

A HISTORY

OF THE

ARTICLES OF RELIGION:

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A SERIES OF DOCUMENTS,

FROM A.D. 1536 TO A.D. 1615;

TOGETHER WITH

ILLUSTRATIONS FROM CONTEMPORARY SOURCES.

BY

CHARLES HARDWICK, M. A.

FELLOW OF ST. CATHARINE'S HALL, CAMBRIDGE, AND WHITEHALL PREACHER.

PHILADELPHIA:

HERMAN HOOKER, S. W. CORNER CHESNUT AND EIGHTH STREETS.

1852.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following Chapters were drawn up with the idea of contributing, in some measure, to the satisfaction of a want which is felt more especially by Students in the Universities and elsewhere, who are reading for Holy Orders.

Notwithstanding the multitude of authors who continue to enrich our stock of literature by expositions of the *doctrine* of the Articles, there has been no regular attempt to illustrate the framing of the Formulary itself, either by viewing it in connexion with the kindred publications of an earlier and a later date, or still more in its relation to the period out of which it originally grew.

Very much of the material which is wanted has been doubtless gathered to our hands in the course of historical inquiries respecting the rise and progress of the English Reformation: yet as there must always be a large class of readers, anxious to be accurately informed,

but precluded from consulting the voluminous collectors, such as Strype, Le Plat, or Wilkins, it has been thought that a hand-book like the present, if compiled in a fair and discriminating spirit, cannot fail to be as generally useful to the Church as some of the similar attempts to elucidate the Book of Common Prayer

St. CATHARINE'S HALL, CAMBRIDGE,
March 19, 1851.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE REFORMATION.

	PAGE
GENERAL CRY FOR REFORMATION IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY	15
Council of Pisa (1409) a "reforming" Council	17
Memorial of Richard Ulverston	17 (<i>note</i>)
Council of Constance (1414—1418) "reforming"	18
Hottric Abendon's Sermon	18
"Reformation-College" (1415).	18
Anxiety of the English for Reformation (1425)	18 (<i>and note</i>)
Council of Basle (1431) "reforming"	19
Letter of Pisan prelates (1511)	20 (<i>note</i>)
Final outbreak of the Reformation	20
Reforming character of Adrian VI.	21
<i>Centum Gravamina</i> (1522)	21
Reforming committee of Cardinals (1538)	22
Fatal effects of the prejudice against Luther	22 (<i>note</i>)
Bellarmine on the corruption of the Church	22
De Mézeray	23
Bossuet	23
Frederic von Schlegel	23
Möhler	23
REGULARITY OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION	24
Principle on which it proceeded	24
Antiquity and catholicity of the principle	24
Papal supremacy—its growth, excess, and synodical abolition	25—28
Reasons for resisting it, from contemporary sources	28—30
Restorative aim of the Reformers	30
(1) English	30 (<i>note</i>)
(2) Lutheran	30, 31

CHAPTER II.

THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

	PAGE
Its intimate connexion with England	32
Condition of the German Reformers in 1530	32, 33
Divergence of the Lutheran and Zwinglian tenets	33 (<i>and note</i>)
Elements of the Augsburg Confession	33
<i>Schwabach Articles</i> , 1529	34
Augsburg Confession strictly <i>Lutheran</i>	34
Mode of its composition	34
Presented to the Emperor (June 23, 1530)	35
Analysis of its contents	36—41
Desire of the Reformers to mediate	42 (<i>and note</i>)
<i>Confutation of the Augsburg Confession</i> (1530)	42
Its nature and contents	43, 44
Fresh attempt to mediate	44
Final breach with the Lutherans	45
Subsequent hope of reunion at Ratisbon	46 (<i>and note</i>)
How frustrated	46

CHAPTER III.

THE ENGLISH ARTICLES OF 1536.

Two great parties in the Church of England	47
"Old and new learning"	47 (<i>note</i>)
Gardiner and Cranmer	47
Revolutionary faction	48
General disquiet of the Church	49
Origin of the <i>Ten Articles</i> (1536)	49
Remonstrance of the Lower House of Convocation	51
False opinions then current	51 (<i>note</i>)
Germs of truth among them	51 (<i>note</i>)
Proceedings of the Upper House of Convocation	51
The royal message, conveyed by Cromwell	52
Disputes on the state of the Church	52, 53
Ten Articles, the result of a compromise	53 (<i>and note</i>)
Variations in the Title	53
By whom composed	53, 54

	PAGE
Two Lists of subscriptions	56
Transitional character of these Articles	56
Analysis of their contents	57—62
How far they were accepted	62
Disaffection in the North of England	63
Publication of the Articles followed by revolt	64
How superseded	64
<i>Institution of a Christian Man and Necessary Doctrine</i>	65 (<i>notes</i>)

CHAPTER IV.

THE THIRTEEN ARTICLES; CONFERENCES WITH THE LUTHERANS.

General sympathy between English and German Reformers	66
Actual negotiations (1535)	67
Frustrated or deferred by Gardiner	68
Private Conferences at Wittenberg	68
<i>Articles</i> drawn up	69 (<i>and note</i>)
Negotiation resumed	69
Lutheran Legation to England	70
Its proceedings	71
When and why it failed	71, 72
<i>Six Articles</i> (1539)	72 (<i>and note</i>)
Result of the Conference with the Lutherans extant	74
Importance of the XIII. <i>Articles</i>	75
Connexion with other <i>Articles</i> exhibited	75, 76
(?) <i>Articles</i> drawn up in 1540	77, 78

CHAPTER V.

THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES OF 1552.

Accession of Edward VI. (1547)	79
Influence and character of Cranmer	79
His opinions, with one exception, <i>Lutheran</i>	80
His present doctrine of the Eucharist	80 (<i>note</i>)
His reverence for antiquity	81, 82
Plan of a <i>General Reformed Confession</i>	82
How frustrated	83

	PAGE
First sketch of the <i>Forty-two Articles</i> (1551)	84
Sent to the bishops	84
Revised by Cranmer	84
Submitted to Cheke, Cecil, and six royal chaplains	84
Returned to the Council, Nov. 24, 1552	85
Mandate for subscription, June 19, 1553	85
Publication of the <i>Articles</i>	86
Separately and in company of the <i>Catechismus Brevis</i>	86
Traces of the <i>Articles</i> during their formation	86, 87
Records of Hooper's Visitations, 1551 and 1552	87
Controversy with Joliffe and Johnson	88
Nature of his "Articles"	88
Their resemblance to the <i>Articles</i> of 1552	89
Their number	90
Why so few were answered by Joliffe	90
Against whom were the <i>Articles</i> directed	91
Internal evidence	92, 93
The <i>Reformatio Legum</i> : its value as a commentary	91 (note)
Sittings of the <i>Council of Trent</i>	92 (note)
Evidence from the history of the times	93
Rise of the "Anabaptists"	94, 95
Their numerous heresies	95, 96
Progress in England	96, 97
Royal commission against them, 1548	97
Growth of Arianism in England	97
Royal commission against a new sect (Family of Love?)	99
Domestic controversies	100
Distinct aim of the several <i>Articles</i>	100—107
Did the <i>Articles</i> of 1552 ever pass the Convocation?	108
Objections and answers	108—110
Positive proof of their synodical authority	111, 112
Summary of the steps taken for this purpose	113, 114
Effects of the death of Edward	115
Gardiner's series of XV. <i>Articles</i> (1555)	115
Four <i>Articles</i> compiled by Convocation (1558)	115

CHAPTER VI.

THE ELIZABETHAN ARTICLES.

	PAGE
Accession of Elizabeth, and her early measures	116
Conservative character of Parker	116, 117
Suspension of the Edwardine <i>Articles</i> for some years	118, 119
The <i>Eleren Articles</i> compiled	119
Analysis of their contents	120, 121
<i>Articles of the Principal Heads of Religion</i>	120 (note)
Eleven <i>Articles</i> enjoined in Ireland	121
How superseded in England	122
Rapid return to the reformed doctrines	122
<i>Forty-Two Articles</i> revised	123
Corrected by Archbishop Parker	123
Many of the corrections from the Wirtemberg Confession	124, 125
Four new <i>Articles</i>	125
Other Additions	126
Substitutions	127
Omissions	128
Meeting of Convocation 1562	128
Deliberation of the Bishops	129
Have we an authentic record of their labours	130
The Parker MS.	131
Three more <i>Articles</i> erased in Convocation	132
Clause dropped in Article III. and reason	132 (and note)
The Art. respecting the Lord's Supper, and reason	133 (and note)
Remaining alterations of the Upper House	133, 134
<i>Articles</i> sent to the Lower House, and subscribed	134, 135
Approved by the Queen and printed in Latin	137
Contents of this copy	137
Evidence respecting the disputed clause in Art. XX.	138—140
Proceedings in connexion with the <i>Articles</i> in 1566	140
Plan for legalising subscription	141
Opposed by the Queen, but finally carried	141, 142
Puritanical Attempt to establish a <i>New Confession</i>	143
Light thrown by it on the Stat. 13 Eliz. c. 12	145

	PAGE
Proceedings in connexion with the Articles in the Convocation of 1571	146
Were the Articles, now revised by the prelates, submitted to the Lower House?	146, 147
No allusion made to the Stat. 13 Eliz. c. 12	147
Nature of the alterations in 1571	147, 148
Are the <i>Latin</i> and <i>English</i> Articles equally authoritative?	149
The Articles not a <i>solitary</i> standard of doctrine	150, 151

CHAPTER VII.

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

Repute of St. Augustine among the Reformers	152
Influence of Calvin, and his school	153
His system divergent from that of St. Augustine	154
Embraced by many of the Marian exiles	155
But not engrafted on the Anglican Formularies	156
Increase of 'Calvinism' in the reign of Elizabeth	156
Origin of the <i>Lambeth Articles</i>	157
The Calvinistic contest at Cambridge	157
Professor Baro's teaching	158
Proceedings against William Barrett	160
Appeal to the Primate	160
Whitgift at first somewhat favourable to Barrett	160
Influence of Dr. Whitaker	161
Controversy renewed	161
The Primate endeavours to mediate	162
Calvinistic Conference in London, Nov. 1595	163
First draught of the <i>Lambeth Articles</i>	164
Conduct of Whitgift in assenting to them	164
Changes introduced into the original draught	165
The Articles destitute of all ecclesiastical authority	167
Their immediate suppression	167
Reaction from 'Calvinism'	168

CHAPTER VIII.

THE IRISH ARTICLES OF 1615.

Irish Reformation like the English	169
<i>Brief Declaration</i> of 1566	169

	PAGE
Were the <i>English</i> Articles of 1562 authorized in Ireland?	170
Causes leading to the formation of a new series	170
Influence of Ussher	170
Said to have made the first draught of the <i>Irish Articles</i>	171
Summary of their contents	171
Their general character	172
Amount of their authority before 1635	174
Were the Bishops empowered to demand subscription?	174
Proceeding of Convocation, 1635	174
<i>English</i> Articles synodically accepted	175
<i>Irish</i> Articles virtually withdrawn	176, 177

CHAPTER IX.

SYNOD OF DORT, AND THE ROYAL DECLARATION.

State of the Quinquarticular controversy	178
Rise of 'Arminianism' (1604)	180, 181
The <i>Remonstrance</i> (1610)	181
Meeting of the synod of Dort (1618)	181
Patronised by James I.	182
His deputation of Divines	182
Their character and instructions	183, 184
Proceedings of the Synod	184
Expulsion of the Arminians	185
Moderation of the English delegates	185
Their parting advice	186
Fresh outbreak of disputes in England on the <i>Five Points</i>	187
Attempt of the King (James) to repress them	188
Similar attempts of Charles	188
<i>Proclamation</i> of 1626	189
<i>His Majesty's Declaration</i> prefixed to the Articles (1628)	190
Its general nature	190
Effects of its circulation	191
Vow of the House of Commons	192
Bearing of this agitation on the true character of the Articles	192

CHAPTER X.

OBJECTIONS TO THE ARTICLES AT DIFFERENT PERIODS.

	PAGE
Earliest example (1562)	193 (<i>and note</i>)
<i>Admonitions to the Parliament</i> (1572)	193
Puritans opposed to the general <i>doctrine</i> of the Church	194
And in some measure to the Articles	194
Bolder denunciation of the Articles (1587)	195, 196
Dissatisfaction betrayed by the Lambeth and Irish Articles	196
Attempt to annex the Lambeth Articles (1604)	197
Objection of the Puritans to Art. XVI.	197
. to Art. XXIII.	198
. to Art. XXV.	198
Proposed addition to Art. XXXVII.	198
Revision of the Articles by the <i>Assembly of Divines</i> (1643)	199
Nature of the changes	200—202
Further agitation against the Articles, 1660	202
. 1689, and subsequently	203
How affected by the <i>Act of Toleration</i>	204

CHAPTER XI.

HISTORICAL NOTICES OF SUBSCRIPTION TO THE ARTICLES.

Purport of subscription	205
Mode of interpreting the Articles	206
Five canons proposed	206, 207
Subscription first publicly enjoined, June 19, 1553	207
Intermitted as a general rule from 1559 to 1571	208
Enjoined afresh by Stat. 13 Eliz. c. 12	208
Was any limitation granted as to the number of the Articles?	208
Evidence, affirmative and negative	208—210
Proceedings of Convocation on the same subject	211
Resistance of the Non-Conformists	211
Laxity of other prelates repaired by Whitgift	212
Fresh laxity and complaints of Bancroft	213
Subscription ordered by the Canons of 1604	214
Extended to the Universities	215
Revived at the Restoration	215

Subsequent efforts to remove it	216
Agitation headed by Blackburne (1771)	217
Repelled in the House of Commons	218
Present state of the question	218

APPENDIX I.

Ten Articles of 1536	221
--------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX II.

Thirteen Articles of 1538	237
-------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX III.

Articles of Edward VI. and Elizabeth (1552—1571)	251
--	-----

APPENDIX IV.

