabeth's accession, I will propose that the conveyance of aid to prisoners represented a paradox regarding two equally important Humanistic concepts of duty. Although subjects were expected to obey Elizabethan and Marian secular laws, the unnatural persecution of innocent Catholic and Protestant patriarchs weakened the older, divinely appointed family structure. As noted by Crawford and Matheson, many lower-ranking laypeople and respectable married women felt compelled to intervene in response to their superiors’ inaction, indifference, or imprisonment. Catholic martyrologists often mentioned the names of unofficial non-martyrs when chronicling the lives of executed priests, while Puritans like Foxe deemed the charity of sympathetic Marian proto-Protestant laypeople an example for contemporary readers to apply to their own everyday lives. By claiming inferior members of the elect followed a divergent, but equally important, path to salvation, I will argue that Jesuits, Anglicans and Puritans could highlight martyrdom’s exclusivity, attack earlier authority figures as unjust, and reassert the persecuted church’s patriarchal structure by assigning executed clergymen and older men leadership roles.

Fearing laypeople’s disorderly, unauthorised religious activism could bring retribution upon the entire community, Catholics counterbalanced every act of passive resistance, or criticism of the regime, with proof of their own trustworthiness and political neutrality. Male recusants could potentially convey books, letters, money, or food to jailed friends, but there was a high risk of ruining the family’s reputation if detected, and thus the task often fell to women such as Thomas More’s daughter Margaret. Charity was portrayed as the fulfilment of female and lower-ranking recusants’ subordinate role, and as a means to exalt male martyrs’ superior, conscious decision to choose honourable martyrdom over self-preservation. An example of this allegory can be found in More’s own letters, where the jailed ex-Chancellor compared his final pre-execution meal to Christ breaking bread with his Apostles at the Last Supper, in the hope that More’s friends would ultimately follow his own example of self-sacrifice. Seeking to establish continuity between contemporary recusants and the networks that aided More, Elizabethan Catholics encouraged wealthy readers to imitate Christ eating with paupers to ensure low-status laymen aided in the spreading of Catholicism, as the “poor innocent artisan” Carter did when he printed and disseminated forbidden books. The giving of “charitable alms” to poor recusants was intended to subvert Anglican claims that pre-Reformation clergymen were uncharitable, uncaring parasites, and instead undermine Protestants as dishonest and mercenary false ministers who exploited the people. The testimonies of jailed low-ranking Northern recusants, including Lancashire joiner John
Thompson, suggest that many deemed it acceptable to use deliberately vague answers during interrogations: declaring neutrality in the event of foreign invasion, and neither affirming nor denying allegations of sheltering priests because it was not in their position to do so. By naming suspects who were already dead or captured, recusants could avoid committing perjury, or hindering the Catholic mission by betraying priests who travelled in disguise and appeared indistinguishable from laymen.

Deeming themselves literal successors to pre-Reformation saints triumphing over their enemies through love, priests believed compassion from their captors confirmed that moderate Elizabethan Anglicans were not fanatical heretics, but ignorant, simple heathens unaware that duty to Queen and Pope were not incompatible. A class division was evident in Catholic portrayals of sympathetic officials; high-status Anglicans like royal adviser Hatton were assigned important leading roles as protectors, while commoners were portrayed as the supporting cast, won over by priests’ superior arguments. Elizabethan officials’ reluctance to harm priests like Crichton (a supporter of James VI’s claim to the English throne) implied that ancient bonds of friendship and duty to God could occasionally outweigh obedience to Elizabeth’s unjust anti-recusancy laws. Lower-ranking jailers, including Londoners John Lillie and Richard Fulwood, helped Jesuit John Gerrard escape the Tower of London in a boat after years of torture with the rack, thumbscrews, and prolonged suspension from the wall in shackles. Similarly, future Jesuit leader Garnet claimed Wisbech jailer Grey was not only reluctant to mistreat his prisoners, but also that he allegedly permitted them to attend Mass. However, these men’s true confessional identity remained ambiguous, because Catholics often exaggerated sympathisers’ religious conservatism to terrify the Puritan faction, and reassure fellow priests that there was a large pool of potential converts among a dissatisfied lay-Anglican population whose pure, ancient Catholic mentalities could not be suppressed.

Unlike Elizabethan Puritans, however, recusant officials were less numerous, and hindered by a government campaign to systematically remove Catholics from positions of power by forcing them to swear an oath acknowledging royal church supremacy. Those who refused, or broke their vows, were denounced by Anglican lawyer Cosin, and the preacher Baker, as disobedient traitors who pledged allegiance to the Pope through contempt for Elizabeth’s unification of church and secular government into an exclusive English confessional state. Bishop Vaughan feminised Lancashire jailer Colville by claiming the latter’s low-birth made him impulsive, greedy, and foolish: allegedly allowing prisoners to hunt with guns, taking bribes, and helping seminary priest Atkinson escape. By interpreting Northern conservatism as popery, and Colville’s blunder as malicious treachery, Vaughan could recommend his own honest servant, of gentry background, as a replacement. Likewise, prisoners who deliberately used vague answers were depicted as arrogant, insolent criminals seeking not to prevent bloodshed, but to slow the persecutions and give fugitive priests time to escape and stir further disorder. By branding lay-Catholics bad patriarchs and disobedient subjects, Elizabeth’s reformist supporters could not only denounce popery as inherently corrupt, but also convince their superiors that the continued persecution of trustworthy, law-abiding Puritans was needless due to their common rejection of Papal authority.
In Protestant martyrologies, Marian martyrs’ friends were depicted with an active agency, breaking unjust laws for a greater good (the abstract ideal of Anglicanism) and honouring the deceased by distributing their books among the literate middling-sort. Eager to provide contemporary Anglicans with a sense of purpose, Elizabethan martyrologists retrospectively argued that Protestants who assisted prisoners were not traitors, because Queen Mary had unlawfully surrendered England’s independence to the Pope and Spaniards. Instead, lower-ranking allies of the early martyrs were represented as second line troops or squires, resisting popish ignorance by provisioning and maintaining the morale of warrior-scholars facing execution. This ensured that godly prisoners like Bradford, Rogers or Cranmer would survive until their trial, and thus regain their honour by publicly defending their beliefs. As an exile himself, Foxe sought to prove Puritan ideals appealed not only to learned men, but also to low-status Marian laymen allegedly nostalgic for the Edwardian church, including the builder Henry Dance who concealed the books of his friend, gentleman Edward Underhill, so the latter could escape from London. Sickened by the unsanitary conditions of jail, Bishop Hooper was sent food and bedding by sympathisers like Italian servant Guido, whose idea of concealing letters in beer casks was originally used by Medieval crusaders besieged by the Moors. Elizabethan soldier Bourne, who described this subterfuge in his book on military tactics, may well have been aware of the analogy between the decadent Papacy and Turkish Sultan. Such a model certainly appealed to Anglican gentleman Alison, who believed the Pope’s cruelty and many blasphemies outweighed lay-Protestants’ minor misdemeanour of conveying a few messages. Additionally, several formerly Catholic authority figures aided jailed reformers, in imitation of the compassionate jailer at Philippos who protected St. Paul. These officials were portrayed positively partly because their descendants were patrons of the Elizabethan church, and partly because anti-Catholicism was not deemed incompatible with obedience to Mary’s secular laws. Foxe, Whetstone, and 17th-century MP Bacon retrospectively deemed it acceptable for their forebears to disobey pre-schism church courts overseen by self-serving conservative bishops who answered to the corrupt Antichrist Pope. Unlike King Henry, who allegedly passed laws for the collective wellbeing of his subjects, the Bishop of Rome was depicted as a greedy, unjust and uncaring judge prone to “begging, persuading, commanding and threatening” laypeople unable to pay the tithes that allegedly funded the Catholic clergy’s dissolute lifestyle. The divisive nature of the persecutions compelled God’s chosen elect to collectively right injustices overlooked by uncaring officials, because humanitarian compassion for one’s friends was vital for the fulfilment of one’s duty to God. One notable non-martyr whom Foxe exalted as a godly man was the future Bishop Horne who, as a young pre-Reformation friar, helped his “special friend” Robert Barnes fake death by drowning in order to escape abroad, and thus postpone the unenviable choice of death by burning, or damnation for abjuring. Besides claiming that a network of avowed Protestants existed before Elizabeth’s accession, Foxe could argue that contemporary Anglican bishops earned their positions as divine reward for their earlier kindness. Horne’s supporting role to the martyr Barnes was portrayed as an allegory for the advancement of young servants and apprentices in the patriarchal

hierarchy: only through temperance, exemplary behaviour, courage, honesty, and conscientiousness could a man earn the right to lead others.

Besides female martyrs burned as heretics, Foxe and Coverdale also recorded many Marian women subversively upholding Protestant patriarchy by feeding or sheltering prisoners and fugitives. Through male eyes, the ideal Protestant woman was one who fulfilled her everyday domestic roles, because, like the Virgin Mary, women were primarily wives and mothers. For Foxe’s readers, supportive female activists provided a human face to the Marian elect, unlike paranoid and jealous papist persecutors whose threats and insults disdained not only respectable women, but the entire family-based hierarchy. Anne, widow of martyred Bishop Hooper, called a coin depicting Mary and Philip the “effigies of Ahab and Jezebel” and disseminated her husband’s books to figuratively assume ownership not only over Hooper’s property, but also his Protestant beliefs. Due to their advanced age and high status, Protestant women like Londoner Elizabeth Vane or “ancient good Lady” Anne Knyvet of Norfolk could subvert Marian anti-heresy laws by hosting Protestant services in their houses, and sending food and clothing to men whom they deemed brethren in Christ. Despite Lady Vane’s learning, the martyrs Philpot and Bradford depicted her not as a scholar, but as a simple “child of God and citizen of heaven,” who put aside “beauty and estate” by willingly doing textile work associated with low-ranking women: an acknowledgement that all members of the elect were equal before God. Foxe, too, represented Vane as non-threatening to the patriarchal hierarchy by claiming that, as an aged widow, she had more in common with married, orderly Protestant preachers than unmarried papist bishops who had allegedly become more interested in material gain than prayer or study.

Fearing a growing underground network of lay-Protestants would destabilise England, Marian Catholics denounced heretics, and their sympathisers, as disorderly criminals contemptuous of religious and secular laws. Unlike the humble Catholic servant who willingly obeyed his monarch, parents and Pope, low-status Protestants were deemed covetous, selfish mercenaries who assisted their fugitive superiors not through zeal or misguided affection, but greed and resentment of the government. If a lower-ranking Protestant, such as the servant Walker, died in prison, Catholic laymen Huggard and Machyn would proclaim the individual’s demise punishment for disobedience and possession of dangerous texts. As respected members of their communities, Machyn and Huggard’s writings highlighted the divisions within Marian London; despite Foxe’s claims that most commoners sympathised with the condemned, there were also many conservatives nostalgic for pre-schism Henrician stability. Huggard deemed Protestant martyrs’ wives adulteresses, whores and deceivers who encouraged their husbands to die bravely, only to immediately remarry their lovers. The implication was that heresy was the real threat to patriarchal family values, because self-taught Protestants spurned their priestly spiritual fathers in favour of false prophets who, like Satan, promised gullible laypeople short-term rewards before their damnation.

During the 1590s, Elizabethan officials feared not only Catholic rebellions, but also radical Puritan desire for a Presbyterian church hierarchy, where elected ministers supplanted bishops appointed by the
Queen.\textsuperscript{51} Due to lack of sufficient evidence, Catholics who installed priest-holes in their houses, and Puritans who kept unauthorised printing-presses in secret rooms, were punished for violating planning laws intended to prevent epidemics.\textsuperscript{52} However, many Anglicans made no distinction between real and spiritual diseases, because the latter angered a vengeful God capable of inflicting plagues upon sinners. The Puritan Brownist (or Barrowist) separatists who disseminated the 1588-89 Marprelate tracts criticising the Church of England’s aforementioned episcopacy, were branded “lewd and ungodly”\textsuperscript{53} traitors and heretics for threatening to dismember a church representing royal infallibility.\textsuperscript{54} Aware they would receive more lenient punishments, married Puritan women often took the blame for their husbands’ heresy; in Norwich, Matthew Hammond’s wife Isabel openly proclaimed willingness to join her husband on the gallows for Arianism (rejecting Christ’s divinity), but secretly petitioned the Queen in a futile attempt for leniency.\textsuperscript{55} Fearing the government could not suppress libels and unauthorised meetings through force alone, Bishops Bancroft and Whitgift disseminated counter-propaganda claiming Puritan women wished to usurp their husbands’ preaching roles, potentially fragmenting the family structure, and breeding resentment of the Queen who had previously enjoyed a monopoly over religious doctrine.\textsuperscript{56} Unlike Yorkshire recusant Margaret Clitheroe, however, no Puritan woman died for contempt of court, because Anglican officials were more interested in the fugitive preachers whose recantation could be used to reassert royal claims of infallibility; whose letters could be used to identify other traitors; and whose printing-presses could be seized to slow the spread of heresy.\textsuperscript{57}

Unlike their recusant rivals, however, Presbyterians had many influential allies within the Anglican Church and secular government who, despite being duty-bound to suppress schismatic books, sympathised with the radicals’ opposition to vestments, transubstantiation and excessive rituals.\textsuperscript{58} Indeed, Edwardian Bishops Bale and Coverdale’s opposition to vestments contributed to Elizabeth’s decision not to reinstate them to their sees after the Marian persecutions. Fearing the government would brand every blasphemer a Puritan, and thus leave the entire Presbyterian faction tainted, many radicals abandoned the earlier clandestine provisioning of prisoners in favour of directly negotiating with influential patrons uneasy over the regime’s heavy-handedness towards Englishmen with a common fear of the Pope. Harnessing memories of the Marian persecutions, conformist Puritan ministers like Perkins urged Elizabeth to show restraint towards jailed radicals, deeming them not rebels or enemies of the church, but fearful prodigal sons in need of reconciliation, education, and correction.\textsuperscript{59} The successful reintegration of nonconformists into the wider family unit of the Anglican Church was intended to highlight the superior teaching abilities of ministers appointed by the monarch, and equate Elizabeth’s own leniency towards penitent men with God’s forgiveness of sinners. Lord Treasurer Burghley also intervened to save his heretical separatist kinsman Robert Browne from the flames by infantilising him as a harmless, misguided youth whose reprieve not only appeased Burghley’s respectable cousin Christopher Browne (father of the aforesaid Robert), but also highlighted the need for further internal Protestant reform.\textsuperscript{60}

My source analysis suggests the positive representation of law-breaking for a greater good continued throughout the Tudor period: Catholic and Anglican writers believed primeval duty to faith and family,
and humanitarian compassion for fellow Christians, outweighed obedience to earthly rulers who had forsaken their patriarchal vocation of impartially dispensing justice on God's behalf. The alleged sympathy of Marian or Elizabethan authority figures for the plight of the elect seemingly confirmed a more widespread internalisation of Protestantism or Counter-Reformation Catholicism, besides implying that the persecutions did not serve England’s collective interests. While anyone could embrace martyrdom, Catholics and Protestants feared that excessive portrayals of angry youths or irrational women would usurp the church’s efforts to exalt executed clergymen. Hence, martyrologists often portrayed their social inferiors as working under the leadership of martyred patriarchs, to deter contemporary radical laypeople from engaging in disorderly or reckless acts. Eager to counterbalance the disorderly connotations of unauthorised female activism, Jesuits and Puritans often focused upon Elizabethan or Marian women utilising their charitable and domestic skills in a subordinate way: to relieve fugitives and prisoners deemed important leaders of the wider family of the elect. Additionally, Puritans could directly petition influential allies in Parliament on behalf of jailed friends, not only to appear law abiding, but also to stall the repression of the elect at the expense of other, allegedly untrustworthy sects.

Not executed: Martyrs of Chains

Catholic and Protestant primary sources suggest that two distinct types of unrepentant non-martyr existed during the Tudor Reformation: exiles who evaded capture and fled overseas; and the so-called martyrs of chains who died in jail, or endured torture but ultimately avoided execution. As first-hand witnesses to the persecutions, the latter group earned a limited degree of recognition as unofficial second-class martyrs, especially among Jesuit and Puritan martyrologists seeking to prove that their religious group had suffered most, and was thus worthy to call themselves God’s elect. 16th-century dungeons were dark, cramped and filthy places, where prisoners could be confined for years before trial; and where disease was rife. Elton argues that persecutors caused the “convenient death” of prisoners by allowing them to die of Sweating Sickness (Typhus), preventing the expense of a trial or an opportunity for political opponents to criticise the regime from the stake or gallows. I will discuss whether such mistreatment was deliberate, as Catholic and Protestant martyrologists claimed, or simply the result of prison overcrowding; and will propose that depictions of martyrs of chains’ suffering were motivated by a combination of desire to attack earlier persecutors’ reputation, and highlight the prisoner’s steadfastness.

Henry VIII arbitrarily dispensed justice depending upon whether papists or Protestants posed the greater threat to royal authority at that specific time, but Puritans rejected the notion that the King was a tyrant due to their need to maintain the favour of his daughter Elizabeth. Former Marian exiles retrospectively drew parallels between the Elizabethan regime and the recent past, to claim the Henrician schism was part of God’s pre-ordained plan; and establish continuity between Henry’s alleged leniency towards honest proto-Protestant “true subjects,” and Elizabeth’s tolerance of conformist Puritans. Foxe, Nowell and Day claimed Henry willingly pardoned pre-schism heretics wrongly jailed by vengeful fellow clergymen because, unlike corrupt papists, reformist theologians exalted the King; shared his interest in Humanist
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education; and supported his desire to suppress corruption.64 One alleged proto-Protestant was the “good and learned”65 Dr Collet, whose sermon urging an alliance with France impressed the King to the extent that he forgave Colet for translating the Lord’s Prayer into English and made him Dean of St. Paul’s.66 It is more likely that Colet was spared due to his age and subservience before his monarch, but Foxe argued that Henry, despite his initial religious conservatism, was open to reforms, because he allegedly foresaw the creation of an independent Anglican Church.67 Although Colet himself never renounced the Pope, he was depicted as a Protestant, and his Humanist books reprinted by the Elizabethan regime, because these instructed subjects to venerate God, and not the saint cults.68 By pardoning repentant wrongdoers, Henry could be portrayed as generous and tolerant, while cooperative clergymen like Dissolution-era monk Richard Beerley were depicted not as renegades seeking release from their clerical vows, but dutiful subjects consciously working to improve the nascent Anglican Church.69

Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans claimed Henry and Edward spared many papist reactionaries, and future Marian persecutors, through desire to convert them through kindness and education; or awareness that the natural deaths of retired monks represented the symbolic, final burial of popish paganism by Anglican Israelites.70 Ageing Henrician abbots’ desperate negotiations and undignified scramble for pensions signified the Dissolution-era monasteries’ weakness and decay; although in reality the monks’ swift and peaceful retirement was probably motivated by fear of a King who, if not subordinate to the Pope, was equally powerful and capable of dispensing grisly retribution.71 Foxe and Bale depicted Edward VI not as a weak boy and the son of a papist Queen, but as a chivalrous, merciful and humble Protestant Josiah, [fig.2] who confirmed his own patriarchal credentials by forgiving jailed priests’ treachery and cruelty in recognition of their status as churchmen.72 Edward’s well-intentioned failure to convert the papists highlighted the bestial untrustworthiness and malice not only of senior persecutors, but also of lower ranking recusants unable to overcome their unnatural urges to commit idolatry.73 Countering Jesuit “pseudo-martyrologist”74 Wilson’s attempt to venerate executed priests as saints, Burton claimed more heretics died under Mary than James and Elizabeth combined, to imply the Marian bishops spared execution by Edward ungratefully repaid Anglican benevolence with cruelty. Attributing the Marian burnings to petty revenge, jealousy and resentment of Edward’s Protestant advisers, later Anglicans like Bacon retrospectively branded Mary an obstinate idolatress who spurned the efforts of Edward’s council to “satisfy her with reason,”75 and mercilessly refused to forgive vanquished foes.76

Rejecting government claims that the Anglican Church best served Englishmen’s spiritual needs, Catholic priests Parsons, Anderton and Allen denounced vindictive, ruffian-like Protestants who, despite their learning, lacked humility and respect for their elders.77 Seeking explanations for the contagion of Puritanism, and eager to contrast Mary’s decisiveness and benevolence with Edward and Elizabeth’s alleged weakness, Jesuits highlighted the bad example of ungrateful heretics spared by previous regimes, who had allegedly exploited and abused their monarch’s goodwill to turn the entire nation into “Protestant libertines.”78 Catholic gentleman Eliot and Marian artisan Huggard adapted the Henrician Humanist idea that low-status heretics were not evil but misled, and undeserving of execution due to their
insignificance. Young Marian criminals were subsequently depicted as Protestants and spared for propagandistic value, like the youth who struck a priest at St. Margaret’s, or the Thames waterman who threw stones at Franciscan Friar Peyto. Besides extolling the superiority of Catholic education, priests could brand Edwardian Anglicanism a deviant and chaotic sect associated with rebellious, irrational boys, including the late King. Subsequently, Peyto was portrayed not as a persecutor, but a loyal subject and model Christian, showing patriarchal concern for the souls of his flock by patiently turning the other cheek in imitation of Christ.

Later Protestants reinterpreted Catholic exaltations of Peyto’s saint-like patience to depict him as a malevolent Spanish agent whose compassionate gestures concealed malice and deceit, like the fallen angel Satan seducing men into sin. Fearing Catholic criticisms of the Anglican Church would result in laymen rejecting Elizabeth, Foxe attributed Marian priests’ leniency not to benevolence, but greed and lust for earthly riches; aware true Anglicans would never sincerely abjure, persecutors bided their time until the prisoners unwittingly implicated their wealthy friends. Camden and Lord Burghley retrospectively branded “begging friar” Peyto a vagrant, traitor and false priest who, like his master Cardinal Pole, harboured grudges against the future Queen Elizabeth and her mother Anne Boleyn, and had more in common with the corrupt Dark Ages church than enlightened Henrician Humanism. For Anglicans, the real heroes were the ministers who patiently endured years of imprisonment for putting England’s best interests first. When godly Protestant youths saw through and rejected Peyto’s benevolent façade, the fearful and reactionary Marian regime soon revealed its true, antichristian nature by indiscriminately killing godly men and breaking its promises of leniency to jailed Protestants.

The late-1540s English Church remained, in McCulloch’s words, an “institution at war with itself,” with reformist bishops like Cranmer, and conservatives like the Duke of Norfolk, seeking to shape Henrician and early Edwardian doctrine by proclaiming themselves Catholics opposed to popery. Of the two following case studies of high-ranking martyrs of chains, the first will analyse post-Marian representations of Bishop Shaxton, a married Edwardian reformer who was stripped of his bishopric by the Marian authorities, and died in poverty after his release from prison. Posthumous Protestant depictions of Shaxton highlighted a divide among the Marian exiles; radicals branded him a coward for disregarding the calling of martyrdom, but more moderate voices viewed him sympathetically for falling for papist deceptions. Puritan ministers Foxe, Turner and Crowley portrayed Shaxton as a weak and foolish man who irrationally snubbed true religion, and burned early Protestants through fear of Henry. Foxe included Shaxton in the Acts and Monuments partly as a testament to the consequences of apostasy, and partly as a means to highlight the exceptional godliness of fellow bishops who successfully reached the stake. Shaxton’s shameful final years contrasted to the brave Cranmer, whose thrusting of his “unworthy right hand” into the heart of the flames brought atonement for initially succumbing to weakness and signing a recantation. However, more moderate Anglicans, including Bishops Bale, Cooper, Ridley, and Latimer, used accounts of both Shaxton’s imprisonment, and Cranmer’s burning, to accuse the Marian regime of breaching the trust between monarch and subjects. Although Shaxton was
Introduction to Non-Martys.

not recognised as a true martyr, he was depicted less negatively than the unrepentant Bonner due to his (Shaxton’s) leading role in the Dissolution of the Abbeys and early support for Henry’s church supremacy. Shaxton’s recantation was motivated not by cowardice, but naïve faith in an irrational and unpredictable ruler, implying the Tudor royal personality cult had its limitations, and was conditional to the monarch serving England’s best interests.

By contrast, Bishop Bonner was universally depicted as a bad role-model by Anglicans and anti-clericalist Puritans, because this insolent papist openly defied Edward; willingly burned heretics under Mary; and allegedly sympathised with the conservative West Country peasants of 1549 who rioted against the enclosure of common land and Edward’s English prayer-books. This enduring portrayal attested to the successful attack on Bonner’s posthumous reputation by Protestant exiles seeking to link celibacy with depravity and treachery. In the decade between Bonner’s 1559 imprisonment and 1569 death, Foxe, Bale, Coverdale, and the anonymous pamphleteer who used the pseudonym Lemeke Avale, depicted jailed papist bishops as perverse hypocrites unworthy to preach, due to their inability to rule over households as husbands and fathers. Eager to portray papists as anachronisms that risked destabilising the patriarchal Tudor hierarchy, Bale claimed his conservative rivals Gardiner and Bonner lavished their ill-gotten wealth on many mistresses, while other priests molested children, visited prostitutes, or resorted to sodomy. As bastards, Gardiner, Tunstall and “Bloody Bishop Bonner” were deemed low-born, degenerate, and dishonourable, resorting to feminised scheming to remain in favour, and using celibacy to conceal the bestial lusts and womanising they inherited from their many fathers. Foxe deemed Bonner, Gardiner and their “crafty setters-on” gossips who spread rumours of Anne Boleyn’s infidelity in the hope Henry would disinherit Elizabeth. Here, Foxe’s claims are a fabrication: Anne considered “Mr Stephen” a friend since 1529, sending gifts and praying for him when he and Bonner went to Rome to negotiate Henry’s divorce. However, Bonner’s earlier good relations with Elizabeth’s mother were obscured by later Anglican efforts to hold older persecutors accountable to a higher power; and portray their eventual dismissal and death in jail as comeuppance for longstanding abuse of power.

Combined with the aforementioned effort to discredit jailed Marian ex-persecutors as “vicious priests,” Elizabethan Puritans included accounts of Protestant survivors who were flogged, mutilated, imprisoned or publicly humiliated by papist bishops in order to prove that, due to their suffering, the Anglican elect were the rightful successors to the early Christians. Foxe, Charke and Adams depicted Bishops Bonner and Morgan as perverts and brutal child abusers, who concealed “loose living” behind a disciplinarian façade, and spared their victims not out of charity, but sadistic desire to inflict further tortures upon them. Corporal punishment, typically inflicted on schoolboys, was intended to shame and infantilise low-status heretics as irrational, unworthy to speak, and worthless, but Puritans portrayed the beatings as badges of honour similar to those endured by St. Paul and Silas. Examples included Marian London hatter Thomas Hinshaw, and 12-year-old John Davis of Worcester, a future Elizabethan Anglican minister left crippled by the regular beatings and confinement in irons by Bishop Morgan. By personally whipping young Protestant apprentices [fig.13], the bishops usurped the role of legitimate
teachers, gratified their own perverse impulses, and prolonged the victims’ torment by incarcerating them without trial, thus leaving Protestants in a state of limbo. These prisoners received neither the honour of martyrdom, nor parole, until Queen Elizabeth released them in a Tudor version of the Israelite custom of Jubilee, and restored Edwardian normality by jailing surviving persecutors for their many crimes.

Fearing for their group’s long-term reputation, Catholics demonised Anglicans as self-serving heretics who usurped the legitimate bishops’ positions; and compared Bonner’s allegedly exemplary conduct in jail to the prophet Daniel. Having witnessed first-hand the tumultuous 1540s iconoclasm, Huggard infantilised Edward VI as weak and indecisive, jailing Catholic bishops not out of reluctance to create new martyrs, but because he was a powerless puppet to his self-serving uncle, the Duke of Northumberland. Disturbed by Protestant gloating over Bonner’s death, later Elizabethan Catholics questioned the chastity of Anglican “false bishops,” and proclaimed Bonner a dutiful royal servant and “blessed saint” whose reputation had been unjustly smeared by Puritans seeking to conceal the treachery of early Protestants. Jesuits Parsons and Fitzsimon claimed Bonner was unjustly imprisoned for obeying orders devised by God and the Pope, and proclaimed him a zealous, godly man whose sacrifice of his liberty under Elizabeth ensured that, like St. Paul, he would be forgiven for blindly rejecting papal supremacy after the 1533 Schism. Bonner may have conformed under Henry, as did Anglican reformers Cranmer and Latimer, but that did not make him a heretic because the excommunicated King still followed essentially Catholic doctrine and furthermore never declared himself a Protestant.

Kesselring argued that unless there was evidence of a conspiracy, Elizabethan Anglican officials viewed lay-Catholics more as a nuisance; the feeding of prisoners was expensive if they had no wealth to seize, while treason trials were disruptive because they risked alienating local conservatives. Lacking the resources to observe and punish every offender, the regime relied extensively upon the power of persuasion. Recusancy fines were used to economically cripple recusants until they acknowledged their transgressions and agreed to reintegrate out of either genuine remorse, or fear of isolation in the community. By accusing Sabbath breakers of drunkenness and recusancy, Anglican Archdeacon Mullins and Bishop Robinson could justify more rigorous reform, to prevent indifferent youths from reverting to pre-Reformation wickedness and raising equally ignorant and rebellious offspring. Besides gaining long-term revenue from fines, the government could appear benevolent by pardoning repentant recusants like William Bray, a smuggler who sheltered missionary priests and distributed forbidden books. In an effort to infantilise and discredit rabble-rousers, Bishops Sandys and Andrewes used harsh words and public shaming to reassert the English confessional state’s claims of omnipotence, by treating young recusants not as malevolent plotters, but as insolent boys whose correction by the bishops was analogous to a schoolmaster reprimanding disobedient students. Yorkshire recusant Sir Robert Stapleton was forced to apologise for robbing, slandering, and assaulting Bishop Sandys, being saved from further punishment only by his youthfulness, previous good character, and acceptance of royal supremacy. Similarly, Cardinal Allen’s servant Antony Skinner was pardoned by Attorney-General Coke after claiming to be ignorant of the law forbidding contact with priests. Besides his honesty and
respectability, Skinner provided intelligence regarding the movements of Jesuit missionaries. The successful re-conversions of these prisoners enabled the bishops to appear generous: as firm but fair patriarchs whose verbal disciplining of Catholic prisoners redressed the imbalance to the hierarchy, and reminded other recusants that every transgression would eventually be detected and punished.

Contrary to the Anglican regime’s earlier dismissal of papists as an irritation, some of Elizabeth’s more radical supporters deemed all lay-Catholics potential traitors, and urged harsh measures to contain or eliminate “superstitious, disloyal recusants” suspected of plotting rebellion in support of foreign invaders. Fearing lay-Catholics were not priests’ pawns, but active, politically aware conspirators, royal adviser Hastings, and spymaster Walsingham, proposed separating recusants from their neighbours by imprisoning them in the houses of zealous Protestants until their trustworthiness could be proven. By expropriating wealthy Catholics, the regime could not only finance the war against Spain, but also criminalise contact between recusants and returning Jesuits. Nathaniel Bacon’s papers provide insight into local level enforcement of Elizabeth’s anti-recusant laws by a Puritan Norfolk judge, jailing suspects until jailer, constable and churchwarden confirmed them fit for release. Despite this hard-line rhetoric, however, officials of the 1580s faced the same logistical problems as the Anglicans sent to suppress the 1569 rebellion; the only solution was short-term containment of lay-Catholics and targeting of popish priests, whose open subversion of Anglican doctrine made them more deserving of execution.

Due to the proliferation of early Christian saints and desire to focus on Elizabethan missionary priests, Jesuits proclaimed second-class martyrs who died in jail inferior to officially sanctioned martyrs for whom a miracle, death by execution, Papal recognition and an exceptionally pious life were required. Wilson, Parsons, Walpole, and Barrett feared the Anglican regime’s refusal to hang many jailed priests would undermine the very purpose of the English mission: self-sacrifice on the gallows as a means to convert a mass audience. Subsequently, these martyrologists drew parallels between Henrician and Elizabethan cruelty by commemorating Dissolution-era monks who died in prison from “cold, stench and famine;” and the sufferings of contemporary lay-recusants who sheltered priests. Prisoners could be chained in cramped, disease ridden dungeons; “cruelly racked” and unlawfully tortured; or, in the case of “ancient and venerable” gentleman Thomas Pound, lose their ears and endure the indignity of the pillory. Catholic martyrologists aimed to prove that Elizabeth’s efforts to reform the population had failed, because a sizeable recusant elect remained despite their mistreatment by insolent and low-born jailers like Richard Topcliffe. By depicting every corrupt official as a Puritan, Catholics sought to undermine Elizabethan Protestantism as the inversion of normality, because ruffians occupied positions of power, and false ministers were unable to prevent laypeople from overcoming their bestial urges. Countering allegations that his kinswoman Anne was a whore who willingly betrayed the priests she sheltered, gentleman Thomas Bellamy rehabilitated her as an unofficial martyr of chains, whose suffering highlighted the depravity of local officials depicted as predatory, criminal and deceitful Puritans. Anne was proclaimed an unwilling informer who was either brutalised and raped in prison; or was seduced by Topcliffe and afterwards discarded. While acknowledging female gullibility, Bellamy’s public petition to
the authorities was intended to remove alleged Puritans from positions of responsibility; unlike moderate, honourable Anglicans and church-papists, Puritan fanatics had no intention of keeping their promises and instead treated women as tools to apprehend priests.

