

Concordia Theological Monthly

Continuing

LEHRE UND WEHRE
MAGAZIN FUER EV.-LUTH. HOMILETIK
THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY-THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Vol. VI

September, 1935

No. 9

CONTENTS


	Page
Babylon. Alex Heide!	641
Kleine Studien aus dem Galaterbrief. L. Fuerbringer	650
Die "Theologie" der Deutschen Christen, des Reichsbischofs und des Professors E. Hirsch. W. Oesch	661
Anglo-Lutheran Relations during the First Two Years of the Reign of Edward VI. Arthur Carl Piepkorn	670
Der Schriftgrund fuer die Lehre von der satisfactio vicaria. P. E. Kretzmann	687
Dispositionen ueber die altkirchliche Evangelienreihe	689
Miscellanea	702
Theological Observer.— Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches	704

Ein Prediger muss nicht allein *weiden*,
also dass er die Schafe unterweise, wie
sie rechte Christen sollen sein, sondern
auch daneben den Woelfen *wehren*, dass
sie die Schafe nicht angreifen und mit
falscher Lehre verfuehren und Irrtum ein-
fuehren. — *Luther*.

Es ist kein Ding, das die Leute mehr
bei der Kirche behaelt denn die gute
Predigt. — *Apologie, Art. 24.*

If the trumpet give an uncertain sound,
who shall prepare himself to the battle?
1 Cor. 14, 8.

Published for the
Ev. Luth. Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States
CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.



ARCHIVE

eine Komponente hergeben, ihn zu bereichern. Um das aber tun zu können, muß sie sich erst selbst „wehrlos“ „wagend“ von der jeweiligen geschichtlichen Stunde, jetzt von der nationalsozialistischen, infizieren lassen. Das bezeichnendste Kapitel ist das zwischen den beiden Hauptteilen stehende „Zwischenstück: Philosophie und Theologie“. „Sowohl das dem evangelischen Christentum eigen-tümliche Durchleiden und Mitgestalten wie auch die Erhebung dieses Durchleidens und Mitgestaltens in den Logos durch die Theologie, es trifft also gerade das beides, daran eine Volklichkeit und Staatlichkeit ihr Wesen hat: das Verhältnis dieser Volklichkeit und Staatlichkeit zu dem verborgenen Ursprunge seines Lebens und Aufbau und Haltung des gemeinsamen Lebens“, lesen wir Seite 75. Das heißt also: Diese Sorte von „Evangelischen“ und ihre Sprecher, die „Theologen“, sind die Heilande, die das ganze Volk selig machen durch den Saft, den sie in seine Geschichte hineinzaubern. Sapienti sat. Von den Gewalttaten der Deutschen Christen berichteten wir. Nun lernten wir ihre „Theologie“ kennen. Unser Urteil können wir so zusammenfassen: Logische Volkstreuer des Abfalls vom Schriftprinzip, des Synergismus und des volkskirchlichen Gedankens, in dem sich bisher fast alle evangelischen Theologen einig waren. Seien wir logisch! Ist die Kirche Volkseinrichtung, dann darf sie keinen vom Volkskörper gesonderten „Leib“ haben, dann darf sie nicht in einem teils gläubigen, größtenteils ungläubigen Volk „Leib Christi“ sein. Dann ist sie bloß Teil des Staates mit einer besonderen Funktion. Dann müssen die Philosophen des Herrn Omnes und die Theologen der Kirche in eins fallen. Die Grundsätze dieser deutsch-christlichen Theologen, die selbstverständlich die Kirche zugrunde richten, reichen auch aus, den jungen hoffnungsvollen deutschen Staat zu Fall zu bringen. Es gibt auf dem Erdboden keine größere Pest als abgefallene Theologen.

London, England. (Fortsetzung folgt.)

W. S. J. S.

Anglo-Lutheran Relations during the First Two Years of the Reign of Edward VI.

The Regency Council to whom the affairs of government in England were committed during the minority of Henry's youthful heir and successor, Edward VI, was dominantly pro-Reformation, and Mr. A. F. Pollard is of the opinion "that Henry deliberately sought to smooth the way for the Reformation by handing over the government to a Council committed to its principles."¹)

At the head of the Council stood Somerset, the Lord Protector,

1) *Cambridge Modern History*, II, 475.

one of the most remarkable rulers in the long annals of England's administrative history. His character is not without contradictions. He was one of the most practical visionaries ever to wield royal authority, though some of his dreams were centuries in coming true. Like the rest of the people of his age, he lusted for gold, but his defense of the victims of the economic revolution which was concentrating the lands of the realm in the hands of a few despots was, if not strikingly successful, at least devoted and vigorous, and it is a significant commentary on his consistency that he voluntarily gave his tenants the legal security of an Act of Parliament against eviction by himself. Nurtured in an atmosphere of Neronian despotism and vested by the dying Henry with dictatorial authority, he endeavored to rule upon a basis of civil liberty and religious toleration. Turbulent as were the times, the brief record of his government is unsullied by the blood of a single religious martyr. Himself committed neither to Lutheranism, Calvinism, or Zwinglianism, least of all to Romanism, he sought to guarantee to all faiths the right to worship God according to the dictates of their several consciences, and to this end he secured the erasure from the statute books of the heresy laws, the Six Articles legislation, the multifarious prohibitions against printing, reading, preaching, teaching, and expounding the Holy Scriptures, "and all and every other act or acts of Parliament concerning doctrine or matters of religion."²)

His foreign policy was equally circumspect. Any action which could be construed as antipapal was to be avoided at all costs, lest it destroy one of the fondest Tudor hopes, union with Scotland, or convert the wary friendship of Charles V into active enmity and provide an occasion for the pan-Roman league which the Pope and Cardinal Pope were agitating. So March, 1547, saw on the one hand a polite rejection of the alliance proposed by the now weak and divided North European Evangelical princes, and on the other the beginning of conversations looking toward a treaty with France and the union of the royal houses of the two countries in a marriage between a member of the French dynasty and the Princess Elizabeth.