Eleven Articles of 1559	311
-----------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX V.

Lambeth Articles of 1595	317
------------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX VI.

Irish Articles of 1615	325
----------------------------------	-----

CONTEMPORARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES	343
--	-----

HISTORY

OF THE

ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

CHAPTER I.

THE REFORMATION.

THE ARTICLES OF RELIGION were compiled under the pressure of those memorable circumstances, in which the Church of England found herself at the time of the Reformation.

Their design will, accordingly, be understood in proportion to the clearness of our view respecting the character of the event which brought them into being.

The present is not indeed the place for enlarging upon the details of a question so vast, momentous, and complicated; but no history of the Articles can be regarded as complete, which does not at least enable the reader to occupy the position of the compilers, and from thence to estimate the claim, which has been subsequently exercised by the Church, in requiring the adherence of the clergy to a formulary of that nature.

For this end it will be desirable to establish the two following propositions:

- (1) The universal prevalence of abuses anterior to the Reformation.
- (2) The regularity of the means adopted by the English Church in their correction or abatement.

SECT. 1. *The general cry for Reformation.*

The early part of the *fifteenth* century was already marked by the struggles of the Church after a revival of religion, and by the gradual concentration of this movement against the corruptions of the Roman court. As an older and purer literature was rapidly diffused on all sides by the agency of the press, it enabled the earnest and critical scholar to detect the spuriousness of a multitude of documents, which had been long respected by the Church as the principal ground of the papal pretensions: ' while a comparison of the actual Christianity with the New Testament and the Primitive Fathers was gradually convincing him of the errors which had been superinduced upon the Gospel, and of the rank and deadly weeds which had mingled with its growth, during the torpor of the Middle Ages.

Causes of a secondary kind were doubtless conspiring, under the guidance of God, to extend this healthy fermentation. The cupidity of laymen was excited by the large possessions of the Church, or rather of the monastic orders: the spread of intelligence among the middle classes increased their impatience of a rule which had too often degenerated into harshness and oppression: and the statesman in particular, galled by the preponderance of the spirituality and their exemptions from his intermeddling or control, was bent upon evoking the secular principle to help in regaining his dominion over the entire body of the people.

When we realize the existence and the strength of these feelings, our surprise must be, that reformation had been so long thwarted and delayed, or that when it actually commenced its sanitary progress, so few of its sanguine promoters were driven by the violence of reaction into extremes upon the other side.

There is no greater mistake than to suppose that the reforming spirit was confined, in the fifteenth century, to a single spot or

¹ *e. g.* The fabrication, entitled the "Gift of Constantine," exposed by Laurentius Valla. The same searching criticism has subsequently removed the strongest remaining proof of the extreme papal claims, viz., the Spurious Decretals. They were boldly assailed by the Magdeburg Centuriators, and have since been abandoned by the most respectable writers belonging to the Roman Communion.

nation, to a few enthusiastic individuals, or to a capricious and indiscriminating class. The highest authorities in Church and State¹ were then equally forward in aiding its propagation, and in deploring the virulence of the disease by which Western Christendom was afflicted.

These questions had been in some measure forced upon their notice by bold and desultory movements in Bohemia² and elsewhere; but principles far more certain of success, because less tainted by revolutionary elements, were equally at work in the great mass of society, paving the way to a gradual restoration of discipline and of morals, to a reorganization of the ecclesiastical system fast dying and decomposing, and ultimately to the recovery of the Primitive Faith, which is embodied in our English Service-Books and the Articles of Religion.

But this general cry for reformation will be most clearly illustrated by a few striking examples from the public documents of the age.

Let us first turn to the council of Pisa, assembled on the 25th of March, 1409, and universally allowed to be one of the most numerous and august of the later ecclesiastical synods. It was convoked, on account of the papal schism, by twenty-two cardinals, who were induced to pledge themselves that whoever was elected pope, the council should not be dissolved until it had commenced a purification of the Church, "both in head and members."³ Their choice fell unanimously upon Peter of Candia (Alexander V.), and one of the first promises which he made after his election, betokened the willingness of the pontiff "to forward the work of Reformation."⁴

¹ Even the Spanish cardinal Ximenes, was affected by this movement. For an account of his ecclesiastical reforms, see Prescott's *Hist. of Ferdinand and Isabella*, II. 481, seqq. ed. 1838.

² In the 14th century, before the time of Hus, Matthias von Janow, confessor to the emperor, Charles IV., had pressed the importance of commencing a reformation. Guericke, *Kirchen-geschichte*, I. 774, Halle, 1843.

³ Schröckh, *Kirchen-geschichte*, xxxi. 364, 365, Leipzig, 1800.

⁴ Lenfant, *Histoire du Concile de Pise*, I. 290, Amst. 1724. See also a very important paper drawn up by our countryman, Richard Ulverston (or Ullerstone,) as a memorial for the Bishop of Salisbury at the same council of Pisa. Von der Hardt, *Concil. Constant. I.* 1126, seqq.

Other subjects, however, intervened during the sessions of the council; and when several of the prelates had departed, it was judged expedient to proceed no further in the correction of abuses, till the assembling of a future synod.

The Reformers experienced a similar disappointment, when the next opportunity was offered at Constance (Nov. 5, 1414): for although one of the objects of that council was the "Reformation of the Church,"¹ the chief care of the prelates was directed to the healing of the papal schism. Von der Hardt has collected all the sermons delivered on the occasion (during the years 1414—1418); and it is interesting to observe that among others who dwelt upon the urgent necessity of reform, was an Oxford-man, Hottrich Abendon.² The most cursory perusal of these sermons will demonstrate the general corruption of the Church, and also the very ardent desire which was then manifested in all quarters for an immediate and effectual remedy. At the same synod, Gerson, the Chancellor of the University of Paris, exhibited a long catalogue of abuses:³ and while it must be confessed that few of them proceed further than temporal and disciplinary matters,⁴ there can be little doubt that the sifting of these would have brought into greater prominence a variety of questions "de Fide," with which they are closely intertwined.⁵

It is also remarkable that during the council of Constance (June 15, 1415), a committee was formed under the title of the "Reformation-College,"⁶ including among its members three cardinals and deputies from each "nation," together with divines and civilians.

¹ Lenfant, Hist. du Concile de Constance, i. 46, 373, Amsterdam, 1727.

² His sermon was preached Oct. 29, 1415. For an account of it, see Lenfant, Liv. iv. s. xxxvi.

³ In Bp. Jewell's *Epistola de Concilio Tridentino* (Works viii. 86, ed. Jelf) the number is stated at *seventy-five*.

⁴ Lenfant, ii. 136.

⁵ That such a connexion was felt by many writers of the period, is proved by Schröckh, *Kircheng. seit der Reform.* i. 100, 101. "Ther are olde wrytynge of certayne lerned men, that haue flouryshed in other nacions which dyd lament the calamities of the churche, and touched the selfe same errours which our men do reprove." The causes why the Germanes wyll not go nor consente vnto the council of Mantua; Sowthwarke, 1537, printed by James Nicolson. Cf. Bp. Taylor's *Dissuasive Works*, vi. 225, ed. Eden.

⁶ For a list of their resolutions, see Lenfant, ii. 309, seqq.

The plan of a general reformation of the Church suggested at this period, was again agitated on all sides before the assembling of the council of Basle. An instructive proof of the anxiety with which men were looking forward to the redress of their grievances, may be seen in the *Propositiones super acceleratione Generalis Concilii pro reformatione Ecclesie*,¹ addressed in the name of our own king (Henry VI.) to pope Martin V. (Nov. 27, 1425). The tone of these papers is dutiful throughout, and were other evidence wanting, they alone would abundantly prove, that even among those who were most devoted to the support of the papal chair, a feeling had been gradually awakened of the absolute need of amelioration, if the Church was to retain her hold upon the heart and intellect of Europe.

On the 23rd of July, 1431, the council of Basle was opened: yet here also attention was diverted from the subject of reformation by the angry and protracted disputes respecting the subordination of the pope to the authority of an œcumenical synod. Doubtless this quarrel tended indirectly to strengthen the cause of the Reformers, by lowering the pretensions of the papacy; and when the council at length ventured to pronounce the deprivation of the Roman pontiff, in language no less measured than the fulminations of Luther,² an earnest was given of the boldness and decision which found utterance a century later in the decree of the English Convocation.

During the interval which elapsed from the council of Basle, little or nothing was effected in the removal of corruptions; and we might have thought that the reforming principle had been suppressed, or had sunk down into lethargic despair, were there

¹ Brown's *Fasciculus*, Præf. pp. x—xxi. The following is a specimen: "Profecto, beatissimo pater, ni fallitur ipso rex, ni falluntur cum, ipso viri doctissimi multumque per V. Sanctit. devotissimi, hac misericordia nullum V. S. offerre potest Deo sacrificium acceptabilius, nullam populo Christiano vobis commisso gratiam conferre potestis ampliorem: sed et nulla laus durabilior, nullumque magis pœrenne decus vestris operibus virtuosis potest retribuui, quam si diebus vestris sanctam hanc Ecclesie Dei reformationem, concilio Constantiensi solenniter promissam, concorditerque per omnes nationes, in concilio ad Christum (sic) tunc quinquennium celebrando, necessario fieri debere conclusam, adimplere merueritis in populo Dei." p. xiv.

² See Schröckh, xxxii. 78—85.

not some evidence surviving to assure us of the prolongation of the struggle.¹

On the rising of the council of Lateran, however, in 1517, the unlimited dominion of the papacy was synodically re-established; and hardly one sign appeared on the surface of the Church to indicate the deep and violent convulsion, which, before the close of the reign of Leo, was to rend Christendom to its centre. The Hussites had dwindled into obscurity; the Lollards and other kindred sects had ceased to provoke the sword of persecution; France also, at one time a formidable malcontent, was on the point of composing her quarrel with the pope, by the abrogation of the "Pragmatic Sanction;" and if any apprehension was felt by the earnest churchman of the day, it must have arisen from the paganising tendency of religion, and the frequent association of the Greek philosophers with our Lord and His Apostles.

But this lull in the cry for Reformation was at length followed by the storm: men woke still more consciously to the perception of their bondage and the magnitude of the evils by which they were encompassed; and refusing all the opiates administered by fear, would not rest² till they had vigorously attempted the purification of the Church.

In this case, as before, the agitation was aroused by the prevailing disciplinary abuses, and continued for a while to attract the co-operation even of the Roman pontiffs. Adrian VI. (the successor of Leo) did not hesitate to declare by his nuncio Chie-

¹ *e. g.* The Pisan prelates addressed a letter to the emperor Maximilian (Nov. 12, 1511) of which the following is a portion: "Assurge, igitur, Cæsar Optime, adesto, vigila, labitur Ecclesia, opprimuntur boni, impii efferuntur, mergitur justitia, colitur impietas, surgunt in sinumque recipiuntur infideles; qui vero pro Ecclesia consilium capiunt, illique opem et auxilium ferunt, quasi hostes ejiciuntur, opprimuntur, obruuntur. Age, Cæsar Maxime, majestatem tuam appellat ipsa cujus advocatam et protectorem te fecit Omnipotens, Ecclesia, videlicet Romana ac universalis. Tuum magna miserabilique voce auxilium rogitat." Apud Richer. *Histor. Concil. Lib. iv. Part. i. 121, 122. Colon. 1681.*

² "When I see His vineyard overgrown with thorns, brambles, and weeds, I know that everlasting woe appertaineth to me, if I hold my peace and put not my hands and tongue to labour in purging His vineyard." Archbishop Cranmer, Preface to the "Book on the Sacrament."

regati,¹ at the imperial diet at Nuremberg (1522), "We know that, for a long time there have existed many abominations in this holy see, abuses of spiritual things, excesses in the exercise of jurisdiction: all things, in short, have been changed and perverted. Nor need we wonder that corruption has descended from the head to the members, from the supreme pontiff to the inferior prelates. We have all, that is, prelates and ecclesiastics, turned aside each one to his own way: for none of us have done well, no, not one."

On the same occasion the German princes drew up the memorable document, entitled "Centum Gravamina adversus sedem Romanam, totumque ecclesiasticum ordinem,"² than which no stronger evidence can be quoted of the enormities then prevalent in the administration of the Church, and of the fearless manner in which they were assailed by the temporal authorities of the age. At Rome these complaints were naturally construed into a latent sympathy with the school of Luther, to which the pope, as a Dominican divine, was peculiarly opposed; and on that account, among other causes, they were either ill-received or wholly disregarded when at length submitted to his notice. The reforming pontiff himself expired in the course of the following year, and with him all reasonable hope that a satisfactory system of reformation would proceed from the court of Rome.

Yet even there evidence continued to exist of the urgent necessity of change. Long after the Lutheran theology had struck its roots in the heart of Germany, and had thus prejudiced the minds of many against *all* salutary measures,³ a "select committee of

¹ Instructions to Francisco Chieregati, apud Rainald. *Annal. Eccl. Tom. xx. ad an. 1522, n. 66.*

² See them at length in Brown's *Fasciculus*, i. 354, seqq., and an abstract in Herbert's "Henry VIII.," 125, seq.

³ The effect of this feeling was manifest at the council of Trent, where Cardinal Pole in vain warned the assembly not to reject an opinion *solely because it was held by Luther*. Ranke, *Hist. of Popes*, i. 204, 209 (note;) Engl. Transl. 1841. The same fatal prejudice prevented the success of the plan alluded to in the text. When it was discussed in a full consistory, the following opinions of Cardinal Schomberg prevailed: "Il ajouta que par-là l'on donneroit lieu aux Luthériens de se vanter d'avoir forcé le Pape à cette réforme; il insista beaucoup à faire voir que ce seroit un pas non seulement pour retrancher les abus, mais aussi pour abolir les bons usages, et pour

cardinals and other prelates" was appointed in 1538, by pope Paul III. to consider what could possibly be done "de emendanda Ecclesia."¹ Among the signatures appended to the report are the names of Gaspar Contarini, and our own Reginald Pole. "It is the will of God," was their unhesitating language, "to rescue the tottering and all but subverted Church by your instrumentality, to lend a succouring hand to her ruin, to raise her to the eminence of old, and to retrieve her ancient honour. We have the best reason for this inference respecting the Divine will, since your holiness has instructed us, that, without reference to your own advantage or the advantage of any other, we should point out to you the abuses, yea, rather diseases, by which for a long time the Church of God, and especially this Roman court, have been most grievously afflicted: from which also it has resulted, that as the pestiferous disease became gradually inveterate they have been almost involved in a general ruin."

