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

Abstract

Amid the great Protestant martyrologies of the mid-sixteenth century, Heinrich Pantaleon’s Martyrvm historia (1563) has been comparatively overlooked. This article argues that Pantaleon’s martyrology acted as a capstone to the narrative framework of Protestant suffering and resistance. Pantaleon’s command of vernacular languages gave him access to a wider range of material than other martyrologists, material which his Latin text made accessible to learned readers across Europe. This article also examines the collaboration between Pantaleon and John Foxe, which directly inspired Pantaleon’s martyrology and enabled Foxe to give a cohesive, trans-European account of Protestant martyrs in his Acts and monuments.

I: Introduction and background

At the end of his life, John Bunyan quoted a letter written from prison by ‘that godly man, Pomponius Algerius, an Italian martyr’.1 The fact that a lay preacher in Bedford, without any formal education, knew of a letter written by an obscure Italian martyr over 130 years earlier is due to two authors. One of these, John Foxe, in whose Acts and monuments Bunyan read the letter, is well-known today among scholars.2 The other, Heinrich Pantaleon, is a more obscure figure among scholars.3 Yet his martyrology, the Martyrvm historia, was not only Foxe’s source for Pomponio and his letter, it was also, as discussed here, the source for much of Foxe’s narrative of Protestant martyrs in Germany, Italy, and, to a
lesser extent, France. (Although the work of the great French martyrologist, Jean Crespin, is mentioned below as it relates to Foxe’s use of Pantaleon, Foxe’s wider use of Crespin is too extensive to discuss fully here.) As with other martyrologies, the example of Bunyan and Pomponio suggests that the works of Foxe and Pantaleon, which were linked on several levels, helped create a history of the ‘True Church’ and its martyrs cherished by Protestants across much of western Europe for centuries.

Protestants began commemorating their martyrs in the 1520s and, for the next three decades, continued with small but often widely circulated works glorifying contemporary martyrs and, sometimes, extolling ‘proto-Protestant’ martyrs of the Middle Ages. In 1552, this situation began to change with the publication of the first volume of Ludwig Rabus’s martyrology. This volume collects the stories of martyrs from the early Church, but, starting with the second of what would become eight volumes, Rabus concentrated on Lutheran martyrs in German-speaking Europe. Other Protestant martyrologies, focusing on the martyrs of a specific country or region, appeared throughout the 1550s. These included the initial editions of what would become the massive martyrologies of Jean Crespin and John Foxe, as well as Adriaan van Haemstede’s volume on the persecution of Protestants in the Low Countries.

These works were not isolated, for other Protestant martyrological texts were printed at the time. Nevertheless, certain common features of the martyrologies by Rabus, Crespin, Foxe, and Haemstede, taken together, separate them from these other Protestant martyrologies, including Pantaleon’s. One feature is that the martyrologies of Rabus, Crespin, Foxe, and Haemstede were written in their authors’ vernaculars. Admittedly, a Latin edition of Crespin’s martyrrology was printed, and Foxe, while in exile, wrote two Latin martyrlogies. Nevertheless, all the other editions of Crespin’s martyrrology were in French; and, after Foxe returned to England, his martyrlogies were printed exclusively in English. The first volume of Rabus’s martyrrology was a translation into German of his
original Latin volume, but the remaining seven volumes of his martyrology appeared only in German, and a second edition of Rabus’s complete martyrology was published solely in German.¹⁰ Haemstede’s martyrology was only printed in Dutch. The printing of these martyrologies in vernacular languages meant that each of these four martyrologies became primarily associated with particular countries or regions: France, England, Lutheran Germany, the Netherlands. Each of the four martyrologies also included significant amounts of original material, whether official documents, letters, shorter works, or material drawn from oral sources and eyewitness accounts. This material (much of it local) made these works valuable, even indispensable, sources for national or regional history.

