Martyrologists without boundaries: the collaboration of John Foxe and Heinrich Pantaleon*

Abstract

Despite the wealth of research on the mid-sixteenth-century Protestant martyrologies of John Foxe, Jean Crespin, and others, Heinrich Pantaleon’s *Martyrvm historia* (1563) has been comparatively overlooked. This article, however, maintains that Pantaleon’s martyrology was important. Unlike other Protestant martyrologists, Pantaleon could read not only classical languages but also Dutch, German, and Italian. Pantaleon drew on vernacular martyrologies and translated the material for incorporation into his own Latin text, making this material accessible to the learned across Europe, and creating a more cohesive group of international Protestant martyrs. An example of this effect is provided by Foxe’s use of Pantaleon’s accounts of the German and Italian martyrs, which is explored fully here.

I: Introduction and background

In the last year of his life, John Bunyan quoted from a letter written from prison by ‘that godly man, Pomponius Algerius, an Italian martyr’.¹ The fact that a lay preacher in Bedford, without any formal education, knew the contents of a letter written by an obscure Italian martyr over 130 years earlier is due to two authors. One of these, John Foxe, in whose *Acts and monuments* (popularly known as Foxe’s ‘Book of Martyrs’) Bunyan read the letter, is well-known today, at least among scholars.² The other, Heinrich Pantaleon, is a more
obscure figure, particularly among Anglophone scholars. Yet his martyrlogy, the *Martyrvm historia*, was not only Foxe’s source for Pomponio and his letter, but it was, as this article discusses in detail, the source for a great deal of Foxe’s narrative of Protestant martyrs in Germany, Italy, and, to a lesser extent, France. (Although the work of the great French martyrrologist, Jean Crespin, is mentioned below as it relates to Foxe’s use of Pantaleon, Foxe’s wider use of Crespin is too extensive to discuss fully in this article). As with other martyrologies, the example of Bunyan and Pomponio suggests that the works of Foxe and Pantaleon, which were linked on several levels, helped create a history of the ‘True Church’ and its martyrs cherished by Protestants across much of western Europe for centuries.

Protestants began commemorating their martyrs in the early 1520s and, for the next three decades, continued with small, desultory, but often widely circulated works glorifying contemporary martyrs and, in some cases, extolling ‘proto-Protestant’ martyrs of the Middle Ages. In 1552, this situation began to change with the publication of the first volume of Ludwig Rabus’s martyrlogy. This first volume is a collection of stories of martyrs of the early Church, but, starting with the second of what would become eight volumes, Rabus concentrated on Lutheran martyrs in German-speaking Europe. The same year, 1554, Jean Crespin, a Calvinist printer, published the first edition of his martyrology, an octavo, which would ultimately grow, by the time the definitive edition of 1564 was printed, into a folio of about 1,000 pages chronicling the persecution of the Huguenots. Also in 1554, John Foxe published his *Commentarii*, essentially an account of Lollard dissidents and martyrs from John Wyclif to Reginald Pecock, and the precursor of the *Acts and monuments*. In 1559, the Dutch Calvinist minister Adriaan van Haemstede’s published a 450-page martyrlogy devoted largely to the persecutions in the Low Countries.

These works do not stand in isolation, for other important Protestant martyrological texts were printed in the same period. Nevertheless, certain common features of the
martyrologies of Rabus, Crespin, Foxe, and Haemstede, taken together, separate them from other Protestant martyrologies of the period, including Pantaleon’s. One of these features is that the martyrologies of Rabus, Crespin, Foxe, and Haemstede were written in their authors’ vernaculars. Admittedly, a Latin edition of Crespin’s martyrrology does exist, and Foxe, while in exile, wrote two Latin martyrologies. Nevertheless, all the other editions of Crespin’s martyrrology were in French; and, after Foxe returned to England, his martyrologies were printed exclusively in English. The first volume of Rabus’s martyrrology was a translation into German of his original Latin volume, but the remaining seven volumes of his martyrrology appeared only in German, and a second edition of Rabus’s complete martyrrology was published solely in German. Haemstede’s martyrrology was only printed in Dutch. The printing of these martyrrologies in vernacular languages meant that each of these four martyrrologies would become primarily associated with particular countries or regions: France, England, Lutheran Germany, or the Netherlands. Each of the four martyrrologies also included significant amounts of original material, whether official documents, letters, shorter works, or material drawn from oral sources and eyewitness accounts. This material made these works valuable, even indispensable, sources for the history of particular countries or regions. The use of such local sources bound the chains linking these martyrrologies to specific countries and regions even more tightly.

This consequence has had several significant effects on the study of the great sixteenth-century Protestant martyrrologies. For one thing, they have been studied individually rather than collectively. The literature on Foxe is enormous, but there have also been significant studies of Rabus, Crespin, and Haemstede, which focus on these martyrrologists individually but do not concentrate on their links with other martyrrologists. In contrast, there is relatively little work considering the major sixteenth-century Protestant martyrrologies as a group. There is also very little work examining the textual interchanges
across these martyrologies.\textsuperscript{15} This tendency is both strengthened by, and strengthens, the propensity to study the role of these martyrologies in creating national churches.

These modern preoccupations were not shared by the Protestant martyrrologists or their contemporaries, but they have accounted for a general neglect of Heinrich Pantaleon’s \textit{Martyrvm historia}.\textsuperscript{16} Additional factors include the fact that Pantaleon wrote in Latin, and, except for some material on Italian evangelical martyrs (discussed below), there is little in his martyrology not printed elsewhere. All of the four major Protestant martyrologies contained some extracts from other works, but Pantaleon’s was composed almost entirely of such extracts. And yet, Pantaleon’s perspective was truly international, and his martyrology was not concerned with the development of a particular regional or national Church. In sum, although the \textit{Martyrvm historia} seems derivative and thus much less interesting or significant than the more famous martyrologies, the importance of its role in disseminating information across Protestant Europe cannot be denied.

II: Oporinus and Foxe’s Latin martyrologies

Rabus, Crespin, and Haemstede were, to some degree, concerned with godly martyrs throughout Europe, but Foxe was the most internationally minded of these major authors, with large sections of his martyrology devoted to topics such as the Ottoman Empire and the Hussite wars. He also had a very strong interest in the Reformation across western Europe. Much of Foxe’s interest in, and access to, the sources for Protestant martyrs in western Europe were due to his mentor John Bale. Bale’s deserved reputation as a bare-knuckled polemicist should not obscure the fact that he was an internationally respected scholar with strong ties to the great Lutheran scholar, Matthias Flacius Illyricus, and the Magdeburg Centuriators.\textsuperscript{17} The desire of Flacius and his colleagues to integrate Bale and Foxe into the
larger historical projects of these scholars probably led the two Englishmen, during their exile, to settle in Basle and work as proof-readers for the great Protestant printer, Johannes Oporinus. More significantly, Oporinus eventually brought Foxe and Pantaleon together for a project that became, in many respects, a joint martyrlogy.

