

Protestant Polemic in the 1570s: Elizabethan responses to the
Northern Rising, the Papal Bull and the Massacre of St
Bartholomew's Day

by

Mark Frederick Wilson

A thesis submitted to The University of Birmingham for the
degree of MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History
School of History and Cultures
The University of Birmingham
August 2013

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Between 1569 and 1572, a series of events, domestic and continental, occurred that shook the confidence of many Elizabethans, including those who served the Privy Council and Parliament. The Northern Rising (1569), the issue of Pius V's Papal Bull (1570) and the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre (1572), in Paris, all triggered political and polemical responses from those connected with the political institutions outlined above.

The Protestant polemical print I have investigated, issued warnings to Elizabethans, via the perceived threats of foreign invasions, the fear of Papal power, sedition, treason, moral evils and the damnable doctrines that Catholicism represented to many Protestants. I have explored the nature of these polemical representations of Catholics and analysed the ways that those accused of involvement in the Northern Rising, Pius V and those accused of manufacturing the St Bartholomew's Day massacre, were represented, in order to warn those Elizabethans perceived to be religiously uncommitted at court (including the Queen herself) and presumably the general public in the streets, of the threat that Catholicism represented to Protestant confessional identity and the Realm of England. Ultimately, it informed Elizabethans to be vigilant in the contemporary, confessional and political struggle, experienced by those in power.

Abbreviations and References

I have used the following abbreviations in the footnotes.

BL	<i>British Library</i>
CSPD	<i>Calendar of State Papers Domestic.</i>
CSPF	<i>Calendar of State Papers Foreign.</i>
CSPS	<i>Calendar of State Papers Spanish.</i>
DNB	<i>The Dictionary of National Biography.</i>
OED	<i>The Oxford English Dictionary.</i>

Referencing

When quoting state papers, I have only used the calendar references where I have not personally consulted the documents. I have used R. Lemon's editions of the Calendars of State Papers Domestic & Foreign, and M.A.S. Hume's edition of the Calendar of State Papers Spanish.

When referencing online sources I have included the URL and the date the source was accessed in the footnotes. In the bibliography, online references will appear where appropriate; i.e. in either the Published Primary Source or the Secondary Source list.

I have not modernised spelling and punctuation in the original printed or manuscript sources, except where specifically stated.

Dating

I have used old style dates, taking the year to have begun on January 1st.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to Professor Richard Cust (University of Birmingham) and Dr Alexandra Gajda (Jesus College, University of Oxford) for supervising this thesis.

Dedication

To the memory of Dr Bob Bushaway.

Contents

Introduction.	1.
<i>Historiography.</i>	2.
<i>Methodology: Strengths and Weaknesses of the</i>	
<i>Primary Source Material.</i>	7.
I – The Northern Rising and Papal Bull.	11.
<i>The Northern Rising.</i>	13.
<i>The Papal Bull.</i>	19.
II – The St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre.	36.
<i>The Background context: the St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre.</i>	38.
<i>The Immediate responses at the English Court.</i>	39.
<i>The Popular Reaction in London: Bishop Sandys’s response.</i>	42.
<i>The popular conception of Mary Stewart and her perceived</i>	
<i>involvement in the massacre.</i>	44.
<i>Catherine de Medici and the Valois Court: Machiavellistes.</i>	48.
<i>The Admiral Coligny as martyr and John Foxe’s Acts and</i>	
<i>Monuments: An International collective, Protestant cause?</i>	54.
<i>John Stubbs’s Gaping Gulf.</i>	58.
Conclusion.	62.
Bibliography.	65.

Introduction

The objective of this study is to decipher the nature of Elizabethan Protestant responses in England to events involving a Catholic or Papal driving element, and decipher the literary devices used to discredit Catholics, of both domestic and foreign origins. The aim is to expand upon past studies, some distant, others more recent and contribute further to the historiography of the politico-religious climate of Elizabethan England in the 1570s. This study will demonstrate that this period was the pivotal decade of Elizabeth's reign when anti-Catholic feeling amongst officialdom and the laity began to form a united English, Protestant front, against domestic Catholics in England, the Pope, the Valois and Guisard Catholic elements in French confessional politics and the Catholic superpower that was Phillip II's Spanish and Hapsburg Empire. Importantly, the study will also determine the chronology chosen as the time when anti-Catholic feeling in England was harnessed by the state via the medium of print.

The *OED* defines the noun, polemic as a "strong, verbal or written attack". The adjective is defined; "engaging in strong or controversial debate or dispute". It is derived from the Greek word *polemikos*, meaning "war".¹ The dissertation will explore polemical methods used to construct and then consolidate, strengthen and confirm Protestant confessional identity in Elizabethan England during the middle part of the Elizabeth's reign, when the politico-religious struggle for hearts and minds, in England, escalated. It will analyse and consider printed anti-Catholic and anti-Papal polemic from Protestant writers and investigate how the main politico-religious events in the British Isles and Continental Europe, during the period from 1569 to 1572, were represented in print. I will focus in Chapter One on the reactions to the

¹ *OED*, (2004 Edition).

Northern Rising of 1569 and the publication of the Papal Bull in 1570. Chapter two focuses on reactions to the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572. Initially it will attempt to review the current historiography on this subject, in the process of this exploration. The aim of the dissertation, therefore, will be to focus on those polemical tracts which constitute the printed reaction or response to events where Catholics, whatever their confessional identity or relationship to Rome was, were portrayed in a negative religious, social or cultural context in comparison to England's 'true' religion, Elizabethan Protestantism.

Historiography

We may deduce that Elizabethan policy was centred on what Alec Ryrie has called the "politics of fear".² Much of this feeling, as Peter Lake argues convincingly, was the result of the construction of a dialectical relationship between "anxiety and assurance". For many Protestant polemicists, not least John Foxe, the fear was of a return of England to the days of the Marian persecutions. The dynamic at play, therefore, was what has been termed, one between the certainty of a Protestant godly victory and the fear of the strength of the enemy or popish antichrist.³ The 'fear of Popery' is apparent in much of the polemical source literature as it was a political standpoint of the Elizabethan State which gained solidity from the issue of the Pius V's bull in 1570.

It has been suggested that simply to be a Catholic "savoured of sedition" in the context of the Northern Rising and the Papal Bull. Deference to Rome inevitably meant disloyalty to the Queen. Gestures of Catholic continuity and defiance

² A. Ryrie, *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realm 1485-1603* (London, 2009), pp. 231-253.

³ P. Lake, 'The Significance of the Pope as Antichrist', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31(1980), p. 168.

suggested a rejection of the English Reformation and the Elizabethan Settlement. The counter position was conformity to the Church of England, which represented a stamp of national allegiance, civic responsibility and respectable Protestantism.⁴ The early 1570s has also been labelled the era of 'confessionalization' by historians of the Reformation. Diarmaid MacCulloch proceeds to suggest a balance of power, in the period from 1570 to 1572, switched the confessional emphasis in northern Europe to the Protestants. In addition, John Bossy in his account of the English Catholic Community, and William J. Sheils identifies 1570 as the time of "watershed" in the relationship between English Catholics and the Tudor State.⁵ Beyond 1571, there were no Catholics to be found in the House of Commons. R.B. Wernham has claimed the period from the 1570s onward was when "the great mass of Englishmen, even if they did not become active Protestants, turned their backs finally and conclusively on Rome".⁶ Michael Graves notes how, what he calls the "crisis years" of 1568-72, ushered in a change of policy towards English Catholics.⁷ This political context informs the chronology of this study.

In more specific terms, current work by Krista Kesselring, focusing on a domestic crisis for Elizabeth's government, concludes that the reaction to the Northern Rebellion was the point at which restrictions were reinforced on Elizabethan Catholics and argues that the anti-Papal nature of the regime in particular, was instrumental in highlighting proof that the Pope was the sworn enemy of England. Her work focuses on how the official *Homilie Agaynst disobedience and Wyllful*

⁴ A. Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*, (Suffolk, 1993), p.13.

⁵ D. MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London, 2003), p.xxiv; J Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*, (London, 1975), pp.11-76 & W.J Sheils, 'The Catholic Community' in S. Doran and N. Jones, (eds.), *The Elizabethan World*, (Oxford, 2011), p.255.

⁶ R.B. Wernham, *Before the Armada*, (New York, 1980), p.337.

⁷ M.A.R. Graves, *Thomas Norton: Parliament Man* (Oxford, 1994), p.159.

Rebellion (1571) of the Northern Rising, created anti-Catholic feeling via a propaganda campaign.⁸

Political-religious events and anecdotal evidence from Continental Europe were seized upon to further discredit Catholics. For example, in 1572, the infamous St Bartholomew's Day Massacre, created an opportunity for anti-Catholic polemicists to accuse European Catholics to be uniformly guilty of an international conspiracy, led by the French Monarchy, Rome and Spain. Mack Holt and Barbara Diefendorf's analysis and narrative of the events remain the most thorough, and suggest the massacres were a series of interconnected events.⁹ There is little evidence of English published responses, although they may have existed. Lisa Ferraro Parmalee has suggested that the massacres proved a catalyst for an influx of French publishers to register with the Stationers Company in London.¹⁰ Other work has shown that much of the printed response was the work of angry Calvinist refugees from Catholic France, and they constructed a mythology around such events.¹¹ A.G Dickens has outlined discourse regarding the massacre, which highlighted an Elizabethan fear of popery, and 'Politique-Machiavellistes', in Elizabethan England and add that it triggered a governmental fear of Mary Stewart. Writing for a collection of essays to commemorate the 400th Anniversary of the massacre, it remains the

⁸ K. Kesselring, *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England*, (London 2007) & Kesselring "A Cold pye for the Papistes", *Journal of British Studies* (2004). Archbishop Parker and his chaplains prepared *An Homilie agaynst Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion*, which was a six-part sermon complete with Prayer and Thanksgiving. It was printed separately in 1571 and 1573, and was added to the second book of Homilies in 1574.

⁹ B. Diefendorf, *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth Century Paris* (Oxford, 1991), pp.93-106 and M.P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629*, (Cambridge, 2005) pp.76-95.

¹⁰ L. F Parmalee, *Good Newes from Fraunce, French Anti-League propaganda in Elizabethan England*, (New York, 1996) pp. 30-31. . In particular, Parmalee highlights the work of Thomas Vautrollier, who together, with the work of the translator Arthur Golding, who published and translated a biography of the murdered Admiral Coligny, which was one of the major massacre pamphlets.

¹¹ R. Kingdon, *Myths about the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacres, 1572-1576*, (Harvard, 1988), p.2, 125-135.

sole work specifically dedicated to printed responses.¹² This fear was apparent in and around the Privy Council and Parliament. As we shall see, writings by experienced and learned individuals Thomas Norton and Robert Beale indicate that there was a perceived international Catholic conspiracy to root out the Reformed religion. The 1572 massacres were proof of that. This standpoint was also evident in the views of Phillip Sidney, influenced by his mentor Hubert Languet, as well as those at the heart of Government, such as Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, William Cecil, Lord Burghley and the secretary of state, Sir Francis Walsingham (Beale's brother-in-Law).¹³

What appears to be absent from much of the historiography of the Elizabethan confessional and international political struggle of the earlier part of the 1570s, is a study of the impact of printed polemic. The aim of this study is to provide a commentary and analysis which focuses primarily on the written responses via polemical tracts, within a political context, whether they were for circulation at court or in the "public sphere" of the street. I agree with Peter Lake, who suggests there was a "public sphere", which was taken advantage of by using a variety of media interactions committed to the protection of the Elizabethan regime suggesting the interests of the monarch, court and the general public were all interconnected to some extent.¹⁴ It is also a legitimate claim that these characteristics are interfaced and interactive with the interests of the other. The message or pitch that was broadcast called on bodies of opinion and a series of "overlapping publics", which were used to decide the religio-political issue or debate at hand. In the context of this

¹² A.G. Dickens, 'Elizabethans and St Bartholomew', in, A. Soman, (Ed), *The Massacre of St Bartholomew*, (The Hague, 1974).

¹³ P.Collinson, 'The politics of religion and the religion of politics in Elizabethan England', in, P.Collinson, *This England: Essays on the English Nation and the commonwealth in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 42-44.

¹⁴ Lake expands on Habermas' notions of the medieval public and private sphere paradigm. See below.

study, these “overlapping publics” can be considered to be of the court and the street. Additionally, the appeals of opinion did not rely on personal authority, institutional position or the social or political standing of those making the claims.¹⁵ Furthermore, Andrew Pettegree points to the alliance between the Stationers Company and the book trade in London with the Elizabethan Government, which both agencies saw as being “self-serving” and each was able to complete a degree of control over the literature produced.¹⁶ Patrick Collinson writes that it was a mode of political positioning used by what he calls “the monarchical republic” of Elizabethan England, as it attempted to defend itself against the perpetual demands of the considerable “Elizabethan exclusion crisis”, that lasted up to execution of Mary Stuart in 1587.¹⁷ This study uses these perspectives to inform the contextual template of the conclusions and seeks the mechanisms of this particular ‘public sphere’ of social interaction and debate, from the early 1570s via printed religious polemic. Jesse M. Lander focuses primarily on the convergence of protestant polemic in Early Modern England with the technologies of printing, and argues that it was mainly polemical literature, of a religious nature, that shaped the literary culture of early modern England. The “printing press and religious hostilities” gave the process of polemic its “greatest impetus” in the arena of public debate.¹⁸

The Government also patronised certain individuals practising the trade. William Cecil’s involvement with the Stationers Company, demonstrates the relationship between the authority of the “elite society” and the “mass society” and the discourse

¹⁵ P. Lake, ‘The Politics of Popularity and the public sphere: The monarchical republic of Elizabeth I defends itself’, in P. Lake, and S. Pincus, (eds.), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, (Manchester, 1998),p 59.

¹⁶ A. Pettegree, *The Book in the Renaissance*, (New Haven, 2010), p.222.

¹⁷ P. Collinson, ‘The monarchical republic of Queen Elizabeth I’, in *Elizabethan Essays*, (London, 1994), pp.31-57; Collinson, ‘The Elizabethan Exclusion Crisis and the Elizabethan Polity’, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 84, (1995), pp. 52-94.

¹⁸ J.M. Lander, *Inventing Polemic* (Cambridge, 2006), p.5.

of anti-Catholic polemic.¹⁹ Elizabeth Evenden's work on the career of Puritan printer, John Day, who received patronage from both William Cecil and Archbishop Matthew Parker, has shown that he was "crucial to the regime", in addition to being a successful individual in the London book trade; providing pro-Elizabethan Episcopal propaganda as well as anti-Catholic polemic.²⁰ William Cecil has emerged as a more Protestant figure, who was concerned regarding the Queen's tendency to 'drag her feet' regarding certain matters of Religion. John Stubbs received patronage from Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. The "political puritanism" of the Leicester-Walsingham axis and Cecil's robust Protestantism were dominant features in the landscape of the patronage to polemical print. One can acknowledge the insecurity and anxiety against both domestic and foreign Catholic uncertainties regarding loyalty to the realm, which propelled such printed matter. Within this context, I have focused specifically on those texts which are polemic reactions to the events which sparked such responses.

Methodology: Strengths and Weaknesses of the Primary Source Material

Although a textual analysis of printed responses was paramount in this study, I chose to contextualise these findings by looking at Parliamentary Proceedings, State Papers and correspondence between Privy councillors. Official papers were consulted as well as printed texts for this purpose. The parliamentary proceedings and the State Papers offer a view of official discourse regarding issues of State Security and judicial responses to the events outlined in this study. Similarly the proceedings of Parliament also can be exploited to show the concerns that ministers

¹⁹ P. W. Blayney, 'William Cecil and the Stationers', in M. Harris and R. Myers (eds.), *The Stationers' Company and the Book Trade: 1550-1990*, (Winchester HA, 1997) pp.11-34.