This consequence has had significant effects on the study of the great sixteenth-century Protestant martyrologies. These works have been studied individually, not collectively, and furthermore modern scholarship tends to examine the major sixteenth-century Protestant martyrologies as a group.¹¹ At the same time, very little work examines the textual interchanges across these martyrologies.¹² The modern orientation towards the history of national churches was not shared by the martyrologists or their contemporaries, but they have contributed to a general neglect of Pantaleon’s Martyrvm historia.¹³ Additional factors include the fact that Pantaleon wrote in Latin, and, except for some material on Italian evangelical martyrs (discussed below), little in his martyrology had not already been printed elsewhere. And yet, Pantaleon’s perspective was truly international. Although the Martyrvm historia seems derivative and thus less interesting or significant than more famous martyrlogies, the importance of its role in disseminating information across Protestant Europe cannot be denied.

II: Oporinus and Foxe’s Latin martyrologies

Rabus, Crespin, and Haemstede were concerned with godly martyrs throughout
Europe, but Foxe was the most internationally minded of these major authors. He had a strong interest in the Reformation and Protestant martyrs across western Europe, nurtured by his mentor John Bale. Bale’s deserved reputation as a bare-knuckled polemicist should not obscure the fact that he was an internationally respected scholar with ties to the Lutheran scholar, Matthias Flacius, and to the Magdeburg Centuriators. The desire of Flacius and his colleagues to integrate Bale and Foxe into their larger historical projects probably led the two Englishmen, during their exile, to settle in Basle and work as proof-readers for the great Protestant printer Johannes Oporinus. And eventually Oporinus would bring Foxe and Pantaleon together for a project that became, in many respects, a joint martyrology.

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

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

While the haste to produce the *Rervm* – due to Foxe’s desire to return to England after Mary I’s sudden death – meant that, apart from brief biographies of Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague, the volume contained only material on English and Scottish martyrs, the intention to write a complete history of the mainland martyrs had not been abandoned. A second part to the *Rervm* was explicitly promised in the book’s text, where Foxe praised Martin Luther but regretted that an account of his life ‘would be too long for weaving into my narrative here unless it follows in the next instalment of this history, [which is] presently on the English and the Scots. Truly afterwards, [if the account were not so long.] I would have decided to report on the German people, Luther among them, in their turn’. Although Foxe eventually compiled a life of Luther for the *Acts and monuments*, he would not be the author of a second part to the *Rervm*.

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

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

III: Heinrich Pantaleon and the *Martyrvm historia*

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

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

Oporinus, by entrusting the *Rervm’s* continuation to Pantaleon, relied on an
internationally recognised scholar, but Pantaleon also possessed the advantage of having been a friend of Bale and Foxe during their exile (though it is unclear when these men first met). Pantaleon had written a poem praising Bale for his piety and learning, and Bale used the poem as a preface to his great biographical dictionary of English authors. Pantaleon further claimed that Bale had encouraged him to write historical works, and described Bale and Foxe as ‘my total friends’.

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

It seems likely that, if Foxe had been willing to write the second volume, Pantaleon would have handed over his notes, or they would have co-authored the work. In either case, an important, but not solitary, indication of the remarkable degree of cooperation between Foxe and Pantaleon is that the first edition of the *Acts and monuments* and Pantaleon’s *Martyrvm historia* were printed simultaneously. It took a few months to print Pantaleon’s folio of 361 pages and, as aforementioned, eighteen months to print the first edition of the *Acts and monuments*, the colophon of which reads ‘Anno. 1563 the .20. of March’. Pantaleon’s dedication to the *Martyrvm historia*, by comparison, was dated ‘13 calend[is]
April[is] Anno reparatae salutis 1563⁴¹: 20 March according to the Roman calendar.⁴¹ This common date cannot have been a coincidence. Oporinus wanted Pantaleon’s work ready for the spring Frankfurt book fair starting on 28 March. Pantaleon’s volume appears to have been ahead of schedule and could have been published in plenty of time for the spring fair (rather than cut it so close), since the last section goes on to describe events as late as February 1563.⁴² Yet, it seems certain that Oporinus wanted the martyrologies of Foxe and Pantaleon to appear simultaneously, as doing so would link Foxe to the Martyrvm historia and, with luck, increase sales for both the Rervm’s pars prima and pars secunda.