Although Foxe’s first martyrlogy, the Commentarii, had been written in England, it was printed in Strasbourg in 1554. With relatively little coverage of martyrs outside Britain, the Commentarii contained accounts of two popular preachers, Thomas Conecte, a French Carmelite, and the notorious Girolamo Savanorola, the firebrand friar of Florence, who were burned in 1434 and 1498 respectively for their vehement denunciations of particular pontiffs. At the end of the Commentarii, Foxe declared that he intended to write a continuation of this history as soon as he could, and that this second work would extend to the time of Luther. It is most likely that he planned for this continuation to cover events on the European mainland more thoroughly than he had in the Commentarii.

By the end of 1558, Foxe had already proceeded quite far with his continuation of the Commentarii. This continuation, like many of Foxe’s works printed during his exile, was to be published by Oporinus. It also appears, from his correspondence, that Foxe intended this volume to describe reformers and martyrdoms on the mainland. On 13 May 1559, less than five months before this second martyrlogy’s publication, Foxe wrote a letter from Basle to Heinrich Bullinger asking for accounts from Bernardino Ochino and other Italians in Zurich regarding the persecution of reformers in Italy. He also asked Bullinger to send him a narrative of the history of the Reformation in Zurich: ‘For although I am more immediately concerned with British history, yet I shall not pass over the sacred history of other nations, should it come in my way’. A month later and still from Basle, Foxe pressed Bullinger for material on Zwingli, assuring him that the material would be published in England, if not in Germany. By this point Foxe and Oporinus had probably decided that there would be a
second part to Foxe’s second martyrrology, and that this second part would be printed in England, presumably after Foxe returned there. Writing to Bullinger from Basle as late as 2 August 1559, Foxe asked again for information about Zwingli and promised that he would print an account of the great Swiss reformer in England if it could not be printed in Basle. Even on the eve of his departure from Basle at the end of September 1559, Foxe was gathering material on the martyrs of the mainland.

While the haste to produce the Rervm – due to Foxe’s desire to return to England after Mary I’s death – meant that the volume, apart from some discussion of Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague, contained only material on English and Scottish martyrs, the intention to write a complete history of the mainland martyrs had not been abandoned. The full title of the Rervm assures the reader that more was coming from Foxe on the Reformation beyond Britain: Commentaries on the events that have happened in the Church in these latter and perilous times, and especially of the great persecutions throughout Europe and of the holy martyrs of God, and of other matters if any may be of more notable significance, arranged by kingdoms and nations. The first part. In which is contained a narrative firstly of events in England and Scotland, and especially of the dreadful persecution under Mary, the recent queen. By John Foxe, Englishman. The implicit promise of a second part to the Rervm was made explicit in the book’s text, where Foxe praised Martin Luther but regretted that an account of his life ‘would be too long for weaving into my narrative here unless it follows in the next instalment of this history, [which is] presently on the English and the Scots. Truly afterwards, [if the account were not so long.] I would have decided to report on the German people, Luther among them, in their turn’. Although Foxe eventually compiled a life of Luther for the Acts and monuments, he would not be the author of a second part to the Rervm.

As we have seen, Foxe arrived back in England sometime in October 1559, and yet in November a letter of Nicholas Ridley’s, edited by Foxe, was printed. A striking feature of
the work was Foxe’s declaration that this was a but a foretaste of ‘other Volumes… which we
ar about, touching the full Historie, processe, and examinations, of all our blessed brethren,
lately persecuted for rightousnes sake’. In other words, almost immediately on reaching
England, Foxe had begun researching and planning the first edition of what became the Acts
and monuments. Having fixed his eyes on that particular prize, Foxe seems to have devoted
little thought and less effort to a second part to the Rervm.

Nevertheless, even before Ridley’s A frendly farewel reached the press, developments
in Geneva demonstrated that Foxe was still mindful of a broad European readership for his
works. In the Rervm’s introduction, Foxe stated that two editions of the work were sought,
one printed in Latin at Basle (the current volume), while another printer in Geneva was
insisting on a French edition. Steps were being taken in Geneva to bring this about. On 16
October 1559, the printer Nicholas Barbier asked the Genevan Consistory for a license
lasting four years, during which he would have a monopoly on printing the ‘Historia
ecclesiastica Johannis Foxi’. On the same day, however, Jean Crespin asked the Consistory
for a licence for a new and larger edition of his Livre des martyrs, which would include
martyrs from England and other regions. The Consistory granted the requested licences to
both printers, and although nothing more was heard of Barbier’s translation of the Rervm,
Crespin incorporated a great deal of the Rervm into his only Latin martyrology, printed in
1560. Indeed, J.-F. Gilmont has estimated that eighty-five per cent of Crespin’s next French
martyrology, printed in 1561, consisted of passages translated from the Rervm.

III: Heinrich Pantaleon and the Martyrvm historia

After his return to England, Foxe spent two years feverishly gathering written and
oral sources for his martyrology, and another eighteen months after that helping to get these
materials printed. Whatever promises Foxe had made to Oporinus, they were part of the sacrifices of time, energy, and commitments that Foxe immolated on the altar of his first edition of the *Acts and monuments*. Oporinus, however, wanted the second part of the *Rervm* completed. On 1 September 1562, he wrote to Foxe from Frankfurt on the eve of the book fair, responding to a letter that Foxe had just sent to him along with a printed copy of a ‘little book on the tyranny of the popes’, which Foxe had written anonymously. Oporinus candidly admitted that he had not yet had time to read the work thoroughly, but he assured Foxe that, from what he had hastily scanned, it would add further lustre to Foxe’s reputation. The work Foxe sent to Oporinus must have been *A solemne contestation of diuers popes*, which Foxe had published in autumn 1560. Foxe probably sent this work to Oporinus, almost two years after it had been printed, as a token gift or peace offering because he was concerned that his lack of progress on the *Rervm’s pars secunda* would disappoint his old employer and patron. In fact, at the end of Oporinus’s letter, he bluntly stated to Foxe that ‘I beg in earnest that you consider reviewing your other martyrs’; put simply, he was asking whether Foxe had any serious intention of writing the second volume of the *Rervm*. Foxe probably told Oporinus that he could not or would not do it, so Oporinus recruited another Protestant scholar, Heinrich Pantaleon, who conveniently lived in Basle, to compile the second volume.

