

THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW

NO. XXXIX.—JULY 1895

The Condition of Morals and Religious Belief in the Reign of Edward VI

I.

IN the general absence of contemporary diaries and the extreme scarcity of most of the publications of the few years of the brief reign of Edward VI it is very difficult to determine what was the state of morals, or what was the prevalent form of religious belief amongst the masses of the people, though no such difficulty exists as regards their leaders and others who played a conspicuous part in the changes that were continually going on. The consequence has been that very considerable mistakes have been made as regards both these points, and it is only of late years that the true state of the case has begun to dawn upon writers of history. Till Mr. Froude reached this period of his work it was commonly supposed that the protestant party were pretty well united among themselves in their opposition to the abettors of the old learning, and that as distinguished from catholics they were mostly patterns of a somewhat austere but genuine piety; whilst Archbishop Laurence's 'Bampton Lectures' of 1804 were eagerly accepted, as having distinctly proved that the English church had been modelled much after the Augsburg confession, and that no material changes had been introduced into the English ritual and offices subsequent to the year 1552, when the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI had been published, with the design of superseding the less perfect development of doctrine which had appeared in the earlier Prayer Book of 1549. A little light had indeed been thrown upon the subject by the republication of both these Books of Common Prayer, the contents of which were scarcely known half a century ago even to the better informed

amongst the clergy. Some of the publications of the Parker Society also had opened men's eyes to the fact that the reforming party, on the showing of their own adherents, were very inferior, as regards their morals and general mode of life, to what had been commonly believed, and the 'Zürich Letters' especially had revealed the fact that English reformers had far more sympathy with the Zwinglianism of Switzerland than the Lutheranism of Germany.

The erroneous view of Laurence's 'Bampton Lectures' held its ground for a full generation, no other volume of this series ever having had so extensive a circulation or passed through so many editions during the first quarter of the present century. At a later time additional information caused a reaction in the minds of the better educated of the English clergy, who began to see that the First Book of Edward was in the main much more catholic in tone than the Second. It thus came to be a received opinion amongst a very large section of them that all things were going right as long as the English divines had everything their own way, and that it was not till the interference of Bucer, Martyr, and other foreign reformers was allowed to influence proceedings that sundry further alterations were made in a protestant direction. Yet still the defence of the existing Prayer Book of the church of England was made to rest on the supposed catholic tone of the book of 1552 rather than on the slight changes made in the Elizabethan Prayer Book or the more important additions which were inaugurated at the Hampton Court conference and after the failure of the Savoy conference in 1661.

This view prevails extensively even in the present day, though it has been entirely annihilated by recent discoveries which have been made by a collation of the state papers and scarce printed books of the reign. It can no longer be denied that the changes were brought about by the protector Somerset, himself a rank Calvinist, and that the intention was from the very first to carry things in the protestant direction beyond the point which was reached by the Prayer Book and articles of 1552. The evidence of all this, as well as some account of the deterioration of morals all through the reign, may be seen in various publications which have appeared during the last thirty years. A general view of the nature of the change in religion appeared in this *Review* in the year 1886, in an article entitled 'The Restoration Settlement.' A more particular account both of the gradual development of Zwinglianism and its change into Calvinism was given in two articles printed in the *Church Quarterly Review* in October 1892 and 1893, where copious extracts from the scarce publications of the period were quoted in evidence of the view advocated.

The general state of morals during the reign was scarcely touched upon in these articles, and in directing our readers'

attention to this subject, as well as to the gradual nature of the proceedings in the changes of doctrine, we shall avoid any allusion to the publications there referred to. There was, however, in the first of these articles, on the 'Preparation for the First Prayer Book,' an omission of any notice of a very remarkable though very scarce little volume entitled 'The V abominable Blasphemies contained in the Masse,' published in London by H. Powell, 1548, 16mo. It is evidently one of a series of works of a similar kind which the council secretly encouraged, but were obliged to appear to the outside world to discountenance, as going much too fast for their present purpose. The only copy of this book which I have seen is in the archbishop's library at Lambeth, and is calendared as xxxi. 9, 3 (14). It has no title, but it can easily be identified, as the second leaf, with the signature A_u, is headed with the words 'contained in the masse.' The importance of this work must plead my excuse for making considerable extracts from it, but its tone and tendency may easily be judged of by its first sentence, which shall be quoted at length.

Here I was minded (good Christian readers) to have made an end of writing against that cursed and abominable sacrifice of the Mass, but being compelled by the obstinate blasphemy of certain papists which everywhere do depredicate and say that we run before the King and his Council (for, good Christian readers, this is their only refuge that they flee to, not having one syllable in the Scriptures to confirm their purpose) I am fain to meddle further in this matter and to shew how they go about in so saying to make the King and his Council partakers of their ungodly blasphemy against God and his Scriptures, which may be proved after this manner. . . .

Afterwards the writer continues—

Now mark ye this argument, mark ye, I say, what followeth of your sayings, if the King and his honourable Council have not yet (as ye most craftily persuade unto the simple and ignorant people, which, if it were not for you, would gladly and joyfully receive the Gospel of the Son of God) disannulled and put down the Mass, that is to say the most abominable and damnable idol that ever Satan with all his craft could invent, then are they by your own confession all ungodly and also partakers of your idolatrous blasphemy, which thing ye shall never be able to avoid. . . . Ye attach yourselves of plain and deadly treason against the King and his honourable Council, which all (thanks be unto the lord, that hath the hearts of all rulers in his hand) be as far in this point from all ungodliness and blasphemy as ye are now from all truth and verity that so stiffly keep up the banner and standard of your master Satan. This, I say, is the very banner and standard of Satan, the devil, which he hath set up to obscure, pervert and utterly banish from the memory and remembrance of all men the death of our Saviour Jesus Christ, blinding all the world with most pestilent error, that is to say with full persuasion that the Mass was a sacrifice and oblation to obtain

remission of sins or a work whereby the priest that offereth Christ and they that are participant of the same do deserve *ex opere operato*, that is to say of the work that is wrought, forgiveness of their sins and heavenly joy not only for them that be in purgatory but also for them that be in hell, briefly for all them that are alive and dead though it be a thousand years ago. Is not this to blaspheme and dishonour Christ, to burn and oppress his cross, to bring his death to perpetual oblivion and forgetfulness, to take away the fruits of his passion, and to enervate and abolish the sacrament of his death? These five abominable blasphemies I will here, with the leave of God, so lively depict and set before the eyes of all Christian readers that the very infants and babes shall clearly see that they which so lewdly affirm that we so run afore the King and his Council intend nothing else but to defame their prince and all them that be about him with papistical heresy, therewith seeking to keep the true subjects of this illustrious realm in perpetual blindness and ignorance.

The rest of the volume from signature A₃ to B₇ is occupied with the five blasphemies, which are as follows:—

1. The Interference with the everlasting priesthood of Christ, the massing priests being substituted in the room of Christ, that is still withholden with death, as suffragans of his everlasting priesthood, which for all them remaineth without end; whereas, according to S. Paul, 'since Christ cannot be letted by death he is that one only priest and hath no need either of suffragans or successors.'

2. It obscures the passion of Christ, who bids us eat and drink, and this is the way to apply the sacrifice of the cross unto us, when we feed upon the body and blood of Christ spiritually either in the holy mysteries or in the hearing and receiving of his word faithfully.

3. It drives away from memory the death of Christ, for what is the Mass but a new and clean contrary Testament?

4. It takes away the fruits of the death of Christ, for who will trust that his sins are forgiven when he seeth every day a new sacrifice afore his eyes? It is to say we are therefore bought and redeemed of Christ because that we should redeem ourselves.