Scholars are unlikely to find a smoking gun here, but the evidence suggests the following. Printing commenced on the first edition of the Acts and monuments around September 1561. At some point, probably in 1562, Foxe agreed to publish his work in tandem with Pantaleon’s. As the printing of Foxe’s much larger work dragged on, Oporinus may have advised Foxe and John Day, Foxe’s publisher, that Pantaleon’s work had to be printed and ready for the Frankfurt fair that spring. In response, Foxe and Day may have said that they would be finished that winter, which timing would explain an agreed date of 20 March, the last day of winter in 1563. Working in haste to meet this deadline, Day finally had the work completed in time.⁴³ If Foxe seems to have been remarkably accommodating here, one should recall that Foxe owed Oporinus a good turn since he had failed to complete a promised project for the printer who had employed him during his lean years of exile. Moreover, Oporinus was not alone in wanting to see Foxe’s martyrlogy published as quickly as possible, for it was in Day’s interest to finish the job, and pressure was probably also coming from William Cecil and others.

At some point before their works were published, Pantaleon must have sent some of the fruits of his research to Foxe, for a few excerpts from Pantaleon’s Martyrvm historia appear in the Acts and monuments of 1563. Two anecdotes of martyrdoms in 1525, of a minister and a peasant, which originated in sermons of the German Reformer Oecolampadius, are directly
translated from Pantaleon.\textsuperscript{44} An account in Foxe of the near arrest of the Protestant theologian, Simon Grynaeus, was also taken from the \textit{Martyrvm historia}.\textsuperscript{45} Other instances are more complicated. The narrative of the Bavarian martyr, Jörgen Wagner, for example, could have been drawn from either of the virtually identical accounts of Pantaleon or Crespin.\textsuperscript{46}

Although it seems clear that Pantaleon had sent Foxe extracts from his work before it was printed, the timing is less than clear. Since material that Foxe took from Pantaleon was printed less than a quarter of the way through the first edition of the \textit{Acts and monuments}, one can assume that Pantaleon sent this material to Foxe relatively early in the printing – by autumn 1561. Pantaleon may have sent it to Foxe because Foxe had requested it, or because Pantaleon and Oporinus still held out the hope, soon to be dissipated, that Foxe was working on the \textit{Rervm’s pars secunda}.

Pantaleon’s \textit{Martyrvm historia} is a collection of materials from an impressive range of other martyrologies and histories. Pantaleon had consulted the martyrologies of Rabus, Haemstede, and Crespin, as well as the \textit{Rervm} and other works, to provide the most geographically comprehensive account of Protestant martyrs then available. Pantaleon exercised authorial oversight by condensing materials and omitting long sections of primary sources, but, with a few exceptions (where he obtained new information on certain Italian martyrs), his work did not contain original or unpublished material. The international and polyglot nature of Pantaleon’s martyrology underscores its major advantage over other Protestant martyrologies; for, unlike Rabus, Crespin, Haemstede, and Foxe, Pantaleon could read German, French, and Dutch.\textsuperscript{47} As a result, while other martyrologists had to work with Latin editions or employ translators, Pantaleon could easily draw on Rabus, Crespin, and Haemstede. By bringing material from all the major Protestant martyrologies together, and printing this material in Latin, the \textit{lingua franca} of the educated, Pantaleon allowed Foxe and others to access accounts originally written in languages they could not read.
IV: Foxe and the martyrologies of Ludwig Rabus and Adriaan van Haemstede

