

CHAPTER IV.

THE XIII. ARTICLES:—CONFERENCES WITH THE LUTHERAN REFORMERS.

NOTHING could be more natural in the earlier stages of reformation, than the anxiety manifested by the English divines, to establish a good understanding with their fellow-workers in Germany. They had been equally burdened by the papal yoke: they had mourned over the same festering abuses in the Church of which they were members: they had embarked with like earnestness of purpose in the same remedial project; and despairing at last of a "true general council," had simultaneously come to the conclusion, that it was the bounden duty of "every prince to redress his own realm."¹

The greatest obstacle in the way of this friendly communication was the quarrel between Henry VIII. and Luther: but as they were neither of them unwilling to forget their early fulminations, the obstacle could no longer be considered insuperable. It was in fact ultimately removed by the moderation and good offices of Melancthon, for whom Henry appears to have manifested a peculiar partiality. As early as March, 1534, he was pressed to come over and help in the reformation of the English Church; and the same wish was repeated by the king himself on many subsequent occasions.² While cherishing the spirit of national

¹ Cf. the "Causes" why the Germans did not recognise the Council of Mantua (quoted above p. 20,) with the contemporary "Protestation" of the English, in Fox, 1085.

² Archbp. Laurence, Bampton Lectures, Sermon. i. note (3;) Sermon. ii. note (3.) In 1538, Henry wrote as follows, to the Elector of Saxony: "Pro his, quæ feliciter agi coepta sunt, feliciter absolvendis concludendisque expectamus, ut Dominum Philippum Melancthonem, in cujus excellenti eruditione et sano judicio a bonis omnibus multo spes reposita est, doctosque alios et pro-

independence, Melancthon and his associates could feel no sympathy with the lawlessness, impiety, and misbelief, which had followed in the track of the great religious movement. They had shown the firmness of their principles by standing aloof from Carlstadt and his rationalistic speculations: they had opposed the growth of the political tumult which ended in the "Peasants' War," and had subsequently repelled the followers of Zwingli, and denounced the swarm of sectarian fanatics who went under the name of "Anabaptists." Their system was thus fully vindicated in the eyes of all thinking men: it was proved to be conservative of the truth no less than destructive of the modern perversions by which the truth had been woefully corrupted; and on this account the tone of the Wittenberg divines was far more nearly in harmony with the English Reformation than with the bolder and revolutionary measures adopted on the continent of Europe.

An increasing affinity in matters of religion, combined with diplomatic considerations, had already suggested the opening of a negotiation with "the princes of the Augsburg Confession," in the year 1535. The first accredited envoy was Robert Barnes, afterwards a victim of the reactionary school and the caprice of his royal master. He was followed in the winter of the same year by bishop Fox and Dr. Hethe,¹ who found the Lutheran states in consultation at Smalcald, respecting the political and religious alliance, which was called after the place of meeting. The admonitions of Henry, as delivered by his delegates (Dec. 24), were gratefully acknowledged by the "Smalcaldic League," who added their willingness to admit him also as a member of the confederacy upon his acceding to the usual conditions. Among the rest it was stipulated that he should adopt, or at least approve in general language,² the true doctrine of Christ, as laid down in the Confession of Augsburg, and unite in defending it, under the title of "Patron and Protector of the League."

bos viros, primo quoque tempore, ad nos mittat. Seckendorf, *Histor. Luther.* lib. iii. § 66. add. 1: Francof. 1692.

¹ Strype, *Eccles. Mem.* i. 225—228. They had an interview with Pontanus and Burckhardt, Dec. 15: Melancthon. *Opp.* ii. 108, ed. Bretschneider.

² The English were required to conform to the Confession and Apology, "nisi forte quædam . . . ex verbo Dei merito corrigenda aut mutanda videbuntur." Ranke, iii. 661: cf. Strype, *ubi sup.* Append. No. LXIV.

This design, so full of momentous bearings, is said to have been in a great measure frustrated through the instrumentality of bishop Gardiner,¹ at that time the English ambassador in France. He represented, that the king would be so entangled by this treaty in the affairs of the German nation, as to be unable without their consent “to do what the Word of God shall permit;” that as Henry was “head” of the Church of England, by the authority of scripture, so was the emperor “head” of the Germanic Churches, and that consequently the princes subject to his authority would not be justified in acting without his consent. By these and other similar arguments, applied with his peculiar skill, the bishop of Winchester was enabled to restrain the alacrity of his master, and eventually to thwart the projected alliance. At present, however, the reply of Henry, though less warm than his previous communication, continued to hold out a prospect of success. He does not absolutely decline the honour intended for him by the German princes, in placing him at the head of their league, but postpones the acceptance of it, until “agreement shall be had betwixt him and their orators,” respecting the terms of religious union. “For it should not be sure nor honourable for his Majesty, before they shall be with his Grace agreed upon a certain *concord of doctrine*, to take such a province upon his highness. And forasmuch as his majesty desireth much that his bishops and learned men might agree with theirs; but seeing that it cannot be, *unless certain things in their Confession and Apology should, by their familiar conferences, be mitigate*; his Grace therefore would their orators, and some excellent learned men with them, *should be sent hither*, to confer, talk, and common upon the same.”²

But while Henry was thus hesitating on the subject of the religious confederation, a conference was actually proceeding in Germany between the members of the English legation and the foreign theologians.³ The place of meeting seems to have been at Wittenberg, in the house of Pontanus, the chancellor of Saxony,

¹ Strype, *ibid.* 226, and Append. No. LXV.

² Strype, *ibid.* Append. No. LXVI. 163.

³ Luther and Melancthon were of the number. The latter joined the conference Jan. 15, 1536. See his communication to Burkhardt; *Opp.* III. 26.

where Fox strenuously insisted on the Lutheran tendencies of the English, and more especially of his royal master.

An account is preserved in Seckendorf¹ of certain Articles of Religion, which were drawn up by those mediating parties, in the winter of 1535–6. One article relates to the Lord's Supper, and is an expanded form of the Augsburg definition: a second denies in the name of the “League,” that “any primacy or monarchy of the Roman bishop doth now obtain, or ever hath obtained by divine right.” The Germans moreover insisted upon the abolition of private masses, and the relaxation of clerical celibacy; but on these, as on other points appertaining to the discipline of the Church, the English were unable to yield them an equal satisfaction.

In the following year (1536) the negotiation, at least in its religious bearing, proceeded still more slowly² for the Wittenberg divines had now lost all confidence in Fox, and were suspecting the motives of Henry, who appeared to them far more anxious to gain his political objects, or their assent to the lawfulness of his divorce, than to forward the progress of religion and the purification of the Western Church.³

In 1538, however, the apprehension of hostilities from the continent, combining with the earlier causes, induced him to reopen his negotiation with the Germans, and to urge the establishment of a religious alliance with corresponding vigour. The princes of the Augsburg Confession had assembled early in the year at Brunswick, whither he dispatched a confidential messenger, with certain preliminary questions. He spoke “of his Christian zeal and pro-pension of mind towards the Word of God, and his desire to plant the sound doctrine of Christian religion in his kingdoms, and

¹ Comment. de Lutheran. Lib. III. § XXXIX.: “Extat elaborata a Wittenbergensibus, acceptata etiam et domum reportata a legatis Anglicis, *repetitio et exegesis quædam Augustanæ Confessionis.*” III., Francof. 1692. They are said to exist both in Latin and German: Melancthon. *Opp.* III. 104, note (2). An expression in a letter dated Nov. 28, 1536, implies that either the *same Articles revised*, or a fresh compilation, were again recommended by the English to the notice of their Saxon friends, III. 192.

² On the 9th of March, the divines were engaged in purely doctrinal discussions (*Ibid.* III. 45); and on the 30th, after much hesitation, they had agreed “de plerisque.” On the 24th of April, the English Ambassadors departed.

³ Strype, *ibid.* 229, 230.

wholly to take away and abolish the impious ceremonies of the bishop of Rome.”¹ As the Germans still persisted in their demand, that all who entered the confederacy should acknowledge their Confession, he begged them to carry out a former promise, and send a legation of divines (including the learned Melancthon),² to confer upon the disputed points with some of the English theologians. To this wish the Lutheran princes appear to have readily assented, except so far as it concerned Melancthon, whose presence was needed at home to direct the counsels of the state, and the affairs of the University of Wittenberg. The chief persons actually chosen for this office were Francis Burckhardt, vice-chancellor to the elector of Saxony; George à Boyneburg, a nobleman of Hesse, and doctor of laws; and Frederic Myconius, superintendent of the reformers at Gotha. A recommendatory letter to the King, bearing date May 12, 1538,³ was carried by Burckhardt as the head of the legation. It implores the English monarch to reflect on the imminent perils of the Church, and to aid in devising measures which may tend both to establish a firm consent among the promoters of the Reformation, and to dissuade the other European princes from participation in the papal cause.

As soon as the Lutheran Embassy arrived, a committee was nominated by the King, consisting of three bishops⁴ and four doctors, to act as the representatives of the Church of England. The course of the discussion was regulated by the plan pursued in the Augsburg Confession; and we are told that the points of faith were alone sufficient to engage the interest of the disputants for a period of two months.⁵ It is not easy to trace all the steps

¹ Strype, *ibid.* i. 329.

² Herbert, *Life of Henry VIII.* 494.

³ Strype, *ibid.* App. No. xciv.

⁴ Cranmer and Tonstal were of the number, and represented different schools. Herbert, 495.

