

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)

CHAPTER I

1538 and after: the Virgin Mary in the century of iconoclasm

Here is confounded and overthrown the foolish opinion of the papists, which would have us to worship a creature before the Creator; Mary before her Son. These wise men do not so; they worship not Mary; and wherefore? Because God only is to be worshipped: but Mary is not God.¹

In 1538, in the late summer or autumn, in Chelsea or Smithfield or Tyburn, we can surmise – from both casual remarks recorded at the time and various histories and memoirs some years later – that one or more fires was lit and in it (or them) were burned statues, “images,” of the Virgin Mary, most probably those that had been brought from shrines dedicated to her at Doncaster, Ipswich, Penrhys, and Walsingham.² Local records suggest that similar images from Caversham, along with roods from Bermondsey, Boxley, Islington, and others were added to this, or similar, fires elsewhere. In 1537, the reformist bishop Hugh Latimer had announced that in his own diocese there reigned “idolatry, and many kinds of superstition,” and during what Helen Parish terms 1538’s “long summer of iconoclasm,” he also named the statue of the Virgin at Worcester a “devil’s instrument.” He gloated that the statue, along with “her old sister of Walsingham, her young sister of Ipswich,” and statues from Doncaster and Penrhys, “would make a jolly muster” and, he added for good measure, unlike flesh-and-blood heretics, would not “be all day in burning.” There are conflicting accounts on the date or dates on which such a “jolly muster” took place, and exactly when and what “idols” were destroyed, whether publicly or privately, but, Latimer pronounced, they were destroyed because they had “been the instrument to bring many (I fear) to eternal fire.”³

¹ Latimer, *Sermons* II, 153. ² Parish, *Monks, Miracles and Magic*, 81.

³ Frere, *Visitation Articles*, II, 12; Latimer, *Sermons*, II, 395. G. W. Bernard notes that the Ipswich and Walsingham images were reputedly “mustered” in July, Caversham’s in September: *Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church*, 455. For Our Lady of Penrhys being “mustered” in September, see Chidgey, *Our Lady of Penrhys*, 10–11.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)

A series of invented traditions, differing according to whose records or reminiscences are followed and one's attitude toward the Reformation, have grown up over the centuries, to celebrate, denounce, or simply describe these acts. In 2008, nearly five hundred years later, an act of reconciliation or reparation for the burnings was planned, and the spot chosen was as ambiguous as the early records, "close to" the site of Chelsea Manor, once the home of Sir Thomas More, which, it was pointed out, had been given that same year of 1538 to Thomas Cromwell. The announcement came from the pointedly named Art and Reconciliation Trust, thus inviting both aesthetic and religious support. The site chosen for the new statue incorporated references to both Cromwell, the chief persecutor, and More, a most determined defender, of the Virgin's honor and much else of traditional religion, in the 1530s: "it was," said the announcement, "to Chelsea Manor that the Image of Our Lady of Walsingham was taken and burnt along with her other 'sisters'."⁴

The ambiguities surrounding the place and timing of the fires, and the number and identities of the victims, have been sufficient over the centuries to generate wish-fulfillment fantasies on behalf of some of the "images" that were destroyed, especially those of Our Lady of Ipswich and Our Lady of Walsingham. There are nostalgic sentiments, frequently expressed on guided tours, in booklets, websites, and even in relatively sober histories, that somehow they were mysteriously saved from the fire and smuggled away to places of safety, thereby to continue their work of (depending on one's viewpoint) miracle or idolatry. In the case of the Ipswich Virgin, Our Lady of Grace, it is possible that a medieval statue in the Italian town of Nettuno is of English origin. Stories of its miraculous arrival around 1550 have given devotees the hope that the Ipswich madonna escaped the fire. In the 1930s, there was even speculation that the Nettuno statue was the much-revered Walsingham image, and not a few accounts of Walsingham cherish the alternative, even more unlikely, possibility that somewhere, perhaps in the Norfolk village of Little Walsingham itself, waiting to reappear at some time during the triumphal revival of the shrine of the Virgin in the twentieth century, is the image that Erasmus called, as if disappointed by its appearance as opposed to its reputed miraculous powers and the opulence of its tributes and gifts of gold and jewels, "*Ostenditur imaginula, nec magnitudine, nec materia nec opere praezellens*," cheap looking, not impressive, and not well constructed.⁵

⁴ www.artandreconciliation.org/1000projects.htm.

