Domesticating the Reformation:

Material Culture, Memory and Confessional Identity in Early Modern England

Alexandra Walsham (University of Cambridge)

Forthcoming in *Renaissance Quarterly*

The centrepiece of this essay is a remarkable object in the British Museum. This is an example of tin-glazed earthenware (conventionally known as delftware) made in the Netherlands in the late seventeenth century. This extraordinary large plate or charger shows the figures of four religious reformers (John Wyclif, Martin Luther, Jean Calvin, and Theodore Beza) seated at a table at the centre of which stands a lighted candle symbolising the gospel (fig. 1). As the approximate dates of death recorded below indicate, these men represent four separate generations of Protestant and proto-Protestant reform: Wyclif died in 1386, Luther in 1546, Calvin in 1564, and Beza in 1605. Opposing them on the other side of the table are the forces of popery: the pope with his triple-tiared crown, a cardinal, a bishop, and a monk, huffing and puffing in a desperate attempt to extinguish the flame. The Dutch inscription in the centre of the picture can be translated 'The candle is lighted', while one of the texts streaming from the mouths of its enemies reads 'we cannot blow it out'. Dated 1692, the plate is inscribed with the names of Jan van Dieninge and Jannetie van Wyn Bergen, but it is unclear whether it was made to mark the anniversary of their marriage in 1680 or perhaps Jan's election an as officer of his Amsterdam guild. The latter possibility is suggested by the symbols of scissors, pliers, and buttons or nails, indicating the tools of Jan's trade as a tailor, with which the reverse is decorated (fig. 2). It may have been commissioned by the couple, but it is more likely that it was given to Jan as a gift by his friends, neighbours and fellow tailors to celebrate his professional elevation.[1]

Whatever the case, this is at once a highly personal and a public object. Marking a critical phase in the human lifecycle, an ecclesiastical rite of passage, or a career turning point, it is also an item that memorialises a key juncture in European history: the advent of the Protestant Reformation and its triumphant progress despite the best efforts of the Roman Catholic Church to prevent this. It intertwines remembrance of a private event with remembrance of an international movement that permanently ruptured medieval Christendom. This compelling artefact provides an opportunity to explore the interconnections between material culture, memory and confessional identity in the early modern period. The workmanship of the item is of exceptionally high quality and no comparable piece of delftware bearing this striking design has yet been identified. Although the main focus of the analysis is England rather than the Netherlands, as will become apparent, there was ongoing traffic and constant cross-fertilisation between the British Isles and the European mainland in the early modern era. Objects and the decorative schemes they carried were highly mobile. Their travels cast light on the migration of goods, ideas and images across national boundaries and on the intricate entanglement of religious and consumer cultures that were themselves in a state of constant flux.[2] They also illuminate the afterlife of the European Reformation: the creative process of selective remembering and forgetting by which it entered into historical consciousness and into the realm of popular tradition and legend as a momentous development. The title of this essay, 'Domesticating the Reformation', should be understood in both a literal and a figurative sense: it is concerned with the ways in which memory of the religious upheavals of the sixteenth century infiltrated the space of the home and with how that past was received, appropriated, contested and altered in the English context. In the process, it will endorse Diarmaid MacCulloch's call for us to resist the insularity of traditional Reformation scholarship and to put England back onto the map (or, more aptly in this instance, back into the picture) of Europe as a whole.[3] The

discussion is arranged in two sections: the first looks at the medium (the category and genre of material objects to which this delftware plate belongs) and the second at the message (the visual image and text that has been painted upon it).

Part I: The Medium

Until recently, objects like this Dutch delftware plate have suffered from relative neglect by mainstream historians, despite the excellent museum catalogues and monographic studies produced by a dedicated band of experts such as Michael Archer, Frank Britton, Aileen Dawson and Anthony Ray.[4] Practitioners of the discipline of the History of Art traditionally prioritised the paintings of the masters of the canon and regarded the 'applied arts' somewhat disparagingly as an inferior aesthetic category. The criteria of artistic worth, status, and taste which shaped their enquiries did not favour items of 'vernacular' origin, especially specimens that were crudely made, mass produced, damaged, or broken.[5] More generally, the scholarly distrust and suspicion of things is a legacy of the iconoclastic assault upon relics and other religious objects launched by Protestants during the Reformation era; its roots lie in theological disputes which denied that physical matter could be a vessel for salvific grace and sacrality and elevated the spoken and written word as the sole conduit of grace and truth.[6] As the anthropologist Birgit Meyer has argued persuasively, it is a product of a prevailing post-Enlightenment conception of 'religion' as private and interiorised, a 'mentalist approach' that prioritises belief and devalues the expression of spirituality in visible and tangible forms.[7]

Over the last decade, however, material objects have begun to move from the margins of historical enquiry into centre stage. Inspired by the work of archaeologists and anthropologists, as well as art historians, early modernists are increasingly alive to the insights they can yield into the priorities and preoccupations of the societies that produce, purchase, use, collect and preserve them. Directly or indirectly, they reflect the patterns of

belief and behaviour of the people who created and consumed them and open a revealing window into everyday life. By paying attention to what Arjun Appadurai and Igor Kopytoff famously described as the 'social life' and 'cultural biography' of things, one can learn much about the worlds in which they circulated.[8] In relation to the era of the Reformation, David Gaimster, Andrew Morrall and Tara Hamling have demonstrated how schemes of interior decoration and portable domestic items such as pots, tiles, and stoves function as modes of visual address, project particular religious identities, and embody moral and spiritual values. In an age of linguistic diversity and limited literacy, they had a unique power to project meaning and to bridge the gap between disparate social groups. Attesting to the proliferation of images and objects in the middle and upper class home, the work of these scholars is helping to dispel ingrained assumptions and prejudices originating in the period under consideration. It is undermining the idea that Protestantism's intense allergy to idolatry made it inherently hostile to pictures and material props to worship and piety and documenting their pervasive presence in Tudor and Stuart households. It is likewise illustrating that ethical anxiety and embarrassment about the trappings of wealth coexisted with the instinct to accumulate luxury goods.[9] Indeed, the tendency to see Calvinist asceticism as standing in tension with the desire to acquire and display material objects is itself a distorting effect of contemporary polemic; instead it is necessary to recognise their role in mediating encounters with the divine, in constituting religious sensibility, in carrying spiritual meaning, and in shaping the project of confessionalisation. In the words of Mark Peterson, Protestant piety 'created patterns of thought and feeling that flowed as easily into the genteel forms of a culture of consumption as they did into the frugal and disciplined norms of the "spirit of capitalism".'[10]

The research that underpinned this article is also indebted to important theoretical interventions regarding the nexus between materiality and memory, notably those of Andrew

Jones. Focusing upon how things help societies to remember, his book of 2007 stresses that memory is not merely an internalised cognitive function but something produced 'in the current of quotidian activities' – in the course of routine, performance, and action. In other words, objects do not operate just as symbolic media or visual mnemonics; they are tangibly experienced by people through bodily interaction, which is integral to the process of recollection and cognition.[11] Felt and touched with the hands, as well as seen by the eyes, they are sites of sensory interaction as well as modes of communication and loci of aesthetic investment.[12] Simultaneously and somewhat paradoxically, artefacts can function as agents of forgetting.[13]

With these ideas in mind, this essay turns first to the category of ceramic objects known as tin-glazed earthenware, the origins of which lay in maiolica imported to northern Europe from Italy and Spain before 1500. The techniques used to manufacture and decorate maolica were adapted by craftsmen in the Low Countries and the cities of the northern and southern Netherlands –Haarlem, Amsterdam, Rotterdam and above all Delft – soon became centres for its commercial production, especially after 1620. The trade was also fundamentally shaped by the European encounter with Asia, not least through the activities of the Dutch East India Company: a vogue for Chinese porcelain rapidly took hold and soon began to leave its imprint upon domestically produced material, not least in the guise of the blue and white colour scheme that is so characteristic of delftware. Imported Dutch objects of this kind found their way to Britain in the early sixteenth century and in 1567, to escape the religious wars in Flanders, two Antwerp potters named Jasper Andries and Jacob Jansen settled in Norwich. The first pottery in London dates from 1571 and the small industry that developed in subsequent decades centred on Lambeth and Southwark, though after 1650 it stretched its tentacles into the provinces, including Bristol and later Liverpool.[14] It is important to stress that foreign expertise continued to play a key part, not merely in the guise

of immigrant workers but also via the export of the decorative patterns with which these products were embellished.[15] As Anthony Wells-Cole and others have traced in admirable detail, many prints of Dutch, Flemish and German origin crossed the Channel and/or were adapted and reissued by local printers and stationers to satisfy the growing demand in England.[16] 'Pottery', David Gaimster observes, 'was in the vanguard of the migration of cosmopolitan Renaissance culture' into Britain'. This 'post-medieval ceramic revolution' is an index of European acculturation, while its changing iconography is a sensitive gauge of the impact of humanism and the Reformation.[17]

Delftware also sheds light on an evolving culture of consumption and its complex connections with fashion and social identity. Its spread in the second half of the seventeenth century reflected the emergence of a flourishing market among affluent merchants, professionals and landed gentry. Probate inventories, household accounts, and other sources suggest that this may also have filtered lower down the scale to yeomen and artisans, though much of the earthenware referred to in such sources must have been of the more mundane, undecorated variety. Nevertheless, they chart the rapid growth of ownership of domestic pottery between 1675 and 1725. Demand was highest in London and the east and south east, but by the mid eighteenth century earthenware was present in significant numbers of households in provincial and rural England.[18] Some delftware pieces bear the arms of the livery companies of which those who commissioned them were members and one chinoiserie dish destroyed in World War II was made for a Sephardic Jewish couple called Benjamin and Deborah Nunes; the latter is recorded as having worked as a servant in 1659.[19] Ceramic objects of this kind could be expensive commissioned artefacts, but they could also be purchased comparatively cheaply, as it were, off the shelf.[20] The many examples of English delftware that survive in the British, Ashmolean, Fitzwilliam, Victoria and Albert, Bristol and Liverpool Museums, as well as in private collections and in repositories in North America,

date mainly from the period between c. 1650 and 1750. Their preservation is largely a measure of the transformation of these objects from useful and fashionable products to subjects of antiquarian fascination. Serious collection of delftware began with Horace Walpole in the 1770s and within a century there was sufficient appetite for such pieces to foster a sideline in forgeries, facsimiles and fakes that still continues today. Many other examples have undoubtedly been lost, disappearing as they ceased to comply with current taste and became obsolete.[21]

As elsewhere, in England tin-glazed earthenware took a variety of forms: from large chargers to smaller plates, dishes, and bowls on which food might be served; posset pots, mugs, tankards, and jugs; tiles and plaques to adorn fireplaces and walls; vases, hand-warmers and flower holders. Reflecting the general rise in living standards and the imperatives of Jan de Vries's 'industrious revolution', these objects sat alongside and complemented a range of other architectural features, items of furniture, and household accessories: decorated chimney breasts; embroidered boxes and book-bindings; plasterwork ceilings and cast-iron fire-backs.[22] Many were functional items intended for practical use, but others were designed for ceremonial display on walls, dressers, cupboards, and mantelpieces. As the antiquary Randle Holme commented, by the seventeenth century the possession and presence of decorative objects became a sign of social status and aspiration in metropolitan and provincial England: 'they were not looked up to be of any great worth in personalls, that have not many dishes and much pewter, Brasse, copper, and tyn ware, set round about a Hall, Parlar and Kitchen'.[23] Those that survive in good condition may reflect a steady process of drift from utility to ornament, though the polarity implied here may be misleading and anachronistic. More significantly, their preservation probably attests to the tendency of those who possessed them to prize them as special and precious objects and to pass them down as heirlooms.

