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This transnational study compares Catholic Spain and Protestant England as two countries that adopted opposing views on religious images in the early modern period. The Reformation questioned the value of and justification for the use of representations of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary and the saints found in medieval Catholic churches. This investigation focuses on how and why ideas about images written mostly by clergymen played themselves out differently in each country. The interaction of doctrine, official policy, audience, and practice is central to this analysis as it reveals the character of the religious culture of each country.

This analysis argues that unlike Trent that considered the doctrine of images as non-essential, the Church of England viewed images as a key component of their fight against Catholicism because images symbolized all the external and ceremonial aspects that had to be reformed. Spanish Catholic writers showed their concern for possible misuse and the need to clarify this doctrine to the laity. While it is clear that the Spanish policy toward censorship to a great extent halted any debates with Protestants, the English Protestants, who did not face those limitations, chose not to debate directly with authors from other countries. The discussion about images reveals an essential difference in the religious cultures of Catholic Spain and Protestant England. While in England more complex discussions targeted a lay religious culture that was accustomed to reading and discussing a great deal of religious subjects, in Spain the writings on images were directed mainly at a clergy who, in turn, had to instruct the laity on the meaning and proper use of images.

In Spain, confusion concerning the significance and role of images stemmed from the lack of clarity and detail in the decrees of the Council of Trent. It is likely that the
Catholic Church only focused on explaining the areas of doctrine that were essential for salvation: the use of images was encouraged but not required. Despite the secondary importance of the doctrine of images in the eyes of the fathers of Trent, they seemed concerned by misuse. Spanish authors might have observed misuse of images, and thus they felt the need to clarify the doctrine of images to their readers to fill the vacuum left by Trent. The Spanish Church actively dealt with abuse and misuse of images through the Inquisition and archbishoprics. Most Spanish Catholic authors adopted a more conservative stance than Trent and seemed to emphasize the importance of understanding devotional practices. Occasionally, a few authors were explicit about the possible dangers of images and disagreed with traditional Church views. The program of censorship discouraged the clergy to debate controversial doctrine with the laity and to engage in direct confrontations with Protestants. While there were debates over predestination and the Immaculate Conception, no direct discussion about images took place because they were part of a doctrine of marginal significance.

The Church of England offered a detailed doctrine of general principles without seeking to unify ideas. Images had been destroyed in the early years of the Elizabethan period, and thus divergence of ideas about them was allowed in order to facilitate the progress of reform. From this freedom of thought, a few views revealing toleration towards images emerged. The bans on publication focused on Catholics and Protestants were allowed to debate with their Catholic counterparts who were in exile. Eventually the rise to power of a group of high clergymen with an Arminian outlook during the reign of Charles I established a tacit new era of toleration of images, making illegal the works of Puritans who decried the return of symbols of Catholicism. The writings of English Catholics in exile demonstrate the different strategies used to advance their agendas in exile without openly criticizing the Queen. To their dual audiences of English Catholic and Protestants, these authors presented themselves as reformed Catholics with a conception of images different from the medieval church.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Reformation questioned the value of and justification for the use of material objects that were part of the traditional ceremonies of the medieval Church. Images represent one form of these material objects, as essential elements of ritual. Agreeing Johan Huizinga, Carlos Eire argues that “images allowed ‘the multitude’ to have no need for intellectual proof in matters of faith, [because] the mere presence of the visible image sufficed to establish the truth of holy things.”\(^1\) Unless otherwise indicated, the term ‘images’ in this study refers to paintings, sculptures, and crosses made as representations of episodes in the lives of Christ, the saints, and the Virgin Mary found in churches.\(^2\) For the medieval Church, religious architecture, candles, priest vestments and relics, processions, and other highly visual ceremonies contributed to parishioners’ visual knowledge of God. By abandoning the use of these types of visual imagery, Protestants “changed their way of worship, view of their relationship with God,” which included the way to know God.\(^3\) Conversely, Catholics stressed the value of images for early modern Christians.

During the early modern period, Spanish and English authors articulated their views on images in a variety of texts. While my study is for the most part an enquiry into Spanish and English intellectual history, it also has elements of cultural history which were useful in the articulation of the context in which religious ideas were expressed during the early

---

\(^1\) Eire borrowed from Huizinga the term ‘multitude.’ See Carlos M. N. Eire, \textit{War Against the Idols, the Reformation of Worship from Erasmus to Calvin} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 14.

\(^2\) For a full explanation of the concept ‘religious images’ see section of terminology of this chapter.

modern period. As a part of culture, attitudes and practice are important because they played a role in the shaping of ideas about images. However, I decided not to include photos of actual images so as to reinforce that this is a study of ideas. This work investigates how and why debates over images common to the two countries played out differently in each location. Thus I will focus on the role played by religious culture of each country—theology, official policy, audience, and practice in the production of ideas on images.

The analysis of my sources uncovered important similarities between the writing of both Spanish and English authors. They all struggled to define the concept of ‘image’, its role in religious practice, the positive or negative implications of its use, and the differences between the two main groups (Spanish Catholics and English Protestants). Although there was less diversity of opinion among Spanish Catholics than among English Protestants, there was some divergence within the two groups. The writings of Spanish converts to Protestantism and English Catholic exiles reveal in a unique way the influence of national circumstances and their particular goals as exiles.

The findings of my study engage with four broad historiographic debates to shed light on them. 1) How effective was the approach of Trent towards non-essential doctrine? 2) What was the nature and effects of English Protestant doctrine? 3) What were the consequences of the censorship campaign of the Counter-Reformation over debate inside the Catholic community and with people outside it? 4) Were there significant differences between religious reading culture between the Protestant and Catholic? The discussion of these questions is presented below.
As a result of the differences in religious culture of these two countries, both Spanish and English authors produced ambiguous claims. In Spain, confusion stemmed from the absence of detail in the decrees of the Council of Trent concerning the definition and proper use of images. That only a brief paragraph on the use of images was included in the decree on purgatory seems to indicate that the use of images was not very important. It is likely that Trent focused on promoting uniformity only in matters that were essential to salvation like the concept of transubstantiation. The total absence of Thomas Aquinas’ views on images in the decree is intriguing because of the prominence of his ideas in the sixteenth-century Catholic Church. Spanish authors wrote to fill the void left by Trent because they had concerns about orthodox practice and the possible disregard for orthodoxy among conversos and moriscos (Jews and Muslims converted to Christianity). They feared that their claims might be read as contrary to Church doctrine, thus they were cautious. The censorship imposed by the Inquisition contributed to a lack of exchange of ideas on images among authors within the country or with the outside world. This ideological retreat experienced in Spain was unique because, in the rest of Europe, the Counter-Reformation took the form of a constant counter-attack.\(^4\) Spanish authors wrote primarily for an audience of clergymen because of the low levels of literacy among the laity. Nonetheless, they expected to reach the laity through sermons in order to correct abuse and ensure orthodox practice.

The approach of the Church of England’s doctrine on images, especially in the Elizabethan Homily of 1563, produced some variation in the writings on images among early modern English authors. The Elizabethan Church did not intend to create uniformity

in practice, but only provide a guideline of basic doctrine. While considerable consensus about the rejection of images among Protestants existed during the second half of the sixteenth century, by the end of the reign of Elizabeth a reevaluation of images began to occur. A few authors considered that images, as part of the ceremonial, might have a place in religion. This tolerance of images reached its zenith under the early Stuart kings who supported Arminianism and its focus on the visual. Whereas Arminians kept almost complete silence about their views on images, there is evidence that reveals their thinking. Authors of Puritan views, who advanced reform in the previous century and between 1620 and 1650, vehemently opposed what they saw as the return of Catholic practice. Unlike the Spanish Catholic authors, English Protestants wrote for an audience composed of clergy and a segment of the laity, mostly from the gentry and merchants who were likely to read these kinds of texts. In spite of printing restrictions on the part of the monarchy, most authors, except for Catholics, were able to publish their religious positions no matter how controversial they were. For instance, while some reformers opposed the use of visual ceremonial and symbolic elements, like vestments, others considered them necessary for the success of reform. Some reformers presented radically different views of the sacraments, especially that of baptism. A presbyterian system was promoted by those who opposed the governing of the Church by bishops.

Description of Primary Sources

The distinct national historical circumstances of the two countries as well as practical considerations of this project determined the sources analyzed here. Spanish
Catholics and English Protestants sponsored radically different views about images as well as opposing official policies. However, in both countries visual and oral cultures were important and complemented each other. In Spain, the plethora of religious images pointed toward its significance. During the early modern period preaching reached an unprecedented place as a means of communicating the message of Christianity.\(^5\) In England, the destruction of images did not make English Protestantism a visual-free religion. The Ten Commandments and prayers written on walls of every church, the presence of representational stained glass windows in many churches and a cross in all of them, the powerful illustrations in some popular early Protestant religious writings, and the cult of Elizabeth, the ‘Virgin Queen,’ attest to the different ways in which the English religious visual culture was expressed.\(^6\)

I used a variety of printed sources: treatises that included discussions of the most important matters of doctrine, liturgy, and church authority; catechisms; spiritual guides; manuals for confessors; historical narratives of the origin and cult of specific images; and art discussions. Forty authors wrote these works: eighteen Spanish and twenty-two English writers. Only a few of these texts, in both Spanish and English, focused exclusively on the subject of images. Most of the works included discussion of images as a sub-theme of a broader subject within the book.

On the Spanish side, this project includes all the writing I found that discussed the doctrine on image use between 1550 and 1660. Guided by the references in secondary sources and catalogues of various Spanish archives, I found most of my sources at the

---

\(^5\) See discussion about the significance of the role of preaching in: Felix Salgado Herrero, ed., *La Oratoria Sagrada Española de los Siglos xxvi y xvii* (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1996), 118. So important was preaching in Spain that Canizares Olvera has argued that it saved Spain from Protestantism.

\(^6\) Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 120.
National Library of Spain. Because Protestants rejected the use of images, the English authors produced a volume of writings far greater than that of the Spanish authors. Special considerations therefore determined my approach to English sources: I wanted to work with a similar number of sources for each of the two countries of my investigation, and consequently, I had to select those works that were the most significant and the most representative. All these writings are available through digital archives available on the internet, which facilitated my work. In most cases, works discuss images as part of bigger treatises that include a variety of topics including attacks on papal authority, essays on doctrine, instructions for ceremonies, and reflections on the sacraments, the creation of liturgy, and the use of ornaments.

In addition, more information exists about the English authors than about their Spanish counterparts. Spanish scholarship lacks a resource such as the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography that provides substantial information on each English author who attended the major universities, Cambridge and Oxford. Secondary works also provided information about the English writers. In contrast, many of the Spanish authors remain unexplored; therefore, there is scant information available about them through secondary sources. I prepared short biographies of all my authors in the appendix to which I will refer in subsequent chapters.

**Comparative Approach and Organization**

---

7 I included at least two writers per decade when possible. When I found more than two, I only included those works that contained new arguments.
I used a comparative approach to investigate the complexity of the Spanish Catholic and English Protestant arguments about the legitimacy and the proper uses of images. This transnational assessment allowed me to overcome national parochialism encountered in local studies. By analyzing Spanish and English ideas about images against the backdrop of the religious turmoil of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation period, this work explores English Protestant and Spanish Catholic thought without isolating one group from the other.

To apply this methodological approach most effectively, this study organizes the comparison thematically by subject in each chapter. Next I present the early modern authors in the following order: Spanish Catholics, English Protestants, English Catholics, and Spanish Protestant converts. The exception to this organization occurs when I discuss the writings of two authors who debated with each other.

**Religious Reading Cultures: Literacy, Audience, and Censorship in the Dissemination of Ideas**

The intended readership of these works on doctrine and theology was shaped by factors such as literacy, audience, and censorship. Who could read and who was supposed to read determined the audience of the texts produced by the authors analyzed in this study. The question of who could read deals directly with literacy rates, and indirectly with ease of access, which, in a significant way, related to economic means. The question of who was supposed to read different kinds of religious texts refers specifically to the intended audience of the author.
Studies have established an approximation of literacy levels during the early modern period in Spain. According to Maxime Chevalier, eighty percent of the Spanish population were “partially or totally illiterate” in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, including “all the rural population and the majority of craftspeople.”8 Chevalier agrees with Henry-Jean Martin that reading skills were directly linked to professions: most clergymen, nobility, professionals (teachers, lawyers, doctors, artists), tradesmen, and bureaucrats could read.9 Although they knew how to read, artisans, government officials of middle rank, and especially hidalgos (low nobility) would not have had the economic power to buy books.

The language in which these theological and doctrinal books were written indicates their intended audiences: writing in Spanish indicates, at least in theory, a desire to reach the literate laity, who did not know Latin, the official language of the Catholic Church. This goal notwithstanding, the majority of the laity in Spain, and a significant number of clergymen, especially those who lived far from urban centers, were illiterate or semiliterate at best.10 The program of reform to improve the education of the clergy produced positive results even if progress was made at a slower rate than Trent intended.11 In Cuenca, clergymen with degree level education rose from fifty-three to eighty-seven percent by 1650.12 Evidence shows that by the early seventeenth century, many parish priests from the northern regions of Cataluña and Cantabria as well as from the center of the country did

---

8 Maxime Chevalier, Lectura y Lectores en la España del siglo XVI y XVII (Madrid: Ediciones Turner, 1976), 22
9 Ibid., 20.
12 Ibid.
not have basic writing skills. Allyson Poska reports that in Ourense, in the northeast region, the Bishop encountered a high level of illiteracy by 1682. Some scholars have therefore concluded that unlike in France, the Spanish Church’s attempts to educate the priesthood according to the spirit of Trent failed. According to Helen Rawlings, Philip II’s plan for Cathedral chapters to provide funds for seminaries for the priesthood failed. Universities also refused to implement programs to widen the enrollment for the clergy for fear of losing their status as elite educational institutions. The problem of raising the standards of clerical education was related to the distribution of bishoprics in the Iberian Peninsula. As a result, fourteen seminaries were established in Castile and six in Aragon between 1564 and 1600.

Progress towards literacy for the bulk of the lay population was also slow. Learning how to read and write could occur in different venues: Jesuit schools, Church-sponsored schools, and the use of Cartilla-Catecismo (booklets that included basic reading and writing lessons as well as the basic doctrine). The Cartilla-Catecismo differed from the traditional teaching of the catechism, which was done exclusively orally—recited, sung, repeated, told, explained, and memorized, but was never read. For the semi-literate clergyman, oral teaching served as the only option for instructing the laity. Antonio Vinao

---

14 Allyson Poska, Reforming the People: The Catholic Reformation in the Seventeenth Century, Culture, Belief and Tradition (Boston: Brill, 1998)
15 Ibid.
16 Rawlings, Church, Religion, 25-35.
17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid., 65.
20 Ibid., 62.
Frago argues that while the sixteenth century shows an increase in literacy as a result of these efforts, progress was significantly halted in the seventeenth century.\(^{21}\)

In addition to the ability to read, economics determined the audience of a book. Books were accessible to those who could purchase them; in an era lacking public libraries, the cost of books often determined who could read. Data about the affordability of books in early modern Spain remains unclear. For Maxime Chevalier, the data accumulated by Henri-Jean Martin demonstrates that the price of books in early modern Spain made them inaccessible to an important segment of the literate population.\(^{22}\) Nonetheless, Arantza Mayo more recently has shown that certain kinds of publications like catechisms and meditation books were relatively affordable for people of lower income.\(^{23}\)

Information available about the type of religious literature that reached those who could read is sketchy at best. By analyzing records of private book collections, Chevalier concludes that merchants bought more devotional texts than any other group.\(^{24}\) Books of hours, meditation guides, catechisms, and hiegographies were the most popular publications in early modern Spain.\(^{25}\) Especially books on meditation like Loyola’s Exercises had been heavily controlled for several decades.\(^{26}\) Even when Bibles in the vernacular were allowed to circulate later in the period, the clergy sought to retain control over the Bible. People learned from the Bible during Mass and catechetical instruction. Given the limits of the educational reform for the clergy, and the basic level of religious

---

\(^{21}\) Ibid., 61.  
\(^{22}\) Chevalier, Lectura y Lectores, 22.  
\(^{24}\) Chevalier, Lectura y Lectores, 22.  
\(^{25}\) Alastair Hamilton, Heresy and Mysticism in Sixteenth-century Spain (Cambridge, UK.: James Clarke, 1992),130; Eire, War Against Idols, 508.  
\(^{26}\) Hamilton, Heresy and Mysticism, 130.
instruction attained by the laity, it is likely that discussion on complicated theology
between a priest and his parishioners was not promoted by the Church. Yet, there were
some people who managed to acquire considerable knowledge about the Bible. The
Inquisition discovered a case of a woodcarver who learned from his book of hours and
could remember passages from the Bible that he had heard in sermons.  

The audience of the Spanish authors included two different types of Christians: Old
Christians and converts. Throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the
presence of a population of converted Jews and Muslims gave birth to two different groups
of Christians. Old Christians were proud of not having Jewish or Muslim, blood in their
veins. New Christians, or conversos and moriscos, often faced the difficulty of not being
able to erase the stigma of ancestry even after several generations had passed. Some of the
arguments of these authors indicate that they might have been interested in also reaching
New Christians.

The challenges of measuring literacy in England have been articulated by David
Cressy who concludes that current knowledge of reading practices in the early modern
period remains incomplete. In his view, indirect evidence related to education and access
to books leads to ‘inferential judgments’ about literacy, which sociological historians do
not see as reliable. Despite its limitations, the picture provided by counting signatures
and marks gives us an approximate rate of readership in this period. According to this
method, Cressy explains,

---

27 Sarah Tilghman Nalle, Mad for God: Bartolomé Sanchez, The Secret Messiah of Cardenete (London:
University of Virginia, 2001), 64.
28 See Cressy, Watt and Elizabeth L. Eisenstein’s The Printing Press as an Agent of Change.
29 Ibid., 42-46. He explains the connections between literacy, education, book production and book
ownership that have been made. This rests on a series of assumptions that failed to account for other factors.
evidence from the seventeenth century...shows that England was massively illiterate despite an epoch of educational expansion and a barrage of sermons. More than two-thirds of the men and nine-tenths of the women were so illiterate at the time of the civil war that they could not even write their own names.\textsuperscript{30}

Clergy and members of the professions comprised the most literate group, with the gentry following closely behind them. Because of the similarities in literacy, these cluster together at the accomplished end of the literacy scale. They were separated from the next cluster of yeomen and tradesmen by 30 percentage points. Below yeomen and tradesmen were husbandmen and poorer people, and at the lowest of end of the literacy scale lay laborers and women.\textsuperscript{31}

In England, where Protestantism had rejected the use of Latin as the language of the Church, English became the official language of religion, enabling access to it by ‘all’ English people.\textsuperscript{32} However, even writings composed in the vernacular remained inaccessible to many. Tessa Watt argues that the first half of Elizabeth’s reign, from 1560 to 1580, witnessed an ‘educational revolution’ in which all social groups increased their ability to sign their names. Conversely, a period of ‘educational recession’ between 1580 and 1610 contracted those gains. During the reign of James I, an era of ‘pronounced improvement’ occurred in the 1630s.\textsuperscript{33} Margaret Spufford reminds us that the statistics of literacy reflect gross estimates because reading skills predated writing skills.\textsuperscript{34} Most of the


\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 122-129. Among tradesmen and craftsmen, illiteracy was stratified by occupation and trade as well as by general social categories. Commercial elite of the country towns were close to the level of the clergy and gentry. Skilled craftsmen and business men like clothiers, goldsmiths and innkeepers ranged from 14 to 33\% in illiteracy. People involved with the textile industry and manufacturing were 35-52\% illiterate. Other trades like carpenters, millers and butchers were 56-68\% illiterate.

\textsuperscript{32} The criticism of the use of Latin as a means to preserve their position as mediators between God and the faithful goes back to the Waldensians in the fourteenth century. It was Erasmus who requested the translation of the Bible into the vernacular so that “plowmen, weavers, and ‘the lowliest women’ would be able to read it.” See \textit{The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation}, V.2. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 400.

evidence comes from grammar schools, which leaves aside the situation of elementary education. Cressy also reminds us that literacy could also be acquired outside the formal school setting.35 While Cressy agrees that ‘an overall expansion of facilities’ took place during this period, he stresses that the progress of education was irregular. As a result, such expansion primarily benefited the middle and upper groups of society, who already possessed basic literacy skills.36

In relation to literacy directed at reading the Bible, Cressy argues that “religious conservatives of the mid-Tudor period saw little reason for people to trouble themselves with literacy, and viewed with disdain the early protestant effort to spread the vernacular Bible.”37 According to Richard Griffiths, reformers discussed whether or not the translation of the Bible into English was beneficial in uniting the Commonwealth. It was not a matter of a reformist program against conservative aims, but rather of elites against ordinary people as the former feared that reading the Bible might generate discussions among the people that could threaten the nation as a whole.38 In 1543, the ‘Act for the Advancement of True religion and for the Abolishment of the Contrary’ forbade women and the lower segments of society to read the Bible, making it clear that this prohibition included noblewomen and gentlewomen for fear that they “should read it in the hearing of anyone, lest they inadvertently teach.”39 As the Reformation progressed, the forces promoting the democratization of access to the Bible triumphed.

35 Cressy, Literacy and the Social, 52.
36 Ibid., 53.
37 Ibid., 2.
Tessa Watt states that the prices of books did not fluctuate much from 1560 to 1653 which, she argues, means that books became more affordable during that inflationary period.\textsuperscript{40} The pricing of a book was complicated because it depended on several variables. Illustrated books cost up to 100 percent more than other books, but not as much when printed with old and reused wood-blocks. Reprints were cheaper than new books, and books became less costly as they aged.\textsuperscript{41} Even after tracking the cost of a book, Watt reminds us of the almost impossible task of knowing what was ‘affordable’ to a person; one had to know the money that an individual kept after he or she covered his or her basic subsistence.\textsuperscript{42}

Despite the difficulties in accounting for levels of literacy, there is evidence that the English literate read serious religious literature. Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes have demonstrated that males and females of the gentry read Augustine, Foxe, and A Kempis among others, in addition to the Bible.\textsuperscript{43} Foxe’s Actes and Monuments and the Bible became the most widely read books of post-Reformation England.\textsuperscript{44} Devotional books were an important genre used to foster private meditation and prayers.\textsuperscript{45} According to Heal and Holmes these reading books about complicated religious subjects constituted a common pattern among the English gentry of the seventeenth century. Paul Seaver has investigated the fascinating reading habits of an artisan of the early Stuart period. Seaver’s work shows that it was possible for a literate person of the lower ranks to have access to

\textsuperscript{40} Watt, \textit{Cheap Print}, 111.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 262.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 112.
\textsuperscript{44} Nigel Wheale, \textit{Writing and Society: Literature, print and politics in Britain 1590-1660} (London: Routledge, 1999)
books that included theological discussions of his era.\textsuperscript{46} Nigel Wheale mentioned the satisfaction caused to an educated Englishman by the sight of a four year old son of a shepard who was found reading the Bible to his father in 1667. Note-taking from complicated sermons was common practice. Later those notes were read and repeated for private devotion with the family or copied and circulated.\textsuperscript{47}

Determining the audience of these writings is key to understanding possible differences in religious reading culture. Although in some cases the genre of the book determined its audience, there are several works whose ‘real’ audience is hard to determine. Even when an author indicated or suggested his target audience, the subject and the style of the work often pointed toward completely different audiences. A few Spanish authors insisted that their writings were addressed to \textit{ignorantes} (ignorant people), referring to those who knew almost nothing about Church doctrine and who were most likely illiterate. In practice, these writers might have reached a small segment of the laity and a larger portion of the clergy who were literate. In England, several texts claimed to address the person or persons whose ideas were being refuted or attacked. The author of this kind of book expected an audience comprised by clergymen and laity who supported and opposed the views expressed in it. Many English authors suggested that they intended to address a wide audience, and this analysis shows the English wrote for a larger lay audience than did the Spanish. Higher levels of literacy in England supported by the Protestant focus on the word as means of communicating God’s message meant that more people could read the printed word.

\textsuperscript{47} Wheale, \textit{Writing and Society}, 47.
In addition to the standard definition of audience that consists of literate and semi-literate people, it is possible that some of these authors expected a secondary audience through preaching and instruction. Cressy stresses that “the world of print and the oral culture were not entirely separate, and in fact, there was a constant feeding from the one to the other.”

He presents evidence that the English New Testament drew illiterate auditors in the 1530s, just as printed ballads, newssheets, and chapman’s wares were read aloud later in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Auditors might refer to the illiterate and possibly those who could read but did not have easy access to books. A member of the clergy or the religious orders might have read sections of one of these books to clarify doubts about Christian doctrine. Of course, mediators pose problems as they add another layer of interpretation to the authors’ arguments, further distancing the author from the ‘reader.’

Another factor that determined the formation of a religious reading culture was the level of censorship. The reach and effectiveness of the Inquisition as an all powerful institution of control in early modern Spain has been re-evaluated. The effectiveness and force of its policies were not as encompassing given regional variation. Even if the program of censorship of the written word established by the Church through the Inquisition was not very effective, it attempted to control the ownership, publication, and sales of books in the peninsula, as well as the introduction of foreign books into the country, in order to halt the circulation of ideas that resembled Protestantism. An edict of the Inquisition informed that anybody who owned books in Hebrew, Latin, or any Romance language whose content was “contrary to our holy Catholic faith” or any letter or

49 Ibid.
text from the “unfortunate Luther or any of his students and henchmen” was in trouble.\textsuperscript{50}

While new books had to be pre-approved, old books that raised suspicions had to be examined. The wide range of books that had to be checked for ‘errors’ and unorthodoxy included translations of the Bible into the vernacular and of devotional books into Castilian.\textsuperscript{51} The ‘errors’ found in books were deleted by covering the text to make it illegible.

Several Indexes Librorum Prohibitorum were issued in Spain throughout the early modern period in which the Inquisition condemned various anti-Catholic writings, including those penned by some Catholic authors, as heretical and dangerous.\textsuperscript{52} Although part of the contents of the Spanish Indexes overlapped with the Indexes issued in Rome and Louvain, some books in the list were uniquely linked to local authors and developments.\textsuperscript{53} Some of the listed authors were later removed from the Index, but the ones who remained had already severed their link with the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{54} Those who published, imported, or owned such books suffered punishments ranging from loss of property to death.\textsuperscript{55} Publishing policies in Spain had regional variations; between 1640 and 1652 the Crown of Aragon had a different system than the Crown of Castile. The black market of books by ‘Protestants,’ including exiled Spanish ‘heretics,’ introduced in Spain via sea ports and

\textsuperscript{50} Virgilio Pinto Crespo, \textit{Inquisición y Control Ideológico en la España del siglo XVI}. (Madrid: Taurus, 1983), 30.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., 111.
\textsuperscript{52} The book of William Perkins, an English Protestant who wrote on images translated into Spanish, was put in one of the Indexes of Prohibited Books in 1599.
\textsuperscript{53} The first Index of the early modern period was issued in Rome in 1540 followed by another in 1545. Spain published two Indexes: 1551 and 1559. Although Rome produced the Index of Trent in 1564, this document did not always take precedence over other Indexes previously published in various countries. This is evidence of the difficulties in achieving uniformity throughout Catholic Europe.
\textsuperscript{54} This is the case of Cypriano de Valera, who made a brief contribution to the discussion on images. His books were put in several indexes.
\textsuperscript{55} Pinto Crespo, \textit{Inquisición y Control}, 89.
borders caused great anxiety among Spanish authorities.\textsuperscript{56} Virgilio Pinto Crespo, for example, reports that a priest was accused of receiving and hiding the ‘heretical’ books sent by some monks from the monastery of St. Isidro after escaping to Germany.\textsuperscript{57} Between 1558 and 1612, two \textit{cedulas reales} (royal edicts) and thirty-three proclamations warned about this problem.\textsuperscript{58} Despite government efforts to stop the smuggling of books, the problem continued.

In England, since the emergence of the Injunctions of 1559, the Elizabethan government established a system that required all books to be approved before publication.\textsuperscript{59} The severe proclamations issued in 1570 against fugitive tracts popular in the recusant community demonstrate the fear of the effects of the constant circulation of new Catholic books. The on-going debate between Protestant authors and Jesuits, whose works were published abroad, reveals that many books entered the country illegally during this time.\textsuperscript{60} In 1586, authorities tightened the rules for publication by requiring texts to be licensed by the bishop of London or the archbishop of Canterbury.\textsuperscript{61} This type of control of ideas in England persisted in the early Stuart period. Arminians, whose ideas were considered radical and openly anti-Calvinist, were not allowed to publish their views during the 1620s.\textsuperscript{62} The next decade presented Arminians with the opportunity to publish

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 108. According to Pinto Crespo, Spanish authorities tried to avoid all communication between the crew of a boat and the people at the ports until the cargo of the ship could be inspected.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 30.
\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 110.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 25.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.
their works, but this was promptly halted in 1640 with the beginning of hostilities between government and parliament.\textsuperscript{63}

\textbf{Catholic and Protestant Concepts of Devotion}

One of the consequences of the Reformation is that Catholics and Protestants came to understand devotion in different ways. The analysis of these authors’ works offer a glimpse of what these differences entail. Both groups engaged in various devotional practices as part of their religious life. For Spanish Catholics, almost all their devotional practices were performed in the presence of images. Mass, prayer, meditation, pilgrimages, among other practices and ceremonies, gave people the opportunity to experience devotion in externally emotional ways. Images served to encourage demonstrations of various emotions through crying, kneeling, and touching an image. In contrast, English Protestants seemed to focus their devotion on activities related to the Bible because they had rejected the ceremonial aspect of traditional Christianity. By reading the Bible, hearing sermons, and private meditation among other practices, English Protestants turned their experience of devotion in exercises of learning and understanding the word of God. While English Protestants seemed to privilege proper religious understanding, in some cases based upon reason, over feeling, Spanish Catholics, for whom the Bible and the Mass may have formed part of a more expressive Latin culture, placed a higher valuation on emotion.

\textbf{Contribution to Current Historiography}

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid.
Taking into account the different elements involved in the dissemination of the ideas, my transnational study contributes to the four historiographical questions mentioned earlier. These questions address the unifying force of the Council of Trent, the degree of conformity of the official position on images among the English clergy, the effects of censorship of the Inquisition in the dissemination of ideas, and the differences in religious culture between Protestants and Catholics. A brief recapitulation of these historiographic debates follows.

1. In a decree finalized in 1563, the Council of Trent summarized the Catholic Church’s position on doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, many of which had been under attack from Protestants. The evaluation of the Tridentine doctrine as well as its effects at the ideological level has been debated. Guiseppe Albergio and Palma Martinez-Burgos Garcia agreed that the Council of Trent produced an increasing uniformity of practice and thought. In his study of the impact of Trent, Guiseppe Albergio stressed the preeminence acquired by its decrees as the source of authority for everything Catholic. The Catholic Church addressed every aspect of the CounterReformation in Trent, which resulted in an unexpected degree of uniformity of doctrine during the Protestant schism. Albergio made clear that the Council never intended to reformulate all of Catholic doctrine, but rather sought to condemn the errors of the heretics and to present true Catholic doctrine. He held that the Council made an enormous effort to offer an ‘adequate’ explanation of doctrine. His assessment of the Council’s performance seems too broad given the evidence offered in

64 Raymond F. Bulman and Frederick J. Parella, eds. From Trent to Vatican II: Historical and Theological Investigations. 12.
65 Albergio, 27.
this study by the writings of early modern authors. The doctrine on images presented by Trent was not complete because images were not essential matters for salvation.

More specifically than Albergio, Palma Martinez-Burgos Garcia held that the Council of Trent created a ‘well elaborated and defined’ theology on images. She examines the relation between what she calls “the controversy” over images in Spain, using a very broad definition of images that included mental images and imagery used in sacred theater. Her main contribution was to point out that the dogmatic corpus established by Trent did not originate in the council or the Counter-Reformation, but in ideas of Pre-Reformation theologians who advanced the religious reform initiated by Cardinal Cisneros at the end of the fifteenth century. Martinez-Burgos’s assertion that the theology of images was defined and well-elaborated needs to be reconsidered in light of the findings of my analysis.

John O’Malley and Julio Caro Baroja present a different assessment of the doctrinal achievements of Trent. John O’Malley analyzed the evolution of the Council of Trent as a historical event as well as its effects in early modern Catholicism and beyond. He acknowledged that the theologians of Trent never intended to provide a complete and detailed set of doctrine because they recognized the value of theological speculation and the preeminence of the Scripture over theology. Julio Caro Baroja considered ideas about images within the larger religious culture of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spain. He analyzed the discourses of a few theologians and moralists about images produced after the
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Council of Trent and argued that those who defended images did not possess strong arguments with which to respond to the real possibility of image abuse.\(^\text{71}\) He linked disagreements among the learned about what constituted the abuse of images to the lack of clarity of the Decrees of Trent.\(^\text{72}\) Baroja’s observations support my reading of the early writers who found themselves without any guidance when responding to the accusations of abuse of images because the Church seemed reluctant to acknowledge that possibility.

2. Tolerance of images in the later Elizabethan era and during the Arminian ascendancy under the early Stuart monarchs raises questions about the nature of the doctrine produced by the English Reformation as well as its effects. My analysis shows that the English Church did not seek to impose uniformity rather it chose to accommodate the different views held among Protestants. Three works specifically focus on the question of images and address the English Protestants’ ability to have their own view on doctrine, which led to the emergence of somehow tolerant views. Margaret Aston’s study of the destruction of images from 1560 to 1660 concludes that the toleration of images came from two fronts. In the late sixteenth century, a conception of images as church art produced anxiety over and thus a desire to prevent the destruction of images, as indicated in the visitation articles of some bishops.\(^\text{73}\) At the same time, the idea that images had a legitimate ‘historical’ use if placed in non-religious settings took root.

John Phillips argued that as a result of the inconclusive religious context of the early Elizabethan settlement, traditional attitudes regarding images returned.\(^\text{74}\) Although this change did not center specifically on images, the reevaluation of the nature of worship
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\(^{72}\) Ibid., 109.

\(^{73}\) Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 105.

in the Anglican Church indirectly promoted increased toleration of images. He highlighted the more tolerant attitudes and ideas about images that emerged and led moderate reformers and even moderate Puritans to reject radical Puritan attempts to eliminate the few images that remained in churches by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Agreeing with Phillips, Julie Spraggon concluded that the first challenge to the Elizabethan rejection of images appeared in the 1580s in the writings of moderate Anglicans. Although initially images were not addressed, the support for ceremony in Church rituals led to the reappraisal of images. She focused on several moderate Anglicans as well as some Calvinist bishops during the early Jacobean period who relaxed their views on images and even preached against local iconoclasm. Spraggon stressed that these views became strongly associated with the ascendance of Arminians in the second quarter of the seventeenth century. My evidence supports the existence of a level of conservative thinking about the doctrine of images.

3. The impact of the Counter-Reformation’s censorship campaign on debate among Catholics and with others remains an issue for scholars. Unlike the combative nature of Protestantism, the stance taken by the Counter-Reformation did not seem to promote debate within or outside of the Catholic community. Virgilio Pinto Crespo argued that the Catholic Church discouraged verbal and written confrontations with Protestants by restricting theological debates to Latin. The Inquisition created mechanisms to control topics of discussion whose effectiveness is under debate. Still, clergymen and members of
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the orders participated in controversies over the key doctrines of predestination and the Immaculate Conception that dominated the Post-Tridentine era. These debates took place not only in writing but also in the form of oral disputations in universities, monasteries, and even on the streets. While the Church tolerated the controversies over predestination and the Immaculate Conception, though scrutinized by the Inquisition which always searched for unorthodoxy, it strictly forbade oral disputes with ‘heretics.’ The texts written about the doctrine of images supports Pinto Crespo’s assertions because Spanish authors did not argue directly with one another and refused to engage with or refute those who held ‘heretical’ ideas.

4. The question of whether a religious reading culture was more advanced among Protestant lay people than among the Catholic laity is difficult to answer directly. However, the data on advances in literacy and on religious instruction in England and Spain complemented by the texts on the doctrine of images can be used to establish a clearer picture of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation religious cultures in those countries. R. Po-Chia Hsia claims that an important number of devotional texts, sermons, and catechisms printed in Spain during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries sought to provide much needed religious instruction. In practice, he points out the inconsistent results throughout the peninsula: while townspeople learned the basic tenets of Christianity, rural residents did not. The clergy was not interested in offering the laity more than the most basic concepts of Catholicism. The restriction on circulation of books in vernacular languages ordered by several Indexes reduced the number of works available for the lower clergy, who did not know Latin. This lack of material resources contributed to the slow
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down of Trent’s ambitious objectives of educating the priesthood. Conversely, Felicity Heal and Clive Holmes argue that, in addition to having access to the Bible, those English people who could read (mostly the upper segments of the society), were exposed to a variety of complex theological and spiritual texts that went beyond the basic tenets of religion. The texts on images that I analyzed reinforce the idea that the different policies towards literacy and religious instruction promoted by the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation produced a lay religious culture significantly more advanced in England than Spain.

**Terminology**

The terminology used by the Spanish and English authors throughout this discussion requires some important clarification. Spanish Catholic authors used the verbs to honor, to venerate, to revere, to adore, and to give adoration as interchangeable terms with which to refer to worship. According to the Spanish dictionary *Tesorode la Lengua Castellana o Española*, published in 1611, the verbs *adorar* (adore), *reverenciar* (reverence), *honorar* (honor), and *venerar* (venerate) were generally considered to be synonyms.82 This dictionary failed to mention that the verb *adorar* could be used to refer exclusively to the highest form of worship. Occasionally when there was a need to
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82 There is an extremely close relation among all of them. The verb *adorar* (to adore) meant *reverenciar* (to reverence), and it added that theologians had established three forms of adoration. The verb *venerar* (to venerate) was equivalent to *honrar* (to honor). The verb *honrar* (to honor) also meant *reverenciar* (to reverence). Though the verb *reverenciar* was not found in the dictionary, its noun form *reverencia* (reverence) meant the respect that a person showed, through humble body and facial movements, in the presence of another. See Covarrubias.
distinguish among these verbs, the terms ‘highest worship’ or ‘highest adoration’ were used.83

As a consequence of the Reformation, the verb to adore (from the Latin adorare) was not used in most English authors’ discussion on images, and the verb to worship was used both as a generic form that included to venerate, to honor, and to revere, and as a synonym of the same verbs. The Oxford English Dictionary provides insight into the way in which this verb was used in the early modern period: similar to the Spanish version, the verb ‘to worship’ was seen as resembling the verbs to honor, to revere, to adore, and to venerate.84

The terms ‘Counter-Reformation’ and ‘Catholic-Reformation’ have been the subject of considerable disagreement among scholars.85 Guy Bedouelle presents one of the most recent syntheses of the discussion since the adoption of those terms in the eighteenth century.
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83 The close relation amongst the verbs adore, honor, reverence, and venerate was articulated by the Spanish Jesuit Martin de Roa who defined the verb adorar as “similar to give honor, or reverence to things, or people, who deserve it given their Sanctity, or any other graces being natural, or supernatural.” According to Roa, adorar came from “SORAR, [which derived] from two Latin words, AD, which is ‘towards’ and ORA, which is ‘mouth’. And because we only bring clean and pure things [to the mouth], the ones that we love the most, or we desire to honor, thus, ADORAR” in the secular sense was broadly shared by many cultures as “custom so used among humanity that it is not known a nation in the world that has not had it: either by kissing the hands, feet, knees, face of those who are honored, falling on the floor at his presence with a hand raised toward the person.”

84 According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the verb ‘worship’ meant “to honour or revere as a supernatural being or power, or as a holy thing; to regard or approach with veneration; to adore with appropriate acts, rites and ceremonies, [or] to treat with signs of honour or respect; to salute, bow down.” The verb ‘to honor’ meant “to pay worthy respect [by some outward action], to worship, perform one’s devotion to…” and also to reverence. The verb ‘reverence’ meant “to salute (a person) with deep respect…by bowing, kneeling [or] to regard with reverence and veneration as having a divine or sacred character; to worship in some manner.” The verb ‘venerate’ meant a “feeling of deep respect and reverence directed toward some person or thing”.

85 In God in La Mancha, Sarah Tilgham Nalle uses ‘Counter-Reformation’ and ‘Catholic Reformation’ interchangeably for the events of the mid-sixteenth century. In Idols and Images, Palma Martinez- Burgos uses the term ‘Counter-Reformation’. In Heresy and Mysticism in Sixteenth-century Spain, Alistair Hamilton also uses ‘Counter-Reformation’. In Spanish Catholicism, Stanley Payne uses ‘Spanish Catholic Reformation’ from the late 1400s to 1540, and ‘Counter-Reformation’ from 1540 to 1600. In Local Religion in Sixteenth Century Spain, William Christian refers to ‘Catholic Reformation’ to events in the late sixteenth century.
century. Bedouelle reminds us of the important contribution of Hubert Jedin who used the term ‘Catholic Reform’ to mean a series of phases from the end of the middle ages to the century after the Council of Trent, and ‘Counter-Reformation’ to mean the self-defense that included the controversies against Luther, the emergence of the Roman Inquisition of 1542, and the creation of the Index of Prohibited Books. While some authors have abandoned these two controversial terms altogether and adopted terms like ‘Catholic renewal’ or ‘Early Modern Catholicism’ or ‘Refashioning of Catholicism’ to refer to this period, Bedouelle argues that the word ‘Reform’ is consonant with his research on Trent. He holds that the ‘articulation’ of dogma and discipline in the Decrees of Trent was the “key to its lasting success.”

According to Stanley Payne, who focuses on early modern Spain, seeing the ‘Catholic-Reformation’ as a period of liberation and experimentation and the ‘Counter-Reformation’ as a period of return to scholasticism and isolationism obscures the fluidity that existed throughout the sixteenth century. Studying the writers of various churchmen, Payne has concluded that the two trends, Inquisitorial supervision and Inquisitorial experimentation, co-existed in a complex world that these two terms attempt to simplify. Another Hispanist, Carlos Eire, argued that although ‘Catholic-Reformation’ has been substituted for the term ‘Counter-Reformation,’ the latter reflects a more accurate view of the period. In this study, I will use the term Counter-Reformation because it allows the
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continuity of the reforms of the Church to coexist with the self-defense response prompted by Protestantism.

My definition of the term ‘religious images’ encompasses two and three-dimensional representations—paintings and sculptures—of the Virgin Mary, God the father and the son, and the saints. This definition fits the view of early modern authors who indistinguishably referred to paintings and sculptures as ‘religious images.’ Yet paintings and sculptures were only a part of a wider range of religious visual expressions. These representations were presented independently of any event, like a statue of a contemplative Virgin Mary, or within a context of a key episode in the life of these individuals, like a painting of Jesus Christ carrying the cross.

Images and the Practice Surrounding Them

While it is evident that images in Spain and England shared many characteristics, there were also differences among them. In Spain, these representations could be displayed as an individual piece or as one of the many elements that integrated a retablo. Retablos were structures usually made of wood, but sometimes built with stone, marble, and semi-precious materials. They became common by the late Middle Ages throughout Catholic Europe. In the most prominent place of the structure, usually the middle section, the most important image of the church was placed. Wood, stone, plaster, gold, paint, and ink were among the materials used to create sculptures. According to A.R.G. de Ceballos,

92 Ibid., 235-245.
sculptures preferred wood treated with polychromy over marble or bronze.\textsuperscript{93} Many sculpted figures were augmented with natural hair, tears of crystal, and dresses in order to enhance their realism. Among the most dramatic figures were those of Jesus Christ used during processions. In painting, the depiction of the practice of asceticism and mysticism in the lives of saints is one of the main themes of the period.\textsuperscript{94} In England, the evidence obtained mostly from studies of late Middle Ages demonstrates that, in addition to images on stained-glass, the most common materials used for images were alabaster, wood and stone.\textsuperscript{95} Katherine Kamerick argues that the high demand for images resulted in some of them being poorly crafted, and thus ill-proportioned. Eventhough there were big sculptures of child-like height, most images were relatively small placed at eye level.\textsuperscript{96}

In Spain, many images were acquired by the parish churches, and many more were provided by private donors or confraternities, but the faithful may have felt that those images belonged to the community as a whole. The number of images that a church possessed was in direct proportion to its financial resources and the support of confraternities, guilds and individuals. There were also other important factors at play such as the emergence of new cults and the popularity of those already established. Lay individuals and groups made sure that images were properly maintained. Some individuals funded chantries, which were endowments given in order that masses be conducted for the donor’s souls or the souls of their family members. In some cases, a chantry included funds for the maintenance of a specific chapel or altar and its corresponding images, which would be the site for these masses. The important religious function of confraternities was

\textsuperscript{93} A. R. G. Ceballos, “arte Barroco” in Diccionario de Historia Eclesiástica de España, 1972 ed.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{95} Katherine Kamerick, Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Devotion and Idolatry in England 1350-1500, (New York: Pulgrave, 2002), 75-77.
\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 78.
the continuing worship of patron saints. For this purpose, these lay organizations obtained funds to buy candles and ornaments, repaired and cleaned the images of their parish churches, and organized celebrations around these images according to the Church calendar.

Image devotion took place in different ways; personal needs that related to the divine and church doctrine conflated in a mosaic of rituals. People looked at images to learn from them, to admire their beauty, and to communicate with God and the saints. Most of the time the faithful used images to invoke the intercessory powers of saints. One important feature of image devotion was the practice of lighting candles that signified the request of a favor or to give thanks for one. Many people demonstrated their devotion and gratitude through gifts of money for supplying candles. Parishioners also kneeled and bowed to images to show their respect. When possible, many individuals kissed and touched the icons, perhaps as a sign of deep love, humility, honor, and gratitude. Touching the icon connected the ordinary person with the intangible. This act confirmed an emotional relationship between the individuals and their parish images. As part of the celebrations of a specific cult, images were paraded through the streets in very elaborate processions. Statues were dressed up in fine clothing and jewelry; images were adorned with flowers. When the image approached, people in the streets knelt down as a sign of reverence. Pilgrimage was considered another type of devotional experience in which images had a central place. Drawn by the power and fame of a specific cult, people

---

97 The use of the words confraternity, fraternity and guild are used interchangeably by several authors to discuss lay associations with religious functions. For a very detailed explanation of the differences of these terms see Farnhill, Ken, *The Guilds and the Parish Community in Late Medieval East Anglia*.
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traveled to other towns, regions and even other countries. These pilgrims gave offerings in the form of cattle, food supplies, money, or wax images to their venerated image.\textsuperscript{100}

The discussion of ideas about images in the early modern period did not occur in a vacuum. Religious practice influenced the works of those who had observed the use of images. There was interplay between ideas on the one hand, and events and practices on the other. A note about practice in this study is necessary to understand this relationship.

In Spain, there is plenty of material and textual evidence about the images that filled churches and other religious spaces. However, specific evidence of how images were used or misused, or what was said about images is extremely limited. We know that images were sometimes taken outside the enclosed locations to be used during official pilgrimages. In rural areas, it was also a common practice to bring images to the fields to perform relatively unorthodox rituals to end droughts, floodings and other natural calamities.\textsuperscript{101}

There is evidence that the cult of saints was not under complete control of the Church. The case of a friar who died in Valencia illustrates how the members of his order rushed to set his image on banners without following official guidelines about claims of sainthood.\textsuperscript{102}

Virgilio Crespo wrote about an Inquisition case where an image of Christ accompanied with a text gave a confusing message. During interrogations of Alumbrados in the sixteenth century, the Inquisition reported they denied the usefulness of images.\textsuperscript{103}

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item[100] Ronald C. Finucane, \textit{Miracles and Pilgrims} (Tottowa,N.J: Rowman and Littlefield), 205.
\item[103] Virgilio Pinto Crespo, \textit{Inquisición y Control Ideológico en la España del Siglo XVI} (Madrid: Taurus, 1983)
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same was true of a woodcarver who held that the Virgin Mary was part of the Holy Trinity after seeing an image.\textsuperscript{104}

In England, the evidence of practice related to images decreases significantly after the Henrician Reformation. Nonetheless, throughout the previous two generations, investment in new images and the maintenance of the old ones was a key manifestation of popular devotion. People offered large sums of money to embellish images through guilding, painting, in addition to the lights, jewels and coverings to honor them.\textsuperscript{105} Like in Spain, every region had its distinctive saints, shrines, and observances, however, the similarities among regions revealed the common features of a national character of devotion to the saints.\textsuperscript{106} While this information depends, to a significant extent, on data provided by wills, images in the form of paintings of the saints on Rood-screens survived in big quantities in East Anglia and Devon. It is clear that the roof-screen with a crucifix in the center and Mary and Joh on either side was the main visual element of the parish church.\textsuperscript{107} The changes in lay devotion to specific saints were influenced by geographical factors, the iniciative of an the faithful or news of cures and miracles.\textsuperscript{108} Thus people went on pilgrimages to visit specific images of the saints and those with enough money and influence had their favorite saints painted on the walls of the church.\textsuperscript{109}

Women and the Eucharist in Early Modern Texts.
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Two important subjects of direct connections to the debate over the use of images did not receive enough attention in the writing of early modern authors. Because images had been an essential component of the female piety in traditional religion, it is worth drawing attention to the limited discussion of women and their relation to images in these works. As reformer Theresa of Avila and Marjorie Kempe indicated in their writings, images were highly praised as objects of devotion, as it was the case for women in general. The Spanish Catholics might not have wanted to emphasize the female component of image devotion to avoid reinforcing the idea that images were not a manly concern. However, the few instances in which women are mentioned, they are always presented as weak and responsible for corrupting images in their religious devotional practices. The English Protestants could have stressed the female close attachment to images to feminize their opponents.

The Eucharist is another subject that received relatively little attention in these texts. Transubstantiation was among the most important doctrinal disagreements between Protestants and Catholics during the Reformation. The Council of Trent’s emphasis on the idea that latria, the highest worship, was only given to God might have been a strategy to reinforce the idea that the Eucharist could be seen as the only ‘image’ that encompassed the item signified and the signifier at the same time. It is likely that Catholic authors might not have directly linked images to the Eucharist in order to avoid the possible implication that the Eucharist was an image. Protestants could have argued that Catholics equated ‘all’ images and the sacrament to imply that in all of them there was a real presence. English Protestants did not resort to that strategy because it was difficult to explain why they had accepted the representational role of the Eucharist, but then rejected this same function in
images. However, it is possible that Catholics hoped that their defense of images as symbols indirectly underscored the unique status of the representational role of the Eucharist.

**Organization of Chapters**

Chapter 2 provides a historical and contextual background for the whole study. This chapter focuses on views on images during the Middle Ages and the development of Christian Humanism and *Devotio Moderna* in relation to the critique of images. It also describes the context of England during the Long English Reformation and Spain before and after the Counter-Reformation.

Chapter 3 explores the Spanish and English authors’ definitions of the key words ‘idol’ and ‘image’ as well as their views on the practice of idolatry and the consequences of its encounter with Christianity. Whereas both Spanish and English thinkers agreed on the prevalence of idolatry among pre-Christian populations, they disagreed on the fate of idolatry with the rise of Christianity. Spanish Catholics were confident that in the past idolatry was limited to non-Christians, and believed that Christians had vanished idols and idolatry. Images that represented saints and God in current worship thus were used in a legitimate way. English Protestants reminded their audience that images and idols were used in similar ways by Christians and non-Christians. What images intended to represent was irrelevant for Protestants, who averred that God and the saints could not be visually represented.
Chapter 4 analyzes the authors’ understanding of the message of the Ten Commandments in relation to the prohibition of images. Given the Counter-Reformation policy not to argue with heretics, unless as part of a dialogue among theologians, Spanish authors did not mention the other version of the Ten Commandments offered by Protestants. Spanish Catholics concentrated on the claim that the prohibition of images in the Bible had been directed exclusively at Jews in the past. Conversely, English Protestants emphasized the superiority of the Jerome version of the Commandments in which one could find a clear and permanent prohibition of images. The discussion of the Commandments related to images was very important because it questioned the validity of the translation of the Catholic Bible and more importantly, the validity of the translations and interpretations of their dogmas.

Chapter 5 presents early modern considerations of the categorization of worship established by the medieval Church and looks at the underpinnings of the different ways in which Spanish and English authors saw the role of images in worship. The arguments centered over the possibility that images could result in wrongful worship. While in the two chapters below there is a strong sense of ideological consensus, this discussion about worship revealed a level of doctrinal confusion among Catholics. The problem arose when the fathers of Trent rejected Thomas Aquinas’ understanding of worship –holding that images of God deserved the same worship as God Himself in a veiled way without even mentioning his name. Even several English Protestants acknowledged a problem caused by Aquinas’ views and used it to portray the Catholic Church as inconsistent. The lack of clarity regarding the Church’s position led to misunderstandings among Spanish authors.
about Aquinas’ view, which questions the idea that the resolutions of the Council of Trent increased uniformity of ideas.

Chapter 6 explores the authors’ assessment of the apparent functions that images had in instruction, modeling behavior, and intercessory prayers. While the function of instruction was not intrinsically as dangerous as the function of worship, both Protestants and Catholics recognized the need for the best teaching methods for the benefit of the laity. While in the Middle Ages visual images were accepted as a primary path to experience Christianity, the questioning of this notion in the early modern period was driven to an important extent by the new horizons brought by the printing press. For Catholics the sight of images, and other aspects of visual religious culture of the Church, had many benefits; however, learning about the Bible had to be done auditorily. For Protestants, knowledge of the Bible had to be acquired mostly auditorily through reading (often vocal reading by another person) or hearing the preached word based upon the Bible, but the sight of images was rejected. Spanish and English authors held opposing views on the use of images for instruction. They disputed whether images could offer visual models of conduct to people. The essence of this disagreement was based on whether or not images could be seen as capable of representing the features that distinguished the virgin and saints from other humans. Finally, the influence of physical images over the effectiveness of prayers of intercession created an additional dilemma. Several Catholic authors recognized that the miraculous responses to such prayers were sometimes understood as originating in the images themselves and not in the subjects represented by them.

Chapter 7 presents the authors’ opinions about the possible difficulties or obstacles in the making of images. The disagreement between Catholics and Protestants was based
on a different understanding of the nature of religious subjects and human capabilities of representing them. For Catholics, the subjects represented by images could be visually represented through metaphors and allegories. Skillful artists were the best suited for this important task. For English Protestants, God, the Virgin and the saints were subjects that could not be visually represented, and thus regardless of the skill of the artist, any attempt at representing them was doomed to fail.

Chapter 8 investigates Spanish and English perceptions of the powerful effects that images had on people’s emotions and how such devotion should be manifested. Spanish Catholics viewed crying, shaking, and other gestures of ecstasy as beneficial emotional reactions produced by the viewing of images because they were expressions of love and devotion to the figure represented in the image. The real significance of those emotions lay in their ability to move people to amend their lives and become better Christians. English Protestants did not dismiss these expressions of emotions as forms of devotion per se, but because they were the result of visual stimuli. Their main concern was, however, the dangers that images could generate by distracting the mind, producing lustful thoughts, and encouraging idolatry.

Chapter 9 offers a discussion of the main conclusion of the study as well as an explanation of the significance of the project.
CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The aim of this chapter is to prepare the reader to understand the background in which Spanish Catholics and English Protestants developed their opinions on images. This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section focuses on the orthodoxy of Christian religion during the Middle Ages in Spain and England. The second section addresses the challenges and changes posed by humanism and the Devotio Moderna to medieval Christianity. The third section concentrates on the major developments of the English Reformation and their relation to the ideas about images. The fourth section explores the role of the events that led to the consolidation of Spain after the Reconquista (the Reconquest), and the emergence of Spain as a major Catholic influence before, during, and after Trent.

I. Images and Unorthodoxy in the Middle Ages

As early Christianity developed, religious images increasingly became a common element of the landscape that was embraced by many but rejected by others. In the seventh century, Pope Gregory the Great (540-604) wrote a letter to Serenus, bishop of Marseille, who had ordered the destruction of all images in his diocese. In it, Gregory expressed his support for a legitimate use of images: “it is one thing to worship a painting, and quite another to learn from a scene represented in a painting what ought to
be worshiped. For what writing provides for people who read, painting provides for the illiterate (idiotis) who look at them, since these unlearned people see what they must imitate; paintings are books for those who do not know their letters, so that they take the place of books, especially among pagans.”¹ While the case of Serenus might have been an isolated event, serious opposition to image use emerged in the Byzantine Empire in the eight century. Three stages of this struggle are discernible: a period of iconoclasm during the reigns of Emperors Leo (717-741) and Constantine V (741-775) with the ecumenical council of 757; the council of Nicaea (787), and the restoration of Nicaea (815-842).

Even though many authors expressed diverse views on the subject of images, John of Damascus produced a very comprehensive work that includes many of the aspects that concern early modern writers. John of Damascus, a spokesman of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, wrote three treatises defending the use of images from a monastery in which he had retired.² The significance of Damascus is his extensive discussion of various aspects related to the use of images that formed the early corpus of Church orthodoxy.³ He borrowed St. Cyril of Alexandria’s words to define Christian representations: “Images are representations of their archetypes and therefore are similar to them.”⁴ While Damascus did not provide a definition of ‘idol,’ he defined the term ‘idolatry’ as the mistaken action of “holding idols to be gods, and worshipping them as

² New Catholic Encyclopedia, “John Damascus”
such.”⁵ He questioned interpreting the Commandments as a prohibition of all kinds of images, when he wrote, “those who do not understand the mind of Scripture say that God said through Moses the lawgiver: ‘You shall not make yourself a graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath.’”⁶ Thus, he suggested that in order to get the ‘true’ message of the Commandments, one had to look carefully at the text: “It is good to search the Scriptures, but we must attend to them with a discerning mind. There is one God, one Lawgiver of the Old and New Testaments, who ‘spoke of old in many various ways to our fathers by prophets.’”⁷ If understood historically, the prohibition against the use images was directed exclusively to warn the Jews, “who were still children and susceptible to the sickness of idolatry, holding idols to be gods, and worshipping them as such, abandoning the worship of God, offering to the creature the glory due the Creator.”⁸ No longer living in that specific historic circumstance, the prohibition had expired, and consequently the use of images was legal in Christian religious practice.

Damascus determined that there was one superior worship of God and one inferior worship of other beings and their images.⁹ He presented the first type of worship as “absolute worship [that] is adoration [of] Latria, which we give to God alone. Only He by nature deserves to be worshipped.”¹⁰ A second type of worship “[was] given to those…Images of past events to assure that He will be remembered thus we venerate the honorable figure of the cross, or the likeness of the physical features of our God, or of her
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⁵ Ibid., 54.
⁶ Ibid., 7.
⁷ Ibid.
⁸ Ibid, 54; The decision to use of the word Jew instead of Israelite is explained in the previous chapter 3.
¹⁰ The way the verbs refer to adoration, to worship, to honor, and to reverence were used by early modern writers, and the challenges this posed are expounded in the introduction to Damascus’ work.
who gave birth to Him in the Flesh, and every one who is part of Him."¹¹ This category included images of God the father, Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints.¹² Damascus held that images of intangible and invisible beings provided important visual information that was otherwise unavailable to humans. He recognized the way in which images overcame human cognitive limitations:

All images reveal and make perceptible those things which are hidden. For example, [a] man does not have immediate knowledge of invisible things, since the soul is veiled by the body. Nor can man have immediate knowledge of things which are distant from each other or separated by place, because he himself is circumscribed by place and time. Therefore the image was devised that he might advance in knowledge.¹³

Not only were images helpful in acquiring necessary information of Christian history and relevant figures, but they made possible the understanding of the mysteries beyond human comprehension. In his view, images offered the possibility that

secret things might be revealed and made perceptible. Therefore, images are a source of profit, help and salvation to all, since things so obviously manifest, enable[e] us to perceive hidden things.¹⁴

Damascus claimed that while it was theoretically impossible to give shape to the divine incorporeal essence, in practice God and the Trinity could be conceived in visual forms. As Damascus wrote, “God wills that we should not be totally ignorant of bodiless creatures, and so He clothed them with forms and shapes, and used images comprehensible to our nature, material forms which could be seen by the spiritual vision
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¹² Despite the significance Nicaea II would acquire for the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century, at the time of the council it lacked such acclaimed status. In fact, subsequent councils immediately challenged and condemned its conclusions. According to Edward Symonds, the rejection of Nicaea II’s conclusions probably resulted from a mistranslation of its text. Because it was believed by counciliar fathers that Nicaea II appeared to have proposed that images also deserved the highest adoration or latria, its rulings fell into oblivion.
¹³ Damascus, On the Divine, 74.
¹⁴Ibid.
Specifically, Damascus agreed with the early Christian writer Dionysius the Areopagite that humans needed material forms to apprehend the spiritual realm:

We can envision analogous shapes….Anyone would say that our inability immediately to direct our thoughts to contemplation of higher things makes it necessary that familiar every-day [figures] be utilized to give suitable form to what is formless, and make visible what cannot be depicted, so that we are able to construct understandable analogies.16

Damascus suggested that while “Scripture also has forms and images of God Himself,” humans could legitimately use certain visual forms found outside the Bible.17 This accounts for the representation of the Trinity as a sun with light and rays.

Damascus found that contemplation of the lives of saints created positive effects in the viewer. According to him, exemplary Christian behavior materialized in “good deeds,…assist the increase of virtue,…and…benefit generations to come, that by gazing upon such images we may be encouraged to flee evil and desire good.”18

From the central to the later Middle Ages, the number of religious images increased and their uses evolved.19 While in the eleventh century, biblical stories and representations of saints from early Christianity had been painted on the walls of churches, from the thirteenth century forward, images of saints who had lived recently became the predominant subject matter.20 Even though during the rest of the Middle Ages there was no repeat of the iconoclastic violence of the Byzantine era, throughout this period arose within the Church voices of discontent with, and support of, the use of images. Bernard de Claivaux (1090-1153), a Cistercian abbot in France, opposed excess

15 Ibid., 73.
16 Ibid., 76.
17 Ibid., 79.
ornamentation because “sensible pleasure does not benefit the monastic life which is devoted to God alone.”21 However, he found that images in cathedrals and churches could benefit the people inciting them to devotion.22 St. Bonaventura recognized the importance of the artist who made images and “art emerges and acts as a conduit toward spiritual ascension.”23 He also agreed with Pope Gregory’s assertion that images had a role to fulfill given the lack of education, and bad memory of the common people.24

In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas took on the task of formulating a doctrine on images. His ideas on a categorization of worship are presented here because they served as the departing point for a major discussion in the early modern period. The emphasis of his discussion was on the worship of God, the saints, and the Virgin, but he also applied his ideas to the material representations of those beings used during worship. In the 1260s, in a section of his *Summa Theologiae*, a synthesis of philosophy and theology based on Aristotelian principles

Aquinas offered his definition of image as a neutral synonym for representation that could acquire a positive or negative connotation; in contrast, he asserted that idol had an exclusively negative meaning. According to him, an image was an “independent reality [in the form of] a piece of wood, carved or painted [that had] a representational function.”25 Thus Aquinas explained that “images [were] made by the pagans for worship of their gods,” which indicates that he deliberately used the word image in a neutral way.26 However, idolatry meant “offering divine worship to idols.”27 The act of

22 Ibid..
23 Ibid. 157
24 Ibid.
26 Ibid., 193.
idolatry presupposed the use of idols which he suggested had exclusively negative meaning. He made clear that, “in itself idolatry is the most serious of sins since it sets up another god in the world, diminishing God’s primacy. But knowing heretics sin more grievously than ignorant idolaters.”

Aquinas held that while the Commandments did not forbid images in religious practice, they stressed the need to use images legitimately. He observed that if the statement, “‘Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven things or any likeness’” was read and interpreted without taking into account the text as a whole, the resulting message was incomplete, and therefore mistaken. However, when the previous statement was put in context, it was clear that “What is forbidden by this precept is not the making of graven images or likenesses but the making of these as objects of worship, as is made clear [by] what follows, ‘Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them.’” In Aquinas’ view, God’s prohibition was specifically referring to those “false gods…made by the pagans for worship of their gods, that is, of the demons.”

Aquinas also explained that there were three levels of worship: latria, the highest one, was given to God; hyperdulia, given to the Virgin Mary and her images; and dulia, assigned to the saints and their images. Aquinas was among the most important medieval theologians who sought to clarify the status of the Virgin Mary. By dedicating a special type of worship to the Virgin he may have brought attention to the debate over
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32 According to Schimitt the categorization of worship was necessary to move away from the ambiguity of language that contributed to the Byzantine iconoclasm.
her immaculate conception. Aquinas made clear that we give worship to God, not because He needs it, but because it “strengthens in ourselves by sensible signs a true opinion about God.” Images were part of the sensible signs that constituted worship.

The most significant difference between Damascus and Aquinas centered on latria: while the former claimed that only God, the father and son could receive latria, Aquinas held that latria could also be given to the image of Jesus Christ. Aquinas argued that “the same reverence is shown to the image of Christ as to Christ himself. Since Christ is paid divine [worship], so too his image should be paid divine [worship].” Nonetheless, he clarified that the worship given to the image was totally dependent on the subject represented in the image as,

No reverence is shown to the image of Christ in so far as it is an independent reality—a piece of wood, carved or painted—for reverence cannot be given to any but a rational being…[therefore]…whatever reverence is shown it has in view its function as image.

Aquinas defined idolatry as an exclusive practice of pagans who had misused images. Aquinas explained that “the adoration of images” practiced by pagans had “to be accounted [as] an unfruitful work for two reasons.” Two related aspects made the pagan practice inappropriate, illegitimate, and dangerous: “Firstly, because there were
some [pagans] who adored images in their material reality, for they believed, by reason of
the oracles pronounced through them by the demons and because of other similar
prodigies, that they contained some divinity.39 Aquinas blamed this belief on demonic
activity that tricked people into thinking that they were receiving divine communication.
Second, the practices of the pagans were bad “because of what their images represented;
for they set up images of certain creatures to which, in the images, they offered divine
worship.”40 Having any god other that the true God meant that the true God did not
receive the honor and love that He deserved. It is significant that Aquinas did not use the
term idolatry to refer to the action of improper worship, perhaps because he purposely
tried to avoid a term that had caused so much strife during the Iconoclastic period in
Byzantium.41

Aquinas articulated the relationship between image practices of the pagans and
those of Christians. Without fully identifying his source, he explained that although “the
Apostle forbids us to have any part in the unfruitful works of the pagans; he does not
forbid us to share practices of theirs which are useful.”42 While he recognized that one
such ‘useful’ practice ‘shared’ by both groups concerned images, he emphasized the
difference between pagan and Christian practice.

In the 1300s, the English Dominican friar, Robert Holcot, unintentionally backed
what was later to become the Lollards’ view (followers of John Wycliffe) by casting
doubts upon the legitimacy of Aquinas’ theory of worship. Holcot analyzed the theory
formulated by Aquinas on the type of worship given to images, and rejected the ‘accepted

39Ibid.
40 Ibid.
42 Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, 193.
usage’ that the same honor given to God could be given to the representation of God. It is not clear if Holcot’s comments were the result of a broader ideological dispute within the Dominican order.

In the first half of the fourteenth century, John Wycliffe (1320-1384) articulated one of the strongest dissenting views of the Middle Ages against various church doctrines and practices including the use of images. Eventually, he influenced the views on images of a group of his followers known as ‘the Lollards.’ Wycliffe, a clergyman who had studied at Oxford, believed that the Bible was the only source of authority in these matters; thus he set his disciples to translate it from Latin into English. According to Margaret Aston, Wycliffe’s position is remarkable for its lack of extremism and for its historical awareness, when compared with the radical claims and actions of many later Lollards. He backed up Pope Gregory the Great who asserted that images could be used for instruction of the unlearned. He recognized that while in the Old Testament images had been prohibited because people were prone to idolatry, Christians in the New Testament did not face that danger. In his view, the problem with images in his own time was the danger of misusing them in violation of the Commandments. It is clear that he saw images as a paradox for he claimed,

It is evident that images may be made well and ill; well in order to rouse, assist and kindle the minds of the faithful to love God more devoutly; and ill when by reason of images there is deviation from the true faith, as when the image is

44 Lollards who got the name from the Dutch word lollen which meant ‘to mumble.’ Sheridan Gilley and W. J. Sheils eds., A History of Religion in Britain. Practice and Belief from Pre-Roman Times to the Present (Oxford, UK.:Blackwell, 1994), 73
46 Ibid., 138.
worshipped with *dulia* (worship to saints) and *latria* (worship to God) or unduly delighted in for its beauty, costliness, or attachment to irrelevant circumstances.47

For him, the First and Second Commandments clearly pointed out that images could lead people into committing idolatry. Unlike the Lollards, Wycliffe seldom called for the removal and destruction of images as a preventive measure against the possibility of idolatry.48

The Lollard attack of images from the fourteenth century on represents a radical step up from Wycliffe’s criticism. While some of his followers embraced his same positions, others gave them more radical interpretations. In *Twelve Conclusions*, the Lollards claimed that the worship of images was a kind of idolatry.49 They mocked Pope Gregory’s claim by arguing that images were “books of errour” for the lower people.50 Finally, they denied that Aquinas’ classification of worship had anything to do with images.51 While Lollards in practice destroyed very few images, many people were tried for their verbal attacks on them. The first Lollard martyr was burnt at the stake in 1401. After a revolt in 1414, the group seemed to have lost direct influence, but there is evidence of a limited revival after 1490. Over a hundred people received this punishment during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.52 To this criticism the Church responded with various texts in the vernacular and in Latin.53

48 Ibid., 142.
50 Ibid.
51 Ibid., 27.
In a text written around 1390, Augustinian canon Walter Hilton sympathized with the emotional appeal of images and argued that people who did not understand the difference between *latria* and *dulia*, and consequently did not give the proper worship to images, should be excused. In 1396, Roger Dymmok, a Dominican, responded directly to the *Twelve Conclusions*, arguing that the use of images was beneficial for the souls of Christians because they had been instituted by God. In the fifteenth century, in *Destructorium Viciorum*, Alexander Carpenter repeated many of Dymmok’s ideas, but like Halcot, he disagreed with Aquinas’ idea that ‘true adoration’ should be given to something other than God. To avoid falling into the practice of idolatry, he suggested the medieval role of images in worship should be changed to be expressed as ‘I adore Christ before the image of Christ’.

He expressed doubts about the extent to which adoration was a positive feature of Christianity. The last two works produced in the fifteenth century, *Dives and Pauper* and *The Pore Caitif*, presented the lengthiest expositions of these types of worship. *Dives and Pauper* was a text written in the form of a dialogue that mentioned the three aspects of the ‘primary rational’ for the use of images commonly presented in medieval theology: images teach, images move people’s emotions, and images remind people of the saints and Christ. *Dives and Pauper* held that the laity had to understand the theory of worship in order to remove all danger of idolatry in their use of images. *The Pore Caitif* was a compilation of religious tracts that included an explanation of the Ten Commandments. It differentiated between idolatry among Jews and the lawful worship of images among Christians. Unlike any previous work, it established a visual hierarchy with the host at the top, the crucifix in the middle, and the
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images of saints at the bottom.\textsuperscript{56} Exceptionally, one of the medieval versions of this work revealed fears that images could deceive people, which echoed Lollards’ preoccupations. According to Katheleen Kamerick, the thread that ran through these writings was the view that the ‘simple laity’ was likely to be endangered by the use of images. In her view, “both the vernacular works and their Latin models faced enormous difficulties in reconciling the apparently absolute Decalogue prohibition of images with common religious practice.”\textsuperscript{57} It is significant that while all these works insisted on the rational approach to image worship, medieval theologians could not agree on the terms used to define the various types of worship.\textsuperscript{58}

While the issue of images was addressed in the profusion of works written in England during the Middle Ages, Catholic thought in the Iberian Peninsula was shaped by the \textit{Reconquista} (the Reconquest). In the words of historian Helen Rawlings, the experience of the Reconquest “set a militant stamp on Spanish Catholicism that was to remain one of its distinguishing features throughout the early modern period.”\textsuperscript{59} The eight centuries of \textit{Convivencia} (coexistence or living together) in which Christians, Muslims, and Jews lived together under a Muslim \textit{califat} (center of Muslim government) came to an end when Christian rulers from the northern bastions of Christianity moved southward to expel the Arabs during the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{60}

Centuries long tolerance of Muslims and Jewish populations in lands recovered by the \textit{Reconquista} gradually decreased after the infamous pogrom of 1391. Further

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 52.
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\textsuperscript{59} Helen Rawlings, \textit{Church, Religion and Society in Early Modern Spain}. European Studies Series (China: Palgrave, 2002), 1.
pressure for Jews to convert or leave the country in the early 1400s led to the semi-voluntary conversions in 1411 and 1414 of half of the original Jewish population of 400,000.61 Far from creating a unified Christian population, these events produced a new kind of Christian who was seen with suspicion as somebody who had ‘officially’ converted, but who in practice remained faithful to his/her original religion. Old Catholics claimed that the remaining Jewish population incited the converted Jews, *conversos*, to secretly practice their old faith. To promote religious unity necessary for political integration, the Spanish crown obtained permission from Pope Sixtus IV to establish the Holy Office of the Inquisition in 1478. Immediately the Inquisition started to persecute *conversos* who were suspected of being ‘false Christians’, and in 1492 it expelled all Jews who refused to convert in order to attack the problem at its root. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, there were fewer cases of accused *conversos* by the Inquisition, and the newly converted Muslim population known as *moriscos* became the government’s new target.62 In the case of the *morisco* population, Catholic Church officials tried to ensure a sincere Christianization through programs of instruction and acculturation. In Granada, the implementation of these programs resulted in violent demonstrations of the *morisco* community.

Although in Spain there was never open opposition to the use of images, the rejection of images in Islam and Judaism indicates that the new Christians had a difficult time accepting this aspect of Catholic practice. Although the Church had responded negatively to the first appearance of the Talmud (sacred corpus of commentary of main Jewish laws) around the sixth century, it was not until the thirteenth century when it

61 Ibid., 35.
became aware of the importance of this text and its potentially damaging implications for Christianity.  

From the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, despite the increasing anti-Jewish sentiment, various ‘disputations’ (meetings) between Jewish and Christian religious authorities ‘discussed’ the differences between the two faiths. In reality, as the Middle Ages progressed, those meetings increasingly became forums where Jews were forced to defend their doctrine before the attacks of the Christian majority. Various Christian authors wrote treatises to demonstrate the superiority of their religion over the errors of the beliefs of the Jews. The text *El Declarante de los Judios*, written by an anonymous author in Castile in 1295, was presented in the form of a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew. For the author, the Jewish attitude towards the material aspects of Christian devotion was evidence of their mistaken position. The tone of this text sounds more like a reprimand against Jews than a dialogue. To respond to the Jewish claim that images were banned by God, the author reminded them that their people had committed gross affronts against God by adoring images. This author explained that Christians understood that an image was a material thing and thus they did not treat it as a god.