The evidence supplied by the above extracts might seem enough to demonstrate the prevalence of corruption in the times preceding the Reformation: but since it is not unusual in our day to extol the perfections of the mediæval system, and to decry the movement of the sixteenth century as an outbreak of individual fanaticism, a few passages may be profitably subjoined from distinguished historians and polemics of the later Roman communion.

Let us hear the avowal of the learned cardinal Bellarmine:² "Some years before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy, according to the testimony of those who were then alive, there was almost an entire abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical

exposer à un plus grand danger toutes les choses de la religion: parce que la réformation que l'on feroit, étant une espèce d'aveu que les Luthériens avoient eu raison de reprendre les abus auxquels il avoit fallu remédier, serviroit à fomentier tout le reste de leur doctrine." Sarpi, *Hist. du Concile de Trente*, i. 151; ed. Courayer.

¹ *Consilium Delectorum Cardinalium et aliorum Prælatorum de emendanda Ecclesia*, in *Le Plat, Monumenta Concil. Trident. ii. 598*, Lovan. 1782. One of the first abuses animadverted upon is the unfitness of the clergy, particularly the priests: "Hinc innumera scandala, hinc contemptus ordinis ecclesiastici, hinc divini cultus veneratio non tantum diminuta sed etiam prope jam extincta." It is a significant fact, that this document has been itself thrust into the "Index Expurgatorius."

² *Concio xxviii. Opp. vi. 296*; Colon. 1617.

judgments; in morals no discipline, in sacred literature no erudition, in divine things no reverence; religion was almost extinct."

In the same candid spirit is the following statement of de Mézeray, the historiographer of France: "As the heads of the Church paid no regard to the maintenance of discipline, the vices and excesses of the ecclesiastics grew up to the highest pitch, and were so public and universally exposed as to excite against them the hatred and contempt of the people. We cannot repeat without a blush the usury, the avarice, the gluttony, the universal dissoluteness of the priests of this period, the licence and debauchery of the monks, the pride and extravagance of the prelates, and the shameful indolence, ignorance and superstition pervading the whole body. . . . These were not, I confess, new scandals: I should rather say that the barbarism and ignorance of preceding centuries, in some sort, concealed such vices; but, on the subsequent revival of the light of learning, the spots which I have pointed out became more manifest, and as the unlearned who were corrupt could not endure the light through the pain which it caused to their eyes, so neither did the learned spare them, turning them to ridicule and delighting to expose their turpitude and to decry their superstitions."

Bossuet³ in the opening statements of his "*Histoire des Variations*," admits the frightful corruptions of the Church for centuries before the Reformation; and he has been followed in our own times by Frederic von Schlegel⁴ and Möhler.⁴ While all of them

¹ *Abregé Chronol. viii. 691*, seqq. à Paris, 1681.

² "Qui me donnera," disoit saint Bernard, "que je voie, avant que de mourir, l'Eglise de Dieu comme elle étoit dans les premiers jours? Si ce saint homme a eu quelque chose à regretter en mourant, q'a été de n'avoir pas vu un changement si heureux. Il a gémi toute sa vie des maux de l'Eglise. . . . Les désordres s'étoient encore augmenté depuis. L'Eglise Romaine, la mère des Eglises, qui durant neuf siècles entiers, en observant la première avec une exactitude exemplaire la discipline ecclésiastique, la maintenoit de toute sa force par tout l'univers, n'étoit pas exempte de mal; et dès le temps du concile de Vienne [1311,] un grand évêque chargé par le pape de préparer les matières qui devoient y être traitées, mit pour fondement de l'ouvrage de cette sainte assemblée, qu'il falloit réformer l'Eglise dans le chef et dans les membres."

³ *Philosophy of History*, 400, 401, 410, Engl. Transl. 1847.

⁴ *Symbolik*, ii. 31, 32, Engl. Transl.

are most anxious to prove that the *Lutheran* movement was revolutionary and subversive of the ancient faith, they are constrained to admit the universality of the abuses, which, in the language of Schlegel, "lay deep, and were ulcerated in their very roots."

SECT. 2. *The regularity of the English Reformation.*

We may now, therefore, pass to the question more immediately bearing upon our own country: How did the *Church of England* reply to the general clamour of the age for the correction of the prevalent evils?

The principle upon which she proceeded may be briefly stated thus:—A national Church,¹ through the medium of its representative synod, duly convened with the royal sanction, has inherent authority from its Divine Founder to remove every species of abuse, whether of doctrine or discipline, existing within its own jurisdiction; nay, is absolutely bound by its allegiance to Christ and its regard for the people committed to its charge, to vindicate and extend the truths of the Gospel, as once for all delivered to the saints and taught in the Early Church.

Nor in asserting and acting out this principle did the Church of England exceed the power which had been claimed by domestic synods in the purest ages of the faith. They had always been considered competent to discuss the heresies, errors, and abuses which sprang up in particular Churches. "This right of provincial synods, that they might decree in causes of faith, and in cases of reformation, where corruptions had crept into the sacraments of Christ, was practised much above a thousand years ago by many, both national and provincial synods. For the council at Rome under pope Sylvester, anno 324, condemned Photinus and Sabellius; (and their heresies were of high nature against the faith). The council of Gangra about the same time [between 325 and 380] condemned Eustathius for his condemning of marriage as unlawful. The first council at Carthage, being a provincial, condemned rebaptization, much about the year 348. The provin-

¹ The phrase, "Ecclesia Anglicana," is at least as old as Magna Charta.

cial council at Aquileia, in the year 381, in which St. Ambrose was present, condemned Palladius and Secundinus, for embracing the Arian heresy. The second council of Carthage handled and decreed the belief and preaching of the Trinity; and this a little after the year 424. The council of Milevis in Africa, in which St. Augustine was present, condemned the whole course of the heresy of Pelagius, that great and bowitching heresy, in the year 416. The second council of Orange, a provincial too, handled the great controversies about grace and free-will, and set the Church right in them in the year 444. The third council of Toledo (a national one), in the year 589, determined many things against the Arian heresy, about the very prime articles of faith, under fourteen several anathemas. The fourth council of Toledo did not only handle matters of faith, for the reformation of that people but even added also some things to the Creed which were not expressly delivered in former creeds. Nay, the bishops did not only practise this to condemn heresies in national and provincial synods, and so reform these several places and the Church itself by parts, but they did openly challenge this as their right and due, and that without any leave asked of the see of Rome; for in this fourth council of Toledo they decree, "That if there happen a cause of faith to be settled, a general, that is, a national synod of all Spain and Galicia shall be held thereon;" and this in the year 643: "where you see it was then catholic doctrine in all Spain that a national synod might be a competent judge in a cause of faith. And I would fain know what article of faith doth more concern all Christians in general, than that of *Filioque*? and yet the Church of Rome herself made that addition to the Creed without a general council. . . . And if this were practised so often and in so many places, why may not a national council of the Church of England do the like?"¹

The first act, which the recovery of these principles accomplished, was the rejection of the papal supremacy. Originally independent of the Latin Church, this country had been gradually drawn into a comparative subjugation. The Roman element in our Anglo-Saxon Christianity had overpowered the influence exerted by the

¹ Archbp. Laud, against Fisher. Sect. 24, 126, 127, Oxf. 1839.

surviving British communion and the missionaries from Ireland; till at length a considerable degree of deference, and even of servility, was manifested by the king, the clergy, and the people, towards the dominant court of Rome. Anterior to the Conquest the feeling was that of gratitude and affection, such as we may now trace in the language of the American Church with regard to the Church of England: but when the papal pretensions had grown into the form which they assumed under Gregory VII. and his successors,—being developed from a primacy of order into a supremacy of power,—the tone of the English was frequently altered, and symptoms appear in their intercourse with the popes, of the warm and unflinching nationality which effected the Reformation. From the time of the dispute on the subject of investitures,—when “the king and his nobles, the bishops also, and others of inferior rank, were so indignant as to assert that rather than surrender the privileges of their forefathers, they would depart from the Roman Church”—till the final struggle in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, the encroachments of the pope had been calling forth a spirited opposition; and if we allow that his interference was in some cases salutary, and as such cordially desired by a large body of the nation, it is impossible to study the civil enactments of the period,* without perceiving the growth of that deep exasperation, which eventually repelled the papal aggressions, and secured the freedom of the Church.

These aggressions, separately attempted after the time of the Norman Conquest, and either absolutely denied or impatiently conceded, were made up of the following particulars:

- (1) A judicial power in matters ecclesiastical, or cases of appeal.
- (2) A power of granting licences and dispensations.

* Archbp. Anselm's letter to Paschal II.; in Twysden's *Vindication*, 16, new edit. The constitutions of Clarendon “were an actual subversion, as far as they went, of the papal policy and system of hierarchy introduced by Gregory VII.” Turner, *Middle Ages*, i. 246, ed. 1830; and at one time there was a general idea that Henry II. would have anticipated the resistance of his eighth namesake, 259.

* See a list of *protestant acts during the Middle Ages*, in Fullwood, *Roma Ruit*, chapters VIII.—XIII.

- (3) A liberty to send legates into England and to hold legatine courts.
- (4) A power of granting investiture of bishops, of confirming episcopal elections, and of distributing ecclesiastical patronage.
- (5) A privilege of receiving first-fruits, the tenths of English benefices, and the goods of the clergy who died in estate.

The motives of the monarch, in whose reign our country was providentially relieved from these foreign encroachments, have no necessary connexion with the English Reformation. The Church herself, duly convened and canonically represented, was the real judge of the questions at that time mooted in her communion: and, after examining them severally upon their distinctive merits, pronounced her authoritative sentence, as similar points had been uniformly decided by the Church of the earliest ages. For example, in the year 1534, after a few limiting statutes had been carried in parliament, it was solemnly proposed to the bishops and clergy, in the provincial synods of Canterbury and York, *Whether the bishop of Rome has in Holy Scripture any greater jurisdiction, within the kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop?*—and the question was answered in the negative with only four dissentient voices. In this judgment the universities, after five weeks of deliberation, also cordially acquiesced, and were followed by the cathedral chapters and the various conventual bodies; so that, excepting the single bishop of Rochester, the votes of the ecclesiastical authorities were all unanimously recorded against the pretensions of the Roman pontiff.¹

The ground, upon which this decision was rested, will be seen in the following extracts from an almost contemporary document. They prove that the English divines of the period were actuated by no spirit of revolution, but proceeded with their critical task upon the principles which they had drawn from the study of Christian antiquity.

“I believe that these particular Churches, in what place of the world soever they be congregated, be the very parts, portions or

¹ Burnet, *Hist. Reform.* III. 158, 159, Oxf. 1816; Records, No. 26, 27: Rymer's *Fœdera*, XIV. 487—527, ed. 1728; Wilkins, *Concil.* III. 771.

members of this catholic and universal Church. And that between them there is indeed no difference in superiority, pre-eminence or authority, neither that any one of them is head or sovereign over the other; but that they be all equal in power and dignity, and be all grounded and builded upon one foundation . . . And therefore I do believe that the Church of Rome is not, nor cannot worthily be called the catholic Church, but only a particular member thereof, and cannot challenge or vindicate of right, and by the Word of God, to be head of this universal Church, or to have any superiority over the other Churches of Christ which be in England, France, Spain, or in any other realm, but that they be all free from any subjection unto the said Church of Rome, or unto the minister or bishop of the same. And I believe also that the said Church of Rome, with all the other particular Churches in the world, compacted and united together, do make and constitute but one catholic Church or body . . . And therefore I protest and knowledge that in my heart I abhor and detest all heresies and schisms whereby the true interpretation and sense of Scripture is or may be perverted. And do promise, by the help of God, to endure unto my life's end in the right profession of faith and doctrine of the catholic Church."¹

If it be alleged that the rejection of the papal supremacy is here almost exclusively based upon a theory of the Church, the following passage from the same book will exhibit the historical reasons which influenced the English synod:

"As for the bishop of Rome, it was many hundred years after Christ before he could acquire or get any primacy or governance above any other bishops, out of his province in Italy. Sith the which time he hath ever usurped more and more. And though some part of his power was given unto him by the consent of the emperors, kings and princes, and by the consent also of the clergy in general² councils assembled; yet surely he attained the most part thereof by marvellous subtilty and craft, and specially by colluding with great kings and princes; sometime training them

¹ Institution of a Christian Man; A. D. 1537; "Formularies of Faith," 55—57, Oxf. 1825.