At home, England, unused to the treatment Somerset gave it, mistook liberty for license. Every bishop, every vicar, every curate, fell to doing that which was right in his own eyes, and England became a vast laboratory of religious experimentation. To render confusion worse confounded, a mighty invasion of invited and uninvited foreign divines — not one of them an orthodox Lutheran — thronged the gateways to Britain, and the resultant bedlam came to resemble Babel more than Pentecost.

The vanguard arrived in 1547: Peter Martyr (Pietro Martire

2) *Ibid.*, 477.

Vermigli), ex-Augustinian and a Florentine; Emmanuel Tremelius, Jew, Hebrew scholar, and a native of Ferrara; and Bernardino Ochino, late of Augsburg, but a native of Siena, and successively a Friar Minor and a Capuchin. Jean Véron of Sens punctuated his eleventh twelvemonth of English exile with a vitriolic attack on the Mass in the same year.

Of these immigrants Peter Martyr is undoubtedly the most important. He opposed Romanism and Lutheranism with equal impartiality and his professorship in divinity at Oxford endowed his pronouncements with far-reaching authority and influence. A tract on the Eucharist published in 1548 teaches Receptionist doctrine. The recitation of the words of institution "whenever it happens during Communion that wine is wanting in the cup"—required by the stop-gap 1548 Order of the Communion—he regarded as superfluous. In a disputation with Richard Smythe in 1549 he definitively yielded the doctrine of the real presence. In keeping with this position he denounced reservation, also for communicating the infirm, and opposed Eucharistic vestments, which he described as "relics of the Amorites." He boggled even at the surplice and the square cap.³⁾ In one of his *Theological Letters* he declares: "I judge that it would be most expedient for that vestment [the surplice] and the rest of the ilk to be abolished as soon as it may conveniently be done, whereby church matters are by far the simplest handled. For you will see that where symbols not commanded in the Word of God are stiff-neckedly contended for, there men are less zealous for the realities of religion."⁴⁾ In a letter to Sampson, written from Zurich under date of November 4, 1559, he declares: "When I was at Oxford, I would never use those white vestments in the choir, even though I was a canon."⁵⁾ Baptism he held to be "a sign of a regeneration which God had perhaps bestowed previously upon the child baptized," and his anti-Lutheran fanaticism went to such lengths that he proclaimed it better for a Protestant child to die unbaptized than to receive Holy Baptism at the hands of a Lutheran priest. He was emphatic in his denial that grace is conferred by the sacraments. Walch, Buddeus, and even V. E. Loescher have insisted that Peter Martyr was originally a Lutheran, and on October 29, 1548, Burcher, writing to Bullinger, refers to "Peter Martyr and other Lutherans" as having influenced the Archbishop of Canterbury; but it cannot be doubted that by the time the English phase of his career had fairly begun, he was definitely a Reformed partisan. Thus also

3) Peter Heylyn, *Ecclēsia Restaurata* (ed. Robertson; Cambridge, 1849), I, 194 f.

4) *Loci Communes*, London (1583) edition, p. 1085.

5) George S. Tyack, *Historic Dress of the Clergy* (London, 1897), 69.

Heylyn describes him as "more addicted to the Zwinglian than the Lutheran doctrines."⁶) When Richard Smythe in 1549 implied that Peter Martyr had been "but a Lutheran" at his first coming to Oxford and had "turned his tippet and sang another song" because he perceived that Lutheranism was unpopular, Cranmer testified: "Forasmuch as he lodged within my house long before he came to Oxford, and I had with him many conferences in that matter, and know that he was then of the same mind that he is now, and as he defended after openly in Oxford, and hath written in his book."⁷)

During 1547 and 1548 the use of English in the services of the Church greatly increased, especially in the capital, but unfortunately for our purposes not many of the forms have been preserved, and it is impossible, therefore, to relate them either to the Latin texts or to the subsequent Prayer Book.⁸) We know that on Easter Monday, 1547, Compline was sung in English in the Chapel Royal; that on September 18, *Te Deum* was sung and the sermon preached in English to commemorate the victory at Pinkie; and that on November 4, at the opening of Parliament, the ordinary of the Mass, or at the least *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Creed, and *Agnus Dei*, was sung in English. At the same time a gentleman of the Court, Sternhold by name, was composing his English metrical version of the Psalter to displace the "lewd" songs of the common people.⁹) On July 31 there was published *Certain Sermons, or Homilies, Appointed by the King's Majesty to be Declared and Read by all Parsons, and Curates, Every Sunday in Their Churches Where They Have Cures*. The authorship of twelve of the homilies contained in this book is certain: Four were written by Cranmer and one each by Bishop Edmund Bonner of London, Archdeacon Nicholas Harpsfield of Canterbury, and Thomas Becon (Cranmer's chaplain); Ridley and Latimer have been supposed to be the authors of two of the remaining sermons.¹⁰)

6) *Ecclesia Restaurata*, I, 164.

7) Quoted in Thomas Walter Perry, *Some Historical Considerations Relating to the Declaration on Kneeling* (London, 1863), 17.