²⁰ E. Evenden, *Patents, Pictures and Patronage: John Day and the Tudor Book Trade*, (Aldershot, 2008), pp.119-154.

of both the government and church had when faced with events such as the issuing of the Papal Bull and the political and religious fallout it created. This shows how the Queen, Privy Council and Parliament attempted to deal with potential crises. The Council itself was an important instrument of the Elizabethan monarchy; it was responsible for enforcement of the religious settlement, public order and policy form. Official correspondence, such as notes and letters written between Privy Councillors are also useful in gaining insight regarding the concerns of these individual Council Members. These specific records were not intended for a wide circulation or even publication. It can be argued that they may offer a truer perspective of the feelings of those in the Privy Council when faced with what they considered were threats to the security of the realm. These sources have been used to contextualise the printed literature, which forms the centre point of the investigation. Although these sources are useful, they cannot be used in isolation. They illustrate how anti-Catholic feeling was formed around these events, and show development of the official responses, but not the polemical reactions to these issues. This leads us onto the remainder of the methodology.

A search for items was conducted on the Short Title Catalogue via Early English Books Online, for the texts. The opening search for the first chapter was given the parameter 'Northern rebellion' and 'Papal Bull'. The years of publication were entered as 1569-1571. The search rendered 29 entries for the "Northern rebellion" and 15 entries for the Papal Bull. For the second chapter I used a search parameter of 'St Bartholomew's Day' and 'Wars of Religion'. The years of publication were added ('1572-1576'); this rendered 8 entries. François Hotman's *A true and plaine report of the Furious Outrages of Fraunce, & the horrible and shameful slaughter of Chastillon the Admirall without any respect of sorte, kinde, age or degree*, surfaced 5

times alone in this search; there were five editions of the title. A search with the parameters 'France' contained 82 entries, again using the parameters 1572-1576. This provided an ample range of texts which could be studied to explore the themes present, although the length of this thesis is not enough to consult all texts in these samples.

The strengths of the material used for the study are twofold. Firstly, they highlight the nature of the literary assault upon Catholicism in the early 1570s, via the textual nature of the pamphlets. Secondly, they also show the origin of the pamphlets via authorship, place of publication and print. This second point is notable because in certain cases, it can highlight links between the authorities and the printers, as several of them worked with patronage from within the Privy Council itself. Such links provide a basis for speculation regarding the motives or the target audience for printed polemic, in response to the above events. For example, we can question whether the circulation was at court or in the public sphere of the street, and whether the target was the Queen herself, religiously uncommitted courtiers or the general public.

The weakness in consulting such printed matter is the fact that we do not have evidence to suggest how far these pamphlets were circulated. We can only draw inferences regarding the demand for such items, then suggest that the print run for a particular item would have been dictated by popularity. We have little idea of the readership - although presumably these pamphlets were popular in court and on the street as they were cheap to purchase - because it is difficult to gauge the juxtaposition or convergence of both, via their "overlapping publics". Some responses to St Bartholomew's Day are also by non-English authors, but they were published after translation into English. These texts must be used with caution if

seeking an objective perspective on the events. Some of these texts were produced by French Protestant authors, who would have been undeniably biased against any Catholic actions in France and beyond. However, this is not the entire focus of our analysis, as we are more concerned with representations of Catholics via these reactions, and the printed discourse shows how Catholics were represented, and how this may have influenced courtiers, policy, the public and ultimately Elizabeth herself. Finally, there are also the deficiencies in our knowledge regarding print runs and it is unclear the proportion of such works to have survived.²¹

The converging of oral, printed and theatrical media was used by satirists to publicise anti-Papal motifs. The strength of these sources lies in their authors' literary devices, which call upon the use of imagery and certain metaphors, in order to discredit Catholics, both in England and abroad. They sometimes show how the Queen herself was criticised for certain decisions or indecisions. They imply that a semi-official or unofficial discourse was taking place in direct response to the events in the short chronology studied. Above all they promoted attitudes and attempted to prompt some kind of action in the readership in one direction or another; in this case to be aware of a Catholic threat both at home and abroad at a time when the Privy Council began to tighten their control over religious and confessional allegiance.

²¹ D.F. McKenzie, 'Printing and Publishing 1557-1700: constraints on the London Books Trades', in, J. Barnard, M. Bell and D.F. McKenzie (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Volume IV 1557-1695, (Cambridge, 2002).p.556.

I

This chapter will address polemical reactions to events that developed into serious concerns of the Elizabethan Protestant elite at the outset of the 1570s. The various literary methods which were used to portray Catholics, following the Northern Rebellion and the issuing of the Papal Bull, via polemical print, will be analysed along with the political responses of the Privy Council and the Court, via political correspondence and parliamentary responses in the wake of these events. It will also be necessary to analyse the revisions of the Law of Treason regarding attacks on Queen Elizabeth I and responses in the political sphere, also to emphasise that the contemporary response to Popery and Catholicism in order to sketch the politico-religious context of this polemic. Textual analysis of the printed works will be necessary in order to gauge the nature of the reaction of the Regime at a time of political insecurity and concern for the Elizabethan realm. Importantly, it will pin down how the responses from the regime generated discourse and debate, and how capable these polemical responses were of raising public and courtly awareness of the Catholic threat. The focus of this particular time of awareness signifies a time of change in the politico-religious climate in Elizabethan England. The political ideas of the elite, with the popular printed responses in turn, created an interdependent interface of religious public opinion. In addition, the very individuals writing the printed responses, who were otherwise excluded from political life, could play a role in defending the realm from a Catholic 'attack'.

At this point, it is necessary to contextualise the setting of Elizabethan England at the time of, and prior to the events of the Northern Rebellion and the Papal Bull. By the end of the 1560s, the Elizabethan Settlement had not impacted upon the North of England to the same extent as it had done elsewhere in the realm. The Bishop of

Carlisle commented in 1562, that “many people” expected a change in religion to Catholicism, and were prepared for it. It is understandable that contemporaries could be forgiven for believing that the ‘new’ religion may not have lasted. After all, 1562 saw Elizabeth herself, dangerously ill and close to death with smallpox. Christopher Haigh highlights that many churches in geographically diverse places such as Kent, Lancashire and eastern Yorkshire, held onto their Catholic fittings, images and rood lofts as late as the 1570s, suggesting a pre-Elizabethan Catholic continuity.²² The Privy Council were also mistrustful of the laity in the north. Certainly in the north, there was a clear, if not extremely mutinous, anti-Settlement feeling to be tapped into by those who opposed Elizabethan religious change that potentially could spark rebellion. At a time when church and state became mutually interdependent, the fear of a Catholic takeover concerned many political figures. A spiritual threat to Protestants was present in the political landscape, which threatened to snag the unwary or the careless. By the early 1570s it is clear that Catholicism was identified with sedition, and the political values it espoused ran contrary to those of the Elizabethan Government, as the regime sought to suppress dissent. Attention must now be turned to the various political and printed responses to the Rebellion, otherwise known as the Northern Rising, in order to emphasise the authoritative reactions to the conflicting confessional positions of the rebels and their actions.

²² C. Haigh ‘Church of England, Catholics and the people’, in P Marshall, (ed.), *The Impact of the English Reformation*, (London, 1997), pp.235-237.

The Northern Rising

A brief outline of the various events of late 1569 is necessary to chart the actions of the rebels, in order to understand the reactions from the authorities and also those printed responses. The aims and objectives of the rebellion also need to be understood in order to gain insight into the nature of these responses, at a time of some political disquiet for the Elizabethan regime.

It has been recently claimed that the rebellion was “in no small part a religious uprising with ardent popular support”.²³ From this starting point, it is possible to contextualise the printed responses to the rebellions of the autumn of 1569. During October and November 1569, Thomas Percy, the seventh Earl of Northumberland, and Charles Neville, the sixth Earl of Westmorland, had led a failed uprising, or rather a conspiracy, to overthrow the current regime and place Mary Stewart as the successor to the Protestant English Queen.²⁴ They began to rally popular support across the northern regions of England. The rebels marched under the banners of the Five Wounds of Christ and the flag of those who wished to better the Commonwealth with the motto “God Speed the Plow”. The ‘Badge of the Five wounds’ was seen by loyalists to the crown as treason, and this therefore, was an incredible slight to the Elizabethan Settlement itself. However, the rebels claimed that they were the “Queens most trewe and lawful subjects”, and proclaimed that the “diuerse new set upp nobles” were to blame for their rebellions. They protested their good intentions, but they also used religion as an issue. They opposed the new heresies, and called all men from sixteen to sixty, to join them”as your dutie toward

²³ K. Kessrling, *Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England*, (Basingstoke, 2007), p.46.

²⁴ A. Fletcher and D. MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, (London, 2003), pp.102-115.

God doth bynde you for the setting forth of his trew and Catholique religion".²⁵ On November 14th they rode into Durham, entered the cathedral, overturned the communion table and celebrated Mass. The religious zeal of the uprising is difficult to deny. Thus the rebellion began.²⁶

Understandably, the rebellion carried serious political fallout for Catholics, both mutinous and loyal, and the Government had to respond. As Kesselring reports, many rumour mongers and talebearers created certain degrees of alarm throughout taverns and marketplaces; these needed to be counteracted with official stories and reports regarding the rebellion.²⁷ Elsewhere, James Lowers has illustrated how the Homily had a prominent role to play in the Government's propaganda campaign in 1570. Archbishop Parker and his chaplains prepared *An Homilie agaynst Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion*, a six-part sermon complete with Prayer and Thanksgiving. The Homilies themselves served to take the debate into the parishes, then spread the warnings of rebellion to the general populace, whilst also emphasising the treasonable nature of any involvement with the uprising. It was printed separately in 1571 and 1573 and was added to the second book of Homilies in 1574, no doubt in response to the rising as well as the publication of the Papal Bull. Church officials were directed to see that on nine Sundays and Holy Days in each year, congregations would hear a part of the 1547 sermon of obedience and one of the six parts on the new sermon of disobedience and wilful rebellion. They would then recite the prayer for the Queen's safety.²⁸

²⁵ J.K. Lowers, *Mirrors for Rebels: A study of polemical literature relating to the Northern Rebellion*, (California, 1953), pp.32-33.

²⁶ Kesselring, *Faith, Politics and Protest*, p.66.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p.147.

²⁸ Lowers, *Mirrors for Rebels*, pp.10-11.

The Government also organised a propaganda campaign, comparable to that of Henry VIII in 1536, following the Pilgrimage of Grace, in order to challenge the aims of the rebellion. This was a frequent blurring of official and semi-official writing against rebellion.²⁹ Richard Morison, an openly Lutheran Protestant, colleague of Thomas Cromwell, was responsible for what may be identified as the first known “professional Protestant propaganda”.³⁰ Morison earlier wrote, following the royal defeat of the Pilgrimage; “God hath deliuered his highnes from the bondage of the byshoppe of Rome, his subiectes from errors, his realme from the foule sinne of idolatry”.³¹ A theme of Popish error, tyranny and Catholic rebellion against various princes in their own, native countries is one which is observed in the official and semi-official tracts following the Northern Rebellion and the issuing of the Papal Bull. In addition to Parliamentary reactions, episcopal authority used the Homily to counter any treasonable actions or reactions against the realm.

It is possible to see how the political responses and official legislation interacted with the sentiments of the printed responses. Regarding the motives behind the rebels’ actions, it is clear that the religious claims and confessional identities of the rebels were identified as a defining factor; it was the fundamental position they held. From the authorities’ perspective, these actions were linked to the Pope and treason against the Elizabethan Settlement. The writers of such printed responses had returned to a polemical position forged in a rhetoric that had its beginnings in earlier

²⁹ J. Cooper, *Propaganda and the Tudor State: Political Culture in the West Country*, (Oxford, 2003), p.239.

³⁰ G.R Elton, *Reform & Renewal: Thomas Cromwell & the Commonwealth*, (London, 1972), pp.55-61. Richard Morison was drafted in after the Pilgrimage of Grace was crushed and was promoted quickly to a strategic position in Government. He became the official Henrican propagandist, publishing primarily against the rebels. Morison and his contemporaries used both subtle argument and bombast in the campaign to defuse potential or outright insurrection. In the *Invective ayenste Treason* Morison railed that Pope Paul “had ayenst all right and equitie a ruler aboue hym, whiche alwayes enforced hym selfe to kepe his hyghnesse, and all the reste of his subiectes in seruitude, error, and idolatrie”.

³¹ R. Morison, *Invective ayenste Treason*, (London, 1536).

responses to the Pilgrimage of Grace and the Prayer Book rebellions of 1549. Lewis Evans wrote following the rising; addressing them and reminding them that they would fail to raise rebellion against their Queen and realm, “though you do thinke that many be as you Of Popishe mynd”? He continues elsewhere in the text, to accuse the rebels, that they have “cankerdyly with treason abused” their Queen and realm. Their “foolish opinions”, in imagining themselves to be “princes”, were the product of their “traytourous mindes”.³² However, it also offered a new angle based upon an apocalyptic struggle between the true and false churches, with other authors turning to the recently published *Acts and Monuments* to contextualise these recent events.³³ Both the polemical and political position was that Catholics were simply traitors, and had acted against the interests of loyalty to the realm, the Queen and the Protestant faith; the politics of which were all intertwined with the theological position, that placed England as the chosen realm or nation to represent God, in the religious struggle against ‘traitorous Catholicism’. The alternative approach is also to see the polemical print as a deterrent; thus by informing the rebels that they are doomed to fail. Not only are the potential subjects of the “aunswer” informed of their traitorous actions and they are warned to stop or suffer the consequences. Other potential sources of insurrection could also be discouraged before they occurred. The content of these publications shows that the authors understood the nature of the revolt and had definite ideas regarding why it had begun. It is to the printed responses we now turn.

A significant theme apparent, following the Northern Rebellion, was that the writers of such polemical responses claimed that the rebels were guilty of stirring up rebellion and discord in the realm. William Seres, echoing Sir Richard Morison from

³² L. Evans, *An Aunswere to the Proclamation of the Rebels in the North*, (London, 1570).

³³ Kesselring, *Faith, Politics and Protest*, p.156.

the 1530s, versified *An answer to the proclamations of the rebels of the North*, replied to the rebels claims. He accused the participants in the rebellion of being guilty of “subuert, and ouerthrowe, and make this Realme a pray”. They would suffer for “troubling still the flock of Christ and such a quiet Queene”; after all Elizabeth was along with her subjects, part of “Christes Flocke”. It was the case that “the Caytifes now most cankerdly with treason haue abused” Elizabeth, whose “prudent heade” had saved England from treason and foreign invasion.³⁴ In a single sheet ballad, John Phillips, echoed the official line as he accused the rebels of creating “disquiet”. Defending the realm and the Queen, it was God who “cut short the rage of those” who would dare rebel against their Queen and “countrie”. The union of England’s realm, with Calvinist Protestantism and God, put the majority at unease with those who “tread thy gospel downe”, but Elizabeth frustrated their efforts, with God’s help. England was now free from rebellion, thanks to the combined effort of the Godly Queen and God himself. With God’s help, she would also “weede such papistes out”, and the “papistes” will suffer retribution for their actions.³⁵ The links between English Catholics and the work of traitors were a commonplace in these reactive texts, published soon after the rebellion’s demise.

Thomas Drant’s sermon at St Mary Spital, London, in 1570, suggested that it was; “true that two and two make four, that when sun is in the midst of heaven it is noon time, so it is infalliably true that no perfect papist can be to any Christian prince a good subject”.³⁶ Drant and Phillips’ use of the traditional Protestant discourse seeing Catholic rebels as traitors and guilty of treasonable actions, is replicated elsewhere in other contemporary responses. Thomas Norton echoed this attack on Catholics

³⁴ W. Seres, *An answer to the proclamations of the rebels of the North*, (London, 1570).