⁵ Smith, *The Madonna of Ipswich*; Erasmus, *Pilgrimage of Pure Devotion*, 29. Except where noted, I quote from this first (?1536–7) English translation of Erasmus's *Peregrinatio Religionis Ergo*.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)*1538 and after*

3

These initial stories of event and legend, violence and nostalgia, expectation and mystery, with missing details and many variations and contradictions, provide an apt initial metaphor for this study of the Virgin Mary in English culture from the late Middle Ages until the mid seventeenth century, by which time the waves of iconoclasm had, at least on the surface of English life, died down. Rather ambiguously we have come to term this period “early modern,” but it might as easily be called “late medieval,” since its fades and traces were seen and felt long after the so-called Middle Ages were supposedly over. The burnings of Marian idols in 1538, in the middle of the process in the late 1530s by which the religious foundations, including many centers of Marian devotion in England, were shut down and most destroyed or wrecked, is my fulcrum. I move forward and back from that date, which is both historically important but more, of great symbolic significance. Reformation iconoclasm in England was, of course, not solely directed at the Virgin, but at certain times and with certain people, she became become an intense, even obsessive, focus of iconoclastic denigration and destruction.

In this study, I shall draw on the many closely documented historical studies of these events but I also attempt to ask about motive and desire, feelings and fantasies – matters that are not easily available to empirical verification, and overlap uneasily with conventional history and are more the province of psychoanalysis or theology. In what sense, for example, did the events of 1538, not only in Chelsea (or Smithfield or Tyburn) but across the country, mark the end of an era – not just in material terms but in men’s and women’s emotional allegiances and their deeply rooted, even unconscious, patterns of behavior? Why did the Virgin become a target of unusual Protestant violence in England in this decade and for the next century? To what extent did feelings about the Virgin disappear? Did the reformers, in their attempt to “control” Mary’s role in salvation, end by banishing or tragically diminishing “maternal feminine symbolism” by their “commitment to an unambiguously patriarchal Father God,” as the contemporary Catholic theologian Tina Beattie claims.⁶ After the Walsingham “idol” had been burnt, Roger Townshend, one of Thomas Cromwell’s Norfolk agents, wrote to him: “I cannot perceive butt the seyd Image is not yet out of sum of their heddes.” To what extent did the image and all it stood for get out “of their heddes”? As Margaret Aston poses the question, “how are we to account for what seems like a transformation” of a society of “image-worshippers” into “image-breakers” and

⁶ Beattie, “Queen of Heaven,” 205.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)

“image-haters?”⁷ Why did the reformers become so insistent on removing the presence of the Virgin from people’s minds? To what extent were they successful? And what happened to the memory of Marian centers such as Ipswich, Penrhys, and (greatest of all) Walsingham, and (in a sense) to the Virgin herself, after the Dissolution of the late 1530s and the great fires of 1538?

“Iconoclasm was the central sacrament of the reform,” states Eamon Duffy. It is an assertion that is more provocative than strictly accurate, especially in its dismissive use of the term “sacrament” in association with the Anglican Church, but many historians have persuasively presented iconoclastic extremism as a defining factor in the English Reformation.⁸ The long struggle over “images” had broad and deep connections with the transformation of English society and the ideologies of selfhood, identity, gender, and sexuality that governed, or as Louis Althusser puts it, “interpellated,” men and women into the grand narratives of their culture.⁹ Today, some may say the picture of the world advanced by the reformers was maybe no less false, the idolatry of the Word no less pernicious than the idolatry of the Image. Yet Aston confesses that while she believes that historians are “not supposed to take sides,” she finds it hard to “sympathize with the reformers’ zeal for destruction . . . Doing without images is one thing, annihilating them another. Destruction may be exhilarating, but it has an eventual fall-out which is the opposite of life-enhancing.”¹⁰ My sympathies are similar but, nevertheless, from the 1520s onward a vociferous minority of English men and women did feel liberated by the revolutionary nature of Protestantism and its creation of a new sense of selfhood. Their enthusiasm and persistence (along with what Shakespeare termed in his Sonnet 115 the “million’d accidents” of history) intensified the pace of reform, animated the surges of iconoclasm of the next century, and eventually contributed to the Enlightenment project of a rational, autonomous, coherent self – a self, Beattie argues, that increasingly becomes “male through and through” in part because the Virgin “had been eradicated from Protestant consciousness.”¹¹

