Résumé : Les Actes and Monuments de Foxe contiennent de nombreuses représentations de femmes martyrisées, représentations qui entrent en rapport de manière significative et complexe avec les idées contemporaines de la femme. La transgression par ces femmes des attentes et convenances culturelles devient, ironiquement, le témoignage le plus puissant de leur foi. Le martyrologe doit louer et essayer de justifier ces transgressions, même à contrecœur. En dépeignant le comportement et les paroles souvent osés des femmes martyrs, l’ouvrage de Foxe démontre l’interdépendance compliquée des constructions de l’identité sexuelle et du genre littéraire à l’époque.

John Foxe’s Actes and Monuments chronicles the sufferings of Protestant martyrs under Mary I, as well as the lives and deaths of early church and medieval martyrs whom Foxe considered Protestantism’s spiritual predecessors. Published in nine English editions between 1563 and 1684, the book was arguably one of the early modern period’s bestsellers. Among its many martyrological narratives, Foxe’s Actes and Monuments contains numerous accounts of women who were willing to suffer steadfastly for their faith. In presenting narratives of these women, the Actes and Monuments must negotiate often conflicting expectations for women and for martyrs. In doing so, it demonstrates the intricate interdependence of gender and genre constructions in the period. Within martyrological writing, for instance, silence and obedience — according to numerous early modern advice manuals, traits eminently desirable for women — do not necessarily indicate virtue but may rather become positively sinful. If the primary function of martyrs, as the root of the word (martyria) suggests, is to testify to their beliefs even to the point of death, then in the Actes and Monuments the most powerful testimony for the “truth” of female martyrs’ beliefs becomes, ironically, their trans-
gressions of prevalent conduct-book expectations of and for women. Their martyrrologist must attempt not only to justify but to celebrate those transgressions, and his uneasiness is often apparent. The *Actes and Monuments* attempts to present gender transgression as testimonial validation while also containing the more radical implications of such a project. In doing so, the text reveals that gender in the early modern period derives its meaning relationally, with respect both to other cultural matrices for shaping subjectivity — most notably religious belief — and to generic codes and assumptions.

Despite the wealth of religious writing by and about sixteenth-century women, scholars have too frequently underestimated the importance of religion for early modern female subjectivities. For instance, the editors of the valuable collection *Feminist Readings of Early Modern Culture: Emerging Subjects* argue for the importance of attending to multiple articulations of subjectivity through discourses of gender, class, and sexuality. Religion must be added to that list, however, for religious belief implies, shapes, and indeed often compels particular habits of writing and interpretation, which in turn interact with the ways in which gender may be configured. In the case of martyrrology, the steadfastness of the martyr, her voicing of her beliefs in the face of opposition, and her calm but confident resistance to authorities generate the testimonial force of the account. The testimony of Foxe’s martyrs models the beliefs and postures of the particular Protestant community Foxe wishes both to establish and celebrate; as Steven Mullaney has argued, Foxe’s book is “not so much the product as the ongoing production of the English Reformation.” In producing that Reformation, the testimonies Foxe’s martyrs offer do not float free of the cultural forces shaping the witness herself. In his study of the richness of Foxe’s narrative strategies, D. R. Woolf suggests that Foxe ultimately erodes the particular characteristics and circumstances of his martyrs: “By localizing his characters in time and space, and by bringing out their differences in circumstance, education, social degree, and occupation, Foxe was able to demonstrate to the reader that these were mere accidents, external features that conceal inner similarities.” Woolf’s observation accounts for the similarities among Foxe’s numerous accounts of Protestant and proto-Protestant martyrs. Yet the differences in the martyrs’ “external features” are not always so easily dismissed. Indeed, it is through the conjunction of particular subjects and shared beliefs that Foxe’s book gains its value as a *copia* of Protestant testimony.

In the case of the text’s configuration of gender and genre in relation to each other, however, that conjunction can look more like a collision. In Foxe’s text, transgressions of gender occur with regard both to some com-
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mon early modern definitions of female nature and to common prescriptions for feminine conduct. These include the standard assumption that women’s frail natures made them emotionally inconstant and intellectually inferior and the conduct-book expectation that women were to obey male authorities. Female martyrs’ transgressions of these expectations and assumptions are marked sometimes by their martyrologist and at other times, and with considerable hostility, by their Catholic interrogators. Foxe often delights in the sharpness of “seely sheep” such as Anne Albright, who charges that her interrogators are “the children of perdition” and “subverters of Christ’s truth” (p. 1859). Like some of Foxe’s male martyrs of lower socioeconomic status, such as the cook George Tankerfield or the Welsh fisherman Rawlins White, many of Foxe’s female martyrs emphasize their unlearnedness and/or their simplicity. The readers whom the text works so hard to usher into its Protestant community are to conclude that only God could inspire such constancy and zeal in otherwise unremarkable people. This strength-within-weakness paradigm might imply that only exceptional women may transgress common gender roles, and only in limited circumstances. Thus, Mullaney argues, women martyrs’ “strength is not their own: it is virile but, visited as it is upon them by God, their ‘manly stomach[s]’ cannot be perceived as a transgression of social or religious or gender codes.”

Yet it is precisely these martyrs’ transgression of gender codes that the text repeatedly uses to validate the testimonies women offer. In particular, the antagonistic, interrogative settings in which Foxe’s female martyrs articulate their religious beliefs mean that the perennially-reviled Catholic authorities are the ones who wind up policing “gender codes.” The text often places anti-feminist sentiments in the mouths of Catholic interrogators, while sidenotes, woodcuts, and editorial commentary demand that the godly reader disagree vehemently with every word the interrogators speak. Because articulations of gender are bound up with religious conflict, the “gender codes” which Catholic authorities attempt to invoke become subject to contestation. Further, the text frequently complicates the strength-within-weakness paradigm Mullaney identifies, and thus blurs any neat separation between an inherently weak vessel and the strong, defiant martyr-role that women may, under certain circumstances, assume. Perhaps most significantly, Foxe’s text tends to justify female martyrs’ gender transgressions in the same way that many male martyrs’ beliefs are validated: by pointing to a divinely-guided conscience as the inspiration for their words and actions. By highlighting, albeit inadvertently, the contingency of gender in relation to the circumstances and forms of its representation, the Actes and Monu-

ments demonstrates that gender was not as consolidated in the period as the conduct-book authors might have wished. We run the risk of simplifying or
distorting Foxe’s text if we approach it using gender as a largely free-floating category of analysis, for gender accrues meaning primarily in relation to the testimonial purpose of Foxe’s text and to the Protestant martyrological genre that text works so hard to develop and demarcate.

