ROYAL STUDIES JOURNAL

2017 IV

Catholic, Anglican, and Puritan Representations of Royal Martyrs

Nick K. Crown

WINCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

Catholic, Anglican, and Puritan Representations of Royal Martyrs

Nick K. Crown

This article, which will discuss posthumous representations of three British queens as martyrs, was written with the intention of filling a gap within the existing historiography by providing one of the first in-depth comparative studies of Catholic and Protestant depictions of martyrdom in England, since Patrick McGrath and Arthur Dickens' 1960s analysis of Elizabethan Puritan and Roman Catholic congregations.[1] Using both Catholic and Protestant printed propaganda, and written testimonies where available, this article will analyse the extent to which these women were depicted as fulfilling existing expectations of both the idealised influential queen, and of the humble, submissive subject following their prosecution and removal from power. As observed by Eamon Duffy, a type of royal personality cult emerged in England following Henry VIII's 1533 schism from Rome, where the allegedly infallible and divinely appointed institution of the monarchy replaced long–dead saints as the focus of the congregation's devotion.[2] Due to his position of power and responsibility, the King was considered analogous to God: a terrifying but benevolent figure "above the law and above humanity" who, to paraphrase Jacques Derrida, was empowered to spare or take life if such actions served the country's interests.[3] As God's alleged earthly representative, the monarch's authority (as suggested by Michel Foucault) depended upon the ability to successfully inflict punishments upon the bodies of condemned criminals before their consignment to hell.[4] Lori Underwood has expanded on these earlier discourses of early modern European justice by arguing that royal authority stemmed not only from the use of terror, but also from the ability to spare repentant commoners who outwardly professed their loyalty to the established patriarchal hierarchy dominated by monarch, church, and parliament.[5] No male claimants to the English throne were recognised as martyrs during the Elizabethan era; however, this paper will analyse representations of three women martyrs: Anne Boleyn, Jane Grey, and Mary Queen of Scots. Mary and Jane had ruled as queens regnant, and Anne had been consort to the king, but all three women had been rendered powerless through deposition, imprisonment, and a ritualised judicial trial, before finally being beheaded for treason.

Unlike the existing historiography, which has focused on biographies and case studies of individual queens, this article will comparatively analyse martyred Catholic and Protestant royal women as a group. I will discuss the degree of awareness that Anne Boleyn, Jane Grey, and Mary Stuart had in regards to their posthumous legacy, and identify common patterns in Catholic and Protestant sources. I will also examine the reasons why the three queens beheaded for secular crimes, were portrayed as defenders of an uncorrupted form of Christianity, whether this be Roman Catholicism, or an exclusively English form of Protestantism that allegedly pre-dated the Henrician schism, and came into existence independently of the religious groups on the continent. In her case study of Anne Boleyn, Retha Warnicke proposes that the posthumous portrayal of high status women as martyrs (whose witnessing of persecution and eventual execution was

[1] A. Dickens, *The Counter-Reformation* (London, 1968), 90.
[2] E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England* (New Haven, 1992), 195.
[3] J. Derrida, *The Beast and the Sovereign* (Chicago, 2009), 54.
[4] M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York, 1979), 27.
[5] L. Underwood, *Terror By Consent: The Modern State and the Breach of the Social Contract* (New York, 2007), 11.

represented as the ultimate attestation to their sect's exclusivity) resulted in a conflict between learned Catholic and Protestant writers who took it upon themselves to catalogue, and commemorate the lives of, recent martyrs.[6] As argued by Karin Klenke, Elizabethan martyrologists from every religious group (most of whom were clergymen) posthumously rehabilitated royal women as heroic role models because they were "exceptional by men's standards."[7] These women overcame their perceived feminine physical weakness and fear of death by overcoming temptations to abjure, and avoided the unwelcome implications of interfering in affairs of state by claiming to die not for a political cause, but for their religion. Influenced by Alexandra Walsham's discussion of the symbolic repurposing of sacred pre–Reformation objects by later generations (in which literal, mystical depictions were given new, allegorical meanings), this article will propose that post–1558 Protestant depictions of martyred queens generally represented adaptation and transition, being intended to unify reformist and conservative readers alike around God, monarch, and country.[8] By claiming ownership over the post-schism Henrician and Edwardian eras, English Protestants could subvert earlier criticisms of female rule with biblical analogies confirming Elizabeth's legitimacy as head of both church and state. Additionally, by drawing parallels not only between Elizabeth and her father Henry VIII, but also with her mother Anne and her cousin Jane, Protestants could portray Elizabeth's church reforms as a return to Henrician normality, and thus counter Catholic claims that early proto-Protestants spread chaos and contradiction that weakened both church and secular hierarchy.

Jonathan Wright and Pamela Tudor–Craig have observed that the Tudor regime drew parallels between the current ruler and Old Testament figures due to the belief that an older lineage confirmed a nation's superiority. Seeking to prove that the doctrine of the Church of England pre-dated the Roman papacy, supporters of Edward VI and Elizabeth promoted a unique, monotheistic English Protestant identity focused upon duty to the monarch, the rejection of Papal authority, and the suppression of objects and rituals associated with artificial popery.[9] This article will discuss the relationship between Protestant memories of earlier persecutions, and the exaltation of Elizabeth in martyrologies (books commemorating individuals executed for their religion), as part of a wider effort to portray England as the exclusive, divinely chosen successor to ancient Israel. John King argues that Henry VIII's self–identification with the Israelite kings David and Solomon was intended to challenge the Pope's claim to be Christ's direct successor, and instead credit the Tudor dynasty with transforming England into the first truly independent country.[10] The king was depicted by his supporters as an omnipotent, omniscient patriarchal figure, whose ability to exert power over both church and state was attributed to appointment by a wrathful, terrifying, but benevolent male God. As Mary Villeponteaux and Anne Mearns have noted, many learned men of the early modern period believed that women were unsuited to ruling a country because their alleged physical and mental inferiority to men rendered them unable to directly channel God's commands, and thus incapable of impartially acting in the country's best interests. It was feared that without proper guidance a queen regnant would either be weak, indecisive, and reluctant to sentence criminals deserving of execution, or, conversely, an unpredictable tyrant who

[6] R. Warnicke, *Wicked Women of Tudor England: Queens, Aristocrats, Commoners* (New York, 2012), 19.
[7] K. Klenke, *Women and Leadership: A Contextual Perspective* (New York, 1996), 2.
[8] A. Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2011), 566.
[9] P. Tudor-Craig, "Henry VIII and King David", in *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the 1987 Harlaxton Symposium,* ed. D. Williams (Woodbridge, 1989), 192.
[10] J. King, "Henry VIII as David: The King's Image and Reformation Politics", in *Henry VIII and his Afterlives: Literature, Politics, and Art,* eds. M. Rankin, C. Highley, and J. King (Cambridge, 2009), 35.

punished innocent and guilty alike.[11] Mary I, for example, was posthumously depicted as Jezebel due to her alleged cruelty to English Protestants, and her supposed domination by foreign (or foreign–backed) male authority figures, such as her husband Philip II of Spain, Bishop Gardiner, Cardinal Pole, and the Pope.[12] Susan Doran has noted that, perhaps in response to these fears of female rule, Elizabeth rarely identified herself with Israelite rulers associated with "royal supremacy and theocratic kingship," and revered for their authorship of the Psalms (credited by Protestants as the inspiration for the vernacular Book of Common Prayer).[13] Instead, such Old Testament archetypes were applied to Elizabeth by her supporters, seeking to claim ownership over the recent past by drawing parallels between the personal beliefs and policies of Elizabeth, and those of her royal forebears during the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. However, the older Jezebel analogies were not discarded entirely; expanding upon Aidan Norrie's research on the Marian era, this article will also discuss Elizabethan efforts to discredit contemporary papists like Mary Stuart for allegedly worshipping the Pope, images, and long dead saints instead of Jesus.[14] Deeming attack the best form of defence, Catholic and Protestant martyrologists all emphasised the virtues of the queens they had claimed as their own, while denouncing rival claimants as ineffective failed monarchs, wicked and perverse criminals, or treacherous usurpers deserving of execution for challenging the legitimate queen's right to rule. Besides discussing the relevance of positive Old Testament analogies to Anglican and Puritan representations of the aforementioned proto-Protestant queens who preceded Elizabeth, this article will also analyse Catholic efforts to subvert these depictions by both adapting earlier criticisms of female rule, and exalting martyred high status women (especially Mary Stuart) as alternative figureheads to Elizabeth.