That claim (and the many qualifications to it I will gradually present) introduces a major focus of this study. Julia Kristeva calls the Virgin a “combination of power and sorrow, sovereignty and the unnameable,” making up “one of the most powerful imaginary constructs known in the

⁷ Gillett, *Walsingham*, 65–6; Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 29.

⁸ Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 480. ⁹ Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy*, 174.

¹⁰ Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 116–17. ¹¹ Beattie, *New Catholic Feminism*, 127; *Eve’s Pilgrimage*, 138.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)

1538 and after

5

history of civilization.”¹² It is Kristeva’s “unnameable” by which I am primarily fascinated, both in relation to the Virgin herself (insofar as we can speak of “her” as dissociated from any construct of her), and in relation to the reactions of attraction and repulsion to the Virgin in early modern England. The force of that “unnameable” may at times be explicit, but more likely has to be inferred, forcing us to search for the non-saids and the unsayables as well as the saids, probing silences (what was not said) and the absences (what was not able to be said) of recorded events, records, and literary and other “cultural” texts.

I shall have more to say as I proceed on the difficulties of how we might go beyond what Sir Philip Sidney (not entirely fairly) calls historians being “captivated to the truth of a foolish world” and thereby tied down to the evidence of “old mouse-eaten records.”¹³ I will be looking at many of the same records as well as drawing on many interpretations of them. But I will be looking at them with an unashamed, though (I hope) “lightly worn,” presentist perspective.¹⁴ I do not believe that the past can speak on its “own” terms, but only through and ultimately for the ever-changing present. To make my case, I draw on an eclectic selection of contemporary perspectives: cultural psychoanalytic scholars such as Kristeva herself, feminist theologians such as Tina Beattie, and sociologists of popular religion such as Michael Carroll. Beattie speaks of how we might “detour” or (as she quotes Luce Irigaray) “sidle” up to different struggles toward truth, discovering questions and issues from a variety of sources without committing to their overriding narratives.¹⁵ I feel it is an apt metaphor. Naming the unnameable is not the easiest of human callings, and we may (perhaps must) inevitably fail; but it may be among the most important tasks we give ourselves (or have given to us) as human beings. Discussions of methodological “sidlings” will recur throughout this study, though usually with at least some warning. At one point in his study of Irish wells and pilgrimages, Carroll warns that “readers who like their history devoid of psychology, and in particular, readers for whom a good cigar is – under all circumstances and all conditions – never anything more than a good cigar may or may not wish to continue.”¹⁶ I will try to give equivalent warnings, most especially in Chapter 2 when I speculate about the underlying sexual contradictions of late medieval and Reformation idealizations and denigrations of the Virgin,

¹² Kristeva, *Tales of Love*, 237. ¹³ Sidney, *Apology*, III, 113.

¹⁴ I am grateful to Peter G. Platt for this phrase in his generous review of my *All's Well That Ends Well: New Critical Essays*, 495.

¹⁵ Irigaray, *Speculum*, 36; Beattie, *New Catholic Feminism*, 10. ¹⁶ Carroll, *Irish Pilgrimage*, 166.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)

or in the final chapter when I return to speculate, perhaps with a certain amount of wistfulness, about the continuing power of the Virgin in our culture. In some cases, what needs to be said can only be expressed through modern discourses, especially in such areas of intimacy and controversy as the Virgin's sexuality.