One of the most significant anti-Jewish books of the early fifteenth century was written by a Jewish convert known in Spanish as Jerónimo de Santa Fe. Santa Fe converted to Christianity in 1411 and started a zealous program to convert other Jews. He became physician to Pope Boniface XIII in charge of organizing the Disputation of
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Tortosa which took place in 1413. His book *Errores y Falsedades del Talmud*, ordered by the Pope, included all sections of the Talmud where falsehoods and slanders were made against Christianity. By identifying those damaging aspects of Judaism, the Church could proceed to attack them and thus facilitate the conversion of Jews to Christianity.67

In a chapter dedicated to the discussion of the service to God, Santa Fe accused rabbis for “giving [people] permission to serve [a] strange god and participate in idolatry.”68 This was the case when “the people of Israel while in the desert…adored the idol Pehor” (a Phoenician divinity venerated in Moab whose cult was known for its obscenity).69

According to Santa Fe, the biggest affront to Christianity came when a certain rabbi claimed that Christians committed idolatry on Sundays. Santa Fe quoted the rabbi as saying “Do not have commercial transactions with idolaters, nor have peace with them [instead] either make them abandon this idolatry or kill them.”70

A last example of this kind of anti-Jewish propaganda is found in *Tratado Contra los Judios* written in 1484 by an Augustinian theologian called Jaime Perez de Valencia. He refuted the Jewish charge that Christians adored the material cross and images in place of God, and explained at length the correctness of Christian practice.71 In this respect, Justo Formentin and Maria Jose Villegas suggest that Perez de Valencia’s arguments, and therefore the opinion of other anti-Jewish writers, cannot be taken at face value because the position of medieval Jewish authors, writing in the Iberian Peninsula, was not unified. In the twelfth century, Moses Maimonides argued that all images were
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forbidden because of the constant danger of veneration. A few decades later, Moses ben Nachman held that the only images that should be banned are the ones made expressly for the purpose of veneration. In addition to his criticism of the Jewish position on images, Perez de Valencia also rebuked the population of sarracens (term used to refer to the Muslim population) for having a negative view of the Christian use of images.

In the late 1400s, a *converso* chronicler known as Pulgar challenged several aspects of Christian doctrine. He rose to notoriety as he caught the attention of Hernando de Talavera, Queen Isabelle’s confessor. The author suggested that the more one learned about Christianity, the more it became evident that Judaism was superior to it. He specifically expressed doubts about the validity of the cult of images and saints.

Although it is impossible to tell how widespread this view was, Pulgar’s opinion contributed to intensify the suspicions of the Inquisition towards the *converso* population as a whole.

Besides these Jewish voices, the fifteenth century witnessed the unorthodox claims of a renowned, and at some point, infamous, humanist Alonso de Madrigal El Tostado (1400-1455). He had studied theology, philosophy, and arts at the University of Salamanca where he later taught. The prolific writer was accused of unorthodoxy by the Dominican Cardinal Juan de Torquemada, who was acting under the orders of Pope Eugene IV. Among other things, Madrigal had denounced the practice of pretending that images bled, cried, moved, and grew hair as miraculous signs in order to extract money
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from churchgoers. In his view, all these stratagems and lies caused common people to become a ‘heretic and idolater’ because they believed that those images had special powers. Madrigal fled until King John II of Castile took him under his protection, naming him counselor and later bishop of Avila.75

II. Christian Humanism and the *Devotio Moderna*

The literary and intellectual movement known as Humanism which originated in Italy in the fourteenth century underwent adaptations as it was embraced by various European nations. While in Florence, Pico de la Mirandola and Ficino had a Neoplatonic perspective, in Spain, Cardinal Jimenez sought to balance this new learning with the older scholasticism, and in France, Jacques Lefrevre d’Etaples gave preference to the Bible.76 Although Christian or northern Humanism (found in northern Europe and England) did not emerge exclusively from later Italian Humanism, it was inspired by Italian traditions and sources.77 Erasmus of Rotterdam (1444/9-1536), possibly the most influential northern humanist, assimilated Christian humanism with a new school of spirituality native to the Netherlands that resulted in what has been referred to as *Philosophia Christi*.78

From the fifteenth century on, the spread of this new systematization of the meditative form of mental prayer known as *Devotio moderna* had a significant impact on
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early modern Christianity.\textsuperscript{79} While this set of norms for ‘affective spirituality’ was originally designed as a tool to reform monastic and clerical life, it eventually was adapted to the needs of laymen.\textsuperscript{80} Although in theory the \textit{Devotio moderna} did not run against communal worship and the ceremonialism of the Church, in practice, it promoted a highly individualistic act.\textsuperscript{81} By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the challenges presented by \textit{Devotio moderna} and Christian humanism impacted the European scene in various ways.

According to scholar Carlos Eire, Erasmus can be seen as the genesis of the Protestant critique of Catholic \textit{cultus divorum} (cult of the divine).	extsuperscript{82} Eire believes that the influence of his ideas was such that “the roots of the Reformed Protestant attitude toward worship must begin with Erasmus, since it is he who gave rise to a new Christian interpretation of the relationship between the spiritual and the material.”\textsuperscript{83} Although Erasmus remained a Catholic, his protest was well received by many individuals who seem to have been waiting to ignite their own artillery against what they saw as a decadent and corrupt Catholic Church. Not only did Erasmus influence Luther, but his opinions on \textit{cultus divorum} also influenced Andrea Karlstadt, Huldrych Zwingli, Gillaum Farel, and John Calvin.\textsuperscript{84} Erasmus’ influence was clearly demonstrated by the fact that on the subject of images, Karlstadt, Zwingli, Farel, and Calvin were closer to Erasmus than to Luther.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., 32
\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 32.
\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 34.
\textsuperscript{83} See Eire’s discussion of the influence that Erasmus writings had in several Protestant reformers.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 28.
Erasmus did not oppose the mere existence of devotional imagery as Protestants later did, but he abhorred the misuses that they inspired.\footnote{Bataillon, \textit{Erasmo y España}, 229.} In the \textit{Enchiridion Militis Christiani} and in the \textit{Colloquies}, Erasmus articulated a direct critique regarding the cult of saints. In the \textit{Enchiridion}, published in 1503, he criticized some practices and beliefs that involved saints and their representations. In two of his \textit{Colloquies}, published in 1522 and 1526 respectively, he presented a satire in the form of a dialogue in which the use of images was challenged. It is important to note that he firmly expressed his objections to certain practices that he considered excessive or inappropriate in the use of image. Erasmus’ views on \textit{cultus divorum} did not lessen with time, and only when the Church inquired into his opinions did he emphasize that he did not ‘completely condemn’ the doctrine of images.\footnote{Eire, \textit{War Against}, 47.} In his later years, he remained relentless with his critique while he rebuked those who tried to associate him with Luther.\footnote{Ibid.}

Erasmus disliked the notion of requesting help from a specific saint according to the type of problem which that saint specialized in.\footnote{According to Anthony Levi, Erasmus once cured of his quartan fever in January of 1497, wrote a poem of thanksgiving to Saint Genevieve for her intercession. Anthony Levi, \textit{Renaissance and Reformation: the Intellectual Genesis} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002).} In his satirical style, he explained that there were people who prayed to St. Apolonia when they had a toothache because they believed that she could get rid of the pain.\footnote{Ibid.} While he ridiculed this common practice, not officially endorsed by the Church, he did not reject the doctrine of intercession itself.

Another mistaken practice he identified was the notion that God’s intercessors had unique fixed physical locations. As an example Erasmus mentioned one individual...
who “had devotion towards St. Christopher, but must have his images in front” and another person who “regularly visits [St.] Job’s effigy”…to ask for protection against the Black Death.90 Erasmus made clear that the idea that prayers had to be said in front of an image or effigy set in public religious places was shared among Catholics of other nationalities; for instance, in France people honored St. Paul just as the Flemish honored St. Jerome.91 Erasmus argued that if these devotions “are not directed mainly to Christ, leaving to the side all the request for favors, they would not be Christian, but they would be close to being profane and close to the superstition of the gentiles.”92 For Erasmus, these erroneous Catholic devotions were comparable to those of pagan nations who offered a rooster to their god of medicine, St. Esculapious, to help them recover their health when sick.

After denouncing ‘superstitious’ practices involving images, Erasmus presented a more conciliatory and sympathetic view on saints’ cults. He argued that the relationship between the faithful and their saints, materialized through their images, should be of a more spiritual nature. He understood that people had a strong need to request favors from the saints, but he warned that if people asked St. Roque for health, they should offer that health and their whole lives for Jesus Christ instead of performing exterior ceremonies such as candle lighting. Still he acknowledged that people took great pleasure in honoring Christ through his saints, so he set a condition for the existence of image devotion. He was willing to approve of this exterior gesture of devotion if people used it to imitate the lives of the saints and, in this way, correct their vices.

90 Ibid.
91 Ibid., 227.
92 Ibid., 228.
In the first half of the sixteenth century, Erasmus of Rotterdam’s writings presented a resounding critique of the use of images in Catholic practices that had an important impact in religious thinkers in both England and Spain. Nonetheless, the difference in reception between the two countries reveals the divergent intellectual and religious atmospheres in which challenges to traditional church practices and doctrine were viewed.

During the second half of the fifteenth century, the English educated elite showed an increasing interest in Christian humanism. According to Anthony Levi, the first great English patron of Italian-style learning was Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, younger brother of Henry V. His interest in collecting books in Greek and Latin was fueled by his desire to participate in the discussion of the \textit{via moderna}, and the new attitudes towards the approaches proposed by Humanism in Italy. The \textit{via moderna} was used to refer to Nominalism, a metaphysical view of philosophy used by Ockham, as opposed to the \textit{via antigua} of the Thomists. In the same way, \textit{Devotio moderna} was the new kind of mysticism.\footnote{R. Garcia Villoslada, “Devotio Moderna,” in New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed.} By 1458, Magdalen College in Oxford initiated a change in its educational approach with the foundation of a grammar school. After 1470, a larger number of academic visitors such as John Colet, William Grey, Robert Flemmyng, William Grocyn, William Lily, Thomas Linacre and William Latimer traveled to Italy to learn first hand the latest discussion on the \textit{via moderna}.\footnote{Levi, Renaissance and Reformation, 180.}

Reform-minded individuals in England readily embraced several of Erasmus’ ideas. Erasmus and his writings had a major impact upon English thinkers. He visited England six times and claimed to have liked the country. In his first visit in 1499, which
lasted six months, he gained the respect of Thomas More, the future Henry VIII, and the Oxford theologian John Colet. In another visit Erasmus worked on a translation together with More, a process that resulted in a friendship. He also finished his *The Praise of Folly* that he dedicated to More under the name *Encomium Moriae*. His friend Archbishop Warham gave him a position as the curate of Aldington. Erasmus became teacher of theology in Cambridge thanks to his friend, John Fisher, who was President of the University of Cambridge. Despite his useful pedagogical insight set in his writings, he was not the best of pedagogues; his lack of knowledge of the English language as spoken by his students and his unwillingness to adapt culturally to the ambiance of English university life remained an obstacle.\footnote{See Jean-Claude Margolin who argues that Erasmus did not like to drink beer as his students did. He ordered a considerable supply of his favorite red wine during his stay in England. Alexandre Vanautgaerden ed. *Erasme et l'Anglaterre*, by Jean-Claude Margolin (Bruxelles: La Lettre Vole a la Maison d’Erasme, 1998) 57.} According to Levi, the number of translations and adaptations of his text is proof of the influence of Erasmus’s ideas in the intellectual life of England.\footnote{For a full discussion Erasmus’ career Jean-Claude Margolin cites E.J. Devereux, *Renaissance English Translations of Erasmus. A Bibliography to 1700*.}

The turmoil of the early stages of the English Reformation led to the manipulation of Erasmus’s ideas in some of these translations. His *Colloquies* generated the interest of many English reformers who seemed to have been satisfied with the original version in Latin. Because they wanted to make these available to the common people, they began to translate individual *Colloquies* throughout the sixteenth century. Although in 1606 the first large section of the *Colloquies* that dealt with abuses of the Church of Rome was translated, the whole work was not translated until 1699. The first translation of *The Praise of Folly* was done in 1549 and was reprinted twice in that century; subsequent
translations were made in 1668 and 1683. *The Enchiridion*, a work that presents the transformations envisioned by Henry VIII and Cromwell, was translated in 1522 by Tyndale, who preserved the spirit of the Dutch humanist. Erasmus’ greatest influence was the publication of a translation into English of the *Paraphrases in Novum Testamentum*. This project was supported by Catherine Parr, the sixth wife of Henry VIII. This text was based on a commentary of the Church fathers and was widely accepted in England, thanks to the receptive mood that Oxford reformers displayed towards humanist trends. The order to provide a copy of Erasmus’s *Paraphrases* for every parish church during the reign of Edward VI was a sign of the success of this project.97

Erasmus was one of the earliest significant foreign critics of the use of images in traditional ceremonies of the Church, whose arguments had a direct impact on early English Protestants.98 Two of the early reformers, Thomas Bilney and Hugh Latimer, who aired their criticism of traditional Catholic ceremonies and rituals in the early 1530s, had clearly been inspired by Erasmus.99 In the following decades, several other English reformers continued to use statements by Erasmus to make their case against images.

Although the Spanish Church was fighting heterodoxy among newly converted Christians during the early sixteenth century, it was also experiencing a period of self-redefinition.100 In the last decades of the fifteenth century, Cardinal Jimenez de Cisneros, once confessor to Isabel of Castile, initiated a program to reform the whole Spanish

98 Ibid.
99 Ibid., 56.
100 Historians who use the terms ‘Reformation’, ‘Catholic Reformation’ and ‘Counter Reformation’ have not reached an agreement. Many authors view the monastic campaign initiated by Jimenez de Cisneros by the end of the fifteenth century either as a ‘Reformation’ or a ‘Catholic Reformation’, but describe the changes that began in the mid-sixteenth century, directed more specifically against Protestantism, as a ‘Counter Reformation’. For a fuller discussion see section on terminology in Chapter 1.
Church, starting with monastic life. Besides the new University of Alcalá de Henares founded by the reforming bishop Jiménez in 1502, twenty-seven more were established within the same century.  

Jiménez’ objective was to use humanism in the teaching of theology and the training of priests. Jiménez was also instrumental in the publication of the Polyglot Bible in 1522 that appeared as a six-volume critical edition of the Scriptures with the objective ‘to improve the dissemination of the word of God’. Among the most accomplished representatives of Spanish humanism, Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540), befriended Erasmus from a young age while he was studying in Brussels. His writings addressed issues of poverty, education, and international relations from the perspective of Christian philosophy. Another humanist was the Spanish theologian Melchor de Cano who pioneered in the use of a series of unexplored biblical sources as a methodological approach to his studies.

Although Erasmus never set foot in Spain, the power of his ideas was impressive. While his works in Latin were generally well received, the translation of his *Enchiridion* into Spanish in 1526 transformed him into a best-selling author. According to Marcel Bataillon, in that year Juan Maldonado, a contemporary of Erasmus, wrote a letter to the theologian informing him that, “for those who do not know to read in Latin, several experts are working in translating into our language your works.” Maldonado reported that the *Enchiridion* “had just been published in Spanish, and even with thousands of printed copies, the printers could not satisfy the crowds. Some of the dialogues in the
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Colloquies translated into Spanish were immediately bought by men and women.”\textsuperscript{106}

The four editions of the *Enchiridion* can be seen as proof of the popularity that Erasmus enjoyed in Spain. This is significant to the discussion on images because Bataillon considers that Erasmian ideas caused “a profound revolution in Spanish life, and it was not an issue among an obscure minority, among few people; instead it was received with extreme passion and interest by the aristocracy, high and low, and reached the masses.”\textsuperscript{107}

Even if Bataillon seemed to exaggerate the reach of Erasmus’ works, the consensus indicates that it is likely that Erasmus had a considerable audience in Spain.\textsuperscript{108}

Several reasons could explain the popularity of Erasmus’ works in Spain. One possibility is that Erasmus’ ideas were a continuation of the program of reform started by Cardinal Jimenez a few decades earlier. He had been invited to participate in the creation of the Polyglot Bible, even though he never set foot in Spain. Erasmus’ works seemed to have provided educated Spanish readers with material that supported his critique of certain practices of the Church.\textsuperscript{109} A factor that allowed Erasmus’s works to penetrate the Spanish intellectual world was the support of a group of powerful individuals in the court of Charles V who openly embraced Erasmus’s teachings.

While the threat of Protestantism began to rise beyond the border of Spain, some Spanish theologians mounted strong attacks against Erasmus’ ideas. In the summer of 1527, thirty-three of the most prominent theologians gathered in Valladolid to discuss the lack of orthodoxy in Erasmus’ claims. Franciscans and Dominicans opposed his

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 24.
\textsuperscript{108} Bataillon argues that the number of translations and editions of Erasmus’ works between 1527 and 1535 demonstrated the popularity of this author in Spain. See Bataillon, *Erasme et l’Espagne*, 302.
criticism of monasticism; these religious orders formed a significant anti-Erasmian block, taking advantage of the absence of Charles V’s advisors. Although no conclusion was reached due to an outbreak of the plague, Lu Ann Homza holds that their positions were inconsistent and that nobody fully accepted nor rejected Erasmus’ ideas. While Spain officially turned its back on Erasmus and his ideas just a year after the translation of the *Enchiridion* into Spanish, surprisingly this book was not banned until 1599, in spite of the fact that in Paris the Sorbonne had prohibited it since 1544. The Spanish Inquisition linked his teachings with several heretical movements that were seen as a new threat to religious unity.

III. Status of Images From the beginning of the English Reformation to 1650.

England’s Reformation had both types of influences, native inherited elements and continental Protestant influences. According to G.R. Elton, “the real story of England and the Continent in the sixteenth century presents a complex interplay of contacts between a self consciously separate national entity and massive cross-currents of continent-wide cultural explosions.” Thomas Cromwell, the architect of the reformation in the 1530s, received an education with less emphasis on English tradition, and had a significant knowledge of the European continent. The English reformation owed much to that of Protestant Europe; however, scholars have agreed on the difficulty
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of measuring and locating this influence.\textsuperscript{112} The evolution of one major English Protestant can illustrate this point. William Tyndale, the first major decrier of images of the sixteenth century, was heavily influenced by Luther’s ideas, but by the 1530’s he was becoming an independent thinker, relying on his own convictions. It is clear that the remnants of the \textit{Lollard} phenomenon and Erasmian evangelism prepared the stage for the reception of Luther’s message. Reformists such as Tyndale, forced into exile in Europe, acquired direct knowledge on the matter from their hosts. Lutheran ideas found their way, and had an impact upon legislation under Henry. This trend began to change by 1538 when Martin Bucer, Zwingli, and Calvin became the new ideological mentors of English Protestants. The Protestant exiles who left England during Mary’s reign in the the 1550s were also able to establish closer connections with Theodore Beza and Calvin in Geneva and Heinrich Bullinger in Zurich. Ideological differences between the English and the Europeans began to appear during the reign of Elizabeth. The reformers who pushed for further reform within the Church of England started the movement known as Puritanism which eventually developed into a separatist branch based on Calvinist ideas. Scholars now suggest that Puritanism should be seen as a ‘variant’ of the Anglican faith instead of as its ‘Geneva-oriented’ enemy.\textsuperscript{113} At the same time, in England, a distinguishable form of Christianity, in structure and doctrine, emerged from the modifications to the medieval past and adaptations of a Calvinist faith. This process was facilitated by the English tendency to naturalize foreign ideas during the reformation.

As was the case with all major Continental reformers, for a period of time Martin Luther’s position on images swayed according to iconoclastic episodes that he had

\textsuperscript{112} Elton believes that despite the immense amounts of research done in this subject, there are still many questions to be asked before any conclusion can be made.

\textsuperscript{113} Elton. “\textit{England and the Continent},” 12.
witnessed. Luther’s statements are hard to read because of constant contradictions in his work.\textsuperscript{114} At first, Luther recognized the abuse and misuse of images in among Catholics, but he argued that this misuse could be rectified by preaching the word rather than by destroying the images. Focusing on the functions they served, he accepted their validity as an instructional tool.\textsuperscript{115} Later on in one of his sermons he claimed “Christ’s kingdom is a hearing-kingdom, not a seeing kingdom, for the eyes do not lead and guide us to where we know and find Christ, but rather the ears do this.”\textsuperscript{116}

For John Calvin, the problem was that images could serve to divide the honor due to God alone. He disagreed with the distinction made between the two types of worship officially recognized by the Catholic Church, \textit{latria} and \textit{dulia}, in the writings of Thomas Aquinas.\textsuperscript{117} Zwingli, a humanist who had served as a parish priest in his native Switzerland, acknowledged that Erasmus’ critique of the cult of saints had lead him to reassess his own beliefs. In 1525, in his most complete discussion on the use of images, \textit{In Answer to Valentin Compar}, he argued that any object that was set between the believer and God took worship away from Him.\textsuperscript{118} For this reason, God should be worshipped on His own. Zwingli’s ideas were expanded by his successor in Zurich, Heinrich Bullinger. In his \textit{On the Origin of Errors} written in 1528, which mostly repeated the theological arguments of his predecessor, Bullinger collected a large number of evidence of image abuse and organized them in a systematic way. This book became a text book for theologians, pastors, and laymen.\textsuperscript{119} Martin Bucer built upon the arguments
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\end{itemize}
of Zwingli and Bullinger but focused on practical aspects of the use of images. While he claimed that the miracles performed by images had a demonic origin, he showed more concern for the uncharitable aspects of the cultus divorum than any other reformer.\textsuperscript{120} The money spent on making images and lighting candles to them should be used to help the poor and the sick.

The policies that were put in motion during Henry’s reign to undermine the theology and ceremonies of the medieval Church became the king’s legacy. In spite of the important voices of image defenders like Thomas More and Stephen Gardiner, image detractors succeeded in translating their beliefs into policy.\textsuperscript{121} Between 1534 and 1536 there were no official statements on images by the Church of England; thus it became clear that a policy was needed to avoid confusion.\textsuperscript{122} Archbishop Cranmer, head of the faction against images within the Church of England, initiated a campaign to eliminate them. Meanwhile, several conservative bishops and clerics firmly defended the use of images and the lighting of candles as an essential and valid devotional practice. In 1536 the Ten Articles was the first expression of the official doctrinal position on the use of images by the Church of England. Despite strong opposition to images among many church officials, this document accepted a traditional view of image devotion. While idolatrous worship was forbidden, images contained in books which served as reminders of ‘heavenly things’ were acceptable.\textsuperscript{123} For this reason, the Ten Articles represented a temporary victory for conservative forces. However, the Injunctions that were used to

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 90.
\textsuperscript{121} Other individuals who opposed doctrinal changes were Bishop Lee of York, Stokesley, Bishop of London, and Turnstal, Bishop of Durham. See John Phillips The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 59.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 56.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 54.
secure the implementation of the Ten Articles indirectly attacked images. They established that only those images that were abused by superstition would be destroyed; nonetheless, this implied that images might always be used for superstitious practices. Ultimately, the defenders of images came to realize that opposition to images had been translated into a policy that would be implemented in quick and definitive steps.

Another indication of the direction this debate was taking was given by the doctrinal handbook known as the Bishop’s Book published in 1537. The Bishop’s Book prohibited the possession of images with the intention of worship. It established, however, that images were reminders of spiritual things, and therefore pictures of God were allowed. Images were also accepted as a means to instruct and to increase devotion. The Bishop’s Book had been issued and authorized by the bishops for the instruction of clerics. In 1538, Thomas Cromwell presented a new set of Injunctions (based on the Bishop’s Book) which, for the very first time, ordered the removal of all abused images from churches. (The Bishop’s Book had refuted the claim that there was a need to ban all of them from churches.) In the text known as the King’s Book, a revised version of the Bishop’s Book published in 1543, the policies on images reflect a clear retreat brought about by Gardiner and the King’s personal intervention. This book refuted those who claimed that the second commandment prohibited not some but the use of ‘all’ images. As a result, future reformers in the 1540s viewed Henry’s reforms as important, albeit incomplete; they hoped their aspirations would be fulfilled by the next monarch.
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During the reign of Edward VI, the reforming party adopted a radical policy that swept away centuries of image-based devotional practices. Conservative individuals like Bishop Bonner and Bishop Gardiner argued that any additional reform should wait until the young king Edward came of age, but their voices were ignored. Instead, the reformed party organized a campaign in which the king was portrayed as King Josiah, a biblical figure who had been a fierce fighter against idolatry. Those who had left England under Henry VIII because of their radical views returned with renewed commitment for the continuation of the Reformation. New Injunctions in 1547 distinguished between abused images and images that were appropriately used. However, in practice it was impossible to separate the two. The absence of any mention of the instructional role of images in this document meant that images had lost that significant function in the eyes of the reformers. The need for religious iconography and the practice of lighting candles to images was eliminated as the dissolution of chantries and fraternities in 1547 annulled the intercessory function of the saints. With the fall of the Duke of Somerset and rumors of a Catholic plot in 1549, fears that the ‘trapping’ of old religion could derail reform emerged. Reform-minded individuals sought the complete destruction of images.130 According to John Phillips, by the end of Edward VI’s reign most images had been destroyed, and the splendor of medieval churches in England was lost forever.131

In 1553, the ascent of a Catholic monarch to the throne only temporarily halted the forces against images. A small number of images that had been damaged or removed were repaired and replaced. Queen Mary recognized that concessions had to be made,

130 Aston, England’s Iconoclasts, 267.
131 Phillips, Reformation of Images, 100. The types of images that remained were those on glass windows. The images that were supposed to have been destroyed sometimes were rescued. Contemporary reports indicated that three or four shiploads of images left England to be sold in Paris and other places.
and most churches were not restored to their Pre-Reformation condition to avoid fueling hatred of images by filling up churches as had been traditionally done. The first legal measure taken regarding images was the annulment of the Edwardian statute that ordered the abolition and removal of images. By the end of Mary’s reign, most parishes in England displayed at least one image. One of the insurmountable tasks for the new monarch was the recovery of church property that had been removed, including church plate and images. Although there is no evidence of the return of images, the Church persevered in reclaiming chalices, patens, and crosses. Church officials prioritized the restoration of images that used to occupy the space of the rood, and especially those that represented the patron saint of the church.

Queen Elizabeth’s interest in the continuation of certain reforms, balanced by her conservatism in other areas, was clearly demonstrated in an ambiguous policy toward images. The few images that returned to churches under Mary symbolized the constant threat of Catholicism; thus to ensure that the new regime was a permanent one, the destruction of those images was necessary. In the Act of Uniformity of 1559, the Queen claimed the middle ground between the views of Henry and Edward. These Injunctions emphasized the “rejection of images associated with devotion or adoration and acceptance of images only in their commemorative aspects.” It also cautiously allowed for the use of crosses, lights, and vestments. These injunctions continued the ambiguous distinction between abused and non-abused images. In the same year, Bishop Parker supplemented the previous injunctions with new articles that presented a

---

133 Ibid., 281.
136 Ibid.
stronger position against images. They ordered their immediate removal and destruction; the requirement included “all images, all tables, candlesticks, rolls of wax, pictures, paintings and all other monuments of feigned and false miracles, pilgrimages and idolatry, and superstition.”

The difference between the Injunctions and the Visitation Articles points out to the ambiguity of positions and the gap between ideas and practice existent during the reign of Elizabeth. Margaret Aston has suggested that the disparities between these two documents might be explained by the function of each document: the Visitation articles served as a practical guide, necessitating a more radical tone to achieve results, while the Injunctions provided the foundation for royal policy, which in turn showed the Queen’s real stance. Although these Visitation and Articles demanded the regulation and supervision of image removal in order to avoid the excesses and disruptions of previous iconoclastic episodes, lack of clarity resulted in the destruction of remaining images and roods. As a response to this event, a royal proclamation was issued in 1561 to ensure supervision and uniformity in relation to the physical fabric of the church.

The last official document on images produced by the Elizabethan government was a homily titled *An Homilie Against perill of Idolatrie, and Superfluous decking of Churches* which was delivered in 1563, and which remained the official policy on images until the 1640s. This document expounded on the danger that abused images posed to the worship of God given the human inclination to idolatry and drew a parallel between Catholics and pagans. It made clear that Elizabeth had chosen a measured approach to
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the problem of images in the face of the radical aspirations of some reformers. The Church of England provided a doctrine based on Calvinist principles, but it never attempted to define many areas of practice. The doctrinal guidelines established by the Queen and her advisors also allowed clergymen to discuss those ideas profusely. While most of them agreed on those essential elements of the critique of images, there was some disagreement over a few of its aspects.

Several of reformers wrote to clarify what they considered was or should be the position of the Church of England in relation to images. A few of them responded in their writings to the Catholic voices of English exiles that published their views from Louvain. Those who came back from exile in Geneva, Frankfurt, and Zurich brought a fresh reforming zeal referred to as Puritanism. According to Phillips, early in Elizabeth’s reign, the term ‘Puritan’ was used to refer to those who pushed for further reform or ‘purification’ of the Church of England. Among those exiles, two became privy councilors to Elizabeth and sixteen became bishops. Amidst an overwhelming opposition to images, a reaction to Puritan ideas emerged towards the end of Elizabeth’s reign. Richard Hooker argued that important traditional values of the church were disappearing with the total rejection of ceremonies. Although he did not directly mention images in his writings, during the reign of the early Stuarts, those tolerant views of traditional worship would resonate with those espoused by Arminianism.

During the reign of James I the views and aspirations of Catholics, moderate Protestants, and Puritans alike hoped that the new monarch would further their respective agendas. Married to a Catholic, James believed strongly in the need for peace and
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harmony between the various religious views. The remaining English Catholics hoped he would restore Catholicism, or at least permit public worship of that faith. Moderates were anxious to see that no backward steps were taken in relation to the religious gains of the Reformation. The Puritans, who split into various subgroups throughout this period, displayed the most intolerant opinions.

With respect to images, however, James rejected the radical view of the Puritans. He offered a moderate stance which allowed some level of tolerance. From the beginning of his reign he condemned the use of representations to worship God, but unlike Elizabeth, he emphasized that there was a difference between the use and the abuse of images.¹⁴² He vehemently opposed the iconoclastic ideology supported by Puritans and held tolerant views on medieval ceremonies and worship. In his view, abuse of images in the past did not eliminate the inherent value of images; images linked the early church to the present, creating uniformity and order in worship. To promote the proper use of images, James I gave his bishops ample authority to act on matters of image worship. Bishop Andrew Lancelot, one of the most influential spokesmen of the Church of England, believed that the external and internal expressions of faith were proper and criticized the anti-materialism espoused by Puritans. It is significant that while his own chapel was decorated with religious stories, in his sermons he continuously warned about the potential dangers of images.¹⁴³ He seemed to have felt that he had to protect himself by presenting a prudent rhetoric on images while he embraced them in practice.

Charles I’s open acceptance of images grew out of his support of the program of Arminianism, which had been embraced by Archbishop William Laud. Charles backed

¹⁴² Spraggon, _Puritan Iconoclasm_, 19.
¹⁴³ Ibid., 20.
up Laud’s ideas because they coincided with his own view of liturgy.\footnote{Phillips, \textit{Reformation of Images}, 165.} Arminians, named after the Dutch Jacobus Arminius, held that people should be allowed to use images because humans were not prone to idolatry. Laud argued that images were essential elements of the worship of God. Worship had to make use of material things, visible signs, to reach the spiritual realm.\footnote{Ibid., 159.} Laud also defended the capacity of images to ‘teach’ about historical events, as Catholics had done in the past, but never accepted a comparison with the Church of Rome.\footnote{Ibid., 160.} In his view the Church needed to find a balance between an excess of visual material and the total absence of it. Laud demonstrated prudence by avoiding any mention of images in his Visitations Articles.\footnote{Ibid., 162.} Instead, his discussion of ‘church furniture’ was easily read to include images.\footnote{Ibid., 158.} Charles I approved of Laud’s ‘beauty of holiness,’ a program designed to restore images to churches that included biblical stories, the Virgin Mary, the Holy Trinity, and Crucifixes, many of them represented on stained glass.\footnote{Spraggon, \textit{Puritan Iconoclasm}, 96. According to Sppragon, Laud’s term ‘holiness of beauty’ is based on Psalm 29 v2..}

By the 1620s the Arminian program had resulted in the return of some images to the churches, and curiously a more relaxed stance against images was observed among a few Calvinists. Robert Sanderson and George Abbot, among others, argued that images were no longer a danger, and therefore, they could be reintroduced with caution. However, the great majority of Calvinists continued to reject images fiercely.

The issue of images deepened the rift between Puritans, Arminians and factions holding the middle ground. During the civil war, Puritans and other radical groups that
opposed Jacobean church policies on images engaged in their destruction. The Jacobean
demand for uniformity among non-conformist groups had created a clear sense of
oppression and intolerance. When war broke out between Parliament and King, Bishop
Laud was tried and eventually executed, convicted of various offenses including filling
churches with images to promote his ‘popish’ inclinations. The Long Parliament ordered
the elimination of what was left of the remaining Church ‘fabric’. According to John
Phillips, the iconoclasm of the civil war was more ‘virulent’ and ‘comprehensive’ than
the sixteenth-century episode. The new era of iconoclasm, promoted by Oliver
Cromwell, differed from that of the sixteenth century in that its targets were within the
Protestant church. Before military hostilities began, the House of Commons and Lords
struggled to reach agreement on the measures to approach the problem. The Commons
issued the Order for the Suppression of Innovations in 1641, which demanded the
removal of crucifixes and of ‘scandalous pictures’ of the Holy Trinity and the Virgin
Mary. The following year, that order became a bill with the authorization of both
Houses, which ensured the removal of images in a controlled way. Although it was
never put in practice, the Commons used other measures to confront ‘idolatrous’
offences. In 1643 the first national legislation for the reformation of images was created.
This expanded its reach to include images in churchyards and any locations that belonged
to churches and chapels. The following year, the last piece of legislation of this period
added a new prohibition of symbolic representations such as a lamb representing Christ.
This policy, in place when Oliver Cromwell was victorious in 1648, had legitimized the
second most important iconoclastic period of the history of England. The next decade

150 Phillips, Reformation of Images, 185.
151 Ibid., 71.
started with a significant degree of religious tolerance. With no more images hanging from walls and on stained glass windows, writings on images decreased, signaling the end of an era so preoccupied with them.

IV. Spain, before, during and after the Counter-Reformation.

The country that Charles V inherited from the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand and Isabella in 1517 lacked religious cohesion despite the enormous efforts taken to assimilate the remaining Jewish and Muslim populations. *Conversos* were persecuted by the Inquisition especially during the first half of the sixteenth century. The numbers of prosecutions, however, declined rapidly by the mid-sixteenth century as the Holy Office transferred its focus to the old Christian population over charges of blasphemy and bigamy.

*Devotion moderna* was another important factor present in Spain which shaped the Catholic Reformation. This was evident in the writing of the Spanish mystics such as Ignatius of Loyola and Teresa of Avila. After a mystical experience and a long spiritual journey, Ignatius founded the Society of Jesus, a new religious order conceived as a spiritual army to help the Papacy in the fight against the ever growing Protestant threat and in the quest to bring Christianity to all corners of the world. In the early 1520s Ignatius wrote his famous *Spiritual Exercises*, a mystical guide that leads the reader through progressive stages of prayer and contemplation. Ignatius’ method focused exclusively on mental images. Evidence of Loyola’s support for visual images comes from a request to Jerome Nadal to illustrate a book of biblical scenes called *Evangelicae*
Historiae Imagines. Given the arguments against images expressed by Protestants in the Continent and the unorthodox claims by some Spanish clergymen, it is surprising that Loyola did not state his support for images in writing. In the climate of suspicion generated by the Inquisition, Ignatius also became suspected of unorthodoxy. While studying in Alcalá in 1526, Ignatius had participated in prayer with groups of Erasmians, and he was later arrested for allegedly belonging to the sect of the Alumbrados or Iluminados. They were accused of holding heterodox spiritual beliefs that negated any Church intermediaries between God and the individual. Although Loyola was not condemned by the Inquisition, by the time his Exercises were published, they had been heavily revised by church authorities. Teresa’s reform of the nunneries of the Carmelite order, which began in the late 1550s, set a precedent for the rest of the religious houses. She wrote several treatises on mysticism and asceticism that offered guidelines to ensure the orthodoxy of the avenues used to communicate with the divine. Several of her writings were examined by the Inquisition because of the accessibility of her ideas, the emphasis on the role of feeling in meditation, and the implications of her views on mystical union. Although Teresa did not comment on doctrine, in her writings she reported using images during prayer and meditation. She remembered that one day, feeling very lonely when her mother died, “she approached an image of Our Lady and asked her to be [her] mother.” Teresa was aware of the Protestant disgust with images and lamented that “these unfortunate heretics are to blame for having lost the consolation

153 Gran Encyclopedia de España, “Illuminados.”
of images. Ultimately Teresa, like Ignatius, was cleared of all suspicions and became a major symbol of orthodoxy.

In the 1520s the emergence of small cells of practitioners of *Alumbradismo*, a unique kind of mysticism, raised serious concerns for the Catholic Church. By 1545 the assimilation of elements from *Devotio Moderna* and the ‘devout humanism’ of Erasmus generated a native Spanish mysticism that was in full bloom. Spain witnessed a growing interest in *Alumbradismo* spirituality whose goal was to unite with God via an exclusively spiritual experience. The sixteenth century saw the production of an important number of original works on mystical and ascetic spirituality. In the first two decades of the century, mysticism was accepted by the Church, which in turn encouraged the lay population to experience this form of communication with the divine. However, by the early 1530s the Church began to reconsider this position, and ultimately it sought to make mysticism into a very exclusive religious experience available to few individuals.

The practitioners of *Alumbradismo* rejected the ceremonialisim of the Catholic Church, including the use of images. The *Edictos de Fe* (Proclamations of Faith) distributed by the Inquisition informed the people of the main beliefs of the *Alumbrados*. Theses texts were read in public during Sunday mass to prompt the faithful to denounce their suspect neighbors. An *edicto* read in Toledo in 1525 by the general Inquisitor Don Alonso Manrique established that the following ideas were heretical: that exterior actions
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related to prayer were useless, that dressed up images of our Lady paraded in procession on the street was wrong, that reverence to the images of our Lord or our Lady did not make sense because they were sticks, and that the cross should not be given honor.\footnote{Huerga, \textit{Historia de los Alumbrados}, 3.} Thus, Post-Tridentine authors wrote about images aware that not only were \textit{conversos} suspect of rejecting images, but also \textit{Alumbrados} and those who had been influenced by the ‘unorthodox’ ideas of Erasmus. In the sixteenth century, the Inquisition, which actively persecuted these three groups, added Lutherans to its list of offenders.

Although it is clear that Luther’s teachings did not take root in Spain in any significant way, it is undeniable that they produced a climate of fear and suspicion.\footnote{Ibid.} The religious, cultural, social, and political circumstance of sixteenth-century Spain did not encourage, or even tolerate, any kind of reception of the Protestant point of view. Anything that further threatened the religious stability of the peninsula was immediately rejected. At the political level, the threat of Protestantism increased as it had been adopted by states considered by Spain as rivals or enemies.\footnote{Payne, \textit{Spanish Catholicism}, 45.} Charles remained unworried about the escalation of Luther’s strife which started in 1517 until he saw him in person during the Diet of Worms in 1521. Compared to other European rulers, Charles reacted swiftly in his determination to show that Luther represented a true menace for the Catholic Church and Europe as a whole. From the 1520s, the Catholic Church paid attention to new unorthodox ideas that were being introduced into Spain from abroad.

After Phillip II became king, and as a consequence of the general perception of Protestantism, the Spanish Church adopted a more rigid attitude toward deviation, using the Inquisition to fight heresy. During the first part of the sixteenth century, the
Inquisition had discovered mostly Alumbrado sects, pseudo-mystics, and Erasmians.¹⁶³ But now, the fact that a third of the supporters of Lutheranism were foreigners gave the Church a sense of control; it felt that once the borders were controlled, no more ‘heretical’ ideas would enter the country. Thus, when in the late 1550s two groups of ‘authentic’ Protestants in the towns of Valladolid and Seville were discovered, a wave of collective panic was stirred up by the authorities. This event led to the royal decree of 1559 prohibiting any Spaniard to study in educational centers abroad, including Catholic universities.¹⁶⁴ Philip II responded to the Protestant and Alumbrado challenges to religious orthodoxy by isolating Spain from abroad to protect the country from foreign influences. In 1568 the Inquisition renewed its quest to fight heterodoxy by persecuting Protestants that entered Spain through the French border.

The Church sought to stamp out religious discourse by restricting the circulation of ideas through the creation of a new Spanish Index of Prohibited Books in 1559. It is important to remember that the Spanish Index was only controlled by the Spanish authorities and that Rome did not have any say in it.¹⁶⁵ The General Inquisitor Fernando Valdes updated previous Indexes adding books that reflected Spanish tastes.¹⁶⁶ This development closed the door on any remaining communication which had existed between educated Spanish readers and foreign authors as disparate as Erasmus, Stephen Gardiner, and Boccaccio.¹⁶⁷ Many devotional works written in Castilian and all Scriptures written in vernacular were banned too.¹⁶⁸ Besides closing access to foreign

¹⁶³ Perez, Tratado contra, 69.
¹⁶⁴ Huerga, Historia de los Alumbrados, 3.
¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 93.
¹⁶⁷ Ibid.
¹⁶⁸ Hamilton, Heresy and Mysticism, 111.
heretical writings, including the ‘eccentricities’ of foreign Catholics, this measure drastically reduced the number of works in Spanish available to the lower clergy who did not know Latin.\footnote{Kamen, Spanish Inquisition, 95.} This meant that the upper, educated clergy increasingly monopolized religious texts to the detriment of the Counter-Reformation’s objective of expanding education to all the clergy. Throughout the early modern period, other Indexes were produced with varied agendas. For instance, the Index of 1612 prohibited all vernacular translations of Erasmus’ works, while some of his texts in Latin were allowed.\footnote{Ibid.} As a result of this policy, Spain did not have access to foreign books, which according to John Elliot, “administered a drastic shock to Spanish intellectual life.”\footnote{J. H. Elliott, Imperial Spain 1469-1716 (London: Penguin Books, 1990), 226.} The only option open to those who became interested in Protestant ideas was to leave the country and start a new life as converts to Protestantism.

Anybody who had had contact with Protestantism in one way or another became suspect of embracing reforming ideas. A large segment of those tried by the Inquisition for Lutheranism were clergymen of different social strata. Most of them had not only been exposed to Protestant ideas through books, but also by traveling extensively during the first half of the sixteenth century. And even the Index of prohibited books did not stop books from being available in the black market.\footnote{Payne, Spanish Catholicism, 4.} Among those accused of Lutheran leanings, there was the famous Inquisitorial process of the Archbishop of Toledo, Fray Bartolomé Carranza, who despite his apparently impeccable career as theologian of Trent and defender of Catholicism in England was accused of harboring
heretical ideas.\textsuperscript{173} He was a member of the Dominican order who had served as confessor to King Philip II during his married life with Mary Tudor in England.\textsuperscript{174} Given his past connections with various ‘Protestants’ in Valladolid, when he published his 

\textit{Commentaries on the Christian Catechism}, where he advocated the reform of the Church, he was denounced as a heretic by the Inquisition. Although he denied all the accusations, his case became entangled with personal rivalries and consequently, he spent seven years in jail before his release.\textsuperscript{175}

Some individuals who agreed with the Protestant views left the country so as to espouse their new faith publicly. Because most of these ‘Spanish Protestants’ had created connections with Continental reformers for several years during the first half of the century, many of them received all kinds of support from outsiders when they embarked on their new life. Francisco de Enzinas, who corresponded with Melanchthon, traveled to Wittenberg. The Spanish theologian Miguel de Servet (1511-1553), who had contacts with Bucer, Melanchthon, and Calvin, went to Italy and Germany, where he remained for a long period. Most of the ‘Spanish Protestants’ became involved in the Reformation process in their new countries through their writings.

Even among those who did not embrace Protestantism or \textit{Alumbradismo}, a few important Spanish thinkers in the first decades of the sixteenth century voiced their concern for the possible misuse of images. The philosopher and moralist Juan Luis Vives, wrote all his works outside Spain, which he left at a young age to avoid the

\textsuperscript{173} Marcelino Menendez Pelayo, \textit{Historia de los Heterodoxos} (Madrid: F. Maroto e Hijos, 1980), 21.

\textsuperscript{174} Payne, \textit{Spanish Catholicism}, 46.

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., 46.
persecution of his parents and siblings by the Inquisition for being a *converso*.\textsuperscript{176} Although Vives was offered promising opportunities in Spain, he feared his status as a *converso* would be an obstacle to his career; thus he chose to stay in Louvain and Oxford, where he established a close relationship with Thomas More and Erasmus of Rotterdam.\textsuperscript{177} Like Erasmus, Vives argued that some ‘scandalous’ practices should be controlled. Although he acknowledged the legitimacy of image devotion, he considered that it was even better to worship the subject represented in the image, and not the image itself. He criticized the clergymen who made false claims about the power of images to perform miracles in order to extract offering from the common people. When he died, most of his writings were put in the Index of forbidden books compiled by the Inquisition.\textsuperscript{178}

The opinions of humanist author Juan de Valdes (1500-1541) were not welcomed by the Inquisition. He had exchanged correspondence with Erasmus at the apogee of his fame in Spain. His name appears for the first time in the records of the Inquisition because of his close relationship to an infamous Alumbrado.\textsuperscript{179} In 1531, suspected by the Inquisition partly on account of his *Dialogo de doctrina Christiana* which had been published in 1529, Juan de Valdes left Spain, making first for Rome where he worked at the papal court.\textsuperscript{180} From his exile (from the Peninsula) in Naples, he wrote his work where he criticized the use of images.\textsuperscript{181} He claimed that only those who did not have a spiritual understanding of Jesus Christ felt the need to set images in every corner of their

\textsuperscript{176} *Gran Enciclopedia de España*, s.v. “Juan Luis Vives”. Vives is well known for his role as tutor to Mary Tudor of England and for his writings on education.
\textsuperscript{177} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{178} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{179} *Gran Enciclopedia de España*, s.v. “Juan de Valdes (1500-1541).”
\textsuperscript{180} Hamilton, *Heresy and Mysticism*, 41.
\textsuperscript{181} Naples became part of the Spanish territories in the early seventeenth century.
house, church, or street. At the same time, less notorious individuals also expressed their concern about the need to clarify what images are and what they are not. In 1533, Fray Pablo de Leon argued that images were important not because of their material value, but because of what they represented. An image and a yoke could be made out of the same piece of wood, and in that sense the image would not have more virtue than the yoke. What was valuable about images was that they reminded people of that who they represented. The uncertainty expressed by these authors was in part due to a void of a concrete doctrine on images.

After meeting intermittently from 1545 to 1563 the Council of Trent finally reached its conclusions, which were published in a document called Session 25 in the *Decree on invocation, veneration and relics of the saints, and on sacred images.* This text presents a series of brief statements about various practical aspects related to the use of images. It is intriguing that these statements focused on practices with images rather than on the doctrine behind those practices. Protestants not only attacked practices with images, but they pointed out at the lack of real doctrine on images as proof of its illegitimacy. The reason why theologians of Trent did not focus on offering a full declaration of Catholic doctrine on images is that images were not essential for salvation. Unlike other subjects discussed in the decree, the father of Trent viewed images as of secondary importance. This document emphasized that people must use images in orthodox ways, but the theological justification for such practice could be ignored. The
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182 Juan de Valdes. *Trataditos.* Libreria de Diego Gomez Flores. Coleccion Reformistas Antiguos Espanoles. XXIV. (Barcelona), 64.
184 Norman P. Tanner SJ, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, v.2. Trent to Vatican II (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), 774-775. From now on I will refer to this decree as ‘Decree on Images.’
writing of some early modern authors reveals that their attempt to articulate a doctrine to avoid confusion and ultimately the misuse of images. In this attempt, despite their agreement on the basic position regarding images, some of them acknowledged real problems with the use of images and blamed them on the lack of doctrinal guidance.

In a few brief statements, the decree focused on the functions that images had in religious practice as their main justification. It stated “that images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the other saints should be set up and kept, particularly in churches, and that due honor and reverence is owed to them…because the honor showed to them is referred to the original which they represent.”\footnote{Ibid.} It was proper to show this honor and reverence to the original “through the images which we kiss and before which we uncover our heads and go down on our knees.”\footnote{Ibid.} Knowing that these actions were seen as idolatrous by Protestants, the fathers of Trent denied that images themselves were the subject of worship. While images did have a role during worship, honor and reverence is owed to them “not because some divinity or power is expected from them, or because confidence should be place on images as was done by the pagans of old.”\footnote{Ibid.} These arguments amounted to the whole defense against accusations of idolatry made against Catholics. The language employed in the decree did not significantly clarify the major controversial issues of the debate. ‘Worship,’ ‘honor’ and ‘veneration,’ century-old key terms in the understanding of the role of images, were not clearly defined or explained in the document.

Besides their interest in their role in worship, the authors of Trent praised images as tools for instruction, as aids during prayers for intercession, and as representations of

\footnote{Ibid.}
role models. The bishops had to ensure that “the faithful are instructed and strengthened by commemorating and frequently recalling the articles of our faith through the expression in pictures or other likenesses of the stories of the mysteries of our redemption.” The decree is again careful when referring to the advantages presented by images when people requested favors to those represented in them. It emphasized that “great benefits flow from all sacred images, not only because people are reminded of the gifts and blessings conferred upon by Christ, but because of the miracles of God through the saints.” Additionally, images influence people’s behavior by presenting the “salutary example [of the saints] before the eyes of the faithful [so that they] shape their own lives and conduct in imitation of the saints.”

Following the standards established by the Council of Trent, the Spanish Church addressed any problems related to the use of image in *Constituciones Sinodales*, produced in local synods led by the bishop of each diocese. In 1602, the critical attitude of the people of Cuenca toward images seemed to have prompted Bishop Andres Pacheco to set specific rules for the making and use of images. His goal was to emphasize that images had to be treated with respect and had to be ‘decently’ made in order to communicate the correct message. The *Constituciones* ordered that all existent images should be inspected and that the painting of any new image required the authorization of the bishop. According to Nalle, around one hundred and fifty images were destroyed as a result of Pacheco’s program. Images could not be taken out of the church and carried
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around to avoid “indecencies, scandal, carelessness, and lack of veneration.” Miracles allegedly performed by an image would be investigated and no commemorative signs of miracles could be placed next to any image. Additionally, the Constituciones forbade the selling of images or crosses in the streets. Pacheco acknowledged that some people misunderstood the role of images in intercession when they believed that the images themselves performed miracles.

Several decades later, the Constituciones of Zaragoza showed that it was necessary to remind people of the orthodox use of images. In 1656 this document ordered the clergy to deal with the problem of improperly clothing and adorning images by removing profane elements from them and avoiding these in new images. It also stated that old images that were falling apart should be removed from the church to avoid mockery and impiety. Despite the Catholic zeal that Philip II infused to the Counter-Reformation program, it took several decades for the Spanish clergy to implement many of the reforms required by Trent due mainly to bureaucratic apathy and lack of resources. The articles of the Constituciones Sinodales of the seventeenth century show that those reforms had never been implemented, or that, if implemented in the past, they had become obsolete.

The extent to which the common people used images in an orthodox way is the ultimate question, for which there is extremely limited but interesting evidence. The records of the Inquisition in Cuenca prove that some people held unorthodox ideas about
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195 Sarah Tilghman Nalle is one of a few authors who mention the practical effects of Trent in the use of images.
images at the time when the spirit of Counter-Reformation was at its highest. In 1582, a school teacher suggested that there was too much freedom to paint and have images: he said that just by painting a sword in the hand of the image of a woman, a St. Catherine was created. 196 In 1567 a man who was not afraid of speaking critically of images confessed that some statues “were so old and badly carved [that] instead of moving one to devotion, they took it away.” 197 In the same year, a man was accused of comparing an image of Jesus Christ on sale at a shop, with “someone who sells tripe or collects vine-cuttings.” 198 In 1571, a parish priest who resented the pilgrimages made to a certain image asked the pilgrims, “why they had devotion for a stick of wood that Castillo, the carpenter, would make for four maravedies.” 199 Because these individuals were old Christians, one has to wonder what the opinions of the new Christians might have been if questioned about images. To the extent that what Nalle found in Cuenca is a sample of a common occurrence throughout Spain, it is significant that the writers did not explain what was wrong with those practices.

The campaign that limited creative impulses of intellectual freedom among the learned began to ease after it had peaked in the decade of the 1560s and most of the 70s. 200 Stanley Payne argues that during the last two decades of the sixteenth century, Spanish universities offered a more critical type of scholarship. There was also a neoscholastic revival at the University of Salamanca that reached its zenith in this

196 Tilghman Nalle, *God in La Mancha*, 150.
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199 Ibid. Maravedi was the Spanish currency in circulation form the XIth to the XVIIIth centuries. Gran Enciclopedia de España, “maravedi”.
That the Inquisition became less active in this area might in part explain that a few seemingly unorthodox statements of some Catholic authors passed unnoticed.

The Spanish religious works on images considered in this study were produced in a climate of suspicion created by the Catholic Church. Throughout the sixteenth century, the Inquisition had persecuted those who suggested unorthodoxy starting with New Christians, who could always secretly return to their old religion; those influenced by Erasmus, whose popularity in Spain had made him dangerous; the Alumbrados, whose ideas challenged the institutional authority of the Church, and finally, those who embraced Lutheranism. While the authors of the works analyzed here saw the need to explain the correct use of images, they were aware of the possible dangers of doing so. The simple mention of the correct use of images implies that there was an incorrect use in which people could engage. As witness of the ignorance and abuses of the people that these authors saw around them, and despite the possibility to get in trouble with the Inquisition, they set about addressing the lack of doctrine on images by exploring their origin, legitimacy, functions, creation, and emotional potential.

\[^{201}\text{Ibid.}\]
CHAPTER THREE

IDOLS OR IMAGES BEFORE AND AFTER CHRISTIANITY

During the Reformation, Protestants authors sometimes claimed, although more often merely implied, that the Catholic use of Christian representations equaled idolatry committed by pagans in the past. The antecedents of this accusation emerged in the eighth century during the iconoclastic periods in the Byzantine Empire.1 In the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas articulated the relationship between pagan and Christian uses of representations in his *Summa Theologiae*.2 While he constantly referred to the practice of what might be called idolatry, he avoided the use of that term and used neutral vocabulary instead.3

Because Protestant attacks on images centered on the accusation of idolatry, both Spanish and English authors compared pagan idolatry to the Christian use of images in order to establish a possible connection between the two.4 Three issues constituted this discussion: the definition of the terms ‘image’ and ‘idol’; the people responsible for the origin of idolatry; and the early Christian encounter with the practices of the pagan

---

1 Idolatry was a term that included the making of representations and their veneration. See F. Nicks/J. Gouillard, “Iconoclasm,” in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed.

2 St. Thomas Aquinas (1225/7-1274) was an Italian theologian whose work had great influence on the Catholic Church for centuries until present times. He was canonized in 1323 and became doctor of the Church in 1567. See chapter on historical background.

3 According to Katheleen Kamerick, the accusation of idolatry among Christians was repeated only in a very few instances in late medieval England. In fifteenth-century England, the Lollards, a group of religious dissidents, accused the Catholic Church of treating images as if they embodied the Virgin Mary or Christ or the saints. In their view, idolatry was not only idol worship, but also the adoration of Christian images. Kathleen Kamerick, *Popular Piety and Art in the Late Middle Ages: Image Worship and Idolatry 1350-1500* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 3.

4 Although some English authors used the term idolatry in a more general sense to attack their opponents in discussions that did not have anything to do with images, this work will focus on the use of the term when directly related to the use of representations.
world. More specifically, Spanish and English authors explored the following questions: Were the meaning of terms image and idol fixed? Were images and idols defined by their physical characteristics or by their use? Under what circumstances, if ever, could an image become an idol? Who was to blame for the origin of the practice of idolatry? Did Christianity eradicate idolatry?

The accusation of idolatry was the most controversial claim that motivated early modern authors to express their views on images. Both Spanish Catholics and English Protestants acknowledged the powerful significance of idolatry when used to discredit the use of images. English Protestants seemed to have been more successful in stressing the similarities between pagan and Catholic practice than the Spanish Catholics were at disarming their opponents. That the Spanish Catholic authors were not very explicit about the differences between idols and images might have resulted from a fear of censorship.

This chapter offers an analysis of the terms ‘idol’ and ‘image’ as a basis for the discussion of ‘idolatry’. It begins with the definitions offered by early modern dictionaries as background. The following section presents the views held by Spanish and English writers in regards to pre-Christian use of images among Jews and pagans. Finally, the chapter explores early modern views on the encounter of Christianity with idolatry and its significance for contemporary practice.
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5 In this chapter the term ‘image’ refers to representations of the Virgin Mary, Jesus Christ, God the Father, and the saints, unless it is indicated otherwise.
I. Ideas on the Concepts of ‘Image’ and ‘Idol’.

A. Early Modern Dictionaries and Spanish Catholics Views.

Early modern dictionaries offer a closer approximation to the contemporary usage of these terms. The Spanish definitions for the terms *idolo* (idol) and *imagen* (image) are found in the dictionary, *The Tesoro de la Lengua Castellana o Española* by Sebastian Covarrubias, which was published in the first quarter of the seventeenth century.\(^6\) As a contemporary of some of the Spanish authors examined here, Covarrubias lived in a world permeated by religion in all areas of society, which was evident in his definitions of image and idol. Covarrubias offered an entry on *imagen* (image) that included a detailed explanation of Catholic practice,

> Usually among the Catholic faithful [we] refer to the figures that represent Our Lord Christ as images, his blessed Mother and Virgin Holy Mary, his apostles and the other saints and the mysteries of our Faith, in as much they can be imitated and represented, to refresh [our] memory [of] them and [for] the common people who are illiterate, [images] serve as books to know the history; hence the books that have figures to signify what each chapter says, [they] are called books with history and historical illustrations.\(^7\)

In contrast, the meaning of the word *idolo* (idol) Covarrubias explained, “means any figure, or statue that is venerated for being a resemblance of some false god, like


\(^7\) Original text: “Communmente entre los fieles católicos llamamos imagenes las figures que nos representan a Christo Nuestro Senor, a su benditísima Madre y Virgen Santa Maria, a sus apostoles y alos demas santos y los misterios de nuestra Fe, en quanto pueden ser imitados y representados, para que refresquemos en ellos la memoria y que la gente ruda que no sabe letras, les sirven de libro, con al que las sabe la historia; y de aqui viene que los libros que tienen figures, que sinifican lo que contienen cada uno y cada capítulo, se llaman libros historiados, y las estampas históricas.”
Jupiter, Mercury and the rest that the gentiles revered and adored, all of them moved by the devil.”

An English-Latin dictionary, the *Thomae Thomasii Dictionarum*, published in 1620, defines the Latin word *imago* as “an image, a similitude, appearance, or representation of a thing; a likeness; a co[un]terfait; a vision, [and] an idle toy.” The Latin word *idolum* is described as “an idol, an image, also a vain vision, [and] a false imagination.” According to these definitions, by the early reign of the Stuarts, both words had acquired a negative meaning, but *imago* could also be used neutrally.

These dictionary definitions highlight the differences and similarities between the Spanish and English interpretations. While in England the word image was given a more secular and general meaning, in Spain it contained a religiously specific valence. The word *Idolo* (idol) was given the same negative meaning in the two languages, which was equally linked to the context of pagan practice. The definition of the term image offered by Covarrubias corresponded to the language use by the Council of Trent.

The only official discussion about images in the early modern period took place during the Council of Trent (1545-1563) and stopped short of addressing the difference between an image and an idol. However, Trent recognized the need for the bishops to supervise the creation of representations to ensure they were ‘true’ images. By implication, representations that were not ‘true images’ were idols, yet the Catholic

---

8 Original text: “esta contrahido a sinificar alguna figura, o estatua, la qual se venera por semejanza dealguno dios falso, como Jupiter, Mercurio y los demas que reverenciavan los gentiles, o otro demonio o criatura de las que los indios y los demas barbaros reverencias y adornan, induzidos los unos y los otros por el demonio.”


10 Ibid., 154.

11 A comparison of earlier and later dictionaries could provide an interesting viewpoint, however, I have not been able to locate them.
Church seemed reluctant to use the word idol in important documents such as the Decree of Trent.

The first early modern Spanish author who tried to clarify the difference between an image and an idol was Gabriel Vasquez, a Jesuit theologian who achieved prominence in universities in Rome and Alcala for his knowledge of Aquinas’ scholasticism. In 1594, he wrote a lengthy treatise in Latin about the doctrinal justification for the use of Images. As he often did throughout his text, he concurred with the English Catholic exile Nicholas Sander that an idol was said to “represent an existing thing which is [not].” Vasquez based his definition of idol on what it represented, not on how idols were used. His constant reference to the ideas of Sanders demonstrates the significance of the work of the latter in the ideas of some Spanish theologians and possibly in other Catholic countries in Europe even after his death in 1581. Despite the policy against ‘suspect’ Catholic books in Latin of the Indexes, Vasquez’s access to Sanders’ book can be explained in different ways. Not all foreign Catholic books reached the Indexes. If Sanders’ book was ever placed on the Index, Vasquez could have obtained it before that happened. It is always possible that theologians could obtain material from the black market. To illustrate the difference between idol and image, Vasquez explained that “the image of Jupiter is called an idol because it represents Jupiter as God and something holy.” According to Vasquez, such a view was equivalent to that of “Augustine” in book 6 of Questions of the Old Testament…where he says that an idol is the false

---

12 See Appendix.
14 Ibid., 62.
15 Ibid.
likeness of God.” It is not surprising that Vasquez stressed the similarity between his views and those of Augustine for he was a profound admirer of the saint. While Vasquez used the word image as a neutral term equivalent to ‘representation,’ he made clear that an idol is mistakenly taken to be what it is not, which was what Damascus had established.

Jaime Prades, a theologian who defended the use of images against the Protestant destruction that took place throughout Europe, argued that images and idols could be distinguished from one another by the subject of representation contained within it. In 1596, Prades directed his book at ‘unlearned’ people who did not know Christian doctrine on images. This group was composed of the literate and semi-literate members of the laity and clergy who remained unaware of discussions of doctrine and who were usually part of the upper economic groups in society.

In an indirect way, the doctrine on images might have reached the illiterate people through the sermon of a preacher, as Prades emphasized the importance of reaching a wide audience. The danger was that people then might have asked questions that the parish priest or friar was not able to answer properly. Such confusion could have put people in danger of being accused by the Inquisition of doubting and questioning Christian doctrine.

The lack of clarity in several parts of his presentation might have resulted from his fear of promoting a discussion among his audience, which was exactly what the Church wanted to avoid. Any works of a religious nature, especially those directed at a

---

16 Ibid. Author’s emphasis.
17 Vasquez was known as ‘Agustinus redivivus’ or the Spanish Augustine. See Donnelly, J.P. “Vasquez, Gabriel,” Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús, Institutum Historicum S. I.
18 Jaime Prades had an ecclesiastic position in his native city Valencia where converted Muslims created a climate of tension. See Appendix.
lay audience with a developing religious reading culture, faced the possibility of misinterpretation; thus Prades was also aware that the Inquisition paid attention to statements that could be construed as unorthodox. In addition, because of his work in the south of Spain where _moriscos_ represented a significant segment of the population, Prades might have feared that his teachings would be used to denounce Catholic practice.

Although both images and idols constituted material objects with a given shape, Prades disregarded the materiality of images because he wanted to call attention to their differences rather than their similarities. Following Aristotle, Prades concluded that, in general, representations consisted of two elements: “one is a material like gold, silver, iron,…wood,…stone or clay of which [images] are made,” and the other part was defined as “the shape given [to the matter] by the craftsman through composition and order.”

However, in the case of religious images, Prades argued that one had to take into account only their “essential definition” –what they represented– “without taking into consideration the material [images] were made of.” Prades implied that unlike pagans, Christians valued the shape or subject of representation instead of the matter from which it was made. Consequently, he defined images as “nothing else but a representation of the subject represented.” This circular logic exemplifies the lack of clarity often found in Prades’ writing. Prades assumed that the subject of an image could only be Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, the saints, and other Christian characters.

In 1625, Martin de Roa, a Jesuit who focused on the positive role of religious art for the Catholic Church, asserted that the subject of the representation and the use given

---

19 Jaime Prades, _Historia de la adoración y uso de las santas imágenes_. (Valencia, 1596), 13.
20 Ibid., 14.
21 Ibid.
to it were the two features that determined the difference between ‘images’ and ‘idols.’

Unlike pagan representations, images represented real subjects who had an important place in the history of Christianity. Roa observed that while “images, not only in their exterior shape but also in their signification…represent true people…idols are false images…that represent things that are not or that do not [represent] what they supposedly represent.” Additionally, images were not only representations of specific subjects in Christianity, but representations of unique subjects that were themselves divine and holy. According to Roa, “the images of God and…the saints” are proper and true because they “clearly represent true individuals who have a divine and supernatural essence either given by nature or by grace.” And because of those characteristics, Roa concluded, “Images [can] be considered holy,” as opposed to pagan representations that intend to “present the profane as sacred, and the abominable as saintly.” For instance, Roa mentioned the ‘idols’ known as “Jupiter or Venus, which in the shape of the body are similar to men…[but] represent a divinity which does not exist, and therefore they are vanity and lies.” The fact that Roa and Vasquez mentioned the Roman gods may indicate that both authors – Vasquez writing in Latin and Roa in Spanish – addressed an educated audience who would understand such a reference.

Against Roa’s implication that Catholic images only depicted ‘real’ subjects, the Catholic Church struggled to suppress the increasing number of images that mixed classical mythical characters in biblical scenes, which was a problem more prominent in

---

22 Martin de Roa wrote many hagiographical works and saw religious art as an important aspect of Christianity. See Appendix.
23 Martin de Roa, *Antiguedad, veneracion i fruto de las sagradas imagenes* (Sevilla, 1622), 5v, A7v.
24 Ibid., 4r
25 Ibid., A7r
26 Ibid., 5v
Another serious problem emerged in images of people who had not been officially declared saints but were often depicted as such – for example, the controversial images of (St.) Simon in Valencia in 1613. What neither Roa nor Prades clarified was the status of this problematic representation. Should an image of Simon as a saint be considered an idol? The Baroque period, which started in the early seventeenth century, witnessed the growth of commissions of religious representations by patrons from the secular and regular clergy as well as the affluent laity. Given these circumstances, the problem with the image of St. Simon might not have been unique.

Roa was the first to recognize that even if an image represented a divine or holy subject, if it was not treated properly, it could become an idol. Roa explained that according to Catholic doctrine, the form of worship given to an image depended on the subject represented. Hence it was very important that only the proper worship be given. An image became an idol when such an “image represent[ing] something or somebody – who deserves some type of veneration given the quality or merits of [the represented]– was given an undeserved honor,” which meant that worshippers responsible for not corrupting images by worshipping them incorrectly. Roa clearly agreed with the Protestant claim that Christians could commit idolatry through their image practices, but his recognition blurred the difference between image and idol that he wanted to present.

Beyond offering a proper definition of these terms, Roa engaged with a specific Protestant claim that distanced images from the sacraments. To the Calvinist claim that

---

30 This issue will be addressed in the chapter on the functions of images.
“only the sacraments are living images,” he replied that images were not dead “because they are signs of sacred things, and [they] realistically represent God, the angels, and the saints.”31 Roa suggested that images were also alive because they made present the subjects depicted in them. He turned the argument around and argued that only pagan representations, not Christian ones, were “dead images because they represent lies.”32 While Roa might have been aware that Catholics drew a unique parallel between the Eucharist and images, neither Roa nor any of the other Spanish authors, directed mentioned such an idea. The issue was directly related to God’s presence: Catholics held that through a process of transubstantiation, Christ was present in the Host, an idea which some people linked to images. The high profile sixteenth-century Dutch theologian Johannes Molanus (1533-1585), for instance, wrote that the images and the sacrament of the Eucharist were part of the same struggle.33 Roa’s reference to images as ‘lively’ suggested that those represented in images were present in them in the same way Jesus Christ was present in the Eucharist.34

Roa was the only Spanish author whose stated objective was to confront and expose the arguments of ‘the heretics of our times’–Protestants.35 Roa may have believed that if Catholics were aware of the specific accusations and arguments of Protestants, they would not be taken by surprise and, if necessary, they would have a response. This

31 In 1643 Henry Hammond had argued “to worship the bread in the Sacrament, must certainly be idolatry” because Catholics insisted that bread was transformed into the body of Christ and thus they worshipped it.
32 Ibid., 24v.
33 Johannes Molanus, Traite des Saintes Images, Patrimoine Cristianisme 94 Francois Boespflug, Oliver Cristine, and Benoit Tassel trans. (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1996). It is indicated in a footnote that this idea was repeated by many Catholic writers, whose names are not given.
34 In the latter Middle Ages, people reported to have seen a baby Jesus or a lamb depicted in the Host. See Caroline Walker Bynum, Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 77.
35 Roa, Antiguedad, 9. See Apendix.
was one of the few instances in which a Spanish author commented derogatorily about Protestants.

Roa’s attention to this subject is not surprising because the length of his book allowed him to discuss most topics in depth. Roa emphasized that he wrote in Castilian (Old Spanish, originally from the province of Castile) because he saw the need to “ensure in all sorts of people the sincerity and purity of the veneration that must be given to sacred images.” Roa might have felt that the increase in religious images that took place in the early modern period required people to clearly understand the difference between an image and an idol. In theory, he tried to clarify doctrine for the literate clergy and laity, but he also indirectly addressed the majority of the laity, who were unlearned and who would likely only have access to these ideas through a preacher or religious instruction through a catechism. Despite Roa’s confident and positive attitude about the reach of his book, in practice his book could not have reached ‘all sorts of people’ given diverse aspects that influenced the development of a religious reading culture. Although levels of literacy increased after the Counter-Reformation, people in Spain did not read complex theological discussions because the Church discouraged it.

In 1652 Cristoval Delgadillo, a theologian and member of the order of the minor Franciscans who focused on the doctrinal aspect of religious practice, added a new element to this discussion when he remarked that there was a distinction among the terms ‘image,’ ‘likeness,’ and ‘idol’ based on the subject represented. Delgadillo remarked that the term ‘likeness’ was important to the understanding of the other key terms because

36 Ibid., A3v
37 See section on audience in Chapter 1.
38 Cristoval Delgadillo wrote a long treatise in Latin analyzing the doctrine of the incarnation and the use of images. See Appendix.
it was a word used by him and other Spanish authors to discuss the message of the First Commandment, which will be the theme of the chapter on the Commandments that follows. Delgadillo explained that his understanding of likeness and idol was “derived from the common…understanding of the Fathers to [represent] the bad [thing], that is…a false image and….the gods of the Gentiles.”\textsuperscript{39} The term image “[was] taken to [be] the good part, that is…the true image….of God or of some true Saint [just as the image of]…Christ the Lord is said to be the image of the Father.”\textsuperscript{40} Like the definition in Covarrubias’ dictionary, Delgadillo emphasized that idol was a word that belonged to the pagan past whereas the word image belonged to the Christian present.

**B. Ideas by English Protestants, English Catholic Exiles and Spanish Converts.**

Whereas in the Catholic world, the Council of Trent did not define these terms, the Elizabethan Homily of 1563 officially established their meaning for English Protestants. Avoiding any mention of the fact that pagan and Christian representations depicted different subjects, the Homily stated, “Our Images and the Idols of the Gentiles bee all one concerning themselves, [as] is most evident, [in] the matter of them being gold, silver, or other mettall, stone, wood, clay, or plaster, as were the idoles of the Gentiles.”\textsuperscript{41} The authors of this document purposely focused on the material similarities between images and idols, leaving aside any reference to the subject of representation, which was the aspect given more weight by the Spanish Catholics. By the logic of the

\textsuperscript{39} Cristoval Delgadillo, \textit{Duo Tractus Alter de Incarnatione de Adoratione Alter}, (Alcala de Henares, Spain, 1652), 26.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{41} Rickey, Mary Ellen and Thomas B. Stroup, \textit{Certaine Sermons or Homilies} (Gainesville, FL: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968), 60.
Homily, it did not matter if an image was misused or not because its material characteristics immediately made any Christian representation into an idol. Similarly, the terms image and idol mattered little because they both contained the same negative meaning.

In 1597, William Perkins, a Puritan clergyman who influenced theological discussion in the late Elizabethan period, argued—in keeping with the Homily of 1563—that the terms image and idol shared the same meaning. Perkins’ commitment to this subject was shown in the lengthy arguments he developed in the several books in which he discussed images. Nothing more than a linguistic difference separated the two terms. Thus when comparing the two terms, he explained that “What image is in Latin, Idol is in Greek [because] the word idol generally and properly signifies as much as image, [which is] the resemblance of anything either good or bad.” In this way, Perkins tried to warn his wide audience not to be confused by apparent but meaningless verbal differences. In England, the percentage of literacy increased in the early modern period among especially among the gentry and the affluent segments of society. Perkins reached a wide audience of people accustomed to reading and discussing a variety of subjects related to liturgy, theology, and doctrine.

He divided representations into two different types: representations of true gods and representations of false gods. He remarked that while “Idols are images of false

42 William Perkins was a Church of England clergyman and representative of Calvinist scholasticism. His reputation as the most significant theologian of his age lies in his effort to expand theological discussion among the laity. Despite his criticism of an ‘idolatrous’ Roman Catholic church, he remained a defender of the essential doctrines and liturgies of the Church of England. See Appendix.
44 Ibid.
45 See discussions about literacy by David Crassy, Tessa Watt, and Alexandra Walsham in chapter 1.
gods, [as] all men graunt…images…of the true god” should also be also considered idols because “an idol is anything set up to be worshipped, either in the room of God, or as God.” Perkins differentiated representations of false gods and representations of the true god. The former was considered an idol because of its subject and because of the worship given to it. The latter should be seen as an idol only when it was set up for worship. Although Perkins did not offer an example of these two types of representations, it can be deduced that a depiction of God the Father as an old man would have been a considered a representation of a ‘true God,’ and a depiction of a calf used by the Israelites represented a ‘false God’. Perkins feared that people would be unable to recognize when an image of the ‘true God’ became an idol because, under the Catholic Church, worshipping images had become habitual for Christians. The most significant part of his statement suggests that images that were not used in worship were not idols. Such suggestion was of paramount significance for a Puritan author who influenced most Protestant thinkers of his time as well as later generations.

Perkins viewed the trinity as the most offensive representation used by Catholics because as a supposed image of the true God, it became an idol even before being worshipped. Perkins presented the views of the apostle Paul on how the true God was transformed into idols when people

\[
\text{turned the glorie of the incorruptible God [in]to the similitude of an image of a corruprible man conceived out of the Father, Sonne, and holy Ghost; or out of Christ our redeemer God and man For when then mind abstracts the Godhead from the Father, Sonne, and holy ghost, God is transformed into an Idol.}
\]

---
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The preoccupation of various Protestant authors with the visual representation of the Holy Trinity will be discussed at length in the arguments exploring the making of images.\textsuperscript{50} Perkins made clear that this was a very dangerous representation because this image was viewed by many people as a true representation of the Trinity.

Yet representations of false gods were immediately recognized by contemporary Christians as idols because they portrayed animals and strange figures as gods. This was the case with the Jews worshipping the golden calf as God as well as with the false gods created when “the Egyptians represented and worshipped God in the formes of wilde and tame beasts.”\textsuperscript{51} To show that the representation of the Holy Spirit as dove was unacceptable, Perkins drew a parallel between the animal representations of non-Christians and of Catholics. Ultimately, Perkins committed his work to instructing his audience about why they should reject these different types of representations.

The early Stuart Kings did not produce new legislation in regard to images because in theory the legislation provided by the Homily of 1563 sufficed; in practice, however, images made a slow but steady return to churches. In the 1590s, a group of conservative reformers held that the Catholic threat had diminished and sought an alternative to their perception of the growing extremism of Calvinism.\textsuperscript{52} The strong group formed by several Bishops who openly adopted ‘Arminian’ views after 1619 defended this change as a harmless effort to recover the ceremonialism and tradition of the Church.\textsuperscript{53} Despite the absence of doctrinal justification for these claims in favor of

\textsuperscript{50} See Chapter 8, The Making of Images.
\textsuperscript{51} Perkins, \textit{Warning Against}, 3.
\textsuperscript{53} The Synod of Dort was a crucial moment in the rise of English Arminianism because differences with Calvinism were freely discussed, and dissenters from Calvinism in England and in the Continent found a common cause. See discussion by Tyacke.
images, Church authorities engaged in a campaign to ensure that images were placed and kept in churches. After William Laud became archbishop of Canterbury, toleration of images increased. Images returned to churches under the Laudian program of ‘beautification’ that sought to approach God and everything related to Him with the dignity He deserved.