³⁵ J. Phillips, *a cold pye for the Papistes*, (London, 1570).

³⁶ T. Drant, *Two sermons preached at St Mary Spittal*, (London, 1570).

who sought to harm the realm and the Queen. Norton's *To the Queen's Majesty's Poor Deceived Subjects of the North Country, drawn into rebellion by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland*, suggested that they had been deceived by the Earls, but that even if all they wanted was a return to the old faith, then they were participating in treason; finding themselves in plots designed to overthrow the Queen, bring in enemies from foreign realms and enrich the earls. Above all they had been duped by the Pope too, as they risked all for these causes. Whatever perspective Catholics, who were not linked to the rebellion, took, is not recorded sufficiently to make a counter judgement.

Norton continued increasing the weight in his argument against the treason of the rebels, when he suggested, in a second publication entitled *Warning against the Dangerous Practices of the Papistes and Specially the partners of the late Rebellion*, that he could prove that "every papist, that is to say everyone that believeth all the pope's doctrine to be true, is an enemy and a traitor". According to Norton, Catholic rebels would not be persuaded by "clemency or gentleness.....nor by "loving dealing can win a papist while he continueth a papist, to love her Majesty". Norton was warning his readership about this threat. Echoing his fellow polemicists, he wanted harsh penalties for the rebels and Papists in any future incidents.³⁷ More importantly, Norton established a link between the rebels and the potential conspiracy, with the Papacy or foreign Catholic powers, whether imagined or exaggerated. The idea of English or English-based Catholic traitors conspiring with foreign Catholics would prove, for any unwavering souls, to be a timely reminder to

³⁷ T. Norton, *To the Queen's Majesty's Poor Deceived Subjects of the North Country, drawn into rebellion by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, & Warning against the Dangerous Practices of the Papistes and Specially the partners of the late Rebellion* (London, 1570). See also Kesselring, *Faith, Politics and Protest*, pp.154-56.

be vigilant of such danger. It would also precipitate the harsh penalties metered out to plotters in the 1580s. We now turn our attention to the issuing of the Papal Bull in 1570.

The Papal Bull

The issue of the Papal Bull was an interconnected event, parallel to the Northern Rising. The tension in the Privy Council mounted following the document issued on February 25th 1570. Pope Pius V (1566-72) issued, what was identified as a unilateral declaration of war against Elizabeth I, albeit only on paper, known as the Papal bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*, a document not far removed from the previous year's autumnal stirrings in the north of England, in that Catholic noblemen had been in contact with the Pope, reporting that the earls in the north were in revolt and were requesting foreign assistance. It was not published until May 25th, in England, at which point in the drama, a Catholic, John Felton, nailed a copy to the door of St Paul's Cathedral. Felton was later executed for his actions. Both the Northern Rising and the Bull created fear, exacerbated religious tension and offered further proof, for Protestants, of the link between treason and Catholicism.³⁸ The Bull was issued after an English Papal emissary, Nicholas Morton had been sent to England by Pius to investigate the likely responses by Catholic noblemen in clarifying Elizabeth's status as a heretic. By February 1570 Morton returned with encouraging news; the rebellion along with the earls' ultimately futile requests for help with the rising, provided Pius with the zeal to act swiftly. Twelve English exiles gave testimony, which confirmed that Elizabeth had deprived ordained bishops of their offices and replaced them with laymen, heretics and schismatics; including evidence of the appointment of married men as clerics in the Elizabethan Church. Pius also

³⁸ Kesselring, *Faith, Politics and Protest*, pp.156-160.

investigated the possibility that Elizabeth had the power to prohibit the spread of heresy if she so wished, as Mary Tudor had done. The adjacent point was that Elizabeth had the freedom to overrule her councillors if she wished to do so. The earls responded in the affirmative; Pius enthusiastically replied to this evidence by issuing the Bull on February 25th.

In the Bull, Pius declared that “Elizabeth, pretended queen and daughter of iniquity”, was a heretic and she was excommunicated. This meant that her subjects had no moral or spiritual obligation to obey her, or recognise her authority over them. Pius stated that “our apostolic power declare the aforesaid Elizabeth a heretic and favourer of heretics”, and thus added justification for her deposition and potential assassination.³⁹ Pius had hoped to encourage English Catholics to support the rebels, rather than a foreign invasion, when he issued the Bull, but he had not realised that the rebels had already been arrested and arraigned. In fact, the major rulers of Catholic Europe were all dismayed by the Bull and chose to ignore it.⁴⁰ Weiner argues that the early commentators of the Rebellion had seriously misunderstood the Pope’s influence on the rebellion and many English Catholics knew nothing of the Bull until 1571.⁴¹ While this is an uncertain claim, one may also argue that some Protestant contemporaries purposely misrepresented the Pope’s influence on the rebellion to create a climate of loyalty towards Elizabeth, her realm and Government. Pius sought to depose the Queen and excommunicate her from the Roman Church. We should consider the impact it had on Elizabeth herself, her Privy Councillors and indeed her subjects. Along with the aftermath of the Northern

³⁹ *Regnans in Excelsis* (1570), cited in; L. Álvarez-Recio, *Fighting the Antichrist: A Cultural History of Anti-Catholicism in Tudor England*, (Eastbourne, 2011), p.72.

⁴⁰ S. Doran, *England and Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, (Basingstoke, 1999), p.87.

⁴¹ C.Z. Weiner, ‘The Beleaguered Isle: A study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism’, *Past and Present* 51(1971), pp. 30-31.

Rising, it signalled a shift in attitude from the Government towards Catholics in England. It also represented a refashioned Counter-Reformation Catholicism, an enthusiasm which Wallace MacCaffrey has termed a “resurgent Catholic militancy”.⁴²

Legislative responses were adopted by the Elizabethan authorities and these were evident in the Parliament of 1571. Ominously, for English Catholics at least, it was the first English Parliament that required that every member of the Commons take the Oath of Supremacy. Not a single openly, declared Catholic sat in the Commons. The Parliament of 1571 opened on April 2nd and the proceedings were begun with a vitriolic sermon from the Marian exile, Edmund Sandys. He had been appointed to the See of London and declared that the Church had to be “purged of all false doctrine”, and be free “from all idolatry and superstition”. The Northern Rebellion and Papal Bull were his concern, as he retorted that “If we linked together in the fear of God and in true concord and amity among ourselves, put our helping hands, every one dutifully in his calling, to the supporting of the state and defending thereof, doubtless no enemy, no foreign power can hurt us, no bull of Basan shall prevail against us; our Commonwealth, in despite of all both corporal and spiritual enemies, shall be strengthened and [e]stablished for ever”.⁴³ In May 1571, the Parliament passed a bill against the issuing of Bulls, confirming the fear of another Catholic uprising and the determination of the authorities to root out such sedition and treason.⁴⁴

The bill of 1571 extended the breadth of treason, although as John Bellamy writes, the crucial precedent of extending the scope of treason itself can be traced back to

⁴² W. MacCaffery, *Elizabeth I*, (London, 1994), p.327.

⁴³ J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, Volume I 1559-1581* (London, 1953), pp.185-186.

⁴⁴ 'House of Commons Journal Volume 1: May 9th 1571', *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 1: 1547-1629* (1802), 88. URL: <https://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=7099> (Accessed: 14 January 2013).

the Henrican Reformation Parliament of 1530-36.⁴⁵ In the 1571 Parliament, the crimes classified as traitorous when done a second time, by the act of 1559, were made treason for a first offence. The law had been revised because it was considered insufficient to ensure “the surety and preservation of the Queen’s most royal person”. The severity of the law was increased because the scope of treason had now been broadened and extended. Additions to the law were the clauses that proclaimed treasonable offenses for those who threatened the Queen’s person, and encompassing bodily harm of the Queen. It was also amended with use of the phrases “within the realm or without”. This was included for primarily stirring foreign invasion. A charge of praemunire, which carried the death penalty, was also introduced for importing Bulls or instruments of worship from the See of Rome.

Sedition and perceived treason would be dealt with relatively harshly and ‘traitors’ would be facing severe punishments if found guilty. The act was proclaimed to make “certayne offences treason”. To label the Queen, “a heretick, schismatycke, Tyrant, Infidel or usurper of the crowne” was treasonable.⁴⁶ The statute contained a warning not to “estrangle and alienate the myndes and hartes of sundry her majesties subjects from their dutiful obeydeyance, and to raise and stir sedition and rebellion in this realm”. The Pope, or “byshopp of Rome”, was charged with disturbing “the happy peace thereof” with “his diverse Bulls and wrytyngs”.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ J. Bellamy, *Tudor Law of Treason*, (London, 1979), pp.22-23. These acts had no medieval precedent back to when treason itself became an offence in 1352 under Edward III. The treason parameters were further extended in 1552. A second general treason statute was introduced during Edward VI’s reign. It was now treasonable even to utter an accusation suggesting the king was “a heretic, a tyrant, schismatic, infidel or usurper”. There were gradations within the sanctions as before; it was treason the first time committed if perpetrated by writing, but only on the third time by speech. Bellamy believes that this was inserted following the second Act of Uniformity to stop any altercations arising from slanderous accusations aimed at the king that could lead to riots or rebellions.

⁴⁶ T.E. Tomlins (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm IV Edward VI to Elizabeth 1547-1585*, (London, 1819), pp.526-8.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*p.528.

Christopher Wray, the new speaker of the Parliament, continued with an oration that would set the tone for the rest of the Parliament; he stated that the Queen's authority over all matters spiritual and ecclesiastical was "absolute", he that suggested Papal Supremacy was curtailed, England's Commonwealth in these matters would be free from Papal authority. The Queen's case for claiming the Royal Supremacy was not a power allotted to her by Parliament, it was "inherent in the prerogative".⁴⁸ An anonymous journal author and witness, present at the Parliamentary Proceedings noted that the Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon, stated that the Queen's divine prerogative was in place to ensure that her subjects experienced "the puritie of religion, the deliverie from the tyrannie and oppression of the Pope and popelings".⁴⁹ The main contribution the Parliament of 1571 had made to the discussion was that the debate regarding treason and heresy was established. The Pope's authority had been officially extinguished. In the minds of the crown's lawyers and legal phrases linking religious belief to traitorous actions had become commonplace after 1570.⁵⁰

The apocalyptic tradition, a struggle between forces of good and evil, or loyalty and treason, in printed polemic was influenced by John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, popularly known as "The Book of Martyrs", which was first published in 1563, and told narratives of the Marian persecutions. Subsequent editions of *Acts and Monuments* were published in 1570, 1576 and 1583. Foxe's work was itself rooted in a tradition of martyrdom and persecution that could be traced back to the works of William Tyndale. Within this tradition was a struggle and conspiracy between the 'true' church and the corrupt one of Rome. Gradually in work such as Foxe's, apocalyptic language increased in use and its definition narrowed, to identify the

⁴⁸ Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments*, pp.187-88.

⁴⁹ *Anonymous Journal, 2-21 April*, cited in Hartley, T.E (ed.), *Proceedings of the Parliaments of Elizabeth I* Volume 1 1558-1581,(London, 1961) p.198.

⁵⁰ Bellamy, *Treason*, p. 67.

Antichrist, with the prophecies of Rome.⁵¹ There is not enough room for a discussion or full analysis of Foxe's work here, but one must refer to it in order to acknowledge a basis for printed polemical tracts and pamphlets. Much of the later Protestant printed rhetoric is anchored in the roots of Foxe's *Martyrs*.

Patrick Collinson has suggested that Foxe's discourse was of the age when Protestantism was not internalised or "decorous".⁵² The polemic studied here supports this, as one can see the literal religious struggle manifesting itself via print, itself during this period. Thomas Freeman also concludes that "these stories of providential wonders which Foxe printed demonstrate what these goals were: the conversion of unbelievers to the gospel, the correction by example of sinners, and the edification of the godly. The gathering and printing of providential stories were of great importance to Foxe's success in attaining these goals".⁵³ Foxe did not generally invent, or even embellish this material; instead he abridged or edited it, suppressing or deleting what did not suit his purposes.⁵⁴ Comparisons can be drawn between *Acts and Monuments* and the Elizabethan polemical texts studied here, and Foxe certainly provides the confessional context for our texts. It has previously been claimed that Foxe was an Elizabethan propagandist, but his attitudes changed towards the political order in the quarter of a century between his various editions. This idea can be dismissed, although he was linked to the regime via his printer, John Day. In the celebratory epistle of 1563, printed by Day, Elizabeth was seen as a monarch who succeeded to the throne as a divine instrument to further religious reform, rather than in her own right. This epistle was for broad reading rather than

⁵¹ K.R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645*, (Oxford, 1979), p.72.

⁵² P. Collinson, 'The Veracity of John Foxe's Book of Martyrs', *Elizabethan Essays*, (London, 1994), pp.175-176.

⁵³ T.S. Freeman, 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction in Foxe's Book of Martyrs', *The Historical Journal* 43 (2000), p. 623.

⁵⁴ T.S. Freeman, Texts, Lies, and Microfilm: Reading and Misreading Foxe's "Book of Martyrs", *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 30, (1999), p.40.

just Elizabeth's, and Foxe was addressing the concerns of Protestants who were dissatisfied with the level of Elizabethan reforms.⁵⁵ These polemicists mirrored the concerns of these individuals in print. Important within this framework was the image of Rome as Antichristian.

Foxe's publications represented a warning to the unconverted. Essential to the whole configuring of apocalyptic prophecies is the identification of the Pope with the Antichrist. Foxe described the Pope (along with the Turk) as the Antichrist. Firth argues that the use of the term "Antichrist" remained part of the apocalyptic tradition, which can be observed in Foxe's response to the Papal Bull and the Pope.⁵⁶ The polemical responses towards the Papal Bull often issued warnings to those who might waver and be taken in by the Antichrist. It is clear to note how the focus in the literature concerned with the Bull shifts the emphasis from the rebels' responsibilities to that of the Pope, in control of his "calves"; in Protestant eyes the Pope is encouraging rebellion and sedition.

Heinrich Bullinger, the Swiss reformer, in a ninety eight page confutation of the Bull translated into English in 1570 warned of what he saw as the historically damaging Papacy. He cited previous bulls as examples of monarchs in European history, being stripped of authority and tells how the reader may "haue heard how great calamities the Popes haue of tymes wrought to kyngdomes and nations by such maner of Bulles. And he is a wise man that can learne to beware by other mens harmes".⁵⁷ He continued that "For such is the nature & bond of holy Religion, that whatsoeuer

⁵⁵ J. King, 'Guides to Reading Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in, *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68, (2005) p.134.

⁵⁶ Firth, *Apocalyptic Tradition*, p.99.

⁵⁷ H. Bullinger, *A confutation of the Popes bull which was published more then two yeres agoe against Elizabeth the most gracious Queene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland, and against the noble realme of England*, (London, 1572).

happeneth to any seuerall members of Christes Church, the feeling therof disperseth itself into the whole body, so as they ioy together & sorow together, & also lay all their forces together, to withstand their comon enemy". Written in dedication to Lord Robert Dudley, one can imagine how the writer wished to present the Papacy, via a mixture of fact and exaggeration, but still confuting that the Papacy encouraged rebellion and treason in realms other than Rome.