For the moment, however, as all readers of early modern culture must, I want to rely (and with deep gratitude) on the modern descendants of Sidney's historians to describe something of what was destroyed or obscured by what Duffy calls "generations of subsequent iconoclasm, first religiously and then aesthetically driven."¹⁷ No other European country went through such a sustained period of struggle over images, representation, and the relationship of the material to the spiritual as England. The bonfires of 1538 were followed by a century of iconoclasm, consisting of both surges of destruction and a continuing undercurrent of state-encouraged iconophobia. It was by no means all directed exclusively at the Virgin, but because of her place in Catholic theology, liturgy, and devotion, she was given an unusual degree of hostile attention. The early reformers attacked, sometimes systematically and sometimes seemingly randomly, what they saw as superstitious practices, proofs that the medieval church had degenerated into a deceptive morass of idolatry and blasphemy, putting millions of souls over hundreds of years in jeopardy. At the core of their attacks was the belief that the sign and the signified should be kept separate, that the material world could not contain divinity, and they rejected and feared any suggestion that human instrumentality, the manipulation of objects of the material world – whether the bread of the Mass or images and relics – could influence or control the supernatural and give material things such as bread and wine "a life of their own."¹⁸ The reformers' targets included not only unscriptural beliefs and devotional practices, but also many interconnected aspects of medieval religion, including papal authority, transubstantiation, the doctrine of works, along with the communion of the living and dead (and therefore the doctrine of Purgatory, a fond thing vainly invented, as Article 22 of the Church of England puts it). Key to their attack on sacramentality was a rejection of transubstantiation: the Mass was ridiculed as the ultimate foolishness and idolatry.¹⁹ Near the center of their targets was the intercession of the saints, especially the power of Mary, who held the "special and leading place" within what Carlos Eire terms the "paralythetism" of medieval Christianity. And it was, as I will discuss in

¹⁷ Duffy, *Fires of Faith*, 3. ¹⁸ Janes, *Victorian Reformation*, 15–16.

¹⁹ Schwartz, *Sacramental Poetics*, 29–33.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)*1538 and after*

7

Chapter 2, specifically the material, bodily nature of the Virgin that was intensely at issue. As Lyndal Roper states, the body of the Virgin was a “litmus test of the separation of the divine and the human” for Catholics and Protestants and what became their “radically different theologies of the body.”²⁰

All sides in the Reformation struggles agreed that deep and mysterious powers had been attributed to the Virgin and to relics and places especially associated with her. For Catholics such attributions were, with the exception of some marginal and pardonable exaggerations and a little corruption, truthful and reflected God’s purposes; for Protestants such claims were false and demonic, slippages into paganism and evidence of the irredeemable corruption of the Roman Church. Reformers generally acknowledged Mary as God’s chosen instrument, but rejected what Latimer saw as the “foolish opinion and the doctrine of the papists, which would have us to worship a creature before the Creator.” The continental reformer Melanchthon regretted that “in popular estimation the blessed Virgin has completely replaced Christ”; Bishop John Jewel referred to the blasphemy of regarding Mary as “our lady and goddess”; William Perkins attacked the view of Mary as “a Ladie, a goddesse, a queene whom Christ her sonne obeyeth in heaven, a mediatresse, our life, hope, the medicine of the diseased”; it is, he thunders, a blasphemy that “they pray unto her thus.”²¹ The degree of hostility toward Mary varied greatly across Reformation Europe, in both time and place, with Lutherans more amenable to modifying rather than radically reducing her role, but a not uncommon note in Reformed polemic was that under papist superstition – in the words of the Puritan polemicist William Crashaw, who, along with his son Richard, will be mentioned frequently in this book – “the paps of a woman” were blasphemously “equaled with the wounds of our Lord, and her milke with his blood,” even though “the holy scriptures speak no more of her, but as a creature,” and, in a significant slur, as merely “a woman.”²²

Getting it “out of . . . their heddes” took a long time. More drastic and immediate measures than polemic and exhortation were used, not just for the destruction of the idols themselves, but also for the bodily elimination of opponents. Eventually, what Christine Peters, quietly understating the process, terms an “adaptation” or “reshaping” of the Virgin’s significance

²⁰ Eire, *War Against the Idols*, 12–13; Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 178, 184.