Pantaleon was a remarkable polymath who was a successful physician and had successively held chairs in dialectic, physics, and medicine at the University of Basle. Also, he held a licentiate in theology after having been a deacon. Previously, at the age of 24, he had written a Latin comedy, *Philargyrus*, which dealt with conversion of the Biblical character Zaccheus and dramatized justification by faith. His reputation as a historical writer was established in 1550 by his *Chronographia Christianae Ecclesiae*, a learned reference work presenting the history of the Church in parallel tables. Pantaleon further
raised his profile in 1556 with a translation of Johann Sleidan’s celebrated *Commentaries* from Latin into German; while Sleidan denounced the translation – first on political and subsequently on stylistic grounds – it was a considerable commercial success.⁴⁰

Oporinus, by entrusting the *Rervm’s* continuation to Pantaleon, relied on a scholar with an international reputation, but Pantaleon also possessed the advantage of having been on good terms with Bale and Foxe during their exile (though it is unclear at what point these men first came into contact). Pantaleon had written a poem praising Bale for his piety and learning, a poem which prefaced Bale’s great biographical dictionary of English authors.⁴¹ Pantaleon further claimed that Bale had encouraged him to write historical works, and described Bale and Foxe as ‘my most absolute friends’.⁴²

Oporinus’s letter to Foxe, asking if he intended to work on the second part of the *Rervm*, was written a little over five months before Pantaleon’s martyrology was printed. At the time of the letter, Pantaleon must have already been preparing the volume, presumably with Oporinus’s encouragement. Nevertheless, despite Foxe’s refusal to write it, real efforts were made, probably at Oporinus’s behest, to associate Pantaleon’s martyrology with Foxe’s *Rervm*. In fact, the subtitle of Pantaleon’s work announced that it was the second part of a two-volume martyrology: ‘While, in the first part, the martyrs of England and Scotland at least were recorded by John Foxe, Englishman, some years ago’.⁴³ In the dedication of his *Martyrvm historia*, Pantaleon was careful to observe that a second part of the *Rervm*, covering the martyrs outside of England and Scotland, had been Foxe’s plan from the outset, and that the volume was only completed by someone else ‘since truly we had waited, in vain, for several years’ for Foxe to undertake the task.⁴⁴

It seems likely that, if Foxe had been willing to write the second volume, Pantaleon would have handed over his notes, or they would have co-authored the work. In either case, an important, but not solitary, indication of the remarkable degree of cooperation between
Foxe and Pantaleon is that the first edition of the *Acts and monuments* and Pantaleon’s *Martyrvm historia* were being printed simultaneously. It took a few months to print Pantaleon’s folio of 361 pages and, as noted above, eighteen months to print the first edition of the *Acts and monuments*, the colophon of which reads ‘Anno. 1563 the .20. of March’. Pantaleon’s dedication to the *Martyrvm historia*, by comparison, was dated ‘13 calend[is] April[is] Anno reparatae salutis 1563’, which is 20 March according to the Roman calendar.\(^{45}\) This common date cannot have been a coincidence. Oporinus wanted Pantaleon’s work ready for the Frankfurt book fair that spring, which started on 28 March.\(^ {46}\) Pantaleon’s volume appears to have been ahead of schedule and could have been published in plenty of time for the spring fair (rather than cut it so close), since the last section goes on to describe other events as late as February 1563.\(^ {47}\) Yet, it seems certain that Oporinus wanted the martyrologies of Foxe and Pantaleon to appear at the same time, as doing so would link Foxe to the *Martyrvm historia* and, with luck, increase sales for both the *pars prima* and *pars secunda* of the *Rervm*.

Scholars are unlikely to find a smoking gun here, but the evidence suggests the following. Printing commenced on the first edition of the *Acts and monuments* around September 1561. At some point, probably in 1562, Foxe agreed to publish his book in tandem with Pantaleon’s volume. As the printing of Foxe’s much larger work dragged on, Oporinum may have advised Foxe and John Day, Foxe’s publisher, that Pantaleon’s work had to be printed and ready for the Frankfurt fair that spring. In response, Foxe and Day may have said that they would be finished that winter, which timing would explain an agreed date of 20 March, the last day of winter in 1563. Working in considerable haste to meet this deadline, Day finally had the work completed in time.\(^ {48}\) If Foxe seems to have been remarkably accommodating here, it is worth remembering that Foxe owed Oporinus a good turn since he had failed to complete a promised project for the printer who had employed him.
during his lean years of exile. Moreover, Oporinus was not the only person who wanted to see Foxe’s martyrology published as quickly as possible, for it was in Day’s interest to finish the job, and pressure was probably also coming from William Cecil and others.⁴⁹

At some point, Pantaleon must have sent some of the fruits of his research to Foxe before their works were published simultaneously. A few excerpts from Pantaleon’s *Martyrvm historia* appear in the first edition of the *Acts and monuments*. Two anecdotes of martyrdoms in 1525, of a minister and a peasant, which originated in sermons of the German Reformer Oecolampadius, are directly translated from Pantaleon.⁵⁰ The account in Foxe of the near arrest of the Protestant theologian, Simon Grynaeus, was also taken from the *Martyrvm historia*.⁵¹ Other instances are more complicated. The account of the Bavarian martyr, Jörgen Wagner, for example, could have been drawn from either of the virtually identical accounts of Pantaleon or Crespin.⁵²

Although it seems clear that Pantaleon had sent Foxe extracts from his work before it was printed, the timing is less than clear. Since material that Foxe took from Pantaleon was printed less than a quarter of the way through the first edition of the *Acts and monuments*, it can be assumed that Pantaleon sent this material to Foxe relatively early in the printing – i.e., by autumn 1561 – but the material must have been in Foxe’s hand by late spring 1562 at the latest. Why Pantaleon sent it to Foxe may have been because Foxe had requested it, or because Pantaleon and Oporinus still held out the hope, soon to be dissipated, that Foxe was working on the *pars secunda* of the *Rervm*.

