Introduction

As with many aspects of English Renaissance culture, modern ideas about the festive world of Shakespeare's England were to a certain extent manufactured by Shakespeare himself. Shakespeare's representation of the traditional pastimes inherited from the late medieval Catholic liturgical year and transformed at the Reformation did indeed partially reflect the realities of Elizabethan and Jacobean experience, as C. L. Barber's pioneering work of cultural criticism, *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy*, established long ago.[1] In suits brought by neighbors in provincial England over traditional pastimes, in the rhetoric surrounding the Book of Sports controversy, in records of ecclesiastical visitations and other documents of governmental and religious control, characters such as Malvolio, Bottom, Touchstone, and Autolycus seem to come to life, now with ordinary English names: Mrs. Ward, godly opponent of maypoles in Wells; John Court, recusant piper; Thomas Smyth, a Lancastrian churchwarden who "made the communyon cup to be a common drynkeing cup at his beare baytinge"; Robert Blindlosse, JP, accused in Star Chamber of being "a dissemblinge hypocrite" for doing accounts and meeting prostitutes after divine service, despite piously outlawing Sunday games.[2] In provincial practice, the maypoles, midsummer games, holiday dancing, Whitsuntide celebrations, bonfires and shows of the period were – as François Laroque has suggested – often secular activities that encouraged neighborliness and community good-will. They may not have ended, as Shakespeare's comedies often do, with weddings or a jig, but they served a similar function in resolving social tensions.[3] They

[1] C. L. Barber, *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy* (Princeton University Press, 1959).
[2] On the Wells May Games and Thomas Smyth, see James Stokes, ed., *Records of Early English Drama: Somerset* (University of Toronto Press, 1996), 261–367 and 164; on Court, see David George, ed., *Records of Early English Drama: Lancashire* (University of Toronto Press, 1991), 15–16; on Blindlosse, see Public Record Office (henceforward PRO): STAC 8/55/20, 3.
[3] François Laroque, *Shakespeare's Festive World*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Cambridge University Press, 1993).

were seemingly denounced only by a spoilsport or two who might well, like Malvolio, be attacked for being "a kind of Puritan" (2.3.140), whether they were or not.[4] Elizabethan and Jacobean political and ecclesiastical authorities, like the mostly benign despots of the comedies, tolerated and even embraced pastimes as long as they did not threaten social order.

The image of merry old England encouraged by Shakespeare's festive fictions is accurate in many ways, but it needs to be reconsidered in light of recent reassessments of the nature of reformation in early modern England. Barber's work was based on the assumption that ideological disputes over festivity were – like the Reformation itself – resolved after the early years of Elizabeth's reign. David Cressy has partially confirmed Barber's secularization argument in showing how the early modern state re-channeled festive energies from religious to patriotic purposes.[5] But that process of secularization was not quickly completed: neither the theological issues of the Reformation nor disagreements over the religious transgressiveness of traditional festive practices were entirely settled in Shakespeare's lifetime. Scholars may never reach consensus on whether reform in the sixteenth century was primarily accomplished by pressure from above or popular sentiment from below, but recent work has at least agreed that it was, in Christopher Haigh's words, "a long and complex process," marked by inconsistencies, retrenchments, local variability, and the human propensity to be maddeningly inconsistent in matters of faith and belief.[6] The work of Haigh and Eamon Duffy has demonstrated the vitality of late medieval Catholic culture and the reluctance with which that culture was in some cases given up, clearing the way for the task undertaken by more recent scholarship: tracing the continued intersections of Catholic and Reformed beliefs in Elizabethan and Jacobean culture.[7]

Festivity provides a particularly useful way to investigate those intersections, since traditional pastimes were from the beginning of the Reformation associated with religious controversy. The Edwardian