²¹ Heal, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary*, 53; Johnson, “Mary in Early Modern Europe,” 364; Perkins, *Works*, 340.

²² Crashaw, *Jesuites Gospell*, 32.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)

occurred.²³ Perhaps, as many Catholics (then and now) would maintain, both the virulence of the attempts to ensure forgetfulness and the length of time it took reflected the depth of attachment England had to the Virgin. But over the course of the next century, the Protestant cultural revolution was sufficiently successful that by the 1620s and 1630s, even moderate Protestants would feel uneasy about Archbishop Laud's imposition of what they saw as papist ceremonies and practices, not necessarily because they were a return to old ways, but because by then they were being seen as innovations. Even so "catholic" an intellectual as John Donne – who, it is surmised, kept a painting of the Virgin in his study – could preach in 1622 that by then, God had been "a hundred years" in his "repairing" of the Church, and had ordered "not a faint discontinuing of idolatry, but . . . utter destruction," and not just mentally or spiritually, but "the utter destruction of the very place, not a seising of the riches of the place, but the place it self."²⁴

What lay behind the reformers' uneasiness about the place of the Virgin was not an upsurge of entirely new views. As Beattie comments, they believed indignantly that "the ancient goddesses and their female devotees still whisper[ed] and beckon[ed] in the cult of Mary," and saw their attacks as a return to the principles of the early Church. Concerns had often surfaced about excesses of popular devotion, false relics, and exaggerated claims of miracles associated with Mary, especially during the rise of what Erasmus, typically tongue-in-cheek, termed "thys new learnynge, whiche runnythe all the world over nowadays."²⁵ I will refer in Chapter 3 to Marian miracle stories, one of the most popular forms of creative non-fiction (or often purely fiction) in Christian history; one of Cromwell's agents, Richard Layton, wrote to him that he would send him "a book of Our Lady's miracles well able to match the *Canterbury Tales*," and his sneer reflects a dismissal of anything in excess of what could be verified and proven and which relied on tradition, or false imaginings, rather than being scripturally based. But as the English Reformation proceeded, in its zigzags, fits and starts, and eddyings (all currently favorite metaphors of modern historians), both within the factions that battled in the 1530s and 1540s and for the next century, there was no question, as Michael O'Connell comments, of merely "checking abuses and reforming excesses." The zeal of the reformers in the 1530s and 1540s was "directed against the entire system of worship and devotion."²⁶

²³ Peters, *Patterns of Piety*, 208, 223. ²⁴ Donne, *Sermons*, v, 132–3.

²⁵ Beattie, *Eve's Pilgrimage*, 70; Erasmus, *Pilgrimages*, 19.

²⁶ O'Connell, *Idolatrous Eye*, II, 50. For Layton's *Canterbury Tales* comparison, see Cook, *Letters to Cromwell*, 38.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)*1538 and after*