The Tudor Confessional State

During Elizabeth's reign, English subjects from every religious background were under constant pressure to prove their loyalty to the existing confessional state (where church and the secular central government were under direct royal control), due to official fears that those who failed to sufficiently honour God and the Queen were deviant, insolent internal enemies who endangered the entire nation.[15] For the purposes of this article, the term 'Anglican' will be used to refer to the members of the established Church of England or "Ecclesia Anglicana", due to the broadness of the term Protestant.[16] Although moderate Anglicans generally accepted royal church supremacy, some were influenced by continental reformers' efforts to implement a vernacular, Bible-based form of worship, while more conservative individuals (not to be confused with the Church Papists who attended both Anglican Sunday services and Catholic mass) envisioned an independent English Catholic church where the monarch replaced the Pope, but pre-Reformation rituals and objects were perpetuated. The other, smaller faction of English Protestants were the Puritans (so–called for their desire to cleanse post–Marian England of remnants of alleged pre–Reformation superstition), most of whom outwardly conformed to the established church

[11] M. Villeponteaux, *The Queen's Mercy: Gender and Judgment in Representations of Elizabeth I* (New York, 2014), 17.
[12] A. Mearns, "Unnatural, Unlawful, Ungodly and Monstrous: Manipulating the Queenly Identities of Mary I and Mary II", in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I,* eds. S. Duncan and V. Schutte (New York, 2016), 199.
[13] S. Doran, "Elizabeth: An Old Testament King", in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth,* eds. A. Hunt and A. Whitelock (New York, 2011), 95.
[14] A. Norrie, "'Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise and Chaste': Queen Elizabeth's Biblical Analogies", *Royal Studies Journal*, vol. 2, no. 2 (2015), 27.
[15] A. Wood, "A Lyttull Worde ys Tresson: Loyalty, Denunciation and Popular Politics in Tudor England", *The Journal of British Studies,* vol. 48, no. 4 (October, 2009), 846.
[16] M. Mullett, *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation* (Lanham, 2010), 11.

through either fear of retribution, or enthusiastic desire to reform the church internally.[17] Patrick Collinson and Patrick McGrath have both argued that Puritan was an artificial, general term for a Protestant radical, similar to the pre–Reformation denunciation of every heretic as a Lollard. During Elizabeth's reign, most English Calvinists (deeming themselves exceptionally zealous members of the Church of England) instead referred to themselves as gospellers, or "the godly", and sought to prove their trustworthiness by accepting the Queen as head of the church.[18] Many conforming Puritans, including John Foxe, sought to distance themselves from radical breakaway Protestant sects, such as the separatist congregations of Henry Barrow or Robert Browne, by writing propaganda that both endorsed the English confessional state, and attacked Roman Catholicism. These Puritans proclaimed their loyalty to Elizabeth by attending Sunday services in their local Anglican church, despite their dislike of vestments, excessive rituals such as kneeling, images within churches, and the established church's episcopal hierarchy.

Before analysing Elizabethan Catholic and Protestant depictions of royal martyrs, it is necessary to define and contextualise the Tudor confessional state established after Henry VIII's 1533 schism with Rome, initially as a form of independent English Catholicism where the King (previously solely head of the secular government), supplanted the Pope as head of the church. The Church of England was reformed on more Protestant lines under Edward VI, and restored under Elizabeth after Mary Tudor's attempt to re–Catholicise England. Many Anglicans and conformist Puritan clergymen deemed Elizabeth's accession the fulfilment of the dying King Edward VI's prayers for the nascent Church of England's survival, and viewed themselves as localised agents of a monarch enforcing God's pre–ordained commands to complete the English Reformation.[19] Although the Henrician, Marian, and Elizabethan regimes prized literacy, many religious books were prohibited both before and after the Henrician Schism through fear that they contained subliminal, coded messages urging evildoing, insurrection, or regicide.[20] Elizabeth and her predecessor Mary publicly burned "seditious books" as a means to focus popular and official outrage upon papists or heretics whose promotion of alternative religious lifestyles risked sparking rebellion that would destroy both church and secular government.[21] In addition, the destruction of such texts deprived religious dissidents of a posthumous legacy, and sent a warning to other would–be dissenters to either abjure, or join their texts on the bonfire for rebelling not only against Queen Elizabeth, but also her supernatural patron: God himself.[22] Early modern people generally viewed God as a wrathful, all–seeing judge who could dispense exemplary retribution at any time, and had to be continually appeased to prevent England sharing the fate of the idolatrous ancient Israelites: enslavement and annihilation by their pagan Assyrian and Babylonian enemies.[23] After the 1569 Northern Catholic Rebellion, Elizabeth's excommunication, and the failed invasion of the Spanish Armada in 1588, government officials Powell and Bishop Matthew portrayed Anglican religious centralisation as a conflict between the respectable Protestant elite and ignorant papist recusants (so–called for their refusal to accept royal church supremacy), whose subjugation depended upon the use of both printed texts and physical force.[24] Eager to merge the distinct threats of Jesuit missionary priests, Puritan separatists,

---

17 P. McGrath, *Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth* (New York, 1967), 45.
18 P. Collinson, *Godly People: Essays on Protestantism and Puritanism* (Chippenham, 1983), 1.
19 J. Keltridge, *Two godlie and learned sermons appointed, and preached, before the Jesuites, seminaries, and other aduersaries to the gospell of Christ in the Tower of London* (London, 1581), 8.
20 Elizabeth I, *A proclamation against certaine seditious and schismaticall books and libels* (London, 1583), 1.
21 J. Hainault and S. Patrick, *The estate of the Church with the discourse of times* (London, 1602), 644.
22 Anon., *A ballad rejoicing the sudden fall of rebels of rebels that thought to devour us all* (London, 1570), 1.
23 J. Wright, "The World's Worst Worm: Conscience and Conformity during the English Reformation", *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* vol. 30, no. 1 (Spring, 1999), 118.
24 D. Powell, *To Lord Burghley, London, 25 April 1589*. Lansdowne MS.60, fol.42r.

English Catholic rebels, and foreign enemies into a single conspiracy, the Elizabethan regime denounced religious dissidents as treacherous bad subjects, amoral bad teachers, and self–serving bad clerics whose failure to fulfil their patriarchal vocation of protecting and instructing ordinary subjects earned them an unpleasant death allegedly befitting adherents of a false religion.[25]

Royal Martyrs

With the Elizabethan confessional state contextualised, I will compare the martyred queens who, though deprived of their positions of power before their beheading, were retrospectively portrayed as independently thinking, rational precursors to the contemporary Catholic or Protestant elect. This concept, variants of which were used by Catholics and Protestants alike throughout Europe, emphasised that one religious group (due to its similarity to the ancient, uncorrupted early church) had been chosen by God to survive the apocalyptic final battle against the Antichrist, and the devilish or erroneous false religions followed by ignorant persecutors who, though nominally Christian, were typically depicted as irrational, uncivilised, and godless pagans.[26] For English Protestants in particular, the rehabilitation of royal women like Anne Boleyn (1501–1536) was useful for confirming that the 1533 Henrician schism was part of God's providential plan to transform England into a new Israel. Anne was unpopular in life, but posthumously she was depicted as a figurative prophet or saint by Marian exiles like John Foxe, due to the need to not only provide high-status role models for contemporary readers, but also to demonise Catholics for their alleged unchristian violence and cruelty to women.[27] In accordance with Villeponteaux and Norrie's observations, the rehabilitation of Anne Boleyn served the purpose of confirming that Elizabeth I's gender did not necessarily render her unfit to rule, and that her education rendered her fit to rule. Additionally, Anne's rehabilitation enabled Protestants to draw parallels between Elizabeth's religious policies and the personal beliefs of her Henrician era forebears. By depicting Anne as both a passive conduit for divine energy, and a dynamic force for Protestant reform in a church that Henry VIII initially envisioned as Catholicism without the Pope, Elizabethan Anglicans and Puritans could exalt Queen Elizabeth as the divinely chosen, legitimate successor to the courageous Israelite King Henry and the virtuous proto–Protestant Queen Anne. John Foxe praised Anne's charity, godliness, and rationality, and portrayed her as the ideal wife who, besides excelling in her domestic duties, had a God–given strength to denounce papist superstitions, protect reformist clergy, and raise her daughter Elizabeth as a Protestant.[28] Anne's failures as queen were retrospectively supplanted by later Protestant efforts to rehabilitate her as a model wife, scholar, and patron of clerics of "right good learning", including several future Edwardian bishops and Bible translators.[29] William Latimer, Anne's former chaplain, depicted her as a "gracious, virtuous lady" moved by divine intervention and love for Henry to reform the Church to the point of self–sacrifice.[30] Similar sentiments were voiced by the Elizabethan poet William Warner, who portrayed Anne's beheading as an error of judgment on the part of Henry VIII, and urged Elizabeth to exceed her brilliant but flawed father by rectifying the "tragic, tyrannous reign" of Mary I.[31] Although Anne never produced the "son of King's blood" anticipated

[25] H. Crosse, *Virtues Commonwealth or The high-way to honour* (London, 1603), 78.
[26] B. Gregory, *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Harvard, 1999), 152.
[27] J. Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online, 1563 Edition* (Sheffield, 2011), 3: 500.
[28] J. Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online, 1583 Edition* (Sheffield, 2011), 8: 1106.
[29] A. Boleyn, *To the Magistrates of Bristol, 20 January 1535*. Lansdowne MS.1045, Art.62, Fol.79r.
[30] W. Latimer, "Chronicle of Anne Boleyn", in *Camden Miscellany,* ed. M. Dowling (London, 1990), 39: 47.
[31] W. Warner, *Albion's England: A continued history of the same kingdom* (London, 1597), 198.