8) Francis Aidan Gasquet and Edmund Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (third edition; London, 1891), pp. 58. 147; Walter Howard Frere, "Edwardine Vernacular Services Before the First Prayer Book," *Journal of Theological Studies*, I, 229 ff.; Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (1563), 891. For additional bibliographical references see F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite* (second edition; London, 1921), LXX.

9) Pollard in the *Cambridge Modern History*, II, 482.

10) Brightman, LXIX. The general tone of the homilies is illustrated by the fifth, written by Cranmer, in which he denounced hallowed bread, holy water, palms, candles, etc., as "papistical superstitions and abuses." This is a far different Cranmer from the conservative prelate who in 1536 regarded these and similar things "as not to be contemned and cast away, but continued to put us in mind of spiritual things"; see Percy Dearmer, *The Parson's Handbook* (fifth edition; London, 1903), page 38, note 1.

August saw the issuance of a series of royal *Injunctions* to the thirty Visitors designated for a general visitation of the Kingdom. The twenty-second of these instructions directed that at high mass the Epistle and Gospel be read "in English and not in Latin in the pulpit or in such convenient place as the people may hear the same," and repeats the requirement that on all Sundays and holy days an English Lesson be read at matins and at even-song. The twenty-fourth calls for the Litany, said kneeling and without perambulation, before high mass; the thirty-third desires the reading of one of the appointed homilies every Sunday; and the thirty-seventh ordains the omission of Prime and Hours when there is a sermon.¹¹⁾ No lights in the future were to be burned before any image.¹²⁾

The official Latin record of Convocation in November relates a petition to the upper house from the lower house "that the work of the Bishops and others who have been occupied, in accordance with the command of Convocation, in examining, reforming and publishing the Divine Service, may be produced and submitted to the examination of this House." This demand is elucidated by a reference in one of Cranmer's manuscripts: "Whereas by the commandment of King Henry VIII certain prelates and other learned men were appointed to alter the service in the Church and to devise other convenient and uniform order, who according to the same appointment did make certain books, as they be informed: their request is that the said books may be seen and perused by them for a better expedition of Divine Service to be set forth accordingly."¹³⁾

The iconoclasm which seems characteristic of the Protestant temperament flared up repeatedly during the year. The chronicles report significant instances of religious vandalism inspired by the Royal Visitors during November. Thus on the seventeenth, according to the author of the Grey Friar's chronicle, "at night was pulled down the Rood in Paul's with Mary and John, with all the images in the Church; and two of the men that labored at it were slain and divers others sore hurt." Wriothesley expressly ascribes the impulse to this action to the Visitors and adds: "Likewise all images in every parish church in London were pulled down and broken by the commandment of the said Visitors."¹⁴⁾ On Advent Sunday (November 27), according to the latter chronicler, Dr. Barlow, Bishop of St. David's, "preached at Paul's Cross, where he showed a picture of the Resurrection of Our Lord, made with vices, which put His legs out of the sepulcher and blessed with His hand and turned His

11) *Ibid.*

12) Gasquet and Bishop, 53.

13) Francis Proctor and Walter Howard Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1902), 37, and note 2.

14) Gasquet and Bishop, 68.

head; and there stood before the pulpit the image of Our Lady which they of Paul's had lapped up in cere cloth, which was hid in a corner of Paul's Church and found by the Visitors in their visitation. . . . After the sermon the boys broke the idols in pieces."¹⁵)

October 30, 1547, saw the issuance of an anonymous version of the Cologne Church Order, *Simplex et pia deliberatio*, under the title *A Simple and Religious Consultation of Us, Hermann, by the Grace of God Archbishop of Cologne and Prince-Elector, Etc., by what means a Christian reformation, and founded in God's Word, of doctrine, administration of the divine sacraments, of ceremonies, and how the holy cure of souls and other ecclesiastical ministries may be begun among men committed to our pastoral charge*. John Day issued a revised version of it, "perused by the translator thereof and amended," the following year. Before 1548 appeared Miles Coverdale's translation of *The Apology of the Germans Against the Council of Mantua*. Philip Melanchthon is represented among the translations of 1547 by a tract on Justification,¹⁶) and by J. C. Weesell's *The Epistle of P. Melanchthon made unto King Henry the Eighth for the revoking and abolishing of the Six Articles set forth and enacted by the crafty means and procurement of certain of our prelates of the clergy*.¹⁷)

1548 was a year of momentous events. On January 27 the Council ordered that candles, ashes, and palms were no longer to be used on Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, and Palm Sunday, and shortly afterward the veneration of the cross on Good Friday, holy bread, and holy water were included under this ban.¹⁸) On January 28 the revised translation of Archbishop Hermann's *Consultation*, already referred to, appeared. From the Continent came Miles Coverdale, returning from his German exile to become chaplain to Edward VI and almoner to Queen Catherine Parr; Pullain of Strasbourg, who is frequently mentioned as having indirectly affected the Second Prayer Book; John à Lasco (Laski), a Polish nobleman of Zwinglian views; and the last-named's disciple, Charles Utenhove, a native of Ghent. The year also saw the production of the Order of Communion and the completion of the First Prayer Book; the death of Queen Catherine and her funeral according to a Protestant rite; the publication of vast numbers of Lutheran and Protestant treatises

15) *Ibid.*, 69.

16) *Ibid.*, 125. Henry Eyster Jacobs (*The Lutheran Movement in England during the Reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI and Its Literary Monuments* [revised edition; Philadelphia, 1894], p. 352) dates the English version of this tract to 1548.