Foxe’s account of Alice Driver provides one representative instance of the testimonial value with which he invests gender transgression. Driver, Foxe writes, was a thirty-year old woman from Grousborough in Suffolk (p. 2048). Foxe’s representation of Driver’s interrogations shows her glorying in her imitation of bold martyrs despite her humble background, as she proudly manipulates strength-within-weakness logic to best her interrogators. Through both of her examinations Foxe shows that she, like many of his other Marian martyrs, prevails against her Catholic interrogators in exchanges over transubstantiation. Yet for Foxe, Driver’s gender and class heighten the force of her anti-transubstantiation arguments; one of his sidenotes reads, “The papists [are] put to silence by a simple woman” (ibid.). Driver is still a “simple woman” despite her defeat of her interrogators in this debate; the impact of that defeat depends in part upon a reminder of her gender and social station.

As represented in the account, Driver too is pleased that a humble woman has such a strong and well-reasoned faith. She lambastes her interrogators’ ignorance, using her own self-portrait to demonstrate the power that she believes God has given her:

You bee not able to resist the Spirit of God in me a poore woman. I was an honest poore mans daughter, never brought up in the universitie as you have bene, but I have driven the plough before my father many a tyme (I thanke God): yet notwithstanding in the defence of Gods truth, and in the cause of my maister Christ, by his grace I will set my foote against the foote of any of you all, in the maintenance and defence of the same, and if I had a thousand lyves, it should go for payment thereof. (p. 2049)

Driver echoes Foxe’s sidenote (or perhaps it is the other way around): because she is just a simple woman and yet defeats the authorities arrayed against her, she must have the spirit of God within. She takes pride in her humble beginnings and uses the presence of God “in me” to suggest the appropriateness and even the glory of her defying worldly authorities. She includes an expression of physical combat (setting one’s foot against another’s) to indicate her fierce resolve to defend her beliefs. There is also, perhaps, a reference to the traditional notion that virtue may reside in a humble plowman or, in this case, plow-woman; Foxe brings out this element of her background in a sidenote that reads “Driver brought up at her fathers plough” (ibid.). Because the account stresses the value of her words as those words are juxtaposed with her gender and social position, she is not
just a simple woman who confounds several bafflingly inept churchmen. Rather, her transgression of the social roles her words foreground is crucial to the account’s testimonial force. In this case, the rhetoric of strength-within-weakness serves a powerful testimonial function, while that testimonial purpose legitimates defiant speech.

Female martyrs’ transgressions are also highlighted by their Catholic interrogators’ responses to their behavior, responses that complicate the text’s stance toward its female martyrs. Often the Actes and Monuments praises Protestant women’s faith and biblical knowledge by characterizing these women as exceptions to their sex. In fact, Foxe occasionally derides women as poor interpreters. At the martyrdom of the cook George Tankerfield, for instance, Tankerfield reportedly claimed that he felt no pain in the fire, though several “superstitious” women refuse to believe the testimony that he has no pain (p. 1691). Foxe counts on the combined force of gendered and religious derogation to discount these women’s reactions. When Catholic interrogators voice derogatory comments about women, however, a complication arises. In Foxe’s text, many Catholic interrogators chide female martyrs, reminding them that because they are simple women they should not endeavor to debate with learned men. Through the Catholic interrogators’ responses to female martyrs, the Actes and Monuments marks the martyrs’ behavior and words as challenges to some contemporary expectations, while at the same time it pushes Protestant readers to support those challenges and thus to entertain the possibility that not all women are “simple” or poor interpreters of religious texts.18

Indeed, Foxe gives evidence that women were instrumental in circulating Protestant texts in Marian England. Foxe prints nine examinations of a woman named Elizabeth Young, arrested for bringing Protestant books from Emden into England. Mullaney has argued that Foxe has difficulty with Young because of her gender and relatively low social station. He claims that Foxe’s brief introduction to her account is evidence that Foxe, like her interrogators, cannot “triangulate among her gender, class and tongue to perceive a woman capable of being imagined more concretely, or being fully represented.”19 Foxe does provide only a brief introduction to her interrogation record. This is not, however, unusual. A few pages before Young’s first appearance in the 1570 edition of the Actes and Monuments, Foxe prints the account of the scourging of one Thomas Grene, beaten for possessing a Protestant book and refusing to disclose who gave it to him. In the 1563 edition of the Actes and Monuments, only Grene’s account appears; Foxe did not yet know that Elizabeth Young helped get the book into Grene’s hands. In the 1570 edition, Foxe identifies Young’s role in a sidenote to Grene’s account; next to a reference to “the woman which brought the
bookes over” is the note, “This woman was one Younges wife.” 20 A few pages later, Foxe prints nine of her thirteen examinations, which he says are the only ones he has. A quick comparison between the accounts of Grene and Young is instructive: in neither case does Foxe provide a lengthy introduction, and in neither case does he provide a conclusion. 21 The brevity of his introduction to Young’s account cannot, then, be taken as evidence that she represents “an ideological blindspot in Foxe’s narrative representation.” 22

