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INTRODUCTION

Victorian Protestants of all denominations insisted that without the Reformation, there would be no economic success, no intellectual and scientific growth, no political liberty—in other words, no modern Britain. And yet, the Reformation’s success apparently foretold its undoing. “As Protestants we had greatly lost, through disuse and long ease and prosperity, the armour of the Reformation,” thundered the evangelical Edward Bickersteth, exploding into a battery of mixed metaphors. “While we slept the enemy has been busy sowing tares, and the tares are rapidly multiplying. The plague of popery is spreading through the camp, and it is needful to make haste and withstand it.” By the end of the nineteenth century, praising the Reformation and mourning its incipient loss had become one of the leading hallmarks of popular anti-Catholic discourse, spilling into tracts, lectures, poems, catechisms, histories, biographies, and novels. Nor were Protestants alone in worrying about the Reformation’s cultural significance: increasingly as the decades wore on, Roman Catholic and Anglo-Catholic historians, controversialists, and novelists appropriated the Protestants’ favorite topic in order to narrate an entirely different
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history, one in which the Reformation’s “success” actually marked the beginning of widespread cultural and political collapse. Writing about and debating the Reformation became one of the Victorian era’s most popular, and most loaded, national pastimes.

This phenomenon, however, is virtually unknown in literary studies, even though the heat of the debates fueled poetry, drama, and (most importantly for my purposes here) several dozen novels. The reason is not hard to find: this popular obsession with the Reformation, so crucial for Protestant and even Catholic identities, was carried on not by now-canonical authors but by some of the most successful religious novelists—figures like Deborah Alcock, Elizabeth Rundle Charles, A. D. Crake, Lady Georgiana Fullerton, Emily Sarah Holt, Emma Leslie, George E. Sargent, and Frances Taylor. Their work was widely reviewed in the leading Christian periodicals, pirated in the United States, and translated into languages ranging from French to Bengali; some of the most successful were reprinted well into the twentieth century. For example, Charles’s *Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family* (1863), in which Martin Luther plays a leading role, went through over a dozen editions in Britain and as many in the United States; was translated into German (also going through multiple editions), French, and Arabic; and was re-released as late as 2003, in an edited version, by an evangelical small press. John Scott Lidgett, a leading Methodist activist and theologian from the late Victorian period to the mid-twentieth century, remembered his father reading *The Pilgrim’s Progress* with as much fondness as he remembered him reading the *Chronicles.*

Thus, this book insists not only that controversial fiction played a crucial role in nineteenth-century popular religious and literary cultures, but that any study of religion and literature that dismisses them in favor of canonical works will badly skew our understanding of the Victorian religious landscape. Although such familiar figures as Walter Scott, Charles Dickens, and George Eliot will appear in the course of this study, when it comes to understanding the complexities of Victorian religious narratives, close reading of classic works for traces of religious controversy is not, in the end, the most productive strategy.
Working with popular religious fiction poses its own problems, such as a nonexistent canon, frequently unanswerable questions about authorship, and difficulties in establishing reception histories. Moreover, by their very nature, these works push an explicit rather than an implicit agenda; theoretical approaches that emphasize decoding or a “hermeneutics of suspicion” founder when faced with a text that, at first, seems all surface. For this reason, the chapters that follow will combine close reading with the interrelations of novelistic groups, as narrative patterns and thematic elements emerge, consolidate, and eventually disperse across time.