Archbishop Laud briefly addressed the question whether or not an image was different from an idol during his trial in 1641. Although Laud might have not anticipated an audience reading learning about his ideas on images, this episode offers a glimpse into the foundation of his thinking on toleration of images. He articulated what he believed was the ambiguity of government policy expressed in the Homily of 1563, making clear that “Images are expressly and truly said not to be Idols, till they be Worshipped.” In fact, this claim incorrectly interpreted the text of the Homily of 1563 that posited Christian images and idols as the same thing. Throughout his years in a position of influence, Laud took advantage of the ambiguity present in official policy—a legacy of the Elizabethan period—and when the government of King Charles I fell, Laud might have hoped that his enemies saw his ambiguity about images and would use it to justify a lenient punishment.

In 1624, Richard Mountague, a bishop of Chichester (1628) and Norwich (1638) whose Arminian views caused a stir among clergymen, remarked that not all religious representations should be considered as ‘idols.’ In his book, he defended his position, an argument for the continuity of the Anglican Church, against attacks from two fronts:

54 Phillips, Reformation of Images, 165.
56 See Appendix.
first, John Heigham, a Catholic publisher in exile, who had previous refuted Mountague’s views and second, a group of ‘Catholic Limitors,’ probably a reference to the people defending what seemed to be Catholic beliefs and proselytizing them in his dioceses.  

More generally, he wanted Protestants and ‘Papists’ to read his book to clarify misconceptions about what he believed. Mountague had a close connection with Archbishop Laud and his group of Arminian bishops who had promoted the use of images, but he seemed to be the only author who published these views. Because his position rejected common Protestant views on images, it is significant that his book did not cause concern. However, his later book on saints caused uproar among clergymen and politicians, including those of Arminian belief because of the radicalism of his ideas and his aggressive style.

Agreeing with Prades and Roa, he stressed that images were different from idols as the former represented ‘proper’ subjects. Images had to be “resemblances, which in use and application, may in naturall proportion haue such a relation vnto the Prototype, that they supply the roome thereof, insinuating the forme and fashion thereof.” He postulated that images could effectively represent or copy their originals, an idea rejected by several English Protestant authors who argued that making images of God, the Virgin Mary, and the saints was impossible.

He opposed the misuse of the term ‘idol’ by those who argued that all images – regardless of what they represented – were ‘idols’. He concluded that whomever “calleth

58 Ibid., 10-11.
59 Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 20.
61 Mountague, Gagg for the New, 314. Author’s emphasis.
62 See full discussion on Chapter 8. The Making of Images.
the Image of our Lady of Lauretto, an Idoll, [would also] call the Picture of Baronius, or Bellarmine, Idols." He assumed that unlike the images of the Virgin, which were worshipped and therefore seen, correctly, as idols, no one would be interested in worshipping a painting that displayed an Italian cardinal and an Italian theologian; thus it was a mistake to see their pictures as idols. By the time Mountague wrote his book, the Italian Catholic leaders were already dead, but he might have suspected that one day their images would be put on altars after their canonization.

While Mountague argued that that images and idols were two different things, he–like Roa–recognized the possibility of the transformation of an image into an idol through wrongful worship. In his view, "Images and Idols may be two things: [idols are] prophane and impious, neuer tolerable: [images are] not vnlawfull, and sometime profitable, especially resemblances of Stories." However, "those Images which…[were] abused [by] adoration in the Church of Rome indeed became idols." Mountague was specific in his statement: he did not say that images generally worshipped were a problem. Rather only those who were given the ‘adoration’ –the highest type of worship in the typology created by the Catholic Church–were problematic. Regardless of his rejection of adoration, by accepting the worship of images, he contradicted all standard Protestant theologians on the continent as well as in England.

---
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English authors writing in the 1640s would have been aware of the destruction of images around them. In 1646, Henry Hammond, a conservative clergyman and theologian who agreed with Arminians in a few matters, explained the relationship between image and idol in ambiguous terms. He appears to have been one of the few authors with Arminian inclinations writing during the civil war, when Puritans were using their newly acquired force to crush royalists and their allies. Although Hammond has also been described as a mainstream Protestant, a careful reading of his views on images indicates a more complex religious stance. Hammond acquired notoriety when he wrote a catechism for young parishioners that impressed Charles I and became very popular. He also had the special role of being one of the few apologists for the Church of England during the Interregnum.

Hammond stressed the negative meaning of idol without completely equating it with the term image. Like Perkins, he started by comparing its Hebrew, Greek, and Latin equivalents, and concluded that “idol…signifies an Image or representation of any kind.” This assertion was supported by text in the Bible where ‘idol’ was said “to express both…an image, or similitude, any kind of figure in generall, and….a carved or graven image in specie, a statue of wood, or stone, any kind of Sculpture.” After reluctantly suggesting images and idols were linguistically identical, Hammond turned to emphasize the exclusively negative meaning of idol. In his attempt to prove that both early Christians and pagans defined the word ‘idol’ in negative terms, he stressed the
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67 For a discussion of image destruction in England during this period see Chapter 2.
68 He remained with Charles I after his fall. During the ‘Interregnum’ the defense of the Church of England remained in the hands of apologists led by Hammond. See Appendix.
71 Henry Hammond, Of idolatry, Oxford: Printed by Henry Hall, printer to the Universitie, 1646, 2.
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emptiness of any representation described by St. Paul’s definition of ‘idol’: “a nothing that hath no being…or a no God…that hath no Divinity.”

Outside the Christian world, the Greeks had used the term ‘idol’ to refer to “the Heathen gods under the notion of false…filthy, uncleane, and abominable.” Hammond’s statements reflected the complexity of Arminianism with respect to the use of images: he had to establish that his position was not the same as that of Catholics by demonstrating his contempt for idols while also supporting a distinction between image and idol.

In an unprecedented statement, Edward Hyde, a moderate clergyman who supported King Charles, attacked the ceremonial and material practices of the Anglican Church. In 1659, Hyde opposed all religious images without exception because they were intimately linked to the Roman Catholic Church. He observed that the lack of clarity in the use of the words ‘image’ and ‘idol’ in the Bible caused confusion in contemporary discussions of religious representations. In his book, Hyde wanted to disprove the ideas put forward by a certain individual identified as G. B. who was described as “nearly devoted to the Church of Rome.” He held that throughout the Bible, the Apostles and “other holy men…. [had] promiscuously used these two words Images and Idols.” Hyde directly blamed the authors of the Bible for the loose usage of terms, apparently questioning the text itself. This was a serious accusation, which could have implied to his audience that the misconceptions of contemporary Catholics resulted

---
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from mistakes committed by the early Christians who set down the Bible in writing.

Hyde’s attitude can be seen as a belated response to the Laudian regime in which non-Puritan authors adopted more radical views against the possible return to Catholic practices.

While he accepted that there might be some linguistic differences between the two terms, he remarked that all Christian representations were idols because they were all worshipped. Thus, even if there was “a Grammatical difference betwixt an Image and an Idol, yet a Theological difference there is not, since he that worships an Image, doth without all peradventures make that Image an Idol to himself.”

Unlike Perkins, Mountague, and Hammond, who claimed that an image became an idol only when used incorrectly during worship, Hyde dismissed as impossible any proper use of images.

Three individuals who rejected the official religion of their countries presented their views in defense of the use of images. While a large number of Englishmen who remained Catholic went into exile, there is evidence that a few Spanish Catholics who left Spain to embrace Protestantism in an atmosphere of tolerance were found in various places in the Continent. The English exiles demonstrated a unique adaptation of traditional Catholic and Protestant views in their arguments and strategies.

During the Elizabethan period, Nicholas Sanders, a Catholic exile who traveled to Spain under the orders of the Pope to plan the invasion of England, explained the difference between idol and image.

In his book published on the continent in 1567, Sanders confirmed that he intended to reach Protestants, Catholics, and those with doubts about doctrine of religious images. His intention was to “recover to the Catholic Church
some of them who by ignorance ha[d] wandered out of the right way,” but more importantly to “move my countriemen (not only in this point of honouring images, but much rather in all the rest) to returne again to the Church” of their ancestors. To reach this audience, the book had to be smuggled into England, which was apparently successful – in 1571, during his visitations, Archbishop Edmund Grindal asked if people had read material written by the ‘English papist’ Sanders.

Like the Spanish authors Prades and Delgadillo, Sanders held that idols differed from images based on the subjects represented in them. He stressed the negative characteristics of idols to separate them from the positive traits of images. Sanders agreed with the Apostle Paul who remarked that an idol “hath no real truth in it self, no heavenly power, no virtue [in] the thing represented by the graven or painted…[an idol] is either nothing in it self, or as the least it is nothing toward salvation.” This statement implied that images were supposed to fulfill all the characteristics that idols lacked. By adopting Paul’s position, Sanders indirectly defined images as having special powers, which is significant because this dimension of images was a main focus of criticism in the writings of Erasmus and most early Continental reformers. In this instance, Sanders closely resembled the traditional medieval views supported by most Spanish Catholic authors. Sanders hoped that both English Catholics on the Continent as well as Protestants in England would read his book, but the latter group might not have received well his suggestion that images somehow had ‘heavenly powers.’ This aspect of his

82 Sanders, *Treatise of Images*, 62r.
views contrasted with his emphasis on clear language and arguments that were not controversial used throughout his book.

Two Spanish converts who left their country to embrace their new faith provide a Protestant perspective. Cypriano de Valera, an ex-monk who abandoned the Catholic religion and eventually settled in England as an Anglican minister, rejected the Catholic idea that ‘images’ and ‘idols’ were completely different concepts.\textsuperscript{83} He was a member of a group of Spanish religious dissidents who left their country in 1557. Despite the tightening grip of the Inquisition, these individuals were possibly exposed to the reformist ideas of Erasmus and the \textit{Alumbrado} philosophy as well as to Protestant writings available in the black market. There is evidence that Valera, along with nine other Spaniards, was living in Geneva in 1588, and it is possible that some of them might have been ex-monks from the Convent of St. Isidro.\textsuperscript{84} Like many other Protestant émigrés, after the death of Queen Mary, Valera moved to England. He studied at Cambridge and Oxford and embarked on a career in teaching and preaching his Calvinist views.\textsuperscript{85} Once in England, Valera experienced conflicts with other prominent Spanish converts –Antonio Corro and Casiodoro Reina– who had formed a Spanish bloc in the Italian Church of Geneva. The discord among these individuals related to the disagreements and power struggles among ‘religious refugees’ from Spain, France and Italy.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{83} Cypriano Valera was an ex-monk who wrote several texts attacking the doctrine and hierarchy of the Catholic Church. See Appendix.

\textsuperscript{84} Paul J. Hauben, \textit{Three Spanish Heretics and the Reformation: Antonio Corro, Casiodoro de la Reyna, and Cypriano de Valera} (Geneve: Librairie Droz, 1967), 108.

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 111.
As a member of a group of Spanish reformers living in Protestant countries, he was able to publish his book in London in Spanish in 1594 and in English in 1600, which indicates that he wrote for both Spanish and English audiences of both religious groups. Despite the tight restrictions that sought to stop books written abroad from entering Spain, in practice Spanish authorities were not completely successful; books were accessible through the black market. The Spanish edition of this treatise was added to the list of the prohibited books in 1599, followed by some other of his works in 1603.

Like most Protestant authors, Valera tried to demonstrate that images of Catholics did not differ from the idols of pagan. He explained, “The Romanists make a ridiculous distinction betw[een] an Idol and an Image….They say an Idol is an Abomination, but an Image it is not. They say they detest idols, but [they] honour Images.” Valera implied that the fact that image-worship transformed them into idols. In his view, what mattered was that God saw all religious representations as idols – including those that were not worshipped – and consequently He had banned them all. It is likely that his reference to the ‘Roman Church’ was a strategy to separate himself from it. Even if he had been a Catholic in the past, he had to demonstrate that he had been an ‘englightened’ one who recognized the things that were wrong with it. Using a constantly negative tone – a characteristic of his writings – he added, “the distinction between Idol and Image created by the Papists [is] frivolous and false.” Valera called attention to what he saw as vague
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87 For a discussion of the black market of books included in the Index of prohibited books see Virgilio Pinto Crespo, Inquisición y Control Ideológico en la España del Siglo XVI (Madrid: Taurus, 1983)
88 Ibid., 215.
90 Ibid. Author’s emphasis.
claims used by Catholics to argue that idols and images were different things, whereas in reality they were the same thing.

Fernando de Tejeda, another ex-friar who converted to Protestantism, wrote several anti-Catholic treatises for King James and agreed with Valera’s views but used historical evidence to clarify the meaning of image and idol.\(^{91}\) Tejeda’s book was apparently first published in Latin; the second edition used here was published in Spanish in the Netherlands in 1633.\(^{92}\) Tejeda attempted to reach different audiences with the two editions of his book. The first edition of \textit{Carrascon} targeted the higher clergy and a select group of learned individuals, whereas the second edition expanded his reach to include a large number of clergymen and possibly lay people.\(^{93}\) Tejeda explained that he wrote to offer his daughters an account of the path his life had taken after his conversion. While this might have been true, it is clear that his goal went beyond that desire; he wanted to challenge some of the most important aspects of Catholic doctrine and practice. Because the Spanish Catholic laity was not accustomed to reading doctrinal and theological discussions, the writings of Tejeda would have attracted a very specific subgroup. It is likely that the ideas of an ex-friar who criticized the policies of Rome were attractive to individuals who saw the power of the Church as excessive and intrusive at best: old Christians who might have had problems with the Inquisition for a variety of reasons, and \textit{conversos} and \textit{moriscos}.

Tejeda offered a detailed list of authorities, including Catholic writers and their opponents, who equated the two terms to show that the Catholic Church had purposely

\(^{91}\) See Appendix.
\(^{93}\) The word \textit{carrascon} does not have a meaning in Spanish. Some scholars speculated that the author’s real last name could be derived from that last name Carrasco, but the idea was dropped by more recent investigations. See Appendix.
manipulated the real meaning of the terms ‘idol’ and ‘image’. Tejeda argued that because important figures used these words interchangeably, no real difference existed between them. In his view, the most ancient and distinguished authors agreed that the two terms equally meant “similarity and representation.” As an example, Tejeda mentioned Cicero (106-43 B.C.), the Roman philosopher and statesman, and his book De Finibus in which he had allegedly used the words ‘idol’ and ‘image’ as synonyms; St. John Chrysostome (ca. 347-407 A.D.), Bishop of Constantinople and greatest preacher of the patristic era, who did the same in one of his famous homilies; an obscure figure called Xifilino who referred to the ‘image’ or figure of wax that represented a dead emperor as an ‘idol’; and finally, the early Christian apologist Tertullian (ca. 160-220) who “viewed all representations and figures as idols.” In addition to these authors from late antiquity, Tejeda mentioned two early modern authors, Johannes Molanus (1533-1585) and Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597), who wrote two of the most important works on images in the sixteenth century. According to Tejeda, Molanus, the Dutch theologian, defined “the words statue, sculpture, simulacrum, image, and idol as having the same meaning.” and the Italian Cardinal Paleotti also considered the words “idol, image, and simulacrum, [to be] synonyms” Tejeda’s mention of these two authors strengthened his argument as the writings of these two authors were the key treatises on images produced in the Renaissance and early modern period. Because of his mention of so many authors and their works, Tejeda might have hoped to reach learned clergymen as his main audience.
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It is intriguing that Tejeda was the only Spanish author who mentioned the work of Molanus.

Valera and Tejeda adopted the same strategy of analyzing God’s words from the Bible in Hebrew. Valera reminded his audience of the location of the word in question: “Thou shalt not make to thy self a Psel…[a word] derived from the Verb Pasal, which signifies to Carve, Grave, or Cast, there fore ‘tis plain that images and idols are the same thing.” Tejeda explored the Hebrew term Pesel to show that the two words image and idols should be understood as being the same thing. Accordingly, Tejeda remarked that the word pesel which meant “all image and similitude” reflected the true sense of the text of the Ten Commandments. To bolster this claim, Tejeda offered diverse translations of pesel into different languages that proved his point. A Greek source note specified noted that “the word pesel is sometimes translated as idolum,” and even the Catholic Church commonly translated pesel as sculptile or sculpture. Even the highly respected Spanish humanist Antonio de Nebrija defined pesel in a variety of ways: “statue, sculpture… image, and representation.” Tejeda’s mention of Nebrija called attention to the inconsistencies among Spanish Catholic clergymen and possibly hinted at their lack of proper knowledge of biblical languages. By insisting on the importance of the proper definition and translation of a Hebrew word, these two Spanish authors offered a justification for conversos to reject the Catholic faith. This is a direct attack for a nation that struggled to assimilate its population of New Christians into Catholicism, and therefore into every sphere of Spanish life.
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All the Spanish Catholic authors agreed that an image was a representation of a God, the Virgin, the saints, and other biblical characters, with specific functions authorized by the Catholic Church’s doctrine. Although most Spanish authors presupposed that all Catholic images fulfilled those two requirements and thus, at least in theory, an image could not be confused with an idol, Martin de Roa acknowledged that in practice a misused image could become an idol. None of these authors discussed the problems presented by images that displayed unorthodox elements like the Trinity represented as a man with three heads or other variations that were investigated by the Inquisition. They seemed reluctant to openly accept that those deviations blurred the differences between image and idol.

The view of the English authors offered a more complicated picture of what elements defined images and idols. For moderate Anglican authors, images inevitably became idols when worshipped, whereas for Puritans, like Perkins, and for Arminians, like Mountague, images were not transformed into idols when kept only for their memorializing and representational function. The premise was that if images were not worshipped, they did not become idols. That the early Stuart kings supported Arminianism explains the distinction between images and idols made after the 1620s. However, the leniency towards images, expressed by Perkins many years before Arminian influence took root, demonstrates that even by the end of the Elizabethan period, some radical Protestants like Perkins had begun to loosen their criticism against images.

While Spanish Catholics and English Protestant authors using the terms image and idol concurred with early modern dictionaries, their definitions did not exactly conform to the official precedent provided by their national churches. The only official attempt to define the word image occurred in the thirteenth century by Thomas Aquinas, but unlike the Spanish authors, he defined and used the word image as a synonym of the neutral term ‘representation.’ The reluctance shown by Aquinas may also have motivated the fathers of Trent not to use the word ‘idol’ in the Decree on Images: perhaps the latter believed that by stressing ‘differences’ between the two terms they would be calling attention to their ‘similarities.’ In England, the text of the Homily of 1563 argued that the concepts ‘image’ and ‘idol’ should be understood as having the same meaning.

The Spanish Protestants and the English Catholics in exile repeated the most common arguments used by Protestants and Catholics respectively. Like the Spanish Catholics, the English Catholic Sanders emphasized the differences between the two terms. In the same way, the two Spanish Protestants Valera and Tejeda, tried to demonstrate the linguistic and practical similarities between the terms by analyzing a Hebrew word. Tejeda provided a lengthy analysis of the terms that resembled very closely the discussion of various English Protestant writers. Through this strategy, Tejeda suggested that his Spanish Catholic counterparts were ignorant of such linguistic knowledge. By claiming that images and idols were the same thing, Valera and Tejeda might have been attempting to stir opposition to the Church in Spain from groups of conversos and moriscos.

Defining the terms central to this discussion was a requirement for many early modern Spanish and English authors. To move from theory into practice, these authors
traced the historical evolution of peoples who engaged in ritual activities with representations during the Pre-Christian era. The arguments focused on pagan and Jewish populations whose use of representations was seen as evidence of idolatry.

II. Early Modern Ideas of the Practice of Idolatry in Pre-Christian Times

The use of the terms gentile and idolatry in this literature needs to be clarified. According to J.J. Castelot, the word ‘gentile’ usually designates those who are not Israelites; however, in the New Testament, it refers to non-Jewish people regardless of their nationality.103 The Oxford English Dictionary acknowledges that ‘gentile’ could also mean heathen or pagan, which is the way in which the early modern authors participating in this discussion used it.104 Here the term pagan will be used generically to refer to pre-Christian peoples excluding Jews. The term ‘idolatry’ presents its own challenges. It was rarely used by early modern writers even as they often referenced the practices to which it pertained quite clearly. Julie Spraggon reminds us that the accusation of idolatry as a central sin was a useful weapon against the Catholic Church in all kinds of discussions unrelated to images.105 For this reason, my analysis will focus on the references to ‘idolatry’ only when directly related to representations.

For the two Spanish Catholics who participated in this discussion, the participation of pagans and Jews in idolatry became a key point of departure in the history of the use of images. The Council of Trent did not produce any statement related to the participation of these two groups in idolatry. The authors of the Decree on Images

104 Ibid.
105 Spraggon, Puritan Iconoclasm, 114.
may have feared that any mention of idolatry and its history would generate more questions and attention to the issue than the Church wanted.

In 1596, Jaime Prades saw pagans as the forerunners of idolatry in the ancient world. To explain this “damaging doctrine [that] expand[s] and set[s] roots in the hearts of men, [one had to] refer to the time when men began to abuse them, and [to the] people [who] first adopt[ed] this error.” Prades held that “believing that there was divinity in them, [pagans] worship[ed] [images] as gods, [which seemed to be]…an old habit.” This problem, Prades explained, emerged because “the Gentiles had totally ignored the existence of only one God to whom they owed the highest reverence and worship.” By blaming the pagans for their mistaken choices, Prades reinforced the negative ideas already circulating about them.

Prades viewed the Jewish adoption of pagan practices as a new stage in the evolution of idolatry. Although St. Augustine had clarified that Jews were not considered idolatrous, the association of Judaism and idolatry was present in some medieval disputation texts. The Biblical worship of the golden calf (Exodus.32:4) was used to sustain this accusation. Like any Spanish of his time, Prades’ views of the Jews were influenced by the continuous presence of newly converted Christian populations whom Catholics continued to see as tainted by their original religion. By the end of the sixteenth century, the activity of the Inquisition in relation to conversos (converted Jews) had decreased significantly, shifting its focus to the Morisco population and to those few

---

106 Prades, Historia de la Adoracion, 26.
107 Ibid.
108 Ibid., A5.
109 Sara Lipton, Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible Moralisee (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 40. Among those text there is the writings of John Chrysostome in early Christianity and the Bible Moralisee, a French work of the 1200s. For two examples of disputation against Jews see the end of the first section of Chapter 2.
people who held Protestant ideas. Nevertheless, attitudes towards Jews and new Christians permeated every aspect of social life for many decades to come.

According to Prades, when the Jews faced the loss of their leader as explained in the Old Testament, they found solace in the worshipping of an ‘idol.’ They requested of their priest Aaron to: “Make for us your gods to guide us in the desert, even if they do not talk.”\footnote{Prades, Historia de la Adoración, 40} This plea was an act of desperation because “They thought that Moses…was dead [and hoped] that the idol made with superstition could take the place of Moses.”\footnote{Ibid.} When the Jews observed “Aaron taking the gold from them, he made a [representation of a] lamb at the moment when the sun entered in the sign of the bull,” they assumed that such representation was endowed with divine powers, and thus worshipped it as a God.\footnote{Ibid.}

In addition to the traumatic event of the departure of Moses, the actions of the Jews could be explained by their own tendency toward idolatry as well as the close contact they had with other idolaters. The violation of God’s will was explained by the fact that “the Jews had just left Egypt, land where idolatry was rampant.”\footnote{Ibid., 43.} Prades believed that because “God saw them very inclined to commit idolatry [He forbade] all images of himself and those of Angels, and of any other creature, and did not allow their making or having them under any excuse.”\footnote{Ibid.} Prades clarified that the reason for these measures against images was “not because images are bad [on their own], nor because its possession [be a] sin, but because they cause [the Jews] to sin by committing idolatry and negating God.”\footnote{Ibid.} Prades was careful to assert, however, that God would not have
forbidden the images that Catholics defended, thus blaming Jews and supporting Catholics.

Cristoval Delgadillo was another author who explained the idolatrous behavior of the Jews as the result of their own natural tendency to idolatry as well as the bad influence of pagans.\textsuperscript{116} In 1652, he reminded his audience that Jews “are despised as idolaters first because they carried out that which is forbidden…that is, the erection of a likeness…even if they did not commit idolatry on that occasion, [but above all] on account of their all-too-great inclination of worshipping idols.”\textsuperscript{117} He implied that the presence of an object of idolatry did not necessarily result in idolatry, but it increased the potential danger to sin. For this reason, “even if those people worshipped the True God in the calf [only] on that occasion and at that time, they nevertheless exposed themselves (on account of their propensity for idolatry) or, in any case, their successors, to the danger of practicing idolatry.”\textsuperscript{118} Idolaters in this rendering could cause further harm by passing this wrongful practice to future generations.

Besides this propensity toward idolatry, the behavior of the Jews had to be understood in its context. When Aaron made the golden calf for them, he made “specifically the image of a calf because Apis, the god of the Egyptians, was depicted by a calf. So they, accustomed to the ritual and use of the Egyptians….To that god, they transferred the name of the True God and they worshipped him in [an] image of a calf [of] their own.”\textsuperscript{119} According to Delgadillo, Jewish practices were heavily influenced by Egyptians who were, in his view, pagans. Although the events narrated by Delgadillo

\textsuperscript{116} See Appendix
\textsuperscript{117} Delgadillo, \textit{Duo Tractus, Alter}, 541.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.
belonged to the past, his audience of theologians might have read them as important in the present. By the mid-seventeenth century, Spanish *conversos*—New Christians—were still viewed disdainfully and treated poorly. Delgadillo’s statement might have had the effect of warning Catholics to avoid contamination by not befriending or dealing with people whose religious practices were suspect.

Contrary to the negative association of idolatry with Jews presented by Prades and Delgadillo, several English authors offered a more lenient assessment, implying that they had copied certain practices from pagans as a result of close and constant interaction between the two groups. Whereas no Edwardian policies framed these views, early Elizabethan policy briefly referenced the pre-Christian practice of idolatry. The Homily of 1563 stated that the practice of idolatry “first came from the Gentiles, which were idolaters and worshippers of Images, unto us,” without any mention of the Jews.\(^\text{120}\)

John Hooper was the radical Edwardian bishop of Gloucester (1551) who personally engaged in the destruction of material objects for he considered them superstitious remnants of the Roman Church. He argued that pagans and Jews were wrongly accused of idolatry.\(^\text{121}\) Like most of the English authors, he wrote to promote his views among a wide audience that included clergymen and laypeople. He explained that “it was not the opinion either of the Iews or of the wisest of the Gentiles, that grauen or carued images were their Gods: the very light of nature did teach them the contrarie.”\(^\text{122}\) While defending the reputation of both groups, Hooper stressed the superiority of Jewish people
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\(^{120}\) Rickey, Mary Ellen and Thomas B. Stroup, *Certaine Sermons or Homilies* (Gainesville, FL: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968), 60.

\(^{121}\) John Hooper was a first generation reformer whose conviction of the need for reform led him to die as a martyr. See Appendix.

over pagans, “specially [Jews] made a distinction between their gods and the images.”\textsuperscript{123}

For this reason, he argued, “the Scriptures doe not simply condemne religious images…onlye because Iewes and Gentiles [had] esteemed and held them for their gods.”\textsuperscript{124} Here, Hooper foregrounded arguments that positioned Catholics as uniquely inferior to Jews and pagans.

Contrary to Hooper’s view, in 1565 John Jewel, a highly influential reformer and bishop of Salisbury (1569-71) who was active in disputes over Church rituals, recognized that Jews and pagans had practiced idolatry, but assigned different responsibility to each of these groups.\textsuperscript{125} A sermon presented to an audience a year before its publication served as the point of departure of a controversy between Jewel and the Catholic exile Thomas Harding. In 1564, four years after the publication of the sermon, Harding published a treatise answering Jewel’s assertions. Jewel chose to ignore the challenges from more radical proto-Puritans but engaged in a long-lasting controversy with Catholic exiles that eventually included Nicholas Sanders and John Martiall.

Jewel claimed that Jews had succumbed to the influence of the pagans because of their constant intermingling with them. Contrary to Harding, Jewel remarked that Jews had disobeyed the law because they “dyd not withstanding by the example of the Gentiles or Heathen people that dwelt about them [sucumbed] to the making of images, and worshypynge of them, and so to the committing of moste abominable idolatrie.”\textsuperscript{126} By stressing the influence of pagans on Jews, Jewel suggested that the Jews should not be blamed so harshly for their practices.

\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{125} See Appendix.
\textsuperscript{126} John Jewel, \textit{An apologie or answere in defence of the Church of Englande} (London, by Reginald Wolfe, 1562), 26.
Sharing the same positive attitude toward Jews, William Perkins in 1597 argued that while the Jews had engaged in the same idolatrous practices of the pagans, unlike pagans, their actions had been motivated by the intention to correctly worship the true God.\textsuperscript{127} Perkins remarked that “the Iewes worshipped God after the devised fashions of the Gentiles, though their meaning was to worshippe nothing but God.”\textsuperscript{128} For him, action was important, but intention was paramount. He implied that the proper intention of the Jews diminished the gravity of their fault.

Radical Puritan authors of the 1640s were again able to publish after a period of censorship views that reflected their feelings of alienation from the Anglican Church and specifically their distaste for the Laudian program. The king’s decision not to call Parliament or hold Convocation during that period explains the lack of official opposition to Arminian policies between 1629 and 1640.\textsuperscript{129} Yet sermons and complaints to the Court of Chancery reveal disagreement with King Charles I and Archbishop Laud.\textsuperscript{130}

Edmund Gurnay, a Puritan, clergyman, leader of a Puritan faction at Cambridge, opposed the toleration of images by Arminians.\textsuperscript{131} When censorship policies set by the government and the Arminian bishops who controlled the press ended in 1641, Gurnay published his ideas. He lessened the blame on pagan practice to stress the weakness and wrongfulness of people like the Arminians who supported images. In his opinion, although idolatry was a temptation for everybody regardless of their beliefs, even some pagans had been able to resist it. Despite the fact that “Heathens in their times, [and] also the very people of God in their times,” have been tempted to “runne a whoring after

\textsuperscript{127} See note 54.  
\textsuperscript{128} Perkins, \textit{Warning Against}, 179.  
\textsuperscript{129} Phillips, \textit{Reformation of Images}, 170.  
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\textsuperscript{131} See Appendix.
Images,” he mentioned certain groups of pagans who recognized and rejected such practice. Among those who resisted idolatry, there were

> those Lacedemonians which would not suffer any kinde of Images to stand in their Senatehouse, only for fear lest they should grow remissse in their Civill consultations by the means; wittesse also those Eutopian, which not only permitted no Images to stand in their Temples, but also would scarce endure the common light to shiene into them.\(^{133}\)

Gurnay suggests that even pagans were less idolatrous than contemporary conservative Christians because they had sometimes stopped wrongful worship. While the goal of his work was to respond to Arminian views of images, he tried to reach larger audiences of clergy and laity. After many years of censorship, it is likely that people interested in his religious views would have taken advantage of the opportunity to read his book. Because people had seen an increasing number of images set up, they might have looked for an explanation in a policy that contradicted the views of Protestantism.

Far from justifying the actions of the Jews, in 1646 the conservative clergyman Henry Hammond suggested that the accusation of idolatry against Jews was more legitimate than it had been considered before. Despite the title of his work Of Idolatry, he did not focus on idolatry as related to images; instead he discussed various aspects of the state of doctrine and ceremony in general. It is puzzling that an author who had previously espoused Arminian views would have chosen such a scandalous title, one more likely to be used by Puritans who wrote against Arminian tolerance of images. He may have intended to get back into the good graces of the reformers who now controlled the government and church, disavowing his earlier Arminian views. Like Jewel and
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Perkins, he acknowledged that pagan practice had influenced Jews: “it being cleare that their falling off to the Heathen idols brought them…to these Heathen sinnes also.”

However, Hammond focused not on the faults of the pagans but on the wrongful actions of the Jews. Thus, he affirmed, “it seemes not improbable…that the frequent expression of the Idolatrous practices of the Jews….may be somewhat more then a trope, or figure of Rhetoricke, having thus much of Reality in it also.”

Unlike Perkins and Hooper, Hammond’s judgment of the behavior and character of the Jews seems harsher because he implied that the Jews were responsible for their own actions.

Not surprisingly, the English Catholic Nicholas Sanders disagreed with the views of Protestant authors about pagans. But he also differed from the Spanish writers considered here, as the only Catholic author who blamed pagans for engaging in idolatrous practices that involved the worshipping of the devil. Medieval texts that recorded *disputations* (dialogues) between Jews and Christians accused Jews of worshipping the devil through idols. According to Sanders, ”the Gentiles committed diverse greate abuses about their Idols…[such as] offer[ing] Sacrifice to the verie graven Ydol [which] the Devil, professing enmitie to God, most vehementlie affected to have sacrifice made to himself.”

With the reference to the devil in this statement Sanders might have attempted to distance Christian practice from that of pagan peoples, by using a trope that was also used against Jews. Yet his reference to the devil’s role in idolatry was rarely used by Protestant authors to attack and discredit Catholic use of images.
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Catholic narratives of images, on the other hand, are filled with stories of images that fight with Satan.

The two Spanish Catholics who addressed the use of images in pre-Christian time disagreed with the views of English Protestants about the role of pagans and Jews in the practice of idolatry. These Spanish Catholics focused their attention on Jews and pagans to distance Catholic practice while English Protestants attempted to draw close parallels between Catholic and pagan practice. Prades and Delgadillo established that the pagans had first started this practice and held Jews responsible for adopting idolatry from pagans. Their emphasis on the role of Jews differed from that of Aquinas who presented idolatry exclusively as a pagan problem. However, underscoring Jewish blame for the centuries-old problem of idolatry seemed to reflect the negative Spanish perception of Jews and conversos persistent in this period.

Conversely, a majority of the English authors assigned responsibility for idolatry to pagans while deemphasizing the role of Jews. This stance concurred with the doctrine set by the Elizabethan Homily which stressed the direct connection between pagans and idolatry. Following this same argument, the English Catholic Sanders blamed pagans for their evil practices and remained silence about the role of the Jews. Because Jews had been expelled from England in the Middle Ages, English society did not have to contend with them, except for very small cells that settled in London by the sixteenth century. A few English Protestants implied that Catholics were worse than pagans because some non-Christians had been able to recognize and avoid idolatrous practices. Regardless of the origin of idolatry, what occurred at the onset of Christianity was of great significance.

In their work, Spanish and English authors saw the use of representations among pre-Christian populations as the undeniable point of departure for idolatry. It remained to be seen how the arrival of Christianity had dealt with this practice. This step was essential as the practices established in early Christianity were seen, at least in theory, as a precedent and justification for contemporary usage.

In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas articulated the relationship between image practices of the pagans and those of Christians. Without fully identifying his source, he explained that although “the Apostle forbids us to have any part in the unfruitful works of the pagans; he does not forbid us to share practices of theirs which are useful.” While he recognized that one such ‘useful’ practice ‘shared’ by both groups concerned images, he emphasized the difference between pagan and Christian practice.

Four Spanish writers argued that Christianity ended the practice of idolatry and made the use of images orthodox. In 1563, Martin Perez de Ayala, one of the influential Spanish theologians invited to the council of Trent who contributed to the debate over the Eucharist, viewed the Christian use of images as completely different from the practices of pagans. He had no doubt that although both groups used representations, “the doctrine of the Church stands apart in a significant way from the principle of pagans in the veneration of images.”
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140 Martin Perez de Ayala was trusted by Carlos I to persuade Protestants to be part of the council of Trent. He enforced the resolutions of Trent that led to the reform of the priesthood. Later he became archbishop of Valencia. He wrote on the subject on images in at least two books: a catechism for new converts and a theological treatise written in Latin. See Appendix
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characteristics defined pagan’s practice: they “attributed divine honors to their idols, thinking that something of a spirit was present in them, on account of the fact that a demon for the most part gave responses in them…[and]…paganism thought that those images were of true Gods although they were false.” Like Sanders, Perez de Ayala explained the involvement of demons in the practices of pagans but failed to clarify whether demons could also cause trouble in the Christian use of images.

What mattered for Aquinas was that Christianity had ended the abuses committed by pagans in their use of representations by establishing the orthodox use of images. As a result, he explained, “we...attribute no spirit to an image, nor do we give to it honors worthy of a god, nor do we adore false spirits or heroes through them; but we adore and venerate true objects and, most importantly, objects shown for the sake of the memory, which the presence of images arouses in us.” Unlike the other theologians who wrote in Latin, Perez de Ayala’s treatise differed in size and style. Instead of using the scholastic method of syllogism in which premises are presented and challenged – producing lengthy works like those of Delgadillo and Vázquez– he simply summarized his views. Therefore it is possible that Perez de Ayala’s intention was to prepare a simple synthesis of views about images available to a larger number and perhaps a less educated body of clergymen.

In 1596, Jaime Prades also remarked that since the beginning of Christianity, Church doctrine endorsed the use of images, establishing continuity up to the early
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modern period. Thus he asserted that, “In the whole world, since Christianity began…there has been a custom to have images of God and his Saints, which…remains nowadays…in all the churches.”¹⁴⁵ This statement responds to Protestant claims that there were no images in the early Church.¹⁴⁶

Agreeing with Aquinas, Prades recognized the parallels between pagan and Christian practice, but stressed the transformation from a wrongful pagan practice into an acceptable orthodox one.¹⁴⁷ Without any reservation, Prades acknowledged that the use of images was “ordered by Gentiles through their natural instinct, [however,] it was improved by God [to make us] worship Him through them without any superstition, and confess His faith.” Prades emphasized the positive aspect of this transformation to convey the extent of change needed to modify a practice that was radically different. This enhancement was achieved because “Jesus Christ, doctor and teacher of ours, sen[t] by our celestial Father to teach us though figures, clear and openly, the true way to give reverence to God, transferred the use of images to his Church, ordering that through them we honor and worship him and his saints.”¹⁴⁸ However, two conditions had to be met: images must represent a Christian subject, and they must be used to properly worship and honor God and his saints. According to him, in order to keep idolatry away, it was essential that “this doctrine of the holy images should not remain new” and ordered that

¹⁴⁵ Prades, Historia de la Adoracion, 56.
¹⁴⁶ The earliest evidence of the existence of Christian images has been traced back to the end of the second century. This information of the first Christian image did not come to light through archaeological research but from a written mention of it. According to Reiner Sorries, the oldest information of an image of Christ is in Irineus’ work (d.ca.200). The results from the search for material evidence account for the period of persecution of Christianity. There is consensus that the adoption of images in early Christianity was influenced by the Greek tradition that emphasized the value of representation.
¹⁴⁷ See note 28.
¹⁴⁸ Prades, Historia de la Adoración, 56.
this be taught to both pagans and Christians.\textsuperscript{149} He invited clergymen to instruct the many people who did not know Church doctrine and whose practices were in danger of resembling those of pagans. The two non-Christian groups with whom one would have expected Spanish clergymen to be most directly concerned, Muslims and Jews, were both firmly monotheistic. Indeed, both groups accused Catholics of paganism for their idolatrous worship of saints and images! Thus the invitation that Prades extended must have applied to both old Christians who held incorrect understandings of their faith, as well as conversos and moriscos who were ‘new’ to Christianity.\textsuperscript{150}

The changing use of the symbol of the cross serves as an example of the reformation of images. Crosses were present among “the Gentiles [who] had invented [them] guided by natural reason.”\textsuperscript{151} Prades argued that the invention of crosses among these peoples in the Old Testament was a premonition that served “to leave in the memory the history of the things….that were coming [in the future] because in this way… [people] remembered.”\textsuperscript{152} Despite the apparent similarity among different peoples in the custom of adopting crosses, each of these pagan and non-Christian peoples used crosses in different ways and assigned them various meanings. For instance,

the Arabs venerated the cross [as] the Ethiopians also [did] and believe[d] that there [were] deities in them, as they put them among their gods in temples and sacred places and worshipped them…the Greeks put [crosses] over their idols…[and] among the Jews before the captivity of Babylon, the letter $\text{Tau}$ was [a cross] too.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid., 52.
\textsuperscript{150} After many decades of their adoption of Christianity, Conversos and Moriscos in the Spanish Empire were seen as new Christians whose faith was always in doubt.
\textsuperscript{151} Prades, Historia de la Adoracion., 131.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 132.
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid., 128.
From those disparate meanings, Christianity superimposed a new and universal significance and use onto the symbol of the cross: every cross had to commemorate the crucifixion of Christ. The order for this momentous change came when “Iesu Christ and his Apostles approved of the crosses, and the use of [them by] the Gentiles, in having and giving them reverence, so that through them…his passion remain[ed] in the memory [by] having in front [of them] the figure of the cross in which the body of the Lord was...on earth.” For Prades, this story indicated the transformative effect of Christianity on pagan practices, in which the cross played a significant role.

Despite his belief in the value of instruction, Prades recognized that the efforts to promote the legitimate use of images had encountered resistance from newly converted Christians who were unwilling to modify their old habits. Thus, during early Christianity, the Church was forced to take drastic measures to correct erroneous practices with images. Initially new converts constituted Christianity’s flock, and they were used to idolatry. Prades explained the actions that were taken in those circumstances:

> those holy Fathers, [considering] that the Gentiles of those regions newly converted to the faith, were inclined to idolatry, and to venerate images in the way Gentiles used to...they judged that for the cure of this illness in this people...a convenient medicine would be to ban and destroy them [images]: mak[e] use of this destruction as a way to teach those men that they should not be worshipped

Prades thus suggested that the early Church was forced to implement a paradoxical policy: protecting Christianity demanded destroying the same Christian images that the Church used to promote Christianity. In the sixteenth century, the Catholic Church was unlikely to have gone that far in order to correct abuses because such an action would
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have meant recognizing that idolatry was an unbeatable problem for Catholics. However, this statement might have warned the less educated clergy and a limited lay audience of the repercussions of abuse and disregard for the teachings and authority of the Church.

Another author who remarked on the problems encountered in the process of this transformation was Martin de Roa.156 In 1624 he argued that the reformation of the use of images by Christians had not been completely successful. Like Prades, Roa argued that Christianity marked the end of idolatrous practices because with “the coming of Christ, the light of the faith rose, and the true Religion…removed the shadows of Idolatry and superstition.”157 After this unequivocal statement of victory, he recognized that “with the new laws, and new empire, even if [pagan practices] did not completely disappear, [Christianity] improved [those] practices.”158 Like Prades, Roa was forced to recognize that the use of images in early Christianity might have been tainted with pagan elements. That the early Church had been unable to achieve a complete reformation of the use of images might have implied that the Catholic Church never eradicated those idolatrous elements.

Roa was more specific than Prades in explaining the specific actions that had been taken to achieve this transformation. First, pagan practice was cleansed and transformed “by removing all vanity and lies [and] then giving [images] a similarity to the truth and the representation of the people or sacred things that justly deserve honor and worship.”159 Once representations of Christian characters replaced those of idols, the use of the representations was addressed: “God took the honor away from idols…[and] gave
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its place to His Images, and those of His saints...[then He] taught reason, and how and when they had to be venerated, using for this purpose the teaching of the Apostles and the use and approval of His Church” as a model to follow.\textsuperscript{160}

Like Prades, Cristoval Delgadillo agreed with Aquinas, recognizing that that despite the apparent close link between religious and civic practices, Christian image practice was unique. Referring to pagans as ethnics, in 1652 Delgadillo wrote “The use of images, which was accustomed to honor outstanding men through the dedication of images and statues, is received from ethnics.”\textsuperscript{161} Delgadillo’s curious use of the word ‘ethnics’ to refer to pagans might reflect a strategy to avoid the use of the word ‘pagan’ which sounded antithetical to Christianity. His next statement, “the use of images [among Catholics] is not of this sort, however much it descended from them,” recognized the roots of Christian practice and, at the same time, blurred this acknowledgement.\textsuperscript{162}

In a more radical English assessment, John Hooper determined that rather than reforming idolatry, Catholics had adopted pagan practices and had become even more idolatrous than pagans.\textsuperscript{163} In 1548, he remarked that there was “no difference at all between a Christian man and gentil in this idolatrie, saving onelie the name,” because they engaged in the same practices.\textsuperscript{164} Taking his attack to a higher level, Hooper remarked, “For they [pagans] thought not the images to bee God, but supposed that their gods would be honoured that waies, as the Christians doo.”\textsuperscript{165} By accusing Catholics of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., A3r \\
\textsuperscript{161} Delgadillo, \textit{Duo Tractus Alter}, 45. \\
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{163} See note 128. \\
\textsuperscript{164} Hooper, \textit{Declaration of the Ten}, 31. \\
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid. 
\end{flushright}
these ‘abominable idolatries,’ Hooper invoked the strongest possible criticism against them.

Even though the policies of the Edwardian church did not engage in this issue directly, Nicholas Ridley, an early reformer who became bishop of Rochester (1547) and London (1550), died as martyr defending his radical views. In 1555, he argued that rather than ending idolatry, Christians were in constant danger of continuing the practice because this pagan custom had contaminated them forever.166 The language used by Ridley as well as his emphasis on the importance of communicating in English instead of Latin indicates that he also wrote for the literate laity. For him, “an image made in the memory of Christ, and set up in the place of religion, [would] occasion the same offence” that was caused by the idolatrous worship of idols by pagans. This was due to the fact that “Images have their beginnings from the heathen; and upon no good ground, therefore, can they be profitable to Christians,” or be used without idolatry.167 In his view, longing for the loving presence of Christ would inevitably make Christians embrace idolatry. As a committed reformer, these ideas eventually led him to martyrdom during the reign of Queen Mary.

Ridley argued that early Christianity had not replaced idols with Christian images because pagan authorities had not allowed the Christian minority to have any representations. He explained that while Christianity was trying to acquire a powerful position, pagans opposed anything related to it, thus “in the primitive Church, images were not commonly used in churches, oratories, and places of assembly for religion;

166 See Appendix.
167 Nicholas Ridley, A Pious Lamentation of the miserable estate of the church (Imprinted at London: By VVillyam Powell, dwelling in Fletestrete, at the signe of the George, nere to Sainct Dunstons Church, 1566), 85.
[because] they were generally detested and abhorred... by the heathen, as a crime.”168 It seems that Ridley referred to anybody who rejected Christianity as heathen, including the Romans. Like Roa, Ridley might have been thinking of Muslim and Jewish converts who often rejected representations of the divine as unlawful and sinful, just as Protestants did.

During the reign of Elizabeth, the Homily of 1563 presented an unambiguous position on the nonexistence of images in the early Church. It determined that “Christians in the Primitive Church...[did not] conforme themselves to the Gentiles...[because that Church] being specially to be followed as most incorrupt and pure, had publikely...neither idols of the Gentiles, nor any other Images.”169 According to the authors of the Homily, the logic of the early Church opposed the direction taken by Catholics. The end of idolatry could only have been achieved by avoiding the use of all representations of any kind, which the Homily suggested was the stance taken by the early Church.

In 1564, John Martiall, a Catholic exile and one of the main contributors to the foundation of the English College in Douai, wrote his Treatise of the Cross as a reply to a sermon of John Fulke and to support the Queen’s position on the crucifix controversy. It is possible that the queen read Martiall’s work because she rebuked the excessive language of an individual who attacked Martiall in a court sermon.170 Moreover, Martiall entered the controversy right after the proclamation of the Homily that produced a new
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169 Rickey, Mary Ellen and Thomas B. Stroup, Certaine Sermons or Homilies (Gainesville, FL: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968), 45.
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surge of destruction of images. The controversy over Elizabeth’s position on images began in the Fall of 1559 when it was reported that a crucifix and two candlesticks were placed in her royal chapel. For many reformers close to the Queen, the presence of a crucifix was an extremely dangerous matter that threatened Protestant advances against images. Fulke did not enter the controversy in printed form until 1580 when he wrote a response to Martiall.

In the preface to his book, Martiall explained to the Queen that according to “the bokes of the old fathers…[the] doctrine of the crosse is avouched and confirmed.” He claimed that he had been moved to speak out because “the church hath bene so pitifully defaced by Satan and his ministers, and the crosse of Christ cast out of churches.” This statement boldly invited the queen to use his work to substantiate her position in favor of the cross. In the same way that Sanders referred to Satan as an agent in pagan idolatry, Martiall links Satan with those who destroyed crosses. Through the Reformation period, Catholics and Protestants linked each other to Satan as a strategy to emphasize the evil and corrupted nature of the other group. While English Protestant authors constantly referred to the Pope as Satan as well as many other names, English Catholics seemed to have abstained themselves from insulting the queen in this way because they did not want
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to be seen as anti-English in the eyes of the laity. When Martiall wrote, the English exiles still hoped that Catholicism could return to England, and thus wanted to maintain a civil relation with the queen.

In his work, Martiall remarked that Christianity had changed the meaning of the image of the cross from the one given to it by pagans. Christ’s death had raised the previously abject state of the cross into an object worthy of respect and honor, thereby reforming pagan practice.175 According to Martiall, there was an enormous “difference betweene the crosse in the old lawe and the crosse in the newe,” as St. Augustine had explained.176 “Before, the crosse was a name of condemnation, nowe it is made a matter of honour: before it stode in damnation of a curse, nowe it is set up in occasion and signe of salvation.”177 Christ’s crucifixion had transformed the cross from “an abominable signe of extreme punishment and most shameful death, [into a thing] more bright and honorable than any princes crowne.”178 Martiall stressed the positive significance that the death of Christ imbued on the cross, particularly its salvation-oriented effect. At the same time, he seemed to suggest that the Queen should recognize that her power was not above the authority of the Catholic Church.

The focus on representation of the true cross brought to the fore advantages and disadvantages. While Martiall might have expected that his defense of this specific representation would provide support for all images, his strategy could have worked against his intent. An image of the cross shared its essential representational feature with other representations, but this type of image was unique because it signified the raison

175 Martiall wrote his major work to response to James Calfhill opinions. He attempted to promote dialogue with between reformers and exiles in hopes to demonstrate their mistakes.
176 Martiall, Treatise of the Cross, 7r.
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d’être of Christianity. Therefore, the stress put on the image of the cross could imply that other images were inferior and secondary.

In 1565, a year after the publication of his tract, Martiall received a reply to his book, not from Fulke but from John Calfhill, a progressive reformer and archbishop of Worcester, who rejected the material and ceremonial features kept by the Church of England. Calfhill wrote An Answer to the Treatise of the Cross after the crisis over the Queen’s crucifix had been averted, albeit with an ambiguous immediate outcome, but Martiall’s claims must have upset Calfhill.

Calfhill denied that early Christian use of crosses and crucifixes had marked the elimination of pagan practice. Contrary to Martiall, he noted that it was impossible to find evidence for the use of the cross following the events of the crucifixion. In his view, and unlike Prades, “The apostles…never used the signe of the Cross, nor gave any counsel or commandement for it.” Additionally, Calfhill remarked that there was no evidence in the testimony of important early medieval authors that supported the use of the cross: “Origen [in the] 280 year after Christ, knew nothing, but rather by the law condemned such observances.” Calfhill also denied the evidence that Martiall had supposedly gathered from the early Christian author Lactantius and argued that

by al likelyhode there were no Churches in [Lactantius] time, and therefore no roodes in Churches…no holiness, no religion is in any earthly matter, and…that neither crosses nor crucifixes, were eyther worshipped, or wished for.

Calfhill quoted an individual described as the psalmist, who held that in early Christianity, “There was no Roode, no Crosse, no likenesse of any thing, no Crosse, no likenes of

179 See Appendix.
180 Calfhill, An Answer to John Martiall’s Treatise of the Cross… (Imprinted at London: By Henry Denham, for Lucas Harryson, Anno 1565), 34v.
181 Ibid., 31r.
182 Ibid., 82v.
any thing, save onely spirituall, of grace and vertues.”

Evidence from the Bible and from early Christian authors demonstrated that the use of crosses neither existed nor was approved.

Contrary to Prades and Roa, Calfhill observed that pagans may not have embraced the Christian cross, as Catholics suggested. According to him, crosses used by pagans may have retained a non-Christian meaning because “wheresoever a signe of a Cross was, were it eyther in mountaine or in valley, in taverne or in chambre,” they saw it as a “rather an heathenish observaunce, a superstition of them, that never thought on Christ.”

Calfhill implied that the presence of the material cross meant little in terms of the actual beliefs of people. For instance, he suggested that Christianized Egyptians had not completely abandoned their old religion. Most likely, “when [Christians] pulled downe the Images of Serapis out of their windowes and walles, and placed in their steade the signe of the Cross…to win the Egyptians to the faith, [the Egyptians]would retayne something of their old observance.” For this reason, “many of the learned among the Egyptians, were the rather content to embrace Christianitie b[e]cause they sawe the Crosse esteemed: [which was] before, a great ceremonie of theirs.”

Calfhill’s argument that the cross retained a non-Christian meaning among pagans might have gone too far. His doubts about the efficacy of the sign of the cross in the process of Christianization could have cast doubts on the same cause he was trying to defend: the power of the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross.
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In 1641, Thomas Warmstry, the moderate Dean of Worcester, who despite his rejection of images remained loyal to the king at the onset of the civil war, observed that rather than abolishing idolatry, early Christians had been coerced into practicing it. Before Warmstry’s book was published, he acknowledged he had originally presented his ideas in a speech for an audience of educated men of “riper yeares and more mature studies” than himself.

Warmstry explained that early Christians had adopted pagan ways when forced into idolatry by the deceiving stratagem of a false Christian emperor. Warmstry blamed Julian the Apostate, who “set up his Idols upon his owne Picture…[in order] to ensnare the Christians to Idolatry, or at least to draw them into the imputation of it.” People were caught in a dilemma because “if they bowed, and gave civill respect (as it was accustomed it seems) to the representation of the Emperor, they might then be taken to be worshippers of the Heathen Idols: if they refused, they were executed, not as Christians, but as despisers of the Emperour in his resemblance.” Early modern Christians faced an equivalent paradox; according to Warmstry’s explanation of the dilemma in which people of Puritan views found themselves due to the policies of Arminian bishops,

\[\textit{truly the case is very like with Christians now in respect of these Images, being set up in place of Gods worship; if they doe outward reverence unto God, they are in danger to be misinterpreted to doe it to the Altars, and Images; if they refuse to doe it unto them, they are accused, and punished, as denying it to God; and to so they are in a manner necessitated to appeare either prophane, or superstitious, and idolatrous.}\]
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He acknowledged the difficult position faced by Protestants for either performing a reverence to an image or refusing to do it.

Two Catholics whose life alternated between the two continental towns of Douai and Louvain – important centers of exiled communities – offered opposing views to his Protestants counterparts.

In 1564, Thomas Harding, a Catholic clergyman who became one of the most important English Catholic controversialists, published his reply to John Jewel, in which he refuted his sermon of 1560. Contrary to Jewel, Harding asserted that the use of images among Christians differed from pagan idolatry because Christian images were set up without “the intent [that] the people might worship them.” This statement suggested that the intention of the authority rather than the actual practice of the people distinguished one from the other. Harding did not acknowledge that the problem was that if people had the capacity to worship an image, the intention of authorities was irrelevant. In his view, another difference emerged from the origin of Christian representations: “images…were not first invented by man, but commaunded by God, brought unto use by tradition of the Apostles.” Like other Catholic authors, Harding explained that differences between pagan and Christian practice stemmed from the authority conferred by their origin.

In 1567, Nicholas Sanders remarked that the Christian tradition of using images, which on the surface resembled pagan practices, was essentially different. Like the
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Spanish authors Prades and Delgadillo, Sanders dismissed the physical similarities between pagan idols and Christian images. For this purpose, he focused on matching cultural traits, explaining that even when “we use certeine things like as the Gentils doe, as meate, and drincke, howses, garments... [and] our Images be made of wood, or stone, or of silver, as the Images of the Gentils,” we are not gentiles. He was aware of the constant reference to pagan and Christian similarities in their use of images. He hoped the simple logic used in this argument allowed him to communicate his ideas to both English lay and clerical populations in England and in the countries on the Continent that received English exiles.

Because Spanish Catholics denied any relationship between the practices of pagans and those of Christians, they were ambiguous when describing the use of representations in the pagan world as compared with the use of Christian images. These authors presented Christianity as a definite break from the way in which ‘religious’ images had been used in the past. In their view the reformation of idolatry –substituting images for idols and good practices for bad ones– embedded in the spread of Christianity validated the existence of contemporary practice. Nonetheless, Roa and Delgadillo agreed with Aquinas that at some level the use of images among Christians resembled the practice of pagans, and more importantly, that idolatrous tendencies could be found in Christian practice. Consequently, they believed that idolatry remained a potential danger for Christians until the end of times. Because of the difficulty of detecting true idolatrous practice, Catholic authors might have decided not to stress the similarities of images and idols. Specifically, they might have been worried about confusing the laity. Agreeing with the Homily of 1563, the English Protestant authors posited that Christian images had
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not existed in early Christianity, thus rejecting the idea that early Christians had eliminated idolatry by establishing the orthodox use of images. In this way, English Protestants asserted that Protestantism was based in the ‘purer’ and ‘original’ practices of the early Christian church that had always rejected images and idolatry.

Conversely, three English Catholics writing in exile suggested that images had replaced idols since early Christianity and that the practices of Christians and pagans relative to representations were completely different. The arguments used by Martiall might reflect the aspirations of the English exiles as a whole. While he suggested to his readers (the Queen included) that the Queen was not above the ‘true’ Church, the Catholic Church, he was also careful not to portray the Queen in excessively negative terms.

These arguments were part of the direct controversies that took place in the 1560s between English Protestant and English Catholic authors in exile. That Sanders’, Harding’s, and Martiall’s books, published on the continent, were read and subsequently attacked demonstrates that Catholic books circulated in England despite the government ban against those texts. Whereas the writings of these authors received responses by Jewel, Calfhill, and Fulke, the Catholic authors did not always start the debate. The continuous production of various texts produced during each controversy by both sides as well as the intervention of additional authors in the dispute shows the commitment each side had to refuting the arguments of the opposite side.

* * * * *

My analysis of the arguments of early modern Spanish and English writers has elucidated the specific features that differentiated the concepts image and idol, as well as
the Christian use of images and the practice of idolatry. For both Catholics and
Protestants, convincing their audience of their views about idolatry was essential.
Catholics rejected any charge of idolatry, understood as heretical and unorthodox beliefs
or behaviors used to attack various rituals and ceremonies of the Catholic Church. That
English Protestants were aware of the effectiveness of the accusation of idolatry created
an imperative among Catholics to disprove such charges.

Because Trent did not mention the historical precedents of images, several
Spanish authors used the Bible and works by Christian and non-Christian authors to
establish a clear difference between images and idols. For English Protestants, however,
the Elizabethan Homily of 1563 provided the doctrinal basis that guided their ideas.
While most Spanish Catholics argued that images and idols were different, there were
some disagreements among English Protestants about the relationship between the two
concepts. Among Spanish Catholic writers only one accepted the possibility that an
image was similar to an idol or that an image could become an idol. While most
Elizabethan English writers held that worshipping any image transformed it into an idol,
the Puritan author Perkins and the Arminian clergyman Mountague claimed that images
only became idols if they were used incorrectly. That these authors could make claims
contrary to general consensus demonstrates the freedom to dissent in the post-
Reformation debate.

Spanish Catholics and English Protestants interpreted early Christianity’s
encounter with pagan practices in opposite ways. By linking idolatry to pagans and Jews
in pre-Christian times, Spanish Catholics distanced their contemporary Christians from
such dangers: idolatry had been practiced in the past but did not represent a threat in the
However, two Spanish writers, Roa and Delgadillo, openly acknowledged that the ‘reformation’ of pagan image practices was not completely successful. More significantly, they recognized the possibility that the use of images among Christians carried with it an ‘innate’ element of paganism. These two authors might have seen nothing wrong with making those claims because their main objective was to ensure orthodoxy in Catholic practices. Their ideas may have not been regarded as anti-Catholic or unorthodox because the doctrine of images was not essential to people’s salvation. Several English Protestants, in contrast, denied any differences in the use of representations by pagans, Jews, and Catholics. They argued that it was not early Christians who had established the use of images, but rather later Catholics who had copied this idolatrous practice from pagans.

The religious reading culture in each country as well as the goals of these authors determined the reach of their ideas. While both the Spanish and English thinkers addressed different audiences, the Spanish audience was more limited in size and range of membership than the English one. A few Spanish authors, like Delgadillo, Vasquez, and Ayala, wrote in Latin for other theologians and highly educated clergymen. But Roa and Prades directed their discussions in Spanish to the lower clergy and the educated laity. In general, the lay population who were literate or semi-literate did not read discussions of theology. It is likely that sermons allowed priests, friars, and other preachers to serve as mediators between the works of Roa and Prades and the less educated members of their audience. In contrast, The English authors wrote in English
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for a population engaged in religious reading which included lay people of the upper segments of society who increasingly read theological and spiritual tracts.

It is only possible to spot an actual ‘debate,’ a direct exchange of ideas, in the works of a few English Protestant and Catholic writers. Most often it was expressed in the forms of attack and criticism published on both sides of the English Channel. Those who had conformed to the Reformation and those who had gone into exile on the continent challenged one another. Both sides made use of their ample knowledge and energy to prove their opposition wrong. Although the exchanges between Martiall and Calfhill were followed by a wide audience, the ‘dialogue’ between Harding and Jewel contributed to what became known as ‘the Great Controversy.’

While in general Catholics of both nationalities presented very similar arguments about images and idols, the English Catholic Sanders stood out as distinct because his opinion on the role of the Jews differed from that of the Spanish Catholics. Although English Protestants did not hold a single, unified view on what differentiated images from idols or Christian from pagan practice, the Spanish converts Tejeda and Valera agreed with the general opinion that images and idols were the same and Catholic practice amounted to idolatry.

The arguments of these authors indicate the extent to which their ideas were shaped by national concerns. English exiles like Martiall firmly believed that England could be recovered to Catholicism and thus he used different strategies to blame Protestants without directly attacking the Queen. He would not have wanted to be seen as anti-English. To respond to possible questions about his religious convictions, the

---

Spanish convert Valera suggested that he had always known, even as a friar in Spain, that there were many things wrong with the Catholic Church.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE PROPER INTERPRETATION OF THE FIRST AND SECOND COMMANDMENTS

Among the doctrinal disagreements that resulted from the Reformation, the wording and correct interpretation of the Catholic and Protestant texts of the Ten Commandments was directly relevant to the discussion on images. There were two versions of the Ten Commandments: Catholics recognized the one authored by St. Augustine, while Protestants upheld the one by St. Jerome. Spanish and English authors correspondingly used one of these texts to justify their position on the use of images. At the center of the discussion was the proper recognition and worship owed to God. This chapter explores the different readings that these authors gave to these commandments to determine how Spanish and English authors interpreted the message of the commandments, and how much importance they assigned to this legal code.

This chapter argues that Spanish Catholic and English Protestant writers disagreed not only with one another but also among themselves about what the Commandments intended for the use of images. While most Spanish Catholics held that the Commandments did not prohibit the contemporary use of images in religious practice, some of them accepted that misusing images could violate the First Commandment. Most but not all English Protestants argued that the Commandments clearly banned the production and use of images in the present as well as in the past.
Spanish Catholics and English Protestants knew the importance of using the text of the Ten Commandments to justify their views. Because Christians held that the will of God was outlined in the Ten Commandments, the group that could properly interpret God’s command on images had an enormous advantage over the other. Neither Spanish nor English Catholic authors presented a coherent and unified explanation of the text of the Commandments. Although the observance of the Ten Commandments was essential to salvation, the Council of Trent chose not to address the discrepancies in the two versions of the text. Unlike the English who focused on the two different versions of the Commandments found in the Bible, the Spanish avoided this discussion altogether as a way to invalidate Protestant claims. Most, but not all, English Protestants used strategies similar to each other in their approach to ‘reading’ the text of the Commandments.

After introducing the text of the Ten Commandments, the first section of this chapter focuses specifically on the evolution of this text from the Middle Ages to the early modern period. The second section reviews ideas by Spanish Catholics, followed by the third section that presents an analysis of the arguments offered by English Protestants. The last section analyses the views of English Catholic exiles and Spanish Converts.

I. The Wording and Evolution of the text of the Ten Commandments in Early Modern Bibles

The Ten Commandments –the heart of the narrative about the making of the covenant between God and His people– are part of the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament. Located within the Pentateuch (the first five books), the Ten Commandments appear
twice in two different versions: first in Exodus (chapter 20) and then in Deuteronomy (chapter 5).\(^1\) According to the Exodus narrative, God gave Moses, the leader of the Israelites, the Ten Commandments as two tables or tablets; thus a discussion of the Commandments could refer to either the first table or the second table.\(^2\) The Bible of the Catholic Church in use in Spain presented the Ten Commandments in Latin:

**Exodus**

Locutus quoque est Dominus cunctos sermones hos
Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus qui
Eduxi te de terra Aegypti de domo servitutis
Non habebis deos alienos coram me
Non facies tibi sculptile
Neque omnem similitudinem quae
in caelo desuper et quae in terra
Deorsum
Nec eorum quae sunt in aquis sub
Terra
Non adorabis ea neque coles
Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus fortis
Zelotes
Visitants iniquitatem partum in filiis
In tertiam et quartam generationem
Eorum qui oderunt me\(^3\)

**Deuteronomy**

ego Dominus Deus tuus qui
eduxi te de terra Aegypti de domo serivitutis
non habebis deos alienos in conspectu meo
non facies tibi sculptile nec similitudinem omnium

---

\(^1\) The Commandments are divided into two separate tablets or tables: the first one included the precepts related to the relationship of God and His people; while the second contained those precepts that established how an individual was to relate with his family members and community members.

\(^2\) When Moses saw Aaron and the people worshipping the golden calf, he broke the tables with the Commandments; consequently God gave him a second set. See S. M. Polan, “Ten Commandments,” in *New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed.*

\(^3\) *Biblia Sacra Vulgate Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, Preface by Bonifatio Fisher OSB, Iohanne Gribomont OSB (Stuttgart, Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt 1969), 104.
quae in caelo sunt desuper et quae in terra deorsum et quae versantur in aquis sub terra non adorabis ea et non coles ego enim sum Dominus Deus tuus Deus aemulator Reddens inquitatem patrum super Filos in tertiam et quartam generationem his qui orderunt me et faciens misericordiam in multa milia diligentibus me et custodientibus praecepta mea non usurpabis nomen Domini Dei tui frustra

The Latin Vulgate Bible—referred to as the Sixto-Clementine for Pope Clement VI, approved by the Council of Trent, but not fully completed until 1592—constituted the standard Bible for the Spanish Catholic Church. This Bible was the exact reproduction of a Vulgate revised by Alcuin (704-804), which had been the ‘official’ text for the Western Church. Before 1592, Cardinal Francisco Jimenez de Cisneros attempted to elevate his creation, the Polyglot Bible, as the standard text of Spain. However, it never reached the status of the Vulgate. There were also several Bibles in the vernacular that had been published in Spain without too much control, but with the spread of ‘Lutheranism,’ the Church banned all vernacular editions of the Bible for several years. After intense debate, the Council of Trent decided to allow vernacular Bibles that were properly annotated and brought into line with the Vulgate. By the end of the sixteenth century, Bibles in many vernacular languages, including Old Spanish, had been published—and sanctioned—in the Catholic world. Nonetheless, the translation of these texts did not
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4 Ibid., 249.
5 In the Late Medieval period there were several Bibles translated into Old Spanish with a mix of regional languages of the Peninsula like Riojano and Navarrese. See X.G. Arce, “Bible,” in New Cath Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. See also Mark G, Biblia Romanceada: The 13th Century Spanish Bible Contained in the Escorial M.S. II8, The Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies (Littlefield, Wis., 1983).
mean that they became available to more people; the primary purpose of these editions
was for the clergy to instruct and preach Catholic doctrine to the people.\(^7\)

The English Protestants writers who participated in this discussion based their
ideas on their readings of the following Bibles. The Coverdale Bible, also called the
Great Bible, became the first translation of the Bible into English, appearing in 1535 and
including the work of William Tyndale and Miles Coverdale.\(^8\) This same text was
published again in 1568 but under a different name, the *Bishops’ Bible*. The full texts of
the relevant passages concerning the commandments read as follows:

**Exodus 20**

And the LORDE spake all these wordes, and sayde: I am the LORDE thy God, which
have bought the out of the londe of Egipte from ye house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other Goddes in my sight, Thou shalt make the no graven ymage nor any similitude, nether of it that is beneth upon earth, her of it that is in the water under the earth. Worship them not, and serve them not: for I the LORDE thy God am a jealouse God, visitinge ye synne of the fathers upon the children, unto ye thirde and fourth generacion, of them that hate me. And do mercy upon many thousands, that love me, and kepe my commanundements.

**Deuteronomy 5**

For ye were afrayde of the fyre and wente not up to the mount and he said: I am the Lord thy God, which love brought the out of the londe of Egipte, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other goddess in any sighte. Thou shalt make the no graven ymages of any maker of lickenesse of things [that] are above heaven, beneath upon earth and in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not honour them nor serve them. For I [your] LORDE [your] God am jealouse God, vysitinge the synne of the fathers up the children unto the thirde and fourth generacion.\(^9\)

In 1611 the Bishops’ Bible was revised and appeared as the King James Bible, which became the standard translation of the Anglican Church from its first printing to

---

\(^7\) Barbara Aland and Erroll F. Rhodes, “Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of Christianity.*

\(^8\) Ibid.

\(^9\) *Biblia the Byble, that is, the holy Scription of the Olde and New Testament,* faithfully translated in to Englyshe. [Southwark?, J. Nycolson], M.D.XXXV [1535]
the present. ¹⁰ The commandments were now numbered, and the wording was somewhat different. Here they are copied with their verse numbers.

Exodus 20

And God spake all these words, saying,
2[2a] I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.
3[2b] Thou shalt have no other gods before me.
4[3] Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:
5[4] Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me;
6[5] And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.¹¹

Deuteronomy 5

5 I stood between the LORD and you at that time, to shew you the word of the LORD: for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount; Saying,
6[6a] I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage.
7[6b] Thou shalt have none other gods before me.
8[7] Thou shalt not make thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters beneath the earth:
9[8] Thou shalt not bow down thyself unto them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me,
10[9] And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.¹²

Translating the Bible into English allowed literate people in England to read the Commandments themselves (often aloud) and gave more opportunities for the illiterate to listen to someone else read these texts to them. The Commandments had acquired

¹¹ The Bible, Holy Scripture, 160. These are verse numbers copied exactly as it appears in the text.
tremendous importance by the reign of Elizabeth, as the inscriptions on the walls of every church attest. Between these inscriptions and the presentation of the commandments as catechisms on walls, the text became available to almost everybody. This feature demonstrates that English Protestant culture did not abandon the visual by rejecting religious images; it only made use of the visual in new ways.

The disagreements over the order and content of the Ten Commandments that plagued early Christian history of biblical law reappeared in the sixteenth century among Protestants and Catholics. The flurry of new translations of the Bible from its original languages (Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic), facilitated by Humanism, generated a reassessment of the text of the Ten Commandments. As Leanne Van Dyk explains, “the Commandments, of course, are not numbered in the biblical text, and so the demarcation so the commandments has long been disputed in the Christian and Jewish tradition.” In Christianity, these disagreements emanate from the differences between two versions of the Old Testament – St. Jerome and St. Augustine’s. The translation of Deuteronomy by St. Augustine was adopted by the early fathers of the West and became the doctrine of early modern Catholics and Lutherans, while the translation of Exodus by St. Jerome was supported by the Greek fathers and became the basis of reformed Protestant doctrine. According to S. M. Polan, the version of the Commandments adopted by most Protestants, except for Lutherans, was the more original form of the Decalogue or Ten Commandments because it followed the oldest tradition of this text.

---

13 Ibid.
16 Ibid., 7.
Based on these two versions of the Ten Commandments, early modern English Protestants and Spanish Catholics upheld their own version of the Commandments—both its order and content—as the true and correct one. The numbering of the Commandments comprised the most obvious difference between the two versions; English Protestants argued that two Commandments, the First and the Second, addressed the issue of images, while Catholics claimed that only the First Commandment was dedicated to this subject. These differences in content and interpretation of the Commandments led to opposing arguments. Most English Protestants asserted that the First and Second Commandments supported an everlasting prohibition on all images, while Spanish Catholics claimed that the First Commandment simply recorded a prohibition that had since expired.

II. Early Modern Spanish Catholic Interpretations of God’s Message On Images.

Whereas the Decree on Images of 1563 did not mention the Ten Commandments, the Catechism produced by the Council of Trent—called the Roman Catechism—articulated the importance of the First Commandment for the doctrine of images.\textsuperscript{17} The catechism stated the broad meaning of the commandment: the order “\textit{Thou shalt not have strange gods before me}” contained both a mandatory and a prohibitory precept.\textsuperscript{18} The first required people to acknowledge God as the only and true god, and the second forbid the worshipping of a multitude of gods.\textsuperscript{19} In relation to images, the catechism denied that the First Commandment forbade all images. The authors of this catechism made clear

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17} Catechism of the Council of Trent for parish priests, issued by order of Pope Pius V.: John A. McHugh, O.P., and Charles J. Caillahan, O. P. Trans. (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, inc, 1934. \\
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., 368. \\
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\end{flushright}
that the order “Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, not the likeness of any thing….prohibited [images] only in as much as they are used as deities to receive adoration, and so to injure the true worship of God.” Images that were properly used could be made following the example set by God in the Bible when He made the Cherubim and the brazen serpent.

Martin Perez de Ayala, the theologian who participated in the doctrinal debates of the second session of Trent and later focused on Christian instruction and clergy reform, approached the First Commandment in different ways in two of his works. Perez de Ayala articulated the practical implications of the commandment; he deciphered what exactly it was that contemporary Christians were expected to do. It is noteworthy that he acknowledged the possibility of confusion about the message of the First Commandment. In this work that was written before 1566 but published posthumously in 1628, Perez de Ayala employed the rhetorical strategy of a dialogue between a lay person and a learned individual. He emphasized the importance of the Ten Commandments as he suggested that it was essential to “pay attention to the law of God because God spoke through it and manifested his divine will.” As the highest church authority in the province of Valencia, Perez de Ayala’s catechism constituted part of the Counter-Reformation effort to instruct the laity on basic doctrinal issues. His work was expected to reach the people through the mediation of a priest. However, a significant number of secret Muslims populated Valencia, which presented a difficulty. These people were not ‘Infidels’ but ‘Apostates,’ because although they had been baptized, they
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20 Ibid., 366-373.
21 Ibid. 373.
22 See Appendix
23 Martin Perez de Ayala, *Catechismo Para Instruccioin de los Nuevamente Convertidos de Moros*, (Valencia, 1599), 347.
rejected Christianity. Teaching them the catechism thus proved extremely difficult due to their poor command of Spanish or Valenciano (a regional language) and because they tended to live in remote areas, precisely because they wanted to practice their Muslim faith.\textsuperscript{24} The pressure to reach this resistant group and the lack of general education and religious preparation among the lower clergy forced Perez de Ayala to be especially clear and concise in his work.