Furthermore, Foxe seems to take great care to guard against a potential blindspot his readers might have regarding learned women. Precisely because of her considerable learning and her ability to articulate her beliefs, Young’s interrogators repeatedly accuse her of whoredom, an accusation conflating sexual, religious, and political promiscuity. As she asserts the truthfulness of her Protestant beliefs and her innocence of treason, each of her statements is greeted by variants of the same refrain: “rebell whoore and traitorly heretike” (A&M 1570, p. 2272). Her interrogators assume that she must have had sexual relations with a clergyman in order to learn so much about doctrinal debates: “What priest hast thou lyen withall, that thou hast so much Scripture? Thou art some Priestes woman, I thinke.” 23 Young denies the charge, asserting that she believes “thynges that are written in the Scriptures given by the holy Ghost unto the Church of Christ, set foorth and taught by the church of Christ”; upon such a basis she will “ground [her] faith and on no man” (A&M 1570, p. 2273). 24 Foxe heartily endorses this statement, printing a sidenote that reads, “True beliefe dependeth not upon men, but, upon the rule of Gods word” (ibid.). Young stresses that her own enlightened interpretation of scripture makes her faith independent of an exchange with men, sexual or otherwise. Foxe’s sidenotes link the accusations of whoredom directly to attacks on fundamental Protestant beliefs. For instance, in response to her assertion that when she receives “the holy Sacrament of Christes body and bloud . . . in faith and in spirite, I do receive Christ,” her least articulate interrogator, one Sir Roger Chomley, sputters, “Ah whore? Spirit and faith whore?” Foxe’s sidenote reinterprets Chomley’s attack on her supposed bodily impurity as an attack upon the spiritual purity of true faith: “Chomley can not abide spirite and faith” (A&M 1570, p. 2270). As in so many places, Foxe’s sidenotes here are insistent; they bully the godly reader to read the martyrs’ words as their editor does. Here, the proper focus of the Protestant sacrament — spirit and faith, not Christ’s natural body — is implicitly paralleled to the Protestant reader’s proper focus on Young’s faith, not the bodily trespasses of which she is accused. Given Foxe’s repeated endorsements of Young’s obviously well-informed theological arguments, the apparatus with which Foxe surrounds Young’s ac-
count uses Catholic interrogators’ accusations to trouble even Foxe’s own earlier implication that women are generally unperceptive readers. For Foxe, Young’s religious alignments inspire and even demand the defense of her outspokenness and learning.

The attacks on Young’s supposed sexual incontinence are not unique; Catholic authorities often associate female martyrs’ transgressions of expected norms with sexual misbehavior.25 Foxe’s recurrent presentations of this association perhaps serve to deflect anxiety among his readers regarding these women’s outspokenness, yet such presentations also work to garner sympathy for true-confessing women who are wrongly accused. In another account, a woman named Rose Allin is accused of being a whore simply because she resists the authorities’ pressures. When government agents come to her home to arrest her, her mother, and her stepfather, they first encounter Allin, who is on her way to her mother’s sickbed, and try to persuade her to recant. She answers that she is willing to burn “for my Christes sake, if so I be compelled” (p. 2006). In response, the agents test her bravery by holding her hand in the flame of a candle that she was carrying to her mother’s room.26 The woodcut illustrating her story shows a steadfast, placid Rose with her hand in the flame and behind her, hanging on an inner wall of her house, a picture of several martyrs burning; the implicit comparison of her bravery to theirs is clear. The agents, who are naturally insensitive to this prefiguring of her martyrdom, misread her willingness to chastise her flesh and associate her boldness with sexual incontinence: “Thou young whore, wilt thou not cry? . . . strong whore, thou shamelesse beast, thou beastly whore.” Their slanders, however, have no effect on her. She responds: “And now if ye thinke it good begin at the feet, and burne the head also. For he that set you a worke, shall pay your wages one day I warrant” (p. 2007). Foxe’s sidenote supports Allin’s retort: “The devil payeth the persecutors their wages” (ibid.). Allin’s interrogators link steadfast women with sexual transgression, while Protestant readers are presumably to see the connection between her resistance to authority and sexual incontinence as cruelly unjust. Through its suggestion of differing audiences’ reactions to these women, Foxe’s text both celebrates the defiance of women like Allin and registers the challenge that defiance presents.

In the process of recording and celebrating such defiance, the Actes and Monuments at times tests the rhetoric of exceptionality underpinning the strength-within-weakness paradigm. The text pushes at the limits of what “woman” is or ought to be as it evokes but does not consistently or neatly resolve the tensions between patriarchal expectations for women’s behavior and generic expectations that martyrs will be bold and resolute. There are two gendered characterizations of the martyr figure — what might be
broadly labeled in the terms of modern literary scholarship constructivist and essentialist positions — often in tension in Foxe’s work. Foxe frequently associates steadfast martyrdom with an assumed masculine role. Hugh Latimer’s famous final words to Nicholas Ridley indicate a self-conscious assumption of a masculine stoicism: “Be of good comfort, Maister Ridley, and play the man: wee shall this day light such a candle by Gods grace in England, as (I trust) shall never be put out” (p. 1770).27 The assumption of a masculine role is not limited, however, to educated, prominent male martyrs like Ridley and Latimer. Foxe celebrates the fact that Agnes Potten and Joan Trunchfield, “beyng so simple women,” nevertheless “manfully stoode to the confession and testimony of Gods worde and veritie” (p. 1893).28 The adverb “manfully” genders martyrdom as masculine, while simultaneously raising the possibility that one who is not a man may and indeed ought to, at times, behave like one.29 Yet Foxe’s description of another female martyr, Margery Austoo, suggests that the giving of such bold testimony might not be only a role that Protestant women can assume, but rather may emanate from a woman’s own divinely-bestowed self. Foxe records that Austoo and her husband answered their interrogators boldly, but “especially the woman, to whom the Lord had geven the greater knowledge, and more ferventnes of spirit” (p. 2019). In the accounts of many female martyrs, this tension between martyrdom as an expression of a God-given self and as a gendered role one adopts in order to testify more convincingly recurs, suggesting inconsistent explanations for female martyrs’ boldness and steadfastness.