by the reformist faction, the adult Elizabeth was retrospectively masculinised as a great prince who led England into a golden age.[32] By posthumously exalting Anne as both a queen and (in the words of Archbishop Cranmer) a "saint in heaven" like the Virgin Mary, Anglicans could claim she overcame her feminine inferiority and became a catalyst for Reformation – thus synthesising allegorical portrayals of sainthood, Renaissance Humanism, and Bible-based Protestantism into an exclusive English identity superior to the supposedly irrational, artificial, and alien popery fabricated by a succession of corrupt Roman bishops.[33]

Anne's opponents exploited traditionally negative feminine stereotypes to depict her as an ungrateful, devious adulteress and scold who dishonoured the legitimate Queen Catherine, and abused Henry's goodwill to steal the Catholic Church's wealth.[34] Concurrent with both Walsham's theory of reinterpretation, and also Mearns' research on early modern arguments that women's gender rendered them unfit to rule, Catholics blamed Anne for misleading and corrupting Henry VIII through selfish desire to rule the country herself. Following the accession of Mary I, such depictions evolved to attack not simply female rulers, but specifically Protestant women, in order to discredit Mary's sister Elizabeth as illegitimate, and reassert the superiority of celibate, self–disciplined Catholic priests over impulsive, self–serving Protestant ministers whose irrational and divisive heresies contradicted Roman Catholic efforts to maintain a unified, universal form of international Christianity. Henrician gentleman Thomas Lanquet (a supporter of Catherine Howard) portrayed the ex–queen Anne as a harlot and scold, to imply she was guilty of the perverse, unnatural crimes of treason and witchcraft, and thus discredited her as the unclean, irrational, and promiscuous inversion of the ideal Tudor wife.[35] Friar Peyto, future chaplain to Mary, and a notable persecutor of heretics, also branded Anne a domineering "whore queen" who, aided by Satan, usurped Catherine of Aragon's rightful position and almost corrupted Henry into heresy, as Jezebel did to Israelite King Ahab.[36] By damaging Anne's posthumous reputation with allegations of witchcraft, and by blaming her for causing the 1536 Pilgrimage of Grace Rebellion (a protest by conservative Northern commoners against the Dissolution of the Abbeys), Marian priests Roger Edgeworth and Nicholas Sander could undermine the Protestantism she championed as inherently divisive, seditious, and a threat to the orderly patriarchal household which represented a microcosm of both an earthly kingdom, and God's heavenly realm.[37] Writing from exile after Elizabeth's accession, Sander questioned the legitimacy, rationality and justness of both Anne and her daughter Elizabeth, by implying the latter had been a heretic and schismatic decades before her excommunication in 1569.[38] Conservative nobleman Thomas Wriothesley blamed Thomas Cromwell for Anne's demise, by falsely accusing Anne of poisoning both Catherine of Aragon, and Henry VIII's bastard son Henry Fitzroy.[39] This accusation of murder, complete with allegations of sexual misconduct to attack Anne's femininity, is comparable to seventeenth-century witch trials, when vengeful neighbours deliberately denounced marginalised rivals through fear or greed.

---

[32] Anon., *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne wyfe vnto the moost noble kynge Henry the .viij* (London, 1533), 8.
[33] G. Burnet, *The History of the Reformation in England,* (London, 1681), 1: 204.
[34] J. Harding, *Chronicle of Ihon Hardyng in Metre* (London, 1543), 140.
[35] T. Lanquet, and R. Crowley, *Epitome of Chronicles Containing the whole Discourse of the Histories as well of this Realm of England, as al other Cou[n]treys, with the Succession of their Kinges, the Time of their Reigne, and what Notable Actes they did* (London, 1559), 313.
[36] E. Stanley, and H. Faryngton, "To King Henry VIII, July 1533", in *Original Letters Illustrative of English History,* ed. H. Ellis (London, 1825), 2: 44.
[37] R. Edgeworth, *Sermons very Fruitful, Godly, and Learned, preached and set forth by Master Roger Edgeworth.* (London, 1557), sig. Cc.ii.
[38] N. Sander, *De Origine Ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani* (Ingolstadt, 1587), 172.
[39] T. Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England during the Reign of the Tudors*, (London, 1875), 1: xxvi.

The portrayal of martyred queens under Elizabeth underwent a divergence between traditionalists, who extolled feminine weakness or sensitivity, and radical Puritans, who sought to legitimise female martyrs as exceptionally zealous individuals who took it upon themselves to resist Mary's unlawful surrender of England's independence to Rome. Analysis of Elizabethan primary sources suggest that, in accordance with the views of Eamon Duffy, supporters of the Tudor dynasty sought to supplant the veneration of pre–Reformation saints with a type of royal personality cult, where Elizabeth became the focus of devotion. The portrayal of Anne as a godly, but physically weak, woman not only reasserted the patriarchal credentials of Henry VIII and the reformist faction, but also (concurrent with Klenke's theories) enabled mainstream members of the established church to depict Elizabeth as an exceptional woman capable of rectifying the failures of her predecessors. Moderate Anglicans like Archbishop Cranmer (writing during the reign of Edward VI), and Elizabethan London tailor John Stow, used Anne Boleyn's weeping to highlight her humanity, and remind readers that even after the Henrician schism, the Church of England was not fully Protestant.[40] After her arrest for witchcraft and adultery, Anne exploited longstanding stereotypes of female weakness by tearfully begging Henry for mercy while proclaiming her innocence and ignorance of the allegations.[41] Similarly, Anglican translator Raphael Holinshed and Bishop Abbot rejected the veneration of Jane Grey after her beheading under Mary Tudor, and instead depicted the vulnerable girl as a tragic victim to stir hatred for the current Spanish enemy.[42] By placing their fate in the hands of the secular authorities, and thus holding themselves accountable to a higher power, Anne and Jane seemingly upheld the patriarchal hierarchy, while portraying their own proto–Anglican beliefs not as disorderly or heretical, but identical to Henry or Edward's long-term goal of purging the English Church of Medieval corruption.[43] Ambiguously deeming tears a sign of either remorse or innocence, later Protestants, including Anglican schoolmaster Christopher Ockland and Puritan translator John Sharrock, used Anne's emotional instability to exalt Elizabeth as the perfect queen who overcame her mother's feminine physical weakness, and her father's wrathfulness and cruelty, to complete the Reformation.[44] Due to her stronger royal bloodline (being the daughter of the previous king), Elizabeth was portrayed as compassionate like Anne and Jane, courageous and decisive like Henry VIII, and rational and studious like Edward VI, thus completing her forebears' initial attempts to establish an environment free from papist tyranny.[45]

Seeking pre–Reformation precedents for their own personal beliefs, Elizabethan Puritans preferred to highlight early martyrs' self–control at their execution, desiring to prove that English proto–Protestant teaching successfully transformed stereotypically weak women into zealous defenders of true, uncorrupted ancient Christianity.[46] Countering allegations that Anne Boleyn was unpopular in life—and implications that her earlier tears signified ingratitude, guilt, or scepticism of her husband's claim of infallibility—Elizabethan playwright Ulpian Fulwell deemed her composure a parable: the tears the late queen consort denied herself at her beheading would be shed by later generations collectively mourning her loss.[47] John Foxe, and fellow Puritans like John Hales and the clergyman Samuel Ward, claimed that the self–sacrifice and masculine courage of Anne, Jane, and other high–ranking proto–Protestant women brought about the Elizabethan Golden Age,

[40] T. Cranmer, *To Henry VIII, May 1536*. Cotton MS, Otho C.X. no.29, fol.225r.
[41] A. Boleyn, *To the King asserting her innocence, May 1536*. Cotton MS, Otho C.X. no.30, fol.228r.
[42] R. Holinshed, *Third Volume of Chronicles* (London, 1586), 1100.
[43] E. Howes, and J. Stow, *The Abridgement of the English Chronicle* (London, 1618), 224.
[44] J. Sharrock, and C. Ockland, *The valiant acts and victorious battles of English nation* (London, 1585), 50.
[45] G. Abbot, *An Exposition vpon the prophet Ionah* (London, 1600), 520.
[46] S. Ward, *The Life of Faith in Death* (London, 1622), 26.
[47] U. Fulwell, *The Flower of Fame* (London, 1575), 42.