⁵ See the “Brevis Summa” of the Germans, in Strype, App. No. xcvi., where they also inform us that “they could not stay for the rest of the disputation concerning abuses;” 261. This account tallies with a letter of Cranmer, (No. ccxxx.; i. 261, ed. Jenkyns), dated Aug. 18, in which he states that the “Orators of Germany” durst not tarry, “forasmuch as they have been so long from their princes,” and were fully determined to depart within eight days from that time. They were finally induced to remain a month longer.

of this interesting conference, but it seems that the delegates had gradually come to an understanding upon the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and had proceeded “to put their articles in writing.”¹ Strype asserts that the queries of the King were submitted in the first instance to the “Orators” (as the German envoys were entitled,) and that after the answers had been returned to him, they were examined by the English committee.² Be this, however, as it may, the fact of their ultimate agreement on the principal points of the Christian faith is stated in a letter addressed by Myconius to Cromwell,³ a short time before his departure (Sept. 7, 1538.)

But their labours in the second field of investigation did not lead to a similar issue; and when the German reformers took their leave of Henry, he still clung to the ancient abuses against which they had struggled from the first with unrelenting sternness. These abuses were, the prohibition of both kinds in the ministrations of the Lord’s Supper, the custom of private propitiatory masses, and the absolute injunction of clerical celibacy.⁴ Cranmer had in vain striven to engage the rest of the English committee in this part of the discussion; for in a letter to Cromwell (Aug. 23,) he remarks that when the Orators of Germany were anxious to proceed “in their book, and entreat of *the abuses*, so that the same might be set forth in writing *as the other articles are*,” he had “effectiously moved the bishops thereto,” but they made him this answer: “That they knew that the King’s Grace hath taken upon himself to answer the said Orators *in that behalf*, and thereof a book is already devised by the King’s majesty; and, therefore, they will not meddle with the abuses, lest they should write therein contrary to that the King shall write.” “Wherefore,” he continues, “they have required me to entreat now of the sacraments of matrimony, orders, confirmation, and extreme unction; wherein they know certainly that the Germans will not agree with us, except it be in matrimony only. So that I per-

¹ Cranmer’s Letters, *ubi sup.* and 264.

² Eccles. Memor. i. 330: cf. Original Letters, ed. P. S. 612, 613.

³ In Strype’s Eccles. Memor. i. Append. No. xcv.

⁴ See the “Judgment concerning Abuses,” composed by the German envoys on this occasion. *Ibid.* No. xcvi.

ceive that the bishops seek only an occasion to break the concord."¹

The "boke" alluded to by Cranmer in this letter was actually drawn up by Henry, with the assistance of bishop Tonstal,² who was devoted to the "ancient learning." It proves, what the archbishop had indeed suspected, that the anti-reformation party was now gaining a fresh ascendancy at court,³ and that, however much Henry had been willing to approach the Lutheran standard of doctrine, there was no prospect of weaning him from the corruptions and abuses which had crept into the practice of the Church. It is true, that on the departure of the German envoys, he invited them to return to England, and resume the discussion of those points in which the conference was divided; and in the letter which Melancthon wrote to him,⁴ March 26, 1539, a hope is confidently indulged, that as he had begun to take away "wicked superstitions," he would correct those which remained: but the feelings of Henry had in the mean time been still more estranged from the continental reformation; and when Burckhardt and his colleagues renewed their visit in the spring of the following year,⁵ the influence of Gardiner was sufficient not only to baffle all their negotiations,⁶ but to carry, both in the convocation and the parliament, an "Act for the abolishing of Diversity of Opinions," or, as it was not unfrequently entitled, the "bloody Statute of the Six Articles."⁷

¹ Works, i. 263, 264; ed. Jenkyns.

² In Burnet, i. Add. Nos. 7, 8. ³ Prof. Blunt's Reform. 189, note (5).

⁴ In Strype, i. App. No. ci. ⁵ Strype. Eccl. Mem. i. 341.

⁶ In a document drawn up on this occasion (Strype, Eccl. Mem. i. 341; Collier, ii. 171), it is remarkable how far the Lutherans were disposed to make concessions in favour of the "older learning;" cf. Luther's Schriften, xvii. 342—345: ed. 1745.

⁷ This "whip withe sixe strings," as Hall terms it, enforces a belief in the following articles: (1) of transubstantiation, or the entire Physical change of the elements in the Eucharist, (2) the non-necessity of communion in both kinds, (3) the sinfulness of marriage after receiving the order of priesthood, (4) the absolute obligation of the vows of chastity or widowhood, (5) the propriety and necessity of "private masses," (6) the expediency and continual obligation of auricular confession. (Stat. 31^o Hen. VIII. c. 14). All these dogmas, excepting, perhaps, the first, refer to the recent negotiations with the Germans, and on that account are strongly censured by Melancthon, in a letter which he addressed to the English monarch, Sept. 22, 1539. Fox, 1172 seqq.: cf. Melancthon, Opp. iii. 783, 784.

It does not fall in with our object to investigate the origin of those Articles, or to recount the frightful persecutions which accompanied their publication. A more pleasing and congenial inquiry is suggested by the mission of the foreign reformers, which the enactment of the "bloody statute" had so abruptly intercepted. Abundant memorials have survived of the partial disagreement which existed between them and the English committee: yet it is no less certain that union was effected to a very considerable extent, and that a number of Articles were actually compiled as the result of their deliberations on the leading verities of the faith. A document of this nature must be one of the deepest interest to all who engage in the study of the English Reformation; and it has been for the first time placed within their reach by the researches of a living writer. In looking for remains of Archbishop Cranmer, Dr. Jenkyns discovered among a bundle of papers belonging to that prelate, a thin folio manuscript, entitled, "A Boke conteynynge divers Articles de Unitate Dei et Trinitate Personarum, de Peccato Originali," &c. He informs us that the documents tied up in the same bundle relate chiefly to the negociations with the Lutheran envoys in the year 1538, and believes that the "Articles" were those agreed upon at the conferences which were held in London at that time. "The 'boke' itself is manifestly founded on the Confession of Augsburg, often following it closely, and departing from it exactly in those instances, where the mixture of English and German theology might have been expected to cause a variation. It is also in Latin, and this circumstance adds to the probability of its having been composed in concert with foreigners; for such other Formularies of this reign as were designed for domestic use are in English. And, lastly, the Article, namely, that on the Lord's Supper, which there is an opportunity of comparing with the conclusions approved by Fox and Hethe in Germany, is word for word the same."¹ This argument is further supported by the fact, that the manuscript Articles do not embrace any of those topics on which the English and German delegates had failed to arrive at a perfect understanding; while three other separate papers,² also in

¹ Cranmer's Works, i. xxii. xxiii.

² Ibid. iv. 292 seqq. This bundle has been re-examined for the benefit

Latin, of the same general form, and of nearly the same length, refer to points which were then actually disputed, and are most probably draughts of the articles which were not accepted by the Lutheran divines.

But there are other reasons for fixing our attention upon the Thirteen Articles of 1538, as the basis of the projected alliance with the Germans. While indicating the disposition of our leading reformers to acquiesce in the dogmatic statements which had been propounded by the Augsburg Confession, they had a very important prospective bearing, and seem to have constituted the ground-work of the Articles now in use. No one can deny indeed that the framers of the Forty-two Articles in the reign of Edward VI. drew very largely out of the Lutheran Confession, which had been compiled in 1530; but the discovery of the Thirteen Articles has made it probable that the derivation, instead of being direct, as was hitherto generally supposed, took place through the medium of this later channel. Such an inference is at least supported by the fact, "that the expressions in Edward VI.'s Formulary, usually adduced to prove its connexion with the Confession of Augsburg, are also found in the Book of Articles: while it contains *others*, which can be traced as far as the Book of Articles, but which will be sought for in vain in the Confession of Augsburg." From what we know of their general character, the framers of Edward VI.'s Articles would be "anxious, in the execution of their undertaking, to meet, if possible, the views of their brethren on the continent, as well as of their countrymen at home; and they could scarcely pursue a surer method of attaining their object than by borrowing from a form of doctrine already approved by both."¹

The Articles, thus serving as a link between the religious Formularies of the two countries, are drawn up under the following

of the present work. It contains, among other valuable pieces, the exposition of the "Sacrament of confirmation," contained in the "Institution of a Christian man" (which is said to have been "agreed upon *communi consensu* :") and also "Certain Articles admtyted in Germany," endorsed by Sir Ralph Sadleyer, who became Secretary of State in 1540. The latter document seems to be an abstract of one alluded to above, p. 67, note (3.)

¹ Ibid. I. XXIV.

heads: (1) De Unitate Dei et Trinitate Personarum; (1) De Peccato Originali; (3) De duabus Christi naturis; (4) De Justificatione; (5) De Ecclesia; (6) De Baptismo; (7) De Eucharistia; (8) De Pœnitentia; (9) De Sacramentorum usu; (10) De Ministris Ecclesiæ; (11) De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis; (12) De Rebus Civilibus; (13) De Corporum Resurrectione et Judicio extremo.

The means of comparing them minutely with the Augsburg Confession on the one hand, and with the subsequent English Articles on the other, will be provided in the Appendix to the present volume: but the most cursory perusal is enough to convince us how closely they adhere both in arrangement and in substance to the elder of those Formularies of Faith, and how much at the same time they have anticipated of the materials of the latter.

The first of the XIII. Articles, though bearing a different title, is almost a verbal copy of Art. I. of the Augsburg Confession, and includes the first of the XLII. Articles.

The second corresponds with Art. II. of the Augsburg, but, like the eighth of the XLII. Articles, it speaks of "*peccatum originale*" instead of "*peccatum originis*," and contains the expression "*originales justitia*," which is not in the Augsburg.

The third is identical with Art. III. of the Augsburg, and includes the second of the XLII. Articles.