17) Jacobs, *l. c.*

18) Brightman, LXX. In February the removal of all images was decreed (Pollard, in *Cambridge Modern History*, II, 483).

in English translations; and the final declension of the leaders of the English Church from the Lutheran position.

The rising tide of Lutheran publications is exemplified by the following works of Luther: 1) *The chief and principal articles of the Christian Faith, to hold against the Pope and all Papists and the gates of hell, with other very profitable and necessary books. . . . Made by Doctor Martin Luther.* The title-page carried this assurance: "In this book shall you find, Christian Reader, the right probation of the old Catholic Church and of the new false church, whereby either of them is to be known; read and judge!" 2) *A fruitful and godly exposition and declaration of the Kingdom of God and of the Christian Liberty, made upon the words of the Prophet Jeremy in the XXIII. chapter, with an exposition of the VIII. Psalm, in-treating of the same matter, by the famous clerk Dr. Martin Luther.* 3) *Sermon of the Keys and of Absolution, on John XX,* translated by one R. Argentine, a physician. Melanchthon had at least three items: 1) *Melanchthon, his weighing and considering of the Interim,* translated by John Rogers. 2) *Of the true authorities of the Church.* 3) *The Confession of Faith delivered to the Emperor Charles the Fifth by the Lords of Germany,* translated by Robert Singleton. Urban Rhegius, with four, is more popular than either the Reformer or the Magister of Germany: 1) *A declaration of the Twelve Articles of the Christian Faith, with annotations of the Holy Scriptures where they be grounded in,* done into English by Richard Judge. 2) *The old learning and new compared together, whereby it may be easily known which of them is better and more agreeing with the everlasting Word of God,* by William Turner. 3) *A little treatise after the manner of an epistle written by the famous clerk Doctor Urban Regius to his friend about the causes of the great controversy that hath been and is yet in the Christian Church.* 4) *A godly sermon of Doctor Urban Regius upon the IX. chapter of Matthew, of the woman that had an issue of blood, and of the ruler's daughter,* published as an appendix to Luther's *Fruitful and godly exposition* (2, above). About this year also must be put Richard Rice's translation of Archbishop Hermann's *Of the right institution of Baptism* and Wolfgang Musculus's *Treatise of matrimony and burial of the dead.* In 1548 also Joy translated and published Osiander's *Con-jectures of the end of the world,* wherein the end was fixed for between 1585 and 1625. The left wing of the Continental Reform movement was represented by translations of works of Zwingli, Calvin, Bullinger, Hegendorp, and Bodius. An anonymous tract from Nuremberg found its way into English also: *A Disputation between a Christian shoemaker and a papist parson,* in which especially the recitation of the Divine Office was made the butt of satirical comment.

Liturgically, the way was gradually being prepared for the Prayer

Book. The first step was the so-called *Order of the Communion*, drawn up in January and February by a commission of certain bishops and divines called together by Cranmer at Windsor. The order is obviously a compromise between the Roman and the reforming parties and corresponds closely with the recommendation of Tunstall, whereby Latin was retained for the Mass itself, while the distribution of the Sacrament was ordered to be done in English. The Order was published in March and its use enjoined after Easter Sunday.

It begins with an exhortation to be delivered by the minister "the next Sunday, or holy day, or at the least one day before he shall minister the communion." This exhortation is based upon the first exhortation in the preparation office of the *Consultation of Hermann*, which had been drawn up at the Archbishop's request by Bucer, Melancthon, and Sarcerius and published in German in 1543. Cologne in turn had borrowed the exhortation in question from Cassel 1539.

Then follows an "Exhortation at the time of the celebration of the Communion," retained with minor alterations as the third exhortation of the later Prayer Book. This may be traced through Hermann's *Consultation* and Brandenburg-Nuremberg, 1533, to the exhortation composed by Wolfgang Volprecht, prior of the Canons Regular of S. Augustine at Nuremberg, in 1524.

The warning which follows, "If any man here be an open blasphemer, advouterer," etc., seems suggested by the long list of those whom the *Consultation* debars from the Sacrament in dependence on the Cassel Exhortation already referred to.

The beautiful prayer of confession is adapted from the Cologne order, and the "absolution" is a free rendering of the parallel passage in the same source.¹⁹⁾ The Comfortable Words are also borrowed from Hermann, but with this difference, that the Cologne Order places them between the confession and the "absolution."

The formula of distribution, though based on the Sarum form for the administration of the Sacrament to the sick, is influenced by Nuremberg to the extent of adding "which was given for thee," "which was shed for thee." The direct impetus for this addition may have been given by the instruction of the Cologne Reformation that the "ministers should always admonish the people with great earnestness to lay to heart the words 'given for you,' 'shed for you for the remission of sins.'" ²⁰⁾ The influence of the Small Catechism (*Sakrament des Altars: Wie kann leiblich Essen und Trinken solche grosse Dinge tun?*) is obvious.²¹⁾

19) See Jacob's demonstration of this point, page 242.

20) Cf. Jacobs, *ibid.*

21) The most complete source analysis of the Order of Communion will be found in Brightman, LXXIII—LXXVI.

The procedure implied by this Order was the following: At the Mass, which was to be celebrated as hitherto without "varying of any rite or ceremony," the celebrant was to consecrate "in the biggest chalice" sufficient wine for the communion of the laity (to whom the cup was thus restored) and after one draught to leave the rest upon the altar covered with the second corporal, the equivalent of our pall. After the mass the people were to be communicated in the manner described. If in communicating the people the sacred species in the chalice were to fail, he was directed to consecrate anew as much as necessary by reciting the pertinent words of institution, but without elevation.