5. The supper of the lord is cancelled.

Look what difference between giving and receiving that the same is betwixt this word sacrament and this word sacrifice. This communion the sacrifice of the Mass hath clean banished away from the congregation, and hath brought in instead thereof a very excommunication. . . . This, I say, is the adulterous Helen with whom all the Papists throughout all the world do commit deadly fornication and adultery. But blessed be that puissant lord of hosts which of his tender love and mercy hath preserved our most sovereign lord and prince Edward the Sixth from the flattering lips of this adulterous harlot, which hath so by the space of these five hundred years and more deceived all nations, alluring them from their true spouse and husband Jesus Christ to all kinds of abomination and filthiness. Oh, how much bound are we all which have any zeal to the gospel of Christ to laud and praise that Almighty and merciful father which hath provided such a noble protector and defender not only of all the king's dominions and realms, but also of all truth and verity, which

at this present time Satan doth not cease with his ministers to expugn and assail on every side, calumniating the true preachers thereof, as though in this matter they should run before the king and his honourable council, surely is nothing else but which to accuse their prince and governor with all his honourable Councillors of plain blasphemy against God and his word, which to do is no less than deadly treason, as I have said before. Beware therefore and cease to bear yourselves in this your abomination by your prince or any of his honorable Council, which all do detest, abhor, and hate all such idolatrous blasphemy, being always ready with all their might and endeavour to seek, set forth and promote the glory of Almighty God, to whom with the son and the holy ghost be praise, glory and honor for ever. So be it.

Finis.

There is no evidence to show who was the author of this little work. We need hardly inform our readers that it was not published *cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum*. But, on the other hand, neither is there any evidence that the council made a scape-goat of the writer or publisher.

We proceed now to give some further evidence of both the points we have undertaken to illustrate, by quotations from some printed volumes of the succeeding reign, which are almost as inaccessible to general readers as that from which we have made so many extracts. And first as regards the general deterioration of morality. It is curious to observe how early this laxity of morals began to set in. Perhaps one of the earliest evidences of it may be seen in the proclamation of 24 April 1548 against such as putting away one wife, married another, or who kept two wives at once. Some taught that this was lawful for the husband, and some went the length of advocating the same licence for the wife, arguing that the prohibition was not of God's law, but only by command of the bishop of Rome. And so the king straitly charged bishops to proceed against all such as should have offended, or should hereafter offend, in this way. All such offenders are to be delated to the archbishops and bishops, and if they should be negligent in enforcing the law and in punishing such evildoers, then the Justices of peace in every shire shall declare such offenders to the King's highness Council by their letters, that his highness by the advice aforesaid might see a convenient redress made of such misorders and look more straightly upon the Archbishops and Bishops which doth not execute their duties in this behalf according to the trust committed unto them.

The evidence of opponents of protestantism in Mary's reign will not be thought of so much value as many of the numerous testimonies to the same effect which are borne by protestant writers of the period; but it may be taken for what it is worth after making such deductions as the reader may think reasonable on the score

of probable exaggeration or prejudice in writers who are describing the effects of a system to which they were opposed.

This remark applies especially to the first and earliest of the printed volumes we are going to refer to. It is entitled 'The displaying of the Protestantes, and sondry their practises, with a description of divers their abuses of late frequented. Newly imprinted agayne, and augmented, with a table in the ende of all suche matter as is specially contained within this volume. Made by Myles Huggarde, servant to the Quene's maiestie. Anno 1556. *Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.*'¹ We cannot find any evidence of an earlier edition except the statement made by the writer in the dedication that it had been

before this time imprinted, although not in such perfection as the same is at this present, having called, since the first edition, the aid of my friend, and therefore thought it more mete the dedication unto your majesty.

The date at the end of the prologue to the reader is June 1556, and the only allusion to time in the course of the work is that of the burning of the four Sussex men at Canterbury, which he speaks of as being 'about twelve months past,' which was 12 July 1555. He speaks of one being a Dutchman of Lewes; and it is remarkable that he supplies what Foxe has taken no notice of in his account of Sheterden's examination and martyrdom—how, when he was examined on baptism, he replied that

it is but an extern sign, and worketh little grace. For, saith he, like as a man doth wash his hands in a basin of water, signifying that the hands are clean, so the child is washed at baptism to accomplish the exterior figure. Then was objected unto him the saying of christ unless a man be borne again with water and the holy ghost he could not be saved. 'Tush,' said he, 'the water profiteth nothing, it is the holy ghost that worketh' (fol. 20).

The chief purpose of the volume is to display the fact that, as the author expresses it in the prologue, 'our late elders and ministers (for so they termed themselves) neither established an uniform religion nor yet persuaded correction of life.' We are not here concerned with the variations of protestants abroad—of which he specifies Lutherans, Zwinglians, anabaptists, Jews, and papists, whose chief captains are Calvin, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, Musculus, and such like—but he notices that Hooper and Cranmer had admitted they had erred greatly in taking Luther's part. And he mentions the fact that about twenty years before a priest had consecrated with ale instead of wine, and, having repented, bore a fagot at St. Paul's Cross; and that a tyler had done penance in the same way for maintaining the opinion that Christ's death only was of benefit to those who died before his incarnation. We do

¹ Brit. Mus. C. 87. b. 45.

not profess to give a complete analysis of the book, but only make such extracts as throw light upon the teaching and morals of the time of Edward VI. Thus, speaking of the marriages of priests, he says (fol. 74)—

The women of these married priests were such, for the most part, that either they were kept of other before, or else as common as the castway; and so bound them to incestuous lechery, which women are led with divers lusts, ever learning and never able to attain unto the truth. Were not the said women ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, being led with divers lusts, using their bodies with other men as well as with their supposed husbands: yea, and one of them with another's woman, taking it (as it is thought) for a brotherly love, one to help another, after the doctrine of Friar Luther, the first author of their marriage; (*In libro de captivitate Babylonica.*) Is it not seen now by experience that some of their women being divorced, are married again to ruffians, and such other gallants, following the opinion of Sir Jhon Hoper in his book of the 'Ten Commandments'?

As to the mode of celebration of the holy communion in Edward's time (fol. 80), he says that they were constantly changing the position of their table; some turning their faces towards the north, south, or west; some using leavened, some unleavened bread; the changes adopted in the first office for communion and that of the First Prayer Book being compared to the work of a mason first rough-hewing the stones, then polishing them, the authors of the two offices admitting that they were but rough-hewn, 'wherein they said truth, for God knoweth they were but homely stuff. But this book,' meaning their last book of communion (which was the worst of all), 'is wrought to the perfection.' As to the mode of receiving, he says—

Some of the communicants stand, some sit, some kneel, some would hold the cup himself, some would receive it at the minister's hand, some of his next fellow, some would have a short piece of bread, some a thin, some a thick and thin. Some would use the ministration themselves, some were contented to take it in the church, some at their own tables, and after supper, according to the institution. Some would have the wine to be drunk in pewter, some in silver, some in a glass or treue dish. Some would have a table cloth to cover the board, some a towel, and some neither of them both. Thus in sum they used the matter in such sundry forms, that the Total was nought.

Probably there is not elsewhere to be found any so detailed an account of the practice of the time. At fol. 94 the writer says—

Nothing is less used than morning and evening prayer, never was more irreverence in the church, never such disobedience to magistrates, and as for repairing to the church, it is counted a thing of no importance.

With regard to the denial of sacramental grace, his account (fol. 112) is as follows:—

Have they not denied the power of God's word, to work anything to the justifying of man, by the water of baptism? Have they not also denied the most manifest words of God spoken, touching the consecration of his real body in the sacrament of the altar, and say that those words be spoken tropically and figuratively, and that they can work no such effect, as bread to be transubstantiated into his body, although Christ by his Evangelists, Apostles, Prophets, Doctors, Martyrs doth most plainly affirm the same? Have they not also denied the power of God, in the words spoken by the priest at the time of confession, being so plainly commanded by Christ saying, Whose sins you forgive, the same shall be forgiven? Have they not also denied the power of God's word in the rest of the seven sacraments, abolishing five quite out of their company as unworthy thereof, and the other twain remaining as they handled them, scarce worthy the name of a sacrament? And as they have denied the power of godliness in these sacraments: so have they also denied the same in the works of God wrought by his grace in all godly men, to be any means to attain to justification, contrary to the words of S. John. . . .