² This epithet was applied at the time of the Reformation to other synods besides those which were strictly *oecumenical*. Cf. Art. xxi.

into his devotion by pretence and colour of holiness and sanctimony, and sometimes constraining them by force and tyranny: whereby the said bishops of Rome aspired and arose at length unto such greatness in strength and authority, that they presumed and took upon them to be heads, and to put laws by their own authority, not only unto all other bishops within Christendom, but also unto the emperors, kings, and other the princes and lords of the world, and that under the pretence of the authority committed unto them by the gospel: 'wherein the said bishops of Rome do not only abuse and pervert the true sense and meaning of Christ's word, but they do also clean contrary to the use and custom of the primitive Church, and also do manifestly violate as well the holy canons made in the Church immediately after the time of the Apostles, as also the decrees and constitutions made in that behalf by the holy fathers of the Catholic Church, assembled in the first general Councils: and finally they do transgress their own profession, made in their creation. For all the bishops of Rome always, when they be consecrated and made bishops of that see, do make a solemn profession and vow, that they shall inviolably observe and keep all the ordinances made in the eight first general Councils, among the which it is specially provided and enacted, that all causes shall be finished and determined within the province where the same be begun, and that by the bishops of the same province; and that no bishop shall exercise any jurisdiction out of his own diocese or province. And divers such other canons were then made and confirmed by the said Councils, to repress and take away out of the Church all such primacy and jurisdiction over kings and bishops, as the bishops of Rome pretend now to have over the same. And we find that divers good fathers, bishops of Rome, did greatly reprove, yea and abhor, (as a thing clean contrary to the Gospel, and the decrees of the Church,) that any bishop of Rome, or elsewhere, should presume, usurp, or take upon him the title and name of 'the universal bishop,' or of 'the head of all priests,' or of 'the highest priest,' or any such like title. For confirmation whereof, it is out of all doubt, that there

¹ For this reason the point brought before Convocation in 1534 was respecting the *Scripturalness* of the papal claims.

is no mention made, neither in Scripture, neither in the writings of any authentical doctor or author of the Church, being within the time of the apostles, that Christ did ever make or institute any distinction or difference to be in the pre-eminence of power, order, or jurisdiction between the apostles themselves, or between the bishops themselves; but that they were all equal in power, order, authority and jurisdiction. And that there is now, and sith the time of the apostles any such diversity or difference among the bishops, it was devised by the ancient fathers of the primitive Church, for the conservation of good order and unity of the Catholic Church; and that either by the consent and authority, or else at the least by the permission and sufferance of the princes and civil powers for the time ruling.”¹

This subject was authoritatively resumed in the “Necessary Doctrine for any Christian Man,” A. D. 1543, and discussed in the same spirit, with the aid of still more historical precedents against the usurpations of the papacy.² The whole drift of the arguments employed convince us, that the aim of the Reformers was not to establish a new system of their own, but to re-establish one which they saw falling to decay,—not to depart from the communion of the rest of catholic Christendom, but to suppress the unlawful jurisdiction of a proud and daring pontiff,—and by following in the steps of the primitive Church, to regain for the whole of the English nation many pure and practical elements of the faith, which in the lapse of the Middle Ages had been gradually obscured, distorted, or denied by the dominant class of schoolmen.³ This point has been so frequently urged with regard to the Church of England, that the production of further evidence is altogether superfluous:⁴ but the reader will be interested to find the same

¹ Ibid. 117, 118. ² 282—286.

³ See Field, “Of the Church,” i. 165 seq., and especially Appendix to Book III., “wherein it is clearly proved that the Latine, or West Church in which the Pope tyrannized, was, and continued a true, orthodox, and protestant Church, and that the devisers and maintainers of Romish errors and superstitious abuses, were only a faction in the same, at the time when Luther not without the applause of all good men, published his propositions against the prophane abuse of papal indulgences.” II. 1—387, ed. E. H. S. 1849.

⁴ e. g. “Reformatio non aurum abstulit, sed purgavit a luto: non vel fundamenta evertit, vel parietes diruit aut tecta, sed vepres solum excidit, et

principles no less strongly affirmed in a document drawn up by the Lutheran states (March 5, 1537), and immediately translated into English: ‘For the sklauder is moost fals, (they write,) which our aduersaries do oftentymes cast forth, that errorrs sometyne condemned are scattred abrode and olde heresyces renewed of our men; and therefore they denye that ther is any nede of tryall. Nother is it onye harde thyng to refute this sklauder, our Confession’ once shewed fourth. For thys pure doctryne of the Gospel whiche we haue embraced is, wythout doute, euen the verry consente of the catholyke Church of Christ: as the testimonies of the olde Church and of holye fathers do euydentlye declare. For we do not receaue or approue any wycked opynions, or such as fyghte with the consent of the holy fathers; yee rather in many artikles we do renew the teachynges of the old synodes and fathers, which the latter age had put out of the way, and for them had geuen forth other false and conterfette doctrynes, wyth the which oure aduersaryes do shamefully fyghte wyth the judgements of the fathers and authoryte of the synodes.”⁵

finum eiecit: non carnem, ossa aut sanguinem corpori detraxit, sed saniam et humores pestiferos expulit. Aut si clarius hæc dici velis: quicquid aureum, solidum, fundamentale, quicquid catholicum et antiquum est, retinuit: en solum quæ internis sordibus vestra, lutea, morbida, et fundamento assuta, quicquid novum, hæreticum, idololatricum, aut antichristianum erat, amputavit. De substantia antiquæ et catholicæ fidei, nihil quidquam a nobis immutatum; quicquid tale est amplectimur ambabus ulnis, exosulamur, tuemur.” Crakanthorp, Defensio Eocl. Anglican. 601, ed. Oxon. 1847.

¹ The allusion is to the Augsburg Confession, where among other statements of a like character, it is declared: “Hæc fere summa est doctrinæ apud nos, in qua cerni potest, nihil inesse, quod discrepet a Scripturis, vel ab ecclesia Catholica, vel ab ecclesia Romana, quatenus ex Scriptoribus nota est (Germ. aus der Väter Schrift.)” Confessio August. Pars I. § XXII.: Libri. Symbol. Eocl. Lutheran. 25, ed. Francke, 1847.

² The Causes why the Germanes will not go, nor consente vnto that Councel, &c. (the proposed synod of Mantua) A. v. Sowthwarke, 1537. The original is printed in Le Plat, Monumenta, II. 567.

CHAPTER II.

THE CONFESSION OF AUGSBURG.

THE observations at the close of the foregoing chapter have enabled us in some measure to anticipate the design of the first Reforming Confession, compiled in the spring of 1530, and presented at the diet of Augsburg to the emperor Charles V. It was this very remarkable document which suggested the idea so generally adopted in the middle of the sixteenth century; and had no further affinity subsisted between it and the ARTICLES OF RELIGION, it would at least have demanded some cursory notice.

But there is a far more imperative reason for embracing the history of the Augsburg Confession within the scope of the present volume. It is intimately connected with the English Reformation; and in addition to the influence which it cannot fail to have exerted by its rapid circulation in this country, it contributed directly, in no inconsiderable degree, to the construction of the public Formularies of Faith approved by the Church of England. The XIII. Articles, drawn up, it would seem, in 1538, were almost entirely based upon the language of the Germanic Confession; while the same sort of respect is no less apparent in the Articles of Edward VI., and consequently in those¹ which are now binding on the whole body of the clergy.

On this account, therefore, it is necessary to understand the position of the Wittenberg Reformers in the year 1530, when they laid a formal record of their opinions before the imperial States.

Since the time of the diet of Worms in 1521, the movement, of which Luther was the ruling spirit, had become far more moderate in its tone, and far more purely theological. Its earlier vehemence had been expended in decrying the disciplinary abuses of the age, and the extravagant claims of the Roman pontiff: it had after-

wards entered into a partial union with the bolder followers of Zwingli, and was accordingly in danger of imbibing his strong political maxims, as well as some portion of his peculiar theology: but the conference at Marburg¹ in 1529 was conclusive, both to themselves and others, that the two schools of foreign reformers were essentially divergent, and that however warmly they agreed in protesting against errors maintained in the Church at large, it was impossible to bring them, either by means of persuasion or of pressure, to subscribe the same standard of faith.

Ranke supplies an epitome of the two contending factions in the masterly contrast he has drawn between the character and feelings of their leaders: "Whereas Luther wished to retain everything in the existing ecclesiastical institutions that was not at variance with the express words of Scripture, Zwingli was resolved to get rid of everything that could not be maintained by a direct appeal to Scripture. Luther took up his station on the ground already occupied by the Latin Church; his desire was only to purify, to put an end to the contradictions between the doctrines of the Church and the Gospel. Zwingli, on the other hand, thought it necessary to restore, as far as possible, the primitive and simplest condition of the Church; he aimed at a complete revolution."²

This contrast was strongly imprinted on the minds of the Wittenberg reformers, when they proceeded in March, 1530, to frame the Augsburg Confession.

The idea of such an apology was conceived by Pontanus (or Brück,) the chancellor of Saxony;³ and with the consent of his

¹ Ranke, Reformation, III, 189, seqq. Engl. Trans. 1847.

² Ibid. III, 86, 87. "The reformers [i. e. the Zwinglians, as opposed to the Lutherans] would have nothing but the simple Word. The same end was proposed in all the practices of the church. A new form of baptism was drawn up, in which all the additions 'which have no ground in God's Word' were omitted. The next step was the alteration of the mass. Luther had contented himself with the omission of the words relating to the doctrine of sacrifice, and with the introduction of the sacrament in both kinds. Zwingli established a regular love feast (Easter 1525.)" p. 88.

³ The following was the advice given by Pontanus (March 14, 1530:): "Die- weil Kais. Mt. Ausschreiben vermag, dass eins Itzlichen Opinion und Meinung, gehört soll werden [i. e. at the ensuing Diet,] will uns fur gut ansehen,

¹ The amount of this influence will be exhibited in the Appendix.

master, the elector John, the divines took as the basis of their work a series of somewhat older Articles, which had been carefully drawn up in the year preceding. This document was known by the name of the "Schwabach Articles," where it had been exhibited, Oct. 16, 1529, as the preliminary step of a contemplated alliance with the rest of the foreign reformers. It was in its turn no more than the corrected version of a test which had been also offered to the Zwinglian delegates, in the previous meeting at Marburg¹ (Oct. 3, 1529.)

The Articles are seventeen in number,² and manifest in the whole of their structure the deep and fundamental separation, which was then thought to have grown between the Lutheran body and those who persisted in their attachment to the rival school of Zwingli.

We have no reason, therefore, to anticipate that when Melancthon was deputed to remodel the "Schwabach Articles," and to introduce some additional matter respecting ecclesiastical abuses, he was acting in any way as the representative of more than his own communion; and after perusing the result of his labours as they stand in the Augsburg Confession, the inference which might have been drawn from the circumstances of the times, is entirely supported by internal testimony. That document is exclusively *Lutheran*, opposed to the Zwinglian tenets upon every controverted point, and distinguished by the same cordial respect for the authority of the past, which we trace in a greater or less degree among all the writings of Melancthon. In gentleness of tone, in gracefulness of language, and in general perspicuity and arrange-

dass solche meinung darauf unsers Theils bisanher gestanden und verharret, ordentlich in Schriften zusammen gezogen werden mit gründlicher Bewährung derselbigen ans göttlicher Schrift, damit man solchs in Schriften furzutragen hat, wo man den Ständen auch die Prediger in den Handlungen die Sachen furzutragen lassen je nit würde verstatten wollen." Fürsteman, Urkundenbuch zu d. Gesch. d. Reichstages zu Augsburg in J. 1530, i. 42 seqq. It is clear from the imperial edict, as well as from other sources, that the Augsburg Confession was *not meant to be a complete system of doctrine*, but only an apologetical statement of the Lutheran position with respect to the different subjects actually in dispute: cf. Guerike, Kiroheng. ii. 174 (note.)

¹ Ranke, Reform. iii. 197.

² See them at length in Weber, Kritische Gesch. der Augsb. Conf. i. App. 2.

ment, it is also highly characteristic of the compiler: while in substance it is careful to adhere as closely as the truth permitted to the existing standards of Western Christendom. Melancthon seems to have felt distinctly that he was treading in the steps of St. Augustine and the rest of the Early Fathers; his protests were, accordingly, confined to a number of modern innovations by which the schoolmen had been gradually corrupting the faith and discipline of the Church.

A rough draught of this venerable Confession was first made in Latin, and sent (May 11) to Luther at Coburg, with a request from the Saxon elector, that he would revise it with the greatest caution. His answer, which is dated May 15, expresses the satisfaction with which he had perused the production of his colleague. "I have read over Mr. Philip's Apology (the original name of the *Confession*;) it pleases me very much. I know not how to improve or alter anything, if that indeed would not be unbecoming, for I cannot tread so gently and softly. Christ our Lord grant that it may bring forth abundant fruit, even as we hope and pray."¹

A further revision by Melancthon and others especially by the chancellor Pontanus, was not terminated until the 31st of May,² when a copy of the Latin Articles³ was placed in the hands of the Lutheran princes then present at the diet. To the effect of the criticism which it received during this interval may be attributed some portion of the various readings which appear in the earlier editions.⁴ The work of revision was still proceeding when a message from the emperor informed the Lutherans that he would hear their Apology on the 23rd of June, and on that day a German version, also from the pen of Melancthon, was read aloud to the assembled States in the chapter-room of the episcopal palace.⁵ This copy as well as the Latin original was then delivered to the

¹ Guerike, ii. 172.

² Libri Symbolici Eccl. Lutheran. ed Francke, Lips. 1847, Prolegom. xvi. note (10.)

³ Melancthon next undertook the German version which was completed on the 14th of June. Ibid. xvii.

⁴ See Ranke, iii. 274; Guerike, ii. 176. Notwithstanding the prohibition of the emperor, the Confession passed through seven editions in the course of 1530. Francke, ubi supra, xxiv.

⁵ Ranke, iii. 277.

emperor, having previously received the signatures of the elector and the other members of the diet, who were in favour of the Lutheran cause.¹

After the above description of the circumstances which attended its origin and presentation, we may now proceed to a review of some of its principal contents. It consists of two parts, the first having reference to matters of faith, and the second to ecclesiastical or disciplinary abuses. The former are distributed into twenty-two articles, and the latter into seven.

The first article is entitled "De Deo," and in it the Lutherans express their entire acceptance of the Nicene Statements respecting the Unity of the Divine Essence, and the Trinity of Divine Persons. They also condemn all the heresies by which this doctrine had been impugned both in ancient and modern times.²

The second article treats "de peccato originis," and affirms that all men naturally sprung from Adam are born in sin, and that this original disease (*morbis seu vitium*) is sin, entailing eternal death on all who are not born again (*per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum.*) This article also condemns the Pelagians and others.³

The third article reiterates the received language of the Creeds respecting the incarnation of our Lord; His life, death, resurrection, and ascension, with all their saving fruits; adding (in the German copy of the Confession) a condemnation of all heretics who impugn these articles of the faith.