where rational Edwardian Old Testament values supplanted Marian papists' feminised worship of the dead Virgin Mary, and obsolete, inanimate Baalist images of powerless saints.[48] These depictions of spontaneous activism against idolatry are related to the concept of duty explored by Patrick Collinson, where post-Marian Puritans, fearful of the alleged corruption of surviving pre-Reformation images, took it upon themselves to promote Old Testament-inspired religious reforms including Bible study, iconoclasm, and observation of the Sabbath. It was hoped that these public displays of godliness would strengthen the authority of the confessional state, and avert divine retribution in the form of natural disaster, rebellion, or foreign invasion.[49] Seeking to highlight both the glory and tragedy of martyrdom, Anglican deacon Thomas Brice contrasted the dignified end of respectable Marian martyrs with the undignified weeping of their lower ranking female friends.[50] Although Jane Grey initially appeared nervous and clutched her prayer book to gain comfort from its words, Foxe provided a message of hope by claiming Jane's soul was saved through the potency of Edward's earlier Bible-based church reforms. These had allegedly equipped Jane, and many lower ranking female Marian Protestant martyrs, with the godliness, rationality, and courage to reject meaningless Latin invocations in favour of English prayers and Bible study.[51] Foxe depicted Jane not as a usurper, but as a reluctant martyr who humbly, but firmly, defied Marian demands to recant in favour of fulfilling her own vocation to "follow God in faith" by defending the uncorrupted, universal Edwardian Anglican Church from idolatrous popish heresy.[52] Besides highlighting papist cruelty and vindictiveness, Jane's courage was alluded to by Protestants seeking to confirm that the young pretender was aware of the long-term implications of her death, and thus worthy to be counted among God's elect. Marian exile John Banks claimed that Jane took the throne not out of malice towards the Catholic Mary Tudor, or out of misguided loyalty to her self-serving and ambitious father, but because she felt compelled to honour her dead cousin Edward and temporarily defend his church reforms to the best of her abilities.[53]

Catholic horror at the beheading of Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury (1473–1541), suggested that executing old or terminally ill people was considered taboo because it deprived them of a dignified, quiet death in bed. As observed by Alexandra Walsham, European Catholic Counter–Reformation depictions of martyrdom represented both a reaction to Protestant heresy, and a form of renewal for the Church.[54] Within the context of Tudor England, it can be said that Catholic portrayals of martyred women of royal descent signified an effort to subvert the royal personality cult, while reasserting the pre-eminence of the divinely guided institution of the Papacy as a force for uniting the Christian kingdoms. Janice Liedl proposes that Margaret's beheading was reinterpreted after her death to justify the claim of Mary I's husband, Philip II of Spain, to the English throne, and to establish continuity between the Henrician and Elizabethan persecution of recusants and priests. Exiled priests argued that the irrational cruelty of both Henry VIII and his daughter Elizabeth towards law-abiding Catholics rendered them unfit to rule, and

---

[48] J. Hales, "Oration to the Queens Majesty", *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online, 1576 Edition,* ed. John Foxe. (Sheffield, 2011), 11: 2032.
[49] P. Collinson, "From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: The Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation", in *The Impact of the English Reformation 1500-1640*, ed. P. Marshall (New York, 1997), 279.
[50] T. Brice, *A compendious Register in Metre, conteining the names, and pacient suffrygns of the membres of Jesus Christ* (London, 1559), 20.
[51] J. Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online, 1570 Edition* (Sheffield, 2011), 10: 1622.
[52] J. Fekenham, *Communication between Lady Jane and Mr Feckenham four Days before her Death, 1554*, ed. J. Foxe. Lansdowne MS.389, fol.142r.
[53] J. Banks, "To Henry Bullinger, London, March 15 1554", in *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation,* ed. H. Robinson (Cambridge, 1846), 304.
[54] A. Walsham, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (Farnham, 2014), 366.

signified the supposed corrupting and feminising influence of heresy.[55] Cardinal Allen, an old Marian priest involved with the training of Elizabethan Counter Reformation missionaries, retrospectively gave Margaret's execution a religious angle, by claiming the Countess was falsely accused of treason by Henry VIII to entrap her absent son Reginald, empty the Tower of prisoners, and blackmail other noble families into accepting royal supremacy with the threat of expropriation.[56] Margaret's previous reputation for piety, her tendency to criticise supposedly unjust political dealings, and her friendship with Mary Tudor's mother Catherine of Aragon, were (according to Alison Weir) perceived to be challenges to the king's secular authority. Hence, Henry's advisers implicated the Countess in a fabricated regicidal conspiracy to prevent the Pole family from becoming too powerful and influential.[57] The aged Margaret was unaware of her death's religious significance, but due to her kinship with Cardinal Pole, Elizabethan priests with the benefit of hindsight deemed her a living link to Medieval Catholicism and the House of Plantagenet, and thus an alternative heir to the English throne. Margaret's alleged attempt to run away at the scaffold may suggest senility, terror, or defiance, but Catholics believed this disruption of the ritual-based demonstration of state prestige was evidence that the tyrant Henry had lost touch with his subjects, and furthermore proved that England's secular hierarchy was tarnished by the schism from Rome.[58] Margaret's prolonged, brutal beheading by a clumsy boy–executioner shaped Cardinal Pole's role in the Marian persecutions; he proudly proclaimed himself the "son of a martyr", willing to follow his mother's example by dying for Catholicism.[59] Likewise, later Elizabethan Jesuits like Leonard Lessius used Margaret's beheading to shame Anglicans as cruel and merciless, in addition to challenging Elizabeth's competence because she was born of an unlawful union between the selfish, mad Henry and the wicked harlot Anne Boleyn.[60] Exiled Scottish Bishop Leslie praised Margaret's qualities as a mother, because she produced many sons to honour her family name, unlike Henry VIII's heretical offspring whose childlessness was a punishment for their father's illegal schism.[61]

Counter to Catholic efforts to transform Margaret into a political tool whose mistreatment by alleged heretics justified the later Marian persecutions, Elizabethan Anglican chroniclers denied a religious angle to her beheading, and instead proclaimed the Countess a usurper justly executed for treason.[62] In contrast to Norrie and Mearns' research on Elizabethan depictions of Mary Queen of Scots and Mary I of England, there was little interest in equating Margaret with tyrannical Old Testament figures like Jezebel, because despite her royal blood, Margaret had neither held the throne nor claimed the title of princess (and thus never outranked Henry's children). Additionally, by denying a religious angle to Margaret's beheading, Protestants could counter Catholic efforts to depict her as a martyr, and by extension argue that every post–Marian papist was executed not for their beliefs, but for the secular crime of treason. The self–censorship in official chronicles implied unease at Margaret's messy, botched beheading, with writers like Richard Baker and John Stow omitting the details of the execution itself, and instead

---

55 J. Liedl, "Rather a Strong and Constant Man: Margaret Pole and the Problem of Women's Independence", in *Women and the English Reformations: Renegotiating Gender and Religious Identity,* eds. J. Chapell and K. Kramer (New York, 2014), 30.

56 W. Allen*, A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland* (Antwerp, 1595), 59.

57 A. Weir, *Traitors of the Tower* (London, 2010), 26.

58 E. Herbert, *The Life and raigne of King Henry VIII* (London, 1649), 468.

59 R. Pole, "To the Cardinal of Burgos, Capranica, August 1541", in *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII,* ed. J. Gairdner (London, 1898), 16: 507.

60 L. Lessius, *The Treasure of Vowed Chastity in Secular Persons*, *also the Widows Glass* (St. Omer, 1621), 341.

61 J. Leslie, *A Treatise touching the right, title and interest of the most excellent princess Mary Queen of Scotland* (Rouen, 1584), 18.

62 M. Drayton, *Poly-Olbion* (London, 1612), 277.

focusing on Henry's wars, Parliamentary sittings, and other political events.[63] Despite his conservatism and apparent nostalgia for pre-Reformation stability, Stow proclaimed the aged Countess of Salisbury a foolish and ungrateful old woman, whose age represented childish irrationality, and whose treasonous contempt for the divinely appointed ruler and lawful Henrician confessional state was attributed to the sermons of malicious renegade priests.[64] By contrast, more reformist Anglican chroniclers like Edmund Hall, or Stow's rival Richard Grafton, actively linked popery with treason, and considered the manner of Margaret's death (being slowly hacked to death by an incompetent executioner) comeuppance for both her own malice and her ancestors' treachery during the Wars of the Roses.[65] Raphael Holinshed described Margaret as "last of the right line and name of Plantagenet" descendants of the old monarchy Henry's father defeated in 1485, and potential rebels that had to be removed as a matter of long–term national security.[66] Eager to justify the punishment of prominent Elizabethan papists as lawless conspirators (especially priests and high-status Northern rebel leaders), Holinshed emphasised Margaret's powerlessness and inferiority before the Tudor justice system, and symbolically portrayed her beheading as Henry's ultimate victory over the tyrannical old Yorkist enemy. This negative portrayal, grounded in a combination of xenophobia and a sense of duty towards the institution of the English monarchy, was intended to warn contemporary recusants of the dangers of choosing the distant, foreign Pope over their natural–born king, and confirm that unauthorised contradictions of official church and government policy would inevitably lead to disorder and rebellion.