Here follows an argument against justification by faith alone, quite implying that antinomianism was rampant in England amongst the protestants.

The same view of the great varieties of belief and practice which existed in the preceding reign appears in the work of Bishop Christopherson on 'Rebellion,' published by Cawood, London, 1554. The bishop speaks of Friday being turned into a feast day, and persons invited in order to allure them to heresy, of the carnal liberty which procured divorces and remarriage. He alludes to the destruction of images, the digging up of crosses, the blessed sacrament being trodden under foot and the last communion book teaching that it was only common bread. As to varieties of opinion, some held all things common, some thought all things fatal and that there was no free-will. Some believed God to be the author of sin. Some believed no resurrection, and some that all should be saved; some that Christ took no flesh of the Virgin Mary and was less than the Father, and that there was neither heaven nor hell, that the inward man did not sin, but that a man having the Spirit might lie with another's wife. In fine, there was no heresy that ever was which had not shown its face in England. The colophon bears date 24 July 1554. A copy is in the British Museum, 697. a. 17. All this is attributed to Lutherans, or rather Zwinglians.

Such is the account of an enemy. On the other hand the following extracts from a work published in the first year of the reign tell us what one of their own number thought of his fellows. The copy we take them from is in the Grenville library, 5921. It is entitled 'A faythful admonycion of a certen trewe pastor and prophete, sent unto the germanes at such tyme as certen great princes went about to bring in alienes into germany, and to restore

the papacy, the Kingdom of Antychrist etc. Now translated into Inglyssh for a lyke admonycyon unto all trewe Inglyssh hartes, whereby thei may lerne and knowe how to consyder and receive the proceedings of the Inglyssh magistrates and Bissshops, with a preface of M. Philip Melancthon.' As this is a translation from a German book adapted to English circumstances, we are only concerned here with the preface of the translator, who styles himself Eusebius Pamphilus. Who he was we are unable to say.

This preface is to the general effect that God had permitted the death of 'our late Josias, noble King Edward' as a punishment for the sins of the nobles and people who had embraced the Gospel. The editor says—

O Ingland Ingland thy nobles were preached unto and told plainly enough by Gods prophets, that Gods wrath was at hand if they would not redress their enormities, but they could not be heard, yea those to whom they preached made a mock and a Jest at their earnest crying and calling upon them, asking them who made them so mock of Gods counsel. It would never sink into their heads that God would so deal with them as the preachers out of the spirit of God threatened them. They thought peradventure that it was enough for them to pretend Gods true religion how little soever they framed their lives thereafter. (Signat. A_{iii}.)

After continuing his invective for some time he adds—

Thus much be spoken to the nobles for their advertisement, whose insolency and supine dissoluteness without doubt hath been a great cause of this plague that is now come upon us. Notwithstanding I mean not thereby to clear and excuse the inferior and mean sort, as though their part were not therein also. How unthankful have they been also in receiving and how slack in following the earnest advertisements that were daily given them Let us all, therefore, repent our former negligence. Let us all amend our former faults. And also let us all be true followers of the gospel indeed as we have long been professors thereof in word. And then doubtless God shall cease and withdraw his plague wherewith he had minded to scourge us, he shall drive the papists and the aliens (which they go about to bring in to maintain their kingdom and to make themselves strong against God) out of our country. (Signat. A_v.)

After this follows the preface by Melancthon, but the expressions used are so unlike his writing and so immediately applicable to English affairs of the day that we are half inclined to think that either it was composed by the editor himself or else materially altered to accommodate it to existing circumstances, such as the approaching arrival of Philip of Spain to marry the queen. The following passage is in point:—

First, people are to abstain from intercourse with idolatrous unbelievers, and then to make known their faith to others; for there are many

who pretend to dislike the supremacy of AntiChrist, the bishop of Rome, and yet act in religion as if they had got all from Rome, not caring what villany is practised (as the Spaniards are most vile and beastly people, given to vice and brutishness), and if they should once be suffered to enter they will creep into all the high places and will establish the idol of Rome and the whole cursed papacy again. Already those who have preached true doctrine are imprisoned and deprived. There is no reason because of the sins of professors of the true religion to run to idolatry. These idolaters find fault with our sins, which are incomparably less than the idolatry of the Mass of the Latin service, of the invocation of saints, of the filthy and abominable pretended chastity, that is of the Sodomitical single life of priests, and of such other hypocrisy and superstition as our adversaries go about with fire and fagot, with tooth and nail to maintain and set up for the service of God. For whatever vices rule among the professors of the true religion yet they have not among them murder and blasphemy and idolatry. All other sins may be forgiven, but a fautor of such murderers shall never be forgiven. It is right to resist tyrants who set up idolatry, separate godly men from their lawful wives and bring in strangers to subvert the state of the commonwealth, and such like, for it is easy to see that the Spaniards will subvert all rule, if they are once allowed to enter.

It is needless to say that the colophon, 'Imprinted at Grenewych by Conrade Freeman in the month of May 1554,' is a fiction, the tract being plainly in Zürich type. Melancthon can hardly have written this preface, which appears to have been penned just before the coming of Philip to England in July 1554. Indeed, it seems to us scarcely probable that there was anybody at that time living who could have used such filthy language except Bale, afterwards bishop of Ossory, who has earned the well-deserved reputation of being the most foul-mouthed of all the protestant reformers.

There is one other publication of the year 1554, which we believe has escaped the notice of all historians. We know no more of its history than what the colophon informs us of, where it is dated thus: 'From Wittonburge by Nicholas Dorcastor An. M. D. L. iiii. the xiiii of May.' Who the refugees were, and how many, and under what circumstances they were tolerated in such a hotbed of Lutheranism as Wittenberg, we do not know. But this little volume, a copy of which exists in the Bodleian Library (Tanner, 76), gives us a very curious and most instructive confession of their faith, addressed to their brethren in England, which represents the matured opinions of the reformed party at this time, very much in the same style as most of the publications of the preceding reign. It is entitled 'The humble and unfained confession of the belefe of certain poor banished men, grounded upon the holy Scriptures of God and upon the Articles of that undefiled and only undoubted true Christian faith which [the

holly Catholic, that is to say universal Church of Christ professeth. ¶ Specially concerning not only the word of God and the ministry of the same, but also the Church and sacraments thereof, which we send most humbly unto the lords of England and all the commons of the same. ¶ To believe with the heart justifieth and to confess with the mouth saveth. Lord, increase our faith.'

The first six leaves of this curious little work are taken up by a prefatory epistle addressed in the singular number by a curate to his late flock, lamenting the passing away of King Edward's days and the present punishment under which the nation is suffering, of which the writer says—

I certainly believe that our too much slothfulness in prayer and our slothful and seldom coming to the holy supper of the Lord are two of the great causes why the Lord hath thus plagued us.

Nevertheless, he says, he has 'set forth this following confession,' which he doubts not those who read will see

that all their struggling is to bring thee to their stinking Romish puddles again. Be not abashed therefore with names, titles, dignities, as lord, duke, &c., or bishop, doctor, &c., for except he bring the word of God and Christ's communion, with the maintenance of it, doubt not; by the fruits know him, and give him his name that the Lord giveth him, a blasphemer of the synagogue of Sathanaas.