The fourth section approaches the doctrine of justification, declaring that men are not made acceptable in the sight of God by any works or merits of their own, but are justified gratuitously for the sake of Christ through faith (*propter Christum per fidem.*)

The fifth article, "de ministerio ecclesiastico," affirms that the

¹ The names stand in the following order: John, the elector of Saxony; George, the markgrave of Brandenburg; Ernest, duke of Lüneburg; Philip, landgrave of Hesse; John Frederick, electoral prince of Saxony; Francis, duke of Lüneburg; Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt; the senate and magistracy of Nuremberg; and the senate of Reutlingen.

² Some of the "neoterici" here condemned were Servetus and his party, whose opinions were then spreading in Germany. Francke, 13, note 7.

³ In the "Apologia Confessionis," 57, ed. Francke, Melancthon specifies "scholastici doctores."

Holy Ghost, who produces faith, is given by means of the Word and Sacraments (*tanquam per instrumenta.*) It also condemns the Anabaptists and others, who were circulating a different tenet.

The sixth article, "de nova obedientia," maintains that faith must result in good works (*debeat bonos fructus parere,*) but denies that we may hope by their means to deserve justification before God. It appeals, in proof of this statement, to the language of Holy Scripture, and to ancient ecclesiastical writers.

The seventh article, admitting that the church is one, holy, and perpetual, defines it as a congregation of saints (or of all the faithful,) in which the Gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments rightly administered: adding, that these two conditions are enough for the true unity of the Church.

The eighth article explains, that notwithstanding the former definition, there are hypocrites always mingling in the communion of the faithful. It affirms also, that the Word and Sacraments are efficacious, even when administered by evil men (*propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi,*) and condemns the Donatists and others¹ by whom this doctrine had been impugned.

The ninth article, 'de Baptismo,' declares that this sacrament is necessary to salvation, that the grace of God is offered by it, (*per baptismum offeratur*) and that children ought to be baptized, in order to be thereby admitted into the favour of God. It also repudiates the errors of the Anabaptists.

The tenth article, "de Coena Domini," declares that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present (*vere adsint,*)² and are distributed to the recipients. It also censures those who maintained a contradictory tenet.

The eleventh article, "de Confessione," declares that private absolution ought to be retained, but denies that the enumeration of all sins is to be regarded as essential.

The twelfth article, "de Pœnitentia," affirms the remissibility of sin committed after baptism, and defines penitence as consisting of contrition and faith together with the fruits of penitence, *viz.,*

¹ The followers of Wiclif were included; see *Apol. Confess.* 149.

² *Germ.* wahrhaftiglich unter Gestalt des Brots und Weins im Abendmahl gegenwärtig sey.

good works. It condemns the Anabaptists, who asserted that persons once justified could not lose the Holy Spirit; the Novatians, and other kindred sects; and repudiates the opinions then current respecting the merit of human satisfactions.

The thirteenth article, "de usu sacramentorum," teaches that sacraments are not only badges (*notæ*) of our Christian calling, but rather signs and testimonies of God's will towards us, ordained for the purpose of exciting and confirming faith. It also condemns those who maintained that sacraments justify "ex opere operata,"¹ and neglected to teach that faith is required to the profitable use of sacraments.

The fourteenth article, "de ordine ecclesiastico," simply states that no one ought to preach or administer sacraments who is not rightly called (*rite vocatus*.)

The fifteenth article, "de ritibus ecclesiasticis," affirms that festivals and other similar institutions, though not essential to salvation, are to be retained, so long as they be celebrated without sin, and conduce to tranquility and good order in the Church. It adds a protest against the error that human traditions have any virtue in meriting the grace of God, or in making satisfaction for sins.

The sixteenth article, "de rebus civilibus," vindicates the authority of the civil powers from the lax and revolutionary opinions of the Anabaptists, declaring also the lawfulness of war, of property, of oaths, and marriage.

The seventeenth article, "de Christi reditu ad iudicium," affirms the doctrine of the resurrection and final judgment, the everlasting happiness of the holy, and the endless misery of wicked men and devils. It condemns the Anabaptists, who maintained that future punishment would be finite, and those also who were circulating "Judaical opinions" respecting a reign of the faithful upon earth before the resurrection.

The eighteenth article, "de libero arbitrio," while admitting

¹ This phrase is explained in *Apol. Confessionis*, "quod sacramenta non ponenti obicem conferant gratiam ex opere operato sine bono motu utentis," 203. (cf. the ninth English Article of 1538, *Append. No. II.*) The further explanations of Luther with respect to the question of *infant* baptism may be seen at length in his "*Catechismus Major*," Part. IV. s. 41 seqq.

that the human will has a certain liberty of choice and action,¹ denies that man can work out spiritual obedience, or things pleasing to God, without the grace of the Holy Spirit. It bases this doctrine upon the language of St. Augustine, and condemns the Pelagians and others who overrated the powers of nature.

The nineteenth article, "de causa peccati," declares that the cause of sin is to be found in the will of the ungodly, viz. of the devil and wicked men, which has turned itself away from God.

The twentieth article, "de fide et bonis operibus," is a detailed answer to the objection that the Lutherans discouraged or prohibited good works.² It affirms, chiefly on the authority of St. Paul, and in the language of St. Augustine, that we are received into the favour of God solely for the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ, as opposed to any merits of our own, that we obtain this gratuitous justification by faith only (*tantum fide, or fiducia*), and that as the result of this acceptance and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, we put on new affections and are fruitful in good works.

The twenty-first article, "de cultu sanctorum," while it recognizes the duty of imitating the good examples of the saints, affirms, as the doctrine of Holy Scripture, that Christ is the one Mediator, Priest, and Intercessor, and on that ground prohibits the invocation of any other.

The twenty-second article concludes the First Part of the Confession, by declaring that there is nothing in the doctrine of the Lutheran body which differs either from the Scriptures, or the ancient Church. The dissension (it goes on to state) rose out of

¹ "Ad efficiendam civilem justitiam (*Germ.* iusserlich ehrbar zu leben) et deligendam res rationi subjectas."

² It begins by noticing an improvement in the general language of the clergy; "De quibus rebus olim parum docebant concionatores; tantum puerilia et non necessaria opera urgebant, ut certas ferias, certa jejunia, fraternitates, peregrinationes, cultus sanctorum, rosaria, monachatum et similia. *Hæc adversarii nostri admoniti nunc dediscunt, nec perinde prædicant hæc inutilia opera, ut olim. Præterea incipiunt fidei mentionem facere, de qua olim mirum erat silentium: docent nos non tantum operibus justificari, sed conjungunt fidem et opera, et dicunt, nos fide et operibus justificari. Quæ doctrina tolerabilior est priore, et plus afferre potest consolationis, quam vetus ipsorum doctrina."*

certain abuses (*de quibusdam abusibus*) which had crept into the churches without competent authority. The promoters of the German Reformation felt it their duty to interpose and correct these growing evils, but had no wish to set up a new standard of doctrine, or even to abolish the ancient usages of the Church when freed from their abuses.

The corruptions to which the Lutherans had alluded form the subject of the Second Part of their Confession.

The first article, "*de utraque specie*," is occupied in vindicating the right of the layman to communion in both kinds. This right is based upon the clear language of Holy Scripture and the practice of the Early Church.

The second article, "*de conjugio sacerdotum*," relates to the many scandals which arose from the compulsory celibacy of the clergy. It asserts the honour of the married state, and quotes St. Cyprian as maintaining that even those who have promised to live single are not absolutely bound by their promise.

The third article is entitled "*de missa*." It begins by declaring that "the mass" had not been abolished by the Lutherans, but was performed by them with the greatest reverence,¹ only with a slight change in the ceremonial, and the addition of some German hymns for the instruction of the people. The "private masses" had, however, been discontinued on account of the profane and mercenary spirit in which they were too generally celebrated. The "opinion" was repelled which taught men to regard the mass as a work which effaces the iniquities both of the living and the dead, "*ex opere operato*;" and great stress was laid upon the Eucharist as a *communion*, after the example of the ancient Church.

The fourth article, "*de Confessione*," while denying the necessity of a particular enumeration of sins, declares that confession had not been abolished by the Lutherans, but was positively enjoined as a prerequisite to participation in the eucharist. They taught also that absolution is a very great benefit (*maximum beneficium*).

The fifth article, "*de discrimine ciborum et traditionibus*,"

¹ "*Falso accusantur ecclesie nostræ, quod missam aboleant. Retinetur enim missa apud nos et summa reverentia celebratur.*"

affirms that an opinion had prevailed in all quarters respecting the efficacy of these human ordinances in making satisfaction for sin, and proceeds to recount the disastrous consequences which resulted from such an error. The Lutherans, however, did not prohibit individual discipline and mortification of the flesh, and retained all the traditional usages which conduced to a seemly performance of divine service, though refusing to them any meritorious value.

The sixth article, "*de votis monachorum*," maintains that in the time of St. Augustine religious associations were purely voluntary, and that vows were only introduced as discipline was corrupted. It refutes the idea that the monastic is the highest order of Christian life; and after vindicating the dignity of marriage, declares the dangerous effects of confiding in recluse habits as the ground of some special sanctity.

The seventh article, "*de potestate ecclesiastica*," distinguishes between the functions of the spiritual and civil authorities, about which the disputes had been long and vehement. To the former, as the representatives of the apostles, it assigns the preaching of the word, the power of the keys, and the administration of the sacraments: while the secular princes are engaged in protecting the persons and property of their subjects, and in illustrating the ordinance of God under a very different aspect. It ends by declaring that the Lutherans had no wish to wrest the spiritual power out of the hands of the lawful bishops, but that a schism was likely to ensue, if these latter persisted in their ritual demands with the same imperious rigour.

In the "*Epilogue*," subjoined to the Confession, it is stated, that the above are "the principal articles which seemed to be the subjects of controversy;" that a longer list of abuses might have been drawn up, extending to the question of indulgences, pilgrimages, &c.; but that the Lutherans had acted mainly on the defensive, confining themselves to matters respecting which they were constrained to speak out distinctly, lest a handle should be left for the prevalent imputation, that they had excepted as part of their doctrine and ceremonial what was contrary to Scripture or to the Catholic Church.¹

¹ "*Tantum ea recitata sunt quæ videbantur necessaria dicenda esse, ut in-*

The abstract here given of the Augsburg Confession is enough to convince us that in presenting it to the emperor, the Reformers indicated a strong desire to keep within the boundaries of the Latin Church, and to approximate as closely as possible to the generally received doctrines.¹ Their moderation is peculiarly discernible in the silence which they maintained respecting the encroachment of the papal power, as well as respecting the scandalous abuses which had called forth their original protest. They were now manifestly anxious to justify their own ecclesiastical position, to keep clear of the Zwinglian and Anabaptist reformers, and to win from the emperor and the Romish states at least a plenary toleration, until their grievances could be authoritatively redressed by the meeting of a general council.²

Yet the gentleness of Melancthon and his colleagues was very far from conciliating their opponents. Some of the more violent advocated an immediate appeal to the sword, in execution of the edict which had been promulgated against Luther at Worms: but the counsels of a party somewhat more moderate and forbearing were at last adopted by the emperor. At their suggestion, a committee of divines, then present at Augsburg, including Eck, Faber, and Cochläus, was appointed to draw up a formal confutation of the articles recently submitted to their notice; but it was not till the third of August that the princes, by whom they were employed,

tolligi possit in doctrina ac cæremoniis apud nos nihil esse receptum contra scripturam aut ecclesiam catholicam, quia manifestum est, nos diligentissime cavisse, ne qua nova et impia dogmata in ecclesias nostras serperent." 50.

¹ Ranke, Reform. III. 270, 271. "They wished for nothing but peace and toleration; they thought they had proved that their doctrines had been unjustly condemned and denounced as heretical. Luther brought himself to entreat his old antagonist, the Archbishop of Mainz, who now seemed more peaceably disposed, to lay this to heart: Melancthon addressed himself in the name of the princes to the legate Campeggi, and conjured him not to depart from the moderation which he thought he perceived in him, for that every fresh agitation might occasion an immeasurable confusion in the Church." 276.

² The following points were at this time regarded as indispensable by Melancthon—sacrament in both kinds, marriage of priests, omission of the canon in the mass, concession of the secularized church-lands, and lastly, discussion of the other contested questions at a council. Ranke, 286.

could be induced to accept their elaborate production.¹ On that day, however, it was read in public amid the applause of the enemies of Luther.²

This document is most interesting to the student in theology, because it gives him an opportunity of judging how far the representatives of the scholastic system, at a later period of the conflict, were disposed to soften the extreme opinions which had roused the zeal of the reformers. Some of the articles of the Augsburg Confession are therein absolutely approved, others are as absolutely rejected; while the rest are in part accepted and in part condemned.

Those which come under the first division relate to the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, the necessity of baptism, and the efficacy of the sacraments (the only objection being that the number "seven" is not specified,) the mission of the clergy, the authority of the magistrates, the final judgment and the resurrection. To these may be added the holy Eucharist, with the statement of which no fault is found, but the Lutherans are required as a further exposition to admit the doctrine of concomitance; *i. e.*, to deny the necessity of communion in both kinds.

With regard to those points where approval was positively withheld, it is still important to observe how the Romish theologians had modified their language. They no longer taught that the sacraments justify, "ex opere operato," *i. e.*, by the mere performance of the act, nor that works which are done without grace are of the same nature as those which are the fruits of the Holy Spirit. They also approached nearer to the repudiation of human merit, and while condemning the Lutheran formula of "*sola fides*," maintained that faith and good works are the free gifts of God, and are absolutely nothing (*nulla sunt et nihil*), when compared with the rewards which He has mercifully attached to them. The article "*de ecclesia*," was rejected, because it seemed to imply

¹ Ranke, 283.