The fourth is a much longer statement on the subject of justification than Art. IV. of the Augsburg, yet both affirm that men are accepted by God "*gratis propter Christum per fidem*." The English definition is, however, different in some measure from the German, including, like the Articles of 1536, the idea of a "*true renovation in Christ*" as equivalent to "*remission of sins*." The Article also embodies a portion of Arts. V. and VI. of the Augsburg, but has no expressions in common with the corresponding Articles of 1552.

The fifth is a considerable departure from Art. VII. of the Augsburg, though manifestly copying some expressions from thence, as also from Art. VIII. It views the Church under two aspects, either as completely holy and the mystical body of Christ, or as the congregation of those who have been baptized, and have not

¹ See App. No. II.

been excommunicated. This latter it describes as the catholic and apostolic church composed of all national and particular Churches. No trace exists in it of the twentieth Article of 1552: but, what is very remarkable, it includes the thirty-third and the twenty-seventh of that code, using language in both cases which is *not* found in the Augsburg Confession.

The sixth, on the subject of baptism, is much fuller than Art. IX. of the Augsburg, though stating precisely the same doctrine. It seems to have much in common with the articles of 1536, and, so far as language is concerned, has no affinity with the twenty-eighth of the XLII. Articles.

The seventh is also an expansion of Art. X. of the Augsburg, and agrees verbatim with the statement adopted in Germany during the Conferences of 1535. It has no terms in common with the twenty-ninth of the XLII. Articles.

The eighth is a long and for the most part original essay on "Penitence." It may, however, be compared with Arts. XI. and XII. of the Augsburg.

The ninth, respecting the efficacy of the sacraments, has much in common with Art. XIII. of the Augsburg, but far more with the twenty-sixth of the XLII. Articles, where the language is almost identical.¹

The tenth, though bearing a different title, is based upon Art. XIV. of the Augsburg, and agrees still further with the twenty-fourth of the XLII. Articles.

The eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth, are long dissertations, in the main agreeing with Arts. XV., XVI., and XVII. of the Augsburg; but if we except a few general sentiments, they are altogether without parallels in the later English Articles.

It is worthy of remark, that a number of rough draughts for different parts of the above document exist in our public repositories, and that several are corrected in the hand-writing of Cranmer, and one in that of the King. Until the discovery of the copy containing the XIII. Articles in their collected form, it had been usual to assign those draughts to the labours of a committee

¹ A fuller example of this adoption of much older theology may be remarked in the Homilies for the Passion and Resurrection, which had appeared almost verbatim in Taverner's "Postils," as early as 1540.

appointed in April, 1540, to draw up a "Declaration of the principal Articles of the Christian belief." Henry, it is true, had been considerably appeased by the burning of the unhappy "Gospellers," who persisted in rejecting the "Six Articles," and had repeated his earnest desire of accommodation, denouncing the "rashness and licentiousness of some, and the superstition and stiffness of others:"² but there is no satisfactory evidence to show that the commissioners undertook such a compilation as the document above described. Strype, who has collected six of the Articles,³ assigning them to the labours of this commission, admits that many of the accompanying papers were "drawn up by the divines for the king's use" in the discussions with the German envoys.⁴ And it is very doubtful whether the same statement does not also apply to the definitions of Christian doctrine preserved in his own "Appendix:" for besides their being composed in Latin, which would favour this conjecture, the records of the commission are confined almost entirely to "Questions and Answers concerning the sacraments, and the appointment and power of bishops and priests."⁵ Fox, indeed, intimates that "a book of Arti-

¹ Archbp. Laurence, Bampton Lectures, Sermon i. note (5.) The names of the Commissioners are given in Strype (Mem. of Cranmer, i. 173;) who describes them as "generally learned and moderate men." Gardiner was not of the number.

² Strype, Eccl. Mem. i. 356.

³ De ecclesia, de justificatione, de eucharistia, de baptismo, de poenitentia, de sacramentorum usu. Eccl. Mem. i. App. No. cxii., where they are printed with notes of the king in the margin. They present considerable variations in language, but accord in doctrine (so far as they go) with the XIII. Articles.

⁴ Mem. of Cranmer, i. 179.

⁵ Ibid. App. Nos. xxvi.,* xxvii., xxviii. xxviii*; cf. Cranmer's Works, ed. Jenkyns, i. xxiii. (note), xxix. seqq. Still it is a *possible* supposition, and by no means inconsistent with the view here advocated, that the Articles of 1538 were revived two years later by this commission. The operation of the "bloody statute" was suspended in 1540, as we know from a fresh correspondence, which took place in the spring of that year, between Henry VIII. and the German princes. At the urgent request of the English monarch a number of well-digested arguments were also forwarded to him from certain of the Lutheran divines; but no further traces have been found of the correspondence after April 12, 1540. Melancthon, Opp. iii. 1005-1016.

cles" was completed in accordance with the views of Cranmer, but no Formulary answering this description is now extant: and if such a work did exist, it appears to have been speedily suppressed, and to have gained neither royal nor ecclesiastical sanction. A corroboration of this view, which is derived from the absence of the document itself, as well as from the lack of historical testimony, was furnished by the Injunctions of Bonner in 1542,¹ who directed his clergy to procure and study "The Institution of a Christian Man," which he could hardly have done in this public manner, if there had been a more recent work invested with authority; and the same was subsequently implied in the spring of 1543, when an Act² "for the advancement of true religion" suggested the compilation of the last public Formulary in the reign of Henry VIII.³

¹ Quoted by Dr. Jenkyns, *ubi supra*.

² Statutes of the Realm, 34° and 35° Hen. VIII. c. 1. Among other things it abolishes "all books comprising any matter of Christian Doctrine, Articles of the Faith, or holy Scripture, contrary to the doctrine set forth sithence A. D. 1540, or to be set forth by the King."

³ "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man."

CHAPTER V.

THE XLII. ARTICLES OF 1552.

THE death of King Henry VIII. in 1547, like that of Luther in the year preceding, is said to have excited a most lively joy among the members of the Council of Trent.¹ Yet their triumph was certainly premature, if not altogether illusive: for the reign of his successor was destined to widen the breach already existing between our own and the Roman Churches, and to establish the English Reformation upon a deeper and more lasting basis. The reactionary school, under Gardiner and his colleagues, had no chance of resisting the impetuous spirits who stood first in the royal favour; and if there was any subject for present apprehension, it rose out of the very opposite quarter, lest the flexibility of the youthful king should be made instrumental in propelling the Church into rash and revolutionary changes.

The man, who seems to have been raised up as our guide in the midst of those critical times, and who succeeded in the construction of a bulwark, not only against Romish corruptions, but against the rising flood of puritanical innovations, was the primate of all England. Though we may not exempt him from human failings, and though his gentleness in particular was apt to degenerate into weakness and indecision, the character of Cranmer, regarded as a whole, was one of the noblest of his age: to him, under God, we are principally indebted for the sobriety of the English Reformation, and the general accordance of our present system with pure and primitive models.

On this account it is important to ascertain what were his leading opinions at the accession of Edward VI.; (for although

¹ Sarpi, i. 275, 467; ed. Courayer.

we may not identify the teaching of the Church with that of the individual writer, the animus of a man like Cranmer must always, more or less, appear in the public decisions of the age.) A reply to our question is furnished by the fact, that in the first year of the new reign he "set forth" an English Catechism, of a decidedly *Lutheran* stamp,¹ having been originally translated from German into Latin, by a bosom-friend of the Wittenberg reformer. With the exception of one single tenet, respecting the nature of the presence in the holy Eucharist,² the views of Cranmer underwent no further variations upon any fundamental subject. His Lutheran predilections are also manifested in the formation of the First Service-Book of Edward VI., put forth in the month of June, 1549; for, like the corresponding work of the Saxon reformers, our own is derived almost entirely from the ancient, or the mediæval Liturgies, and, in no inconsiderable degree, through the medium of a Lutheran compilation,³ itself based upon the older Offices of Nuremberg.

The conservative temper of the archbishop, in the adoption of these measures, is particularly felt on contrasting the English Prayer-Book, as it was arranged under his eye, with the modern forms of worship adopted at Geneva; where Calvin (according to Archbishop Laurence⁴) "chose rather to become an author than

¹ Archbp. Laurence, Bampton Lect. 16, 17 (note.)

² This change seems to have taken place 1548, and is mainly attributed to the influence of John à Lasco, whose opinion at the same period may be drawn from the following passages: "Mysterium porro omnium summum in cœna esse puto, communionem corporis et sanguinis Christi: in hoc vero nullum usque dissidium video. Omnes enim ingenue fatemur, nos in cœna vero Christi corpori et sanguini vere etiam communicare, quicumque verbo illius credimus. Quod jam attinet, quo modo id fiat," etc. Letters of à Lasco, quoted in Dr. Jenkyns' "Cranmer," i. lxxx. This, however, is a very different dogma from that of the Zwinglians. See, for example, Zwingl. Opp. ii. 546, b. Bucer and others attempted to harmonize the Lutheran and Helvetic doctrines, but without success.

³ "The Consultation of Herman," Archbp. of Cologne, drawn up by Melancthon with the aid of Bucer, published in 1543, and translated into English in 1547. Our present Litany, for example, is taken almost verbatim from this work.

⁴ Bampton Lect. i. note (6.)

a compiler, preferring the task of composing a new Liturgy to that of reforming an old one."

Nor did the Second Service-Book of king Edward VI., though maimed in one or two particulars, abandon the uniform reverence for the past which had distinguished its predecessor. The bulk of the materials out of which it was constructed were the bequest of anterior ages; and while practically attesting the continuity of the Church, illustrated the spirit of the English reformers.