Echoing his attack on the Northern rebels, Thomas Norton wrote that the Bull was to turn "English Papistes, to vndermyne faith and allegeance to the Quene". He continues, in the past the Pope had issued, "Buls for all England, when he claimed or vsurped the Lordship of England as annexed to hys personage".⁵⁸ In this case, the Pope was a dangerous vehicle of sedition and possible civil war; tearing apart the unified Protestant realm or nation. Steven Peele's publication known as *The pope in his fury doth answer return*, portrayed the Pope himself writing to all who opposed his power and confessional position. Peele essentially wrote from the Pope's imagined perspective in his rhyming broadside. This is essentially a piece of polemical propaganda to show the Pope as a confessional threat, who would "gladly be revenged on England y[e]t I might, Because they have much abused my Bull with great delight". It was, according to Peele, the Pope's Bull that had caused John Felton and the Northern Rebels to die for the Papist cause.⁵⁹

Therefore, the Bull, understandably, created fear amongst both the Government and Protestants, as it swiftly followed the Rebellion in the North. Not surprisingly it was

⁵⁸ T. Norton, *An addition declaratorie to the bulles, with a searching of the maze Scene and allowed*. (London, 1570)

⁵⁹ S. Peele, *The Pope in his fury doth answer returne, To a letter ye which to Rome is late come*, (London, 1570).

William Cecil's protégé, Thomas Norton, who once more cautioned his readership against the treason of Catholics, and carried the polemical torch to enlighten his audience. In the pamphlet *A disclosing of the Great Bull* from 1570, he warned of "Englishe papistes" who took up arms and marched under the banners of the Pope, those with the "Five wounds of Christ".... "agaynste our Queene". Norton railed against Catholics whom he suggested would "reconcile all such as would return from the Christian (Protestant) religion and would have those subjects disobey the Queen and our "lawes". In addition, Norton wrote attacking an anti-Christian Catholic Church, also with a "hellish bosom" housing an antichrist; "The one conteineth a power and forme to pardon, assoyle, and reconcile all such as would returne from the Christian Religion now taught in England, which they call veresie, and from obeying our Quéene & her lawes, which they sclaunderously call schisme, to the bosome of the Church of Rome which we may truely call Helles mouth".⁶⁰ This Protestant view of the Papacy was nothing new.

Peter Lake's work has refashioned the previous historical commonplace of the Pope (and indeed the successive Popes) as "the antichrist". His template of the 'antichrist' can be read in the responses to the debate surrounding the Papal Bull, but it was not a new phenomenon in the confessional battle against the Counter Reformation. It had been a long tradition in Protestant Europe. As early as 1521 in Lutheran Germany, a set of woodcuts had been published possibly contributing to the establishment of the Protestant cultural tradition of seeing the Pope as antichrist, sitting in inversion from Christ. The Protestant tradition had taken a form of ownership over the late medieval tradition of the heterodox and oppositional

⁶⁰ T. Norton, *An addition declaratorie to the bulles, with a searching of the maze Scene and allowed.* (London, 1570).

Christianity from the middle ages.⁶¹ For Martin Luther, the Pope was far from being God's representative on earth, but was the manifestation on earth of "the antichrist". The Pope and the Roman Church were part of the problem that was a barrier to religious reform, and the message was that the apocalyptic vision was a final struggle of good against evil. This message was popular over much of Protestant Europe across the social hierarchy.⁶² It represented the end of the world with the "antichrist" and Satan wielding their power with unprecedented fury.⁶³ By the 1570s in England, this feeling had been cultivated into a millenarian apocalyptic view that saw England at the centre of the Protestant bulwark against the antichrist. The English, as Carol Weiner argues, were prone to millenarian thought. The English feared that they must achieve total victory over their enemy. Weiner points out, to English Protestants, the Roman Church "marched on in an unbroken, unswerving line", and the Roman Church and Catholics in general, were not seen as "a collection of disparate individuals", but as a partisan movement, "a highly organised united front".⁶⁴ They were accused of being disloyal to the realm and of dividing the country. The reality was probably much different, although we have no certain evidence regarding how many Catholics were loyal or wished for a foreign-led coup d'état to depose the Queen. But how was this framed within the Protestant consciousness?

Elizabethan Protestants generally took the Lutheran theological stance, outlined above, in this matter. The emotional content of Elizabethan anti-Catholicism was related to the idea and fear of the coming apocalypse. Based on the Book of Revelation, this ideology was one of fear. This inspirational text, one that drove the

⁶¹ B. Scribner, *For the Sake of Simple folk*, (Oxford, 1994) pp.148-150.

⁶² D. MacCulloch, *Reformation* p.128, 133, 153.

⁶³ U. Rublack, *Reformation Europe*, (Cambridge, 2005), p.3.

⁶⁴ C.Z. Weiner, 'The Beleaguered Isle: A study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism', in *Past and Present* 51, (1971), pp.30- 31.

millenarian movements was not borne out of peaceful times, but of an era which saw the persecution of Christians. As a result, English anti-Catholicism and anti-papery was not joyous but fearful of Papal strength.⁶⁵ This theme can also be observed in Government sponsored literature. Norton wrote; “I therefore the least of all the members of Christ, hearing dayly Antichrist and his artificers (I meane the Pope and the Papistes) so cunning in the Cannon lawe, and Popish doctours, that there is nothing in them that they do not both exactly vnderstand, and also vtter, to the maintenance of their head the Pope“.⁶⁶

Accusations of sexual corruptness are usual in the polemical response to the Papacy. There had long been a tradition that the Antichrist was the antithesis to Christ, the Son of God and born of a virgin, filled with the grace of his father, whereas the Antichrist was sired by the devil, born of a whore and educated in the black arts by witches and magicians.⁶⁷ Therefore, according to Protestants, Catholics who followed the Pope, or the Antichrist, were following in the ways of whoredom and adultery. The anonymous author of *an answer to a papistical bull* of 1570, warned against the “idolatry and adulterie” of the “papistes”. Adultery here could be taken both in the literal sense and in the metaphorical one. The author was suggesting that if an English Catholic was to follow the spiritual head of his church, then surely he would be committing a form of adultery against his own country and ruler, by giving his soul to the Pope, hence committing treason. Literal accusations of sexual corruptness or “lewdness” was aimed at Catholic priests who were told that they “must forsake” thier “wicked lyues, and that their own “wyues”, were compared to

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp.58-59.

⁶⁶ T. Norton, *A disclosing of the great bull and certain calues that he hath gotten, and specially the monster bull that roared at my Lord Byshops gate* (London, 1570).

⁶⁷ A. Bevan Zlatar, *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England* (Oxford, 2011), p.109.

common prostitutes, and “must to the stewes”.⁶⁸ In addition, the long standing legend of Pope Joan VIII, disguised as a man, but who disclosed her womanhood by giving birth in a procession, enabled Protestants to “associate the Pope with unnatural womanhood and sexual degeneration”.⁶⁹

Elsewhere the image of the Pope as a monster or a beast, threatening the very security of England itself is another reoccurring metaphor in these pamphlets. It represented a long tradition of labelling the Pope as a beast or, as we observed earlier, the Antichrist. Lake suggests how certain individuals in the hierarchy, from John Whitgift, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, to the printer, John Field considered “the Pope to be Antichrist”. For Whitgift, this was a theory in the central element of the Protestant case against Rome. For other Elizabethan Protestants, it was a refashioning of the Antichristian nature of Popery, representing a doctrinal world view with at its core, the Pope as Antichrist.⁷⁰ Illustrating this phenomenon is Norton’s vivid description of the Roman Church as “Helles mouth”, housing the antichrist personified as the Pope. The chief ideological tool would be propaganda and polemic would be the vehicle to play a part in the printed responses to the Bull.

The key central element in this wave of anti-Catholic discourse was the resurgence of the pope as the main demonic figure, as opposed to Mary I in earlier polemic. The sexual and predatory imagery was a centre point to this polemic. Therefore, once the Bull had been published by the end of May in England, there was no shortage of

⁶⁸Anonymous, *An answer to a papistical bull*, (London, 1570).

⁶⁹T.S. Freeman, ‘Joan of Contention: The Myth of the Female Pope in Early Modern England’, K.Fincham and P.Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, (Woodbridge, 2006), pp.65-6.

⁷⁰P.Lake, ‘The Significance of the Pope as Antichrist’, in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 31, (1980), pp.161-162.

polemical Protestant responses and attacks on the Pope himself, as a Protestant counterattack on the Bull ensued. Published in 1570, an anonymous single sheet ballad entitled "*The braineles blessing of the bull*" attacked the bull, but more importantly, it attacked Pope Pius himself and "the Romish Breede". For this unknown writer there was certainly a division between the Protestants, the Pope and Catholic confessional identity. In this monolithic perspective, the Pope was the master of all Catholics, whether prelates, recusants, exiles or foreign Catholics. The reader of the ballad can appreciate the Pope's position as the antichristian demon, the devil incarnate and the mistaken assumption of the Papacy; that the Pope is the ordained head of Christendom;

O Sathans sonne, O Pope puft vp with pryde,

What makes thée clayme the clowdes where God doth dwel? ⁷¹

This metaphor had earlier been propagated by Martin Luther who had written a pamphlet about a two legged calf that stood upright known as the 'Pope Ass'.⁷² This was also represented in literary forms. Readers were urged to take the vision seriously, as it signified that the last days had begun. In England there was a literary tradition amongst ballads and broadsides, from the mid-Tudor period, emphasising the representation of monstrosity or physical deformity as a warning from God to mankind to reform its ways.

However, it is clear by the 1550s & 1560s a newer discourse of monstrosity was emerging. A shift appeared within the notion of what monstrosity was. Some authors

⁷¹ Anonymous, *The braineles blessing of the bull the hornes, the heads and all, light on their squint eyed skonses full that boweth their knees to ball*, (London, 1570).

⁷² Rublack, *Reformation Europe*, pp.1-2. The representative tradition of the 'Pope Ass', which was originally symbolised in visual form via a series of ten German woodcuts in 1545, sported long feminine legs and a large belly. The belly was representative of lust, corruption and greed.

suggested that the monsters were the sins themselves. The deformed were capable of the most evil, but the deformity was the evil deed itself.⁷³ Thomas Norton continues this pattern when he accused the Northern Rebels in 1569 of being deformed as a result of their rebellious and traitorous behaviour: “the defomitie of your faulte, leane not to wipe away those spots that have so fowly arrayed you, that you loke not like Christian people but like monsters in nature and policie”.⁷⁴ The author of the *The braineles blessing of the bull* stated the Pope resembled a beast;

Nor neuer Pope so lyke an Asse or Mule,
Or dunghyll Cocke to crow and clap his winges.
Stand backe good dogs, the Bul he leapes & flinges
He bleates and bleathes ashe a baightyng were,
And fomes at mouth, lyke Boare with bristled heare.⁷⁵

Norton also wrote elsewhere of the Pope; “ The Monster of whom I tolde you, is no way so fitly to be described, as by the olde tale of the ancient Poetes, that seme as it were to haue foreshewed him in figure, as followeth”.⁷⁶ He insisted that the animated bull itself consisted of the “wordes of a man”, but with “the sense of a deuill. To this individual, the Pope had written the “selfe same monster Bull is he that lately roared out at the Bishops palace gate in the greatest citie of England, horrible blasphemies agaynst God, & villanous dishonors agaynst the noblest Queene in the world

⁷³ K. Brammall, ‘Nature, Morality & the Rhetoric of Monstrosity’, in, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 27, (1996),pp.15-16. Brammall writes that the Marian Bishop Stephen Gardiner and Bishop Bonner of London were singled out for savage rhetorical treatment as a result of their supposed part in the Marian persecutions by protestant pamphleteers.

⁷⁴ T. Norton, *A Warning Agaynst the Dangerous Practices of Papists and especially partners of the late Rebellion*, (London, 1570).

⁷⁵ Anonymous, *The braineles blessing of the bull*, (London, 1570).

⁷⁶ T. Norton, *A disclosing of the great bull and certain calues that he hath gotten, and specially the monster bull that roared at my Lord Byshops gate*, (London, 1570).

Elizabeth the lawfull Queene of England, he stamped and scraped on the ground, flong dust of spitefull speches and vaine curses about him, pushed with his hornes at her noble counsellors and true subiectes, and for pure anger all to berayed the place where he stoode. And all this stirre he kept, to make a prooffe if hys horned armye of calues would or durst come flyngyng about him toward midsommer moone”.⁷⁷ However, this was just one metaphorical mechanism which represented the Papacy as a threat to England’s realm and her people. We can turn to the ever present mentality of disease and illness in the early modern mind to acknowledge other forms of representation.

In other works, the papacy was represented as a form of disease or cancer, eating away at the ‘godly’ body politic, or a plague ready to infect the whole populace. This theme is in proximity to, and an extension of, the monstrous individual, but the metaphor is disease rather than deformity. The emphasis on Popery being a disease or curse that must be stopped before it corrodes away the spiritual and temporal English Protestant realm, is a powerful metaphor for the Elizabethan reader and audience. The writer of the “*Blessed Bull*”, tells the reader that the “cancered curse that wolde consume this realme with wracke and ruine, Returne to Rome with fyre and fume, to bryng the Pope in tune”. As before, one sees spiritual and temporal fear as the unseen pestilential threat to the Protestant realm waiting to envelope it. Bullinger also warned of “great Treasons that haue bene practised to confound the whole state, by reason of the Popes most pestilent Bull”.⁷⁸ The metaphor of the Popish plague sweeping across England during a time when plague, disease and

⁷⁷ Norton, an *addition*.

⁷⁸ H. Bullinger, *A confutation of the Popes bull which was published more then two yeres agoe against Elizabeth the most gracious Queene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland, and against the noble realme of England* (London, 1572).

famine were sometimes endemic in sections of the population, indicates how contemporaries may have translated Bullinger's meaning; as a coming death or destructive force, threatening the realm and infecting the state. Steven Peele noted in his ballad; "how quickly are some taken hence" by the 'infection' of Catholicism and many "strange diseases are seen to be encreasing and appearing" each day.⁷⁹ The writer of the ballad to John Felton, the Catholic executed on 8th August 1570 for nailing a copy of the Bull to the gates of the Bishop's Palace, near St Paul's, was 'told' he had tried to "eke the Realme and all the rest, as mutche as in thee lay, Thou soughst by thy Traiterous harte, to bringe vnto decay."⁸⁰ The decay would most probably be representative of the perceived Catholic immorality and 'popish evil'. However, the victor in this battle between the two confessional positions is Protestantism and, in national terms, England. The author of *an answer to a papistical bull*, also drew upon the 'victory' of the English realm over Rome and treason, suggesting that the 'old religion' at its practice was redundant and was told to; "Go home mad Bull to Rome, and pardon soules That pyne away in Purgatorie paynes, Go triumph there, where credit most remaines. Thy date is out in England long ago".⁸¹

Following the Northern Rising and the publication of the Bull, the Elizabethan regime and a significant number of its populace were concerned about the Popish threat and the general threat of Catholic rebellion. As we have observed, the official political response was rapid and also represented the end of a relatively tolerant religious

⁷⁹ Peele, S., *A proper new balade expressing the sames concerning a warning to the London dames*, (London, 1571).

⁸⁰ Anonymous, *The end and Confession of John Felton who suffred in Paules Churcheyard in London, the .viii. of August, for high Treason*. (London, 1570).

⁸¹ Anonymous, *an answer to a papistical bull*, (London, 1570).

policy by Elizabeth. The sometimes semi-official printed polemical response was a series of spiritual and temporal warnings about the threat of the Roman Church and its supporters. Using apocalyptic rhetoric, drawing upon metaphorical and allegorical warnings concerned with following the antichrist, along with deformity, disease and sinful lust, the pamphleteers were warning Englishmen to avoid the corruptive influences of the Papacy. Along with the Treasons Bill and the Homilies – and arguably more importantly – these printed responses would presumably have had a great impact on the still religiously conservative Elizabethan populace, and they also offered a critique on the regime and the Queen who was seen to not take this Catholic ‘threat’ seriously. In a wider context, these representations of Catholicism contributed to policies against English Catholics and a new sense of English national identity that would develop over the following decades.