In the second edition of the Acts and monuments, published in 1570, Foxe added about seventy folios on Protestant martyrs on the European mainland. If this addition seems small (about three per cent of the total text), it is worth noting that it was of comparable size, on its own, to Foxe’s and Crespin’s earliest martyrologies. This addition also came when supplies of paper for the Acts and monuments were running low, and frantic efforts were being made to limit the size of the work. The fact that Foxe devoted this much paper to non-British Protestant martyrs is one indication of his committed international perspective. Another indication was that Foxe was occasionally able to draw on personal testimony from a network of European contacts. For example, Foxe included an account of François Civaux, a former secretary to the French ambassador in England and convert to Protestantism, who fled to Geneva, became secretary to the Council there, and was ultimately martyred at Dijon in 1558. Civaux was not mentioned in the Martyrvm historia or in any of Crespin’s martyrologies. Rather, Foxe states that his account was taken ‘from the written testimony of the Genevan Council’, suggesting that someone in Geneva had copied the records and sent them to Foxe. Foxe also reported the execution of an unnamed man in Sicily in 1559. The martyr had, according to Foxe, come to Sicily from Geneva ‘upon zeale to do good’, and Foxe added that his end was ‘wytnessed to me by hym, whiche beyng there present the same tyme, did both then see that whiche he doth testifie, and also doth now testifie that he then saw’.

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

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

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

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

The possibility that Foxe drew on Haemstedt’s martyrology has attracted scholarly attention, although claims that Haemstedt’s martyrology influenced the scope of Foxe’s martyrology have been challenged. Guido Latré has examined the account of the martyrdom of Bertrand le Blas, a sacramentarian of Tournai executed on 29 December 1555. Latré observes not only that Foxe cited Crespin, Pantaleon, and Haemstedt as his sources, but also that Foxe used a few terms unique to Haemstedt in his account, referring to Tournai
as ‘Dornic’ (Haemstede had rendered it as ‘Doornicke’) and stating that le Blas was tortured on the ‘pyneban[n]ke’ (from the Dutch for the rack, ‘pijnbanck’). Latrè is correct in arguing that this use of Dutch terms indicates that Foxe made direct use of Haemstede’s martyrrology, but the issue is to what extent. As with Rabus, it seems probable that Foxe simply scanned Haemstede, using Pantaleon’s text as an aid. Moreover, these borrowings (and the failure to translate ‘pijnbanck’ as rack) suggest Foxe’s limited understanding of Haemstede’s Dutch.

Foxe elsewhere cited Haemstede in conjunction with other martyrrologies. Foxe cited Crespin and Haemstede as his sources for the martyrdom of one Jean l’Anglois in Sens in 1547. Foxe’s single sentence account, however, contains nothing not in Crespin’s Latin martyrology, except the citation of Haemstede. Foxe’s citation for the martyrdom of Guillaume Neel, in Evreux in 1553, is interestingly worded: ‘Henr. Pantal. Lib. 9. and Crisp. and Adrian [i.e., Haemstede] maketh mention also of one William Neel’. Foxe stated that all three mention Neel, but he did not state that they were his sources. In fact, the accounts of Neel’s martyrdom by Pantaleon, Crespin, and Haemstede are so similar that it is impossible to determine whether Foxe used any one or all of them; but, as before, it seems likely that Foxe primarily used Pantaleon (because of the specific reference to Book 9), and then noticed the account in the other works. Foxe has another interesting citation for his account of Arnaud Monier and Jean de Cazes, both burned at Bourdeux in April 1556: ‘This story is testified and to bee found both in the volume of the French martyrs printed by Iohn Crispine .lib.6. and also in the booke of Dutche martyrs written by Adrianus’. Once more, Foxe was not as specific as one might like when identifying his sources, but the accounts are found in Crespin’s 1564 French-language martyrrology and in Haemstede. These two accounts are very similar, though there is no direct evidence that Foxe actually read Haemstede’s Dutch account or Crespin’s French account. In other places, however, Foxe had clearly drawn solely on the 1564 edition of Crespin for material; there is no case where he did so with Haemstede.
Foxe may have had a more sustained engagement with Haemstede’s martyrology in one final case. At the end of his account of the ‘German’ martyrs, Foxe writes: ‘Furthermore, in the Dutch boke of Adrian, diuers others be numbered in the Catalogue of the Germane Martyrs, which likewise suffered in diuers places of the [Low Countries].’ A list of about fifty martyrs follows, almost all from Haemstede and some whose martyrdoms are only recorded in Haemstede. This list merely provides martyrs’ names, dates of death, and locations. Undoubtedly Foxe scanned through Haemstede’s work for these names, but that is not the same thing as reading Haemstede’s book. In sum, it seems that Foxe drew what he could from Haemstede, either for information exclusive to the Dutch martyrologist, or simply to confirm accounts mentioned by Pantaleon or Crespin, but that was the extent of Foxe’s use of his Dutch counterpart’s work.