Perez de Ayala’s interpretation stands out because it combined the text of the First Commandment with that of the Second Commandment which focuses on the name of God. According to him, Exodus stated, “I am your Lord God. You will not have strange gods to worship, you will not make an image to worship. You shall not make wrongful use of the name of God.”\textsuperscript{25} He argued that two possible interpretations of this text were valid and complementary. First, the commandment “warns men not to have, recognize nor worship a false god,” which implied that “men recognize, worship and love the only true God, which is the one who gave this holy law.”\textsuperscript{26} Second, the commandment required people “[to] love God above everything with your soul, mind and will.”\textsuperscript{27} He reassured those concerned about the correct interpretations that these two were correct and complementary. The first interpretation required people to perform two simultaneous actions: to avoid evil and to do good because “when God orders us not to do something [it meant] therefore that [God] wants us to do the opposite of that which he has ban[ed].”\textsuperscript{28} The second interpretation reaffirmed the importance of giving God the

\textsuperscript{25} Perez, \textit{Catechismo Para Instrucción}, 347.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
worship that He deserved. In his view, the confusion over the real meaning of the commandments derived from the co-mingling of negative commandments and positive affirmations of faith. He concluded that these two interpretations of the commandment resulted not from human error, but from the nature of the Old Testament, which was “set like that in the Scripture and also pronounced by God.”\textsuperscript{29} Perez de Ayala was the only author who skillfully addressed the issue of lack of clarity in the Ten Commandments, and who indirectly questioned the precision of the Bible. Because he did not pronounce a judgement against this text, his statement was less likely to raise suspicions of unorthodoxy with the Inquisition.

The focus of Perez de Ayala changed when he discussed the First Commandment in his Latin treatise directed at other theologians. In this case, he did not see the need to explain each statement contained in the commandment. The emphasis of his work was on its justification in the context of the Old Testament events. Thus he explained that “when…God forbade the people of Israel to make some engraving or to depict some likeness, he did not intend to simply condemn the use of images, [which] would contend with the order of nature prescribed by Himself, [instead] He sought to avoid idolatry in…this race.”\textsuperscript{30} The implication was that the tendency to idolatry of the Jews was not shared by contemporary Catholics because it was an exclusive characteristic of the Israelites. Perez de Ayala explained that the statement, “‘You will not make silver gods with me’, [should be read] as if He was saying, ‘Take precautions against depicting every likeness and against creating an engraving to which you could easily grant honors owed

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 349.
\textsuperscript{30} Martin Perez de Ayala, \textit{De Imaginobus Sanctorum}, 67.
\end{flushleft}
to me”. 31 Perez de Ayala suggested that nobody expected the Jews of the Old Testament to follow this rule because idolatry was race specific. It is likely that mentioning this subject in his catechism would have caused negative feelings among conversos.

In 1594, Gabriel Vasquez, a Jesuit theologian, metaphysician, and one of the most famous teachers at the University of Alcalá, analyzed the order of the Commandments to prove that there was no prohibition of images. 32 In his Latin treatise, he asserted that “there are only Ten Commandments in Exodus 31 and 34 and Deuteronomy 4, 9 and 10,” as St. Augustine taught. 33 Therefore, the addition of a supposed Second Commandment that prohibited images would alter the number of Commandments in violation of God’s will. Vasquez explained, “If, moreover, it had been prohibited to fashion images or also likenesses and not only to show worship of idolatry to them, there would have been more than Ten Commandments.” 34 Protestants disagreed that the number of the Commandments would be altered because most Protestants used St. Jerome’s version. Unlike the version of St. Augustine where the last two commandments addressed the sin of covetousness, in St. Jerome’s version only the Tenth Commandment talked about covetousness. Consequently, Protestants could have two commandments talking about images without altering the total number of Commandments. Thus, Vasquez concluded that any objections about the order of the Commandments did not prove that “the use of images was…prohibited by Ancient Law”. 35

A different focus was taken in 1596 by Jaime Prades, a theologian who recognized the importance of teaching about the origin and the use of images. After
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31 Ibid., 67.
32 See Appendix.
33 Gabriel Vasquez, De Cultu adorationis… (Compluti, ex off. Iannis Gratiani, ap. Viduam, 1694), 94.
34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
determining the audience for which God had intended the First Commandment, he noted that the commandment’s warning against the misuse of images did not apply to early modern Christians. Like Damascus, Prades held that its literal meaning had applied only to a certain group of people in the past: God had directly ordered the Jews “not [to] make to you any sculpted thing, nor likeness of [the things] that are above in heaven, on earth, nor in the sea…not worship or honor any of these things” because they “had a propensity to idolatry.” He reassured his readers by explaining that this tendency to worship idols did not exist among contemporary Catholics, which meant that the commandment did not carry the same meaning for them. He described Catholics as people “without superstition and vanity…[who] do not believe that there are gods in images, do not worship them and know how to reject what seems wrongful religious practices,” implying that Catholics not only lacked the negative idolatrous traits, but also that they had enough knowledge and understanding to sustain an orthodox use of images. Such a positive strategy to address this subject with his audience might have caused people to feel confident about their practice, but also it could have caused people to overlook a possible misuse of images. Although the First Commandment was directed exclusively at Jews of the Old Testament, Prades remarked “that written law…[teaches] the way in which they had to perfectly honor God with love and charity.” This statement reminded contemporary Catholics of the necessity of worshipping God in a proper way.

36 See Appendix.
37 Jaime Prades, Historia de la adoración y uso de las santas imagenes....(Valencia, 1596), 55.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid., 43.
Prades’ emphasis on the negative traits of the Jews of the past was an extremely sensitive issue for the Spanish of the early modern period. Prades would have been aware of the criticism of Catholic images expressed by Jewish authors in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In those writings, Jewish authors made clear that late medieval and early modern Jews had a special aversion towards the use of images in religious practice. Because of the persecution and the constant stigma that *conversos* faced throughout the early modern period, a strong emphasis on the ‘negative’ traits of past Jews could alienate these new Christians. But the same language about Jews seemed to demonstrate his orthodoxy to anyone concerned with his stance on images.

In 1597, Robert Bellarmine, an eminent Italian-born theologian of extraordinary influence in Spanish Catholicism, remarked that the First Commandment was relevant because some people gave the honor owed to God to other beings. Bellarmine belongs in the group of Spanish writers because his theology and intellect contributed in significant ways to Catholicism in Spain and its empire. His catechism was widely used in Spain and its colonies as a standard text well into the second half of the eighteenth century. Bellarmine was a skillful controversialist who distinguished himself for his knowledge of the details of inter-confessional disagreements. He participated in a series of arguments with the English monarch James I on various aspects of doctrine.

---

40 See Chapter 2 on Context and Historical Background.  
41 See Appendix.  
42 Galeota, G. “Bellarmino, Roberto,” in *Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús*.  
According to his catechism, the message of this Commandment repudiated “those heretics who do not believe in God…who put their hope in other men…who love other creatures as much as they love God,…[and] who hate God.”⁴⁵ His use of the word ‘heretics’ is significant because it gave him the opportunity to equate non-Christian in the past and Protestants in the present. In this statement, he seemed to imply that Protestants, like any other ‘heretics,’ did not believe in God because they rejected the authority of the Catholic Church and opposed its doctrine. In addition, his mention of ‘other men’ in which people put their hope might have referred to Luther, Calvin, and other Protestant reformers. While his catechism was not a book written to directly respond to Protestant views, in it he addressed several issues raised by Protestants such as the message of the First Commandment. Thus, it is not surprising that some of his statements contained contentious elements such as his reference to those who ‘hate’ God.

Bellarmine distinguished three complementary messages in this Commandment because, like Aquinas, he held that each and every statement of this text should be understood in conjunction with the others. The first part reminded his audience that “we need to acknowledge God as [the true] God,” which meant to believe in God as the highest truth and honor Him.⁴⁶ The second part stated that “we should not substitute God for anything else”, which referred to the prohibition against setting up material items or humans beings in the place of the true God.⁴⁷ The third part specifically warned “against making idols, in other words, statues or images that be taken for gods, and to...[be]
worshipped as idols.” His comment that pagans had worshipped the sun and the moon as God because they had not known the true God suggests an attempt to offer a benevolent account of their actions to contrast them with Protestants who, in spite of being Christians, disobeyed God’s teachings.

Through his scrutiny of the text of the First Commandment, he implied that because Catholics did not violate the law of God in any of these forms, they were free to use images. Unlike Prades, Bellarmine directly stated that the goal of his writings was to help his audience of priests who were in charge of teaching the catechism. His more elaborated three-part interpretation of the First Commandment might have presented challenges to the many clergymen who lacked both proper training to understand a sophisticated discussion of this type.

In 1593, Bartolomé de Medina, an influential theologian and member of the Dominican order who taught at the famous University of Salamanca, distinguished between two separate but complementary objectives set in the First Commandment. In his manual for confessors, Medina held that God’s own words made clear that this commandment directly addressed the Jews, “‘Listen Israel, I am your Lord and your God, [you] would not neither have other gods before you, nor make idols or likeness to worship.’” This commandment informed the people of God’s status and role as the highest authority. Thus, “God declares [Himself to be] our sovereign governor who lawfully gives orders [and who] offers rewards and punishments” to those who obeyed or

48 Ibid., 64.
49 Ibid., 65r.
50 Ibid., Introduction.
51 Bartolomé de Medina was committed to the teaching of Catholic doctrine to the masses, while he contributed to the formation of new priests. See Appendix.
52 Bartolomé de Medina, Summa de Mandaamientos (1593), 66r.
disobeyed His will. Unlike previous authors, Medina specifically emphasized God’s intention to establish his authority in determining the type of worship that humans owe Him.

The commandment also specified the actions that people had to avoid as well as those that must be performed. Medina explained,

we neither know nor worship any other god beyond the true one… we should not give the honor that belongs to the supreme Lord to idols, nor should we make them to worship them like gods, [but] this precepts orders that we honor, invoke and worship this big and eternal God [whom] we love with all our heart, and our soul, above all things, without giving this form of cult to any creature.

His preoccupation with the possibility that people did not worship God above everything else stemmed directly from the importance that the cult of saints had during the early modern period. Given their intercessory powers, specialist saints were adopted as patrons of different causes by individuals and groups of people. Thus, Medina reminded the reader that “though it is true that Christians honor and give reverence and invoke saints who are in heaven, enjoying the glory of God, we should not transgress this commandment, as the glory owed to God must not be given to the creature.” While he did not directly question the validity of devotion to the saints, he seemed to emphasize that worship given to God was superior to that given to saints. Medina is the only author who acknowledged that some people prioritized their relationship with the saints over their relationship with God, which would constitute a violation of the First Commandment.

53 Ibid.
54 Ibid., 67r
55 For a discussion of the importance of various saints in early modern Spain see: Sarah Tilgham Nalle, God in la Mancha: Religious Reform and the People of Cuenca, (Baltimore:Johns Hopkins, 1992), 23.
56 See Chapter 1.
57 Medina, Summa de Mandamientos, 67r.
Medina’s voice is one of the few that directly expressed a concern emanating from Protestant accusations. This discussion was a ‘taboo’ subject that Catholic writers were unwilling to discuss in settings accessible by the laity, but because he wrote a manual exclusively for clergymen that would help priests in the administration of the sacrament of confession, he possessed the freedom to respond to Protestant complaints. Medina’s statement invited the confessor to address the possible misuse of images through a hypothetical rather than a direct discussion.

In 1640, another manual for confessors written by Juan Eusebio Nieremberg, the exegete and philosopher of the Society of Jesus who focused his efforts on the promotion of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, acknowledged idolatry as a sin against the First Commandment that confessors ought to address during confession. According to him, the First Commandment prohibited “idolatry or infidelity, denying the true God, and worshipping idols and fake Gods.” It is significant that although he wrote lengthy paragraphs explaining other sins associated with the rest of the Commandments, he neither made clear how this image idolatry took place nor the implications of such practices. There are three divergent ways to explain his silence on the matter. First, it is possible that he believed that idolatry did not pose a real danger to contemporary Catholics and he therefore saw this aspect of the First Commandment as formulaic. As a result, he might have thought that linking idolatry with Catholic images was dangerous because it would stir up doubts in the minds of those who could not understand the difference between worship of God and worship of saints and their representations.

---

58 Juan Eusebio Nieremberg was a prolific writer who fulfilled various missions throughout Europe for the Spanish crown. See Appendix.
59 Juan Eusebio Neremberg, Practica del Catecismo Romano, (1646), 303.
Nieremberg had to confront the possibility that the confessors using their manuals could misunderstand what they read.

Second, even if he saw the possibility of idolatry among Catholics as a real problem, Nieremberg might have feared that if his statements sounded unorthodox, they would attract the attention of the Inquisition. Nieremberg’s discussion of the other types of sin associated with the First Commandment offers a third possible reason for Nieremberg’s reluctance to talk about the sin of idolatry. Other sins related to the church as an institution consisted of actions such as “denying any truth that God has revealed to the Church, or even consciously doubting any of these truths, or…failing to confess things related to faith.”60 Nieremberg implied that those who doubted any of the Church’s teachings were bad Christians and that the ideas of the church were not open to debate. Medina and Nieremberg showed two distinct approaches to the subject of images and idolatry which showed that despite the presence of the Inquisition there was room for divergent ideas in seventeenth-century Spain.

A theological treatise in Latin written in 1652 by Cristoval Delgadillo, the teacher and theologian who wrote to clarify the doctrinal justification of the use of images, determined the validity of the prohibition of images according to the medieval classification of moral and ceremonial commandments. Like previous Catholic writers, his goal was to prove that the commandments’ image ban had lapsed in the present.61 Like Prades, he denied the claim that according to this “ancient law the use of sacred images was prohibited [and] therefore [contemporary use of images was]… illicit.”62 In

60 Ibid.
61 See Appendix.
his view, the order that “You may not have any engraved image, nor any likeness before
you of that which is in heaven, neither on the earth, nor in the waters below earth,”
existed only in the past.63 In his Latin treatise, Delgadillo presented a complex analysis
to his highly educated readers. This categorization of the Commandments reflected
Church teaching already in place before the Reformation.64 It is extremely puzzling that
Delgadillo was the only author who mentioned it because it provided a serious doctrinal
justification to the Catholic interpretation of the First Commandment. It is possible that
this distinction was seen as theologically complex and thus other authors did not make
use of it.

Delgadillo argued that the Commandments could be either ceremonial or moral –
the former could expire because they were temporal and according to circumstance, but
the latter contained timeless propositions. While most Commandments were moral, the
ceremonial Commandments referred to propositions that related to specific historical
circumstances such as the prohibition of eating meat. Therefore, he remarked that
“beyond the third [Commandment]…which is the limitation to the observation of the
Sabbath, [the Commandments]…are moral and not ceremonial.”65 The First
Commandment was unique in that “it was both moral and ceremonial at the same
time,…[because it contained]…a two-fold precept, that means a mixed one.”66 When
one read the Commandment focusing on the section that was “partially moral (of course,
to the extent that it prohibits idolatry), it is explained with these words: ‘no engraved

63 Ibid.
65 Delgadillo, Due Tractus Alter, 532.
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images for you,’” the message should be considered active in the present. However, if the focus was on the “partially ceremonial (of course, to the extent that it simply prohibits every use of images); it is explained with [this general phrase]: ‘every likeness,’” the message should be considered inactive. Thus, he agreed with theologian Prades that while in the First Commandment “the use of images is now not prohibited,” the ban against idolatry remained.

The two versions of the Commandments and the medieval classification were two key areas in need of discussion that these Catholic authors failed to address. It is intriguing that only one author mentioned the medieval classification of the Commandments. This aspect of doctrine was an opportunity to give cohesiveness to the Catholic position. If this classification –moral and ceremonial– was only known by theologians, it is puzzling that only Delgadillo referred to it. Another issue that failed to call the attention of the Catholic writers was the differences between St. Augustine and St. Jerome’s versions of the Ten Commandments. A possible explanation for the absence of this discussion by all but one author is that Catholics might have felt that the mention of an alternative version of the Commandments could cast doubt among those who lacked deep knowledge of the Scriptures.

While several Catholic authors struggled to make sense of the wording of the First Commandment, only one individual openly complained about this problem. Perez de Ayala was careful in explaining the source of the difficulty avoiding a negative opinion on the Bible. Additionally, he might have feared that doubting the clarity of the Ten Commandments could be read as a veiled acknowledgement that there were other
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possible readings of it. In this way, Perez de Ayala unintentionally blamed God for the challenging wording, a move which might have relieved Protestants of any responsibility for unorthodox interpretations of it.

That the authors of Trent did not mention the First Commandment in the Decree of Trent indicates that they were reluctant to call attention to an additional version of the commandments. Although Church authorities clarified the text of the Ten Commandments in the Catechism of Trent, it did not explain their meaning. It is also possible that the fathers of Trent feared that any clarification of the message of the First Commandment would have been viewed by Protestants as a legitimatization of their accusations against the Catholic doctrine. As a result, early modern Spanish authors lacked doctrinal guidance from any authoritative source.

To explain the vague discussion over images presented by the fathers of Trent, it is possible to argue that images were not seen as essential doctrine for salvation. However, while the Church might have been indifferent to the use of images, the question is how the Church viewed the misuse of images. The fathers of Trent briefly recognized the possibility of the misuse of images, and thus they ordered the high clergy to supervise and enforce a ‘proper’ use.

The Spanish Catholic authors considered here agreed with the medieval assertion than the First Commandment allowed the making and use of religious images because the prohibition contained in it was addressed to non-Christians who had worshipped false gods in the past, rather than to contemporary Christians. Despite this shared understanding of the general message of the First Commandment, these Spanish Catholics still diverged on the interpretation of the commandment in slightly different
ways. A few Spanish Catholics recognized that the prohibition of the First Commandment could apply to contemporary Catholics, as people did misuse images. Prades suggested the need to remind people to avoid the wrongful worship of images. In a paradoxical statement Nieremberg warned against the sin of idolatry, which indicated that such a problem existed in the present, but immediately he suggested that this warning only concerned the use of idols and false gods created by non-Christians. Medina was unique in that he overtly remarked that the use of images of saints could violate this commandment. This evidence indicates that some individuals expressed concerns akin to Protestant claims even if doing so emphasized possible weaknesses of the Catholic doctrine.

III. Perspectives by English Protestants.

Almost all English Protestants authors tried to demonstrate that the First and Second Commandments prohibited everybody from making and using images in the past and the present. The only exception came from a writer who favored Arminian views of images in religious space. However, those who argued against images supplied a variety of different reasons in their quest to establish that the Protestant version of the Second Commandment was the only valid one.

The official position of the Edwardian reign on the commandments’ message emerges from the visitation articles written by Bishop Hooper for the dioceses of
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70 Since the late fourteenth century, the Lollards had viewed the message of the Commandments as key to the rejection of images in religion. See Margaret Aston’s discussion of Wycliffe’s Treatise of the Decalogue in Margaret Aston, “Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy.” In Late Medieval Religion. (London: Hambledon Press, 1984), 140.
Gloucester and Worcester in 1551 and 1552.\textsuperscript{71} The destruction of all images, not only the abused ones, had been ordered by the Injunctions of 1547.\textsuperscript{72} In this context, and under a new sovereign, article nine stated that “the doctrine…of the veneration, invocation, and worshipping of…images is….against the doctrine of the first and second commandment of God, contained in the first table.”\textsuperscript{73} Archbishop Cranmer observed that some Protestants put more emphasis on the First Commandment and others on the Second Commandment; he remarked that newer ‘interpreters’ found the ban on images in the First Commandment, ancient ones included it in the Second Commandment, and still others remained closer to Continental reformers who highlighted the role of the First Commandment.\textsuperscript{74}

In 1549, John Hooper, as bishop of Gloucester, demonstrated his stance on images with his participation in the destruction of images in his diocese, focused almost exclusively on the message of the Second Commandment. Hooper mentioned the First Commandment only briefly because in his view the Second Commandment specifically addressed the violation of God’s message. Whereas each commandment gave different emphasis to the external and internal aspects of the problem of ‘idolatry,’ the first two spoke to interrelated aspects of the same problem. In his view, in the “second commandement [God] calleth man from all grosse and carnall opinions, or iudgements of God…and forbiddeth externall idolatrie, [while] the First Commandment it condemneth internall [idolatry].”\textsuperscript{75} Curiously, Hooper seemed to assume that his readership would

\textsuperscript{71} See Appendix.
\textsuperscript{72} Aston, Lollards, 140.
\textsuperscript{73} John Hooper, A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments (Zurich: Printed by Augustine Friars], 1548, 269.
\textsuperscript{75} Hooper, Declaration of the Holy, 29r. Author’s emphasis.
easily understand the difference between these two concepts, which might suggest that he was writing for clergy the rather than for the general public. Additionally, he argued that his work should be read with “judgment and knowledge” and invited the reader to offer “criticism” on it, which seems to confirm he wrote for the clergy. Nonetheless, if the goal of his book was to underscore the prohibition against images in the Commandments, the absence of conceptual explanations harmed the clarity of his propositions regardless of the intended audience.

In his view, the importance of the Second Commandment is essential in knowing how to relate to God. Through it, “we learned that God is the onelie and sole God, and that we should not thinke, nor faine anie other besides him…[It] sheweth vs further, how we should honor and reverence this our almightie and mercifull God.” Hooper’s tone made the message more approachable because he claimed that God Himself explained in detail how people should relate to him. Because honoring God required instruction and preparation, “god first instructeth the minde and soule of man, before he requireth anie outwarde worke or externall reverence; or else altogether were hypocrisie.” Of all the writers analyzing the commandments, he was the only one who highlighted the essential role of instruction in the fulfillment of this Commandment; however, Hooper did not specify at what point God instructed the people and, more importantly, why the danger of idolatry co-existed with God’s instructions.

Hooper called attention to the two related but separate messages of the Second Commandment: not to make images and not to use them. Through the first, God had “taketh from vs all libertie and licence, that we in no case represent, or manifest the God
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invisible and incomprehensible with any figure or image, or represent him unto our
senses, that cannot bee comprehended by the wit of man nor angel.”

The second message clearly moved from creation and possession of images to the use of them. Thus, God’s word reinforced the prohibition by reminding people of His omnipresence, “I am the Lord thy God…present with thee…[so there is] no need to seek me and my favorable presence in anie image.” Hooper suggested that the second message logically flowed from the first, and both were complementary. In this explanation Hooper focused exclusively on images of God, which gave the impression that the Second Commandment had nothing to do with images of the Virgin Mary and the saints.

Around 1550, Thomas Ridley, who as bishop of Rochester adopted a reformist stance and died as a martyr under Mary, emphasized the unchanging message of the Commandments. Like Hooper, he argued that the most important part of the Second Commandment related to images, which included an obligation that had not changed throughout the centuries. Thus, Ridley affirmed that “if by virtue of the Second Commandment, images were not lawful in the temple of the Jews, then by the same commandment [nowadays] they were not lawful in the churches of the Christians.”

Like the Spanish author Delgadillo, Ridley distinguished between the moral and ceremonial quality of the Commandments, but his assessment countered Delgadillo’s view. According to Ridley, morality gave the Second Commandment its force: “being a moral commandment, and not ceremonial…it is a perpetual commandment, and bindeth
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81 Like Hooper, Ridley was one of the more radical clergymen, who as Bishops, using the opportunity of the Injunctions of 1547 that authorized the destruction of all images, committed radical actions. It was reported that Ridley almost ripped out a tomb with his own hands. See Appendix.
82 Thomas Ridley, A Pious Lamentation of the miserable estate of the church, (London: By VVillyam Powell, dwelling in Fletestrete, at the signe of the George, nere to Sainct Dunstons Church, 1566), 84.
us well as the Jews." It is significant that, like most Spanish Catholic theologians, most English authors failed to make use of this moral-ceremonial distinction to support their claims.

Ridley presented the text taken from Deuteronomy that emphasized the contractual nature of the Commandments and the consequences of its violation.

Beware that thou forget not the covenant of the Lord thy God which made with thee, and so make to thyself any graven image of anything which the Lord hath forbidden thee,...if thou...make to yourselves any graven image, doing evil before the Lord your God, and provoke him to anger, I do this day call heaven and earth to witness that you shall quickly perish out of the land which you shall possess.

In this way, Ridley reminded his audience of the commitment contracted through the covenant with God and stated that obeying the prohibition against images helped validate this agreement. He also warned of serious punishment that would befall violators of this law. While Ridley implied that he was quoting Deuteronomy, cited most likely from the Coverdale Bible, he provided a statement comprised of direct quotations from the Bible strung together with his own words.

During the reign of Elizabeth, the *Homily Against Peril of Idolatrie* that appeared in 1563 addressed the message of the Commandments without mention of two separate commandments. So important was the place of the Commandments in the Church of England that in 1561 Queen Elizabeth ordered churches to paint them on the walls. This policy resulted in what Tessa Watt has called the beginning of ‘a text-based aesthetics.’ The authors of the Homily might have believed that such clarification was unnecessary.
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because official Protestant doctrine accepted and recognized the text as a whole. This Homily stated that

the Jews, to whom this Law was first given (and yet being a morall commandement and not ceremoniall, as Doctours interpret it, bindeth us as well as them) should have the true sense and meaning of Gods Law so peculiarly given unto them.87

This document drew attention to the Jews as the original target of God’s message and underlined their obedience to God’s law. The Homily made clear that contemporary Christians were also obligated by this law. Its reference to the distinction between moral and ceremonial commandments—an aspect of medieval Catholic thought—is noteworthy because most Spanish Catholics failed to mention this.

Additionally, the Homily focused on the legal consequences of the violation of God’s word. “Whosoeve… prepare for himself any image, or to worship it, either to set it in a Chuch, or in any private house, or else to kepe it secretely, if he be a Bishop or a Deacon, let him be deposed: but if he be a private person…lette him be accursed….as one which withstandeth the commaundements of god.”88 This text made clear that worshipping an image constituted only one of a myriad of ways of violating the commandment; making, having, displaying, and setting of images also disobeyed it.

In 1567, Nicholas Sanders, the English Catholic priest who left England to fight for the return of Catholicism, viewed the First Commandment as both permanent and temporally specific at the same time.89 The goal of Sander’s book was twofold: to his Protestant audience, he wanted to show the mistakes of their doctrine; and to his Catholic readers, he sought to confirm the orthodoxy of their beliefs. He noted that while the
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commandment “which containeth the immutable law of nature, concerning the true worship of God…is [in] the first Table,…no general or immutable commandment of God is against the making of [images].”90 By separating the action of making from the action of worshiping images, Sanders presented a more complex interpretation of this commandment than the Spanish Catholics. He distinguished between the unchanging nature of the requirement to worship God in the proper manner and the expired requirement of not making images. Instead of using the concepts moral and ceremonial that Ridley and the Elizabethan Homily recognized, he might have used the terms mutable and immutable to distance English Catholics from a medieval Church understanding of the Commandments.

Sanders rebuked Protestants for arguing that the Commandments forbade all representations of creatures. He explained that they had misread the statement, “Thou shalt not make to thy selfe the similitude of any thing that is in heaven above or in the earth beneth, [as if it]… meant precisely that the resembling of any creature is utterly forbidden.”91 God had never wanted to ban the representations of all creatures because if that had been the case, “all the world were in the state of damnation,” including the Jews, the prophets and the high priest who participated in one way or another in the “making, having, keeping or beholding the similitude of al kind of creatures [such as] animals and herbs.”92 Sanders seemed to warn his readers of the far ranging implications of

90 Nicholas Sanders, A Treatise of Images of Christ and the Saints… (Louanii: Apud Ioannem Foulerrum, 1567), 78v.
91 Ibid.
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misinterpreting God’s order by reminding them that if all representations were forbidden, this also included the non-religious space.\textsuperscript{93}

Throughout his discussion Sanders remained vague about the commandment to which he was referring, the first or the second. Sanders’ intended audience may explain this ambiguity: if he sought to reach a mixed Protestant-Catholic audience, he might have purposely chosen not to emphasize the differences in organization of the commandments to avoid sounding too contentious. Although he used the same language used by the Spanish Catholics, this seemed to be a coincidence.

In the 1570s William Fulke rejected Sanders views on the organization and validity of what Catholics presented as the First Commandment. Fulke was the theologian of Puritan convictions who participated in the various controversies exposing the errors of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{94} Although had been the subject of an attack by Martiiall in the early 1560s, Fulke did not enter the controversy with the Catholic exiles until the next decade. According to him, Sanders’ interpretation “is a confusion of two commandements in one, the former shewing the matter of substance of Gods honour, the other the essentiall forme thereof to be spirituall.”\textsuperscript{95} He suggested that this confusion was not accidental but deliberately orchestrated by Catholic writers. Fulke also rejected the claim that under certain circumstances the commandment could be ignored,

\begin{quote}
I answere that neither Moses, nor any gouernor, had authoritie to make any images in any vse of religion, other then God commanded, no more hath the Church any authoritie to allowe any worshipping of them whiche she hadth none
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{93} Peter Marshall, ed. \textit{The Impact of the English Reformation 1500-1640} (London: St. Martin’s Press, 1997).
\textsuperscript{94} William Fulke was a theologian and college head interested in science, who held radical views and participated in debates with Catholic exile authors. See Appendix.
\textsuperscript{95} Fulke, \textit{Dr. Heskin, Dr. Sanders…} (London: Printed by Henrie Middleton for George Bishop, 1579), 599.
\end{footnotes}
authoritie by God to make, but an expresse commandement forbidding both the making and the worshipping of them, in the first table.\textsuperscript{96}

According to Fulke, the Bible demonstrated that no exceptions existed to the rules established by the Commandments. He denied the categorization given to the Second Commandment by Sanders. With his statement that “this prohibition was not immutale, but temporall to that people, he passeth all bounds of reason and commun vnderstanding as the iudgment of God... as if were lawfull for Christians, who more straightly than Iewes must worship God in spirit and trueth.”\textsuperscript{97} Fulke was among the few Protestants who refer to the medieval categorization of the Commandments to strengthen his opinion.

In 1597, William Perkins, the prolific Puritan controversialist who popularized theological discussions, distinguished between inward and outward worship, and focused his attention on the second type.\textsuperscript{98} Perkins only analyzed the Second Commandment in his study of the prohibition of images, thus implying the Second Commandment included such a prohibition. In his view, those “\textit{Graven images & likenesses mentioned in the second commaundement [were]}... plaine idols.”\textsuperscript{99} For this reason, “[the] vse of Idols in religious maner, which vse stands in the worship thereof, [is] vtterly condemned in the [phrase] : \textit{Thou shalt not bowe downe to them and worship them.”\textsuperscript{100} Perkins explained that those two specific actions –inward and outward worship– violated the Second Commandment. While inward worship meant the “\textit{Inward [honor shown] in affection of reuereence, [the]}... Outward honour standes in all gestures of the bodie... as the putting

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 601.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., 600.
\textsuperscript{98} William Perkins’s reputation was as the most significant theologian of his age. He was a representative of Calvinist scholasticism, and despite his criticism of an ‘idolatrous’ Roman Catholic church, he remained a devoted defender of the essential doctrines and liturgies of the Church of England. See Appendix.
\textsuperscript{99} William Perkins, \textit{A warning against the idolatry of the last times...} (Cambridge: Printed by John Legat, Printer to the Uniuersity of Cambridge, 1601), 19. Author’s emphasis.
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 108. Author’s emphasis.
off the hatte, the lifting vp of hands and eies, bowing of the knees, prostrating of the bodie and such like. 

It is surprising that he did not elaborate on the meaning of inward honor as outward honor was more easily understood and identified with body gestures.

The authors who wrote during the reigns of the early Stuart kings faced the increasing toleration of images that culminated with the rise of Arminianism. The change of attitudes towards images among this influential group of clergymen, supported by the crown, took place in the absence of any new legislation regarding images that overrode Elizabethan policy.

Lancelot Andrewes, a moderate Bishop of Chichester (1605-1609), Bishop of Ely (1609-1618), and Bishop of Winchester (1618), provided a practical reading of what the First and Second Commandment required from Christians. Despite his Calvinist theology, he did not see the need for further ecclesiastical reform. He remained held in esteem for his preaching and scholarship during the reign of James I. His guide to prayer and devotions, possibly written in the first decades of the seventeenth century, was -like the rest of his writings- published posthumously in 1655. He claimed that the First and Second Commandments expressed two complementary messages, and each required specific actions from the people. While there is evidence that he participated in an unpublished 'dialogue' or discussion with Robert Bellarmine over matters of papal authority and Anglican Church policy, it not clear whether they discussed doctrine related to images.

101 Ibid. Author’s emphasis.
103 Lancelot Andrews was scholar and linguist. He established a dialogue with Roberto Bellarmine about papal authority and the policy of the English Church. See Appendix.
In his work, Andrews argued that the First Commandment dictated the manner in which worship should be given to God. The First Commandment called people to recognize the superiority of God’s power and authority over any other being, “by worship[ping] him with all [their] heart, by acknowledging him to be the only God; by honouring, serving, and prasing him above all things.” He noted that fulfilling the First Commandment required a private and quiet experience, such as in the “secret corners of [their] hearts” where the inward worship of God took place. Like Perkins, he acknowledged a difference between inward worship and outward worship, but only the former counted as legitimate. This Commandment also warned against “attributing any honour to other Gods and Idols” because it was a grave disobedience of God’s word. Like previous English Protestant authors, Andrews failed to offer a clear definition of inward worship. If the goal of his writings, as articulated by the individual who wrote the introduction to his publication, was to teach the general public how to pray, it is hard to imagine that he resolved all the doubts of his readers.

The strong group formed by several bishops who had adopted ‘Arminian’ views defended this change as a harmless effort to recover the ceremonialism and tradition of the Church. Despite the absence of legal justification behind these claims in favor of images, Church authorities engaged in a campaign to ensure that images were placed and kept in churches.

Contrary to Protestant views, in 1623 John Heigham, a successful Catholic bookseller who printed and smuggled semi-liturgical books –Tridentine primer, manual
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and breviary— into England, wrote to rebuke the views offered by Mountague in a sermon.\textsuperscript{109} According to Heigham, the First Commandment recognized an exception to its own ruling, and consequently, “[God] warranted the making, the setting up, the behoulding, and the reverencing therof, to be exepted from the breach of the first commandement…as Doctor Sanders most learnedly concludeth.”\textsuperscript{110} Although Heigham directly referred to the views of Nicholas Sanders, the latter had written more than half a century before Heigham, which demonstrates the lasting influence of Sanders among the exile community. Although Heigham was not a clergyman like most of the authors examined here, he demonstrated that his religious convictions surpassed his interest in the prosperity of his publishing enterprise. He must have been aware of the increasing number of images set up in churches under the Arminian ascendancy, which might have given him and other exiles new energy to help sustain the Catholic community in England.

In 1624, Richard Mountague, the clergyman of Arminian views who rose to the bishoprics of Chichester and Norwich through the support of Archbishop Laud, denied the ban on making images.\textsuperscript{111} Mountague responded to Heigham’s rebuttal in a book that exposed his unusual views that contradicted the Protestant official doctrine. Though his stance aligned with the Arminianism of Archbishop Laud, an alliance that resulted in his elevation to high office, Mountague publicly denied an affiliation with the Laudian

\textsuperscript{109} John Heigham was a controversialist and bookseller who advanced the Catholic cause by publishing religious texts for distribution in the continent as well as in England, through the black market. See Appendix. The sermon given by Mountague was not been located, and thus it was not included here.

\textsuperscript{110} John Heigham, \textit{The Gagge of the Reformed Gospell}, (St. Omer: C. Boscard, 1623), 146.

\textsuperscript{111} See Appendix.

Unlike all previous English Protestants previously discussed, Mountague argued that the only action forbidden in the commandments was worshipping images. Despite denying accusations of being a Catholic, Mountague’s position was close to that of his opponent Heigham. However, he made clear that “It is not lawfull for men, of themselves, out of their owne voluntary motion to make [images,]” which was the only Protestant method of controlling the production of images.\footnote{Richard Mountague, A Gagg for the New gospel? No: a New Gagg for an Old Goose (1624), 299.} In addition he clarified “that which Protestants mislike and condemne in Papists, is not the hauing, but adoring and worshipping of Images; the giuing them honour due vnto God; as the ignorant doe.”\footnote{Ibid.} This radical difference in opinion presumably resulted from the increasing tolerance of images by Arminian leaders. Strikingly, however, he was the only author whose works expressed an overtly Arminian position in writing. Using a strategy similar to that of most of Spanish Catholic writers, Mountague agreed with the prohibition against idolatry but disagreed with the ban on making and possessing images. The position taken by Mountague is puzzling: he disregarded the arguments against images produced by a great number of people in the more than half a century since the beginning of the Reformation. Not surprisingly, he faced the challenge of convincing his readers that, despite this view, he was neither a Catholic nor an Arminian.

In 1641, Edmund Gurnay, an Anglican Church pastor of Puritan leanings who viewed Laudian promotion of images with great anxiety, contested the consequences that
the expiration of the Second Commandment provoked.\textsuperscript{115} The title of his work, *Vindication of the Second Commandment*, revealed his preoccupation with what he saw as the constant violation of God’s will. Although he made clear that the violation of the Second Commandment could occur through different forms, he insisted that “none are more likely to make bold with that Commandment then they [who] are addicted unto Images.”\textsuperscript{116} He acknowledged that the validity of this Commandment had expired, which was what Catholics argued; nonetheless, he remarked that “Images do rather lose then gain any liberty by vertue of that Laws expiration.”\textsuperscript{117} Unlike Ridley, Gurnay, in an apparently illogical argument, held that the expiration of this commandment renewed its validity.

According to Gurnay, God’s strong emotional reaction against images provided an additional reason that people should obey the Second Commandment. He explained that “none of the Commandments are grounded upon his Jealousie but onely that [commandment] which is against Images” which was set in His own words “Thou Shalt not make any kind of Images, &c- For I the Lord thy God am a Jealous God.”\textsuperscript{118} Among the types of images that had made God jealous were those of “honorable creatures (as of saints, princes…) and of profitable animals (as Oxen, Sheep…) but also of terrible and hatefull creatures (as Lions, Dragons…)…[which] had been made gods of.”\textsuperscript{119} This explanation stands out because God’s human-like emotions are used as an incentive for people to obey this commandment.

\textsuperscript{115} See Appendix.
\textsuperscript{116} Edmund Gurnay, *Toward the Vindication of the Second Commandment* (Cambridge: Printed by Thomas Buck, one of the printers to the University of Cambridge, 1639), 4.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., 40.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 21.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid., 22.
In addition, Gurnay held that using the communion bread to represent God in the celebration of the mass disobeyed the First Commandment’s statement that “the making gods of other things is as much forbidden as the making gods of Images.” Among the English Protestants examined here, Gurnay was the only one who linked images with communion bread. He was responding to the Catholic claim that seemed to equate presence of Christ in the host with the presence of the person represented in his/her image. While he acknowledged that while images and communion bread were related, at least in theory, the issue of presence was irrelevant in the discussion of images. As a result, Gurnay only used this comparison to introduce his discussion of transubstantiation as a separate subject. While the goal of his work was to respond to specific Arminian claims in favor of images, he used the opportunity to reach larger audiences of clergy and laity. After many years of censorship, it is likely that people interested in his religious views would have wanted to read a book by a Puritan author.

The clergyman Edward Hyde demonstrated his allegiance to Charles I by advocating for the supremacy of the king during the monarch’s trial. In 1659, he argued that Catholics had purposely changed the order and content of the First and Second Commandments to allow violations of God’s will. Throughout his work, Hyde directly accused the Italian Cardinal Bellarmine and the English Catholic Laurence Vaux—who had written many decades before Hyde— for manipulating the true wording of those two commandments to fit their mistaken ideas. Hyde targeted Vaux instead of a more prominent member of the exiled community like Sanders, and Hyde’s decision to rebuke

120 Ibid., 25.
122 See Appendix.
Bellarmine demonstrated the significance that this writings of this Catholic theologian held among Protestants.

Hyde’s denunciation of Catholic views first focused on the interpretation of St. Augustine’s view on images. Contrary to Vasquez, he noted that by “making no second Commandement,” Catholics tried to avoid the discussion of the problem of idolatry. In order to do this, they intended to “make the first and second Commandements into one” which was unacceptable “because God hath made them two.” Hyde denied that St. Augustine had invalidated a Second Commandment that banned images as Catholics argued, and thus Hyde attempted to disprove that “Saint Agustin and all Catholick Divines after [him who ] reckon these two but as one.” In his view, none of the Church fathers agreed “either in making the second no Commandment, or in making no sin through ignorance against it”, which meant that Catholics manipulated words of ancient writers. St. Augustine had not “thought the second [was] comprised in the first”, instead the early Christian had viewed the First and Second Commandments as having the same purpose: “to prohibit an external Idolatry in woshipping the Godhead by any Image or representation.”

In an apparent contradiction, Hyde acknowledged that Augustine changed the organization of the Commandments, but he insisted that the main message had not been altered. This contradiction might have stemmed from an attempt to moderate his opinion on an important matter of Church doctrine, especially one in which Augustine had
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influenced Luther’s ideas so forcefully. It was clear that Augustine “did only make bold with the place and order, but not with the prohibition or substance of that Commandement,…[however]….doubtless were Saint Augustine now alive, he would again parted the second Commandement and divide it from the first, merely out of hatred to this your most abominable idolatry.”

In his quest to prove his point, Hyde pointed out a ‘mistake’ made by one of the Church fathers, which he immediately tried to deemphasize by his assurance of Augustine’s ability to correct himself.

In an example of his awareness of continental Catholic authors, Hyde attempted to strengthen his case by citing references to the writings of Bellarmine, who seemed to agree with him. Bellarmine, who had “endeavoured to elude this very Commandment,” had himself demonstrated that the Bishop of Utica’s testimony ”prove[d] that St. Augustines’ new division of the Decalogue was not yet received in his own church because the Africanes an hundred years after he had made that division, did still reckon but six Commandments in the second Table.” According to Hyde, Bellarmine also cited Procopius Gazaeus, an author of the Greek Church, who in his comment on Exodus asserted that “the second Commandement is that which forbids Idols and Images; for unless we follow this division, we cannot have a right order of the Commandements.”

A more recent authority, Thomas Aquinas, never approved of “the division of the Decalogue generally received in the Church from Saint Augustines daies.” In Hyde’s view, these opinions left no doubt that Augustine’s interpretation had been recognized as a mistake, and thus it lacked force. The paraphrasing of Bellarmine demonstrated that

128 Ibid., 159.
129 Ibid. Hyde is the only author who refers to the Ten Commandments as the Decalogue.
130 Ibid., 42
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English Protestants like Hyde knew Bellarmine’s ideas and writings very well and used them to argue against Catholics.

In addition to rebuking Bellarmine’s assertions, Hyde directly confronted his countryman Laurence Vaux over the views presented in his catechism. Vaux was a Catholic who in the previous century had gone into exile on the continent, from where he published his work in 1567. With sarcasm, Hyde tells the reader “surely I think your Catechist Laurence Vaux much more ingenious who goes to prove by this very Commandment, that it is not only lawful, but also necessary to worship the Images of saints.” 132 In Hyde’s view, Vaux had twisted the meaning of the text by saying that those “who breaketh the first Commandment of God, by irreverence” were the people who “do not give due reverence to God and his Saints.” 133 Thus, Hyde accused Vaux of changing the words of the Commandment: ‘do not make and do not worship images, to express the opposite: “you shall make, you shall worship graven Images.” 134 Although Hyde accused Bellarmine and Vaux of the same violation, Hyde acknowledged that Vaux did it more ‘covertly’ because Vaux was writing “for the use of children and ignorant men, [while Bellarmine] wrote for the greater and most learned Scholars.” 135 This was an important and sharp recognition that the message and style of the discussion varied according to the audience which demonstrates Hyde’s commitment to this debate.

To show that a change in the Commandments had nefarious consequences, he compared the Ten Commandments and the Creed to argue that the preeminence accorded to the content of these two texts meant neither could be modified. The Creed references
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by Hyde came from the Thirty-Nine Articles, also called Articles of Religion, sanctioned by the queen and her council in 1563.\footnote{Guy Fitch Lytle III, “Creed,” in \textit{The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation}.} He rebuked those who viewed the Decalogue as less important than the Creed “for the Ten Commandments of the Decalogue are no less fundamental in regard of our Charity, then the twelve Articles of the Apostles Creed are fundamentals in regard of our Faith.”\footnote{Hyde, \textit{A Christian Vindicatioin}, 149.} Unlike in the Catholic tradition, the Protestant tradition could not modify either the text of Ten Commandments or the content of the Creed. Therefore he claimed that just as the Creed “doth teach us to know God in Christ, as he will be known; so the Decalogue doth teach us to worship God in Christ, as he will be worshipped.”\footnote{Ibid., 152.} If the teachings of the Bible and the Creed were everlasting, their wording and organization were as well.

Hyde emphasized that slight modifications of the Commandments and the Creed generated serious consequences. “All the Decalogue is as necessary to salvation as all the Creed; for as he that dis-believes any one Article is in the state of damnation, so he that disobeyes any one Commandment.”\footnote{Ibid.} Thus, he warned that whoever “being rather willing to expunge or confound the second Commandement, then to obey it, sins not only in fact but also in faith against his God, and doth in effect expunge that Article out of his Creed which immediately concerneth the Deity, [that reads] \textit{I believe in God}.\footnote{Ibid., 156.} Hyde made clear that changing the wording and organization of the First and Second Commandments represented one of the worst sins –the lack of faith.

\footnote{136 Guy Fitch Lytle III, “Creed,” in \textit{The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation}.} \footnote{137 Hyde, \textit{A Christian Vindicatioin}, 149.} \footnote{138 Ibid., 152.} \footnote{139 Ibid.} \footnote{140 Ibid., 156.}
IV. Ideas by English Catholic Exiles and Spanish Converts.

The crossing of boundaries between Catholic and Protestant ideas is reflected in the arguments of both English Catholics and Spanish Protestants. The three English exiles used distinctive approaches to argue that the Commandments did not ban the making and use of images. These approaches included ideas that borrowed Protestant elements. On the other hand, the two Spanish reformers took advantage of their knowledge of a lack of profound understanding of traditional practices among Catholics practice and doctrine.

In addition to the English exile Nicolas Sanders discussed above in the context of his controversy with William Fulke, two more English Catholic writers opposed those who attacked images. Laurence Vaux published his work in Louvain, a center of continental Catholic learning, under his own name; in contrast, the anonymous author who used the pen name of Philopater (lover of the Father) was evidently concerned about the risk of publicizing views that ran contrary to official English policy. Although from the front page of Philopater’s work it appears to have been published in England, this is unlikely because Catholics found it difficult to get their work printed. Like many other Catholic books, this text too was probably published abroad and brought into England. Philopater serves as a reminder that other English Catholic voices were suppressed at this time.

In 1567, Vaux, a Catholic exile who collaborated with the mission that the Pope assigned to Harding and Sanders in Louvain, avoided mentioning images in his
explanation of the First Commandment.\textsuperscript{141} According to his catechism, God’s message in
this commandment established that “Thou shalt have none other Goddes but one: God the
Father, god the Sonne, and God the Holy Ghost, three persons and one God. Thou shalt
worship the Lord God, and only serve him.”\textsuperscript{142} This statement did not discuss the
production of images, a debate in which many English and Spanish authors engaged.
Vaux explained that Catholics obeyed this commandment by believing in God and
worshipping Him, while avoiding “idolatrie and worshipping of false Gods, art magic,
divination, superstitious observations, and al[l] wicked worshipping,” which were
prohibited and condemned.\textsuperscript{143} Unlike most Spanish Catholic authors, Vaux implied that
Christians faced a real danger of sinning against the First Commandment. However, he
did not explain in detail what each idolatry-related action entailed, including the misuse
of images to worship God. However, by recognizing the possibility that Catholics may
participate in these sinful actions, Vaux presented himself as a progressive Catholic who
condemned practices that the medieval Church had tolerated.

In a unique way the anonymous Philopater offered an interpretation of the
Commandments that was neither fully Catholic nor fully Protestant. In 1652, he took the
commandment that addresses the treatment of God’s name (the Second for Catholics and
Third for Protestants), and emphasized the worship and honor owed to God without
mention of images. The result was a Commandment that read, “Thou shalt not take the
name of the Lord thy God in vain, for our Lord will not hold him guiltlesse that taketh

\textsuperscript{141} See Appendix.
\textsuperscript{142} Laurence Vaux, \textit{A Catechism, or Christian Doctrine, Necessary for Children and Ignorant People}
(Antverpiae: Apud Iohannem Foulurer, Anglum, 1574), 26r.
\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., 26v.
his name in vain.”\textsuperscript{144} The meaning of this commandment was clear for Philopater: “[it] bound all men to give a relative religious honor and worship unto his [God’s] name.”\textsuperscript{145} Philopater explained that the ‘name of God’ could be “an artificial thing, sometimes pronounced, sometimes painted, written or ingraven; other sometimes expressed in picture and images.”\textsuperscript{146} Philopater’s distinctive version of the Second Commandment added to the complexity of the discussion on images. The question was whether or not the Catholic Church could accept this unusual and broad interpretation of the text of the Ten Commandments, even from a clearly Catholic supporter.

In contrast to these three English Catholic authors, two Spanish converts to Protestantism blamed the Catholic Church of purposely violating God’s Commandments. In 1594, Cypriano de Valera, the ex-monk moved to England where he held a Calvinist outlook until he moved back to the continent, denounced the wrongful interpretation of the Second Commandment.\textsuperscript{147} Valera was the only Protestant author who openly denounced the doctrine proposed by John of Damascus, an issue never mentioned by either the Spanish Catholics or the English Protestants. He rebuked Damascus “[the] great Defender of Images [for saying] they ought not only to be made, but even to be worshiped and adored” which nevertheless was contrary to the Second Commandment.\textsuperscript{148} It is puzzling that one of the major Christian defenders of images in history did not appear in the works of other early modern authors either to support or refute their claims.

\textsuperscript{144} F.P. Philopater, \textit{The Nurse of Pious Thoughts}, (Douvai, 1652), 119.
\textsuperscript{145} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{147} See Appendix
\textsuperscript{148} Cypriano de Valera, \textit{Tratado para confirmar los pobres...} (Barcelona: Libreria de D. Flores, 1588), 391.
Like Hyde, Valera directly accused Catholics of manipulating the text of the Ten Commandments. Valera’s strategy involved directing attention to what he viewed as the Catholic Church’s wrongful practice of modifying the sacred texts. He told his readers: “Let us but continue constant to what [God] commands,” which had been clearly expressed by God.¹⁴⁹ He blamed the alterations to the text of the commandments on “The Church of Rome [that] has taken away the Second Commandment, and that they may have Ten remaining [by making] two out of the Tenth.”¹⁵⁰ Valera’s rejection of the other version of the commandments, followed by Catholics and Lutherans, served him to demonstrate his commitment to Protestantism. For Valera, this was an unprecedented violation that of the word of God because neither “the Jews nor the Primitive Greek and Latin Fathers did….so; [and instead] they acknowledged the Second Commandment against Images, and [respected it] accordingly.”¹⁵¹ By praising the behavior of Jews Valera might have attempted to win over or at least create doubts for conversos who felt alienated from Catholicism. As a consequence of this action, the Church of Rome “is cursed of God, since it has presume[e]d to alter and add to the most holy, eternal and inviolable Law of the Almighty, which no body ought either to add to or diminish from.”¹⁵² Thus Valera suggested that the Church would eventually destroy what was left of ‘true’ doctrine and concluded, “If then the Church of Rome has so manifestly and so shamelessly taken the Liberty to introduce Innovations, it would try anything.”¹⁵³ The

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.
¹⁵⁰ Ibid.
¹⁵¹ Ibid.
¹⁵² Ibid.
¹⁵³ Ibid., 10.
Pope was as a consistent element in the negative statements of Valera’s writings and in this case, he blamed him directly for ordering that images be made and worshipped.”154

Fernando de Tejeda, another Spanish convert who held Protestant views as a member of clergy of the Church of England, wrote several anti-Catholic treatises under the early Stuart kings in England.155 He also accused Catholics of purposely misinterpreting the words used to refer to a representation in the First and Second Commandments. He observed that Catholics viewed the prohibition to “make an idol, or any likeness” as unrelated to images because they defined “…idol [as] the likeness of a thing that is not; and image [as] the representation of a thing that is.”156 Tejeda rejected the idea that images were not idols because they were representations of real subjects—the Christian God—as opposed to a false subject—the pagan God.

Tejeda noted that several influential Spanish Catholics understood God’s commandment in line with the Protestant outlook.157 According to Tejeda, the fifteenth-century theologian Alonso de Madrigal, known as ‘El Tostado,’ affirmed that in the commandment “not only were idols banned, but also images.”158 It is significant that Tejeda relied on an individual who had been persecuted by the Church for his unorthodox ideas; he might have tried to expose the Catholic Church for targeting those who contradicted its ideas. Tejeda dismissed the differences between the words idol and image and concluded that images could be considered idols because they intended to represent real subjects, and more importantly, that they were treated as such. Tejeda also

154 Ibid., 292.
155 See Appendix.
156 Fernando Tejeda, Carrascon (Barcelona: Libreria de Diego Gomez Flores, 1633), 174.
157 Around 1400, Alfonso de Madrigal was persecuted by the Church for his unorthodox ideas expressed in his book Tratado de los Dioses de la Gentildad.
158 Tejeda, Carrascon, 174.
mentioned Spanish theologian Benito Arias Montano. In the first quarter of the century, Arias Montano had held that in the Commandments, “God prohibited all images to the Jews; those of Himself, [as well as] those of angels, and any other creature.”

Tejeda’s reference to Arias Montano is unique because he was a theologian and Hebrew expert who had been accused of *Judaizar* (practicing Judaism). William S. Matlay argues that Arias Montano “carried alone the Erasmian tradition into the Age of the Counter-Reformation, albeit discreetly, for an interior faith based on scripture.” Erasmus’ influence on Tejeda can not be determined as he never referenced him. Tejeda’s ideas have resonated with Spanish readers sympathetic to unorthodox views.

Tejeda referenced individuals of high repute and authority within the Catholic Church in order to attract attention to internal dissent. Additionally, he pointed out that Jaime Prades “convinced of the force of the truth, [had] confessed” and recognized this same message in the Commandments. This is one of the few times when one of the Spanish authors analyzed in this thesis referred to another. The analysis of Prades presented above shows opposite views to those of Tejeda. Because Tejeda wrote more than three decades after Prades had published his book, Tejeda might have been trying to tarnish the reputation of a respected clergyman. By demonstrating the strength of the anti-Catholic bloc in Spain, Tejeda undermined the Catholic Church in the eyes of English readers and may have reduced the hegemonic presence of the Church for those in Spain whose faith was not strong. Both authors targeted the Spanish reader, which implies that they were confident their books could enter Spain despite the supervision of the authorities.
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Although the Homily of 1563 mentioned the medieval classification of the Ten Commandments, either as moral or ceremonial, only two Protestant authors included this aspect of the discussion in their writings. Ridley was the only English author who, agreeing with Elizabethan policy, confirmed that because the prohibition of images was part of a moral commandment, its validity had not expired. The Puritan Gurnay also explored the expiration of the Second Commandment without mentioning the medieval classification. Other Protestant authors might have avoided this reference to medieval classification to distance themselves from the Catholic Church.

Two authors articulated the violation of the First and Second Commandments through the concepts of inward and outward worship. Andrewes and Perkins tried to explain in plain terms the specific actions that people should avoid to obey the commandments. Thus they referred to both the unobservable process of the mind – thoughts and feelings – and visible actions – body gestures – that people had to recognize and stay away from.

The version of the Commandment by St. Augustine was the main focus of the writings of Edward Hyde. It is significant that no earlier Protestant took issue with them in regards to the Commandments and the views of Augustine. Hyde was the only author who rebuked the ideas of two major Continental Catholic authors several decades after their deaths. The references to early Christian sources used by this author indicate that there was an abundance of materials related to the developments surrounding the version of the Commandments supported by Augustine.

While most English Protestant authors agreed that the First and Second Commandments prohibited the making, having and using images, Richard Mountague
partially disagreed. According to his Arminian outlook, this author held that the Second Commandment warned against misuse of images but never prohibited the making and having of them. It was not the image itself that was the problem, but the use given to them. Mountague’s radical stance indicates that he felt that he could make that claim without any negative consequence.

Several English Catholic exiles offered interesting variations in their analysis of the Commandments. Sanders suggested that the Protestant interpretation of the prohibition of images in the Commandments was an extreme and nonsensical position against all representations. This author followed the tendency of several Spanish Catholics to discuss the Commandments without specifying when they were talking about the First or the Second Commandments. However, he chose not to use the terms moral and ceremonial to refer to the Commandments, which was a feature of the medieval Church. Like Sanders, Vaux held that the message of the First Commandment focused on the proper worship of God. However, he was among the few Catholics who suggested that idolatry was not a practice that existed only in the past. At the same time he implied that despite such danger, it was valid for contemporary Catholics to make and display images. He was outspoken about this possibility in a way that very few Spanish Catholics were. A unique explanation of the Commandments was that of Philopater, who integrated the Commandment about the name of God into the Commandment about images. It is likely that by writing under a pseudonym, this author felt free to make such an unusual claim.

The arguments of the two Spanish converts appear to display the influence of Protestant rhetorical strategy. Like many Protestant authors, Valera was relentless in
criticizing and attacking the Church of Rome, and specifically the pope, for manipulating
the message of the First and Second Commandments. Because Lutherans and Catholics
agreed with the same version of the Ten Commandments, he might have tried to
distinguish himself from both groups. Tejeda might have emulated Protestant authors
when he focused on the Spanish definitions used to interpret the message of the Second
Commandment. He also called attention to the ideas of Spanish individuals who voiced
Protestant-like views.

* * * * *

Unlike the Spanish authors, English Protestants recognized that the disagreements
over the Commandments stemmed from disparate translations of two versions of the text
—one by St. Jerome and one by St. Augustine. Protestants claimed that the version
accepted by Catholics provided an incorrect translation of the Commandments, which
was purposely used to manipulate the message of the Commandments. In contrast, many
Spanish Catholics might have worried that even a brief mention of an alternative version
of the Commandments would expose Catholic doctrine to doubts over its legitimacy.
Because of the status of the Commandments as one of the most important texts of
Christianity, most Spanish authors seemed reluctant to discuss their content in depth. Yet
Nieremberg, Medina, and Prades seemed to accept the possibility that the Commandment
was a warning against idolatry to contemporary Christians. These authors knew that the
distinction between idolatry and legitimate use of images was blurry. Thus they had to
express those views with caution to escape the implication that they equated images with idols.

The different ideas generated by the Spanish Catholics might indicate that these authors felt compelled to explain the meaning of the First Commandment in the context of the doctrine of images. Spanish Catholics encountered difficulty explaining the meaning of this Commandment: it was challenging to argue that images were not forbidden when the text of the commandment said that images were prohibited. In their attempt to clarify this complex issue, these authors must have feared that the less educated lower clergy could be confused by this discussion.

Almost all English Protestants emphasized that the statements of the First and Second Commandments banning images were still valid. The exception was Richard Mountague. Arminians who held formal office in the Anglican Church, including the champion of images Archbishop Laud, generally kept silent about their views on images. They probably feared that any statement of support for images would antagonize the clergy—moderate Protestants and Puritans—as well as the laity, who had come to regard images as equivalent to idolatry. Mountague’s interpretation of the Commandments is therefore particularly interesting. Although his statements offer a unique written record of Arminian views, they are part of an earlier and hardly noticeable shift to more tolerant ideas that supported the return of images by 1630.

The Spanish and English authors who embraced religious identities different from those accepted by the majority of their countrymen also contributed complex viewpoints. Spanish converts Valera and Tejeda focused on the Protestant accusation that Catholics had modified the original order and content of the text of the Ten Commandments.
Valera followed the Protestant strategy of blaming the pope for anything that went wrong in the Catholic Church. It is likely that as an exile in England, Valera struggled to be accepted. His emphasis on the ‘true’ version of the commandments could have been an opportunity to show that he was not just a Protestant but a Calvinist. English Catholics incorporated some aspects of the Protestant outlook into their interpretation of the First Commandment. This situation led Vaux to recognize, or at least suggest, that the Commandment addressed a real possibility of misuse of images among Christians of all times. Through this recognition, Vaux was differentiating himself as well as English Catholicism from a medieval Church that had tolerated those abuses. Haigham might have wondered what the response of lay Catholics in England would be to the return of images under the Arminian regime. Because there were no more English Catholics defending images, his work might have provided fresh help to a new generation of readers. Philopater offered the most innovative explanation of the Commandments as he combined various commandments into one. Even if this author intended to diffuse the disagreements over the meaning of the First and Second Commandments, it is unlikely that the Catholic Church would have approved of his strategy.

The Ten Commandments were a doctrinal text supposedly known universally by all Christians, clergy and laity alike. The Church expected everybody, including illiterate people, to know the Commandments, especially after the changes generated by the Counter-Reformation. In Spain, while arguments directed at theologians and the learned could be more complex, those who targeted the lower clergy—who to an important extent lacked proper education and who were in charge of instructing the laity— or lay people directly had to present their ideas in simple ways. In early modern England, the reading
religious culture was superior to that of the lay population in Spain, which meant broader audiences could pay attention to these debates. Moreover, a special connection of the English laity to the written text of the Ten Commandments had been created by the policy of writing this text on the walls of every church.

A few Protestant authors openly debated their ideas with Catholics. While the policies of Counter-Reformation Spain discouraged clergymen from engaging in writing about controversial subjects, the English Reformation allowed for the exchange of ideas of all Protestant persuasions. Mountague and Fulke dealt with contemporaries in long discussions over the correct interpretation of the First and Second Commandments. Unlike them, Henry Hyde directly confronted long dead Catholic opponents as if they could respond on behalf of the Catholic Church. In the same way, that Spanish convert Tejeda picked on Prades’ writings (written twenty five years earlier) underscores the significance that such work had in Spain.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE ROLE OF IMAGES IN WORSHIP

Until the Reformation, the devotional practices of most Roman Catholics featured worship in the presence of an image. Like other devotional practices, defined as religious acts usually performed in words and gestures, Christian worship ultimately created and fostered the devotee’s relationship with God.¹ Two definitions of worship had been proposed since early Christianity. John of Damascus and Thomas Aquinas advanced their own categorization of worship in an attempt to address these two questions: what is worship and how is worship performed.² In other words, they tried to explain the theory and practice of the forms, direction, and action of Christian worship. While these categorizations of worship focused on resolving whether or not the Virgin Mary and the saints should be worshipped in the same way as God, they also addressed, albeit in an incomplete form, the validity and the practical implications of using images during worship.

This chapter explores the arguments that English and Spanish authors used to explain how a material image partook in the action of worshipping the being represented in it. This analysis will help us understand the essence behind the accusation of idolatry used by Protestants to justify the destruction of images and the Catholic understanding of their own practices.

² For a discussion about Damascus and Aquinas’ ideas see section on Images and Unorthodoxy in the Late Medieval Ages in Chapter 2.
The rejection of Aquinas’s understanding of worship by the fathers of Trent generated distress among most Catholic writers. Although most Spanish Catholics sided with the view of Trent, several of them articulated ambiguous opinions about the meaning of *latria*. That two authors supported Aquinas speaks to the absence of doctrine that guided the clergy and the laity. Aware of the confusion among Catholics, several Protestants denounced Aquinas’ categorization of worship as faulty. The lack of clarity in medieval doctrine was also reflected in the views of English Catholics: one of them expressed his frustration by lashing out at Catholic theologians, and the other by presenting his unique understanding of worship as a combination of ideas from Damascus and Aquinas.

This chapter presents the discussion of worship divided into four sections. The first explores the medieval Catholic precedent, followed by the analysis of the views of early modern Spanish writers. The third section analyses the ideas of English Protestants. A fourth section addresses the arguments of individuals who rejected the official religion of their nation of origin.

I. The Function of Images in Worship: A Medieval Precedent and Early Spanish Catholics

Since early Christianity, theologians sought to define the possible forms or types of worship. According to them, the Christian act of worship, seen as a major component of the relationship between the creator and the created, includes two main elements: prayer and honor. The former can be private or public and the latter can be given through
praise or thanksgiving by way of word, symbol, or action. Attempts to define the various types of worship also considered the place of images in the act of worship itself. The first systematic discussion of images and worship occurred in the Christian Neo-Platonism of the Pseudo Dionysius Areopagite in the fifth century. Given the supposed ‘similarity’ of an image and the person represented in it, images were seen as possessing the ability to visually convey the ‘essence’ of the represented. Consequently, an image could be used to offer worship to the subject represented in it. This idea, repeated throughout the centuries by the supporters of images, can be linked to the conclusions reached by J. L. Koerner. In his study of Lutheran images in the early modern period, Koerner points out that an image “maintaining itself in a state of remove assert[s] by visual means that what it shows is elsewhere and invisible. Yet at the same time as it dialectically cancels its appearance, it also stubbornly stands there.” A parallel can be found with the early modern views on the use of images within worship: the image is worship, but it is not.

In 1563, the Council of Trent updated the medieval conceptualization of worship and images by implicitly rejecting Aquinas’ premise concerning latria. Speaking of images of Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints “honour and reverence is owed to [them]…because they honour showed to them is referred to the original which they represent…. And this has been approved by…the second council of Nicaea, against the
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6 For a discussion of the unresolved issue of different the forms of devotion used by Catholics see Jose Luis Sanchez-Lora, Mujeres, Convento y Formans de la Vida Religiosa (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1988)
This suggested that *latria* should be only given to God the Father and the Son and not to their representations, which was contrary to what Aquinas had argued. Trent did not explain what giving honor and reverence to images entailed, which forced Catholic writers to articulate their own views that often displayed disparate elements. Additionally, Trent did not mention the concepts of *dulia*—worship owed to the saints—and *hyperdulia*—worship given to the Virgin Mary—, which was superior to that of *dulia*. It is significant that Trent did not comment on these two categories of worship. In the case of *hyperdulia* the Catholic Church had been promoting the image of the Virgin as a unique being through the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. It is possible that Trent chose not to emphasize the position of the Virgin because the Reformation created a controversy about her nature and role in Christian doctrine.

In the face of these inconsistencies, several Spanish Catholic authors offered views that seemed to pull together disparate elements from Trent, Damascus, and Aquinas. In 1563, the year when the council of Trent concluded, Martin Perez de Ayala, the theologian who as bishop of Segovia (1560) and archbishop of Valencia (1565) implemented reforms of the clergy, wrote to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between Aquinas and Trent on worship with images. It is significant that Perez de Ayala did not mention Aquinas even though the thirteenth-century theologian was held in high regard by the early modern period. Perez de Ayala had to be very cautious to avoid the impression that he doubted the efficacy of the conclusions of the fathers of Trent.

Perez de Ayala acknowledged that the idea that an image was owed the same adoration as its original was denied by the council of Trent and various theologians.
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Perez de Ayala tried to explain why it was constantly said among theologians that people should “not… adore an image and the subject depicted with the same adoration,” which seemed to contradict the words of Aquinas. In the case of an image of Jesus Christ, he recognized that “adoring an image through the adoration of Latria does not conflict… since this is a part of Latria.” Perez de Ayala implied that the claim that the same adoration of the represented was given to images had not been properly understood. Images were given adoration in name but not in practice as the passage by Pope Gregory explained: “[people] worship the highest God out of habit [even though] they are unable to perceive [Him] with their senses; [people] venerate an image bearing Him and, not stopping in the images, but transferring adoration to the represented.” Like all Catholic authors presented here, Ayala held that God the father and His image were owed the worship of latria eventhough neither Aquinas nor Trent acknowledged this. What had to be understood was that images, as objects in the service of their originals, were not appropriate recipients of adoration.

Therefore, Perez de Ayala claimed that the Church tried to avoid confusion among the people by a simple wording regarding the use of images. A clear explanation was needed because [image worship] is a subject of such a kind that if it is turned from the right path of truth in adorations of [the wrong] sort…. especially in idiots and the simple-minded who hear these things and scarcely know how to distinguish,… [error] can occur.

For this reason, he suggested that when talking to the people, “in no way would I want to say that [images] should be adored with the same adoration with which the
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subjects represented in them are adored."\textsuperscript{13} To avoid misunderstandings emerging from complicated language, he advocated proper instruction that explained each aspect of the proper use of images in worship.

It seems more proper to me if the people were taught frankly without any hindrance whatsoever, so that [the people] may venerate sacred images first on account of that which they represent and then because they are symbols placed for this purpose by those more powerful; that they may be taught to comfort their entire understanding and the effect toward the subjects which they represent, by no means stopping in [the images]; and that they adore and venerate in the presence of those images (which were placed in the temples for this purpose) the subject which they represent."\textsuperscript{14}

In 1594, Gabriel Vasquez, a theologian who focused on the works of Thomas Aquinas and the major doctrinal debates of the Counter-Reformation period, also tried to explain the meaning of Aquinas’ definition of adoration, which seemed to contradict the fathers of Trent.\textsuperscript{15} Like Perez de Ayala, Vasquez did not mention the name of Aquinas during his exposition of the Doctor’s ideas. Vasquez’s opinion is unique because of his remarkable knowledge as an expert in Thomist definition as well as the admiration he felt for Aquinas. According to him, “The Catholic truth is that adoration ought to be bestowed upon images, that is, signs of servitude and submission, through an embrace, by candles, by the offering of perfumes, by the bearing of the head, etc.”\textsuperscript{16} Physical actions like an embrace or touching an image or an object were part of the religious devotion of Catholics. To explain adoration, Vasquez restated Perez de Ayala’s focus on the distinction between the represented and the representation. Drawing a parallel between the Biblical story of the adoration given to Jesus Christ’s shoe and adoration of images,

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 88.
\textsuperscript{15} See Appendix.
he stated “Just as the lifeless object is not sacred by itself, but, on account of its order to
another thing to which sanctity applies first is called sacred, so also can [the lifeless
object] not and must not be adored unless with relation to another, and optimally with the
other [being represented].”17 Unlike Perez de Ayala, Vasquez added ‘sanctity’ as a new
element of the discussion of worship and images, complicating the already difficult
arguments. His status as an eminent theologian and scholar gave him the authority to
assert his ideas among other theologians.

Vasquez explained that the strategies and sources used by Catholics to prove the
validity of such practices were not self-evident. He seemed to be responding to the
Protestant idea that Catholics simply did not have strong evidence to substantiate their
claims. The problem was that although “we can easily confirm this [truth] with the
testimonies of Scripture, of the Councils and of the [church] Fathers,” Catholics referred
to arguments that were more difficult to demonstrate.18 His idea of the existence of an
abundance and clarity of sources that justified the use of images in worship was not
completely accurate. Vasquez would have known that, in general, sources on images
were limited, ambiguous, and conflictive. Catholics opted to “primarily strive to
demonstrate it from various places of Scripture not because it may be expressed in it –it is
from a number of those traditions which were not expressed in Scripture, just as
Damasc[us]…attests– but because it is clearly deduced from Scripture.”19

In 1597, Jaime Prades, the theologian who lamented the profanation of churches
and destruction of images by Protestants, confirmed the terminology used in the
categorization set by Aquinas. He focused on the worship given to God and the Virgin

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
Mary and completely ignored the saints. He distinguished between the type of worship given to God and the type given to an image of the Virgin. In his view, the image of the Virgin Mary deserved the same level of worship given to the Virgin herself. However, Prades made clear that “[we] do not worship the image of our Lady the blessed Virgin Mary with the worship [of latria]…. but [with] a lesser one…. [that] Theologians called Hyperdulia.”

Because of the complexity of this subject, Prades might have avoided an explanation of hyperdulia and dulia to avoid confusing his readers from the lower clergymen with little theological knowledge as well as his limited number of lay readers.

Prades focused his attention on the use of latria in representations of the cross and the crucifix. He observed that crosses and crucifixes deserved the same worship given to Jesus Christ because they were representations of Him and His sacrifice. Following Aquinas’ view, Prades explained that in the presence of images of the cross “we experience [God’s] presence, and we adore our Saviour in [them], and through them [we] acknowledge the health of [our souls].” Because of what the images of a cross represented, he held “[we] have to worship [all crosses] with the same worship that Theologians called Latria, [because] they are images of [Jesus] that represent him.”

This was the rule because by “nature and purpose a sign refers to what is signified, as St. Augustine states in the book of Christian doctrine, [which is so] in all the crosses, without any distinction.” Prades acknowledged the only exception: the very cross “in which our
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20 See Appendix.
21 Jaime Prades, Historia de la adoracion y uso de las santas imagenes. (Valencia, 1596), 81r
22 Ibid., 132.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
Lord died [is] superior to all [the crosses] of the world.”25 The idea that any cross was worshipped as if it was Christ Himself was outrageous to the English Protestant authors.

Martin de Roa, a Jesuit teacher of Latin and theology who saw images as a sign of true Christianity, presented an explanation of the categorization of worship that integrated Damascus’ views with those of Trent.26 In 1624, he implied that proper worship required a clear understanding of the meaning of latria and dulia. He clarified that because God “infinitely surpasses all excellent things,” he deserved a worship of latria, understood as “[a] profound acknowledgement and subjection of the will.”27 The other type of worship, dulia, called for “an honorable and religious service given to those with a combination of divine and human qualities…[like] the sanctity, glory and grace of the Angels and Saints.”28 There was a superior worship owed only to God, and another inferior worship owed to special humans as well as their images. Roa emphasized that he wrote in Castilian because he saw the need to “ensure in all sorts of people the sincerity and purity of the veneration that must be given to sacred images.”29 Complex theological concepts such as latria and dulia were not likely to be understood by all his audiences as he wished. To his audience of clergymen with limited education, this presentation was incomplete because it did not explain those categories in depth. Moreover, for the laity who read this book or heard it read by a mediator, this subject would have been completely out of their reach.

Roa maintained that people understood that they worshipped the individual represented in the image, not the image itself as Protestants claimed. Roa implied that a

25 Ibid.
26 See Appendix.
27 Martin de Roa, Antiguedad, veneracion i fruto de las sagradas imagenes... (Sevilla, 1622), 81r.
28 Ibid., 81v
29 Ibid., A3v
saint and his/her image were owed the worship of *dulia*, but that they were treated as being the same thing. In his view, people easily recognized the differences between the represented and the representation as they focused on the intangible and the invisible represented by the images, but not on the materiality of the images. Thus he proudly announced “Christians clearly understand and know that images do not have virtues and excellences of their own for which they are venerated; [they know that images] only represent the person [represented] in it, whom we adore.” He underscored that as Christians “we give honor to an image...not for the material, nor for the shape it has, [but] for what the senses perceive in the painting, [or] what it represents.” Roa’s stress on the ability of Christians to differentiate between represented and representation might be read as a hidden effort to instruct his audience and boost their confidence.

According to him, people learned how to use images from nature and independently from what the Church taught. This implied that the Church was teaching a skill that people had to acquire naturally from life experience, and thus the Church could not be fully blamed for misuse of images. Thus, he explained, “[nature] shows that the honor or lack of honor given to an Image is directed to [the] person represented in the Image. [Therefore] Religion cannot oppose nature, [even if] Heretics [do].” This is one of the very few instances in which a Spanish Catholic author expressed his frustration and anger towards Protestants. Roa implied that they senselessly opposed a religious idea that was supported by the irrefutable authority of nature, meaning God’s creation.

Nonetheless, Roa’s explanation of the actual progression of the act of worship blurred the difference between image and person represented, a move that might have
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30 Ibid., 96v
31 Ibid., 63v
32 Ibid., 87r
confounded the reader. He observed that the people perceived the image and its original as indistinguishable, therefore

when we see the image of a Saint, we comprehend the person of that Saint, as if he truly and really was in it, even though he is not, given that, as we comprehend the person and his image together….as if they were one same thing, [so] we venerate together the person in the Image, and the Image with the person.”33

Roa’s statement was problematic to the reader because it implied that image and original became the same thing, and thus he deemphasized the distinction he had previously stressed. He recognized the difficulties of discussions on ‘metaphysics’ and other complicated subjects like this for his clerical and lay audience. Despite efforts by the Counter-Reformation, the lower clergy had not reached an advanced level of instruction by the mid seventeenth century, and together with the lay population, they had a developing religious reading culture that did not promote knowledge of theological subjects.