The last Catholic royal martyr was Mary, Queen of Scots (1542–1587), who, unlike her distant relative Margaret Pole, actively portrayed herself as a martyr to counter accusations of involvement in a treasonous, regicidal conspiracy with young recusant nobleman Anthony Babington and Jesuit John Ballard.[67] Unlike Jane Grey, whose youth and gender rendered her dependent on male guardians (and whose matrilineal descent from the daughter of Henry VII placed her lower in the line of succession than her cousins Mary and Elizabeth), Mary Stuart had the unusual privileged position of being the only surviving child of Scotland's king, James V, so she not only ruled as queen regnant in her own right, but was also a middle-aged widow with no earthly patriarch to control her. Posthumous representations of Mary Stuart's beheading demonstrated a symbolic battle between Catholic and Protestant writers seeking, respectively, to depict either Mary or Elizabeth as the sole legitimate Queen.[68] Antonia Fraser and John Staines argue that romanticised depictions of Mary Stuart served as a "Catholic rallying cry" on both the continent and among English recusants, and the exaltation of Mary's domestic skills and royal dignity attempted to undermine Elizabeth's legitimacy.[69] Staines suggests Mary's self–identification with Catholic martyrs was motivated primarily by desire for revenge upon her cousin.[70] By calling into question Elizabeth's claims of benevolence, and by assuming the English Queen's right to name an heir, Mary Stuart could imply that Elizabeth, as the bastard daughter of Anne Boleyn and also a usurper of Papal authority in England, lacked endorsement from God's sole infallible earthly representative the Pope. Exiled Jesuit John Wilson compared the late Scottish Queen to the Virgin Mary because, despite being robbed of her earthly dignity, Mary Stuart remained pious and patient in the hope her martyrdom

[63] R. Baker, *A Chronicle of the Kings of England* (London, 1643), 51.
[64] J. Stow, *The Chronicles of England from Brute unto the Present Year of Christ* (London, 1580), 1016.
[65] E. Hall and R. Grafton, *The Union of the Noble Families of Lancaster and York* (London, 1548), 240.
[66] Holinshed, *Third Volume of Chronicles,* 953.
[67] M. Stuart, *To Anthony Babington, Chartley, 17 July 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXa, no.154, fol.238r.
[68] M. Stuart, *Declaration of Mary Queen of Scots touching her Right to the Succession of the Crown of England, Sheffield, July 23 1583*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXa., no.34, fol.78r.
[69] A. Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (London, 2002), 678.
[70] J. Staines, *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots* (Farnham, 2009), 25.

would bring divine intervention to save her son James from heresy.[71] In her letters, Mary adapted Catholic love for one's enemies to portray herself as a rational scholar, vulnerable woman, decisive political leader, and pious saint: fully aware that her beheading would damage her cousin Elizabeth's reputation among the international Catholic community.[72] By praying in Latin at her execution, Mary challenged the Protestant rejection of Purgatory and prayers for the dead, not only to establish continuity with England's ancient Catholic rulers, but also to whitewash her own crimes, including the murder of her husband Lord Darnley. Elizabethan Catholic plotter Babington masculinised Mary Stuart as his "most excellent dread sovereign", while belittling Elizabeth as an indecisive virgin girl incapable of regulating England's religious and political affairs.[73] As a descendent of ancient French and Scottish warrior kings, Mary was posthumously proclaimed an honorary man, worthy of commemoration after being "unworthily murdered" for protecting lay English Catholics from spiteful, devious Puritans seeking to supplant ancient Papal infallibility with an inferior, artificial royal personality cult.[74] Low-born criminals could be compelled to submit to the monarch, but, being a foreign queen endowed with masculine rationality and courage, Mary was Elizabeth's equal, and deemed herself above the "inferior judgments" of lesser men.[75] Jesuits like Parsons questioned not only Elizabeth's chastity and femininity, but also her competence, in the hope of shocking the Queen into reconciling with Rome, hastening her death from stress or natural causes, or, as a last resort, causing her overthrow and replacement by a neighbouring Catholic monarch.[76] The Pope himself advocated for Elizabeth's deposition, linking Mary's "unnatural imprisonment" with the cruelties of Roman persecutors like Nero or Diocletian towards the early Christians.[77] He contrasted Mary, whom he depicted as a gracious princess, with the excommunicated Elizabeth, whom he proclaimed a bastard, usurper, and tyrant for arrogantly ignoring the warnings of the Catholic missionary priests she executed from the 1570s onwards. Unlike the married Mary, who heeded priests' advice by honouring the saints, Elizabeth represented the dangers of the uncontrolled female body, as her tolerance of heresy (which supposedly feminised clergymen and high-status laypeople by eroding their rationality and self-control) risked confusion, war, and the destruction of patriarchy itself.

Catholic claims that Mary Stuart died bravely were corroborated by Anglican sources; although, like earlier accounts of Margaret Pole, these either depicted Mary as a pawn of treacherous priests conspiring to restore Papal tyranny, or denied a religious angle to her beheading. Many mainstream Anglicans portrayed Mary's beheading as the lawful execution of a secular criminal, being reluctant to use the unflattering Jezebel analogies described by Norrie due to fear that Catholics would use similar arguments to attack Elizabeth's gender, as the conservative recusants of the North had previously done during the 1569 rebellion. Joseph Hall (a future Jacobean bishop) feared that these Old Testament archetypes would also be used by radical Brownist Puritan separatists seeking to break from the church, and subsequently exalted Elizabeth as a decisive, learned, and rational monarch, whose "hatred of error" contrasted with the papists' and Protestant separatists'

---

71 J. Wilson, *The English Martyrology* (St. Omer, 1608), 198.
72 M. Stuart, *Declaration of the Queen of Scots asserting her Innocence, 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IX.b., no.265, fol.462r.
73 A. Babington, *To Queen Mary, 6 July 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXa, no.155, fol.238r.
74 J. Wilson, *A Treatise of Religion and Government with reflexions vpon the cause and cure of Englands late distempers and present dangers* (London, 1670), 110.
75 W. Cecil, *To Secretary Davison, 1586*. Egerton MS.2124, no.12, fol.38r.
76 R. Parsons, *Discussion of the answer of William Barlow to the Book intituled The iudgment of a Catholike Englishman living in banishment for his Religion* (St. Omer, 1612), 427.
77 Sixtus V and W. Allen, *A declaration of the sentence and deposition of Elizabeth the usurper and pretended queen of England* (Antwerp, 1588), 1.

insolent attempts to criticise a divinely-appointed monarch.[78] Subsequently, Mary's beheading was portrayed as a matter of national security, and a last-ditch response to the Scottish Queen's continued involvement with various regicidal plots, in open contempt of Elizabeth's own earlier leniency.[79] By branding Mary a failed ruler due to her unnatural murder of her husband, her impenitence, and her foolish submission to the foreign Pope, Anglican courtiers like spymaster Francis Walsingham could not only exalt Elizabeth as both compassionate and pragmatic, but also attack popery as a corrupting and chaotic ideology, which spread contradictions to weaken royal authority.[80] William Udall (formerly a government spy) blamed Jesuits for exploiting Mary Stuart's despair during her imprisonment to further their own agenda against Elizabeth: the plot for which Mary ultimately paid with her life was allegedly instigated by the "treacherous counsel" of priests like Ballard on behalf of the Pope and England's Spanish enemies.[81] Anglican schoolmaster William Camden, a supporter of both Elizabeth and her successor James VI & I, deemed Mary's Latin prayers a gesture of defiance, unlike martyred Protestant queens Anne Boleyn and Jane Grey, whose vernacular prayers confirmed their allegiance to England rather than Rome.[82] Although the royal personality cult was generally used to exalt Anglican rulers, Camden reinterpreted Mary Stuart's scaffold speech as a foretelling of the later Stuart monarchy, in order to appease Mary's Protestant son James VI of Scotland, and to depict England and Scotland as equally godly nations of the elect. Despite Mary's idolatry, treachery, and attempted regicide, Camden claimed that the Scottish Queen gained foresight from God, shortly before her beheading. According to Camden, Mary vaguely foretold that England and Scotland would unite, but named neither James nor Philip II of Spain as Elizabeth's successor because England's ultimate salvation or damnation depended upon the people's commitment to either Protestant progress or backward popery associated with tyrannical and decadent pagan Rome.[83] With hindsight, Elizabeth's successful execution of Mary as a traitor seemingly confirmed England's pre-eminence over Scotland, but this was counterbalanced when God chose Mary's Protestant son James to inherit the throne, and to unify ancient English Israel with virile Scottish Judah.[84]