II

Lisa Ferraro Parmalee has suggested that the French Religious Wars found their way into the consciousness of an English readership, because of a two-fold concern; their obvious Protestant sympathies and the dread of a civil war in their own land.⁸² This discourse fired the already evident Elizabethan thirst for news from the Continent. The St Bartholomew's Day Massacre of August 1572 was represented a nightmare for many Elizabethans, and it represented a stark warning of what may happen in the future. These responses must also be looked at as part of a wider concern in England surrounding Catholic conspiracies following on from the Northern Rebellion, the issuing of Pius V's Bull and the various plots linked to Mary Stewart.

I will analyse both immediate and short term consequences of the massacres by looking at political responses at Court through the State Papers and other political correspondence. This will enable me to contextually understand responses to the Massacre of St Bartholomew. Elizabethan polemical authors asked themselves if such events could be repeated in England, as a precursor for a potential coup d'état against Queen Elizabeth and her council and what safeguards were needed in the realm to protect their country against similar happenings. Secondly, the chapter will focus upon the printed responses which were circulated in English, or at least in England, as the majority of published pamphlets were published in French, in Geneva. Pamphleteers were clear who perpetrated the atrocities: Catherine de Medici, King Charles IX or the Guise faction, including the Cardinal of Lorraine, Henri, the Duc de Guise and even Mary Stewart were seen as responsible, not only directly for the murder of Gaspard de Coligny, but more importantly the mob slaughter that

⁸² L.Ferraro Parmalee *Good Newes from Fraunce: French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England*, (New York, 1996), p.75.

followed across many areas within France. Where Mary Stewart was concerned, it was stressed that her mere presence in England could precipitate the same anti-protestant atrocity. An antithesis to this is also apparent when we look at the idea of the murdered Coligny as a protestant martyr, a figurehead to all Protestants in Europe. From this we may discern and discuss an international movement amongst Protestants, particularly those whose confessional identity and position would have been Calvinist.

Some of these pamphlets were not circulated by Englishmen themselves, and such literature may have proven to be dangerous in a diplomatic sense, at a time when Elizabeth was looking for compromise with France after the signing of the Treaty of Blois in April 1572. Unfortunately, analysis of the Stationers Company registers, which record the publication of texts, during the years preceding the massacres, are at this point impossible. The records for the years 1571 to 1576 are missing. It is unclear how those texts not produced in English, received an audience amongst Elizabethans. However, an English reaction can also be discerned from the circulation of French or Latin texts regarding the French Wars of Religion and the Massacre. I can only speculate whether or not Englishmen understood such pamphlets, but it is probable that their French Huguenot counterparts would have shared these texts outside of their own small communities. Those Englishmen, as we have discussed, would have had interest in these matters. Some pamphlets were translated and some Englishmen did speak and understand French. It is also possible that some French authors arranged for their publication or English sympathisers could have done so. Although, as we know, there were Englishmen present in Paris at the time of the Massacre, the horrifying outcome did not, as might be expected result in an explosion of pamphlets, by godly and indignant,

patriotic Englishmen, and many of the pamphlets were written by French Protestants.⁸³ This leaves a reliance on speculation that French texts were in circulation via translation, word of mouth or were simply lost. When looking into the printed responses to the Massacre that circulated in England, in the years following, it is important to differentiate the variant themes that surface in the texts.

The Background context: the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre

The St Bartholomew's Day Massacre itself is more appropriately understood as a series of four interconnected events played out over approximately six weeks following the Royal Wedding of August 18th 1572, between Marguerite of Valois and Henri of Navarre, ironically a marriage which was organised officially, at least, to promote pacification in France between Catholic and Protestant alike. The initial spark occurred via the attempted assassination of Admiral Coligny on Friday August 22nd, by a retainer of the Guise faction. Following on, the coordinated assassination of several Huguenot leaders took place in the early hours of the August 24th, St Bartholomew's Day. Thirdly, a wave of popular killings erupted in Paris over the course of the next three days, spawning a provincial tide of violence that ran from late August to October 1572. Although it is difficult to quantify the impact of these shocking events, it has nevertheless been estimated by modern historians, that 2,000 Protestant Huguenots were slain in Paris and a further 3,000 lost their lives in the provinces.⁸⁴ In purely political terms, the coup against the Huguenots and following massacres rendered the Peace of St Germain (1570), also known by contemporaries as the Edict of Pacification, which had concluded the Third Religious Civil War, redundant. Not surprisingly, historians of the French Wars of Religion,

⁸³ A.G. Dickens, 'Elizabethans and St Bartholomew', p.60.

⁸⁴ M.P. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629* (Cambridge, 2005), pp.76-95.

over the centuries, have attempted to apportion responsibility upon Catherine de' Medici, the Duc d' Anjou, the Guise faction, or the actions and decisions of the lame Charles IX. These factors will be outlined via the textual analysis of the polemical responses to the massacres and the Wars of Religion. It is fitting to now gauge the more immediate political feelings and responses in England, immediately following the massacres.

The immediate responses at the English Court

It is clear that there was a considerable anti-Catholic and anti-French climate of feeling at Court and in London, which had the potential to be harnessed, via the later printed, polemical propaganda. Reports first reached England of the events via the stories told by refugees fleeing from France. The first refugees were noticed at Rye, in Sussex; they had sailed across the Channel from Dieppe and many were soon reported in London.⁸⁵ Francis Walsingham's reporters were delayed at Boulogne by unfavourable weather conditions until September 3rd, whilst the Queen's secretary stayed in Paris under guard.

Lord Burghley was in no doubt that Elizabeth's kingdoms were in mortal danger and the great Catholic conspiracy against England had not gone away following the massacres in France. Rapid action and reaction to the events was paramount.⁸⁶ In addition, the immediate reaction to and consequences of the massacre suggested that the English Council believed there were severe implications for English relations with France, and that there was suddenly a climate of distrust concerning the Medici- Valois Court and their dealings with the Guise faction.

⁸⁵ M.A.S. Hume (ed.), CSPS 1568-1579, p.413.

⁸⁶ S. Alford, *Lord Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I*, (New Haven, 2008), pp.198-99.

Walsingham's correspondence with Burghley suggests that he was in an understandable state of shock en route to London; "As the bearer returns home thoroughly instructed, and is able to render a very good account of what he has seen but hopes his Lordship can guess why he forbears to afford many lines".⁸⁷ However, as John Cooper has recently shown, there is no surviving narrative of the massacres in Walsingham's own papers. Walsingham was either extremely traumatised by what he had witnessed and experienced, or more likely he may have been reluctant to commit too many of his thoughts to paper regarding such sensitive issues surrounding national security. He would have certainly been aware that diplomatic dispatches could have been intercepted and may have sent messengers who would have committed to memory his dispatches from France.⁸⁸ Other Privy councillors soon put ink to paper in apportioning responsibility for the events and also deciphering the urgency of a response to a possible French threat. For many contemporaries a 'counter reformation catastrophe' lurked around the corner.

On September 6th Sir Humphrey Gilbert echoed this concern when he wrote to Count Montgomery and Lord Burghley, that he was aware of a French Catholic threat which had to be countered. He told how he was "greatly moved by the news from France, which he trusts is not so horrible as the report goes. He hopes he will communicate the particulars to the Queen and point out the danger ready to fall on her", and; "If the opportunity favours them there is nothing else to look for but the tragical destruction of all the Protestants in Europe". Burghley was anxious to take some preventative measures.⁸⁹ Perhaps more serious was the charge that the massacre, far from being a political incident unique to France was an international Catholic

⁸⁷ R.Lemon, (ed.), CSPF, 1572-74, p.173.

⁸⁸ J. Cooper, *The Queen's Agent: Francis Walsingham at the Court of Queen Elizabeth I*, (London, 2011), p. 80.

⁸⁹ C. Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth*, (London, 1960), p.86.

conspiracy to destroy Protestantism. Certainly, there was a sense of urgency in England in the autumn of 1572 as the Privy Council planned its next move in the defence of its religion and realm from the threat abroad. As if to corroborate this, Antonio de Guaras, the Spanish Ambassador writing to the Duke of Alba reported, possibly with relish, that, the “late events in France have silenced all matters here. The surprise is so great that nothing else is spoken of and posts come from France bringing fresh particulars. This Court is much distressed, and the alliance with France is now declared a nullity”.⁹⁰ Burghley was seriously alarmed and on September 11th he wrote to Walsingham, with a certain anxiety; “Sir, I see the devil is suffered by Almighty God for our sins to be strong in following the persecution of Christ’s members”.⁹¹

Others willed Elizabeth to take the lead, in dealing with what was seen as a future threat to the realm. On September 19th, Burghley received correspondence from Arthur, Lord Grey of Wilton, who wrote; “This morning I received your letter, wherein your Lordship doth moste truly guess of th’increase of my greif by the late horrible and tirannical dealings in France, and with your Lordship I do pray to God that her Majestie maye have wisdom to follow, and magnitude to execute, the things that may divert the same from hence”. By late October, Archbishop Parker had called for divine mercy for the persecuted Christians, “who are as sheep appointed to the slaughter”. It included prayers for the persecutors themselves.⁹² On this final point, we may consider the wish of Elizabeth to keep an uneasy alliance with the French, by not taking a harsher political stance, despite the immediate state of high alert. Burghley called for strong surveillance in the southern counties. By the middle of

⁹⁰ CSPS 1568-1579, 6th September: *Antonio de Guaras to the Duke of Alba*, p.413.

⁹¹ Burghley to Walsingham, Cotton MS Vespasian Fo.6f.148r-v.

⁹² Dickens, *Elizabethans and St Bartholomew*, pp.62- 64.

September he sent out ordinances to put the south coast on a state of alert. The counties of Dorset, Essex, Kent and Sussex were summoned to provide the musters of able men, armour and provisions for the improvement of fortifications and castles against invasion. Preparations were made to improve the naval fortifications on the Isle of Wight and at Portsmouth.⁹³ Although the alarm was ended in December, the training recommendations for able bodied men alongside the usual peacetime musters – the Trained Bands – date from 1573, which suggest that the country was on a state of alert in the 1570s.⁹⁴

The Popular Reaction in London: Bishop Sandys's response

Considerable tension was apparent outside courtly circles. Correspondence between those in the city and those at court provide a clue regarding popular reaction to the Massacre. It is clear that religious opinion was at fever pitch in the capital. Bishop of London since 1570, Edwin Sandys, wrote to Burghley on the September 5th that “the citizens of London in these dangerous daies need prudentlie to be dealt with all; the preachers appointed for the Crosse [St Paul’s Cross] in this vacation are but yonge men, unskilful in matters political, yet so carried with zeale, that they will enter into them and poure forth their opinions” against the French alliance, which had only been official since the April 19th 1572. The Treaty of Blois was seen by Burghley to be an important bulwark against Spain and an advantage in economic terms, and believed that a French alliance contained more advantage than liability even following August’s events.

⁹³R.Lemon (ed.), CSPD 1547-1580 (London, 1856), pp.450-452, 453.

⁹⁴L. Boynton, *The Elizabethan Militia 1558-1638*, (London, 1967) pp.13-14.

Political considerations appeared distant from the popular response especially that recorded in the streets of London. The Bishop of London, Edwin Sandys reassured Burghley and wrote that he would “not faile to direct them (the Londoners) so well as I can”.⁹⁵ Other sources corroborate the tension reported in London. Surviving unsigned letters from unknown persons, to the Duke of Alba, report on the religious and political climate amongst the capital’s populace. As early as the August 30th one reported that; “On the 28th the news arrived here (but not the particulars) of the destruction committed on the Huguenots in Paris. This affair has dismayed and grieved the sectarians here (in London)”.⁹⁶ A further letter reported that Burghley had removed to London “with the intention of pacifying it”. This was most probably after the correspondence with Sandys, as many of the “sectarian” Protestant populace had been “holding meetings and showing signs of a desire to make some movement against the Catholics, as retaliation for what was done to the Huguenots. This has gone so far that some of their preachers have not hesitated to urge them from the pulpit to take such action”.⁹⁷ Sandys noted that, “the ministers of the French church in London were medlers in these matters”.⁹⁸ However, Sandys must have had some sympathy for those who wanted retribution or justice for what had taken place in Paris. Either that or he felt a degree of ecclesiastical responsibility for national security. He went on to submit a list of nine points “for the saiftie of our Queen and Realme“. Papists were to be gaoled, the Queen surrounded by Protestant guards,

⁹⁵ Cited in; Dickens, *Elizabethans and St Bartholomew*, p.62.

⁹⁶ M.A.S. Hume (Ed.), CSPS 1568-1579 (London, 1894), *30 August 1572 Letter of Intelligence (Unsigned) from London to the Duke of Alba*, p.408.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 413.

⁹⁸ BL Lansdowne MS 17, no. 33, fol. 67.

leagues made up with all Protestant princes, the Gospel earnestly promoted and the church “not burdened with unnecessary ceremonies”.⁹⁹

The popular conception of Mary Stewart and her perceived involvement in the massacre.

The outpourings of anger and fear propelled the print and publication of these narratives, and they show us how these printed responses shaped the Elizabethan mental processes concerning who was to blame as well as the wider interest of European Catholicism. Predictably one such scapegoat was Mary Stewart. George Buchanan’s *Detection of the Doings of Mary Queen of Scots* was originally completed in 1571. Although published before the massacres, it set an anti-Stewart template that would be repeated in texts published in Protestant realms following August 1572. It is, therefore, no surprise that Protestants in England and Scotland set out to destroy Mary’s reputation. Buchanan’s treatise had originally been used in manuscript form, and it was presented in instalments compiled for the Scottish Government in the early 1570s, but was later printed at an unknown address and circulated in London.¹⁰⁰

Mary was implicated in a number of despicable crimes in the treatise. Firstly, she was accused of the murder of Lord Darnley her second husband. This was a horrendous combination of murder and high treason. The damning evidence against Mary was a set of letters, known as ‘the casket letters’ that had been retrieved from her lover, the Earl of Bothwell, certainly without “quenlike majestie” or matronlie modestie“, as Buchanan claimed.¹⁰¹ The Protestant lords had claimed the letters

⁹⁹ Cited in; Dickens, *Elizabethans and St Bartholomew*, p.62.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, p.131.

¹⁰¹ G. Buchanan, *Detection of the Doings of Mary Queen of Scots*, (London, 1571).

were in Mary's own hand. The letters were themselves thought to be forgeries.¹⁰² However, they were published in French the following year. It is thought that Burghley promoted the first publication of these letters in 1571, then the French versions in early 1572, which was extremely risky at a time of Anglo-French amity. Not surprisingly, the place of publication was not disclosed, although the 1572 Parliament was to bring the matter to the forefront of its business.

Mary was the subject of attempts to despoil her by linking her to conspiracy to usurp the English throne, and also by linking her, by way of her Guise ancestry to the massacres. The house of Guise, in particular Mary's uncles, the Cardinal of Lorraine, its leader, and the Duke of Guise, were very much implicated. The Puritan clerk Robert Beale repeated the fear regarding the threat that Mary represented to the English realm and the Queen. He recognised the threat as akin to the Norman invasion of 1066, and he warned that if England continued to ignore the alarming signs following the massacre, then Anjou would marry "the Queene of Scots" and a French battle fleet would follow. As usual there would also be assistance from the "Kinge of Spaine". The threat from Mary Stewart would only be dealt with by her execution, according to Beale. He then warned, exaggerating his own case that English Catholics would then raise a rebellion, and their loyalty to Elizabeth would be proved false.¹⁰³

Anne Maclaren has argued that anti-Catholicism was in part a response and a reaction to a particular problem; the issue of the succession and Mary's own future

¹⁰² R.M. Warnicke, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London, 2006), pp.199 -201.