Roa also noted that while the various physical manifestation of worship –kissing, bowing, touching, and crying– offered by Christians might resemble those of pagans, they were different because they were regulated and guided by the Church. He observed that although the “humbl[ing] before them, kissing them, crowning them, and other similar services to them” might resemble the actions performed by non-Christians, Catholics had a proper understanding.34 A series of physical actions like the ones mentioned by Roa were common routine for Catholic expressing their religious devotion. Unlike pagans, he clarified, “we make these services to Images not because we understand that there is a Divinity or virtue in them, as the Idolaters in the past

33 Ibid. 63v.
34 Ibid.
thought."  Roa was confident that these manifestations of worship were given “with the moderation and intention that the Church teaches.” In this way, Roa acknowledged that excessive gestures and demonstrations of affection towards images was a problem even when done with proper intention. Even for the Church, defining moderation in religious devotion posed a challenge: What was the correct formula? Would two kisses and four bows in front of an image be too much, too little, or just right? The degree to which the Church could regulate any individual’s intention presented another problem: how could the Church determine if those actions were offered to the image or to its original?

Unlike Prades, Roa remarked that while the image of Jesus Christ was not owed the same worship as its original, His image should be treated like other religious representations. Aware of the strong Protestant opposition to crosses and crucifixes, he explained,

[we] should honor the Cross in which IESU Christ died, as well as all the copies of it because the Scriptures, the Saint Doctors, and the Miracles teach…[that these] signs of the Cross….must be honored in the same way because they are Images of the [site] where Christ offered [Himself] in Sacrifice.

In this way, by worshipping any cross, one worshipped the death of Christ that saved humanity. He explained that because “Scripture tells us that the Lord, fervently took the Cross as an altar where he wanted to be Sacrificed by the sinners…[the image of] the Cross must be honored as an altar, and as an instrument of the goodness, power and glory of God, and our justice, victory and exaltation.” It is possible that his comparison of the cross to the altar was prompted by the Protestant opposition to the altar.

35 Ibid., 86r.
36 Ibid., 86r.
37 Ibid., 103v
38 Ibid., 103r
Roa sought to justify that three-dimensional crosses were commonly made of precious materials while the ‘true cross’ was made of simple wood. According to him, the tradition that “the Cross [is] ma[d]e in solid materials such as silver, gold, stone, or wood is and has always been honored among Christians.” He seemed to acknowledge the possibility that some people might have wanted to give more honor to crosses of precious stones than to simple crosses of wood. Thus he immediately added, “we make them, kiss them, worship, [to] worship the Lord in it, and not [their] materials.” The implication was that worship given to those crosses had nothing to do with the materials used in their making, no matter how precious they were.

Like Roa, Bernardino de Blancalana, a subject of the King of Spain who wrote to promote the veneration of an Italian image of Christ in the Iberian Peninsula, focused more specifically on the details of the act of worship to emphasize the difference between image and the original. In 1638, he maintained that “the adoration does not stop in the image, but gets to the person represented to whom the veneration is given [consequently]…it is the same thing to give reverence to the Image than to the Lord Himself.” This statement acknowledges that it was impossible to distinguish whether an individual was worshipping the image or the original. In his book on the cult of the famous image of the crucifix of Luca, Blancalana’s main objective was to give a historical account of its origin and miracles, yet he also explained the relationship between images and worship. Blancalana might have been aware of the disagreements

39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
41 Bernardino Blancalana was born in the Italian territories under the control of the Spanish Empire. See Appendix.
42 Bernardino Blancalana, Historia de la Sagrada Imagen de Christo Crucificado (Madrid: Imprenta del Reyno, 1638), 49r, 68r.
among Catholics and Protestants about the use of images, and thus he included a brief section on doctrine in his book to emphasize the orthodoxy of this cult.

In 1649, Francisco Pacheco, a painter who worked for the Spanish Inquisition supervising religious art production, adopted the views of Aquinas and consequently disagreed with Trent on the categorization of worship. Perhaps because Pacheco felt that his profession and job did not fully qualify him to expound on the types of worship, he relied in part on the discussion of Aquinas offered by the Italian Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti, who had written on the subject in the fifteenth century. According to Pacheco, the worship of latria was reserved for “God, father, son, and Holy Spirit, and His divine images, [as well as to] the Holy Sacrament of the altar,” while dulia should be given to the saints and their images. For this reason, he emphasized that “the Saint made by His Majesty and its imitation by the painter are very similar in respect to veneration, respect, and adoration.” The ambiguity of this claim is evident as Pacheco equated the image of God with God Himself and the sacrament. According to Catholic doctrine, reaffirmed by the Council of Trent, during the celebration of the mass, at the moment of consecration of the bread and wine –previously symbols of the body and blood of Christ– were transformed into the actual body and blood of Christ. It is unclear whether Pacheco recognized this statement as praise to his profession, which would be discussed in chapter 7.
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43 Francisco Pacheco was a painter recognized among the best of his time who nonetheless failed to achieve the desirable position of official painter to the Spanish monarch. See Appendix.
44 Francisco Pacheco. Arte de la pintura, su antigüedad y grandezas (Sevilla: Simon Faxardo impressor de libros a la Cerrajeria, 1649), 153.
The similarity to Aquinas suggests that Pacheco might not have known the text of Trent. As an employee of the Inquisition, Pacheco was careful to rely on the knowledge of a clergyman because he knew the Inquisition could inspect his work. It is puzzling that he was allowed to make a claim that went against the doctrine preached by Trent. There are two possible ways to explain this. It is probable that the books of certain authors of high repute like Paleotti were not examined as closely by Church authorities. More likely, theologians might have enjoyed a degree of freedom to express views that differed from the official consensus reached by the Church.

Pacheco touched on this complicated subject in his book that addressed two different audiences, gente docta (learned people) and the common people. In this case, the learned people possibly included other painters and artists, who did not know much about the different types of worship. Pacheco must have believed that dulia and latria were unknown concepts for his lay audience. However, he might have been imitating authors like Roa and Prades, who included these concepts, in order to give authority to his own text.

Pacheco knew the importance of underscoring the reason behind the worship of image. He argued that Christians had to “venerate images [to]...honor the memory of the saints, and through that exterior sign, reverence is given to the glory of those who were on earthly sites for the Holy Spirit.” He acknowledged that more qualified authors could expand on the topic and provide an accurate theological explanation of the matter demanded by educated audiences. Thus Pacheco directed those readers to other books, such as those produced by writers like Johannes Molanus, the Dutch theologian, the
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46 Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597) was an Italian cardinal and archbishop of Bologna who played an influential role in the Council of Trent.
47 Pacheco, Arte de la pintura, 155.
Bishop of Bologna, Cardinal Paleotti, and most importantly, his contemporary, the Spaniard Martin de Roa.

Like Roa and Pacheco, Cristoval Delgadillo, the teacher and theologian who wrote to clarify the doctrinal justification of the use of images, recognized the doubts that Aquinas’s conception of worship provoked. He suggested that Aquinas’ proposition on latria had been subject to a careful scrutiny by theologians of the Catholic Church. According to him, nobody would deny that “many [Church] Fathers and councils…distinguish[ed] worship of the exemplar from the worship of the image, and said that worship of the image of God or that of Christ God is not Latria, but a certain other distinct worship.” Curiously he made clear that he did not intend to judge or pronounce a verdict as to which interpretation was correct.

Following Roa’s strategy, Delgadillo detailed the progression of the act of worship to demonstrate the orthodoxy of the practice. According to Delgadillo,

[when] the image is seen… the thought or the remembrance of the exemplar is aroused. [O]nce the thought of the image is left behind and while the thought of the person represented remains strong, the will may elicit the effect of submission around the person represented.

He stressed that the merit of the images emerged from their ability to connect sight with memory, and thus “an image should be prayed to… because the image is the replica of the person represented.” An example of this occurred when a person “prays to the image of Christ the Lord by praying to Him in the image, as if he were present…

48 See Appendix.
49 Cristoval Delgadillo, Duo tractatvs alter de incarnatione; de adoratione alter, in qvibus legitima svtibilis (Compluti [Madrid]: Ex-Officina Maria Fernandez Typogaphae Vuniversitatis,1653), 549.
50 Ibid., 548.
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sing[ing] praises belonging to Christ God.”52 It is noteworthy that neither Delgadillo nor any other Spanish Catholic author directly stated that images served as an essential component of worship. They never argued that worship could not be done without images.

In 1658, Cristoal Vega, a Jesuit teacher of theology and preacher who wrote a spiritual guide for monks on the veneration and worship given to the Virgin Mary, suggested that images gave people the opportunity to have a ‘physical intimacy’ with the divine.53 Giving practical advice on the worship owed to the images of the Virgin, he suggested “we should not content [ourselves] to honor [her only] on holydays, but we should venerate her images, performing deep veneration in front of them.”54 Given that veneration should be constant, he advised his reader not to limit himself to setting up an image inside his cell, and recommended that he too “carry it with him, or hanging from his neck (being close to the heart) or at least in a medal of the Rosary.”55 For Vega, images deserved to be treated as live objects; thus he argued that his readers could not have anything –such as books– that could offend her ‘pure eyes’, and suggested that every morning they should turn “to the image… and with extreme decency, greet her, just as good children do to their mothers.”56 The language used by Vega confounded the material image with the Virgin herself. It is possible that for the laity, Vega’s recommendation was an excessive form of religious devotion. He suggested that “once in front of the image, one should adore her with deep reverence, giving her immortal

52 Ibid.
53 Cristoal Vega was a member of the Jesuit order whose major contribution was his missionary travel. See Appendix.
54 Cristoal Vega, Devocion a Maria: Pasaporte y salvo conducto que da paso a una buena muerte (Valencia, 1655).
55 Ibid., 425.
56 Ibid., 426.
gratitude …then throw the soul, life, wishes, and worries in front of the heart of Mary.”

While some of these devotional exercises comprised an element of the conventional ascetic discipline, they may have differed from that which a priest recommended to a lay person. Vega’s direct explanation of the actions to be performed with an image of the Virgin Mary differed from the complicated theological explanations of previous writers. Whether or not his audience of monks was aware of those theological arguments related to latria, dulia, and hyperdulia is not clear.

When the fathers of Trent wrote about the proper use of images during worship, they rejected the main premise proposed by Aquinas, in spite of his status as the most important medieval Church doctor. This might explain why Aquinas was never mentioned throughout the decree on images. Aquinas had argued in his *Summa Theologiae* that the same worship owed to the represented could be given to the representation, and therefore, latria (the highest form of worship owed to God) could also be given to images of God. Although Aquinas qualified his statement by adding the condition that such worship must be given only in function of the original. Yet, for the fathers of Trent and many of the Spanish authors, Aquinas’ position seemed ambiguous. Thus, while Trent implicitly acknowledged the existence of different levels of worship, it categorically denied that latria could be given to an image or representation of God. The failure of the decree to acknowledge the contradiction generated vis-à-vis Aquinas’ interpretations resulted in an incomplete and vague discussion of the problem.

In agreement with Trent, most Spanish authors denied that images could not receive the same worship given to their originals and stressed the distinction between represented and representation. Although these authors seemed aware of the confusion
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created by the two competing views, they knew that an open acknowledgement of this
disagreement could have attracted the attention of the Inquisition. Perez de Ayala is
unique in that he tried to explain to his audience the reactions of contemporary authors to
Aquinas’ concept of worship. In a conciliatory tone, he implied that Aquinas’ views
were not wrong, but that he had been misunderstood. On the other hand, Delgadillo was
more direct in expressing his concern for the confusion created by the lack of clarity in
Aquinas’ ideas. Although, he did not say that Aquinas was mistaken, he suggested that
his ideas went largely unexplained. Because he was writing in Latin for other
theologians, Delgadillo may have felt the freedom to be more critical of such an
important church figure. These theologians did not engage in debates over this crucial
doctrinal disagreement.

Contrary to the position of Trent, two Spanish authors held that the worship given
to the original could be given to the image. It is puzzling that a theologian like Prades,
whose arguments usually aligned with those of Trent, remarked that any representation of
the cross and crucifix was owed the same adoration given to God, as Aquinas claimed.
The lay author Pacheco also supported Aquinas despite his lack of official theological
instruction. Pacheco can be seen as an example of a lay person who even after reading
the various Church authorities that he cited in his book was unable to grasp the
complexities of the discussion of worship. The views of Prades and Pacheco might be
explained as the result of the lessening of control of the Inquisition over intellectual
freedom in the seventeenth century.

It is unlikely that any of the Spanish Catholics writers expected this complex
discussion to reach a lay audience. While their main objective was to clarify proper
practice, the difficulties of this theoretical discussion of images did not seem to contribute to a better understanding of it. Although none of these authors stated it directly, it was suggested that priests and preachers especially avoid complex discussions on the types of worship with the laity.

The discussion of worship made clear that Catholics encouraged the demonstration of emotions and gestures as part of proper religious devotion. They suggested that images promote feelings that prepare the individual to experience the benefits of worshipping the divine. Despite the apparent freedom to perform these spontaneous acts, there is concern for excesses. One author acknowledged the difficulty in determining the line that separates proper and improper signs of devotion.
II. English Protestant Views.

Because a few English Protestant and Catholic authors engaged directly in a controversy concerning the role of images in worship, this section presents a unique organization. Instead of discussing first English Protestant authors followed by English Catholics, here I gather three pairs of authors together in an immediate dialogue. For the authors whose works were not the result of direct controversies, I keep the original organization used in this study.  

Already in the reign of Edward, the idea that images were wrongfully used for worship appeared in official documents. The Royal Articles of 1547 note that using images for purposes other than remembering those represented in them equated to idolatry. In the same year the Royal Injunctions warned that the clergy were not [to] set forth or extol any images…nor allure the people by any enticements to the pilgrimage of any saint or image…[and that] kissing and licking of the same…have not only no promise of reward in Scripture….but contrariwise great threats, and maledictions of God, for that they be things tending to idolatry.  

This statement implies that the affectionate treatment given to these material images by the people proved that they were viewed as having a connection with God. In addition to the problem of idolatry, those actions did not constitute proper religious devotion.

In 1548, John Hooper, the early reformer who defended his radical views on doctrine and ceremonial aspects of the church until his death as a martyr during the reign

58 See organization of analysis in Chapter 1.
60 Ibid. See Royal Injunctions of Edward 115.
of Mary, argued that Catholics worshipped images outwardly and inwardly.\(^{61}\) In the articles of his visitation for the dioceses of Gloucester and Worcester of 1551, he wrote that “the veneration, invocation, and worshipping of saints or images, is contrary and injurious to the honor of Christ.”\(^{62}\) He observed that honor given to an image “[through] outward service [like] “bowing, kneeling, sacrifices, oblations, lightening of tapers, burning incense, the erection of altars and temples, and pilgrimages to them” was motivated by the “internall and inward ignoraunce of God and his word.”\(^{63}\) Internal actions, even though they were not visible and less obvious, were equally dangerous because they demanded mental performance akin to “the deuotion of the minde, in confidence, hope, inuocation, vowes and such like.”\(^{64}\) He suggested that by directing exterior and interior actions to images, Catholics proved their misconception about the relationship God wanted to have with His people. God wanted people to know Him through His word, not through engagement in these ‘senseless’ acts.

In the Homily of 1563 the government of Elizabeth, for the first time, made reference to the categories \textit{latria} and \textit{dulia} proposed by the Catholic Church. The Homily sought to demonstrate that

\begin{quote}
their lewde distinction of \textit{Latria} & \textit{Dulia}...the Saints of God can not abide... as much as any outward worshipping bee done or exhibited to them. Wherefore those which give the honor due to the creator, to any creature, doe service acceptable [not] to Saintes, who bee the friends of God, but unto Satan.\(^{65}\)
\end{quote}

\(^{61}\) Hooper was influenced during his exile in Switzerland where he established contact with major reformers. Upon his return to England, he became a bishop who took the destruction of images as a priority. See Appendix.
\(^{62}\) See Injunctions in Frere, \textit{Visitations, Articles and Injunctions}, 269.
\(^{63}\) See John Hooper, \textit{A Declaration of the Ten Commandments} (Zurich: Printed by Augustin Fries, 1548),.. 74.
\(^{64}\) Ibid.
\(^{65}\) Mary Ellen Rickey and Thomas B. Stroup, \textit{Certaine Sermons or Homilies} (Gainesville, FL: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968), 50.
According to Protestant doctrine, saints did not require or deserve any form of worship or reverence, and more importantly, God did not share the honor He deserved with the saints and by extension with their images. It is noteworthy that the category hyperdulia, the higher type of dulia dedicated to the Virgin, was not even mentioned in this Homily. This document also emphasized the loyalty of the saints to God while directing the blame at those who worshipped them. This same message had been presented in the Royal Injunctions of 1559, as the text explained that “to the intent that all superstition and hypocrisy crept into men’s hearts may vanish, they shall not set forth or extol the dignity of any images…[instead] they shall take away,…destroy all shrines…pictures, paintings and all monuments of…idolatry.”

Nonetheless, the Homily of 1563 also presented a more conciliatory argument, distinguishing images that were dangerous from those that were not. In this respect, the Church of England would admit and graunt…that Images used for no religion, or superstition rather, we meane Images of none worshipped, nor in danger to bee worshipped of any, may be suffered. But Images placed publicly in Temples, cannot possibly bee without danger of worshipping and idolatrie.

The Homily emphasized that Catholic image-worship supplied the major reason to oppose them. This statement implies that a religious image that was privately held by an individual did not face the same danger as images in churches. This suggests that there was something about the communal experience of viewing an image inside a religious building that yielded wrongful worship.
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In 1567, Nicholas Sanders, the English Catholic theologian who wrote to defend the doctrines and authority of the Catholic Church, blamed the widely-used term ‘adoration’ for misunderstandings about the meaning of worship among Catholics.\(^6^8\) In Sanders’ view, the use of the word adoration to refer to the worship given to God and the saints was inappropriate because it implied that the same adoration was given to both. The problem arose because “Adoration is a doubtful word, and it may signifie either the proper honour of God or also the honour of creatures.”\(^6^9\) When people used ‘adoration,’ they frequently meant something else because “when we speak of adoring or honouring Images…such honour…is due to God alone.”\(^7^0\) He acknowledged that Protestants were outraged at the use of the word ‘adoration’ because in their view, as well as in his, the Bible contained the Latin injunction, Non adorabis (Do not adore), which clearly prohibited the giving of adoration to anybody or anything other than God.\(^7^1\) However, Sanders was confident that the use of the terms latria and dulia eliminated this linguistic problem.

Sanders demonstrated his contempt for Aquinas by assigning St. Augustine the authorship of the categorization of worship. According to Sanders, even if Aquinas had given the word latria an official meaning, St. Augustine first used the term. Augustine had expounded on two types of worship: “[the] service which is appointed to the worshipping of God is…alwaies called Latria,…[while the] service which is due to men…[as] servants do under their masters is called in Greeke by the name….doulia.”\(^7^2\)
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\(^6^8\) See Appendix.  
\(^6^9\) Nicholas Sanders, *Treatise of the images of Christ and his saints*… (Lovaine: Apud Ioannem Foulerum, 1567), 48v  
\(^7^0\) Ibid., 9r  
\(^7^1\) Ibid., 11v  
\(^7^2\) Ibid., 51v
Paradoxically while Sanders emphasized the importance of the terms *latria* and *dulia* in clarifying the meaning of worship, he dismissed language as secondary. Thus he claimed that even though “the words which betoken honour be in maner confounded in all toungs…the h[e]art whence the honor cometh, knoweth the difference of every thing.”\(^{73}\) Just like Mountague, Sanders asserted that the intention of an action mattered more than the words used to describe that action.

Even if differentiating between terms solved the theoretical problem of ambiguous language, there remained little clarity as to the application of *latria* and *dulia* to images. Sanders stated that while it was clear that “among so manie degrees of honour, we geve one degree to Holie Images,” it was not apparent “whether it be some inferior degree of worship.”\(^{74}\) Like Delgadillo and Roa, he was convinced “gods word only forbiddeth us to geve unto Images the honour of *latria* which is due to God alone,” but he was not sure on the specific honor that the various images deserved.\(^{75}\) Therefore he argued, “we defend it [to be] the most probable, that the same degree of honour is not due to the Image of Christ, of our Ladie, or of other Saints, which is due to Christ, our Ladie, and to other Saints themselves.”\(^{76}\) It is significant that Sanders wrote in the plural, as if to demonstrate that others agreed with his argument. Though he intended to clarify the relation between *dulia* and images, his use of the word ‘probable’ showed that he did not fully understand it. This specific kind of discussion seemed too complex for both lay Catholics and Protestants who wanted to know whether or not their practice conformed to the theory.

\(^{73}\) Ibid., 11v
\(^{74}\) Ibid., 8r, 58r.
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Sanders pointed out that images were essential to the visual apprehension of intangible subjects. He explained that “the knowledge of the Image, and of the thing whose image it is, make both but one knowledge.”

For [the worshiper] understand not one after the other, but both together.” The detail of what occurred between the worshiper and the image was as follows: “the mind is provoked to pass immediatlie from the Image to the truth, which it standeth to signifie…so spedilie… that one thought, one moving, one act, and one intention serveth at once both the Image, and the truth thereof.”

Sanders emphasized that moving past the material object into the realm of the original was the goal of worship. For instance, “we see the Image of Christ crucified, we straight lay aside the brasse, iron, or wood, whereupon that Image was drawen or made, and we apprehend Christ himself, to whose person that Image doth leade us.”

Viewing the image of Christ as a means to grasping the real Christ crucified proved unacceptable for Protestants because in their view, people did not need visual help as Christ was constantly in people’s hearts and minds. These statements demonstrate Sanders’ willingness to address complex issues of religious practice to clergymen as well as Protestant and Catholic laity in England. The problem for Protestants was that even if the theory behind the use of images in worship made sense, this did not mean that people understood it and used it to guide their practice.

Like the Spanish author Delgadillo, Sanders acknowledged that among Catholics there was disagreement about the nature of image worship. In his view “there hath bene thought to be some controversie between Catholiques, because [some] have thought that
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the honor due to the thing it self,” was given independently of what it represented.”

This acknowledgement of the lack of consensus among Catholics might be interpreted as a sign of his commitment to an open discussion of the problems of the Catholic Church, a dimension largely absent in the works of most Spanish writers subject to scrutiny of the Inquisition. Only Perez de Ayala had also acknowledged the lack of clarity about the proper place of images in worship.

William Fulke was a theologian of Puritan views who as a college head rejected the academic dress at Cambridge as a remnant of popery. In a book published in the 1570s, he criticized two major aspects of Sanders’ understanding of images in worship. First, he rebuked Sanders’ solution to the problem of idolatry, for it would have permitted all kinds of pagan practices. According to him, “He giveth a rule how to auoide idolatries Give God thy heart and after be secure that thy honour which is giuen in any respect be for Gods sake.” Fulke denounced the seriousness of Sanders’ proposal and warned of the big danger of trusting people’s hearts. “By this reasons, we may worship not onely all idols, but we may make idols of all Gods creatures, and worship them for God sake, as the egyptians did [with] Oxen, crocodiles, cattles.” Fulke assumed that Christians were so attracted to idolatry that, if allowed, they would immediately turn to pagan practice.

The other major concern for Fulke was the meaning of the concepts included in the categorization of worship used by Catholics.

First of the signification of Latria, as though god had written his Lawe in Greeke, and not in Hebreu: and yet Latria, according to the Graecians, hath no such restraint to signifie the servie of God only, but euerie service of men also, and is
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alone that Doulia, which you will haue to be giuen to images, is a more slavish and servile worship then that whiche you would haue vs to giue God.85

While Fulke disqualified the term *latria* as a word emanated from God, he held that Catholics were mistaken about the real meaning of *latria* and *dulia*. The actions emanating from such misunderstanding resulted in a serious disrespect to God.

Denying Protestant criticism, the Catholic exile Thomas Harding defended the Catholic interpretation of worship with images. Harding was an influential member of the English College in Douai who had collaborated with William Allen.86 In 1565, he argued that “Of al the Fathers none hathe a plainer testimonie, bothe for the use, and also for the woorshippinge of Images then S. Basile. ‘I doo both honour the stories of their Images and openly Ad[o]re them.’”87 The use of the verb ‘adore’ instead of ‘worship’ was problematic for Protestants because it implied that all images deserved the highest worship given to God. Aware of the confusion and doubts generated by the various terms that encompassed the categorization, he explained in detail

howe Images maye be woorshiped, and honoured without any offence. That Godly worship…is called Latria, is deferred onely to the Blessed Trinitie. As for the Holy Images, to them we doo not attribute that worship at al, but an inferiour reuerence or Adoration…which is nothinge elles, but a recogni[tion] of some vertue or excellencie protested by outwarde signe, as reuerent kisinge, bowinge downe, kneeling and such the like honour.88

To reply to the Protestant accusation of idolatry, Harding emphasized that images functioned as symbols that aided humans to attain knowledge of God. Thus he explained,
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“if men praye kneelinge before any image or triumphant signe of the Holy Crosse, they worship not the Woodde or Stoane Figured, but they honour the highest God. And whom they can not beholde with senses, they reuerence and woorship his Image representing him.” 89 What demonstrated the orthodox use of images was that the action performed to the image did not “rest or stay in the Image, but transferred the adoration and worship to him that is represented.” 90 Despite his stated intention to clarify terminology to erase confusion, Harding offered a confusing explanation. In essence, while he often treated the words honor, reverence, adoration, and worship as having different meanings, other times he used them as synonyms.

In 1565, John Jewel, the theologian of radical ideas who achieved great influence as some of his books became essential in the instruction of the clergy and useful for the laity, held that any involvement of images during worship cancelled the worship given to God. 91 Jewel referred to one of the most familiar defenders of images to substantiate his claim against them. In his view, “Neither doth Gregory calle [images]Goddes to be honoure, but onely bookes to be read” but to avoid the appearance that he was supporting Gregory’s claim, he immediately qualified his assertion by saying images were “neither bookes of profounde knowledge to instructe.” 92

Jewel viewed Harding’s explanation of the worship of images as an illogical presentation of ideas. He analyzed every sentence written by Harding to expose his contradiction. Jewel held that Harding’s idea that “the Adoration, that is made in this sorte, is not Principally directed to the Image [meant that] the corruptible creature of
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Woode or Stoane may be worshipped, although not Principally, or chiefly, as God him selfe, whiche is thereby represented."93 According to Jewel, Harding’s logic could be read as if “he taketh an indifferent way bitweene bothe: as if he would saie, an Image may be Woorshipped: and yet it may not be woорshipped."94 What worried Jewel the most was that “the very shape and proportion of a man set aloft, after it once beginneth to be Adoured, and honoured of the multitude, it breedeth in euery ma[n] that mos vile affection[n] of erroure, tha although he finde there no natural mouinge or token of life, yet he thinketh some God, or godly thinge is within it."95

Jewel sought to expose the contradiction of the Catholic doctrine, which he believed was based on the ideas of one of their main theologians. According to Jewel, Aquinas’ categorization was proof of abuse and wrongful worship,

Thomas Aquin[as], after longe debatinge of the mater, thus at laste ruleth ouer the case: The Image, and the thinge thereby represented, must be worshipped bothe with one kinde of Adoration: And, for example he saith, The Crosse, or Image of Christe must be honoured with Latria (that is with godly honour) because Christ himself is so honoured: And the Image of our Lady must be honoured with Doulia, because the honour, is Dwe vnто our Lady.96

Like other Protestant authors, Jewel seemed to ignore that the Council of Trent had implicitly modified Aquina’s categorization of worship to stress that an image did not receive the same worship given to its original. This situation is not surprising given that various Spanish Catholic authors presented ambiguous views on this categorization, which exposed their confusion. Jewel referenced a well-known medieval theologian to support his criticism of Aquinas. He explained that “this determination of Thomas is reproued by Holcot: And his reason is this: Latria, or Godly honour, is dewe onely vnто
God: but an image of God is not God."97 Holcot’s claim, Jewel concluded, was furthered sustained by various schooled doctors.98

In the last two decades of the sixteenth century, Richard Hooker, the clergyman and theologian of great influence in the Anglican Church, wrote an impressive work of ten volumes where he articulated its doctrine, authority and organization, in contrast with that of the Catholic Church.99 Even though he hardly discussed or mentioned images directly—he used general terms like ceremonial and traditions to refer to material and visual elements of the medieval Church—he rebuked Thomas Aquinas for spreading his mistaken classification of worship. The idea that “the same Adoration to the Sign of the Cross, and neither less nor other… is due unto Christ himself” was the source of confusion among Christians.100 Curiously, Hooker used the same terminology of Catholics by using the phrase ‘sign of the cross’ to refer to images of the cross.101 Hooker held Aquinas responsible for

> ingenuously grant[ing], that because unto reasonable Creatures, a kinde of reverence is due for the excellency which is in them, and whereby they resemble God; therefore… reasonable Creatures, Angels, or Men, should receive at our hands, holy and divine honor, as the Sign of the Cross doth.102

He concluded that the Catholic Church deceived people with its confusing language. The Catholic articulation of the use of images within worship presented a paradox—the idea was affirmed and denied at the same time—that could not be resolved.
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Therefore it was illogical to say that “we honor not [images] alone, but we honor God with them.” To explain this contradiction, Catholic authors “varnish[ed] and qualify[ed] their sentence, pretending…that the honor which they jo[in]tly do to both” was given exclusively in “respect principally [of] his Person, and the Cross but only for his Persons sake.”

Hooker held that the confidence that Catholic theologians put in the discerning capacity of the people was unfounded. Theologians argued that nobody would worship a cross for its own merits because it was seen as “a dead Image, which every man knoweth to be void of excellency in itself.” However, Hooker contended that practice demonstrated the opposite: “we have by over-true experience, been taught how often, especially in these cases, the light even of common understanding faileth; surely, their usual adoration of the Cross is not hereby freed.” In his view, no amount of instruction could prevent the error of men, or cause them always to respect God in their adorations [because] in actions of this kinde, we are more to respect, what the greatest part of men is commonly prone to conceive, then what some few mens wits may devise in construction of their own particular meanings.

He implied that the perception of the majority of the people who worshipped the cross overrode the ideas of a few theologians. Thus Hooker considered that despite the variety of complex arguments used by Catholic theologians, “the people not accustomed to trouble their wits with so nice and subtle differences in the exercise of Religion, are apparently no less ensnared by adoring the Cross, than the Jews by burning Incense to the...
Brazen Serpent.” Hooker clearly emphasized the distance between the theological arguments and how the people perceived worship of the cross in practice. This author had a preoccupation with the image of the cross because he was familiar with the crises that occurred when the queen defended her ‘right’ to keep a crucifix in the royal chapel.

William Perkins, the Puritan author who sought the need to establish the differences between the Anglican and the Catholic Churches, saw the concepts *latria* and *dulia* as part of the Catholics’ strategy to purposely manipulate language to hide their misuse of images. In 1601, he argued that all worship, no matter what the names or forms, should be given exclusively to God. In Perkins’ view, Damascus’ idea that “[we] giue worship to God alone, and that they honour Angels, Saints, and Images with service,” was a play on words. Perkins rejected the different terms Catholic doctrine used because even if “Inuocation and the rest…be called Worship or Servuice, they are still proper to God: who will not be mocked with words.” It is significant that Perkins blamed John of Damascus’ classification of worship for attempting to hide the misuse of images by confounding various verbs, without making any reference to Aquinas. Perkins’ statements might have resonated with the experience of the laity, a large segment of his audience, who might have otherwise been confused by words such as honor, service, worship and adoration.

Besides his critique of language, Perkins argued that the worship of images corrupted the real worship that was owed to God at different levels. He held that proper worship to God differed from the mistaken worship given to images because whereas
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God deserved a worship that was “heavenly, divine, and spirituall,” the worship of images was “foolish, carnall, [and] vain.” This implies that worship of God through His image, as well as through images of saints, corrupted the true worship that He deserved.

The Catholic suggestion that God was present in images that claimed to represent Him caused a great deal of concern to Perkins. Although by 1601, most images had been removed and destroyed, he might have thought that the idea of Godly presence in material images still reminded in people’s minds. Thus he remarked, “God hath [never]…bound himselfe by any word to be present at Images, and to heare vs, when we call vpon him, at them, or before them.” Although neither Perkins, nor any other English Protestant discussed in depth the subject of presence, this seems to have been one of the crucial aspects of the accusation of idolatry against Catholics. The hundreds of miracles assigned to images, informally or formally, by the Spanish Church were based on the idea that God’s presence and power became tangible if at least for a moment.

The Laudian program, in full expansion during the reign of Charles, upheld the conviction that seventeenth-century Protestants were safe from the idolatry of Catholics. According to John Phillips, “Laud was convinced that popery had been vanquished in England because its people were at last sufficiently instructed in the dangers of worshipping images; consequently, paintings and sculpture could be lawfully used in churches without fear of idolatry.” At this time, a controversy between a Catholic and an Arminian author ensued. In 1623, John Heigham, a Catholic bookseller exile,
published the largest amount of works by English and continental authors. Writing to challenge the views of Richard Mountague, Heigham claimed that the same reasoning behind the lawfulness of worshipping and honoring the name of Christ applied to images representing Christ because they both had the same representative role. He explained that “If Images ought not to be worshipped, we may not (whatsoever the Apostle saith) bowe our knee at the name of Iesus: seeing [that] wordes (as Aristotle saith, and as the truth is) are signes representative of the thinges they signifie and are the pictures of the eare, as the other are of the eyes.” To answer accusations that physical gestures made to images proved that worship was given to the material things, he commented,

The difference of honor, proceedeth principally from the minde, and not from the exterior bowing or demeanor of the bodie. For if I fall downe before an Image and kisse the same, being all the while of the minde it is not God nor reasonable creature, but only a remembrance of God, towards whom I deserve to shew myne affection, God knoweth how far off myne honor is, from that honor which is due to him alone.

For this author the action performed by the body was of secondary importance as a sign of religious devotion because what mattered was that the person understood the meaning of the action performed. In an argument seldom developed by either English or Catholic authors, Heigham used a common interpretation of the Eucharist among Protestants to defend the use of images in worship. He explained that Reformers themselves confes to honor the Sacrament of Christs supper, which they teach to be an Image or representation of Christs body and blood. And seeing they beleue, no other substance to be in the Sacrament, besides bread and wine, nor will not give the honor of Latria thereunto, hence it doth follow invicibly, that they doe serve or honor some Image.
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Following this logic, he concludes “Now, as they would not for all this, have us to judge or call them Idolaters…For as they do not stay this honor in the bread and wine, but from thence refer to it to Christ himself: even so do we transfer all our honor from all Images unto the first forme or pattern.”119 In an skillful argument, Heigham focused on the representational role of the Eucharist, and the validity of worshipping this symbol.

In 1624, Richard Mountague, the Arminian bishop who wrote against Catholics and Puritans, engaged in written controversies over tithes, saints, and other doctrinal issues.120 He opposed Puritans like Perkins by asserting a distinction between improper adoration of images and proper honoring of them. This position also found a good reception among those holding to Catholic doctrine. Comparing the biblical passage in which the shoes of Jesus Christ were given reverence to the honor given to images, he acknowledged that “upon some occasion, some insensible things may be honoured; which no Protestant ever went about to deny.”121 He rebuked the Catholics who argued that “an image, representing unto us an holy thing, may be worshipped… and not honoured [because] honour we contend not: our difference is about worship onely.”122 According to him, giving honor to an image was a correct action, but worshipping it, as Catholics did, was not.

He rejected the Catholic emphasis of the concepts of latria and dulia that determined the correct use of images. He argued that because “Honour and worship differ more than latria and dulia,” the terms ‘honor’ and ‘worship’ should not be used
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interchangeably as Catholics did. Apart from his disagreement with these terms, Mountague conceded that the biggest problem lay in the specific actions that these words conveyed, “In tearmes there is not much difference: you say they must not haue Latria: so we. You giue them Dulia. I quarrell not the terme, though I could.” Whatever the terms used, Christians should acknowledged that honor and respect were only “giuen relativiely vnto the picture, signe, resemblance, monument of great men, friends, [and] good men,” while worship was given only to God. What made Mountague unique among his fellow Protestants is that he seemed to be the only Arminian making these claims in writing. Although many individuals in high positions in the Church might have shared his position, the radicalism of his book lost the support of many Arminians and won the disgust of moderates and Puritans.

Like Hooker, he blamed Aquinas for promoting the wrongful worship of images, specifically representations of the cross and the crucifix. He criticized the idea that “the same respect is due vnto the Represent[ation], as must be giuen to the represented. So that the Crucifix is to bee reuerenced with the self-same honor that Christ Iesus is a blasphemy not heard of, till Thomas Aquinas set it on foote.” Despite his agreement with other Protestants, Mountague differed with them in one essential matter. He told his Catholic opponent, to whom he was replying, “Cleere these enormities, and others like these, then come, and wee may talk and soone agree concerning honor and respect vnto
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Images of Saints, or Christ.”¹²⁸ The implication was that crosses and crucifixes had to be treated like any other image, which meant that they should be honored.

Mountague demonstrated that Catholics had internal disagreements about the use of images within worship. According to him, a lack of consensus was demonstrated by a few theologians who held opposing opinions. The conflict was between “Saunders….and Bellarmine [who] doe maintaine adoration was giuen vnto [images] [and] Vasques [who] denieth it.”¹²⁹ By calling attention to the apparent contradictions of Catholics, Mountague may have been responding to those who accused him of being a Catholic. That Montague mentioned the Spanish theologian Vasquez demonstrates that he was a scholar of fame known among Protestants.

In 1641, Edmund Gurnay, the Puritan pastor who feared that the Arminian toleration of images was a return to Catholic practices, directly used the term ‘idolatry’ to refer to Catholic worship.¹³⁰ In his opinion, despite the many decades of policies against images, “people deify not the thing signified by the image but the image itself [and] people are so prone to idolatry that even a rock that does not have any similitude of eyes or mouth can be transformed into a god.”¹³¹ He agreed with Perkins that image worship insulted God because it bestowed on others the worship that only God deserved.

He blamed Thomas Aquinas for distinguishing between a worship owed to the image and another worship owed to its original. Gurnay’s focus on Aquinas makes clear that he was accusing the Arminian bishops of promoting Catholic doctrines. Like Hooker
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and Mountague, he presented Aquinas’ position as representative of early modern Catholic doctrine, ignoring that the council of Trent rejected the most important premise of Aquinas’ categorization of worship. Gurnay denounced Aquinas for having mistakenly argued that “the Images of Christ and the Saints are to be reverenced, not onely as they are samples, but also…in [their] own right even so farre as that the veneration may settle and determine it self upon the Image.” He suggested that by promoting image worship independent of worship of the original, Aquinas invited Christians to behaved like the heathens of the past. Moreover, he characterized Aquinas’ idea that “The same honour which is due to the Trinity, [is] attribute[d] unto an Image” as the gravest violation against God. While many of Gurnay’s arguments targeted a lay audience, his view of Aquinas reflected a topic of conversation among clergymen.

Similar to Hooper in the mid-sixteenth century, Thomas Warmstry, Dean of Worcester, argued that images disrupted the internal worship of mind and the external worship of body that honoring God requires. Warmstry participated in the two convocations of the clergy in 1640 with a speech against images. In 1641, Warmstry argued not only against Arminians, but also against English Catholics. He explained the importance of two aspects of worship: “the internall worship of the soule, which consists in inward devotion [and] the externall of the body, consisting for the most part in outward Reverence.” Images disrupted internal worship, because “[i]t is usually the more intended, [when] the minde is more fixed unto God [there is] a more free passage unto
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Internal worship was essential because it created a connection between the mind and God. Proper religious devotion was understood as a private and silent action. Warmstry was the only author who paid attention to the physical set up of images in places of worship and prayer. He held that images “distract the minde, and are as blocks and hindrances in the thoughts passage unto God; especially [those] set up in the very faces of Oratories, as if they were placed there to intercept our Prayers, and our devotions between the soul and heaven.” This statement suggests that images, regardless of people’s intention, hindered the action of praying to God.

In 1641, Joseph Mede, a Hebraist and biblical scholar of moderate Anglican views whose works made an important contribution to the religious outlook of his time, questioned the importance of bodily gestures and stressed the mental and psychological intent in worship. According to him, “it is not the face of our bodies, or their posture,” but what matters was that one “must face nothing else but God…. When we… approach or direct our supplication towards [Him]… nothing must be an object but God.” In this case, his second ‘face’ seemed to mean the intention of the mind and not of the body. This was a rejection of the Catholic view that the senses—the body—were an essential component in the action of worship.

Mede also mentioned the quality of transitus (passing the worship to the person represented in an image). Thus he remarked that “God is most one, and without all multiplicity, so must the honour and service which is given unto him have no
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In his view, if the worship owed to God could not use any mediation or *transitus*, the role of images was annulled. The sophistication of his discussion and his use of Hebrew indicates that clergymen comprised his intended audience.

III. Ideas by English Catholic Exiles and a Spanish Convert

The group of individuals who refused to follow the religion of their country and thus went into voluntary exile offered arguments that add to the diversity of opinions in both countries. Their arguments allow us to explore the role of nationality and religion in the Protestant and Catholic outlooks.

In 1567, Laurence Vaux, the Catholic exile who taught doctrine in Louvain and who returned to England to start the English mission on behalf of William Allen, rejected the views of his Protestant co-nationals. Although he did not mention images in his explanation of the categorization of worship, he clarified that adoration was only owed to God. In the form of a dialogue, a common rhetorical form used in catechisms, he defined honor, worship, and their relationship to images. He defined *latria* as “a Service, Adoration, honour and worship, that must be given onely to God being the beginning and ende of every creature…[with Latria] we must honour, worship and reverence the blessed Trinitie, and Christe incarnate the second person in Trinitie.” He defined *hyperdulia* and *dulia* as “a reverence, worship and honour”, but the first was exclusively given to the
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Virgin Mary,\textsuperscript{143} Dulia differed from hyperdulia in that it “appertain[ed] to reverende persons both in heaven and in earth.”\textsuperscript{144} Because he wanted to stress the distinction between dulia and latria, he explained in detail,

we worship and honor the Angels and Saintes in heaven. But we do not honour and worship Sainctes, as putting more confidence and trust in them, than in God, nor with such honour as is due to God. For we honour them as the fr[i]endes of God….Also with this honor of Dulia we honour our Parents, Superiors, and al reverend persons.\textsuperscript{145}

It is likely that like Roa, Vaux refused to directly link the categorization of worship with the use of images for fear of confusing the less prepared clergymen who used his catechism. With this statement, Vaux seemed to reassure his readers that he was in favor of a continuity of a traditional social order in which the clergy was above the laity. This could be read as an unintentional agreement with the episcopal system of the Church of England.

Another set of Catholic views emerged from an anonymous English Catholic author whose book was first published in the Continent. In 1652, this anonymous author, who called himself Philopater, incorporated the language of Damascus and Trent’s categorization as the official Catholic doctrine on worship and images. His definition of ‘religious worship’ applied to “the spiritual Kingdome of Gods Church as it is spirituall, wheather it be exhibited to God, to the Officers of his Church, other Christians, or to sacred things dedicated to his honor.”\textsuperscript{146} Within the religious worship that Philopater proposed, there was an ‘absolute’ type of worship which was exclusively given to God
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because he was “the end of all goodness, esteem and dignity.”  

However, the things created by men to use in the service of God, such “sacred images, signes and images,” could receive a ‘relative’ worship.  

Philopater differed from Damascus when he implied that officers of the Church could also receive relative worship, an idea that might have caused more outrage among Protestants than the worship of images.

Philopater underscored God as the ultimate recipient of worship. Turning the accusation of Protestants on its head, he scornfully asserted that “any Catholic worshipping an image would deny [that an image] be a God or to worship it as a God as they understood that images neither had substance nor were creatures.”  

This suggests that Philopater trusted people’s understanding of Catholic practices, making him unique in that he provided an answer from the perspective of the people rather than one based on theoretical propositions about the use of images. Additionally, Philopater’s response provided a pragmatic lesson that his readers could invoke if accused of misusing images.

Unlike other Spanish and English Catholic authors, Philopater explained worship as an act of love in which affection is emphasized. In his view, the honor of images was necessary because “one gets to love what one honors, love opens the heart and it creates a passage towards the beloved.”  

The represented, not the representation, ultimately received that love because the worship “does not stayeth there, but hath a further relation to God, the end of all goodnesse, as of whom, and by whom, and from whom the thing worshipped hath that honor and worship, and not of itselfe, by itselfe.”  

Philopater’s sources:
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stress on love as worship might have been an effort to show the Catholic view of the affectionate relation between God and the people.

The last atypical author was Fernando de Tejeda, the Spanish convert who became a member of the Anglican Church to promote the Protestant cause. He remarked that an incorrect conception of worship among Catholics had promoted the idea that images were owed some worship. In 1633, he disqualified the Catholic categorization of worship, claiming that it was based on a wrongful understanding of the meaning of the Greek terms *latria* and *dulia*. Tejeda’s linguistic criticism is consonant with that of Delgadillo and Sanders’ objections to ‘unclear terms.’ According to him, *latria* and *dulia* came from the Greek and were wrongfully translated in the Spanish as *honor* (honor) and as *servicio* (service). He argued that service ought to be placed higher than honor, as honoring certain people might not be difficult but giving service to them would cause us great disgust and unhappiness. As a result of this mistake, people would give “more [to] the Saints and their images [than to] God.” Tejeda’s chief concern was that this flawed theological doctrine on worship damaged souls. That Tejeda recommended that those interested in a deeper discussion of the terms *latria* and *dulia* should consult the works of the English Puritan William Perkins shows that Tejeda was up-to-date with the most influential author of Elizabethan England. This also demonstrates that Tejeda wanted to reach the Spanish priests who might have had access to a Spanish translation of

---

152. See Appendix.
154. Ibid., 234.
155. Ibid. Tejeda referred to a work by Perkins titled “Demonstratio Problem et verbo, intercession” not found in the EEBO (Early English Books On Line catalogue)
Perkins. That one of Perkins’ works was put in an index of prohibited books in Spain is evidence that at least a few Protestant books overcame the controls of the Inquisition.

Tejeda denounced the worship given to crosses and crucifixes as another piece of mistaken doctrine upheld by Catholics. He rebuked Church theologians for “teach[ing] that the cross should be adored in the same way God is adored.”

Tejeda used this opportunity to rebuke the Spanish Jaime Prades for his faulty translation of Aquinas. Tejeda lamented that Catholics were required to adore “the real Cross…[and] all its representations made” regardless of its material. As a result, “Papists gave the same adoration of Latria [to those crosses] humbling, venerating and adoring the straw, wood and stone as their creator and redemptor.”

Given the uniqueness of representations of the cross, it could be argued that they should have caused more concern than other types of images. However, Tejeda did not show special preoccupation for the worship given to crosses.

In contrast to the position held by Aquinas, Trent and most of the Spanish authors, most English Protestant authors argued that under no circumstance should an image receive any kind of worship because images misdirected the worship owed only to God. They rejected the use of gestures as proper religious devotion because worship of God was a mental activity that required all focus on Him. For these authors, the accusation of idolatry was the backbone of their rejection of images especially in worship. A few Protestants directly denounced the various terms –latria, dulia, honor, reverence, and adoration– as useless concepts used by Catholics to confound and manipulate people. Perkins was the only author who directly blamed Damascus for his role in this
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‘deception,’ while three authors referred to Aquinas as the source of misleading arguments about the use of images in worship. The Puritan Gurnay offered the most assertive criticism of Aquinas for his attempt to convince people that although image and original received the same adoration, they were not treated and viewed as the same thing. This statement might have been a blow at Arminians, who were often seen as secret Catholics.

An exception to the general Protestant consensus was offered by the complex views of Mountague. Like most Spanish authors, Mountague disagreed with Aquinas’ understanding of adoration, but unlike the Spanish, he also denounced the concepts latria and dulia as useless. In his view, whereas images should not receive the same adoration as the originals, they deserved a specific worship and honoring that was proper to them. Mountague derived this explanation from his understanding of the Ten Commandments. The views of this Arminian author show that the religious climate of England evolved towards a certain level of toleration of images, which culminated in the embrace of images under King Charles.

In addition to the theological discussion of Aquinas’ understanding of worship, several authors focused on the dangers of the act of worshipping images in practice. Although they all agreed that images should not be worshipped, they offered slightly different justifications for it. For Perkins, images confounded people because they created the impression that there was a presence in them. Gurnay argued that images inevitably awakened the idolatrous tendencies of people. Hooper and Warmstry held that worship of images disrupted proper worship of God and insulted Him. Although the concern about practice changed dramatically from the early stages of the Reformation to
mid-seventeenth century, English Protestants reminded their readers of the consequences of the use of images.

The English Catholics called attention to the terms *latria* and *dulia* and their relation to the words worship, honor, reverence, and adoration. Although Sanders was confident that *latria* and *dulia* clarified the confusing terminology used by Catholics, he insisted that the intention of the actions mattered more than the words used to define the action. When Sanders moved to a practical explanation of these concepts, he revealed doubts about it. Similarly, the exile Harding had trouble explaining the practical implication of the key terms of this debate because he used them as synonyms. Unlike any other lay author, Heigham demonstrated a high level of theological knowledge that he put in clear words for his audience. Unlike Sander and Vaux, Philopater produced a notion of worship that combined Damascus’ and Trent’s categorizations. This discussion reveals that several English Catholics experienced difficulties when explaining or using these various terms.

Two English Catholics incorporated original ideas to the traditional support for the use of images within worship. Philopater was the only author who considered worship as an act of love, therefore stressing a caring and affectionate aspect of the relation between humans and God. However, his most important contribution to this discussion was his acknowledgement that nobody would plead guilty to the charge of idolatry. Heigham skillfully utilized his theological knowledge to put together a clear message for his audience. First, he demonstrated that the worship of the name of Christ was equivalent to worship of His image. Then, he engaged in the complex subject of the relationship between images and the Eucharist that only a few authors briefly mentioned.
In a very interesting argument he used the Protestant understanding of the Eucharist for his defense of images. By rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation, Protestants argued that this sacrament was only a symbolic representation of Christ that deserved to be honored as such. Heigham pointed out that if Protestants agreed to honor the representation of Christ in the Eucharist, they had to do the same with other images. Unlike the English Protestants who blamed Catholics for purposely manipulating language, the Spanish convert Tejeda argued that the problem with Catholics was their ignorance of the languages of the Bible. Therefore, instead of blaming Aquinas’ ideas, he rebuked the Catholic clergy for mistranslating and misinterpreting the words of the Doctor of the Church. It is significant that Tejeda recommended that his readers consult the English Protestant Perkins for clarification of the meaning of the terms *latria* and *dulia*. This gesture shows that Tejeda was comfortably absorbing the teachings of Puritanism.

* * * * *

This discussion exposed a contradiction between Trent and Thomas Aquinas’ views on the role of images in worship that generated confusion among Catholic authors. Although Trent did not mention Aquinas, the Tridentine Decree effectively denied his premise that images demanded the same worship given to the subjects they represented. By offering an incomplete explanation of the relation between images and worship, Trent created a vacuum of doctrine that left the Church ideologically vulnerable to Protestant attacks. Spanish Catholic authors struggled to reconcile the two views without calling too much attention to their differences. The consequence of the Church’s ambiguous
position is best appreciated in the argument of support for Aquinas’ view presented by Prades and Pacheco.

The English Protestants took advantage of this confusion among Catholics and of a weak doctrinal base in the Catholic Church. Because Protestants considered that Aquinas’ views on worship were mistaken, they attacked Catholics by stressing their similarities with him. Nonetheless, the Arminian author Richard Mountague maintained a neutral opinion of Aquinas’ stance, and instead, he modified it to fit his own opinion of the role of images in worship.

The arguments of two English Catholics exiles underscored the inconsistency of doctrinal views among Catholics while showing considerable originality. Whereas several Spanish authors acknowledged the confusion surrounding Aquinas’ position on worship, the English Catholic Nicholas Sanders underscored the serious problems that resulted from disagreements among Catholic theologians. Although he did not directly criticize Aquinas, or the fathers of Trent, he suggested that it was unacceptable that the Church did not provide clear doctrinal guidance. It is possible that Sanders’ sharp awareness of the consequences of Aquinas’ stance was in part due to Protestant influence. Sanders was exceptionally open to admit this problem. He was interested in promoting a focus on the understanding of doctrine by all Catholics, which would definitely represent a break from the medieval Church. Vaux, another English exile, presented an unusual explanation of the role of images in worship that combined ideas of John of Damascus and Aquinas. The lay author Heigham presented a unique argument using the Protestant understanding of the Eucharist to defend the use of images. That a lay Catholic discussed
this issue, usually left to the clergy in Spanish Catholicism, speaks of an English Catholicism that was more intellectually engaging for the laity.

It is significant that among these writers, it was Philopater who stated in clear words what was at the crux of this discussion. Philopater presented the people who used images as having the last word about the accusation of idolatry. He invited people to use their common sense and be outspoken about it.

The discussion of worship offers a glimpse at the differences between the Spanish Catholic and English Protestant views on expressions of religious devotion. Catholics promoted the use of the body –touching and kneeling- as well as demonstrations of happiness or sadness as forms to show devotion. Protestants suggested that those actions were empty because those who performed them did not have an understanding of how God should be worshipped. English Protestants implied that meditating and reading were true forms of religious devotion because they are rational.
CHAPTER SIX

IMAGES FOR TEACHING, IMITATION AND INTERCESSION

In addition to the role that images played in worship, they assisted people in acquiring the tools necessary for the life of a Christian. According to medieval Church doctrine, images were supposed to teach the viewer the historical events presented in the Bible, especially those related to the lives of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints. Images were praised for displaying the exemplary lives of the saints, which promoted the imitation of those Christian virtues. Though images were not required for prayer, they were also used as the visual focus for prayers requesting the intercession of the saints.

This chapter analyzes these three functions –instruction, models for imitation, and prayers for intercession- that Spanish and English writers discussed in their writings. Their ideas about these functions were an essential component in the Catholic defense and the Protestant rejection of images. Like the role of worship previously analyzed, the discussion of these functions articulated the ways in which people were supposed to use images.

Discussions about the role of teaching generated more interest than those related to saintly behavior and prayers of intercession. Teaching received the attention of a large number of Catholic authors precisely because the instructional use of images had served as the primary justification for images since the early Middle Ages. It is hard to explain why the name of the champion supporter of images Pope Gregory was almost never
mentioned. While Spanish Catholics saw images and words as equally capable of
teaching, some asserted that images were superior to books and sermons, a claim that
could be read as a challenge to the supremacy of the Bible. English Protestants defended
the superiority of the written and spoken word based on the idea that God had
communicated his message in words, not in images. Consequently, they also rejected the
idea that people could acquire visual knowledge of Christian behavior through the images
of saints.

While the relatively few observations about the function of images in intercession
might indicate that Catholics did not want to discuss miraculous images, it is surprising
that Protestants did not use this opportunity to attack the idea of miracle-making images
that had acquired a prominent role in popular Catholic practice. The discussion about the
link between images, the favors requested to God through his intercessors, and the
presence of miracles and signs revealed inconsistencies among Catholic authors. They
all made it clear that using images when asking for God’s help was a legitimate practice.
Nonetheless, some of their statements suggest that they acknowledged the possibility that
people might think that images have the power to make miracles.

This chapter investigates the three additional roles that images were supposed to
fulfill. Each of these three roles is discussed in order of importance: first, the teaching
function of images, then the role of images as models for imitations, and finally, the
participation of images in the process of intercession.
I. Images as Teaching Tools: Medieval Precedent.

Since the beginning of Christianity and well into the early modern period, Christian doctrine had been transmitted to the laity orally through preaching and reading of the Bible and visually through images, symbols and rituals. The status and role of images and words –seen by some as complementary and by others as oppositional- had been disputed throughout the centuries. In the central Middle Ages, a more intense focus emerged on visual elements like theater, images, and procession through which the laity experienced religion.¹ In the sixteenth century, the Reformation brought this unfinished discussion to the forefront. The comparison between images and the written/spoken word required that Spanish and English authors pick sides, which led them to a paradox. Both Spanish Catholic and English Protestant religious cultures relied both on the visual and the word. Thus although most English Protestants sided with the word in the debate over images, Protestants in general made used of the visual in other ways. Tessa Watt argued that by the end of the sixteenth century the writings of Protestants reflected their awareness of tension between the visual and the verbal, which continued in the seventeenth century when hybrid forms like the emblem and tablets with pictures emerged.² Most Catholic authors had a difficult time arguing for the superiority of the image, because through the Golden Age, the Catholic Church praised the role of the word in preaching. While all Spanish Catholics viewed images as having the same teaching

¹ See Jean-Claude Schmitt, Les Corps Des Images: Essays Sur La Culture Visuelle Au Moyen Age, (Bona, Italia: Gallimard, 2002), 133. He argues that this new visual religion counteracted the predominant place of writing as depositary of the God’s word.
² Tessa Watt, Cheap Print and Popular Piety 1570-1740 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, 331
capacity as words, only a few Spanish Catholics claimed that images could teach more efficiently than words. In contrast, English Protestant authors held that images were unable to offer proper Christian instruction.

As early as the sixth century, Pope Gregory the Great (590-604) emphasized teaching as the most powerful justification for images. In Western Europe, religious images became common by the twelve century, and Gregory’s view of images as instructional tools was prevalent. He referred to images as *libri pauperum* (books for the poor) that in his time were essential to the consolidation and expansion of Christianity.³

In the early modern period, the Council of Trent endorsed the use of images to teach as one of several important functions. The Council acknowledged that “through the stories of our redemption expressed in paintings and other copies, the people is instructed and confirmed, [when] remind[ed]…of the articles of faith.”⁴ This was only part of the program to increase Christian culture that Trent launched in the second half of the sixteenth century. The Church used catechetical instruction as the primary vehicle to achieve its reforms. Like Damascus, the Council of Trent argued that images taught the masses the doctrine and historical information that every Christian should know.

A. Ideas by Spanish Catholics.

Several Spanish Catholic authors expanded on the opinion of Damascus and the Tridentine doctrine, asserting that sacred images were as efficient as books in conveying

messages or even superior because they addressed the needs of both the literate and illiterate. The Portuguese-born Bartolomé de los Martires, archbishop of Braga, played an important role in doctrinal discussions in Trent and in the implementation of reforms thereafter.\(^5\) In a publication written in 1580 for the instruction of clergymen into the basics of Church doctrine, he argued that images, written words, and preaching all had the capacity to teach Christian doctrine.\(^6\) Contrary to the rest of the Catholic Spanish authors, Martires did not compare the efficacy of each of these forms of communication, but implied that each of them was valid because they achieved the same goal. Proof of this was the fact that

The Holy Church our true Mother, desiring to stamp this Faith in our hearts, and seeing how distracted and scattered are the thoughts of its sons in worldly matters, [has] tried a thousand remedies and tactics, and holy inventions to…imprint in people’s awareness the memory, reason and will the Mysteries of our Holy Faith…. For this purpose all the Sacred books were written, for this [purpose] it was ordered that the Mysteries to be preached in live voice; for this [purpose] it was ordered that the Mysteries of our Faith be represented in images and paintings.\(^7\)

In his view, preaching, texts, and images attempted to address the limitations of human nature in comprehending the teachings of the Christian faith. He noted the proactive role of the Church in finding the most efficient way to communicate doctrine to the people. With this message, he seemed to be suggesting that priests had to be well prepared to use each and every form of communication in their ministry, which implied that illiteracy was not an option.

---

\(^5\) Bartolomé de los Martires was an influential figure who distinguished himself for his charitable work. As Portugal became part of the Spanish crown, he defended the position of his archbishopric in the ecclesiastical structure of the Spanish territories. See Appendix.

\(^6\) Raul de Almeida Rolo. “Martires, Bartolomé de los,” in *Diccionario de Historia de Portugal*.

\(^7\) Bartolomé de los Martires. *Catecismo o Doctrina Christiana*… (1653)
Bartolomé de Medina, the influential Dominican who taught at the University of Salamanca, accepted that images in general could represent visually what words described orally or when written. He wrote his book as a guide for the priesthood of Spain that, according to Trent, was in desperate need of instruction. He articulated his message in a simple language to ensure it was understood by his audience. In 1593, he remarked that, “in the same way words and writing represent things [for the educated], paintings are like the books of the illiterate.” If the Bible told us that “Daniel had seen God in the form of an old man…and that the Holy Spirit had appeared in the shape of dove,” there was no reason why images could not represent these same events. Medina was the only author who emphasized that this function of “the venerable and holy images” has been shown to be legitimate by “tradition of the Church….the council of Nicaea II…and the council of Trent.” He acknowledged that tradition could not be the sole authority for this practice, thus he named the councils of Nicaea and Trent to strengthen his claim.

In 1596, Jaime Prades, the theologian who taught basic doctrine on images to ensure orthodoxy, also argued that images and words shared the objective of Christian instruction, but, unlike Medina, he claimed that images were superior to words. That Prades specifically wrote for audiences without clear knowledge of doctrine explains why these theologians differ. He emphasized the importance of images among the uneducated masses who could only have access to his ideas through a preacher. Prades seemed
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8 He was committed to teaching the importance of devotional practices and the sacraments. See Appendix.
9 Bartolomé de Medina, Breve Instrucción de como se han de administrar el Sacramento de la penitencia, (Alcala: casa de Juan Iniguez de Leguerica, circa 1580) 67v.
10 Ibid.
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12 See Appendix.
convinced that the act of ‘reading images’ would eliminate the obstacle that illiteracy posed to religious instruction. This idea worked against the development of religious reading culture in Spain.

In a paradoxical statement, Prades recognized the similarities of words and images while also arguing for the superiority of images. Prades proceeded with care because, as part of the Bible, the words he was referring to had been inspired by God. He claimed that the venerable Bede, the early Christian theologian and Church doctor, had equated images with words when he said that, “looking and contemplating [a painting] and…understanding what [it] means, was called reading.” Prades acknowledged the importance of the written word but showed that images were equal to words to the extent that they could literally be ‘read.’ Given the advantages offered by the use of images, “it is fair that these two arts of writing and painting had the same dignity and place.” As the Council of Nicea in 325 had made clear, images possessed a teaching ability, and he concluded that “those who deny the teaching function of images deny and contradict nature.” Prades suggested that not only were images equal to texts but they were above words because “images represent the events of the Bible in a more lively way” than writing did in books. The visual features such as color and shape made the image’s message more attractive and easily accepted by the viewer. Only Prades made clear that before images could instruct, it was necessary to instruct the people on the doctrine of images, which was the objective of his book. With this comment, Prades might have

13 Prades Jaime Prades, Historia de la adoración y uso de las santas imágenes... (Valencia, 1596), 22.
14 Ibid., 102.
15 Ibid., 40.
16 Ibid., 17.
sought to moderate his stance on the value of images, fearing that the Inquisition might find it unorthodox.

In 1597 Robert Bellarmine, the theologian and teacher who worked close to the Pope and the Philip II of Spain in essential aspects of the Counter-Reformation, borrowed Pope Gregory’s argument that images constituted books for the illiterate. When he explained that images could teach more than the stories of the Bible or the lives of the saints, his wording resembles that of Trent. He held that “through the same images many Mysteries of our Faith...are [also] taught.” In discussing the objective of instructing the masses, he equated the roles of images with that of words; however, unlike the previous authors, he did not explore the similarities or differences between the two. The function of images, he explained, is to “make us remember Christ, and the Virgin his Mother, and the Saints, and in this way [images] are useful [as] if they were books for those who do not know how to read.” As the author of a catechism that became common in Catholic Europe and beyond Europe, he was aware that instruction through images could not totally replace instruction through texts. Like Medina, Bellarmine’s intended audience was the priesthood, but his address to the clergy was more articulate than Medina’s.

In 1624, Martin de Roa, the Jesuit theologian who wrote to defend Catholic Church from ‘heretical’ ideas that might reach the people, taught the doctrine of images to a wide audience, arguing that images could teach both the literate and the illiterate. Even though the unlearned masses derived great benefit from images, this did not mean
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17 See Appendix.
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that images “do not teach those who are the most learned, and move [them] as experience shows us.” This statement might indicate that he expected his message to be conveyed to the illiterate through preaching.

Roa remarked that one advantage of learning through images was that it was fast and effortless while learning through books required a significant amount of intellectual work. The same information was obtained when “idiots with their sight very easily learn from them what learned people achieve through the hard work of reading books.” He argued that people could learn from an image in an instant what others could get from “countless words” after several hours of reading. Consequently, both the literate and the illiterate could reach the same level of Christian knowledge through different paths. Roa observed that the experience of another Jesuit priest highlighted the instructive effectiveness of images. Father Richaolme recalled “a wonderful example…of a three year old boy…who knew a big part of the Stories of the Old and New Testaments [thanks to] paintings.” In addition, Roa identified an obstacle present for the literate: even if people could read books, they often did not understand the messages of “wisdom and theology” because of the complexity of the subject. Roa’s focus on the difficulties of reading discouraged people from engaging in reading religious subjects.

Whereas Protestants argued that Catholics who used images in place of instruction did not know the true doctrine of the Church, and that instead, images promoted superstition, Roa believed that the lack of images resulted in the heretical
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21 Martin de Roa, Antiguedad, veneración i fruto de las sagradas imágenes. (Sevilla: Gabriel Ramos Vejarano, 1622), 66v
22 Ibid., 66v
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., 44v
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beliefs of Protestants. He contended that “Given the lack of Images [in Protestant lands] one can see today among Heretics extreme ignorance in the common people, who do not know more about matters of Faith, Histories of the Saints, [and] the obligations of Christians than a Turk does.”26 In his view, most of the controversies over religion could be solved by placing more images in churches because, he implied, those who accepted images understood the meaning of Christianity. This message reassured Roa’s audience that as long as there are images to teach, Catholics could not fall into heresy.

An artistic perspective was added to the discussion in 1633 by Vicente Carducho. A painter and theoretician who became the official painter to King Philip III after his work in the palace of El Escorial, he supported images as the ideal language for the uneducated.27 As Carducho indicated, his work had more than one type of audience, as well as more than one objective. As a theoretical work of instruction, he intended to expand the knowledge of his educated audience; at the same time, Carducho, like other painters, felt that his work should not be taxed, and thus he tried to demonstrate the nobility and virtue of his craft. Not surprisingly, Carducho stressed that images constituted a clear language understood by everybody, “especially women and idiot people who do not know how to read.”28 This reference to gender reflected early modern literacy rates. In general, women were less educated and less literate than men, which might be a key factor in explaining why a large number of women incorporated images into their religious life.29 Carducho was among the very few individuals who referred to

26 Ibid., 44v.
27 Vicente Carducho was born in Italy, but moved to Spain early in life where he became a famous painter. See information on Vicente Carducho in Appendix.
28 Vicente Carducho, Dialogos de la Pintura, su Defensa, su Origen, Esencia,Definición, Modos y Diferencias (Madrid: Francisco Martinez Impresor, 1633), 271.
29 See the finding in the analysis of material culture in Sarah Tilgham Nalle, God in La Mancha: Religious Reform and the People of Cuenca (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 186.
gender. Other authors may have tried to avoid linking images and women because they did not want to convey the idea that the use of images was a female characteristic.

It is noteworthy that Carducho was the only Spanish author who directly mentioned that Pope Gregory had first ordered the placement of images of saints in churches to be used to teach doctrine to the laity. Carducho also referred to John of Damascus who had claimed that the Holy Spirit helped humans learn with the ‘miraculous creation of painting.’ With this statement, Carducho effectively elevated the status of painting as a major teaching tool and, correspondingly, the role of the painter as the teacher.

Francisco Pacheco, the famous painter who defended the special status and role of religious images, offered the most enthusiastic support for the teaching role of images in 1649. While other Spanish authors referred to words and books that taught Christian doctrine, which could have included catechisms, saints’ lives, and books of hours, among others, Pacheco openly compared images with the Bible. In addition, Pacheco, clearly influenced by Damascus’ ideas, argued that images could instruct people in the inscrutable doctrines of Christianity as effectively as theology did. He held that given their nature “sacred images, [could teach] the Mysteries of our Faith just as Sacred Theology did.” Pacheco exceeded the praise offered to images by other Spanish authors. Even though his work was directed to a learned audience who would have understood that as an artist Pacheco took very seriously the role of images in religion, it is unlikely that theologians and clergymen would have supported his statement.
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30 Carducho, *Dialogos*, 271.
31 See Appendix.
32 Francisco Pacheco, *Arte de la pintura, su antiguedad y grandezas* (Sevilla: Simon Faxardo impressor de libros a la Cerrajeria, 1649), 466.
Theology remained the exclusive domain of experts who discussed Christian dogma in Latin, the official language of the Church.

Like Roa, Pacheco noted that the intellectual capacity of the reader was a major impediment for teaching with books. According to him, most people forgot very easily what they read in books; therefore, images, which remained in the mind for longer, could be a more efficient instrument of learning. Considering that “the faithful…cannot understand holy things, [when] they are explained with words, and…because of the fogginess of their mental capacity,” he assumed that most people would not grasp ideas, and if they did, they would forget quickly what they read. Therefore, the use of sacred images could fill this gap because images were not easily forgotten. Because Pacheco’s audience was a group of lay educated people, he tried to belittle the value of being literate in the religious context to demonstrate they benefited from images. He observed that as “Images are more fair and universal than any other [language,]” every body could take advantage of them. Despite his previously positive remark, Pacheco recognized that the learned and the illiterate used different skills and knowledge, and thus he suggested that the masses could learn through paintings while the doctors learned from books.

Pacheco entered uncharted territory with his claim that when an image was aesthetically pleasing, it could teach more effectively than words. Although Spanish artists produced an enormous amount of religious art in that period, only Pacheco mentioned the subject of beauty. He pointed out that nobody “doubts that the beauty
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33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., 138.
35 Ibid.
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37 Since the 1960s there has been an interest in religious and theological aesthetics that deal with the concept of beauty in various ways. For a bibliography see Kimberly Vrudny and Wilson Yates, eds. Arts, Theology and the Church: New Intersections (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2005), 37-38.: Richard Viladesau
and the spiritual component of Christian paintings [make them] more effective” than books.38 It is not surprising that a painter emphasized the importance of aesthetics; however, Pacheco provides one of very few direct references to the role of beauty in Spanish writings. Pacheco referred to St. Augustine’s claim that “images are an Art form worthy of the Christian man, that [lead] us to true knowledge.”39 Here, Pacheco might have presented religious images as art to justify his appreciation of beauty.

Although he suggested that as part of their teaching function, images were supposed to awaken curiosity that led to questions, the religious climate of early modern Spain was not conducive to such inquiry. Pacheco stated that by looking at images, the people who did not know Christian doctrine would be able to “to ask questions to the wise.”40 It is not clear what he meant by the ‘wise,’ but it might have meant parish priests who, as the local representatives of the church, were directly involved with the people.41 Although Pacheco was not a clergyman, he might have also included himself among those with knowledge because of his position in the Holy Office. He made reference to Germanus, Bishop of Constantinople in the eight century, who had claimed, “at least images cause people who look at them to ask questions and converse” about their meaning.42 As overseer of religious art, Pacheco must have talked to other artists about their paintings.

Like Medina, Pacheco compared images with preaching, but unlike him, he situated images above preaching and thus directly challenged the superiority of the
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38 Pacheco, Arte de la Pintura, 38.
39 Ibid., 466.
40 Ibid.
41 Ibid.,138.
42 Ibid.
spoken word. It was remarkable that Pacheco, who had worked so closely with the church, was allowed to express that opinion. This raises the possibility that even though the Church resisted such claims in principle, in practice it might have viewed images as a better instructional means than sermons and speeches. While there were images in every church, it was more difficult to have a good preacher in every parish. According to Pacheco, images used by Catholics “notably would get…respect from the masses, that are universally unlearned; [given that] the purpose of [painting] is more sublime, and glorious,” and also because “painting represents to the sight the things as they occurred, in a much better way than the lessons that we hear” in sermons.43 Pacheco’s idea found support in the writings of St. Augustine, who had said that sacred painting “did and may have done more work in the conversion of some souls, than preaching.”44 In a world in which a significant number of people were illiterate, preaching Christian doctrine was one of the most important avenues available to teach people; to elevate imagery over speech highlights the power and significance of art. After all, Jesus Christ preached and set his disciples to preach his message, but he never commanded them to use images to do so. In this context, Pacheco’s lengthy exposition of the teaching abilities of images is surprising but could result from an attempt to make his audience realize this important function of images. Despite his role in the Inquisition, Pacheco’s claims seemed riskier that those of theologian Prades because the laity was not qualified to discuss doctrine, which Pacheco seemed to propose with his invitation for questioning.

43 Ibid., 144
44 Ibid., 466.
B. Perspectives by English Protestants, English Catholics, and one Spanish Convert

In contrast to Spanish writers, English authors who held a range of Protestant positions from moderate to radical shared the idea that the materiality of images alongside the unreliability of their messages discounted images as tools for providing Christian instruction. Nicolas Ridley, the first-generation reformer active during Edward VI’s reign who became bishop of London and was martyred during the reign of Mary, emphasized the negative effects that images produced in every sector of society.45 Ridley’s language as well as his emphasis on communicating in vernacular English instead of Latin indicates that he wrote for a lay audience. In his work published around 1550, he distinguished among the different effects that images could have upon three specific groups of people: “to the learned and confirmed in knowledge, neither necessary nor profitable, [t]o the superstitious, it is a confirmation in error, [t]o the simple and weak, an occasion to fall, and very offensive and wounding to their consciences; and therefore very dangerous.”46 As bishop, Ridley was aware of the attraction images held for the large segment of churchgoers who were poor and uneducated, and he remarked that images provoked idolatry.47 He referred to ‘the Book of Wisdom,’ a book of the Old Testament, in which images were described as “the trap and snare of the feed of the ignorant” to show that images taught nothing and merely increased confusion among the masses.48 Ridley observed that the learned people did not seem to be affected directly by
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images in any positive or negative way, but argued that images wasted the time of the literate.

While Ridley accepted that images could teach, he qualified his statement by explaining that they could only teach incorrect Christian doctrine. He worried that “blind books and dumb schoolmaster have more prevailed by their carved and painted preaching of idolatry, than all written books and preaching in teaching the truth.” 49 Although Ridley recognized that images could efficiently communicate ideas, he failed to address the possibility that by correcting the message of images, they could be used to advance Protestantism. It is significant that Ridley referred to images as “painted preaching” for it implies that images could serve as a form of preaching; since some Protestants had argued that preaching represented the only way to learn Christian doctrine, Ridley’s comment suggests that images could themselves preach. His direct reference to idolatry represents his radical stance adopted after the death of King Henry whose conservative views of doctrine had led radical reformers to keep silent or leave the country. 50

With one exception, no official documents of the Church of England addressed the teaching function of images. The Elizabethan Homily of 1563 rejected the Catholic claim that images fulfilled a teaching role, and ordered churches to do “away for shame with the coloured clokes of Idolatrie, of the bookes and scriptures of Images and pictures, to teach idiots, nay to make idiots and starke fooles and beastes of Christians.” 51 Despite such view, a Bible containing a few images was published in 1570, which indicates that
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some reforms did not take place immediately. The Homily of 1563 introduced a new figure of blame: “Satan hath penned the lewd lessons of wicked idolatry, for his bastardly disciples and schollers to behold, reade and learne, to Gods most high dishonour and their most horrible damnation.” The reference to Satan in the Homily might have been an insult directed at the pope. It suggested that he was responsible for pretending that people could learn through images as if they were books. Not only did images fail to teach anything but they promoted idolatry.