The work itself, commencing with a salutation addressed to their brethren in England, states their confession, which includes Scripture and the three creeds, discarding all traditions. Their definition of the church affirms that, though there are various significations in which the word 'church' is used, yet what they mean is one only apostolic and holy catholic church, which is sanctified, and which exhibits holiness of life, and to this church belong all those who are citizens with the saints, God's elect and chosen, who are the salt of the earth, the light of the world, who do all good works, to whom it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, whose unrighteousness is forgiven, and whose sins are covered and not imputed to them. This church has the keys, and in this church of the elect the pure word of God is preached, the sacraments administered, and discipline is applied. In it, though some may err, none shall perish. It is invisible, though it may be known by its fruit.

The next part in the 'Confession' refers to the ministry of the word of God. This part is briefly treated, few points being alluded to except that divers ministers are appointed for the purpose of edifying, and that these must preach the atonement and have faithful wives. The next subject which concerns the sacraments is dealt with at greater length. It is opened by a description of the sacraments of the old law, circumcision being spoken of as not

being only a mere sign, but 'a very seal in which the holy Ghost certified their consciences of their portion in the said everlasting life.' In the passover, the other sacrament of the old law, they, giving faith and credit to the said promise made in the blessed seed, saw the worthiness and merits of Christ's blood, by the comfortable sweetness whereof in the operation of the holy Ghost they were assured of the said life everlasting.

After a few words about the manna in the wilderness, which served the same purpose of certifying, it proceeds to the sacraments of the new law, of which they say—

Moreover the sacraments that are of the Lord's holy institution we do reverently esteem to be no vain or bare signs, neither only evidences of the profession of Christian men, but also certain assured and effectuous testimonies (or rather seals) of the righteous grace and goodwill of God towards us, whereby he, working in us supernaturally and after an invisible manner, doth not only stir up our faith towards him but also establisheth and confirmeth it the more in the assurance of everlasting life. Wherefore like as stedfast faith in the operation of the holy Ghost, doth certify us, even so the Sacraments by proper similitudes being used according to the Lord's institution testify the same. For the holy Ghost, who glorifieth his own ordinances with his blessed presence, and also the word itself, assureth us that nothing, though it be outward and external (appointed and appertaining to the right, whole, and perfect use of God's holy sacraments), is in vain or but a bare sign, forasmuch as when the minister doth execute the Lord's will according to his holy ordinance in the ministration of the visible sacrament by an outward action, the holy Ghost not only certifieth the faithful siccaciners (*sic*) that they are partakers of the things promised, that is to say everlasting life (which life everlasting is even God the Son, whose divine nature is joined with the humanity now sitting in glory), not only, we say, certifieth but also invisibly worketh in them those virtues whereby they be undoubtedly joined unto Christ and one towards another, his mystical members and partakers of eternal life. So that to be partakers of that everlasting life is to be as verily joined unto him and to be a member of his glorious body of his flesh and of his bones as his own divine nature is joined unto his humanity.

The writer goes on to say that as there was a prescribed form under the old law for circumcision and the passover, so under the new there is also for baptism and the supper of the Lord. As regards the latter, the following is a significant commentary upon the alteration of the words used in the First Prayer Book into those of the Second Book. The form of administration is described as being that

where first the minister, taking the bread, giving thanks, and breaking it, ought by the Lord's ensample to deliver it unto other, willing them also to take and eat it in remembrance of the Lord, whose words also he ought to repeat accordingly. And likewise taking the cup to give thanks and to deliver to the communicants, willing them all to drink thereof in remembrance of the Lord.

After this follows a protest against the ceremonies of the mass with this intimation : 'Ye shall see shortly a book when every part of the Mass began.' A special exception is then taken to the use of wafer bread and the denial of the cup to the laity, and the protest ends with the writer's opinion that nothing has caused God's anger so much as 'the most filthy and abominable idolatry and superstition of their mass.' The peroration states that the brethren in exile hold the sacrament in such honour as being

a singular jewel left to the congregation, designed as a special renewing of his covenant and seal of mercy, and should be a provocation to good works to those who duly examine themselves and approach it reverently, and who worthily receiving such notable increase of heavenly comfort and spiritual repast in our consciences are armed afresh for the conflict against the world, the flesh and the devil.

II.

There are three principal sources of information subsequent to the death of Edward VI which throw a little further light upon the belief and practice of the period of his reign. The first is the account given by the persons imprisoned for false doctrine at the commencement of Mary's reign. This exists in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library. Archbishop Laurence printed from this as much as suited his purpose, which seems to have been to show that Calvinism scarcely existed at all in Edward's reign ; but he omitted the greater part of the manuscript, which contains an elaborate argument written by Augustin Bernher, a Swiss attendant upon Hugh Latimer, by which he attempts to prove against the advocates of free will the Calvinistic doctrines of election and reprobation. The second is the account given by Utenhoven, which was published in 1560, of the reception the Dutch and English members of the foreigners' church in London met with at all the Lutheran towns in Norway, Denmark, &c., where they touched. The third is the 'Troubles of Frankfort,' published by one of their own body, William Whittingham, afterwards dean of Durham. We propose to give some account of these sources in as few words as possible.

1. As regards the first, Archbishop Laurence asserts that there is no evidence contained in the volume to show that Cranmer and Ridley were specially addicted to Calvinism. His argument is entirely superfluous, for no one ever accused them of Calvinism ; but the whole of the tract plainly proves that the majority of the prisoners were of this way of thinking, and that those whom they styled free-willers and Pelagians were quite an insignificant number. Also whereas the archbishop of Cashel hazards the assertion that there were few Calvinists, and they of the sublapsarian school, if he had read Bernher's tract, which it did

not suit him to publish, he might have seen that this writer at least stands committed to the supralapsarian view; for he professes to give an answer to the four very pertinent questions put to him by Henry Hart, whom he speaks of as a Pelagian and a free-willer.

The questions are the following:—

1. Whether God would have all men to keep his law or no?
2. The man which gave the talent to his three servants, the one servant hiding his talent in the ground, whether it was his master's will and ordinance that he should hide it; yea or nay?
3. The certain man that had the fig tree, and came three years, one after another, and sought fruit and found none, and yet let it stand one year more to see whether it would bring forth fruit or no, whether that man had ordained that tree to that end that it should bear fruit or no?
4. What is the root of the olive tree of the which the branches were broken off, and what were the branches that for unbelief were broken off, and what were the branches that, contrary to nature, were grafted in? The answer is that

God of his infinite mercy was determined and purposed before the foundation of the world was laid to take some out of the lost seed of Adam and to regenerate them and make them heirs of his kingdom and vessels of his glory, to set forth in them his profound mercy and goodness, and also that he hath prepared the rest to be vessels of his wrath, in whom he is determined to shew and set forth his righteous judgments and justice, rewarding them according to their deeds with everlasting punishments, whereby he bringeth to pass that the wicked may feel his hatred against sin, and also the godly may the more see the exceeding goodness of their heavenly father towards them.²

In the course of his argument Bernher will not allow that it was in the power and liberty of the man who had the one talent not to hide it, but to use it profitably, for fear he should grant free-will to man, as his adversary does, and he asserts that

it sufficeth the children of God to be assured in their heart by the operation of the holy Ghost that they themselves be chosen to eternal life before the world was made, and in that God doth give them faith and true repentance and all manner of spiritual gifts they praise him for it and confirm their election by it. That is to say, they learn to know and by the operation of the holy Ghost they are assured that by the immutable counsel of God they are chosen to eternal life; as for the reprobate, they will not dispute with God why he did not ordain them also to life, but rather do worship and reverence his divine Majesty and unspeakable power and wisdom, by the which he is able to set forth his own glory and renown even in the very reprobate, which shall be damned for evermore because of their own wickedness, God himself being just and holy in all his works, and not the author or cause of any evil.³

² Bodleian MS. 1972, fol. 109.

³ *Ibid.* fol. 110.