The same kind of deference may be seen in the First Book of Homilies (1547), especially in those portions which are the work of archbishop Cranmer: and even in his polemical Treatises on the subject of the Eucharist, where (if ever) he was at times betrayed into the use of unprimitive language, he is still true to his former professions of adherence to the Early Church. "Lest any man," he writes, "should think that I feign any thing of mine own head, without any other ground or authority, you shall hear, by God's grace, as well the errors of the papists confuted, as the catholic truth defended, *both by God's sacred Word, and also by the most old approved authors and martyrs of Christ's Church.*" And again: "This is the true catholic faith, *which the Scripture teacheth and the universal Church of Christ hath ever believed from the beginning*, until within these four or five hundred years past, that the bishop of Rome, with the assistance of his papists, hath set up a new faith and belief of their own devising."¹ Or take an extract from his memorable appeal, in 1556, after the sentence of degradation had been passed, and he was standing on the brink of death: "Touching my doctrine of the sacrament, and other my doctrine, of what kind soever it be, I protest that it was never my mind to write, speak or understand, any thing *contrary to the most Holy Word of God, or else against the holy Catholic Church of Christ*; but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I had learned of *the Sacred Scripture and of the holy Catholic Church of Christ from the beginning*;

¹ "Defence of the true and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament," published in 1550: Works, II. 313, 356, ed. Jenkyns. Cf. "Answer to Smythe's Preface," III. 23: "Answer to Gardiner," III. 41—43.

and also according to the exposition of the most holy and learned Fathers and Martyrs of the Church."¹

Carrying with us a knowledge of these facts as to the kind of influence which presided over the compilation of our later Formularies of Faith, we may now pass on to the particular inquiry proposed in the present chapter.

It has been a subject of wonder to many writers, that so long an interval was suffered to elapse from the death of king Henry VIII. to the publication of the XLII. Articles in 1553; and that the "Necessary Doctrine" continued to be the standard of belief, so far as it was not overruled by the more recent circulation of the Homilies, the Ordinal, and the Prayer-Book. Whatever may have been the collateral causes of this delay, one is undoubtedly to be sought in the scheme which Cranmer was then cherishing for the comprehension of all the reformed Churches in one general communion. This idea had been suggested as early as 1539, in a letter of Melancthon, addressed by him to king Henry VIII.; it was renewed in 1542, and again at the opening of the reign of Edward.²

Captivated by a project, which, during the rage of religious disputation, must have been peculiarly attractive to a man like Cranmer, he seems to have lost no time in his arrangements for attempting its immediate execution. In July 1548, several learned men had already arrived from the continent;³ and although the unwillingness of Melancthon to participate in the present plan deferred and eventually frustrated the proceedings of the conference, the anxiety of Cranmer to obtain his counsel is manifested by repeated applications, one of which was sent to him as late as March 1552.⁴ His reluctance, and that of others, was occasioned in some measure by the political perplexities of the times,⁵ and the increasing troubles of the Wittenberg reformers; but it is far

¹ IV. 126.

² See Laurence, Serm. II. note (3): Cranmer's Works, ed. Jenkyns, I. 337, 338, note (r).

³ "Accersivimus igitur et te (writing to à Lasco) et alios quosdam doctos viros; qui cum non gravatim ad nos venerint ita ut nullum fere ex iis præter te et Melancthonem desideremus," etc. Cranmer's Letters, cclxxii. I. 330.

⁴ Dr. Jenkyns' Pref. cv., and Letters there referred to.

⁵ Todd's Cranmer, II. 226, ed. 1831.

more attributable to the inherent difficulties, or rather impracticability of the scheme, they were now invited to consider. A congress of the kind contemplated by Cranmer was to embrace a deputation from the Swiss reformers,¹ as well as the learned and pliant Bucer; it must therefore have necessarily turned upon the Eucharistic controversy, in which, after earlier attempts at mediation, there was no hope of a general concord. Indeed, a letter written by John à Lasco (July 19, 1548), before his own arrival in England, describes the adjustment of the "sacramentary contention,"² as the *main* object of the future meeting: and although Cranmer (March 20, 1552), was himself desirous of extending the discussion to a variety of controverted topics,—to "all the heads of ecclesiastical doctrine, and not only to the things themselves, but also to the forms of speech,"—he looked on the dissensions respecting the "sacrament of unity" as the sorest evil of the Church.³

It is not easy to ascertain the precise time when this project of a General Confession was finally abandoned in England, but there is reason to believe⁴ that it was still cherished by the Arch-

¹ See Cranmer's Letter to Melancthon (cclxxv.), where he adds "Scripsi ad D. Calvinum et ad D. Bullingerum, eosque hortatus sum, ne operi tam necessario, adeoque utili reipublicæ Christianæ deesse vellent." In writing to Calvin he asks, "Adversarii nostri habent nunc Tridenti sua concilia, ut errores stabiliant, et nos piam synodum congregare negligemus, ut errores refutare, dogmata repurgare et propagare possimus?" Letter cclxxxiv.

² Contentio Sacramentaria cœpit illic exagitari per quosdam, estque instituta ea de re publica disputatio, ad quam magnis multarum precibus vocor. Bucer expectatur. Franciscus noster Dryander jam adest. Et de Calvino mussatur, nisi quod Gallus est." Ibid. I. 330, note (a). Bucer had arrived with Paul Fagius in May, 1549. Their influence over the Archbishop was looked forward to with apprehension by Burcher (who considered them to be Lutherans): "I wish they may not pervert him, or make him worse." Original Letters, ed. P. S. 652.

³ Letter cclxxxiv. *passim*.

⁴ The last letter of invitation is the one above mentioned, bearing date, March 20, 1552, and in a subsequent communication of Calvin the project is spoken of as relinquished. Cranmer's Works, I. 347: Laurence, Serm. II. note (4). Calvin himself revived it early in the reign of Elizabeth (Strype's Parker, I. 69, ed. 1711), but died immediately after it was submitted to the royal Council.

bishop and his friends long after they had actually begun to frame a domestic Formulary of Faith.

The first sketch of this document was prepared as early as the summer of 1551, the king and his privy council having "ordered the Archbishop to frame a book of Articles of Religion, for the preserving and maintaining peace and unity of doctrine in this Church, that, being finished, they might be set forth by public authority."¹ It is indisputable that the principal burden of the work was borne by Archbishop Cranmer; for when questioned on this point in the following reign, he did not hesitate to admit that the book of Articles was one of the productions which had been framed under his own eye.²

The rough draught, however, as soon as it came from his pen, was transmitted to the rest of his episcopal brethren for their criticism and corrections. It remained in their hands until the spring of the following year, when a letter (May 2) was sent from the council to the Archbishop, requiring him to send the Articles that were "delivered the last year to the bishops, and to signify whether the same were set forth by any public authority, according to the minutes."³ They were forwarded to the council in obedience to this order, but soon afterwards returned to the Archbishop, in whose possession they remained till Sept. 19. He now digested them still more carefully, and after adding titles and introducing supplementary clauses, placing a copy of them in the hands of the two distinguished laymen, Sir William Cecil and Sir John Cheke,⁴ desiring them to take the work into their serious consideration. After a careful revision from these "two great patrons of the Reformation at the court," it was again submitted to the King, with the request that it might be published, and enforced upon the clergy.

A fresh delay, however, intervened; for on the 21st of Octo-

¹ Strype, Cranmer, lib. II. c. 27: II. 366, ed. E. H. S.

² Fox represents the Archbishop as declaring that the work was one of "his doings," but the official report of his language is somewhat different: "Quoad Catechismum et *Articulos* in eodem fatetur se adhibuisse ejus consilium circa editionem ejusdem." Lambeth MS. quoted by Todd, II. 286.

³ Strype, *ubi sup.*

⁴ "I have sent the book of Articles for Religion unto Mr. Cheke, set in a

ber following, a letter was addressed to the six royal chaplains, Harley, Bill, Horne, Grindal, Perne, and Knox, to reconsider the projected Formulary, and to "make report of their opinions touching the same."¹ It was now remitted (Nov. 20) to the Archbishop at one of his country-houses for the "last corrections of his judgment and his pen," and on the 24th of the same month he returned it to the council, accompanied by the following observations: "I have sent unto the same [your good lordships] the Book of Articles, which yesterday I received from your lordships. I have sent also a schedule inclosed, declaring briefly my mind upon the said book; beseeching your lordships to be means unto the King's majesty, that all the bishops may have authority from him to cause all their preachers, archdeacons, deans, prebendaries, parsons, vicars, curates, with all their clergy, to subscribe to the said Articles. And then I trust that such a concord and quietness in religion shall shortly follow thereof, as else is not to be looked for many years."²

A further delay of six months ensued before this authority was publicly accorded, but on the 19th of June, 1553, a mandate in the name of the King was directed to the officials of the Archbishop of Canterbury, requiring them to see that the new Formulary should be subscribed;³ which was accordingly carried into effect, at least in two or three dioceses of the realm.⁴

better order than it was, and the titles upon every matter, adding thereto that which lacked." Cranmer to Cecil, Sept. 19, 1552: Strype's Cranmer, II. App. No. LXVI.

¹ *Ibid.* II. 367: Todd, II. 288, who remarks that a version of the Articles in Latin, with copies of their names subscribed, is now in the State-Paper Office. It has been collated for the present work (App. No. III.) and has supplied a number of important variations.

² Strype's Cranmer, II. App. No. LXIV.

³ See the mandate in Wilkins, IV. 79. It extended also to schoolmasters, and apparently to members of the university on admission to degrees. Todd, II. 293.