¹⁰³ R.Beale, cited in, Cooper, *The Queen's Agent*, pp.80-81.

position.¹⁰⁴ At the opening of Parliament in May 1572, Thomas Wilbraham, the Attorney of the Wards, presented a speech outlining the case against Mary which he divided into five sections. The first dealt with her challenge to the English crown, made in France at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. The second dealt with the plot to marry Mary to the Duke of Norfolk, the third and fourth linked to her connections with the Northern Rebellion and the defeated rebels; the fifth was longest of all and dealt with the Ridolfi Plot. Thomas Norton, known for his puritan position, called for Mary's execution as a "necessity" for Elizabeth's safety as a result of the links between Mary and the above plots. In addition, in order "to binde that Scottissh" woman, the Duke of Norfolk's "mischief" had to be remedied by his execution. Burghley labelled her "that dangerous traitress and pestilence of Christendom".¹⁰⁵

It is clear that the Queen of Scots was considered a traitor; a "monstrous and huge dragon" who was "borne out of kinde". The Catholicism and joint French-Scottish nationality of Mary was, in part, why she was labelled a traitor, as the dualities of these elements of Mary were opposed to Protestant England. Edwin Sandys suggested with some ferocity that the pressing cause was "forthwith to cut of the Scottissh Queen's heade".¹⁰⁶ The 'great cause' as Parliament termed it, had been at the forefront of the sessions several months before the massacres.¹⁰⁷ For Elizabethan Protestants, Mary Stewart represented ambition, lust and political treachery; a truism that was not extinguished until her execution in 1587, and was also the framework within which the French Huguenots placed her. It is no surprise

¹⁰⁴ A. Maclaren, Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism: Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Genesis of English Anti-Catholicism, in, *The American Historical Review*, 107 (June 2002), pp.739-767.

¹⁰⁵ T.E Hartley(ed.), *Proceedings in the Parliament of Elizabeth I* Volume I 1558-1581, (Leicester, 1981) pp.270-272, p.310.

¹⁰⁶ Dickens, *Elizabethans and St Bartholomew*, p.62. Latin translation: "Itself is the cause of our calamities".

¹⁰⁷ Neale, *Elizabeth and her Parliaments* (London, 1953), p.247.

that Mary was linked closely with the French business of St Bartholomew in the months following Parliament and she was clearly fortunate in 1572, as the Parliament had met a few months before the massacres. The massacres however, made it less likely that Mary would be tried. It would have been dangerous with the ascendancy of the Guise in France to have publicly executed Mary in England, so Henry Killigrew was sent to Scotland to negotiate her return for trial. Elizabeth, as Neale suggests, “momentarily surrendered” and agreed a secret plan to return Mary to Scotland as long as she would be put to death immediately by the Scottish Parliament.

However, events didn't turn out as calamitous as feared. The bill was twice prorogued and eventually to the exasperation of Burghley, the bill simply expired.¹⁰⁸ By 1576, Francis Walsingham was secretary and one assumes that his surveillance of her correspondence was effective. In her captive state under house arrest at Sheffield, Buxton and Tutbury the Privy Council had dissipated much of the direct threat that Mary may have carried or represented, and her activities were strictly monitored from 1571 onwards by the harsher terms of imprisonment. The Elizabethan Government used the Continental situation, domestic recusancy and arrival of seminary, then missionary priests, as a series of excuses to tighten its grip on her freedoms, whilst continuing to consider her return to captivity in Scotland. This suggests Mary was worth more to the English alive than dead: she roused a patriotic feeling amongst Englishmen, she bound Queen, Privy Council and Commons together and helped the English to fuel a siege mentality against Catholic

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp.313-14.

Europe.¹⁰⁹ We now turn to printed perceptions of the Valois Court after St Bartholomew's Day.

Catherine de Medici and the Valois Court: *Machiavellistes*

The Valois Court, with Charles IX and Catherine de Medici at the head, were targeted with criticism similar to Mary. Written soon after the events had concluded "*Ane new ballet set out be ane fugitiue Scottisman that fled out of Paris at this lait murther*", it was written by Robert Sempill, a Scottish Protestant, court poet and controversialist, and was published at St Andrews in late 1572. Catherine de 'Medici's responsibility for the Massacre was Sempill's main theme. He stated that a planned conspiracy with the Guise faction was evident; "Now Katherine de Medicis hes maid sic [seek] a Gyis [Guise] To tary [stay] in Paris the Papistes ar tykit[?]" Sempill continues the theme by suggesting what seems to follow is a common theme, laying responsibility at the feet of what was seen as the 'Machiavellian' Queen Mother's plan in devising a plot to murder the Admiral Coligny, by seeking the "Gyis [Guise]" and then conspiring a "slewing" of the Huguenots in Paris. Sempill is also disapproving of the Guisards and Italians much like his French Protestant contemporaries. He concludes by warning Elizabeth that these events must not be repeated in England and that Catholicism must not return, as he follows Robert Beale's pattern by warning the reader and Queen Elizabeth of a joint threat from the Pope and Spain to be defended against; "Now wyse Quene Elizabeth luik to your self Dispite them, and wryte thame, ane bill of defyanche The papistis and Spanyards". Finally Sempill prays that "Christ keip thie pure Ile [Isle] of ouris in the auld richt [right] Defend vs and send vs, the life Euerlasting The Lord send vs quyetnes, and keip our young king (James VI of Scotland) The Quene of Inglands

¹⁰⁹ P.J. Holmes, 'Mary Stewart in England', *Innes Review* (1987), pp.211-12.

Maiestie, & lang [long] mot[might] yai [you] Ring[reign] and therefore, safe from catholicism".¹¹⁰ Sempill's poems circulated widely, both in manuscript and print; many were published as broadsides by the Protestant printer Robert Lekprevik. English envoys sent several to their government in London where they were circulated around court.¹¹¹ According to A.G. Dickens, Sempill had fled from the Massacre and the ballad was quickly circulated in London, although other sources suggest that it is unclear whether or not he was present.¹¹² However, Sempill's poetry can tell us much about the attitudes towards the French court and the surrounding factions in seeking responsibility. Similarly, Lord Burghley believed that "the quarrel between the Duke of Guise and the Admiral" was responsible for the events. The Earl of Shrewsbury reported that Burghley had announced in a letter that the atrocity "could not be expressed with tongue to declare the cruelties, whereof it is now said that the king taketh repentance that he was abused to cause it to be committed by the duke of Guise and the faction of the papists".¹¹³

This theme was quickly replicated by Robert Beale. Beale was originally thought to have been an eyewitness to the massacre whilst on diplomatic duty in Paris. His account is one of the few English accounts that survive. For many years it was assumed by historians that Beale was in Paris, but recently, the late Patrick Collinson has shown that, like Sempill, he was not present. Beale did not need to be present to have his world view confirmed: for Beale Catholicism was; "an atrocious religion" and a threatening political system to not only England, but Protestant

¹¹⁰ R. Sempill, *Ane new ballet set out be ane fugitiue Scottisman that fled out of Paris at this lait murther*, (Edinburgh, 1572).

¹¹¹ P.J. Bawcutt, *Robert Sempill (d 1595?)*, in, Oxford DNB, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25075?docPos=51397> (Accessed: 1 May 2012).

¹¹² Dickens, *Elizabethans and St Bartholomew*, p.59 and Bawcutt, *Ibid*.

¹¹³ R.Lemon (ed.) CSPF, 1572-74 (London, 1876), p.175.

Europe in general.¹¹⁴ The effect on him was such that he became determined to echo Walsingham's rhetoric, with an urgent argument concerning the quick action in order to defend the commonwealth and not trust the French, or any Catholics. In August, when he wrote *A Discourse after the murder and other places in France*, Beale warned how countless "men, women and children" were murdered by "horrible tirannie". He added, "I think it time for us to awake out of our dead sleep, and take heed lest like mischief as has already overwhelmed the brethren and neighbours in Fraunce and Flanders embrace us which will be left in such sort as we will shall not be able to escape". He further warned that Englishmen should "be afraide that they (the catholic French) spared not their own", as well as foreigners including "good Englishmen" who were attacked in the Parisian streets. He reminded the addressee that "the popes bull" had declared "the Queene a usurper and schismatic", and that care should be taken that another massacre of nobles not be repeated.

Beale's *Discourse* highlighted the actions committed by the Catholics on Bartholomew's Eve and proceeding days, was a result of the aggressive Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation, following the Council of Trent; "that late horrible accidente showed the romishe fury of the committee of the council of Trente to roote out all those as contrarie to the pope's freedome".¹¹⁵ It is probable that the *Discourse* was circulated around Court, as it is a letter in manuscript form. However, it does follow some themes also apparent in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* and John Stubbs's *Gaping Gulf*, as we shall later observe. This rhetoric emphasised that the survival of the Queen and English liberty were anchored to the strength of

¹¹⁴ P. Collinson, 'Servants and Citizens: Robert Beale and other Elizabethans', *Historical Research*, 70, (2006), p.496.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.80.

Protestantism in Europe, and these two matters were mutually dependent.¹¹⁶ Now we turn to the Elizabethan context of Machiavellian political ideas within the framework of St Bartholomew's Day and the early 1570s.

Machiavelli's works had been read and studied in England prior to Elizabeth's reign, and entered Elizabethan literature and consciousness not as of a statesman but as a villainous murderer; an author of underhand or immoral political tactics removed from the episcopal sphere.¹¹⁷ Contemporary commentators also equated Machiavellian thought with paganism and opportunism.¹¹⁸ Elizabethans also recognised "practic".¹¹⁹ The implication was that any future alliances with the Valois monarchy would be not in Elizabeth's best interests politically. One French author, Jean de Serres, suggested that "politiques....are those who give more to men than God".¹²⁰ Furthermore, Innocent Gentillet, in his *Anti-Machiavel*, offered remedies for the supposed advice of the Florentine 'politique', via a series of maxims which he called counsel, religion and police. He offered a social and political ideal that served as a corrective to the "tyrannical" and "atheistic" views of Machiavelli.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ R. Beale, *Discourse after the murder in Paris*: BL Cotton Titus, F. iii, pp302-308, Cooper, *Ibid*, p.80.

¹¹⁷ L.A. Weissburger, 'Machiavelli and Tudor England', in *Political Science Quarterly*, 4 (1927), pp.589-607.

¹¹⁸ F. Raab, *The English Face of Machiavelli*, (Oxford, 1964), pp.30-1. Englishmen had been reading Machiavelli critically, and responding to his writings from approximately not long after the time of the statesman's death in 1527.

¹¹⁹ N. Orsini, "'Policy": Or the Language of Elizabethan Machiavellianism', in, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 9 (1946), pp.124-33. Orsini suggests that the Elizabethan perception of Machiavelli is derived from which practice derives and which originally meant "concerned with action, practical as distinguished from theoretical," also acquired the meaning of "artful, crafty, or cunning" in the Elizabethan period, and was frequently used to describe certain political practices. These were accusations levelled at Catherine De Medici by both English and French commentators.

¹²⁰ J. De Serres, *The three partes of the Commentaries Containing the whole and perfect discourse of the Ciuill warres of Fraunce, vnder the raignes of Henry the second, Frances the second, and of Charles the ninth. With an Addition of the cruell Murther of the Admirall Chastilon, and diuers other Nobles, committed the 24. daye of August*, (London, 1574).

¹²¹ D.R. Kelley, *The Beginnings of Ideology: Consciousness and society in the French Reformation* (Cambridge, 1981), p.190, pp.204-5.

Machiavelli's writings could be used as a weapon in politico-religious polemic and it was not confined to one, or against any one particular group.¹²² From this paradigm, the new 1576 Edition of Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, stamped the idea of a contrast between the antitheses of 'godliness', or specifically 'Popishness' and Machiavellism, upon the English minds.¹²³ By 1583, Foxe claimed that "catholiques" who could not prevail against the Protestants in the French Wars of Religion, "began to devise how by crafty means to entrap them".¹²⁴ This claim refers to the actions of the Valois and Guisard as protagonists of the massacres.

François Hotman's account notes how that following the initial shooting of Coligny, Catherine encouraged Charles and the leading dukes, to meet in a highly secretive, and what may be termed a 'cunning' manner. Notably, the meeting is reported to have been taken in isolation from the Huguenot leadership, as Hotman writes; "After noone the Queene mother lead out the King, the Duke of Aniw, Gonzague, Tauaignes, the Countie de Rhetz (called Gondin), into hir gardens called Tegliers [Tuileries]". This location was chosen as it was remote from court, and Catherine "thoughte most fit for this their last consultation". Hotman perceived this to be an organised strike against the Huguenot leadership and that it was planned secretly. Coligny, "lay in his bed maymed of both his armes and coulde not stirre", after his initial shooting. Hotman claims this point which represented "a notable opportunitie", and Catherine De Medici "offred to dispatch the matter".¹²⁵

¹²² Raab, *The English Face*, pp.55-60.

¹²³ Dickens, *Elizabethans and St Bartholomew*, pp.61-62.

¹²⁴ J. Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, (1583 Edition), p.2176. Accessed via Acts and Monuments online : <http://www.johnfoxe.org/index.php?realm=text&gototype=modern&edition=1583&pageid=2176> (Accessed: 14 October 2012.)

¹²⁵ F.Hotman, *A true and plaine report of the furious outrages of Fraunce & the horrible and shameful slaughter of Chastillon the Admirall without any respect of sorte, kinde, age or degree*, (London,1573).

Emphasising the pre-emptive nature of the plan, Hotman wrote that “For all the chiefe captaines were fast closed vp in Paris, and the rest in other townes were all unarmed and unpreped, and that there were scarcely to be founde ten enimies to a thousand Catholikes”.¹²⁶ The implications are that the populace was actually encouraged to rise up against the outnumbered Huguenots in Paris. Interestingly, this was also the view of Robert Beale, who also suggested that King Charles and Anjou had been part of a plan that had not even “spared their own children” and had “pr[o]stituted there [their] own sister (Queen Marguerite) to traine men” to carry out the “slaughter”, which “hath destroyed a greate nobilitie of their owne blood and bone”. Beale was no doubt exaggerating his polemical call to warn his fellow Englishmen to be aware that this threat and conspiracy could continue overseas; more specifically England and Elizabeth were under serious threat.¹²⁷ Henri Estienne’s outspoken publication, *A mervaylous discourse upon the lyfe, deeds and behaviours of Katherine De Medicis, Queene Mother*, accuses Catherine of being an atheist, “nourished in atheism”, which is credited to be a by-product of her Florentine ties to Machiavellianism. Two hundred pages accuse her of poisoning, bawdry, mass-slaughter and a variety of other crimes, from where she has learnt “is such a practice as she hath learnt from her Machiavellistes” and states that Catherine “bore no naturalle affection toward the [French] Kingdome”.¹²⁸ The implications from this that Catherine would put her political or religious position ahead of the constitutional, spiritual or even social needs of France itself. Then if this happened in France, Machiavellianism or Catholicism may spread to her Protestant neighbours across Europe.

¹²⁶ *Ibid* p.20.

¹²⁷ R. Beale, *Discourse after the murder in Paris*: BL Cotton Titus, F.iii, 305.

¹²⁸ H. Estienne, *A mervaylous discourse upon the lyfe, deeds and behaviours of Katherine De Medicis, Queene Mother* (London, 1573).