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

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

How much, then, of Foxe’s material on the mainland European martyrs was taken from Pantaleon? Foxe’s section on the German martyrs begins with seventeen accounts. Of these Foxe cited Pantaleon directly for three. He translated Pantaleon’s text and repeated his citations for another three. Foxe gave no citations for his accounts of martyrs drowned in the Rhine and killed at Dithmarschen, but he provided details found in Pantaleon (but not Crespin). Similarly, Foxe’s account of Peter Spengler contains the martyr’s name, which was supplied by Pantaleon but not Crespin. Foxe cited Rabus for the execution of Hans von Salhausen, a monk in Prague, but the account was more likely derived from Pantaleon or Crespin, or both. Foxe offered no source for his accounts of Gasper Thauber
(martyred at Vienna in 1524) and Jörgen Wagner (at Munich in 1527); these accounts could have been obtained from Pantaleon or Crespin, or both. 82

Other accounts among these first seventeen are more complicated. Two were unquestionably from Crespin despite Foxe’s citation of both Pantaleon and Crespin in the first case. 83 The account, reprinted from Foxe’s first edition without alteration, of the early Lutheran martyrs, Hendrick Vos and Johann van den Esschen, is a mixture of elements from Crespin’s account with details only found in Luther’s. 84 The account of the lynching of the Lutheran preacher Heinrich Zütphen in 1524, also reprinted from the first edition of the Acts and monuments, cites and follows closely Luther’s narrative. 85 Foxe cited Sleidan’s Commentaries as his source for his account of Johann Heuglin, and the wording of Foxe’s account clearly shows that it was copied from John Daus’s translation of Sleidan. Daus wrote: ‘The byshop of Constaunce, had a litle before caused one John Huglie [sic], a priest, to be brenc at Merspurge, for that he woulde not allowe the bishops of Romes doctrine in all thinges’. 86 Foxe’s account in the first edition, which was reprinted very similarly in the second, recorded that ‘the bishop of Constance caused a certain priest, named John Howgly to be burned at Merspurge, for that he would not allow the bishop of Romes doctrine in al poyntes’. 87 Foxe also cited Sleidan as the source for his narrative of the burnings of Peter Fliesteden and Adolf Clarebach at Cologne in 1529. This account was reprinted exactly from Foxe’s first edition, and again, Daus’s translation seems Foxe’s most likely source. 88 In sum, of the seventeen narratives opening Foxe’s section on the ‘German’ martyrs, eight definitely derived from Pantaleon, three probably derived from him, and six derived from other authors.

Foxe’s section on ‘German’ martyrs then became more schematic because the remaining martyrs were listed in a table of thirty-nine accounts of martyrdom or persecution. 89 This table makes even clearer Foxe’s dependence on Pantaleon. Eight of the accounts include direct citations to Pantaleon, and in four cases Foxe cites him as his sole source. 90 In another three,
Foxe cites both Pantaleon and Rabus as sources which, as before, effectively means that Pantaleon was Foxe’s source. For the last of these eight, that of Bertrand le Blas, Foxe cites Crespin, Pantaleon, and Haemstede.