⁴ On the 22nd of June (not the 2nd, as in Strype,) the clergy of Canterbury were cited for this purpose, but it is uncertain how many of them actually subscribed. According to Burnet, the Articles were not circulated widely on account of the death of Edward, which followed very soon after (July 6:) III. 365-367. When examined by Queen Mary's commissioners, Cranmer declared that he only "exhorted such as were willing to subscribe; but

Before this period, however, the Articles had been already put in general circulation; as we learn, among other sources, from the following title: "*Articles agreed on by the bishops and other learned men in the synod at London, in the year of our Lord God, 1552, for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of religion.*" Published by the King's Majesty's commandment, in the month of May, 1553. Rich. Graftonus, typographus regius excudebat. Lond. mense Junii, 1553." This work was printed *separately*,¹ and in English: but another edition of 1553, from the press of Raynold Wolfe, exhibits the Articles in Latin, appended to a distinct treatise, bearing the title "*Catechismus Brevis Christianæ Disciplinæ.*"² These two works, similarly connected, but in an English version, were published in the same year, "by the King's Majesty's authority," and the royal Injunction prefixed to the Catechism is dated May 20, 1553.³ The Articles are in both cases said to have been "agreed on by the bishops and other learned and godly men in the last Convocation" (in ultima synodo,) A. D. 1552; but their object is described with a slight variation from the copy as it was printed by Grafton.⁴

It has been remarked already, that the original draft of this document was made by Archbishop Cranmer, and by him sub-

against their wills he compelled none." Fox, 1877. The bishops were permitted to suspend all compulsory measures for a period of *six weeks*. Todd, II. 296.

¹ An important consideration, proving (as Dr. Cardwell remarks) that the Articles were not treated as a mere appendage to the Catechism, with which they were often combined. Synod. I. 6.

² The author of the Catechism is unknown. It has been ascribed to Ridley, Ponet, and Nowell; but the reasons are strongest in favour of the second. See a Letter of Sir John Cheke, June 7, 1553, and the remarks upon it, in Cranmer's Works, ed. P. S. I. 422, note (2.)

³ A very short interval must have elapsed between this order and the actual publication, for in a letter of Utenhovius to Bullinger, dated London, June 7, 1553, he remarks that "Articles are *now printed in the king's name*, to which all persons must subscribe who are to be appointed to any office in the Church, as also those who are already appointed, under pain of deprivation." Original Letters, ed. P. S. 594.

⁴ "For to roote out the discord of opinions, and stablish the agreement of trew religion."

mitted to a number of revisions during an interval of eighteen months. In what particulars it was modified or augmented by this long and varied criticism we are unable to ascertain precisely; and yet the letter of the King to Ridley, bearing date June 9, 1553, as well as that of the Archbishop to Cecil in the previous September, would lead us to suppose that the amount of alteration had been very considerable; for it describes the Articles, which were then publishing in their final form, as "*devised and gathered with great study, and by counsel and good advice of the greatest learned part of our bishops of this realm and sundry others of our clergy.*"¹ We cannot, therefore, resist the conclusion, that they had been exposed to a searching review, and freely discussed and amended by a number of auxiliary hands, before the date of their general circulation.

But some of the uncertainty in which this question has been thought to be enveloped, is dispelled by the records appertaining to the visitations of bishop Hooper in 1551 and 1552;² *i. e.* during the time when the Articles were in process of formation but had not been publicly sanctioned by the Crown. In a pastoral letter to the clergy of Gloucester, in the year 1551, signifying the intention of the bishop to visit that diocese in the summer, he informs them that "according to the talent and gift given him of the Lord, he had collected and gathered out of God's holy Word, a few *Articles*, which he trusted would much profit and do them good." In the course of the visitation he exacted subscription to these Articles, as he himself wrote to Cecil in a letter dated Gloucester, July 6, 1552.³ This, however, must have been upon his individual authority; for in the same communication he expresses the strongest wish that a document still more binding on the clergy may proceed from higher quarters. "For the love of God," he writes, "cause the *Articles*, that the King's majesty spake of, when we took our oaths,⁴ to be set forth *by his authority.*" In Oc-

¹ Strype, Eccl. Mem. II. 421.

² Strype, Cranmer, Book II. ch. xviii., and Documents.

³ Ibid. App. No. xlvi. One of his "interrogatories" on the same occasion was: "How many priests in the deanery *have subscribed unto the Articles that I put forth unto them?*" Eccl. Mem. II. 355.

⁴ *i. e.* on his appointment to the bishopric of Worcester (which he held "in commendam"), May 20, 1552.

tober, 1552, he proceeded to Worcester in continuation of the same visit, but was interrupted by two Romanizing prebendaries, whom he found unwilling to acquiesce in certain of the doctrines which he had propounded in *his* Articles of Religion. This act of resistance on their part led the way to a disputation with the bishop an account of the result of which was immediately communicated by him to the royal council (Oct. 25, 1552); while Joliffe, one of the prebendaries, after the accession of Elizabeth, gave the whole of the controversy to the world in a book published at Antwerp, in 1564. This volume¹ comprises the arguments of the objectors, together with the answer returned to them by Hooper, and a confutation of that answer by Gardiner, who was at the time a prisoner in the Tower: but, what is still more interesting and important, it has also presented us with a copy of the Articles which were the moving cause of the dispute.

At first sight we may be inclined to consider them *altogether distinct* from the Formulary which was subsequently circulated by the King, for subscription in the Church at large. Such indeed appears to have been the inference of Strype;² and the language of Hooper, where he speaks of the Articles "gathered" by himself out of the Holy Scriptures, would unquestionably tend to the same conclusion. Yet, on the other hand, there is satisfactory proof that the two documents are very closely related, or had even proceeded from the common source; for out of the *nineteen* Articles animadverted on by the prebendaries, *ten* will be found to coincide precisely (a few cases of varying phraseology excepted)

¹ See some account of it in Strype's *Ecel. Mem.* ii. 354. The title of a copy in the Library of the University of Cambridge is as follows: "Responsio venerabilium sacerdotum Henrici Ioliffi et Roberti Jonson, sub protestatione facta, ad illos Articulos Ioannis Hooperi, episcopi Vigornie nomen gerentis in quibus a Catholica fide dissentiebat, etc. Antv. 1564."

² "When he visited them he gave them Articles concerning Christian religion, to the number of fifty." Cranmer, ii. 220. A full account of the visitation was perused by Strype in a certain folio MS. of which a copy from Dr. Williams' Library has been obligingly furnished for the use of the present writer, by the Editor of Bp. Hooper's "Remains," (preparing for immediate publication). The title there given describes the Articles as composed for "the unity and agreement as well as for the doctrine of God's Word, as also for the conformity of the ceremonies agreeing with God's Word."

with the Latin Articles of 1552, though the order in which they occur is different throughout; while of the *nine* remaining Articles, *seven* are as obviously the same in substance, though not so fully enunciated as certain parallel definitions of the later Formulary. The only Articles of which no traces were preserved in those of 1552, are the first and the eighteenth in Joliffe's publication; the former being directed against errors on the subject of our Saviour's Incarnation, and the oneness of His propitiatory sacrifice;¹ the latter, against the superstitious services of the mass as they had been commonly celebrated, anterior to the Reformation. There are expressions also in the reply of Hooper, which although hardly reconcilable with his previous language, imply that the Articles tendered by him to the Worcester clergy were in some way sanctioned by the authority of the King, or perhaps in accordance with the Formulary drawn up at the royal order. These passages² have prompted the idea that after the Articles were returned by Cranmer to the privy council in May, 1552, the King had by a private act³ recommended the well-affected prelates to urge them upon the notice of the clergy, for the purpose of ascertaining

¹ "Christi corpus non ex virili semine, nec ex ulla alia materia nisi tantum ex substantia Virginis Maria, opera Spiritus Sancti factum est, idque semel, et semel tantum oblatum est." Art. i. fol. 13. "Missa quæ consuevit a sacerdotibus dici, superstitionis et abusus plena erat, et præter epistolas, evangelia et verba cœnæ, perpauca instituta per Christum habuit: sed a Romanis Pontificibus et ab aliis ejusdem notæ hominibus inventa et excogitata est." Art. xviii. fol. 188. b.

² Hooper (or, as some suspected, Harley or Jewel) began his confutation of it in the following terms: "Quod serius quam pro vestra expectatione, ad ea quæ in *Articulos regios scripsistis* responderim," etc. fol. 6. b.; and again: "Quid hic de regis majestate, *qui mihi author fuit*, ut hæc suis omnibus, tam qui in clero sunt, quam qui in promiscua multitudine proponerem, suspicimini, aliis divinandum relinquo. Me vero, meique loci et ordi alios, *qui his jam pridem subscripsimus* quo ingenio *alpeceas* nota liberetis non video, postquam hos articulos, quos verbo veritatis freti approbavimus, sacræ Scripturæ, analogiæ fidei, et ecclesiæ determinationi vestra censura adversantur." fol. 7. b. It is clear also from Joliffe's statement, that the authority was pleaded in the enforcing of subscription (fol. 5): but Gardiner's Replication (fol. 8. b) implies that no such authority had been brought to bear, except directly and *in terrorem*.

³ Soames, *Reform.* iii. 651.

their willingness on the matter of subscription. Yet on the contrary, it must be remembered that early in the year preceding, allusion had been made by Hooper to what he then designated *his* Articles; and since they in their turn are frequently identical with those, which he offered in 1552 to the prebendaries of Worcester, a rough sketch of the document, hereafter published by authority, was already in active circulation, at least among some of the reforming prelates.¹

Be this, however, as it may, there is not evidence enough to support the conclusion of archbishop Laurence, that the number of Articles as originally compiled at Lambeth, did not exceed nineteen, or that Cranmer in the first instance composed little or nothing more than a condemnation of "Romish" errors.² It is clear from an extant English copy, that the list of bishop Hooper amounted to no less than *fifty* Articles, and if *some* of these only were refuted by the disaffected prebendaries of Worcester, the reason might be that the remainder were considered less open to attack, or were even such as the objectors had no scruple in subscribing.