[4] J. M. Lothian and T. W. Craik, eds., *Twelfth Night* (London: Methuen, 1975).
[5] David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Jacobean England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
[6] Christopher Haigh, "The Recent Historiography of the English Reformation," in Haigh, ed., *The English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), 19–33, esp. 19. For recent overviews of both the history and the historiography of Catholic studies, see Michael A. Mullett, *Catholics in Britain and Ireland, 1558–1829* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998), 1–26, and Ethan Shagan, "Introduction: English Catholic History in Context," in Shagan, ed., *Catholics and the "Protestant Nation"* (Manchester University Press, 2005), 1–21.
[7] Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford University Press, 1993), and Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400–c.1580* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992).

reformers' attack on the ritual year was part of a larger effort to dismantle the entire structure of late medieval worship, including the worship of the saints. Despite the ongoing process of secularization and an overall pattern of decline, festivity continued to be religiously controversial throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods, as Ronald Hutton's *The Rise and Fall of Merry England* has shown.[8] Even in the later Tudor and early Stuart periods, in certain circumstances traditional pastimes retained their associations with Catholicism. Though reformers mostly succeeded in detaching these from church and worship, that achievement was not uniform throughout the country, nor was it definitively accomplished after the first decade of Elizabeth's reign. The overall success of efforts to secularize festivity should not mask the fact that traditional pastimes continued to have religious associations – positive and negative – in early modern England.

This book's goal, then, is to restore a sense of the devotional issues surrounding festivity to our understanding of its early modern cultural representations, and particularly to the festive world created in Shakespeare's plays. Specifically, it demonstrates how Shakespeare engages, confronts, and makes merry with those controversies in his representations of festivity, and it argues for the importance of the continued association between traditional pastimes and Catholic "superstition" in early modern culture and Shakespeare's plays. As can only be expected from a playwright of such infinite variety, the plays considered here do not present a unified argument on the topic of festivity and its relationship to the devotional divisions of the Reformation. Rather, they consider festivity through the imperatives suggested by the other aesthetic, theatrical, or ideological obsessions of these works. What emerges from these richly diverse plays is a dramatist who not only acknowledges the relationship between traditional pastimes, stage plays, and religious controversy, but who also aligns his own work, on aesthetic though not theological grounds, with festive energies identified with the old religion.

Given the current state of Shakespeare studies it is necessary to issue the immediate caveat that this book makes no claims about Shakespeare's personal religious convictions. It does not speculate about the playwright's counter Reformation activities during his "lost years," nor mine the plays for coded assertions of Romanist sentiments.[9] As Robert S. Miola has

[8] Ronald Hutton, *The Rise and Fall of Merry England: The Ritual Year* (Oxford University Press, 1994).
[9] The title of Claire Asquith's recent book suggests its methodology: *Shadowplay: The Hidden Beliefs and Coded Politics of William Shakespeare* (New York: Publicaffairs Books, 2006). Recent scholarly

written, though Catholicism "functions as a potent fund of myth, ritual and concern" in Shakespeare's plays, allusions to the old religion "do not amount to a manifesto of the playwright's personal belief."[10] Recent scholarly assertions of the secret Catholicism of a playwright who clearly conformed to Protestantism have, if anything, tended to discredit subtle and important work in the field of early modern Catholic studies by Alison Shell, Arthur Marotti, Frances E. Dolan, Anthony Milton, Michael Questier, Alexandra Walsham, and others. Such scholarship has rendered largely meaningless the question now ubiquitous among non-Shakespeareans – "Was Shakespeare Catholic?" – by providing a new model of devotional identity that rejects the sharp devotional categorization that question assumes. For example, Milton's work has demonstrated the close relationship and mutual influence of Catholic and Reformed theology in the early seventeenth century. Questier, in many important articles but especially in *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580–1624*, has shown the broad appeal of Catholicism to potential converts, especially in the late Elizabethan and early Jacobean periods, a fact the virulent anti-popery of the culture has tended to mask. Marotti has revealed the importance of anti-Catholic discourse to the "cultural fantasies" of English culture, while Dolan has exposed the gendered nature of those fantasies; Shell has shown both the richness of English Catholic literary achievement and also the centrality of Catholic authors to literary developments in the mainstream, Protestant canon. And Walsham, ever since her 1993 *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* expanded the definition of Catholics and enlarged the field of study beyond a small group of recusants and exiles, has continued to demonstrate complexities of the English Catholic community itself, and of that community's relationship to the English ecclesiastical establishment.[11] As this