9

Cromwell's agents, who were responsible for gathering up the superstitious images that were burned in the summer (or autumn) of 1538, saw exposing false miracles and destroying feigned relics not only as part of the elimination of the religious houses, with the financial advantages that would bring the Crown, but also as the means to achieve much more deeply rooted changes. The reformers perceived the necessity of wholesale cultural revolution and (if possible) the rooting out not just the "structures," but the "feelings" attached to them, to use Raymond Williams's distinction.²⁷ Their goal was to destroy the images and idols within people's minds. Getting it out of their heads, not just destroying buildings and sending tens of thousands of monks and nuns out into the community, was therefore crucial to the revolution. But the "fantassie of idolatrie" might be so deeply rooted, the reformers feared, that "idolatrie will neaver be left till the said images be taken awaie." Cromwell instructed his agents to remove popular "idols" as discreetly as possible but to highlight what could be presented as obvious fakes, the "certain engines and old wire with rotten sticks," which could be used for propagandist purposes. Reformers jeered that the destruction of some of the more dubious relics and images – the Blood of Hales and the images of Our Lady of Walsingham and her sisters among them – did not provoke the once revered objects to respond, retaliate, or miraculously escape: "Throw them down thrice, they cannot rise, not once to help themselves." With some successes in exposing "idols" and "false reliques," it became easier to make the case that all relics and images were fakes and needed, in the words of a 1535 Proclamation, "utterly to be abolished, eradicated and erased out." Some of the targets were easy, others made to appear ridiculous, such as the promiscuous veneration of "that ladye in that place and that ladye in that," a sneer that struck at one of the most common and comforting aspects of popular religion, the local saints and madonnas that we may today associate primarily with Italy or Mexico but which was before 1538 as naturalized a habit of English society.²⁸ From the other side of the ideological divide, traditionalists distinguished between true "Images" and false "Idols," affirming that when the images of saints are erected and properly venerated, the saints made intercession to God. In the reign of Queen Mary, looking back at what he saw as such blasphemous acts of desecration under Henry and Edward VI, James Brooks, Master of Balliol,

²⁷ Williams, *Keywords*, 288; Aston, *England's Iconoclasts*, 10.

²⁸ *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 231. Carroll points out that we should, strictly speaking, speak of "madonnine" rather than "Marian" images, since there was only one Mary but multiple madonnas: *Veiled Threats*, 17.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-76296-0 - The Virgin Mary in Late Medieval and Early Modern English Literature and Popular Culture

Gary Waller

Excerpt

[More information](#)

condemned not just “the pulling down of God’s houses and hospitals; the defacing of churches,” but the “breaking down of altars; the throwing down of crosses; the carting out of images; the burning of tried holy relics.”²⁹ Once Elizabeth became queen, the Church of England’s homilies, first issued in 1547, were revised and reissued and became a key document for justifying official iconoclasm. The longest, 120 pages in four parts, Homily xiv, is headed “against peril of idolatry, and superfluous decking of churches.” It was probably partly authored by Bishop John Jewel, and appeared first in the edition of 1562. It looks back to the recent return of papistry under Mary, the “corruption of these latter days,” when “infinite multitudes of images” had once again “secretly and by stealth to creep out of private men’s houses into the churches, and that first in painted clothes and walls.” It provides a relentless compendium of biblical and historical precedents against images, assembles a didactic history of iconoclasm controversies in the history of the Church, and (having in mind that the Council of Trent was still in session) mounts a series of attacks on recent “reasons and arguments made for the defence of images or idols.” Idolatry, the Homily thunders, is committed “by infinite multitudes, to the great offence of God’s majesty, and danger of infinite souls,” and is directly associated with “images set up in churches and temples, gilded and decked gloriously.” These images, it pronounces with threatening finality, “be indeed very idols.” More than twenty years after they had been destroyed, the images at Ipswich and Walsingham are still specifically mentioned by name as idols that had been revered by a previous generation in the mistaken belief that “decking and adorning of the temple or house of God” would seduce people to be “the more moved to the due reverence of the same, if all corners thereof were glorious, and glistering with gold and precious stones.” What, asks the Homily, are such idols “but an imitation of the Gentiles idolaters, Diana Agrotera, Diana Coriphea, Diana Ephesia, &c. Venus Cypria, Venus Paphia, Venus Gnidia? Whereby is evidently meant, that the saint for the image sake should in those places, yea, in the images themselves, have a dwelling, which is the ground of their idolatry. For where no images be, they have no such means.” The Homily’s warning that, all too easily, “we like mad men fall down before the dead idols or images,” is an anxiety about an ever-present threat inherent in human nature. Such blasphemous practices have, the Homily continued, echoing Calvin and Zwingli, whose influence on the revised Elizabethan homilies was pronounced, misled

²⁹ Brooks, quoted by Shagan, “Confronting Compromise,” 65.