In sum, Elizabethan and Marian officials alike were unwilling to kill too many prisoners through fear it would de-legitimise the state and undermine popular consent, preferring instead to jail, flog or fine minor offenders until they submitted. Besides asserting its superiority over the previous regime, the government’s effort to deliberately deprive prisoners of martyrdom was motivated by desire to render rival sects powerless, so these internal enemies would slip into obscurity. Although disproportionate physical punishments were an effective short-term deterrent, imprisonment was a more effective means to trap non-martyrs in an allegorical limbo; not only were their movements restricted and their public reputation ruined, but heretics, recusants and priests who died before their trial were unable to clear their name or die heroically. Fearful for their sect’s reputation, martyrologists retrospectively used accounts of prisoners’ sufferings to brand the regime unjust and lacking in impartiality, in order to justify the later Catholic Counter-Reformation or Elizabethan Anglican Church settlement as vital for rectifying earlier injustices and restoring normality. If the English Reformation represented a battle between the elect and the damned, Puritans and Jesuits could imply persecutors’ leniency was motivated not by benevolence, but sadism: illegally torturing prisoners for their own perverse amusement. These martyrologists implied there was a sexual element to these punishments; by raping women or scourging young boys and other second-class martyrs, persecutors intended to rob prisoners of their dignity and rationality. However, this cruelty only highlighted earlier authority figures’ devilish depravity and illegitimacy, because they forsook their patriarchal duty of care and instead revelled in the pain of innocents.

**Representations of Marian and Elizabethan Exiles**

During the Marian and Elizabethan persecutions, many educated men used their connections to escape overseas, thus avoiding the fate of the martyrs of chains who became powerless, depersonalised property of the state through prolonged incarceration. The study of exiles is vital for understanding the agenda of Protestant martyrologists Foxe, Bale and Brice who had fled punishment under Mary. However, with a change of regime, these fugitives could become persecutors of their old rivals, thus highlighting the interchangeable nature of Smith and Gregory’s concept of the duty of intolerance, where learned men were expected to not only repress deviant beliefs, but also risk their lives for their own convictions. Wood suggests the ruler’s claim of legitimacy depended upon maintaining an illusion of omnipresence centred on the alleged ability to detect, apprehend and punish fugitives. Exiles were considered dangerous traitors who subverted the aforesaid royal claims of omnipotence by refusing to return and stand trial which, subsequently, emboldened secular criminals and rebels to challenge a weakened justice system. This section will propose that martyrologists’ commemoration of Marian and Elizabethan exiles represented evolution, especially among Puritans seeking to counter allegations of cowardice by justifying their earlier flight as part of God’s greater pre-ordained plan. These depictions were motivated by a
combination of the martyrologists’ personal guilt over failing to attain martyrdom; fear for their sect’s reputation; and desire to rehabilitate surviving clergymen as courageous veteran spiritual warriors.

Many moderate Elizabethan Anglicans, especially older men who had been raised Catholic, deemed exile both shameful and a test of faith, having been forced to make the unenviable choice between execution for disobeying the monarch, or damnation for conforming to a false church. Citing the Bible, and Edwardian proclamations against Catholic bishops, Marian Protestants justified their reluctant exile by identifying with the prophet Elias or Elijah who was instructed by God to flee into the wilderness and lead the surviving Israelite elect. Prominent advocates of this construct included Bishop Barlow; Deacon Thomas Brice; and Bible translator Peter Morwen, who equated exiled Anglicans and Puritans with the scattered Twelve Tribes of Israel, and proclaimed Protestantism’s ultimate return a confirmation that God had chosen England to replace the Jews. For these Elizabethan clergymen, attack was the best form of defence because it was easier to denounce popish traitors’ depravity than explain one’s own disobedience of King Edward’s successor Mary. Bishop Barlow, an ex-monk who benefited from Anne Boleyn’s patronage, was married by Edward’s reign, suggesting the main reason he fled, and thus forsook martyrdom, was not on conscientious grounds, but fear of making a widow of his wife and orphans of his children. Barlow, and Henrician Anglican Humanist Starkey, contrasted the selflessness of early Protestants fleeing overseas to avoid betraying their friends with the wickedness of exiled papist Cardinals: Allen allegedly supported the 1588 Armada, and Pole was suspected of plotting regicide when he advocated resisting Henrician anti-Catholic laws deemed “hurtful to the commonwealth.” John Barthlet, an Essex Calvinist who may have been related to Henrician Dissolution-era commissioner Bartelot, justified his own exile in more blunt animalistic terms, proclaiming a “living dog was better than a dead lion” because after Mary’s death, returning exiles could lawfully restore the true church. Fearing that allegations of slandering dead Queen Mary could be interpreted as malice against her heir Elizabeth, Anglicans used deliberately vague language to portray themselves as humble subjects fleeing not through insolence, but desire to minimise disorder and bloodshed. As exemplified in Brice’s martyrology, ambiguous prayers for an end to the persecutions could be taken either as a longing for Mary’s death; or endorsement of Elizabeth’s accession and ultimate restoration of Edwardian normality.

By contrast, Puritans deemed exile not only a necessary tactical retreat, but also an opportunity to organise resistance against Papal agents: by symbolically transferring their allegiance from sinful Mary Tudor to a new figurative Virgin Mary, the future Queen Elizabeth. Foxe accepted that Marian exiles were inferior to the strong-willed heretics burned for opposing popish tyranny, but portrayed surviving members of the elect as dutiful subjects tasked by God to unite the diverse post-1559 Protestant sects into a strong Anglican Church. Becon and Perkins retrospectively deemed the banishment of older Protestants not shameful, but proof of divine protection; even Mary and Joseph fled to Egypt at the angels’ command for the greater good of preventing the young Jesus’ murder by Herod. This brazen view was shared by Anglican Bishops Cooper and Bale, who countered Catholic criticisms of returning Protestant exiles by attacking recently hanged ex-persecutors as “stinking martyrs” and traitors who

were punished not for religion, but for treachery against the dead Henry and Edward. Deeming Elizabeth's accession the dawn of a new Protestant Golden Age, Becon and Bale accused Marian bishops of renouncing ancient, uncorrupted Christianity by re-joining the decadent “spiritual court of Romish stew.” These Protestant exiles deemed it ironic that Marian persecutors like Pole punished heretics and traitors when they themselves had divided the nation by restoring idolatry; fled abroad rather than stand trial for treason under Henry; and damned their souls by aligning with the Pope.

Lay-Catholic exiles included older high-status recusants who fled overseas after the 1569 Northern rebellion, and young scholars who went to the seminaries to undergo training as priests. The Elizabethan government expropriated recusants who sent their children to study overseas, through fear that younger Catholics would be taught to “refuse allegiance to the Queen and turn to the King of Spain,” before receiving holy orders and returning to destabilise England. By punishing the families of exiled recusants, the regime aimed to prevent influential papists from corrupting their subordinates, funding missionary priests, or encouraging prisoners to give a “feigned submission” which they could later break. Anglican gentleman Palfreyman and lawyer Puckering argued that “fugitive renegade papist” noblemen like the rebel leader Francis Dacre were faithless, insincere hypocrites whose failure to stay in England and die for their beliefs was proof that they followed a false religion. By branding every papist an ungrateful threat to national security, the authorities could overlook the deaths of jailed high-status rebels from disease or neglect, and justify the redistribution of recusant wealth to loyal Anglican subjects.

Puritan playwright Whetstone and Lord Burghley deemed the exiled Earl of Westmorland a “faithless beast,” whose later poverty and isolation from his family was punishment for his betrayal of the patriarchal institution of the monarchy. Westmorland, who eventually became a mercenary in Flanders, continued to be considered a threat until the 1580s, when government spy Sledd linked the Earl with Jesuit missionaries to imply that every recusant was a malevolent foreign agent.

Jesuit depictions of exiled laypeople were more flexible and adaptable than their rivals claimed, with educated priests justifying disobedience in religious affairs by focusing not on the earthly sins of fugitive male rebels who happened to be Catholics, but upon the piety of their faithful recusant wives. These conscientious, respectable women contrasted with immoral low-born Calvinist Puritans and dishonest atheists who occasionally attended Anglican services and made hollow pledges of allegiance to the Queen while secretly spouting treachery and schism. Deeming heretics the real threat to patriarchy, Lessius, Almond and Parsons depicted exiled female lay-Catholics as fearful, childlike victims of Elizabeth who, despite her abusiveness, remained their lawful monarch and parental figure. The poverty and indignities these women endured were compared to Christ’s apostles abandoning their material goods to start a new life in anticipation of England or Israel’s judgment or conversion. While acknowledging the leaders of the 1569 rebellion were rash and foolish for their futile violence against a powerful government, Jesuits admired women like Anne, Countess of Northumberland, who comforted her jailed husband by reminding him that beheading would release him from his “long, painful troubles.” Anne’s encouragement of male martyrs while avoiding their fate was far from hypocritical, because recusant
wives had a separate function: raising their children Catholic and petitioning the Queen to secure posthumous vindication, if not a pardon, for their martyred kinsmen.170

Although Elizabethan Jesuits were portrayed as craving death on the scaffold, not all were able to attain it; survivors like Parsons and Gerrard were tormented by the knowledge they survived when others were hanged, and had no opportunity to make amends with their natural secular ruler. Fellow priest Southwell compared Parsons with Protestant ministers banished in the 1550s, claiming it was “no sedition for many in Queen Mary’s time to be harboured in Geneva.”171 Seeking to establish continuity with the pre-Reformation church, missionary priests looked to the example of Cardinal Pole, who atoned for his earlier flight overseas by later returning to England and transforming from persecuted fugitive into eminent diplomat and enforcer of Marian anti-heresy laws. Pole depicted himself as a Humanist spiritual physician battling the contagion of heresy, and argued that even if the King was a tyrant, it was unlawful to depose him because foreign rulers could exploit the chaos to seize power.172 The Cardinal’s dutiful, selfless exile contrasted with the flight of selfish Protestants, who held the legal system in contempt by printing forbidden texts for “lucre and covetousness of vile gain,”173 and whose furtive, guilty gestures when captured confirmed their cowardice, malice and selfishness.174 This highlighted the underlying post-schism conflict over who the real traitor was: insolent Protestants who disobeyed the Queen, or Catholics who aligned with Spain, the birthplace of Queen Mary’s mother and husband?175 Elizabethan Counter-Reformation priests faced a similar dilemma to their Henrician forebears: if they remained in exile they were declared outlaws, but if they returned to England they would be forced to apostatise, or face prolonged torture and interrogation by a regime unwilling to counter the Puritan threat.176 Inspired by Pole’s stoic endurance of hardship on the continent, Parsons deemed it prudent for exiles to postpone their return to England until after Elizabeth’s death, and in the meantime rectify their personal shortcomings by instructing and preparing younger Jesuits for martyrdom.177 As their return would endanger other missionaries, and confirm Anglican allegations that all Catholics were traitors who held their Queen’s supposed goodwill in contempt, Jesuit survivors were assigned other tasks: as teachers and propagandists, who honoured God by writing martyrologies.178

Elizabethan depictions of priests deprived of martyrdom underwent a divergence in the 1590s due to a widening internal conflict for dominance over the recusant community between radical Jesuits, and moderate secular priests willing to compromise with the Anglican government. This culminated in the Appellant Controversy of 1601, where secular priests rejected the Pope’s Archpriest Blackwell because he was deemed too close to the Jesuits.179 Exploiting this longstanding internal division, Anglican officials published propaganda claiming jailed priests begged for their lives and renounced popery, in order to undermine Jesuit aspirations for martyrdom, and attack Counter-Reformation leaders Allen and Parsons as cowards for sending impressionable, gullible young Catholics to their deaths. For the government, banishing Jesuits served two ends; besides highlighting Elizabeth’s benevolence, exiled priests overburdened the seminary, transforming it into a holding pen rather than a short-term school for missionaries.180 Bishops Bancroft and Bale branded Jesuits successors to the “fugitive friars and hedge
priests” expelled by Henry, in order to discredit the entire priesthood as “vile traitors” who overstepped their religious functions by meddling in secular affairs. Parsons’ escape to France damaged his reputation among many moderate Catholics who deemed him a publicity seeking coward for his unauthorised predictions of divine punishment, and comparison of Elizabeth to pagan Roman tyrants Diocletian and Domitian. Enticed by government offers of favourable treatment, defecting secular priests (especially Bell and Bagshaw) denounced Jesuit exiles as unpatriotic cowards and liars whose radicalism endangered not only the secular Anglican regime, but also England’s recusants. Aware Parsons’ vitriolic propaganda would provoke government retribution upon lay-Catholics, secular priests accused the Jesuits of heretically worshipping Loyola and behaving like elitist Puritan Pharisees by separating themselves from their fellow prisoners.

My source analysis suggests Catholic and Protestant perceptions of exile were flexible, adaptable and open to interpretation; failed martyrs from the elect were praised as virtuous or fortunate, while exiles from rival sects were feminised as weak and cowardly. If they were unable to successfully counter persecutors’ criticisms, Anglican, Puritan and Jesuit exiles feared that laypeople would reject contemporary priests or preachers as inept patriarchs whose inability to verify the sect’s claim to be the elect negated their right to exert authority. Protestants generally deemed exile a lesser evil, because it prevented the death of valuable clergymen, and opened the possibility of restoring true religion under a future monarch. With hindsight, however, some Puritans considered exile a blessing rather than a badge of shame, because it enabled them to study new continental Protestant ideas, before returning to assume positions of responsibility within the restored Elizabethan Anglican Church. By contrast, Catholics often deemed exile shameful because they had a large reserve of missionary priests eager to fulfil the calling of martyrdom. Even here, however, the conversion of the ignorant was not always a suicide mission, because living men were needed to record the fallen, train new missionaries, and pray for the elect’s ultimate success. Fearful for Catholicism’s reputation, priests who failed to die in England countered Protestant criticism by arguing that celibacy gave them the self-control and foresight to postpone their return, rather than rashly squander their own lives without making any meaningful gains.

### Post-Dissolution Nuns

Traditionally, pre-Reformation convents were respectable substitutes to marriage and motherhood, because they opened educational opportunities to Catholic women and provided spiritual skills useful in the secular world, including the ability to pray for relatives’ souls. Expanding upon Evangelisti’s research on European nunneries, I will discuss depictions of post-Reformation nuns who remained in England, and those who chose exile to preserve their old religious order. By applying my earlier analysis of exiles and martyrs of chains to this previously overlooked group, I will discuss the reason why few nuns were executed under the Tudors, and argue that, despite the persecutions, vows of chastity remained relevant for English recusant women who, like later Spanish nun Luisa Carvajel, sought an exclusive identity through charity and self-imposed virginity. Additionally, I will examine Protestant
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representations of nuns, where the patriarchal structure of the Anglican Church resulted in a long-term suspicion of celibacy, and where depictions evolved to exalt the superior godliness of ex-nuns who renounced their monastic vows in favour of subordination to a male preacher.

Despite their leadership potential, few English nuns died for their religion during the Tudor period, apart from aged Yorkshire prisoner Isabel Whitehead in the 1580s, and young Kentish prophetess Elizabeth Barton in the 1530s. Deeming themselves subjects, not clergy, Henrician nuns usually remained within their abbey, praying for the souls of their patrons and maintaining neutrality in the public sphere by neither endorsing nor criticising royal policies. High-ranking nuns Katherine Bulkeley, Jane Messynde and Margaret Vernon relied upon the power of suggestion to swing potential supporters’ consciences, by reminding their wealthy patron that if the abbey was dissolved, nuns could no longer pray for his soul in Purgatory. Additionally, these nuns exploited the government’s fear of disorder to ensure they received fair treatment; Abbess Bulkeley claimed “never to have offended God’s laws nor the King’s” while implying that if Cromwell did not allocate her subordinates an adequate pension they would end up as beggars and vagrants. Being single females living in isolation, nuns had few legal opportunities to protest in the political sphere, unlike the Canterbury monks publicly petitioning to preserve Henry’s “lawful matrimony” to Queen Catherine and gain leniency for fellow prisoners. This suggests that, contrary to Crawford’s theory that young women were more likely to challenge gender roles, post-Reformation nuns were hindered by their virginity, being considered not true women, but irrational and subordinate girls.

For Elizabethan Catholic priests, memories of the Dissolution were useful not only for branding Cromwell a thief and a bully, but also for urging the Queen to punish heretics under the same Henrician anti-corruption laws used to suppress the abbeys. Nuns exiled overseas played an important supporting role to the priests, as the Virgin Mary did with Christ, by commemorating the fallen and creating, in Rowlands’ words, a “timeless collective memory comparable to Foxe’s Book of Martyrs.” Unlike priests, nuns like Anne Neville (daughter of beheaded rebel Duke of Northumberland) renounced the outside world and instead devoted themselves to the daily running of the convent, and the honouring of pre-Reformation saints’ days. Contrariwise, some older post-Dissolution nuns, including former Prioress Isabel Whitehead of Arthington, stayed in England to do itinerant charitable works, collect alms, and heal poor women’s spiritual and physical afflictions in the absence of priests. When discovered on her sickbed at a recusant widow’s house, Elizabethan priest hunters dragged Isabel off to prison, believing the nun, as a woman, worked under priests’ orders rather than independently. Catholic priest Green branded the searchers barbaric for “spoiling and breaking the house” and sexually threatening for intruding into Whitehead’s personal space with naked swords. The extreme violence highlighted the regime’s fear during these unstable times; despite Whitehead’s advanced age, officials feared she was a Spanish agent and interred her corpse with dead criminals to deny papists a shrine.

Elizabethan Puritans retrospectively proclaimed the Henrician Dissolution a watershed, where genuinely pious monks and nuns rejected unnatural celibacy and became model Protestants, while stubborn,
backward and wicked papists fled overseas and continued fornicating, embezzling church money, worshipping Satan, and plotting regicide. Within this allegory, ex-nuns’ assimilation into the Anglican family unit implied convents were obsolete, in a land where every inch of ground was sacred, and where vernacular Bibles enabled every commoner to devote their life to God. Marriage was not deemed incompatible with the fundamental message of pre-Reformation monastic vows, because Protestant ex-nuns practised the vocation of charity by comforting and feeding their jailed husbands, in addition to silence by refusing to name other members of the elect. Notable ex-nuns among the Marian exiles included Dorothy (wife of Bishop Bale), and London priest William Living’s wife Julia, whom Foxe claimed wore the gown of her old religious order not as a proclamation of Catholicism, but for warmth. Julia’s denunciation of popish mass as superstitious, and willingness to stand trial alongside her husband rather than resume her cloistered lifestyle, made her a superior Christian to the celibate priests whose cruelty, depravity, and jealousy of superior Protestant scholars was deemed unnatural and devilish. This ex-nun’s earlier vow of poverty was fulfilled by the hardship of prison; and her vow of chastity was reflected in her abstinence from sexual relations until her husband’s release. Furthermore, Julia’s disputation with infantilised Marian priests (including Bonner’s chancellor the future Jesuit Thomas Darbishi re) reflected early Christian nuns’ duty, as teachers, to instruct and rebuke stubborn children who irrationally mistook Latin or English translations of Hebrew Scripture for “the Devil’s Testament.”

Adapting pre-Reformation anti-clericalist resentment of greedy friars, Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans branded Medieval abbeys wasteful for housing men and women too idle to do honest work, and hypocritical for purchasing gold and silver religious objects rather than relieving the poor. Influenced by Calvin’s sermons denouncing celibacy as perverse, Puritan ministers Foxe and Wither branded contemporary exiled nuns lazy parasites and thieving “strumpets of Rome” who spurned marriage and childbearing in favour of a comfortable life. These nunneries were branded the unnatural antithesis of the ideal Protestant family unit because there were no married men to control and instruct the nuns. Eager to perpetuate the association of treason with sexual depravity, Bale depicted contemporary convents as brothels where intemperate, feminised priests met to fornicate and plot regicide. Bishops Abbot and Sandys embellished Bale and Foxe’s earlier allegations by claiming the offspring of young novices were murdered by senior nuns; over 600 infants’ skulls were reputedly unearthed at a Yorkshire convent after the Dissolution. If nuns represented amoral harlots, then papist bishops like Bonner were debauched, bigamous and bestial pimps who exploited nuns’ childlike lack of self-control to satisfy their own perverse desires, and impregnate the women with the next generation of persecutors. By proclaiming nuns bastard-bearers spreading venereal diseases, Anglicans could make a mockery of celibacy, discredit the veneration of consecrated objects, and reassert married Elizabethan preachers’ pre-eminence over unmarried priests excluded from the family unit.

It can be said that nuns were generally assigned subordinate roles within the Catholic community, because they were not clergymen, and thus not obliged to preach or seek martyrdom. Priests claimed nuns were motivated by duty to preserve England’s pre-Reformation heritage, and by maternal desire to save the
country from damnation through the power of prayer. Anglicans and Puritans, by contrast, mistrusted nuns as parasites, accomplices of fugitive priests, or vagrants for living itinerant lives uncontrolled by men. The universally negative Protestant depictions of nuns were motivated by fear of the abuse of celibacy; and of unsupervised women allegedly meeting to gossip, fornicate, or usurp older patriarchs’ dominant positions over the Mother Church. While not viewing the nuns themselves as regicidal conspirators, Anglicans and Puritans believed these women had links to Marian persecutors and Elizabethan priests, and were thus abominations with no place in the family based post-1559 hierarchy where the only Virgin was Elizabeth. Concurrent with Macek’s argument that Protestants were fearful of uncontrolled female agency, Elizabethan Puritans were more likely to exalt ex-nuns who renounced their vows of chastity and integrated themselves into the family unit, by defending their husbands from cruel priests, and by raising future generations of Protestants in fulfilment of the superior vocation of motherhood. This depiction was intended to portray the post-schism era not as a period of instability and upheaval, but a natural transition, where formerly irrational virgin girls abandoned a life of idleness in their old parent-house in favour of becoming respectable, mature women whose learning was not incompatible with reproduction.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, the definition of a non-martyr revealed an underlying conflict between moderates and radicals motivated by uncertainty over having to choose between two allegedly infallible patriarchal institutions: the English monarchy or the Roman Papacy. Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans shared a common fear of contradiction and disorder, and thus used non-martyrs’ suffering to further draw attention to the exceptional piety of those who successfully died by fire or noose. Despite their frequent portrayal as background characters, exiles and martyrs of chains were useful for martyrologists seeking not only to demonise persecutors as unjust and unfit for office, but also to confirm that a divinely chosen minority endured and triumphed over adversity. Fearing that inability to counter Catholic criticisms would undermine Anglican claims to be the elect, Puritans justified their own exile or imprisonment as part of God’s long-term plan. These former Marian fugitives attributed their survival to foresightedness, providence and necessity: exile was the least damaging option, because the elect gained little if every clergymen died alongside doomed martyrs unable to escape. This sympathetic depiction contrasted with later Catholic emphasis on guilt and the vilification of exiles from rival sects. Unlike their Henrician forebears, Jesuits intended to seek martyrdom for God’s greater glory, and felt compelled to discredit their Puritan rivals with allegations of depravity and criminality to counter allegations of hypocrisy.

Although the language of inversion normally served to discredit rival sects as lawless, immoral and cowardly, not every failed martyr was viewed negatively; those who assisted exiled fugitives were praised as second-line spiritual troops safeguarding Catholicism or Anglicanism for the next generation. The division between radicals and moderates explained why Jesuits and Puritans were more likely to commemorate heretics or recusants who died in jail; being comparatively new sects, radicals could
exercise greater flexibility than the pre-Reformation church, although they continued to consider martyrs of chains inferior to genuine martyrs who died by execution. As discussed previously, the divisions between Henrician Catholics and early Anglicans were blurred, with Henrician Protestant officials declaring themselves Anglican Catholic reformers, and conservatives initially denouncing popery and defending their monarch from allegations of heresy until they were able to reconcile with Rome after the King’s death. This caused problems, particularly for Elizabethan Anglicans seeking to create an exclusive English Protestant identity, prompting the post-1571 Tudor government to denounce insincere conservative conformists as untrustworthy cowards, rebels and traitors. The next chapter will further explore Catholic, Puritan and Anglican efforts to equate treachery and apostasy with sexual depravity: stereotypically feminine behaviour intended to discredit members of rival sects as the un-masculine antithesis of the idealised rational warrior-scholar described by Gregory and Raynor.

[Fig.12]: Depictions by Verstegen of the tortures inflicted on Catholic Martyrs of Chains: stretching on the rack, [above] and confinement to an iron hoop known as the Scavenger’s Daughter. [below] Other prisoners are tortured with heated iron pokers, and with thumbscrews: small iron vices for crushing one’s digits. The outstretched arms and tilted head of the unidentified man on the rack [a.] are reminiscent of Christ’s crucifixion, while the portrayal of the exhausted prisoner being dragged to the torture chamber [b.] reflects the laying of Christ’s body in the tomb before the Resurrection. In the second image the guard’s armour is given elements of Roman styling, including a plumed helmet, to further highlight the similarities between Elizabethan recusants and the early Christians.
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Chapter 4: The Non-Martyr as an Enemy of the Elect.

As mentioned previously, the non-martyr represents a new research field, where the language of inversion was used by Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrologists to attack members of rival religious groups as violent, sinful and insolent antitheses of the obedient, honest and law abiding English subject. Following on from the largely sympathetic depictions in the preceding chapter, I will now analyse more negative Tudor portrayals of non-martyrs who either failed their mission, or abandoned their faith. Martyrs and non-martyrs alike were executed by burning, beheading or hanging by a government fearful of papist corruption or continental heresy, but the final decision rested with Catholic or Protestant propagandists to either legitimise a prospective martyr in print, or reject him as deficient. These non-martyrs could be depicted posthumously as either insolent, dangerous enemies; or as powerless, passive victims whose weakness contrasted with the godliness and bravery of genuine, approved martyrs. Concurrent with Wood’s research on attitudes to sedition, the Henrician, Marian and Elizabethan governments’ desire to appear omnipotent was motivated primarily by fear of the domestic sphere; it was impossible to observe private meetings behind closed doors, and thus the regime relied heavily upon ordinary subjects to testify against deviant neighbours. In his general analysis of the European Protestant Reformation, Gregory proposed that even the godliest men could, when jailed, succumb to the “weakness of flesh that made them balk at torture and execution.”1 This chapter will cross-examine the impact of fear in shaping the evolving perceptions of martyrologist and persecutor alike, and discuss whether official efforts to discredit non-martyrs through print were an organised effort to exert power over the condemned man’s posthumous reputation, or a knee-jerk reaction to criticisms of authority. Within the context of Tudor England, were apostates and informers simply terrified of the government; or was this a willing betrayal of the old faith motivated by duty, personal gain, or realisation that reform was inevitable?

Executed Catholics and Protestants not recognised as Martyrs

The existing historiography suggests that the post-1533 Tudor regime deemed recusants and heretics equally dangerous, unlike idealised law abiding subjects whose conformity to the established church was intended to uphold royal or Papal claims of infallibility. As argued by McClendon, however, the persecutions had logistical limitations; local officials were unable to punish every dissident due to the trials’ disruptiveness, and subsequently targeted unrepentant ringleaders. Utilising the two perspectives of history from above, focusing on the elite, and history from below, focusing on the everyday lives of commoners, I will analyse select case studies of Catholic and Protestant representations of non-martyrs, including official efforts to claim priests or heretics were executed not for religion, but for secular crimes. Concurrent with Foucault’s discussion of the retributive character of early modern justice systems, the Tudor government’s long-term aim was to equate religious minorities with a dangerous, criminal section of society, or “bad other,” whose beliefs were the opposite to normal Christian decency, and whose suppression underlined royal prestige and potency. In Tudor times, the connotations of cowardice had serious implications, calling into question not only a man’s rationality and courage, but also his right to
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exert authority as a patriarch or spiritual leader. Despite being part of the same networks as official Catholic, Anglican or Puritan martyrs, several individuals executed by the regime were rejected by their peers because of their crimes’ severity: thieves, frauds, suicides, witches, traitors, insolent blasphemers, and murderers. Influenced by post-structuralist concepts regarding fear of the other, I will discuss whether a sect’s denunciation of its own lawless non-martyrs was motivated largely by fear of retribution; fear of alienating its readership; or desire to reconcile with the regime by appearing non-threatening?

Post-schism Henrician officials uprooted years of tradition by exalting Kings previously deemed tyrants, including Henry II and John, for resisting Papal corruptions deemed prejudicial to English interests. By depicting priests as criminals, and criminals as papists, early Anglicans could imply that popery was lawless, disorderly, and prejudicial to Henry’s attempted extension of royal hegemony to include not only the King’s right to regulate England’s secular laws, but also common subjects’ personal religious beliefs. Unlike the majority of abbots, who sent Henry and Cromwell gifts of money or (in the case of Abbot Wells of Crowland) “fine fish” in return for a pension, there were some (including Abbot Boreman of St Albans) who defiantly voiced preference to beg in the streets rather than surrender their abbeys. The subsequent localised execution of uncooperative monks suggested an effort by the state at centralisation through intimidation, while their occurrence between spring and late autumn demonstrated the limits to royal claims of omnipotence: travel was difficult during harsh winters. Abbot Whiting’s 1539 hanging for the “robbing of Glastonbury church,” for example, was justified by his possession of a Papal Bull, a book criticising Henry’s divorce, and another glorifying Archbishop Becket. By treating the punishment of these monks as an impartial investigation of tax-dodgers and traitors linked to Robert Aske’s Pilgrimage of Grace (a protest by Yorkshire commoners against the Dissolution of the Abbeys), Anglicans could counter Catholic criticisms of the King, and contrast the willing submission of reputedly loyal English subjects with the arrogant and perverse reactionary clergymen aligned with the Pope.

Concurrent with Derrida’s theory that early modern monarchies represented a type of personality cult, my analysis of royal proclamations suggests that the Tudor regime exploited popular fear of strangers to justify its own existence as England’s sole protector and patriarchal provider, empowered to exert absolute control over the lower-orders. Believing that royal authority depended upon the ability to dispense retribution, the Henrician and Elizabethan governments frequently adapted secular laws against master-less “vagabonds and mighty beggars” to punish heretics and itinerant Catholic priests as insolent gossips or travelling quacks, whose subversive and erroneous printed propaganda caused chaos and confusion. By denying a religious angle to the persecutions, Elizabethan Anglicans and conformist Puritans could brand the entire Catholic priesthood a criminal organisation resisting centralising efforts to bring secular and religious institutions under royal control. Deeming Elizabethan Jesuits and Marian persecutors false ministers and usurpers, Anglican judge Mildmay and Bishop Bancroft claimed that the time priests spent ministering to jailed felons resulted in their own descent into criminality, unlike the idealised Marian Protestant martyr who was depicted as a humble subject dutifully enforcing lawful Edwardian church reforms to convert the ignorant. Foxe deemed the 1560s a transition, where papists
were held accountable for their earlier abuses; no longer protected by the Catholic Church, one unnamed former Marian priest was hanged at Newgate for clipping pieces from gold coins to make counterfeit money. Another 54-year-old priest was executed for pickpocketing; the scar on his thumb signified that he had already pleaded benefit of clergy to escape punishment for an earlier crime. Due to their leadership skills, priests were feared as potential rabble rousers, and thus had to be discredited with accusations that celibacy rendered them effeminate, impulsive, devious and antisocial like their devilish master the Bishop of Rome.

Elizabethan depictions of violence depended upon context; fearing Catholic allegations that early Protestants were motivated primarily by jealousy of their natural superiors, moderate Anglicans Brice, Stow and Speed rejected Marian rioters whose insurgency was doomed to failure, because only God could bring England’s deliverance. Protestant exiles made great efforts to distinguish unlawful rebellion against the secular Queen Mary from lawful resistance of hated Papal and Spanish agents, including the Counter-Reformation English priests sent to destroy royal church supremacy. Foxe and Bale justified violence only when it was directed against inanimate objects, such as religious images that allegedly represented the Pope’s regional presence, or priests who, as agents of the foreign Papacy, profaned the church by encouraging idolatry. Deeming spontaneous anti-clericalism and iconoclasm patriotic Christian duty, Foxe praised ex-monk William Flower for stabbing a Marian priest; Hussite violence; and Scottish Protestants killing Cardinal Beaton to avenge the burning of preacher George Wishart. Although rioting left England vulnerable to foreign attack, Foxe depicted executed gentleman Thomas Wyatt as a dutiful Protestant subject (albeit not a martyr) whose failed uprising was intended not to usurp the Queen, but to prevent England’s ruin at the hands of secular advisers and bishops seeking to betray England to a foreign power. In reality, however, Wyatt was a Catholic who had no interest in reforming the church or renouncing the Pope; hatred of Spain was not confined to Protestant exiles, because the two countries had been enemies since Henry VIII divorced Queen Catherine. Other reputedly Protestant rebels denied full recognition as martyrs included Marian gentleman John Bethell (or Bedyll) who was hanged for sabotaging Portsmouth’s artillery; John Throckmorton; and Richard Uvedale (alias Udall) who conspired with courtier Henry Peckham to rob the Royal Mint and fund the planned uprising of Jane Grey’s father, Henry Duke of Suffolk. Stow and Becon argued that if the ruler reconciled with Rome, the only option was to flee into exile until the tyrant’s death, rather than follow the bad example of violent and insolent rebels whose rejection of the lawful monarch risked tearing England asunder. Like later Puritan separatists, rebels’ lawlessness earned them a shameful death by execution, and no prospect of rehabilitation because they were acting not out of misguided duty, but proud ambition.