books that also argue for Shakespeare's secret Catholicism include Richard Wilson, *Secret Shakespeare: Studies in Theatre, Religion and Resistance* (Manchester University Press, 2004), and Peter Milward, *Shakespeare the Papist* (Ann Arbor, MI: Sapientia Classics, 2005). Stephen Greenblatt's *Will in the World* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2004) provides a subtle discussion of the indeterminable nature of John Shakespeare's devotional identity (102–3), though it has also lent support to the possible but unprovable assertion that Shakespeare spent his lost years among Jesuits in Lancashire, a theory proposed by E. A. J. Honigmann, in *Shakespeare: The Lost Years* (Totowa, NY: Barnes & Noble Books, 1985).

[10] Robert S. Miola, "'An Alien People Clutching Their Gods'?: Shakespeare's Ancient Religions," *Shakespeare Survey* 54 (2001): 31–45, esp. 45.

[11] Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge University Press, 1995); Michael Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580–1624* (Cambridge University Press, 1996); Arthur Marotti, *Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005); Frances E. Dolan, *Whores of*

partial overview suggests, recent scholarship has shown the continued vitality of Catholicism to early modern intellectual, literary, political, social, and religious culture. The topic of festivity provides a way to explore both Catholic culture and the intersection between Catholicism and Protestantism, since changes in festive practices in the sixteenth century were part of the Protestant ideological break with the Roman Church, and since such activities continued to have a devotional charge in certain contexts.

Historians of festivity have disagreed about the extent to which religion was a factor in the decline of traditional pastimes over the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods – a decline that was, it is important to note, unimpeded by festivity's continued and indeed increasing celebration in nostalgic literature. David Underdown, for example, has argued that social organization and religious ideology together explain the decline, basing his analysis on evidence that festivities were more apt to survive in the traditionally structured farming areas of Wiltshire, Somerset, and Dorset, and more subject to decline in cloth-producing areas in those counties more heavily populated by Puritans.[12] Those claims have been challenged by Martin Ingram, who has suggested, based largely on an extensive analysis of church court records, that the decline of pastimes in Wiltshire was linked to village size rather than social organization, and due partly to changes in church financial operations that "owed little or nothing to puritan ideology." Ingram pointed out that whatever the specific factors in festivity's decline, there was "a considerable *variety* of opinion . . . about the beneficence or otherwise of sports and games," and that for authorities in many places, "the principle of leaving well alone in fact represented the majority opinion."[13] In the most extensive study of festivity to date, Hutton acknowledges the importance of economic, social, and political factors in skirmishes over traditional pastimes suggested by both Underdown and Ingram, but his work also demonstrates the "paramount importance of evangelical Protestantism" in the decline

Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth Century Print Culture (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999); Alison Shell, *Catholicism, Controversy and the English Literary Imagination, 1558–1660* (Cambridge University Press, 1999); Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993).

[12] David Underdown, *Revel, Riot and Rebellion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 73–105; see also Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), 92–9.

[13] Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), 101, 103, 104; see also Hutton, *Rise and Fall*, 161–3. For corroboration of festivity's multiple social meanings, see Barbara Palmer, "'Anye Disguised Persons': Parish Entertainment in West Yorkshire," in Alexandra F. Johnston and Wim Husken, eds., *English Parish Drama* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996), 81–94.

of traditional pastimes, despite the frequent influence of other factors.[14] Neither the often undefined and contradictory attitudes of Elizabeth and James I toward festivity, nor abortive Parliamentary and ecclesiastical efforts of control, nor social or financial changes in parish life can adequately explain the consistent diminishment of traditional pastimes Hutton found in his exhaustive study of the records, including all extant churchwarden's accounts from the period. Hutton concluded that "religion was the most potent source of attitudes to traditional festivity" in the Elizabethan period, though "social anxieties" were also prominent.[15] Though the Book of Sports controversy and the later rise of Laudian ceremonialism were to alter the nature of debates over festivity, religion was an equally if not even more important element in the Stuart era for both festivity's supporters and detractors.[16]