More specifically, this study focuses on how such popular religious fictions—by authors of any denomination—imagine historical processes at work, processes that, for these authors and their readers, led beyond nineteenth-century national history to the apocalypse itself. It is by now a commonplace that the Victorian era was quintessentially “historical” in its attitudes, seeking to position every political, economic, cultural, or religious event against a sweeping, explanatory backdrop. These novels, however, narrate the past in accord with a providential, eschatological framework that often remains buried in modern studies of both Victorian historiography and Victorian fiction. George Levine has recently argued that Victorian fiction “tends toward the secular even as it insists—as it so often does—on the providential order of things”; “virtue” cannot succeed in due course without breaking all “the rules of the novel, the canons of plausibility.” I argue in this volume, by contrast, that religious historical novelists pushed the historical novel’s “secularity” to the breaking point, often by rewriting its fundamental epistemological and moral assumptions. For these novelists, history’s core drama lay in the transformative potential of individual, national, and even global conversion, one of the core emphases of pan-evangelical belief in the nineteenth century. Such fictions do not, as Elizabeth Deeds Ermarth argues of conversion narratives more generally, “do away with the need for history”; instead, they narrate the convert’s coming to grips with the authentic, providential history underlying all human action through the self’s realization of error and consequent transformation. To modern readers,
the sheer repetitiveness of this patterning across novels set in wildly
different time periods soon comes to seem tediously predictable—yet
that predictability is precisely the point. These novels lay out a uni-
versal plot, one that repeats itself across time and space; its universality
means that the reader, too, can transform him- or herself along the con-
vert’s model. At the same time, this plot’s apparent suitability for all
historical moments yokes past and present together, so that the “his-
torically radical” becomes the “contemporaneously orthodox”—an
apparent difference that is, in fact, not one.8

It would be difficult to find a nineteenth-century historical novel
that did not touch, even superficially, on religion, whether it be W. H.
Ainsworth’s *Windsor Castle* (1842), Edward Bulwer-Lytton’s *The Last
Days of Pompeii* (1834), or Robert Louis Stevenson’s *The Master of Bal-
lantrae* (1889). This study, however, takes a more tightly defined form
of religious historical fiction as its province: the controversial historical
novel, a subgenre that has been virtually written out of mainstream
literary-historical narratives about the fate of the genre after Sir Wal-
ter Scott. By *controversial* historical fiction I mean historical fiction
that explicitly foregrounds questions of faith—whether in an obvi-
ously doctrinal fashion or not—in order to convert the reader.9 These
novels situate and attempt to historicize contemporary theological de-
bates in narrative form. At the very least, like controversial novels more
generally, they “seek to prove the truth of a particular understanding
of Christianity [or any other religion, for that matter] at the expense
of others.”10 They frequently incorporate catechetical dialogues, staged
trials, scenes of biblical reading and exegesis, and sermons. These dis-
cursive moments exist in a larger providential framework, which the
characters themselves must learn to decode; in fact, learning to inter-
pret apparently secular events according to their proper providential
signification is frequently one of the controversial historical novel’s
key lessons.

From its very beginnings in Grace Kennedy’s *Father Clement: A
Roman Catholic Tale* (1823), the controversial novel often was a his-
torical novel. This choice of genre was not incidental: setting theolog-
ical debates in the past validated or invalidated the present state of
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religious affairs, identified significant moments of origin, and highlighted connections between religious opinions and their sociopolitical equivalents. Thus, Kennedy wraps her Presbyterian catechetical dialogues in a combination conspiracy and inheritance plot set during the Jacobite Rebellion of 1715, indicting the Catholic clergy as conspirators. Moreover, her final vignettes include a Roman Catholic tourist heaving a “sigh” as he ponders his near-vanished church, “almost forgotten” in Britain. Both Kennedy’s politicized setting and her self-conscious dwelling on Catholic loss banish Roman Catholicism from nineteenth-century British culture: the Catholic tourist is posed on the brink of his own eradication, trapped in a nostalgia unshared by his Protestant neighbors. Kennedy repurposes Sir Walter Scott’s famous evocations of cultures vanishing under the pressure of modernization to proclaim that Roman Catholicism constitutes an improper anachronism in modern British culture. Her numerous Catholic respondents evidently noted the anti-Catholic politics involved in her choice of genre, for the several responses that followed were all pointedly set at least within a decade of their publication: far from vanishing into the unstable past, nineteenth-century Catholics insisted that they were there to stay.