**The Admiral Coligny as martyr and John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*:
An International collective, Protestant cause?**

The other side of apportioning responsibility to the Guise, Valois and Medici collective for their alleged role in designing the Massacre was to create a martyrology of the Protestant victims of these alleged crimes. The words and deeds of martyrs like Admiral Coligny were flashes of triumph in a flesh and blood spiritual battle. It was a creative phenomenon, because it cemented persecuted Protestants together, strengthened their collective faith, but yet it created deeper rifts between Catholic and Protestant communities and lessened the prospects for reconciliation.¹²⁹ Arthur Golding's translation of Hotman's *The lyfe of the most godly, valeant and noble capteine and maintener of the trew Christian religion in Fraunce, Iasper Colignie Shatilion, sometyme greate admirall of Fraunce*, printed by Thomas Vautrollier in 1576, was one such text to respond to the massacres and the murder of Coligny. Hotman suggested that Protestants across Europe were united in grief and righteous horror and anger towards the Guise, Catherine and the Valois regime, when finally the "tidings of the slaughter at *Paris* was caried into *England, Scotland, and Germanie*", as those who "hild the same Religion of the Gospell which the Admirall had done". It also created hatred for the Valois Court, "forasmuch as in those who making report that the Admirall was a noble gentleman, a great and wise capteine". The implication is clear, that Coligny was being promoted as a martyr as he "was knowen to be of greatest credit and authority among the protestants" and he

¹²⁹ B.S. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*, (Harvard, 1999), p196.

had been amongst the earliest of the French nobility to follow the reformed church “which imbraced the trew religion”.¹³⁰

John Foxe similarly outlined the nature of Coligny’s martyrdom, using Hotman’s work as a primary source, as it was the 1583 edition of *Acts and Monuments* which included the Massacre of St Bartholomew.¹³¹ In Book Twelve, Foxe gives a short narrative about the “horrible Massaker at Paris” of extolling “the Martyrdome of this good man”, emphasising the savagery of the Paris “people raging agaynst him” and the contrast between the mob and the apparent helplessness of Coligny and his fellow protestant “martyrs”.¹³² What is apparent in this text is that Hotman and Foxe were promoting and celebrating both Coligny’s faith and character in life along with his death as a martyr for the Protestant or Calvinist cause. Presumably, when circulated amongst Elizabethans, it would strengthen their Protestant resolve and deepen anti-Catholic or anti-papal sentiments and give common cause to Protestants across Europe.

Richard Helgerson’s treatment of *Acts and Monuments* suggests that Foxe’s storytelling was the product of an apocalyptic vision between the Erastian Protestantism of Elizabethan England and the Papacy.¹³³ Foxe’s work has been called “one of the cornerstones of English protestant identity” and the main objective of it was to highlight the sufferings of Protestants in the international struggle with the

¹³⁰ F. Hotman, *The lyfe of the most godly, valeant and noble capteine and maintener of the trew Christian religion in Fraunce, lasper Colignie Shatillon, sometyme greate admirall of Fraunce*, Translated by Arthur Golding, (London, 1576).

¹³¹ King, J., *Foxe’s book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge, 2006), p.126, 139.

¹³² Foxe, pp.2175-76.

¹³³ R. Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood*, (Chicago, 1992), pp.249-294 (especially pp.266-268). Helgerson sees Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments* as the major influence and reference point for all later forms of English erastian and national resistance to Rome. Helgerson draws on the Erastian insistence which he says contributed to its vision of an English Community of Faith.

'Antichrist' at Rome.¹³⁴ However, Patrick Collinson has persuasively argued that what he calls Foxe's "textual community" was somewhat exclusive, as his sectarian language was not to promote an English nationhood, but was for a community with a shared sectarian world view, that of a collective, international Protestantism. He argues that religion and nationhood in the sixteenth century were actually "opposing forces", indeed tensions existed between the idea as Protestants as a persecuted minority, against being a commonwealth of Christians.¹³⁵ Increasingly in later editions, Foxe's martyrologies began to expand, in order to include the "True Church" beyond the British Isles.¹³⁶

There is other evidence that Foxe's preaching began to support the idea of a Calvinist cause beyond English shores. It was not a new development for Foxe himself, of course; he had no aversion to both preaching and writing about the rights of Protestants in other parts of Europe prior to the 1583 publication. For example, in 1577, the French ambassador complained to the Privy Council, when Foxe, reportedly suggested in a sermon at St Paul's Cross, that the French Protestants would be within their rights to take up arms against their king, Henri III.¹³⁷ Foxe used the narrative of the massacres to underline the "bloody boucherie" and "slaughter" of the Protestants in the latest phase of the French wars perpetrated by untrustworthy "merciless papistes", echoing the rhetoric of the anti-Machiavelles. Foxe goes on to highlight the celebrations of "such joy at Rome" when news of the Massacre reached them, whereupon the Pope was known to have had a medal struck to in

¹³⁴ D. MacCulloch, *Reformation*, p.285.

¹³⁵ P. Collinson, 'John Fox and National Consciousness', in, *This England*, pp.203-4.

¹³⁶ E. Evenden, & T. S. Freeman, *Religion and the book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'*, (Cambridge, 2011), p.109.

¹³⁷ M. Morrissey, *Politics and the St Paul's Cross Sermons 1558-1642*, (Oxford, 2011), p.85.

commemoration.¹³⁸ This episode confirms that a Catholic aim had been achieved – to destroy Protestants in France.

King Charles IX who died on May 30th 1574, is seen as a main protagonist of the massacres. According to Foxe, Charles's own suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis was "a spectacle and example to all persecuting kings and Princes polluted with the blood of Christian martyrs". Robert Beale, more immediately after the massacres, suggested that Rome itself was aiming to eradicate Protestantism altogether. He railed that it "could not be denied by "these late horrible accidents in France, the conjuration of the council of Trent to root out all such as contrary to the Pope's traditions".¹³⁹ An International Calvinist polemical rhetoric was evident, which sought to give warnings to Protestant monarchies, about domestic or foreign Catholic confessional or political opposites.

These narratives created alarm and anxiety in neighbouring Protestant countries. As we have seen many refugees brought with them the stories of the massacres in France to London, which was a key centre of settlement. Some were very prominent individuals such as Count Montgomery and Phillipe Duplessis-Mornay, who were influential and eloquent spokesmen for French Protestantism.¹⁴⁰ Others such as Hotman, had earlier had contact, with Marian protestant exiles in Geneva during the 1550s. English Protestants and Puritans maintained links and had involvement in affairs with the reformed 'stranger' churches not only in London, but also in Norwich, Colchester and Canterbury. The account books of the French Church in London were preserved for the period from November 1572 to December 1573, presumably

¹³⁸ Foxe, *Martyrs*, pp.2176-9.

¹³⁹ Beale, *Discourse after the murder in Paris*: BL Cotton Titus, F.iii, 305.

¹⁴⁰ Kingdon, *Myths about St Bartholomew*, pp.20-1.

because they record a creditable account of English benevolence following the massacres, when refugee pastors fled into Southern England.¹⁴¹ As discourse flowed through these communities, we may speculate about Protestant responses to the massacres as Elizabethans learned and read about the events, especially when we consider the political responses by the likes of Lord Burghley and Robert Beale in the immediacy of the massacres. The period up to this publication also witnessed the massacres in France, and the continuing negotiations between Elizabeth and the duc D'Alençon which had seen opposition from “godly” Protestants who were, by now, unhappy with Elizabeth’s lack of commitment to further reform, in their struggle against ‘The Antichrist’. John Stubbs was one such unhappy Protestant.

John Stubbs’s *Gaping Gulf*

This politico- religious dissent resurfaced with the publication of the John Stubbs’s *The Discovery of a Gaping Gulf*, in which the Puritan pamphleteer vehemently opposed Elizabeth’s pursuit of the Alençon match in 1579. This is, perhaps, the first surviving, extended account we have on the events of August 1572 by an English commentator since the reports by Beale; a full seven years following the massacres.¹⁴² Stubbs’ anger centred on the Massacre as a key reason to oppose the match, and as a result, he argued that the Church of Christ had been “razed” by the Valois Monarchy and particularly Charles IX.¹⁴³ Building on the horrors of St Bartholomew, Stubbs claimed that France was a “house of cruelty,” especially “against Christians”; meaning Protestants. He was under no illusions whom he perceived to be the persecutors. Following the same themes as Hotman and Foxe,

¹⁴¹ P. Collinson, ‘England 1558-1640’, in M.Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism 1541-1715* (Oxford 1985), p205, 210.

¹⁴² Dickens, *Elizabethans and St Bartholomew*, pp. 68-70.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*,p.69.

Stubbs focused upon the “manifest cruelties” and treacheries against God’s church” perpetrated by the French Catholics, whose monarchy under Henry II, Charles IX and Catherine have “resisted the Gospel”.¹⁴⁴ As a result, it was under the “falsified sworn word” of Charles that had “led the Saints of God to the shambles all day long” and had seen the slaughter of “many innocents” and his sister’s wedding had been “imbued with blood” as a result.¹⁴⁵

Susan Doran has contended that Stubbs’s concerns mirrored those of the Privy Council: Religion and Nationality.¹⁴⁶ The “very name of the Parisian marriage” will “affray any Protestant of England or France from looking for any good coming out of this ill”. Using language which stirred up an image of a Catholic conspiracy, Stubbs is certain that worse bloodshed could be repeated should a union be realised and French Catholics gain influence within the English Court; “if they went up to the knuckles in French blood then they would go up to the elbows in English blood”.¹⁴⁷ Stubbs goes on to suggest that the historical and “ancient hurts” that France, has bestowed upon England via previous intermarriages could be repeated once more, via the repeal of current religion and policy. In addition, the French are seen as “atheist”, “Godless” and likely to put out “God’s gospel” and because they are “by profession Papistes”, they would “bring in idolatry” or would seek “to enlarge the Antichrist”.¹⁴⁸

Stubbs saw the above factors leading to the future persecution of Protestants, the massacres and subsequently onto the resurgence of Catholicism in England. Elizabeth, like Henri of Navarre following the massacres, would be forced to convert

¹⁴⁴ J. Stubbs, *The Discovery of a Gaping Gulf*, in L. E. Berry, (ed.), (Charlottesville, 1968), p. 22.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p.26.

¹⁴⁶ S. Doran, *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I*, (London, 1996), pp.154-55.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p.27,40.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p.41. Stubbs refers to the medieval unions of Stephen of Blois & Adela in 1080 and Geoffrey Plantagenet & Matilda in 1128. These unions were a template for much anti-French propaganda.

to Catholicism. Should Elizabeth die in childbirth then England would be at the risk of becoming “a spoil to foreign invasion and as a stack of wood to civil wars”. Alternatively, if there were to be female children “issued” by the match, Stubbs claimed there was the possibility that they may be tutored in France, barred from rule by Salic Law, be raised Catholic, returned to England and may “strive to [e]stablish Popery”, as Mary Stewart had done in Scotland almost twenty years earlier.¹⁴⁹ Echoing Robert Beale’s concerns regarding Mary, Stubbs feared a potential “Popish rebellion” on a domestic front under Mary then aided by foreign Catholic League forces leading to the destruction of all Englishmen.

It has been argued that Leicester or Walsingham supplied Stubbs with Sussex’s arguments to engineer popular opposition to the match; this was certainly what Elizabeth thought.¹⁵⁰ As a result, Stubbs and his printer, Page, lost their right hands for publishing. William Camden was present at the execution of Stubbs’s and Page’s punishment and told of how the crowd fell silent out of “horror” or “pity, but also” out of hatred for the marriage which most men presaged would be the overthrow of religion.¹⁵¹ As we have noted above, these views were shared by the likes of Leicester and Walsingham and it suggests that St Bartholomew Massacre had a

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p39, 40, 53.

¹⁵⁰ N.Mears, ‘Stubbe [Stubbs], John (c.1541–1590)’, *DNB*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, Sept 2010 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26736>, accessed 14 Oct 2012]. Mears suggests that it is difficult to trace close connections between both men and Stubbs, but the book was later printed by Hugh Singleton, who also printed the first edition of Edmund Spenser’s *The Shepherdes Calendar*. Spenser was a member of Leicester’s household at this time, and his poem, too, was critical of the marriage. See also: A. Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life*, (Oxford, 2012), p.101.

¹⁵¹ W. Camden, *The History of the Most Renowned and Victorious Princess Elizabeth, late Queen of England Containing All the Most Important and Remarkable Passages of State, Both at Home and Abroad (so far as They are Linked with English Affairs) During her long and Prosperous Reign*, (London, 1688): cited in; E. Kruse, ‘The Virgin and the Widow: The Political Finesse of Elizabeth I and Catherine De’ Medici’, in, R. Buckholz and C. Levin (eds.), *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, (Nebraska, 2009), p.135.

longer term effect of damaging the reputation of the French monarchy and eroding the credit of English monarchy.

The St Bartholomew's Day Massacre cemented fear, and represented a warning against the Counter Reformation politics of Rome, and it confirmed without a doubt what many Elizabethans drew from the latest "exploits of the Counter Reformation", from Pius V's Bull, the Northern Rebellion, Alva's brutality in the Netherlands, the Ridolphi Plot and the conspiracy which we have observed circulating around Mary Stewart, alias Guise. I will reiterate what A.G Dickens suggests, that it also fostered a disillusion with an authoritarian monarchy and a Queen who seemed to possess a lack of conviction in certain affairs, not the least that of religion, courtship and Mary Stewart. It also presented many men with a chance to commit themselves to an international Calvinist creed, irrespective of their rulers, namely the Puritan branch of the Protestant confessional. It also began a long distrust, then chasm, with Rome and Catholicism that would surface into persecution of Catholic laity and priests alike, as well as war with Spain in the 1580s and 1590s. These later decades saw Englishmen turning their backs on Catholicism. I would argue that the distribution of anti-Catholic discourse aligned to the massacres in the 1570s, helped cement this about turn.

Conclusion

The varied nature of the polemical and political reactions towards the events I have examined, has enabled an analysis of what the driving force behind the printed and written material used, specifies in terms of the confessional representation of both Catholics and Protestants in the early 1570s, as well as pinpoint this time as a turning point in policy towards Catholics in England. Despite the gaps in our knowledge it would not be incorrect to suggest that Protestant polemic was complementary to Elizabethan Government policy regarding Post-Trent Catholicism. It is now time to summarise, draw out some central observations of the political and literary responses to these events, and suggest where further study of this topic may take our perspectives of Elizabethan printed polemic.

It is clear that several themes were followed by the polemicists, and mechanisms of mid-Elizabethan protestant polemical print operated in reaction to several key contextual events. This was at a time when the Protestant Privy Council were truly uncertain, and indeed quite insecure, regarding the future of the Elizabethan succession and subsequent religious direction, polemical print and media proved a strong tool to garner support for a Protestant shift in the 'Cold War' of the Post Reformation political sphere. Contextually we can speculate this as the early 1570s does present a turn in policy and Parliamentary debate and legislation against Catholics. The driving forces behind such polemic were to warn the Queen herself, uncommitted religious courtiers and the general populace against both a domestic and international Catholic threat posed towards England's realm, her monarchy and 'Godly' Protestant people and strengthen ties with Protestants in France and other protestant countries. I have suggested that we may only speculate how successful the strength of this polemical rhetoric proved, as we must rely on guesswork

regarding the levels of circulation in print. However, the middle period of Elizabeth's reign did see treason laws against Catholics tighten up, especially following the Parliament of 1571. This is when the Elizabethan State became, namely Patrick Collinson's "confessional state", when no Catholics could be found in the Commons, and the voices heard from the Privy Council were those of the "hotter sort of protestants".¹⁵²

With this in mind we should not be too surprised at the printed and political responses observed in 1570s. The Government, with its links to the world of print, provided alarm, via these literary devices and mechanisms. It would be unusual to conclude that both authors and the readers of such polemic were not influenced by such vivid portrayals of Catholic danger and threat, via responses to the events outlined here. It is clear that English Catholics in general, the Papacy and the French Guise-Valois axis were not to be trusted. As a monolithic whole, they were told via polemic that they would ultimately fail to convert England back to Catholicism. They were traitorous, seditious, monstrous, antichristian, harbingers of 'Catholic decay', murderous, Machiavellian and ungodly. This template was the antithesis to 'godly' English Protestantism. Indeed to be Catholic was be suspected of sedition and treason via confessional identity alone by the 1570s, despite Elizabeth's early pledge of not to "make windows into men's souls" at her accession.