The present book does not propose a new theory for the decline of festivity against the work of these historians. Rather, it attempts to consider the ramifications of the importance of religious factors in disagreements over traditional pastimes for our understanding of literary and dramatic representations of festivity, especially those in Shakespeare's plays. Though it focuses on the importance of Catholicism to these disputes, this is partly because the role of evangelical Protestantism in this process has already been thoroughly discussed by both historians and literary scholars. The book does not claim that a conceptual relationship between pastimes and popery was the only, or even always the most influential, reason for the support of traditional festive practices. It would be absurd as well as humorless to maintain that everyone who participated in May games, Whitsuntide celebrations, and midsummer revelry – to say nothing of bear-baitings and ale-house libeling – were driven by religious fervor, and not even all those who attacked such activities were so motivated, though that was more often the case. Instead, the book provides a qualitative analysis of the continuing association between festivity and religious ideology in both lived practice and textual representation, exploring particularly the role of Catholics and Catholicism in the ongoing festive culture of early modern England. In this, it seeks to contribute to our understanding of the post-Reformation Catholic recusant experience, to join with recent scholarship that has explored the intersections of Catholic and Protestant culture in early modern England, and to reconsider received notions about festivity and secularization in Shakespeare's plays.

[14] Hutton, *Rise and Fall*, 143. [15] Hutton, *Rise and Fall*, 146.
[16] For a further discussion of the Book of Sports, see below, Chapters 1 and 5.

In part, the book's emphasis on the relationship of religion and festivity should be seen as a corrective to the very different orientation of important recent literary scholarship on this topic, most of which has stressed the political and social meanings of early modern festivity.[17] For example, in *The Politics of Mirth*, Leah Marcus argues that both James and his son Charles I encouraged regional festivity as part of a conscious project to deploy royal power through the countryside. Marcus suggests that festive misrule encouraged by the Book of Sports, the proclamation relaxing certain regulations concerning Sunday sports first issued by James in 1618 and revived by Charles twelve years later, paradoxically re-inscribed monarchical power, so that "the license and lawlessness associated with the customs could be interpreted as submission to authority." This "interesting experiment" in "open social engineering" allowed the early Stuart monarchs to extend their royal power into the countryside, where festive customs reiterated the royal power they symbolically represented.[18] Though *The Politics of Mirth* certainly acknowledges both the Book of Sport's original Jacobean context in regional religious disputes and the importance of Laudian ceremonialism to festive practices in the 1630s, festivity is identified throughout Marcus's study with Stuart royalism. But if festivity is seen instead in the broader context of the Reformation, then the role played in its control by the monarchy, though important, emerges as only one of many factors determining the survival and decline of holiday pastimes. Further, without denying the importance of Ben Jonson, Robert Herrick, Richard Lovelace, Andrew Marvell, and John Milton to the topic, the identification between festivity and royalism – clear enough in the work of those particular writers, who as Marcus shows often themselves register ambivalence toward royal appropriations of festivity – is not corroborated when a wider range of cultural evidence is considered, including representations of festivity in popular, legal, moral, and dramatic texts. By re-examining festivity in the context of the ongoing religious controversies reflected in a broader array of contemporary cultural documents,

[17] An important work among political and social investigations of festivity is Naomi Conn Liebler's *Shakespeare's Festive Tragedy: The Ritual Foundations of Genre* (New York: Routledge, 1995). The scholar who has most throughly explored the relationship between calendrical pastimes and religion is Alison Chapman, whose work on calendrical reform, more specifically engaged in the chapters below, includes "Whose Saint Crispin's Day Is It? Shoemaking, Holiday Making, and the Politics of Memory in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001): 1467–94; "The Politics of Time in Edmund Spenser's English Calendar," *Studies in English Literature* 42:1 (2002): 1–24; and "Now and Then: Sequencing the Sacred in Two Protestant Calenders," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33:1 (2003): 91–123.