Much of the tin-glazed earthenware in museum collections has a commemorative purpose. Like the plate described at the start of this essay, it was commissioned or presented to mark an important transitional event such as a birth and baptism, a marriage, or (less often) a death. If some could afford to pay for the manufacture of a unique object, the circumstances of others dictated the personalisation of mass-produced items. Among many examples, the British Museum possesses a mug inscribed Thomas Balard 1644 and another from the prolific Pickleherring factory bearing the names of Elizabeth and Edward Searle, probably commemorating their marriage in 1650 (fig. 3).[24] Its collections also contain a charger showing the story of the Prodigal Son, which appears to be marked with the initials of Robert Gray and Anne Law and the year of their marriage at St Saviour's, Southwark, on 23 January 1659/60.[25] In another collection there is money box painted with the words 'Ann Whittin was born ye 14 of October 1717'.[26] More poignantly, a mid-eighteenth century mug in the Fitzwilliam Museum records the demise of Mary Turner at the tender age of 2 years and 14 days on 2 September 1752 (fig. 4).[27] All of these items are symbols and vessels of emotion and sentiment: to echo Leora Auslander and Angela McShane, they are not merely material expressions of love, they carry and convey affective weight themselves. They help human beings to accommodate absence, loss, and death. Handed down the generations, items like a late seventeenth-century handwarmer or ornament in the shape of two books inscribed with the words 'IONE ELEXANDRE HER/BOOKE' became relics and remains of departed family members and lost ancestors. They forged a physical link between the living and the dead and brought men, women and children into the presence of their own past.[28] The very act of handling them honed them as tools for remembering. As Andrew Jones notes, 'memory is experienced precisely because of the temporal disjuncture between people and things'.[29] And as they travelled through time and space, their meanings and significance changed and mutated. Sometimes, moreover, their mnemonic function was made quite explicit, as in the

case of tankards and mugs inscribed 'When this you see Remember mee G.L.' (fig. 5) and

'Mary Fayerthorne When this you see remember Mee anno 1647'.[30]

It is worth underlining the point made by Frances Yates long ago that in the early

modern period memory was understood in material and physical terms. It was conceptualised

as a building, a palace, and a group of rooms in which individual items of information and

knowledge were stored and from which those who cultivated the art of remembering were

able to retrieve them.[31] Jean of Tournes, printer of the influential sixteenth-century French

picture bible *Quadrins historiques de la Bible* urged the readers of Claude Paradin's book to

adorn 'the chambres of thi minde and remembraunce' with objects and images that would

educate and edify them.[32] Reinforced by the strategies of humanist pedagogy, this was a

precept which Protestantism fully embraced and which helped it to carve out a legitimate

place for the pictorial and applied arts in reformed culture. In the wake of work by Tessa

Watt, Tara Hamling and now Adam Morton (augmented by the research of Joseph Koerner,

Bridget Heal and others on Europe), scholars have now moved well beyond Patrick

Collinson's rather sweeping claim that post-Reformation England was a society 'suffering

from severe visual anorexia' and largely devoid of what is now called 'art'.[33] Luther's

defence of images in churches as in books 'for the sake of memory and better understanding'

is well known and Calvin himself declared that he was not so 'superstitious' as to think that

iconography of any kind was unlawful, admitting that sculpture and painting were gifts of

God. He thought that depictions of past events were useful and permissible for admonition

and instruction, words closely echoed by his English follower William Perkins who held it

'good and lawful … to represent to the eye the acts of histories, whether they be human or

divine'.[34] Reformed Protestants departed from Luther in condemning the setting up of

religious pictures in ecclesiastical settings but they conceded the acceptability of their

erection and display in private places. Their iconophobia was conditioned and tempered by

consideration of the dimension of space.[35] And although some worried that the genre of portraiture might open 'a door to idolatry', most regarded the production of exemplary pictures of godly divines and other worthies as legitimate and laudable. Adorning one's dwelling place with pictures of famous reformers and preachers and with scriptural stories was entirely compatible with the priorities of a religion that has too often been described as forbiddingly abstract and rigidly bibliocentric.[36]

Delftware provides ample evidence of the penetration of the home by this visual culture of the Word, and especially by representations of stories from the Old Testament. Thus one dish dated 1648 depicts Susannah and the Elders and another from 1660 shows Jacob's dream with winged angels mounting the ladder to heaven, while the Victoria and Albert Museum holds an early eighteenth-century tile depicting Esau visiting Isaac on his deathbed.[37] Scenes from the New Testament are perhaps slightly rarer. Mary Magdalene appears on a dish dated 1637 and another plate shows Jesus walking with two of his disciples to Emmaus as described in Luke 24.[38] A fireplace tile rescued from a dilapidated house in East Hampton illustrates John 20, where doubting Thomas thrust his hand into the side of the resurrected Christ.[39] Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Protestants were sometimes squeamish about portraying God the Son, though the fact that he been incarnated as a man provided a convenient loophole; by contrast, depicting the Father in anthropomorphic form was anathema. The Hebrew tetragrammaton was one acceptable substitute but on other occasions the vernacular word for the deity was used instead.[40] The most popular themes to appear on tin-glazed earthenware pieces are Abraham and the Sacrifice of Isaac, the Prodigal Son, and above all the Temptation of Adam and Eve. The latter theme was often invoked in the context of marriage, as a reminder to young couples of the dangers of lust, a lesson that also seems to be enshrined in an unusual Dutch plate dated 1712 which graphically depicts the story of Amnon raping the virgin Tamar (2 Samuel 13). A number of other dishes, by

contrast, display emblematic images of buxom naked women symbolising fecundity.[41] Sometimes, moreover, there is an intimate link between the scriptural passage illustrated and the form and function of the item on which it appears: strikingly, the story of Lot's wife, transformed into a pillar of salt when she looked back toward iniquitous Sodom adorns a silver salt cellar now in the Beeling collection in Leeuwarden.[42]

As Tara Hamling and Anthony Wells-Cole have shown for other aspects of interior decoration, many of the images that appear on delftware are copied from Dutch and Flemish prints of which were widely disseminated in England, including those of Marten de Vos and Gerhard de Jode. They correlate with and mimic Dutch household objects (from sugar spoons, tea caddies and button hooks to cradles, caskets, cupboards and damask tablecloths) on which Old and New Testament scenes appear.[43] But home-grown publications could also provide a design template: an unusual dish dated 1688 derives from a broadside ballad poking fun at contemporary fashions and reproving sumptuary excess and the extravagant headgear worn by trend-setting late Stuart women.[44] This is an object that seems to both embody and partially resolve the ambivalence at the heart of the contemporary culture of consumption: it admonishes those who see it against the very acquisitive instincts of which it is a product itself.

Other items incorporate biblical verses. Didactic Protestant mugs, cups, jugs and pots instilled sobering lessons about divine providence and the transience of life in those who ate and drank from them. Alongside readings of Scripture, which often took place at meal times in rooms whose walls and ceilings might be decorated with similar improving texts, they taught members of godly households what God expected of them as upright Christian believers. The messages borne by surviving specimens include: 'FEAR GOD HONOR GOD', 'FAST AND PRAY 1659', 'WHEN YOU SEE THIS REMEMBER ME. OBEAY GODS WORD', and 'RICHARD BIRCHET 1641 DRINKE TO THY FREND BUT

REMEMBER THY ENDE 1641'.[45] If some mugs and cups bore humorous and bawdy messages encouraging light-hearted carousing and provoking titillation, others admonished those who used them of the dangers of over-indulgence and intoxication: one in the Colonial Williamsburg Collection reads 'BE NOT DRUNKE'.[46] 'Speaking crockery' of this kind helped fervent Protestants to internalise the lessons laid out in dozens of guides to practical divinity, handbooks of household government, and collections of domestic prayers.[47] An aid to spiritual meditation in the miniature church that was the home, the vessels and utensils used on the table were themselves in some sense blessed by the graces said by fathers, masters, children or servants before the family sat down to eat.[48] The same was true of other items: a handwarmer in the Ashmolean Museum dated 1672 is a *memento mori* which reads on one side 'TOE POT[T]ERS CLAY THOU TAKEST ME TO BE REMEMBER THEN THYNE MORTALYTY 1672' and on the other 'EARTH I AM IT IS MOST TREW DISDAIN ME NOT FOR SOE ARE YOU 1672' (fig. 6).[49] The inscriptional wisdom painted on items of this kind is 'a tool for provoking active rumination': reminding the viewer and user of the brittle material of which they are made, they operate as emblems of the fragility of the human condition.[50] These objects were media by and through which religious and moral guidance was provided. Relying on the senses of sight and touch as well as the intellect for their effects, they break down the boundary between the literal and metaphorical apprehension and reflect a world in which religious and especially biblical words had 'a decorative, protective and emotional effect'.[51]

They may also have been badges of belonging to the hotter sort of the Protestant religion and of solidarity with the style of fervent piety that attracted the disparaging nickname 'puritan'. Other examples, by contrast, appear to have a different denominational flavour. Some Protestants might not have approved of the Crucifixion scene on one plate made in 1698 or of the sacred monogram of the Holy Name of Jesus depicted on another

dated 1721. Their provenance is unclear but in an earlier era, both would have been regarded as incriminating evidence of Roman Catholicism; by the later Stuart and early Hanoverian period they may reflect the entry and absorption of this kind of imagery into mainstream Anglicanism.[52] Even so, it would be wrong to approach such objects as if they provide a transparent window into the souls and a clear imprint of the religious mentalities of their owners and users. The meanings they carried must also have shifted as they travelled down the generations from parents to children and as they were bought, borrowed, pawned and sold. They circulated in a multiconfessional society in which particular iconographies were never the monopoly of any single religious community. Individual artefacts acquired fresh inflections depending upon into whose hands they fell and the locations and situations in which they were employed and displayed.

Other delftware was evidently a vehicle for displaying and inculcating patriotic feeling and loyalty to the English monarchy.[53] The earliest known example is a charger from 1602 encircled by the verse 'The Rose is red the leaves are grene God save Elizabeth our Queene'.[54] A slightly later specimen, which appears to be an anniversary gift for a couple married in 1614 and which was made around 1627, shows Princess Elizabeth, her husband the former King of Bohemia, and their children. Derived from a print by Willem van de Passe, it testifies to a groundswell of affection for James I's daughter and her family, victims of the Counter Reformation resurgence that sparked the Thirty Years War in 1618.[55] To own and display this plate was to reveal one's support for the international Protestant cause at a moment of acute crisis and concern about its future. Most examples, however, relate to those who occupied the English throne. The first delftware piece to bear the royal cipher is a cistern dated 1644, and marked 'C.R.', but the majority date from the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.[56] There are dozens of jugs, plates, flasks, mugs and porringers commemorating the return of Charles II (fig. 7), usually showing a bust of the restored Stuart king and/or marked

with the initials C. R., though he also appears sometimes on horseback,[57] while his wife Catherine of Braganza is depicted on a dish of 1682 now in the Fitzwilliam Museum.[58] Despite his short reign, similar pieces representing James II and his consort Mary of Modena appeared (fig. 8). The Birmingham Museum and Art Gallery even has a bleeding bowl inscribed I.R. and painted with his crowned head dated 1686: the king's image even entered the sick room.[59] Reflecting a fashion fostered by Mary herself, who collected porcelain and delftware and displayed it at Hampton Court, there are many tin and lead-glazed plates, dishes and pots marking the coronation and reigns of the beneficiaries of the constitutional coup of 1688, William and Mary (fig. 9). Several mugs in the Fitzwilliam Museum have the inscription ':GOD: BLES: KING: WILIAM: &: Q MARY:'.[60] The accession of Queen Anne in 1702 produced another crop of royal memorabilia.[61] Her immediate heir, 'the most Illustrious Princess Anna Sophia of Hanover' was the subject of an unusual delftware plaque, although she predeceased Anne and the crown consequently passed to George I, who in due course was depicted on a number of delftware dishes.[62]