² See it at length in Francke, Append. 44—69. A more candid statement of the objections taken by the Romish party to the Augsburg Confession is the "*Consilium*" of Cochläus, presented to the king of the Romans, at his own request, June 17, 1540; in Le Plat, II. 657—670; cf. also the "*Consultatio*" of G. Cassander, A. D. 1564, *ibid.* VI. 664 seqq.

that sinners are in no way members of the Church; and those relating to the invocation of saints, the denial of the cup, and the compulsory celibacy of the priesthood, were assailed by references to Holy Scripture, to the usage of the Early Church, and to the statements of the forged decretals. The propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, the use of the Latin language, monastic vows, and other kindred topics, were in like manner reaffirmed and supported by the citation of ecclesiastical authorities: and while hopes were afforded that some disciplinary abuses should be hereafter corrected or removed, there is no abatement of the claims which had long been propounded by the Latin Church to the absolute obedience of all the faithful.

Among the articles accepted in some measure only, was that which related to original sin, (objection being taken to the term "concupiscence,") and those which affirmed the Lutheran view of confession and penitence; the first being regarded as somewhat too lax, and the second as underrating the necessity of satisfaction.

The general impression of the diet after listening to this confutation was hostile to the cause of the Wittenberg Reformers. The emperor more particularly declared his determination to act as became the protector of the Roman Church; and had he not been deterred by the elector of Saxony and the threatened invasion of the Turks, no further attempt at pacification would have met with his sanction. As it was, however, he consented to the suggestions of the more moderate of his party, and, on the 16th of August, a conference was opened with the view of eliciting some scheme of mediation and of re-establishing the unity of the German Churches.

"The dogmatical points at issue presented no insuperable difficulties. On the article of original sin, Eck gave way as soon as Melancthon proved to him that an expression objected to in his definition was, in fact, merely a popular explanation of an ancient scholastic one. Respecting the article on justification 'through faith alone,' Wimpina expressly declared that no work was meritorious, if performed without grace; he required the union of love with faith, and only in so far he objected to the word 'alone.' In this sense, however, the protestants had no desire to retain it; they consented to its erasure; their meaning had always been

merely that a reconciliation with God must be effected by inward devotion, not by outward acts. On the other hand, Eck declared, that the satisfaction which the catholic Church required to be made by penitence, was nothing else than reformation; an explanation which certainly left nothing further to be objected to the doctrine of the necessity of satisfaction. Even on the difficult point of the sacrifice of the mass, there was a great approximation. Eck explained the sacrifice as merely a sacramental sign, in remembrance of that which was offered on the cross. The presence of Christ in the Eucharist was not debated. The protestants were easily persuaded to acknowledge not only a true, but also a real or corporal presence. It was certainly not the difference in the fundamental conceptions of the Christian dogma which perpetuated the contest. . . The real cause of rupture lay in the constitution and practices of the Church."

The zeal of the papal legate Campeggi put an end to these pacific measures, by inflaming the emperor still more strongly against the whole of the Lutheran body. He insisted that the ordinances of the Church, to some of which they had ventured to object, were immediately dictated by the Holy Spirit; and as the result of his untiring efforts the States were at length brought to decree, that until the decision of the expected council, the reformers should appoint no more married priests; that they should enforce confession with the minuteness of former years; that they should neither omit the canon of the mass, nor abolish private masses; and, above all, should admit that communion in one kind is no less valid than in both.*

* Ranke, III. 306, 307. The truth of this statement is illustrated by the whole history of the papacy. To recognize the supreme authority of the Roman pontiff was the one indispensable condition required of our own Church in the time of Queen Elizabeth (Twysden, 198, et seqq. Cam. ed.), and it is still exacted with the same rigour of all who submit to the Roman communion. In the case of the Russian "Uniates" we are told that "nothing is required but the one capital point of submission to the pope." Mouravieff's Hist. of the Russian Church, 142, Engl. Transl. cf. 390 (note).

* Ranke, III. 310. The refusal of the Lutherans to comply with this edict, and the project of a Recess which was based upon it, suggested the composition of their second symbolical book, the "Apologia Confessionis;" in which

It was this arbitrary edict of the diet of Augsburg which extinguished the hope of reconciliation so warmly cherished by the moderate on both sides of the discussion; and although one more effort was made under the auspices of Contarini, whom the pope sent as his legate to a meeting at Ratisbon, in 1541, it was thwarted in the same manner as before, by the unyielding pretensions of the Roman court, and the intractability of party spirit.¹

The approbation of the pope and of Luther was equally denied to the mediating body, and in a few years the council of Trent put an insuperable bar to all similar endeavours, by its rigorous definition of the Romish doctrines, and its absolute denunciation of all their opponents.

the main points of their system are stated more fully, and in a somewhat less Roman style.

¹ The Pope, as usual, had required in the first place the acknowledgement of his ecclesiastical supremacy; but Contarini kept it back till other questions had been settled. Melancthon and Bucer advocated the cause of the Reformers. It is most remarkable that the whole assembly came to an agreement on the four important articles of the nature of man, original sin, redemption, and even justification. The friends of Contarini congratulated him on the success of his endeavours; and among others, we find Cardinal Pole addressing him in these terms: "When I observed this unanimity of opinion, I felt a delight such as no harmony of sounds could have inspired me with; not only because I see the approach of peace and concord, but because these articles are the foundation of the whole Christian faith. They appear, it is true, to treat of divers things, of faith, works, and justification; upon the latter, however,—justification—all the rest are grounded; and I wish you joy, and thank God that the divines of both parties have agreed upon that. We hope that He who hath begun so mercifully will complete His work." Quoted from Pole's Letters, in Ranke, "Popes," i. 164, 165. The proceedings at Ratisbon were, however, repudiated by Luther in violent language, and afterwards by some of the Cardinals, and the Pope. Bucer's remark on this occasion was too sadly verified in the result: "Most reverend Sir," he declared to Contarini when overruled by fresh instructions from Rome, "the people are sinning on both sides; we, in defending some points too obstinately, and you in not correcting your many abuses." Reccatelli, Vit. Contarini, apud Quirin Diatrib. III. 110.

CHAPTER III.

THE ENGLISH ARTICLES OF 1536.

THE first triumph of the English Reformation was the synodical rejection of the papal supremacy, in 1534. In the execution of this important measure the intelligent members of the Church had very generally acquiesced. But notwithstanding so much harmony of action at the outset of the reforming movement, there existed little or no ground for hope that its progress would continue to conciliate the same uniform approbation.

The Church of England, like the rest of Christendom, was distracted by a number of hostile parties, widely differing in the details of their systems, but reducible under two popular designations, as favourers of the "old" or of the "new learning."¹ The first may be said to have symbolized more or less with Gardiner, bishop of Winchester; the second, if we exclude the more violent of them, with Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. Gardiner was a prelate of no ordinary powers, but like many of his gifted contem-

¹ See Archbishop Laurence, "Bampton Lectures," 198. In strictness of language, however, this distinction was untrue, and as such was combated by the reforming party: "Surely they that set asyde the blynde iudgements of the assercion, and loke earnestly vpon the matter, iudge otherwyse of vs: For the olde auncient fathers dyd neuer knowe or heare tell of the moost parte of these thynges whyche oure contempners do teache: than ye maye be sure that theyr learnynge oughte not to be rekened for olde learnynge and apostolicall. Farthermore not euery thyng that the olde fathers wrote sauoureth of the syncrenesse and purenesse of the spete of the apostles. Certayn thynges whiche were deuised wythin these foure hundreth yeares, yee rather euen of late haue bene receaued by and by of them, as soone as they were made, namely thys is theyr learnynge and so olde, that they desyre for thys, that the Gospell almost shoulde be cast awaye, and counted as a new teachynge and learnynge." A comparison betwene the Olde learnynge and the Newe, translated out of Latyn unto Englysh by Wyliam Turner, 1538, A. III: cf. Archbp Cranmer's Works: i. 375, ed. Jenkyns.

poraries, he deemed the work of reformation complete, when the encroachments of the foreign pontiff had been successfully resisted. He had himself acted a conspicuous part in this emancipation of the English Church; but when the established religion of the country became an object of vigorous assault, and not unfrequently of furious vituperation, he placed himself at the head of the reactionary or anti-reformation school, and contested every inch of the ground, which he was finally forced to abandon.

Cranmer, on the contrary, while ranking far higher than his rival, both in the extent of his theological learning and in his deep religious earnestness, was the champion of the doctrinal reformers: he was gradually perceiving the errors and abuses in his own provinces of the Christian Church, and, as became "the primate of all England," was zealously promoting the work of restoration.

It would, however, be most indiscriminating and unfair to identify the opinions of Cranmer and his party, with those of the many turbulent spirits, both at home and on the continent, who were assailing the first principles of religion, and erecting upon the ruins of the papal supremacy their own eccentric institutions. We have seen that the views adopted by Luther and the rest of the Wittenberg divines, were incapable of all sympathetic union with the revolutionary tenets of Zwingli; and the same kind of discrimination will be necessary still, if we would ascertain the actual position of the early English reformers. Their conflict with the numerous adherents of Gardiner was only one aspect of a diversified struggle, which the truth in that stirring crisis had been destined to encounter. Very soon after the rejection of the papal supremacy, a host of misbelievers, known by the general name of "Anabaptists," but differing from the Church at large on almost every fundamental doctrine,² began to propagate their creed in this country. A royal commission "contra Anabaptistas,"³ bearing

¹ See his Treatise "de Vera Obedientia," with Bonner's Preface, in Brown's Fasciculus, II. 800—820.

² Ranke (III. 588 seqq.) has an excellent chapter on the "Unitarian" and other Anabaptists. More evidence will be adduced respecting their extreme heresies, when we come to consider the misbelievers against whom the XLII. Articles were directed.

³ Wilkins, Concil. III. 836.

date October 1, 1538, describes their system as pestiferous and heretical, and urges the archbishop and his comprovincials to enter upon instant measures for their conviction or extermination. The introduction of these foreign elements gave fresh warmth and acrimony to the disputes already raging in the bosom of the Church of England. "Too many there be," says the Homilist,¹ "which upon the ale-benches or other places, delight to set forth certain questions, not so much pertaining to edification, as to vain-glory, and showing forth of their cunning; and so unsoberly to reason and dispute, that when neither part will give place to other, they fall to chiding and contention, and some time from hot words to further inconvenience." A specimen of the taunts, which appear to have been at that time in every man's mouth is then added² by the same writer: "He is a pharisee, he is a gospeller, he is of the new sort, he is of the old faith, he is a new-broached brother, he is a good catholic father, he is a papist, he is an heretic."

In the midst of this strife of tongues, daily waxing louder and more virulent, was put forth the first code of doctrine produced by the English Reformation. It is aptly entitled "*Articles to stablyshe christen quietnes and unitie amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions.*"³

The proximate cause of their compilation will be found in the history of the Church in the year 1536, and more particularly in certain acts of the convocation which assembled on the 9th of June. The lower house seem to have proceeded at once to draw up a representation of the errors "then publicly preached, printed

¹ Sermon against Contention and Brawling, 135. Camb. ed. The same kind of language is employed in a more nearly contemporary document, entitled "The King's proclamation for uniformity in religion," cir. A. D. 1536; Wilkins, III. 810.

² Ibid. We have a curious illustration of these disputes in the last speech of Henry VIII., whose great object had been to bring about uniformity: "I hear daily that you of the clergy preach one against another without charity or discretion: some be too stiff in their old *mumpsimus*, others be too busy and curious in their new *sumpsimus*. Thus all men, almost, be in variety and discord, and few or none preach truly and sincerely the Word of God as they ought to do." Herbert's Life of Henry VIII. 600.

³ These Articles will be found at large in Appendix, No. I., together with collations of the several forms in which they have been recorded.

and professed ;” and on the 23rd of June Richard Gwent, arch-deacon of London and prolocutor, brought their complaint before the notice of the upper house,¹ requesting that order might be taken to stop the further propagation of all such dangerous positions. They are divided into sixty-seven heads; and though Fuller, who transcribed them from the records of convocation, is disposed to regard them as “the protestant religion in ore,” there is justice in the critique, which Collier has passed upon his language, that “unless we had found a richer vein, it may very well be questioned, whether the mine had been worth the working.”² Fuller admits, indeed, that “many vile and distempered expressions are found therein;” and it is impossible to read through the list without feeling how much both of profaneness and of dogmatic mischief was calling for “special reformation” in this quarter, “as well as on the Romish side.” The majority of them are most truly described by Carte, as “erroneous opinions, which had been held by the Lollards formerly, or started now by the Anabaptists and others.”³ At the same time, it cannot be denied, that in more than one of the propositions thus censured by the convocation, we may discern the rudi-

¹ Wilkins, III. 804.

² II. 121; ed. 1714.