Nor is this view altogether unsanctioned by the testimony derivable from the work itself; for in the "argument" prefixed by Joliffe, he admits that while some of "the many Articles" were heretical and impious, others entitled to the name of "catholic" had been artfully interspersed, in order that the simple and incautious might be the more easily led astray.³ In such a case, it is evident that we can hope to recover the Articles of 1552, from the records of the Worcester disputation, so far only as they were distasteful to the party who opposed the reformation-movement: and accordingly when we ascertain the subjects which were handled in

¹ The truth seems to be that the Articles in Hooper's "Visitation-Book" are a popular *English* form of this original draft, enlarged by ritual injunctions for the guidance of his clergy, as well as modified in different ways. Very many of his extreme statements are *softened down* in the authorized Articles, as may be seen from the collations in Append. No. III.

² Bampton Lectures, II. note (6).

³ "Is (i. e. Hooperus) sub annum sextum Edouardi Regis VI. articulos multos, alios errore atque hæretica impietate plenos, alios *catholicos*, quo simplices et incautos magis deciperet. . . . probandos subscriptione postulavit atque decendos obtrusit." fol. 6.

the longer of these lists, but omitted in the shorter, we find them generally bearing upon questions which were common to the "old" and the "new learning," and therefore unlikely to have called for rebuke from the champions of the "Romish" tenets. It has been remarked, for example, as somewhat singular that the first Article of 1552, touching the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, has no equivalent definition in the report of the controversy between Hooper and the Worcester clergy, yet the existence of such an Article in the series which was actually submitted to their notice, appears to have been placed beyond reasonable doubt; for in the "True Copy of Bishop Hooper's Visitation-Book," there is an order to the following effect: "That they faithfully teach and instruct the people committed unto their charge, that there is but one God, everlasting, incorporate, almighty, wise and good, Maker and Conserver of heaven and earth, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also He will be called upon by us. And albeit there be but one God in essence and unity in the Godhead, nevertheless in the same unity there be Three distinct Persons,"¹ &c. The same view is further illustrated by the first Article in Joliffe's publication. It was chiefly directed against the errors not of the Romanizing but of the Anabaptist party, as we learn from a contemporary work,² in which it has reappeared; yet as the closing observation was intended to glance at the scholastic dogma of a *repeated* oblation of our Lord in the sacrament of the altar, it was so far assailed in the reply of the Worcester prebendaries:

¹ Art. II.

² The "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum," in process of construction at the same time with the Articles, was the work of nearly the same hands, and is therefore an excellent commentary (see Todd's Cranmer, II. 325, seqq.) The section, "de Hæresibus" contains a denunciation of those forms of misbelief, at that time existing in the Church, "quarum præsens pestis in perniciem religionis nostrorum temporum, adhuc incubat." In c. v. among other false opinions reprobated by the compilers there is one quite identical with that which stands first in the Worcester controversy (cf. above p. 85): "Qui errores omnes sacrarum Scripturarum autoritate sic corrigendi sunt ut Christus meliore natura Deus sempiternus accipiatur, et quidem æqualis sit Dei Patris; humana vero corpus habeat ex tempore factum, neque *scipius* quam semel, neque ex alia materia quam ex *Mariæ virginis vera et sola substantia*."

and to this circumstance alone are we indebted for the preservation of all the Article.

But while the theory of Archbishop Laurence, as to the number and nature of the original draft, is thus shown to be wanting in solid proof, it may suggest an important investigation connected with the history of the Articles, and one which has not hitherto been pursued with the minuteness it deserves. What was the leading aim of the reformers in selecting the particular subjects which are handled in the Articles of 1552? On what principle may we explain the introduction of this point, or the omission of that? Were they designed to be a *complete system of theology*, or simply to express the judgment of the English Church on a variety of sacred topics at that time actually controverted within her own jurisdiction?

The internal evidence afforded in the solution of these queries may be stated in a few words. In the title of the English Articles¹ as published by Grafton, in 1553, they are said to have been constructed with reference to "*certain matters of religion*," and in all the copies, "for the establishment of a godly concord and the avoiding of controversies" apparently agitated at the time.² Two of them (the eighth and the thirty-seventh) deny the errors of the Anabaptists upon original sin and a community of goods; four others (from the thirty-ninth to the forty-second) are directed against as many forms of misbelief affecting the resurrection, the state of the dead, the millenarian hypothesis, and the ultimate salvation of all men: the eighteenth anathematizes all those who wilfully deny the necessity of the Gospel: while the twelfth and thirteenth reject "the doctrine of the school-men,"³ touching hu-

¹ This translation, according to Dr. Cardwell, was probably made concurrently with the original Articles, and under the same direction. Synod. i. 18.

² In the "*Reformatio Legum*," where many of the Articles re-appear in a somewhat different form, attention is distinctly confined to the heresies then in course of propagation. "*Posset magna colluvies aliarum hæresum accumulari, sed hoc tempore illas nominare solum volumus, quæ potissimum hisce nostris temporibus per ecclesiam diffunduntur.*" 22: ed. Oxon. 1850.

³ This phrase in the Articles of 1562 was exchanged for "the *Romish doctrines*;" the council of Trent having in the mean while spoken out distinctly and adopted as portions of the Christian faith many of the opinions, which

man merit and works of supererogation: and the twenty-third touching purgatory, indulgences, and other tenets which were in like manner strenuously defended by the anti-reformation party.

But although we are not able to state from internal evidence what were the heresies proscribed in the rest of the XLII. Articles, we have reason for expecting to meet with them in the contemporaneous history of the Church.⁴ As in the case of the Augsburg Confession, from which those Articles have copied largely, they had an eye in the first instance to the existing necessities of the times, and were designed both as a protest against the scholastic corruptions, and as a curb on the licentiousness of private speculation, which the removal of the ancient yoke had too frequently occasioned. To borrow the strong but accurate language of a distinguished writer⁵ on this period, "the papal infallibility was sometimes transferred to the leader of a petty sect: at other times a dreaming enthusiast would become his own pope, and would consult nothing but the oracle within his own breast." It was, indeed, a stirring crisis in the life of Western Europe, when the human soul, starting up from its long torpor and finding itself free, rushed headlong into the wildest misbelief or the darkest moral corruption; when the cold-hearted rationalist and the visionary mystic, presuming on their individual

had been floating in the Church, and advocated in the schools. The council had commenced its sittings in Dec. 1545: they continued till 1549: after an interruption of two years they resumed; but before the business of the synod was completed a very long suspension intervened, and did not expire till Jan. 18, 1562. The "actions" were then reopened, and finally confirmed by a papal bull bearing date Jan. 6, 1564. In several letters of the reformers we may observe the interest with which they were watching the contemporary disputations at Trent: e. g. Cranmer's Works, i. 346, 349.

⁴ This was certainly the view of Cranmer when he requested the continental reformers to take part in such a compilation: and Calvin understood him in this sense, as we read in a letter which he addressed to the Archbishop, while the English Articles were in progress. He there says that the doctors were invited, "*ut ex diversis ecclesiis, quæ puram Evangelii doctrinam amplexi sunt, convenirent precipui quique doctores, ac ex puro Dei verbo certam de singulis capitibus hodie controversis ac delucidam ad posteros confessionem ederent.*" Cranmer's Works, i. 347. Cf. Ridley's language, in Strype's Annals, i. 260; ed. 1725.

⁵ Le Bas, Cranmer, ii. 88.

powers, overleapt all the boundaries of thought which had been imposed by the sacred Scriptures, and threatened to sweep away in their avenging blindness not only the mediæval errors, among which they had been nurtured, but also the purer exhibition of the Gospel revived by the Anglican Reformers.

The origin of these varied misbelievers may be traced, in nearly all cases, to the scene¹ of the earlier collisions between the "old" and the "new learning." Their first and fundamental error was the rejection of infant baptism; and to this peculiarity of their system they owe the name of "Anabaptists." Mistaking the language of Luther² as to the *universal* necessity of faith in the recipient of the holy sacraments, they postponed their administration of the initiatory rite until the subjects of it were (as they thought) actively exercising the pre-requisite conditions. But their divergencies from the doctrine of the reformers were not confined to this single point. They proceeded to assail the Lutheran tenet of justification by faith only, and in this way fell into the further question respecting the two natures of our blessed Lord. Hans Denk,³ and others, affirmed that man may earn salvation by his own virtuous actions, and regarded the Founder of Christianity chiefly in His character of a Teacher. In Him, as one of the purest of our race, God was peculiarly manifested to the world, but to assert that He was our Saviour, in the received meaning of the term, was, in their view, to convert Him into an idol.

While these impious opinions were spreading on all sides,⁴ a second school of "Anabaptists" had been devising a very different

¹ "It is a matter of the first importance that the Word of God should be preached here in German, to guard against the heresies which are introduced by our countrymen." Micronius to Bullinger, in a letter dated London, May 20, 1550: "Original Letters," ed. P. S. 560.

² This connexion was manifest in the case of Storch, who had been a disciple of Luther. His inference was, however, vehemently confuted in the Catechismus Major, Pars IV. § 21, seqq., and elsewhere in the works of the Saxon reformers, who uniformly maintained with Bishop Taylor, that faith and repentance are not *absolutely* necessary to the efficacy of the sacrament, but accidentally needed on account of the superinduced necessities of adults: Works, II. 248, ed. Eden.