Sometimes these pieces recall the historical interventions of military figures and politicians like General Monck, who played a key part in restoring Charles II to the throne.[63] One charger remembers Henry Sacheverell and the Tory riots against the toleration of dissent which his outspoken sermons and subsequent trial in 1710 served to foment. It may be suspected that the original owner of this plate was a Tory sympathiser rather than a Whig.[64] Another series of delftware items attests to Jacobite and anti-Jacobite sentiment. One dish sold at Christie's in America for $15,000 in 2011 celebrates the defeat of the Jacobite army at the Battle of Culloden in 1745, while the British Museum collections contain a punch bowl bearing a portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart dated 1749. Some of these artefacts were explicitly partisan, marked with the words 'God save the King' or blatant slogans like 'Confusion to the Pretender' and 'Duke William for Ever'.[65]

While it is doubtful that many people actually ate off these objects, delftware of this type offers insight into the contours of royalism in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth century. It shows how images and assumptions that underpropped the restored monarchy crossed the porous boundary between the public and private sphere and inserted itself within domestic interiors, penetrating the domain of the kitchen, dining room and parlour.[66] While the production of commemorative ware may have been officially sponsored, the purchase, possession and display of such items must be seen as indices of commitment to the Stuart dynasty; they are objects that promote an affective relationship between the subject and his or her sovereign, especially where they are inscribed with the initials of their owners.[67] One red slipware jug dating from 1660 admonishes those who view and use it to 'OBEAY THE KING': it is quite literally a lesson in loyalty.[68] These everyday items may reflect greater esteem and more spontaneous appreciation of William and Mary than has sometimes been assumed. It has been speculated that pottery of this kind may have played a part in buttressing the legitimacy of a king who had only a tenuous claim to the throne and whose reign was plagued with instability, discontent and fears of invasion. The same observation might be made about the much maligned monarch ejected as a result of the Glorious Revolution.[69]

But items of this kind also carry an undercurrent of subversive baggage with them and in the context of the political turmoil of the period their connotations could easily alter overnight. It might be wondered, for instance, what it meant to own a plate now in the Victoria and Albert Museum depicting Charles I with Princes Charles and James in the background. It dates from 1653 but is copied from a print of 1641-2. Possessing an object commemorating a king who had been executed as a man of blood and a traitor to his people during the Interregnum might be seen as an act of resistance to the Cromwellian regime, akin to the actions of Anglicans who clung to the cult of the royal martyr during these chaotic and dangerous years.[70] Similarly, after 1688, delftware plates and mugs bearing the image of

James II also inevitably acquired a different resonance: while those who supported the Revolution may have hidden these items in the back of their cupboards in embarrassment, those who opposed it and looked to Bonnie Prince Charlie as their great white hope probably kept them as talismans of their Jacobite values. Had the referendum on Scottish independence in September 2014 yielded a different result, a plate in the British Museum celebrating the union of England and Scotland in 1707 might have become a relic of a severed political relationship – mourned by some but heralded as a watershed by others (fig. 10).[71] Once again, such pottery indicates how the significance of objects shifts over the course of their cultural biographies and is constantly renegotiated by the people who own and use them. Capable of being deployed by critics as well as supporters, to quote Kevin Sharpe, they 'enabled both the sacralisation and demystification of regality as they passed into a consumer culture and public sphere increasingly divided over religious and state affairs'.[72] It also highlights the politicisation of everyday life.

Some delftware artefacts also evoke the memory of what David Cressy has called the icon events of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – the providential deliverances of the English monarchy and state from its enemies.[73] One such motif that enjoyed widespread popularity was the story of the Boscobel Oak in which the future Charles II hid from the pursuing Parliamentary forces after the Battle of Worcester in 1651. Celebrated as the preservation of this 'our earthly saviour' from fanatics intent upon further regicide, it entered into legend and after the Restoration became a symbol of the restored Stuart monarchy, celebrated yearly on Royal Oak Day. The tree itself became a tourist destination and pilgrims nearly killed in their eagerness to carry off relics of the king's arboreal place of asylum.[74] A number of examples of plates and chargers commemorating Charles II's miraculous escape survive, including one Dutch delftware dish bearing the words 'PURSU'D BY MEN, PRESERV'D BY GOD'.[75] Widely recounted in text and image, the episode also made its

way onto cast-iron firebacks (fig. 11) and an enamelled plaque mounted on a piece of wood

or bark, possibly from the Boscobel Oak itself.[76] The outbreak of anti-Catholic hysteria that

was the Popish Plot in 1679-80 also left its imprint on delftware tiles and plates, as well as a

series of playing cards. One example (sold by Christie's in 2010 for over £13,000) shows the

conspirators signing their pact to kill the king.[77] Protestants who placed these items of

crockery on their dressers and tables or hung them over their mantelpieces fed the fears of

papistical invasion and schemes of assassination that had simultaneously fuelled national

feeling and engendered division and conflict since the late sixteenth century. These pieces of

'documentary pottery' are the ceramic counterparts of paper 'monuments' and embroidered

memorials of the scattering of the Spanish Armada in 1588 by heaven sent winds and the

thwarting of the Gunpowder Plot in 1605 by the all seeing eye of God. Both sets of objects

and pictures are based on Samuel Ward's *Double deliverance* of 1621, a highly provocative

print to issue in the context of the negotiations for the Spanish match which landed this

Ipswich preacher in gaol and cast suspicion on anyone who possessed a copy of it.[78] Other

events that were linked in this chain of divine mercies to the English nation and 'thankfully

remembered' in image, print and object were the 'return of the Gospel's light' and the end of

the 'night of Popish superstition' with Elizabeth I's accession and ecclesiastical settlement of

1558-9.[79] Fusing pious commemoration with royal propaganda and interweaving fashion and

faith such items fanned the flames of sectarian sentiment and laid the foundations for an

enduring and resilient tradition of anti-Catholic prejudice. They helped to forge a cohesive

and empowering sense of Protestant national identity, but at the same time they were visual

objects that could foment dissent and provide a stimulus to the internal divisions and frictions

of post-Reformation English society.

So too did those that recalled to mind the excoriating experiences of the Protestant

martyrs burnt at the stake during the reign of Mary I, whose stoicism and heroism found

graphic expression in the woodcuts in Foxe's *Actes and monuments,* in engravings such as *Faiths victorie in Romes crueltie*, probably made in the mid 1620s, at a time when the memory of these events was becoming increasingly contested.[80] The depiction of scenes of religious incineration on firebacks also highlights once more how the materiality of domestic objects was integral to the message they sought to convey: the capacity of the metal to withstand the heat of the flames mirrored the bravery of the men and women who had perished for their faith in the mid 1550s.[81] Casting light on how confessional identities were created and how they infiltrated the early modern home, such items illustrate the critical importance played by memory in this process. This is particularly apparent in the case of a delftware wall panel depicting the monument erected to the Great Fire of London of 1666, which publicly denounced it as a dastardly act of Catholic arson: this is a two-dimensional tin-glazed earthenware replica of a three dimensional stone memorial (fig. 12). The initials A and W at its base are indicative of the intimate entanglement of personal and national history, of the lifecycles of individuals and the saga of the English Protestant state, which is a repeated feature of tin-glazed earthenware.[82]

The story of the Reformation which surviving household objects tell is not, however, one focused solely upon indigenous heroes and divine deliverances. Both in England and the Netherlands, the objects that people bought to use and display in their homes also betray awareness of belonging to an international movement with a European pedigree. A seventeenth-century Dutch brass tobacco box, for instance, is inscribed with the busts of Luther and Calvin, both holding an open bible in their hands.[83] Derived from a 1714-15 mezzotint print consisting of 21 plates of the European Protestant reformers made by the London based miniaturist John Faber the Elder, their portraits also appear on a pair of painted porcelain vases exported from Qing Dynasty China and probably produced between 1730 and 1760 in the region of Jingdezhen which are now preserved in the Victoria and Albert

Museum (fig. 13).[84] Several similar examples of *chine de commande* survive, including a tea cup and saucer with the Wittenberg leader and a plate on which he appears with two putti inside a cartouche, both of which may have been made to commemorate the two-hundreth anniversary of his death. Based on an engraving first used on the title page of the Dutch translation of the Lutheran bible in 1648, the Luther who appears on the latter has distinctly oriental features.[85] Such items highlight the global reach of the material culture of consumption in which British buyers were implicated and to which their religious, social and intellectual values helped to give shape. They illustrate the 'complex exchange of gazes between Asia and Europe' that became a hallmark of the eighteenth century.[86]

Part II: The Message

This provides a neat link to the second part of this essay, which analyses the message conveyed by the image on the Dutch delftware charger with which it began. This striking piece of iconography is another example of what Margaret Aston once described as 'pictorial migration'.[87] It too mimics a printed image and the many progeny it engendered. Its earliest prototypes were probably German, and owed something to a wider family of group portraits of the reformers.[88] Such images were very common in northern Europe in the seventeenth century, as Einer Molland and, more recently, Joke Spaans, have demonstrated in considerable detail. Several examples produced by Dutch publishers survive, including Cornelius Danckertz's *t'Licht is op den kandelaer geselt*, produced sometime between 1620 and 1656 and an Amsterdam impression issued by Hugo Allard dating from c.1640-1684. A number of these profess their indebtedness to a copy made in London.[89] This English 'copy' appears to be a precursor of the print brought out by the godly bookseller Thomas Jenner in the 1620s (fig. 14). Published at the height of concern about the Spanish match and a foreign policy marked by reluctance to intervene to support English Protestants' suffering brethren

abroad, Jenner's print, which spawned several imitations, may itself be an adaptation of one

of the Dutch editions.[90] Harnessed to speak to topical debates and to comment on current

developments, a number of other versions tailored for the Bohemian Hussites, Hungarian

Protestants, French Huguenots, and German Pietists appeared. There were also Catholic

parodies, including one entitled *Diabolicum Haeresiarcharum nostril et parentum circa*

annum 1533 ('Diabolical council of the arch-heretics of our and our parents' time'), which

may have been intended to teach seminary priests in training for missionary service in the

Netherlands.[91] Subtly modified for the different commercial markets, national contexts and

temporal junctures in and at which it appeared, this iconographical motif is an emblem of the

creative flexibility and rich cross-fertilisation that characterised the pictorial arts in this

period. It is also a visual trope which exhibited the capacity to shift seamlessly between the

realms of polemic and commemoration, blurring the generic boundary between the political

graphic satire and the pious broadsheet 'monument' intended for domestic display.[92]

The table depicted in these prints is very much more crowded than the dimensions of

the delftware plate would permit. In Jenner's version, alongside Wyclif, Luther, Calvin and

Beza are a host of other European reformers: Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague, Philip

Melanchthon (Luther's successor in Wittenberg), Huldrych Zwingli, Henry Bullinger, Peter

Martyr Vermigli, Martin Bucer, Hieronymus Zanchius, Johannes Oecolampadius, Matthias

Flaccius Illyricus. There are two British figures in the mix: the Scottish firebrand John Knox

and the Cambridge Calvinist William Perkins. This pantheon of Protestants, earnestly

consulting the bible and writing in their books, contrasts with the popish figures below: here a

hideous black devil takes the place of the bishop in the delftware plate. These prints are

visual variants of the texts that recorded Martin Luther's *Table Talk:* their composition

echoes the title-page of the 1567 edition and is curiously reminiscent of contemporary

imaginations of the Last Supper.[93] Luther and Calvin fill the space at the centre of the picture

in which Christ was habitually located. The candle that casts its light on the scene and which

the papists try fruitlessly to extinguish alludes to the apocryphal book of Esdras ch 24, verse

25: 'I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out', as well

as the text of Proverbs 20: 27 ('The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord'). It recalls images

of the evangelists such as St Matthew, illuminated by a taper held by an angel as he writes his

gospel.[94] These group portraits of the reformers are also the counterparts and alter-egos of the

conspiratorial cabals of priests and lay plotters portrayed in prints like Ward's *Double*

deliverance, which continued to be depicted in images like this impression dating from 1653

throughout the seventeenth century.[95] They are pictures in which time is distorted and

telescoped and which plays tricks with memory: they bring together a set of men who were

not contemporaneous and who never all met in any kind of convention. One mid to late

seventeenth-century adaptation of the scene depicts a fictitious dispute between leading

Protestants (Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, and Oecolampadius) and

representatives of the Catholic Church, who are seated opposite each other with the candle

labelled 'evangelium' between them.[96]

In both England and the Netherlands, the image was repeatedly copied by painters: a

picture now in the Society of Antiquaries introduces the Irish primate James Ussher and the

martyred Archbishop Thomas Cranmer (fig. 15); in another the martyrologist Foxe displaces

the Italian-born reformer Zanchius; in a third, cruder version the identity of the figures is

harder to discern. Others survive in Glasgow, Hertford College, Oxford, Lewes, and Perth.[97]

In a later version of the print preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum, the cast of

characters is exclusively English with Latimer replacing Luther in the chair, surrounded by

the Marian martyrs John Hooper, Nicholas Ridley, Thomas Cranmer, John Bradford and

Rowland Taylor. Below them are the verses: 'Tho' Hell and Rome with all their might,

Labour to put out Gospel Light, Yet their Attempts are all in vain, God ever will his Truth

maintain'.[98] In instances such as this, the Reformation has been completely domesticated. It has undergone a process of Anglicisation and become an insular event: unassisted by foreign brethren, it no longer projects an image of pan-European Protestant solidarity.