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

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

Foxe’s section on French martyrs relied more heavily on Crespin than Pantaleon, but the latter still made a significant contribution by providing material supplementing that provided by Crespin. Of the eighty-seven accounts, in five Foxe cited Pantaleon alone, although in two of these Foxe’s account is one sentence long, and it is impossible to determine whether he drew from Pantaleon or Crespin, or both. For the martyrdoms of Etienne Pouillot and Denis le Vayr, Crespin’s accounts are very close to Pantaleon’s, and, in both cases, Foxe could have been drawing on both, though he cited Pantaleon alone. Foxe also cited Pantaleon as his sole source for the story of a wealthy Parisian merchant persecuted by the Franciscans; this account does not appear in any of Crespin’s martyrologies. In the next story, immediately following the account of the merchant in both Foxe and Pantaleon, Foxe simply translated Pantaleon’s account along with his citation; again, Pantaleon was
In eleven other accounts of French martyrs, Foxe cites both Pantaleon and Crespin. Close examination reveals that Foxe indeed drew on both authors for some of these. For the martyrdom of Sanctin Lyvet (Pantaleon, Crespin, and Foxe give his name as ‘Nivet[vs]’), Foxe cited Pantaleon first and Crespin second, but, because the two Latin accounts are nearly identical, Foxe could have drawn on them equally. For the martyrdom of Etienne Brun, Foxe followed Crespin but added detail from Pantaleon emphasising the martyr’s miraculous resistance to pain. Although Foxe cited both martyrologists for the persecution in Paris following a mob’s attack on a Protestant congregation in September 1557, he principally used Crespin’s 1564 edition, except that he added a paragraph from Pantaleon about the successful intervention of German and Swiss ambassadors on behalf of some of the prisoners. For other cases where Foxe cited both martyrologists, or gave no source at all, but accounts of the event exist by both Crespin and Pantaleon, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which Foxe used either author. Yet, while Foxe’s section on the German martyrs would have been dramatically reduced without the aid of Pantaleon’s text, Foxe’s account of the French martyrs by comparison would have been left largely intact.

Foxe’s table of Spanish martyrs contained one entry from Pantaleon. In contrast, essentially the entire table of Italian martyrs, apart from Francisco de Enzinas’s account of his escape from prison, comes from Pantaleon. Admittedly, Foxe cites both Pantaleon and Crespin for the martyrdom of Fannino Fanini, and it could have come from either. The account of Algieri Pomponio de Nola, including his letter, is translated from Pantaleon without attribution. For three accounts in this section, Foxe repeated both Pantaleon’s text and citation. For the remaining Italian accounts, Foxe cited Pantaleon alone.

Foxe’s relied on Pantaleon for information on the Italian martyrs was because most of this material was first printed in the *Martyrvm historia*. The accounts of Fanini and Cabianca, however, were first printed in Ludwig Rabus’s martyrology, and the account of the two
Augustinians came, according to Pantaleon’s attribution, which Foxe repeated, from Manlius’s *Locorvm communium collectanea.* Pantaleon stated that the account of Trezio came to him ‘ex Caelio’, that is from Celio Secondo Curione, an Italian humanist scholar who fled to Basle in 1542 and remained there until his death in 1569. Pantaleon’s accounts of Pascale and Bonello, as well as the persecution of Protestants in the kingdom of Naples, came from a letter of Simone Fiorillo, a preacher in Capua who, in 1552 when suspected of heresy, fled to Geneva and later led a Protestant congregation in Chiavenna. Pantaleon printed Fiorillo’s letter describing the persecution of these martyrs; this letter was written to Guglielmo Gratarolo, who taught medicine at the University of Basle alongside Pantaleon. Pantaleon also printed two other letters, the epistle of Algieri Pomponio and one describing the persecution in Calabria. Pantaleon did not cite his sources for these letters, but they almost certainly were obtained for him by Italian Protestants in Basle. The accounts of these non-British martyrs, from Pantaleon, Crespin and other authors, remained essentially unchanged in subsequent unabridged editions of the *Acts and monuments.*

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

Foxe was an indefatigable compiler of documents, but he was also an unsleeping editor. He customarily appropriated other sources, often changing them by making extensive additions to and deletions from the texts. For two reasons, however, Foxe did not need to alter material from Pantaleon as extensively as he did for other sources. First, this material came from a staunchly Protestant author who often pulled his material from other equally Protestant authors; the material came to Foxe effectively filtered several times for doctrinal impurities. Second, Foxe was primarily interested in demonstrating that martyrs existed in many regions, victims not simply of an individual magistrate or prince, but of Antichrist’s false church. For the martyrs outside Britain, numbers mattered more than details to Foxe and
sometimes he did abridge material, especially official documents and records, when translating from Pantaleon.116