Pantaleon’s work was, at less than 400 pages, significantly shorter than the martyrologies of Haemstede and Rabus, never mind the massive martyrologies printed by Foxe and Crespin in 1563 and 1564 respectively. The *Martyrvm historia* is a collection of materials from an impressive range of other martyrologies and histories. Indeed, Pantaleon consulted the martyrologies of Rabus, Haemstede, and Crespin, as well as the *Rervm* and
other works, to provide the most geographically comprehensive account of Protestant martyrs then available. Pantaleon exercised authorial oversight by condensing materials and omitting long sections of primary sources, but, with a few exceptions (where he obtained new information on certain Italian martyrs), his work did not contain original or unpublished material. The international and polyglot nature of Pantaleon’s martyrology underscores its major advantage over other Protestant martyrologies; for, unlike Rabus, Crespin, Haemstede, and Foxe, Pantaleon could read German, French, and Dutch. As a result, where the other martyrologists had to work with Latin editions or employ translators to access material in the other martyrologies, Pantaleon could draw on Rabus, Crespin, and Haemstede with ease. By bringing material from all the major Protestant martyrologies together, and printing this material in Latin, the lingua franca of the educated, Pantaleon allowed Foxe and others to access martyrological accounts originally written in languages they could not read.

IV: Foxe and the martyrologies of Ludwig Rabus and Adriaan van Haemstede

In the second edition of the *Acts and monuments*, published in 1570, Foxe added a section of about seventy folio pages on Protestant martyrs on the European mainland. If this addition seems small (about three per cent of the total text), worth noting is that it was of comparable size, on its own, to Foxe’s and Crespin’s earliest martyrologies. This addition also came at a time when the supplies of paper for the *Acts and monuments* were running low, and frantic efforts were being made to limit the size of the work. The fact that Foxe nevertheless devoted this much paper to non-British Protestant martyrs is one indication of his commitment to an international perspective. For English martyrs throughout the sixteenth century, Foxe relied heavily on personal testimony from a network of contacts. His ability to use the same contacts for martyrs across the Channel was limited, but in a few instances he
was able to garner testimony from others. For example, Foxe has an account of François Civaux, a former secretary to the French ambassador in England and convert to Protestantism, who fled to Geneva, became secretary to the Council there, and was ultimately martyred at Dijon in 1558. Civaux was not mentioned in the *Martyrum historia* or in any of Crespin’s martyrologies. Rather, Foxe states that his account was taken ‘from the written testimony of the Genevan Council’, which suggests that someone in Geneva had copied the records and sent them to Foxe. Foxe also reported the execution of an unnamed man in Sicily in 1559. The martyr had, according to Foxe, come to Sicily from Geneva ‘upon zeale to do good’, and Foxe added that his end was ‘wyntnessed to me by hym, whiche beyng there present the same tyme, did both then see that whiche he doth testifie, and also doth now testifie that he then saw’. These snippets of individual testimony provide further evidence of Foxe’s desire to gather as much evidence as possible regarding Protestant martyrs regardless of nationality.

Foxe divided these martyrs into four groups, each of which had its own section in his edition of 1570: the German martyrs (including those in Switzerland, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Netherlands), the French (including those in present-day Belgium), the Spanish, and the Italians. Foxe drew predominantly on the martyrologies of Pantaleon and Crespin for his accounts of these martyrs, as indicated by his abundant source citations. However, these citations need to be approached with caution. Foxe produced them as a pre-emptive rebuttal of any accusation that he had invented these martyrs or the details in their accounts; indeed, at one point he declared that he added a citation for a particular martyrdom ‘lest this so rare and straunge example of crueltie shall seme to lack credite’. Moreover, Foxe sometimes cited sources that his sources had given as their sources, especially if these original sources were prestigious. For example, Foxe reprinted anecdotes from the 1563 edition of the persecution of godly individuals, anecdotes which had been drawn from
Pantaleon and Crespin, who had taken these stories from Oecolampadius’s sermons; accordingly, Foxe gave Oecolampadius as the source.  

At other places, Foxe cited Flacius, the Swiss minister Johann Gast, Melanchthon, and Sleidan as his sources for material actually taken from Pantaleon. Ascertaining Foxe’s sources, as ever, can be quite tricky. Foxe’s account of the Bavarian martyr, Leonard Keyser, for example, closely matches the account in Crespin’s 1560 martyrology, but Foxe cited Luther as his source. Crespin did not mention Luther, but Pantaleon (in his longer version of the Bavarian’s execution) had the same citation of Luther as the source for Keyser’s martyrdom. Foxe probably used Crespin but consulted Pantaleon for the latter’s citation of Luther here, but there are no set patterns regarding Foxe’s citation in his sections on mainland martyrs: sometimes he cited the source he directly consulted; sometimes he cited the source his source cited; sometimes he did both; sometimes he cited nothing. Foxe’s citations are valuable clues to his sources, but his text must always be compared with the texts that he cites as well as those he used in other places.

Although the important textual interactions between Foxe and Crespin are too complex to discuss comprehensively here, it is worth examining the interactions between Foxe and two other authors, Rabus and Haemstede, before discussing Pantaleon. There are suggestive indications that Foxe, for a handful of the ‘German’ martyrs, consulted Ludwig Rabus’s martyrology. Foxe’s account of the execution of the Lutheran pastor Wolfgang Schuch follows Pantaleon quite closely, but, while Pantaleon does not cite a source, Foxe cites ‘Ex Ludou. Rabo et Pantal’. The account in Pantaleon appears to be based on the account of Schuch in Rabus, so Foxe probably located the source behind Pantaleon even though the latter did not cite it. Similarly, Foxe’s account of Ursula and Maria, two virgin martyrs burned at Delden in 1545, follows Pantaleon’s account closely. Foxe cited Rabus,
while Pantaleon supplied no citation but did, in fact, abridge and rearrange the account as it had been printed by Rabus.\textsuperscript{67}

In other cases, Foxe’s citations of Rabus appear to be mistaken. Foxe cited Rabus as one of his sources for the martyrdoms of a Frenchman named Nicholas and a woman named Mariana (or Marion), the wife of a barber in Mons in 1549.\textsuperscript{68} He also cited Rabus as a source for the martyrdom of Pierre Mioce in Tournai in 1545, and Rabus as his sole source for the martyrdoms of François Varlut and Alexandre Dayken in Tournai in 1562.\textsuperscript{69} Yet, there are no accounts of any of these martyrs in either edition of Rabus’s martyrology. Foxe clearly followed Pantaleon (or Crespin) for the accounts of Nicholas and Mariana.\textsuperscript{70} Foxe also seems to have drawn on Pantaleon for the martyrdoms of Mioce, Varlut, and Dayken.\textsuperscript{71} On other occasions where Foxe cited Rabus, he simply repeated Pantaleon’s citation.\textsuperscript{72} It appears likely that Foxe consulted a copy of Rabus’s martyrology; but, probably because his German was rudimentary at best, his understanding of what Rabus wrote was limited, and his notes from Rabus may have gotten mixed up with those from Pantaleon. In any event, Foxe probably only scanned the names and places of martyrs from Rabus’s text, most likely \textit{after} finding the martyrs’ accounts in Pantaleon.