Afterwards (at fol. 144) Bernher says—

God would have Adam to fall because he thought it so good. Why he thought it so good is unknown to us. Adam did fall, the providence of God so appointing the same ;

and again afterwards (*ibid.*)—

If you grant an election before the beginning of the world you must needs grant likewise a reprobation, for they be correlatives, so that there could be no election except there be also reprobation.

The prisoners who adopted the Calvinist creed seem to have been much the most numerous ; the others, being twelve or fourteen in number, protest against them for their opinions, as well as for their practice of gambling and other amusements, which were thought unlawful, their indulgence in which they considered the result of their doctrine of assurance, which caused 'many to live at free chance careless,' and to neglect prayer except for corporal necessities. The dispute ran so high that after much altercation they refused to communicate with each other at Christmas 1554.

What is most remarkable is that this supralapsarian Calvinist should claim as being on his side 'my dear master Latimer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Mr. Ridley and Mr. Bradford, Philpott, Careless, and the rest of the saints of God.'

The penultimate document is in favour of the Calvinistic doctrine, addressed from the ministers, seniors, and deacons, evidently a much larger body than the free-willers, to whom it is addressed, and the last is from C. P. to the ministers, thanking them for their letter and book which had been sent him on the subject of predestination. Whether this was Bradford's or Bernher's does not appear. The minority may be best described as Zwinglians, the majority as Calvinists. The free-willers, as they are called, make their appeal to the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, and the Calvinistic opinions avouched by their opponents certainly go beyond anything that either the Prayer Book or the forty-two articles countenance. But though few at that time would have expressed their faith in the language used by Augustin Bernher, the distinction between the sublapsarian and the supralapsarian view being yet scarcely pronounced, yet the former tenet seems to have been that which was adopted by the greater number of protestants of the time. The controversy between the two parties, who seem by common consent to rest all their arguments on separate texts of Scripture, is extremely instructive as to the uselessness of reference to isolated passages of Holy Scripture with no other clue to their interpretation than the reader's fancy. The texts adduced by either party, or taken by themselves, must have seemed entirely conclusive on the one side for absolute decrees of election and reprobation, and on the other for the existence of free-will, which, it must be admitted,

they did not press unduly, or interpret, as their adversaries imagined, in any Pelagian sense, but only as the foundation of moral responsibility.

Probably the confession of faith made by John Clement, a wheelwright who was in the King's Bench prison, and who, in protest against the various sects of protestants which had sprung up, drew up for himself his confession of faith, indicates the popular form of belief. It seems from Strype's account that 'there were now abundance of sects and dangerous doctrines. Some denied the Godhead of Christ, some his manhood; others denied the doctrine of predestination and free election, the baptism of infants.' Accordingly Clement says, as against those who deny 'the doctrine of God's firm predestination and free election in Jesus Christ, which is the very certainty of our election,' that he firmly believes that he is 'a true, lively member of this blessed church of Christ, which can never wholly err in any necessary point of salvation.' He affirms that good works ought to be done to 'shew obedience to God and the fruits of faith unto the world.' He accepts the last book given to the church by the authority of King Edward VI and the godly articles agreed upon in the convocation house in the last year of his most gracious reign. He further professes that the two sacraments are certain and sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's goodwill towards us, which sacraments have a wholesome effect and operation in such only as do worthily receive the same; that 'Baptism is a sign and seal of our new Birth, whereby the promises of God and our adoption are visibly signed and sealed to us; yea, faith is confirmed and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.' Of the supper of the Lord he says that it is a sure seal and a firm testimony of our eternal redemption by Christ's death and blood-shedding, 'insomuch as to such as with true faith and feeling of the mercy of God do rightly and worthily receive the same they do spiritually receive Christ.' And in confirmation of all this he claims the sanction of the names of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Rogers, Saunders, Bradford, and divers other godly preachers. Against the Pelagian sect, which, he says, swarms everywhere, he professes that

the will and imaginations of man's heart is only to evil and altogether subject to sin and misery, and bond and captive to all manner of wickedness, so that it cannot once think a good thought, much less then do any good deed as of his own work, until such time as the same be regenerate and prevented by the grace of God.

In conclusion he recurs to the subject of predestination and free election, which is the sure certainty of our salvation in Jesus Christ, asserting that of the number of those appointed to be saved 'my firm faith and belief is that I, although unworthy, am one,' so

that 'neither I nor any of these his chosen children shall finally perish or be damned,' and that this is a wholesome and comfortable doctrine, to be received of all Christian men. In support of this theory he refers to Ochino's sermons. The writer follows closely on the lines of the so-called Calvinistic articles, and especially resembles the seventeenth article in his avoiding all notice of reprobation, which he absolutely declines to enter upon, herein differing entirely from the treatises on the subject written by Bradford and Bernher. As being a mere illiterate mechanic, he was quite incapable of inventing these views for himself. He simply reflects the general tone of opinion of the protestants of his time.

2. The second source we have alluded to is the description of the sufferings of the Marian exiles, chiefly Dutch, with some French, English, and Scotch men. This congregation had been formed in July 1550, when Edward VI granted them a patent to assemble under their superintendents, John Alasco and Peter Deloenuz, apparently intending this church to be a model on which the church of England was to be reformed. Alasco, with about 175 others, set sail from Gravesend, 17 Sept. 1553, in two vessels. In the larger was Alasco himself, with Micronius and Utenhoven, who wrote the account which we now abridge. They were driven by stress of weather to the coast of Norway, from whence they managed to get, partly overland, partly by boat, to Elsinore. But the king of Denmark, who was a bigoted Lutheran, refused to allow them shelter in his dominions, alleging that they were of the sect of sacramentarians, whom Luther abhorred, though the exiles persisted that after all there was no great difference between their opinions and those of the Lutheran party, and they were willing to discuss the differences according to Scripture. They, however, put out a form of faith which materially differed from that of the Augsburg confession. In vain did they plead that they had themselves been tolerant of Lutherans, as even their friends at Zürich had admitted to communion the Swedish ministers who had quitted their country because of the *Interim*. The plea urged against them was their contemptuous mode of administering the Lord's supper and the many divisions that existed among them. Wherever they went they met with the same treatment, the Lutheran authorities urging that they were only following out Luther's views, the chief pastor at Bremen, Jacob Probst, quoting Luther's own words—*Beatus vir qui non abiit in Concilio Sacramentariorum et in via Zuinglianorum non stetit et in cathedra Tigurinorum non sedit*. After many refusals of settlement the whole party of the larger ship arrived at Emden, Lübeck, and Wismar. Those in the smaller vessel reached Copenhagen on 3 Nov., where they were evidently taken for anabap-

tists, but where they remained unmolested till the magistrates had orders from the king to get rid of them unless they would subscribe to the king's confession of faith. This they refused to do, and departed for Rostock. Here David Whitehead, who was afterwards pastor at Frankfort, and had the first offer of the archbishopric of Canterbury from Elizabeth, was their spokesman; but he failed to satisfy the Lutherans, and so in January 1554 they were obliged to depart and make their way to Wismar. Here Micronius was their spokesman; but he too failed to convince the authorities that they were not dangerous sacramentarians, who would pay no heed to magistrates; and on 22 Feb. they were forced to migrate to Lübeck. The fear was that some of them were perhaps anabaptists, and therefore Micronius gave a written confession of their faith, which is as follows:—

Baptism is a seal of divine grace towards all those who, according to the testimony of the gospel, have communion with God the Father and the Son and the holy Spirit. The ministration of baptism ought to be done in the church, without any of those superstitions of the Papists which obscure its mystery. We therefore condemn all those things in its administration which have been invented by men and obscure its dignity. We allow that the baptism of children has place in the church of Christ. For since Infants, according to the testimony of the Gospel, have communion with God the Son and the holy Ghost, and are already members of the church which Christ cleanses with the washing of water by the word, it is impossible to deny them the right of baptism, unless at the same time it is denied that they are members of the church and have a saving communion with God. Meanwhile we strongly repudiate that preposterous reliance on infant baptism which is the faith of so many at the present time.