**In Search of the Controversial Historical Novel**

But calling these controversial fictions *historical novels* raises questions about our definition of the genre itself. From Georg Lukács to present-day postmodernists, theorists of the historical novel have stipulated that it is a secular, post-Enlightenment form, defined by historical relativism, proto-anthropological cultural awareness, realism, and materialism—although, ironically, some of Scott’s contemporaries thought his work was a brilliant exemplar of religious argumentation. Even the most recent poststructuralist scholarship, which emphasizes what Linda Hutcheon calls “historiographic metafiction” (that is, fictions that reflect on the narrative construction of history itself), continues to rely on these basic presuppositions. From Lukács
onward, most theorists of the historical novel have argued that it is about transformation—in Lukács’s words, “a clear understanding of history as a process, of history as the concrete precondition of the present.” In Sir Walter Scott’s fiction, Lukács argues, we see the emergence of new social, political, and cultural conditions out of a Hegelian dialectic of warring forces, channeled through one of Scott’s bland but nevertheless historically “typical” protagonists. While some have suggested that Scott’s practice may be less representative than it at first appears, Lukács’s identification of the historical novel with narratives of how the present necessarily came to be remains attractive, even when Lukács’s interest in the historical novel’s implicit politics goes by the wayside.

Controversial historical fiction—especially in its Protestant incarnations—explicitly calls into question this argument that past and present must be different, that the past is the necessary “prehistory” of modernity and not identical to it. Against Lukács, Fiona Price has recently suggested that we think about a religiously inflected model of historical fiction that, far from chronicling the rise of modern commercial culture, instead “attempts to construct a tradition of continuous heroism and self-sacrifice.” Price describes this alternative model as “the other historical novel.” Like Price, I agree that for the controversial historical novelist, economics and ideology do not define history, and the “past” very well may be fundamentally identical to the present. But the novels I discuss do not assume continuity so much as they seek to teach the reader how to reconstruct it. In one sense, the sixteenth-century past is “lost”; in another, it remains alive through an untiring and ever-watchful project of storytelling, memorialization, and reenactment. Moreover, history’s true “author” or “maker” in these texts is God, not the people or even “Great Men”; men and women act out their destinies with greater or lesser degrees of free will but always in accordance with the greater, if ever only retrospectively glimpsed, design of divine providence. The historical novelist may represent economic or ideological differences in all their complexity, and yet those differences are not themselves important or even necessarily determinant of what follows. And this relative lack of importance has
significant moral implications, for the religious historical novel strips the secular, material world of significance in order to direct the reader to an historical narrative that normally escapes human representation—what the Anglican novelist Elizabeth Rundle Charles calls, in a metafictional moment, “Church history,” which “is being silently lived on earth, is being silently written in heaven.”

Tellingly, the only book-length study of historical fiction with an overt religious bent, Royal W. Rhodes’s *The Lion and the Cross: Early Christianity in Victorian Novels* (1995), is by a historian of religion, not a literary historian; and the two best-known studies of evangelical fiction more generally, Margaret Nancy Cutt’s *Ministering Angels: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Evangelical Writing for Children* (1979) and Elisabeth Jay’s *The Religion of the Heart: Anglican Evangelicalism and the Nineteenth Century Novel* (1979), have virtually nothing to say about historical fiction. Yet the historical novels that the Victorians produced and consumed in mass quantities frequently flout all of modern criticism’s ground rules for the genre, and they persist in doing so until the end of the century, long past the purported terminal date for “literary” fiction with religious overtones. For that matter, they do so despite what some have diagnosed as a significant historical difficulty in late-Victorian theology: “If a religion was founded upon events in history, and the events possessed the particularity which all events must possess, how could they be of universal, redeeming significance?” These novels do not neatly adhere to the timeline scholars have established for religious crises in either high literature or high theology. And yet, the Victorians themselves saw no necessary contradiction in calling both controversial and “secular” historical fiction historical fiction. I therefore address what is becoming a core problem in literary history: understanding the complicated interface between literary and religious discourses. Our attention to the “high” literary tradition of historical novels obscures the centrality of explicitly religious definitions of historical change to the historical novel’s development.

Whether or not such texts had the intended effect on their target audiences, needless to say, is an open question. For example, *Father Clement* proved to be an exceptionally successful novel, remaining in
print until the end of the century, but while Edmund Gosse suggested that it determined his father’s rabid anti-Catholicism, the novelist Lady Georgiana Fullerton claimed that it contributed to her eventual conversion to Catholicism. The level of theological sophistication in such texts varies wildly. By the same token, the Catholic historian John Lingard’s History of England (1819–30) sometimes shows its influence in unexpected places—especially in more nuanced depictions of Mary I, something I shall discuss in chapter 4. Moreover, these novels frequently offer an extreme position on sola scriptura that makes the Bible astonishingly easy to understand, thereby sidestepping the heated disputes on biblical hermeneutics taking place in nineteenth-century Britain and, of course, Germany. Elisabeth Jay’s observation that “most novelists found it easier to concentrate on the way in which Evangelicals ‘used’ the Bible rather than dealing with the thorny topic of Biblical inspiration” extends well beyond literary figures like the Trollopes. Such occluded religious boundaries enabled writers to address an amorphous range of readers—children, adults, working class, middle class—without stepping on too many sensitive toes, an approach encouraged by ecumenical Protestant publishers like the Religious Tract Society (RTS).