[18] Leah Marcus, *The Politics of Mirth* (University of Chicago Press, 1986), 3, 2, 17.

the present book challenges the argument that Stuart festivity is inherently royalist, and suggests the equal importance of religious controversy to politics both in those activities and in their literary re-inscriptions.

Michael Bristol is another scholar whose work has stressed the political and social dimensions of festivity. Over the past twenty years Bristol has explored the functions of "carnival" in early modern texts, working with a theoretical framework provided by Mikhail Bakhtin.[19] While this Bakhtinian approach has illuminated many aspects of the political and social functions of early modern festivity, it has also, like *The Politics of Mirth*, under-emphasized festivity's continuing religious associations. The result has been the critical reproduction of erroneous assumptions about early modern festivity and religion, some of which Bristol shares with an equally influential scholar in the field, François Laroque, whose work is similarly foundational for the present study. So, for example, Bristol has recently written in *Blackwell's Companion to Renaissance Drama* that, in early modern England,

> parish churches were . . . important centers for a range of significant cultural activities that included not only baptisms, weddings, and funerals, but also festive celebrations in the form of church ales (the selling of ale and other goods), which were a customary way for the parish to raise funds for various local needs.[20]

But these assertions do not accurately describe the Elizabethan church's attitude toward ales and wakes. Indeed, the contrary conclusion must be drawn from the fact that church ales were in a pattern of sharp decline

[19] Particularly important to the present work have been the essays "Shamelessness in Arden: Early Modern Theater and the Obsolescence of Popular Theatricality," in Michael D. Bristol and Arthur Marotti, eds., *Print, Manuscript, Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2004), 279–306; "The Festive Agon: The Politics of Carnival," in R. S. White, ed., *Twelfth Night* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 72–81; and "In Search of the Bear: Spatiotemporal Form and the Heterogeneity of Economies in *The Winter's Tale*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42:2 (1991), 145–67. See also *Carnival and Theater: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England* (New York: Methuen, 1985); "Lenten Butchery: Legitimation Crisis in *Coriolanus*," in Jean E. Howard and Marion F. O'Connor, eds., *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology* (New York: Methuen, 1987), 207–24; "Charivari and the Comedy of Abjection in *Othello*," in Linda Woodbridge and Edward Berry, eds., *True Rites and Maimed Rites: Ritual and Anti-Ritual in Shakespeare and His Age* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992), 75–97; and "'Funeral Bak'd Meats': Carnival and the Carnivalesque in *Hamlet*," in Susan Zimmerman, ed., *Shakespeare's Tragedies* (New York: St. Martin's, 1998) 237–54.

[20] Michael Bristol, "Everyday Custom and Popular Culture," in Arthur F. Kinney, ed., *A Companion to Renaissance Drama* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), 121–34, esp. 125. Bristol cites Laroque, who claims in *Shakespeare's Festive World* that in Elizabethan England church ales and wakes were "both officially encouraged by the Church" (159).

over the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods. Though frequent at the end of Henry Vlll's reign, they were all but obliterated by the end of the Edwardian era.[21] Like other celebratory customs associated with the late medieval Catholic liturgical calendar, church ales were revived in the Marian period, continued in the first decade of Elizabeth's reign, and then underwent the same pattern of decline that characterized festive celebrations more generally. By the end of the century they were, according to Hutton's analysis of the data, "confined to the West Country and to the valleys of the Thames and its tributaries."[22] Since the main thrust of Reformation efforts to control festivity was to detach mirth from worship, the claim that the church encouraged these activities is particularly misleading, as it obscures the religious tensions that continued to surround such practices. Bristol's analysis of how festivity expressed and adjudicated political and social conflicts has illuminated many aspects of the topic, and the present study is particularly indebted to his work, but that focus has also led to a distorted understanding of festivity's meaning in both early modern England and Shakespeare's plays, one widely promulgated in the critical literature.