Marian Catholics viewed allegedly Protestant rebels with a mixture of disappointment and contempt, deeming them rash and deluded for wasting their lives and careers; and accusing leading agitators of heresy to imply Edwardian Anglicanism deviated from true, universal Catholicism. By conflating diverse groups of dubious loyalty into a single Protestant conspiracy, schoolmaster John Proctor and diarist Henry Machyn could justify the persecution of “traitors and heretics” deemed unworthy of a reprieve or
trial by jury. Kentish rebel Wyatt was declared a lawbreaker who conspired with exiled Lords, Protestants, and the French enemy to supplant Mary with her sister Elizabeth, and potentially restore the heretical schism with Rome, or seize the crown for himself. The rebels’ defeat at London by Mary’s troops was depicted by royal chaplain Cancellar as evidence that God favoured the Catholic elect, not disorderly, subversive heretics motivated by greed and envy. Later Elizabethan Catholics nostalgic for the Marian era, including Allen and Parsons, branded Elizabethan Anglicans hypocritical for allegedly endorsing Wyatt’s violence and xenophobia, while baselessly denouncing the peaceful 1537 Pilgrimage of Grace. In this instance, heresy was defined by behaviour rather than confessional identity; Wyatt ceased to be a Catholic and began behaving like a Protestant or Hussite when he rebelled against the legitimate Queen. Closely linked to the wider theme of the elect and the damned was the Elizabethan and Edwardian government view that popery was associated with “rude and ignorant” peasant rebels, while Anglicanism, as the religion of educated men, represented progress and stability. For Protestant academic Cheke, Edwardian Cornish rebels’ conservatism was a useful tool for depicting popery as inherently seditious, because it was impossible for subjects to serve two opposing rulers: God’s representative King Edward, and Satan’s puppet the Pope. After the 1569 rebellion, and the 1571 plot by Italian banker Ridolfi and the recusant Duke of Norfolk to supplant Elizabeth with Mary Stuart, ex-Marian persecutors like Dr John Story and Parson Plumtree of Durham were hanged as traitors, and their posthumous reputation smeared by Elizabethan officials seeking to depict the entire Catholic Church as a treacherous, regicidal organisation. Fearing England’s recusant minority rejected not only Elizabeth’s church reforms, but also her secular authority, Anglicans proclaimed the execution or imprisonment of older, previously respected papists comeuppance for their “blood and treason” and Marian cruelty. After his 1571 hanging in London, Story was depicted by Judge Reynolds and London printer Colwell as insolent and immoral for openly criticising royal church supremacy; questioning Elizabeth’s chastity; infantilising King Edward as an irrational child; and attempting to flee overseas after escaping from jail. Having served under Bishop Bonner, former Marian officials allegedly followed a “false Bloody, Antichristian and Merciless Religion” identical to that of later Jesuits who “disguisedly and secretly wandered the realm” spreading popery. Although many trial documents confirming Story’s hanging survive, Plumtree’s very existence is questionable due to the allegedly summary nature of the priest’s 1569 execution; and official desire to justify the arrest of Northern conservative clergymen who were only nominally Anglicans. Sir Francis Drake and Puritan minister Humphrey mentioned Plumtree’s hanging alongside other members of the rebel Lords’ “miserable army,” but these accounts were based on hearsay, and desire to discredit contemporary priests as false prophets who misquoted the Bible to justify law-breaking. Although violence by Elizabethan Jesuits was rare, this did not stop Anglican lawyer Hesketh from claiming priests like Thurstan Hunt conspired to break fellow prisoners from jail in a misguided interpretation of “Moses striking the Egyptian.” By attacking executed papists’ chastity and rationality, the Anglican government could link the unnatural crime of treason with depravity and gossip, thus feminising every Counter-Reformation agent as a deceitful Papal harlot unworthy to hold authority.
The Elizabethan government’s successful depiction of priests as rebels put Catholics in a difficult position, because honouring convicted criminals would confirm official allegations that papists were enemies of God, Queen, and social order. Although some radicals, including Parsons, deemed Edwardian rebels early recusants defending “truth, reason, law and order,” most Jesuits considered armed resistance rash, because it complicated martyrologists’ efforts to distinguish between harmless missionaries, and genuine traitors. The hanging of an unnamed Cornish priest for stabbing iconoclast William Body during the 1549 rebellion was reinterpreted as the vengeful, unjust killing of an innocent by a weak government incapable of capturing the real killer. Parsons attributed the killing of Body to popular outrage at Edwardian iconoclasm and vernacular prayers; and ambiguously deemed the priest an “accessory to Body’s death,” who imitated Christ by selflessly taking the blame so the real killer, like Barabbas, could seek redemption. Despite their dislike of Elizabeth’s Protestant advisers, Jesuits initially declared neutrality in political affairs, and urged recusants to patiently obey unjust secular laws in imitation of early Christians persecuted by Nero. Claiming evildoing could never justify good ends, Southwell and Fitzsimon refused to recognise several executed lay-recusants as true Catholics, and instead branded them genuine conspirators incapable of forgiving their enemies. After his hanging at Tyburn, the soldier Edmund Squire, a convert to Catholicism, was branded the inversion of the chivalrous Christian page because, far from courageously defending Queen and country on the battlefield, Squire conspired to use the feminine weapon of poison to murder his royal employer. Catholic priest Aray claimed Squire “died a Protestant” despite proclaiming his Catholicism, because Squire’s misquoting of the Bible to justify murder and unchristian vengeance were analogous to Old Testament inspired Puritan sermons. By depicting Squire as a deceitful Puritan agent or madman, Aray could exonerate recently hanged Jesuits as impartial upholders of order and normality, while warning recusants of the outcome of lawlessness and misguided fanaticism.

Nostalgic for pre-schism Henrician stability, Catholics often equated nonconforming Edwardian and Elizabethan Protestants with exceptionally odious pre-Reformation heretics, including blasphemous Donatists and Arians; Bohemian Hussites who violently rebelled against their King; and 16th-century German Anabaptists who opposed infant baptism, potentially consigning their offspring to hellfire. Eager to discredit Elizabethan Anglicanism as inherently divisive, Catholic priests like Aray, Ainsworth, Fitzsimon and Walpole retrospectively proclaimed Edward’s burning of heretics no worse than Mary’s later persecutions, and drew parallels between contemporary Puritans and the self-serving heretical advisers who deceived Henry VIII into breaking from Rome. Besides confirming the warnings of Catholic Humanists in regards to the dangers of diverse religious opinions, Elizabethan Jesuits defiantly subverted Foxe’s depiction of Thomas Cranmer as a martyr by highlighting the Archbishop’s own role in the torture and execution of Protestants. By depicting heretics as chaotic antitheses to the idealised Christian subject due to their hypocrisy and rebellion against the ancient church, priests could imply that contemporary Protestants were guilty of other depraved acts including treachery against Mary Tudor. Parsons argued that the Edwardian church was powerless against heretics, and blamed the ready
availability of vernacular Scripture for the insolence of radicals like Dutchman George Parris who, before his burning in London, defiantly “avouched to have learned out of the sacred Bible that he had studied in his own language.”\(^\text{60}\) It was implied that Edward’s religious settlement had failed, because far from strengthening royal authority, prayer-books enabled impudent self-taught fanatics to openly ridicule Anglican clergymen; reinterpret official proclamations against idolatry to justify vandalising or stealing church property; and exploit Calvinist predestination as a license to sin.\(^\text{61}\)

Anglican officials were equally fearful of Protestant nonconformity, and retrospectively argued that Edwardian radicals deserved a particularly painful death, for rejecting royal church supremacy and spreading dissent that would culminate in the 1590s Brownist Puritan separatist sect.\(^\text{62}\) Seeking to distance the Anglican Church not only from popery, but also from Lollardy and continental Anabaptists, Bishops Cranmer and Jewel claimed the heretics burned on Edward’s orders were not the elect, but Satanic agents conspiring with criminals, papists and other internal enemies against the monarch.\(^\text{63}\) As a testimony to the Elizabethan regime’s successful repression of breakaway Protestant sects, Foxe ambiguously claimed Edwardian pudding-wife Joan Bocher and Dutch surgeon Parris were not martyrs, but misguided secular criminals who “died for certain articles not much necessary here to be rehearsed.”\(^\text{64}\) The portrayal of both Catholic recusancy and radical Puritan nonconformity as deviant mentalities enabled Anglicans like the royal printer Richard Grafton or the scholar and MP Alexander Neville (secretary to Archbishop Parker) to retrospectively compare Robert Kett’s Norfolk Protestant rebels of 1549 with the Edwardian Catholic insurgents in the West Country; despite the East Anglian rioters “not mentioning religion”\(^\text{65}\) and being primarily concerned by the enclosure of common land by the gentry. The implication was that anyone who held the established religious and secular laws in contempt undermined the divinely ordained Tudor confessional state whose existence was underpinned by the monarch’s claim of infallibility, benevolence and omnipotence.\(^\text{66}\) John Calvin and Scotsman John Knox feared uncontrolled activism by laymen would dismember the English Church, and alienate a Queen deemed open to further reform.\(^\text{67}\) Aware of England’s strategic importance in resisting popery, these reformers made compromises with the post-1558 government by distinguishing the unjust burning of Marian martyrs from lawful punishment of insolent, rebellious blasphemers whose refusal to conform (and thus covertly reform the church internally) was a treasonous rejection of Elizabeth’s figurative anointment by God as the Tudor counterpart to ancient Israelite Kings.\(^\text{68}\)

The Elizabethan Puritan separatist or Brownist movement (named after young Presbyterian minister Robert Browne) was influenced by early Protestant claims that Catholic bishops’ luxurious lifestyles rendered them wicked successors to apostate ancient Jews who embraced Jezebel’s paganism.\(^\text{69}\) Frustrated by the slow pace of Protestant reform in England, ministers born after the Marian persecutions, including Penry, Barrow, Browne, Greenwood and Cartwright, promoted an alternative construct of the elect, by exalting contemporary separatists as the true successors to the Marian martyrs, Israelites and early Christians who refused to worship Caesar.\(^\text{70}\) Londoner Henry Barrow challenged Foxe’s exaltation of martyred reformist bishops like Cranmer by declaring them not virtuous Protestants, but selfish
persecutors who burned proto-Puritans under Edward, and deceitfully recanted under Mary in the hope of avoiding the same fate.⁷¹ The implication was that the space of the established church and its episcopal hierarchy, allegedly invented in decadent pagan Rome, had a malign influence over ambitious clerics.⁷² After one young member of Barrow’s 1590s breakaway congregation, Roger Rippon, died in jail, he was eulogised as a “servant of Christ”⁷³ deliberately starved to death by Anglican Bishop Freke. Nonconformist Puritans (including not only separatists, but also unwilling radical conformists seeking greater local autonomy) suspected Freke of being in league with the Jesuits, or even a Catholic himself, for his conservatism and leniency towards church-papists who testified against Protestant radicals.⁷⁴ Being a minority, the separatists’ views did not gain widespread appeal, especially after Barrow and Penry were hanged for spreading rumours that Elizabeth fornicated with the Earl of Essex, and the remaining Brownists or Barrowists fearfully re-joined the Anglican Church or fled to the Netherlands.

In a continuation of the pre-Reformation practise of branding every heretic a Lollard, the Elizabethan government depicted religious deviants, regardless of true confessional identity, as Brownist Puritans, whose radicalism risked destabilising the hierarchy.⁷⁵ These could include itinerant, self-taught mechanic preachers; radical conformists who excessively contradicted official Anglican doctrine; various London separatist congregations; and the Dutch based Family of Love who (like the later Quakers) opposed infant baptism and royal church supremacy.⁷⁶ Fearing the so-called Familists’ belief in unsupervised male and female company would undermine the patriarchal hierarchy, Anglican preacher Keltridge and gentleman-satirist Nash smeared this sect with allegations of both literal adultery against their spouses; and “disloyalty, deceit and treachery”⁷⁷ against a monarch tasked by God to protect England from the Pope.⁷⁸ Additionally, Bishop Bridges and Lincolnshire gentleman Simon Patrick branded radical Protestants recusant conspirators, fifth-columnists and false prophets, to link them to contemporary papists who committed treason by denying Elizabeth was God’s infallible earthly deputy.⁷⁹ Fearful of foreign heresies supplanting established Anglican doctrine, Bishops Whitgift, Horne and Sandys highlighted the Dutch descent of executed Protestants, including Norfolk plough-wright Matthew Hammond, carpenter-turned-preacher Vitell, and Londoners Peters and Turwest, whose allegedly alien beliefs separated them from the Anglican majority.⁸⁰ By infantilising Hammond as irreverent and insolent, Anglican judges like French could depict every Puritan as an angry, rash youth, whose criticisms implied ingratitude for older bishops who had earned their authority after enduring hardship under Mary.⁸¹ Executed Brownists’ ultimate descent into obscurity allegedly confirmed the monarch’s God-like ability to control the popular memory, while Anglican clergymen’s successful effort at persuading commoners to reject the feminised separatists’ frivolous and “hypocritical conversations”⁸² confirmed that Anglican Church and secular policy best served the laity’s needs.

Traditionally, suicides and lunatics were depicted negatively in Protestant martyrologies, because self-inflicted violence implied faithlessness, despair and ingratitude towards a provident God; while senseless destruction and violence towards others could potentially inspire later Puritan radicals to assault officials representing royal authority.⁸³ The willingness of Elizabethan madman Burchett to plead guilty to the
charge of stabbing a minister was attributed not to remorse, but selfish desire for a quick death: by hanging as a murderer rather than burning as a Puritan heretic. By fearing such radical agitation endangered the Elizabethan Anglican Church’s long-term existence, Bishop Andrewes portrayed the earlier Marian persecutions as a lesson for lay-readers: the English confessional state’s future depended upon radicals and moderates uniting under Elizabeth’s banner against the main papist threat. Rather than senselessly oppose senior clergymen who had themselves resisted Papal tyranny, laypeople were encouraged to imitate early martyrs defending themselves in a scholarly version of trial by combat, where written texts replaced conventional weapons. Puritan minister Sampson’s respectful depiction of Marian fugitive John Cheke, who died in jail, contrasted with his hostility to Judge Hales who first tried to stab himself, and then “threw himself into the river and was miserably drowned” following his 1553 arrest for heresy. Seeking to equate suicide with the spiritual crime of apostasy, where men wilfully betrayed God and church, these former Marian exiles depicted Hales as a weak, self-serving wretch unworthy of inclusion among the elect, because he first rejected Queen Jane; and then aided the Spanish backed Marian regime by forcing laymen to attend Mass. By rejecting Hales’ Protestant credentials, and portraying him as a persecutor, Anglicans could imply popery was inherently corrupting; Hales’ suicide and damnation reflected the ultimate fate awaiting contemporary recusants and converts who knowingly forsook Protestant progress for falsehood.

By contrast, Foxe and Coverdale’s depictions of madmen were more sympathetic, being intended primarily to attack “malicious papists” as uncaring, anachronistic, and incapable of serving the people’s best interests. Unwilling to usurp God’s right to decide whether a sinner was saved or damned, Foxe and Coverdale used case studies of Judge Hales and Londoner John Collins to contrast priests’ dishonest betrayal of vulnerable prisoners with benevolent Anglican efforts to bring unity, redemption and reconciliation. Driven insane by his wife’s adultery, Henrician gentleman Collins was burned for shooting an arrow at a crucifix in the presence of some Spanish sailors, baptising his dog in a font, and challenging Bishop Longland with scriptural passages denouncing unrighteous judgments in an apparently suicidal bid to die. In a variation of his earlier animalistic puns, Foxe deemed Collins’ burning a parable; the loyal dog burned alongside its master [fig.4] was a better Christian than the priests who callously ignored Collins’ spiritual malady; denied him a fair trial; and behaved like undignified, vicious curs by howling for their prisoner’s blood. Unable to recognise Collins as a true martyr because his violence and profanation of the font suggested Anabaptistry, Foxe compromised by claiming Collins reconciled with the “holy company of saints” by regaining his rational, masculine courage at the stake. Similarly, Hales was proclaimed a helpless, emotionally unstable victim temporarily driven to desperation by the shock of losing his position of trust after years of loyal service. Foxe’s decision to list Hales and Collins alongside the martyrs (although not recognising them as such) may have been an effort to reassure their bereaved respectable families, or, alternatively, attack Elizabethan Jesuits’ willingness to die, by deeming their recklessness suicidal and their loyalty to Rome a delusion. While admitting Hales had died in jail, later Anglicans like Bishop Babington reinterpreted the wording of Foxe’s martyrlogy, to brand Marian
officials murderers who arranged Hales’ death to look like suicide.\textsuperscript{96} This portrayal was inspired by Foxe and Hall’s claims that Henrician Lollards (including London tailor Richard Hunne) were strangled by corrupt pre-schism bishops like Wolsey or Fitzjames, who sought to deny the prisoners Christian burial in revenge for their anticlericalism; and facilitate seizing their goods without trial.\textsuperscript{97}

As part of the counter-propaganda campaign intended to deny that Marian Protestant martyrs of chains were suicides, Anglicans claimed jailed Elizabethan priests died not from disease or mistreatment, but deliberate self-murder caused by selfish pride and inability to reconcile Protestant truth with popish lies.\textsuperscript{98} The unnaturalness of suicide seemingly confirmed papists’ guilt, and feminised the entire priesthood as irrational, perverse traitors who were eternally damned for their arrogant attempt to cheat the hangman. Eager to equate celibacy with childish weakness, later Anglicans with hindsight claimed Edwardian priest Richard Langrich and the unnamed predecessor of Elizabethan Jesuit John Cottam deliberately drowned themselves through fear of torture, unlike the idealised Protestant prisoner who ultimately triumphed over hardship upon reaching the stake.\textsuperscript{99} By portraying Jesuits’ alleged desire for martyrdom as shallow boastfulness, clergymen like Sutcliffe could attribute prisoners’ later despair, “bitter curses”\textsuperscript{100} and madness to punishment from a God angered by papists’ impudent contempt for royal church supremacy.

Puritan minister Burton and ex-priest Munday deemed the reputed high proportion of Catholic suicides proof that the average Jesuit was a coward unable to face justice; a murderer for taking his own life; and a traitor for impeding the Queen’s right to dispense punishment.\textsuperscript{101} Since suicides generally harmed themselves when separated from fellow priests, Protestants implied that the Catholic mission had failed because its adherents could not competently prepare themselves for death, and were inferior patriarchs whose excessive dependence upon other priests rendered them unfit to preach independently.

Fearful these attacks on Jesuits’ alleged aspiration for martyrdom could undermine Catholic claims of universality, priests responded by transforming the tragic deaths of despairing recusants into a parable of redemption, where prisoners like Lancashire gentleman John Finch avoided damnation by exercising the self-control necessary to resist temptations to self-harm.\textsuperscript{102} Deeming the final moments of jailed laymen a battle between heaven and hell for the recusant’s soul, Jesuits adapted elements of the Catechism to claim that the ritualised discipline of Catholicism enabled even the weakest members of the congregation to die bravely in imitation of the saints. Wilson and Parsons highlighted Finch’s learning and charity, while blaming his temporal insanity on betrayal by a godless, sexually immoral spy and gossip.\textsuperscript{103} Concurrent with Dickens’ argument that martyrdom represented a path to perfection, Finch’s eventual execution brought his salvation: spurning incitements to recant and patiently enduring imprisonment before triumphantly ascending the scaffold.\textsuperscript{104} Similarly, ex-Calvinist and church-papist John Thomas “conquered the horror of death with fear of hell”\textsuperscript{105} before his hanging, and atoned for his heresy by encouraging the crowd to reconcile with Rome. Seeking to convert indifferent church-papists into avowed recusants, priests exploited their readers’ feelings of guilt and horror by reminding them that further judgement awaited sinners in the afterlife; and that a brave death in defence of the church could potentially redeem earlier sins.
My source analysis suggests Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrologists generally rejected individuals whose insolence, violence, despair, blasphemy or cowardice damaged the entire sect’s reputation by confirming government allegations of sedition, corruption and treason. The slandering of other sects was the best means of preventing attacks on one’s own religious group, because it forced rival clergymen on the defensive and sowed the seeds of doubt among commoners fearful of dangerous, deviant internal enemies whose existence allegedly threatened routine, order and normality. These depictions were motivated primarily by fear for the Catholic or Protestant elect’s reputation; martyrologists from every sect knew that if official and semi-official martyrs were depicted as anything other than perfect role models, critics would exploit their forebears’ negative character traits to drive a wedge between the congregation, and contemporary priests or ministers. The Elizabethan government was also fearful that later generations would imitate radical heretics, rebels or popish recusants deliberately disobeying the divinely appointed monarch. Subsequently, executed religious dissidents were depicted as members of a disorderly criminal organisation prosecuted not only for blasphemy against the true church, but also for undermining national security by rejecting the regime’s right to regulate subjects’ consciences. Radical Protestants who refused to integrate into the Church of England were denounced by Anglicans and mainstream Puritans alike because of their failure to win converts; and were branded insolent blasphemers, not martyrs, for rebelling against the Elizabethan confessional state instead of resisting Catholic invasion. Eager to merge the distinct threats of papist priests, Puritan separatists and foreign enemies into a single conspiracy, the Elizabethan regime depicted recently executed non-martyrs as treacherous bad subjects; amoral bad teachers; and self-serving bad clerics whose failure to fulfil their patriarchal vocation of protecting and instructing ordinary subjects earned them an unpleasant and ignominious death allegedly befitting adherents of a false religion.

**Apostates and Conformists**

As noted by Thompson and Loades, conservatives and radicals alike held positions in the post-schism Henrician church, where being an Anglican was defined by allegiance to the ruler rather than rejection of pre-Reformation rituals. As Henry and Elizabeth initially considered themselves reformist Catholics rather than Protestant heretics, conformists had to avoid contradicting official doctrine centred on royal claims of infallibility, or the Church of England’s largely Catholic structure. My research will reassess the generalised category of radical Puritans known as nonconformists, by dividing it into two groups: the first being the Brownist or Barrowist separatists with whom the term became associated post-1600, as noted by Pastoor and Johnson. The second type of nonconformists were the individuals that I term Reluctant Conformists, whose adherence to the Church of England was motivated primarily by fear of retribution, and (to a lesser degree) a similar sense of duty to the monarchy exhibited by more enthusiastic Puritan conformists like Foxe. Ha and McGrath suggest that many Elizabethan Puritan Presbyterians, lacking widespread support or strength, avoided execution for opposing the Anglican episcopacy and excessive rituals by outwardly accepting royal church supremacy. Once established, however, they used their positions to incite anti-Catholic persecutions, demand further church reform, and protect their
radical friends until they were potent enough to challenge Anglican traditionalists during the 17th-century. Expanding upon this earlier research, I will compare Northern Catholics and East Anglian Presbyterians who attended both their own prohibited underground services, and Anglican Sunday prayers. Continuing with my main argument, that every depiction of non-martyr was grounded in fear, I will theorise that these individuals’ conformity to the Anglican Church represented not a religious obligation, but a secular chore essential for appeasing a wrathful monarch. This presents an under-researched area worthy of further study: were conformist Puritans and church-papist laypeople generally depicted by their peers as apostatising traitors to the faith; powerless victims of coercion; or a fifth column with its own agenda of reforming the church internally?

The pre-schism Henrician government sometimes pardoned repentant heretics to demonstrate that God and his earthly deputy the King were not only vengeful, but also merciful towards powerless prisoners who genuinely regretted their misdeeds. However, Marian and Elizabethan Catholics distrusted and feminised apostatising high-status former Edwardian Anglicans who behaved like stereotypical unfaithful wives, by deceiving their patriarch with insincere recantations and promises while falsely blaming innocents. By arguing that Protestant apostates like John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland (father of Jane Grey), were dishonest oath-breakers undeserving of mercy, Marian Bishop Christopherson and Catholic gentleman Wingfield could justify the punishment of other heretics who had “abused and plundered” the Kingdom and corrupted the weak boy-king Edward VI into becoming a Protestant puppet. Quoting Foxe’s own Acts and Monuments, Elizabethan Jesuit Parsons claimed Northumberland first seized power from his predecessor the Duke of Somerset, then renounced Protestantism and declared himself a Catholic under Mary in a futile attempt to escape beheading in 1553 for treason. Deeming attack the best form of defence, Parsons claimed Northumberland’s cowardly recantation and nervousness at his deserved beheading implied guilt, and seemingly proved the Edwardian Church of England was not a genuine Christian sect, but a devilish and criminal band of “condemned heretics and wicked malefactors” dedicated to self-enrichment.

Puritans like Foxe, Baker and Bentley occasionally justified early Protestants’ short-term outward conformity under Mary, because subjects were expected to confirm their trustworthiness and submission to existing patriarchal officials before earning the right to exert authority. Elizabeth’s own Marian conformity and initial perception of pre-1563 Anglicanism as an independent and uncorrupted offshoot of “Christ’s holy Catholic Church” were portrayed by her supporters not as conservatism, but as foresighted desire to guide England into an orderly, long-term transition from Marian backwardness to Protestant progress. By depicting Elizabeth as a wise, pragmatic and committed reformer, Foxe and Bentley could not only conceal her previous reluctance to abandon excessive rituals, but also portray her later church reforms as the long-term outcome of Henry’s schism. Although unafraid of punishment under Mary, Elizabeth was unwilling to plunge England into chaos by usurping her sister’s crown, and subsequently called Wyatt’s rebels “Christians in name but Jews in deed” because their rash, violent uprising risked further bloodshed and conflict. Elizabeth’s ultimate ascension from powerless, feminised
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prisoner to rational and decisive Queen provided a lesson for other ex-Marian officials seeking assimilation; by pledging allegiance to the institution of the monarchy and loyally serving Mary’s legitimate successor, subjects could regain their dignity and atone for their complicity in the earlier persecutions. Many married Anglican clergymen, unable to flee abroad, found themselves in a difficult position under Mary, because if they chose execution they would leave behind widows and orphaned children. Marian exiles feared that excessive denunciation of conformists would raise questions over their own unlawful flight overseas; and thus distinguished between avowed Protestant clergymen reluctantly conforming for the greater good of restoring the Anglican Church; and mercenary papists who willingly betrayed true, ancient Christianity. Influenced by the arguments of London martyr John Bradford, Becon reminded readers that Biblical figures like Rahab were rewarded “not for their lying, but for their mercy to the children of God,” and claimed that, likewise, the deceitful conformity of apostatising Marian fellow ministers was motivated by long-term concern for their dependents. Without the prospect of reconciliation with the Elizabethan church, deprived ministers feared their wives would be stigmatised as harlots, and their children would be considered bastards ineligible to inherit property. For Elizabethan Anglicans, the unwilling conformity of former Edwardian officials like Sheriff Necton was a convenient tool for demonising bloodthirsty priests as liars and corruptors, whose conversion of former Protestants was attributed not to religious zeal, but sadistic desire to demoralise the elect by forcing them to watch the burning of their friends. Welshman George Constantine had burned heretical books for the Henrician and Marian regimes, but after accepting Elizabeth's church supremacy he was rehabilitated by moderate Anglicans as a dutiful, honest subject who diligently enforced the commands of his superiors to the best of his ability. Despite Foxe’s allegations that Constantine was a self-serving papist atheist, Holinshed deemed the late preacher’s loyalty to Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth proof of his obedience and trustworthiness, and an indication that the Welsh had become civilised and assimilated through acceptance and internalisation of Elizabethan Anglican doctrine.

Expanding upon Ha and McGrath’s analysis of Presbyterian conformity, my research has identified three distinct types of Elizabethan Puritan during the 1580s: individuals I term enthusiastic conformists who willingly accepted royal church supremacy; reluctant conformists fearful of retribution; and radical separatists who rejected the Anglican Church as popish and tyrannical. The three types of Puritan were not necessarily monolithic: nonconformists (reluctant conformists and ex-separatists) could sometimes become enthusiastic conformists and receive Anglican parishes, in return for apprehending priests and pledging allegiance to the divinely appointed Elizabeth. Many Puritan enthusiastic conformists, including Foxe and Burton, believed the best way of turning England into a godly commonwealth was to take over the Anglican Church and use it to impose their values upon the laity. Inspired by Foxe’s example, Londoner Fulke and Leicestershire gentleman Hastings depicted themselves as exceptionally godly Anglicans defending Elizabeth from “gross gospellers and prattling Protestant” separatists; hostile papist nations; and ungrateful recusants. Seeking to differentiate themselves from insincere Henrician conservatives, these Puritans indirectly accepted Elizabethan bishops’ authority and the new vernacular
prayer-book, to enjoy the protection of influential courtiers who shared their long-term goal of a reformed, independent English Church free from popery. In turn, Puritans could petition for the release of their jailed friends; claiming to be concerned for the Anglican Church’s reputation, not the welfare of separatists, Foxe himself tried to prevent the burning of Anabaptists Turwest and Peters at Smithfield, because their ashes supposedly polluted the site where Marian Protestants were martyred.

The other common type of Elizabethan Puritan was the reluctant conformist, who, like Catholic church-papists, submitted to the government not out of idealistic desire for religious unity, but fear of punishment for treason and heresy. This type of Puritan was generally more radical, and part of the younger generation born after the Marian persecutions that opposed not only pre-Reformation rituals, but also the Anglican episcopacy. Puritan fears that papists and atheists had infiltrated and corrupted the Elizabethan church coincided with wider awareness of the need to depict Anglicans not only as Englishmen vaguely opposed to Papal supremacy, but also as avowed Protestants with a long-term commitment to internal church reform. Heeding Foxe’s accounts of the Marian persecutions, however, Presbyterians like Teye and Morse bided their time, because they knew intolerant bishops would eventually die and be succeeded by more competent, sympathetic successors. Exeter minister Anthony Randall and the congregation of Dedham, Essex, deemed themselves part of a “third church” distinct from Anglicanism and popery, but proclaimed Elizabeth their chief elder to avoid contradicting royal claims of infallibility. Others, including London ex-separatists Wright and Gilgate, were coerced into re-joining the Anglican Church, and writing anti-separatist propaganda. Aware of Lord Burghley’s Puritan sympathies, Wright attributed his own survival to divine providence that moved officials to show mercy, in order to flatter the Queen by contrasting Anglican benevolence with unenlightened, intolerant and indiscriminate papist persecutors. While superficially, Wright portrayed himself as a grateful prodigal son, his letters contained an allegorical message: that the ageing Elizabeth and her conservative bishops were identical to their Henrician forebears, and that internal church reform would inevitably return at the end of their lifetimes, as happened when Henry VIII was succeeded by Edward VI.

The third group of Puritans, comprising Brownist (or Barrowist) separatists who advocated separation of church and state, totally rejected royal supremacy over their sect, through fear that the monarch was susceptible to corruption. Subsequently, the radical breakaway faction faced persecution from the Anglican regime, and criticism from conformist Puritans who feared that if the church’s integrity was compromised, England would be left vulnerable to invasion. Countering allegations of Arianism and Donatism, the insular Brownist congregations proclaimed themselves not recusants or heretics, but law-abiding subjects trying to honour God in anticipation of Judgment Day. Barrow and Greenwood, both of whom were later hanged as traitors, adapted Henrician criticisms of popish corruption to equate Anglican bishops with idolatrous Babylonian priests deceiving the Israelites. Alleged papist superstitions within the Anglican Church included clerical vestments, transubstantiation, the presence of illustrative or secular images in churches, and reliance on erroneous prayer-books rather than exclusively Bible-based worship. Ministers who opposed separation from the Anglican Church were branded either
blind, foolish children, or malign informers who had forsaken God.\textsuperscript{145} Seeking to draw parallels with insincere Henrician conformists, the anonymous author of the Marprelate tracts equated such conduct with Christ’s betrayal by Judas, and warned that submission to the bishops would transform contemporary Puritans into persecutors.\textsuperscript{146}

Seeking to enforce anti-recusancy laws upon a conservative population suspicious of Elizabeth’s religious settlement, conformist Puritan supporters of the London based government claimed lay-Catholic church-papists were motivated not by duty, but fear; without the threat of jail and fines, many Englishmen would allegedly choose Latin Mass over Anglican services. Foxe, Smith and Burton distrusted contemporary church-papists as spreaders of “division and discord”\textsuperscript{147} within the post-schism church, and unfavourably compared them to wicked Israelites who reverted to paganism, unlike the elite monotheistic tribe of Levi analogous to the Puritan church faction. Insincere Catholic conformists were deemed cowardly liars: swearing false oaths or weeping like ungrateful children, before relapsing into wickedness and recusancy at the alleged instigation of their rebellious wives.\textsuperscript{148} Fearful that wicked high-status men exploited Elizabeth’s church settlement to gain positions of power, Puritans used negative portrayals of older conformists as a means to assert the honesty and godliness of the true Protestant elect. Perhaps the most successful of these early conformists was William Paulet, a contemporary of royal advisers More and Cromwell who supported Henry’s church supremacy and divorce; reverted to Catholicism under Mary; and declared himself a Protestant to remain in favour with Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{149} Alarmed by Elizabeth’s continued burning of Protestant separatists, Foxe depicted Paulet as a Catholic due to his role in the Henrician persecution of heretics, and the conservative Anglicanism he followed under Elizabeth.\textsuperscript{150} Puritans deemed it impossible for a true subject to loyally serve both Queen and Pope, because the former represented order and progress, while the latter was a false “spiritual king”\textsuperscript{151} and usurper who conspired to restore pre-Reformation backwardness and subjugation.