Two versions of the early church martyr Julitta’s story illustrate the problem of whether the female martyr’s constancy and strength stem from female nature itself, or derive primarily from women’s divinely-inspired assumption of the martyr role, so that strong, bold women are the exception rather than the rule. Foxe writes that Julitta comes to the attention of Roman authorities after she sues a man who has taken all of her property.30 In order to retain the stolen property, this man accuses her of being Christian; she does not shrink from the charge but rather rejoices in the prospect of martyrdom. Julitta’s final words combine what Helen C. White has termed the oldest of the martyrological genres — the address of consolation and encouragement — with a powerful argument about the strength both of her faith and of feminine nature;31

To the women beholding her, sententiouslye shee spake: Sticke not, O sisters, to labour and travell after true piety and godlines. Cease to accuse the fragilitie of feminine nature. What? are not we created of the same matter, that men are? Yea, after Gods Image and similitude are we made, as lively as they. Not flesh only God used in the creation of the woman, in signe and token of her infirmitie, & weaknes, but bone of bones is she, in token that shee must be strong in the true and living God,
all false Gods forsaken... With these words she embraced the fire, and sweetly slept in the Lord. (p. 95)

Encouraging the women who witness her martyrdom, Julitta posits that female spiritual strength is grounded in women’s very bodies, reading the female body as containing a “signe and token” of strength and recuperating feminine nature from its supposed “fragilitie.”

Julitta’s story recurs in Foxe’s account of the prominent preacher John Bradford. Just before Bradford’s martyrdom, a friend’s maid visits him in prison, and Bradford instructs the maid to uplift her mistress with Julitta’s story. Interestingly, however, the reading of the female body is slightly altered:

being brought to the place of execution, she exhorted all women to be strong and constant. For (sayth she) ye were redeemed with as deare a price as men. For although ye were made of the rib of man, yet are you also of his flesh: so that also in the case & trial of your fayth towards God, ye ought to be as strong. And thus dyed shee constantly, not fearyng death. I pray you tell your Maistresse of this history. (p. 1623)

In Bradford’s retelling, Julitta’s forceful attack upon the supposed “fragilitie of feminine nature” is somewhat toned down. His Julitta changes “bone” into the more problematic “rib” and indicates an equality of strength rooted primarily in “flesh” — that is, in an economy of sacrificial exchange: because Christ suffered for men and women, both men and women should sacrifice their flesh for his sake. This emphasis upon harnessing the flesh for Christ’s sake reflects in part Bradford’s own keen sense of the value of martyrdom’s sacrifice. Yet these slightly differing versions of Julitta’s story are also indicative of a larger problem in the Actes and Monuments: namely, that the text is conflicted over whether female martyrs’ bold speech and assertive behavior derive from feminine nature or from the extraordinary circumstances in which female martyrs find themselves. That conflict is not consistently resolved, suggesting that both positions are useful, under different circumstances, for Foxe’s testimonial purposes.

The accounts with the most potential to challenge patriarchal conceptions of female nature and expectations for feminine behavior are those in which a wife must stand independent of her husband. In one such instance, Julitta’s rewriting of the moment of creation is remarkably extended to a rewriting of the fall itself. In Joan Dangerfield’s account, conflicting religious and domestic responsibilities result in a rewriting of the originary moment which, for many Renaissance writers, demonstrated woman’s inferiority and sinfulness. The strength-within-weakness paradigm, so powerfully invoked in Driver’s account, breaks down, as Dangerfield proves to be strong and constant, while her husband, much to his own surprise, shows...
himself the weaker vessel. Under suspicion for her Protestant beliefs, Dangerfield is taken from childbed to prison along with her small infant and her husband. Foxe describes the authorities’ encounters with her husband in language that draws upon the third chapter of Genesis: “In the mean season while they lay thus inclosed in several prisons. . . . the Bishop beginneth to practise not with the woman first, as the serpent did with Eve, but with the man, craftily deceiving his simplicitie, with fayre glosing wordes, falsely perswading him that his wife had recanted . . . and so subtilly drew out a form of recantation” (p. 1933). 36 Joan’s husband later shows her that recantation. He believes that she has behaved as Eve did, yet the account soon reveals that he is the one who succumbed to temptation. His wife corrects him forcefully: “the wife hearyng what her husband had done, her hart clave asunder, saying: Alacke, thus long have we continued one, and hath Satan so prevayled, to cause you to breake your first vow made to Christ in Baptisme?” (p. 1933). The “one flesh” of husband and wife is divided here by the husband’s inconstancy. After his release from prison, his grief over his inconstancy results in his Judas-like suicide; Joan Dangerfield, examined in prison, sticks firmly to her original beliefs and is martyred (ibid.). As with Margery Austoo and her husband, discussed above, Foxe uses this account to demonstrate the value of a godly woman’s strength in confession, in the process unsettling gender stereotypes about masculine steadfastness and feminine inconstancy.37

In the case of Dangerfield, Foxe undermines the strength-within-weakness paradigm to produce an effective, startling revelation of the inconstancy of an apostate man. In other cases, Foxe reinstates that paradigm both for its testimonial force and for its ability to contain transgressive behavior within a scope that martyrology can successfully manage. The strain that martyrdom puts on patriarchal expectations about feminine nature and behavior is perhaps most evident in the text’s use of a woman’s own conscience to justify her transgressive behavior. The account of another female martyr dramatically demonstrates the multiple conflicts that may arise between a woman’s desire to testify to her inwardly-held beliefs with integrity and constancy and her duty to submit to male authorities, including her husband. This martyr, nameless through most of her account, is “many times rebuked” by her husband and children for her Protestantism. Her conflict between domestic and religious duties is resolved by an inward motion, which she interprets as coming directly from God:

she made her prayer unto God, calling for helpe and mercy, and so at length lying in her bed, about midnight, she thought there came to her a certaine motion and feeling of singular comfort, wherupon in short space, she beganne to grow in contempt of her husband and children, and so taking nothing from them, but even as she went,
departed from them, seeking her living by labor & spinning as well as she could, here & there for a time. (p. 2050)