³ III. 137; ed. 1752. The following are a few of the objectionable tenets: “Divers light and lewd persons be not ashamed or afraid to say, Why should I see the sacrificing of the high mass? Is it any thing else but a piece of bread, or a little pretty round Robin?”—“Priests have no more authority to minister sacraments than the laymen have.”—“All ceremonies accustomed in the Church, which are not clearly expressed in Scripture, must be taken away, because they are men’s inventions.”—“A man hath no free will.”—“God never gave grace nor knowledge of Holy Scripture to any great estate of rich men, and they in no wise follow the same.”—“It is preached and taught that all things ought to be common.”—“It is idolatry to make any oblations.”—“It is as lawful at all times to confess to a layman as to a priest.”—“Bishops, ordinaries, and ecclesiastical judges have no authority to give any sentence of excommunication or censure, ne yet to absolve or loose any man from the same.”—“All sins, after the sinner be once converted, are made by the merits of Christ’s passion venial sins, that is to say, sins clean forgiven.”—“The singing or saying of mass, mattens, or even-song, is but a roring, howling, whistling, murmuring, touring, and juggling; and the playing at the organs a foolish vanity.”—“It is sufficient and enough to believe, though a man do no good work at all.”—“No human constitutions or laws do bind any Christian man but such as be in the Gospels, Paul’s

ments of a purer faith¹; and in these Cranmer and the more moderate of the reforming party, must have felt a secret satisfaction. It is indeed probable that one of the concluding articles of the remonstrance was directed against the archbishop and his colleagues; for the lower house complain, that “when heretofore divers books have been examined by persons appointed in the convocation, and the said books found full of heresies and erroneous opinions, and so declared; the said books are not yet *by the bishops* expressly condemned, but suffered to remain in the hands of unlearned people, which ministrereth to them matter of argument and much unquietness within this realm.”²

While these and other controversial topics were under the review of the lower house, the bishops seem to have been disputing in their turn upon the unhappy prospects of the Church. They were divided into nearly equal parties, the one side being favourable to some further reformation, the other, with the exception of the papal supremacy, adhering to the state of things which existed at the time of their consecration. In the first division we may reckon Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, Goodrich, bishop of Ely, Shaxton, bishop of Salisbury, Latimer,³ bishop of Worcester, Fox, bishop of Hereford, Hilsey, bishop of Rochester, Barlow, bishop of St. David’s. The second consisted of Lee, archbishop of York, Stokesley, bishop of London, Tonstal, bishop of Durham, Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, Sherburne, bishop of Chichester, Kite, bishop of Carlisle, Nix, bishop of Norwich.

epistles, or the New Testament; and that a man may break them without any offence at all.”

¹ *e. g.* “They deny extreme unction to be a sacrament.”—“All those are antichrists that do deny laymen the sacrament of the altar, *sub utraque specie*.”—“Priests should have wives.”—“There is no mean place between heaven and hell wherein souls departed may be afflicted” (referring to the prevalent doctrine of purgatory, and not to that of the intermediate state, as now taught by the English Church).

² Wilkins, III. 807.

³ By Cranmer’s appointment he had preached the Sermon at the opening of the Convocation (Latimer’s Sermons, 33 seqq. ed. P. S.), and had remonstrated in his plain-spoken manner with the rest of his brother prelates for tolerating superfluous ceremonies and a variety of superstitions. He had also condemned the “monster, purgatory,” and the impious sale of masses: 50, 55.

During the first session of the assembly, Cromwell, in his character of "vicar-general of the realm," delivered an oration in the name of the king, assuring them of the concern felt by his majesty for the speedy termination of religious discord. "The king studyeth day and nyght," he says, "to set a quietnesse in the Church, and he cannot rest vntil all such controuersies be fully debated and ended, through the determination of you and of his whole parliament. For although his special desire is to set a stay for the vnlearned people, whose consciences are in doubt what they may beleue, and he himselfe by his excellent learning, knoweth these controuersies wel enough, yet he will suffer no common alteration, but by the consent of you and of his whole parliament." His majesty next admonishes the prelates "to conclude all thinges by the Word of God, without all brawling or scolding," and will not suffer "the Scripture to be wrasted and defaced by any gloses, any baptisticall lawes, or by any authority of doctours or counsellors, and muche lesse will he admitte any article or doctrine not conteyned in the Scripture, but approued onley by continuance of time and olde custome, and by vnwritten verities."

A disputation instantly arose, in which Stokesley was the chief speaker on one side, and Cranmer on the other. The speech of the archbishop is preserved,¹ and opens with an exhortation to cease from debating about words, so long as agreement is obtained "in the very substance and effect of the matter." "There be waighty controuersies," he continues, "nowe moued and put forth, not of ceremonies and light thinges, but of the true vnderstanding, and of the right difference of the lawe and of the gospell; of the manner and waye how sinnes be forgeuen, of comforting doubtful and wauering consciences; by what meanes they may be certified, that they please God, seeing they feele the strength of the lawe, accusing them of sinne: of the true vse of the sacramentes, whether the outward worke of them doth iustifie men, or whether we receaue our iustification by fayth. Item, which be the good

¹ See the speech at length in Fox, 1182, ed. 1583. Atterbury (Rights of Convocation, 367, ed. 1700) contends that this meeting of the bishops took place in the year 1537: but Collier, Burnett, and others, refer it to the present year.

² Fox, *ibid.*

workes, and the true seruice and honour which pleaseth God: and whether the choise of meates, the difference of garmentes, the vowes of monkes and priestes, and other traditions which haue no worde of God to confirme them,—whether these (I say) be right good workes, and suche as make a perfect Christian man or no. Item, whether vayne seruice and false honouring of God, and mans traditions, doe binde mens consciences or no? Finally, whether the ceremony of confirmation, of orders, and of annealing, and such other (whiche cannot be proued to be institute of Christ, nor haue anye worde in them to certifie vs of remission of sinnes) ought to be called sacraments, and be compared with Baptisme and the Supper of the Lord, or no?"

This statement of the questions more especially demanding the attention of the upper house, is an important illustration of the Articles, to which those questions led the way. According to Fox, the debate itself turned chiefly upon the meaning of the word "sacrament," and the number of Christian rites to which it may be legitimately affixed. Aless, a Scotch refugee, whom Cromwell had introduced as a learned guest to the council of the bishops, contended that the term sacrament, though capable of a wider signification, should be confined to those ordinances of the Gospel "which haue the manifest word of God, and be institute by Christ to signify vnto us the remission of our sinnes."¹ He grounded this limited definition upon the authority of St. Augustine: but Fox, bishop of Hereford, who had lately returned from a negotiation with the foreign reformers, exhorted him to conduct his argument by a simple reference to Holy Scripture, declaring that the Germans had made "the text of the Bible so playne and easye by the Hebrue and Greeke tongue, that now many thinges may be better understand without any gloses at all, then by all the commentaries of the doctours." The chief disputant on the opposite side of this question, as of others, was Stokesley, the bishop of London, who "endeauoured himselfe with all his labour and industry, out of the olde schoole gloses, to maynteyne the seuen sacramentes of the Church." He was not unwilling to re-

¹ Fox, 1183. It is worth observing that when the bishops were assembled on the following day, Cranmer sent a message to Aless "commanding him to abstain from disputation." *Ib.* 1184.

gard the Bible as the written Word of God, but asserted that by the language of the Bible itself we are commanded to receive a number of oral traditions, which may worthily be called "the Word of God unwritten," as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures.

The irreparable loss of the convocation-records has prevented us from pursuing these discussions to their close, and has at the same time left us uncertain as to the manner in which the above-mentioned remonstrance of the lower house was handled by the bishops. Enough is, however, surviving to evince the disunion of the rulers no less than of the Church at large, and the consequent necessity of adopting some mild and pacific measures.

It is probable that the contest was in both houses followed by a considerable compromise of opinions, and that the "Ten Articles about Religion," of which we are now treating, were the immediate result of this mutual concession.

They seem to have been brought into the convocation by Cromwell,¹ and were, therefore, drawn up in private; but the manuscript varieties and corrections existing in the several copies of them demonstrate that men of different principles were employed in their compilation or revision.²

According to one of the present versions³ they are entitled "Articles devised by the King's Highness," &c., and are said to have been "also approved by the consent and determination of the hole clergie of this realme:" while another copy⁴ describes them as "Articles about Religion, set out by the convocation, and published by the King's authority." The former of these titles has created a belief that the document was composed entirely by the king, when he saw the inextricable quarrels in which the houses of convocation were entangled; nor is other testimony

¹ Herbert's Henry VIII., 466.

² An example of this is given by Dr. Jenkyns (Cranmer's Works, i. xv.) where Tonstal inserted a sanction of the practice of invoking saints, while Cranmer added a qualification that it must "be done without any vain superstition." Both clauses are retained in the printed copies.

³ See the edition of Thomas Berthelet (the king's printer) Lond. 1536, reprinted in the Appendix. This was also the title in Fox's copy, 1093.

⁴ In Burnett, Addend. to Vol. i. 459 seqq. from a MS. in the Cotton Library (Cleop. E. V. fol. 59.)

wanting to give this supposition a still greater degree of plausibility. In the royal "Injunctions" issued during the same year (1536), it is stated that "certain Articles were lately devised and put forth by the King's highnesse authority, and *condescended upon* by the prelates and clergy of this his realme in convocation."¹ In like manner the king declares in a letter written at the same time, that the increasing discord constrained him "to put his own pen to the book, and to conceive certain Articles, which were by all the bishops and whole clergy of the realm in convocation agreed on as catholic;"² and he proceeds to charge the bishops whom he is addressing openly in their cathedrals and elsewhere, to read and declare "*our said Articles,*" plainly and without any additions of their own.

These passages appear to claim the authorship of the Articles for the king himself exclusively; and yet it is difficult to reconcile that hypothesis with the language of the Declaration prefixed to them in nearly all the existing copies. He there states that being credibly advertised of the diversity of opinions which prevailed in all parts of England, he had "not only in his own person at many times taken great pain, study, labours, and travails, but *also had caused the bishops, and other the most discreet and best learned men of the clergy to be assembled in convocation, for the full debatement and quiet determination of the same.*"

After weighing this evidence together, the most natural inference is, that a rough draft of the Articles was made by a committee,³ consisting of the more moderate divines, and presided over by the king himself, or at least in frequent communication with him by means of the "vicar-general." After various modifications had been made to meet the views of discordant members,

¹ Wilkins, III. 813.

² Ibid. 825.

³ Strype (Cranmer, Lib. i. c. xi. : i. 83, ed. E. H. S.) conjectures that the Archbishop of Canterbury "had a great share therein," but gives no proof or reason. Archbishop Laurence has noticed a correspondence between the article on justification and the definition contained in Melancthon's "Loci Theologici" (Bampton Lectures, 201, Oxf. 1838), which, together with the Lutheran tendency of some of the other Articles, would point to the influence of Cranmer, and the reforming party. Professor Blunt, relying on evidence adduced by the same writer, believes that Melancthon had a voice in the drawing up of this document. Reform. 186, Lond. 1843.

and after the revisions of the royal pen had been completed,¹ it was submitted to the upper house of Convocation, and perhaps to the criticism of those prelates who had taken no part in its compilation. There is also strong reason for supposing that the edition printed by Berthelet, in 1536, contains the most authentic record of the Articles, partly on account of the correction, in that copy, of errors which are found in the Cotton Manuscript, and partly from the incorporation of the Articles as they stand in the printed form with the "Institution of a Christian Man," which was published in the following year.²

A further discrepancy has been found to exist between the different copies of the Articles, apart from those minor points, which will be exhibited hereafter. Collier has transmitted two lists of the *subscriptions*, one of which is considerably shorter than the other. The first is derived from a Manuscript in the State-paper Office, from which also he has printed the copy of the Articles³ contained in his "History of the Church." It was probably intended as a record for the single province of Canterbury, and accordingly includes the signatures of those members only who belonged to that jurisdiction. The second and longer list of the assentients is found in the Cotton Manuscript⁴ alluded to above: and as it comprises the names of *both* the Archbishops, we may conjecture that in the passing of this document, the two convocations of Canterbury and York had acted for once in concert.⁵

From the above sketch of the external history of the Articles, we may now pass to a survey of their object and contents.

As seen from our own point of view they are the work of a transition-period, of men who had not learned to contemplate the

¹ Burnett, III. 237, states that he had seen copies of some portions of it, with alterations by the king's own hand: and Dr. Jenkyns adds (Cranmer, I. xv.) that MSS. corresponding to Burnet's description are still extant among the Theological Tracts in the Chapter-House at Westminster.

² Formularies of Faith, vii. Oxf. 1825.

³ Probably one of the earliest draughts, as we may argue from its incompleteness, and the absence of the royal Declaration. *Ibid.*

⁴ A facsimile of the signatures is prefixed to Vol. I. of Dodd's Church History, ed. Tierney.

⁵ Lathbury, Hist of Convocation, 131.

truth in all the fulness of its harmonies and contrasts, and who consequently did not shrink from acquiescing in accommodations and concessions, which to their riper understanding might have seemed a betrayal of their sacred trust. It would be ungenerous to suppose with Fox, that the King and the reforming members of the council had deliberately consented to adulterate the Gospel, through a false tenderness for "the weaklings, which were newly weaned from their mother's milke of Rome;" and yet a comparison of the fruits of the discussion with the principles avowed on its opening and its progress, must convince us how far the majority were disposed to recast or to modify their system. The truth is, they were treading upon ground with which few of them were as yet familiar, and we need not wonder if they sometimes stumbled, or even wholly lost their way. An example of this want of firmness may be traced in the conduct of bishop Latimer. Although one of the sermons which he preached at the assembling of Convocation is distinguished by a resolute assault upon the received doctrine of purgatory,¹ he ultimately put his hand to the statement of the Article on that subject, enjoining men to "pray for the souls of the departed in masses and exequies, and to give alms to other to pray for them, *whereby they may be relieved and holpen of some part of their pain.*"² In the same manner Fox, as reported by his namesake, was strongly disinclined to lay stress on the testimonies of "doctors and scholemen, forsomuch as they doe not all agree in like matters, neither are they stedfast among themselves in all poyntes;" in which also he was but echoing the stronger speech of Cromwell. Nevertheless both their names are appended to the document, wherein it is absolutely enjoined that all bishops and preachers shall construe the words of Holy Writ according to the Catholic Creeds, and "as the holy approved doctors of the Church do entreat and defend the same."³

¹ See above, p. 51, note (3).

² In Collier's copy, most probably an early draught, the language here italicized was much softer, but it still involved the doctrine against which the bishop had protested. It is just possible that he was contemplating an extreme view of purgatory, like those repudiated at the end of the same Article.

³ Art. I.

These and other like instances, while betraying the not unnatural oscillation of men's minds, betoken also the depth and violence of the changes which were then proceeding in all quarters. And the Articles themselves are a reflection of the same convulsive struggles both in the soul of the single Christian and in that of the Church at large.