As previously discussed by Mary Villeponteaux, Protestant efforts to equate female rulers with Old Testament tyrants such as Jezebel were motivated primarily by fear of their gender. The implication was that papist queens were neither compassionate nor rational, but impulsive, excessively cruel, sexually incontinent, and either stubborn or indecisive due to the unnaturalness of occupying a traditionally male position of power.[85] During his own exile, Scotsman John Knox actively equated both Mary I of England and Mary Stuart with Jezebel, and argued that "nature doth paint them to be weak, frail, indirect, feeble and foolish, while experience hath declared them to be unconstant, variable, cruel, and lacking the spirit of counsel."[86] Contrary to the theories of Mearns and Villeponteaux, however, Elizabeth's more reformist supporters argued that the problem lay not with female rule alone, but with the inherently corrupting and wicked popish religion. Roman popery was blamed not only for the short and disastrous reign of Mary Tudor, but also that of Mary

[78] J. Hall, *A common apology of the Church of England* (London, 1610), 19.
[79] Elizabeth I, *Proclamation declaring the Sentence lately given against the Queen of Scots, Richmond, December 4 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXb. no.250, fol.450r.
[80] F. Walsingham, *Certain Articles to be remembered in the Queens Marriage, February 1572*. Cotton MS Caligula C.III, no.186, fol.412r. Microfilm M2507, SCH 84999.
[81] W. Udall and W. Camden, *The history of Mary Queen of Scotland* (London, 1624), 158.
[82] W. Camden, *History of the life and death of Mary Stuart Queene of Scotland* (London, 1624), 179.
[83] W. Camden, "Proceedings against Mary Queen of Scots", in *A Complete Collection of State Trials,* ed. T. Salmon (London, 1730), 1: 155.
[84] S. Garey, *Great Britain's Little Calendar, or a Remembrance of Three Days* (London, 1618), 3.
[85] Villeponteaux, *The Queen's Mercy,* 17.
[86] J. Knox, *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (Geneva, 1558), 10.

Stuart, whose alleged instigation of later regicidal Catholic plots confirmed that she was beyond redemption. These Puritan attacks on Mary could be motivated by either a degree of support for the Anglican confessional state as a safeguard against papist persecution, or, alternatively, an awareness that Elizabeth was a temporary custodian who was to be obeyed until she chose a male successor capable of completing the Reformation.[87] Seeking to establish parallels between Mary Stuart's flight from Scotland and the Israelites' overthrow of pagan tyrants, Bishop Parkhurst portrayed Mary as Jezebel, "defiled and overwhelmed by many great crimes" that caused her downfall, thus implying that popish idolatry brought the destruction of both the body and soul.[88] Royal adviser Christopher Hatton deemed Mary the antithesis of a saint because her adultery, plotting, and expulsion by her own Scottish subjects contrasted with Elizabeth's stable and prosperous reign.[89] More virulent depictions existed in an anonymous 1570s Puritan petition, written before the Babington plot, where the imprisoned Mary was dehumanised as a vicious "snake or mad dog" unworthy of mercy for her plotting, dishonesty, jealousy and longstanding grudges against her cousin.[90] Mary's ingratitude and deceit represented not only a contradiction of the idealised perception of monarchs as honourable role–models, but also signified a betrayal of her cousin's hospitality. Mary's trial and execution demonstrated the powerlessness of her Papal patron, her Spanish allies, and the dead saints that she idolatrously invoked in a futile challenge to the Tudor monarchy that answered directly to God.[91] These depictions suggest that Puritan endorsement of the royal personality cult was conditional on the monarch's ability to impose further Protestant reforms; Elizabeth was a good queen because she maintained England's independence, but her sister Mary Tudor, and cousin Mary Stuart, had forsaken their infallibility and legitimacy for unlawfully submitting to the reputedly wicked, corrupt, and reactionary Pope in Rome.[92] Bishop Morton's argument that "the kingdom of England is God's kingdom" was intended to deter disobedience from Catholic recusants and radical Puritans alike, by portraying Elizabeth as England's divinely appointed protector. Despite her gender, Queen Elizabeth possessed sufficient wisdom, courage, and duty to lead both church and secular government until her eventual succession by a more reformist male heir, the Calvinist James VI of Scotland.[93]

Finally, mention must be made of Protestant efforts to equate Elizabeth not only with her father, but also with earlier royal martyrs, as a means to retrospectively confirm the Queen's superiority over her forebears, and to depict her accession as the culmination of God's plan to transform England into the successor of ancient Israel.[94] As observed by Susan Doran, such depictions were generally applied to the Queen by her Protestant supporters, hopeful of convincing Elizabeth to implement further church reforms, and to crack down on recusancy because of the combined threat that internal Catholic plots and Spanish invasion posed to the Anglican confessional state's long-term existence. Henry VIII had identified himself with David, a righteous "prince of justice" whose victory over Goliath and the barbarian Philistine army was equated with Henry's resistance of a pagan papist church after England's schism from Rome.[95] After the Marian persecutions,

---

87 E. Hake, *A joyful continuance of the commemoration of the most prosperous and peaceable reigne of our gratious and dear soueraigne lady Elizabeth* (London, 1578), 26.
88 J. Parkhurst, "To Bullinger, Ludham, 20 January 1573", in *Zurich Letters*, ed. H. Robinson (Cambridge, 1842), 278.
89 C. Hatton, *Summary of charges and proofs against Mary, 1586*. Egerton MS.2124, no.13, fol.42v.
90 Anon., *A bitter invective against Mary Queen of Scots, London, September 6 1572*. Cotton MS Caligula C.III, no.192, fol.420v.
91 Elizabeth I, *To Sir Amias Paulet, 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXb, no.271, fol.473r.
92 F. Burton, *The Fiery Tryall of God's Saints* (London, 1612), 2.
93 T. Morton, *Solomon or a treatise declaring the state of the Kingdom of Israel* (London, 1596), 5.
94 S. Bateman, *The New Arival of the Three Gracis into England* (London, 1580), 16.
95 Henry VIII, *Yet once agayne by the Kynge to the shyryues, 9 June 1535* (London, 1535), 1.

reformist clergymen like Bishop Abbot or John Foxe co-opted earlier Henrician and Edwardian Old Testament analogies to counter allegations that Elizabeth's gender rendered her unfit to rule, by arguing that the Queen had inherited not only Anne Boleyn's compassion, but also Henry's masculine courage, studiousness, and competence to assume control over both church and state.[96] Aware of the similarities between warfare and religious persecution, Lord Burghley and Lord Dudley portrayed Elizabeth as a perpetually youthful, superhuman representative of God who was not only sensitive and benevolent, but also decisive, valiant, and rational due to her prosperous reign and pursuit of Protestant education.[97] Like Anne and Jane, Elizabeth herself had endured persecution and imprisonment, enabling Foxe to attribute Elizabeth's initial religious conservatism to a desire to guide England into an orderly, long–term transition from so-called Marian backwardness to Protestant progress.[98] Adapting and reinterpreting pre–Reformation symbolism associated with the Virgin Mary, Bishop Pilkington compared Elizabeth's lifetime marriage to her country, and dissemination of vernacular scripture, to a pelican selflessly feeding its young with its own blood. Elizabeth's endurance of hardship during the 1550s rendered her an equal of reformist bishops such as Hooper or Cranmer (both burned as heretics in the years following Jane Grey's beheading), whose ultimate fate diverged due to God's decision that Elizabeth should remain alive to serve her country.[99] Elizabeth's ultimate ascension from powerless, imprisoned woman to rational and decisive queen regnant provided a lesson for conservative and reformist subjects alike: that the right to exert authority had to be earned through a combination of submission to existing secular officials, in addition to steadfast and uncompromising adherence to Protestant doctrine.[100]

Conclusion

The evidence analysed here suggests that royal women were posthumously rehabilitated as martyrs because Catholics and Protestants alike had a common fear of allegations of lawlessness, and they both sought proof that their beliefs were not treasonous or disorderly. Although executed for secular crimes, these queens were depicted as using religion to regain some control over their posthumous reputation, because Catholic and Protestant martyrologists (aware of the unnaturalness and chaotic connotations of the crime of treason) sought to challenge the legitimacy of the Elizabethan or Marian monarchies by attacking allegedly unjust religious policies, especially the persecution of members of the Catholic or Protestant elect, as unlawful in the eyes of God. In life, royal women like Anne Boleyn or Jane Grey may have been unpopular, but they were also kinsfolk to Queen Elizabeth, and thus could be posthumously rehabilitated as important precursors to the Elizabethan Anglican Israelite elect, whose willingness to die in defence of their beliefs mirrored Elizabeth's own later rejection of the Pope. Seeking to unify their readers against popish acolytes, Puritans portrayed martyred queens not as helpless victims reacting to uncontrollable circumstances, but as dutiful subjects and dynamic forces of religious reform who regained control over their fate in the afterlife by refusing to renounce their proto-Protestant beliefs. Such depictions were useful for subverting the longstanding Jezebel archetype discussed by Norrie and Mearns in their analysis of Mary I. Although relevant for early Protestant exiles like Knox, who had been persecuted by

[96] G. Abbot, *An Exposition vpon the prophet Ionah* (London, 1600), 500.
[97] Elizabeth I, R. Cecil, R. Dudley, et al. "Answer to the first petitions of the Lords and Commons, Richmond, November 1586", in *The Copie of a letter to the Right Honourable Earl of Leicester* (London, 1586), 19.
[98] J. Foxe, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online, 1576 Edition* (Sheffield, 2011), 12: 2336.
[99] J. Pilkington, *Aggeus and Abdias prophetes the one corrected, the other newly added, and both at large declared* (London, 1562), 189.
[100] T. Bentley, *The Monument of Matrones* (London, 1582), 7.