The motive for her departure from her husband and children is, remarkably, figured in the same terms of inward revelation that Foxe uses in other accounts to signal conversion to Protestantism; the “comfort” this martyr receives is the assurance that her leaving her husband and children is not only acceptable but a direct suggestion from God himself.38 Later sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century patriarchal marriage theory allowed such wifely disobedience only when the wife’s soul was in jeopardy.39 Strikingly, in this account the determination that the martyr’s soul is in danger is made based upon an “inner motion” knowable only to the woman herself, yet the text discourages the reader from questioning that inner motion’s authenticity. When Catholic interrogators insist that she is led by the devil, she counters: “it is the spirit of God which leadeth me, and which called me in my bed, & at midnight opened his truth to me. Than was there a great shout and laughing among the priestes and other” (p. 2051). Foxe’s sidenotes mark the bishop’s doubts as heretical and the woman’s claims as legitimate: “Blasphemy of the byshop. How God reveled his truth unto her” (ibid.). The sidenote validates the inner motions that led her to take the extraordinary steps of leaving her family and working to support herself; recursively, those steps become powerful testimony of her extraordinary inner directives.

The fact that she has left her husband is particularly vexing for her interrogators. The bishop accuses her of not fulfilling her marital duties, asking her, “Are thou not a man’s wife?” The woman likens herself to those who must choose between earthly and heavenly duties and, belying her supposed ignorance, identifies scriptural warrants for her actions:

she answered . . . that she had a husband and children: and had them not. So long as she was at liberty, she refused not, neyther husband, nor children. But now standing here as I doe . . . in the cause of Christ & his truth, where I must either forsake Christ, or my husband, I am contented to sticke onely to Christ my heavenly spouse, and renounce the other. . . . And here she making mention of the words of Christ: He that leaveth not father or mother, sister or brother, husband. &c. (p. 2050)

In response to her appeal to this scriptural passage, the Bishop charges that Christ’s injunctions about leaving behind familial duties pertain only to “holy martyrs, which dyed because they would not doe sacrifice to the false Gods.” She promptly links herself to such martyrs: “I will rather dye then I will do any worship to that foule Idoll, whiche with your Masse you make a God” (ibid.). Her willingness to sacrifice herself for her beliefs has justified, in her eyes, her unusual behavior.
The rest of her account brings this point home forcefully. Taunted by her interrogators, she is accused of being a bad wife: “Belike then you are a good houswife, to flee from your husband, and also from the church.” She concedes her poor housewifery, but stresses the hierarchy of loyalties which she espouses: “My houswifry is but small but God geve me grace to go to the true church” (ibid.). The end of her account solidifies her reconstruction of women’s familial duties, as she recasts those duties in spiritual terms. After her sentence has been handed down, she is encouraged to recant and to return to her husband. She retorts: “I wyll never turne from my heavenly husband, to my earthly husband: from the felowshippe of aungels, to mortall children: And if my husband and children be faithfull, then am I theirs. God is my father, God is my mother, God is my Sister, my Brother, my Kinsman, God is my frend moste faythfull” (p. 2052). The faithfulness of her family is the condition under which her submission may be secured; as is evident from the beginning of her account, however, the ascertaining of whether the family abides in the true faith depends upon her own inner conscience. This martyr draws upon martyrrological tenets of integrity of conscience and religious independence of familial loyalties, and thus the account implicitly suggests that the discourse of martyrdom itself compels, locally at least, the reshaping of admirable female behavior.

Yet Foxe stresses throughout how unusual this martyr is, using her uniqueness as a form of testimonial validation which simultaneously works to shut down the more radical implications of her account. Despite earlier assertions that she is a woman whose conscience is guided by God, a woman willing to forsake everything for what she believed, Foxe nevertheless terms her a “weak vessel,” whose adoption of the martyr’s role is, for him, an adoption of a masculine stance made possible only by God’s presence: “almightye God is highly to be praysed, working so mightely in such a weake vessell: so men of stronger and stouter nature, have also to take example how to stand in like case: when as we see this poore woman, how manfully she went through with such constancy and pacience” (p. 2051). The account’s emphasis on her gender and its predicaments — the Bishop’s attacks on her because of her sex, her redefinition of women’s familial duties, and her repeated validation of her own testimony as a woman — is here balanced with a reminder that only exceptional women may do as she does, and only under certain circumstances.

Interestingly, despite her repeated insistence that her duties are owed first to God rather than to her family, Foxe closes the account by returning her — textually, at least — to her husband. After narrating her martyrdom, Foxe discloses her name: “Touching the name of this woman (as I have nowe learned) she was the wife of one called Prest” (p. 2052). The woman who
spent much of her interrogation defending her right to leave her husband for religious reasons is at the end identifiable only by his name. Even in the 1570, 1576, and 1583 editions, Foxe still begins this woman’s account by stating that he has not yet learned her name and closes by noting that she is “the wife of one called Prest”; Foxe never emended the beginning of the account to reflect the revelation at its end. The account closes with this uneasy paradox: the *Actes and Monuments* has demanded that godly readers endorse this woman’s steadfast adherence to her faith despite familial and societal pressures, yet those readers can finally identify her only by the marital relationship which her martyrdom eschewed.

Foxe’s uneasiness over transgressions like those committed by Prest’s wife does not vitiate, however, his determination to celebrate the motions of Protestant women’s consciences. The account of the gentlewoman Joyce Lewes suggests a careful control of a woman’s conscience by male authorities — in this case, a community of male clergymen and friends. Yet Foxe also implies that this woman’s steadfast martyrdom, which is a surprise to Catholic authorities, who assume that she will weaken when forced to stand on her own, is rooted in her resolution of her own struggles of conscience. Further, Foxe claims that her steadfastness has wider repercussions, as it proves a model for other women. Lewes’s struggles of conscience make an interesting parallel with those of one of her mentors, one John Glover. While Glover does not suffer from “outward fire,” he suffers from frequent, severe doubts over his salvation and is thus, in Foxe’s eyes, a “double martyr.” Given Foxe’s detailed description of the torments Glover’s uneasy and uncertain conscience inflicts upon him, and given the reference to Glover’s torments in one of the sidenotes accompanying Lewes’s account, Foxe’s readers would recognize that Glover and Lewes share similar struggles. Her uneasiness in conscience and her dependence upon a community of supporters could not, then, be attributed to supposed feminine weakness alone. Her conscience, like that of Glover, becomes the primary marker used to testify to her sanctity.