Then again, sometimes an account so interested Foxe that he would print it at length. He seems, for example, to have greatly admired a Parisian tailor interrogated by Henry II and then executed for his faith. Foxe not only rendered the complete account of the martyrdom as it appeared in Pantaleon and Crespin, for he also added opening sentences extolling the tailor and – most unusually – criticising Crespin and others for not writing more about him: ‘Among many other godly martyrs that suffered in France, the story of this poore Taylour is not the least nor worst to be remembred. His name is not yet sought out in the French stories, for lacke of diligence in those writers: more is the pitie’.117

These didactic and hortatory impulses occasionally led Foxe to manipulate his accounts by juggling multiple sources for details that he wanted to disseminate but were not in his principal source. For instance, Foxe drew chiefly on Crespin for the martyrdom of Etienne Brun but for the sake of detail added Pantaleon’s praise of Brun’s ‘miraculous’ stoicism.118 As previously noted, Foxe printed Crespin’s account of the persecution that followed the discovery of the clandestine Protestant congregation in Paris, but he added Pantaleon’s account of Swiss and German intervention on behalf of their French co-religionists.119 In a few instances, Foxe cut material from his sources for purposes of moral instruction. Foxe related, for example, almost all of the account of Aymon de la Voye, which he found in Pantaleon and Crespin, but dropped passages in which de la Voye appeared hesitant or uncertain when interrogated.120 Overall and for the most part, though, Foxe made relatively few polemically motivated emendations to the material he took from Pantaleon and Crespin.

Analysing the intertextual relationships between Foxe and his fellow martyrrologists reveals Foxe’s desire to include Protestant martyrs from other countries and regions in his work. Despite the formidable linguistic difficulties, he had excerpts from Crespin’s Actes
des martyrs translated. Without Pantaleon’s martyrology, Foxe’s *Acts and monuments* would have been a record of Protestant martyrs in England, Scotland, and France, with scattered additions from the Low Countries and Spain. Foxe’s section on German martyrs would have been drastically reduced, his section on Italian martyrs virtually non-existent. Indeed, Foxe was able to use Pantaleon’s work as a ladder from which he could reach the texts of Rabus, Haemstede, and others.

Foxe’s use of Pantaleon’s *Martyrum historia* reveals an important dimension of Foxe’s ecclesiology and ideas of Church history. Notwithstanding the claim that Foxe inspired English nationalism, his personal vision was not of a national Church but of a universal Church, and his unflagging efforts were bent towards seeing that his compatriots could learn about, and draw inspiration from, their co-religionists of the True Church who lived and died on the European mainland.

Yet, without Pantaleon’s research, Foxe would not have been able to present English readers with the spectacle of their martyred co-religionists in the Low Countries, the Holy Roman Empire, and Italy. Other martyrrologists’ decision to publish their works in vernacular languages, instead of Latin, enabled Germans, Frenchmen, and so on to read the accounts of their heroes’ suffering, but their decision also had the potential to divide Protestant history among the different languages zones of its members. To a significant extent Pantaleon’s work prevented this balkanization from happening.

As a result, Protestants could look beyond the challenges they faced in a particular place and moment, and identify as a part of the True Church, which had members across the world in every age since the time of Christ. This fostered a sense of belonging to a universal brethren, persecuted by the False Church, which helped to maintain some unity despite diverse doctrines, languages, and allegiances among European magisterial Protestants. This common identity, provided by shared martyrs and the experience of shared persecution also helped to engender immediate and lasting hatred between Protestants and Catholics across
Europe. In remarkable ways, the martyrologies of Foxe and Pantaleon helped readers recognize both the local and the international dimensions of the Protestant cause against their adversaries before, during, and after the sixteenth century.

---
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