This confession, the petitioner says, 'shews how far we are from the opinions of the anabaptists.' There can, therefore, be no doubt that Micronius and his party expressed the highest view of baptism that they could; and we ask any candid reader whether more can be made of it than this, that it sets a visible seal to a grace which has been conferred independently of and antecedent to the sacrament. The same separation of grace from the administration of the other sacrament is expressed in exactly similar language, the only difference being that, whereas baptism is styled *signaculum*, the Lord's supper is designated as *obsignaculum*. The latter is not a classical word, and we know not how to render it, unless we adopt the expression for the two respective words of seal and counter-seal, though it is difficult to perceive any distinction of meaning in the present case.

Upon their arrival at Lübeck they found several of their companions, who, after being driven away from Copenhagen, had arrived at Lübeck, 19 Dec. 1553. Here they had been allowed to remain till 3 Jan. 1554, when a complaint was lodged against them

that they had spoken disparagingly of the sacrament. But upon their further remonstrance, and chiefly on account of the severity of the weather, they were still permitted to stay till the end of February. On the 26th of this month Micronius, who was at the head of the newly arrived party, held a controversy with certain Lutheran pastors. But all endeavours were in vain. They were driven from Lübeck and had to take refuge at Hamburg, where several others of the Dutch congregation had collected in the preceding October. Here, on 3 March, he disputed with the celebrated Lutheran Westphal, who seems to have implied that no departure from the Augsburg confession could be allowed, and represented that the Zwinglian views had been entirely disposed of at the Marburg conference in 1529. Micronius, however, on the contrary, was of opinion that the Zwinglians had the advantage in that controversy, the truth being that both parties had shaken hands and agreed to differ as to the matter of the real presence. On the following day, 4 March, when the colloquy was renewed, Westphal turned to a Scotchman named Simpson and asked him what he thought about the sacraments, to which he replied that he was of the same opinion as Micronius, and that theirs was the same doctrine that was established in the reign of Edward VI in England.

On the next day they were summoned before the magistrates, who accused them of being anabaptists and of belonging to the Münster sect. They, however, presented their petition with their confession of faith, but all to no purpose. They were driven away from Hamburg, and they at last settled at Emden. Alasco remained there a year, and thence migrated to Frankfort, and Micronius superintended a congregation at Norda. In 1556 Alasco returned to Poland. The whole history shows that these exiles believed themselves to be in conformity with the Zwinglian doctrine as preached at Zürich, as well as the well-understood meaning of the Second Book of Edward VI, and as such were rejected at every place where they requested shelter in which the Lutheran doctrine was established. They were treated everywhere by the Lutherans as what the Marian sufferers were almost always designated by them, as the devil's martyrs. They were not condemned for any pronounced Calvinism, but for the special denial of the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence in concomitance with the bread and the wine in the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

The opinions of these exiles would, of course, be of little importance if it were not that they so materially contributed towards the formation of the religious views of the protestant portion of the nation during the reign of Edward VI. Alasco had been converted probably by Zwingli himself at Zürich about the year 1530, though for many years afterwards he retained his

benefices in the Roman church, and when he came to England it is plain that he was mainly instrumental in drawing off Archbishop Cranmer from his Lutheran views to the anti-sacramental opinions he afterwards advocated. He had, when it suited his purpose, endeavoured to represent the difference between his own and Luther's views as of small importance, and after the death of Luther in 1546 he had hoped that a nearer approach to unity amongst protestants of the German and Swiss schools might have been effected. And it was specially with this view that Cranmer had summoned Alasco to England. But after Bucer's death on 28 Feb. 1551 the last faint hopes of any such amalgamation had died away, and Peter Martyr and Alasco carried everything before them.

Cranmer's change of opinion may be gathered from the following short extracts:—

1 Aug. 1548. 'All our countrymen . . . entertain in all respects like opinions with you . . . I except the Archbishop of Canterbury . . . he conducts himself in such a way . . . as that the people do not think much of him, and the nobility regard him as lukewarm.'

28 Sept. 1548. 'Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans.'

31 Dec. 1548. 'The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion upon this subject. . . . I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism now those that were considered its principal and almost only supporters have come over to our side.'

All this was written to Bullinger by Bartholomew Traheron.

The next extract is from John ab Ulmis, writing from Oxford to the same, 27 Nov. 1548.

Even that Thomas Cranmer himself, about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man master John Alasco is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy.

And again, 2 March 1549—

The Archbishop of Canterbury . . . has, contrary to the general expectation, delivered his opinion on the subject correctly, orderly, and clearly, and by the weight of his character and the dignity of his language and sentiments easily drew over all his hearers to our way of thinking—

i.e. the views advocated by Martyr, following in the steps of Zwingli. These extracts show the opinion of a foreigner resident in England, who appears, from his letters, to have been cognisant of all that was going on in the changes of religion and worship.

But we have also distinct evidence of Alasco's influence over Cranmer in other letters which have been printed in Gorham's

'Reformation Gleanings.' Thus Alasco, writing to Bullinger, 10 April 1551, says—

Not long ago Dr Martin Bucer departed this life. The Archbishop of Canterbury consulted me on inviting to this country several learned men. I therefore proposed Musculus, your Bibliander, and Castalio; he suggested also Brentius, but when I mentioned that he did not agree with us on the Sacramentarian matter, he replied that he had already been so informed. I could strongly desire, holy man, that we had here some of your ministers. I already number Musculus among yours, and I knew some time since, that Bibliander is your co-pastor; already the Archbishop of Canterbury has instructed John Hales to provide for the journey of Musculus and Bibliander, if they be disposed to come. If you think it possible to persuade Castalio to undertake a journey hither, I request you to ascertain and inform me of his wishes.

From all this it is abundantly plain that Martyr and Alasco were carrying all before them, and that we are far more indebted to them than to Ridley and Cranmer for the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI and the forty-two articles which quickly followed it. There was evidently a lingering hope in Cranmer's mind that, now that Bucer, the sole remaining Lutheran in England after the German reformer's death, had followed him to the grave, some compromise might yet be made with his adherents, some of whom were fast developing into Zwinglianism. But it did not suit Alasco's purpose that Brentz should be invited to take part in the changes going on, and so the Lutheran reformer remained at his post till his death, his last will condemning all heretics, especially the Zwinglians, whom he does not hesitate to speak of as liars. He made his confession at his death; expressing his agreement with Luther's doctrine.

This was the state into which affairs had drifted in the year 1551. There had been a systematic attempt from the first to get rid of catholic doctrine, and to reform the church after the model of foreign protestantism. It was not, as has been erroneously supposed, that the English reformers were becoming gradually enlightened, and so slowly adopted changes as they from time to time approved themselves to their better judgment. On the contrary, every change was deliberately made with a view to a subsequent alteration; and a Third Prayer Book would soon have supplanted the Second, just as the Second had been designed to supersede the First. The pretence of the compilers of the Second, that it was only an improved edition of the First, must be seen to be mere hypocrisy when the two are compared together in regard to the doctrine of sacramental grace. If the two books do not seem to any one to proclaim this on the face of things, how is it possible to resist the evidence afforded by the correspondence of the period and the history of the Marian exiles? Is it not plain that the denial of the

real presence is as clear in the Second as its assertion is in the First? That it was so to Lawrence Humphrey and Thomas Sampson in July 1566 is plain from their complaint alleged in a letter to Bullinger, when they averred that

the Article composed in the time of Edward the Sixth respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the Real Presence in the Eucharist and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect.⁴

This, of course, refers to the reintroduction, in 1559, of the words used in the First Prayer Book of 1549—'The body [or blood] of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.'