As Elizabethan England stabilised, Anglican propagandists differentiated between obedient and respectable conformist conservatives; and the cowardice and treachery of avowed recusants who insincerely pledged allegiance to the Queen through fear of punishment.\textsuperscript{152} By praising and rewarding high-status ex-Catholics who renounced the Pope, the regime hoped that their example would inspire lower-ranking readers to focus their devotions upon the Queen, and reject outside religious influences as dangerous and frightening.\textsuperscript{153} Lord Paulet was depicted by his kinsman Rowland Broughton and London tailor Stow not as a mercenary and fearful papist, but as a wise counsellor, obedient subject and link between the Henrician, Edwardian and Elizabethan eras who ultimately died an Anglican.\textsuperscript{154} Paulet’s high office, great age, and many grandchildren were useful analogies for government propagandists seeking to credit Anglican patriarchs for England’s prosperity, unlike depraved Jesuits who earned an unnatural, untimely death for the perverse crime of treason.\textsuperscript{155} Seeking to assert Anglican education’s superiority over popery, Anglicans depicted church-papists as Protestant converts; Francis Savage’s allegedly patriotic devotion to Queen and country were superior to his aged mother’s deluded worship of popish saints and dependence on untrustworthy priests.\textsuperscript{156} Due to this propaganda, and the threat of expropriation,

Catholic gentlemen like John Bishop or Richard Shelley strove to prove their loyalty, by vowing to fight against foreign invasion, report conspirators to the authorities, and defy the priests by admitting that even the Pope could sometimes be mistaken. For the government, the submission of these respectable individuals not only confirmed that Anglican ideals appealed to learned men, but also legitimised Elizabeth’s control over localised religious affairs.

Catholic attitudes to conformity represented a division between radical and moderate priests, the latter of whom believed the unmarried Elizabeth’s reign would be short, and Catholicism would return under her future successor. Many moderate priests and laymen recommended that lay-Catholics treat conformity to the Protestant church as a menial chore, through fear of angering the Queen; confirming Puritan allegations of insolence; and potentially inviting a repeat of the violence and summary executions dispensed by panicking officials upon lay-Catholics after the failed 1536, 1549 and 1569 rebellions. Deeming church-papists not heretics, but lapsed recusants requiring guidance, secular priest Reynolds and Jesuit Garnet justified occasional conformity by respectable Catholics seeking to avoid expropriation, and thus continue funding missionaries trained at the overseas seminaries. Aware of the long-term damage imprisonment could inflict upon the recusant community’s morale, lay-Catholic gentlemen like Lecey adapted the secular priests’ argument that the “act of going to Protestant sermons was no damnable sin” because the Anglican Church, as an extension of the secular government, had a different function to the international, politically neutral Catholic Church. Catholic convert Johnson equated poverty with martyrdom; recusant and debtor alike lost the prestige and credit they once held in the community, and thus had no choice but to outwardly conform while covertly provisioning their jailed spiritual leaders.

While outwardly professing their loyalty to the monarch, these church-papists resisted the taint of heresy by assisting the underground community; gentleman James Bird attended Anglican services, but was “never outside the Catholic Church, being one who observed as far as he could its tenets and precepts.” Similarly, recusant John Colville attended Anglican services to evade detection, until he could flee abroad when the government imposed church reforms he deemed heretical.

Conversely, some of the more radical Jesuits had a more uncompromising stance towards church-papists, because recusant deficiencies or weaknesses would be co-opted by Puritans to attack Catholic martyrs as wicked, devious traitors. Exiled priests feared that heretics, and even atheists, could advance themselves by idolatrously venerating Elizabeth instead of God and the saints: a disturbing analogy to the end-times of Revelation, where people forsook Christianity for sensual, earthly pleasures. Within this wider context of an apocalyptic conflict between the elect and the damned, Jesuits equated church-papists’ inaction with malice, in hope of increasing the number of avowed recusants to such an extent that the persecutions would be un-enforceable and the excommunicated Elizabeth would ultimately capitulate. Becanus, Ainsworth and Fitzherbert exploited laymen’s guilt by warning them that divine retribution awaited adherents of a false church that usurped and profaned Catholic Mass. These Jesuits implied the Church of England was inferior, and Elizabeth’s bishops were amoral because “at every change of prince they changed the Book of Common Prayer” to suit their own agenda. Subjects were expected to merely
attend church rather than internalise the sermons, and little effort was made to investigate laypeople's private beliefs because, according to Fitzherbert, bishops like Andrewes or Abbot were secretly Calvinist. This raised the possibility that self-serving Puritans could infiltrate the episcopacy in addition to the Privy Council, and “pretend to defend”\textsuperscript{168} royal supremacy while plotting violence against England’s recusants; or schism from the Anglican Church if Elizabeth disagreed with their long-term plans.

Finally, this section will discuss conforming Catholic clergymen, including older conservative bishops who initially deemed Henry’s schism a usurpation of Papal authority, but ultimately accepted royal supremacy to eliminate reformist court rivals. Despite receiving lucrative rewards, the bishops’ conformity was motivated primarily by fear of a wrathful King who had earlier beheaded Cardinal Fisher for opposing the royal divorce.\textsuperscript{169} As subjects, Bishops Lee, Bonner, Tunstall and Gardiner could not restore Catholicism without royal consent, but, being Lords and clergymen, they could perpetuate older antiheresy laws to suppress disorderly, spontaneous church reforms of the type approved by later Elizabethan Puritans.\textsuperscript{170} These bishops never proclaimed themselves Protestants, and instead deemed the Church of England the successor of the early Catholic Church; Henry the lawful King; and the Pope a heretic for perpetuating fraudulent superstition.\textsuperscript{171} During his imprisonment under Edward, Gardiner avoided directly criticising the King with unfounded allegations of heresy, and instead depicted himself as a loyal subject duty-bound to provide long-term spiritual care for the English flock.\textsuperscript{172} After his 1553 reinstatement, Gardiner proclaimed himself a good Catholic reacting to adverse circumstances; his earlier conformity was motivated not by heresy, but weakness and ignorance of Anglican error. By blaming deprived Edwardian reformers for his own moment of weakness, Gardiner could exalt Cardinal Pole as a superior teacher, and avoid antagonising Mary by slandering her dead father and brother as heretics.\textsuperscript{173} Depending on the circumstance, apostatising Catholic priests could sometimes be spared by Anglican officials seeking to prove that Papal agents, and by extension the Pope himself, were not infallible.\textsuperscript{174} Such depictions could be sympathetic, in regards to young Elizabethan missionary priests who reconciled with their natural Queen; or negative when discussing older Marian bishops deprived and imprisoned for their insolent rejection of Elizabeth’s restoration of Edwardian church supremacy. Elizabethan Bishops Bancroft, Matthews and Hutton exploited priests’ despair; fear of death; anti-Spanish xenophobia; or impatience at the slow pace of re-Catholicisation, to divide and demoralise prisoners, and ultimately inspire them to recant.\textsuperscript{175} These Anglicans claimed that celibacy rendered priests inherently flawed and inferior boys, whose lack of willpower and decisiveness meant that, unlike the sexually aggressive and power-hungry bishops, lower-ranking clergymen were never fully committed to popery and thus could potentially be saved.\textsuperscript{176} By depicting every apostatising priest as a Jesuit, the bishops hoped to weaken the Catholic mission, and use defectors’ recantations to turn Northern laypeople away from popish “dangerous books and counterfeit politic discourses.”\textsuperscript{177} Eager to sow further discord among the Edwardian and later Elizabethan recusant communities, Anglicans distinguished the lawful conformity of Protestant family men, and later defecting ex-missionaries, from the selfish greed of mercenary papist bishops deemed “common cutthroats”.\textsuperscript{178} who served Henry, Edward and Mary solely through fear of
losing their many privileges. Adapting Biblical analogies, Foxe, Ponet and Bale linked Marian bishops with Israel’s idolatrous enemies, and implied that these persecutors would have ultimately betrayed Queen Mary if she ceased to be useful. Bonner and Gardiner’s earlier willingness to shift between popery and Anglicanism was branded cowardly and opportunistic, making them wicked Tudor counterparts to the Jewish priests who left Zion vulnerable to conquest by Babylon.

By the 1590s, a divide emerged in the English Catholic community: between moderate, nonviolent secular priests deemed “loyal subjects,” and Jesuits accused of furthering their ends through lies, conspiracy and treason. Although most secular priests still considered themselves Catholics attempting to reconcile Elizabeth with Rome, they exploited the persecutions to eliminate their rivals and assume control over England’s recusant community. Others, disillusioned by prolonged exile abroad or the unpleasantness of imprisonment at Wisbech Castle, were enticed by offers of an Anglican parish, and proclaimed themselves Protestants through fear for England’s long-term independence, or irreconcilable disagreements with their Catholic superiors. Bell, Mush, Bagshaw and Clarke were uneasy over Cardinal Allen’s apparent endorsement of violence against the lawful Queen, because lay-recusants would bear the brunt of government retribution. Eager to establish common ground with moderate Anglicans, Mush and Bell attributed their submission to anti-Spanish patriotism and the superior learning of Protestant ministers who revealed the Pope’s true nature: a power-hungry foreign King seeking to subjugate England. In reality, however, these ex-priests’ conformity and ultimate conversion was motivated primarily by resentment of Jesuits’ alleged extremism, excessive rules, and political interference. Adapting the unflattering language of inversion to implicate Jesuits in a conspiracy with other internal enemies, defecting priests compared their rivals to pharisaic Puritans and suicides, and declared Jesuits wicked heretics “unworthy of the priesthood” for their allegedly overenthusiastic desire for martyrdom.

In response, Jesuits Gordon and Parsons blackened the reputations of rival priests by accusing them of committing crimes during their time in continental seminaries, and before their capture in England, in order to establish parallels with Foxe’s early proto-Puritans who forsook their priestly vocation. By claiming defrocked priests ceased to be Catholics, Jesuits were not merely defending their sect from criticism, but proclaiming England’s entire church hierarchy unlawful. Priests who converted to Anglicanism were depicted as spiritual adulterers who renounced the Mother Church, and the masculine self-control of celibacy, for a decadent false church equated with the Whore of Babylon. By feminising defecting priests as covetous and sexually immoral, Jesuits intended to highlight the unnatural depravity of betraying a church that pre-dated the Tudor monarchy. These apostates allegedly bore grudges against the Catholic Church, like being passed over for promotion; selfish jealousy of fellow priests; or being expelled from the seminary for lusting after women. Unlike Jesuits gaining heavenly rewards for their self-sacrifice, apostatising priests allegedly lived unhappy lives as comeuppance for betraying church and Pope. Of the six books covertly printed in London by Parsons, one dealt with Nichols, an Anglican minister and insincere Catholic convert described as the “disciple of bawdy Bale.” Seeking to raise recusant morale, Parsons and Alfield denied Nichols was a Jesuit, and accused him of ignorance, conceit
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and childish egotism for choosing the false Protestant church (representing a deviant, illegitimate parody of universal Christianity) not through misguided zeal, but for earthly enrichment.\textsuperscript{191}

My research suggests that, for prisoners, fear of death was a much more effective long-term motive for conformity than the punishments themselves, especially for married Marian Protestants who feared leaving their families destitute, and hoped that future good deeds would provide opportunities for atonement. Although the primary motive of Elizabethan Catholic and Marian Protestant conformists was terror, there was also some consent; many church papists and moderate Puritans deemed conformity to Elizabeth’s Anglican Church vital for their personal survival, and the long-term triumph of their ideology, because they could achieve more by internally directing localised religious reforms; persuading officials to eliminate other sects; and secretly aiding imprisoned friends. Unlike willing and reluctant conformists who compromised with the regime in order to minimise the bloodshed and disorder, however, many Jesuits and Puritans deemed conformity under Elizabeth or Mary a shameful sign of weakness and faithlessness, in order to highlight their own sect’s claims to be exclusive and uncorrupted. The implication was that formerly decisive patriarchs were seduced by deceitful, feminised Elizabethan or Marian false ministers, and spurned true religion in favour of committing spiritual adultery with an inferior and immoral false church. Although the momentary lapse of a foolish and weak layperson could occasionally be excused, a clergyman’s renunciation of his faith was deemed unforgivable, because priests and ministers were expected to lead through example and overcome temptation, rather than revert to bestial spiritual adultery. Oath-breaking and treachery were deemed so depraved and unnatural, that the perpetrator lost his Christian identity as a result of forsaking universal masculine codes of honour, righteousness, self-control and courage: the implication being that impenitent men who betrayed the true elect were doubtlessly guilty of other, worse transgressions against both church and secular hierarchy.

**Spies and Informers**

Preliminary analysis of Gatrell suggests that there was little doubt regarding the short-term general effectiveness of early modern mechanisms of coercion: torture, imprisonment and the threat of death or expropriation forced many transgressors to recant and implicate others.\textsuperscript{192} As Wood argues, however, the Tudor government’s ability to punish criminals depended on evidence acquired through the willingness of subordinates to betray one another to their rulers.\textsuperscript{193} I will address the issue of whether spies were motivated by fear of punishment, or consent: some form of privilege, reward, or charitable desire to contribute to England’s national security. Fearful that any weakness would result in the underground congregation’s fragmentation, Elizabethan Catholic and Anglican martyrlogists often portrayed earlier informants in negative sexual terms, to imply that betrayal was a deceitful, depraved and feminine crime, and spies, like harlots, lacked any loyalty or affection for their employers. Additionally, I will discuss themes of evolution, especially the Anglican regime’s efforts to attract reluctant Puritan conformists by adapting existing concepts of civic duty to justify infiltrating recusant networks. As theorised by Foucault, early modern governments praised and rewarded one favoured social group at the expense of an allegedly
deviant minority, to increase control over a divided population, and provide examples of good behaviour for subjects to follow. Counter to the moral dilemma of betraying one employer to another, I will discuss Puritan justifications for reporting treasonous conspiracies, including fear that indifference to Catholic infiltration endangered monarch, church, and secular patriarchal hierarchy.

Throughout the Tudor period, the definition of a heretic or traitor was rewritten according to the religious climate, meaning both Catholics and Protestants could be punished for contradicting official centralisation and standardisation of religious doctrine. Henrician Lollards were given an opportunity to recant and do penance, by bearing a wooden faggot in a ritualised procession that not only celebrated the prestige of church and state, but also highlighted the powerlessness of the King’s vanquished enemies. Lord Chancellor More persuaded Henry to enforce the punishments for Lollardry on Lutherans: requiring clergymen to identify and prosecute heretics, and the secular authorities to burn them to prevent England’s contamination with barbarous error, anticlericalism and rebellion. Fearing heresy and papist rejection of royal supremacy would evolve into contempt for the King, post-schism Henrician officials waged a propaganda campaign to convince every subject that the regime was capable of seeking retribution for any “tumult and uproar” caused by the spreading of rumours. Local officials were offered bounties to “cease and destroy all manner of heresies and errors,” and reassert the social order by punishing alleged rumour-mongers with jail, execution, or at least a ruined reputation that would bring ostracism in the community.

After the Marian persecutions, an atmosphere of paranoia and fear of invasion permeated the Elizabethan Anglican Church due to the actions of turncoats who betrayed Protestants to the previous Catholic regime. Eager to differentiate the godly Protestant minority from the hostile papist multitude, conformist Puritans Foxe and Wilkinson depicted the apostates Hart, Constantine and Philips as shameless, mercenary papists masquerading as Protestants, who infiltrated Edward’s church to undermine godly preachers. Consistent with early Christian predictions of persecutions heralding the end-time, Anglicans and Puritans contrasted masculine Protestant values of self-sacrifice and honour with corrupt, feminised Marian priests and Catholic gentry supposedly using bribes and threats to divide families and turn ungrateful servants against their godly masters. By depicting spies as convicted thieves, gamblers, whoremongers and debtors whose immoral lives and later stigmatisation in the community reflected the depravity of betraying one’s own friends, Foxe and Bishop Vaughan could draw parallels with contemporary Sabbath-breakers, “lewd priests” and recusants whose behaviour contradicted the Anglican norm. Upset with allegations of betraying young Marian heretic Julius Palmer to the Marian authorities, Northampton preacher Thackham wrote to Foxe demanding vindication. Although Thackham was ultimately absolved, sporadic attacks on “crafty, ungodly, fond and foolish” Protestant apostates continued, prompting Foxe to differentiate between unwilling, repentant informers, and untrustworthy perjurers whose presence rendered the Anglican Church vulnerable. The Marian regime’s willingness to reward, not punish, the latter allegedly highlighted popery’s inherently treacherous
and unchristian nature, setting subjects against one another in an unnatural reversal of Edwardian religious centralisation intended to unite the people and reassert the prestige of the family unit. 207 Due to a common hatred of foreign Catholic nations, the Elizabethan government allowed Puritan conformists to participate in the persecution of Northern papists in order to prevent internal conflicts within the Anglican Church, and give post-Marian Protestants a sense of purpose, identity, and opportunity for advancement. 208 Deeming Puritans more trustworthy and reliable than church-papists, Bishop Bancroft equated government agents who exposed and suppressed pagan popish idolatry with the Israelite spies who led Joshua’s army into Canaan. 209 Unlike fearful Catholic informers, Protestant agents like Constable and Gilbert felt no remorse, and justified the persecution of priests with claims to be dutiful subjects enforcing the Queen’s policy of creating a new Israelite godly commonwealth. 210 These spies identified areas of England with a Catholic majority for the regime to investigate, and reconquer by sending reformist ministers to break up recusant networks, and convince laypeople to report missionary priests associated with idolatry, devilish witchcraft, and Papal tyranny. 211 Besides judges, sheriffs, jailers and other local officials, ordinary subjects were required to aid the investigation of recusancy if it was in any way relevant to them, meaning anyone could receive royal warrant to apprehend priests. 212 The itinerant professional priest hunter George Eliot, an ex-convict, deemed espionage a form of redemption, and credited Anglican sermons for transforming him from a thief and rapist into a respected, rational official and zealous Puritan patriot whose responsibilities gave him a newfound respect for the law, and the self-control to overcome his youthful, bestial urges. 213 Unlike conformist Puritans motivated by zeal, duty or personal gain, most Elizabethan Catholic informers were motivated by suspicion of the Jesuits, and fear of retribution or hardship. Deeming treachery the basest form of dishonour, the government distrusted these papists, and frequently cast them aside when rendered superfluous. 214 As an example, Welsh doctor William Parry (employed to spy on Catholics), was hanged for plotting to assassinate Elizabeth in 1584, prompting Lord Burghley to denounce Parry as a “miserable, wretched natural-born subject of no religion” for betraying both Catholic and Anglican Churches. 215 Fearing that Catholic informants feigned loyalty to conceal their own criminality, spymaster Sir Francis Walsingham hired other spies, including convict Vincent Murphy, to monitor the movements of his papist agents and ensure that these new recruits were not fifth columnists with their own dubious agenda. 216 However, the combined testimonies of dishonourable prisoner, and respectable Protestant gentleman, were useful for a regime seeking to amass credible evidence against Jesuits and their accomplices. 218 By establishing their own Anglican credentials, and spying on retired Marian priests like Gilbert Bourne, former church-papists like gentleman Richard Shelley or physician Matthew Pattenson could reduce the possibility of investigation into their own affairs, and potentially regain assets seized by the government. 219 Aware of their positions’ precariousness, Elizabethan spies portrayed themselves in self-deprecating terms; Nichols, an Anglican minister who pretended to convert to Catholicism in order to infiltrate the seminary at Rome, proclaimed it was better to be a “fool who professeth the truth than a wise man that commits idolatry” because regardless of Jesuits’ scholarly credentials and self-flagellation
to appear pious, they were irrevocably damned for defying their natural Queen. By claiming Jesuits “irritated and exasperated the prince with foolish books, lewd pamphlets and dangerous letters” ex-priests Gifford, Tyrel, Mush, and Tedder could portray themselves as “dutiful subjects” upholding the Queen’s secular laws in imitation of Christ obeying Caesar.

Adapting existing concepts of negative feminisation, Catholic priests argued that Elizabethan spies lost their masculine rationality due to the inherently depraved and heretical nature of perjuring against Papal representatives. Eager to depict the Anglican Church as inherently deviant and chaotic, Jesuits drew parallels between contemporary informers and the fallen disciple Judas lustig after silver, in order to highlight the betrayed missionary priests’ saint-like courage, Christ-like selflessness and steadfastness. Jesuits’ disdain for spies reflected their close knit military based structure, where discipline and loyalty to one’s comrades were vital for winning the war on heresy, and informants were feminised as devious Puritan agents who profited from the downfall of honest priests rather than earning respect through hard work.

In an attack on the Puritan concept of spontaneous civic duty, Jesuits depicted spies as amoral Protestants using false religious zeal as pretext for robbery, and the localised forced implementation of heretical religious reforms not approved by the central authorities. Rejecting Foxe’s claim Marian persecutors were criminal criminals, Crichton, Parsons and Southwell claimed renegade Catholic informers, and their Puritan handlers, were disorderly troublemakers barred from God’s Kingdom because their own families had disowned them. Such was the notoriety of ex-priests Cecil, Bagshaw and Munday, Jesuits proclaimed them benchmarks for other apostate Catholics, who risked plunging England into evildoing and atheism through their increasingly depraved acts. Seeking explanations for the government’s successful apprehension of fugitive missionaries, Catholic priest Batt adapted and subverted Anglican claims of divine favour by proclaiming spies’ betrayal of their own friends was actually part of God’s plan of hastening pure Jesuits to the calling of martyrdom. The spies’ increasingly wicked acts seemingly confirmed that they had sold their souls to the heretics; while the Elizabethan regime’s reliance on disreputable, criminal informants was attributed to fear that superior priestly warrior-scholars would expose Protestant doctrine as false, and thus discredit official efforts to unlawfully venerate Elizabeth.

Due to the feigned conversions of many avowed Protestant agents, new recruits to the seminary were viewed with suspicion by fellow Jesuits, until they could prove their trustworthiness, piety and Catholic credentials. By publicly confessing their “errors and iniquities;” defending Catholic doctrine from criticism; and writing denunciations of Anglican heresy, ex-Protestants like Wadsworth could differentiate themselves from self-serving infiltrators like Bell, Tedder, Munday, and Tyrel (or Tyrrell). The longstanding feelings of guilt among surviving spies (especially ex-priests) attested to the success of Catholic martyrologists in demonising spies whose hindering of the Counter-Reformation mission, and rejection of Christ’s successor the Pope, was akin to selling one’s soul to Satan in return for short-term survival. Many unwilling Elizabethan informers were ashamed of betraying Catholicism under duress, and feared losing their religious identity and salvation after prolonged contact with heretics. A gender bias is evident in Catholic portrayals of informants; sympathetic depictions were mostly restricted to high-status
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laywomen like Elizabeth Hill, whose childlike vulnerability to deception made them less blameworthy than self-serving male defectors who were expected to overcome hardship. My research suggests that, concurrent with Foucault’s more general analysis, 16th-century Catholic informants’ terror, depression, and tendency to blame Puritans for their own inadequacy, stemmed from inability to reconcile two concepts of good: duty to monarch and church. Stigmatised by the Jesuits for forsaking martyrdom, ex-priest Tyrel tried to save face in his public confession, and a letter to Lord Burghley, by depicting himself not as a coward, heretic or traitor seeking an easy life, but a weak victim who submitted after prolonged torture, fear for his family’s welfare, and desire to make amends with his Protestant cousin Anthony Cook. This is comparable to Henrician lay-brother Richard List who, terrified of the hanging and disembowelment awaiting traitors, agreed to inform upon fellow monks at Greenwich during the 1530s so his mother would not lose her son.

My source analysis has identified two distinct types of spies: unwilling prisoners motivated by coercion, and professional agents who infiltrated underground Elizabethan Catholic or Marian Protestant sects with the sole intent of bringing them down. Although Gregory correctly argues that anyone could become an informer given the right level of coercion, the ‘typical’ Tudor spy was represented as a disgraced young man with a sexually deviant or criminal background. Due to the perverseness of betrayal, Catholic and Protestant martyrologists alike depicted infiltrators from rival sects as immoral, self-serving atheists shunned by their own families, and subsequently expelled from God’s elect for their prodigality, law-breaking, and double treachery against the monarch or Pope, and their former friends, on behalf of a third party. However, there was much evolution in Elizabethan Puritan perceptions of avowed Protestant spies, who were depicted not as disloyal or low-born mercenaries, but as dutiful and respectable subjects who defended the Anglican Church from schism, and whose reliable testimonies enabled the central government to direct resources to regions requiring further church reform. When these Puritans infiltrated recusant networks to bring them down, they gained credibility among Anglicans who, as Ha has noted, normally viewed radical reluctant conformists with suspicion. Despite the prospect of reward, however, these Puritans were also motivated by fear: that failure to prove their trustworthiness would spark future persecutions of their sect, while indifference to malevolent conspiracies could result in papists instigating rebellion, foreign invasion, and conflict.

Conclusion

To conclude, the underlying motive behind depictions of non-martyrs was fear; martyrologists, conformists and informers all feared official retribution and embarked on a process of self-censorship to avoid drawing attention to themselves, or confirming opponents’ claims that the suppression of underground Catholic or Protestant sects was not a religious persecution, but the impartial investigation of a criminal organisation. My analysis of apostates, spies, and offenders denied recognition suggests that non-martyrs were defined primarily by their behaviour in life, as their treatment before death and manner of execution differed little from that of approved martyrs. Despite efforts by condemned heretics and
rebels to proclaim themselves not secular criminals, but martyrs, the final decision rested with contemporary Catholic, Puritan or Anglican propagandists who generally favoured the most learned and godly individuals, especially clergymen who outwardly obeyed secular laws. The behaviour of non-martyrs from rival sects was recorded extensively by martyrrologists seeking to explain what a good Catholic or Protestant was not, and to warn readers of the consequences of treachery. In the long-term, it was hoped that recurrent unflattering depictions of rival sects in print would result in their rejection by the people, and their remembrance not as a persecuted minority, but as dangerous, dehumanised conspirators associated with chaos and division.

As discussed earlier, my definition of government included not only aristocratic advisers and secular MPs with regional power, but also Anglican bishops who, despite their subordination to the monarch, maintained the ability to fine recusants, prosecute Catholic priests, and burn nonconforming Protestant heretics. Although Elizabethan Anglican officials relied on local cooperation, many conformist Puritans and church-papist commoners feared the monarch was indeed omnipotent, and capable of identifying and punishing those who failed their duty of reporting seditious rumours. Official efforts to draw parallels between the monarch and a terrifying God tormenting sinners’ souls were primarily motivated by fear of disorder, and the realisation that state power had its limits; as argued by Foucault, Wood and McClendon, it was impossible for the central government to totally suppress dissent through force alone. In a variant of the feminisation discussed earlier, the Elizabethan government equated Jesuits and Puritans with angry disaffected youths, because, despite their hot blood and courage, radicals allegedly lacked the patience and self-control of older men, and could rashly resort to violence or law-breaking to further their aims. Adapting this official depiction to contrast the godliness and exclusivity of their own sect with the wickedness of their rivals, Anglicans, Puritans and Jesuits represented spies, apostates and traitors as insolent, deviant and sexually immoral, because the betrayal of one’s church, kin, monarch, or country was equated with patricide and contempt for God’s right to appoint earthly rulers. Thus, martyrrologist and persecutor were motivated by fear of disorder, contradiction and rebellion; if a sect lost its credibility, laypeople could potentially defect to other churches. This had particularly serious implications for Catholic priests whose very authority depended upon popular acceptance of the Pope as Christ’s infallible earthly successor; and for Anglicans whose religious and secular hierarchies were underpinned by absolute outward acceptance of what Derrida termed the royal personality cult.
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[Fig. 13]: Illustrations by Foxe depicting Bishop Bonner flogging a Protestant with a bundle of birch twigs [a], and burning a prisoner with a candle. [b] Puritan minister Foxe reinterpreted Bonner's attempt to infantilise and exert power over young low-status heretics as proof of the entire Catholic clergy's depravity, because the undignified job of torturing prisoners normally fell to a low-born executioner (often a former prisoner). After the ex-Bishop of London's immortalisation in the Acts and Monuments as a cruel persecutor, ladybirds were nicknamed Bishybarnabees (Bishop Bonner's bees) in rural East Anglia because these red beetles resembled drops of blood from the heretics Bonner allegedly enjoyed scourging.
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Chapter 5: Representations of Supportive and Hostile Crowds.

Sixteenth-century executions were public spectacles; large crowds observed the final moments of Marian Protestants and Elizabethan Catholics with the intent of either reviling the wicked criminal, or reassuring and encouraging the godly martyr. Martyrologists from every sect depicted crowds in abstract terms: they might signify England’s collective consciousness; they might be neutral background characters; or, if hostile, they might represent obstacles for the divinely chosen minority to redeem or overcome. In many instances, little mention was made of the multitude’s composition, other than vague references to the poor or the young, although eyewitness statements (including those of Catholic merchant Machyn and Anglican chronicler Stow) suggest that many gentlemen and respectable members of the middling-sort also observed the executions. Tudor society was not merely divided between Catholics and Protestants, but also between the government and commoners; the gallows crowd was feared by the educated elite as an unpredictable and dangerous “many headed monster,”¹ to quote Munro. Jesuits, Puritans, and the Elizabethan Anglican government, sought to convert the large, religiously neutral majority using a combination of Terror (the threat of gruesome punishment in this life or the next); and Consent (reminding subjects of their duty to serve church, monarch or country). In my review of the existing historiography, terror and consent were not always incompatible, because, concurrent with the belief in a terrifying but benevolent God, subjects were expected to both fear and love their monarch. By combining gruesome executions with a festive atmosphere providing a break from daily work based routines, the London based central government could gain the cooperation of the religiously neutral faction of the mob that, according to Lake, attended executions out of curiosity or bloodthirstiness.² Due to the scarcity of primary sources, I will rely primarily on propagandistic pamphlets, official proclamations and martyrologies to uncover the conflict between different evangelising factions, regarding expected behaviour of both the onlookers and the condemned during the Marian and Elizabethan persecutions. To what extent did the martyrs and members of the crowd uphold or violate these ideals?

**Government expectations**

This chapter will apply elements of Foucault’s approach to public executions to the context of Tudor England: namely the use of disproportionate punishments by a regime seeking to terrify subjects into submission and confirm its own claim of omnipotence by ridiculing and emasculating criminals.³ The patriarchal governments of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth feared sedition: the spreading of rumours that could, ultimately, bring about rebellion and chaos to the benefit of England’s internal enemies. The reaction of the crowd, whether hostile or sympathetic to the condemned man, was manipulated and portrayed by government and underground sects alike for their own ends. Crowds that appeared sympathetic to a martyr’s fate terrified the regime, because low-status subjects’ objection to the decreed punishments implied insolence and disorderliness. Sharpe argued that early modern governments utilised theatrical spectacle to redress imbalances to the hierarchy through the ritualised destruction of criminals’ bodies.⁴ Moreover, I will propose that this procedure was motivated primarily by the regime’s
fear of usurpation, loss of privileges, and rejection by their inferiors. Besides providing a foretaste of hell, these punishments were a lesson for commoners: defiance brought death, but humility, submission to authority, and admission of wrongdoing could lead to a reprieve, or at least salvation in the afterlife.\(^5\)

Fearing the chaotic connotations of large crowds gathering at public events, the Tudor regime attempted to control and indoctrinate the multitude by asserting royal claims of omnipotence, and providing dehumanised scapegoats in the form of criminals and religious dissidents for the mob to denounce and torment. Combining Scripture with the Classically-influenced Humanist ideas of Erasmus and More [fig.7], the Henrician government argued that the patriarchal hierarchy was divinely ordained, and the King’s duty was to protect his subjects and reward loyal service.\(^6\) At this time, church and state were inextricably linked; just as disobedience of the monarch was equated with disobedience to God, so too were heresy or recusancy deemed rebellion against a ruler whose word was law.\(^7\) Seeking to restore England to its pre-schism state, Mary took a subordinate role to the Pope in religious affairs, but maintained her secular authority.\(^8\) The depiction of bishops as both Papal representatives and royal servants enabled Mary to link her own policies to those of her father, who, even after the 1533 schism, expected bishops to suppress unauthorised preachers.\(^9\) The ideal subject was required to respect his superiors, standing trial rather than fleeing justice, and appearing repentant in the hope his wise, benevolent monarch would forgive his transgressions.\(^10\) Everyone was expected to serve prince, church and country to the best of their abilities, by reporting chaotic, “seditious and slanderous tales and news”\(^11\) that contradicted Elizabethan Anglican or Marian Catholic sermons.\(^12\) The notion of civic duty was particularly appealing for conforming Elizabethan Puritans, who (as discussed previously) spontaneously aided the persecution of recusants suspected of hindering internal church reforms.