But rite and ceremony were varied, the rubric notwithstanding, and in no less influential churches than the Cathedral of London and the chapels royal. According to Wriothesley as early as May "Paul's choir and divers other parishes in London sung all the service, both matins, mass, and even-song, and kept no mass without some received the communion with the priest." This last provision represents exactly the Lutheran standpoint, midway between the view which condemned non-communicating attendance and the Roman position, which permitted celebrations without any to receive beside the celebrant. On May 12 the year-mind of King Henry VII was kept at Westminster, "the mass sung all in English, with the Consecration of the Sacrament also spoken in English, the priest leaving out all the canon after the Creed [?] save the Paternoster, and then ministering the communion after the King's Book." It will be noted that this again represents contemporary Lutheran practise. Of these offices Gasquet and Bishop say: "It would appear likely that the matins and even-song in English and the English mass at Westminster in the May of 1548, as well as the offices in use in the King's Chapel in September, were *substantially those afterwards incorporated in the First Book of Common Prayer*."²²) The movement spread, as the churchwardens' accounts of S. Michael's Cornhill for 1548 attest: "Paid to the schoolmaster of Paul's for writing of the mass in English and the *Benedicite* [*sic*!] 5 shillings." The same accounts record the purchase of "eight Psalters in English."²³)

By September, 1548, the Prayer Book seems to have entered upon its final stage. On the fourth of that month the Lord Protector wrote "from Syon" to "our loving friend, the Vice-Chancellor of

22) Page 181. Of the Westminster mass the same authorities declare: "It is impossible not to see in it a first draft of 'the supper of the Lord, commonly called the mass' as it appeared in the first Book of Common Prayer" (p. 103).

23) *Ibid.*, 102. The *Benedicite* is the "Song of the Three Children," from Daniel 3. The English Rite orders it in place of the *Te Deum* during Lent.

Cambridge, and to all masters and rulers of colleges there," ordering them for the present to use in all colleges, chapels, and churches "one uniform order, rite, ceremonies in the Mass, Matins, and Evensong, and all divine service in the same to be said or sung, such as is presently used in the King's Majesty's Chapel, and none other, the which we have for more instruction by this bearer or sent unto you."²⁴) Though the ritual mentioned has been lost, nevertheless from this letter it is clear 1) that the services of the chapel royal had been reduced to three, as in the subsequent Prayer Book, matins, mass, and vespers, with the suppression as a separate office of the experimental English compline of the previous year; 2) that these new orders departed in both rite and ceremony from the ancient usages; 3) that considerable experimentation had taken place in the use of the services which were to be incorporated in the Prayer Book.²⁵)

Probably about the end of October the Prayer Book was submitted to most of the bishops, at least for subscription and approval,²⁶) but Cranmer, who must be regarded as largely responsible for its contents, seems subsequently to have made certain alterations without their consent. In December we find it the subject of a heated debate in the House of Lords, of which we shall speak presently.

In discussing the question to which we now address ourselves, Is the Book of Common Prayer a Lutheran or a Reformed document? we must, since an analysis of its sources is reserved for treatment elsewhere, content ourselves at this time with a review of the historical evidence. Two points are clear: 1) The Prayer Book was substantially completed by September, 1548; 2) the Prayer Book is essentially the work of Cranmer. The issue must, in consequence, be largely decided by what we can discover of the religious views of the Primate of All England during this fateful year.

Our most significant exhibit in this connection is a translation from Cranmer's pen published in August, 1548, under the title, *Catechismus: A Short Instruction into Christian Religion for the Singular Commodity and Profit of Children and Young People*.²⁷) The history of this volume is interesting. Andrew Osiander and

24) Proctor and Frere, p. 40 f.

25) For the significance of this letter see Proctor and Frere, *l. c.*, and Gasquet and Bishop, p. 146 f.

26) Pollard, in *Cambridge Modern History*, II, 484.

27) See especially John C. Mattes and M. Reu, *An Historical Introduction to Luther's Small Catechism* (Minneapolis, 1929), pp. 30—33. Previously one of the collaborators, Dr. Mattes, had reprinted the sections reproducing Luther's Small Catechism, together with a historical introduction and Cranmer's "Sermon on the Authority of the Keys" in a small brochure, *Luther's Small Catechism in the English Translation of Thomas Cranmer MDXLVIII* (Philadelphia; no date).

Dominic Sleupner had written a series of *Kinderpredigten*, "of considerable pedagogical merit," about the time that Cranmer was a transient resident of Nuremberg. These sermons were published as part of the Brandenburg-Nuremberg Church Order the next year (1533). The characteristic feature was the summary of each sermon in the *ipsissimis verbis* of Luther's Small Catechism of 1529. In 1539 Justus Jonas, Sr., made these sermons available to a wider public by translating them into Latin. It was this Latin version which Cranmer rendered into English, "set forth, overseen and corrected," as the title-page and preface inform the reader. To it he added a sermon on the Keys, a fourteen-page dissertation on idolatry and images appended to the First Commandment, and a short section preceding the First Petition of the Lord's Prayer. Most of the remaining changes and omissions are of a minor sort.²⁸⁾

But there are two alterations which shed a significant light upon Cranmer's thinking at this stage. In the Latin version the text was illustrated with small woodcuts. This feature is retained in Cranmer's English text, and in general the English pictures adhere quite closely to the Jonas illustrations, but there are two not unimportant changes:²⁹⁾ Where the Latin text has a penitent making his confession privately to his confessor, the Cranmer version takes St. John 20 as its basis for the illustration and shows our Lord addressing seven disciples, each of whom bears a key. More significant is the alteration which has taken place in the picture preceding the last sermon of the Latin edition. Cranmer himself describes it as showing "an altar with candles lighted, and the priest appareled after the old sort, putting the wafer into the communicant's mouth."³⁰⁾ For this Cranmer substituted a conventional Last Supper.³¹⁾

28) A list will be found in Edward Burton, *A Short Introduction into Christian Religion, being a Catechism set forth by Archbishop Cranmer, Etc.* (Oxford, 1829), pp. XIII—XVI.