The possibility that Foxe drew on Haemstede’s martyrology has drawn some scholarly attention, although larger claims that Haemstede’s martyrology influenced the scope of Foxe’s martyrology have been challenged.\textsuperscript{73} Guido Latré has drawn attention to the account of the martyrdom of Bertrand le Blas, a sacramentarian of Tournai executed on 29 December 1555. Latré observes not only that Foxe cited Crespin, Pantaleon, \textit{and} Haemstede as his sources, but also that Foxe used a few terms unique to Haemstede in his account, referring to Tournai as ‘Dornie’ (Haemstede had rendered it as ‘Doornicke’) and stating that le Blas was tortured on the ‘pyneba[n]ke’ (from the Dutch word for the rack, ‘pijnbanck’).\textsuperscript{74} Latré is certainly correct in arguing that this use of Dutch terms indicates that Foxe made
direct use of Haemstede’s martyrrology, but the issue is to what extent. As with Rabus, it seems probable that Foxe simply scanned Haemstede, using Pantaleon’s text as an aid. (Moreover, these borrowings suggest Foxe’s limited understanding of Haemstede’s Dutch, for why did not Foxe translate ‘pijnbanck’ as ‘rack’ if he understood what it meant?)

Foxe made other token citations of Haemstede in conjunction with other martyrrologies. Foxe cited Crespin and Haemstede as his sources for the martyrdom of one Jean l’Anglois in Sens in 1547. Foxe’s single sentence account, however, contains nothing not in Crespin’s Latin martyrrology, except the citation of Haemstede.75 Foxe’s citation for the martyrdom of Guillaume Neel, in Evreux in 1553, is interestingly worded: ‘Henr. Pantal. Lib. 9. and Crisp. and Adrian [i.e., Haemstede] maketh mention also of one William Neel’.76 Foxe stated that all three mention Neel, but he did not state that they were his sources. In fact, the accounts of Neel’s martyrdom by Pantaleon, Crespin, and Haemstede are so similar that it is impossible to distinguish whether Foxe used any one or all of them; but, as before, it seems likely that Foxe primarily used Pantaleon (because of the specific reference to Book 9), and then noticed the account in the other works.77 Foxe has another interesting citation for his account of Arnaud Monier and Jean de Cazes, both burned at Bourdeux in April 1556: ‘This story is testified and to bee found both in the volume of the French martyrs printed by Iohn Crispine .lib.6. and also in the booke of Dutche martyrs written by Adrianus’.78 Once more, Foxe was not as specific as one might like when identifying his sources, but the accounts of the two martyrs are found in Crespin’s 1564 French-language martyrrology and in Haemstede.79 These two accounts are very similar, though there is no direct evidence that Foxe actually read Haemstede’s Dutch account or Crespin’s French account. In other places, however, Foxe had clearly drawn solely on the 1564 edition of Crespin for material; but there is no case where he did so with Haemstede.80
Foxe may have had a more sustained engagement with Haemstede’s martyrology in one final case. At the end of his account of the ‘German’ martyrs, Foxe writes:

‘Furthermore, in the Dutch boke of Adrian, diuers others be numbered in the Catalogue of the Germane Martyrs, which likewise suffered in diuers places of the lower country [i.e., the Low Countries].’  

81 A list of about fifty martyrs follows, almost all from Haemstede and some whose martyrdoms are only recorded in Haemstede. 82 This list merely provides martyrs’ names, dates of death, and locations. Undoubtedly Foxe scanned through a copy of Haemstede for these names, but that is not quite the same thing as reading Haemstede’s book. In sum, it seems that Foxe drew what facts he could from Haemstede, either for information exclusive to the Dutch martyrologist, or simply to confirm the existence of martyrs mentioned by Pantaleon or Crespin, but that was the extent of Foxe’s use of his Dutch counterpart’s work.

V: Foxe’s sources for the ‘German’ martyrs

Foxe’s attempts to draw on Rabus’s German and Haemstede’s Dutch underscore the importance of Pantaleon’s Latin text. Hard as Foxe might strain at the linguistic leash holding him back, on his own he could make only limited use of martyrologies written in vernaculars other than English.

How much, then, of Foxe’s material on the mainland European martyrs was taken from Pantaleon? Foxe’s section on the German martyrs begins with seventeen accounts. 83 Of these Foxe cited Pantaleon directly for three. 84 He translated Pantaleon’s text and repeated his citations in another three. 85 Foxe gave no citations for his accounts of martyrs drowned in the Rhine and killed at Dithmarschen, but he provided details found in Pantaleon (though not Crespin). 86 Similarly, Foxe’s account of Peter Spengler contains the martyr’s
name, which was supplied by Pantaleon but not Crespin.\textsuperscript{87} Foxe cited Rabus as his source for the execution of Hans von Salhausen, a monk in Prague, but the account was more likely derived from Pantaleon or Crespin, or both.\textsuperscript{88} Foxe gives no source for two accounts, one of Gasper Thauber martyred in Vienna in 1524, and another of Jörgen Wagner in Munich in 1527; these accounts could also have been obtained from Pantaleon or Crespin, or both.\textsuperscript{89}