Catholic queens, Elizabeth's supporters feared that these unflattering Old Testament depictions would be used by Catholics to question the Queen's legitimacy, divine favour, and claim of infallibility.

Unlike the submissive Anne Boleyn (who had little royal blood, and thus did not consider herself in a position to criticise her husband) and the 15-year-old Jane Grey, mature Catholic royal women, like Margaret Pole or Mary Stuart, appeared defiant and unrepentant. These women might resort to deception, question the lawfulness of their own punishment, or disrupt the solemn, ritualised judicial process that had traditionally served as a means to demonstrate the monarch's claim of absolute power. Mary Stuart's criticism of her trial's legitimacy was, in accordance with the observations of Fraser, motivated primarily by revenge. Besides stirring anti-English sentiment on the continent, the Scottish Queen knew that her death could be used by Catholic propagandists to instigate a backlash among England's recusants, in a similar manner to Foxe and Banks' harnessing the memory of Jane Grey's beheading to instil feelings of hatred for the Spanish among Elizabethan Protestants. Although Anne Boleyn was depicted as a defender of the post-schism Henrician confessional state, and Mary Stuart sought primarily to subvert the royal personality cult, both women used weeping in an attempt to gain sympathy from their captors, both displayed a degree of awareness that their deaths would be posthumously remembered, and both were portrayed posthumously as victims of religious persecution. The use of Latin or English prayers by Mary Stuart and Jane Grey respectively represented a proclamation of allegiance either to universal international Roman Catholicism or independent English Protestantism; and the women's courageous, dignified behaviour (whether humble or defiant) signified their moral superiority to the existing monarch.

In response to Catholic efforts to exalt Mary Stuart as an alternative spiritual figurehead to the existing Queen, Anglican and Puritan propagandists not only attacked Mary's reputation, competence, and claims of purity, but also asserted Elizabeth's superiority as a monarch due to her successful imposition of Protestant church reforms where her martyred mother Anne and cousin Jane had failed. Protestant portrayals of Elizabeth as a decisive, rational king seemingly corroborated Duffy, Villeponteaux, and Derrida's arguments that royal authority depended upon the ability to protect the people from real and imaginary internal enemies, and by identifying and punishing criminals. Elizabeth's survival of persecution under Mary Tudor seemingly confirmed her worthiness to complete the Protestant reforms credited to her kinswomen Anne and Jane, and also to lead both church and secular government in imitation of Henry VIII and the virtuous Israelite kings analysed by Doran, Tudor–Craig, and King. The majority of post–Marian Protestants did not oppose female rule, but female papist rule, and (concurrent with the theories of Villeponteaux, Walsham, and Klenke) sought to retrospectively legitimise both Elizabeth and her proto-Protestant forebears as exceptionally godly women by adapting and reinterpreting contemporary accounts of royal martyrs to confirm their supposed Protestant credentials. Due to the grave danger England faced, any subject (including women) could be commanded by God to verbally defend the church from hostile foreign invaders, and take it upon themselves to correct any so-called corruption or lingering pre-Reformation superstitions within the established church.

Bibliography

British Library Manuscripts

Anon, *A bitter invective against Mary Queen of Scots, London, September 6 1572*. Cotton MS Caligula C.III, no.192, fol.420v.

Babington, Anthony, *To Queen Mary, 6 July 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXa, no.155, fol.238r.

Boleyn, Anne, *To the King asserting her innocence, May 1536*. Cotton MS, Otho C.X. no.30, fol.228r.

——, *To the Magistrates of Bristol, 20 January 1535*. Lansdowne MS.1045, Art.62, Fol.79r. Microfilm M982/20.

Cecil, William, *To Secretary Davison, 1586*. Egerton MS.2124, no.12, fol.38r.

Cranmer, Thomas, *To Henry VIII, May 1536*. Cotton MS, Otho C.X. no.29, fol.225r. Microfilm 912 SCH/67809.

Elizabeth I, *Proclamation declaring the Sentence lately given against the Queen of Scots, Richmond, December 4 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXb. no.250, fol.450r.

——, *To Sir Amias Paulet, 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXb, no.271, fol.473r.

Fekenham, John, *Communication between Lady Jane and Mr Feckenham four Days before her Death, 1554,* ed. John Foxe. Lansdowne MS.389, fol.142r.

Hatton, Christopher, *Summary of charges and proofs against Mary, 1586*. Egerton MS.2124, no.13, fol.42v.

Powell, David, *To Lord Burghley, London, 25 April 1589*. Lansdowne MS.60, fol.42r.

Stuart, Mary Queen of Scots, *Declaration of Mary Queen of Scots touching her Right to the Succession of the Crown of England, Sheffield, July 23 1583*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXa, no.34, fol.78r.

——, *To Anthony Babington, Chartley, 17 July 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IXa, no.154, fol.238r.

——, *Declaration of the Queen of Scots asserting her Innocence, 1586*. Cotton MS Caligula C.IX.b, no.265, fol.462r.

Walsingham, Francis, *Certain Articles to be remembered in the Queens Marriage, February 1572*. Cotton MS Caligula C.III, no.186, fol.412r. Microfilm M2507, SCH 84999.

Printed Primary Sources

Abbot, George, *An Exposition vpon the prophet Ionah* (London, 1600). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 34.

Allen, William, *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland* (Antwerp, 1595). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 19398.

Anon., *A ballad rejoicing the sudden fall of rebels of rebels that thought to devour us all* (London, 1570). British Library, *STC* 1326.

——, *The noble tryumphaunt coronacyon of quene Anne wyfe vnto the moost noble kynge Henry the .viij.* (London, 1533). British Library, *STC* 656.

Baker, Richard, *A Chronicle of the Kings of England from the time of the Romans Government unto the Raigne of our Soveraigne Lord, King Charles* (London, 1643). British Library, *Wing* B501.

Banks, John, "To Henry Bullinger, London, March 15 1554", in *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation,* ed. Hastings Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1846), 303-305.

Bateman, Stephen. *The New Arival of the Three Gracis into England* (London, 1580). British Library, *STC* 1584.

Bentley, Thomas, *The Monument of Matrones* (London, 1582). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 1892.

Brice, Thomas, *A compendious Register in Metre, conteining the names, and pacient suffrynge of the membres of Jesus Christ* (London, 1559). British Library, *STC* 3276.

Burnet, Gilbert, *The History of the Reformation in England* (London, 1681). Henry Huntington Library, *Wing* B5798.

Burton, Francis, *The Fiery Tryall of God's Saints* (London, 1612). Harvard University Library, *STC* 24270.

Camden, William, "Proceedings against Mary Queen of Scots", in *A complete collection of state trials, and proceedings for high–treason, and other crimes and misdemeanours: from the reign of King Richard II. to the end of the reign of King George I*, ed. T. Salmon (London, 1730). New York Public Library 668438A, N75. 1: 155–156.

——, *History of the life and death of Mary Stuart Queene of Scotland* (London, 1624). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 24509a.

Crosse, Henry, *Virtues Commonwealth or The high–way to honour Wherin is discouered, that although by the disguised craft of this age, vice and hypocrisie may be concealed: yet by tyme (the triall of truth) it is most plainly reuealed* (London, 1603). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 6070.5.

Drayton, Michael, *Poly–Olbion* (London, 1612). University of Wisconsin, *STC* 7226.

Edgeworth, Roger, *Sermons very Fruitful, Godly, and Learned, preached and set forth by Master Roger Edgeworth* (London, 1557). Bodleian Library, *STC* 7482.

Elizabeth I, *A proclamation against certaine seditious and schismaticall books and libels* (London, 1583). Bodleian Library, *STC* 8141.

Elizabeth I, Robert Cecil, Robert Dudley, et al. "Answer to the first petitions of the Lords and Commons, Richmond, November 1586", in *The Copie of a letter to the Right Honourable Earl of Leicester* (London, 1586), 12–19. Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 6052.

Foxe, John, *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online, 1563, 1570, 1576 and 1583 Editions* (Sheffield: HRI Online Publications, 2011). <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [accessed November 25 2016].

Fulwell, Ulpian, *The Flower of Fame containing the bright renowne, and most fortunate reign of King Henry VIII. Wherein is mentioned of matters, by the rest of our chronographers overpassed* (London, 1575). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 11475.

Garey, Samuel, *Great Britain's Little Calendar, or a Remembrance of Three Days* (London, 1618). British Library, *STC* 11597.