Lewes’s journey of conscience begins with her reaction to the death of Laurence Saunders, one of the first Marian martyrs: “When she heard of the burning of that moste godly & learned M. Laurence Saunders . . . she . . . enquired earnestly of such as she knew feared God, the cause of hys death: and when she perceaved it was because hee refused to receave the Masse, she began to be troubled in conscience & waxed very unquiet” (p. 2012). She approaches Glover and asks him to teach her right doctrine: “shee did oftentimes resort to him, and desired him to tel her the faultes that were in the Masse, and other thinges that at that time were urged as necessary to salvation” (*ibid.*). As a result of this instruction, Lewes undergoes a
conversion: “By the which godly counsell given by him, it happened that she began to waxe weery of the world throughly sorrowfull for her sinnes, being inflamed with the love of God, desirous to serve him” (ibid.). She refuses her husband’s command that she go to mass, and he turns her in to the authorities.

According to the account, Lewes continues to wrestle with her conscience in prison. She seeks counsel from her friends regarding the most effective ways to bear witness, to perform externally the beliefs she holds in her heart: “when the tyme did drawe neare the which God had appoynted fo r her to liv e a n c e... s he ec o ns u lte [w ith f ri e n ds] h o w s he em i g h t be h a v e h ers el f e, t h a t h e r de ath m i g h t b e m o re g lo r i o u s t o th e n a m e o f G o d, c o m f o rtable t o hi s p e o p l e, a n d a l s o m o s t d i s c o m f o rtable u n t o t h e e n e m i e s o f G o d” (ibid.).44 Yet despite this determination to perform well, she suffers a last spasm of doubt: on the night prior to her execution, “Satan” shoots a “fiery dart... questioni ng... h ow s he ec ou ld et e l l h a t s h e w a s c h o s e nt o e t e r n a l l if e a n d t h a t C h r i s t dy d f o r h e r” (ibid.). Her own self-examinations, others remind her, can give her confidence: “her calling to the knowledge of Gods word was a manifest token of Gods love towards her, especially that holy spirite working in her hart that love and desire towards God to please him & to bee justified by him through Christ, etc.” (p. 2013).45 The community around her, together with her remembrances of her own inward life, provides evidence of her sanctification, so that she may in turn witness to others. According to Foxe, this testimony to a broader community is precisely what her Catholic persecutors hope she will not provide: “Well, tomorrow her stoutnes will be proved and tryed. For although perhapses she hath now some frendes that whisper her in her eares, tomorrow will we see who dare be so harde as to come neare her” (ibid.). Two of Lewes’s friends accompany her as far as the stake, and her “stoutnes,” bolstered by them, leads her to reach out to a larger community.46

As she conquered Satan’s fiery dart, so, according to Foxe, she takes control of the scene of her fiery martyrdom. That scene is initially scripted against her. Foxe records that “the papistes had appointed some to rayle upon her openly, and to revile her, both as she went to the place of execution, and also when she was at the stake” (ibid.). Nevertheless, Lewes takes control of the moment’s drama. At the stake, she raises a cup a friend has brought to her, saying “I drynke to all them that unfaynedly love the Gospell of Jesus Christ and wish for the abolishment of Papistry. When she had dronken, they that were her frendes dranke also. After that a great number, specially the women of the towne dyd drynke wyth her” (ibid.). Her successful wrestling with her conscience results in her confidence at the stake and influences women watching her death. This account suggests what is implied by the
rhetoric of other accounts: that martyrdom’s validation of women’s consciences and beliefs may influence broader communities of women to assert their own religious beliefs despite the opposition of political and religious authorities.

Those authorities worried about the influence one woman’s behavior might have on another’s. Foxe notes that some women who supported Lewes at her execution were put to open “penance” and that authorities later sought out but never found other supporters present at her execution (ibid.). He suppresses, however, evidence suggesting that that community of female supporters was not nearly as steadfast as Lewes herself. In other words, he suppresses evidence of feminine inconstancy in order to present the Protestant community in a better light. In Foxe’s papers in the British Library, a record of the abjuration of Agnes Glover, the wife of John Glover, survives. In a list of her religious errors, Agnes Glover makes the following declaration: “Also I have beleved and sayed that Joyce Lewes late of the parrshe of Mancester condemned by the lawe and our mother holy churche for heresy and burned for the same, that she dyed well, wisshing that I might dye as she dyd, and Saying that though her carcas suffred, yet god Receaved her soule.” Glover, or at least the document written for her (she signed it only with the mark of a cross), disclaims her errors, acknowledging that she has come to a new understanding of Lewes’s death: “I ...d o oo l s os t e f a s t l e beleve and here confesse that the forsayde Joyce Lewes Late of Mancester was an obstinate and arrogant heretike, and that she woorthely and justly according to thorder of the Lawe was putte [to] the execucion of Deth by fyer for her hereticall and Devlishe belief against the Sacrament.” The document indicates the great pressure Agnes Glover must have felt as the wife of the man who had ministered to Joyce Lewes. The inclusion of her reaction to Lewes’s death in the list of errors she had to recant confirms the authorities’ concern about the influence one woman’s martyrdom might have on others. Most importantly, perhaps, Foxe’s choice not to include the fact of this recantation emphasizes his wish to end Lewes’s account with a positive statement about the good one woman’s conscience might do for the Protestant cause. The women who support Lewes are represented as more steadfast than they actually were; the demands of his martyrology require his suppression of their subsequent actions.