What these images also partly reflect is Protestantism's robust response to the mocking question repeatedly thrown at it by its Catholic enemies: 'where was your Church before Luther?' Depicting Wyclif, Hus and Jerome of Prague in juxtaposition with the sixteenth-century reformers was another way of demonstrating the existence of an unbroken chain of believers who had defied the papacy and kept the truth alight throughout the medieval centuries of tyranny, corruption and ignorance.[99] The same genealogical succession of eminent men who had worked to release people from thraldom and to plant the gospel also featured in Theodore Beza's *Icones* of 1580. Dedicated to the young Scottish king James VI, this album or gallery of portraits of godly ministers organised by geography and nationality appears to be the model for the individuals depicted in *The candle is lighted* prints and the late seventeenth-century Dutch delftware plate.[100] In turn, it finds another echo in the remarkable frieze that adorns the edge of the ceiling of the upper reading room in Oxford's Bodleian Library, which was painted around 1620, and reflected the convictions of its librarian Thomas James.[101] Catholics detected a distinct irony in these pictorial portrayals of Protestant saints: exiled priests like Robert Chambers, confessor to a house of English nuns in Brussels, saw such iconography as inconsistent with reformed condemnation of traditional hagiography as a species of idolatry, satirising the hypocrisy of 'the images of *Wiclef, Luther, Hus, Melancthon, Calvin*, & of such Apostata condemned companions … painted, sold, & hanged up in every ones hows to be tooted upon'. They ridiculed the tendency of the self-styled godly to 'gravely glote upon them, because they thinck the persons there pointed, to be lightes of the gospel, chosen trumpettes of the truth, great frendes of the lord, & what not'.[102] Despite its venom, their polemic provides further backhanded testimony of the extent to

which individual and group portraits of celebrated reformers were regular fixtures in Tudor and Stuart households.

The Candle is lighted and its visual cousins not only engage in creating and cementing memories, they also entail acts of pious forgetting. In particular, they are images that eclipse the profound frictions and tensions that erupted within Protestant ranks in the course of the sixteenth century: the bitter schisms and failed attempts to reach agreement on such difficult issues as the Eucharist, forms of ecclesiastical government, and liturgical rituals which exposed the Reformation to Catholic taunts about its diabolical disunity. These religious brawls were captured pictorially in other prints, such as a 1590 engraving of Luther and Calvin fighting the Pope (fig. 16). The former figures do not seem to be concerned with assailing the pontiff so much as each other: in a scene out of a cartoon in a *Boy's Own Annual*, Luther pulls Calvin's beard and the pair pinch the Pope's ears, while the Genevan reformer raises a book ready to bring down on top of his Wittenberg rival's head.[103] There is only a hint of these antagonisms in the English versions of this print, in which Calvin turns a cold shoulder to Luther in order to talk to his colleague and successor in Geneva, Beza. Otherwise this is a picture of Protestant ecumenicity in which representatives of Europe's multiple and plural Reformations talk cordially and amicably with each other. It is an optical illusion effacing the serious chasms that opened up within the reformed camp within a generation of Luther's attack on indulgences and which continued to fracture it in the following century. Another set of conspicuous omissions are representatives of the radical wing of the Reformation: figures such as Andreas Carlstadt and the Anabaptist leader Thomas Munster who broke away from the mainstream and devised theologies and political ideologies that horrified the proponents of the socially conservative brand of Protestantism that allied itself with the civic magistrate and state and lost its initial evangelical charisma as

it steadily became institutionalised. This is an image from which these unruly elements have been silently excised.[104]

Attention must now turn to the four figures which appear on the delftware plate of 1692: Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, and Beza. All of these individuals fitted into the lineage which English Protestants constructed of their Church and featured in the empowering story of its history which the Magdeburg Centurians, John Bale and John Foxe had laid out in the sixteenth century. Margaret Aston has expertly delineated the process by which the Oxford don John Wyclif acquired his reputation as the 'morning star of the Reformation' and was assimilated into the catalogue of those persecuted for heresy at the hands of a domineering papacy.[105] Forced out of his college fellowship and then posthumously condemned and excommunicated for his errors, the burning of his exhumed bones at Lutterworth in 1428 was the icing on the cake as far as Foxe was concerned.[106] Subsequent writers added further layers of what R. B. Macfarlane called 'rich brown Protestant varnish' to Wyclif.[107] Some careful and creative sleight of hand was likewise required to assimilate the motley crew of his followers labelled 'lollards' to orthodox Protestant doctrine.[108] Both became key weapons in the Reformation's quest to define its own pedigree and to seek the sanction of the past for its apparent novelties.

Calvin's status as the spiritual grandfather of the brand of Protestantism that was dominant in England until around 1625 has been frequently asserted. With some exceptions, historians have generally endorsed the idea of a Calvinist consensus: the notion that members of the late Tudor and early Stuart Church, whatever their differences on other matters, were glued together by common adherence to the tenet of predestination.[109] Even where they did not share John Knox's view that Geneva was the 'most perfect school of Christ' and press for the adoption of a Presbyterian ecclesiastical polity, they did revere the famous expatriate French reformer as a figurehead of their faith and use him as a convenient stick with which to

goad and beat opponents of various kinds.[110] The awkwardness surrounding the ill-timed

expostulations of Knox and Christopher Goodman against Mary I and 'the monstrous

regiment of women' did not prevent Calvin from becoming a hero or Calvinism from

entering into the bloodstream of Elizabethan England. Puritans like the Cheshire gentleman

John Bruen, who named his son Calvin, may have been a minority.[111] But as Peter Marshall's

work on the vibrant black legend of his dogmatism, sexual depravity and political

seditiousness disseminated by Catholic writers has shown, Calvin assumed iconic status as a

marker of Protestant identity more generally. Mocked as the patriarch, apostle and idol of the

reformed religion, he became a metonymy of the terrible evils engendered by extreme heresy.

If he was a cardboard cut-out in Romanist propaganda, in many ways the Calvin to whom the

godly themselves looked up was also a caricature.[112] His own relatively relaxed attitude to the

institution of episcopacy was at odds with the hard-line taken by those hell bent on destroying

the bishops in the 1580s and 90s and then again at the time of the Westminster Assembly in

the 1640s (when printed portraits of him enjoyed a new surge of popularity).[113] Contrary to

common assumption that has crystallised into tradition, he did not believe in the severe form

of limited atonement espoused by his heirs and his own soteriological ideas were much less

rigid more liberal that the theory of double predestination that evolved after his death.[114] It

has become conventional to echo the title of a seminal essay by Basil Hall and speak of

'Calvin against the Calvinists' – a phrase that draws attention to the significant shifts in

theological emphasis detectable in the work of his successors.[115] His long legacy as a symbol

of second-generation Protestantism has served to eclipse his complexity both as a person and

as a theologian.

This brings us to Theodore Beza, who assumed the reins of the Reformation in

Geneva in 1564. It was Beza who effectively invented the 'experimental predestinarianism'

that lay close to the heart of the phenomenon loosely called puritanism and who sowed the

seeds both of the obsessive introspectivism that became one of its hallmarks and of a kind of voluntarism which provided the faithful with assurance of their elect status. Ironically, this brought Bezan Calvinism within a whisker of the doctrine of faith delineated by Jacobus Arminius, which tore the Dutch Reformed and English Churches apart in the early seventeenth century.[116] Beza too, then, is a far more intriguing and complicated figure than the portraits of him commissioned by his admirers in England imply. He was held in awe even by those who had never read his voluminous writings. A preacher at Paul's Cross in 1601 who was traduced by his hearers for speaking of Beza 'irreverend[ly]' when he dared to disagree with him on the subject of divorce complained that some accorded him an authority 'more canonicall then the canonicall scriptures', despite the fact that they 'have onely heard of his name, but knowe not how to spell it, (for they call him Bezer ….)'.[117] And if Beza arguably did more shape the official ideology and popular piety of the late sixteenth-century Church of England than Calvin himself, other important influences on its development deserve emphasis, including the *Decades* of Henry Bullinger and the *Common Places* of Peter Martyr Vermigli, the Italian Protestant exile who became professor of divinity in Oxford under Edward VI. Vermigli's translator, Anthony Marten, described him as a 'verie Apostle' to the English people.[118]

There is only room to comment briefly on a few of the Englishmen who appear in *The Candle is Lighted* prints. One is William Perkins, the Cambridge divine whose work was translated into Czech, Dutch, French, German, Spanish and several other languages. Writing in 1642, Thomas Fuller said that his books 'speak more tongues, then the Maker ever understood'. Often heralded as the archetypal moderate puritan and the stepfather of Pietism, he has recently been relocated more firmly at the core of the Church of England, stripped of his reputation as a godly dissident, and presented as an apologist for the ecclesiastical establishment by Brown Patterson.[119] Others include John Hooper, whom the Dutchman

Maarten Micron once described as 'the future Zwingli of England' and the martyrs John Bradford, Nicholas Ridley, Hugh Latimer and Thomas Cranmer, architect of the Prayer Book and archbishop of Canterbury, whose contradictions and ambiguities have been so brilliantly recaptured for us in Diarmaid MacCulloch's influential biography.[120] Mimicking a famous woodcut in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments,* the image of him casting the hand that had once signed his recantation of Protestantism first into the flames at he was burnt in Oxford in 1555 encapsulates both his bravery and his human frailties.[121]

Martin Luther has been left until last because his presence in these Dutch and English prints is slightly anomalous. (It is also, incidentally, much less corpulent than recent work by Lyndal Roper has taught us to expect.[122]) In these countries, despite the early appeal of Luther's teachings on justification by faith, the tide turned against a Reformation shaped primarily by his theology. Instead a more aggressive branch of Protestantism associated with the Swiss churches reared its head and spread. Alec Ryrie has charted the 'strange death of Lutheran England' by the end of the 1540s. But he has also observed that the Wittenburg reformer was not completely forgotten and continued to have an afterlife in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Luther's writings (especially those that provided pastoral guidance for afflicted consciences) persisted in being published and he was frequently remembered as a famous doctor, learned father, worthy instrument, grand captain under Christ, a 'Noah' and a 'Hercules of Gods glory'. Later generations of English Protestants found it convenient to forget his views regarding the real presence in the Eucharist and Foxe declared that his readers should not be too exercised by 'one small blemish, or for a little stoupyng … in the Sacrament'.[123] When his *Table talk* was republished by Captain Henry Bell in 1651 a note by another writer in the preface referred to Luther's as 'the first Reformation' and said that it could not 'rationally be expected that at that first dawning of the Gospel light, all Spiritual Truths should bee known in that perfection whereunto God hath brought the knowing

professors of this Age'.[124] In fact, in the words of Alec Ryrie, Carl Trueman and Carrie Euler, Luther increasingly became 'a figure almost entirely lacking in theological substance', a hero of symbolic power rather than a source of specific prophetic and exegetical wisdom.[125]