Hainault, John, and Simon Patrick, *The estate of the Church with the discourse of times, from the apostles vntill this present: also of the liues of all the emperours, popes of Rome, and Turkes: as also of the Kings of Fraunce, England, Scotland, Spaine, Portugall, Denmarke, &c. With all the memorable accidents of their times* (London, 1602). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 6036.

Hake, Edward, *A joyful continuance of the commemoration of the most prosperous and peaceable reigne of our gratious and dear soueraigne lady Elizabeth* (London, 1578). Lambeth Palace Library, *STC* 12605.5.

Hales, John, "Oration to the Queens Majesty", in *The Unabridged Acts and Monuments Online, 1576 Edition*, ed. John Foxe (Sheffield: HRI Online Publications, 2011). <http://www.johnfoxe.org> [accessed November 25 2016] 11: 2032–2034.

Hall, Edmund, and Richard Grafton, *The Union of the Noble Families of Lancaster and York* (London, 1548). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 12722.

Hall, Joseph, *A common apology of the Church of England* (London, 1610). Yale University Library, *STC* 1103:18.

Harding, John, *The chronicle of Ihon Hardyng in Metre* (London, 1543). British Library, *STC* 12766.7.

Henry VIII, *Yet once agayne by the Kynge to the shyryues. 9 June 1535* (London, 1535). Society of Antiquaries, *STC* 7786.

Herbert, Edward, *The Life and raigne of King Henry VIII* (London, 1649). University of California 780925, DA332.H.5, Case R, no.199.

Holinshed, Raphael, *Third Volume of Chronicles* (London, 1586). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 13569.

Howes, Edmund, and John Stow, *The Abridgement of the English Chronicle* (London, 1618). Bodleian Library, *STC* 23332.

Keltridge, John, *Two godlie and learned sermons appointed, and preached, before the Jesuites, seminaries, and other aduersaries to the gospell of Christ in the Tower of London. In which, were confuted to their faces, the moste principall and cheefe poincts of their Romish and vvhoarish religion: and all such articles as they defend, contrarie to the woord of Cod [sic], vvere layed open and ripped vp vnto them* (London, 1581). Bodleian Library, *STC*14921.

Knox, John, *The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* (Geneva, 1558). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 1353:02.

Lanquet, Thomas, and Robert Crowley, *Epitome of Chronicles Containing the whole Discourse of the Histories as well of this Realm of England, as al other Cou[n]treys, with the Succession of their Kinges, the Time of their Reigne, and what Notable Actes they did* (London, 1559). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 15217.

Latimer, William, "Chronicle of Anne Boleyn", in *Camden Miscellany,* ed. Maria Dowling (London: Camden Society, 1990). 39: 23–65.

Leslie, John, *A Treatise touching the right, title and interest of the most excellent princess Mary Queen of Scotland* (Rouen, 1584). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 15507.

Lessius, Leonard, *The Treasure of Vowed Chastity in Secular Persons, also the Widows Glass* (St. Omer, 1621). Folger Shakespeare Library, *STC* 15524.

Montalto, Sixtus V, and William Allen, *A declaration of the sentence and deposition of Elizabeth the usurper and pretended queen of England* (Antwerp, 1588). British Library, *STC* 22590.

Morton, Thomas, *Solomon or a treatise declaring the state of the Kingdom of Israel* (London, 1596). Union Theological Seminary New York, *STC* 1249:10.

Parkhurst, John, "To Bullinger, Ludham, 20 January 1573", in *Zurich Letters*, ed. Hastings Robinson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1842), 277–279.

Parsons, Robert, *Discussion of the answer of William Barlow to the Book intituled The iudgment of a Catholike Englishman living in banishment for his Religion, concerning the Apology of the new Oath of Allegiance* (St. Omer, 1612). British Library, *STC* 19409.

Pilkington, James, *Aggeus and Abdias prophetes the one corrected, the other newly added, and both at large declared* (London, 1562). British Library, *STC* 19927.

Pole, Reginald, "To the Cardinal of Burgos, Capranica, August 1541", in *Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic of the Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. James Gairdner (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1898). 16: 506–515.

Sander, Nicholas, *De origine ac progressu schismatis Anglicani* (Ingolstadt, 1587). Bavarian State Library Polem.2158, H.ref.336.

Sharrock, John, and Christopher Ockland, *The valiant acts and victorious battles of English nation from the yeere of our Lord, one thousand three hundred twentie and seuen: being the first yeare of the raigne of the most mightie Prince Edward the third, to the yeere 1558. Also, of the peaceable and quiet state of England, vnder the blessed gouernement of the most excellent and vertuous Princesse Elizabeth* (London, 1585). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 18777.

Stanley, Edward, and Henry Faryngton, "To King Henry VIII, July 1533", *Original Letters Illustrative of English History*, ed. Henry Ellis. (London: Thomas Davison, 1825). 2: 41–45.

Stow, John, *The Chronicles of England from Brute unto the Present Year of Christ* (London, 1580). Folger Shakespeare Library, *STC* 23333.

Udall, William, and William Camden, *The history of Mary Queen of Scotland* (London: John Dehavilland, 1624). National Library of Scotland, *STC* 2367:12.

Warner, William, *Albion's England: A continued history of the same kingdom* (London, 1597). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 25082a.

Ward, Samuel, *The Life of Faith in Death Exemplified in the Living Speeches of Dying Christians* (London, 1622). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 25052.

Wilson, John, *A Treatise of Religion and Government with reflexions vpon the cause and cure of Englands late distempers and present dangers* (London, 1670). Henry Huntington Library, *Wing* T118.

——, *The English Martyrology* (St. Omer, 1608). Henry Huntington Library, *STC* 25771.

Wriothesley, Thomas, *A Chronicle of England During the Reign of the Tudors* (London: Camden Society, 1875).

Secondary Sources

Collinson, Patrick, *Godly People: Essays on English Protestantism and Puritanism* (Chippenham: Anthony Rowe, 1983).

——, "From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: The Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation", in *The Impact of the English Reformation 1500–1640,* ed. Peter Marshall (New York: Arnold, 1997), 278-307.

Derrida, Jacques, *The Beast and the Sovereign* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

Dickens, Arthur, *The Counter-Reformation* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1968).

Doran, Susan, "Elizabeth: An Old Testament King", in *Tudor Queenship: The Reigns of Mary and Elizabeth*, eds. Alice Hunt and Anne Whitelock (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 95-113.

Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400–c.1580* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1992).

Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Random House, 1979).

Fraser, Antonia, *Mary Queen of Scots.* (London: Phoenix, 2002).

Gregory, Brad. *Salvation at Stake: Christian Martyrdom in Early Modern Europe* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1999).

King, John, "Henry VIII as David: The King's Image and Reformation Politics", in *Henry VIII and his Afterlives: Literature, Politics and Art,* eds. Mark Rankin, Christopher Highley, and John King (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 34-53.

Klenke, Karin, *Women and Leadership: A Contextual Perspective* (New York: Springer, 1996).

Liedl, Janice, "Rather a Strong and Constant Man: Margaret Pole and the Problem of Women's Independence", in *Women and the English Reformations: Renegotiating Gender and Religious Identity,* eds. Julie Chapell and Kaley Kramer (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 29-43.

McGrath, Patrick, *Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I* (New York: Walker, 1967).

Mearns, Anne, "Unnatural, Unlawful, Ungodly and Monstrous: Manipulating the Queenly Identities of Mary I and Mary II", in *The Birth of a Queen: Essays on the Quincentenary of Mary I,* eds. Sarah Duncan and Valerie Schutte (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 197-215.

Mullett, Michael, *Historical Dictionary of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation* (Lanham: Scarecrow Press, 2010).

Norrie, Aidan, "'Courageous, Zealous, Learned, Wise and Chaste': Queen Elizabeth's Biblical Analogies After Her Death", *Royal Studies Journal*, vol. 2, no. 2 (2015), 25-44.

Staines, John, *The Tragic Histories of Mary Queen of Scots* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

Tudor–Craig, Pamela, "Henry VIII and King David", in *Early Tudor England: Proceedings of the 1987 Harlaxton Symposium,* ed. Daniel Williams (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), 183-205.

Underwood, Lori, *Terror By Consent: The Modern State and the Breach of the Social Contract* (New York: Peter Lang, 2007).

Villeponteaux, Mary, *The Queen's Mercy: Gender and Judgment in Representations of Elizabeth I* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

Walsham, Alexandra, *Catholic Reformation in Protestant Britain* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

——, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Warnicke, Retha, *Wicked Women of Tudor England: Queens, Aristocrats, Commoners* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Weir, Alison, *Traitors of the Tower* (London: Vintage Books, 2010).

Wood, Andy, "A Lyttull Worde ys Tresson: Loyalty, Denunciation and Popular Politics in Tudor England", *The Journal of British Studies,* vol. 48, no. 4 (October, 2009), 837-847.

Wright, Jonathan, "The World's Worst Worm: Conscience and Conformity during the English Reformation", *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* vol. 30, no. 1 (Spring, 1999), 113-133.