As the particular instances adduced here indicate, Foxe’s manipulations of gender in his accounts of female martyrs depend first and foremost on what he thinks will most advance the cause for which his martyrs died. His text frequently assumes that the best way to argue that God is on the side of Protestant female martyrs is to show how those women violate their interrogators’ expectations about what women should be, do, or say. At the same
time, the Actes and Monuments tries to contain the more radical implications of such transgressions (as in the close of Prest’s wife’s account, for instance). Foxe seems to fear that female martyrs who are too transgressive, or whose behavior and words threaten to rewrite gender constructions too profoundly, might undermine the cause he is determined to celebrate. Still, the text often urges its Protestant readers to reconfigure their understandings of gender at least long enough to reap the benefits of martyrs’ testimony. The inconsistency of Foxe’s treatments of gender suggests that gender is not an all-encompassing, over-ruling category of analysis for him. The gender of his female martyrs does consistently matter, but it matters in widely varying ways contingent upon a number of other factors. For Foxe, gender meanings accrue in conjunction with — not prior to — the religious discourses, testimonial purposes, and generic features so carefully intertwined in his copia of Protestant history. By shaping a godly reader who will attend to the testimony of women whose behavior sometimes makes even Foxe himself uneasy, the Actes and Monuments demonstrates that gender cannot float free of the circumstances, subjects, and genres through which it is made legible.
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Notes

1. I will use “Foxe” as a term of convenience that acknowledges the association of the Actes and Monuments primarily with his name and work. As various scholars have demonstrated, many others contributed to the volume as well, such as Edmund Grindal, Henry Bull, Miles Coverdale, and the printer John Day, not to mention the numerous martyrs whose “monuments” fill the pages of the book. See John King, “Fiction and Fact in John Foxe’s Book of Martyrs,” in John Foxe and the English Reformation, ed. David Loades (Aldershot, Hampshire: Scolar Press, 1997), pp. 12–35; Thomas Freeman, “Reading and Misreading Foxe’s Book of Martyrs,” in Sixteenth Century Journal 30 (1999): 23–46; and Susan Wabuda, “Henry Bull, Miles Coverdale, and the Making of Foxe’s Book of Martyrs,” in Martyrs and Martyrologies, ed. Diana Wood (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), pp. 245–58. For the purposes of this essay, I am less concerned with whether or not Foxe and/or his sources record female martyrs’ words accurately, to the extent that may be ascertained, than I am with the portraits of female martyrs the Actes and Monuments presented to early modern readers.

2. Margaret Hannay identifies silence and obedience as “primary feminine virtues throughout the Tudor period” (Introduction, Silent but for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works, ed. Margaret P. Hannay [Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1985], p. 4). Commenting on Foxe’s accounts of female martyrs, Carole Levin notes that while Foxe was “certainly concerned with Christian virtues for women . . . in certain ways the examples in the Book of Martyrs not only reinforce, but also modify” definitions of such virtues (“Women in the Book of Martyrs as Models of Behavior in Tudor England.” International Journal of Women’s Studies 4.2 [1981]: 197). On the prescriptive discourse of marriage manuals and their recommendations for female conduct, see my article, “Marital Discourse and
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3. Nancy Wright discusses the root meaning of the word “martyr” in “The Figura of the Martyr in John Donne’s Sermons,” *ELH* 56 (1989): 293–306. Foxe assumes that to be a martyr one need not actually die for one’s convictions but merely must be willing to die; thus, Luther figures as a martyr in Foxe’s scheme. In approaching Foxe’s text as martyrlogy, I do not disagree with those who have argued for the influence of multiple genres on the *Actes and Monuments*, including ballads, romance, and even comedy (see King, “Fiction and Fact,” and D. R. Woolf, “The Rhetoric of Martyrdom: Generic Contradiction and Narrative Strategy in John Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments,*” in *The Rhetorics of Life-Writing in Early Modern Europe: Forms of Biography from Cassandra Fedele to Louis XIV*, ed. Thomas F. Mayer and D. R. Woolf [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995], pp. 243–82). Rather, I wish to stress the testimonial uses to which the multiple genres and modes in the text are put, working from a definition of martyrology based, not upon a certain narrative shape or set of generic characteristics, but upon the use-value of the text for its culture.


9. Unless otherwise noted, all citations of the *Actes and Monuments* are from the 1583 edition (London: John Day), the last published during Foxe’s lifetime.


12. I do not wish to flatten Foxe’s female martyrs into proto-feminists who clamor for a stake of their own, as it were; rather, I wish to stress the possibilities for contestation over early modern constructions of gender suggested by these testimonial accounts. As David Simpson has stressed, literary critics must increasingly turn away from subver-

13. Patricia Crawford has argued that we must complicate the notion that the “godly woman was the successfully socialised woman. . . . If we examine the lives of godly, pious women then we can see how belief could become an individual matter which women could transform into something of their own” (Women and Religion in England, 1500-1720 [London: Routledge, 1993], p. 4). For a discussion of evidence about late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century women readers of the Actes and Monuments, see Levin, as well as Freeman, “The Good Ministreye,” pp. 31–32; Ellen Macek also discusses Foxe’s female readers in “The Emergence of a Feminine Spirituality in the Book of Martyrs,” Sixteenth Century Journal 19 (1988): 63–80.

14. In the 1563 edition, this martyr is known as Elizabeth Driver; in subsequent editions, her first name is corrected to Alice.

15. In her persuasive reading of Foxe’s female martyrs, Robinson suggests that in “finding knowledge and power where it was least credible — in a simple woman — Foxe seizes upon gender expectations to dramatize the topos of Protestant enlightenment versus Catholic ignorance which informs his text” (p. 239).

16. Levin identifies women who play at being submissive as one of several “types” of female witnesses in Foxe, a type that uses submissiveness to survive. Driver does not fit into Levin’s categories, however, as Driver uses supposed submissiveness only as a brief, initial point of dramatic contrast for her subsequent assertive defense of her beliefs.

17. Compare, for instance, William Langland’s Piers Plowman and Chaucer’s Plowman in the General Prologue.

18. See Susan Felch, “Shaping the Reader in the Actes and Monuments,” in John Foxe and the English Reformation, pp. 52–65, for a discussion of how Foxe’s text shaped its readers along moral lines and contributed to the redefinition of education as the “dispensing of factual information and the promotion of moral training” (p. 65).