The use of derogatory language by John Hooper and Thomas Bacon to address the instructional capacity of images reflects a common rhetorical device employed to ridicule Catholics doctrine. In 1548 Hooper, the early reformer who became Archbishop of Gloucester and died as a martyr while defending his radical views, argued that “a man may learne more [from] a living ape, than [from] a dead image if both should be brought into the schoole to teach.” The language he used flowed from his intention to depict Catholics as childish and naïve, a common feature in Protestant writings. In 1560, Thomas Bacon, a theologian who became preacher of Canterbury and collaborated during the royal Visitation of 1559 to impose reforms, suggested that his work was needed by the ‘ignorant’ and by those who considered themselves learned because both were ‘blind and obstinate.’ He observed that it was impossible to acquire “the knowledge of [God] by looking on deformed stocks and stones [rather] than by reading [the Scriptures].”
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The expression ‘stocks and stones’ or ‘sticks and stones’ to refer to images was used by several sixteenth-century English reformers and had been recorded in Lollard attacks on images in the early fifteenth century. The implication was that Catholic statues were lifeless pieces of matter compared to the Bible that was alive.

In 1565, John Calfhill denied that crosses could instruct people on the passion and crucifixion of Jesus Christ as Catholics claimed. He was a Church of England clergyman who presented radical ideas despite the posts he held in a fast-rising Elizabethan career in the diocese of London and as bishop of Worcester (1570). In his opinion, a simple act of viewing did not teach anything because it was necessary to have an understanding of its meaning. Calfhill offers a unique view because he referred to the Spanish to illustrate his criticism of Catholics. Thus he considered, “a man that never hearde of Christ, and bring him to a Spanyard to beholde all his Crosses, at the Mary Masse, and he shall be as learned when he commenth away, as the Ape is devout, when he hath eaten the hoste.” Because images did not provide the necessary context for their message to be understood, they were useless. For instance, “the Crosse, with a picture of a man upon it, with armes sltretched, body pearced, and fete nailed,” could not be distinguished between a thief and a murderer. This extreme assertion used could have been taken by Catholics as blasphemy. Calfhill seemed to assume that Spanish religious practices were representative of mistaken Catholic doctrine. It might be argued that Calfhill was venting an anti-Spanish Catholic sentiment resulting from the fear that the allies of the pope were conspiring to reinstall the Catholic Church in England.
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This author observed that God was the only instructor of the events of the Crucifixion. He feared that “If our heavenly father refuse to teach us…If God do not suffer us a preaching parson, the d[e][v][i][l] doth send us such dumb vicars…an Image or a Crosse will pervert us with a lye.”60 He affirmed that nothing positive could be learned from observing a cross or crucifix because “the Crosse is a schole master of error and impietie.” 61 Thus he asked his readers to reject being taught though pieces of wood or stone.

In addition, he underscored the importance of the word over the symbol of the cross as a way to learn about the crucifixion. While the word contained all that one needed to know about the event and thus, the material cross was not only useless, but also problematic. Calfhill requested the reader to “learne the true service of God, out of his worde, and goe no further…the materiall or mysticall signe thereof, is more than nedeth: to daengerous to be used. We have the worde, the ordinary meane, to leade us into all truth: we must not beside the word seeke signes and tokens.”62 Calfhill remarked that the word of the Bible provided sufficient for Christians because that is how God had intended it to be. He asked, “Shall we that have had the Gospell preached so long amongst us, [us] and our forefathers, stande in neede of such extraordinary aydes”?63

Thomas Harding was a Catholic exile who participated in one of the controversy with English Protestants, defending the material and ceremonial aspects of Catholicism.64 To defend the teaching role of images in 1565, he praised
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the benefit of knowledge for the simple and unlearned people, which be utterly ignorant of letters, [as] in pictures [people] do...reade and see no lesse then others do in bookes, the mysteries of Christian religion, the actes and worthy deedes of Christ and his saintes...as sayeth S. Gregory.  

Like several Spanish Catholics, Harding remarked that the effectiveness of images to communicate information had gained them a status equal to that of one of the most admired forms of speech: “In olde tymes the worke of excellentes poetes was called a speaking picture, and the worke of painters a stille poetrie. And thus the use and prof[i]t of writing and pictures is one.” It is curious that while several Spanish authors compared images with preaching, Harding referred to poetry. Although he indirectly acknowledged the importance of the image makers, he might have felt uneasy about the idea that images were equal to preaching.

In 1565, John Jewel, the theologian whose radical views and writings gained him notoriety as one of the most prolific and committed controversialists, explicitly rejected Harding’s commendation for the teaching role of images. Jewel saw images as distractions from preaching, which Protestants considered the most important avenue for instruction for the laity. Thus he denounced the Catholic Church for “barr[ing] the People from the hearinge of Goddes holy Woorde: and bid them goe, and looke vpon their Images: to talke with their Images: to heare their Images: and to learne of their Images.” Jewel acknowledged that images could teach. He explained “although perhaps the people may haply learne somewhat by these meanes, yet is not this the
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ordinary way, whereby God hath appointed the people to atteine knowledge.” The problem was, Jewel argued, that images taught the wrong things, which was explained by the fact that the larger the number of images, the larger the number of ignorant and superstitious people inclined to idolatry.

During the reign of Charles I, the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, disagreed with the basic premise of the Elizabethan Homily of 1563 that rejected the teaching role of images. Although he did not write a book about this subject, his opinion set the stage for writers of the early Stuart period. According to John Phillip, Laud “had defended images for their ability to communicate historical events of a religious nature.” In his memoir Laud recalled the statement he made during his trial in 1644. When asked about the pictures he had in his missal of the Creation to the Day of Judgment, he had answered,

I know no Crime, or Superstition in this History; And though Calvin do not approve Images in churches, yet he doth approve very well of them which contain a History; and says plainly, that these have their use, in Docendo & Admonendo in Teaching and Admonishing the People: And if they have that use, why they may not instruct in the Church, as well as out, I know not. Nor do the Homilies in this particular differ much from Calvin

This is one of a few instances in which Laud articulated his ideas about images. John Philips argues that Laud rarely made his views on images public, and when he did, they were ‘explicitly interwoven’ with his concerns for aspects of reverence and holy beauty.

While not expressed in writing until the end of his life, his statement on the teaching
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function of images had been put in practice before he became the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633, after which the next two authors advanced their ideas.

In 1639, Edmund Gurnay, the Puritan clergyman who saw the need to challenge the doctrines of the Catholic Church, focused on the inadequacy of information provided by images. By this time, various images, especially crucifixes, had returned to churches under the Laudian program of ‘beautification’ that sought to approach God with dignity through aesthetics. According to Gurnay, images possessed certain characteristics that precluded them from real teaching. He denied that “images are speciall[y] good to give instruction, [being so] silly and barren that [it was impossible] some kernels of instruction may be picked there from.” The lack of certainty in those “matters of fact” was evident when one considered that in a painting “a fool may resemble a wise man in the outward countenance; a wicked man, a saint, a pe[a]sant a Prince; and yet remain wicked.” Gurnay concluded that given the shallowness and uncertainty of the information offered in images, the viewer did not acquire any useful knowledge from them. Although Puritans were not actively fighting Catholics as sixteenth-century Protestants had done, they still saw images as a threat.

In 1641, Thomas Warmstry, generally a moderate who displayed his Anglican loyalty when he joined the king at the beginning of the civil war, took a Puritan view regarding visual aspects of the Church. He attacked Laudian ceremonialism by emphasizing the superiority of preaching. While he did not directly attack the idea that images could teach, he presented preaching as a superior tool for teaching, reversing the
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argument of some Spanish authors. According to him, preaching served as a better teaching strategy than images because God had directly prescribed it as a safer, more efficient method to announce His word. Warmstry chided image defenders for attempting to “preach down preaching to make way for images [which were] invented by men, without any Precept or Promise from God.” His defense of preaching might be understood as a more radical aspect of his thinking because Puritans emphasized the value of preaching as a key promoter of social change. Preaching was superior to images because only it had the sponsorship of God. Curiously, in his appeal to preaching, Warmstry ignored the connection between images and illiteracy. He could have said that preaching rather than images was the antidote to lack of literacy.

Instead Warmstry decried the illiterate as incapable of learning through images or books. According to him, if the illiterate could not be instructed through books, they lacked the capacity to learn from images. He implied that those who did not have the mental capacity to understand the messages offered through words were likely to misinterpret the proper use of images. Warmstry warned that “if any[body] be so stupid as…that they cannot be instructed without Images, it may be feared, they will be stupid too to mistake the true use of an image.” In his view, there was no need for the *Idiotarum libri* (books for the illiterate), a deliberate take-off of the Catholic concept of *Pauperum libri* (books for the poor). The total elimination of images was necessary to avoid “either Images for Idiots, or Idiots for Images,” in which he was using a derivative
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of the Latin word *idiota*, which meant illiterate. Thus he sought to eradicate both images and illiteracy for the sake of the people. Before Warmstry’s book was published, he acknowledged he had originally presented his ideas in a speech for an educated audience of “riper yeares and more mature studies” than himself. This indicates that he intended to address learned people, most likely Puritans.

The teaching role of images offers the opportunity to examine the ideas of those early modern Englishmen and Spaniards who had adopted a faith dissimilar to the official doctrine of their natal countries.

In 1567, Nicholas Sanders, the English Catholic priest who engaged in a written controversy with the Protestant clergyman William Fulke, argued that images could facilitate the instruction of Christians. Sanders argued that images assisted the cognitive process, specifically the double function of acquiring and remembering new knowledge. Through images, he explained, “first we learne thereby some thinges, which we knewe not before [and] second, because other thinges which we knewe before, we do remember.” He also suggested that images provide a solution to poor memory retention because “we doe not onlie remember them (as by reading or repeating) but by the most spedie twinkling of the eye.” According to him, not only could images teach, but they could also reinforce the identity of all Christians, as “we are confirmed in our faith perceiving these thinges, which are painted before our eyes to be so true, that everie where they are openlie seete foorth and honoured.” This statement implied a danger
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that Sanders did not acknowledge: the Catholic Church had to ensure that images always represented ‘true’ things so that people were not ‘unintentionally’ deceived.

Unlike the Spanish Catholics, Sanders observed that the teachings provided by images fixed messages in people’s minds that prevented the real danger of idolatry. Through the contemplation of material images, “We are kepte well occupied, and delivered from occasion to imagine idle thinges of our owne phantastical devising, the which in deede cause Idolatrie”86 Like his co-national authors, he acknowledged that the human mind had the capacity to engage in idolatrous actions. Nonetheless, he understood the cause of idolatry in radically different terms than the Protestants who linked idolatry to the general use of images. He argued that fixed and permanent images were a preferred alternative to mental images that were unstable and open to interpretation. Unlike images, words could be misinterpreted and could activate the imagination. Sanders turned the argument of idolatry on its head by arguing that the absence of images produced the need to create mental images, which could ultimately result in idolatry. That the mind of any individual could be free to create its own secret mental images out of reach of the clergy seemed a dangerous proposition.

Fernando de Tejeda, the Spanish convert who wrote to expose the deviations and mistakes of the Catholic Church, presented an opposing view in 1633. He argued that images lacked the attributes needed to teach Christian doctrine. 87 In his view, the materiality of images prevented them from teaching Christians because “a human creation that is muted and dead can [not] communicate with more efficacy than the word
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of God itself.”

Adopting Protestant language, he referred to images as “stones and sticks,” and remarked that if those were in charge of Christian instruction, “it is understandable that [Catholics] do not know much about God.”

He accused the clergy of allowing images to teach the laity because “the learned individuals...claim that idols teach the simple people,” which was a waste of time and resources.

Using a circular argument, he mockingly suggested that if images were good teachers, as Catholics claimed, they should have also taught the learned people because they were as ignorant as the masses. Although Tejeda did not refer directly to the problem of illiteracy in Spain, he stressed the idea that clergy used images to manipulate the ignorant population. He must have observed that Protestants stressed the importance of access to the Bible.

Spanish Catholic authors observed that images could serve as better teaching tools than books given the clarity and speed with which their message was transmitted. Given the persistent challenges faced by the Catholic Church in instructing important segments of the society that were illiterate, images became essential in the task of teaching.

The English authors vehemently denied the teaching capacity of images, which they claimed offered incomplete and confusing messages. Even worse, images could teach ‘false’ doctrines because they appealed to the emotions.

While all Spanish Catholics concurred with the Council of Trent’s view that images were useful to teach Christian doctrine and history, a few authors disagreed on the importance of images when compared with written words. Prades and Pacheco made surprising claims equating the teaching capacity of images with that of the spoken and
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written word. Moreover, they affirmed the superiority of images over words, an idea that
seemed unorthodox because it implied that images were above the text of the Bible. It
might be that claims of this sort were not censored because of the context in which they
were made. Prades and Pacheco might have felt that their defense of images had to be as
radical as possible to be effective.

Catholic contempt for the capacity of the lay people to learn through Bible
reading ultimately perpetuated a lay religious culture that did not engage in the reading of
doctrinal and theological discussion. For the most part, people were not expected to have
knowledge and understanding of complex theological matters. The position taken by all
Spanish authors favoring images over the written word agreed with the stance of the
Catholic Church that denied access to the Bible to the laity. In 1551, the Spanish Church
published an Index prohibiting the circulation and use of the Bible in Spanish or any
other vernacular language in fear people could misinterpret it. This had been the case of
the orthodox group called *Alumbrados*, who also rejected the use of images. The
problem was that the few people who could read lacked the knowledge to understand it.
By the end of the sixteenth century, the Bible in vernacular regional languages of Spain
was published for the exclusive use of clergymen. Specifically, teaching the basics of
Christianity through images to *conversos* and *moriscos* might have been one of the goals
of the Church. Unlike the English who valued the written and spoken word, Spanish
Catholics saw preaching, the use of images, and other forms of visual information as the
solution to illiteracy.

Contrary to the Spanish, the English attacked the use of images while
simultaneously arguing for the superiority of words over images. In the first decade of
English Protestantism, reformers discussed the idea that the laity should be given complete access to the Bible. Eventually access to the Bible by any Christian became one of the main policies of the Reformation. At the same time, English Protestantism made use of visual information in the form of emblems and texts with tables that combined text with pictures, which indicated that religious English culture maintained a visual aspect. While English Protestant authors asserted that images could not teach any information related to Christian doctrine or history, the core of their argument rested on the proposition that images could teach but conveyed the wrong information. Even if images did not produce idolatry, the possibility of teaching incorrect doctrine equally endangered the salvation of the people. In opposition to such view, an unusual statement from the Stuart Archbishop Laud held that the teaching function of images was legitimate and of great importance -a very rare direct and public pronouncement about images on the part of Arminians.

The Protestant support for the superiority of the written word was challenged by an English Catholic in exile. Agreeing with those who had doubts about the capacity of the people to ‘read’ the proper messages of the Bible, John Martiall argued that the action of reading did not always produce understanding. It is significant that Martiall did not make reference to the debate over lay access to the Bible that took place in England at the beginning of the Reformation, which would have strengthened his view. His preoccupation with the limitations of preaching might have also been a response to the growing importance of preaching among Protestants in England.
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While the arguments about teaching generally juxtaposed written and spoken words with images, another English exile added a new element to the discussion. To stress the permanent and predetermined quality of images, Sanders compared material images to mental images. He concluded that written and spoken words ultimately produced mental images which were undetermined and unstable—a definite danger for the people. Sanders must have been aware of the meditation practices that English Catholics were adopting as a response to the loss of other devotional practices and due to the influence of Protestantism. He might have warned his readers to be cautious during this private exercise. It is significant that Sanders was the only Catholic author who mentioned mental images given that Ignatius of Loyola had based his mystical and spiritual practices on the use of mental images. Spanish Catholics knew of the problems that had derived from the wave of mysticism among the laity in the first half of the sixteenth century, and consequently they might have avoided the topic altogether.

II. Images as Models for Imitation: Early Modern Ideas.

Since the central Middle Ages, visual models of holiness had assisted the Catholic Church in guiding people’s lives to achieve salvation. An emblematic episode of such event was St. Francis of Assisi’s conversion before a crucifix.\footnote{Suzannah Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages: Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages} (New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2002), 134. She explains that in this case of imitation Christi, ‘seeing was not only believing but being assimilated with Christ’s flesh and blood through a visual interaction.’} Although the common people were not expected to imitate the heroic actions of the saints, which had only been achieved through God’s help, they were asked to reflect on the perfection of the saints
and to model their lives accordingly. While the Reformation reevaluated the medieval concept of sainthood, the Catholic Church reaffirmed the importance of the saints. Protestants argued that the Catholic Church had created an excessive number of saints, therefore violating Christian doctrine. Thus Protestants eliminated those saints who arguably did not conform to the “real” idea of sainthood from their pantheon of saints.

In 1563, the council of Trent reaffirmed the transformational effect of the visual display of the struggles and victories that saints had experienced while alive. Once images were “set in front of the eyes of the faithful, the healthy examples of the saints…[lead people to] modify their lives and habits.” Spanish authors argued that images, as constant reminders of what Christian life should be, guided and motivated people to improve their lives. English agreed that ‘true’ saints could serve as examples for the people; however, they denied that images could serve that purpose because images could not possibly represent those traits that had made them such special Christians, and thus they could not be a source of inspiration for change.

Jaime Prades restated the position of the Council of Trent by arguing that images of the Apostles and the Virgin offered models of Christian ideal values. In 1597 he wrote that through images, “we are presented with the faith of the Apostles, the sainthood of the confessors, the strength of the martyrs, the cleanliness of the virgins.” Prades implied that people who viewed these images could discern those virtues and qualities worth of imitation, even if they lacked the basics of Christian instruction.
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used by Prades, he was not suggesting that everybody should adopt the life of asceticism and suffering depicted in images. Rather, he invited people to focus on improving their lives as good husbands and wives, honest individuals, and humble and patient neighbors. Post-reformation Catholicism did not expect people to imitate the experiences of extreme suffering for their faith but rather wanted Catholics to use them as models for Christian daily life.98

In 1624, Martin de Roa expanded on the idea that the deeds and character of those represented in images guided the reader through the process of self-evaluation. Unlike Prades, Roa underscored the importance of the inspiration and guidance that those depicted in images offered. According to him, by “looking at the paintings of those whom we love, we look at ourselves as in a mirror,” and we desire to be more like them.99 This longing for transformation occurred because once “we acknowledge the big differences between those individuals and ourselves…we feel ashamed…[and] compel to imitate the virtues of those individuals whom they represent.”100 Roa assumed that images could represent the character and traits -piety, compassion, and generosity- of their subjects as clearly as a part of the body was depicted in a painting. He observed that some images presented powerful examples because they “[had] produce[d] so much desire and courage [in the viewer] that in their name…[the viewer] perform superhuman deeds that are able to defeat hell.”101 Images often became guides for the lives of everybody, but he emphasized that for “the wise, [they were] remedy to their vices, the
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strength of their obligations.”¹⁰² Roa pointed out that the learned also could benefit from the worthy models offered by images. This motivated the range of people who comprised his audience to look at images for the models that could help them become better Christians.

In 1633, Vicente Carducho explicitly stated the Church’s intention to take full advantage of visually displaying the actions and behaviors of the saints.¹⁰³ Unlike the two previous authors, he emphasized the display of models of piety and sanctity as an essential element in the Church’s agenda. Throughout the centuries, he argued, “the Holy Mother [the Catholic] Church, committed to the conversion of people to their Creator, has provided images presenting healthy examples [of behavior] to the eyes of the Faithful…so that [they] can thank God, and correct their lives and habits, imitating the Saints.”¹⁰⁴ Besides Christians, he seemed to have had in mind Muslims and crypto-Jews that had converted to Christianity, as he was confident that “the conversions made with the use of holy Images” proved the efficacy of the visual presentation of those models.¹⁰⁵ His statement suggested that more people converted by looking at images of saints than by reading and hearing about the lives of saints.

Francisco Pacheco promoted the idea that images produced immediate transformations of sinful lives into virtuous ones. In 1649, Pacheco argued that images of the lives of saints and the Virgin Mary “represent in our eyes and draw in our hearts heroic and magnificent deeds of Patience, Justice, Chastity, Gentleness, and Compassion,
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and scorn for the world.”106 His attention to the features depicted in images came from his experience in analyzing minute details of the content and style of the works presented to him as an employee with the Inquisition. The display of virtues presented in images was so powerful that “in an instant…[they] bring in us virtue and rejection of vice.”107 There was no doubt that when compared with books of saints’ lives, images were considerably more effective. Thus, he argued, “if we consider that several examples of individuals who having read only one book, suddenly changed their lives, why would we not believe that a sacred image, made with devotion, is even more efficacious to that end”108. Here Pacheco conditioned the efficacy of these kinds of images to the intention of the maker and thus elevated the role of the painter.

While Protestants generally restricted the role of saints in promoting piety, a few writers argued more specifically against the ability of images to serve as models of Christian behavior. The Royal Articles during the reign of Edward specified that people should only use images “to put them in remembrance of the godly and virtuous lives of them that they do represent.”109 This changed drastically in the Elizabethan Homily of 1563, which held that the images of saints were not acceptable because they could not properly represent the attributes to be remembered for the benefit of people’s souls. It explained that “the virtues of the Saints, as contempt of this world, poverty, soberness chastity, and such like virtues, which undoubtedly were in the Saints” were a powerful reminder of what a Christian life should be. However, it described images of saints as “[the] glorious gilt [of] images and idoles, all shining and glittering with mettall and
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stone [that teach] other maner of lessons, of esteeming of riches, of pride, and vanity in apparel, of nicenesse of wantonnesse.” The splendor of the materiality of the images overtook sober saintly virtues present within in them, and the images lost the ability to convey positive lessons. The Homily failed to recognize that besides those highly decorated images, there were simple images with no ornaments and dark colors that attempted to depict piety and humility.

In 1565, James Calfhill, Archbishop of Worcester who as a progressive reformer was a relentless voice in the vestments controversy during the reign of Elizabeth, challenged the idea that images could move people to imitate the Christian behavior of those represented in them. Following the Protestant view of saints, he did not deny the sainthood of some individuals but maintained that because images lacked the spiritual qualities that accounted for the saints’ virtuous lives, they could not serve as models of behavior. He remarked that the” most untruth of al[l] [was] that the conversation of holy men is se[e]n in an Image…[because] hope and charitie (which be the chiefe virtues of the Sainctes) are things invisible: But images and pictures are visible.” The true meaning of imitation, he stated, was reflected in the call made by the apostles inviting people to follow them. In other words, the saints should not be seen in terms of “pictures but in virtues: to imitate their faith, not in…Imagerie, but in sincere good workes.” Strengthening faith required behaving like true Christians, not looking at images.
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Thus, Calfhill noted that representations of saints showed characteristics contrary to the virtues they were supposed to embody. A negative model for imitation was set when Mary Magdalen was shown “with nice apparel, and wanton lokes”; as a result, the only thing that people could learn from her was “lustes of vanitie.”\footnote{114} Those kinds of images presented “no example of sobrenesse, charitie, contempt of richesse or vanitie of the world, but of excesse, wantonnesse, pride, and covetousnesse.”\footnote{115} He criticized the lack of relation between what images presented and the real lives of saints. A saint who was said to have “despised hys lyfe, to lyve with God: continued in poverty, to be rich in Christ: rejected the pleasures and lustes of the fleshe,” could not be represented by a man who had “a most cheerful and stately lo\[o\]ke, a gorgeous and rich attire, an embracing in death of the which in lyfe he most abhorred.”\footnote{116} Calfhill sought to combine two requirements: on the one hand, he wanted Christian figures to convey messages of virtue and charity, and on the other, he demanded historical accuracy in the way they are presented. His statements directly responded to Martiall, a Catholic exile in Louvain who dedicated a treatise about the meaning of the Cross to Queen Elizabeth. Calfhill seemed to expect that a large audience of clergymen, both Protestants and Catholic, had read Martiall’s controversial work.

For John Jewel, the radical reformer who became a major controversialist after his exile, preaching constituted the only avenue through which people could learn how to imitate the saints. In 1565, he disagreed with Harding that images served as reminders of the ideal Christian behavior. He lamented that all the hard work of

\footnote{114} Ibid.\footnote{115} Ibid., 164v\footnote{116} Ibid.,165v
our preachers [who]...have instructed and exhorted the people to the followyng of the virtues of the saintes, as contemple of this worlde, povertie, sobernesse, chastity, and such lyke virtues [was lost]; as soone as [people] turne their faces from the preacher, and looke uppon the graven bookes and paynted scripture of the glorious gylte images and idolles, all shynyng and glytteryng with mettalll and stone, and covered with precious vestures.117

He acknowledged that the appeal of adorned images overshadowed the effects of preaching the virtues of the saints. His wording stressed that the physical features of the supposed representations of the saints did not have anything to do with their virtues. Jewel’s distress over the ornamentation of images reflects a concern clearly expressed in the Homily of 1563 but that was discussed by few authors.

Contrary to Protestant views, in 1565 the Catholic exile Thomas Harding explained the transformative influence of images on people’s lives. According to him, after the teaching function, “the second use of images is the styrring of the myndes to all godlynes.”118 Images reminded us of “what Christ hath done for us, and what the sainctes have done for Christ [which caused] the affect and desire of man to [be] quickened and moved to the like will of doing and suffering, and to all endeavour of holy and virtuouse life.”119 Like the Spanish Catholics, Harding emphasized the importance of the visual reminder of the behaviors that the Church sought to reproduce in all Christians. He informed his audience that common people were capable of virtue and sacrifice as Christ and the saints had been.

In 1639, Edmund Gurnay expressed his concern about the superficial information presented by images and the confusion they created. Gurnay wrote his Puritan views rejecting the program of ‘Beautification,’ which was officially led by Archbishop Laud
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since 1633 and was responsible for the return of images to churches. In his view, images only showed the occupation of the subject of the painting, the activities performed, and the clothing worn. There was no information about “whether the fact, person or creature was good or bad, whether to be imitated or avoided; and what were the causes, ends, and consequences of such things.”

Because images could never provide the viewer with all this information and did not offer a clear message, they could not be used as models.

The view of one English Catholic offers an example of the interplay between religion and nationality. Nicholas Sanders did not emphasize the imitation of those represented in images in the same way that his Spanish co-religionists did. Instead, he suggested that seeing the experiences of saints depicted in images was useful only if there was real understanding of the content of the image. Thus he pointed out, “by seeing and knowing we are provoked to become lyke those men whose Images we behold with reverence and estimation.”

Like other Catholics, he believed that the visual message presented by images had the potential to improve the lives of the observers. However, he agreed with views of English Protestants that only when people had previous Christian instruction was it possible to utilize images as models. In this way, he contradicted his previous assertion that images alone were excellent teaching tools. Two actions, seeing and knowing, were necessary for people to understand and follow the example set by the model. The contradiction of his statements might reveal tension in Sander’s opinion. He seemed to think that the full potential of images could only be tapped by people with some level of understanding of Christian doctrine. As Spanish Catholics argued that the message of an image could be grasped immediately and remained in the memory, they

---
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claimed that images of saints and martyrs served as an efficient tool in the promotion of
the ideal Christian behavior. Models of holiness seen in images provoked in people a
longing for the transformation of their lives and gave them the strength to do so.
Conversely, the few English Protestants who engaged in this discussion denied that such
holy behaviors could be imitated from images of saints.

Spanish Catholic authors agreed that images served as valuable role models
because images could accurately depict originals, showing their saintly behavior and
Christian virtues. While all of them assumed that those representations were always
accurate, Pacheco acknowledged that not all representations presented Christians virtues
in a manner that could be imitated. An expert in religious art, Pacheco distinguished
between good and bad painting because he knew its implications for the soul of the
Christian. Despite attempts of two major theologians of the medieval period, the
Catholic Church did not establish a standarized iconographic system that ensured the
standardization of the subjects represented in images. As evidenced by reports of the
Inquisition, in practice, this lack of rules lent to confusion and inconsistency in the
messages and teachings that people sought in images.

While the few English Protestants agreed that images were incapable of
representing the immaterial features for which the saints had won their unique status in
heaven, an English exile offers evidence of adaptation of beliefs. Without
acknowledging it, Nicholas Sanders agreed with specific aspects of both Catholic and
Protestant tenets. He accepted the use images as models for imitation; however, he
conditioned such function to instructing people about what images represented. Sander’s
views seem to be the result of an intellectual process that relied on flexibility and free-
thought that was not seen as often in the Catholic writers. Martaill’s explanation was
more suggestive about the attitudes and behaviors worth imitating from saints because he
might have believed that English Catholics had to be ready to make sacrifices for their
Church.

III. Images in the Process of Intercession

Though the doctrine of intercession started as part of the cult of martyrs during
the first centuries of the Christian era, it experienced its greatest boom in the later Middle
Ages with the promotion of a plethora of saints’ cults.122 People used these intercessors
when praying for God’s help, expecting that the intervention of the Virgin Mary or the
saints would yield a sympathetic response to their petitions.123 While the increasing
number of images in public and private places allowed people to use images during
prayers for intercession, no detailed explanation of this practice was offered to the
people.

Whereas the Spanish Catholic authors suggested that the use of images increased
the efficacy of the prayers for intercession, the English authors viewed this practice as
evidence that Catholics assigned the power of God not only to the intercessor but, most
importantly, to the image of the intercessor. While John of Damascus and Thomas
Aquinas had not made any reference to the role that images played during prayers of

122 K.I. Rabenstein, “Saints and beati,” in the New Catholic Encyclopedia, 2nd ed. Who was a ‘real’ saint
was subject to controversy during the reformation and it is not only indirectly related to the discussion of
images in intercession. Since early Christianity, those recognized as saints were seen as special human
beings, who during their time on earth had lived with faith and charity and some even died for their faith,
now in heaven serving as intercessors with God on behalf of the living and the souls in purgatory.
123 See David Morgan, Visual Piety: a History and Theory of Popular Religious Image, (Berkeley, CA:
University of California Press, 1999), 71. Morgan discusses the sympathy and empathy as the essence in
the relation between devotee and saints.
intercession, the Council of Trent implied that the role that images played in intercession had to be properly understood by the people. It stated that bishops and clergy who taught the people should “carefully instruct about the intercession of the saints, their invocation…and the legitimate use of their images.” As part of Catholic doctrine, Trent praised the role of the saints as intercessors on behalf of people, claiming that “it is good and useful to humbly invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, and helpful assistance to obtain blessings from God through his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who is our sole redeemer and savior.” For this purpose, images could “bring to mind the miracles that God had performed through [the saints].” With this statement, the Church clarified that saints did not make miracles, but that God received requests and granted favors through intercessors. It was unclear, nonetheless, if this reference to miracles included the alleged miraculous signs manifested on several images –crying, sweating blood, growing hair- that were common in this period. Despite the Catholic Church’s doctrine, in the eyes of the people, this phenomenon would have reinforced the idea that power resided in the image itself. Because of the contentious nature of this subject, the fathers of Trent did not mention miracles in any other section of the decree.

In 1579 Juan de la Cruz, a Carmelite monk whose works became the most important ascetic and mystic literature of his time, acknowledged a misperception about the role of images in prayers of intersession. He claimed that “God makes miracles and graces through some images more than others…[because] when an image is properly
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127 Juan de la Cruz translated a controversial version of the Song of Songs that led to his arrest by the Inquisition. See Appendix.
made… the more likely it is that prayer and devotion reach God.”\textsuperscript{128} This statement appeared to emphasize that the communication between humans and God indirectly depended on the qualities of a material object. Thus, de la Cruz felt the need to qualify his previous assertion, pointing out the importance of the intention and sentiment of the worshipper over the physicality of the image. He explained that in reality “[God] does not pay attention to the image,…what matters is the devotion and faith [of the people] in the saint that is represented.”\textsuperscript{129} De la Cruz’s work was among the few authors to acknowledge that certain images were sites chosen by God to display His power. Yet he emphasized that the devotion expressed by the people was the criterion that distinguished some images from others.\textsuperscript{130} He would have been aware that earlier in the century, Erasmus and Luther had criticized what they saw as the incongruent practice of giving different attention and devotion to different images of the same subject.\textsuperscript{131} They rejected the idea that God favored some images above others. De la Cruz directed his mystical writings to members of the clergy and religious orders who sought a guide for their spiritual life, but it is probable that some educated lay people read them too.

In his work, Robert Bellarmine acknowledged existing misunderstandings about the role of images during prayers for intercession, which perhaps reflected an intentional rejoinder to the idea that some images were more powerful than others. In 1597, Bellarmine emphasized that the favors requested through the intercession of the saints were directed to God, not to the saints themselves or their representations. Bellarmine

\textsuperscript{129}Ibid., 1.
\textsuperscript{130}The accounts of miracles or miraculous signs performed by images make evident the fact that not all images were had this ability. See William Christian, \textit{Local Religion in Sixteenth-Century Spain}, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981)
\textsuperscript{131}Eire, \textit{War Against}, 63.
clarified that “images are not alive, nor hear because they are made by men,” and while believers “pray in front of them to ask for favors to those represented by the images,” he emphasized, “[they] do not make requests to them [the images].”132 This veiled acknowledgement indicates that some people doubted whether or not to direct their petitions to the images, to the saints, or to God.

Bellarmine also expounded on the role of images in miracles. He worried that some people believed that images had the power to directly respond to the requests of the people. Thus he tried to clarify these misconceptions in the form of a dialogue. When a person asked, “If images do not feel, how do they make miracles for those who pray to them?,” Bellarmine replied, “all the miracles are made by God, but often times He makes them [as a result of] the intercession of the Saints, or especially of his holy Mother.”133 Agreeing with de la Cruz, he further explained that the reason why God “uses relics or images as instruments for such miracles [was] to demonstrate that he likes our devotion to them.”134 Yet this statement did not explain why some images performed miracles and others did not or why images that were completely abandoned and forgotten could nevertheless perform wonders. This lengthy discussion indicates that Bellarmine wanted to ensure that the priesthood could pass correct teachings to the laity.

According to Bellarmine, the use of imprecise language caused further misunderstandings over the role of images in intercession. For instance, he argued “when somebody claim[ed] to be under the protection of such an image and to have received a grace,” this really meant that “the person [was] under the protection of that

132 Robert Bellarmine, Declaración copiosa de la doctrina Cristiana... Luis de Vera trans. (Madrid: Julian de Paredes vendese en casa de Domingo Palacio, Mercader de Libros en la calle de Antochar, 1656), 67v
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Saint represented in the image, and that God through his [the saint’s] intercession granted him a grace." He worried that vague language used to explain the relationship between the invocation of the saints and images led to misunderstandings and incorrect beliefs. Bellarmine’s preoccupation with the beliefs and practices related to intercession seems related to the anxiety expressed by Erasmus many decades before. It is curious that Bellarmine did not touch upon the central theme of Erasmus’ unease: the use of saintly specialists (saints with an area of expertise, for instance, St. Roque for toothaches) and their images.136

Martin de Roa claimed that images served as both reminders of the intercession provided by those represented in them and as sites for the manifestation of God’s response to those prayers. In 1624 he underscored that images gave hope to people who suffered because in the presence of images people felt that they were not alone in their tribulations. His reader should remember “the big…consolation and help that Images offer us oftentimes in this life. Because with their presence, they bring to memory the many advocates that we have with God so that we invoke them in our perils.” Roa implied that without images people would not easily remember to take advantage of the intercessory powers of the saints. Additionally, images were seen as sites of miracles as if they were “witnesses…who make known and confirm the mercies that God performs to men; [they] are [like] tongues that in silence divulge the greatness of His compassion.” Here he made clear that the material image remained unrelated to the miracle; it only was a receptacle of God’s wonders. As his statement demonstrates, oftentimes Roa adopted a
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more poetic and allegorical literary style that indicates he was writing for an educated audience.

His goal was to show first that people did not pray to the images but to those represented in them and, second, that images did not possess their own power. He explained, “there is no Temple, nor house...that does not have the company [of images] among Catholics, nor anguish or danger, nor illness in which [we] do not find [the faithful] praying to them and asking for their favors.”139 In this statement he indicated that people requested help from images themselves, which is contrary to the message he wanted to convey. His lack of precision in language, constant throughout his work, seemed to reflect a less rigorous approach to scholarship when compared with that of theologian Bellarmine. While the clergy in his audience would have understood what he meant, those without knowledge of doctrine were in danger of comprehending the exact opposite message of that which Roa intended to promote.

For Vicente Carducho, the success of certain images as sites of miracles but not others demanded an explanation. In 1633 he observed that when particular images were chosen as sites of miraculous signs, people flocked to the images to use them as intercessors. Carducho suggested that these miraculous signs –image bleeding, tearing, sweating, or moving- confirmed that the petitions directed to the subject of the images were likely to be answered. Consequently, devotees saw those images as special, although they knew that the “miracles [were] performed [by God] through the saints.”140 Like de la Cruz, Carducho linked the physical features of images to their capacity to perform miracles. Carducho remarked, however, that not all images made with great skill
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and art were miraculous sites. After reflecting on “the perfection of [the] art [in] various miraculous images of our Lady, Christ crucified, and other Saints of huge devotion,” he concluded that the images that “our Lord use to perform big miracles, are made without proportion, without art; and among those made with art, [we] do not see that God performs these wonders, or a few times.”\footnote{Ibid., 280.} Carducho presented a skillful argument in opposition to de la Cruz who argued that new, and therefore well-made images, were favored by God. By denying that God favored good painting, Carducho used this opportunity to emphasize the humility of painters like himself.

In a work possibly written in the last decades of the sixteenth century, but published posthumously in 1658, Cristoval Vega, the Jesuit missionary and theologian who wrote a spiritual guide, held that the image of the Virgin Mary protected people and served to communicate with God.\footnote{Cristo\textipa{\textasciitilde}val Vega was a member of the Jesuit order whose major contribution was his missionary travel. See Appendix.} When discussing the benefits of a medal inscribed with the image of the Virgin, he assured his audience of monks, “if we carried the image of Mary with us, it served as a shield against invisible enemies”; at the same time one had to “put on her care all our things, worries and wishes, so that she can direct them towards the service of his Son, and for the benefit of our souls.”\footnote{Cristoval de Vega, \textit{Devoción a María: Pasaporte y salvo conducto que da paso a una buena muerte...} (Valencia, 1655), 424.} While Vega tried to differentiate between the image and its subject, his imprecise language presented similar problems to those of Roa. In Spanish, the noun medal and the noun image are feminine; thus when Vega recommended that people put their problems “in her care,” he was unclear about whether he meant the care of the medal with the image or the care of the Virgin herself. By suggesting that people should treat the image of the Virgin as if the
Virgin herself were present in the image, Vega implied that images should be worshipped as if they were the originals.

Sixteenth-century policy removed the medieval concept of intercession from Christian doctrine for English Protestants, a change reinforced by the dissolution of chantries. The Articles for the visitation of the dioceses of Gloucester and Worcester in 1551 under Edward articulated the Protestant view that the only ‘Mediator and Redeemer’ to whom prayers should be directed was Christ.¹⁴⁴ Praying to God did not require any visual help as the medieval Church had taught. The Elizabethan Homily of 1563 questioned the role of mediators, arguing that the Church had wrongfully given a role to the Virgin Mary and the saints that belonged only to God. The Homily attacked those who “attribute the defence of certaine countreys” to saints, which resulted in the “spoyling God of his due honour herein.”¹⁴⁵ Like Erasmus in his *Enchiridion*, the Homily mentioned the various names that the Catholic Church had given to specific images of the Virgin Mary as evidence that each of these names was affiliated with an independent power and was thus considered an independent god.¹⁴⁶ It was clear that this practice of having an image of “our Lady of Walsingham, our Lady of Ipswich, our Lady of Wilsdon, and such other…[was] an imitation of the Gentiles idolaters.”¹⁴⁷ It seemed that Catholics gave the saints represented in images localized identities and allegiance as pagans had done in the past.

In 1597, William Perkins, a theologian of a Puritan stance who attempted to convince Roman Catholics of their mistaken worship practices, directly attacked the
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doctrine of invocation of saints by pointing out its lack of historical basis.\textsuperscript{148} There was no evidence that saints were viewed as intercessors in the first centuries of Christianity. According to him, well into the fourth century “the intercession of Saints was utterly unknowne: as appears plainly by the writings of Ireneus, Justin, Clement, Tertullian….”\textsuperscript{149} There was no practice or acknowledgement of prayer to Saints in the true Church of God.”\textsuperscript{149} Even St. Augustine had denied that saints should receive any kind of prayer because, “we doe not make Gods [out] of Martyrs…[and] no prayer is made unto them.”\textsuperscript{150} Perkins held that the absence of images of saints in the early Church proved that the idea of intercession of the saint and the use of images to call upon that mediation were inventions of the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{151} According to Perkins, religious practice had to be backed by both tradition and Church authorities.

The next two authors expressed their views amongst a climate of toleration of images promoted by Archbishop Laud and supported by Charles I. In 1639, the Puritan writer Edmund Gurnay argued that praying to saints and their images for help disrupted the relationship between people and God because mediators were unnecessary. Unlike Perkins, who referred to the lack of historical precedent, he rejected the idea of intercession on the basis of the practical consequences it had on people’s perception of God. When people did not receive the help they requested after having prayed in front of the images of the saints, they concluded that “either there is no true god at all or if there
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be any,...he is...[a] poor, brute and senseless thing."152 Because prayers to images of saints could not reach God, people lost faith in Him because it appeared His might and power had dissipated. Consequently Gurnay recommended that

for the invisible God (unto whom only all Prayer is to bee made) being no where to bee spoken withal but in the closet of the heart; It is necessary that all the powers of the minde should as much as possibly may bee gather themselves unto the door of the heart, toward the enter[t]ainment of that God which at no other dore means to enter.153

He emphasized that prayers should be made only to God, who was accessed by focusing the mind (as opposed to the eyes).

In 1641, Joseph Mede, the biblical scholar whose knowledge of several languages turned him into a respected and influential author of his time, determined that saints’ intercession promoted by Catholics was equivalent to the pagan conception of the divine in which demonic activity was involved.154 He hoped to show that because intercession was invalid, the use of images was useless. He explained that in the pagan world, gods were considered “so sublime and pure...[that] might not bee prophaned with approach of earthly things, or with the care or managing of mortall men businesses.”155 Mede implied that Catholics believed that God could not be bothered with direct requests and instead used saints, “that middle sort of divine Powers which they called...to be as mediatours and agents between the Sovereigne Gods and mortall men.”156 Mede’s distaste for intercession led him to claim that demons were involved in it. During intercession, he explained,
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God is not approached by men, but all the commerce and inter-course betweene Gods and men is perf[o]rmed by the mediations of Daemons;…Deamons are reporters and carriages from men to the Gods, and again from the Gods to men; of the supplication and prayers of the one, and of the inju[n]ctions and rewards of devotion from the other.\textsuperscript{157}

Mede contended that Jesus Christ was the only intercessor because he was the only connection between God and people. Thus he quoted St. Paul’s idea that “as in Christ dwelleth the fulnesse of the Godhead bodily, so that he needed no colleagues or mediation; so also were they complet[e] in him, and needed therefore no agents besides him.”\textsuperscript{158} It is surprising that he was the one Protestant author who emphasized Jesus Christ as the only intercessor. According to scholar Carol Piper Heming, the constant repetition of the phase ‘Christ is the only intercessor’ in the text of the Protestant reformers reveals their fears that eliminating the many intercessors common in religious practices would be a big challenge.\textsuperscript{159}

In contrast, the self-exiled Catholic theologian who sought to support the efforts of the pope against Protestant reforms, Nicholas Sanders, presented the use of images during prayers for intercession as a common practice of Catholics. In 1565, he argued that the images of saints, the Virgin, and Jesus Christ could be equally used for prayers of intercession. He emphasized the prevalent use of images: “we praie to Christe at the sight of his Image, and we likewise desire our Lady, or the Apostles, or Virgins to praye
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\textsuperscript{159} According to Carol Piper Heming’s opinion, Luther’s message had been categorical, “Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.” 34-35.
for us, at the sighte of their Images.”160 Just as Erasmus had done, he rejected the idea that some images made prayers more effective than others.

Cypriano Valera, the convert to Protestantism who as a clergyman of the Church of England was commissioned to do the translation of the King James’ Bible into Spanish, accused Catholics of depriving Jesus Christ of his role as God’s only intercessor.161 In 1594, he blamed the specialist saints, the idea that each saint had a monopoly over resolving specific types of problems such as health or finances.162 Given his vitriolic comments towards the pope, it is likely that he become a radical reformer, possibly a Puritan. Valera categorically accused the pope of “lead[ing] men to honor God with new cults that God never ordered, like invoking saints” for their different afflictions.163 For instance, people who are “given the evil eye invoke St. Lucia, [for] a toothache [they invoke] St. Apolonia, [for] throat pain [they invoke] St. Blas.”164 The ubiquitous use of images irritated Valera for it enhanced the cult of saints. As he argued, “it is still not enough to invoke the saints, but [they] invoke their images, their effigies, or in better words, their idols.”165 His presentation of the issue of saintly specialists very closely resembled Erasmus’ argument and suggests the extent of Erasmus’ influence in Spain.

Valera complained that the abundance of intercessors obscured the role of Christ as the only acceptable intercessor between men and God. That most people called upon images of the Virgin to petition favors led him to lament that no one remembers “God,
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[or] his son Jesus Christ, who is the only intercessor and mediator with his Father”
despite the fact that “in several sections of the Scripture…God orders that [we] invoke
him.” Valera believed that the cult of saints itself worked against the role that Jesus
Christ had been given by God in the salvation of humanity. Curiously he made one of the
c few recognitions of Jesus Christ’s intercession, which was at the center of Puritan
concerns.

Fernando de Tejeda commented that the bodily gestures and prayers used by
Catholics provided proof of image worship. In 1633, he suggested that the strength of
Catholic devotion to images derived from the expectation that people would receive
favors from the material images and therefore worshipped them. In his view, Catholics
believed “there is some deity…in the sticks and stones, in images, that has the power to
make miracles, bring health, and prevent danger…. [Therefore] they are worshipped as if
they were Gods.” He recalled specific examples of Catholic practices that
demonstrated the misconception of the power of images.

Though images were not required for prayer, in practice they were used as the
visual focus for prayers requesting the intercession of the saints. Spanish authors argued
that images made the communication between people and their mediators (usually the
saints and the Virgin Mary) more effective, thus increasing the likelihood that God would
hear their prayers. Conversely, English authors categorically rejected the doctrine of
intercession as part of the challenge of the Reformation to the Catholic cult of saints.

According to Protestantism, only specific individuals, mainly those from early
Christianity, who ‘truly’ fulfilled the characteristics of sanctity – charity and love – were
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considered saints. While Protestants agreed with Catholics that saints were in heaven, they did not grant saints a role in interceding with God for the requests of the faithful.

It is surprising that Puritan authors did not stress the role of Jesus Christ as the only mediator with God, which was at the core of the Calvinist theology. English Protestants might have believed that intercessory prayers had been effectively abolished with the destruction of images and the practices linked to them. This would explain the limited interest in discussing this subject. The biblical scholar Mede, who was not considered a Puritan, was the only English author to use the argument of Christ’s intercessory role. The stress on Jesus Christ’s intercession by the Spanish convert Valera demonstrated the possible influence of Puritan thinking in his writings.

While all Spanish Catholics agreed that images themselves did not have any direct relation to the miracles that take place, the language used by some of them conveyed an ambiguous message. Spanish Catholics tried to explain that in the same way devotees directed prayers of intercession at intercessors—the Virgin and the Saints—, not at their images, people understood that any miracles and signs received came from God. In stark contrast, the English Catholic Nicholas Sanders was very careful in using a clear language to convey his message to the lay audience.

In contrast to the Spanish Catholic stance, the Spanish converts underscored the expectations of people who prayed, asking for help. Using similar rhetorical strategy to that of Erasmus, Valera denounced the idea that saints had different areas of specialization, which seemed to blur the distinction between Christian and pagan practice. What distinguishes Valera and Tejeda is that they were the only Protestant authors who focused on a critique of actual practice they had observed. Hence one can
understand their interest in relating miracles and signs that people saw as responses from the images they had prayed to.

* * * * *

The discussion of the teaching function of images generated considerable attention because this justification had been traditionally used by the medieval Church. Whereas Spanish Catholics supported the premise that images could teach as effectively as words, English Protestant authors denied the value of images as visual instruction. As a consequence, Catholic authors engaged in a paradox of their own. By arguing for the superiority of visual information, they weakened the importance of preaching, which was also a very important tool during the Counter-Reformation.

While Spanish Catholics defended the use of images as models to imitate, English Protestants held that the visual could not communicate information worthy of imitation. Despite the optimism of the fathers of Trent, a Spanish Catholic author questioned the correctness of the representations of saints, and an English Catholic remarked that the information provided by images was not sufficient.

Whereas Spanish Catholics seemed unwilling to enter into a discussion of the link between miraculous signs and images, in order to avoid possible charges of unorthodoxy, it is hard to explain why Protestant writers did not use this contentious subject to attack Catholic practice. The English Catholic Sanders was careful not to focus his discussion on pilgrimages and miracles as those were the features that characterized medieval Catholicism. A few Spanish Catholics struggled to explain that images did not have any agency in the miraculous signs that were commonly recorded by the Church. All but one
English Protestant used this discussion to advance the idea that Jesus Christ was the only intercessor with God as advocated by Calvinists.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE MAKING OF IMAGES

Christians created images of God and Jesus Christ throughout the history of Christianity, from paintings of the Catacombs to early modern images; however, at the same time, the legitimacy of such creation of images was questioned by those who believed that neither God nor Christ could be reproduced in an image. This group of critics considered these images a serious violation of the omnipresent but invisible, non-circumscribed nature of God. Similarly, these critics opposed the production of images of the Virgin Mary, the saints, and other biblical characters because the features that made these individuals worthy Christians were invisible in images.

This chapter examines the arguments put forth by authors who justified or rejected the role of the makers and the making of two and three-dimensional images of God, Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints. This aspect of the larger discussion on images is important because, at least in theory, the making of images could be supervised, regulated, and controlled. The Church could decide upon and enforce criteria to which all images had to conform or, as the Church of England did, could destroy all of them because no image was acceptable. This analysis investigates Spanish and English authors’ concerns about the challenges presented by the creation of images.

1 Images discussed in this chapter include painted, carved, and sculpted representations.
The disagreement between Spanish Catholics and English Protestants stemmed from a larger argument about whether humans were capable of visually knowing the divine and the holy. The Spanish arguments, consonant with that of John of Damascus, suggested that people needed physical knowledge of God to relate to God, and thus the Bible provided examples of figures and symbols with which they could make such images. Following the doctrine proffered by the Church of England that underscored that only God’s word, as relayed in the Bible, could present and make His incorporeal and invisible being present, all English Protestants rejected the creation of images of God by humans. Images presented a problem when people did not understand for what they stood. However, Spanish Catholics claimed that even the most ignorant people understood that images were only symbols. Given the important responsibility of representing the divine and the holy, Spanish Catholics argued that the Bible justified the role of the painters and makers of images, which the English Protestants denied.

This chapter first introduces the role of the Inquisition and the Catholic clergy in the control and supervision of images. The next three sections analyze three related aspects of image-making. First, I examine the creation of images of God and Jesus, which foregrounded the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Then, in a related discussion, I address the significance of the Protestant claims about the problems that arise in making images of saints and the Virgin Mary. Finally, I consider the ideas expressed about the role and responsibility of the painter as the creator of images.
I. Catholic Control and Regulation of Images after Trent

In accord with its attempt to impose orthodoxy of ideas, the Spanish Church aligned the bishops and clergy with the Inquisition to supervise and regulate the production of images. The target of this program was images in the process of being created in workshops as well as completed ones already in churches and other public places. The Council of Trent specifically called upon bishops to ensure that images in churches met the requirements of the Church even though the regulations were not articulated in detail in any official documents.\(^2\) The Inquisition also assigned a supervisor of art to closely scrutinize images and those who made them. The exact form in which this position functioned within the hierarchy of the Inquisitions is unknown.

Two ideological and aesthetic elements received the attention of the supervisors and regulators: the validity of the subject represented in the image, and the way in which that subject was represented. Images needed to show individuals and scenes the Church deemed worthy of representation. For example, in the city of Valencia in the 1610s, a dispute arose between a group that considered a recently deceased friar a saint and the Church establishment that opposed images of an unofficially recognized saint.\(^3\)

---


The physical characteristics of the subjects represented in images were very important because a representation of a saint had to look like saint, not like a peasant. Jean Claude Schmitt makes clear that during the Middle Ages there were no official texts delineating the process of image making or fixed canons of iconography. During the Renaissance, various Italian authors, such as the renowned architect and humanist Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472), the influential Venetian architect Andrea Palladio (1508-1580), and the artist and inventor Leonardo DaVinci (1452-1519), had discussed the features to be used and avoided in religious images. Based in part on these authors, the Louvanist theologian, Johannes Molanus, wrote a comprehensive guide to guarantee the orthodoxy of images. His regulations sought to effectively produce representations with specific kinds of clothing and facial gestures that reflected the personality of those represented in images. All treatises and moralists who repeated those arguments agreed that images had to show ‘decorum,’ which could be interpreted as convenience, dignity, or decency, among other possible meanings.

In Spain, the issue of decency acquired a predominant place: after 1560 all provincial synods rejected nudity and condemned images that were dishonest and/or lascivious.

Trent merely established that not all images were appropriate and orthodox; without a specific list of requirements, regulation of images became difficult if not

---

5 Falomir, “*Imagenes de una santidad*,” 247.
8 Ibid., 248.
impossible.⁹ According to Farga, recent historiography has demonstrated that the work of painters was not subject to any control because the vague rules that defined orthodoxy in images were hardly ever enforced.¹⁰ The dispute over the images of an unofficial saint in Valencia previously mentioned is a point in case. The images of St. Simon portrayed him with signs of sanctity and were made immediately after the death of the friar. When the Church did not approve the images, the supporters of St. Simon’s cause used the vague arguments of Trent, and even those of Molanus, to justify the validity of those images.¹¹

II. Images of God and Jesus Christ: Early Modern Ideas.

While the English observed that the immateriality and invisibility of the divine eliminated the possibility of representing the Trinity, the Spanish held that it was precisely this immateriality that created the need to translate the divine into a visible and perceptible form authorized by God. The discussion focused on the following major questions: Was it possible to represent the immaterial divine essence of God the Father? Could the humanity of Jesus Christ be represented apart from His divine nature? While Spanish and English writers replied to these questions with opposing views, the authors varied considerably on the weight of two important issues: first, God’s approval of and willingness to being made visible through symbolic

¹⁰ Ibid.
¹¹ Falomir, “Imágenes de una santidad,” 178-179.
representations and, second, the significance of biblical injunction and precedent in this process.

The Council of Trent in 1563 recognized that images did not represent the invisible essence of God but rather provided symbolic representations of God. The authors of Trent, recognizing that people could misunderstand the meaning of images, recommended that clergy instruct parishioners that “[images] are not copies of divinity, as if it could possibly be seen by corporeal eyes, or [as] if divinity could be expressed with colors and shapes.” Nonetheless, Trent did not explain what visual forms or symbols could be used to appropriately represent God, why God was often represented in images as an old man, or why artists even gave the divinity a visual form. Unlike the Decree on Images produced by Trent, the catechism published by Trent in 1565—also called the Roman catechism—expressed confidence in people’s proper understanding of images by asking, “Who can be so ignorant as to believe that such forms are representations of the Deity?” The catechism stressed that the shapes and forms used to depict the attributes of those represented were valid because they appeared in the Old and New Testaments. The divergent views of these two documents can be explained by their different purposes: in the decree, the fathers of Trent acknowledged the possibility of people misunderstanding images, while in the

---

13 Post-Tridentine Spanish regional and local synods, as well as Inquisition records show that in practice the Church was unable to completely enforce orthodoxy in the making of representations of God and the saints. In the New Spain, seventeenth century- Inquisition records reported several cases of paintings of the Trinity as three men or as a man with three heads. Carlos Eire reminds us that a statue of the Virgin Mary with the trinity in her womb is a sign of realism of faith that resulted from apparent freedom of interpretation when doctrine was translated into images. For a fuller discussion of the doctrine see Joseph Wolinsky, “Holy Trinity,” in *Encyclopedia of Christian Theology*, 2005 ed.
15 Ibid.
catechism the Church chose to present a more optimistic view of the problem. That
the Church may have feared that a pessimistic view would call attention to the dangers
presented by images among those without enough religious instruction explains the
difference between the decree and the catechism.

Agreeing with Damascus and Trent, six Spanish Catholic authors highlighted
various biblical references that revealed God making images of Himself to show that
He set an image-making precedent to encourage Christians to do the same. In 1594,
Gabriel Vasquez, the Jesuit theologian who specialized in the works of Thomas
Aquinas, described certain conditions for making images of God.16 Agreeing with
Damascus and Trent, he pointed out that neither the image of God nor any other
images were reproductions of those represented in them. He explained that the idea
that “we want to imitate to the point of life His image, just like the image of friends
and of other men,…may be of the highest folly, for God does not have a form and a
figure which could be expressed as a picture or a sculpture.”17 Vasquez stressed the
Bible as the source of authority for the forms used to depict God. The reason why
God is portrayed as a man or as a dove is because he should be “represent[ed] to us
[in]some corporeal figure in which He is worthy to appear…just as he appeared in
chapter 7 of Daniel…as in chapter 3 of Matthew.”18 The authors of the Bible selected
proper forms to provide the reader with useful analogies. Vaquez held that the
ultimate purpose behind images of God lay in assisting human cognition; images
allow “our understanding [to] ascend in some way from the conceivable figure to the

16. See Appendix.
17 Vasquez, Gabriel. De Cultu Adorationis libri tres: accessment, disputationes duae contra Errores
Foelicis, et Elipandi de adoptione et seruiutate Christi in Concilio Francofordiensi damnatus (Madrid :
18 Ibid.
invisible form of God.” That Vasquez included this topic in his discussion indicates that it is possible that even among theologians no consensus on the justification of these types of representations existed.

In 1595, Roberto Bellarmino, the influential theologian and controversialist of the Counter-Reformation, held that images did not represent the subjects as they existed in reality, but visual symbols nevertheless assisted human cognition of the incorporeal and invisible. Through his books, especially his catechism, the ideas of this Italian-born author influenced Counter-Reformation Spain. Because Bellarmino had a teaching appointment in Louvain in 1570, it is likely that he met Johannes Molanus who had attended the university and given a talk about his ‘Treatise on Images’ two years before. Molanus detailed the orthodox way to represent God and this may have influenced Bellarmino. Agreeing with the fathers of Trent, he observed that although “God the Father is painted like an old man, and the Holy Spirit [is painted] in the shape of a dove; in reality they look like that because they are spirits without bodies.” Bellarmino most likely expected that the laity would present this conundrum to priests and thus, in his catechism, he prepared the clergy to offer simple answers. It is not clear, however, that such explanation would have convinced conversos and moriscos because both Judaism and Islam rejected any visual representation of God.

19 Ibid.
20 See Appendix.
21 Molanus, Traite des Sacred, 12.
The use of such figures as representations of God and the Holy Spirit was justified by the Bible. For instance, Bellarmino explained that God had appeared in that shape of an old man in a vision of the prophet Daniel. In the same way, the dove reflected the Holy Spirit because during the baptism of Christ, the Holy Spirit had appeared in that shape. Bellarmino emphasized that people should not believe that God looked like an old man or that the Holy Spirit was a dove. Instead, the Bible presented those spiritual beings in such way, using familiar objects and subject, to help people apprehend what was beyond human sensorial capacities. In Bellarmino’s view, these symbolic representations could “make us understand the attributes and skills they had, even if they do not look like that.”

23 Thus the purpose of painting God as an old man was “to point out that he is eternal and created before all created things.”

24 The Holy Sprit was painted as a dove to convey innocence, purity, and sanctity.

25 In 1624, Martin de Roa, the Jesuit who wrote extensively on the importance of religious art for the Catholic Church, argued that the creation of images was possible and acceptable. Besides responding to the Protestant claim that images of God could not be made, Roa intended to confirm that his readers held orthodox ideas about images. While saints who “had bodies and colors…could be copied” into images, he wondered “how could there be Images of God…[when God was a] spirit without a body…that could be imitated by a brush.”

26 Roa assumed that because saints had once had physical bodies, it was humanly possible to reproduce those bodies; however, he

23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
25 Ibid. 68v.
26 See Appendix.
27 Martin de Roa, Antiguedad, veneración i fruto de las sagradas imagenes. (Sevilla: Gabriel Ramos Bejarano, 1622), 6v.
did not explain how a body that had existed centuries earlier could be accurately painted. Nonetheless, Roa presented his arguments in a manner that reflected his concern with the perspective of the mind of his reader. Unlike Damascus, Roa argued that some of the symbols used to represent God had been chosen by humans. God and other incorporeal spirits were represented “in the shape [of] mysterious figures that are wisely thought to signify some their features of the subject even if these do not really look like their prototypes.”

The representations of God had to convey the infinite power and authority of the almighty. For instance, the image of God as a crowned king with the world in his hand sought to convey the idea that God was all powerful and the king of the universe. While Roa’s readers might have understood why the Bible depicted God as a powerful king, they might have wondered why the Bible represented God as an old man. Representing God as a wise father might not have been self-evident to many viewers. People might also have wondered whether the representation of God as a strong and young king was better or worse than that of God as an old man.

While all the Spanish authors suggested that Catholics understood what an image of God conveyed, Roa was the only author who expressed this sentiment unambiguously. In his view, even among the most simple and ignorant people, “nobody believes that this figure shows God as he really is.” The confidence exuded by Roa here contradicted his doubts about the ability of the Church to teach people the meaning of images in early Christianity. By expressing his confidence in the discerning capacity of the people, Roa disagreed with the fathers of Trent who had

---

28 Ibid., 7v.
29 Ibid., 6v.
worried that people might misunderstand the images they encountered. Roa’s assertion embodied the contradiction that his lay readers might have faced when instructed on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. When presented with a visual representation of the Trinity, they were required to believe in an idea that contradicted what they experienced with their senses and their understanding of the world. The viewer was presented with an image of God in the shape of an old man, while he knew that God was not really an old man. Images were considered useful as representations of those represented in them, but if the image of God was not a representation of Him, this was a unique type of image. The image of God was exceptional in that it was only an allegorical representation of the subject, a stance unacceptable to Protestants.

Like Bellarmino, Bartolomé de Medina, the influential Dominican at Salamanca, remarked that the Bible provided visual images of incorporeal beings that, in turn, made it lawful for people to do the same. In 1593, in his manual for confessors, he referred to the episode in which God the Father and the Holy Spirit appeared as a material figure and then asked his readers, “Why can’t we paint Him in that way?” Here, Medina implied that the Bible served as the unequivocal source of authority for making images; however, he failed to explain why some figures of God were chosen over others. For instance, he asked, why representing God as a ‘burning bush’ was less common than representing Him as an old man. At the same time Medina seemed to equate the Bible presenting a ‘textual image’ with the Church using
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30 See information on Bartolomé de Medina
31 Bartolomé de Medina, Breve Instrucción de como se han de administrar el Sacramento de la penitenciaPadre Maestro G. Bartolomé de MedinaCatedratico de prima de teología en la Universidad deSalamanca de la Orden de Sto Domingo... (Alcalá, Spaín Casa de Juan Iniguez de Le/gesuerica) 67v
a ‘visual image.’ Unlike Bellarmino’s, Medina’s catechism instructed priests to ask questions to their confessants in order to test their understanding of doctrine. Medina might have had too much confidence in the intellectual capacity of the lower clergy as a whole given the gaps in adequate preparation that existed in the seventeenth century.

In 1610, Nicolas Avila, the priest active in the Post-Tridentine program to teach Christian catechism, again justified the creation of images but relied on language more vague than that of Roa and Bellarmino. In his catechism, Avila held that the making of images of God was “lawful and convenient according to tradition from the beginnings of the Church until present times.” This broad claim of ‘Church tradition’ did not explain the standards required in the making of images. Unlike Bellarmino, he chose not to address which specific details made images acceptable and which did not because he may not have felt qualified to do it.

A lay author, the accomplished painter Francisco Pacheco, offered a unique point of view in 1649. In 1618, the Inquisition had appointed him the overseer of religious images because of his reputation and expertise. While Pacheco’s treatise on images resembles that of Vicente Carducho, the other painter who wrote about images, Pacheco’s close contact with the Inquisition adds a unique dimension to his writings. Pacheco might have been required to visit the workshops and public places where religious paintings were made and hung. Although little information exists about the role performed by Pacheco or any other overseer, the effectiveness of the supervision and control of religious paintings was limited. In his book, however, Pacheco offered

32 See teaching functions for a full discussion of the value of the text versus image.
33 See Appendix.
34 Nicolás de Avila, *Suma de mandamientos y maremagnun del segundo...* (Alcala: Casa de Juan Gracian 1610), 49v.
35 See Appendix.
theoretical examples of good and bad paintings that he might have encountered as an agent of the Inquisition. Previously, in the last decades of the sixteenth century, the Inquisition had censured several images whose visual and textual messages conveyed unorthodox ideas. For instance, an image of a crucifix with a person praying for success in business was chastised for lack of devotion. Nevertheless, the Church did not appear to have commissioned Pacheco’s guide to religious painting which contained regulations similar to that of the Dutch theologian Molanus.

Pacheco approached art differently from the rest of the Spanish Catholics; instead of justifying the creation of images of God, he focused on explaining how to make appropriate images. He acknowledged that there were several correct ways to represent the same subject and suggested this could be confusing. Pacheco described and judged the most common painting of the Trinity:

God the father is painted as a serious figure of a handsome old man, not bold, [but] instead with long hair and venerable beard, both very white, seated with majesty as he appeared to prophet Daniel…to his right hand, Christ our Lord, as David says…painted as a 33 year old, with a very beautiful face and handsome body, with wounds in his hands, feet and side….and on top, the Holy Spirit in the shape of dove (because even if it appeared in other forms, this is the most known and used).37

This author agreed with Molanus that no one could surpass the image of God presented by the Bible, but Pacheco assumed that other painters had to know how to follow these rules to produce an image that was as close as possible to that ‘ideal’ model.

36 Virgilio Pinto Crespo, Inquisición y Control Ideológico en la España del siglo XVI (Madrid: Taurus, 1983)
37 Francisco Pacheco, Arte de la pintura, su antiguedad y grandezas... (Sevilla: Simon Faxardo impressor de libros a la Cerrajeria, 1649), 473.
In 1652, Cristoval Delgadillo, the theologian of the order of the Minor Franciscans who wrote a lengthy treatise on the adoration of the Immaculate Conception and the doctrine of images, held that instruction was necessary to clarify the meaning of images and resolve any possible misunderstandings. In his treatise in Latin he shared Roa’s optimistic view that few people would view the material shape of an image as the real essence of God. As he wrote, people were “easily able to be instructed that God and the Angels are not represented in true form, but through analogies or according to a certain proportion of our understanding which understands spiritual matters in a corporeal manner.” In practice, to understand the meaning of the various representations of God, the laity would have required a sufficient level of instruction.

Among the commentators, Delgadillo was the only author who focused on the implications of making images of Jesus Christ. As part of the Trinity, Jesus Christ’s physical body represented two aspects of Himself: His humanity and, at least figuratively, His divine essence. In Delgadillo’s opinion, “it suffices that the humanity [of God] is fashioned, a humanity which we believe to substitute for the embodiment of the Word in which both divine and human nature are commingled.” Like Bellarmino, Delgadillo solved the problem of depicting two natures, one visible and one invisible, by suggesting that the visible could signify the invisible. Unlike the images of God the Father, images of Christ were possible, at least in theory, because he had a human body and thus, like the saints, his fleshly form could be rendered.

---

38 See Appendix.
39 Cristoval Delgadillo, *Duo tractus alter de incarnatione, de adoratione alter...* (1653), 539.
40 For a fuller discussion see note 14.
41 Delgadillo, 539.
In contrast to the position of these Spanish Catholics, the English Protestant authors asserted that the divine nature of God precluded humans from making representations of Him. While the Act of Uniformity of 1559 prohibited all images, it did not explain the reasoning behind the decree. Emulating the policies established under King Edward, no specific explanation of why God the Father and God the Son could not be painted was offered until 1563. The Homily prepared by Elizabethan bishops underscored the nature of God as the major reason why images of Jesus Christ could not be made. According to this document,

“No image either ought or can be made unto God. For how can God, a most pure spirit, whom man never saw, be expressed by a grosse, bodily and visible similitude? How can the infinite Maiestie and greatness of God, incomprehensible [to] mans mind, much more not able to be compassed with the sense, be expressed in a small and little image?”42

Foreshadowing the Catholic response, the authors of the document denied that “Scripture or Writing, and picture, differ but a little…[and that] a painter [could] set [God] as it were a judge in a throne…as he  is described in writing by the Prophets.”43 This document acknowledged that the Bible contained descriptions of God but argued that making an image of Him was impossible because “God is pure spirit, infinite.”44 On pragmatic grounds the authors also rejected rendering an image of Jesus Christ; his human body could not be painted because no present individual knew his physical characteristics.45 For this reason, “there be in Greece and at Rome, and in other places,
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42 Mary Ellen Rickey and Thomas B. Stroup, Certaine Sermons or Homilies (Gainesville, FL: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1968), 40.
43 Ibid., 42.
44 Ibid.
45 Ibid., 41.
divers Images of Christ, and none of them like to other.” They even if the human form of Christ were known, an image of Him would incompletely represent him because it would exclude His divine nature: “Seeing therefore that for the Godhead, which is the most excellent part, no images can be made, it is falsely called the image of Christ. Therefore images of Christ be not onely defects, but also lies.” Even in the absence of these practical obstacles, the Homily specifically prohibited the production of images because the standard was “whether it be lawfull and agreeable to God’s word to bee done or no.”

Authors writing during the reign of Elizabeth viewed the making of images of God the Father as a direct affront to His divine essence. John Jewel, one of the most influential radical bishops of this period who pressed for further reforms, responded to the arguments of a significant number of works published by Catholic exiles. In 1565, in reply to Harding’s arguments, he held that the limited physical description of the subjects described in the Bible precluded making images. A truthful, and therefore complete, representation of the persons of the Trinity was not possible because while the Bible has “certayne descriptions of God, yet if you read on forth, it expounded it selfe, declaring that God is a pure spirite, infinite, who repleniseth heaven and earth, whiche the peinture doth not.” Jewel saw people’s inclination to represent God as a serious problem that violated His unique nature. When people sought to represent God with a material body, “a man there and wyll easily bring one into the heresie of

---

46 Ibid., 42.
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48 Ibid., 41.
49 See Appendix.
the Anthropomorphites thinking God to have handes an[d] feete and to sit as a man.”51

Jewel equated Catholics with pagans because both allowed material representations of
God. Frustrated with Catholic practices, Jewel tried to show how they manipulated
translations of the ‘true’ words of the Church fathers.

In 1565, James Calfhill, the progressive reformer, responded to the Catholic
John Martiall, an exile in Douai. Knowing that this written controversy had attracted
the interest of many people, Calfhill wrote for a large audience of clergymen and laity.
He argued that the auditory quality of God’s delivery of His message provided
essential proof that He intended to prohibit images of Himself.52 The biblical episode
in which Moses “hearde the voyce of…wordes in the mountayne, in the middest of
fyre, but his shape [Moses] saw not,” meant that it was impossible for any human to
represent Him.53 Calfhill did not deny that God might have a visual shape; he simply
asserted that nobody knew or could recognize it. Just as God rejected any visual
representation of Himself, Calfhill wrote, so too did He strongly oppose the creation
and use of crucifixes that presented “the glory of the immortall God,…[in] an Image
framed after the shape of a mortall man.”54 He claimed that all attempts to make an
image of Jesus Christ were doomed to fail.55 In 1597, William Perkins, the prolific
controversialist of a moderate Puritan stance who popularized theological discussions,
rejected the possibility of making any image of the divine because God had not chosen
to present Himself visually.56 Through this book, Perkins reinforced that differences

51 Ibid.
52 See Appendix 1.
53 James Calfhill, An Answer to John Martiall’s Treatise of the Cross… (London : By Henry Denham,
for Lucas Harryson, 1565), 64r.
54 Ibid.
55 Ibid.,135
56 See Appendix.
between Catholic and Protestant were considerable and not trivial as some people argued. Perkins stated that if “God be otherwise conceived than he hath manifested and revealeed himselfe in his owne word,” the result was the creation of “a fiction or idol of the brain."57 This statement could be interpreted in two very different ways. In one reading, Perkins seems to be arguing that the word of God (referring to the Second Commandment) made clear His prohibition of representations of God. A different interpretation of the statement would emphasize the idea that God had exclusively manifested himself through words, not through images, and therefore humans could not represent God.

Perkins held that while the Bible had used symbolic representations chosen by God, nobody should use those symbols to make representations of Him. Perkins observed that those symbols existed only at the moment in which God made Himself present in those forms. However, “the formes in which the Sonne and holy Ghost haue appeared, were not their images but onely sensible signes & pledges of their presence,” which were not intended to be used “foreuer, but onely for the present time, when they appeared.”58 By emphasizing the expiration of those ‘signs,’ Perkins hoped to effectively dismiss the Catholic claim that the symbols used by God could be copied. Perkins told his readers, “it is a falsehood for vs to think, that we may lawfully doe whatsoever God doth, [because only God] can at his pleasure auoide and cut off all occasion of idolatrie, when he represents himselfe in visible formes.”59 Conversely, Perkins found that the mistaken use of symbols to represent God

57 William Perkins, A Warning Against the Idolatrie of the Last Times…. (Cambridge: Printed by John Legat, Printer to the Vniuersity of Cambridge, 1601), 6
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid.
inevitably resulted in idolatry. As the omnipotent being, God owned the exclusive right to use symbols.

When Perkins focused on images of Jesus Christ, he surprisingly admitted that these types of images could be made under certain conditions. Margaret Aston has pointed out that in this instance, Perkins, although a Puritan, resembled an Arminian.\textsuperscript{60} Perkins explained that “it is not unlawfull to make or to have the Image of Christ…two caveats being remembered,…the first [condition], that this Image be onely of the manhood.”\textsuperscript{61} It is surprising that Perkins would take a position that appeared to contradict the Second Commandment and the Homily of 1563. Even an image of the human features of Jesus Christ opposed the idea that the divinity and humanity of Christ were inseparable.

The second condition that he proposed is more intriguing because it was related to the way the image was used. Perkins argued that for an image of Jesus Christ to be acceptable it should also “be out of use of religion.”\textsuperscript{62} This condition can be interpreted in one of two different ways. It is possible that Perkins wanted to exclude the image of Christ from any religious function such as carrying the image during a procession or kneeling down in front of it to pray. It is also possible that Perkins differentiated between locating an image in a church – an official religious place – and finding an image in a private non-religious place. This exception might have generated confusion among the lay people who had constantly been told that all images were dangerous and thus forbidden.

\textsuperscript{60} Margaret Aston, “Puritans and Iconoclasm 1560-1660,” in The Culture of English Puritanism 1560-1700, Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales eds. (New York: St. Martin Press, 1996), 105.
\textsuperscript{61} Perkins, Warning, 6.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., 21.
In 1606, Henry Peacham, the author of the *Art of Drawing with the Pen*, a theoretical work for artists, warned of the danger of attempting to depict God. His work is exceptional in that it is one of few extant sources written from the perspective of an artist. In the introduction he warned “all young Gentlemen, or any els…desirous to become practitioners of this excellent art” to avoid the mistake of representing God in material form. According to him,

> There be some things that ought to be free from the pencil, as the picture of God the father or (as I have seen) the whole Trinitie painted in glass window; which hee cannot do without artificiall blasphemy, and reviving from hell the old heresie of the Anthropomorphites who supposed God to be in the shape of an old man, sitting upon his throne in a white robe, with a triple crowne on his head.