This stripped-down theology was a generic fictional “Protestantism” that, in practice, did not embody the values, practices, beliefs, and norms of any given denomination. Although there were certainly fictionalized polemics devoted to topics like baptism, controversial fiction did not necessarily want to stir up intra-Protestant controversy: many historical novelists tended to either avoid or play down subjects of a hotter sort, whether paedobaptism, predestination, or eternal damnation. (“I certainly do not go blindly over hedge and ditch after the opinions of John Calvin,” one of the pro-Calvinist novelist Emily Sarah Holt’s characters remarks.) Protestantism may have been the means of “encouraging” the British people to “unite against its own and other outsiders,” but how could such a strategy be put into practice without alienating the very insiders one was supposed to unite? Instead of thinking of these texts as oversimplified and overheated Protestantism, we might consider the productive aspects of
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such an approach. Sarah C. Williams warns historians of religion that merely invoking “evangelicalism” conceals “the varieties of theological position, ecclesiological structure, religious disposition and denominational milieu which co-existed throughout this period and which together shaped the religious culture of the nation.” But by constructing an entirely Bible-centered narrative of Protestantism’s clash with Catholicism, novelists could point readers toward a vision of a fully unified—or, at least, a fully cooperative—Protestant community. It was no accident that in its initial ecumenical phase, the British and Foreign Bible Society forbade opening prayers at its meetings. More specific theological controversies, such as those over the Eucharist, predestination, or justification and sanctification, were divisive among even evangelicals in a way that appeals to the Bible were not, and they often vanish from or are downplayed in novels where they really ought to take pride of place. Protestants cast the Bible in the role of “open” text, accessible to any and all comers, whose presence reinstated the “original” promise of Christianity. A bibliocentric history invoked the prospect of a possible, fully purified Protestantism, one that could stand firm against the coming of Antichrist. In many ways, the ideal endpoint of these narratives is not Protestant religion as it is, but Protestantism as it is to come.

Not surprisingly, given their purpose, controversial historical fiction generally appeared in an inexpensive single-volume format from explicitly religious publishers, who by midcentury had clear theological “brands.” The novels in this study were published by a variety of publishers, ranging from the ecumenical Protestant Religious Tract Society, one of the Victorian era’s great publishing concerns, to smaller presses like John F. Shaw (evangelical), R. Washbourne (Roman Catholic), and the Parker brothers (Anglo-Catholic). Only a few books in this study, like Anna Eliza Bray’s The Protestant (1828), were published in double- and triple-decker format by “secular” publishers like Richard Bentley or Henry Colburn. The majority were single-volume novels, sometimes quite slim, published on low-quality paper, and few boasted extensive illustrations. Their audiences were loosely defined: many surviving examples are school prize books, suggesting a
younger audience, but some authors (for example, Charles Edmund Maurice or Emily Sarah Holt) include elaborate footnotes that also target adults. Several novelists, including Crake, Holt, Leslie, and Charles, wrote novels either intended as series (Leslie’s “Church History” tales) or packaged as such (Holt’s “Tales of England in the Olden Days”), and thus could be read as virtual substitutes for the more complex fare of Reformation and ecclesiastical history. Of the novels discussed in this study, some originated in religious serials and were later reprinted in volume form. Many were pirated in the United States, where there was a strong market for British didactic texts. These were cheap novels, sometimes retailing for no more than one shilling, that were inexpensive enough to be purchased by parents, churches, and schools (the latter two for libraries and prize books), and not necessarily by the circulating libraries. And they are novels with a mission.