21. These presentations as well as the sidenotes discussed below remain the same throughout the 1576 and 1583 editions of the Actes and Monuments.


23. Accusations of being a “Priest’s wife” are tantamount to accusations of whoredom in the period.

24. Here, I would disagree with Levin’s assessment that Young survives her interrogation because she plays at submissiveness; she rather seems quite bold in her responses to authorities.

25. See Anthony Fletcher, Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), for a discussion of the ways in which assertive female behavior was frequently linked with sexual impropriety.

26. The testing of one’s hand in flame is a recurrent motif in the Actes and Monuments; see, for instance, Thomas Bilney’s account and its accompanying woodcut and, of
course, Thomas Cranmer’s famous extension of his right hand, the hand that had signed
his recantations of his Protestant beliefs, into the fire.

27. This remark, one of the most famous in the Book of Martyrs, appeared in the 1576 and
subsequent versions, with no readily apparent source. For a discussion of the source
problems for Latimer’s words, see King, “Fiction and Fact,” and Freeman, “Reading
and Misreading.” As Freeman and Patrick Collinson note, these words are also an echo
of the words spoken to Polycarp as he approached his martyrdom (Collinson, “Truth,
Lies, and Fiction in Sixteenth-Century Protestant Historiography,” in The Historical
Donald R. Kelley and David Harris Sacks [(Washington, DC): Woodrow Wilson
discussion of these prominent martyrs, see David Loades, The Oxford Martyrs (Lon-

28. As implied by Freeman’s link of the adverb to Polycarp’s final words (“Reading and
Misreading”), the notion that a martyr behaves “manfully” has a lengthy tradition in
Christian martyrology; not surprisingly, this characterization also recurs in recusant
Catholic martyrologies, such as Thomas Worthington’s A Relation of Sixtene Martyrs
(Douai, 1601; rpt. Ilkley: Scolar Press, 1977), which reports that the martyr John Rigbie
behaved “manfully” (p. 45).

29. This is a telling point of contrast with later marriage manual authors like Thomas
Gataker, who stressed that a “man-kinde woman” is a “monster in nature” (Marriage
Duties Briefely Couched Togither [London, 1622], p. 10).

30. Julitta’s story is first recorded in St. Basil of Caesarea’s fifth homily, In martyrim
Julitam; Foxe cites Basil as his source for this passage.

31. Helen C. White, Tudor Books of Saints and Martyrs (Madison: University of Wisconsin

32. Cf., for instance, Aemilia Lanyer’s redemption of Eve, and thus of all women, in her
long poem Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum; also the prevalent assumption that “the spiritual
persona of woman is inherently defective, that the image of God is seen less clearly in
her than in man” (Jordan, p. 25).

33. This exchange with a servant is not recorded in All the examinacions of the martir J.
Bradforde, wherunto ar annexed his private talk & conflictes in prison (London, 1561)
or in the 1563 edition of the Actes and Monuments; it first appears in the 1570 edition.

34. Consider, for instance, Bradford’s conviction that “because I lived not the gospel truly,
but outwardly, therefore doth he thus punish me; nay rather in punishing blesseth me.
And indeed I thank him more of this prison, than of any parlour, yea, than of any
pleasure that ever I had: for in it I find God my most sweet good God always. The flesh
is punished, first to admonish us heartily to live as we profess; secondly to certify the
wicked of their just damnation, if they repent not” (p. 1625).

35. See James Grantham Turner, One Flesh: Paradisal Marriage and Sexual Relations in
the Age of Milton (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), for a discussion of tensions between
egalitarian and subordinationist readings of the first three chapters of Genesis.

36. The passage echoes the Geneva Bible’s description of the serpent as “subtil” (The
Press, 1969], Gen. 3:1).

37. Diane Willen documents evidence suggesting the importance of women in educating
their households — primarily their servants and their children — in matters of religion.

38. Macek argues that women’s separations from their families for religious reasons “caused disorder in Tudor society even while it enhanced the nascent moral autonomy of the women involved” (p. 74).


40. Of course, a number of Foxe’s female martyrs are referred to as someone’s wife. Alice Driver’s examinations, discussed above, are identified in a header as the examinations of “Drivers wife,” and in a sidenote to the account of Thomas Grene Foxe identifies Elizabeth Young only as “Younges wife.” Still, there is an unresolved tension between Foxe’s identification of this particular martyr only through her marital status and her pointed rejections of her ungodly family.

41. Through God’s intervention, Glover is at last “rid . . . of all discomfort” (p. 1709).

42. The cross-reference first appears in the 1570 edition.

43. Freeman notes that fears about salvation contributed to a number of intense relationships between Protestant divines and Marian women (“‘The Good Ministrye,’” p. 19); although Glover was not a minister, his relationship with Lewes seems to have followed this pattern.

44. Her determination to bear cheerful witness persists through the night prior to her execution: “All that night she was wonderfully chearefull & mery with a certaine gravitie, in so much that the maiestie of the spirit of God did manifestly appeare in her, who did expel the feare of deathe out of her heart, spending the tyme in prayer, reading, & talking with them that were purposely come unto her for to comfort her with the word of God” (p. 2013).


46. In the 1570 edition, Foxe adds the names of those two friends: Michael Renigar and Augustine Bernher; the latter, as Collinson notes (p. 66), was Hugh Latimer’s servant and a member of the Protestant community active in gathering documents for Foxe’s history of the Marian persecution.

47. British Library Harley MS 421, p. 85. In Foxe’s published work, the only hint of Agnes Glover’s recantation appears in the account of her husband’s struggles with his conscience; in a long clause interrupting a sentence about her husband, Foxe mentions that Agnes, after “being had to Liechfilde, & there examined before the bishop, at length after much ado was constrained to geve place to their tyranny” (p. 1714).

48. See Freeman, “‘The Good Ministrye,’” for a discussion of the special pressures the Marian persecution brought to bear on Protestant women.