Peacham knew that those who created such representations justified their work through Ezekiel’s vision of a throne with God sitting on it. Like other Protestants, he argued that such Biblical visions had to be interpreted symbolically, not literally. Instead of attacking all Catholics for such ‘blasphemy,’ Peacham focused the blame on Church authorities, as he remarked that while this type of image “is liked by many good Catholiques,…none of the…divines in their owne Catechismes and confessions” acknowledged any problem with representations of God. Peacham’s attempt to differentiate between these two groups led him to overstate his praise for Catholics. However, he makes clear that opposition to Catholic image doctrine was what made the Catholic people ‘good.’
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63 Henry Peacham was a lay writer and illustrator. See Appendix.
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By the end of the Elizabethan era, clergymen and government officials had removed most religious images from churches and other spaces, with the exception of some stained-glass windows. However, during the early Stuart reigns, official image policies would undergo considerable changes that undid important parts of the reforms achieved by the sixteenth-century monarchs. By the end of James’ rule, tolerance of images, including representations of God the Father, and crucifixes, increased.

A group of Arminians who rose to prominence in the late 1620s and 1630s supported by Charles I backed the return of these types of images. During those two decades, it appears that no English Protestants wrote about why images of God the Father and God the Son could not be made. While the more stringent censorship measures adopted by the crown explains the Puritan silence, it is significant that moderate Anglicans did not express their opposition to what they must have seen as the outrageous return of images. The experience of Archbishop Laud offers a reminder of the incongruities between policy and practice generated by the return of images. In 1639, the disagreements between the king and Parliament reached a breaking point and started the hostilities of the civil war. The Puritan faction of Parliament prosecuted both the king and Archbishop Laud for their abuses. During his trial in 1643, when Laud was asked if he had stated that no one could make an image of God the Father, he replied,

I never justified the making or having that Picture [of God the Father] for Calvin’s Rule, that we may picture that which may be seen, is grounded upon the Negative, that no Picture may be made of that which was never, never can

---

be seen. And to ground this Negative, is the Command given by Moses, Deut 4. you make not to yourselves this Picture; Why? For that you saw no manner of similitude, in the day that the Lord sp[oke] unto you out of the midst of the fire.67

Laud appropriated the authority of Calvin to demonstrate to his prosecutors that, like many of them, he followed Calvinist doctrine. It is striking that he relied on a source that rejected the production of images of God the Father and crucifixes, while in practice he had endorsed setting up of those kinds of images in churches.

Against Laud’s ideas, in 1639 Edmund Gurnay, a clergyman of Puritan leanings who actively opposed Arminian policy, asserted that crucifixes did not have the capacity to represent the suffering of Jesus Christ.68 The publication of Puritan work before the end of Charles I’s censorship suggests the limits of its enforcement as well as the boldness of Puritans in the face of an oppressive regime. Gurnay viewed crucifixes as failed attempts to represent Christ’s suffering, which “greatly dishonour, profane and vilifie those infinite and unexpressable sufferings of our saviour.”69 By representing Christ like any man on a cross, his sufferings were equated to those of any “mortall men. For all they that at any time suffered the like death of the crosse, [as] if they had been pictured as they hung in their agonies and torments, would they not have been more dolefull spectacles then any Crucifix did ever represent!”70

Unlike the rest of the English authors, Gurnay revealed his Calvinist views by
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focusing exclusively on the impossibility of representing the pain that had saved humanity.\textsuperscript{71}

In 1659, Edward Hyde, a Church of England clergyman of moderate stance, remarked that any attempts at representing the Trinity constituted a violation of God’s essence.\textsuperscript{72} He agreed with Jewel and Calfhill that the incorporeal nature of divinity should not be transgressed by a visual representation. He observed that it was not humanly possible to represent the divine essence of God in the Holy Trinity because, according to St. Augustine, “if the Trinity be so invisible, as that it is also incomprehensible, we ought not to have so slight an opinion concerning it, as if it were like any corporeal thing, or to think that it may be represented by any corporeal image.”\textsuperscript{73} In discussing images, Hyde used the arguments of St. Augustine to show that Catholic doctrine contradicted the opinions of the main traditional Church figures. Hyde observed that because humans did not have access to any visual information about the essence of God, those who insisted that they could “represent and worship God the Father under the image of an Old man, God the Son under the image of a Lamb, and god the holy Ghost under the image of a Dove” committed a serious mistake that insulted God.\textsuperscript{74} Thus he implied that those images that claimed to represent divinity actually created false representations.

Three decades before Hyde, at the time Arminians were increasing their influence, Fernando de Tejeda, the ex-friar who left Spain to convert to Protestantism, wrote several anti-Catholic treatises for King James and offered an interesting view on
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Tejeda mockingly criticized the most important aspects of Catholic doctrine and practice, offering an endless list of Biblical references that supported his Protestant views. The Spanish edition of the book, published in the Netherlands in 1623 and smuggles into Spain, indicates that Tejeda possibly expected to reach a lay Spanish audience receptive to his Protestant ideas. Even though concern about active Protestantism in Spain had died down after the scare of 1558, when cells had been discovered in Valladolid and Seville, the Inquisition still occasionally accused individuals of holding Protestant beliefs.

Like most English Protestants, he denied that God’s incorporeal and invisible qualities could be represented visually and tangibly. In his view, it was impossible to create something visible out of something invisible. He introduced the prophet Isaiah who had asked: “How does God look like? What form or shape could you use to represent Him?” According to Tejeda, no image of Him could be made because “everything in God is perfection,” and representing Him in an image was naturally imperfect. People were physically unable to see the true nature of God because “everything that humans can see with their corporeal eyes and perceive with their senses is made out of a substance which is inferior to the perfect substance of God.”

Tejeda articulated a position similar to that of the English Protestants. His emphasis was slightly different: people could not see God because of their own limitations, not because God had not visually revealed Himself.
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Unlike any English Protestants, Tejeda used the arguments of Thomas Aquinas to prove his point. According to Tejeda, Aquinas had argued, “God is not like the sun, moon, stars; nor like fire, air, water or earth; he is not like a lion, an angel, or a dove either,” which implied that nothing that the human eye could perceive could represent God. He warned ‘papists’ that their supposed representations of God had no relation to the real God. Although Tejeda referred to Thomas Aquinas as a source of authority here, he constantly opposed his ideas throughout his book.

The English and Spanish authors fundamentally disagreed on the lawfulness of making images of God the Father, through representations of the Trinity using any other symbols and allegories. The difference in the positions taken by Protestants and Catholic was essential to the discussion about images. The Anglican Church firmly viewed the use of visual symbols as a violation of the divine nature of God and Jesus Christ. The Council of Trent suggested that the use of symbols helped humans comprehend Christian concepts, but at the same time, the fathers of Trent acknowledged the possibility of people misunderstanding their meaning.

A few Catholic authors directly expressed their concern with the possibility that people could misinterpret the symbols used in images. Two theologians who wrote in Latin, Vasquez and Delgadillo, concluded that instruction was the only way to avoid misinterpretation. Bellarmino too told the readers of his Catechism about the importance of understanding the use of symbols in images. The absence of this concern in other Catholic writings might suggest that Spanish Catholics did not want to draw attention to the real possibility of mistaken interpretations of images.
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All of the Spanish Catholic authors heretofore discussed agreed that the intangibility and invisibility of God did not preclude making of images of Him. They accepted the Bible as a model to follow in the creation of these images. The fact that neither Roa nor Bellarmino, whose writings were more detailed than those of Avila and Medina, discussed this option might indicate that they feared their audience could not grapple with the complexities of Trinitarian images and therefore chose not to address it. Specifically, teaching about images of God to the morisco and converso populations might have posed a challenge since Islam and Judaism condemned any visual representation of God.

Beyond the problem of properly understanding the symbolic nature of the images of the Trinity, the Catholic Church failed to provide a guideline for the use of such symbols by the maker of images. As overseer of religious art for the Inquisitions, Pacheco must have witnessed the consequences of the absence of a fixed code of rules. For this reason, Pacheco offered a summary of the rules that a painter, and by association, other artists were supposed to follow.

It is puzzling that the Puritan author Perkins contradicted Protestants by making a single exception: he allowed the creation of images of Jesus Christ. By accepting that the human nature of Jesus Christ could be represented, he suggested that it was possible to separate God’s two natures. Perkins’ acceptance of the creation of the image of Christ might indicate that a growing toleration of ceremonialism among some moderate Protestants during the last decades of Elizabeth’s reign had touched even reformers like Perkins.
In this debate, the Spanish convert Tejeda demonstrated his flexibility in relation to Catholic doctrine. Whereas most of the time he rejected the ideas of Aquinas, in this instance he used them to support his argument. This strategy was not unique to Tejeda; in a few cases Protestant authors used Aquinas’ views to support their claims. These authors did not see a problem in recognizing the ‘enemy’ as a voice of authority when it was convenient.

III. Images of the Saints and the Virgin Mary

In contrast to the arguments between English Protestants and Spanish Catholics about possibility of representing God and Christ, disagreements about images of the saints and the Virgin Mary started from an acknowledgment that the saints and the Virgin Mary were corporeal. Both Protestants and Catholics agreed that unlike God the Father, an invisible and incorporeal being, the saints and the Virgin Mary had human bodies. According to the Spanish, the bodies and features of the saints could be easily represented while the English Protestants held that it was impossible to represent those figures because their real essence lay outside their physical forms.

Three Spanish Catholics asserted that both the physical features, such as facial expression, skin color, and hair type, and the virtues of saints and the Virgin Mary were important in a representation. In 1638, Bernardino Blancalana wrote about the origin and miracles of an image of a crucifix that had been taken from Italy to Madrid
to promote its cult in Spain. In this work, he implied that as long as the saints were represented according to the standards of the Catholic Church, image-making posed no challenge. He remarked that “[the] actions and… virtues [of] the saints can be painted and sculpted for eternal memory…[in] a Catholic and Religious way.” Yet that vague statement failed to offer any guidelines about how to represent those virtues properly. This absence is unsurprising because Blancalana’s objective was to promote the cult of a specific image among the Spanish population, especially in Madrid. The lack of clear standards or rules to follow in religious paintings preoccupied the Inquisition, which in turn became the supervisor of religious art in Spain.

Jose de Siguenza, a member of the order of the Hieronymites, explained that in addition to conveying saintly virtues, images could represent the exact physical characteristics of their subjects. In his descriptive work of 1595 on paintings and sculptures set in the Palace of El Escorial outside Madrid, he described an image of St. Jerome, emphasizing its realism. According to him, the painting showed its subject with a skin so “dry and wrinkled, so natural, as the saint [it] described, [and consequently he] looked as if he were alive.” Even though St. Jerome and other saints and martyrs had lived many centuries before, their physical characteristics could be reproduced with precision. Likewise, Siguenza wrote that an image of the mother and father of the Virgin Mary showed the “purity and grace…that one could
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imagine…[characterized] the parents of the Virgin Mary." Siguenza referred to ‘purity and grace’ as if he was talking about the color of the hair of a person, as something that everybody could recognize and therefore that could be represented. Yet Protestants identified a logical fallacy with this argument: how was this possible without any visual record or description of the subject?

In 1635, in his spiritual guide for nuns, the Jesuit theologian Bernardino de Villegas worried about the increasing use of clothing and ornamentation in statues. Besides being a teacher of theology in the school of St. Esteban of Murcia, Villegas held a position in the Inquisition. Excessive decoration and accessories used in statues suggest the influence of the Baroque style that eventually evolved into an extravagant and unrestrained phenomenon. Although Villegas was not concerned with the difficulties of depicting virtues, he suggested that the wrong attire could damage the reputation of those represented in images. According to Villegas, several theologians such as “Navarro, Fray Luis Lopez, Azor, and other authors of summae consider[ed] that the sin committed by indecently dressing up images of saints…[was] a kind of superstition and irreverence against the respect due to their sanctity.” One could argue that Villegas’ reference to superstition implied that wrongful use of an image of a saint transformed it into an idol. Most importantly, he emphasized that this was a preoccupation shared by many theologians, which might have been a strategy to impress his readers in nunneries of the seriousness of this violation. A study of wills
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of the town of Cuenca shows that most testators who owned images were female.\textsuperscript{88} Because female piety was more closely related to images, it is likely that abuses of images were linked to nuns and lay women in general.

In England, the Elizabethan Homily of 1563 argued that it was impossible to make images of saints. It stated that “the images of Saints, whose soules, the most excellent partes of them, can by no Images be presented and expressed.”\textsuperscript{89} In other words, saints could not be artistically rendered because their virtues could not be represented.

Unlike the Spanish Catholic authors, two English Protestants active at the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign argued that it was impossible to represent the incorporeal aspect of sanctity. In 1565, John Jewel emphasized that the feature that distinguished saints from other humans was the dedication of their souls to God during their lifetime, which was not a visible characteristic. The images made by Catholics only showed the bodies of the saints, while “[their] soules, the more excellent partes of them, can by no images be represented and expressed.”\textsuperscript{90} Consequently, those images were incomplete at best. Jewel thus suggested that just as the invisible essence of God could not be portrayed, so too were the immaterial qualities of the saints inaccessible to the human eye.

In 1565, James Calfhill engaged in an exchange with the English Catholic exile John Martiall. While Martiall praised the images of the saints, Calfhill denied that Catholic images of the saints portrayed virtue and obedience. In his debate with
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Martiall, Calfhill rebuked the early Christian author Germanus for arguing that “the Images of holy men, are a lively description of their stoutenesse, a representation of holy virtue, a dispensation of grace.” According to Calfhill, the most valuable features of saints were the invisible qualities that led them to dedicate their lives to God. Because even when “the Saints were alive, their virtues could not be diseerned with eye,” it was illogical to claim that virtue and grace could “nowe be seen in their dead Images, which have nether mynde, nor sense to hold them.” Contrary to Catholics, he understood virtue as a Christian action that could not be reproduced in an image.

Consequently, Calfhill argued that images of saints made by Catholics only depicted indistinguishable people. Those images had the potential to represent anybody from “Mars or St. George: Venus or the Virgin the mother of Christ” if it were not for the physical markers such as “a spear, or sword, or bo[o]ke in the hand…or a babbe in his armes” and the title that the maker had chosen to give them. For Calfhill, images served as empty skeletons without substance that were easily transformed by a simple change of accessory and name; thus “that which before was the Idoll Venus, shall now become the blessed Virgin.” Calfhill emphasized a direct link between representations of pagan deities and Catholic images, evoking an accusation made by the local unorthodox group called Alumbradismo against Spanish Catholics in the sixteenth century.
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The qualities that distinguished the saints and the Virgin Mary from the rest of the human population lay at the center of the discussion about the making of their images. While a few Spanish argued that virtues could be represented visually, two unrestrained Protestants held that the virtues of saints and the Virgin could not be reproduced in images. Three Spanish Catholics presented a paradoxical view: while accepting the difference between physical characteristics and virtues, they also suggested that they were commingled in or, at the very least, that the physical reflected the spiritual. Conversely, Jewel and Calfhill suggested that the virtues of the saints could not be grasped visually.

The practical difficulties encountered when representing virtues received the attention of very few authors. While Siguenza only partially acknowledged the difficulty of reproducing virtues, Calfhill offered a strong critique of the attempt to reproduce virtues. Siguenza accepted that the excessive ornamentation used in images of the Virgin Mary obscured her virtues. Not even Pacheco, who supervised orthodoxy in images for the Inquisition, was willing to talk about the specific problems he might have encountered. Other Spanish authors may have felt uncomfortable talking about this subject because of the lack of an official canon on iconography. The English author Calfhill remarked that Catholic images failed to represent the saintly behaviors for which saints were admired. In his view, all images looked like generic individuals without any distinguishable spiritual attributes. To stress the spiritual void of images, he claimed that ornaments and accessories depicted in images were the only indicator of the identity of the person represented in the image.
IV. The Role of the Image Maker

After addressing the implications of representing God and the saints, several authors turned their attention to those who made images. While several authors focused exclusively on painters, some of their statements suggest that their arguments referred to a wider group of artists that included carvers and sculptors.

Two Spanish Catholic authors drew a parallel between God as a maker of images and artists as makers of images. In 1597, Jaime Prades, a theologian who denounced the burning and destruction of images outside Spain, held that God started the tradition of making sacred images and served as a model emulated by painters and other craftsmen for centuries.⁹⁶ In his work, he recounted the story of an image of the face of Christ miraculously made by God. The king of the city of Edesa was very sick, but after hearing of Jesus Christ’s healing miracles, the king requested Jesus’ presence to pray for the recovery of his health. Because Jesus could not visit him, the king sent a painter to make a portrait of Jesus for use during worship. When the painter was in the presence of Jesus, the brightness of Jesus’ face blinded the painter making his work impossible, so Jesus put his face on the canvas and miraculously stamped on it which, according to Prades, made God the Son the first painter in Christianity. According to Prades, the authority of this account came from “several and various doctors…who instituted a celebration of this saintly image” and from Pope Stefan III who centuries later verified the story and displayed the image.⁹⁷
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Another instance of God’s direct involvement in the creation of images occurred “during the passion of Jesus Christ when the cloth of the Veronica was stamped with the image of Christ’s face.”98 This story was legitimized by Saint Luke and Nicodemus’ gospel.99 In addressing the lay people in his audience, Prades effectively used a simple narrative of these two major images in Christianity that possibly most Catholics in Spain knew. Prades sought to establish a parallel between the authority of those two unique images and all other images.

Prades named the two key figures in Christianity, St. Paul and St. Athanasius, who had directly promoted the making of crosses and crucifixes that became commonplace in Christianity. According to Prades, St. Paul used his “knowledge of carpentry, and practiced this art thus following doctrine, and representing [the cross] with a real portrait of it.”100 Prades cited St. Athanasius (297-373), bishop of Alexandria, who recalled the first person who made a crucifix,

In the times of the Nicean Council II, Gregory Turonense…made with his hand three crucifixes representing the figure of Christ [because he] wanted to give us…a portrait of his actual dead body in a yellow color, as it occurs in dead [bodies], the eyes darkened…all splashed in blood, and so hurt that even his enemies were moved by compassion…. [This representation] was like a testimony,…[of] the pasion of Christ…[so that] future generations followed his example, and [they] could make in all times images with this goal.101

In 1633, Vicente Carducho, the official painter to King Philip III who viewed religious images as the most important works of painters, wrote a book that combined
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painting theory, Catholic doctrine, and the accounts of a few depositions of artists. Carducho argued that God’s first painting had been made during the creation of the world, as stated in Genesis that God had “created an image or a painting of mankind” copied from His own image. Such statement might have implied that God looked like a human being, which justified the painting of Him as a man. Carducho may have used this complicated analogy of the making of men and the making of images to show his ‘learned’ audience –both clergy and laity– the high praise that should be given to the work made by artists such as himself.

Unlike Prades, Carducho more directly emphasized the connection between God and painters. He held that these “images and paintings from God’s brush” indicated that God wanted to talk to people through images. In his view, God used images to transform His word into visual messages because he recognized the usefulness of it. In this sense, Carducho equated the role of the painter with that of the evangelist as both actions -painting images and writing the Scripture- recorded or testified to the history of Christianity. He held that painters possessed unique, God-given skills to transform those incorporeal and invisible beings into visual images that conveyed the characteristics of their subjects. His own confidence as a painter derived from his ability to depict the events and subjects of images in a realist style. He was convinced that through the good work of a painter, “Christ looked alive, the
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majesty, divinity, beauty and goodness” was made evident, and the “immemorial, venerable and omnipotent [nature] of God” was effectively depicted. Painters demonstrated their skills when they were able to paint “halos and cherubs without having models to imitate.” To reduce the agency of the painter, however, he added that the skills of painters derived from the knowledge and abilities granted by God for this task.

By mentioning the martyrdom of several painters of saints, Carducho emphasized the painters’ unwavering commitment to Catholicism. For example, he wrote, that an artist called Lazarus suffered when emperor Theodosious “cut off his hands to stop him from making sacred paintings.” To the amazement of his contemporaries, Lazarus was able to continue to paint because God miraculously restored his hands. Carducho also suggested that in the early days of Christianity “Luke was the only person whom God trusted” with the making of sacred paintings “because He had trusted him [already] with the Holy Gospel.” That Church authorities authorized his book reveals that Carducho adopted effective strategies to praise the work of painters such as himself, thereby establishing the legitimacy and even sanctity of the profession without raising suspicions of unorthodoxy. Carducho wrote from the position of the royal painter, and this fame and proximity to authority perhaps allowed him to circumvent the Inquisition in ways that less famous and accomplished painters could not. A case in point is Francisco Pacheco, the other painter analyzed in this study, who never exalted the role of painters. Pacheco’s
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experience working for the Inquisition, which Carducho did not have, might have
cauessed him to adopt a more cautious stance. Carducho’s direct and possibly excessive
praise of painters throughout history had a practical purpose. The economic crises in
the empire prompted Spanish authorities to suggest that painters had enjoyed tax
exemptions for too long. Carducho thus sought to strengthen the case for tax
exemptions for painters like himself; by including trial records in his work, he linked
the work of the painter to the promotion of Catholic doctrine and bolstered his
argument for tax exemptions based on religious work. To defend the supremacy of
painting over other art forms, he suggested that sculpture was inferior to painting.

In contrast to Spanish Catholic views, two English Protestants who
experienced the transition from Mary to Elizabeth denounced painters of religious
images as arrogant and disrespectful toward God. Neither Elizabeth’s Act of
Uniformity of 1559 nor the Homily of 1563 or any later policies on the prohibition of
images in churches mentioned the maker of images.

In 1563, John Calfhill expressed his dismay at the Catholic praise of painters
and paintings by referring to them as ‘painters of wicked art.’¹¹¹ He unequivocally
blamed the makers of images: “For what a mad opinion is this of paynters who for
filthy lucres sake, endeavour to make those things that can not be made: and go about
with their wicked handes to expresse counterfeits of those things, which are onely with
heart and mouth acknowledg’d?”¹¹² In his view, the prospect of financial gain, not love
of or respect for God, motivated painters to pretend to portray what they could not
possibly paint. He knew that Catholics would argue that their images expressed
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humanity, not divinity, but for him it was clear that “Christ is by this name both: God and man: it followeth then, that it is the Image of God and man...[and] they [painters] have attempted to paynt the divine nature of Christ, which is not only not to be measured and bounded in, but also not to be comprehended.” He denied that that the two natures of Christ could be separated, the primary doctrine used by Catholic theologians to justify Catholic painting. He was aware of the two strategies painters used to justify themselves:

eyther they [painters] must say that the godhead is circumscribable...and so confounded with the flesh: or else affirm that the body of Christ is void of the godhead, and divided, and moreover a person by it self subsisting in the flesh....For as much then, as they fal[l] into such blasphemy and impietie let them be ashamed, let them abhore themselves, let them cease to practice such things.

Calfhill suggested that if painters could not be convinced of their mistaken views, they ought to be stopped from committing such sinful actions against God. Indeed, he referred to the making of images as 'visual' blasphemy because, in his view, the act of painting displayed irreverence toward God.

Calfhill also contended that painters committed abuses by making images of subjects of human nature. He realized that “some occasion of doubt remayneth in them, as touching the Images of the virgin most glorious and undefiled, the mother of god, of the Prophets, Apostles and Martirs, seing that they be only men, and [they do not] consist of two natures.” Because Martiall had used this argument to justify the creation of images, Calfhill felt compelled to clarify this point. According to Calfhill, the human relationship of Jesus and Mary as son and mother precluded making images
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of the Virgin because the divine being of Jesus had inhabited her body. Thus, he found it outrageous that some “presume[d] to paynt that most praiseworthy mother of god,…through whome [the God head] hath shone upon us that light.”

Additionally, Calfhill argued that those who made images of the prophets, apostles, and martyrs had been “poisoned with the error of the heathen.” Even if these individuals could be painted because, unlike God, they were human not divine, Calfhill linked image production to pagan practices in order to discredit painters.

In the same year and in contrast to that view, the Catholic exile Thomas Harding presented St. Luke as a precedent for other painters of images. Harding’s reply to the Protestant Jewel was one of his most important contributions to the Catholic cause. According to him, his information of the first painter in history was based on Simeon Metaphrastes, a Greek writer who described the life of St. Luke. Because this evidence showed that “Luke made the Images of Christe, and of his Mother Mary,” God must have approved of it. Harding suggested that God’s authorization of St. Luke’s painting implied that all makers of representations were approved by the Catholic Church.

In 1565, John Jewel rebuked Harding’s interpretation of events as well as his source of information. According to Jewel, Harding relied on the wrong source because St. Paul had said that it was “Luke the Physician, and not, Luke the Painter [who had] painted the Blessed Virgin with the colours of the speache, wherein he was...
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counted more eloquent, then any of the rest.” Jewel claimed that the information given by Harding was incorrect and implied that he manipulated reality when he referred to Simeon Metaphrastes, a poor schoolmaster, as a Greek writer. According to Jewel, no source mentioned Luke the Painter because the representation of the Virgin was created with words, not images.

Two authors writing during the early Stuart period blamed the makers of images for creating lies. During this era of Arminian support of images, painters and other craftsmen experienced a recovery in commissions of works of religious nature. In 1639, while claiming that the doctrine opposing images was essential to the Reformation, the Puritan Edward Gurnay blamed painters for manipulating the content of images to present messages that were not in accord with reality and truth. He focused on representations of biblical episodes that according to him included “things coming within the compasse of fables and fictions after... painters and carvers (which think they may lie by authority) have had a hand in them.” Gurnay accused painters of having a sense of entitlement to make images without reference to known biblical individuals, objects, and events. Gurnay’s attack on painters and carvers indirectly transferred the blame from the Catholic Church to the artists.

In 1641, Thomas Warmstry, a moderate Anglican who had become dean of Worcester in 1621, asserted that it was mistaken to believe that painters could represent key episodes of Christianity more powerfully than biblical descriptions of the real events. During Charles’ reign, Arminians promoted the use of images and
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the Crucifix as part of Archbishop Laud’s program of ‘beautification’ that stressed holiness and the majesty of worship.\textsuperscript{125} Warmstry accused those who viewed images in such high regard “as if the painter or carver had set forth the passion in the Picture, better than Christ in the holy Supper.”\textsuperscript{126} For Warmstry, the events in Christ’s life that ensured the salvation of humanity mattered significantly more than images representing those events. This implied that the memory of the real event, impressed by the reading or hearing of the Bible, was more powerful than any attempt to represent it visually.

In contrast to the two Spanish Catholic views, the Catholic exile Henry Heigham, stressed the limits of the work of painters.\textsuperscript{127} In 1622, speaking of the images of God, he explained that because “it is not possible for any painter to express…the inward substance…we must know that it is only the outward shape, and forme of the thing, which is expressed either in this or the like Image.”\textsuperscript{128} Unlike the two Spanish Catholic authors who praised the role of painter, Heigham clarified the limitations of their work. His viewed the making of images as a human manipulation of shapes and colors which did not involve the divine.

Although both Spanish and English writers agreed that carvers and painters played a key role in the transformation of materials like wood and paint into images, they offered diametrically opposed assessments of the painter’s work. Not surprisingly, Carducho linked the role of the painter to biblical references of God as an image maker. Prades and Carducho stressed that their paintings were sanctioned and

\textsuperscript{126} Thomas Warmstry, \textit{A Convocation Speech…} (London, 1641), 7.
\textsuperscript{127} See Appendix.
\textsuperscript{128} Henry Heigham, \textit{The gagge of the reformed gospel…} (St. Omer : C. Boscard, 1623), 153
in some cases inspired by God. Unlike Prades, Carducho emphasized the importance and even sacred nature of his profession in part to bolster his case in favor of tax exemptions for the income generated through his paintings. Whereas the English Catholic Harding agreed that the Bible justified the role of the maker of images, the other English exile Heigham showed more caution about the merit of painters. Conversely, English Protestant writers denounced painters for making sinful images and denied that artists possessed any special abilities. Calfhill was the only Protestant who accused painters of profiting from making unlawful images, which echoes the Protestant charge that Catholics spent too much money on ceremonial and material aspects.

*   *   *   *   *

The question of whether or not people thought that images represented those represented in them comprised an essential part of the early modern discussion about religious images. The Council of Trent expressed concern that people might misunderstand the meaning of images. Although three authors shared this preoccupation with Trent, several writers displayed a more optimistic attitude that ultimately undermined the worries of the council. English authors were convinced that people who saw a representation of God as an old man with a white beard and long hair would assume that God really looked like that. The exception was the influential Puritan author Perkins, who accepted the creation of images of Jesus Christ under certain conditions, thereby showing that it was not impossible to disagree with the official Anglican Church position.
Aware of the Protestant claims that any attempt to represent God violated His will, Spanish authors replied that the use of certain figures and symbols in the Bible proved God’s desire to make Himself visible. In this way, the Spanish authors argued, the Bible authorized the painter’s work. Conversely, for most English Protestants, it was wrong to imitate what God had done in the Bible. They held that it was impossible to transform the invisible and intangible into the visible and tangible, and they viewed Catholic representations of God the Father and God the Son as false images similar to pagan idols.

Images of saints and the Virgin Mary attracted less attention because both the Spanish and the English theologians focused on the more controversial case of the Trinity as it had enormous theological implications. Several Spanish Catholics noted that while images of God could not represent God’s actual form, nature, or presence, images of saints were ‘true’ copies of the saints because their physical features and spiritual qualities could be replicated. English Protestants held that virtues are invisible and thus impossible to copy, and that the physical characteristics of people who had lived centuries before were unknown to early modern people and thus impossible to recreate.

Both Spanish Catholics and English Protestants recognized the significance of the craftsmen who represented God and the saints but focused specifically on the painter. These authors viewed the role in opposite ways: the Spanish praised the makers of religious imagery, while the English blamed painters for creating false images. It is significant that very little attention was given to carvers and sculptors whose three-dimensional images were more realistic than paintings.
In practice, the inefficacy of the Inquisition hampered efforts by it and the Spanish high clergy to supervise and control the creation of images. According to Carducho, until the publication of his work in 1633, no reliable guidelines existed for the Spanish artist involved in making images. It is likely that the absence of a clear set of rules and specifications may have produced a significant number of denunciations submitted to the Inquisition.
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE POWER OF SIGHT: SPIRITUAL AID OR POTENTIAL DANGER

During the medieval period, people increasingly experienced Christian religion through all the senses: hearing sermons and music, moving throughout the liturgy and in processions, seeing images, lights, and church plate, smelling incense, and eating according to food rules. Nonetheless, the role of sight—through architecture, pilgrimages and other rituals and ceremonies, images, and relics—acquired a prevalent place in the religious experience of the people when compared with hearing. In her study of popular piety in the Late Middle Ages, Kathleen Kamerick concludes that people were “driven by passion for continual visual contact with sacred scenes.” Joseph Leo Koerner links the need for the visual expression of God’s word to the medieval practice of holding a mirror to sacred things, such as the host, through which sight became a form of physical contact.

This chapter investigates how Spanish and English authors understood the interplay between images and the senses of sight and hearing. The analysis focuses on arguments about the positive and negative emotional effects of images especially as related to sight. This exploration provides a new understanding of the similarities and differences between Spanish Catholic and English Protestant devotion.

---

1. The Church plate includes the paten, chalice and flagon used during consecration of the Eucharist.
The ambiguity of the medieval Church in relation to the importance of sight and hearing was addressed in opposite ways by Spanish Catholics and English Protestants. Although Trent claimed that sight and hearing were both equally useful, some of the Catholic authors did not seem convinced by this argument. Despite their emphasis on the visual within the context of Bible reading, English Protestants, on the other hand, held that sight was inferior to hearing, which was used in the reading of the Bible that was often done aloud within churches and private households and in listening to sermons. Although a few Spanish Catholics focused on positive emotional reactions that resulted from the sight of images, only one author accepted the Protestant claim that dishonest images could produce lewdness. Unlike Spanish Catholics who argued that negative emotional reactions could be avoided, English Protestants held that the negative consequences of images could not be changed. Both Spanish Catholics and English Protestants held different definitions of devotion: for the former, emotional reactions like crying in front of a suffering Christ were proper expressions of devotion, whereas for the latter, the best form of devotion was the rational understanding of Christianity and its practice.

This chapter starts with a discussion of the status of the senses of hearing and sight in the early modern period. An analysis of the early modern arguments about the significance of the sense of sight (compared to hearing) and the role of emotion follows. The last section of this chapter presents the arguments that addressed the spiritual benefits and dangers experienced by those who viewed images.
I. Sight and Hearing in the Early Modern Period

The early modern Catholic Church, more than ever before, utilized the visual in rituals and ceremonies which, in turn, invited the participation of the laity. Late medieval Christian culture had started emphasizing the visual as the people, who had no access to the sacrament except for one time a year, participated in processions and ceremonies that provided them close contact with the material representation of the divine.\textsuperscript{4} In this sense, images defined Christianity up to the Reformation as a religion of practice, not of knowledge.

In the sixteenth century, as reformers began questioning the status of sight and the visual in religion, conflicting views emerged about what constituted ‘the’ route to religious truth. Erasmus offered one of the earliest criticism of the role of the visual, and therefore of sight, in religion. Nonetheless, it was Luther who best articulated this concern about the dichotomy between hearing and sight; he wrote, “Christ’s kingdom is a hearing-kingdom, not a seeing-kingdom; for the eyes do not lead and guide us to where we know and find Christ, but rather the ears do this.”\textsuperscript{5} Despite this assertion, most Protestants neither rejected the use of sight outright nor opposed a visual religious culture; instead they specifically rejected images. In this context, Luther’s idea that ‘hearing is believing’ really meant ‘knowing is believing’.

The Catholic Church responded to such attacks by affirming the centrality of the visual in religious practices. The Council of Trent stated that the purpose of images was

\textsuperscript{4} Schimitt,\textit{ Corps des Images}, 133.
\textsuperscript{5} Koerner,\textit{ Reformation of the Image}, 41.
to “excite [the observer] to love and adore God.”\(^6\) Mellon and Shilling observe that
“Catholicism intensified its positive attitude to images during the Counter-Reformation as
a way of seducing people toward the ideal Christian life.”\(^7\) According to Maria Rosario
Fraga, Loyola’s *Spiritual Exercises* can be considered a manifesto in favor of the senses
and sensual perception.\(^8\) More than in the medieval period, the eye became essential to
the production of ‘religious ecstasy.’\(^9\) Trent’s program of reform attempted to discipline
the essential devotional practices of the people.\(^10\) The visual stimulation at the core of
such practices constructed early modern Catholicism as a religion of feeling which, at
least in theory, differed significantly from Protestantism, which promoted itself as a
religion of knowing.\(^11\) The arguments of early modern Spanish and English authors,
when examined in the context of religious culture, add to the conclusions reached by
these scholars.

In 1624, Martin de Roa, the Jesuit priest who sought to instruct his readers about
the significance of religious images and buildings, emphasized the intrinsic connection
between sight, images, and the soul.\(^12\) It is surprising that Roa discussed cognitive
processes given his stated intention to avoid complex topics that the people unfamiliar
with theology could not understand. According to Roa, “nothing enters the soul, if the

\(^9\) Mellor, Reforming the Body, 136.
\(^10\) Ibid.
\(^11\) Many modern studies of theology focus on theories about the relation of emotion to cognition, which is
often referred to as ‘emotional knowledge’ See John Corrigan, Eric Crump, and John Kloos, eds., *Emotions
\(^12\) See Appendix.
senses do not let it enter through their doors.”13 Different senses allowed different kinds of information—spoken words, images, or other visceral experiences—to reach the soul. Thus Roa claimed that “images are made more for the sense [of sight]” than for the other senses.14 Trying to be as specific and as clear as possible about the cognitive process, Roa explained that “the information contained in images was codified through colors and exterior shapes [that] in a glance [allowed] the eyes to acquire knowledge about a thousand things inside the soul.”15 Roa’s definition of ‘image’—as shapes and colors—leaves out ‘written words’ that also had to be apprehended by sight. Roa’s reluctance to stress the similarities between images and words underscored the moving force that preaching represented in the seventeenth century.

In addition to its capacity to apprehend information, sight, according to Roa, was the most effective of the senses in accessing the soul and producing the most powerful emotional responses. He held that “given that the eyes have such power over the heart, a single look from them no doubt causes a bigger impression on the soul, it awakens it, requests it to love what was seen, even more than a constant thought.”16 Sight, in this view, took in a ‘painted image’ that was perceived by the soul more intensely and possibly more realistically. When considering the suffering that Christ and the saints endured while on earth, Roa asked, “Who doubts that [the act of] looking at a painting of the death of IESU Christ, of his passion, of the torments of a Martyr, provokes a more significant impression on the soul than the [the act of] hearing about it?”17 This statement exemplifies the author’s descriptive skills, a talent that won him a reputation as

13 Martin de Roa, Antiguedad, veneracion i fruto de las sagradas imagenes. (Sevilla, 1622), 41r
14 Ibid., 41r
15 Ibid., 42v
16 Ibid., 45r
17 Ibid.
one of the best hagiographers of his time.\textsuperscript{18} Compared to his use of language in his theoretical discussions, his ideas around the importance of sight seemed comprehensible for most people regardless of their level of religious instruction.

For Roa, sight more effectively produced an emotional reaction to the suffering of Christ because, unlike hearing, it was more quickly comprehended and served as a more realistic conduit of information. Unlike the processing of words through hearing, he claimed that “sight quickly perceives and lifts the heart with love.”\textsuperscript{19} When compared with the spoken word, “the shapes and colors of a well-prepared discourse are [not] seen as clearly as those of a well-finished Image.”\textsuperscript{20} This statement represents Roa’s first recognition of the similarities between the spoken word and the image. In a sermon, words could describe the same features that images represented to the eye; however, in his view, images were always more effective than even the best preaching.

Roa’s opinion offered the same paradox about the relative value of sight and hearing that the Council of Trent had offered in 1563. He reveals the tension between sight and hearing by refusing to judge preaching, and its reliance on hearing, as negative. He suggests that sight was better than hearing, not that hearing was deficient. Trent recognized that preaching—a function of the religious orders, particularly of the Jesuits, to which Roa belonged—comprised an essential tool of proselytism, an important dimension of the Counter-Reformation program during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.\textsuperscript{21} Roa had to be exceptionally careful not to disparage preaching for two

\textsuperscript{18} Delgado, F. and F. B. Medina. “Roa, Martin de,” in \textit{Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús}.
\textsuperscript{19} Roa., \textit{Antigüedad}, 47v
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 47r
\textsuperscript{21} See Felix Salgado Herrero, ed., \textit{La Oratoria Sagrada Española de los Siglos xvi y xvii} (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1996), 118.
different reasons: first, he did not want to confuse his readers, and second, the Inquisition
would have ruled an anti-preaching position unorthodox.

In 1633, Vicente Carducho, official painter to King Philip III, viewed religious
images as the most important works of painters, as they elevated the sense of sight
because of their ability to produce emotions. Unlike Roa, Carducho exclusively
discussed representations in the form of paintings because by stressing the superiority of
painting over other media he hoped to convince the government to grant a tax exemption
to painters. In Carducho’s view, sight could “significantly awake the soul through
images [in a way that] sermons, advice and inspiration cannot.” While he stressed the
superiority of seeing over hearing, Carducho paradoxically claimed that images were
equivalent to “mute preachers,” implying that images were not as good as spoken words.
This inconsistent equation reflected the paradox in which Carducho found himself by
comparing sight and hearing, both of which had an essential role in early modern
Catholicism.

In elevating sight, Carducho went beyond Roa’s idea of realism. Carducho
argued that sight allowed the viewer of an image to experience the reenactment of these
past events as if he/she were present. Sight had the capacity to engrave “deeply in the
soul the things with their liveliness, as it happens when one looks at a canvas [depicting]
the death of Christ our Lord, His passion, the torments of a Martyr.” Such was the
realism of the experience produced by seeing images that Carducho referred to paintings
as “sweet deceits of the senses…universal food for the affections of the will.”

22 See Appendix.
23 Vicente Carducho, Diálogos de la pintura, (Madrid: Francisco Martinez Impresor, 1633), 409.
24 Ibid., 424.
25 Ibid., 413.
word ‘deceit,’ he conveyed the idea that images tricked the soul into loving what was represented in them. However, this statement also referred to the manipulative aspect of art recognized by modern theorists. Carducho’s statement might serve as an acknowledgement that religious images and other symbols were used, and sometimes overused, in the Baroque period in order to fulfill the Church’s agenda as it gained a more sophisticated understanding of human sensorial capabilities.

Unlike Roa, Carducho directly compared written words with images without acknowledging that words were images of a different kind. Arguing with an unidentified individual called de la Selva, Carducho stated that “painting shows more than writing [given] the efficacious persuasion of sight, [which is] the most dominant of the senses.” He suggested that even though both written words and images entered the soul through sight, the effect of viewing images was stronger than that of reading words. He offered the example of “St. Gregory [who] had read about the same subject several times, [but] he cried only when he saw it painted.” Interestingly, by demoting the effect of the work of the written word, he might have devalued the writings of the Church authors and, more importantly, of the Bible. By drawing attention to the importance of sight and its effects for Christians, he tried to demonstrate to his literate and learned audience, who were

26 See Jose Antonio Maravall, Culture of the Baroque: Analysis of a Historical Structure, (University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 1986), 252- 253. According to Mellon and Shilling, what changed in the later Middle Ages was the new appreciation for sight and the visual as a conscious effort to manipulate the emotions of the people. Thus they agree with Norbert Elias’ observation that the medieval Church increasingly felt the need to control the ‘volatility’ of medieval people, which was characterized by “instinctual and emotional responses …which tended to be more impulsive and unpredictable than those of their modern counterparts.” Jose Antonio Maravall observed that sight was recognized as a connector to emotions in the Baroque period: “the eyes are the most direct and effective means that we can make use of in questions of affections.”
27 Carducho, Diálogos de la pintura, 409.
28 Ibid., 271.
questioning the status of painting in general, that the Catholic Church needed religious paintings.

Despite the superior ability of sight to engage emotions, Carducho recognized that sight, like hearing, possessed a potential vulnerability: “the devil...attacks especially the exterior senses of hearing and sight [because they are the weakest].”²⁹ He implied that the devil could use these senses to access the soul and corrupt it. Attentive to such danger, “the Church provides remedies; for the hearing, sermons, and for sight, the use of holy images.”³⁰ By strategically stressing the weakness shared by both senses, he effectively avoided specifically criticizing sight while equating hearing and sight. The same advantage that Carducho used to justify the superiority of sight – the power to generate emotional reactions – made images vulnerable to the actions of the devil. Since Carducho was neither a theologian nor a clergyman, he had to be careful not to overextend himself on subjects that could have brought the attention of the Inquisition.

Another notorious painter who argued for sight’s superiority in conveying emotional reactions was Francisco Pacheco, painter and official overseer of sacred images for the Holy Office of the Inquisition.³¹ Although Pacheco did not have an economic agenda like Carducho, he similarly centered his discussion on the attributes of painting. Unlike Carducho, Pacheco sought to instruct because he believed that even educated people held incorrect ideas about the appropriate use of paintings.

Compared to Roa and Carducho, Pacheco offered an uncompromising view of supremacy of the sight. He acknowledged that “if words that are heard or read move our

²⁹ Ibid., 280.
³⁰ Ibid.
³¹ See Appendix.
affections,” images that are seen “get into us…with much more violence.”

Thus, Pacheco wondered, “who doubts that lively painted images are the most efficacious and strongest instruments that do violence to the unwary senses.”

From his perspective, the senses rested passively while the exterior stimuli of images proactively attempted to engage the senses. Through his reference to ‘violence,’ Pacheco suggests that the image imposed itself in an assertive way, which might indicate a dangerous quality of images.

In a potentially more disruptive assessment, Pacheco asserted that even the memory of images was powerful enough to produce potent emotional reactions in the viewer. Pacheco referred to St. Gregory’s description of how an individual could retain a mental image after the sight of a material image could impact the soul and heart. When a person, “deliberately thinks about the made images, the essence of the exterior things [the represented] get to be painted in the heart…and the feeling [in] the interior of the soul is touched.”

While Pacheco seemed to praise the capacity of the material image to achieve its effect by leaving a lasting impression on the mind, this statement could have indirectly deemphasized the value of images. If the memory of material images could remain in the minds of the people, material images did not need to be present all the time. Curiously, just such proposition lay at the core of the spirituality of Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus. In his Spiritual Exercises, Loyola guided the reader in a journey of meditation and prayer, in which mental images of the suffering of Jesus Christ led practitioners to God. Pacheco’s comment on mental images might have been dangerous.

---

32 Francisco Pacheco, Arte de la Pintura. (Sevilla: Simon Fajardo impresor de libros a la cerrajeria, 1949), 144.
33 Ibid., 147.
34 Ibid., 144. Author’s emphasis.
given that in the second half of the sixteenth century the Catholic Church had suppressed unorthodox views on meditation with mental images, especially those of the *Alumbrados* and those accused of *Alumbradismo* like Loyola himself. Nonetheless, by the end of the sixteenth century, Loyola’s *Exercises* had been heavily amended and, in the seventeenth century, they were widely read. Therefore, it is likely that Pacheco, like many other educated lay people, was familiar with Loyola’s work.

Cristoval Delgadillo, the Franciscan theologian who participated in the discussion of doctrine in Post-Tridentine Spain, struggled to establish the effectiveness of the sight of an image. In 1652 he suggested that sight of images was more effective in producing emotions than either the spoken or written word. He explained that while in their usefulness, “pictures, readings and words are commonly made equal,…a picture moves more quickly than words and Scripture.” Like Roa and Carducho, he recognized that these three forms of communication were similar in their capacity to produce sensations but differed in one crucial way: the speed at which those sensations were generated. He reassured his reader that “a picture is a certain most effective orator, who, while outwardly mute, internally speaks most persuasively and moves [his audience] most for maximum benefit.” Like Carducho, his praise of the spoken word could also be read as questioning the superiority of images. If images accomplished the same purposes as the best orators, the latter might be able to suffice without need of the former. On the other hand, in the absence of good preachers, images could become essential. Like Roa and

---

35 Helen Rawlings *Church, Religion and Society in Early Modern Spain*, European Studies Series, (China: Palgrave, 2002).  
37 See Appendix.  
38 Cristoval Delgadillo, *Duo Tractus; Alter de Incarnacione, De Adoracione Alter,* (Alcalá de Henares: Compluti Ex officina Mariae Fernandez Typographae Universitatis, 1653), 531.  
39 Ibid.
Carducho, Delgadillo’s argument also suggested an ambiguous position in the valorization of sight and hearing.

The only English Protestant to address the importance of sight was Edward Gurnay, the clerical leader of a Puritan faction in Cambridge who feared that the Arminian toleration of images meant a return to Catholic practices. During his reign, King Charles agreed with Archbishop Laud that a well-composed liturgy had to appeal to all the senses. In 1641, Gurnay denied that sight was necessary in Christian practice. “For wee may both sing and say, heare, preach, and pray…not only without the help of Images, but also without the helpe of our very eyes.” This rejection of the visual was a gross exaggeration to bolster his opposition to images; in practice English religious culture made use of sight in various ways. However, Gurnay dismissed the importance of sight because knowledge of the Bible in Protestant England was acquired through the hearing of the preached word of God and through the reading of the Bible, often done aloud.

Two English Catholic authors provide additional insight into the value given to the senses in relation to religious experience. While Laurence Vaux considered sight supreme, he also argued that all senses were required to know and experience Christian truth. Vaux therefore equated sight and hearing. The author who signed as Philopater presented an ambiguous opinion: he stressed that hearing and sight were similar, while he more heavily emphasized specific features of sight.

---

41 See Appendix.
42 Edmund Gurnay. *Toward the Vindication of the Second commandment*, (Cambridge: Printed by Thomas Buck, one of the printers to the University of Cambridge, 1639), 17.
Laurence Vaux, the Catholic exile who escaped to Louvain after the ascension of Elizabeth and traveled to Rome to assist in the papal plans for the English mission, recognized the importance of sight in serving people and God. In his 1567 catechism, he explained that “this sense of sight is more excellent than other senses [because] God had given to us our eyes, that we may see to flee from such things as be hurtful, either to our bodies, or to our souls [while we] keep such things as be good and necessary.” This statement could be read as an acknowledgement of the English regard for the visual, which English Protestants were not willing to mention. In this context, Vaux asserted that images aided human souls. While the sense of sight protected and guided the individual, the other senses joined sight in honoring God. Vaux told those learning from his catechism, “Sight, Hearing, Smeling, Tasting, and Touching…ought to be used to the honoure of God.” Using sight to contemplate an image or to read the Scripture and using hearing to listen to a preacher were sensorial activities familiar to Vaux’s readers. The senses of smell, touch, and taste were also used in religious rituals: burning of incense, touching of relics, images, and religious artifacts, and the eating of special foods during feasts. The acceptance of the religious experience as a sensorial experience is aligned with Vaux’s Catholic convictions.

In 1652, the anonymous author who signed his work ‘Philopater’ equated the importance and function of sight and hearing. Unlike the Spanish authors, he recognized “the power that…the senses [of] hearing and sight” had in filling our

43 See Appendix.
45 Ibid.
46 The author who signed his work as F. P. Philopater is enigmatic given that in the year his text was published it would have been impossible to do so.
hearts and minds with pious thoughts.” He used the term ‘pious thoughts’ –part of the title of his book –to refer to the desirable effect of using both sight and hearing to apprehend God. Like the Spanish writers, Philopater observed that while both sight and hearing provided paths to reach God, they were not the same. Comparing the working of the two senses, it was clear that

the sound of speech uttered….is represented to the understanding by the sense of hearing, [and] godly matter [visual information] doth stir the mind and with the body….the object of the image [the represented] work[s] like effect in man within and without.48

In his view, hearing and sight communicated the same message at an intellectual level.

Although Philopater held sight in very high esteem, he also had clear concerns about its potential. In his first example, he presented St. Gregory’s analysis of Job’s words: “‘I have made a covenant with mine eyes, that I would not so much as think of a Virgin.’”49 According to Philopater, St. Gregory concluded that “Job might keep the thoughts of his eyes….against his will [and] love, for it is a great burden which the flesh draweth downward, and the Image or Picture of Beauty once tyed to the heart, by means of the eyes, it is hardly loosed with the pulling of both hands.50 In another instance, he wondered,

What force our eyes have to move our mind to think good or evil, as they present unto it, may well appear by our first parent Eve…who looked only upon the forbidden fruit, and saw that the tree was good to eat (as her senses told her) and fair to the eyes, and delightful to behold, and she took of the fruit there of and did eat.51

48 Ibid., 498.
49 Ibid. Author’s emphasis.
50 Ibid., 28. Author’s emphasis.
51 Ibid. Author’s emphasis.
Looking to the story of Eve in Genesis, he suggested that sight could control the mind with potentially negative consequences. If Eve was unable to resist the tantalizing fruit conveyed by sight, no human could do so. Philopater’s distrust for sight might reflect a possible internalization of the dangers of experiencing religion through the senses among English Protestants. In addition to representing the weak side of humans, Eve represents the weaker sex. The idea that the visual was a potential danger for women was related to the belief that they needed constant supervision, control, and protection. The emphasis on the negative role of sight in damning humanity hardly bolsters his defense of images.

At the same time, these two examples reveal that Philopater shared concerns about sight with the Spanish authors Roa and Carducho, which at the same time reinforces the idea that the relation between sight and hearing was a critical issue for Catholics of various nationalities during the early modern period.

Because both sight and hearing were extremely important for the Counter-Reformation, some Spanish authors struggled to articulate the superiority of sight in the process of justifying the use of images. Their statements reveal that an undercurrent of tension between sight and hearing. Unlike most Spanish Catholic authors, the Decrees of Trent presented hearing and sight, spoken words and images, as complementary. While Roa and Delgadillo questioned the efficacy of preaching, Carducho praised hearing in order to exalt sight, a strategy that may have appeared contradictory. Despite their efforts to elevate the status of sight, none of the Spanish authors noted that sight also served as an entrance to the soul and could be subject to the same criticisms levied against hearing.

---

52 See discussion of importance of preaching in chapter 5 on the function of images in worship.
II. The Spiritual Benefits and Potential Dangers of the Effects Produced by Images upon Devotional Practices

According to Mellor and Schilling, what changed in the later Middle Ages was the new appreciation for sight and the visual as a conscious effort to manipulate the emotions of the people during devotional practices. Thus they agree with Norbert Elias’ observation that the medieval Church increasingly felt the need to control the ‘volatility’ of the laity, characterized by “instinctual and emotional responses …which tended to be more impulsive and unpredictable than those of their modern counterparts.”

Jose Antonio Maravall observed that sight was recognized as a connector to emotions in the Baroque period: “the eyes are the most direct and effective means that we can make use of in questions of affections.”

While early modern authors did not explicitly articulate the significance of realism, A. R. G. Ceballos claims that realism in images during the Baroque period was a tool purposefully utilized by artists to move people’s emotions; this purpose explains the use of real clothing, hair, and even tears in statues, as well as the exploitation of dramatic and pathetic elements –those evoking feelings of pity or sorrow in the viewer in response to religious images.. Ceballos argues that at the same time realism enabled artists to achieve ‘historical’ accuracy that guaranteed the proper instruction of the people.

---
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writings analyzed here made clear that realism had the potential to evoke not only beneficial reactions but also dangerous emotions.

If, in the view of the Catholic Church, sight positively affected viewers by “exciting [them] to love and adore God,” then the Council of Trent made clear that not all of those reactions were desirable or positive. By prohibiting “images of lustful beauty” as well as any profane or lascivious elements in images, the Church acknowledged the potentially negative responses images could generate in the viewer. Ceballos remarks that the concerns expressed by Trent were not felt in Spain with the same intensity as in Italy and other countries because the Christian character of the Spanish Renaissance limited the presence of nude and mythological elements which Trent saw as dangerous. Nonetheless, the Spanish Inquisition published an edict in 1640, a date considered surprisingly late by Ceballos, banning all lascivious images in public or private places.

According to the Inquisition, these kinds of images could interfere with the stated goal of fostering devotional practices. The discussion of spiritual benefits and potential dangers of images only makes sense within the context of the Church’s definition of devotion. Christian devotion can be understood as “fixing the senses and the mind totally on God” through acts that can be performed in words and gestures, of which prayer is the most basic form. Because early modern Catholics and Protestants understood devotion in different ways, this analysis in this section focuses on two issues: the Spanish Catholic and English Protestant views of the positive or negative effects that images had on
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devotional practices, and the way in which such views reveal different understandings of devotion itself.  

In 1579, Juan de la Cruz, whose works became the most important ascetic and mystic literature of his time, pointed out that the Church recognized and valued the capacity of images to produce spiritual benefits. He believed that “images [were] for the purpose marked by the Church of driving the will” toward God and “increas[ing] devotion in the soul.” His assertion demonstrates that the Church attempted to control specific emotions through the use of images. However, not all images were equal in this task because some attracted more people than others. New images became popular while old ones were abandoned. The Church recognized that such a dynamic could be seen as a materialistic aspect of the cult of saints; thus the Council of Trent ordered all bishops to ensure that images were properly maintained and those beyond repair be destroyed. De la Cruz explained that personal preference determined which images more easily awoke people’s devotion for prayer. However, he warned his readers that real devotion did not depend on “preference or natural taste,” but [on a] pure and faithful heart” to God. In his mystical writing, de la Cruz encouraged his audience of monks and priests to use images but lamented that many people did not properly understand them. This reflects a blunt acknowledgement of the possibility of a false devotional practice among Catholics, a practice Protestants referred to as idolatry.
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More directly than de la Cruz, Jose de Siguenza, a poet and historian of the order of St. Jerome who recorded the religious art, relics, and books of the Monastery of El Escorial, affirmed that special images produced positive effects that led sinners to reform their behavior. In 1580, in his book describing the newly built Monastery and Palace of the Escorial, Siguenza relayed the story behind an image of the Virgin Mary to his audience of educated laity and secular and regular priests. He stated that one particular image of the Virgin Mary provided more benefits to the souls than the images of saints because it “had been transformed from a dead thing into a higher thing by the hand of the Lord.” This might have been a reference to miracles linked to the popularity of this image.

As a result of this special feature, images of the canonized could move sinners in extraordinary ways. When people looked at this azabache (a semiprecious stone used as a talisman), Siguenza explained, it acted like “a magnetic stone that attracts the iron and the chains, not only of those who have sinned with the body, but also with the soul.” His analogy between an image and a talisman extended beyond rhetorical strategy in the same way that many Spanish Catholics comfortably combined Catholic beliefs with superstitious elements. According to Siguenza, the power exerted by the image was so strong that sinners “repent their faults, crying and confessing them,” while they acquired “more noble purposes, attaching to divine things that were previously abhorred.”
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Because Siguenza’s work sought to elevate the prestige of his order, he praised the special power of various ‘holy’ images located in the monastery of his order.

In 1624, Martin de Roa, who saw images as a timeless sign of true Christianity, stressed the capacity of images to increase the affection people felt for their savior. Roa argued that “loving Images of those whom they love is a natural thing to do for men, and the more they observe the individuals represented in those images, [the more] this love increases.” This emotional reaction also explained why images moved people to imitate the virtuous actions of those represented in them. Convinced that images of Christ possessed a unique ability to move people, Roa quoted St. Gregory, saying “the memory of Christ represented in his Image burns the heart [of the viewer] in his love.” The contemplation of visual representations of the sufferings of Jesus Christ provoked a strong empathic response in the viewer. This idea echoed Roa’s claim that images differed from idols in that the former seemed to be alive. The body of the viewer physically experienced the emotional reaction first. By looking at them, “the heart beats, the bones shiver, and [with] overwhelmed senses, [the viewer] remains filled …with such an immense love, and infinite mercy.” Roa was the only Catholic author who discussed the body’s physical engagement during an emotional state.

Roa made reference to what bishop and St. Gregory of Nyssa (335-394) experienced while observing images to demonstrate the significant benefits that images
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could exert on such extraordinary individuals. He reminded his audience that every time the saint looked at the painting of the Sacrifice, that showed Abraham the Patriarch, the wood for the fire, the sharp knife, the naked body of the boy, awaiting the stab from his father’s hand, [Gregory] confessed that his soul [taken] by the feeling, cried so much that his tears ran down his cheeks like fountains. 78

Roa explained, “This is how the Saint felt, as…[his soul] passed [from the image to the person figured in the image]: from that shade to the truth, from Isaac to Christ crucified on the Cross.” 79 Roa took advantage of any opportunity to stress to his readers the role played by images in the generation of these feelings. Ultimately, Roa tried to underscore that if an influential individual such as St. Gregory had experienced and described such intense emotions, these reactions were not only valid but beneficial.

Those experiences, Roa implied, were more intense when images were viewed inside a religious space. In his view, when “a Christian enters a Church, the love…for the people and deeds that are represented in images is awakened and lit.” 80 Roa seemed to suggest that a religious space, perhaps enhanced by the abundance of images, was the only setting in which truly Christian emotions were safe. The beneficial effects of seeing an image, Roa added, “are not experienced in this way when [the Christian] sees them in the workshop of the painter or sculptor, where [the viewer] sees them with more curiosity than devotion.” 81 Whether the religious space was public or private was less important than the Church’s interest in supervising the interaction between images and the people. Roa made clear that if an image aroused the curiosity –and possibly the admiration and
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pleasure—of the viewer, it did not fulfill its objective: images had to be seen exclusively as religious objects.

Roa argued that dishonest, lustful, and ugly images produced negative emotional reactions that endangered the soul. He observed that not all religious images promoted love for God: “those images that are not [sacred] but lustful, and ugly, produce despicable thoughts, and promote the imitation of evil deeds.” His position thus agreed with the Council of Trent in opposing lascivious and excessively ornamented images but, unlike Trent, Roa explained what these negative effects could be. The influence of these types of images was so powerful that he wished “the damage caused by dishonest paintings could be lesser.” These unacceptable images made a deep impression on those observers who despite not previously “know[ing] certain vices, they learned them only by imitating what had been painted.”82 He asserted that those images exerted such power over the viewer that it became impossible for “a person who looked at those ugly paintings, not to feel an inclination for vice.”83 While he warned people to avoid those kinds of images, he did not instruct the reader how to recognize them. More significantly, Roa accepted that not all images increased devotion and that some images had the potential to endanger the souls of the people.

His tone indicates that Roa blamed the negative feelings on image-makers rather than on the viewers experiencing those negative emotions. Roa seemed unaware that assigning blame to the painters was risky, for it could be interpreted as a criticism of Church. Because he effectively demonstrated the grave danger that certain images posed to the souls of people, his opponents could argue that if the Catholic Church could not
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control and secure the orthodoxy of all images, it could not honestly promote the use of images.

Unlike Roa, in 1631 Bernardino de Villegas focused exclusively on the spiritual danger that images could cause. Villegas, a theologian and member of the Inquisition who addressed the orthodoxy of practices among nuns, acknowledged that statues that displayed profanity and lewdness showed a lack of respect for what they represented. However, the negative emotional reaction that resulted from this experience preoccupied him. Villegas was the only Spanish author who directly distinguished between two-dimensional paintings and three-dimensional statutes and identified the possible problems with each of them. He agreed with theologian Gabriel Lopez de Navarro, a friar and judge of the Inquisition, about the recommendation made by the Council of Trent. In Navarro’s words, only the images “of Christ our savior, and those of his saintly mother, that are painted with the honesty and decency requird” were approved by the Church. Conversely, the decree warned “it is a sin to paint and decorate Images profanely, when this profanity of the clothing, or disarray and indecency of the painting provoke lewdness and other vices.” Villegas directed his accusations at two different groups: he blamed the artists for making these kinds of paintings, and also targeted the nuns and women in convents responsible for corrupting Catholic devotions through their practice of dressing up their sculptures for their altars. Villegas’ comments fit with the misogynistic views of the early modern Catholic Church that accused women of bringing sin and corruption to religious practice. Villegas claimed that some people not only liked excessive
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ornamentation of sculptures but saw it as an element necessary to increase devotion. According to him, “there will be people who will argue that the dresses of the Saints provoke devotion, and that without those dresses there is no devotion.”87 To those people who adhered to the extreme of ornamentation as a requirement for devotion, he remarked those images “do not move the observer to devotion and reverence; instead [they] produce a lewdness.”88 As a result, ornamentation of an image needed close supervision. In his view, representations of Christ on the cross “with the crown of thorns on his head [and] with a wide collar” and the rest of the body dressed up in…silk was complete nonsense.89 Christ dressed up in fine fabrics and elaborate garments distracted the viewer from a ‘true’ representation of Christ with simple clothes. Because the overall appearance of an image was very important, he required that an effigy of the Virgin Mary look as ‘realistic’ and original as possible. He did not, however, explain how this could be attained given the time between the Virgin Mary’s existence and his era. More importantly, a statue of Mary had to fit the part and look like ‘a virgin,’ not like a ‘whore.’ The excess of ornamentation in a three-dimensional representation preoccupied Villegas because of the emotional response it could provoke. This evidence of Villegas’ deep concern with the potential effects of lustful images contradicts Ceballos’ assertion that a fear of lewdness was unimportant in Spain. In this case lewdness emerged not from nude figures but from inappropriately and overdressed statues.

Those who focused their devotion and worship on the exterior elements of the images, Villegas argued, engaged in the serious sin of idolatry. Villegas warned nuns who engaged in this practice that “it is well known that those people do not worship the
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Saints, [instead they] commit idolatry…[with] those dresses, trying to sanctify those dresses by dressing the Saints as if they were idols.”90 Villegas’ assertion can be understood in two ways: either that excessive ornamentation transformed images into idols because they failed to represent the true originals, or that they became idols because devotion focused on the ornamentation rather than the saint.

Although he recognized the danger posed to the souls of the viewers, Villegas only offered a partial solution. He advised the reader to “pay attention to them so that pious and chaste eyes do not stumble into such indecencies that sometimes are seen on Images and portraits.”91 Keeping away from dangerous images did not, however, require removing the object in question or even reporting the problem. He gave the nuns to which he directed his writings the responsibility to solve the problem themselves. However, he did not address the question of how to handle indecent or excessively decorated images in front of which nuns had to pray everyday; it is unclear if images were permanently removed or just cleared up of excesses. Trent’s reforms on conventual life since Trent focused on ensuring a faithful and chaste behavior among the nuns. Thus miuses of images were not a priority among Church reformers and convent authorities.92

Like Roa and Villegas, Vicente Carducho acknowledged that images required certain characteristics to provoke positive emotional reactions. In his writings published in 1633, he explained that an image

must be shown with propriety [and] convenience [because] the more these two things are related, the more friendship and connection with the painting exists;
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causing more devotion and mov[ing] the emotions to [experience] more fervor, love, and ardent desire to act virtuously.\footnote{Carducho, \textit{Diálogos de la Pintura}, 144.}

He recognized that the reaction of the viewer depended on the skills and craftsmanship of the painter; the two requirements of ‘propriety and convenience’ to be found in ideal representations did not always exist. Unlike other forms of representations, paintings offered a superior capacity to engage the viewer because “while poorly made [paintings] do not [arise fervor and devotion,] painting with nice shapes and delightful perfection…tends to wake up the will to love the Creator.”\footnote{Ibid., 284.} He focused on the paintings that were skillfully made because “good painting is so efficient that God himself demonstrates that he wants to make use of what is represented [in it].”\footnote{Ibid.} Paintings with images of “hell, purgatory, a dead body, a martyrdom, a divine effigy of Christ our Lord crucified [had the power to] valiantly vanquish [sin] by producing emotions of fear, love, tears, suffering, piety, etc.”\footnote{Ibid., 409.} Unlike Pacheco, who focused only on paintings, Carducho acknowledged that three-dimensional image objects constituted one of the most powerful types of representation. Carducho stressed the wide range of positive feelings evoked by the variety of subjects paintings could present. However, unlike Roa and Villegas, he avoided any discussion of the possibility that some paintings were not made with propriety and convenience, and the effects that less sanctified art had on the viewer.

As an example of the benefits of images, Carducho offered several famous individuals who had articulated their experiences contemplating images. He described in detail the emotions felt by St. Augustine when he prayed in front of an image of a martyr:
I am moved by contemplating the flowers of Painting, as I consider the strength of the Martyr, and I admire the prizes, the crowns,…and with jealousy, my heart burns, prostrated and humbled I come to worship God through the Martyr, and get the health I desire.97

Additionally, Carducho mentioned that the seventh-century monk known as the Venerable Bede had claimed that “ignorant and common people who look at a lively history of Jesus are moved [and] their feelings of contrition aroused.”98 Carducho used these two respected figures of the Church to show his learned audience the vital role images played in making good Christians.

In his attempt to praise the effect of images on the people, Carducho might have overstepped his limits by arguing that images were essential to the maintenance of the spiritual lives of Christians. In Carducho’s view, in the same way that “bread is the maintenance of body strength, the goal of paintings is to increase the spiritual [strength] which invites contemplation,… Given that [painting] is married to the spirit, it easily moves its emotions.”99 The mention of the bread might be a reference to the sacramental bread, which was a comparison present in the writings of Catholic theologians of the period.100

Another author who emphasized the importance of realistic images for spiritual benefits was Bernardino Blancalana. He was a ‘familiar’ (a lay collaborator) for the Inquisition and native of the Italian city of Lucca who wrote a book in 1638 to promote the cult of a famous image of a crucifix brought from Italy to Spain.101
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Lucca was part of the Spanish Empire, so Blancalana considered himself a servant of the king. He agreed with Nicodemus, a Pharisee who lived in Jesus’ lifetime and was later recognized as a saint, that images were “a living copy of their prototype that awoke the lukewarm heart to fervent ardour of the spirit.” Blancalana carefully explained that the emotional reaction was produced only as a result of the merits of those represented in the image. This comparison could also have been seen as unorthodox because it implied that an image was ‘almost’ the same as the prototype, which suggested that the distinction between one and the other could be unclear. No Spanish author addressed the paradox that realism presented: it was essential that charity, compassion, and suffering be represented realistically in order to evoke emotions, but precisely that realism created the possibility that people could mistake the image for the prototype.

In 1649, Francisco Pacheco argued that the positive effects that images produced in the viewer required both emotions and reason. From his perspective as an official of the Inquisition, he worried that many people focused only on the emotional effects stimulated by images. He claimed that “by experience, that there is no other thing that delights our eyes in this way, giving them a delicate pleasure, as when paintings [are] done with perfection.” Nonetheless, the satisfaction caused by such images should not be an exclusively emotional reaction but also a rational process. Pacheco recalled Plutarch who believed that “The delight caused by a painting properly done, if we used reason, should be able to raise [people’s hearts] to heavenly love, teaching us its divine
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It is not surprising that Pacheco, who was also recognized as an intellectual among learned circles in Seville, drew attention to the rational aspect of the emotional experience. This acknowledgement echoes the claims made by Erasmus more than a century earlier about the need to understand what each religious practice meant. 

Despite his knowledge of classical and medieval works, Pacheco recognized the inherent difficulty of articulating the specific effects of images. Although he remarked, “It is not possible to explain properly the benefits provided by images,” he produced an explanation that was more precise than those of previously mentioned authors. In his view, there was no doubt that images “guide the reason, move the will, and refresh the memory about divine things…[and]…produce in our mental state the highest and most efficacious effects that can be caused by a material thing in this world.” Pacheco asserted that the intensity of this effect related directly to the action of the viewer, “the more praise is given [to the person represented in an image], the more notable [is] the effect” produced by it. His tone possibly reflected his enthusiasm and pride for his own creations.

Pacheco was the only Spanish Catholic who argued that pleasure and beauty were important elements in the discussion of religious images. According to him, the pleasure evoked by the beauty of an image was beneficial to Christians. Images at the service of the Catholic Church were more effective when “[through] their splendor and the beauty of their ornament…they could satisfy the senses in a wonderful way [being] a source of
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delightful, useful and honest [benefits].”

Unlike Villegas who focused on the ‘excess’ of beauty as a negative attribute, Pacheco saw ‘beauty’ and embellishments as important and positive characteristics that produced affective reactions in the viewer. He suggested that the pleasure offered by the beauty of an image attracted people and consequently positively altered the heart of the viewer. However, as a result of the Council of Trent, beauty was deemphasized while a new focus on the presentation of suffering to purify the viewer increased.

However, it is not surprising that Pacheco, a painter, highlighted the value of aesthetics, a sentiment most likely shared by other artists reading his book.

Like Blancalana and Villegas, Pacheco held that realism was a key component in determining the emotions produced by images. Thus Pacheco could not understand how some people did not experience an emotional reaction when looking at the realistic scenes represented in images. Pacheco referred to St. Tarafio as one ‘courageous defender of the Holy images’ who during a period of Iconoclasm had asked, “Who [is the person] who seeing the fighting martyr represented in lively colors, rejecting the [torments of] whipping and fire, trusting in his creator, does not cry in tears?”

Because most people looking at such images would become very emotional, St. Tarafio remarked that “it is hard to believe that a person can be so unwise, and insensitive that he does not experience the benefits and sympathy that our nature has for images, when they are vividly made and with spirit.”

In the same way, Pacheco presented St. Augustine’s reaction to those kinds of images.
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When one sees with art and lively colors, the martyred Saint, the struggling Virgin, a Christ nailed to the Cross, covered in his precious Blood; it is true that devotion increases, [and] the heart repents, [and those] who are not moved, are made of stone or bronz[e].

Unlike Villegas, Pacheco did not recognize that the attempt to achieve realism—by adding hair and clothing, for example—transformed those represented in images into unrecognizable characters that could produce dangerous effects. His position contradicted his concern that not all images of saints were able to effectively represent saintly virtues. These three early modern authors would have agreed than images needed to properly represent their originals.

Although Pacheco appears to dehumanize those who were not moved by images, he agreed with St. Augustine that images were so powerful that their effects could not be resisted. In Augustine’s words, “There are some exterior images that might awaken even the lazy faith, and stamp repentance and pain in the heart.” For Pacheco, these examples demonstrated that images produced benefits even in those reluctant to love God.

Unlike the other Spanish authors, Cristoval Delgadillo used very precise language to explain the origin of emotional reactions experienced by the viewer. In 1652, Delgadillo asserted that “[images] arouse the memory of the deeds of Christ, the Lord, and the Saints; and consequently, [those deeds] arouse virtuous feelings in the viewers, particularly of gratitude, love, compassion, admiration, and emulation.” Delgadillo’s language reflects the rigor of theological writing and is similar to that displayed by Bellamino. Although others writers seemed unconcerned with linguistic precision,
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Delgaldillo emphasized that the lack of clear language had generated disagreements and confusion. According to him, it was not the material image but the memory of the subject represented in the image that generated emotions. Despite his assurance that the image had a positive effect on the viewer, Delgadillo might have had doubts about making generalizations concerning images. He had previously acknowledged that not all images of Jesus were properly made and therefore not all of them would have had the capacity to produce desirable effects.

In England, although official church policy discussed the danger of images exclusively in terms of idolatry, very few Protestant authors addressed the consequences of what they saw as the negative emotional reactions produced by images during devotional practices. In 1555, Thomas Ridley, a first-generation reformer who later became bishop of London, argued that images created obstacles that disrupted the mental state necessary for effective prayer and meditation. Ridley wrote that although “it is commonly alleged that images in churches stir up the mind to devotion, it may be answered that, they rather distract the mind from prayer, hearing of God’s word, and other godly meditations.” In his view, only by praying and listening to preaching could one direct the will to God; images were obstacles that disrupted this process. His statement implies a definition of devotion as a conscious and rational act that involved listening to the word of God and praying rather than as an emotional response. It is unlikely that Ridley would have ever described the effects of meditation on the suffering of Christ as ‘firing up the heart’ as some Spanish authors did.
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During the reign of Elizabeth, John Harding, a Catholic exile who participated in the organization of the English College in Louvain, acknowledged that the same emotions produced by hearing the Word in the Bible could result from the contemplation of images. He explained that “as when we heare apt and fitte wordes uttered in a sermon or an oration: so when we behold lookes and gestures lovely expressed in images, we are moved to pitie, to weeping, joye, and to other affects.” Because of these emotional reactions, he stressed, “painters have no less grace than either oratours or poetes.” Like the Spanish Catholics, Harding praised the work of the painters for their capacity to generate positive expressions of devotion in the viewer.

In contrast, John Jewel, the radical bishop whose writings became essential in the formation of the Anglican clergy, denounced the negative emotional effect of statues dressed and adorned in Catholic churches. In his reply of 1563 to Thomas Harding and other English Catholic exiles, he criticized the use of foreign and unnecessary elements in images. Moreover, in an argument similar to that offered by the Spanish Catholic Villegas, he denounced the strange elements that could easily lead people to harmful idolatry. Jewel held that “there is like foolishnesse and lewdenesse in deckyng our images, as great puppettes for olde fooles, like children, to playe the wicked play of idolatrie.” Jewel suggested that elaborate ornamentation could sensually arouse the viewer, thereby linking the accusation of idolatry to the sin of spiritual fornication. The “outrageous deckyng of images and idolles with paynting, gyldyng, adournyng with
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precious vestures, pearle, and stone” lured the viewer and aroused his senses. Jewel blamed images for “provocation and [e]ntisement to spiritual fornication.”

Jewel equated idolatry –unfaithfulness towards God– with the sin of fornication. Because he saw the relationship between humans and God as a marriage requiring fidelity, a violation of the marriage through idol worship became spiritual fornication.

In 1641, after the breakdown of censorship, the Puritan clergyman Edward Gurnay rejected the ‘beautifying program’ sponsored by Archbishop Laud which had brought images back to churches. Gurnay argued that once people experienced the emotions provoked by an image, it would be very difficult to break the dependence on them. He wrote, “There is no kind of false god so hard to be dispossessed and cast out of the heart of man as these Image-gods.”

The sight of images “serve[d] only for a kind of common delight” embraced not only by the worst groups of people, including “the ignorant, idle, and superstitious, the carnall, sensuall, and idolatrous, [but also ] the best.” It is not clear if ‘delight’ refers to the same pleasure that the Spanish Catholic Pacheco linked to beauty, but Gurnay suggested that nobody could escape this attraction. Gurnay’s assertion that people naturally tended to idolatry seemed to be related to the ‘delight’ that images produced in the viewer.