Controversial Fiction, Religious Upheaval: Reaction and Revision

Depending on the novelist’s theological and political affiliations, that mission meant anything from saving the Reformation (and Britain) from its detractors to salvaging the Catholic Church (and Britain) from its Reformation antagonists. Anything about the Reformation was fair game. A number of historians have traced the changing fortunes of the Reformation in political and ecclesiastical history, focusing primarily on the work of gentleman scholars, clergymen, and professional academics. In recent years, revisionist historians have challenged the assumption that the Reformation emerged from a decadent and irrelevant medieval Catholicism, pointing out that such Protestant narratives of the Reformation imagine it “as an inexorable process, a necessary sequence unfolding easily to a predetermined conclusion.” Protestant historical fiction shaped popular fantasies of this “necessary sequence” for their readers, while Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic historical novelists seized the opportunity to invent very different narratives of the Reformation’s effects, whether to challenge its...
effects on the Church of England or to dismiss it altogether as a violent break in the very fabric of British national history. In and of themselves, neither the narratives nor the obsessions were new: the Reformation was a recurring canker in the British historical and political imagination, its significance always becoming the subject of passionate investigation during times of religious upheaval. For our purposes, four significant movements, or religio-political events, motivated much of the anxiety about the Reformation and its possible disappearance at the hands of Catholics, both Anglo and Roman.

First, in 1829, after years of campaigning, Catholic Emancipation enabled Roman Catholics to once again sit in the House of Commons. Although Emancipation was welcomed by some Protestants, many saw in it the imminent destruction of every effort made to secure Protestant ascendancy in the wake of the Reformation. Reminiscing some years later, one would-be Protestant versifier found the Catholic “brute” all too “eager for its prey”: “The deadly Bill of Twenty-Nine!—/Ah, well-a-day, the deed!—/My Christian brother! yours and mine/ May be the hearts to bleed.”34 This “deadly Bill” was more than just bad politics. It directly flouted the revelation of God’s will manifested in the Reformation and thereby invited unimaginable—or all too imaginable—acts of divine chastisement.35 Its very legislative success, hard-line Protestants argued, demonstrated that Protestants had cut themselves off from their own historical origins. And in so doing, Protestants had not just enabled Roman Catholicism to succeed but also had damned themselves. It did not help that the Catholic population in England was growing by leaps and bounds, thanks to a combination of clergymen reenergizing their congregations, reconversion and conversion, and immigration. The Catholic claim to “Protestant” space was increasingly hard to ignore.36 As Catholicism made headway in English culture in the 1830s, apocalyptic speculations about the approaching end of days became common currency among all Protestant denominations. Although Protestants had long identified the pope with the Antichrist, Emancipation suggested that the millennium itself was at hand.37

Second, as the anguished response to Emancipation unfolded, John Keble’s sermon “On National Apostasy” (1833) energized what would
coalesce into the Oxford Movement. Traditional High Churchmen (as historians now call them) still insisted that the Church of England was a *Protestant* church, albeit one whose Protestantism was thoroughly English—“moderate and orderly,” “episcopal”—instead of the more radical version from abroad. The Oxford Movement argued that the Church of England still retained its status as a “doctrinally sound expression of the church catholic,” and sought a renewed emphasis on “liturgical worship, eucharistic communion, and intercessory prayer.” The Reformation might have separated the Church of England from the Church of Rome, but the Church of England was no less Catholic for that. More immediately, they opposed erastianism, or government intervention in church matters. Hence Keble’s sermon, which reacts to the “enfranchisement of non-conformists, Catholics and shopkeepers” as a danger to the viability of an established church; under such circumstances, only by liberating the church from the state could the church retain its theological cohesion and “apostolic integrity.” Initial approval from within the Church of England gave way to growing apprehension, however, once readers of the *Tracts for the Times* (1833–41)—the movement’s self-explanatory publications written by Richard Hurrell Froude, Keble, John Henry Newman, and E. B. Pusey, among others—began to suspect that Newman and E. B. Pusey in particular wished not just to restore continuity but to restore the actual Roman Catholic Church itself. Newman’s notorious Tract XC, *Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-Nine Articles* (1841), which closely analyzed the Thirty-Nine Articles to show that an “Anglo-Catholic” could read them in a Catholic, and not Protestant, sense, was understood to encourage essentially Roman Catholic clergy to take over the Church of England from within. It did not help that Newman and James Mozley had co-edited the letters and journals of his fellow Tractarian Richard Hurrell Froude, the *Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*, which, despite its preface disclaiming any Roman Catholic tendencies in the text, included such pull quotes as “The Reformation was a limb badly set—it must be broken again in order to be righted,” and “You will be shocked at my avowal, that I am every day becoming a less and less loyal son of the Reforma-
tion.” This was bad press, and it reinforced anxieties that the leaders of the Oxford Movement and their followers constituted a fifth column within the Church of England.