³ Ranke, III. 559.

⁴ Ibid. 561, 562.

creed.¹ They drew some false dualistic distinction between the "spirit," and the "flesh," and instead of holding, like the former sect, that we may be saved by our own efforts, alleged that the flesh only participated in the fall, and when, by impurity of living, it was most of all obnoxious to the indignation of God, the spirit was still free and uncontaminated by the vilest of the outward actions. They attributed the restoration of harmony between these two elements of our nature to the intervention of the Logos, but maintained that His humanity was altogether peculiar, deriving nothing from the substance of the Virgin. Not a few heightened the impiety of their creed, by abandoning the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and joining the Arian and Socinian schools, which were then rising in Switzerland, Italy, and Poland.

In addition to these extreme errors, some of the foreign Anabaptists inculcated the dogma of an absolute necessity; others preached the restoration of all things, and the final conversion of the devil; others maintained that the soul will sleep during the interval which elapses between death and judgment; while the majority of them were cherishing the belief that a millennial kingdom would be speedily established, and would subsist without any external magistracy, or without the guidance of the Written Word. In connexion with this hope, they asserted the strictest community of goods; they refused all military service of a merely secular kind, and objected to the taking of an oath in negotiations with the world around them; some also held the observance of the Lord's-day to be plainly anti-christian; others advocated polygamy, and affirmed even that to those who had received the Spirit, or the Anabaptist rite of initiation, adultery was no sin. All, however, were agreed in rejecting the authority both of the civil and ecclesiastical powers, denouncing the latter as an intolerable burden, and proclaiming the right of every Christian to circulate his creed, unrestrained by human legislation, or by the discipline of the Church.

If we add to this sketch of continental Anabaptism² another of

¹ John Gastius "De Anabaptistarum exordio," &c. ed. Basil, 1544, has specified *seven* distinct sects, 496—501.

² These and other errors may be seen at large in Zwingli's "Elenchus contra Catabaptistas;" Melancthon's "Propositions against the Doctrine of

its prominent features, we shall understand how formidable it must have looked in the eyes of the English reformers. It was a first principle of the sect that all who were duly initiated were not only able, but *bound* to execute the office of a teacher, as soon as they perceived within them the motions of the Holy Spirit. The effect of this immediate inspiration made them at once independent of the Sacred Volume, which they ventured to characterize as "a mere dead letter," obsolete in itself, and in the course of its transmission so falsified by man as to be unworthy of the faith of Christians. In this way the last outward check on the presumptuous speculations of the individual mind was summarily demolished, and the entire system of Christianity abandoned to the fluctuations of the fevered fancy.¹

The precise date when the Anabaptist teachers found their way into England has not been handed down by the chroniclers of the period. As the sect had no single leader and no peculiar locality, its movements were desultory and obscure, and, at first, somewhat difficult to follow. In the year 1538, however, its appearance in the country was enough to attract the attention of the government, and to call out the royal commission adverted to above.² A

the Anabaptists" (German), in Luther's *Schriften*, xx. 2089 seqq. ed. 1745, where other evidence is given (2072—2220); Bullinger's work "*Adversus omnia Catabaptistarum prava Dogmata*," ed. Tiguri, 1535. See also Ranke, *ubi sup.* and Mühler's *Symbolik*, II. 155—188.

¹ Mühler, *Symbolik*, II. 173.

² See above, p. 48. For other traces of them at this period, see "Institution of a Christian Man," 93, 94; Wilkins, III. 843, 847. By 32 Hen. VIII. c. 49. § 11, all who held the following tenets were excluded from the pardon which had been granted by the King, in July, 1540: "That infants ought not to be baptised, and if they be baptised they ought to be rebaptised when they com to lafull age: That it is not leafull for a Christen man to beare office or rule in the Common Welth: That no mans lawes ought to be obeyed: That it is not leafull for a Christen man to take an othe before any judge: That Christe toke no bodily substance of our blessed lady: That Synners afre baptisme cannot be restored by repentaunce: That every maner of Death, with the tyme and houre thereof, is so certainly prescribed, appointed and determyned to every man of God, that neither any prince by his sworde can alre it, ne any man by his owne wilfulnes prevent or chaunge it: That all things be common and nothing severall."

letter, written at the same time, by some of the German princes,¹ implied that the revolutionary spirits who had long troubled the foreign reformers were actively propagating their tenets on this side of the channel: but the strong measures adopted by Henry for their immediate extermination, continued to retard their progress during the remainder of his reign. On the accession of Edward, the vigilance of the executive appears to have been relaxed; for they now rose into a considerable body, beginning "to look abroad and to disperse their dotages."² They flourished more particularly in Kent and Essex;³ and Hooper, who was remarkable for his zeal against them, has left us a frightful picture of the extremity of their errors. In writing to Bullinger, June 25, 1549, he says: "The Anabaptists flock to the place [*i. e.* of his lecture], and give me much trouble with their opinions respecting the Incarnation of our Lord; for they deny altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh. They contend, that a man who is reconciled to God is without sin, and free from all stain of concupiscence, and that nothing of the old Adam remains in his nature; and a man, they say, who is thus regenerate cannot sin. They add, that all hope of pardon is taken away from those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin. They maintain a fatal necessity, and that beyond and besides that will of His, which He has revealed to us in the Scriptures, God hath another will by which He altogether acts under some kind of necessity. . . How dangerously our England is affected by heresies of this kind, God only knows: I am unable indeed,

¹ Seckendorf, lib. III. sect. XVII. § LXV. p. 181. The princes affirm that besides the hostility of Anabaptism to the civil magistrate, it had introduced an endless confusion of opinions, denying the Divinity and the two natures of Christ as well as original sin, and propagating false and absurd notions on the doctrine of justification.

² Heylin, *Hist. Reform*, I. 153; ed. E. H. S.: Carte, II. 252. The latter authority, quoting Strype, mentions a very strange circumstance connected with the spread of Anabaptism. A letter dated Delft, May 12, 1549, was addressed to bishop Gardiner acquainting him that in consequence of the projected organisation of the reformers, it became necessary to introduce divisions among them, and that this would be best effected by preaching up the Anabaptist doctrines.

³ Original Letters, ed. P. S. 87.

from sorrow of heart, to express to your piety. There are some who deny that man is endued with a soul different from that of a beast, and subject to decay. Alas! not only are these heresies reviving among us which were formerly dead and buried, but new ones are springing up every day. There are such libertines and wretches who are daring enough in their conventicles, not only to deny that Christ is the Messiah and Saviour of the world, but also to call that blessed Seed a mischievous fellow, and deceiver of the world. On the other hand, a great portion of the kingdom so adheres to the popish faction as altogether to set at naught God and the lawful authority of the magistrates; so that I am greatly afraid of a rebellion and civil discord."¹

While Hooper and others like him were thus combating the errors by which they were daily beset in the midst of their parochial ministrations, a royal commission was vigorously at work in aid of the same object. Many of the leading misbelievers were either compelled to recant, or were soon condemned, in the language of the time, "to bear their faggots at Paul's cross." The record of the proceedings against them very frequently discloses the nature of their errors; and while some, like Champynes,² do not appear to have been directly impugning the fundamental articles of the faith, others, like Assheton,³ had openly denied the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of our Saviour.⁴ Indeed, the very fearful spread of Arian and Socinian tenets was deplored by a contemporary writer, as one of the greatest evils at that time poisoning the life-blood of the Church and perplexing the spirits of her teachers. "We have not only (he writes) to contend with the papists, who are almost every where ashamed of

¹ Ibid. 65, 66: cf. Hooper's English "Articles," § 6.

² Strype, Cranmer, ii. 92, 93. Among the propositions maintained by him were the following: (1) That a man, after he is regenerated in Christ cannot sin: (2) That the outward man might sin, but the inward man could not; (3) That God doth permit to all His elect people their bodily necessities of all worldly things.

³ Ibid. 95.

⁴ Joan of Kent was burnt May 2, 1550, for maintaining a heresy like that of the early Valentinians. She denied that our Lord took flesh of the Virgin, from a persuasion that He would in that case have shared the sinfulness of man's nature. See above, p. 91, note (1.)

their errors, but much more with the sectaries, and Epicureans, and pseudo-evangelicals.¹ In addition to the ancient errors² respecting pædo-baptism, the Incarnation of Christ, the authority of the magistrate, the [lawfulness of an] oath, the property and community of goods, and the like, *new ones are rising up every day*, with which we have to contend. The chief opponents, however, of Christ's divinity are the Arians, *who are now beginning to shake our Churches with greater violence than ever*, as they deny the conception of Christ by the Virgin."³

A further commission, which emanated from the royal council in Sept. 1552, enjoins the Archbishop to institute proceedings against the sect "newly sprung up in Kent."⁴ Neither the name nor the character of this sect has been distinctly put on record, but there is reason to conclude that it was the first wave of an inundation which afterwards created the greatest confusion in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Becon,⁵ writing at the time of their introduction, entitles them "Davidians," classing their "wicked and ungodly opinions" with those of the Anabaptists and the Libertines. Their subsequent appellation was the "Family of Love," under which title they grew up into a large and formidable body. Their leader and champion was a native of Amsterdam,⁶ Henry

¹ Otherwise called "Gospellers." For a sketch of them at this period see Bacon's Works, (Catechism, &c.,) 415, 416. ed. P. S.

² The letter is dated London, Aug. 14, 1551.

³ Original Letters, ed. P. S. 574: cf. 560. Among other subjects of inquiry during Hooper's visitation in this same year, he asks "Whether any of them speak unreverently of God the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost?" Strype, Eocl. Mem. ii. 355. The same spirit of profaneness had before occasioned a legislative enactment, 1 Edw. VI., c. 1: "An Act against such as shall unreverently speak against the Sacrament of the Altar," &c.