Other accounts among these first seventeen are more complicated. Two were unquestionably from Crespin despite Foxe’s citation of both Pantaleon and Crespin in the first case.\textsuperscript{90} The account, reprinted from Foxe’s first edition without alteration, of the early Lutheran martyrs, Hendrick Vos and Johann van den Esschen, is a mixture of elements from Crespin’s account with details only found in Luther’s account of the martyrdoms.\textsuperscript{91} The account of the lynching of the Lutheran preacher Heinrich Zütphen in 1524, also reprinted from the first edition of the \textit{Acts and monuments}, cites and follows closely Luther’s narrative of the tragedy.\textsuperscript{92} Foxe cited Sleidan’s \textit{Commentaries} as his source for his account of Johann Heuglin, and the wording of Foxe’s account clearly shows that it was copied from John Daus’s translation of Sleidan. For example, Daus wrote: ‘The byshop of Constaunce, had a litle before caused one John Huglie [sic], a priest, to be brent at Merspurge, for that he woulde not allowe the bishops of Romes doctrine in all thinges’.\textsuperscript{93} In Foxe’s account in the first edition, which was reprinted very similarly in the second, he wrote that ‘the bishop of Constance caused a certain priest, named John Howgley to be burned at Merspurge, for that he would not allow the bishop of Romes doctrine in al poynetes’.\textsuperscript{94} Foxe also cited Sleidan as the source for his narrative of the burnings of Peter Fliesden and Adolf Clarebach in Cologne in 1529. This account was reprinted exactly from Foxe’s first edition, and again, the English translation of Sleidan’s \textit{Commentaries} seems Foxe’s most likely source.\textsuperscript{95} In sum, of the seventeen narratives opening Foxe’s section on the ‘German’ martyrs, eight definitely derived from Pantaleon, three probably derived from him, and six derived from other authors.
Foxe’s section on ‘German’ martyrs then became more schematic because the remaining martyrs were listed in a table of thirty-nine accounts of martyrdom or persecution.96 This table makes even clearer Foxe’s dependence on Pantaleon for his knowledge of ‘German’ martyrs. Eight of the accounts include direct citations to Pantaleon. In four of these eight, Foxe cites him as his sole source for the episode.97 In another three, Foxe cites both Pantaleon and Rabus as sources which, as before, effectively means that Pantaleon was Foxe’s source.98 For the last of these eight, that of Bertrand le Blas, Foxe cites Crespin, Pantaleon, and Haemstede as his sources.99

In a further nineteen cases, Foxe simply repeated the source citation and translated the accounts in Pantaleon.100 In at least three other cases, the wording between Foxe’s account and an account in Pantaleon are so close – at times virtually word-for-word translation – that there is no doubt that Pantaleon was Foxe’s source, even though Foxe listed no source.101 For the remaining nine accounts, Pantaleon was probably the source (or one of several); the only account for which Pantaleon is an unlikely source is the martyrdom of Michelle Craignole, where Foxe cites Crespin alone.102 In sum, at an absolute minimum, Foxe derived over seventy per cent of the table from Pantaleon, but more realistically that figure is over ninety per cent, and, without Pantaleon, Foxe’s material on the ‘German’ martyrs would have been greatly diminished.

VI: Foxe’s use of Pantaleon beyond the ‘German’ martyrs

Foxe’s section on French martyrs relied more heavily on Crespin than Pantaleon, but the latter still made a significant contribution largely by providing material which supplemented that provided by Crespin.103 Of the eighty-seven accounts, in five Foxe cited Pantaleon as his sole source, although in two of these Foxe’s account is only one sentence
long, and it is impossible to distinguish whether he drew from Pantaleon or Crespin, or both. For the martyrdoms of Etienne Pouillot and Denis le Vayr, Crespin’s accounts are very close to Pantaleon’s, and, in both cases, Foxe could have been drawing on both, though he cited Pantaleon alone. Foxe also cited Pantaleon as his sole source for the story of a wealthy Parisian merchant persecuted by the Franciscans; this account does not appear in any of Crespin’s martyrologies. On another occasion, immediately following the account of the merchant in both Foxe and Pantaleon, Foxe simply translated Pantaleon’s account along with his citation of a source; again, it is clear that Pantaleon was Foxe’s source.

In eleven other accounts of French martyrs, Foxe cites both Pantaleon and Crespin. Close examination reveals that Foxe was indeed drawing on both authors for some of these accounts. For the martyrdom of Sanctin Lyvet (Pantaleon, Crespin, and Foxe give his name as ‘Nivet[vs]’), Foxe cited Pantaleon first and Crespin second, but, because the two Latin accounts are nearly identical, Foxe could have drawn on them equally. For the martyrdom of Etienne Brun, Foxe followed Crespin but added detail from Pantaleon emphasising the martyr’s miraculous resistance to pain. Although Foxe cited both martyrologists as sources for the persecution in Paris following the attack of a mob on a Protestant congregation in September 1557, he principally used Crespin’s 1564 edition, except that he added a paragraph from Pantaleon about the successful intervention of German and Swiss ambassadors on behalf of some of the prisoners. For other cases where Foxe cited both martyrologists, or gave no source at all, but accounts of the event do exist by both Crespin and Pantaleon, it is very difficult to ascertain the extent to which Foxe used either author. And yet, while Foxe’s section on the German martyrs would have been dramatically reduced without the aid of Pantaleon’s text, Foxe’s account of the French martyrs by comparison would have been left largely intact.
Foxe’s table of Spanish martyrs contained only one entry from Pantaleon. In contrast, essentially the entire table of Italian martyrs, apart from Francisco de Enzinas’s account of his ‘miraculous’ escape from prison, comes from Pantaleon. Admittedly, Foxe cited both Pantaleon and Crespin as sources for the martyrdom of Fannino Fanini, and it could have come from either. The account of Algieri Pomponio de Nola, including his letter, is printed from Pantaleon without attribution by Foxe. For three of the accounts in this section, Foxe repeated both Pantaleon’s text and his source citation. For the remainder of the accounts in the section on Italian martyrs, Foxe cited Pantaleon as his source.