Third, although Newman and many of his fellows from the movement converted to Roman Catholicism, another contemporaneous movement within the Church of England sought to maintain its Anglican allegiances while also reviving traditional liturgical forms—the Anglo-Catholics, pejoratively known as “Ritualists.” The Anglo-Catholic movement looked back to seventeenth-century Anglicanism and its renewed emphasis on the “beauty of holiness,” in which the decoration of the altar, vestments, and the church itself all came in for new aesthetic care. More seriously, Anglo-Catholics called for more attention to the liturgical rubric of the Book of Common Prayer, to the sacraments, to auricular confession, to the role of the Virgin Mary, and to the church’s role in interpreting the scriptures; some Anglo-Catholic churches conformed so closely to Roman practice that it was necessary to warn unwary Roman Catholics that they were not about to enter one of their own churches. As historians, Anglo-Catholics insisted that the Reformation had not, in fact, severed the Church of England from its Catholic roots but that its hierarchy had deliberately set out to preserve that connection despite the ongoing threats from the more reform-minded. And Anglo-Catholics also began establishing brotherhoods and sisterhoods, with at least ninety sisterhoods alone established in the second half of the nineteenth century. Such apparent returns to the Catholic fold elicited reactions both legislative and violent. In 1859 the congregation of St. George’s, for example, regularly rioted during services against its Anglo-Catholic minister, Bryan King, and was aided and abetted by visitors who came solely for the purpose of making things worse. The government eventually sought to restrain Anglo-Catholic practices by passing the Public Worship Regulation Act (1874), which did not have the desired effect: five Anglo-Catholic clergymen, thanks no doubt to their “devout pugnacity,” opted for jail rather than conformity, and the law eventually lapsed into disuse—in part because it made the more hardcore Protestant organizations look rather cruel.
Finally, the 1850s proved to be the high-water mark for anti-Catholic agitation, thanks to the ugly press surrounding the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in late 1850. English Protestants misunderstood the process of establishing new Catholic dioceses as an actual territorial land grab; indeed, Lord John Russell complained that it was impossible to find in the orders anything other than “an assumption of territorial sovereignty.”

To make matters even worse, the newly appointed Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman’s pastoral address, “From the Flaminian Gate of Rome,” took a triumphalist tone that, as Richard J. Schiefen delicately puts it, “was, to say the very least, unfortunate in its consequences.” Quickly dubbed the “Papal Aggression,” the decision to establish a new hierarchy was cast by even such normally level-headed individuals like Russell as a direct assault on the Church of England in general and quite possibly the Queen in particular. The conflict energized anti-Catholic political agitation for the remainder of the decade, until popular interest eventually faded. In addition, the Papal Aggression crisis appeared to signify to Protestants that Catholics would simply not be content with whatever the British chose to offer them. The government, one Presbyterian journal complained later, had “but encouraged a system which is never satisfied, but cries for more, more, saying Give, give”—catering to a party that, as far as they were concerned, aimed at “Popish rule.”

Even as anxious Protestants complained that England was drifting Romeward, they were also seeking commemorative strategies for reminding fellow Protestants of their endangered religio-cultural heritage. Most prominent among these were celebrations of the Reformation tercentenary, beginning in 1817 with Lutheran observances in Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, and the United States to mark the Ninety-Five Theses. Thanks to Anglican clergyman Thomas Hartwell Horne (1780–1862), the commemorations arrived in England in 1835 to mark the anniversary of Myles Coverdale’s Bible (1535), England’s first full, published, vernacular Bible. Horne took the opportunity to supply the Protestant Memorial (1835), intended as a unilateral defense of Protestantism in toto from Roman Catholic assault. The core of Horne’s argument, which also became the core of the many Reformation tercentenary sermons that appeared in print, was that “in