The official definition of sedition included the engagement of low-status subjects in any activity that challenged royal authority, including gathering without permission, grumbling about state affairs, spreading rumours, or refusing to attend church.\(^13\) As Mears argues, the monarchy’s dominance over church and state depended on its ability to protect its subjects from Satan and his human allies, and successfully suppress dissent.\(^14\) If no evidence of a regicidal plot or uprising could be found, the government fabricated one, resulting in papists and heretics alike being depicted as a dangerous other, whose rejection of royal church supremacy was attributed to malice against the ruler.\(^15\) Elizabethan Bishop Cox deemed the papist church hierarchy a malevolent, venomous “hydra,”\(^16\) and stressed the urgency of discrediting and destroying its heads (missionary priests in England) to reverse the spread of error and insolence; and prevent apathetic conservative laypeople from becoming assimilated into this serpent’s body.\(^17\) Seeking to suppress any lingering pre-Reformation nostalgia, fellow Anglican Bishops Jewel, Bridges, and spies like Murphy portrayed underground Catholic congregations as “spiders’ cobwebs”\(^18\) linked to the Pope who, as Satan’s offspring and antichrist, was blamed for all disorder and injustice in the world. Such depictions enabled Elizabeth’s supporters to draw parallels with Henry’s post-schism consolidation of his authority, and divide the post-persecution population by instilling a sense of fear towards priests and other disorderly strangers from outside the established Anglican community.\(^19\)

The disproportionate, ritualised punishment of being burned or hanged, drawn and quartered [fig.6] signified not only the state's potency, but also a return to normality by totally destroying the physical remains of heretics and traitors who risked tearing England asunder. The Elizabethan government hanged Catholic priests for high treason and Praemunire (appealing to Papal jurisdiction in regards to secular crimes normally judged by the monarch), because unauthorised preaching contravened official efforts to streamline Anglican doctrine. Pre-execution defrocking enabled the regime to literally expel offenders from the Church by using secular sumptuary laws to remove renegade clerics’ privileges and turn them into dehumanised targets of ridicule. When stripped of their vestments, priests and heretics ceased to be legitimate clergymen, and lost their masculinity, identity, and finally their lives for their alleged defiance. Gatrell’s construct of absolute state power over the criminal’s body could also be applied posthumously, to imply the divinely appointed monarch was empowered to deprive criminals of an afterlife. Fearing the unpredictable multitude would exploit public executions as an excuse to riot, Tudor governments desecrated the corpses of recusants and heretics to prevent their veneration, by displaying their body-parts to rot and be eaten by crows, or by interring intact corpses (such as that of Cardinal Fisher) face-down, in the belief that offenders’ souls would descend straight to hell. Such burials, intended to posthumously shame the offender, could be carried out in an isolated corner of the churchyard, or on unclean, unconsecrated ground such as a rubbish-heap or beneath the gallows. This practise continued throughout the period; after Bishop Bonner’s death in prison, he was buried at night to prevent a “flocking of papists” making pilgrimages to his grave, and remind Elizabethan recusants that even if a criminal escaped execution, he would face divine retribution for disobeying his earthly superiors.

Although the Henrician, Marian and Elizabethan regimes prized literacy, many religious books were prohibited through fear they contained subliminal, coded messages urging evildoing, insurrection or regicide. As Bosmajian argued, the destruction of inanimate objects in early modern Europe served as a warning for dissidents to abjure, or join their texts on the bonfire in retribution for stealing the souls of ignorant laymen. Exploiting the crowd’s fascination with festive bonfires, officials publicly burned “seditious books” as a foretaste of the fate awaiting inaccessible exiled traitors and heretics destined for hell. By totally destroying political opponents’ written legacy besides their physical remains, the regime aimed to reassert its prestige and power over dissidents; harness the carnival atmosphere to calm the fearful populace; and convince the multitude to accept official religious centralisation. Eager to discredit heresy as slanderous fraud or witchcraft, Marian officials branded Edwardian vernacular texts erroneous because they were derived from mistranslated Latin Scripture, and weakened the hierarchy by claiming that duty to Pope and Queen were incompatible. These books corrupted and feminised educated men into open disobedience, and had to be ritually cleansed by fire like the pagan idols destroyed by the early Christians. Elizabeth was equally fearful of appearing weak, and thus perpetuated Henrician book-burnings as a means to focus popular and official outrage upon both papists and Puritan separatists whose promotion of alternative religious lifestyles risked internal conflict. In the 1590s, radical Puritans like Thacker and Copping were branded “lewd, evil-disposed persons” whose public immolation
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alongside their works ensured nothing was left for posterity. Their forced recantations were intended to discredit all nonconformists as irrational, childlike and erroneous, in the hope that executed radicals would slip into obscurity as a result of rejection by the people. Subsequently, conformist Puritans like Finch and Fulke adapted earlier anti-heresy laws to attack Papal Bulls as poisonous, and papists as ungrateful madmen, in the hope of diverting Elizabeth’s wrath against disobedient Jesuits whose promotion of idolatry endangered not only the souls of stubborn recusants, but also the English confessional state’s existence.

In 1536, 1549 and 1569, Catholic rebellions threatened to undermine the legitimacy of Henry and his heirs as uncorrupted successors to the Pope, prompting later Anglican propagandists (including Jacobean officials who witnessed Percy, Catesby and Fawkes’ 1605 plot to blow up Parliament with gunpowder) to equate popery with violence and treachery. Fearing a repeat of this instability, Elizabethan Anglicans attributed the contemporary crowd’s reluctance to participate in the execution of priests to malice; ingratitude; and papist sympathies. After the 1569 Northern Rebellion; Elizabeth’s 1571 excommunication; and the failed 1588 Armada, government officials Powell and Bishop Matthew portrayed Anglican religious centralisation as a conflict between the respectable Protestant elite and ignorant recusants, whose subjugation depended upon the use of both printed texts and physical force. Wilfred Holme of Huntingdon, a witness to the 1536 and 1569 Northern rebellions, accused recusant protesters of treason for putting the Pope before their monarch, and thus risking not only earthly punishment, but also damnation. Although Elizabethan recusant violence (such as Durham gentleman Norton’s firing of a fowling-piece to distract priest hunters) was unusual, Anglicans exploited memories of earlier rebellions to justify the continued hanging of priests, and accuse recusants of contempt not only for local officials, but also for their divinely appointed royal patron. Fearing educated men could lead the gullible mob into inflicting worse damage upon the infrastructure, Tudor officials targeted priests, using forced confessions extracted from prisoners to justify punishing disobedient clergymen as deviant, criminal masterminds who roused ignorant commoners with false rumours. The Elizabethan government retrospectively rejected any religious element to earlier uprisings, and instead portrayed leading protesters not as law-abiding subjects concerned by the Dissolution of the Abbeys or the spread of heresy, but as traitors and jealous criminals conspiring to murder the secular elite.

In sum, the Tudor regime’s expectation for low-ranking subjects to appear humble and submissive represented continuity throughout the period, because assembled crowds of young master-less men were feared as inherently disorderly and dangerous. The exception, however, was when respectable, trustworthy subjects intervened to defend the lawful government, by denouncing powerless prisoners, or pledging allegiance to a ruler who expected unquestioning devotion. By portraying executed heretics or papists as dehumanised scapegoats for an outraged population to denounce, government propagandists could confirm Henry, Edward, Mary or Elizabeth’s claim to be England’s sole patriarchal protector. The people’s acceptance or rejection of government propaganda was signified by regional gallows crowds’ treatment of condemned men. Moving on from this contextualisation, the following section will discuss
Jesuit, Puritan and Anglican efforts to harness the gallows crowd’s collective horror, fear or sense of humour to argue that the normally law-abiding multitude, as members of the elect, represented England’s repressed collective conscience. For martyrrologists, the people’s sympathy for the priest or heretic implied that something was amiss with the Marian or Elizabethan patriarchal social contract, and reflected more deep-set problems regarding the monarch’s accountability to God.

Supportive Crowds

Catholic and Protestants retrospectively used the gallows crowd’s sympathy for prisoners as a means to claim that the Elizabethan or Marian regime failed to serve the people’s needs. Adapting and expanding upon constructs used by Ryrie in his analysis of early Protestants, I will argue that the unpredictable response of the gallows crowd was grounded in a sense of fairness, and in conflicting perceptions of loyalty and duty. On the one hand, subjects were expected to obey their monarch’s commands, but conversely, it seemed unnatural to mistreat vulnerable, respected members of the hierarchy: especially clergymen whose reverent prayer and bravery at their hanging or burning implied innocence. As proposed by Walter, the outward gestures of condemned priests and heretics shaped their posthumous reputation as either innocent, humble martyrs honouring the secular hierarchy, or cowardly, insolent criminals whose defiance confirmed official and popular fears of disorder. Was the portrayal of sympathetic crowds in martyrrologies intended to prove Catholicism or Protestantism was entrenched among the low-status majority, or did propagandists use the voice of the crowd to project their own criticisms of the government that would otherwise have been deemed seditious? How did representations of the popular response adapt over time, and to what extent was this shaped by the divide between radicals and moderates within both sects? In a new contribution to the historiography, I will synthesise elements of Walsham and Monta’s methodology to argue that Catholic and Protestant martyrrologists incorporated not only traditional depictions of suffering or seriousness; but also “joyfulness, wit and gallows humour,” to emphasise martyrs’ humanity and portray execution as a joyous and glorious occasion.

These depictions, which could either complement or counter one another, evolved into a conflict drawn on religious lines over which model was the best means to mobilise readers: tragic accounts intended to outrage the audience; or the mostly Puritan use of theatricality and comedy to ridicule contemporary priests and earlier persecutors?

Although the Marian gallows crowd were initially passive and accepting observers, they could potentially be sparked into active defiance if they felt an execution was unjust, and the central government and senior churchmen were ignoring their unwritten social contract to protect the vulnerable. This defiance was retrospectively interpreted by former Protestant exiles Brice, Foxe and Achelly to claim the seeds of Protestantism were already widespread among Marian commoners, whose reluctance to participate in the ritualised executions confirmed the papist regime had lost touch with England’s collective consciousness. Anglicans attributed the crowd’s mourning or anger at the burning of aged Henrician and Marian patriarchs [fig.16] to natural revulsion for popish tyranny. All that was needed to mobilise...
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the crowd was a catalyst in the form of martyred Protestant warrior-scholars like Bradford, Latimer or Samuel giving loud, fiery sermons exposing popery as chaotic, devilish and prejudicial to England’s interests. These dying speeches awakened an apathetic populace, and spurred them into rejecting priests who allegedly abused ancient rituals for personal gain, and misguidedley worshipped the Pope as a demon. Secure Militaristic language appealed to patriotic Elizabethan commoners fearful of Spanish invasion, and hence was used by Anglican Bishops Bridges and Bale to retrospectively depict sympathetic Marian gallows crowds as “valiant soldiers of Christ” aware that Protestant ministers were executed not for heresy, but for urging Queen Mary to exert greater power and control over the church. Comparing Elizabethan progress with Mary’s reign of fear, Anglicans argued that earlier crowds sympathised with martyrs like Cranmer and Ridley because these former bishops had loyally served King Edward, and dutifully resisted Mary’s unlawful surrender of England’s autonomy to Rome. Eager to equate early reformers with order and normality, Elizabeth’s supporters made great efforts to distinguish unlawful Edwardian papist rioting, from the nonviolence of the nascent Marian Protestant crowd allegedly motivated by civic duty and affection for respected clergymen. By voicing words of encouragement, and later spreading word of the martyr’s good deeds, the bystanders safeguarded the dead man’s legacy, and provided a substitute for the funeral that the martyr would otherwise have been denied. Many Elizabethan Puritans portrayed the Marian crowd’s weeping or shocked silence as a conflict of allegiance, caused by the paradox of honouring an unjust monarch while watching the execution of wise, aged patriarchs who had upheld England’s independence. Fearing future persecutions, many younger Presbyterians drew parallels between the passive Marian crowd, and the shocked silence of contemporary bystanders horrified by the regime’s continued punishment of educated men. The people’s collective murmuring, rather than the expected response of jeering the prisoner, implied political awareness, and additionally confirmed that Mary had lost the ability to competently govern England due to repeated abuse of her God-given right to take life. Besides loyally serving King Edward, martyred Bishops Hooper and Ridley utilised humble, passive gestures at odds with typical condemned criminals’ fear or arrogance. The crowd’s spontaneous disgust at Marian priests’ cruelty was depicted by Foxe, Fulke, and Billingsley as proof that most Englishmen rejected corrupt, obsolete pagan popish idolatry, and possessed a natural inclination towards universal, or “true Catholic” Anglican Protestantism. Simple prayers and the singing of hymns, were particularly effective in converting an apathetic crowd because, consistent with Walter’s research, submissive gestures redressed the imbalance to the hierarchy, restored normality, and draw attention to persecutors’ spiteful inability to forgive humble men. Presbyterian ministers Trapp and Penry interpreted the mutilation of Puritans accused of spreading seditious fear as a continuation of Henrician and Marian cruelty, to attack the conservative Anglican episcopacy as a corrupting influence, and contrast nonconformist Protestants’ love for the Queen with papist deceit and treachery. The chroniclers Baker and Camden described the Elizabethan London crowd’s dismayed silence at the excessively cruel punishment of lawyer John Stubbes, who felt duty-bound to oppose Elizabeth’s planned marriage to the French Catholic Duke of Anjou. Protestant contemporaries attributed the removal of
Stubbes’ hand to alleged desire to prevent England’s subjugation to the French, the implication being that he was punished for his patriotism and charitable concern for Elizabeth. Stubbes’ ambiguous cry of “God save the Queen” immediately after his punishment was retrospectively interpreted by later sympathisers not only as a simple pledge of allegiance to the secular hierarchy; but also a literal prayer for God to return Elizabeth to her senses. Eager to establish continuity with Foxe’s early martyrs, Stubbes depicted his low-ranking fellow Puritans passively to demonstrate that they were not a threat to church, Queen or patriarchal hierarchy, but part of the same elect that resisted Marian popery. Deeming separatism a last resort, Stubbes and his fellow Puritans hoped to mobilise laymen against corrupt bishops, in the hope that Elizabeth would prove the continued relevance of the royal personality cult by removing these tyrants as she did to their Marian predecessors Bonner and Tunstall.

Aware of the need to provide proof that the Church of England was the rightful successor to the early church, Elizabethan reformers included portrayals of Marian heretics’ gestures of forgiveness and charity, to draw parallels with Christ’s own asceticism, and retrospectively argue that good Christians gained merit not through insincere rituals, but compassion for one’s fellow men. Unlike priests’ meaningless incantations, Protestant almsgiving confirmed martyrs’ apparently selfless ability to provide for the “poor and needy,” and highlighted the limitations of gruesome punishments when inflicted on innocents endowed with the confidence to treat their execution as one final sermon. Foxe implied that martyrs attended executions in their old fur-lined gowns not through vain desire to avoid shivering (a sign of fear), but so they could bequeath the garments to their friends. Before his burning in Lollards Pit, Norwich academic Bilney forgave his persecutors, including “Friar Bird with one eye,” to prevent the angry crowd from seeking revenge; and because Bilney was aware the friar, blind in both spiritual and temporal affairs, was acting under Bishop Nix’s orders. Laypeople may have disagreed over which rituals were acceptable in the post-1533 church, but universally approved of helping the poor and the sick as a Christian duty that would bring heavenly rewards. The former Marian exiles Foxe, Jewel and Haddon argued that almsgiving established continuity with Henrician proclamations that denounced papists as lazy embezzlers; and with official Elizabethan sermons that encouraged the wealthy to leave bequests for infirm paupers unable to work. At their execution Bilney and Barnes stripped to their shirts and breeches to remind the onlookers that they were preparing to leave this world, besides appearing generous by letting poor people have their clothes. Foxe and Scotsman Alesius, believed the crowd’s sympathy for Bilney’s stoicism at his defrocking not only confirmed the martyred academic’s credentials as a godly, obedient subject, but also foreshadowed later anti-clericalist reforms where direct action in the form of almsgiving supplanted outdated prayers to the saints.

Besides the aforementioned depictions emphasising a martyr’s seriousness, passivity and rationality, Elizabethan Puritans also utilised humour to extol the values of Edwardian education, and ridicule persecutors’ pomp. Foxe, Prid and Cotton frequently depicted the execution as a play, where the anti-clericalist martyr was a tragic hero who escaped damnation for lying, by defying priests’ foolish demands for a false confession. Unlike grave, learned Protestant ministers valiantly defending true religion, priests
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were depicted as clowns; London preacher Bradford allegedly mocked Bishop Bonner’s mitre as a fool’s pointed cap, while cracking jokes about worms and maggots being unable to eat his (Bradford’s) ashes.78 When carried across a muddy field to the stake, Hampshire gentleman Philpot amused the onlookers by asking his persecutors if they intended to make him Pope, in a mockery of pre-Reformation processions intended to highlight the church’s prestige.79 Other martyrs, including Thomas Benet of Exeter and Alice Dryver of Suffolk, mocked priests’ gestures and rituals as the “merry conceits and interludes”80 of a clown, and imitated Christ defying Satan’s seductions by laughing at papists’ misquoting of Scripture.81 In these depictions, Foxe aimed to de-mystify centuries of Catholic tradition and encourage his readers to reject Jesuit missionaries, whose feminised deceit and dependence upon lies and fear contrasted with Protestant martyrs’ down-to-earth honesty; courage; and joy at the prospect of dying on Christ’s behalf. The implication was that Protestants could afford to laugh, because Marian martyrs knew they were part of God’s chosen elect predestined for heaven, unlike hypocritical and impure persecutors set aside by God for burning in the furnace of hell. These papists were damned for the many ugly deeds that were reflected in their un-masculine intemperance; arrogant claims of purity while secretly womanising; unchristian wrath; and physical corpulence.82 [fig.13]

Nonetheless, Anglicans disapproved of the use of humour by Catholics deriding the serious, ritualised spectacle of execution by refusing to atone for their transgressions. These papists were deemed insolent, irreverent and dangerous, because defiant gestures and mockery of royal officials could potentially spark a rebellion.83 Seeking to justify the Henrician schism, and exalt contemporary efforts to create a unified English Protestant confessional state, Edwardian gentleman Hall; 17th-century historian Bacon; and Norfolk scholar Greene retrospectively branded Thomas More a defiant and disrespectful “foolish wise man”84 Instead of appearing penitent and redressing the disruption he caused to Henry’s authority, More arrogantly amused the crowd with gallows jests out of apparent impenitence and malice.85 When the executioner demanded More’s uppermost garment (as was customary), More gave him his cap rather than his gown, and jokingly warned the headsman not to cut his beard.86 As Chancellor, More had sworn an oath to “first look unto God and after God unto the King,”87 but Henrician, Edwardian and Elizabethan Anglicans saw no distinction between royal and divine authority. Any undermining of the royal personality cult had to be swiftly rectified, by displaying traitors’ severed heads as grisly trophies that confirmed the continued relevance of gruesome, horrific punishment as a means to maintain order.

Collective violence was more difficult for the government to punish than that of individuals, but Elizabethan Puritan martyrrologists generally disapproved of spontaneous Protestant rioting, because this worsened religious tensions; undermined the sect’s claim of political neutrality; and endangered innocent lives. Few Marian protesters were punished; Haigh dismisses the majority of youths as “malcontents and hooligans”88 exploiting religious unrest as an opportunity to cause trouble, such as the “wicked knave”89 who disrupted a Catholic sermon by hurling a dagger at royal chaplain Bourne. Fearing contemporary Brownist separatists would follow their Marian forebears’ bad example and assault Elizabethan officials, Puritan ministers Foxe and Perkins depicted allegedly Protestant rioters as irrational boys; ignorant
criminals; or even papist government agents seeking to entrap innocent preachers.\textsuperscript{90} As upholders of order and normality, early Protestant patriarchs were more likely to calm the rioting mob than instigate it, in imitation of Christ stopping St. Peter from assaulting the Jewish priest’s servant in the garden of Gethsemane.\textsuperscript{91} By distancing the godly Protestant elect from the hateful, mindless and lawless rabble, Puritans could distinguish lawful passive resistance from the unlawful, disorganised violence and noisy clamouring of “young people and women”\textsuperscript{92} that destabilised not only the old papist regime, but also the contemporary Anglican secular hierarchy.

Conversely, individual violent acts could, in exceptional cases, be justified by Elizabethan Protestants if directed against inanimate objects associated with the inaccessible Pope.\textsuperscript{93} A dead cat with a “shaven crown”\textsuperscript{94} and paper disc between its paws was hung at Cheapside in mockery of the priest at mass. This was a threat of what would happen to the priests when they were held accountable for their crimes, and an adaptation of the animalistic depictions traditionally used to dehumanise criminals as vermin and scavengers. The Puritans Foxe, Burton and Crowley frequently embellished accounts of Marian anti-Spanish xenophobia, with the intention of unifying contemporary readers against a foreign invader suspected of aiding England’s internal enemies. Criminals condemned for nonreligious crimes gained popular support by adapting the language of Protestant martyrs to attack Mary’s unpopular marriage to King Philip.\textsuperscript{95} One thief, John Tooley, was burned posthumously after preaching on the gallows to a cheering crowd that the Pope was the antichrist.\textsuperscript{96} While Foxe disapproved of law-breaking, Tooley’s anticlericalism provided a useful, symbolic parable, where the repentant petty thief gained redemption by exposing the Pope as a much worse type of criminal: an unrepentant murderer, fraud and extorter.\textsuperscript{97} This allegory enabled Elizabethan propagandists (including Lord Burghley’s servant Barnaby Googe) to retrospectively demonise contemporary priests as depraved traitors and “Romish rebels”\textsuperscript{98} who had forfeited the people’s respect by aligning with England’s chaotic enemies, and forsaking royal supremacy.

Counter to Foxe’s mockery of respected Marian Catholics, Counter-Reformation martyrlogists focused upon the piety, benevolence and zeal of executed Elizabethan priests whose submissive “sacrifice to the multitude”\textsuperscript{99} moved the initially hostile lay-Protestant mob to pity. Although recusant communities continued to exist in the South, priests developed the concept of a North-South divide to equate both the violence and passive resistance of Marian London crowds with rebellion against God.\textsuperscript{100} Londoners’ vulgar cheering of burned Marian heretics highlighted the crowd’s infantile irrationality and ignorance, being allegedly unable to distinguish between chaotic Protestant rabble-rousers, and genuine, benevolent priests.\textsuperscript{101} Later Jesuits Fitzherbert, Barrett, Anderson, and exiled Benedictine Sirenus Cressy depicted London crowds as insincere Protestants, or even pagans, open to conversion through either intervention by God and his angels, or through their own innate compassion for the suffering of their fellow men.\textsuperscript{102} Even Elizabethan Protestants who, in their youth, had witnessed the Marian burnings could be shocked by excessive acts of “Scythian cruelty”\textsuperscript{103} by the regime; one executioner supposedly refused to disembowel Richard Lampton, and a bystander was arrested for criticising the slow, bloody deaths of Haddock and his companions as disproportionate to their alleged offence. With hindsight, priests hoped
that by discrediting radical Puritans, the Anglican Church would fragment and the conservative, religiously neutral majority would reconcile with Rome to prevent the spread of chaos and atheism.\textsuperscript{104}

Catholic portrayals of sympathetic recusant crowds represented evolution, as Counter-Reformation priests reinterpreted Foxe’s portrayal of cheering London Protestant crowds to argue that many regions of South had become corrupted by heresy and ignorance, which, over time, developed into stubbornness and open malice towards legitimate priests. Fearful of losing their influence over the conservative Catholic North, Allen and Bristow exploited the aforesaid North-South divide, to claim Yorkshire recusants were already good Catholics and thus did not need re-conversion, unlike Southern Protestants who had allegedly sympathised with Marian heretics and rejected contemporary missionary priests.\textsuperscript{105}

Jesuits exploited conservative readers’ fears of chaos by warning that prolonged attendance of Anglican Churches would ultimately bring the same corruption and social decay witnessed in the South, and that it was the duty of every Northern recusant to proclaim their allegiance to the Catholic elect rather than the error-ridden Anglican Israel. The ritualised executions of priests, intended to demonstrate royal power, were superseded by the Northern recusant crowd’s participation in ancient, superior Catholic rituals, especially Latin prayers.\textsuperscript{106} Hart and Rastell proclaimed recusants’ rejection of Anglican error not seditious or treasonous, but the voice of the common man fearful of unwelcome heretical church reforms directed by distant London based officials.\textsuperscript{107} Deeming the Northern crowd an organised, politically aware network of Catholics, priests attributed bystanders’ respectful silence to awe at the saint-like stoicism of executed Jesuit missionaries who forgave their tormentors, and proclaimed ignorance of any wrongdoing.\textsuperscript{108} Subverting the typical carnival atmosphere associated with public executions, respectable Northerners, especially women, accompanied Jesuits like 50-year-old John Boste to their hanging, in imitation of the Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalene at Golgotha.\textsuperscript{109} Attired in black like mourners, these recusants provided a sombre and reverent backdrop to the martyr’s final sermon, and transformed the execution from a theatrical performance into a funeral by honouring priests denied Christian burial.\textsuperscript{110}

Fearing the post-1569 Northern crowd’s sympathy towards condemned criminals would inspire general contempt for secular authority, Anglicans and Puritans infantilised low-status lay-Catholics as foolish, ignorant boys controlled by priests and disloyal rebel gentry.\textsuperscript{111} The recusant multitude’s collective violence implied inability to rationally discuss matters with Protestant ministers representing regional extensions of royal authority.\textsuperscript{112} Seeking to justify Elizabeth’s religious centralisation as vital for preventing disorder, and to portray recusants’ forced recantations as consensual re-education, Lord Burghley’s secretary Michael Hicks; Bishop Sandys; and gentleman Richard Molyneux, branded high-status recusants and missionary priests deceitful masterminds who exploited the Northern crowd’s gullibility. Jesuit Thurstan Hunt’s alleged claim that “it was no offence to kill a Protestant”\textsuperscript{113} was attributed to malicious desire to instigate rioting, and subsequently break fellow priests out of prison. Unlike his low-status followers who were pardoned or jailed, Thomas, Duke of Northumberland, was beheaded for “open villainy, open papistry, and open treason,”\textsuperscript{114} due to his leading role in the failed 1569 Rebellion.\textsuperscript{115} Seeking to depict himself as a martyr for posterity, Northumberland utilised unusual
egalitarian language to win the Northern crowd’s support, by calling himself “simple Tom” and refusing to pray for Elizabeth because he no longer deemed her a fellow Christian. As testified by Anglican Sherriff Thomas Gargrave and Puritan printer William Seres, several insolent Catholics rejoiced, being not offended by Northumberland’s insolence, but sympathising with his belief that he was protecting England from deceitful Protestant courtiers. For Anglicans, however, the crowd’s cheering implied that every papist was an untrustworthy potential rebel, and that Northern recusants harboured a longstanding resentment not only towards the Anglican monarchy, but the law itself. Within this context, the continued persecution and containment of ungrateful papists represented a matter of national security, vital for protecting a monarch credited for England’s long-term prosperity.

My research suggests that martyrrologists from every sect claimed that the crowd were sympathetic to humble youths and grave, wise teachers whose charitable criticisms were intended to improve, not destabilise or weaken, England. The bystanders’ silent refusal to participate in the ritualised execution of priests and heretics was intended to evoke a funerary atmosphere and confirm that, as argued by Walter, the concerns of martyr and crowd alike were solely spiritual. By portraying the crowd as an autonomous army of the elect, martyrrologists could claim their religion was already entrenched throughout society, and that royal claims of infallibility had its limitations in religious affairs. Criticisms of the Elizabethan or Marian persecutions represented not the views of a few delinquents, but England’s collective consciousness resisting injustice out of duty to God, and desire to awaken and reconcile with a Queen unaware of her shortcomings. However, the persecutions were more complex than a division between regime and people, or Catholics and Protestants, because radicals and moderates in every sect were battling for dominance over the wider community. Jesuits and Puritans, eager to portray themselves as the true elect, subverted traditional depictions of the crowd as a mindless, many-headed monster, by claiming Marian or Elizabethan bystanders not only sympathised with the martyrs, but shared their ideals. Catholic crowds generally favoured passive, humble martyrs, whose serious expressions, simple prayers and acceptance of their fate appealed to a conservative Northern population alienated by the complex, fiery sermons of heretics, and transformed the execution into a funeral. By contrast, Elizabethan Puritans often combined depictions of horror with stage-managed portrayals of martyrs’ humour or charity, in order to transform the execution into a passion play centred on the ridiculing of priests as powerless clowns; and the endorsement of heroic early Protestants who triumphed over pagan error.

**Hostile crowds**

As argued by Walsham and McClendon, government power was limited by logistics, and generally relied on popular cooperation more than the use of direct force that “gave teeth to the persecuting ideology of church and state.” This section will propose that the early modern crowd’s hostility to condemned heretics or traitors was motivated by a complex combination of terror and consent. Like God, or a married patriarch ruling over his household, rulers were viewed with an equal amount of fear and love, and subjects were under constant pressure to prove their trustworthiness by denouncing internal
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Concurrent with Underwood’s general research into early modern European justice, the Tudor monarch’s authority stemmed not only from the ability to dispense punishments, but also from the unwritten obligation to appease his or her dependents by rewarding their outward profession of loyalty to the established hierarchy. Within the context of the English Reformation, two depictions of hostile crowd existed in Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrologies. On the one hand, martyrlogists often dehumanised the multitude as a mindless, religiously neutral mob directed by clergymen and officials representing regional extensions of royal or Papal authority. Conversely, supporters of the Elizabethan or Marian government portrayed the crowd as an autonomous organism spontaneously denouncing deviants whose behaviour violated the idealised expectation for subjects to be humble, remorseful and submissive when facing their natural superiors. Did martyrlogists record hostile crowds purely to emphasise martyrs’ triumph against overwhelming odds, or did they deem the terrifying rabble’s violence and insolence proof of the previous regime’s failure to create better Christians?

Seeking to justify the Elizabethan church’s existence, and highlight the value of education in creating a more obedient subject, Anglicans and Puritans claimed a small group of avowed Protestants already existed during the 1530s, in defiance of the ignorant, sinful majority. Henrician proto-Protestants like Simon Fish; Marian exiles like Foxe; and later Elizabethan chroniclers frequently blamed deceptive priests and cruel high-status Catholics for exploiting the people until, like apostatising Biblical Jews, they rejected the prophets in favour of superstitious Baalist idolatry. By claiming the “horrible multitude” had limited autonomy, and thus depicting them as potential candidates for reconversion, Puritan preachers Foxe, Fenner, Newcomen and Sutcliffe could attribute the bystanders’ hostility not to anti-Protestantism, but to misplaced loyalty to the Marian priests, and unawareness that the Pope was the enemy. Unlike the childlike bystanders who did not understand the consequences of their misguided hostility, priests allegedly instigated violence because they arrogantly rejected the truth, manifested in the sermons of Edwardian preachers exposing idolatry as foolish superstition. By linking rabble-rousing Marian priests with contemporary Jesuits and merciless continental inquisitors, Puritans could depict papist clergymen as wicked antitheses to the idealised, meek and obedient Anglican subject. Fearing priests’ education and leadership skills, Sutcliffe and Newcomen felt compelled to equate Marian Catholicism with disorder and violence, in the hope of proving that even if they were innocent of the treason charges, Elizabethan priests had committed other crimes that had gone undetected before their eventual arrest.

Priests and gentlemen were not always present to direct and stir the multitude, however; low-status subjects accustomed to simple prayers and rituals could be alienated by the complex, fiery sermons of learned martyrs, especially in traditionalist areas where heresy was deemed an unwelcome outside interference. Fearing schism within the Elizabethan Anglican Church would leave England vulnerable to future persecutions, Foxe, Googe and Coverdale highlighted the earlier Marian crowd’s anarchic nature as a means to terrify contemporary Puritan reluctant conformists into upholding Elizabeth’s religious centralisation. Foxe knew that England’s survival depended upon the successful conversion of laypeople from insincere conformists into avowed Anglican Protestants. Besides using these depictions as a means...
to exalt proto-Protestants’ triumph over adversity, accounts of the “unbelieving rabble” were useful for implying that, by reconciling with Rome, England’s lay-Catholics had become the latter-day counterparts to the wicked pagans who demanded that Roman tyrants execute more Christians. Such depictions presented contemporary lay-Anglicans with a choice: to emulate their godly forebears who embraced the church reforms of Cranmer and Cromwell, or forsake one’s masculine individuality and assimilate into the ignorant, irrational multitude. This aforesaid division was evident in Holinshed’s account of Cromwell’s beheading, where half the gallows crowd lamented the ex-Chancellor, but many others spontaneously rejoiced at the execution of a heretic and traitor. Such semi-autonomous representations of the mob were not incompatible with the mindless depiction discussed previously; all it took was a sizeable minority of low-status ringleaders to collectively sway their fellows into violence. Cardiff fisherman White was silenced by a crowd inciting the executioner to “put fire;” Cambridge academic Hullier was branded an impenitent damned man “unworthy of prayer,” for preaching against Purgatory, transubstantiation and confession; and bystanders threw fagots to silence Dartford weaver Christopher Wade, three Beccles men, and gentleman Julius Palmer of Coventry, whose quoting of Scripture to brand Mary a tyrant was deemed boastful and insolent.