Foxe’s almost complete dependence on Pantaleon for his accounts of Italian martyrs was because most of this material was first printed in the _Martyrvm historia_. The accounts of Fanini and Cabianca, however, were first printed in Ludwig Rabus’s martyrology, and the account of the two Augustinians came, according to Pantaleon’s attribution, which Foxe repeated, from Manlius’s _Locorvm communium collectanea_. Pantaleon stated that the account of Trezio, though, came to him ‘ex Caelio’, i.e., a friend of his, Celio Secondo Curione, an eminent Italian humanist and scholar who took refuge in Basle in 1542 and remained there until his death in 1569. Pantaleon’s accounts of Pascale and Bonello, as well as the persecution of Protestants in the kingdom of Naples, came from a letter of ‘Simonis Florilli’, i.e., Simone Fiorillo, a preacher in Capua who, in 1552 when suspected of heresy, fled to Geneva and later led a Protestant congregation in Chiavenna. Pantaleon printed Fiorillo’s letter describing the persecution of these martyrs; this letter was written to Guglielmo Gratarolo, who taught medicine at the University of Basle alongside Pantaleon. Pantaleon also printed two other letters, one describing the persecution in Calabria, and the epistle of Algieri Pomponio. Pantaleon did not cite his sources for these letters, but they almost certainly were obtained for him by Italian Protestants living in Basle.
Without Pantaleon’s martyrology, the *Acts and monuments* would have been a record of Protestant martyrs in England, Scotland, and France, with only scattered additions from the Low Countries and Spain. Foxe’s section on German martyrs would have been drastically reduced, his section on Italian martyrs virtually non-existent. The accounts of the mainland martyrs of the Reformation remained essentially unchanged in subsequent unabridged editions of the *Acts and monuments*. The 1583 edition, the final edition published in Foxe’s lifetime, concludes with an account of some of the atrocities committed against Protestants in the French Wars of Religion, culminating in the St. Bartholomew’s Day massacre and two examples of divine intervention on behalf of the saints: the failure of the siege of La Rochelle in 1573, and the death of Charles IX the following year. Among the sources on which Foxe based this short narrative was Richard Dinoth’s *De bello civili gallico religionis causa suscepto*, published only the year before in Basle.

VII: Foxe’s editing and inclusion of Pantaleon’s material: final thoughts

Foxe was a compiler of documents on a gargantuan scale, but he was also an unsleeping editor. No matter how much he appropriated from other sources, he often changed them by making extensive additions to and deletions from the texts. Foxe did not, however, alter the material he took from Pantaleon as extensively as he did for other sources; there were two reasons. First, this material came from a staunchly Protestant author who often pulled his material from other equally Protestant authors; the material came to Foxe effectively filtered several times for doctrinal impurities. Second, Foxe was primarily interested in demonstrating that there were many martyrs from many regions, victims not simply of an individual magistrate or prince, but of Antichrist’s false church. Numbers mattered more than details, so Foxe, who could be almost obsessive when verifying martyrs’
names and locations, ruthlessly abridged material, especially official documents and trial records, when translating from Pantaleon.\textsuperscript{125}

However, sometimes an account so interested Foxe that he would print it at length. He seems, for example, to have greatly admired a Parisian tailor interrogated by Henry II and then executed for his faith. Foxe not only rendered the complete account of the martyrdom as it appeared in Pantaleon and Crespin, for he also added opening sentences extolling the tailor and – most unusually – criticising Crespin and others for not writing more about him: ‘Among many other godly martyrs that suffered in France, the story of this poore Taylour is not the least nor worst to be remembred. His name is not yet sought out in the French stories, for lacke of diligence in those writers: more is the pitie’.\textsuperscript{126}

The same didactic and hortatory impulses occasionally led Foxe to manipulate his accounts by combining multiple sources for details that he wanted to disseminate but were not found in his principal source. For instance, Foxe drew chiefly on Crespin for the martyrdom of Etienne Brun but for the sake of detail added Pantaleon’s praise of Brun’s ‘miraculous’ stoicism.\textsuperscript{127} As previously noted, Foxe printed Crespin’s account of the persecution that followed the discovery of the clandestine Protestant congregation in Paris, but he added Pantaleon’s account of Swiss and German intervention on behalf of their French co-religionists.\textsuperscript{128} In a few instances, Foxe cut material from his sources for purposes of moral instruction. Foxe related, for example, almost all of the account of Aymon de la Voye, which he found in Pantaleon and Crespin, but dropped passages in which de la Voye appeared hesitant or uncertain when interrogated.\textsuperscript{129} Overall and for the most part, though, Foxe made relatively few polemically motivated emendations to the material he took from Pantaleon and Crespin.

Analysing the intertextual relationships between Foxe and his fellow martyrologists reveals the pains that Foxe took to include Protestant martyrs from other countries and
regions in his work. Despite the formidable linguistic difficulties, he had excerpts from Crespin’s *Actes des martyrs* translated. Because of the *Martyrvm historia*, however, Foxe did not experience such trouble when including the martyrs of Germany, the Low Countries, and Italy. Indeed, Foxe was able to use Pantaleon’s work as a ladder from which he could reach the texts of Rabus, Haemstede, and others. Notwithstanding the claim that Foxe inspired English nationalism, his personal vision was not of a national Church but of a true universal Church, and his unflagging efforts were bent towards seeing that his compatriots could learn about, and draw inspiration from, their co-religionists of the True Church who lived and died on the European mainland.

2 There is no doubt that Bunyan owned a copy of the *Acts and Monuments* and that he drew upon it heavily in writings throughout his life. (Thomas S. Freeman, ‘A library in three volumes: Foxe’s “Book of Martyrs” in the writings of John Bunyan’, *Bunyan Studies* 5 (1994), 47-57). The letter of ‘Pomponius Algerius’, as Foxe terms him, appears in the second volume, on pp. 181-3 of the 1632 and 1641 editions of the *Acts and monuments*. Bunyan owned one of these editions.
3 The standard biographical account of Pantaleon is Johann Bolte, ‘Pantaleon, Heinrich’, *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 25 (1887), 128-31. Most scholarship has focused on Pantaleon’s *Prosopographia*, which, while coining the name for a historical methodology, was a major biographical dictionary of illustrious Germans, including Pantaleon himself: *Prosopographiae herovm atqvse illustrivm virorvm totivs Germaniae*, Basle 1565-6 (VD16 P 228-30), autobiography on iii, 560-5. Hans Buscher’s *Heinrich Pantaleon und sein Heldenbuch*, Basle 1946, is largely a study of the *Prosopographia*. Matthias Pohlig provides a nuanced description of the *Prosopographia* in the context of Reformation historical writing, but says little about Pantaleon’s career or other writings. Matthias Pohlig, *Zwischen Gelehrsamkeit und konfessioneller Identitätsstiftung*, Tübingen 2007, 259-69.
6 Robert Kolb, *For all the saints: changing perceptions of martyrdom and sainthood in the Lutheran Reformation*, Macon, GA 1987, 56-67, 158-64.
10 For other Protestant martyrrological works of the mid-1550s and the mid-1560s, see Gregory, *Salvation at stake*, 170-1.
11 *1560*. In addition to the *Commentarii*, Foxe wrote a larger Latin martyrology, the *Rervm in ecclesia gestarum... commentarii*, Basle 1559 (*VD16* F 1956). Hereafter cited as *Rervm*.
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52 Foxe, Pantaleon, and Crespin identified Wagner as George Carpenter [Georgius Carpentarius]. Cf. 1563, 436-7 with MH, 61-3 and 1560, fos 53r-55r.
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Another example of Foxe drawing solely on Crespin’s 1564 edition is the account of the martyrdoms of François Rebezies and Frederic Danville in Paris in 1558. Cf. 1570, 1052-55 with Crespin, *Actes des martyrs*, fos. 882r-884v.