Images did not affect everybody with the same intensity, however, because some people were more vulnerable than others. The effects were more significant on “children and ignorant persons [who] are most easily taken up with these Image-gods [because]
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they take up the first and deepest rooms in [the] hearts of men.” Gurnay asserted that images particularly harmed children and people who did not know doctrine, who were, in a sense, as innocent and unaware as children. He criticized as “shallow therefore and preposterous…that polic[y] [that] thinks it good to glaze and playster our Churches with such kinde of Eye delights toward the better winning and alluring our little-ones thereunto” Like Jewel, Gurnay identified certain groups of people who were helpless and thus inevitably more susceptible to being lured in by images.

In 1652, the English Catholic Philopater, who most likely published abroad, argued that images positively affected the mind. The objective of Philopater’s work was to demonstrate to his readers “how much the beholding of sacred pictures, signes, and images, which represent unto us, either God, or the things of heaven, or the mysteries of our faith, may be beneficall [to our] Pious Thougs[h]ts.” He suggested that images fostered ‘noble, heroic and pious’ thought that benefited the soul of Christians. Philopater’s statement implied that these reflections generated by images did not have anything to do with the expression of emotions (weeping and trembling) referred to by the Spanish authors.

While several Spanish authors focused on the positive emotional reactions provoked by images, three of them also recognized that the presence of inappropriate elements could provoke undesirable and negative responses. Although Roa and Carducho agreed with Villegas, the latter made the stronger case for the negative effects of images. Roa and Villegas viewed excessive ornamentation and clothing put on images, a common practice in the Spanish Catholic world, as problematic. This same
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idea was repeated by the zealous reformer Jewel, who stressed that excess of ornamentation made images especially dangerous because it increased the inclination for idolatry.

Whereas all the Spanish Catholic authors agreed that sight of images yielded spiritual benefits and positive emotions, they differed on what types of images accomplished this task. Pacheco and Blancañana suggested that realistic images were more efficient, which reinforced the idea that the Baroque used the visual as propaganda because it was “a live deception.” Roa argued that images that were set in specific locations produced more benefits than others, while Carducho and De la Cruz also implied that not all images generated the same effects. The realism and physical appearance of images were recognized as factors that influenced the emotions produced in the viewer, but there was no consensus as to the significance of each. The absence of formal doctrine weakened Catholic authors who struggled to articulate their views.

Whereas most of the Spanish Catholic authors recognized that images of the passion and death of Jesus Christ could generate considerable effects on people, almost all of them indirectly acknowledged the superiority of three-dimensionality of statues. Aside from the brief acknowledgement made by Roa and Carducho, Villegas was the only author who paid close attention to the negative effects of statues.

Spanish Catholics’ and English Protestants’ understandings of emotionals reveal profound differences in the proper way to experience devotion. For the Spanish Catholics, emotional reactions, including visible bodily signs, represented the expressions of devotion people should cultivate. Conversely, the few English Protestants who participated in this discussion privileged reason over emotion in the quest to achieve
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devotion. Jewel and Gurnay rejected feelings or emotions as damaging to the soul. For them, prayer and meditation did not require the display of sadness or joy, but rather an engagement of the intellect through knowledge and understanding of the word of God.

* * * * *

Spanish Catholic authors offered ambiguous views on the supremacy of sight over hearing in devotional practices. While uncertainty had been present since the medieval period, the fathers of Trent did not claim that one sense was superior to the other. The almost complete silence of English Protestant voices in the defense of hearing over sight calls for clarification of the Protestant concept of sight. Protestants did not oppose the use of sight per se but resisted putting sight in the service of images. In practice, sight was as important as hearing because accessing the word of God in the Bible required both: sight to read the text oneself if literate, hearing to listen to it being read aloud if illiterate, and attending to preaching in both cases.

Alongside a few English Protestants who negatively evaluated the effects of images, two of the Spanish Catholics acknowledged the potentially adverse effects of image viewing. Unlike Protestants who saw the negative effects of images as an unsolvable problem intrinsic to the nature of images, two Spanish Catholics, in accordance with the doctrine of Trent, implied that images should be stripped of all unorthodox elements to avoid the possibility of damaging emotions. Other Spanish authors might have abstained from discussing this subject because the problem of excessive decoration of statues seemed unimportant compared to the display of naked figures, a potentially troubling feature of Renaissance painting styles.

The debates and discussions concerning the effects of images revealed the different ways in which Catholics and Protestants understood the experience of devotion.
Whereas the Spanish Catholic writers viewed emotional reactions as key expressions of devotion, English Protestant authors reference a rational understanding of devotion devoid of emotion.

The literate audiences of the Spanish and English authors complicated the contours of the discussion about hearing and sight. The Spanish authors who elevated the place of sight implied that Catholics needed their eyes to experience devotion through images but not through the reading of the Bible. At the same time, the devaluation of hearing affected the status of preaching, which was an essential tool during the Counter-Reformation. That this discussion took place in written form pointed out the need for literacy, which in Spain was limited to the upper groupings of society. Yet when the English Protestants undermined the usefulness of sight, by implication they questioned its value for Bible reading.

The subjects portrayed and the media used to represent them acquired new significance in these arguments about emotional reactions. All Spanish Catholic authors emphasized that the representation of Christ’s suffering and death on the cross created unique effects for the viewer. Although Villegas was the only author who openly acknowledged it, the arguments of the other authors indicate that they recognized that the tri-dimensionality of sculptures resulted in the most effective representation of such suffering. In this context, the two painters, Carducho and Pacheco, stand out because they continued to focus on the effect of paintings and ignored the strong effects of sculpture that concerned the other writers.
CONCLUSION

My work contributes to our understanding of the theological and doctrinal writings produced in the early modern period in two different contexts: Catholic Spain and Protestant England. This comparative analysis of intellectual history within a cultural context uncovers the influence of theology, official policy, audience, and practice in shaping the ideas generated in these two countries. This study demonstrates that despite differences in religious culture, Spanish and English authors shared a common preoccupation: they struggled to establish a conclusive explanation of the issue of images. The writings on images show that there was more divergence of opinion among English Protestants than among Spanish Catholics. At the same time, the Spanish converts to Protestantism and the English Catholic exiles adaptation of ideas due to their multiple goals and audiences. They offered arguments that could reinforced the views of those who already share their stance, while convincing those who held a different opinion on images.

These finding are the result of an exploration of the writings of eighteen Spanish and twenty-two English authors that were published between 1550 and 1660. Except for two laymen, the Spanish authors were clergymen. Almost half of them belonged to the secular clergy and the other half were members of the religious orders. The secular clergy included two bishops and others who held positions of varying significance at the parish level. The earliest work written by a Spanish author was published in 1579, while the latest was published in 1652. Like the Spanish authors, the group of English writers
consisted of clergymen, with the exception of one lay person. While five individuals occupied bishoprics, the rest of the writers fulfilled positions of different degrees of importance within the Church of England. The earliest work by an English author used in this analysis was written in 1547 and the latest work was published in 1659.

The differences in religious reading culture between Spain and England have a considerable significance in this project. Because the levels of literacy in these two countries were apparently not too different, the extent to which religious texts, and the nature of those texts, were read by the clerical and lay populations of Spain and England are essential questions. In Spain, many written works addressed the educated clergy and, possibly, a minority of literate lay people. The Counter-Reformation Church maintained the medieval outlook that prohibited lay people from reading the Bible and various kinds of religious literature. The Church viewed common people as incapable of understanding written texts and thereby affirmed the role of the Church as a legitimate mediator. This sentiment together with the attempt to stop any Protestant influence led to a religious reading culture that was in its early stages of development. Rather than targeting a lay audience directly, most authors expected that their ideas about images would reach people through the preaching and teaching of the clergy. The goal of the Spanish authors, however, was to ensure proper religious practice rather than to instruct the people on abstract theology. Besides the audience of Old Christians, Spanish authors (Catholics and Protestants) tried to reach the converso and morisco populations who might have not been very receptive to Catholic doctrine. These authors were therefore forced to create a message that would appeal to both groups.
In England, the books discussing the subject of images targeted an important segment of the laity in addition to the clergy. This situation resulted from improvements in literacy of the early modern period combined with the Protestant impulse to allow the laity direct access to the Bible. After the Reformation, religious reading culture in England increasingly distanced itself from that of Spain. In contrast to the Spanish authors, most English writers were not driven by the desire to shape practice, as most images had been removed or destroyed, but by an interest to share their theological and doctrinal discussions with the clergy and lay people.

These writings about images were only possible because authorities of the Church or state allowed them to be published. As a result of the Counter-Reformation program, the Spanish Church in conjunction with the Inquisition tried to control the circulation and publication of books, as well as any spoken debate.¹ Although the Spanish Inquisition promulgated a series of ‘Indexes of Books’ to curtail the circulation of books with unorthodox ideas, books discussing images that were written and published in the post-Tridentine period reveal some unorthodox views among clergymen and theologians.² In the early seventeenth century, one such list included the works of the English Puritan Perkins as well as the two Spanish converts Valera and Tejeda. Some of the Spanish authors suggested that there was a real possibility that image misuse could have negative spiritual effects. My analysis supports Martinez Ruiz’s idea that authors took advantage of the opportunities to express their views more freely during the 1570s when repression

² Ibid.
began to decrease.\textsuperscript{3} It is also possible that because these claims were made in the context of the defense of a Catholic practice, they would have been seen as harmful. Yet fear of the Inquisition remained, and authors were careful not to raise suspicions of unorthodoxy. In addition, as Pinto Crespo has indicated, despite the intentions of the Inquisition, its efforts were not always successful.

In England, the ascension of Queen Elizabeth brought forth a system of censorship to control the publication and circulation of books. Because the system, which required pre-publication approval of texts, was unable to stop publications by Queen Elizabeth’s Catholic subjects who had gone into exile on the continent, a more stringent process emerged in the 1580s.\textsuperscript{4} But despite prohibitions, many works published abroad by Catholic exiles continued to arrive secretly in England. That William Perkins, one of the most prominent Puritans in 1601, showed some toleration about images in a manner that contradicted the official Protestant position demonstrates the relatively open attitude toward the publication of Protestant works that included ideas that challenged, often in subtle ways, official doctrine of the Church of England. However, during the second decade of the seventeenth century, under James I, the Church forbade Arminians from publishing books as part of a strategy to block their advance.\textsuperscript{5} Richard Mountague, a high profile Arminian, wrote what seemed to be the only openly Arminian text of this period. However, with the ascent of Arminianism within the English church in the later

\textsuperscript{4} Suelle Mutchow Towers, Control of Religious Printing in Early Stuart England (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2003)
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.
1620s and 1630s, Puritans could not publish until censorship functionally collapsed at the beginning of the civil war.6

The doctrines of each country produced some disagreement within the two groups of authors. The lack of doctrinal guidance on images in the Decree of Trent prompted Spanish Catholics to fill the void. Some authors seemed to be more conservative than the fathers of Trent when they emphasized the dangers and problems with images. It is likely that one of their main motivators was the practice they observed on the ground. They saw the need to promote uniform practice and to deter misuse or abuse of images. Although there is scant evidence of abuses in records of the Inquisition, they would presumably have witnessed or been aware of any problems.7 When early modern Catholic authors tried to respond to Protestant attacks, they could not find enough substance in the Decrees of Trent on which to base their arguments. Thus, in addition to tradition, they grounded themselves in Scripture and early Church sources, trying to fight Protestants with their own authorities. The Spanish authors, both Catholics and Protestants, had two very different audiences. In some instances, these authors struggled to deliver a message fit for both New and Old Catholics. They tried to cater to the former group who were supposed to know the basic doctrine on images and the latter who were learning about it but were inherently resistant.

In England, a few authors presented some views that diverged from Protestant doctrine because the English Church was prepared to let this happen. The Elizabethan leaders understood that reformers had different views on various doctrinal aspects and thus allowed them to be expressed in arguments and also in practice. Most Protestant
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7 See section on Practice in Chapter 1.
authors studied here conformed to the basic ideas that viewed images as a negative element in religion. English Protestant authors relied extensively on the writings of the Church fathers to justify their views, and to demonstrate that the Catholic use of images had no biblical backing. While many of these authors wrote to confront the opinions of Catholic authors, there were other motives for engaging in this debate. National events kept the fear of a return of Catholicism alive in the mind of many reformers. For many radical reformers the lack of progress towards further reform might have also fueled their interest in these writings. Finally, while most of these authors wrote when most images had been removed, the glass-windows and crosses that remained within some churches, together with the many market crosses, might have caused anxiety.

The comparative method employed in this work offers useful opportunities but also presents limitations that I addressed through the best available strategies. As historians Peter Baldwin and Michael Miller have argued, comparative history helps us to establish causation. Thus this project helps to explain the differences and similarities between the arguments used by a group of unconventional authors: Spanish converts to Protestantism and English Catholics exiled on the Continent.8 This comparison exposes how and why the elements shaping the religious climate of Catholic Spain and Protestant England contributed to the discussion about images.

My study confronted the drawbacks of a comparative study as the project evolved. The first challenge was to produce a balanced sample of works given the relatively small number of Spanish sources relative to English ones. In addition, this analysis recognized the difficulties of comprehending the diverse factors that affected the
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8 Deborah Cohen and Maura O’Connor, eds. *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*, (New York: Routledge, xv)
religious and political climates of the two countries in which these writings were produced. Deborah Cohen acknowledges, “It is often said that comparative histories lose in depth what they gain in scope.”9 This work investigated the factors that shaped the writings on images. Comparing two distinct experiences of one phenomenon also creates potential difficulties if the cultural milieus are not entirely parallel. Yet, by establishing a clear roadmap and objective for my work, I hope that I have been able to overcome doubts about the viability of this comparison.
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9 Ibid., xvi.
A. Main Findings of this Study

An exploration of the terminology used throughout the debate was essential because the discussion about images was intimately linked to it. The accusation of image misuse, and more specifically, the claim that Catholics engaged in idolatry, constituted the core of the writings on images. To determine the similarities and/or differences between idolatry and Catholic use of images, authors defined the terms ‘image’ and ‘idol.’ While most Spanish Catholic authors stressed the differences between images and idols, only one recognized the possibility that an image could become an idol. Spanish Catholics tried to separate Christian use of images from idolatry by underscoring the role of pagans and Jews from the Old Testament in the origin of idolatry. For most Spanish Catholics, idolatry did not represent a threat to contemporary Christianity because they believed that this practice had been reformed. However, one author clearly acknowledged that the elimination of idolatry had not been totally successful. In contrast, most English Protestants argued that images were equivalent to idols, but one Puritan writer and one Arminian writer held that images should not necessarily be equated to idols. Nonetheless, most English Protestants remarked that Catholics copied their practice from pagans and Jews. A comparison between Spanish and English ideas demonstrates that for both groups the concept of idol and idolatry had to be skillfully employed to support their position on images. While Spanish Catholics stressed the physical and conceptual difference between idols and images, the English Protestants underscored the similarities between the two concepts.
Terminology was interpreted in the context of the Ten Commandments because, in this most sacred text of Christianity, the danger of idolatry was spelled out. Although Spanish and English authors both viewed this text as the irrefutable voice of God, they diverged in their views of the content, organization, and reading of the First and Second Commandments. Though most Spanish Catholics asserted that the First Commandment did not prohibit images in the present, a few conceded that the misuse of images could violate it. All Spanish Catholic authors ignored the fact that Protestants based their reading of a ‘prohibition of images’ on a different version of the Commandments. English Protestants recognized that the disagreements between the Catholic and Protestant views stemmed in an important way from using two versions of the same text: Protestants adopted St. Jerome’s version and Catholics adopted St. Augustine’s. Following St. Jerome’s version, all English Protestants, with one exception, claimed that the past ban on the production and use of images remained valid in the present. Not surprisingly, the Arminian author Richard Mountague denied that the First and Second Commandments rejected the use of all images in the past and the present. While Spanish and English writers both clarified the meaning of the commandments, a close comparison of their strategies reveals a profound difference. The English successfully called into question the legitimacy of the Catholic version of the Ten Commandments, while the Spanish chose to ignore the matter, possibly in an attempt to convey that the authority of the Commandments required no discussion.

Beyond the justification found in biblical and early Church authority, the discussion explored the different roles of images in which the laity participated. At a practical level the discussion of images centered on four major functions that the Catholic
Church had assigned to images during the Middle Ages and that continued during the early modern period. While Spanish Catholics praised images for their unique contributions to the lives of Christians, the English Protestants argued that the use of images yielded only negative consequences. Both Spanish Catholics and English Protestants concentrated on the role of images during worship because both understood that this act defined the relationship between God and the devotee. The categorization of worship established by Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century provided the foundation for the discussion.

The Council of Trent implicitly rejected Aquinas’ main premise that images could receive the highest adoration of *latria*, instead arguing that *latria* should exclusively be given to God. Despite Trent’s attempt to establish proper understanding of worship, it did not clarify the difference between the various levels or types of worship that the Catholic Church had approved. Consequently, although various Spanish Catholics accepted the verdict of Trent and acknowledged confusion about the correct interpretation of Aquinas’ words, some authors aligned themselves with Aquinas. While several English Protestants denounced Aquinas’ categorization as part of the Catholic Church’s scheme to confuse people through the manipulation of words –adoration, reverence, and honor–nobody referenced the position taken by the Council of Trent. By deliberately ignoring Trent, the English authors resisted acknowledging the correction directed at Aquinas’ doctrine of images. Unlike most English Protestants, the Arminian author was the only voice that argued that images could legitimately be used in worship. This discussion relates to the Catholic and Protestant understanding of proper religious devotion within practice. Spanish Catholics held that images produced an emotional
connection between the represented and the people that enhanced devotion and therefore worship. English Protestants suggested that worship was a mental state in which images did not have a role because it should be based in the knowledge people had about God.

Unlike the theoretically charged discussion about worship, the idea that images served as tools for instruction could be easily grasped by a lay audience. To determine the validity of the instructional function of images, Catholics and Protestants compared them with the written and spoken word. For Spanish Catholics, the teaching function of images was extremely important. Pope Gregory’s defense of images as the books of the ignorant became a key justification for images. Whereas most Spanish Catholics concluded that images were as good as words, several extended their argument beyond that consensus and claimed that images were superior to words. In contrast, all English Protestants agreed that images could not teach proper Christian faith because they offered unclear information. By comparing the Spanish and English views on the instructional power of images and words, it becomes clear that while the Spanish focused on the practical communication attributes that made images comparable to words, the English centered their claims on the superiority and uniqueness of the use of words that God used in the Bible.

The two last functions of images gravitated around the notions of Christian behavior and divine communication. Images were used as visual models of ideal religious conduct and as conduits of intercession. Not surprisingly, Spanish Catholics and English Protestants held divergent views on the use of images as models for imitation and as enhancers of prayers for intercession. Spanish Catholics maintained that the constant visual presence of virtues and examples of holiness promoted ideal Christian
behavior, whereas English Protestants remarked that virtues and holiness were invisible characteristics that could not be represented in images. Unlike Protestants, who rejected the concept of saints or the Virgin Mary as intercessors, Spanish Catholics argued that the presence of images could make prayers for intercession more effective. Although some of them stressed that people knew that the response to prayers came from God, a few authors admitted that some people viewed miracles as responses to prayers to images. Ultimately, while both Spanish and English authors acknowledged that reminders of virtuous behavior were useful, they differed on the appropriate form of such reminders. As in the discussion of the communication capabilities of images and words, Spanish Catholics held that reminders of virtues could be presented through images while English Protestants insisted on words.

These authors agreed that the functions of images were contingent in determining how to make a visual representation of the divine and the holy. The disagreement between Spanish and English authors centered on what people thought images represented. While Spanish Catholics argued that the laity, including the uneducated people, understood that images were only symbols and allegories, English Protestants maintained that common people lacked the discerning capacity to understand symbols and consequently believed that the image was an exact copy of its original. Images of God were especially problematic because His divine essence could not be replicated. According to Spanish Catholicism, the verbal imagery used to represent God in the narrative of the Bible set a precedent to do the same with images. Conversely, the English Protestants stated that the invisibility of God the father precluded making His image as well as representations of Jesus Christ. Puritan author William Perkins
presented an exception, for he accepted images of Jesus Christ. Making images of the Virgin Mary and the saints, whose material bodies were once visible, presented a different problem. Spanish Catholics claimed that despite the time that had passed since the Virgin and the saints were on earth, it was possible and legitimate to reproduce their ‘exact’ physical characteristics and spiritual attributes. In contrast, English Protestants denied that virtues could be visually represented and held that nobody could know the physical attributes of the Virgin Mary and the saints who had lived in the past.

In addition to these considerations about the making of images, the role of the painter drew the attention of several authors. While Spanish Catholics generally agreed that God authorized painters and image makers, one of the painter-authors praised his God-given skill in a way that might have looked excessive. Such an attitude was not well received by everybody. A member of the clergy claimed that some painters wrongfully refused the authority that the Church had over the making of religious images. Contrary to general Catholic opinion, English Protestants blamed painters for creating false images that violated God’s essence and will.

At the core of the debate over the functions and justifications of images was the recognition –not always overt– that people felt an emotional attraction to them. For Catholics, the expression of those emotions was considered a proper form of religious devotion. Most authors recognized that images produced strong emotional reactions in the viewer. Spanish Catholics argued that sight allowed viewers to experience emotions that produced spiritual benefits. Often the emotions felt by viewers were outwardly expressed through crying and physical gestures. These emotions ultimately made people acknowledge and repent their sins, increased devotion and fervor, and moved the heart to
act virtuously. A few English Protestants, however, stressed the dangers produced by the emotional engagement with images. In their view, viewing images promoted lewdness, distracted people from proper religious devotion, and generated acts of idolatry and superstition. This difference exposes the gap between the Catholic and the Protestant understanding of devotion. For Catholics, external displays of emotion naturally reflected piety whereas Protestants saw devotion as a rational experience. Spanish Catholics maintained the medieval view of the superiority of sight in moving the affections towards God. In contrast, English Protestants praised the sense of hearing as a primary avenue through which to experience the word of God. The comparison between Spanish and English ideas reveals their dissonance on the relation of emotions and images. Spanish Catholics were confident about the positive aspects of emotions, even if they were irrational, while Protestants viewed those emotions as irrational and therefore as a danger to the human soul.

The physical attributes of images and their link to devotion is a subject that almost none of these Spanish and English authors mentioned. Realistic images were especially powerful to engage the emotions of their Catholic viewers. It might be that Catholic writers did not want to emphasize this characteristic because they could be accused of inciting the people to idolatry. English Protestants did not denounce specifically this type of images for provoking demonstrations of improper religious devotion.

A few Spanish converts to Protestantism and several English Catholics in exile held religious views that differed from the official stance in their countries of origin. In the second half of the sixteenth century, several Spanish members of the clergy and the religious orders were influenced by Protestant ideas and left the country to convert. Two
Spanish converts attacked the use of images using arguments similar to those presented by Protestants in England. Nonetheless, their writings reveal special concern for the implications of the doctrine of images in practice. As a result of the abuses they had observed at home, these Spanish converts determined that images had no place in Christian religion. To justify their views, they pointed out the weaknesses in the doctrinal base exhibited by Spanish writers. In addition, one of them also stressed the significance of former and current Spanish voices raised against images.

The case of the English Catholics, who rejected the changes brought by the Reformation and became part of a group of Catholic exiles living in the continent, offers an interesting picture of adaptation. Writing from the towns of Douai and Louvain in the Low Countries, some of these authors defended the traditional views of the medieval Church, while at the same time, were outspoken about the possibility of image misuse in a way that Spanish Catholics were not. While defending the use of images, some of these authors made unique claims that seemed to be at odds with traditional Catholic ideas. Many of them seemed to deemphasize medieval doctrine to stress a difference between reform-minded early modern Catholics and the medieval Church. Some of the arguments presented by the English Catholics borrow elements of Protestant thinking: they acknowledged the lack of Catholic doctrine and emphasized the need to instruct people on the proper use of images. In this circumspect way, these authors seemed to acknowledge the validity of the Protestant critique. English Catholics defended the use of images but promoted a practice guided towards a more rational understanding of doctrine.
B. The Broader Significance of the Project

This study of ideas about images presented by Spanish and English authors both confirms and challenges certain aspects of our current understanding of theological and doctrinal discussions in those countries during the early modern period. Returning to the four wider questions laid out in the introductory chapter allows this project to engage the arguments of leading historians.

1. To what extent did the Council of Trent provide a clear position with respect to theological issues, thereby providing an intellectual justification for the Counter Reformation that served as a unifying force within Catholic countries? Guiseppe Albergio claimed that as a result of the Council’s serious effort to explain Catholic doctrine, the Church reached a significant level of doctrinal unity that was unlikely at the moment of the Protestant schism. However, the vague presentation of the doctrine of images suggests the need to revise this position. The decree did not address some of the most important Protestant accusations related to the misuse of ritual and ceremonies, thus disagreeing with Albergio’s suggestion. My study points to the need to reevaluate the contributions and limitations of the Tridentine doctrine.

Palma Martinez-Burgos Garcia is unique in that her conclusions focused on the doctrine on images. In her view, the Council of Trent created a ‘well elaborated and defined’ theology on images. Even though she used a broad definition of images that included a variety of visual symbolism including theater, my evidence indicates that her
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12 Palma Martinez-Burgos Garcia, Idolos e Imagenes:La Controversia del Arte Religioso en el Siglo XVI Espanol (Valladolid, Spain: Universidad de Valladolid, Caja de Ahorros de Salamanca, 1990)
theory does not hold. Further, whereas she argued that there was a direct controversy about images among Spanish writers during the sixteenth century, my study makes clear that these authors did not engage other Catholic or Protestant writers in debate.

The conclusion of my analysis is parallel to the conclusion of Raymond F. Bulman, who argued that because of the vagueness of the decrees, uniformity of doctrine was achieved only years and even centuries after the end of the Council. It is likely that uniformity of ‘essential matters’ is what Bulman and Jedin had in mind. The vagueness present in the doctrine on images might be better explained by the difference between ‘essential matters’ that were necessary for salvation and those that were of secondary importance. If images were considered not to be ‘essential,’ there was no need to explain in detail the various aspects of their use in religious practice. The Church leaders gathered at Trent faced such great challenge in defining even critical doctrinal issues that they were probably relieved to be able to set lesser matters aside. Thus they did not even attempt to provide specific instruction on every detail of practice.

My findings support a more recent alternative scholarly view that stresses the absence of clearly presented doctrine and practice that typically define orthodoxy. John O’Malley concluded that the lack of doctrine emanating from Trent opened the doors to freedom in theological speculation. Julio Caro Baroja explored the views of a small sample of Spanish authors who wrote in the second half of the sixteenth century. Caro Baroja stressed that as a consequence of the absence of a clear articulation of official doctrine of images, theologians and moralists struggled to make sense of what constituted
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13 Bulman agreed with the notable historian of Trent, Hubert Jedin.
proper adoration and the role of images. My findings also agree with Enrique Martinez Ruiz’s observations about the lack of clarify in various theological controversies such as Predestination and the Immaculate Conception in the decree. For Martinez, the inability of Trent to provide a clear base of theological teachings forced the members of the orders to create an ‘official’ doctrine on images that fit a new form of Catholic religion.16

2. The nature of the theological debate produced by the English Reformation can be explored through the texts about the doctrine of images. The Elizabethan English church, which remained the basis for doctrine and worship through the reign of James I, was prepared to allow a good deal of latitude with respect to ideas and practice used in individual parishes. While most Protestant authors rejected the use of images, the adoption of this Protestant outlook was neither total nor permanent. Towards the late sixteenth century, a few authors displayed toleration towards images, a position that would become an essential characteristic of prominent and influential Arminians during the 1620s and 1630s.

My observations also fit the findings of specific studies of the Protestant attacks on the doctrine of images as presented by Margaret Aston, John Phillips, and Julie Spraggon. The doctrine on images set by the Church of England was designed as a basic guideline for reformers. Among the various ideas held by Protestant authors, a few views of tolerance towards images emerged. My study echoes Margaret Aston’s recognition of multiple influences for those tolerant views: the protection of art history and the influential Puritan defense of images as reminders of history. Another case in point is the work by John Phillips. He viewed the return of a traditional stance on worship in the writings of a few individuals in the Church of England as a consequence of Elizabethan

16 Martinez Ruiz, El Peso de la Iglesia, 6.
policies. 17 My work supports Phillips’ assertions about the emergence of a changing stance among some authors who began to move from a total rejection of images to a restricted tolerance of images under certain conditions. Julie Spraggon also argued that the decade of the 1580s witnessed Protestant orthodoxy beginning to accept a positive view of ceremony and the beautifying of churches. 18 Like Spraggon, I identified the moderate Anglican Richard Hooker with views that indirectly supported images as well as the Puritan William Perkins as leading figures who proposed a certain level of toleration.

3. Did the censorship campaign of the Spanish Counter-Reformation discourage debates within the Catholic community and with people outside it? Virgilio Pinto Crespo shows that after the Council of Trent, the Church in Spain set up policies to ensure orthodoxy in all matters of doctrine, which included the regulation of ideological debates with Protestants. The success of the systems of control established by the Inquisition was limited due to a variety of factors. Pinto Crespo’s focus on the mechanisms utilized by the Spanish Inquisition demonstrates that engaging in spoken and written discussions of polemical subjects with ‘heretics’ was limited to learned theological circles authorized by the Church. The works on images analyzed here fit the picture of control presented by Pinto Crespo. The Spanish authors were not interested in directly refuting Protestant views; instead they attempted to clarify doctrine for their fellow countrymen who did not fully understand the role of images in religious practice: both older Catholics who believed in images but misused them, and newer members of the Church who needed to be persuaded of the validity of images at all. These authors did not show any interest in

engaging any of the major Protestants (English or continental) who wrote lengthy works attacking images. Within Spain, none of these authors tried to argue with dissenters who criticized the use of images. A more literate Spanish population as well as a culture that promoted knowledge and participation in the discussion of religious subjects might have produced a Catholic Church willing to encourage authors to engage members of the lower clergy and lay people in debating with those holding ‘heretical’ views. Although the Catholic Church might have feared ideological contamination, Catholics rejected attacking Protestant arguments in favor of affirming the essential role of images among Catholics.

4. Was religious reading culture among Protestant lay people more advanced than among the Catholic laity? Interpreting the data on literacy and religious instruction in Catholic Spain and Protestant England in the context of the writings about images offers an important glimpse into the lay religious culture –the doctrinal knowledge that informed religious practice– of these two countries. Thus my study complements the conclusions of Antonio Vinao Frago, Maxime Chevalier, David Cressy, and Tessa Watt in relation to literacy, as well as the works on doctrinal instruction and book readership by R. Po-Chia Hsia, Felicity Heal, and Clive Holmes. My study indicates that in Spain few texts on images were directed at the small lay population that was literate and educated enough to benefit from these works. The authors of these books expected that the illiterate would receive their message through the mediation of the clergy. That many of the Spanish texts were written exclusively for the clergy reinforces the idea that the Catholic Church advanced the instruction of basic knowledge and practice among the laity but remained uninterested in teaching people complicated aspects of doctrine. In
England, higher literacy rates among the laity and stronger expectations that people, albeit mostly from the upper segments of the society, would read doctrinal discussions and complex tracts on spiritual and ecclesiastical matters informed these works. Many of the English writings on images studied here targeted a combined clerical and lay audience who could follow the intricacies of theological arguments.

These texts raise critical questions about the relation of doctrine to both the clergy and the laity and about national religious cultures. They therefore point to the need for future research about the degree to which this about images discussion about images reached the laity in the Catholic world. There is consensus that literacy increased in many parts of Western Europe during the early modern period. However, without a policy that promoted the reading of doctrinal discussion, it seems unlikely that this kind of subject would reach the laity. Therefore, if the people did not learn the doctrine of images from books, further research on preaching—such as investigation of sermons and instruction manuals for preachers—and catechetical programs could shed light on how people learned doctrine. The way catechism programs worked, including their stated goals and published content may reveal how the laity encountered the discussion of doctrine in the Post Counter-Reformation period.

Additionally, the present study could be fruitfully extended backward in time. Comparing Spanish and English ideas about religious images between around 1480 and 1550 would allow us to determine whether the two countries shared attitudes at a time when they were both within the broad Catholic fold or whether their beliefs already differed in some respects. Finally, another promising area of research might be a comparison of Spain with another Catholic country to determine if and how local
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19 See Virgilio Pinto Crespo, Maxime Chevalier, and David Cressy.
circumstance produced a discussion about the use of images. Such a study could include other aspects of Catholic practice that the Church deemed non essential for salvation like the use of relics. All these topics warrant further investigation.
Appendix

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

AUTHORS AND THEIR WRITINGS

This section offers the most relevant biographic information about the authors discussed in this work. While I give the general information on each author’s life and the religious and political events that surrounded it, when possible, the focus is on their writings about images.

Spanish Authors

Avila, Nicolas de, author of Suma de Mandamientos y maremagnum del segundo was born in the town of Caravanchel de Abaxo.\(^1\) He was a regular priest in the town of Villa del Olivar, Madrid, Diocese of Toledo. His Suma de Mandamientos, published in 1610, addressed the Spanish Counter Reformation mandate to make instruction of doctrine a top priority. Avila believed that the faithful were in need of a clear explanation over the use of images, which he provided in his discussion of the First Commandment. He emphasized that all his arguments were backed up by the Bible and church Doctors. It is important to note that not all catechisms produced after Trent

\(^{1}\) Information about Nicolas de Avila was obtained from his book.
discussed the subject of images at length in the way Avila’s did.\textsuperscript{2} This text was written in a period of high concern and instability in the political, economic, and social arenas. The new king Philip III, who brought to power a faction of individuals with a different vision of Spain, had a very different governing style than his father. The micromanagement style of his father was replaced by the delegation of the king’s authority onto his minister. The economic crises of the country deepened given the numerous military campaigns that the imperial project demanded. The presence of the morisco population (Christianized moors) across the country increased fears and mistrust among Old Christians. The final solution to the problem was the expulsion of all moriscos from Spain between 1608 and 1614.

Blancalana, Bernardino, the author of the \textit{Historia de la Sagrada Imagen de Christo crucificado que esta en la nobilisima Ciudad de Luca Cuia copia esta en N. S. de Atocha}, was a native from Italy, born in the territories controlled by the Spanish monarchy.\textsuperscript{3} The author viewed his book as a pious and serious work which could inform the reader of the origin and importance of this specific image in his home town. With this book the author offered information to Prince Baltasar Carlos, son of King Philip IV, on how a cult to this image had originated. Blancalana was aware that the prince had shown deep devotion to the ‘Cristo de Luca’ found in the Convent of Atocha in Madrid. Blancalana explained that the devotion to this image in the city of Luca was sponsored by the Catholic Spanish king, and thus, he dedicated his book to the king. He asked the Spanish reader not to judge his brief and imperfect style. In \textit{Sagrada Imagen}, published in 1638, Blancalana’s main goal was to increase devotion to this image with the

\textsuperscript{2} Various catechism reviews for this work mentioned the First Commandment only briefly.

\textsuperscript{3} Information about Bernardino Blancalana was obtained from his book.
advantages that the royal patronage could bring. His target audience seemed to have included a wide range of people, from the literate elite of Madrid to the lower clergy.

Bellarmine, Robert (1542-1621), author of *Declaración copiosa de la doctrina Cristiana*, was a Jesuit theologian who was canonized in 1930. He was born in Italy but spent most of his life in the territories of the Spanish empire working for the Catholic cause. He studied the writings of the most important Catholic and Protestant theologians, and an important part of his work focused on inter-confessional disagreements. Pope Gregory XIII appointed him to teach controversy in the Jesuit College in Rome and Louvain. One of his major works was the *Controversiae* in which he debated the major theological disagreements with Protestants. His impressive skills in this area are shown by the fact that his work on the subject was widely read by Catholics and Protestants alike. Bellarmine was committed to preaching and to the catechetical program of the Counter-Reformation. His *Doctrina Cristina*, published in 1597, became the most popular book in the Catholic world. His writings were extremely influential and his *Doctrina Cristiana* became the basic catechism in the Spanish territories as well. In this medium size work, he explained the proper use of images to guide priests to teach doctrine according to Trent. His preface reminded the reader that it was the responsibility of bishops during visitations to check if the reforms of Trent were being followed. In 1606 James I’s policies against Roman Catholics prompted Bellarmine to start a long period of controversies against him and his supporters.

Carducho, Vicente (1576), author of *Diálogos de la Pintura, su Defensa, su Origen, Esencia, Definición, Modos y Diferencias*, was a painter, theorist, and art critic.

---

who achieved great fame.\textsuperscript{5} Born in Florence in 1585, his family had moved to Spain where he remained for the rest of his life. He started his career when his brother Bartolomé was hired to paint at the Palace of El Escorial during Philip II’s reign. After marrying a Spanish aristocrat, Carducho became a citizen of Spain. He claimed that Florence was his ‘\textit{patria natural}’ (natural nation) but he considered himself “a native from Madrid” because he had acquired his artistic education in Spain and received benefits and support from Catholic monarchs.\textsuperscript{6} In 1608, after his participation in decorating the Place of El Escorial, Carducho was awarded the official title of ‘Painter of the King’. He enjoyed the highest point of his career during the reign of Philip III, and it might be said that Velazquez took away his position during the reign of Philip IV. While Carducho claimed that his work, \textit{Discurso de la Pintura}, published in 1633, sought to teach people how to understand and appreciate the “perfection and nobility’ of painting, he had other practical motives. He defended painting from those who described it as \textit{villana} (criminal and evil) to justify their intention to remove the tax privileges that painters enjoyed for many decades. Thus he argued that the artist who made religious paintings should not be taxed because their work fulfilled essential functions that God and the Church had approved.

\textbf{Cruz, Juan de la} (1542-1591), author of \textit{Subida del Monte Carmelo}, was a Spanish Carmelite monk who became one of Spain’s greatest poets and mystical theologians.\textsuperscript{7} Influenced by Fray Luis de Leon, a renowned humanist at the University of

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Gran Enciclopedia de España}, s.v. “Carducho, Vicente.”

\textsuperscript{6} See Carducho, “Mi natural Patria es la nobilisima ciudad de Florencia...pero como mi educacion desde los primeros años aya sido en España, y particularmente en la Corte de nuestros Catolicos Monarcas, con cuyas Reales mercedes me veo honrado (i alli es la Patria, donde mejor sucede lo necesario a la vida) justamente me juzgo por natural de Madrid.” 19.

\textsuperscript{7} \textit{Oxford Dictionary of Saints}, 5\textsuperscript{th} ed., “Cross, John of the (1542-1591).”
Alcalá, he studied the Bible in Hebrew and Greek. He translated a controversial version of the *Song of Songs*. His writings are considered the pinnacle of the Spanish ascetic and mystic literature, for which he became one of the Church doctors. His *Subida del Monte Carmelo*, published in 1579, presented his view on the use of images to his audience of friars and priests who were interested in contemplation and meditative practice. His effort in the Discalced reform led him to conflicts with conservative forces within the order. His writings raised suspicion of unorthodoxy for which the Inquisition imprisoned him. He was canonized in 1726 and declared a Doctor of the Church in 1926.

**Delgadillo, Cristoval.** (In Latin Christophoro) Delgadillo was the author of *Duo tractatus alter de incarnacione de Adoratione alter* and a member of the Order of the Minor Franciscans. When he wrote this work, Delgadillo was a retired teacher of the Convent of San Diego in the college town of Alcalá de Henares near Madrid. His *Duo Tractatus*, published in 1652, intended to provide a clear exposition of the main doctrines of the Incarnation and the use of images. His audience of theologians and high clergymen, who could read Latin, might have been familiar with these arguments and his writing style.

**Mártires, Bartolomé de los,** (1514-1590) the Portuguese-born author of a *Catecismo o Doctrina cristiana* was archbishop of Braga, Portugal and a member of the Dominican order. During the last years of the Council of Trent, this Catholic reformer participated in discussions on doctrine, even though his emphasis was on the defense of

---

8 The brief information given in the preface to his book. A list of works by Franciscans revealed that an individual with the same name as the author analyzed here, Cristobal Delgadillo Escalante, wrote a book on penitence titled *Penitencia inimitable propuesta en las costumbres virtuosas*. He died in 1671. It is highly likely that this information corresponds to the author of *Duo Tractatus*.

the primacy of his bishopric in his land. Because Portugal had become part of the
Spanish crown, the bishopric of Toledo saw itself as supreme. As a result of this conflict,
during one of the sessions of Trent, two doors had to be opened to allow the entrance of
the two bishops at the same time, which implied that neither was above the other.
Martires was an active pastoral visitor in his diocese where he promoted the reform of
Trent. The *Catechism* he wrote was likely published shortly after the end of the council.
He distinguished himself doing charitable work for the poor and the infirm during periods
of plague. The audience for his *Catechism* was the priesthood to whom Trent had
bestowed the improvement of Christian instruction of the people.

**Medina, Bartolomé** (1527-1580), author of *Breve Instrucción de como se han de
administrar el Sacramento de la penitencia*, was an influential Spanish theologian,
member of the order of St. Dominic. After his studies in the city of Avila, he entered
the convent of St. Esteban in the college town of Salamanca. He taught theology and
natural law at Universidad de Salamanca from 1576 to 1580. He studied the works of
Thomas Aquinas and became a leading figure of *probabilismo* (a doctrine derived from
theology and Christian moral philosophy), whose ideas were spread by Jesuits and
Dominicans in Spain and France. He was confessor of St. Theresa of Jesus. His *Breve
Instrucción de como se han de administrar el Sacramento* was published in 1579, where
he guided the priesthood into the process and meaning of confession.

**Nieremberg Y Ottin, Juan Eusebio** (1595-1658), author of *Práctica del
Catecismo Romano y doctrina Cristiana*, was a Jesuit expert in Biblical exegesis and

---

10 *Gran Enclopedia de España*, s.v. “Medina, Bartolomé de.”
philosopher. Prior to his birth, his family moved to Spain as part of the entourage of Empress Maria de Austria. He became a teacher at the Colegio Imperial, a Jesuit university in Rome. He wrote an impressive amount of books on very diverse topics from spirituality to narratives of the New World. In his works he was interested in the symbolic and the mysterious, thus he considered that ‘the material or visible aspect of the universe is fictitious’. He was appointed by Philip IV to a commission to promote the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. His work *Práctica del Catecismo Romano*, published in 1640, was based on the doctrine from the Catechism of Popes Pio V and Clement VIII authorized at the Council of Trent. The preface to his book explained that this catechism should be constantly used by priests for instruction of the laity.

**Pacheco, Francisco** (1564-1644), author of *Arte dela Pintura: su Devoción y Grandezas*, was an influential painter and theoretician during the Baroque period. Not only was he a gifted artist, but also a learned individual who participated in the intellectual life of Seville. He was knowledgeable about the preoccupation of the Council of Trent concerning orthodoxy in the production of religious art. Despite Pacheco’s fame, he never got the post of Royal Painter that he sought for years. Instead, in 1618 he was assigned by the Inquisition the post of ‘overseer of sacred images’ to supervise the orthodoxy of religious art. Pacheco began his work *Arte de la Pintura* in 1600 and while it was finished by 1638, it was posthumously published in 1649. This work provided the first comprehensive study on art theory, symbolism and criticism on painting, which

---

2 *Gran Encyclopedía de España*, “Pacheco del Rio, Francisco (1564-1644).” See also: Internet page with information about an online exhibit of his painting in celebration of the 350 anniversary of his death. [http://www.cajasanfernando.es/htm/obrasocial/expvir/fpacheco/fpachecobio.htm, accessed 12 August 2007].
existed already in Italy and other nations, but not in Spain. Curiously, he expressed worries about the possibility of being ‘judged’ by the common people, which might have meant ‘misunderstood’. He primarily targeted the ‘learned’ audience because despite being considered ‘learned’, they did not know enough on this subject, and consequently often made incorrect statements. While writing this book, Pacheco realized that Vicente Carducho had just published work that was similar to his.

**Pérez de Ayala, Martin** (1503-1566) author of the *Catechismo para Instrucción de los Nuevos Convertidos en Moros* and *Imaginibus sanctorum* was a theologian and clergyman who reached the archbishopric of Valencia.13 Perez de Ayala was sent by Charles I of Spain to the Diet of Worms to help persuade Protestants to participate in the Council of Trent. Before going to Trent, he became bishop of Granada to where he returned after the work of the council had started. He returned to Trent once the council reconvened and impressed his audience with his theological erudition and his proposals for reform.14 Although the work was not signed, a subsequent archbishop Juan de Ribera determined who the author was and had it published in1628. It is likely that this catechism was intended to be used by clerics who lived in areas of high numbers of *moriscos* who chose to become Christians rather than facing expulsion in 1614.

**Prades, Jaime**, author of *Historia de la adoración y uso de las Santas Imágenes y de la imagen de la fuente de la salud*, was a clergyman and theologian.15 It is not clear if he studied in the seminary of Triguera or San Mateo, and obtained his doctorate in Theology in Valencia. He demonstrated exceptional knowledge of the classics and

---

13 *Gran Encylopedia de España*, “Pérez de Ayala, Martin.”
14 Ibid.
15 The limited Information about Jaime Prades was found in his book. Jaime de Prades. *Historia de la adoración y uso de las santas imágenes, y de la imagen de la Fuente de la Salud* (Valencia: En la Impresio de Felipe Mey, 1596).
church doctors. He was rector of the church of La Villa de Hares de los Ilecaones, in the province of Valencia. *Historia de la Adoración* was published in 1597 as a response to the attacks by heretics of Bearne, France, Germany, and England. During the second half of the sixteenth century, cases of individuals prosecuted by the Inquisition for Lutheranism remained a sporadic event, except for the areas bordering France. Prades argued “the damage caused by the touch of the German infection was in past times lamented in Spain.” Writing in the language of the masses was doubtless a contribution given the need for “those who are Doctors write in this way (in Romance) to the people about holy things.” The goal of this text was that “all Catholics [could] imitate this treatise, and get to know the origin of other images.” Prades made clear that people should not read the Scriptures and that his discussion included “everything people needed to know.” There were two specific factors that motivated Prades to write. First, the stories “about profaned churches and images of our Lord Jesus Christ and His blessed mother and of various saints being burned and destroyed” told by a friend who was traveling across those lands. Second, there was a lack of any teaching of doctrine in rural areas where questions about orthodoxy were on the rise. Prades’ book was published by a prestigious press of Felipe Mey situated in the city of Tortosa in Valencia.

**Roa, Martín de** (1559-1637), author of *Antiguedad, veneración i fruto de las sagradas imágenes*, was a historian and superior of the Jesuit order. Although his education focused on arts, he became teacher of Latin and theology. He also

---

16 Ibid., A4.
17 Ibid.
18 Ibid., A8.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid. 10.
administered five of the Jesuits colleges in the province of Andalucía. His interest in art was evident in his writings on secular and ecclesiastical buildings and works of art of various towns in Andalucía. In his work *Antigüedad, veneración y fruto*, published in 1624, he held that images were “a clear sign of Christianity.” He felt compelled to defend the use of images against those who, despite calling themselves Christians, despised them. One of his goals was to expose “the Heretics of our times, inheritors not so much of the blindness and rebelliousness of the first authors but of the boldness and fury of their father the Demon.” He acknowledged that although many Church doctors had discussed this topic, it was necessary to have this version in ‘vulgar’ (*Castilian*) in order to “ensure in all sorts of people the sincerity and purity of the veneration that must be given to sacred images.” Roa explained that his book was produced for the benefit of an audience who did not understand complicated subjects such as metaphysics nor could afford to buy a bulky book. He made clear that “I do not write here for the shelves of libraries, but for the hands who desire to know about the topic,” which implies that he was addressing literate people.

Siguenza, Jose de (1544-1606) author of *Historia de la Orden de San Jerónimo*, was a clergyman, poet, and historian. Siguenza started his religious education in the Hyeronomite monastery of El Parral in the city of Segovia. He finished his studies at the Dominican school of San Lorenzo de El Escorial where he was praised for his sermons. In 1584 he became the librarian of the monastery of San Lorenzo while his preaching

---

22 Martin de Roa, *Antigüedad, veneración y fruto de las sagradas imágenes* (Sevilla: Gabriel Ramos Vejarano, 1622).
23 Ibid., 3v.
24 Ibid., A3v.
25 Ibid., A4v.
26 *Gran Encyclopedia de España*, “Siguenza, José de.”
gained him the favor of King Philip II. He was subjected to a process by the Inquisition for suspicion of unorthodoxy. However, he was able to prove his innocence. The first part of his History of the Order of St. Jerome was written in 1594 and was published a year later, while the rest of this work was published in 1600 and 1605 respectively.

Tejeda, Fernando, author of Carrascon, was a Franciscan friar who converted to Protestantism.27 Despite the difficulties in establishing the identity of his work, there is evidence that during the reign of Philip III, Tejeda was a friar in the convent of San Agustin in the town of Burgos. In 1620, he left Spain and remained in the Netherlands for a few years. While the second edition of his work Carrascon was published in 1623 in the Netherlands, it seems that the first edition was in Latin. According to Menendez Pelayo, in this period he published two works in Spanish where he discussed liturgy and the most common points of contention between Catholics and Protestants. In England he worked on the translation of English Liturgy into Spanish at the request of King James I, where later he obtained the canonry of Hereford, and the vicary of Blakmer. The bishop of Lincoln might have pressed the idea of this translation in order to have the resources to teach it to the daughter of Philip IV, in case she married the Prince of Wales. He entered Oxford where in 1623 he wrote Tejeda retextus or Hispanus Conversus to explain his views on doctrine. After the death of King James I, he wrote De Monachatu: De Contradictionibus Doctrinae Ecclesiae Romanoe, and Carrascon, all three works in Latin.28 While none of these works were published, the last section of Carrascon appeared in Spanish in the Netherlands in 1623. An additional book registered under

27 Fernando de Tejeda, Carrascon, Colección de Reformistas Españoles, 1633. For a time the name of the author of Carrascon was believed to be Tomas Carrascon.
28 Marcelino Menendez Pelayo, Historia de los Heterodoxos (Madrid: F. Maroto e Hijos, 1980), 186.
Fernando de Tejeda is *Miracles Unmasked*, published in 1625 in Heidelberg.\(^{29}\) In this work directed at the general Spanish literate population, Tejeda traced the motives of his conversion by relating the mistaken practices he was exposed to during his life in a Spanish monastery. Menéndez Pelayo argues that Tejeda did not demonstrate superior scholarship in *Carrascon* as he referred to Catholic authors of poor repute to prove his arguments. The discussion of images seems to be well documented and the length of his arguments showed his conviction that the doctrine of images could be a perfect subject to demonstrate the deceits of the Catholic Church.

**Valera, Cypriano de** (1532-16??), author of *Dos tratados del papa i de la misa Tratado Para Confirmar los Pobres Cautivos*, was a Spanish monk who converted to Protestantism.\(^{30}\) His conversion to Calvinism seemed to have occurred when he was still a student in the Monastery of San Isidro.\(^{31}\) First, he went to Geneva where he remained until he moved to England after the death of Queen Mary. There he enrolled at Oxford and obtained a masters degree in 1566. He was a member of a circle of Spanish exiled reformers who were actively working in England. By 1570 Valera got involved in a conflict between a faction formed by Casiodoro de la Reina and Antonio Corro, two influential exiled Spanish reformers, and their French and Spanish enemies.\(^{32}\) His work, *Tratado Para Confirmar los Pobres Cautivos*, first written in Spanish and published in 1594 in London, was later published in English in 1600. He also wrote a complete translation of *Instruction* by Calvin, which was published in London in 1597. His most

\(^{29}\) Preface to *Carrascon*.


\(^{31}\) According to Menendez Pelayo, Valera was in a convent of the order of the Hieronymites. See Marcelino Menendez Pelayo. *Historia de los Heterodoxos* (Madrid: F. Maroto e Hijos, 1980).

\(^{32}\) Ibid. De la Reina published a New Testament in 1596 in London written in Spanish.
significant contribution was the production of the definite Castilian Bible in 1602, which became the standard text for evangelization of Protestant missionaries in the Hispanic world.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{Vasquez, Gabriel} (1549-1604), author of \textit{Disputationes metaphysicae}, was a theologian and metaphysic.\textsuperscript{34} As an expert in the writing of St. Thomas Aquinas, Vasquez taught at the Roman College in Italy and at Alcala in Spain. His major work was a commentary on Aquinas’ \textit{Summa Theologiae} that took ten volumes. In this approach, he discussed biblical sources, church degrees, and the writing of the Church fathers. His \textit{Disputationes metaphysicae} are a posthumous compilation of the most important sections of his commentary on Aquinas. In this text, Vasquez included a section where he discussed various aspects of the doctrine of images.

\textbf{Vega, Cristobal}, (1561-1599), author of \textit{Devoción a Maria: Pasaporte y salvoconducto que da paso a una buena muerte}, was a teacher of theology and missionary in India and Portugal.\textsuperscript{35} In 1588 he was sent on a mission to Central Asia as part of a group of Jesuits who visited the court of Emperor Akbar, of the Moghur dynasty. Their objective was to open a school to educate the members of the aristocracy in that part of the world. His work \textit{Devocion a Maria} was published in 1658. He focused on the devotional practices surrounding the image of the Virgin Mary.

\textbf{Villegas, Bernardino de}, author of \textit{La Esposa de Cristo instruída con la vida de Santa Lutgarda} was a teacher and superior of the Society of Jesus.\textsuperscript{36} He taught

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Donnelly, J.P. “Vasquez, Gabriel.” in \textit{Diccionario Histórico de la Compañía de Jesús}, Institutum Historicum S. I., 2001.
\end{itemize}
philosophy and theology in the towns of Cuenca, Murcia, and Alcalá. Besides the various leadership roles he occupied in Jesuit institutions, he was an official of the Inquisition. When he wrote this work, Villegas was teacher of theology in his College of San Estevan de Murcia, and official of the Inquisition. Despite his intention that his work remain in a manuscript form that could serve as a spiritual manual dedicated to four nuns of a pious convent, La Esposa de Cristo was published in 1625. This was a manual of practical advice that included a variety of topics about the life of nuns, from attire and prayer to devotional practices. Although this book was directed towards this specific audience, Villegas’ advice also served lay readers because the use of images was a practice shared by all Catholics. The changes proposed in this manual followed the program of reform established in Trent. Though he wrote this work in his late twenties and probably made mistakes, he excused himself for not having time to review it given his teaching responsibilities.

English Authors

Anonym. The work titled The Nurse of Pious Thoughts published in 1652 was signed with the pseudonym Philopater, F.P. The author, who called himself friend of the father, dedicated his work to the “right Honorable Lords, worshipfull knights, Esquires, Gentry and all the free-born people of England” who wanted to know about the defacing and demolishing of images. He appealed to the authorities for protection of ‘sacred objects of piety’ fearing the “utter ruine of our Nation by Atheisme and

37 Ibid.
38 The information about this anonymous author is given in the preface of the book. F. P. Philopater, The nurse of pious thoughts… (Douay: [s.n.], 1652).
prophanenesse."^{39} His objective was to demonstrate that Roman Catholic worship was not idolatrous as the opponents of images claimed. Because Catholics could not publish books in the early 1650s in England, it is likely that this work was published outside the country and brought secretly back in.

Andrewes, Lancelot (1555-1626), author of *Holy Devotions*, held several bishoprics and ecclesiastical positions.^{40} He was a serious scholar and linguist of high reputation in all Europe. Despite his interest in theology of the mainstream Elizabethan Calvinist sort in the 1570-1580s, he did not consider that there was a need for further ecclesiastic reform. After he became chaplain to the queen, he remained in high esteem in the eyes of James I for his reputation in scholarship and preaching. For two years, Robert Bellarmine and Andrews maintained a discussion over matters of papal authority and policies of the English church. During his lifetime he refused to publish his works unless ordered by authority, thus his *Holy Devotions* only appeared posthumously in 1655. This reserved attitude was not very common among Protestant writers who in general published their works with the goal of reaching large audiences. The author of the preface to Andrew’s work explained that *Holy Devotions* intended to teach people how to pray.

Becon, Thomas (1512-1567), the author of *The Principles of Christian Religion*, was a theologian who lived through the reigns of four Tudor monarchs.^{41} Unlike various reformers who lost their lives or remained in exile permanently, he was able to return to Elizabethan England to witness permanent reforms on images. Influenced by reformer Hugh Latimer, Becon assumed a considerably radical stance against the cult of saints, for

---

^{39} Ibid.
which he was forced to recant. His ideas were so radical that in 1546 his books were included in a royal ban on Protestant texts. During the reign of Edward VI, Archbishop Thomas Cranmer appointed him as one of six preachers at Canterbury.\textsuperscript{42} When Mary became queen, he was imprisoned in the Tower, but later he joined other exiles in Strasbourg. During the reign of Elizabeth, he was one of the most active reformers in the royal visitation of 1559. The \textit{Principles of Christian Religion}, a catechism influenced by Zwinglian theology and Cranmer’s ideas, was also published in 1560. Becon expected that through the use of “this little treatise which shall abundantly instruct you in those points of Christian religion,” parents could teach virtues to their children. His works had a pastoral orientation complemented with a polemical spirit that was often all too evident.\textsuperscript{43}

\textbf{Calfhill, John} (1529/30-1570), author of \textit{An Answer to the Treatise of the Cross}, was a Church of England clergyman who became bishop of Worcester.\textsuperscript{44} Calfhill was ordained deacon by Edmund Grindal under Elizabeth, a position that allowed him to rise to prominence. He went back to Oxford as a member of the reforming party where he lamented the state of the university under the ‘papistical yoke.’ In the convocation of 1562-63, he expressed his radical views when he signed the seven articles aimed at the drastic reduction of the ceremonies and vestments prescribed in the 1559 prayer book. This rejection of canonical vestments put him in direct confrontation with the influential Archbishop Matthew Parker. His work, \textit{An answer to the Treatise of the Crosse}, was published in 1565 where he responded to the claims of the Catholic exile John Martial.

\textsuperscript{42} Thomas Cranmer played a key role in the creation of the liturgy of the Church of England and the thirty-nine Articles.
\textsuperscript{44} Usher, Brett. “Calfhill, Brett (1529/30-1570).” \textit{ODNB}, 1973 ed.
Fulke, William (1536-1589), author of *D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and D. Rastel accounted for three pillers and archpatriarches of the popish synagogue...*, was a theologian and scientist. This book published in 1579 was one of twenty-four texts of controversial writing he engaged in. While at Cambridge, he was the leader of a Puritan faction that believed that the Elizabethan settlement had to move towards a fuller reformation. Such was the uproar that he caused in Cambridge that he resigned his fellowship in 1566. He exposed errors in the Roman Catholic doctrine and defended the Church of England against English Catholic polemicists. His knowledge of biblical and classical languages led him to his two most famous confrontations: with Edmund Campion and with English Catholics over the Rheims New Testament. In *D. Heskins, D. Sanders, and D. Rastel accounted*, he argued that although the ideas of this book had already been discussed in several places, it was necessary to keep challenging Catholics. Thus he invited “all such as have the Popish Books... confuted, to confere their arguments with mine answers.” In this book, not only did Fulke write for those Catholics and Protestants involved in the controversy, but also for any clergyman or lay person interested in the subject. He was admired as the successor to John Jewel in the theological defense of the Church of England against Rome.

Gurnay, Edmund (1578-1648), author of *Gurnay Redivivus or An Appendix Unto the Homily Against Images in Churches and Towards the Vindication of the Second Commandment*, was a Church of England clergyman. He was an active Puritan pastor who opposed Bishop Laud’s ceremonial and ornamental policies, and his writing

---

46 Ibid.
48 Wales, Tim, “Gurnay (Gurney), Edmund (1578-1648).” *ODNB*, 1973 ed.
demonstrated his virulence against Catholicism. In *Towards the Vindication of the Second Commandment*, published in 1639, he responded to allegations in defense of images believing that “these answeres which we have premised, we take to be both sound and safe, and agreeable with the Church of England”\(^{49}\) His exposition on the illegitimacy of the use of images was further backed up by his *An Appendix Unto the Homily Against Images in Churches*, which was published in 1641. In this book, Gurnay was more direct in denouncing that the setting up of images in English Churches created a safe and inviting place for recusants. These two works were published again during the Restoration. In the latter, he focused on a few arguments because “the lesse is written at once the more easily it is read, and the more thorowly perused”\(^{50}\) Nonetheless, he explained that the “pronenesse of the Times to advance [images] “made it necessary to oppose them and express the doctrine of the English Church.”\(^{51}\)

**Hammond, Henry** (1605-1660), author of *Of Idolatry*, was a Church of England clergyman and theologian who wrote a catechism that became very popular.\(^{52}\) Charles I was impressed by Hammond’s catechism and promoted him to a canonry in 1645. When Charles I was detained in 1647, Hammond was named one of the King’s chaplains. While most bishops secluded themselves during the interregnum, the defense of the Church of England remained in the hands of apologists led by Hammond. In *Of Idolatry*, published in 1646, he explained that he had been compelled to add his writing to a series of texts that discussed several topics related to idolatry and ceremonies. According to

---

\(^{49}\) Gurnay. *Towards the Vindication*, 150.

\(^{50}\) Gurnay. *Appendix unto the Homily*, 92.

\(^{51}\) Ibid.

Hugh de Quehen, Hammond held Arminian views on questions of God’s graces and some decrees.\(^{53}\)

**Harding, Thomas** (1516-1572), author of *Answer to Maister Jewelle’s Chalenge*, was a Catholic exile who collaborated with William Allen at the English College in Douai.\(^{54}\) He was at New College while Jewel was at Corpus Christi College in Oxford. During the reign of Henry, Harding became a professor of Hebrew who felt a deep admiration for Peter Martyr’s ideas. Although he initially embraced the Reformation, he reverted to Catholicism when Elizabeth became queen. In Louvain, Harding worked closely with the other high profile Catholic exile Nicholas Sanders. His work *Answer to Jewel’s Challenge*, published in 1564, was part of his important contribution to the Catholic cause. Besides Jewel, he must have hoped that his arguments were read by an ample readership of English Protestants, including the clergy and the laity.

**Heigham, John** (1568-c1634), author of *The Gagge of the Reformed Gospell*, was a Catholic bookseller and publisher exiled in the continent.\(^{55}\) From Douai and St. Omer, he organized the printing of books and smuggled them into England. His focus was the Tridentine primer, manual, breviary, and Jesus psalter, and the Counter-Reformation classics by English Catholics like Nicholas Sanders. In addition, he published translations of continental writers including Luis de Granada, Peer Canisius, and Robert Bellarmine. He himself translated several devotional works and wrote the controversial book, *the Gagge of the Reformed Gospell* in 1623.
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\(^{53}\) Ibid.


Hooker, Richard (1554-1600), author of *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, was a theologian and philosopher. By 1593 he had drafted the first major work in the fields of theology, philosophy, and political thought. The eight books containing his work were published at different times. Book 5, in which he discussed worship and church ceremonies, was published in 1597. Hooker explained the ways in which prescribed devotional forms could serve to build up the church. The enormous production of works by Hooker generated different kinds of replies from his readers: some found evidence of Catholic and Laudian views, others qualified his opinions as in agreement with moderate Protestantism.

Hooper, John (c.1495-1555), author of *A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments*, was a first generation reformer who died as a protestant martyr. In 1539 his radical views and sense of urgency upset Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. A verbal confrontation between the two resulted in Hooper’s temporal escape to Paris. He was strongly influenced by the works of continental reformers Zwingli and Bullinger, and his contacts from his stay in Zurich. As bishop of the recently created diocese of Gloucester and Worcester (1541), he established a program of reform not previously seen in England; he created the conditions to increase piety, church attendance and order emulating what he had seen in Zurich. As part of this new atmosphere, he was responsible for the destruction of images and altars for the sake of the purification of worship. Although *A Declaration of the Ten Commandments* was written between 1548 and 1549, it was not published until 1588. In his book, he requested that it be read with judgment and knowledge because the Ten Commandments were a contract

between God and His people. “This doctrine is therefore necessrie tobee knowne of al men: that GOD is iust and true.”

During the reign of Mary, Hooper refused to renounce his beliefs and was put in prison where he died.

**Hyde, Edward** (1607-1659) author of *A Christian Vindication of Truth Against Errour* was a clergyman who subscribed to a Calvinist soteriology (the study of the doctrine of salvation). Holding royalist views, he preached in favor of the king at the time of Charles I’s trial. In 1659, he wrote *A Christian Vindication* where he attacked as superstitious the Roman Catholic practices of praying to the saints and image worship and to vindicate Protestantism. He explained that it was hard to write about contentious topics; however, this work was unavoidable given the “quarreling age” in which he lived. His participation in the discussion on the subject of images had been prompted by the “many exceptions lately brought against the Church of England.”

**Jewel, John** (1522-1571), author of *A Replie unto M. Hardings Answer*, and *The Defence of the Apology of the Church of England*, was a Church of England clergyman with an urgency for reform. According to John Southgate, Jewel was mistakenly labeled a Puritan because he disagreed with some Protestant views. At Oxford, he embraced humanism and met Peter Martyr, the Italian theologian turned reformer, who shaped his thought. With the ascension of Mary, he was charged with having preached heretical doctrine, and was forced to leave Oxford, and eventually, England. When he came back at the ascension of Queen Elizabeth, Jewel’s works became highly valued and seen as essential for the education of the Anglican clergy. Authorities ordered some of
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his books to be placed in every church of instruction of the laity. In 1562, he wrote The Defence of the Apology of the Church of England also in response to Harding’s A Confutation of a Book Called An Apology of the Church of England. The exchanges between Jewel and Harding were part of what has been called ‘the Great Controversy’ in which English Catholic exiles Nicholas Sander and John Martial also participated. Jewel’s involvement in this controversy turned him into the most famous bishop of his time. This work instructed priests to teach the youth to read the scriptures, as well as train them in the ministering of the sacraments. In 1565, he wrote A Replie unto M. Hardings Answer to demonstrate the weak arguments of the Catholic religion. He acknowledged that despite the eloquence of Harding, his cites of the father’s words are “untruly alleged, some corruptly translated, some perversely expounded.” Thereby he trusted the reader to judge the two authors.

Martial, John (1534-1597), author of The Treatise of the Cross was an English Catholic exile and religious controversialist. After Elizabeth became queen, he went into exile in Louvain and later took his BA at the University of Douai. Martial was one of the very few English Catholics who wrote on the use of images during this period. In 1564, as a member of the English College, he dedicated A Treatise of the Cross to the Queen and asked her to defend the sign of the cross, which was a specific reference to the conflict that a crucifix in her chapel had generated. This book was also a contribution to the controversy initiated by John Jewel’s ‘challenge sermon.’ Martial wrote to show the
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Queen “the bokes of the old fathers, by whose testimonies the churche his opinion and doctrine of the crosse is avounched and confirmed.” What moved him to defend the cross was “seing [that] the church hath bene so pitifully defaced by Satan and his ministers, and the crosse of Christ cast out of churches.” After reading his book, his audience could judge for themselves if the use of crosses should be called idolatry. Eventually James Calfhill replied to every one of Martiall’s arguments and because bishop Grindal seemed to have authorized Calfhill’s book, Martiall publicly asked the bishop to establish with clarity the doctrine of the Church of England on the matters discussed in his book. Martiall also received a reply in 1580 from William Fulke.

Mede, Joseph (1586-1638), author of The Apostasy of the Latter Times, was a Hebraist and biblical scholar. He was a teacher at Cambridge where some of his pupils achieved high honors. Although he favored moderation and episcopacy, some of his contemporaries and modern scholars have considered him a Puritan or of puritan inclinations. His major contribution was made in the subject of prophetic studies in 1627. Later in life, he published his work Apostasy of the Latter Times in 1641, during a period of unrest caused by the Gunpowder Plot. In this book he made clear his hatred for Rome, and clarified certain aspects of Protestant doctrine for his readers. He argued that a doctrine of demons had taken over the doctrine of the Church of Rome, as was clear in the practices of “worshipping of Angels, deifying and invoking of Saints, adoring and
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templing of Reliques, bowing downe to Images, worshipping of Crosses.” Mountague, Richard (1575-1641) author of *A Gagg for the New Gospell? No: a New Gagg for an Old Goose*, was a religious controversialist and bishop of Norwich (1628). He took on the task of writing a Protestant refutation to the ecclesiastical history written by Cardinal Baronius, but despite his intention to vindicate the historical continuity of the Church of England, he did not finish it. His participation in a written controversy over tithes established him as a strong casuistic opponent. In 1624 he wrote a response to the text *The Gagg for the New Gospell* by John Heigham to disprove his misconceptions about the Church of England. In *A Gagg for the New Gospell? No: a New Gagg for an Old Goose* published in 1624, he accepted that only eight of the forty-seven propositions equated with English Protestant doctrine were true and advocated some leniency towards Rome. After writing a text on the invocation of the saints, he was accused of preaching in favor of prayers for the saints, which angered Parliament. James IV, however, allowed Mountague to answer his detractors. With the support of the bishop of Durham Richard Neile, who was at the center of a group of influential Arminians, Mountague wrote another text that angered parliament. While, in 1626, an initial conference of bishops headed by Lancelot Andrews determined that Mountague had not affirmed anything contrary to doctrine, the House of Commons determined that he had to be punished for his opinions. The new king made clear his intention to prevent the ‘least’ religious innovation.
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In 1628, Mountague maneuvered to obtain the bishopric of Chichester, which enraged his opponents. During his visitations, he took a moderate stance toward the Puritan clergy. Apparently, the bond with Laud was not as close as it has been suggested: they only shared a common concern for the church. Unlike Laud, Mountague envisioned the possibility of a rapprochement with Rome, for which he held talks with a papal emissary. At the end of his life, he was translated to the bishopric of Norwich which he described to Laud as quiet and uniform.

**Peacham, Henry** (1578-1644), author of *Art of Drawing*, was a writer and illustrator. While he started his career as a teacher of music, his true interest lay in the graphic arts. He produced several books of portraits and emblems, as well as instructional works in the graphic arts. His book *Art of Drawing* that appeared in 1606 was expanded under the title of *Graphice* in 1612. The most read version of this work was published again in the 1630s and 1660s as *The Gentleman’s Exercise*. Despite the brevity of his comments about images, his contribution is significant because he was an artist expressing his opinion in the midst of the destruction of, and opposition to, images.

**Perkins, William** (1558-1602), author of *The Reformed Catholic* and *A Warning Against the Idolatry of the Last Times* was a theologian and Church of England clergyman. He was described as an advocate of Calvinist doctrine and a moderate Puritan. Often considered as the most important theologian of his time, he viewed the transition from Elizabethan to the Jacobean era with expectations and incertitude. Despite his attacks aimed at the ‘idolatrous’ Roman Catholic Church, Perkins remained a devoted defender of the essential doctrines and liturgical practices of the Church of
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England. His contribution did not lie in the originality of his writings, but on his ability to bring to a broad audience a variety of theological and moral issues by making the arguments and the style more accessible and understandable to a wide range of readers.

Three of Perkin’s works discuss various topics directly related to the doctrine of images. His work *The Reformed Catholic*, published in 1597, was a response to those who argued that there were no differences in ‘substance’ between Protestants and Catholics. His purpose was to show differences and similarities between the two churches to a large audience of clergymen and lay people. The fact that his work was translated into Spanish indicates that Perkins hoped that his work could have an audience of disgruntled, or at least, curious people in Spain, or possibly in the Spanish speaking world across the Atlantic. In *A Warning Against the Idolatry of the Last Times*, published in 1601, he focused on the subject of worship. In this work, he distinguished between different types of audiences. While his overall goal was “to informe the ignorant multitude touching the true worship of God. For the remaineders of Poperie yet sticke in the minded of many of them”, those recusants who read it had to be reminded that “Church of Rome...is a maintainer and worshipper of Idols.” He declared that his work would be read outside England as he attempted to “convince the Church of Rome of [its] manifest Idolatry.”

**Ridley, Nicholas** (1501-1555), author of *A Pious Lamentation*, a theologian of the first generation of English Protestants who became bishop of Rochester and London. He adapted his views according to the changing doctrinal views of the reigns of three
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different monarchs. His career was highly influenced by his education in Cambridge as well as by his uncle Robert Ridley, who was a friend of Erasmus. While in the early years of Protestantism, Ridley held conservative views on the Eucharist and other important doctrinal issues, his position changing after the death of Henry VIII. While in 1547 as bishop of Rochester he was careful to distance himself from the views of Anabaptists and Calvinists on the sacrament of the altar. In 1550 he ordered the destruction of altars as one of his first actions as bishop of London. It is likely that he wrote *A Pious Lamentation*, by the time he became Bishop of Rochester in 1547, but it was published in 1566. When Queen Mary assumed power, he was one of the first reformers to be arrested, and later died as a martyr defending his views on a topic that was considered vital for the reformed church: the meaning of the Eucharist.

Sanders, Nicholas (1530-1581), author of *A Treatise of Images of Christ and Of His Saints*, was an English Catholic exile and religious controversialist. When he returned to England after a trip to Rome, he refused to take the oath of supremacy, and thus resigned his fellowship at Oxford. He took part in the Council of Trent as a theologian, participating in the decision that Protestants could not attend Catholic services. In 1564, he went to Louvain where as a student, became an important figure of the exiled community. In *A Treatise of Images of Christ and Of His Saints*, published in 1567, he confronted the arguments previously presented by John Jewel. He disagreed with other Louvanists in regards to their reaction to the actions of the Duke of Alba, who had violently repressed the iconoclasts of 1568. Unlike many of the exiles, he supported the northern uprising in England in 1567, and was an unconditional supporter to the pope’s authority. For this reason, he was sent to Spain by the Pope to help plan the
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invasion of England. His reason for this work, he explained, was “not because I lacked a better Argument to Write of, but because the tyme prouoked me so to doe, and it was also a truthe, which ought not to be neglected in any matter be never so small.” 79 Through his arguments, he wished not only to “recover to the Catholike Church some of them who by ignorance had wandered out of the right way,” but also hoped to “move my Countriemen (not only in this point of honouring holy images, but much rather in all the reast) to returne again to the Church,” of their ancestors. 80 This long treatise was directed at the English population in general, which implies that he believed that despite the ban on the circulation of Catholic writings, it was possible that his text reached a good number of people. Grindal’s visitations of 1571 seem to confirm Sander’s optimism. People were asked if they had read material by the “English papist, Harding, and Sanders [who had] published books at Louvain,” which meant some Catholic books reached an audience. 81

**Vaux, Laurence** (1519-1585) author of *A Catechism, or Christian Doctrine, Necessary for Children and Ignorant People*, was a Roman Catholic priest who left England after the Act of Uniformity and Supremacy. 82 As a member of the community of exiles in Louvain, he functioned as an envoy between Pope Gregory XVIII and the English apostolic delegates, Sanders and Harding. Vaux went on a mission to England to hand a communiqué to the Catholic community on behalf of the official papal delegates who decided it was too risky for them. Back in Louvain, Vaux wrote his *Catechism*, published in 1567, which has close resemblance to the one that bishop Bonner wrote in 1555 in that he avoided controversial issues like purgatory, transubstantiation and
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indulgences. In 1580, Vaux went back to England on a mission, but was apprehended and questioned about his ‘popish’ catechism. He died in prison around 1585 for which he has been considered a martyr.

Warmestry, Thomas (1609/10-1665), author of A Convocation Speech, was a dean of Worcester. In 1641, at the second convocation, he gave a speech at his diocese, just before the start of the civil war, which was published as A Convocation Speech Against Images, Altars, Crosses, the New Canons, the Oaths. In it he explained that given the rumors about the exceptions to the Canons, he felt compelled to express his opinion. He agreed with outward worship, but disagreed with giving worship to images. Although he was against certain aspects of the Oath discussed in his book, he claimed that he did not “dislike anything that the Oath intends principally to guard”, he only wanted to avoid private innovations. Despite his notoriety as a moderate Anglican, he showed extreme dislike for Laudian ceremonialism. During the unrest of 1641-42 he shared with other moderate puritans the idea of reconciliation in church and state.
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