Catholic laymen Huggard and Machyn attributed Marian bystanders’ violence towards heretics not to fear, ignorance or malice, but collective desire to prove their loyalty to the monarch and reject dangerous foreign Protestant beliefs that disrupted centuries of unbroken tradition. The people’s spontaneous rejection of heretics’ incitements to civil disobedience implied that the majority of Englishmen not only respected Mary’s laws; but also agreed that the Protestant scapegoats provided by the regime were indeed dangerous and disorderly criminals receiving their deserved punishment. Catholic sermons at the executions reasserted the state’s prestige and potency against false clergymen, whose denunciation by the people reflected the heretics’ anticipated posthumous rejection by the angels for their treason, theft of church property, philandering, and witchcraft. Elizabethan Jesuits Almond and Parsons argued that Marian Catholics’ failure to convert the assembled crowd proved that the Church of England was a false religion that endangered the nation; and early heretics were deceitful hypocrites who accused the Pope of devil worship to conceal their own depravity. Seeking to exploit moderate Anglicans’ continued suspicion of radicals, secular priest Reynolds urged Elizabeth to continue persecuting “seditious ministers” for profaning sacred space. These post-Marian priests initially avoided directly attacking the monarch, and instead blamed individual Edwardian and Elizabethan heretics who abused their official positions, in order to vindicate contemporary martyred priests as dutiful subjects resisting disorder; and argue that unjust heretical church reforms could not suppress the people’s conscience.

Before discussing representations of executed Catholic missionaries, mention must be made of the conflict between so-called Anglican scandalous ministers suspected of popery or corruption, and lay-Puritan congregations who deemed conformity conditional to Elizabeth’s commitment to implementing Protestant reforms. As argued by Cressy, Protestant women exploited their lack of a full legal identity to assault, criticise or interrupt unpopular preachers, because unlike male Puritans, wives and spinsters
knew they would receive verbal reprimands rather than imprisonment or a fine. Fearful of semi-autonomous Presbyterian congregations usurping the regime’s right to enforce anti-Catholic laws, Anglican bishops responded by branding low-status Essex Puritans vulgar and unlearned for their ignorance of Latin, and insolent for using their scriptural knowledge to criticise church authority instead of patiently awaiting reform from above. Bishop Aylmer reported Hatfield Peverell’s minister for desecrating the prayer-book, and expressed concern over unchristian rituals in Maldon: a young man was hired to “come into church besurered like a fool” and toss the commissioner’s cap among the congregation to imply that mainstream Anglican preachers were identical to illegitimate clown-like Marian idolaters. In a letter to local judge Lord Hunsdon, Bishop Grindal denounced similar behaviour by the parishioners of Henham, who spontaneously ejected preacher John White for failing to read the royal articles during the 1570s. Exploiting the regime’s fear of contradiction, Anglicans like Covell and Wilburn compared their reluctant conformist Presbyterian rivals to insolent pagans disrupting St. Mark’s prayers; and Edwardian rioters in the West Country harnessing existing religious grievances to justify assuaulting clergymen appointed by the monarch.

Elizabethan Anglicans adapted Foxe’s portrayal of executions as a play, to undermine later Jesuits as insolent pantomime villains who, like their Marian papist forebears, were booed and jeered by commoners eager to participate in England’s defence from external threats. Besides providing the people with a break from daily work based routines, the festivity of public hangings was a convenient opportunity for government propagandists to calm Londoners’ “great terror” during the 1580s at the prospect of Northern rebellion, Spanish invasion and a series of suspicious fires blamed on recusants. Elizabethan chroniclers Holinshed, Stow, and the preachers Sparke and Hanmer, deemed the London crowd’s rejection of priests’ Latin prayers evidence that most laypeople accepted the royal personality cult. By appealing to Southern youths’ anger and xenophobia, these Protestants could claim that every Englishman was a member of the dutiful Israelite elect resisting wicked and stubborn priests, whose arrogant, complacent and proud gestures confirmed their guilt. The continued infantilisation of young Elizabethan Jesuits reflected Anglican fears of celibacy and youthful rebellion; since priests renounced marriage, the regime deemed them not rational men and contributors to the patriarchal hierarchy, but troublesome boys and devilish usurpers. Prisoners’ refusal to recant was attributed to cowardice, arrogance or despair; like suicides, Jesuits sought execution because they were unable to live with the guilt and shame of betraying their natural ruler Elizabeth, or with the contradiction of naming their religious order after Jesus while secretly committing depraved crimes on Satan’s behalf.

Countering Puritan depictions of priests as clowns, Catholic martyrologists emphasised the seriousness, learning and dignified appearance of condemned Jesuits overcoming adversity, thus reinterpreting traditional shaming rituals and defrocking as empowering, or even desirable badges of honour. Staffordshire-born Jesuit Edmund Jennings, an ex-Puritan, was paraded through the streets of London in a “ridiculous fool’s coat” in mockery of his attempt to debate with his accusers, but priests compared his ridicule to Christ wearing the purple robe, in order to highlight the potency of a priesthood favoured
by God, the angels and saints.\textsuperscript{157} Subverting Foxe’s claims of widespread anticlericalism among the laity, priests branded Puritan instigators “seditious and popular persons:”\textsuperscript{158} a deviant, lawless minority who were contemptuous of both Papal and royal authority, and would ultimately betray Elizabeth when she no longer served their interests.\textsuperscript{159} Deeming hostile crowds worse than hanging judges for taking pleasure in the suffering of innocents, Jesuits Almond, Martin, Wilson and future martyr Haddock exploited traditional fears of the youth by claiming that heresy turned formerly obedient subjects into antisocial criminals who could only be appeased with bloodshed. Seeking to prove that the crowd represented not the pious majority, but the loudest and most disorderly members of society, Catholics actively drew parallels between the anti-clericalist mob that cheered Marian heretics, and the “lewd felons”\textsuperscript{160} that assaulted legitimate priests. By proclaiming the “barbarous multitude”\textsuperscript{161} not religiously indifferent youths who attended executions solely for amusement, but avowed Protestants or ignorant pagans, Catholics could retrospectively brand Anglican Church reforms a failure, because these did not instil obedience among commoners, but encouraged insolent boys to assault Catholic spiritual teachers representing order and pre-Reformation stability.\textsuperscript{162} These unflattering depictions were intended to question Elizabeth’s rationality and kingly abilities: by implying that her tolerance of heresy and inability to control the mob set a bad example for young male subjects, who behaved like loud, disorderly scolds when they pelted priests with stones, screamed unchristian obscenities, and desecrated sacred objects.\textsuperscript{163}

My source analysis suggests that the crowd’s hostility to Catholic and Protestant martyrs was motivated by a complex combination of terror and consent as regime and population alike sought scapegoats for England’s problems. Although the mob was, as the learned elite claimed, irrational and unpredictable, martyrrologists from every sect were eager to attribute the crowd’s denunciation of rival sects not to curiosity or bloodthirstiness, but affection for the monarch; subscription to the official religion; and desire for a swift return to normality. The bonfires used to burn Marian Protestants and the innards of Elizabethan priests had a longstanding association with festivity, while the condemned men’s gestures of insolence, arrogance, or fear seemingly proved that they were not martyrs, but lawfully executed criminals. Concurrent with Walsham’s concept of charitable hatred, subjects and officials alike feared uncontrolled youths usurping the positions of established patriarchs, and spreading violence, rebellion and disorders. However, to term the persecutions a conflict between youthful martyr and aged patriarchal hierarchy is an oversimplification; many members of the crowd were themselves boys and young men, whose denunciation of youthful dissidents was motivated by awareness that obedient younger apprentices would inherit their masters’ privileged patriarchal positions. Since theatres and alehouses were typical leisure outlets in Tudor times, Puritan and Anglican officials were aware that the mockery of executed papists as foolish clowns was an effective means to win the multitude’s support, if claims of a chaotic, regicidal conspiracy and the depiction of the monarch as God’s terrifying representative did not already suffice.

When members of their own sect faced execution, however, Catholic and Protestant martyrrologists reinterpreted the crowd’s hostility to undermine Marian or Elizabethan persecutors as weak appeasers rather than impartial dispensers of justice. My research suggests that every negative portrayal of the crowd
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was a counterattack to rival sects’ criticisms; official claims that the crowd represented England’s collective consciousness, for example, undermined Catholic claims of universality, or Protestant efforts to formulate a post-Marian English Anglican identity. Fearful for their religious group’s continued relevance, Catholic and Anglican martyrologists equated hostile bystanders with ignorant pagans rejecting Christ, to highlight the martyred priest or Protestant preacher’s triumph over adversity. In these depictions, crowds were deemed less blameworthy than the wicked officials who allegedly roused them, because martyrologists hoped to convert the populace and discredit the previous regime for appeasing the mob rather than dispensing justice. Conversely, Jesuits and Puritans claimed the crowd spontaneously assaulted martyrs, to highlight the divisions within society between God’s virtuous chosen elect, and the wicked and disorderly majority that knowingly renounced Christ. By depicting crowds as either malevolent and chaotic enemies of God, or as deluded fools seduced by deceitful renegade clergy to reject Christ’s calling, these radicals sought to highlight their own group’s exclusivity, and remind readers of the importance of dying bravely to gain posthumous vindication.

Conclusion

To conclude, Catholic and Protestant attitudes to the crowd represented a wider conflict within society over whether civic duty outweighed religious obligations. Although feared as irrational and potentially violent, the multitude’s approval was nevertheless vital for martyrologists seeking to justify their claims to be the elect, because the Catholic and Anglican community’s long-term survival depended upon the conversion of low-status readers. By depicting religiously neutral bystanders as avowed, politically aware members of the legitimate congregation of the elect, post-Marian martyrologists could claim that Catholic or Protestant beliefs were entrenched throughout society, as part of England’s collective consciousness. These writers shared a common fear of disorder, error and injustice, and subsequently depicted gallows crowds as loyal to the secular hierarchy; duty bound to resist unwelcome reform; and eager to enforce the previous regime’s anti-heresy or anti-popery laws with or without the approval of hesitant contemporary officials. Although the crowd was, as Haigh and Walter claimed, fickle and dangerous, submissive gestures from martyrs were generally more likely to gain a sympathetic response, hence the representation of priests and heretics as passive, or vulnerable in some way. By proving younger martyrs were not threatening to the patriarchal hierarchy, Jesuits, Anglicans and Puritans could subvert traditional official fear of the younger generation, and avoid contradicting a government whose secular authority stemmed from its ability to inflict gruesome, emasculating and exemplary punishment upon dissidents. Being conditioned to obey the ruler as God’s earthly representative, commoners could be alienated by priests and heretics who refused to confess their crimes, and thus redress the imbalance caused to the hierarchy. This suggests that a martyr’s conduct on the scaffold, and not his confessional allegiance, shaped the crowd’s perception of him, especially if his gestures or words somehow undermined royal claims of infallibility. Both Catholic and Protestant sources suggest many onlookers were only nominally Anglican, pledging allegiance not to the Pope or a foreign heretical ideology, but to a monarch who, like God, was deemed wrathful and terrifying, but also provident and forgiving. The final chapter will further analyse
the relationship between representations of God and the ruler, both of which were reputedly empowered to destroy sinners’ bodies with gruesome punishments in anticipation of their consignment to hell.

[Fig.14]: 1614 print by Catholic priest John Jennings depicting Jesuit Edmund Jennings’ hanging in London. In the foreground, a recusant woman steals a severed hand from the executioner to keep as a relic.

[Fig.15]: Fearing Catholic-style image worship in the post-1558 church, John Foxe (top) depicted Marian relic collectors not as idolaters worshipping martyrs as false saints, but good Protestants dutifully burying the dead.

[Fig.16]: In Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, sympathetic crowds could sometimes be depicted as active, avowed Protestants shouting encouragement to martyrs whose fiery sermons or humble prayers seemingly confirmed their innocence. [a.] In other instances, the crowd were portrayed as divided, with some individuals passively weeping in response to their fellows’ apathy or hostility; or appearing visibly horrified by the method of execution. The lamenting children at the 1555 burning of aged Colchester priest John Lawrence represented the younger generation of readers who, as adults, would participate in the building of the Elizabethan Anglican confessional state. [b.]
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Chapter 6: Popular Beliefs and the Supernatural.

The final chapter of this thesis will discuss representations of the political functions of rituals and supernatural phenomena associated with Catholic and Protestant martyrs. Contrary to the established historiographical view that Tudor beliefs in the supernatural represented either continuity with the Medieval past, or innovation, I will expand upon the themes introduced in the first chapter to argue that, consistent with Walsham’s research on providence (the belief that every fortunate event was part of God’s plan for his chosen elect), attitudes to the supernatural signified adaptation, transition and evolution. Novel contributions to the historiography include my analysis of the Protestant reinterpretation of relics as symbolic reminders of the deceased rather than magical objects; the evolution of miracles into a more abstract form of Puritan divine providence focusing upon the Marian Protestant elect's triumph over adversity; the Anglican rejection of Catholic and Puritan prophesies; the exaltation of the royal personality cult over popish superstition, and a previously overlooked research field focusing on propagandistic depictions of persecutors’ untimely deaths. Due to the adoption of Foxe’s Acts and Monuments as England’s semi-official martyrology, Anglican Church and secular government efforts to discredit priests’ abuse of ancient rituals (especially veneration of inanimate objects) evolved into what Collinson terms iconophobia, where religious conservatism was equated with popery. Although Davis correctly argues that illustrative religious images remained within books throughout the Tudor period, the veneration of inanimate objects was regarded with fear due to its supposed abuse by pre-Reformation priests. Younger Puritans, eager to prove Elizabethan England’s Protestant credentials, spontaneously destroyed remnants of the polytheistic worship of long-dead saints within churches, and quoted the Old Testament to equate image worship with pagan idolatry; rebellion against God and Queen; and disorderly behaviour that included witchcraft and Sabbath-breaking. Additionally, my research is the first to examine representations of persecutors’ bad deaths within the context of the English Reformation, in an expansion upon Marshall and Caciola’s analysis of sudden deaths in early modern Europe. Martyrologists from every religious group subscribed to the belief that an omnipresent God was ready to physically intervene on behalf of the Catholic, Anglican or Puritan elect, in imitation of the monarch punishing criminals. The implication was that God was subconsciously invoked by his earthly deputy the ruler, or by exceptionally pious martyrs, to judge evildoers who arrogantly thought they had evaded punishment.

Relics

Traditionally defined as inanimate objects endowed with miraculous powers through their association with holy men and women, pre-Reformation relics were, according to Brown, not only reminders of the imminence of death, but also receptors for divine intervention. Objects that touched primary relics (body-parts) or secondary relics (inanimate objects belonging to a martyr) could also be collected by Catholics eager to raise awareness of a locally venerated martyr, and ultimately persuade the Pope’s representatives to legitimise the deceased as an official saint. Quigley suggests that the relics of Catholic martyrs were treated primarily as grisly souvenirs, being collected not out of love, but as part of the
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disorderly, carnival atmosphere of executions that appealed to the religiously indifferent section of the crowd. However, I will argue that post-schism priests retrospectively depicted this relic collecting as an act of piety, in order to turn inanimate objects into instruments of religious defiance, and rouse lay-recusants’ nostalgia for pre-Reformation stability. Adapting Walsham and Collinson’s methodology, I will argue that Anglican and Puritan martyrologies represented evolution: literal depictions of relics coexisted alongside, and were later supplanted by allegorical concepts, and later iconophobia, to counter Catholic allegations of plagiarism and promote a Bible inspired model of devotion equating the ruler with God.

For Henrician Catholics, relics represented continuity with the pre-Reformation practise of commemorating both official and unofficial martyrs by preserving blood, bone, and other body parts. Unlike heretics and criminals, whose flesh either rotted or was burned to ashes, the preserved remains of executed Catholics were considered incorruptible conduits of divine energy confirming not only a martyr’s purity, but also the church’s unchanging nature. These relics were deemed both lucky talismans, and portable statements of the Catholic Church’s prestige, with their gold and jewelled casings serving as visual analogies to the even more precious treasure inside: the remains of locally venerated martyrs. Pilgrimages to the shrines of early Christian martyrs were encouraged for the healing of physical and spiritual ailments, inspiring English recusants to prepare themselves for death from disease, or execution in defence of the Church. Catholic Humanists More and Erasmus claimed the magical powers of relics highlighted Catholicism’s superiority over deluded heresy due to the latter’s lack of credible miracles. More possessed many ancient relics, including a fragment of bone, a locket and a gold crucifix associated with his namesake Thomas the Apostle, who was himself publicly executed. By linking recent martyrs with ancient saints, Catholics could justify disobeying secular commands that dishonoured their early Christian namesakes, and gain confidence when they themselves were later executed.

Within a European context, post-1563 Catholic doctrine was shaped by the rulings of the Council of Trent, a series of meetings called by the Pope and his Cardinals to counter the spread of heresy during the 1540s-50s. Elizabethan Jesuits Southwell, Campion and Martin defended pre-Reformation shrines and ancient relics as links to the early church, and encouraged recusants to collect the remains of executed priests not yet recognised as martyrs, because reports of the objects’ miraculous properties would confirm the deceased’s piety. The efficacy of relics was conditional, and dependent upon the faith and motives of the worshipper; early Protestant claims that veneration was ineffective and fraudulent were interpreted by Counter-Reformation priests as evidence heretics were hypocritical, wicked men unable to channel God’s favour. While acknowledging that corrupt Catholic clergymen could abuse the publicity of relics for financial gain, Jesuits feared that any contradiction of Papal endorsement of miracles would discredit Christianity itself. Unlike pagan idolaters, Elizabethan priests denied worshipping long-dead saints as lesser gods, and instead deemed their martyrs God’s messengers (similar to angels), whose mysticism complemented their proven scholarly credentials. For Catholics deprived of shrines and chapels, executed priests’ body parts were often given miraculous attributes reflecting the alleged purity of their souls. One example was the claim that the thumb of Jesuit Edmund Geninges inexplicably separated
from the rest of the hand [fig.14] and was sent to Edmund’s Puritan brother John who immediately converted to Catholicism and became a priest.\textsuperscript{18}

Catholics also venerated secondary relics sanctified through contact with the body of the martyr, including pieces of clothing, shrouds, instruments of execution; and personal effects like crucifixes, jewellery, [fig.17] small images of saints, or consecrated wax seals depicting Christ the Lamb (Agnus Dei). Although these objects may have been taken from dead martyrs by religiously indifferent souvenir hunters, Elizabethan priests retrospectively proclaimed relic collectors honourable recusants, to sanctify the gallows as a sacred, liminal place of pilgrimage where mortals underwent a transformation akin to Christ’s own ascension.\textsuperscript{19} Deeming themselves not property owners, but temporary custodians of the “goods of God,”\textsuperscript{20} high-status martyrs like More and Mary Stuart believed the act of transferring valuable objects to their kin confirmed their own posthumous piety and generosity; evoked comparisons to dying Biblical patriarchs symbolically transferring authority to an heir; projected the message that martyrs had forsaken earthly vanities for a higher calling; and ultimately served as objects of veneration for later recusants.\textsuperscript{21} Deprived of their more valuable material goods, Elizabethan Jesuits like Hans deemed the blessing of their simple prison clothing or shoes, and the instruments used to end their lives, a gesture of submission analogous to the surrender of one’s soul to God after death.\textsuperscript{22} Subverting government claims that papists received only death, debasement and damnation, these priests proudly proclaimed they would “inherit racks and possess places of execution”\textsuperscript{23} in defiance of official efforts to strip prisoners of their dignity and identity.\textsuperscript{24} Before their hanging, Southwell and Campion kissed the ground where other priests were buried; venerated the gallows in place of destroyed pre-Reformation shrines; and blessed the hangman’s rope and fetters to transform them into holy objects.\textsuperscript{25} By reinterpreting execution as a great honour, Jesuits could highlight Catholicism’s exclusivity; individuals from other false sects may also perform good deeds, but only avowed Catholics could enter heaven because they alone possessed sufficient self control, humility and godliness to die for the good of the collective flock.\textsuperscript{26}

Before discussing Anglican attitudes to primary relics, mention must be made of Catholic efforts to undermine Protestants as fraudulent, inferior and hypocritical, for gathering Marian heretics’ remains in the misguided belief that these had magical potency. The crowd’s apparent defiance of dead King Edward’s prohibition of relic collecting seemingly confirmed the Anglican Church was a disorderly, divisive sect lacking divine patronage; and that English heretics were “rebels against the Creator,”\textsuperscript{27} who followed their own bestial urges rather than heeding clergymen’s teachings. Although these relic collectors were depicted as Protestants they may have simply been Lollards, church-papists, or even Quigley’s religiously neutral souvenir hunters enjoying the spectacle of the burnings. Huggard dehumanised Protestants for “wallowing like pigs in a sty to scrape the heretical dunghill for bones,”\textsuperscript{28} and accused Marian exiles of plagiarism for commemorating the days when heretics were burned. Although the crowd may have sought to simply give their deceased friends a proper burial, Elizabethan recusant Stapleton, missionary priest Broughton, and exiled Marian priest Dorman, accused Protestants of idolatrously venerating “stinking martyrs”\textsuperscript{29} excommunicated and executed for unchristian stubbornness and
disobedience. Fearing Elizabethan conservatives would forsake Catholicism in favour of inferior Anglican Protestant services, priests portrayed the dismembering and scattering of early heretics’ body parts as a form of divine punishment intended to deny the offender burial on consecrated ground, or entry into heaven. The low-born Marian gallows crowd’s grotesque fighting over macabre trophies and idolatrous objects of worship reflected England’s earlier destabilisation and division under Edward, and contrasted with lay-Catholics’ pious, orderly and dignified veneration of genuine relics.

Protestant portrayals of relics underwent an evolution, from emulation of Catholic beliefs, to indiscriminate hostility towards popish saints and other religious paraphernalia that priests allegedly abused for personal gain. The early Elizabethan era represented a transitional time, with returning Marian exiles combining allegorical depictions of relics with Bible quotations and the new printed martyrologies to exalt the Tudor dynasty as divinely favoured successors to Israel’s Kings. As England became increasingly Protestant after Elizabeth’s 1563 religious settlement, Anglican concepts of veneration evolved to focus not upon the body parts of unjustly executed “worthy men,” but upon the landscape surrounding the gallows. Unwilling to contradict government hostility to image worship, Protestant exiles retrospectively claimed low-status Marian relic collectors gathered the remains of dead heretics for burial through charitable desire to prevent their dismemberment by “dogs and birds.” Consistent with Walsham’s research, the ground where heretics were interred represented not a tainted place of execution, but a new Mount Zion: a place where the faithful could directly channel their prayers to an omnipotent God. In an attack on pre-Reformation shrines and pilgrimages, Coverdale and Lyly declared the rubbish heap where Protestants’ ashes were scattered a sacred place, because the entire landscape was created by God and therefore was at an equal state of perfection. Deeming execution a prearranged calling, martyred preachers Careless and Shetterden took Psalm 113 literally, by claiming God would ultimately raise the ashes of godly Marian Protestants from their the dunghill and grant them heavenly rewards, while casting down haughty papist tormenters.

After the Marian persecutions, many Anglicans and conforming Puritans rejected the veneration of body parts, preferring to keep martyrs’ books and clothing, or secondary relics, as allegorical, symbolic reminders with the practical function of providing a martyr with comfort before his burning. Thus, the preservation of blood-stained cloths by low-status laypeople was depicted not as idolatrous worship of the dead, but a spontaneous grass-roots effort to complement printed martyrologies with physical, horrifying reminders of papists’ injustice and incompetence. Lady Vane sent Philpot a scarf which he called “coat armour,” ambiguously implying it provided either warmth, or literal spiritual protection like a charm or Catholic relic. Books and letters were particularly valued, because Foxe, Brice and Coverdale believed a man’s heroic deeds and writings were the true path to immortality, not idolatrous rituals lacking Biblical verification. Seeking to atone for their own flight overseas, Protestants subverted papist efforts to destroy prohibited literature by translating, copying, editing, and redistributing the writings of their martyred friends. Extracts from these books recorded for posterity a martyr’s godliness, in “simple style and metre” to describe the full horror of Marian popery to semi-literate readers, and thus justify the
persecution of Elizabethan priests as a necessary defensive measure. Marian martyrs like Taylor foresaw their own posthumous commemoration, and cheerfully bequeathed their bodies to the executioner, their clothes to their friends, and their souls to God, in the knowledge their beliefs would endure in print.\textsuperscript{44}

Seeking to establish continuity with post-1533 Henrician efforts to prove the Church of England's superiority over popery, Elizabeth replaced pre-Reformation images and crucifixes in church with the royal arms after her 1571 excommunication.\textsuperscript{45} Seeking to formulate a monotheistic form of devotion focusing upon God and monarch, the Anglican government’s public, theatrical parading of offending objects through the streets before their destruction corresponded to Henrician ritual shaming of heretics before their burning, and papists before their hanging.\textsuperscript{46} In a mockery of the Medieval practise of preserving saints’ remains, the post-schism regime boiled Catholic traitors’ corpses and displayed them naked, while burning pre-Reformation relics to remind subjects that death was no escape from retribution.\textsuperscript{47} The desecration of blood-stained objects [fig.18] not only deprived recusants of objects of veneration, but symbolically erased all trace of the offender’s existence and deprived him of an afterlife.\textsuperscript{48}

However, there was a limit to government iconoclasm; moderate Elizabethan Anglicans like Weever denounced excessive image-breaking as “senseless rage against the dead”\textsuperscript{49} through fear that the destruction of secular tombs would alienate low-status laymen seeking a return to normality. High Church Anglicans upheld many other Catholic rituals, including Latin prayers, holy water, vestments, and illustrative secular images within churches if these were not worshipped idolatrously.\textsuperscript{50} By reinterpreting transubstantiation and the consecration of objects as symbolic, Elizabethan Bishops Parker and Babington could deny allegations of idolatry and heresy, and proclaim the Anglican Church a universal religion because it was derived not only from the Bible, but also uncorrupted Catholic doctrine formulated by Medieval scholars like Thomas Aquinas or ascetic Bishop Chrysostom of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{51}

The roots of what Collinson terms Puritan iconophobia lay in Edwardian and Elizabethan proclamations, where Anglican ministers rejected what Duffy termed the pre-Reformation cult of saints through fear that illiterate peasants worshipped angels and saints in a literal rebellion against God.\textsuperscript{52} The government’s rejection of image-worship enabled Protestants to portray England as godly Israel and Rome as inferior Babylon; discredit ancient martyrs as powerless because they were in heaven; and reassert the monarchy’s prestige and Old Testament inspired claim of infallibility.\textsuperscript{53} The whitewashed, plain Anglican churches were intended to restore the atmosphere of early Christianity, and remove superfluous decorations that could potentially distract bored members of the congregation away from the preacher’s sermon. During the 1549 Prayer-Book Rebellion, conservative mobs in Cornwall and Devon had made extensive use of ritual, praying to the saints for victory and imitating Israelites following the Ark of the Covenant by marching behind a procession of the host.\textsuperscript{54} They believed it would cause the walls of cities like Exeter to miraculously collapse, but Edwardian Anglicans like Gilby, and Elizabethan Puritans like Beard, retrospectively branded low-status papists faithless for their dependence upon the rituals of renegade priests and “false prophets”\textsuperscript{55} who misused religion for financial or political ends.\textsuperscript{56} By equating Catholic image worship with treason, Protestants could argue that papists held both God and the Tudor monarchy
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in contempt, necessitating investigation not only of the recusant minority, but also of conservative low-status church-papists whose true religious allegiance remained unclear.\(^{57}\)

Puritans’ iconophobic destruction of the pre-Reformation past was intended to redefine the Anglican Church as an austere, Old Testament inspired branch of Protestantism centred on God, country and Queen rather than angels or long-dead saints.\(^{58}\) Foxe depicted Henrician Essex Protestants King, Debnam and Marsh as proto-Puritans “moved by the Spirit of God”\(^{59}\) to disprove popish idols’ reputedly miraculous powers by smashing or burning them. These particular iconoclasts were vindicated at their own hanging when the regime, despite fearing disorderly uncontrolled iconoclasm, exploited the occasion to burn the damaged image as a demonstration of royal power not only over insolent heretics, but also over blasphemous extensions of Papal authority. [fig.20] Emboldened by the Elizabethan regime’s later approval of limited iconoclasm, Puritans depicted their Henrician forebears as dutiful subjects selflessly taking it upon themselves to uphold localised royal authority over church and state, by destroying barbarous, anachronistic and corrupting idols.\(^{60}\) Puritans feared that such ignorant spectacles invited divine retribution not only upon papists of “popular judgment and carnal hearts”\(^{61}\) but also upon Anglicans who, like their Israelite forebears, failed to suppress this uncivilised practise through ignorance, cowardice, or indifference. Due to the targeting of pre-Reformation religious images by many early martyrs, Puritan ministers Foxe, Wright, Higgins and Crowley felt compelled to distinguish between virtuous early Christians who humbly kissed the chains or sword used to hasten their martyrdom, and superstitious idolaters who irrationally worshipped relics.\(^{62}\) Catholic transubstantiation, and the veneration of pre-Reformation saints’ body parts, were denounced as the meaningless trash of a proud, antichristian and false “dunghill god”\(^{63}\) powerless against rational teachers and spiritual warriors whose missionary work entailed smashing Baalist idols in imitation of Moses, Elijah and Hezekiah.\(^{64}\) Contemporary priests were equated with fraudulent pre-Reformation friars peddling counterfeit relics; and female relic collectors were branded harlots, liars and bastard bearers like the nun who discovered a supposed likeness of hanged Jesuit Henry Garnet’s face in a piece of straw.\(^{65}\) Subsequently, it can be said that fear of idolatry shaped the fabric of Puritan confessional identity; seeking a sense of purpose and belonging within the restored Anglican Church, conformists contrasted the recusant congregation’s alleged spiritual decay with the divinely favoured English Israelite elect’s rationality, discipline, unity, and vigorous Bible study.

My source analysis suggests that Catholics and older Anglicans reinterpreted the crowd’s souvenir hunting not as the morbid curiosity of the religiously indifferent mob previously described by Lake and Quigley, but as the actions of a dutiful survivalist elect defending the ancient church from the unjust whims of an irrational tyrant. Fearing that contradiction of the Council of Trent’s rulings would invite criticisms and allegations of hypocrisy from their rivals, Catholic priests perpetuated belief in the mystical powers of body parts and inanimate objects belonging to martyrs. Conversely, Anglicans and Puritans generally preferred a more allegorical approach to relics, as symbolic, inanimate reminders of their deceased friends with no supernatural powers; bloodstained clothing, for example, represented not mystical objects, but horrific visual reminders of Marian cruelty. These Protestants took it upon themselves to decide who was
a martyr rather than waiting for approval from their superiors in church or central government, and differentiated ignorant papist worship of inanimate objects, from avowed Protestants preserving martyrs’ personal effects or collecting ashes and body parts for Christian burial. The greatest divergence from pre-Reformation traditions can be found in my analysis of what Collinson termed iconophobia, where Elizabethan Puritans, seeking to assert England’s independence and exclusivity, adapted Henrician and Edwardian anti-sedition legislation to attack contemporary priests as disorderly, amoral swindlers and rebels against God. This total rejection of pre-Reformation relics as anachronistic and perverse popish superstition culminated in the culture of iconoclasm, where younger Puritans spontaneously destroyed religious images, and other paraphernalia associated with the pre-schism past, to prove their allegiance to an austere, Old Testament based form of Christianity centred on duty to God, Queen and country.

**Visions and prophesies**

As argued by Scribner, Roper, Ryrie and Fox, visions associated with early modern martyrs had a primarily political function: resisting unwelcome church reforms deemed incompatible with Christian duty.66 This section will revisit themes of evolution and fear: namely my theory that Catholic, Anglican and Puritan symbolic reinterpretations of pre-Reformation depictions of literal prophesies were motivated primarily by concern for the collective sect’s long-term reputation and continued relevance. Catholics and early Protestants believed in an omnipotent God capable of intervening on behalf of his chosen elect, either personally, or by sending emissaries in the form of angels or apparitions of deceased martyrs.67 The Elizabethan central government’s disapproval of Catholic and radical Puritan prophesies originated from a conflict within the post-schism Henrician church over which beliefs and rituals should be retained, and which should be discarded during a transitional period that Ryrie terms a “movement from superstition to rationality.”68 Anglicans deemed literal and allegorical prophesies a “dangerous weapon in the hands of the disaffected”69 because dissidents could potentially use the voices of inaccessible, supernatural beings like angels or pre-Reformation saints to criticise Elizabethan religious policy, or endorse an alternative ruler to the Tudor dynasty. Subsequently, the government suppressed unauthorised low-level prophesies as criminal, irrational popish superstition, because these subverted regional manifestations of royal or church authority, and were open to abuse.70 My own research will propose that evolving post-Marian attitudes to visions represented a conflict between literal Catholic mysticism (sometimes adapting or incorporating Scriptural or Humanist concepts to prove priests’ continued relevance); and Protestant efforts to confirm England’s collective claim to be the new Israel, by portraying a learned martyr as an allegorical Old Testament prophet, whose vague predictions remained open to interpretation. In a new contribution to the historiography, I will also analyse Anglican and mainstream Puritan efforts to reconcile the royal personality cult with the supernatural by depicting the ruler as a prophet, whose direct divine patronage rendered pre-Reformation saints obsolete.