Crespin, *Actes des martyrs*, pp. 812-20. Haemstede did not give the wife’s first name, but Crespin gave it as ‘Jeanne’ and Foxe as ‘Joan’. Haemstede listed one of the son’s names as ‘Baudewin’; Crespin rendered it ‘Baudichon’ and Foxe ‘Baudicon’.

1570, 1005-18. Foxe divided his material into accounts containing one or several martyrs, such as the twenty-eight discussed in one account and executed at Louvain 1544 (1570, 1020).

George of Halle (1570, 1010), Wolfgang Schuch (1570, 1016), and Wendelmoet Claesdoekter (1570, 1018).

The martyrdom of a pastor and that of a peasant, both of which repeat Pantaleon’s citation of Oecolampadius (1570, 1012, 1014-15; cf. *MH*, 46-8, 51-4), and the account of Leonard Keyser, where Foxe repeats Pantaleon’s citation of Martin Luther as his source (cf. 1570, 1017-18 with *MH*, 63-4).

Cf. 1570, 1010 with *MH*, 37 and 1560, fo. 42v.

Cf. 1570, 1013-14 with *MH*, 48-51 and 1560, fos 47v-49v.

Cf. 1570, 1010 with *MH*, 38 and 1560, fo. 43r. Foxe later mentioned this martyr, citing Crespin as his source (1570, 1029). Foxe probably based his first relation of this martyr on Pantaleon and his second on Crespin, not realizing that both referred to the same person.

Cf. 1570, 1010, 1016-17 with *MH*, 39-40, 61-3 and 1560, fos 42v-43r, 53r-55r. Foxe, as noted above, included Wagner in the edition of 1563.

One is the account of the martyrdom of Jean le Clerc in Meaux in 1524, where Foxe cited both Pantaleon and Crespin as sources, as the wording of his account differs from Pantaleon (who added further detail to Crespin’s account) but matches Crespin’s text exactly (cf. 1570, 1010 with *MH*, 43 and 1560, fo. 46r-v). The other is the account of the martyrdom of Jean Castellane in Lorraine in 1524, where Foxe, citing nobody, again followed Crespin very closely, failing to include details in Pantaleon’s longer account (cf. 1570, 1010-12 with *MH*, 40-2 and 1560, fos 44r-46r).


The accounts of Martin Hoerbloc (1570, 1022); Adrian, a tailor of Tournai (1570, 1023); ministers exiled from Locarno (1570, 1028); a preacher of Erfurt (1570, 1029).


The accounts of Johann Pistorius and George Scherrer (cf. 1570, 1019 with MH, 44-5, 68); a priest living outside Basel, twenty-eight people executed in Louvain, Perceval van Bellinghem, and Giles Tilleman (cf. 1570, 1020-21 with MH, 81-2, 96-7, 101-2); Nicholas and Francis Thiessen, Pierre Bruly, an unnamed priest, a priest in Hungary, and the expulsion of Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, from his see (cf. 1570, 1022-5 with MH, 80, 84-96, 156-7, 174, 178); Augustine the barber, a woman in Augsburg, and two girls at Bamberg (cf. 1570, 1025-7 with MH, 188-9, 206, 217); Hostius (‘otherwise called George’), Johannes Frisius the Abbot of Neustadt, 200 ministers from Bohemia, and Godefride de Hamelle (cf. 1570, 1027-8 with MH, 219-27, 283, 299-302, 309).

The accounts of a friar Henry in Tournai (cf. 1570, 1020 with MH, 66); Protestants in Ghent (cf. 1570, 1022 with MH, 102-3); and those who resisted the Augsburg Interim (cf. 1570, 1025 with MH, 200).

The story of a man – ‘the brother of Tamer’ – who recanted then hung himself in despair. Foxe stated that the account is ‘Ex Ioan. Manlio in Dictis Phil. Melanct.’; Pantaleon cited ‘Io. Manlius in dictis Phil. Melanchtonis’ (cf. 1570, 1043 with MH, 217). The reference is to Johannes Manlius, Locorvm communium collectanea, Basle 1562 (VD16 M 603), popularly known as ‘De dictis Philippi Melanchthoni’.

Beyond the 87 accounts, there are lists of French and Belgian martyrs at the end of Foxe’s section on the French martyrs. All of the names on these lists are taken from Crespin’s 1564 martyrology. Cf. 1570, 1060 with Crespin, Actes des martyrs, pp. 907-69, 991-1086.

The accounts of Galeazzo Trezio (cf. 1570, 1068-9 with MH, 246-9); Francesco Gamba (cf. 1570, 1070 with MH, 296-9); two Augustinians in Rome (cf. 1570, 1070 with MH, 265).

The accounts of ‘Dominicus de Basana’ (Dominico Cabianca) (cf. 1570, 1067-8 with MH, 205-6); ‘Johannes Mollius’ (Giovanni Mollio Buzio) (cf. 1570, 1069-70 with MH, 263-5; ‘Johannes Aloysius’ (Aloysius Pascale) and Jacopo Bonello (cf. 1570, 1073 with MH, 337); persecution in Naples and Calabria (cf. 1570, 1073-4 with MH, 337-8).

Rabus, iii, fos 186r-192r. 1570, 1070. MH, 265.

MH, 249.

MH, 337.

MH, 337.


John Foxe, Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable..., London 1583, (RSTC 11225), 2152-4.

VD16 D 1775. See Greengrass and Freeman, ‘Acts and monuments’.


Admittedly, Foxe did precisely the opposite with English documents, which in many cases had not previously been printed. A third reason behind Foxe’s citations to Pantaleon and others might have been his desire to direct his educated readers to more detailed, accessible accounts for the mainland brethren, thus reducing the need to include long documentary extracts. Another factor in 1570, of course, was paper supply.

Cf. 1570, 1035; cf. MH, 185-6 and 1560, fos 157r-158r.

Cf. 1570, 1030 with MH, 82-3 and 1560, fos 66v-67v.


Cf. 1570, 1030-2 with MH, 103-8 and 1560, fos 82r-85v. Foxe dedicated three folio pages to the account because he found de la Voye’s lengthy answers on purgatory and the papacy polemically useful.