And now let us briefly summarise the evidence of the intentions and purpose of the reformers of the reign of Edward VI. If we bear in mind the absolute necessity there was for caution in the mode of proceeding, and also the known opinions of Cranmer expressed during the reign of Henry VIII as regards confirmation and holy orders, there will seem nothing unreasonable in the view which we believe to be the only true account of the changes in religion successively adopted in the reign of his successor, and that account is as follows: There was, from the moment of Henry's death, a systematic attempt made by the men of the new learning, headed at first by Somerset and afterwards by Northumberland, gradually to get rid of catholic doctrine. In furtherance of this project, which was never lost sight of during the whole of Edward's reign, they first put out the order of communion, which was partly in English, partly in Latin; they then proceeded to the First Prayer Book, which came out little more than a year afterwards, and then, whilst pretending that the First Prayer Book of 1549 had been drawn up with the assistance of the Holy Ghost, they hypocritically destroyed the doctrine of the Eucharist, and pared down other sacramental doctrines to the lowest point they could venture. The next step was the new ordinal of April 1550, and then they endeavoured to impose upon the clergy the forty-two articles, with the view of paving the way for a Third Prayer Book, which would go still further in denying sacramental grace and assimilating the church of England to the platform of Zürich and Geneva. The successive publication of the new ordinal between the times of the issue of the two Prayer Books and the improved edition of it which appeared as part of the Prayer Book of 1552 points in the same direction. In the earlier ordinal, though much of the ceremonial was dropped, there were still retained the use of the vestments; the cope, the tunicle, the surplice and the alb, and the pastoral staff being mentioned by name. All these were omitted from the second ordinal of 1552,

⁴ *Zürich Letters* (1st ser.), lxxi. p. 165

because these offices were intended to be performed without any special dress, the careful exclusion of any such mention being an accommodation to the scruples of such men as Hooper.

The matter scarcely needs the additional evidence afforded by the fact that Cranmer had ordered Dr. Taylor, of Hadley, a mere priest, to ordain Robert Drake as deacon in the year 1548, and afterwards admitted him to the order of priesthood, according to some form resembling the ordinal of the following year, which was not yet authorised or perhaps even composed. It was not proposed in the lords till 22 Jan. 1550, and did not come into operation till the following April. The story is not told by an enemy, but by Foxe (vol. viii. p. 107), and plainly proves the indifference both to the law of the land and the customs of the church which characterised that unhappy period.

The men who succeeded in Elizabeth's reign to the place of Edward's bishops were of the same school. They neither valued the apostolical succession which they possessed nor believed in the sacraments they administered. What wonder is it that when Elizabeth had occupied the throne for nearly thirty years no attempt was made to answer Cawdrey's allegation³ that the bishops had all that time for the most part neglected to administer the rite of confirmation? They had been but faithful to the traditions of the Zwinglian party, who had taught them that orders were a state of life allowed in Holy Scripture, and that confirmation had grown of corrupt following of the apostles.

3. The third source of information we have alluded to is the history of the Frankfort and Genevan exiles as detailed in Whittingham's 'Brief Discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in Germany, A.D. 1554, about the book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies, and continued by the Englishmen there to the end of Q. Mary's reign.' This was first published in 1575, and though twice reprinted, once in the second volume of the 'Phenix' in 1708 and again in a separate volume in 1846, is not very commonly met with. It gives an account of the quarrels which originated in the dislike of some of their body of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, which the most influential of the party wished to have in use in their congregation, though by common consent of all the reformers the litany and surplice were to be discontinued, together with other ceremonies that might seem strange to the French reformed communion which had been allowed by the magistrates. Several other ceremonial acts as regards the ministration of the sacraments were omitted as superstitious. Both of these parties, therefore, if they had been at home, would have been in favour of that further revision of the Prayer Book which Cranmer had taken in hand. Accordingly on

³ Styrpe's *Aylmer*, p. 90.

2 Aug. 1554 they wrote off to their fellow-countrymen at Strassburg, Zürich, Wesel, Emden, &c., their ideas about discipline, in order to establish some unity amongst the Englishmen dispersed in those towns, whom they accordingly desired to come and settle at Frankfort. But there were already divisions at Frankfort, tidings of which had spread abroad, and the other exiles would not unite unless they would promise some substantial agreement with Edward's Second Book. But Knox and Lever had already been elected superintendents, and there was no chance of Knox consenting to anything in that Prayer Book which could not be proved from Scripture. Accordingly Knox and Whittingham wrote to Calvin, describing the points they objected to, and from their mode of expression it is plain that they had no idea that there was any consecration of the elements intended, but only a prayer like that which precedes it, 'in which are contained the words of institution;' but they distinctly object to the 'Gloria in Excelsis' as being used by the papists. At Calvin's suggestion a sort of compromise was adopted, which lasted from 6 Feb. 1555 till 13 March of the same year. This letter of Calvin's is the celebrated one in which he uses the expression *tolerabiles ineptiae* of parts of the contents of the Prayer Book. The patched up concord was disturbed by the arrival of Dr. Cox, who in the reign of Elizabeth was promoted to the bishopric of Ely. Cox soon got his own way, and managed to drive away Knox and Whittingham to Geneva. He wrote to Calvin explaining how the magistrates had given them leave to use the English Prayer Book, of which they had, however, given up confirmation, saints' days, kneeling at communion, surplices, crosses, and other like things, for fear of offending the weak brethren. The upshot of the matter was that the congregation was split up, some retiring to Geneva, some to Basle, whilst Cox, Whitehead, and others remained at Frankfort, using the English Prayer Book but omitting the services and ceremonies mentioned above. But the retirement of those who were dissatisfied did not put an end to their differences, which lasted all the time till the accession of Elizabeth. In the discussion of these troubles occurs one of the earliest assertions about the Third Prayer Book, the statement being (p. 82, ed. 1708)

that Cranmer, Bishop of Canterbury, had drawn up a Book of Prayer an hundred times more perfect than this we now have, yet the same could not take place, for that he was matched with such a wicked clergy and convocation, with other enemies.

We need not enter into the details of the quarrels between the elders and ministers and the congregation. It seems as if they could not agree upon any matters of discipline, and as if they were obliged to appoint as deacons men possessed of private means, for fear they should embezzle the alms which it was their business to

collect. The factions seem to have numbered about thirty-six or thirty-eight on one side and fourteen or fifteen on the other. The dispute lasted from 13 Jan. 1557 till 30 March, when the new book of discipline was subscribed by forty-two out of the whole congregation, which were in all sixty-two. Horne and Chambers seem to have been the principal persons in the minority, who found fault with the new discipline; Whitehead the chief of the majority, who were for imposing it. After this Horne and Chambers appear to have left Frankfort and joined the preceding seceders at Geneva in 1558, soon after which tidings reached them of the accession of Elizabeth, when it was thought best at Geneva to close up all differences, and accordingly Kethe was sent with a letter, dated 15 Dec. 1558, to Aarau, Basle, Strassburg, Worms, Frankfort, and other places where there were any English protestants assembled, exhorting them to forget all past grievances and join together, lest the papists should find occasion against them because of their dissensions. This was signed by the well-known names of Goodman, Coverdale, Knox, Gilby, and Whittingham amongst others. The answer to the letter from Frankfort was signed by Pilkington, Nowell, and others, expressing their hope that all would agree in whatever should now be arranged by authority in England and by consent of parliament, 'being not of themselves wicked.' The answer from Aarau, which was nearly to the same effect, is signed by Thomas Lever and three others, and dated 16 Jan. 1559.