29) Mattes, *Luther's Small Catechism in the English Translation of Cranmer*, p. 8 f.

30) Quoted in Perry, p. 166. Because this illustration sheds valuable light on the type of vestment in use in Nuremberg in the early post-Reformation period, we append a detailed description by the Rev. Dr. John C. Mattes contained in a letter to the writer: "The illustration shows only the Gospel corner of the altar with its candlestick and the center of the altar with a chalice standing on a corporal. The celebrant has a paten in his left hand and he is represented in the act of administering a Host with his right. He is standing on the one pace in front of the altar and the three communicants are kneeling in front of the step, not on it. The celebrant is evidently wearing amice, albe, and chasuble, the latter being ample and ornamented with a Y-cross. The stole does not show and there is no manipule."

31) It is most interesting to note that Gardiner, in his attack upon Cranmer, cites the picture in the Latin edition as evidence that at the time Cranmer still held to the doctrine of the Real Presence. In reply Cranmer, not without justice, sarcastically pillories Gardiner's "pithy

More directly significant is a change in the text. In the discussion of Holy Communion, the original runs thus: "God is almighty. Therefore He can do all things that He wills. . . . *When He calls and names a thing which was not before, then at once that very thing comes into being as He names it.* Therefore when He takes bread and says, 'This is My Body,' then immediately there is the Body of Our Lord. And when He takes the chalice and says, 'This is My Blood,' then immediately His Blood is present." In his translation Cranmer omitted the italicized section and renders the remainder in the following equivocal language: "Wherefore when Christ takes bread and saith, 'Take, eat, this is My Body,' we ought not to doubt but we eat His very Body, and when He takes the cup and saith, 'Take, drink, this is My Blood,' we ought to think assuredly that we drink His very Blood."³²)

None of Cranmer's contemporaries were sufficiently well acquainted with the work of Jonas to catch the delicate implication of this change, and the Catechism was regarded generally as setting forth the doctrine of the Real Presence if not in the Roman sense, then at least in the Lutheran intention. Thus Bishop Gardiner declared: "Justus Jonas hath translated a catechism out of Dutch into Latin, taught in the city of Nuremberg in Germany, where Osiander is chief preacher, in which catechism they be accounted for no true Christian men, that deny the presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament. The words 'really' and 'substantially' be not expressed as they be in Bucer, but the word 'truly' is there, and, as Bucer saith, that is 'substantially.' Which catechism was translated into English in this author's [Cranmer's] name about two years past."³³) Compare another statement by the same Gardiner: "Item, That my Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, about the time that the Bishop of Winchester aforesaid preached a sermon on St. Peter's Day, at Westminster, before the King's Majesty, did affirm, publish, and set forth, the *true presence* of Christ's most Precious Body and Blood to be *in* the Sacrament of the Altar."³⁴) And certainly this impression would be given to any reader when he meets with apparently unmistakable declarations like this: "When ye do thus (*i. e.*, examine

argument" and "dexterity in gathering of author's mind" displayed in his effort to make "an argument here of a picture, neither put in my book, nor by me devised, but invented by some fond painter or carver, which paint and grave whatsoever their idle heads can fancy. . . . I marvel you be not ashamed to allege so vain a matter against me." (Quoted in Perry, p. 167.)

32) The significance of this passage is similarly interpreted by Leighton Pullan, *The History of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1900), p. 91 f.; Gasquet and Bishop, p. 130 f.; and others.

33) Quoted in Perry, p. 167.

34) *Ibid.*, p. 27.

yourselves), then ye worthily receive the Body and Blood of Christ. And that so receiveth it, receiveth everlasting life. For he doth not only with his bodily mouth receive the Body and Blood of Christ, but he doth also believe the words of Christ." (Folio CCXXXIX.) No less forthright is Cranmer's rendering of the first part of Luther's statements on the Sacrament: "When ye be asked, What is the Communion of the Lord's Supper? ye may answer: It is the TRUE Body and TRUE Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which was ordained by Christ Himself, to be eaten and drunken of us Christian people, under the form of bread and wine." (Folio CCXL.)

We have the feeling of an explanation after the fact when we read Cranmer's reply to Richard Smythe in 1551: "I confess that not long before I wrote the said Catechism, I was in that error of the Real (*i. e.*, bodily) Presence, as I was many years past in divers other errors, as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the Mass, etc."³⁵⁾ Equally unsatisfactory is his explanation to Gardiner when he was pressed by the Bishop of Winchester on the doctrine of his German Catechism with reference to the reception of Christ in Holy Communion, that the word spiritually should be added or understood; and "then is the doctrine of my catechism," he affirms, "sound and good."³⁶⁾

Other documents enable us to plot the course of Cranmer's waverings with almost dated exactitude. On August 1, Treherne wrote to Bullinger:³⁷⁾ "All our contrymen who are sincerely favorable to the restoration of truth entertain in all respects like opinions with you. I except the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Latimer, and a very few learned men besides."³⁸⁾ On August 18, John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger: "I would have you know this for certain, that this Thomas has fallen into so heavy a slumber, that we entertain but a very cold hope that he will be aroused even by your most learned letter. For he has lately published a Catechism, in which he has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the Papists in the Holy Supper of our Savior, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous,

35) *Ibid.*, p. 155.