What the circulation of *The Candle is Lighted* via the media of paper, paint and tin-glazed earthenware seems to reveal is an earnest desire for pan-European unity in the face of the Catholic threat that was starkly at odds with reality. It underlines Alec Ryrie's point that 'the sundered Protestant family remained conscious itself' and that English, Dutch and German Protestants continued to feel a sense of affinity with the 'sister Reformations' of churches abroad, and with their brethren who suffered under the papists' whip.[126] In the context of British Isles, it is an emblem of the fact that the English Reformation was not idiosyncratic or untouched by the religious currents swirling around the Continent and that it was both coloured by and contributed actively to them. The self-congratulatory myth of Anglicanism that emerged in the course of the seventeenth century and was revived by Victorian Anglo-Catholics has served to erase both the Zwinglian and Calvinist influences that were fundamental to its early formation and its internationalism from historical memory.[127] If the fog is now clearing in the Channel that divides these islands from the European mainland, it is still worth underlining the importance of recognising that there was traffic and exchange in both directions, as well as between England and its Scottish neighbour, its subordinate principalities and kingdoms of Wales and Ireland, and its colonies across the Atlantic Ocean.[128] But nor must the shifts in the centre of ecclesiastical and theological gravity that helped to set the Church of England on a course for civil war in the early seventeenth century be ignored. As Anthony Milton has demonstrated, one symptom of the rise of avant-garde conformity, Arminianism and Laudianism was a gradual mellowing of attitudes to medieval and modern Catholicism and a declining propensity to denounce it as a

limb of Antichrist and Satan. This was accompanied, inversely, by a cooling of fervour, sympathy and affinity with the reformed churches of Germany and Switzerland.[129]

Images and objects such as those examined here suggest that such sentiments did not disappear completely as these developments progressed. Revived and reissued at moments of Protestant vulnerability and crisis, they index a sense of solidarity with co-believers in other countries that remained a feature of the religious landscape throughout the early modern period. Thus the anti-Catholic spasms of 1680s saw a fresh flurry of prints evoking the memory of what was now strikingly entitled the 'Reformation' with a capital R. A militant and resurgent Church of Rome and growing tension between England and France made some feel the urgency of reissuing Jenner's evocative engraving. John Garrett altered the copper plate, adding a defiant rhymed stanza running 'Maugre all Romish, Hellish, Spanish Spight; Truth's Candle flame shall always burne most bright' to bolster the morale of Protestants frightened by the possible consequences of a Catholic restoration. Introducing William Tyndale to the table and advertising itself 'as necessary to be set up in every house and Family', a broadsheet entitled *A True account of the Rise and growth of the Reformation, or the progress of the Protestant religion* (1680) also appeared in midst of the Popish Plot furore. Another version appeared as the frontispiece of a work of ecclesiastical history by John Shirley published after the Glorious Revolution in 1692 (fig. 17).[130] The motif of the candle which the papists sought to blow out was recycled and adapted to impugn the Jacobites, as seen in a print of 1715, *The Antichrist Blowing ye Light of ye Gospel to put it out With ye Pretender and ye False Brother who uphold him* (fig. 18),[131] and 'Portraits of the Principal Primitive Reformers' continued to circulate in the mid and late eighteenth century, against the backdrop of the Methodist challenge to Anglicanism. [132]

In conclusion, this essay has sought to demonstrate how the memory of the Reformation was domesticated in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: first, how it entered the household in the guise of consumer goods in which taste and piety were closely entwined and which defy claims that this evolving culture of consumption was primarily secular in tenor and tone; and second how Protestantism was naturalised as it was implanted in English society. The items and images explored in the preceding pages reveal the various ways in which individual and social, personal and public memory converged and became intertwined, and the changing meanings objects absorb and accumulate as they move in space and time. Transported into new contexts, their significance was reconfigured. Things that began as vessels for topical satire and polemical commentary sometimes became vehicles for sober commemoration and religious reflection; in turn movement occurred in the other direction. The danger of reducing prints and ceramic products to a merely semiotic function has also been emphasised, together with the importance of practical use, physical interaction and sensual engagement in the memory work that they perform. These specimens of 'speaking crockery' and 'documentary pottery' are objects that defy the assumed boundaries between the utilitarian and the aesthetic, and operate at the interface between meaning and feeling.

And if the forms of material culture investigated in this essay highlight the role played by biblical and recent history in fostering confessional antagonism, jingoistic patriotism, anti-popish sentiment and political dissent, they simultaneously illustrate the constant flow of iconographies and the mutual exchange of ideas between England, Europe and other continents. They reveal an ongoing, if unstable and steadily evolving consciousness of being part of an international Protestant world. This study has yielded new insights into the process by which awareness of the Reformation as a chronological landmark and a historic event emerged, and by which it became, in the words of Philip Abrams, 'a happening to which cultural significance has been assigned'.[133] In a recent article Peter Marshall has written about

'the naming of Protestant England' and the 'intricately transactional patterns of identity formation' which this entailed. Here, by contrast, the aim has been to cast a spotlight on the manner in which it was imagined and to illuminate how, in a real as well as metaphorical sense, it was made.[134]

---

[1] London, British Museum [hereafter BM], registration no. 1891,0224.3. For the notice of the couple's marriage on 26 October 1680, see Stadsarchief Amsterdam, DTB, inv. nr 508, p. 72. **[Acknowledgements removed].**

[2] See Paula Findlen, 'Early Modern Things: Objects in Motion, 1500-1800', in Findlen (ed.), *Early Modern Things: Objects and their Histories 1500-1800* (London and New York, 2013), pp. 3-27.

[3] Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'Putting the English Reformation on the Map', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* 15 (2005), 75-95; and *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700* (London, 2003). An important intervention is Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain,* Proceedings of the British Academy 164 (Oxford, 2010).

[4] This study is indebted to the following published catalogues and studies of delftware, supplemented by searchable online catalogues of the relevant museums and repositories. Anthony Ray, *English Delftware Pottery in the Robert Hall Warren Collection Ashmolean Museum, Oxford* (London, 1968); C. H. de Jonge, *Delft Ceramics* (London, 1970); F. H. Garner and Michael Archer, *English Delftware* (London, 1972); Ivor Nöel Hume, *Early*

English Delftware from London and Virginia (Williamsburg, VA, 1977); Henry-Pierre

Fourest, *Delftware: Faience Production at Delft,* trans. Katherine Watson (London, 1980);

Frank Britton, *English Delftware in the Bristol Collection* (London, 1982); Louis L. Lipski

and Michael Archer, *Dated English Delftware: Tin-glazed Earthenware 1600-1800* (London,

1984); Frank Britton, *London Delftware* (London, 1987); Daphne Carnegy, *Tin-Glazed

Earthenware: From Maiolica, Faience and Delftware to the Contemporary* (London and

Philadelphia, 1993); John C. Austin, *British Delftware at Williamsburg* (Williamsburg and

London, 1994); Michael Archer, *Delftware: The Tin-glazed Earthenware of the British Isles.

A Catalogue of the Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London, 1997); Anthony

Ray, *English Delftware in the Ashmolean Museum* (Oxford and London, 2000); Leslie B.

Grigsby, *The Longridge Collection of English Slipware and Delftware,* 2 vols (London,

2000); John Black, *British Tin-Glazed Earthenware* (Princes Risborough, 2001); Aileen

Dawson, *English and Irish Delftware 1570-1840* (London, 2010); Michael Archer, *Delftware

in the Fitzwilliam Museum* (Cambridge, 2013). Where photographs of the items discussed

below are available on the internet, I have provided the museum's item number. In other

cases, I have supplied references to books and catalogues in which they are described and

reproduced.

[5] On the parallel preference of collectors for 'clean books', see William H. Sherman, *Used

Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008).

[6] See Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass, 'Introduction', in *Subject

and Object in Renaissance Culture,* ed. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter

Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1-13; and Alexandra Walsham,

'The Pope's Merchandise and the Jesuits' Trumpery: Catholic Relics and Protestant Polemic

in Post-Reformation England', in Dagmar Eichberger and Jennifer Spinks (eds), *Religion, the

Supernatural and Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe: An Album Amicorum for Charles*

Zika (Brill, forthcoming 2015). See also the editors' 'Introduction' to Michael W. Cole and Rebecca Zorach (eds), *The Idol in the Age of Art: Objects, Devotions and the Early Modern World* (Farnham, 2009), pp. 1-10, at 6.

[7] Birgit Meyer, *Mediation and the Genesis of Presence: Towards a Material Approach to Religion* (Utrecht, 2012); idem and Dick Houtman, 'Introduction: Material Religion – How Things Matter', in Dick Houtman and Birgit Meyer (eds), *Things: Religion and the Question of Materiality* (New York, 2012), pp. 1-23. See also David Morgan (ed.), *Religion and Material Culture: The Matter of Belief* (New York, 2010).

[8] See Igor Kopytoff, 'The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process', in Arjun Appadurai (eds), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 64-91. See also Leora Auslander, 'Beyond Words', *American Historical Review,* 110 (2005), 1015-45; Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (eds), *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and its Meanings* (Farnham, 2010); Luke Syson and Dora Thornton, *Objects of Virtue: Art in Renaissance Italy* (London, 2001); Roberta Olson, Patricia Reilly and Rupert Shepherd (eds), *The Biography of the Object in Late Medieval and Renaissance Italy* (Oxford, 2006).

[9] Andrew Morrall, 'Ornament as Evidence', in Karen Harvey (ed.), *History and Material Culture* (London and New York, 2009), pp. 47-66; 'Protestant Pots: Morality and Social Ritual in the Early Modern Home', *Journal of Design History,* 15 (2002), 263-273; David Gaimster, 'Pots, Prints and Propaganda: Changing Mentalities in the Domestic Sphere 1480-1580' and Tara Hamling, 'Reconciling Image and Object: Religious Imagery in Protestant Interior Decoration', in David Gaimster and Roberta Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation 1480-1580* (Leeds, 2003), pp. 122-44 and 321-34 respectively; Tara Hamling, *Decorating the Godly Household: Religious Art in Post-Reformation Britain* (New Haven and London, 2010); Tara Hamling, 'Guides to Godliness, from Print to Plaster', in Michael

Hunter (ed.), *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation* (Aldershot, 2010), pp. 65-85; Tara Hamling, 'Old Robert's Girdle: Visual and Material Props for Protestant Piety in Post-Reformation England', in Jessica Martin and Alec Ryrie (eds), *Private and Domestic Devotion in Early Modern Britain* (Farnham, 2012), pp. 135-63; Tara Hamling, 'Living with the Bible in Post-Reformation England: The Materiality of Text, Image and Object in Domestic Life', in John Doran, Charlotte Methuen and Alexandra Walsham (eds), *Religion and the Household,* Studies in Church History 50 (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 210-39. See also Raffaella Sarti, *Europe at Home: Family and Material Culture 1500-1800* (New Haven and London, 2004), esp. pp. 126-8.

[10] See Mark A. Peterson, 'Puritanism and Refinement in Early New England: Reflections ono Communion Silver', *William and Mary Quarterly,* 58 (2001), 307-46, at 346; Jan de Vries, *The Industrious Revolution: Consumer Behaviour and the Household Economy, 1650 to the Present* (Cambridge, 2008), esp. pp. 56-8.

[11] Andrew Jones, *Memory and Material Culture* (Cambridge, 2007), p. 31 and passim . See also Marius Kwint, Christopher Breward and Jeremy Aynsley (ed.), *Material Memories* (Oxford and New York, 1999); Irene Barbiera, Alice M. Choyke, Judith A. Rasson (eds), *Materializing Memory: Archaeological Material Culture and the Semantics of the Past* (Oxford, 2009); Sandra H. Dudley, 'Museum Materialities: Objects, Sense and Feeling', in eadem (ed.), *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements, Interpretations* (London and New York, 2010), pp. 1-17. On the home as a 'memory machine', see Rachel Hurdley, *Home, Materiality, Memory and Belonging* (Basingstoke, 2013).