The quarrels of the exiles as detailed by one who professes to be an impartial judge would be of small importance but for the distinct revelation of the fact of the existence of two principal factions amongst them, one of which was for doing away with the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, the other being content to adopt it, with the omission of certain provisions which they disliked, amongst which were the kneeling position at the reception of the Lord's supper and the existence of an office for confirmation, both of which were supposed to be relics of popery. The latter party were Zwinglians in reality, but they were usually designated as Pelagians and free-willers by the others, who were more or less advanced Calvinists.

At the risk of being charged with enlarging upon evidence of what has been abundantly proved already, we venture upon an extract from a very scarce tract which is amongst the last of the publications of the reign of Edward VI. It is a translation by T. C. of a work written in German by Micronius, and addressed by him to the faithful congregation of the Dutch church at London. The only copy we have seen is that in the British Museum, with the press-mark '4926. a.,' entitled 'A short and faythful | Instruction, gathered out of holy Scripture, composed in Questions and Answers, for

the edifyeing and comfort | of the symple Christianes, whych | intende worthely to receyve | the holy Supper of the | Lorde.' To the first question, 'Whereby knowest thou, that thou arte a Christian?' the answer is, 'Bycause the holy ghost by the witsnesse of fayth certieth me in myne herte and sealeth my conscience, that I am the chylde of God alonly through the merite of Jesus Christe.' To the question, 'What are the Sacramentes?' the answer is, 'They are holy exercises, seales and effectual tokens of remembrance, ordeyned of the Lorde himselfe for the comforte of his congregacion.' Again, to 'What is Baptyme?' we have, 'It is an holy ordinaunce of Christ in the recept wherof all the membres of hys congregacion (in which yonge children are conteyned also) are baptysed with water in the name of the father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost.' We have only space for one of the answers to the questions on the other sacrament, viz. 'What profyt and comforte fyndest thou in the due and worthye recepte therof?'

Answer. Truly, in the ryght ministracion therof, it is lyuely and effectually set out to me myserable synner as it were before myne eyes, beaten into my remembraunce, yea wytnessed and sealed to my feble conscience through the holy Ghost, that Christ hath once for al upon the crosse made an euerlastyng full and parfyte oblacion and sacrifice for my synnes, and that I also beleuynge in hym haue thorough hys death and oblacion once made forgyvenes of my synnes wyth comfort and full truste of euerlastyng lyfe as verely, truly and certeinlye as I at hys table eats of the bread broken and drinke of the cuppe of the Lorde, whyche (after the use of holy scripture and maner of Sacramentes) he calleth his body and bloude.

This little work was reproduced exactly in sixteen pages of one of the Camden Society's publications in 1884.⁶ If any one should be inclined to wonder at the extraordinary unanimity of the reformers of Edward's reign in their endeavour to detach the grace of God from the sacramental signs, or to disparage the sacraments, we would, in explanation of this point, refer to what we believe was the original source of it all, viz. the publication, in the year 1527, of the 'Farrago annotationum in Genesim ex ore Huldrychi Zuinglii per Leonem Judae et Casparem Megandrum exceptarum. Tiguri ex aedibus Christophori Froschouer Anno M.D. XXVII. Mense Martio.'⁷ The whole passage from p. 173 to p. 178 is well worth reading, and is most instructive in this relation. We have only space for one short but pregnant extract, from p. 176.

Satis de signis superius loquuti, hic breviter dicimus, Signa quaedam esse miracula, quae fidelium non mentes, sed carnis imbecillitatem non-nihil firmant; infideles excaecant, et eis in testimonium damnationis fiunt. Signa vero pacti aut symbola (quae alii signa sacramentalia vocant), ut est in veteri lege Circumcisio, et agni paschalis manducatio, in nova, baptismus et Eucharistia, fidem interiorem nec adjuvant, nec firmant (ut

⁶ *Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*, edited by the Rev. N. Pocock, pref. pp. xxxi-xlvi. ⁷ Brit. Mus. 690. a. 3.

quidam absque verbo Dei docent) sed admonent hominem officii: et sunt testimonia damnationis his, qui non servant quas per symbola significantur.

It has always been asserted that we are indebted for the Second Prayer Book and the forty-two articles to Cranmer and Ridley, but no evidence is ever produced to show that Ridley's influence was anything more than indirect, whereas all the evidence points to Alasco and Peter Martyr as their compilers or as assistants to Cranmer in compiling them. And it has been urged in favour of their Lutheran origin that the baptismal office is very like Hermann's, and that many of the earlier articles are expressed exactly in the same form as those of the Augustan confession. There is some force in the argument, as it must be admitted that the wording of the articles is more in accordance with the Augustan than with any of the Helvetic confessions. Yet we should remember that the confession of Augsburg was the earliest and far the most celebrated of all the confessions of the sixteenth century, and that even Martyr was quite willing to adopt it if he might be allowed to take it in his own sense, although he was almost as bitterly opposed to Lutheranism as Luther, and after his death Westphal, was to the Zwinglians and Calvinists. Thus in his address to the governors at Strassburg he says, 'I willingly embrace and confess the confession made at Augusta,' though he had refused to subscribe to the agreement made between Martin Bucer and Luther and his fellow-ministers, because he would not grant that they that are without faith in receiving the sacrament receive the body of Christ,⁹ alleging that Bucer himself had taught otherwise at Cambridge. And yet in his epistle to the English he inveighs most strongly against the Lutherans at the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth. For it appears that, though the current of religious belief had set very strongly in towards denying the grace of either sacrament, there were still some who, though opposed to all Roman doctrine, yet adhered to the Lutheran teaching of grace being conferred in both the sacraments. Certain persons who had conceived a dislike of Lutheranism applied to Peter Martyr at Strassburg for advice as to whether it was lawful for them to have their children baptised by one who held to Lutheran doctrine, and Martyr replied that though baptism by a Lutheran was valid, and was on no account to be repeated, yet they ought not to allow a child to be baptised by a Lutheran, because baptism was a seal of faith, and

the faith of the Lutherans and ours are so different that they even detest our faith, and the controversy between us is not about a small matter, but about a principal point of faith. The Lutherans would not allow their children to be baptised by us, so neither should we allow ours to be baptised by them.

⁹ *Common Places*, part ii. p. 138.

In explaining the difference between the Lutherans and himself he says—

They attribute unto the sacraments a great deal more than is requisite, and tie the grace of God unto baptism. There is none agreement between them and us in any of both sacraments. Infants, if they die without baptism, are in no danger, as neither grace nor predestination must be tied to outward things and sacraments. Furthermore, it is better that the discord between us and the Lutherans should be increased than that we should be in danger of ceasing to defend that truth about the Sacrament which has hitherto been constantly held.

In further evidence of the connexion that exists between the expressions of the articles and the opinions of Martyr it seems worth while to exhibit the following comparison of the ninth article with certain phraseology used by Martyr in a letter to an unknown friend in England, written soon after the accession of Elizabeth to the throne :—

But to declare in few words, this is my opinion, that even as by the holy words either heard or read our faith is stirred up, waxeth fervent, and is increased, so doth it also happen while we receive the sacraments which be the words of God, but yet visible words, that our faith is made more firm and increaseth.⁹

Surely these words exactly explain the meaning and intention of the clause in the twenty-seventh article, that 'the promises of forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed, faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.'

Whatever may be said of some of the other articles, there is no trace in the sacramental portion of them of their having been derived from the Augsburg confession, which is so definite in Articles IX. and X.

In baptismo docent quod sit necessarium ad salutem quodque per baptismum offeratur Dei gratia et quod pueri sint baptizandi qui per baptismum oblati Deo, recipiantur in gratiam Dei.

De coena Domini docent quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuuntur vescentibus in coena Domini et improbant secus docentes.

If there were any possibility of evading the plain meaning of these words, the strong language used by Melancthon in his 'Apologia Confessionis Augustanae' cuts away the ground entirely.

NICHOLAS POCOCK.

⁹ *Epistles*, p. 127.