36) Gasquet and Bishop, p. 281.

37) Bullinger has been described by some, also Cannon Dixon, as "a moderate Lutheran." His attitude toward the very Protestant Lutheranism that found its way to Berne should be an adequate refutation of this view. As Gasquet and Bishop point out (p. 232), he was at this very time arranging with Calvin the Zurich *Consensus* which definitely fixed the position of the Helvetian churches, notably in the doctrine of the Supper of the Lord.

38) Quoted in Jacobs, p. 217.

and lucid.”³⁹⁾ On September 28, as another letter from Treherne to Bullinger shows, Cranmer seemed to be inclining toward the Reformed view: “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.”⁴⁰⁾ A month later, on November 27, John ab Ulmis reports in the same tenor: “Even Cranmer, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, Master John à Lasco, is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy.”⁴¹⁾

By December 14 Cranmer’s view had crystallized. On that date there began a disputation on the Eucharist in the House of Lords which lasted for several days. Tunstall of Durham, Thirlby of Westminster, and Bonner of London defended the doctrine of the Real Presence; Cranmer, seconded by Holbeach of Lincoln, Ridley of Rochester, and, with qualifications, Goodrich of Ely, opposed the dogma.⁴²⁾ Bonner urged his hearers to remain faithful to the ancient doctrine “and to go no further than our holy fathers, that have searched the Scriptures and come to the belief which must be followed. They have found it; we should not then go seek it still, but follow them and believe as they did.”⁴³⁾ Cranmer in expressing his belief contended that “they be two things, to eat the Sacrament and to eat the Body of Christ. The eating the Body is to dwell in Christ, and this may be, although a man never taste the Sacrament.” He lays down two principles upon which his speeches throughout the discussion simply ring various changes and which definitely reveal his Calvinism: 1) “The wicked eat not the body of Christ, but their own condemnation”; 2) “our faith is not to believe Him to be in the bread and wine, but that He is in Heaven.”⁴⁴⁾

The English Reformed were not slow in reporting the victory. On St. Stephen’s Day, Peter Martyr wrote from Oxford to his friend Bucer: “Hitherto the Popish party has been defeated and the palm rests with our friends, but especially with the Archbishop of Canter-

39) Quoted in Perry, p. 157. The case is overstated as far as the Catechism is concerned. But it seems quite certain that Cranmer was still undecided about accepting of the Reformed view. This wavering continued at least until the end of October, as John Burcher’s letter to Bullinger under date of October 29 implies: “The Archbishop of Canterbury, moved no doubt by the advice of Peter Martyr and other Lutherans, has ordered a catechism of some Lutheran opinion to be translated and published in our language. This little book has occasioned no little discord.” (Quoted in Jacobs, p. 216.)

40) Quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, p. 231. The comment of the learned authors is most likely correct: “Traheron was probably somewhat premature.”

41) Quoted in Jacobs, p. 216 f.

42) Pullan, p. 92.

43) Quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, p. 170.

44) *Ibid.*, p. 162.

bury, whom they now were wont to traduce as a man ignorant of theology, and as being only conversant with matters of government; but now, believe me, he has shown himself so mighty a theologian against them as they would rather not have proof of, and are compelled, against their inclination, to acknowledge his learning and power and dexterity in debate."⁴⁵) On December 27 Hooper wrote to Bullinger: "The Archbishop of Canterbury entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Supper, and is now very friendly towards myself."⁴⁶) On the last day of 1548 Treherne wrote the epitaph of English Lutheranism: "On the 14th of December, if I mistake not, a disputation was held at London concerning the Eucharist. . . . The Archbishop of Canterbury, contrary to general expectations, most openly, firmly, and learnedly, maintained your (*i. e.*, Bullinger's) opinion upon this subject. His arguments were as follows: The Body of Christ was taken up from us into Heaven. Christ has left the world. 'Ye have the poor always with you, but Me ye have not always,' etc. Next followed the Bishop of Rochester [Ridley], who handled the subject with so much eloquence, perspicuity, erudition, and power, as to stop the mouth of that zealous Papist, the Bishop of Worcester. The truth never obtained a more brilliant victory among us. *I perceive it is all over with Lutheranism*, now that those who were considered its principal and only supporters have altogether come over to our side."⁴⁷)

The progress of Cranmer's departure from the Lutheran doctrine of the Real Presence accordingly may thus be described: Until the middle of 1548 he seems to have subscribed to Luther's view whole-heartedly,⁴⁸) and with a view to propagating this position he undertook the translation of the Nuremberg *Kinderpredigten*. Under the influence of his Protestant-minded associates, he was prepared to make certain concessions in terminology and presentation which would neither deny the Lutheran view nor altogether preclude an interpretation along Protestant lines. By the beginning of October — by which time the Prayer Book in its essentials had been completed — he was in violent conflict with himself on the moot point,

45) *Ibid.*, p. 174 f.

46) Quoted in Jacobs, p. 217. On March 2, 1549, John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger, and speaking of the debate, he affirms that Cranmer had, "contrary to general expectations," spoken on the subject clearly and correctly.

47) Quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, pp. 175. 176; Perry, p. 155.