They begin by declaring that "the fundamentals of religion are comprehended in the whole body and canon of the Bible, and *also* in the three Creeds or symbols: whereof one was made by the apostles, and is the common creed which every man uses; the second was made by the holy council of Nice, and is said daily in the mass; and the third was made by Athanasius, and is comprehended in the Psalm *Quicumque vult.*" It declares that whosoever shall "obstinately affirm the contrary, he or they cannot be the very members of Christ and His espouse the Church, but be very infidels and heretics and members of the devil, with whom they shall perpetually be damned." It also recognises the authority of "the four holy councils, that is to say, the council of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus and Chalcedonense," and reprobates all opinions condemned in those synods.

This article was manifestly directed against the tenets of "the Anabaptists," many of whom denied (as we shall see hereafter) the entire doctrine of the Holy Trinity and of our Saviour's Incarnation.

The second passes to the Sacrament of Baptism, and was intended to meet the same modern misbelievers, as the article itself informs us. It declares that Baptism was instituted by our Saviour "as a thing necessary for the attaining of everlasting life" (John iii.); that by it all, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, obtain "remission of sins, and the grace and favour of God;" that infants and innocents ought to be baptized, because the promise of everlasting life pertains to them also; that dying in their infancy they "shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not;" that they must be "christened because they be born in original sin," and this sin can only be remitted "by the sacrament of baptism, whereby they receive the Holy Ghost;" that rebaptization is inadmissible; that the opinions of Anabaptists and Pelagians are "detestable heresies;" that in "men or child-

ren having the use of reason," repentance and faith are needed in order to the efficacy of baptism.

The third article is entitled "The Sacrament¹ of Penance." By contrasting it with the propositions which were condemned at the same time in the lower house of Convocation, its bearing upon the circumstances of the Church will be seen far more clearly.² It begins by affirming that penance is a sacrament instituted by our Lord in the New Testament as a thing absolutely necessary to salvation, in the case of sins committed after baptism. According to it, penance consists of contrition, confession and amendment of life. The first of these parts is made up of a sorrowing acknowledgment of sin and of a deep confidence in God's "mercy, whereby the penitent must conceive certain hope and faith that God will forgive him his sins, and repute him justified and of the number of His elect children, not for the worthiness of any merit or work done by the penitent, but for the only merits of the blood and passion of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Respecting the second part of penance, it declares "that confession to the minister of the Church is a very expedient and necessary mean," and must in no wise be condemned, for that "the words of absolution pronounced by the priest are spoken by authority given to him by Christ in the Gospel." As to the third part of penance, amendment of life, it consists of prayer, fasting, almsdeeds, restitution in will and deed, and all other good works of mercy and charity.

¹ Hall (Chron. fol. ccxxviii. ed. 1533) noticed in the new book of Articles, as one of the most prominent points, that it specially mentions only *three* sacraments. This has become a very general observation; and the reintroduction of Matrimony, Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction, with the title of sacraments, into the "Institution of a Christian Man" in the following year, is deplored as a retrogressive step. But Dr. Jenkyns (Cranmer's Works, i. xv.) has called attention to a MS. fragment of the Articles of 1536, subscribed by Cranmer, and other members of the reforming party, in which the above sacred rites are actually styled after the manner of the "old learning," though defined in such a way as to distinguish them entirely from the rest. This circumstance led Dr. Jenkyns to the conclusion that Stokesley, Gardiner, and others of the anti-reformation school, preferred to remain silent on the subject in 1536, rather than to adopt those restricted definitions.

² See §§ 26—31: Wilkins, III. 805, 806.

These must be diligently performed in order to obtain everlasting life, and *also* to "deserve remission or mitigation of pains and afflictions in this world;" for although Christ and His death be the sufficient oblation, sacrifice and satisfaction for the which God the Father forgiveth and remitteth to all sinners the eternal consequences of their sin, the temporal consequences are to be removed or abated by the efforts of the penitent himself.

The fourth article, entitled the "Sacrament of the Altar," is in like manner opposed to the "mala dogmata" condemned in the lower house of Convocation. It declares in emphatic language, that "under the form and figure of bread and wine, which we there presently do see and perceive by outward senses, is substantially and really comprehended the very self-same body and blood of our Saviour, which was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered upon the cross for our redemption:" that "the very self-same body and blood of Christ, under the same form of bread and wine, is corporally, really, and in very substance, exhibited, distributed and received unto and of all them which receive the said sacrament;" and that as a consequence the sacrament is to be used with all due reverence and honour, and after careful self-examination.

The fifth article defines "justification" as "remission of our sins, and our acceptation or reconciliation unto the grace and favour of God, *that is to say*, our perfect renovation in Christ." The question had been very warmly agitated, not only among the continental reformers, but also in this country, and the definition here adopted is most probably a compromise between the Lutheran tenet and that which was afterwards established as Roman by the divines of the Council of Trent. For the next paragraph asserts that justification is attained by contrition and faith, joined with Charity, "not as though our contrition, or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily deserve to attain the said justification," but are required by the Almighty as accompanying conditions. He commandeth also, that "*after we be justified* we must have good works of charity and obedience towards God, in the observing and fulfilling outwardly of His laws and commandments."

After the above articles relating to matters of faith, we come

to those "concerning the laudable ceremonies of the Church;" under which designation are included many topics of the deepest practical moment. Like the former series of decisions, they are readily traceable to the circumstances of the times, and are all more or less illustrated by the collection of "mala dogmata," to which the attention of the reader has been so frequently directed.

The first, "Of Images," allows the use of them as "representers of virtue and good example, as kindlers and stirrers of men's minds," specifying the images of "Christ and our Lady;" but at the same time commands the clergy to "reform their abuses, for else there might fortune idolatry to ensue; which God forbid." It also enjoins the bishops and preachers to instruct their flocks more carefully with regard to censuring, kneeling and offering to images, "that they in no wise do it, nor think it meet to be done to the same images, but only to be done to God and in His honour."

The next is entitled "Of honouring of Saints," and while it sanctions a modified reverence on the ground that "they already do reign in glory with Christ," and "for their excellent virtues which He planted in them," it is careful to guard against the error that they may be honoured with the kind or degree of confidence which is due unto God alone.

The next article, "Of praying to Saints," declares that this custom, so long as it regards them as intercessors, praying with us and for us unto God, is in itself laudable; and adds a specimen of the kind of prayer which was thought to be exempt from the charge of superstition. It asserts, however, that "grace, remission of sin, and salvation, cannot be obtained but of God only by the mediation of our Saviour Christ, which is the only sufficient Mediator for our sins," and cautions men against supposing that "any saint is more merciful, or will hear us sooner than Christ, or that any saint doth serve for one thing more than another, or is patron of the same."

The next article enters on the general question of "Rites and Ceremonies," vindicating many of them by name from the

¹ In the King's Injunctions (Wilkins, III. 813), after drawing a like distinction between the two divisions of these Articles, he charges all "deacons, persons, vicars, and other curates," to open and declare it in their sermons.

prevailing accusations, on the ground that they are "things good and laudable, to put us in remembrance of those spiritual things that they do signify;" yet adding the same kind of corrective as before, that "none of these ceremonies have power to remit sin, but only to stir and lift up our minds unto God, by whom only our sins be forgiven."

The last article, "Of Purgatory," commences by affirming that "it is a very good and charitable deed to pray for souls departed," resting the exercise on "the due order of charity," on the Book of Maccabees, on the plain statements of ancient doctors, and on ecclesiastical usage even from the beginning. It accordingly enjoins the duty of committing the departed to God's mercy in our prayers, and of causing others "to pray for them in masses and exequies," in order to accelerate their relief out of the state of present suffering. It adds, however, that we know little or nothing either of their place or the nature of their pains, and must refer the particulars of their lot to God, "trusting that He accepteth our prayers for them." In the mean time it curtails the more flagrant abuses "which under the name of purgatory hath been advanced," specifying popes' pardons, and masses said at *Scala Coeli*.

It is now impossible to ascertain the amount of the majority by which these Articles were passed in the two houses of Convocation. In the longer list of subscriptions there are eighteen bishops (including Stokesley, but not Gardiner,) and forty abbots and priors: while the number of assentients in the lower house is exactly fifty, all of them belonging to the province of Canterbury. They consist of four deans of cathedrals, twenty-five archdeacons,¹ three deans of collegiate churches, seventeen proctors for the parochial clergy, and one master of a college.² If the provincial synods were actually combined on this occasion, as the signatures of Lee, archbishop of York, and of Tonstal, bishop of Durham, would certainly indicate, at least with regard to the pre-

¹ Two of these were Italians, viz. Polydore Vergil, archdeacon of Wells, and Peter Vannes, archdeacon of Worcester.

² Some members of the lower house subscribed in double capacities, which makes the official signatures more numerous. Atterbury, *Rights of English Convocation*, 148, ed. 1700.

lates, the lower house of the northern Convocation must have either withheld their assent almost unanimously, or (what is difficult to conceive under the circumstances of the case) the record of their subscriptions was distinct from that of the southern province.

We may readily imagine that many members of the Convocation would be deterred by the inconvenience of a long journey to London, especially when they foresaw that it must end in angry disputations, or might involve them in oaths and protests, which they could not cordially adopt: and there is reason to believe that in the province of York such reluctance existed in its strongest form. The "old learning" was there cherished with a peculiar fondness, without losing, as in the southern and midland counties, the central tenet of the papal supremacy. "The Opinion of the clergy of the north parts, in Convocation, upon Ten Articles sent to them," has been printed in Strype and Wilkins; and although the articles referred to were not³ identical with the document, which forms the subject of the present chapter, (bearing chiefly upon the royal supremacy,) the answers which they drew from the northern clergy abundantly testify the zeal of that province against the incipient reformation of the Church. Their intense feeling of disaffection appears to have been still more exasperated by the recent enactments of the civil legislature, which called upon them to exhibit their dispensations from the pope; and no sooner had the bishops begun to circulate³ the new "Articles about

¹ The only exception seems to be the archdeacon of *Chester*, William Knyght.

² They are dated 1536, and from their allusion to Stat. 28 Hen. VIII. c. 16, respecting dispensations from the see of Rome, must have been written in the *summer* of that year. They prove beyond a doubt that the northern convocation *was assembled* at this time (cf. Wake, *State of the Church*, 491); whatever may be the true mode of solving the questions adverted to above. Besides advocating the extreme view of the papal jurisdiction, they "think it convenient, that such clerks as be in prison, or fled out of the realm, for withstanding the king's superiority in the Church, may be set at liberty and restored without danger." Wilkins, III. 812; Strype, *Eocl. Mem.* I. 247, 248, ed. 1721.

³ They had been charged to do so on every holy-day by the king, (Wilkins, III. 825,) and a mandate of the bishop of Lincoln (Longland) enjoins

Religion," than they rose on all sides into actual revolt. "This booke," as Hall observes,¹ "had specially mentioned but three sacramentes, with the whiche the Lyncolneshyremen (I meane their ignoraunt priestes) were offended, and of that occasion deprauded the Kinges doynge." He then gives us an account of the spreading insurrection, the leaders of which had complained, as one of their sorest grievances,² that "several bishops had made a change in the fundamental doctrines."

Nearly the last incident associated with the publication of the Ten Articles, arose out of this same rebellion in the north. To convince the formidable body of insurgents that the document had been duly authorized by the Church, and was consequently no mere innovation of the king and a handful of his counsellors, several printed copies of it were sent down in the month of October to the commander of the royal forces, and with them the original itself, as it had been subscribed in the houses of Convocation.³

But its use and circulation appear to have been superseded in the following year (1537), by the compilation of a second *Formula of Faith*, entitled the *Institution of a Christian Man*;⁴ upon which, however, the Articles of 1536 were to a great extent engrafted: and as the new work had not received the formal sanction⁴ either of the Convocation or the Crown, their intrinsic

the beneficed clergymen to avoid all controversial topics, and to preach four times a year, "secundum Articulos, qui nuper per serenissimam regiam majestatem, ac totum hujus regni Angliæ cleri in convocatione suo sanciti fuere." *Ibid.* 829.

¹ Chronicle, fol. ccxxviii. ed. 1583.

² Collier, ii. 131.

³ Strype, Cranmer, i. 84, ed. E. H. S.

⁴ Jenkyns' Cranmer, i. xviii. and the "Letter" there referred to. The "Institution" was drawn up by a number of commissioners (Collier most erroneously affirms *three* years before its circulation, ii. 139;) but never regularly submitted to Convocation; and although published by the king's printer, it was not, like the former book of Articles, provided with a preface by his Majesty, commanding it to be received by his subjects. Being thus destitute of the royal authority, it was called the *Bishop's Book*. It consists of an Exposition of the Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Paternoster, Ave-Maria, Justification, and Purgatory. The introduction to it is no more than a letter from the Commissioners to the king announcing its completion. This drew from him a very guarded answer

authority remained until they were supplanted by the future determinations of the Church.¹

(Jenkyns' Cranmer, i. 188) which, while assenting to the publication of the Bishops' Book, does not commit him to a full sanction of the contents.

¹ e. g. "The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," or the *King's Book*, set forth in 1543. It is on the whole a revised edition of the Bishop's Book, although (as Collier observes) "it seems mostly to lose ground, and reform backwards" (ii. 191: cf. Prof. Blunt's Reform. 190 seq.) Unlike its predecessor, however, it was not only drawn up by a committee of Divines, but actually *approved in Convocation*, and enjoined by a royal mandate: Wilkins, iii. 868; Jenkyns' Cranmer, i. xxxviii. cf. i. 188, 189 (note.) This account of the authority of the two "Books" is the reverse of what has been commonly received; but it is well supported by Dr. Jenkyns, and seems to him the only hypothesis which is capable of explaining all the evidence on the subject. For Burnet's mistake, see Abp. Laurence, Bamp. Lect. i. note (4.)