The purposes of the literary mechanisms studied are threefold. Their significance to the author and reader alike were clear. Firstly, those by Foxe, for example, provide a series of narratives of persecution, providing the reader with a history of Catholic cruelty and typical scheming, untrustworthy behaviours. Secondly, focusing on and

¹⁵² P.Collinson, 'The politics of religion and the religion of politics in Elizabethan England', in, P.Collinson, *This England*, p.42.

issue a future warning to the wavering, from commoner to Queen, that if the Catholic threat fails to be challenged and suppressed, then what atrocities and dangers have happened elsewhere could or would be replicated within the English realm, and an 'unwanted' return to Catholicism was a likely result. This would prove disastrous for Protestants everywhere, not necessarily only English ones. Thirdly, these narratives also represent a deterrent for any Catholics who may be plotting against the realm, by signifying their impending failure. In the spiritual conflict of the sixteenth century, polemic was the most suitable medium for waging that struggle via debate through the existent "overlapping publics".

Word Count: 19,962 (Including footnotes).

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources

BL Cotton Titus, F.III, fol 302r-308v.

BL Lansdowne MS 17, no. 33, fol. 67.

Cotton MS Vespasian Fo.6f.

Catalogue of Published Sources

EEBO: Early English Books Online, 1475-1700.

Online at <https://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>

Printed Primary Sources

Anonymous, *The braineles blessing of the bull the hornes, the heads and all, light on their squint eyed skonses full that boweth their knees to ball*, (London, 1570).

Anonymous, *The end and Confession of John Felton who suffred in Paules Churcheyard in London, the .viii. of August, for high Treason*. (London, 1570).

Anonymous, *An answer to a papistical bull*, (London, 1570).

Buchanan, G., *Detection of the Doings of Mary Queen of Scots*, (London, 1571).

Bullinger, H., *A confutation of the Popes bull which was published more then two yeres agoe against Elizabeth the most gracious Queene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland, and against the noble realme of England: together with a defence of the*

sayd true Christian Queene, and of the whole realme of England. By Henry Bullinger the Elder (London, 1572).

Drant, T., *Two sermons preached at St Mary Spittal*, (London, 1570).

Estienne, H., *A meruaylous discourse vpon the lyfe, of Katherine de Medicis, wherin are display the meanes [of her] vsurping of the kingedome of France*. Anonymous Translation from French (London, 1573).

Foxe, J., *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church*, (London, 1583).

Evans, L., *An Aunswere to the Proclamation of the Rebels in the North*, (London 1570).

Hotman, F., *A true and plaine report of the furious outrages of Fraunce, & the horrible and shameful slaughter of Chastillion the admirall, and diuers other noble and excellent men, and of the wicked and straunge murder of godlie persons, committed in many cities of Fraunce, without any respect of sorte, kinde, age, or degree*. By Ernest Varamund of Freseland, (London, 1573).

Hotman, F., *The lyfe of the most godly, valeant and noble capteine and maintener of the trew Christian religion in Fraunce, Iasper Colignie Shatillion, sometyme greate admirall of Fraunce*, Translated by Arthur Golding, (London, 1576).

Knell, T., *An answer to a papisticall byll, cast in the streetes of Northampton, and brought before the iudges at the last syses*, (London, 1570).

Morison, R., *Invective ayenste Treason*, (London, 1536).

Norton, T., *A Warning Agaynst the Dangerous Practices of Papists and especially partners of the late Rebellion*, (London, 1570).

Norton, T., *A disclosing of the great bull and certain calues that he hath gotten, and specially the monster bull that roared at my Lord Byshops gate*, (London 1570).

Norton, T., *All such treatises as haue been lately published by Thomas Norton the titles whereof appeare in the next side. Seen and allowed according to the order of the Queenes iniunctions*, (London, 1570).

Norton, T., *An addition declaratorie to the bulles, with a searching of the maze*, (London 1570).

Norton, T., *To the Queen's Majesty's Poor Deceived Subjects of the North Country, drawn into rebellion by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmorland, & Warning against the Dangerous Practices of the Papistes and Specially the partners of the late Rebellion* (London, 1570).

Peele, S., *A proper new balade expressing the sames concerning a warning to the London dames*, (London, 1571).

Peele, S., *The pope in his fury doth answer returne, to a letter ye which to Rome is late come*, (London, 1571).

Peele, S., *A letter to Rome, to declare to ye Pope, Iohn Felton his freend is hangd in a rope: and farther, a right his grace to enforme, he dyed a papist, and seemd not to turne. To the tune of Row well ye mariners*, (London, 1571).

Phillips, J., *A cold pye for the Papistes*, (London, 1570).

Sempill , R., *Ane new ballet set out be ane fugitiue Scottisman that fled out of Paris at this lait murther*,(Edinburgh, 1572).

Seres, W., *An answer to the proclamations of the rebels of the North*, (London,1570).

Serres , J., *The three partes of Commentaries, containing the whole and perfect discourse of the ciuill warres of Fraunce, vnder the raignes of Henry the second, Frances the second, and of Charles the ninth. With an addition of the cruell murther of the Admirall Chastilion, and diuer other nobles, committed the 24. daye of August. Anno 1572. Translated out of Latine into English by Thomas Timme minister. Seene and allowed*, (London, 1574).

Serres,J., *The fyrst parte of commentaries, concerning the state of religion, and the common vvealthe of Fraunce, vnder the reignes of Henry the second, Frauncis the second, and Charles the ninth. Translated out of Latine into Englishe, by Thomas Tymme minister. Seene, and allowed*, (London, 1573).

Serres,J., *The fourth parte of Co[m]mentaries of the ciuill warres in Fraunce, and of the lovve countrie of Flaunders: translated out of Latine into English, by Thomas Tymme minister. Seene and allowed*, (London, 1576).

Published Primary Sources

Arber, E. A. *Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers 1554-1640 AD*, 5 vols, London and Birmingham, 1875 (Volume 1) .

Berry, L E. (ed.), *John Stubbs's Gaping Gulf with Letters and other relevant documents*, (Charlottesville, 1968).

Foxe, J. *Actes and Monuments*, (1583 Edition).

<http://www.johnfoxe.org/index.php?realm=text&gototype=modern&edition=1583&pageid=2176> (Accessed: 14 October 2012).

Hartley, T.E. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Parliaments of Elizabeth I* (Volume 1 1558-1581).

Hughes, P.L & Larkin, J.F. (eds.), *Tudor Royal Proclamations Volume II: The Later Tudors 1553-1587* (New Haven, 1969).

Hume, M.A.S. (ed.) *Calendar of State Papers Spanish*, Volume II, Elizabeth 1568-1579 (London, 1894).

Journal of the House of Commons: volume 1: 1547-1629 (1802), 88, May 9th 1571'
<https://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=7099> (Accessed: 14 January 2013).

Lemon, R. (ed.) *Calendar of State Papers Domestic Elizabeth*; 12, (London, 1856-72).

Lemon, R. (ed.) *Calendar of State Papers Foreign Elizabeth*, (London, 1863).

Tomlins, T.E (ed.), *Elizabeth I Statutes of the Realm IV Edward VI to Elizabeth 1547-1585*, (London 1819).

Secondary Sources

Alford, S., *Burghley: William Cecil at the Court of Elizabeth I*, (New Haven, 2008).

Álvarez-Recio, L., *Fighting the Antichrist: A Cultural History of Anti-Catholicism in Tudor England*, (Eastbourne, 2011).

Barnard, J., Bell, M., and McKenzie, D.F (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, Volume IV 1557-1695, (Cambridge, 2002).

Bawcutt, P.J, *Robert Sempill* (d 1595?), in, Oxford DNB (2004),
<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25075?docPos=51397> . (Accessed: 1 May 2012).

Bellamy, J., *Tudor Law of Treason*, (London, 1979).

Bevan Zlatar, A., *Reformation Fictions: Polemical Protestant Dialogues in Elizabethan England* (Oxford, 2011).

Blayney, P. W., 'William Cecil and the Stationers', in Myers, R and Harris, M. (eds.), *The Stationers Company and the Book Trade 1550-1990*, (Winchester HA, 1990).

Bossy, J., *The English Catholic Community*, (London, 1975).

Boynton, L., *The Elizabethan Militia 1558-1638*, (London, 1967).

Brammall, K., 'Nature, Morality & the Rhetoric of Monstrosity', in, *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 27, No.1 (1996).

Collinson, P., 'The Church And the New Religion', in, Haigh, C (ed.) *The Reign of Elizabeth I*, (London 1984).

Collinson, P., 'The Elizabethan Exclusion Crisis and the Elizabethan Polity', in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 84, (1995).

Collinson, P. 'John Fox and National Consciousness', in, *This England*, (Oxford, 2011).

Collinson, P, 'England 1558-1640', in Prestwich, M., (ed.), *International Calvinism 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985).

- Collinson, P., 'Servants and Citizens: Robert Beale and other Elizabethans', in, *Historical Research*, 70, (2006).
- Collinson, P., 'The monarchical Republic of Elizabeth I', in J. Guy, (Ed), *The Tudor Monarchy*, (London, 1997).
- Collinson, P., 'The Veracity of John Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in *Elizabethan Essays*, (London, 1994).
- Collinson, P., *This England: Essays on the English nation and commonwealth in the sixteenth century*, (Oxford, 2011).
- Cooper, J., *Propaganda and the Tudor State: Political Culture in the West Country*, (Oxford, 2003).
- Cooper, J., *The Queen's Agent: Francis Walsingham at the Court of Elizabeth I: The Life of Sir Francis Walsingham*, (London, 2011).
- Dickens, A.G., 'The Elizabethans and St Bartholomew', in Soman, A. (Ed.), *The Massacre of St Bartholomew*, (The Hague, 1974).
- Diefendorf, B., *Beneath the Cross: Catholics and Huguenots in Sixteenth Century Paris*, (Oxford, 1991).
- Diefendorf, B., *The Saint Bartholomew's Day Massacre: A Brief History with Documents*, (Boston, 2008).
- Doran, S., *England and Europe in the Sixteenth Century*, (Basingstoke, 1999).
- Doran, S., *Monarchy and Matrimony: The Courtships of Elizabeth I*, (London, 1996).
- Elton, G.R., *Reform & Renewal: Thomas Cromwell & the Commonweal*, (London, 1972).
- Evenden, E., *Patents, Pictures and Patronage: John Day and the Tudor Book Trade*, (Aldershot, 2008).

Evenden, E., and Freeman, T., *Religion And the book in Early Modern England: The Making of John Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'*, (Cambridge, 2011).

Firth, K. R., *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain, 1530-1645*, (Oxford, 1979).

Fletcher, A. and MacCulloch, D., *Tudor Rebellions*, (London, 2003).

Freeman, T.S., 'Fate, Faction, and Fiction in Foxe's Book of Martyrs', *The Historical Journal* 43 (2000).

Freeman, T.S., 'Joan of Contention: The Myth of the Female Pope in Early Modern England', in K.Fincham and P.Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England*, (Woodbridge, 2006).

Freeman, T.S., Texts, Lies, and Microfilm: Reading and Misreading Foxe's "Book of Martyrs", *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 30 (1999).

Graves, M A.R., *Thomas Norton: Parliament Man* (Oxford, 1994).

Gregory, B.S., *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe*, (Harvard, 1999).

Hadfield, A., *Edmund Spenser: A Life*, (Oxford, 2012).

Haigh, C., *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, 1993).

Haigh, C., 'Church of England , Catholics and the people', in P Marshall, (Ed), *The Impact of the English Reformation*, (London, 1997).

Helgerson, R., *Forms of Nationhood*, (Chicago, 1992).

Holmes, P.J 'Mary Stewart in England', in, *Innes Review* (1987).

Holt, M.P., *The French Wars of Religion 1562-1629*, (Cambridge, 2005).

- Kelley, D.R., *The Beginnings of Ideology: Consciousness and society in the French Reformation*, (Cambridge, 1981).
- Kesselring, K., "A Cold pye for the Papistes" in *Journal of British Studies* 43 (2004).
- Kesselring, K., *The Northern Rebellion of 1569: Faith, Politics and Protest in Elizabethan England*, (London, 2007).
- King, J., *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture*, (Cambridge, 2006).
- King, J., 'Guides to Reading Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 68 (2005).
- Kingdon, R., *Myths About the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacres, 1572-1576*, (Harvard, 1988).
- Kruse, E., 'The Virgin and the Widow: The Political Finesse of Elizabeth I and Catherine De' Medici', in, Buckholz, R and Levin, C (Eds.) *Queens and Power in Medieval and Early Modern England*, (Nebraska, 2009).
- Lake, P., and Pincus, S. (eds.), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*, (Manchester, 1998).
- Lake, P., 'The Significance of the Pope as Antichrist', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31, (1980).
- Lake, P., 'Anti-Popery: The Construction of a Prejudice', in Cust, R and Hughes, A, *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics*, (London, 1989).
- Lander, J., *Inventing Polemic*, (Cambridge, 2006).
- Lowers , J.K., *Mirrors for rebels: A study of polemical literature relating to the Northern Rebellion, 1569* (California, 1953).
- MacCaffery, W., *Elizabeth I*, (London, 1994).

MacCaffery, W., *Queen Elizabeth and the Making of Policy 1572-1588*, (New Jersey, 1981).

MacCulloch, D., *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*, (London, 2003).

Maclaren, A., Gender, Religion, and Early Modern Nationalism: Elizabeth I, Mary Queen of Scots, and the Genesis of English Anti-Catholicism, in, *The American Historical Review*, 107, (2002).

Mears, N., 'Stubbe [Stubbs], John (c.1541–1590)', *DNB*, Oxford University Press, 2004, online edition, Sept 2010 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26736>]. (Accessed: 14 October 2012).

Morrisey, M., *Politics and the St Paul's Cross Sermons 1558-1642*, (Cambridge, 2011).

Neale, J.E., *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments* (2 vols), (London, 1957).

Orsini, N. "'Policy": Or the Language of Elizabethan Machiavellianism', in, *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 9 (1946).

Parmalee, L. F., *Good News from Fraunce, French Anti-League Propaganda in Late Elizabethan England*, (New York 1996).

Pettegree, A., *The Book in the Renaissance*, (New Haven, 2010).

Raab, F., *The English Face of Machiavelli*, (Oxford, 1964).

Read, C., *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth*, (London, 1960).

Read, C., *Mr Secretary Walsingham* (3 Vols), (Oxford, 1925).

Rublack, U., *Reformation Europe*, (Cambridge, 2005).

Ryrie, A., *The Age of Reformation: The Tudor and Stewart Realm 1485-1603* (London, 2009).

Scribner, B., *For the Sake of Simple folk*, (Oxford, 1994).

Sheils, W, 'The Catholic Community in Doran, S, and Jones, N., (eds.), *The Elizabethan World*, (Oxford, 2011).

Sheils, W, ' Catholics and Recusants', in, and Jones, N., and Tittler, R. (eds), *A Companion to Tudor Britain*, (Oxford, 2009).

Walsham, A., *Church Papists*, (Suffolk, 1993).

Warnicke, R.M., *Mary Queen of Scots* (London, 2006).

Weiner, C.Z., 'The Beleaguered Isle: A study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism', in *Past and Present* , 51 (1971).

Weissburger, L..A., 'Machiavelli and Tudor England', in *Political Science Quarterly*, (1927).

Wernham, R.B., *Before the Armada: The Emergence of the English Nation 1485-1588*, (New York, 1980).