Henrician and Elizabethan Catholics perpetuated pre-Reformation mysticism to exalt contemporary priests as representatives of Christ, because their virginal purity and devotion to study put them in direct
contact with God. The government’s harsh punishment of sedition may have deterred spontaneous prophesies by low-status recusants, but precipitated an increase in visions attributed to priests seeking martyrdom, often with Bible quotations added to attract the more literate younger generation. As Welsh Lancastrian nobleman Henry VII seized the throne by the sword rather than by birth, his son and bastard grandchildren’s usurpation of the church was deemed equally invalid. Canterbury monk John Darley predicted Cardinal Fisher and Prior Houghton’s execution by claiming to have dreamed about seeing them “next to angels in heaven,” earning him a public hanging and disembowelment for implying King Henry would die unpleasantly for pillaging the abbeys. After Henry’s death, priests continued to use literal prophesies to establish continuity with the early church, and counter allegations of fraud and sorcery by claiming pure, infallible and ancient Catholicism rectified Old Testament errors reintroduced by the Anglican Church. Elizabethan Jesuits Wilson and Fitzherbert reinterpreted earlier, discredited visions symbolically, by retrospectively claiming that prophesies of martyred Henrician Catholics contained a subliminal meaning that benefited the elect in a long-term way. For example, the prediction of Kentish maidservant-turned-nun Elizabeth Barton (hanged 1534) that Henry would be harmed if he married the unpopular Anne Boleyn was apparently fulfilled when Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth died childless, and their reigns were plagued by Northern rebellions. Barton’s vindication by later priests like Bailey and Allen stemmed from desire to depict Catholicism as woman-friendly, while horrifying readers with extensive lists of the Tudors’ defenceless female recusant victims.

The Anglican regime’s suppression of unauthorised prophesies as heretical, popish and pagan was motivated by fear that rebels would use the voices of angels or saints to justify regicide or undermine officially approved Bible-based education. Lord Burghley, gentleman Barnaby Rich, royal printer Richard Grafton, and spy Thomas Norton, equated prophesies with ignorance and gullibility, to feminise both Henrician and Elizabethan “renegade priests” as gossips and charlatans unfit to preach. By treating false prophesies as secular crimes, Protestants could brand pre-Reformation mysticism a lie, and justify investigating recusant households suspected of harbouring “priests lurking under the guise of schoolmasters” on the grounds that Jesuits were no clergymen, but disorderly thieves and quacks. This rejection of contemporary priests’ supernatural powers was inspired by the earlier burning of Henrician Friar Forrest with wood from an effigy of Welsh saint Derfel Cadarn after criticising royal supremacy with false predictions of disaster. Edwardian chronicler Hall’s pun that the image of Cadarn would “set a whole forest on fire” was a government attempt to discredit false prophesies by ridiculing the supernatural. The denunciation of female prophets like Barton, and Elizabethan Welsh serving-girl Elizabeth Orton, as “hypocritical harlots” was intended primarily to prove that papists mentally and sexually exploited vulnerable girls, in order to use them as mouthpieces for opinions the priests could not utter publicly: namely prediction of the monarch’s impending death or incapacitation.

Conversely, some of the more radical Edwardian and Elizabethan reformers acknowledged papists’ supernatural powers, to confirm early Protestant claims that the pre-Reformation church was a devilish delusion akin to the blasphemous false prophecies described in the Book of Revelation. By claiming
curses backfired on the papists while empowering the English Israelite elect, Protestant propagandists could retrospectively discredit priests as impotent false prophets whose ultimate capture and execution confirmed the monarch’s claim of divine protection. Puritan minister Fulke and Bishop Bridges dehumanised Elizabethan female recusants, and feminised priests, as literal witches in contact with the Pope, whose ignorant pagan idolatry brought strife and conflict. These depictions coincided with a heightened fear of witchcraft, and suggest that late 16th-century Anglicans exploited laypeople’s xenophobia and fear of disorder to implicate the Pope, Spaniards, priests, rebels, and conservative laywomen, into a single malevolent devilish conspiracy against Elizabethan Protestant normality. Seeking to depict the Henrician schism as a war against the devilish tyranny of Rome, Holinshede proclaimed earlier popish prophesies prejudicial not only to Henry’s authority, but also to the legitimacy of his heirs. By exploiting Barton’s 1534 claim to have conversed with the dead, the Henrician and Elizabethan governments could brand every papist unclean and unfit to preach. The allegation that Satan forced Barton to “defile the pure doctrine of the Gospel” by fornicating with many men enabled Anglicans to equate celibacy with perversion and demonic possession, and thus claim papist mysticism was incompatible with both the Tudor royal personality cult, and Bible-based worship of God. Additionally, Anglicans sometimes adapted and combined the distinct depictions of fraud and demonic possession to claim that as a direct result of their criminality, deceit and arrogance, false prophets were controlled and driven mad by Satan. Eager to implicate Puritan separatists and papists into a single, imaginary devilish conspiracy, John Stow; Richard Cosin; and Bishops Bancroft and Harsnett, equated unlawful Protestant prophets with corrupt and ungrateful pre-Reformation friars rousing ignorant commoners into rebellion, and deceiving naive youths in imitation of Satan corrupting Adam. The bishops feared Brownist Puritans would exploit the people’s gullibility by combining Scripture with claims of divine instruction to break from the Anglican Church. Illiterate serving-man William Hackett claimed to be a godly prophet heralding Christ’s return, but contemporary chroniclers Camden and Stow upheld the regime’s criminalisation of the supernatural by depicting Hackett as violent, insolent, and forsaken by God for his malice towards the divinely appointed Queen. This blasphemer allegedly bit off the nose of a schoolmaster; “riotously wasted his estate;” usurped the positions of legitimate preachers; and ungratefully made demands from God rather than appearing humble or fearful. Hackett’s defacing of the royal coat-of-arms was a direct attack on an extension of the Queen’s physical presence, and necessitated government efforts to destroy the wicked minister’s posthumous reputation by claiming that at his 1591 hanging, Hackett died cursing the executioner and God through despair that the shackles did not miraculously fall away. Even Hackett’s former accomplice Arthington denounced him as a diseased, unclean “devil incarnate” for impersonating Christ and conspiring to seize Elizabeth’s throne in defiance of God’s long-term plans. Arthington’s repudiation of Hacket was probably done through fear of execution or desire to make a deal with the regime, although in this recantation, and in official propaganda, Hackett’s opponents claimed to be horrified by the false prophet’s wickedness and depravity.
in order to prove their own loyalty to the English confessional state; and exalt Elizabeth’s potency, rationality, and ultimate triumph over the futile, ineffective attacks of deluded and ungrateful heretics.

Fearing Protestant prophesies would discredit the entire priesthood’s claims to possess exclusive mystical powers, Catholic priests exploited Anglican fears of Brownism by accusing the entire Puritan community of lawlessness and treason. Bristow feared that youthful Elizabethan laymen’s tendency to “scoff at visions” would inevitably bring atheism and ignorance, as insolent, sceptical heretics ridiculed the entire institution of the clergy that served as local representatives of Christ and the Pope. Protestants’ excessive drinking, misguided fanaticism, greed, deceit, and uncontrolled anger contrasted with genuine politically neutral Catholic miracle-workers whose moderation enabled them to passively channel God and the Virgin Mary to selflessly help others. Unlike the learned and pious priests’ genuine visions from God and the angels, Protestant false prophets were depicted as deceivers, frauds and blasphemers, whose ineffective imitation and profanation of ancient rituals invoked not the God of Abraham, but a devil posing as such. Jesuits Fitzsimon, Fitzherbert and Southwell depicted Hackett as a “notorious Puritan” possessed by demons, whose sacrilegious desecration; irrational railing against the Queen; and blasphemous impersonation of Christ confirmed Calvinism was antichristian, chaotic and deviant from Christ’s teachings. Besides being so deluded that even the most radical heretics rejected him, Hackett was branded a hypocrite, madman and traitor who betrayed both the Catholics he was paid to spy on, and his employer by rejecting royal church supremacy in favour of his own devilish delusions. Hackett’s gruesome hanging and disembowelment was a fitting comeuppance for his cruelty and treachery; and a warning of the consequences of tolerating disorderly heresy, because without the prayers and consecrations of genuine priests, England was vulnerable to Satan’s attacks.

Elizabethan Puritan depictions of prophesies were motivated by two overriding fears: Catholic allegations of plagiarism, and the Anglican regime’s attacks on unauthorised visions as ignorant and superstitious. Subsequently, conformist ministers Foxe and Sampson adapted Marian martyrs’ literal prophesies of persecutors’ downfall to retrospectively endorse the contemporary Anglican Church as the legitimate successor to the saints and Israelite prophets; and demonise priests as agents of cruel King Philip and his master the Antichrist Pope. Unlike Catholics’ fraudulent “prodigious visions,” which often included an alleged visitation by a named saint, angel or other supernatural figure, the prophesies of Marian Protestants like Samuel or Potton were usually depicted as vague dreams about the future, including commands directly from God; realistic images of a “bright burning fire;” and metaphorical, Old Testament inspired ladders to heaven. Fearing that criticisms of Queen Mary would inspire later separatists to reject Elizabeth, conformist Puritans gave their forebears’ predictions of divine intervention deliberately vague interpretations: on one level martyrs’ warnings that papists would “cast body and soul into hellfire” seemingly implied a wish for Queen Mary’s death and damnation. However, Foxe left Mary’s ultimate fate in the afterlife ambiguous and instead used these visions to exalt early Protestants as virtuous individuals who not only foresaw their own impending demise, but selflessly prayed for Mary’s redemption and return to sanity.

Bishop Latimer’s warnings of disaster should Mary marry a “stranger

King”

were used during Elizabeth’s reign to attack Philip of Spain as a tyrant associated with the persecutions, war and famine foretold in Revelation. Later unexpected natural phenomena that benefited the Elizabethan regime were retrospectively deemed a fulfilment of earlier martyrs’ prophesies: God caused the storm that destroyed Philip’s Armada as gratitude for Elizabeth’s restoration of true Christianity, and as a foretelling of England’s ultimate triumph over popery.

Although the Elizabethan government disapproved of spontaneous low-level visions, it encouraged efforts to create a personality cult exalting the monarch as an Old Testament prophet with both supernatural and scholarly aptitudes. Returning Marian exiles Brice and Crowley instilled nostalgia for the Edwardian age by claiming the dying King’s warnings of plague, wickedness and disaster were fulfilled by widespread apostasy and idolatry under Mary. Besides his exceptional piety, Edward was at the liminal point between life and death, where individuals were traditionally believed to be in closest contact with God. The portrayal of the monarch as a prophet continued among younger Puritans like Keltridg, who deemed Elizabeth’s accession the fulfilment of the dying King Edward’s prayers for the Anglican Church’s survival; and viewed themselves as localised agents of a monarch enforcing God’s preordained commands. However, Puritans’ endorsement of the royal personality cult was conditional to the monarch’s ability to impose further Protestant reforms; Elizabeth was a good Queen because she allegedly maintained England’s independence, but her sister Mary Tudor, and cousin Mary Stuart, had forsaken their infallibility and legitimacy due to their unlawful submission to Rome. Although the royal personality cult was generally applied to Anglican rulers, Camden reinterpreted the Catholic Mary Stuart’s dying-speech as a foretelling of the later Stuart monarchy, to appease Mary’s Protestant son James, and depict England and Scotland as equally godly nations of the elect. Despite Mary Stuart’s idolatry, treachery, and attempted fratricide, Camden claimed the Scottish Queen gained foresight in death from God: vaguely claiming that England and Scotland would unite, but naming neither James nor Philip of Spain as Elizabeth’s successor, because the ultimate outcome depended upon the people’s commitment to either progressive Protestantism, or backward popery.

In sum, the perpetuation and reinterpretation of literal pre-Reformation prophesies by Catholics and radical Puritans served an important propagandistic function: confirming the sect’s claims to be the divinely favoured unchanging successor to the early church or Israel, and discrediting rival groups for their lack of credible miracles (especially in Catholic depictions). Such depictions were motivated primarily by fear of criticism, fear for the sect’s reputation, and fear of antagonising their moderate allies. Hence, Jesuit and Puritan alike were careful to highlight martyred prophets’ godliness, respectability and prior respect for the law, in order to justify visions as a last resort by subjects concerned for England’s long-term wellbeing at the hands of a ruler who had lost touch with the people. Fearing Catholic allegations of plagiarism, Elizabethan Anglicans often portrayed earlier Protestant prophesies allegorically; and criminalised pre-Reformation rituals as fraud, blasphemy, or witchcraft practised by members of a deviant, chaotic and antichristian conspiracy against the English confessional state. Seeking to render allegedly polytheistic prayers to angels and saints obsolete, Anglicans encouraged the exaltation of the
monarch as an Israelite prophet to compensate for his or her shortcomings, and project what Wood terms an illusion of infallibility and omnipotence. By depicting Edward VI and Elizabeth not as a weak boy or virgin girl, but as decisive Israelite Kings, Anglicans could claim that God directly guided post-schism church reforms, and called godly men to the ministry in order to enforce the proclamations of his earthly deputy, the monarch. This depiction was intended to terrify laypeople into submission; appeal to their sense of duty in supporting localised church reform; and encourage a sense of pride and devotion to the institution of the monarchy, whose supposed ability to regulate laypeople’s minds and bodies safeguarded the English confessional state’s long-term stability and prosperity.

**Miracles, omens, and divine providence**

Before the 1533 schism, miracles were an important facet of Catholic doctrine confirming the priesthood’s potency, legitimacy, and supernatural power in addition to their rationality and scholarly credentials. Examples included the unexpected recovery of the very sick; exorcism of demons through the priest’s prayers; indirect miracles such as great storms and the unexplained destruction of sinners’ property; the birth of deformed infants; and the appearance of unusual clouds, comets, or stars in the sky believed to foreshadow a disaster or time of upheaval. Freeman suggested that Tudor representations of miracles or divine providence served a political purpose, with Catholic and Protestant martyrologists interpreting unexpected events as messages from God endorsing his chosen elect, or manifesting his anger at persecutors.123 Walsham argued that 16th-century attitudes to providence represented adaptation and transition, where new concepts were combined with the symbolic reinterpretation of older rituals by Protestant reformers and Catholic Counter-Reformation priests seeking to “redraw the boundaries between religion and magic, superstition and official religion.”124 Continuing on from the themes of evolution discussed in the previous section, I will argue that two distinct perceptions of providence existed during the Tudor period; the first approach comprised literal accounts of miracles allegedly wrought by Catholic priests nostalgic for pre-Reformation stability; and by some radical Protestants seeking to prove their young sect’s divine favour and ancient origins.125 The second approach to miracles encompassed more abstract depictions, as returning Protestant exiles sought to distance themselves from pre-Reformation superstition by leaving the involvement of angels or long-dead saints ambiguous, and instead attributing unexpected phenomena benefiting the elect to direct divine intervention. Just as early martyrs’ visions and prophesies were adapted by conformist Puritans and Anglicans to legitimise the contemporary monarchy’s church reforms as the fulfilment of God’s long-term plan, so too were the miraculous escape of exiles, and the survival of condemned prisoners, depicted as proof that God favoured and protected future Elizabethan clergymen.

In the years preceding the Henrician schism, many educated men believed the routine, miraculous rituals of consecration, transubstantiation, and the exorcism of demons, were fundamental components of Christian doctrine.126 Fearful that early Protestant scepticism of priests’ magical powers challenged not only Papal infallibility but the existence of God himself, Catholic Humanists Erasmus, Fisher, Gardiner,
and More made great efforts to distinguish genuine, approved miracle-workers from frauds and secular magicians whose false miracles was motivated not by Christian duty to help others, but financial greed. Unlike low-born ruffians’ conjuring tricks, miracles selflessly performed by respectable clergymen were accepted as proof of the individual’s closeness to God: the ultimate, all-seeing patriarch. Like the original saints, priests possessed supernatural powers to forgive dying men so they could enter heaven, and sometimes miraculously cure physical ailments inflicted on sinners. These rituals, which could not occur without God’s consent, highlighted the Catholic Church’s prestige, analogous to the King’s demonstration of secular power through processions and the punishment of criminals. Other unexplained phenomena, including the appearance of bright lights in a condemned prisoner’s cell, were proclaimed evidence of angelic visitation. These were represented as miraculous prerequisites to an unjustly executed individual’s posthumous claim to sainthood; and signs of divine anger towards blasphemers who dishonoured God’s earthly representatives.

The apparent lack of miracles within the Elizabethan Anglican Church was used by Catholics to depict contemporary “holy worthies” as superior to Protestant false ministers. Besides their ability to interpret the Bible, Jesuits argued that martyred priests could directly channel God’s word through their tortured bodies in the hope of re-converting their tormentors. Parsons, Keynes, Matthew, and Wilson deemed Anglican scepticism of miracles evidence that Elizabethan church reform was a failure, because far from creating pious and obedient subjects, the teachings of renegade ministers brought blasphemy, ignorance, and atheism. The failure of the souls of Marian heretics to intervene on behalf of contemporary Anglicans seemingly proved Protestantism’s inferiority to Catholicism, where saints continued to protect priests seeking to imitate their forebears’ self-sacrifice. Missionary priests did not consider exorcisms witchcraft because they healed, not harmed, and were performed in the name of God and the Virgin Mary, not Satan, because a divided hell could not exist. Within this context, Christ’s healing of physically sick men represented an allegory for the priests’ self-sacrifice: overcoming fear of death to save the spiritually blind from damnation. The use of egalitarian language suggested that young Jesuits deemed themselves apprentices, using their childlike innocence and godliness to gain guidance from earlier martyrs, and ultimately earn the same heavenly rewards. Gerard Edwards, a priest who was himself later captured and hanged, assumed the alias “Edward Campion,” to give the illusion that his martyred namesake had miraculously resurrected like Christ or Lazarus, and portray the institution of the priesthood as immortal and unchanging due to its ancient Levite origins.

Puritans adapted these Catholic criticisms to claim the post-Marian Anglican Church lacked miracles because it was a superior religion that had already passed the test of faith and earned the rightful title of God’s elect. Due to the superior godliness and stronger faith of the congregation, ministers did not need to constantly put God to the test by performing excessive and false consecrations, exorcisms, and miracles. As with the prophesies discussed previously, Catholic miracles were equated with fraud and quackery, to imply that mercenary priests’ accomplices feigned madness, disability or injury in imitation of common beggars and swindlers observed by London watchman Dekker. As part of the general theme
of inversion, these feminised rituals contrasted with the superior, masculine virtues of English lay-Protestants, who fulfilled their patriarchal vocation as providers by using their money not to enrich greedy priests, but to help the poor and sponsor warrior-scholars resisting the devilish Pope. By attacking Catholic miracles as “blasphemous spectacles” associated with entertainment rather than piety, Puritan preachers Foxe, Gee and Adams could brand priests vagrants and mountebanks peddling useless false medicine, and thus exploit readers’ fear of strangers to drive a wedge between moderate Anglicans and stubborn recusants. Burton equated papist omens and portents of doom with secular “counterfeit juggling tricks to delude the simple,” and contrasted rational, text based Protestant education with priests’ deliberate spreading of error and corruption. The aim was to discredit Jesuits as the deceitful successors to wicked pre-Reformation clergymen whose rituals had already been exposed as false; one Henrician priest allegedly used ventriloquism to make statues talk, and another was jailed for staining communion-bread with blood from his finger and claiming the host bled miraculously.

Eager to portray the Marian persecutions as a parable highlighting the benefits of honesty, conviction, and humility, Anglicans and Puritans attributed godly ministers’ fortunate survival to divine protection, unlike ungrateful Marian persecutors whose vain and insolent demands from God ultimately brought their ruin, deprival and imprisonment under Elizabeth. The Pope’s failure to subjugate England negated his claims of omnipotence, while faithful Puritans Foxe, Golding and Haddon received positions in the restored English Church as recompense for their commitment to true religion. Adapting Foxe’s representation of martyrdom as a play, Bishops Babington, Abbot, Bale, ex-priest Sheldon, and Anglican physician Cotta depicted contemporary papists not only as foolish clowns or tricksters, but also as malevolent devil worshipping “charmers and enchanters” from “bloody Babylon” who mistakenly venerated demons as saints, and cast evil spells to harm the ruler. Priests’ dependence on rituals or “rotten, ragged miracles” to awe and terrify laypeople highlighted Catholicism’s alleged cheapness and inferiority, while the failure of curses to harm the Protestant elect confirmed that God’s power outweighed that of the papists’ deity Satan. When Henrician martyr Thomas Benet nailed a proclamation to a church door challenging Papal authority, Foxe claimed Exeter’s priests cast a spell to identify this “foul abominable heretic,” cursing Benet in the futile belief it would harm him, while hypocritically invoking the names of God, Mary and the saints. This incantation may never have actually happened, but Foxe and Bale’s ridiculing of priests as ineffective, gesticulating sorcerers was an effective propaganda tool to undermine ancient rituals; instil feelings of horror and revulsion at papist depravity; and exalt fugitive Protestant scholars as superior patriarchs spreading God’s word. One notable parable of providence in Foxe’s Acts and Monuments was the escape of London preacher William Living, whose name was punned as testimony to his ultimate survival. Living, and fellow minister John Lithall, endured the hardship of imprisonment for concealing forbidden books but, ironically, were excised from Foxe’s later editions because of allegations that they used astronomy to predict Queen Mary’s death.

Fearing that excessive accounts of early Protestant martyrs’ ability to perform literal miracles would result in allegations of arrogance or fraud from rival sects, many Puritans favoured ambiguous, symbolic
depictions of portents of doom including diseases; storms; beached whales; and monstrous births.\textsuperscript{156} These were intended not only to prove that contemporary martyrs and early saints were ordinary men unworthy of worship, but also to argue that fraudulent popish rituals angered God, who inflicted retribution upon the enemies of his elect in imitation of an earthly patriarch protecting helpless children.\textsuperscript{157} By retrospectively depicting Marian disasters as divine providence, Puritans could formulate post-1563 Anglicanism’s monotheistic character, and argue that papists’ powerlessness before the forces of nature confirmed that priests had lost their right to exert authority due to their unnatural contempt for Edward’s church supremacy.\textsuperscript{158} Lightning-bolts were mentioned at the trials of pre-Reformation Lollard John Wycliffe, and Edwardian regent Somerset, as Foxe sought proof that Mary’s impending tyranny was brought about by long-term wickedness and ingratitude among conservative papists.\textsuperscript{159} Besides asserting Protestantism’s superiority over popery, these depictions were intended to appeal to Puritans’ sense of civic duty; without continued internal church reform (including iconoclasm), younger preachers like Adams and Taylor feared that God would punish England, as he did after Israel’s reversion to idolatry.\textsuperscript{160}

Belief in divine providence appealed not only to Puritans who conformed to the Anglican Church, but also to younger nonconformists (including separatists and reluctant conformists) seeking to portray themselves as the only uncorrupted remnant of the Marian Protestant elect.\textsuperscript{161} These depictions contain the greatest amount of adaptation; pre-Reformation saints were long forgotten, but radicals reinterpreted Foxe and Brice’s martyrologies to create a new, exclusive religious identity, where recent Henrician and Marian martyrs replaced the early Christians; and Bible quotations supplanted pseudo-Latin prayers and spells as the means for channelling divine intervention.\textsuperscript{162} Countering allegations of summoning demons, the supporters of Lancashire reluctant conformist preacher Darrell distinguished his beneficial exorcisms from inherently evil “false miracles of the Roman synagogue,”\textsuperscript{163} and compared Puritan ministers with Christ expelling evil spirits in God’s name. After the exposure of his alleged shill Somers as a government spy who counterfeited his afflictions, Darrell resorted to allegory to portray himself as a superior teacher and spiritual counsellor.\textsuperscript{164} The demons that possessed his patients were the product of their own fears, and were figuratively vanquished through the power of prayer and education, which miraculously gave weak-minded men the confidence to transform into productive members of the church and secular hierarchy.\textsuperscript{165} By submitting to Anglican Judge Popham, and representing his own miracles symbolically, Darrel could avoid the fate of defiant Brownists like Penry or Barrow, although Darrel’s belief in the continued presence of devils (blamed for causing sickness and madness) implied that the Church of England remained flawed and susceptible to popish corruption due to Elizabeth’s reluctance to impose Calvinist Presbyterian church reforms.\textsuperscript{166}

My source analysis suggests Catholic perceptions of miracles and the supernatural represent efforts to establish continuity with the Medieval Church; and reassert the priesthood’s claim of pre-eminence by claiming that even Kings were accountable to a higher power. Additionally, priests could argue that mysticism and rational Humanist learning were equally relevant, because both were approved by the infallible Pope. Deeming execution a conduit to the word of God and his angels, Jesuits proclaimed their
martys both scholars and miracle workers, while reinterpreting Anglican rejection of miracles to imply English Israel was inferior because its preachers lacked the mystical powers of New Testament saints. By contrast, Anglicans and conformist Puritans adapted the Old Testament to dismiss priests as quacks; pantomime clowns; or malevolent wizards, whose heathenish curses or fraudulent miracles were ineffective against grave Protestant warrior-scholars; an infallible, divinely ordained monarch; and a large congregation of the elect whose faith and commitment were so strong that these laypeople did not need a cheap, insincere popish conjuring trick to reaffirm their godliness. Fearing Catholic allegations of plagiarism, and radical Puritan separatists harnessing the supernatural to justify unlawful disobedience of royal authority, Elizabeth’s supporters retrospectively perpetuated Foxe’s portrayal of early Protestants as ordinary people with limited mystical powers. These martyred spiritual physicians’ ability to save souls stemmed from passive channelling of God’s will to allegorically expel demonic manifestations of ignorance, rather than insolently beseeching powerless images of the saints for a miracle; or deceitfully peddling false remedies like common ruffians. As Elizabethan England stabilised, abstract accounts of divine providence benefiting the Anglican elect, including natural phenomena and lucky escapes supplanted literal miracles associated with rebellion; Jesuit traitors; and seditious Puritan separatists.

**Bad Deaths of Persecutors**

Finally, this chapter will discuss a new area of research within the field of Death Studies: cautionary tales contrasting the courageous deaths of approved martyrs with the unpleasant demise of persecutors who failed Rittgers’ concept of the test of faith, by giving into despair; losing control of their bodily functions; or arrogantly questioning God’s plan for their soul. Unlike the existing historiography, which focuses upon the social or emotional impact of death in early modern Europe, my research will analyse the political function of the untimely end of authority figures associated with an earlier regime. Combining my previous themes of adaptation with the Tudor royal personality cult, I will propose that Puritan portrayals of a “vengeful God,” as the counterpart to an earthly king dispensing disproportionate physical punishment, were motivated primarily by fear and awareness of the Elizabethan state’s limitations. If an unrepentant persecutor died before being held accountable for his crimes, this undermined the Queen’s right to punish criminals, and by extension her claim of infallibility. Combining themes of inversion with constructs discussed by Vivanco in her analysis of Medieval Spanish Christianity, I will argue that, within the context of Tudor England, the unpleasant demise of allegedly wicked officials were intended to counterbalance early martyrs’ heroic, stoic self-sacrifice, and confirm the Catholic or Protestant elect’s exclusivity. These bad deaths took many forms: besides execution by a monarch miraculously made aware of their treachery, evil men could be struck down with insanity; sickness; paralysis; or sudden death. Harvey’s research into early Christian perceptions of sainthood suggests that while pleasant scents were equated with divine favour, the reek of rotting flesh was equated with death, decay, sin, and damnation. According to Seale and Corr, if an individual was deprived of a natural, peaceful death in bed, early modern people believed that something had gone seriously wrong, and the sinner was being punished by God. Expanding upon this existing research into pre-
Reformation depictions, I will argue that for post-schism Catholics and Protestants alike, the bad death reflected Tudor beliefs in moral absolutes, where the manner of one’s death, and posthumous remembrance, were supposedly earned through the choices one made in life.\textsuperscript{172}

Depictions of bad deaths represented a race between Elizabethan Puritans and Jesuits seeking to prove their particular sect enjoyed divine protection, while amassing statistical proof that rival clergymen had failed their patriarchal and civic duties of protecting England from disorderly foreign false religions. Seeking to supplant Purgatory and Catholic prayers for the dead with Calvinist belief in predestination, Puritan ministers Bate Adams, and ex-priest Bell deemed persecutors’ sudden accidental deaths bad not only because they were painful and violent, but also because papists were unable to repent their sins.\textsuperscript{173} Somewhat similar to the Hindu or Buddhist concept of Karma, Puritans believed that every wicked act confirmed an evildoer’s pre-ordained fate: consignment to hellfire and destruction of his soul.\textsuperscript{174} God, the ultimate judge, could dispense exemplary retribution at any time, and had to be continually appeased to prevent England sharing the fate of the idolatrous ancient Israelites: enslavement and annihilation by their pagan Assyrian and Babylonian enemies.\textsuperscript{175} Papists’ powerlessness before the forces of nature implied they were despised by God’s creations, including the maddened bull that supposedly killed Chancellor Whittington of Sudbury for his own butchery of innocent Lollards.\textsuperscript{176} Other examples in Foxe’s \textit{Acts and Monuments} included the priest who broke his neck in a riding accident; and Marian official Plankney who fell into a well.\textsuperscript{177} The water that drowned Plankney, or the dumb beast that killed Whittington, were depicted with a degree of autonomy, because papists lost both their masculine rationality and God-given mastery over the natural world by unnaturally worshiping the Pope and idols of dead saints.

The second type of sudden death commonly found in Puritan propaganda was the belief that death by natural causes, including strokes or heart-attacks, were caused by God or the Devil paralysing English Zion’s enemies with invisible darts.\textsuperscript{178} Many aged Marian clergymen died suddenly from 1558-1559, including Cardinal Pole; Bishop Griffith of Rochester; Christopherson the “brawling bishop of Chichester;” Tunstall of Durham; and Thornton of Dover who hypocritically flouted the Third Commandment by playing bowls on the Sabbath rather than focusing on prayer and study.\textsuperscript{180} Although the demise of these conservatives appeared to be from peaceful old age, Puritans retrospectively deemed it a message from God heralding the literal death of Medieval popery and the birth of Anglicanism; the burial of old papists by returning exiles seemingly fulfilled Christ’s parable from Matthew 5:5 that the meek and righteous elect would ultimately inherit the new Zion.\textsuperscript{181} Puritan ministers Foxe, Beard, and former Marian exile Lupton, claimed that a parson from Crundall in Kent [fig.19] died in the pulpit immediately after he “received the Pope’s pardon from Cardinal Pole and exhorted his parishioners to do the same.”\textsuperscript{182} The priest’s death could be interpreted in two ways: either as divine punishment for his apostasy, cowardice and bragging; or as confirmation that the embracing of devilish popery enabled demons to infiltrate England and spread sickness.\textsuperscript{183} Expanding upon Foxe’s humorous anecdotes, 17th-century Puritan Trapp claimed one Marian woman who reported her husband for heresy was struck dumb, being forcibly transformed into the idealised, silent wife as punishment for inability to hold her
tongue on her own accord.\(^{184}\) By irrationally choosing idolatry over her godly husband’s life, the unnamed apostate lost her rationality and identity, and became a living reminder of the consequences of violating the patriarchal hierarchy.\(^{185}\) These stories, written with the benefit of hindsight, were intended to warn commoners of the consequences of treachery, irreverence, insolence towards preachers appointed by the divinely ordained Edward VI; and the dereliction of every English subject’s duty to resist popery.\(^{186}\) Divine retribution, when it invariably came, was not necessarily inflicted upon the offender; evildoers could lose family members, or their wealth and privilege, to satisfy a vengeful God.\(^{187}\)

In Tudor times, afflictions like cancer, gout or diabetes were equated with overindulgence in luxury food and drink, with the resulting swellings and infections being indicative of one’s spiritual decay under the weight of earthly corruption. Although death from sickness did not necessarily mean an individual was damned, Marian persecutors were depicted in Elizabethan Anglican martyrologies as showing impatience; fear; or ingratitude while “rotting above ground.”\(^{188}\) Contrary to the calm, peaceful death of the sickly but virtuous King Edward.\(^{189}\) Unlike Protestant martyrs who were mourned by their friends, stinking papist persecutors were shunned and died alone, thus confirming their rejection by earthly and heavenly beings alike; and providing a gruesome, visual spectacle of divine retribution akin to the disembowelment of traitors.\(^{190}\) The literal physical decay of papists’ bodies exposed the genuine state of a hypocrite’s soul; highlighted the consequences of not praying or fasting; and enabled Protestants to establish parallels between Elizabeth’s punishment of traitors, and God’s plagues upon the acolytes of rotten, anachronistic pagan cults that threatened the ancient Israelites.\(^{191}\)

Seeking to prove celibacy was a cover for perversion, Marian exiles Foxe, Brice and Lupton attributed the allegedly foul stench and insanity of dying Marian persecutors to venereal diseases like syphilis, or the brimstone of hell.\(^{192}\) By depicting these “unmerciful ministers of Satan”\(^{193}\) as promiscuous inversions of the ideal Christian, Puritans could deprive contemporary recusants of positive role models and, furthermore, imply the Catholic episcopal hierarchy was antichristian.\(^{194}\) Marian bishops were thus equated with ancient persecutors and whoremongers like Antiochus Epiphanes and Herod the Great who died miserably and slowly from rotting bowels as punishment for their cruelty, intemperance and blasphemy.\(^{195}\) After Latimer and Ridley’s execution, Bishop Gardiner allegedly suffered “such a terrible inflammation in his body as if he were burning alive;”\(^{196}\) his limbs turned black; his tongue protruded and he emitted an intolerable stench, reflecting inner corruption and indicating that he was destined for hell.\(^{197}\) This sensationalist depiction may have been derived from descriptions of the cadaver-tomb Gardiner was buried in at Winchester; the rotting corpse was a symbolic reminder of death’s inevitability, not an accurate portrayal of Gardiner’s body pre-interment. [fig.21] Alternatively, Foxe’s account of Gardiner’s corpse swelling and rotting may have simply been mistranslated from the heralds’ account of the funeral, where the removal of Gardiner’s entrails was required for the embalming process.\(^{198}\)

Desperate to rehabilitate their pre-Reformation forebears’ posthumous reputation, post-Marian Catholic priests reinterpreted Foxe’s Acts and Monuments to portray the sudden demise of Anglican officials during epidemics as a warning that everyone, including Elizabeth, was accountable to a higher power.\(^{199}\)
By reasserting the potency of God’s avenging angels, and providing graphic accounts of persecutors’
deaths, Allen, Gerrard, and Fitzherbert could depict every priest as a superhuman miracle-worker who,
far from being powerless before the royal personality cult, channelled divine aid to rectify injustice and
expose heretics’ own impotence against the supernatural.200 Dying Protestants stank because they had
profaned the Holy Church, and lost their rationality as a result of forsaking true religion for heretical folly.
Some priests claimed Elizabethan courtier Walsingham, and “renegade friar”201 Calvin died stinking,
infested with vermin and cursing God, thus drawing parallels with the unpleasant deaths of pagan tyrants
who persecuted the early Christians; and with the demise of the blasphemer Arius for his insolent
rejection of Christ’s divinity.202 Jesuits Radford, Norris and Fitzherbert were motivated primarily by fear
for their sect’s credibility; if Catholic sainthood lost its relevance, younger recusants might attend
Anglican Protestant services, potentially depriving the Catholic Church of future missionaries.203 Like
their Puritan rivals, Jesuits Norris and Fitzherbert equated foul, stinking deaths with the crime of treason:
namely the betrayal of the ancient, universal church for short-term personal gain. The implication was
that God intervened through frustration at Elizabeth’s tolerance of deceitful Puritans and amoral hanging
judges, whose abuse of priests was an attack on true Christianity, and whose later physical
destruction confirmed England’s lack of saintly protectors.204

Countering Anglican allegations that executed Jesuits also emitted a foul stench when disembowelled,
many Elizabethan priests favoured alternative representations of madness and paralysis in the hope that,
like St. Paul, lay-Protestants would eventually awaken from their spiritual blindness.205 The minor,
temporary afflictions of youthful heretics are comparable to the corporal punishments Marian officials
inflicted on lesser criminals, including the whipping of youths deemed too irrational and insignificant to
execute. Priests’ ability to heal insane Protestants through the power of prayer confirmed Catholic claims
that the pre-Reformation church was already infallible and uncorrupted, thus rendering Edward’s church
reforms unnecessary and confirming priests’ potency and benevolence.206 Anyone who struck a priest or
renounced Catholicism, however, was deemed irrevocably damned and unworthy of forgiveness because,
unlike ignorant low-status heretics, an informer, hardened Puritan, or church-papist had knowingly
betrayed the true church. In an attack on Calvinist predestination, Jesuits Wilson, Matthew and Keynes
claimed God continued to send angels in support of the recusant elect, resulting in unrepentant informers
losing the ability to confess their sins and dying either mumbling, or raving mad.207 Here, insanity
represented a parable, where the irrationality and false wisdom of heresy heralded the total physical,
mental and spiritual destruction of fanatical heretics who, unable to confess their sins, were barred from
Heaven. Anglican “mad adversaries” 208 were undoubtedly hell-bound because they had arrogantly
spurned both the warnings of earthly priests, and God’s benevolent attempts to prevent damnation
through use of temporary pain as a form of supernatural shock therapy.