48) That he was exposed to at least a literary Lutheran influence in 1548 is evidenced by a statement of Archbishop Laurence (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 16, note) that the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, has a copy of volumes I and II of Luther's collected works containing Cranmer's signature and a note indicating that these were given to the Archbishop in 1548 by Justus Jonas, Jr., a competent controversialist despite the fact that he attained his majority only that year (Gasquet and Bishop, p. 229).

and by the middle of December he had been converted to the Helvetian position so completely that he was prepared to defend it in open debate.

Cranmer's contemporaries are agreed that for this right-about turn his friends are to be thanked, and especially Latimer, Ridley, Peter Martyr, and John à Lasco. Latimer's own "conversion" is to be placed somewhere around 1547, as his testimony at Oxford in 1554 discloses, when he affirmed that he had rejected the Real Presence "past seven years" before.⁴⁹⁾ Of Ridley, whose Virtualist views were more "guardedly expressed," Heylyn says: "Being well studied in the Fathers, it was no hard matter for him to observe that as the Church of Rome had erred in the point of the Sacrament, so as well the Lutheran as the Zwinglian Churches had run themselves into some error by opposing the Papists: the one being forced upon the figment of consubstantiation; the other, to fly to signs and figures, as if there had been nothing else in the Eucharist. Which being observed, he thought it most agreeable to the rules of piety to frame his judgment to the dictates of the ancient Fathers, and so to hold a Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Sacrament, as to exclude that corporal eating and drinking of the same which made the Christian Faith a scorn both to the Turks and Moors. . . . He maintained it constantly in his sermons also, that 'in the Sacrament were truly and verily the body and blood of Christ, made forth effectually by grace and spirit.' And being so persuaded in his own mind, he prevailed by discourse and argument with Archbishop Cranmer as to bring him also to the same."⁵⁰⁾ Of Peter Martyr's views we have already spoken, but they acquire peculiar importance for the present point in view of a tract discovered by Gasquet and Bishop in the Royal Collection of MSS. in the British Museum. It is labeled *Of the Sacrament of Thanksgiving: A Short Treatise of Peter Martyr's Making*. The translation is dedicated to the Lord Protector in a letter dated from Westminster December 1 (1548). It teaches a forthright Receptionism: 1) "Christ is in the Holy Supper to them that do come to His table and He doth verily feed the faithful with His Body and Blood." 2) "As often as the one (*i. e.*, the bread and wine) is faithfully received, the other (*i. e.*, the Body and Blood of Our Lord) also is." 3) "The Presence of Christ doth belong more nighly and properly to the receiver than to the tokens," that is, "of those receivers that do rightly and faithfully come to

49) Foxe, VI, 505, cited in Perry, p. 156. For Latimer's opinion of Luther the following significant excerpt from the same passage is illuminating: Weston accuses him, "You were once a Lutheran." Latimer retorts, "No, I was a Papist: for I never could perceive how Luther could defend his opinion without transubstantiation!"

50) *Ecclesia Restaurata* I, p. 110. Heylyn errs in the last statement; Cranmer went beyond Virtualism.

the Communion." 4) "The Presence of Christ is not at any time, but in the use of the Supper." 5) The good receive "the body and blood," the wicked receive "nothing but the tokens of bread and wine."⁵¹⁾ It is not inconceivable that Cranmer was strongly influenced by this tract in preparing for the December disputation in Parliament.

Possibly more than any other of the four, however, John à Lasco exercised a decisive influence on Cranmer's "ductile mind." He arrived in England on the Archbishop's invitation in September, 1548, and for six months he lived in Cranmer's own house. A zealous defender of the Helvetian position on the Sacrament, he occupied the same ground as Bullinger and Peter Martyr. In his *De Sacramentis Ecclesiae*, dedicated to Edward VI, he describes both circumcision and the Passover as Sacraments, and regards Sacraments as signs of a grace previously bestowed upon the elect. "In cultus a Zwinglian," as Goebel describes him, he supported Hooper in his opposition to kneeling at Communion and clerical vestments, in the latter matter even going so far as to solicit — vainly — Martin Bucer to join him in his fulminations. His influence on Cranmer exceeded Bullinger's fondest hopes, and John ab Ulmis credits him — as we have seen — with rousing Cranmer from his "dangerous [Lutheran] lethargy."⁵²⁾

With Cranmer's acceptance of the Helvetian doctrine, the sun of Lutheranism went into permanent eclipse in England. The change came too late seriously to affect the First Book of Common Prayer, — except perhaps to add slightly to the indecisiveness of its compromising phraseology, — and it was not until 1552 and the Second Prayer Book that the official *rituale* of the English Church began to speak in an unmistakable Swiss theological dialect.

The Protestant imprint has remained. In the words of the Very Rev. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, Dean of Westminster, "it was its persistent adherence to the Swiss doctrine on the whole which made the Anglican Church, in spite of its episcopal government and liturgical worship, to be classed not amongst the Lutheran, but amongst the Reformed churches."⁵³⁾

Chisholm, Minn.

ARTHUR CARL PIEPKORN.

51) Gasquet and Bishop, pp. 158. 159.

52) It must be clear from the preceding paragraphs how inappropriate and false to Lutheran traditions it is to include Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley in our martyrologies. Martyrs they were, but they died for Calvinism, not for Lutheranism. It is curious that Lutheran tourists to England should feel impelled figuratively to take off their shoes before the Gatehouse of St. Bartholomew's-the-Great in Smithfield, London; lay votive wreaths upon the tomb of Cranmer in Oxford; and harangue the puzzled loiterers and passers-by in St. Giles' Street on the virtues of the archiepiscopal turncoat.

53) *Christian Institutions* (New York, 1881), p. 108.