The present work seeks, then, to add another dimension to our understanding of festivity to complement the work of Bristol, Marcus, and other literary scholars.[23] Because it is particularly interested in the relationship, real and conceptual, between Catholicism and festivity, the book participates in recent developments in the historiography of early modern English Catholicism. Specifically, it attempts, in concert with other scholars working in the field, to move beyond what Walsham has called the "now nearly stagnant debate about the relative roles played by survivialism and seminarism, continuity and missionary conversion."[24] That debate was inaugurated by the publication of *The English Catholic Community* in 1975, in which John Bossy argued that early modern Catholicism should be conceptualized not as an atrophied version of late medieval practice, but rather as the creation of the missionary movement that brought pious Tridentine values to gentry households, beginning in

[21] See Hutton, *Rise and Fall*, 87, who notes that there are only three church ales mentioned in the entire country in surviving accounts from 1557–9.
[22] Hutton, *Rise and Fall*, 87, 119.
[23] For another important literary analysis of the relationship between festivity and politics, see Peter Stallybrass, "'Wee Feaste in Our Defense': Patrician Carnival in Early Modern England and Robert Herrick's *Hesperides*," *English Literary Renaissance* 16 (1986): 234–52.
[24] Alexandra Walsham, "Translating Trent? English Catholicism and the Counter Reformation," *Historical Research* 78 (2005): 288–310, esp. 310.

the 1580s.[25] *The English Catholic Community* provides a reconstruction of the world of "seigneurial" Catholicism to which the present study is indebted, but its focus on the gentry leaves out important aspects of the English Catholic experience, as Christopher Haigh's critique showed. Evidence from public records (as opposed to the mostly private records surviving from the gentry and the mission) suggest the equal (or in Haigh's view at the time, more important) survival of pre-Reformation (and Marian) Catholicism in the culture of this minority community. Haigh's subsequent work on Elizabethan Lancashire provided a very different view of the English Catholic community than Bossy's by demonstrating the continuing importance of surviving Catholic customs in rural England.[26]

Moving past the binary proposed in the survivalism/seminarianism debate, recent scholarship has begun to see English Catholicism as defined by complex interplays between the traditions of the late medieval past and the post-Tridentine present, between local English tradition and foreign (and particularly Roman) influences, and between the religious practices of elite and poorer Catholics. Post-Reformation Catholics are emerging from this work as a group characterized by diversity and dynamic change. As families and individuals grappled in various creative (or destructive) ways with the difficulty of obtaining pastoral care, and depending on the exigencies created by particular local and economic conditions, English Catholics adapted, innovated, and changed the practice of their faith.[27] There were important regional variations in the practice of recusancy, since the public expression of religious conservatism was more likely in areas of Lancashire and Yorkshire where recusants still approached a majority than in staunchly Protestant counties. The task of

[25] John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community, 1570–1850* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1975).

[26] See Christopher Haigh's review of *The English Catholic Community*, in "The Fall of a Church or the Rise of a Sect? Post-Reformation Catholicism in England," *Historical Journal* 21 (1978): 181–6; these ideas are further elaborated in "The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation," in Haigh, ed., *English Reformation Revised* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), 176–208. See also Haigh, *Reformation and Resistance in Tudor Lancashire* (Cambridge University Press, 1975).

[27] Haigh and Bossy have themselves developed scholarship beyond this stalemate; see for example Haigh's review of recent books that analyze "Catholic strategies of evasion and co-existence" (483), in "Catholicism in Early Modern England: Bossy and Beyond," *Historical Journal* 452 (2002): 481–94. Examples of recent studies of such Catholic strategies of adaptation include Lisa McLain, *Lest We Be Damned: Practical Innovation and Lived Experience among Catholics in Protestant England, 1559–1642* (New York: Routledge, 2003), and Anne Dillon, "Praying by Number: The Confraternity of the Rosary and the English Catholic Community, c. 1580–1700," *History* 88 (2003): 451–71.