As testimony to the flexibility of Elizabethan Anglican propaganda, Palfreyman, Bale and Jewel countered
Catholic claims of mysticism by claiming that “he who drinks of the Mass is mad,”209 and implying that
meaningless idolatry enraged God due to its false, chaotic, pagan and devilish connotations.210 Adapting
representations of the torture of secular criminals, where pain allegedly forced an offender’s body to bypass the mind and confess the truth, Protestants claimed that “malicious, wicked” Marian persecutors were driven mad as punishment for betraying dead King Edward. These insane papists, whose cruelty and blasphemy were equated with the heathen Turks, lost their humanity and became playthings of Satan, who asserted his dominance over evil men by tormenting their minds and bodies before dragging them to hell. In a radical subversion of Catholic miracles and visions, Foxe’s contemporaries claimed martyred Protestants appeared to dying persecutors to herald God’s judgment. These depictions, intended to appeal to both moderate and radical lay-Protestant readers, were deliberately left ambiguous, thus opening the possibility that visions of the dead could be vengeful ghosts; devilish illusions; or a deluded papist’s irrational hallucinations. Marian Bishop Morgan, a notorious hanging judge, died raving to have Lady Jane taken away from him; and one of Sheriff Doyle’s servants went insane after burning a young Protestant at Bury St. Edmunds, stripped himself naked, and died crying “James Abbes is the servant of God and is saved, but I am damned.” The persecutors’ weeping, and apparent endorsement of Protestantism, served to feminise the dying papists and imply the entire Catholic hierarchy was inferior due to its adherents’ inconstancy and despair when facing death. Furthermore, this unusual behaviour (possibly caused by consumption of contaminated food) enabled Protestants to reclaim the Anglican Church’s claims of mysticism by supplanting prayers to the saints with accounts of direct divine retribution upon both Marian persecutors, and contemporary foreign inquisitors mistreating English captives on behalf of the Pope and Philip of Spain. Finally, this section will discuss representations of execution or imprisonment as a bad death, with lay-Catholics like Huggard and Verstegen claiming that even heretics who died bravely could go to hell if their cause was unworthy, and face worse torments than burning, hanging and disembowelment. Such texts shaped the perceptions of later Elizabethan priests, who retrospectively proclaimed Henry and his daughter fickle for killing servants who outlived their usefulness, as the depraved Roman tyrant Commodus did to his own slave to appease an angry mob. Believing the high proportion of post-1571 executions confirmed the Anglican confessional state’s illegitimacy and weakness, Catholics argued that for her own heresy, and that of her father, Elizabeth faced strife not only from hostile foreign nations, but also internal rebellions, plague, famine and misery. Wilson, North and Broughton attributed the Anglican Church’s abolition of pre-Reformation rituals not to the adaptability of post-Reformation Catholic Humanism, but to Henry’s weakness and susceptibility to flattery and seduction by self-serving heretics. Regardless of the true confessional identity of disgraced Henrician officials, Counter-Reformation priests denounced beheaded adviser Cromwell and his successors as “promulgers of Protestantism,” to imply Elizabethan reformers were untrustworthy, dishonourable and treacherous antitheses of the ideal, obedient servant. In a society where dying speeches were believed to indicate one’s fate in the afterlife, the despair and shameful begging of Elizabethan double agents like Squire and Parry at their hanging confirmed their criminality, feminine deceit, perjury, and betrayal of both Pope and Queen. Countering official Anglican efforts to convert insincere church-papists into Protestants, Catholic
priests Broughton and Aray portrayed these executions as a gruesome warning of the outcome of apostasy, and an apparent confirmation that Protestantism was a contradictory, divisive and chaotic multitude of sects rooted in treachery against God.224

Elizabethan Protestants frequently exploited priests’ unease over the foul, stinking death by claiming that hanged persecutors emitted a foul stench as proof of their despair, uncleanness, and lack of divine favour.225 Unlike the allegedly sweet scent of lamb-like Marian Protestants roasted as sacrifices to God, Anglicans and Puritans retrospectively claimed papists were already rotting before their hanging, and the reek of their opened intestines represented the brimstone of hell.226 Deeming a violent death a fitting comeuppance for cruelties committed in life, Colwell, Averill, and future Bishop King, depicted persecutors as depraved regicidal conspirators whose undignified behaviour at their execution verified their guilt and malice.227 If England was Zion, executed persecutors like Story and More represented wicked heathen tyrants, whose demise with the “sword of God’s vengeance” was punishment for their unlawful, bloodthirsty assaults on the elect.228 Foxe contrasted the brave deaths of Henrican heretics to the apparent nervousness of Catholic priests Powell, Featherstone and Able executed “not for the same cause but the contrary:”229 irrationally choosing feminised worship of the Pope over duty to their patriarchal King. Similarly, Elizabethan adviser Lord Burghley attributed fugitive Jesuits’ swift apprehension to divine providence, and compared their torture and disembowelment by the regime to Foxe’s depictions of God striking down wicked Marian persecutors.230 By claiming priests died badly, these government propagandists could imply that popery was an insincere, false religion, and furthermore imply that the swift apprehension of fugitives confirmed God favoured the Anglican authorities. Papist prisoners’ arrogant bravado quickly evaporated when facing the prospect of execution: a stark contrast to early Protestants whose strong faith, honesty and courage allegedly confirmed their salvation.231 In these instances, papists’ fear and depression implied they were damned for knowingly “turning the truth of God into a lie,”232 unlike good Elizabethan Anglicans who honoured God and Queen by regularly attending Sunday services and upholding laws derived from the Ten Commandments.233

To Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans raised on the Acts and Monuments, the impoverishment of high-status papist prisoners and fugitives was a reminder that money could not buy salvation, as demonstrated by the unhappy lives of many Marian apostates who betrayed their friends through cowardice, greed or vanity.234 Foxe and Ainsworth added a fitting comeuppance for “miserable traitors”235 like disgraced gentleman Henry Philips, or John Dale, who were shunned by friends and family for reporting fellow Protestants, and died in prison infested with vermin.236 If previously respectable recusants, including former Marian jailer James Alexander, were bankrupted by debts, fines or expropriation, Puritans could attribute the family’s hardship to divine punishment for supposedly worshipping the Pope.237 Such wasteful, extravagant behaviour was not uncommon among wealthy young middling-sort men, but Foxe quoted James’ last words: “evil gotten, evil spent,”238 to imply God himself moved the body of the dying turnkey to speak the truth after living a life of depravity and extortion. Anglican bishops ordained after the Marian persecutions, including Abbot and Andrewes, perpetuated Foxe’s belief that the later
misfortune of papists stemmed from their modus operandi: imitating Cain and Judas by murdering or spitefully perjuring against God’s elect. In a variant of the language of opposites, recusants were depicted as impulsive, dishonest and bad subjects who, as the antithesis of the idealised Protestant, disrespected their fathers’ hard work by squandering firstly their inheritance on recusancy fines, and ultimately their dignity, freedom and lives. Lord Burghley claimed exiled Elizabethan Catholic rebels, including the Duke of Westmoreland, died slowly and miserably on foreign shores, away from their families as punishment for their spiritual philandering and assaults on representatives of royal authority. Deeming the misery of these papists a parable illustrating the consequences of long-term wickedness and un-masculine dishonesty, Andrewes portrayed fugitives’ ignominious, lingering deaths as divine retribution for the merciless killing and robbery of their Protestant neighbours. Papists’ posthumous disgrace was portrayed as evidence that popery was a false, devilish sect that brought ruin upon its adherents; and their self-inflicted poverty was analogous to the monarch’s expropriation of criminals.

In sum, depictions of persecutors’ bad deaths were intended to confirm the ability of both God and the Tudor state to break the bodies of evildoers before their consignment to hell, and emphasise rival clergymen’s powerlessness against the divinely protected elect. Martyrologists from every religious group were primarily motivated by fear: Anglicans in particular feared that if they were unable to confirm their claim of divine patronage, the population would reject not only the clergy, but also the Queen who appointed them. Counter-Reformation Catholics, too, were fearful that literal pre-Reformation miracles alone were no longer sufficient proof of divine favour, and thus adapted depictions of the bad death to attack Anglican Israel’s credibility, and uphold the Council of Trent’s endorsement of pre-Reformation saints as messengers of God; and of priests’ rituals that supposedly protected the entire congregation from physical and spiritual harm. Unlike Catholics, Puritans were more likely to include representations of persecutors dying slow, stinking deaths, to draw parallels with the unpleasant odour of Elizabethan traitors being disembowelled. Besides claiming that allegedly celibate papists were already rotting before death due to their corrupt, intemperate lifestyles, Protestants could portray Elizabeth’s accession as a natural transition heralding the final, literal death and burial of decaying pagan popery. Such depictions resulted in a growing unease among Catholic priests over the stinking death, because executed Elizabethan missionaries could also emit a foul stench when disembowelled. Deeming attack the best form of defence, Jesuits responded with accounts of madness, despair and paralysis, in order to prove Anglican clergymen were inherently irrational, sinful and weak due to inability to protect congregations from the evil spirits believed to cause sickness. However, the underlying message in every depiction of the bad death was one that Catholics and Protestants alike understood: recent persecutors’ madness, despair and sickness represented not only the triumph of the elect over adversity, but also the inherent criminality, falsehood and treachery of rival sects whose collective intemperance, immorality, or irrationality rendered them unfit to exert authority.
Conclusion

My observations suggest that the depiction of the condemned as a martyr, heretic or traitor depended upon the evangelising propagandist’s political or religious agenda, as Catholic, Puritan and Anglican martyrrologists either exalted the secular ruler’s ability to dispense justice, or implied that the government was mistaken in its approach to church reforms, and thus was unqualified to serve England’s spiritual needs. Unlike Catholics’ perpetuation of literal mysticism in the form of relic collecting and incantations to the saints, Elizabethan Puritans generally focused upon early martyrs’ rationality and scriptural knowledge, and used allegorical, posthumous accounts of providence to portray their forebears as ordinary people serving as passive receptors for divine intervention. Attitudes to miracles and prophesies also represented a division between radicals and moderates, with Puritans and Jesuits using the voices of inaccessible supernatural figures to charitably criticise the Marian Catholic or Elizabethan Anglican regime. The combination of credible rituals with scholarly arguments was intended to maintain the support of traditionalists and learned men alike, while countering allegations of quackery, blasphemy, or complicity in a regicidal conspiracy. Fearing Catholic allegations of plagiarism, Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans often supplemented or supplanted accounts of the supernatural with portrayals of the Tudor monarchy as God’s earthly counterpart. If, in Humanist terms, England was a microcosm of heaven where the monarch was the terrifying and infallible head of both church and state, official propagandists could depict obedience to Elizabeth not only as civic duty, but also as a religious obligation. If the ruler was represented as a reflection of God, so too was God portrayed in the image of a wrathful but benevolent King, whose gruesome, disproportionate punishment of the bodies and souls of evildoers was counterbalanced by his protection of the loyal Marian Israelite elect; and by his patronage of the Elizabethan Anglican confessional state. Believing every action had a consequence, Anglicans and Puritans deemed the lingering illness or sudden death of papist persecutors evidence that even if a transgressor evaded punishment by the secular authorities, he would ultimately be held accountable after death for violating a patriarchal church and secular hierarchy associated with order and normality.

[Fig.17]: Glass and gilt metal reliquary containing Mary Stuart’s pearl necklace. (British Museum, c.1586).

[Fig.18]: Mary Stuart’s 1587 execution at Fotheringhay Castle. In the background, officials burn the blood-stained velvet drapes from the scaffold to prevent their veneration. (National Gallery, 1613).
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[Fig.19]: Illustration by Foxe of the sudden death of a Kentish Marian parson who collapsed in the pulpit after inciting the parishioners of Crundall to reconcile with Rome.

[Fig.20]: Hanging of three Essex iconoclasts for prematurely defacing Catholic images following the 1533 Henrician schism. The bearded executioner standing between the two scaffolds is portrayed as a mirror image of his master Henry VIII, presumably to demonstrate the regime’s claim of omnipresence.
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Conclusion: Commentary upon Catholic, Anglican and Puritan depictions of Martyrdom.

My own research suggests much common ground between Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrrologists seeking to prove their sect's claim to be the divinely chosen successors of Israel or the uncorrupted early church. As discussed in the six chapters, fear was the motive behind every martyrology: Elizabethan Anglicans feared disorder and rebellion; Puritans feared future persecution; Catholics feared their sect would lose its long-term relevance; and ordinary subjects feared upheaval and disruption to their orderly, everyday lives. In particular, the Marian and Elizabethan regimes feared papists or heretics would usurp the monarch's dominant position over the Mother Church or secular state, prompting efforts by post-schism Catholic and Protestant martyrrologists to distance themselves from rebellions and conspiracies; and to portray their concerns as religious, not political. When facing apparently unrepentant or defiant offenders, punishments were inflicted to fit the crime; traitors were dismembered because regidcial plots tore the nation apart; unauthorised clergymen were hanged like thieves for stealing laypeople's souls; and blasphemous heretics were burned alive as a foretaste of hellfire. The causes of the Marian and Elizabethan persecutions can be attributed to conflicting notions of duty and allegiance, namely the disagreement between Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics over whether the ruler was entitled to regulate a subject's conscience, besides punishing his body for secular transgressions. Initially a comparison between Catholic and Protestant martyrs, my source analysis also highlights the impact of earlier persecutions upon the post-1559 Anglican identity centred on xenophobic rejection of the Pope; belief in divine patronage; and a sense of duty to church, monarch and community.

The differences between Catholic and Protestant representations of martyrdom highlighted the division between moderates and radicals: the Anglican, the Puritan, the secular priest, and the Jesuit. Before the Marian persecutions, much overlap existed between Catholic and Anglican beliefs; many older Protestant exiles opposed not the existence of pre-Reformation rituals, but the Catholic Church's abuse of them. Catholic martyrrologists were generally more selective than Protestants, continuing to favour celibate priests whose piety, self-control and learning allegedly made them superior men, because their duty of patriarchal care extended to the entire congregation. By contrast, Puritans took a more haphazard approach, incorporating a greater proportion of laymen and Lollards to statistically boost the number of approved martyrs. While Catholic martyrs were expected to imitate their saintly namesakes, Puritans preferred allegorical depictions to portray martyrdom as God's pre-ordained plan for Protestantism's ultimate triumph. Initially a Calvinist mind-set within the Anglican Church, Puritanism eventually evolved into a distinct sect, whose members' enthusiastic or reluctant acceptance of royal church supremacy was motivated by a combination of consent for the royal personality cult, and fear of foreign popery. Although Puritans continued to depict the early Christians as heroic role models, they rejected the idolatrous veneration of both ancient and contemporary martyrs; and instead portrayed saints and Old Testament prophets as ordinary people analogous to the contemporary Elizabethan laity, in order to argue that anyone could answer God's calling. Far from being stereotypical killjoys, Foxe's contemporaries were aware of the importance of what Sharpe terms the theatrical spectacle of public
executions, and used puns not only to ridicule Catholic sainthood and amuse semi-literate readers, but also to claim early Protestants’ names reflected their godly lives or heroic deaths. For example, John Lambert was a sacrificial lamb; William Living escaped death because the exiled elect needed living leaders; and, despite his surname, John Foxe was a loyal hound protecting Elizabeth’s lay-Anglican sheep.

Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* had a lasting impact not only upon Anglican Protestant doctrine, but upon England’s collective identity, centred on xenophobic rejection of foreign Catholic nations as cruel pagan enemies of God aligned with the Antichrist of Revelation. This Father of Lies was the Pope, who reputedly sought to conquer and subjugate the English because of their refusal to worship him. Writing on his own initiative to defend the Elizabethan government, Foxe demonised contemporary papists as a deviant other for his readers to focus their rage upon: wicked priests and treacherous recusants conspiring with the Spanish to restore the Marian persecutions. Concurrent with Gregory’s research on the duty of intolerance, Puritans took it upon themselves to purify the Church of England in support of royal proclamations, and thus gain a sense of purpose in a society where every man was defined by his contributions within what Habermas termed the political or public sphere. By the 1570s, Anglican doctrine had become avowedly Protestant, with the younger generation of ministers attacking not only pre-Reformation abuses or the alleged worship of the Pope, but also any ritual or object associated with pre-Reformation Roman Catholicism. Aware of the need to appease the monarchy, conforming Puritans retrospectively combined Henry’s initial rejection of papal authority with early Protestant denunciations of the Pope as Antichrist, in order to prove their own trustworthiness, and justify Elizabeth’s later church reforms as the culmination of the 1533 schism. Collinson’s concept of 17th-century Puritan iconophobia, or the rejection of religious images, was directly shaped by memories of the persecutions, as younger Puritans within the Elizabethan Anglican Church destroyed physical remnants of the past not only to deter image worship, but also to supplant literal Catholic mysticism with abstract concepts of duty to God and the English confessional state (conditional to the monarch’s own commitment to Protestant reform).

As part of the official effort to incorporate iconophobia and xenophobia into Elizabethan England’s national identity, Protestant martyrologists supplanted the pre-Reformation cult of saints with a variant of what Derrida termed the royal personality cult, which, in the interests of an orderly society, required unquestioning obedience to God and an allegedly omniscient and infallible monarch. By combining the functions of church and secular government, Anglican propagandists hoped to deter Elizabethan recusants and reluctant Puritan Presbyterian conformists from using religion as an excuse for disobedience or rebellion. If man was made in the image of God, Elizabethan Anglicans argued that the ruler was particularly so due to his or her mastery over an entire Kingdom deemed not only a macrocosm of the patriarchal household, but also a scaled down model of the Kingdom of Heaven. In this society based upon moral absolutes, subjects were under constant pressure to prove their loyalty to the Anglican confessional state; the implication was that those who failed to sufficiently honour God and the Queen were deviant, insolent internal enemies who endangered the entire nation. If England was Israel, then the masculinised monarch was analogous to a vengeful God whose authority, and very existence, depended

upon the ability to successfully inflict disproportionate punishments upon the bodies of unrepentant criminals as both a deterrent to disloyal minorities, and as a means to calm an angry populace frightened of conflict and upheaval. The agonising triple death of being publicly hanged, drawn, and quartered not only reasserted what Wood terms the state’s illusion of omnipotence, but also barred offenders from the afterlife. In a subversion of normal gender roles, where every subject was expected to contribute to the patriarchal hierarchy, my research suggests that the execution of traitors represented a grisly parody of childbirth, where treason, rebellion and regicide brought not renewal, but total destruction.

Additionally, the Marian and Elizabethan persecutions were more complicated than a class conflict between the established elite and lower-status members of the underground congregations, because within the general groupings of Catholic and Protestant there were many factions battling each other for dominance. These included radical Elizabethan Jesuits; moderate secular priests and recusant laymen; older traditionalist Catholics ordained under Mary; church-papists who attended both Mass and Anglican services; mainstream Lutheran influenced Anglicans opposed to celibacy and transubstantiation; conservative High Church Anglican clergy who envisioned a form of English Catholicism independent from the Pope; enthusiastic conformist Puritans; Presbyterians who attended Anglican services through fear of the bishops; and radical separatists who opposed both royal and Papal church supremacy. Catholic and Protestant martyrologists contrasted their own martyrs’ godliness with rival clergymen’s insolence, cowardice or treachery, in order to convert the religiously neutral multitude. The collective murmurings of sympathetic crowds were used by martyrrologists to project their personal beliefs that the persecutions were unjust, and portray fallen priests or proto-Protestants as positive role models who were not deviant internal enemies, but the godliest members of the collective English elect. The Elizabethan or Marian regime’s adaptation of traditional symbolic festivity, and Foxe’s own use of amusing puns to project his own beliefs, served to pacify and instruct lower-ranking subjects in terms that they clearly understood. If their forebears were unable to convert this indifferent group, Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans instead exalted courageous martyrs triumphing against adversity, while implying Marian or Elizabethan England was a failed state unable to suppress the bloodthirsty, ignorant and irrational pagan commoners.

One depiction common to Anglicans, Puritans and Catholics was the belief the Tudor persecutions represented a spiritual war, where scholars and clergymen were frontline warriors battling either heresy and schism within the ancient Catholic Church; or efforts by the popish acolytes of devilish Babylon to reverse Queen Elizabeth’s restoration of early Christian or Old Testament values. In this allegorical version of trial by combat, victory would ultimately come to the warrior-scholar with the highest morale and most potent weapons: books, Scripture, mysticism confirming one’s divine patronage, and credible Humanist dogma that exposed rival clergymen’s falsehood. My own analysis disproves Foxe’s claim that Catholicism was backward, reactionary and anachronistic, and instead suggests that Elizabethan Jesuit depictions of martyrdom could be equally as adaptable as Puritan representations. Seeking to establish continuity with the pre-Reformation church, and portray themselves as superior teachers, Jesuits frequently depicted their martyrs as both literal saints and Humanist scholars, whose ability to channel the
Conclusion.

Wisdom of unseen supernatural forces was by no means incompatible with their knowledge of Scripture, and their ability to win arguments. Countering Puritan denunciations of the Catholic Church as pagan Babylon, priests proclaimed Elizabethan England a corrupted, stagnating version of Israel, where contemporary Anglicans represented not the early Christian elect; but the wicked, Christ killing Jews forsaken by God for arrogantly rejecting Jesuit efforts to correct Old Testament error with New Testament values. Closely related to this depiction is the concept of the bad scholar, where early Humanists, educated Anglicans and later Jesuits accused their rivals of seeking knowledge through vanity and arrogance rather than selfless desire to instruct their flock; and of resorting to threats and violence due to their inability to win arguments. Although powerless before the law, Catholic, Anglican and Puritan martyrs were all depicted with a strong piety, unlike the alleged decadence, depravity and spiritual blindness of persecutors deserving either of ridicule, or the righteous outrage of the collective elect.

Similarly, the language of inversion was an effective propaganda tool for Elizabethan Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans seeking to discredit executed members of rival sects with allegations of arrogance, criminality, feminine deception, promiscuity, bestial cruelty and cowardice. By attacking the competence of contemporary persecutors, early Protestants or newly ordained Jesuits could portray themselves as the true representatives of authority. These clergymen saw themselves not as members of a disorderly youthful sect, but selfless, patriotic and rational patriarchs simultaneously promoting progressive education while at the same time defending an uncorrupted remnant of ancient Israel or early Christianity from ignorance. Seeking to exalt Edward VI as a scholar and prophet with wisdom beyond his years, and masculinise his sister Elizabeth as a decisive, courageous Israelite King, Anglicans and Puritans assigned feminine traits to the Catholic Church to link it with the Whore of Babylon. By denouncing priests as devilish idolaters; deceitful conjurers; impulsive fornicators; foolish clowns or cruel tyrants, Foxe’s contemporaries could extol the superiority of Protestant education in awakening the laity and enabling even frail women and boys to challenge unchristian error. My research into the new field of non-martyrs suggests that martyrrologists from every sect sought to define a good Christian by explaining what he was not, and thus draw parallels between the perverse, unnatural crime of treason, and rival sects’ bestial violence or feminine sexual misconduct. The stereotypical exile fled not because God had other plans for him, but because he held the law in contempt; the apostate conformed not out of misguided civic duty to Mary or Elizabeth, but because he lacked faith or feared punishment; and the informer was a criminal and mercenary who betrayed his friends and superiors for personal gain like Judas; a scavenging carrion bird; or a butcher’s dog begging for scraps. Other dehumanising animalistic portrayals like the deceitful feminine snake or vicious wolf were used to attack persecutors as cruel, dishonest, bloodthirsty and irrational; unlike lamb-like Jesuits and proto-Protestants whose willingness to endure execution highlighted their courage, honesty, and respect for the secular hierarchy.

In a deviation from what Duffy terms the Medieval cult of saints, Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans retrospectively adapted depictions of earlier Marian martyrs to incorporate abstract Old Testament concepts of providence, that centralised God’s role and supposedly rendered older, idolatrous rituals

obsolete. Closely linked to this Protestant construct, and the aforementioned language of inversion, are Elizabethan representations (especially among conformist Puritans and their Jesuit rivals) of the bad death of persecutors who died stinking; raving mad; from strokes and heart attacks; or on the gallows. In a subversion of Gatrell and Foucault’s construct of a pre-industrialised, pre-Enlightenment government ruling through disproportionate punishment and fear, Puritans and Jesuits deemed the breaking of an innocent man’s body ineffective because his conscience and soul remained God’s property. Thus, a martyr could endure horrific physical torture, but maintain the same calmness and self-control as a pious man dying peacefully in bed. Countering Catholic claims that the Anglican Church lacked miracles, Foxe reminded his readers that every misdeed had a consequence, and that even unjust authority figures were subject to a higher power. Although the allegedly gruesome, sudden and disgusting bad deaths of Marian papists were often embellished or exaggerated, the basic message was one that every Anglican understood. The corruption of one’s body allegedly reflected the state of one’s soul in the afterlife, and implied that even if an evildoer escaped earthly retribution, he would ultimately face God’s wrath.

In sum, my research suggests the English Reformation generally represented adaptation, re-evaluation and transition as Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans sought to prove their religious group’s collective claim of exclusivity. Facing persecution, schism, foreign invasion and epidemics, martyrrologists from every sect had to remodel themselves in order to prove they still had a place in a post-Reformation world, without contradicting established doctrine and thus compromising their integrity and credibility. The greatest amount of innovation can be found in Puritan martyrologies, where certain pre-Reformation beliefs, including miracles, prophesies or transubstantiation, were viewed allegorically, while others, most notably the veneration of the saints and the belief in sacred space, were replaced by Old Testament models. Although representations of martyrdom varied according to martyrrologists’ personal beliefs, Catholics, Puritans and Anglicans shared a common fear of disorder; criticism; the loss of their sect’s credibility; and future persecution that would bring about bloodshed and the overthrow of the established privileged elite. Many mainstream Puritans had a strong sense of duty and desire to prove their usefulness, by subscribing to Elizabeth’s claims of infallibility; taking it upon themselves to cleanse their local church of remnants of pre-Reformation popery; preaching against lawlessness or insolence, and assisting the government in apprehending fugitive Jesuits suspected of conspiring against the ruler. Despite their distrust of Anglican bishops, conformist Presbyterians upheld the Elizabethan government’s laws, because they feared that a nation still undergoing religious reform remained vulnerable to foreign invasion and domestic insurrections on behalf of allegedly worse tyrants such as Philip of Spain or Mary Stuart. Even Catholic missionaries did not initially oppose Elizabeth’s secular powers; apart from a few radical Counter-Reformation Jesuits, most post-Marian priests and recusants still saw themselves as English subjects. These moderate Catholics argued that conflict between the Queen and the Pope benefited neither sect, because these two leaders had separate, but equally important, roles in the respective secular and religious spheres. In both Catholic and Protestant sources, martyrs were generally depicted as impartial upholders of natural justice who, as argued by Gregory, deemed themselves duty bound to
Conclusion.

prevent England’s damnation and redeem a population fearful not only of divine retribution, but also disorder, conflict, and disruption to their own daily lives.

While resolving my theory that 16th-century English portrayals of martyrdom generally represented evolution and reinterpretation, this Catholic-Protestant comparison has raised further issues regarding the post-Elizabethan Anglican Protestant identity. My next piece of research will analyse the impact of the concept of duty upon later generations of Puritans who, influenced by Foxe’s Acts and Monuments, took it upon themselves to further purify England in anticipation of her transformation into a godly state. Concepts worthy of further comparative study include the spontaneous participation of Civil War Roundhead troops and self-appointed Puritan commissioner William Dowsing in the practise of iconoclasm; the colonisation of the New World by zealous Pilgrims who deemed Anglican Israel deficient; and the activities of Civil War-era witch finder Matthew Hopkins, whose efforts to merge the distinct threats of recusants, witches and royalists into a single conspiracy reflected Puritan zealots’ desire to complete their forebears’ cleansing of England. Additionally, Foxe’s Old Testament allegories, and the Anglican subscription to the royal personality cult, had long-term implications for England’s national character: opposition to popish rituals; the use of opposites to define virtuous behaviour; fear of invasion and future persecution; and a sense of duty towards the abstract institutions of nation, church and monarchy. As discussed in the section on reluctant conformists, however, Puritans’ subscription to the absolutist royal personality cult was conditional to the monarch’s commitment to imposing Protestant reforms for the people’s long-term benefit. Although initially unwilling to overthrow their natural sovereign due to the importance of the institution of the monarchy in maintaining order, were the Puritans who rebelled against Charles I and James II motivated primarily by fear of a repeat of the popish idolatry and mass-burnings described by Foxe? Another aspect worthy of further research is the relationship between later Puritans and the Jews after their re-admission to England by Oliver Cromwell’s post-Civil War regime. Did shared memories of persecution shape the more positive portrayal of the aforesaid Children of Isaac among later 17th and 18th-century breakaway nonconformist Christian groups in Britain and the Americas?
[Fig. 21]: 1550s cadaver tomb at Winchester Cathedral depicting Bishop Gardiner as a skeleton. Did Foxe re-interpret this symbolic reminder of death’s imminence to claim Gardiner rotted while still alive, in the manner of ancient pagan persecutors?

[Fig. 22]: 1564 Illustration from Coverdale's Certain Most Godly, Fruitful and Comfortable Letters showing the Old Testament influences upon the post-1558 Anglican identity; the flames signify Elijah’s triumphant ascent to heaven, while the quotations from Psalms and Revelation are intended to both highlight the apocalyptic nature of the persecutions, and reassure the survivors that a provident God would ultimately intervene on behalf of his faithful Israelite elect. The same image was later used by Foxe to illustrate the burning of six Colchester Protestants, in conjunction with new, more detailed illustrations created especially for the Acts and Monuments, such as the burning of pre-Reformation Lollard John Badby in a barrel of boiling tar. [b]
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