[12] Auslander, 'Beyond Words', 1016.

[13] See Adrian Forty and Susanne Küchler (eds), *The Art of Forgetting* (Oxford and New York, 1999), esp. Forty's 'Introduction', p. 8; Christopher Ivic and Grant Williams (eds),

Forgetting in Early Modern English Literature and Culture: Lethe's Legacies (London, 2004).

[14] For a detailed discussion of the development of the industry, see Kieron Tyler, Ian Betts and Roy Stephenson, *London's Delftware Industry: The Tin-Glazed Pottery Industries of Southwark and Lambeth* (London, 2008).

[15] The history of delftware production is traced in many of the items cited in n. 4. See esp. Archer, *Delftware ... in the Victoria and Albert Museum,* pp. 13-28 and see 27-38 for influences on decoration; Dawson, *English and Irish Delftware,* pp. 9-17. For accounts of the major potteries, see Ray, *English Delftware Pottery,* chs 4-9. See also Lorna Weatherill, 'The Growth of the Pottery Industry in England, 1660-1815', *Post-Medieval Archaeology,* 17 (1983), 15-46.

[16] Anthony Well-Cole, *Art and Decoration in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Influence of Continental Prints, 1558-1625* (New Haven and London, 1997). For general accounts of print making in Britain, see A. M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries,* 3 vols (Cambridge, 1952-64); Antony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-89* (London, 1998); Malcolm Jones, *The Print in Early Modern England: An Historical Oversight* (New Haven and London, 2010). On Dutch religious prints, see, among others, Bart A. Rosier, *The Bible in Print: Netherlandish Bible Illustration in the Sixteenth Century,* 2 vols (Leiden, 1997)**.** This essay focuses on delftware decorated with biblical and royal iconography, but these items need to be set in the context of other styles, which include birds, flowers, abstract patterns, and oriental landscapes and figures. In the analysis that follows, occasional reference is made to lead-glazed earthenware and slipware bearing similar designs.

[17] David Gaimster and Beverly Nenk, 'English Households in Transition c.1450-1550: The Ceramic Evidence', in David Gaimster and Paul Stamper (eds), *The Age of Transition: The*

Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 15 (Oxford, 1997), pp. 171-95, at 188, 172. See also David R. M. Gaimster, 'Saints and Sinners: The Changing Iconography of Imported Ceramic Stove-Tiles in Reformation England', in D. Kicken, A. M. Koldeweij, J. R. ter Molen (eds), *Gevonden Voorwerpen/Lost and Found: Opslellen over Middleeeuwse Archaeologie voor Beuningen,* Rotterdam Papers 11 (Rotterdam, 2000), pp. 142-50.

[18] See Lorna Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in Britain 1660-1760* (London, 1988, 2nd edition), pp. 28-30, 44- 49, 86-7, 110-11; Lorna Weatherill, 'The Meaning of Consumer Behaviour in Late Seventeenth- and Early Eighteenth-Century England', in John Brewer and Roy Porter (eds), *Consumption and the World of Goods* (London and New York, 1993), pp. 206-27, esp. tables on pp. 218-225; Mark Overton, Jane Whittle, Darron Dean, and Andrew Hahn, *Production and Consumption in English Households, 1600-1750* (London, 2004), pp. 102-5 and ch. 5 *passim*; Jane Whittle and Elizabeth Griffiths, *Consumption and Gender in the Early Seventeenth-Century Household: The World of Alice Le Strange* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 144-5. For the broader context, see Linda Levy Peck, *Consuming Splendour: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2005) and for the European dimension, see de Vries, *Industrious Revolution,* pp. 130-1, 152-3.

[19] For delftware bearing the arms of livery companies, see Hume, *Early English Defltware,* plates 19 and 20, p. 31; and for the Nunes piece, see Dawson, *English and Irish Delftware,* p. 302, no. 16.

[20] Based on her study of inventories, Weatherill, *Consumer Behaviour,* p. 111, suggests earthenware cost between 2d and 1s, but this is likely to be the precise for undecorated items.

[21] On Walpole, see Archer, *Delftware,* p. 9; Dawson, *English and Irish Delftware,* p. 23, and see 18-22. For a piece of commemorative delftware redecorated in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century, see Archer, *Delftware … in the Victoria and Albert Museum,* p. 414.

[22] De Vries, *Industrious Revolution.*

[23] Randle Holme, *The Academy of Armory, or A Storehouse of Armory and Blazon,* volume 2*,* ed. I. H. Jeayes (London, 1905), p. 4. Volume 1, which included books 1-III, up to chapter 13, was published by Holme in 1688. See also Robert J. Charleston, 'The Social Background of English Delftware', in Lipski and Archer, *Dated English Delftware,* pp. 9-14.

[24] BM, item nos 1960,0403.1 and 1952,0402.1. Another mug from the Pickleherring or Montague Close poster inscribed William and Elizabeth 1632 is in the Victoria and Albert Museum [hereafter V&A], no. 3839-1901 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O8072/mug-montague-close-pottery/). For a mug inscribed 'RICHARD : WRIGHT : & : ELIZABETH : 1650', see Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1313-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71776).

[25] BM, registration no. 1888,1110.17.

[26] Cited in Black, *British Tin-glazed Earthenware,* p. 32.

[27] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1583-1928. See http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72262.

[28] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1326-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71818). Auslander, 'Beyond Words', 1019; Angela McShane, 'Subjects and Objects: Material Expressions of Love and Loyalty in Seventeenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies,* 48 (2009), 871-86.

[29] Jones, *Memory and Material Culture,* p. 60.

[30] Lipski and Archer, *Dated English Delftware,* pp. 172, 162 respectively.

[31] Frances A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (London, 1966), esp. pp. 129-59, 320-41.

[32] Claude Paradin, *Quadrins Historiques de la Bible* (Lyon, 1558); trans. as *The true and lyvely historyke purtreatures of the wholl bible* (Lyon, 1553), sig. a6v.

[33] Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1550-1640* (Cambridge, 1991); Lucy Gent (ed.), *Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain 1550-1660* (New Haven and London, 1995); Tara Hamling, *Decorating the Godly Household;* Tara Hamling and Richard Williams (ed.), *Art Re-formed: Reassessing the Impact of the Reformation on the Visual Arts* (Newcastle, 2007), 201-14; Adam Morton, 'Glaring at Antichrist: Anti-Papal Images in Early Modern England, c. 1530-1680' (unpubl. DPhil thesis, University of York, 2011); Michael Hunter (ed.), *Printed Images in Early Modern Britain: Essays in Interpretation* (Farnham, 2010), pt I. For the broader European context, see Paul Corby Finney (ed.), *Seeing beyond the Word: Visual Arts and the Calvinist Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI, and Cambridge, 1999); William A. Dyrness, *Reformed Theology and Visual Culture: The Protestant Imagination from Calvin to Edwards* (Cambridge, 2004); Joseph Koerner, *The Reformation of the Image* (Chicago, 2004); Bridget Heal, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Early Modern Germany: Protestant and Catholic Piety, 1500-1648* (Cambridge, 2007). Patrick Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England: Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York, 1988), p. 119. For an overview of recent historiographical trends, see Alexandra Walsham, 'Idols in the Frontispiece? Illustrating Religious Books in the Age of Iconoclasm', in Feike Dietz *et al* (eds), *Illustrated Religious Texts in the North of Europe, 1500-1800* (Farnham, 2014), pp. 21-52.

[34] For Luther, see Pamela Johnston and Bob Scribner (eds), *The Reformation in Germany and Switzerland* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 83; John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* ed. and trans. Henry Beveridge, 2 vols in 1 (Grand Rapids, MI, 1989), i. 97, 100-1; William Perkins, *A warning against the idolatry of the last times,* in his *Workes* (Cambridge, 1603), pp. 829-30.

[35] Perkins, *Warning,* pp. 829-30; David Davis, *Seeing Faith, Printing Pictures: Religious Identity in the English Reformation* (Leiden, 2013), ch. 2.

[36] Margaret Aston, 'Gods, Saints and Reformers: Portraiture and Protestant England', in Gent (ed.), *Albion's Classicism,* pp. 181-220; Tarnya Cooper, 'Predestined Lives? Portraiture and Religious Belief in England and Wales, 1560-1620', in Hamling and Williams (ed.), *Art Reformed,* pp. 49-63.

[37] Dawson, *English and Irish Delftware,* p. 96; BM, registration no. 1855,0811.2; V&A, no. and 3861-1901 (and http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O20591/esau-coming-to-isaac-on-tile-unknown/).

[38] Garner and Archer, *English Delftware,* plate 5, and see pp. 8, 9; V&A, no. 4026:59-1901 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O8073/the-walk-to-emmaus-dish-barnebowe-thomas/).

[39] See N. Hudson Moore, *Delftware Dutch and English* (London, n.d.), p. 10 and plate facing p. 14.

[40] On depictions of the deity, see Margaret Aston, 'Symbols of Conversion: Proprieties of the Page in Reformation England', in Hunter (ed.), *Printed Images,* pp. 23-42, and her 'The *Bishops' Bible* Illustrations', in Diana Wood (ed.), *The Church and the Arts,* Studies in Church History 28 (Oxford, 1992), pp. 267-85; Davis, *Seeing Faith,* pp. 143-78.

[41] For a wedding plate depicting the sacrifice of Isaac dating from 1665, see V&A, no. C.73-1951 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21235/dish-rotherhithe-pottery/). For a dish showing the Prodigal Son feasting in the Liverpool Museum, see Garner and Archer, *English Delftware,* plate 10, and see pp. 8, 9. For an Adam and Eve plate commemorating a wedding of 1635, see V&A, no. C.26-1931 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O11566/the-temptation-of-adam-and-dish-pickleherring-pottery/). Other examples of Adam and Eve plates include Fitzwilliam Museum, nos C.1625-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72349;

C.1627-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72351); and C.1622-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72346). For the Dutch plate showing Amnon's rape of Tamar, see Jan Daniël van Dam, *Gedaleerd Delfts aardewerk/ Dated Dutch Delftware* (Amsterdam, 1991), no. 26 (pp. 56-7). For a fecundity plate, see Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1409-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72365).

[42] T. G. Kootte (ed.), *De Bijbel in Huis: Bijbelse verhalen op huisraad in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw* (Zwolle and Utrecht, 1992), pp. 52, 86.

[43] Wells-Cole, *Art and Decoration*; Hamling, *Decorating the Godly Household;* Kootte (ed.), *De Bijbel in Huis*. For a late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century damask tablecloth into which is woven the story of Susannah and the Elders, see Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, no. SPkk t50.

[44] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1443-1928 (see http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72012). For the context, see Angela McShane and Clare Backhouse, 'Top Knots and Lower Sorts: Print and Promiscuous Consumption in the 1690s', in Hunter (ed.), *Printed Images,* pp. 337-57.

[45] 'FAST AND PRAY 1659' appears on a slipware mug: BM, registration no. 1887, 0307, D.21. For 'WHEN YOU SEE THIS REMEMBER ME. OBEAY GODS WORD', see William Burton, *A History and Description of English Earthenware and Stoneware* (London, 1904), fig. 5 (between pp. 30 and 31); the 'Richard Birchet' jug is BM, registration no. E.35.

[46] Hume, *English English Delftware,* plate 15, p. 29. By contrast a muge dated 1657 in the Kenneth and Jean Chorley Collection reads 'DRINKE: UP YOUR: DRINKE: AND: SEE MY: CONNY' and has a blue rabbit painted on the base of the interior: ibid., plate 20, p. 31.

[47] Juliet Fleming, *Graffiti and the Writing Arts of Early Modern England* (Philadelphia, 2001), 145-58. See also Hamling, 'Old Robert's Girdle', pp. 161-2; Hamling, 'Living with the Bible', pp. 228-32.

[48] See Alec Ryrie, *Being Protestant in Reformation England* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 381-9. See also Alexandra Walsham, 'Holy Families: The Spiritualisation of the Early Modern Household Revisited', in John Doran, Charlotte Methuen and Alexandra Walsham (eds), *Religion and the Household,* Studies in Church History 50 (Woodbridge, 2014), pp. 122-60.

[49] Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, Warren Collection. WA 1963.136.53, reproduced in Ray, *English Delftware*, p. 22.

[50] Andrew Morrall, 'Inscriptional Wisdom and the Domestic Arts in Early Modern Northern Europe', in Natalia Filatkina, Birgit Ulrike Münch, Ane Kleine (eds), *Konstruktion, Manifestation und Dynamic der Formalhaftigkeit in Text und Bild* (Trier, 2012), pp. 121-38, at 128, 133. See also Peterson, 'Protestantism and Refinement', p. 313.

[51] Ulinka Rublack, *Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 167 and 157-69 *passim.*

[52] For crucifixion scenes, see Ashmolean Museum, Warren Collection, WA. 1963. 136.53, reproduced in Ray, *English Delftware,* p. 22; and Bristol Museum, no. G. 2228, reproduced in Britton, *English Delftware,* no. 3.62 (p. 67). See also Jonathan Horne, *A Collection of Early English Pottery,* part 3 (March 1983), no. 61.For the dish with the holy name of Jesus in the Dolz Collection in Alexandria, Virginia, see Lipski and Archer, *Dated English Delftware,* no. 315 (p. 80). For a lead-glazed earthenware example from eighteenth-century Europe, see V&A, no. C.120-1926 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O161427/dish-unknown/); for a fifteenth-century Spanish example, see V&A, no. C.2046-1910 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O161791/bowl-unknown/).

[53] For this group of delftware, see Archer, *Delftware in the Fitzwilliam Museum,* sections A.1-12. It is explicitly omitted from Kevin Sharpe's *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714* (New Haven and London, 2013), p. xx, though there are passing references on pp. 160, 292, 445-8. For similar Dutch delftware commemorative of the House of Orange, see van Dam, *Dated Dutch Delftware,* nos. 3, 5, 14, 15, 57.

[54] London Museum (c. 84), reproduced in Garner and Archer, *English Delftware,* plate 4, and see pp. 5, 7.

[55] V&A, no. C.38-1928 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21170/dish-pickleherring-pottery/).

[56] Austin, *British Delftware at Williamsburg,* no. 715, p. 284.

[57] For a dish, see V&A, no. C.91-1931 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/021184/dish-brislington/). For a mug dated 1666, see V&A, no. C.201-1938 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item021476/mug-unknown/). For a bottle dating from c. 1660-1665, see V&A, no. C.1042-1922 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21117/bottle-unknown/). For a porringer, see Austin, *British Delft at Williamsburg,* no. 392, p. 196. For other examples, see Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1430-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71989) and C.1439-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72002); BM, registration nos 1887,0307,E.81; 1960,1101.1; 1938,0314.108.CR; 1855,1201.116.

[58] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1642-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72376). See also BM, registration no. 1981,0301.1. For a plate depicting them both, see V&A, no. 3869-1901 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21068/dish-brislington-pottery/).

[59] Examples include Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1644-1928

(http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72378). V&A, no. 3872-1901

(http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21071/dish-brislington-pottery/); BM . For the bleeding

bowl, see Garner and Archer, *English Delftware,* plate 52B (and see p. 14).

[60] Fitzwilliam Museum, nos C.1341-1928 and C.1344-1928

(http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71836 and 71840). Other examples include

Fitzwilliam Museum, nos C.1343-1928, C.1634-1928, C.1447-1928, C.1655-1928, C.1449-

1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71841, 72363, 72016, 72397, 72018);

V&A, no. 3873-1901 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21336/plate-unknown/); BM, nos

1887,0307,E.64; 1960,0204.1; 1887,0307, E.150.

[61] For example, Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1636-1928

(http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72365); V&A, no. C.244-1983

(http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21021/plate-norfolk-house-pottery/); BM, no.

1887,0307,E.151.

[62] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1356-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71861).

For a George I plate, see Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1638-1928

(http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72368).

[63] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.40-1934 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/74931);

V&A, no. C.21-1966 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O8078/dish-unknown/).

[64] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1357-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71862).

For another Sacheverell dish, see Grigsby, *Longridge Collection,* ii. 74.

[65] For the item sold at Christie's, sale 2525, lot 138 on 24 January 2011, see http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/lot/an-english-delft-dated-portrait-plate-1746-5403770-details.aspx (last accessed 15 August 2014). For the Bonnie Prince Charlie punch bowl, see BM, registration no. 1890,1210.1. For a bowl with the slogan, 'Confusion to the Pretender', see BM, registration no. E.159; for 'Duke William for Ever', see Austin, *British Delft at Williamsburg,* no. 193, p. 141 and plate 16. For other examples, see BM, registration no. 1887,0210.140; Ashmolean Museum, Warren Collection (WA 1963.136.29) reproduced in Ray, *English Delftware*, pp. 44-5. See also Dawson, *English and Irish Delftware,* nos 20-23 (pp. 68-75).

[66] For a similar process in revolutionary France, see Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France* (Berkeley, 1996) and her 'Beyond Words', 1028-35.

[67] See McShane, 'Subjects and Objects', esp. p. 878. For one Charles II plate with the intials 'MH', see V&A, no. C.617-1925 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O21147/dish-rotherhithe-pottery/).

[68] See V&A, no. LOAN: BM.1030-2001 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O78303/slipware-mug/).

[69] For the role of this type of delftware in buttressing the royal couple's rule, see Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule,* pp. 445-8, and n. 20 on pp. 773-4.

[70] V&A, no. C.71-1998 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O10216/dish-pickleherring-pottery/). On the cult of Charles Stuart, see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr* (Woodbridge, 2003).

[71] BM, no. 1924,1023.1.CR. Other examples are in the Fitzwilliam Museum, nos C.1458-1928 and C.1457-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/72031 and 72030).

[72] Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule,* p. 146.

[73] David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London, 1993).

[74] See Alexandra Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 526-9; Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule*, pp. 88-90, 113, 114.

[75] For delftware plates, see Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1425-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71982) ; BM, registration no. 1939,0607.1. See also Dawson, *English and Irish Delftware,* no. 18 (pp. 64-5). The inscribed Dutch dish is in Grigsby, *Longridge Collection,* ii. 75.

[76] For a fireback with this image, see Jeremy Hodgkinson, *British Cast-Iron Firebacks of the 16th to mid 18th Centuries* (Crawley, 2010)*,* p. 171. This is V&A, no. 255-1906 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O324678/fire-back-unknown/).There is another at Montacute House, Somerset. For the plaque, see V&A, no. C.360:1&2-2009 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O8096/plaque-unknown/). For lead-glazed slipware examples, Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.216-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/73169) and Andrew Morrall and Melinda Hart (eds), *English Embroidery from The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1580-1700* (New Haven and London, 2008), p. 137.

[77] For the item sold at Christie's in sale 7920, 10-11 June 2010, see http://www.christies.com/lotfinder/lot/a-london-delft-blue-and-white-popish-5323620-details.aspx (last accessed 15 August 2014). For popish plot tiles, see V&A, no. 414:823/4-1885 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O73461/the-popish-plot-tile-hamme-jan-ariens/); and for two sets in the BM: reg. nos 1987, 1204 and 2009,8014 and 8015.

[78] 'Documentary pottery' is Anthony Ray's apt phrase: *English Delftware Pottery,* p. 122. For Samuel Ward's 'Double deliverance' print, see London, British Museum, registration no.1847,0723.11. On providential monuments, see Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 250-66.

[79] See Michael Sparke, *Thankfull remembrances of Gods wonderfull deliverances of this land,* bound with *Crumms of Comfort* (London, 1627 edn), fold-out plate showing 'The night of Popish superstition' and 'The return of the Gospells light'.

[80] *Faiths victorie in Romes crueltie* (c. 1620s): BM, no. 1855,0512.317. There is also an edition dated to the 1670s in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D.C. (ART 265962 (size M)). For a different print entitled 'The Bishops who suffer'd Martyrdom for the Protestant Faith; under the Persecution of Queen Mary I', see Fitzwilliam Museum, no. P.9362-R, (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/149966). For the contestation of Foxeian legacy, see Damian Nussbaum, 'Appropriating Martyrdom: Fears of Renewed Persecution and the 1632 Edition of *Actes and Monuments',* in David Loades (ed.), *John Foxe and the English Reformation* (Aldershot, 1997)*,* pp. 178-91.

[81] One surviving example kept at Lewes in Sussex may be a replica of a genuine seventeenth-century product, but it might also be the work of the Piltdown forger. See Hodgkinson, *British Cast-Iron Firebacks,* p. 172; Alexandra Walsham, 'History, Memory and the English Reformation', *Historical Journal,* 55 (2012), 899-938, at 932; Crispin Paine, 'Mystery of the Two Martyrs: Where are the Firebacks Now', *Sussex Past and Present,* 130 (2013), 6-7. See also Jones, *Print,* pp. 58-60. See also Tara Hamling, 'Seeing Sin and Salvation', in Jonathan Willis (ed.), *Sin and Salvation in Reformation England* (Farnham, forthcoming 2015).

[82] Fitzwilliam Museum, no. C.1368-1928 (http://data.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/id/object/71878). See Archer, *Delftware in the Fitzwilliam Museum,* p. 343.

[83] BM, no. 1889,0702.45. [**Acknowledgement removed**].

[84] V&A, nos C.47-1951 and C.48-1951 (http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O494321/vase-unknown/ and http://collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O494322/vase-unknown/). See also Rose Kerr and Luisa E. Mengoni, *Chinese Export Ceramics* (London, 2011), p. 69, plate 89; Kenji Yoshida and Brian Durrans (eds), *Self and Other: Portraits from Asia and Europe* (Osaka, 2008), no. 215 and p. 290.

[85] Keramiekmuseum Princessehof, Leeuwarden, inv. nr. NO 2461; Groningermuseum, inv. nr. 1984-0159. See also K. G. van Manen (ed.), *Lutheranen in de Lage Landen* (Zoetermeer, 2011), p. 366. [**Acknowledgement removed**].

[86] Christian J. A. Jörg, 'Chinese Porcelain for the Dutch in the Seventeenth Century: Trading Networks and Private Enterprise', in Rosemary E. Scott (ed.), *The Porcelain of Jingdezhen* (London, 1993), pp. 183-205.

[87] Margaret Aston, 'Bibles to Ballads: Some Pictorial Migrations in the Reformation', in Simon Ditchfield (ed.), *Christianity and Community in the West: Essays for John Bossy* (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 106-30.

[88] For example, Lucas Cranach's 'Epitaph of Meienburg's Mayor (showing the reformers' group with Martin Luther)', in St Blasii Pfarrkirche, Nordhausen, Germany: Bridgeman Art Library, Image no.151900.

[89] See Werner Hoffmann, *Luther und die Folgen für die Kunst* (Munich, 1984), pp. 157, 320. For a Hungarian example, see http://reformatus.hu/mutat/9163/ (accessed 15 August 2014). The Danckertz version is reproduced in Wolfgang Harms and Michael Schilling, *Deutsche illustrierte Flugblätter des 16 und 17 Jahrhundert*, 4 vols (Tübingen and Munich, 1985), ii. 216-17 (no. 123). For the Allard edition, see Amsterdam, Rijksmuseum, no. RP-P-OB-78.422. On this family of prints, see Einer Molland, 'Reformasjonens fedre eller

"lysestaken": et tema I protestantismens ikonografi og dets forekomst I Norge', *Aust Agder Arv* (Stockholm, 1971-2), pp. 4-58; Michael Windross, 'Word and Image in a Group of Seventeenth-Century Protestant Prints', in Paul Joret and Aline Remael (eds), *Language and Beyond/ Le langage et ses au-delà: Actuality and Virtuality in the Relations between Word, Image and Sound/ Acutalité et virtualité dans les rapports entre le verbe, l'image et le son* (Amsterdam and Atlanta, 1998), pp. 141-53; Pamela Tudor-Craig, 'Group Portraits of the Protestant Reformers', in Tara Hamling and Richard Williams (eds), *Art Reformed: Reassessing the Impact of the Reformation on the Visual Arts* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 87-97; and, the most comprehensive survey to date, Joke Spaans, 'Faces of the Reformation' (forthcoming). **Acknowledgement removed.**

[90] 'The Candle is Lighted, We Cannot Blow Out': London, British Museum, registration number 1907, 0326.31. For discussions of these prints in their context, see Sheila O'Connell, *The Popular Print in England, 1550-1850* (London, 1999), pp. 129-31; Jones, *Print,* pp. 160, 162-3; and Walsham, 'History, Memory and the English Reformation', 929-31. In establishing the chronology of these prints, this article follows the reasoning of Windross, 'Word and Image', esp. pp. 144, 149.

[91] Spaans, 'Faces of the Reformation'.

[92] On other pictorial 'monuments', see Walsham, *Providence,* pp. 250-66. On graphic satire, see Helen Pierce, *Unseemly Pictures: Graphic Satire and Politics in Early Modern England* (New Haven and London, 2008); Joke Spaans, *Graphic Satire and Religious Change: The Dutch Republic 1676-1707* (Leiden, 2011). For another example of the blurring of generic boundaries, see Margaret Aston, *The King's Bedpost: Reformation and Iconography in a Tudor Group Portrait* (Cambridge, 1995).

[93] Reproduced in Tudor-Craig, 'Group Portraits', p. 100.

[94] See for example a Dutch print of the evangelist dating from c. 1600: British Museum, registration no. D,6.90.

[95] For example, Michael Sparke's *The plots of Jesuites* (London 1653): BM, registration no. 1868,0808.13539.

[96] Hans Schwyzer and Kupferstecher Maler, *Effigies praecipuorum, illustrium, atque praestantium aliquot theologorum, qui, quà ore, quà scripto, Romanae Ecclesiae fortiter sese opposuerunt, Ecclesiàmque Christi à Papanis heterodoxiis reformârunt atque repurgârunt* ([1650]): Zentralbibliothek, Zürich. See http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3AZentralbibliothek_Z%C3%BCrich_-_Effigies_praecipuorum_illustrium_atque_praestantium_aliquot_theologorum_-_000008283.jpg.

[97] The paintings are discussed in Tudor-Craig, 'Group Portraits', who notes that at least 15 versions are extant in Britain. The version with Foxe is in the Museum Catharijneconvent, Utrecht, no. RMCC sOO278. Five can be viewed via the website 'BBC Your Paintings' (http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/), s.v. 'Protestant reformers'.

[98] London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 29719.2, press mark GG 51. My thanks to Joke Spaans for drawing my attention to this item. A photograph of it exists in the Warburg Library photographic collection.

[99] See S. J. Barnett, 'Where was your Church before Luther? Claims for the Antiquity of Protestantism Examine', *Church History,* 68 (1999), 14-41; Mark Greengrass and Matthew Phillpott, 'John Bale, John Foxe and the Reformation of the English Past', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 101 (2010), 275-87. See also Alec Ryrie, 'The Problems of Legitimacy and Precedent in English Protestantism, 1539-47', in Bruce Gordon (ed.),

Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe, 2 vols (Aldershot, 1996), i. 78-92; Irena Backus, *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation* (Leiden, 2003).

[100] Theodore Beza, *Icones id est verae imagines virorum doctrina simulet pietate illustrium* (Geneva, 1580). See Aston, 'Gods, Saints and Reformers'; Paul Corby Finney, 'A Note on de Bèze's Icones', in Finney (ed.), *Seeing beyond the Word,* pp. 253-68. See also Mary G. Winkler, 'Calvin's Portrait: Representative, Image, or Icon?', in the same volume, pp. 243-51.

[101] J. N. L. Myres, 'Thomas James and the Painted Frieze', *Bodleian Library Record,* 4 (1952-3), 30-51.

[102] Philips Numan, *Miracles lately wrought by the intercession of the glorious Virgin Marie, at Mont-aigu, nere unto Sichem in Brabant ,* trans. Robert Chambers (Antwerp, 1606), sigs D6v-7r.

[103] For a 1619 German version of this image, see BM, registration no. 1880,0710.390.

[104] On the marginalisation of the radical Reformation, see Lyndal Roper, 'Allegiance and Reformation History', part of a 'Focal Point' on 'Post-Confessional Reformation History', in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* 97 (2006), 289-97, at 294. This is also a central theme of Brad S. Gregory, *The Unintended Reformation: How a Religious Revolution Secularized Society* (Cambridge, MA, 2012).

[105] See Margaret Aston, 'John Wycliffe's Reformation Reputation', *Past and Present,* 30 (1965), 23-51, repr. (with some additional notes) in her *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London, 1984), pp. 243-72. See also her 'Lollardy and the Reformation: Survival or Revival?', *History,* 49 (1964), 149-70.

[106] See Alexandra Walsham, 'Wyclif's Well: Lollardy, Landscape and Memory in Post-Reformation England', in Angela McShane and Garthine Walker (ed.), *The Extraordinary*

and the Everyday in Early Modern England: Essays in Celebration of the Work of Bernard Capp (Basingstoke, 2010), pp. 142-60.

[107] K. B. Macfarlane, *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity* (London, 1952), p. xii.

[108] Patrick Collinson, 'Truth and Legend: The Veracity of John Foxe's Book of Martyrs', in A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse (eds), *Clio's Mirror: Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands* (Zutphen, 1985), 31-54.

[109] See, esp. Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge, 1982) and 'Calvinism and the English Church, 1570-1635', *Past and Present,* 114 (1986), 32-76; Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism c.1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987). For the impact of Calvinism in England, see also Patrick Collinson, 'England and International Calvinism 1558-1640', in Menna Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism 1541-1715* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 197-223.

[110] See Andrew Pettegree, 'The Reception of Calvinism in Britain', in Wilhelm H. Neuser and Brian G. Armstrong (eds), *Calvinus Sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion,* Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies 36 (Kirksville, MI, 1997), pp. 267-89.

[111] Cited in MacCulloch, 'Changing Historical Perspectives', p. 286.

[112] Peter Marshall, 'John Calvin and the English Catholics, c.1565-1640', *Historical Journal,* 53 (2010), 849-70. On the European biographical tradition, see Irena Backus, *Life Writing in Reformation Europe: Lives of Reformers by Friends, Disciples and Foes* (Aldershot, 2008), chs 4-5.

[113] For an illuminating set of essays on Calvin's afterlife in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Johan de Niet, Herman Paul and Bart Wallet (eds), *Sober, Strict and Scriptural:*

Collective Memories of John Calvin 1800-2000 (Leiden and Boston, 2009). See also Irena

Backus and Philip Benedict (eds), *Calvin and his Influence, 1509-2009* (Oxford, 2011).

[114] Print made by John Gaywood and published by John Overton, c. 1644-62: BM,

registration no. O,3.186.

[115] Basil Hall, 'Calvin against the Calvinists', in G. Duffield (ed.), *John Calvin,* Courtenay

Studies in Reformation Theology I (Appleford, Abingdon, 1966), pp. 19-37. See also R.T.

Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979), esp. ch. 2.

[116] Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism,* ch. 2.

[117] John Dove, *Of divorcement. A sermon preached at Pauls Crosse* (London, 1601), sigs

A3r, A4r.

[118] Collinson, 'England and International Calvinism 1558-1640', pp. 214-15, quoting from

Anthony Marten's dedicatory epistle to Elizabeth I in *The common places of the most famous

and renowned divine doctor Peter Martyr* (London, 1582), sig. a3v.

[119]Thomas Fuller, *The holy state* (Cambridge, 1642), p. 92. On the translations of his work,

see Ian Breward (ed.), *The Work of William Perkins* (Appleford, Abingdon, 1970), pp. 106-7,

130, 613-32. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism,* ch. 4. W. B. Patterson, *William Perkins

and the Making of a Protestant England* (Oxford, 2014).

[120] Micron is quoted in Collinson, 'England and International Calvinism', p. 198. Diarmaid

MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven and London, 1996).

[121] John Foxe, *Actes and Monuments* (London, 1563), p. 1503.

[122] Lyndal Roper, 'Martin Luther's Body: The "Stout Doctor" and his Biographers',

American Historical Review, 115 (2010), 351-384.

[123] Alec Ryrie, 'The Strange Death of Lutheran England', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,*

53 (2002), 64-92; Alec Ryrie, 'The Afterlife of Lutheran England', in Dorothea Wendebourg

(ed.), *Sister Reformations/Schwesterreformationnen: The Reformation in Germany and in*

England/Die Reformation in Deutschland und in England (Tübingen, 2010), pp. 213-34; Carl R. Trueman and Carrie Euler, 'The Reception of Martin Luther in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England', in Ha and Collinson (eds), *Reception,* pp. 63-81. Luther is called a 'Hercules of Gods glory' in John Eaton, *The honey-combe of free justification by Christ alone* (London, 1642), 179. The quotation from Foxe is in *The ecclesiastical history* (London, 1570), pp. 992-3.

[124] *Dris Martin Lutheri colloquia mensalia: or Dr Martin Luther's divine discourses at his table, &c,* ed. and trans. Henry Bell (London, 1651), sig. a4v.

[125] Ryrie, 'The Afterlife of Lutheran England', at p. 217; Trueman and Euler, 'Reception of Martin Luther', citations at pp. 72, 80. Robert Kolb notes a similar process in Germany itself in *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520-1620* (Grand Rapids, MI, and Carlisle, 1999). On attempts to harness his theological legacy, see J. Wayne Baker, 'Sola Fide, Sola Gratia: The Battle for Luther in Seventeenth-Century England', *Sixteenth Century Journal,* 16 (1985), 115-33. For contemporary biographical writing about Luther, see Backus, *Life Writing,* ch. 1. For an intriguing account of historiographical amnesia in the twentieth century, see Natalia Nowakowska, 'Forgetting Lutheranism: Historians and the Early Reformation in Poland (1517-1548)', *Church History and Religious Culture,* 92 (2012), 281-303.

[126] Alec Ryrie, 'The Afterlife of Lutheran England', p. 214.

[127] See Diarmaid MacCulloch, 'The Myth of the English Reformation', *Journal of British Studies,* 30 (1991), 1-19; idem, 'Changing Perspectives on the English Reformation: The Last Fifty Years', in Peter D. Clarke and Charlotte Methuen (eds), *The Church on its Past,* Studies in Church History 49 (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 282-302. See also Peter Nockles, 'A Disputed Legacy: Anglican Historiographies of the Reformation from the Era of the Caroline Divines to that of the Oxford Movement', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* 83 (2001), 121-67.

[128] Patrick Collinson, 'The Fog in the Channel Clears: The Rediscovery of the Continental Dimension to the British Reformations', in Ha and Collinson (eds), *Reception,* pp. xxvii-xxxvii.

[129] Anthony Milton, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600-1640* (Cambridge, 1995), esp. ch. 6 and Part II.

[130] London, National Portrait Gallery, NPG D24005; *A true account of the rise and growth of the Reformation, or the progress of the Protestant religion* (London, 1680); J[ohn] S[hirley], *An epitomy of ecclesiastical history* (London, 1692).

[131] British Museum, registration no. 1868,0808.13195. A variant on this theme, depicting the reformers playing music instruments 'in consort', 'to express the Harmony between them', and described as 'A Satyrical or Emblymatical old painting' was the subject of discussion at the Society of Antiquaries of London in March 1746/7: see London, Society of Antiquaries, Minute Book, vol. V (1745), pp. 122-3.

[132] *Portraits of the Principal Primitive Reformers* ('The Candle of Reformation is Lighted'): engraving by Lodge (Private Collection / Bridgeman Images): Bridgeman Art Library, no. XJF173673.

[133] Philip Abrams, *Historical Sociology* (Shepton Mallet, 1982), p. 191.

[134] Peter Marshall, 'The Naming of Protestant England', *Past and Present,* 214 (2012), 87-128, at 91.