⁴ Strype, Cranmer, ii. 410.

⁵ Works, (Catechism, &c.,) 415, ed. P. S. The name *Davidians* is derived from "David George," a co-founder of the "Family of Love." In a letter written from London, May 20, 1550, it is stated that "there are Arians, Marcionists, Libertines, *Davists*, and the like monstrosities, in great numbers." Original Letters, ed. P. S. 560. The editor has added no explanation of this term, but may it not be intended for *Davists* or *Davidians*?

⁶ The displaying of an horrible secte of grosse and wicked Heretiques, naming themselves the Family of Love, &c., by John Rodgers, Lond. 1579, sign. A. iijj.

Nicholas by name, and the following is one of his directions to all who would join his standard: "They must pass four most terrible castles full of cumbersome enemies, before they come to the House of Love; the first is, of John Calvin, the second the papists, the third Martin Luther, the fourth the Anabaptists; and passing these dangers they may be of the Family, else not."¹

If we now add to this crowd of foreign assailants, the unhappy divisions which had sprung up in the heart of the English Church,—the bitter altercations on the use of the vestments,² and other ecclesiastical "traditions;" or the scandal which had been raised by the controversies respecting the nature of the Divine decrees,³ and many kindred tenets,—we shall have no difficulty in appreciating the fitness of the Articles which attempted, at this very feverish epoch, to establish a more "godly concord in certain matters of religion."

Let us turn, therefore, to the document itself⁴ and endeavour in the light of contemporaneous history to point out the primary aim of its several definitions.

The first article "Of Faith in the Holy Trinity," is almost verbatim from the Augsburg Confession, and while condemning the heresy of Servetus,⁵ like the corresponding article of its prototype, it glanced at the system of Lælius Socinus, and a number of anti-trinitarian teachers, who were loud in their denial of the catholic doctrine.

The second article, respecting the Incarnation of the Word, is also derived from the Augsburg Confession. The truth which it undertook to vindicate was strenuously assailed by the Anabap-

¹ Ibid. A. iij. b.

² This vexed question, together with a second one respecting the posture on receiving the Lord's Supper, seems to have been opened by à Lasco. Heylin, Hist. Ref. i. 193, 194. It was very stoutly contested by Hooper on one side, and Ridley on the other. Original Letters, ed. P. S. 486, 586; and more particularly, 672, 673, or Strype's Cranmer, II. 208. seqq.

³ Below, 103, 104, 105. For some account of disputes on the subject of justification, see a letter of John à Lasco, written from Croyden, in Gerdes, Miscell. II. 678.

⁴ See Appendix, No. III. where they are printed both in English and Latin.

⁵ See above, p. 36.

tists' and others, who are described at length in the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum,"⁶ as actually infesting the Church of England.

The doctrine asserted in the third article ("Of the going down into Hell") was in like manner agitated in this country at the time we are now considering.⁷ The violence of the controversy to which it had given rise induced the Convocation of 1562 to drop the concluding clause as it stood in the present version.⁸

The fourth article, on the "Resurrection of Christ," is a complement of the second and third, affirming the proper manhood of our Saviour, against the errors of the Anabaptists. The particular fact of His resurrection had been also distinctly impugned by a Silesian knight, named Gaspar Schwenkfels,⁹ who died in 1561, and the heresy which he persisted in defending was doubtless inculcated by others of the same proselyting faction.

The fifth article, on the "Sufficiency of Holy Scripture," appears to have been originally constructed with a two-fold application. It asserted the necessity of scriptural proof for every doctrine of the Church, in reply to scholastic and Tridentine errors on the subject of "the Word unwritten;"¹⁰ and also condemned the opposite misbelievers, whom we have seen disparaging the authority of the Bible, as compared with the immediate and fanatical inspirations, of which they were the favoured channel.⁷ It is at the same time careful in the second clause to guard against a pre-

¹ See above, pp. 94, 99.

² De Hæresibus, c. v.

³ Original Letters, ed. P. S. 561, (dated, London, May, 20, 1550.)

⁴ See Strype, Annals of Reform, i. 348, ed. 1725. See the various theories on this subject in Strype's Whitgift, 504, ed. 1718.

⁵ Hey, on the Articles, II. 388: Camb. 1798.

⁶ See above, pp. 53, 54. The Council of Trent had stereotyped this error, in the year 1546. Sarpi, i. 266; ed. Courayer.

⁷ "In quo genere teterrimi illi sunt, (itaque a nobis primum, nominabuntur,) qui sacras scripturas ad infirmorum tantum hominum debilitatem ablegant et detrudunt, sibi sic ipsi interim præidentes, ut earum autoritate se teneri non putent, sed peculiarem quandam spiritum jactant, a quo sibi omnia suppeditari aiunt, quæcunque docent et faciunt." Reform. Leg. Ecol. de Hæresibus, c. 3. Alley (Poore Mans Librarie, i. 171, a) speaks of "Swinckfeldians and other fantasticall heades, which do deprave the holy Scripture:" Lond. 1565.

vailing error, which maintained that all the usages of the Church must be clearly deducible from Holy Scripture.¹

The sixth article, on a due reverence for the Old Testament, was manifestly levelled at the Anabaptist teachers,² many of whom, like Servetus, denied that the elder worthies had even the most indefinite expectation of a life beyond the present.³

The seventh article, like the first of those which had been published in 1536, accepted the authoritative definitions contained in the Three Creeds, and by this act condemned all the heresies both of modern and of ancient growth, which had assailed the fundamental verities of the Gospel.

The eighth article, "Of Original or Birth Sin," is directed against the early misbelief which had been propagated by Pelagius and his party; "whiche also the Anabaptistes⁴ doe now-a-daies renue." Like the second of the Augsburg Articles, from which it was evidently drawn, it may also be intended to glance at the errors of the schoolmen touching the absolute *extirpation* of sin by the sacrament of baptism, or even at the formal determinations on that subject, which had been recently established in the Council of Trent.⁵

The ninth article, "Of Free Will," is intimately related to the one preceding, and was intended to repel the Anabaptist errors on the subject of preventing and co-operating grace.⁶

The tenth article, "Of Grace," was a reply to an opposite error entertained by a second school of Anabaptists,⁷ and also by some of the more violent reformers, who went under the name of Gos-

¹ See above, p. 33.

² "Multi nostris temporibus inveniuntur, inter quos Anabaptistæ præcipue sunt collocandi, ad quos si quis vetus Testamentum alleget, illud pro abrogato jam et obsoleto penitus habent, omnia quæ in illo posita sunt ad prisca majorum nostrorum tempora referentes." Reform. Leg. Eccl. *ibid.* c. 4.

³ Calvin, Instit. Lib. II. c. 10. § 1: cf. Gastius, de Anabaptist. 305.

⁴ Cf. Reform. Leg. Eccl. *ibid.* c. 7.

⁵ See above, p. 36, note (3). The question had been decided by the Tridentine divines, June 17, 1546: Sarpi, I. 319.

⁶ See above, p. 94. This reference is clearly established by the testimony of the "Reformatio Legum," *ibid.* c. 7.

⁷ See Bp. Hooper's Letter, above cited, p. 98.

pellers.¹ They pushed their belief in predestination so far as to render the acts of man altogether involuntary, and to attribute his *evil* choice to the direct agency of his Maker.

The eleventh article, touching our justification "by only faith in Jesus Christ," coincides with the fourth of the Augsburg Articles, and like it was primarily directed against the notions of human merit, which had been long taught, more or less distinctly, in the whole of the Western Church.² It was also designed to include under the range of its animadversion the kindred tenets of the Anabaptists on the same vital question.³

The twelfth article, entitled "Works before Justification," repudiates the error of certain "scholeaucthores," who had affirmed, and were still affirming, that the favour of God is recoverable (or that man may be *entitled to receive grace*), in consideration of the merit of actions, which resulted from his own strength, or had been wrought independently of the Holy Spirit.⁴

The thirteenth article, on "Works of Supererogation," is in like manner levelled against a well-known scholastic figment.⁵

The fourteenth article, affirming that our blessed Lord was alone born without sin, impugns the "Romish" doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin.⁶

The fifteenth, "Of Sin against the Holy Ghost," is derived for the most part from the Augsburg Confession, and asserts the remissibility of sins committed after baptism. The errors broached on this subject in the primitive Church, were revived (as we have seen) by the Anabaptists at the time of the Reformation.⁷

The sixteenth article, entitled "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," defines the nature of this unpardonable sin, apparently with the view of removing the strong temptations to despair, which

¹ Hooper's Early Writings, 421, ed. P. S.

² For the existence of a sounder doctrine, even among the schoolmen, see Field on the Church, App. Book III. c. xii.

³ See the above, p. 94; and compare Reform. Legum Eccl. *ibid.* c. 7.

⁴ The Dominicans, at the council of Trent, condemned this idea of merit *de congruo* as Pelagian: Sarpi, I. 344.

⁵ Cf. Reformat. Legum Eccl. *ibid.* c. 8: Field, On the Church, App. Book III. c. xiii.: Joliffe against Hooper, fol. 175.

⁶ See Field, *ibid.* c. vi. Joliffe against Hooper, fol. 165.

⁷ See above, p. 98, and compare Reform. Leg. Eccl. *ibid.* c. 9.

had been introduced by the misbelief prescribed in the former article.

The seventeenth article, "Of Predestination, and Election," was designed to allay the numerous altercations which had been raised in the reforming body,¹ as well as in the older "schools," by these deeply speculative topics. It is at the same time careful to guard against the fatalistic errors, into which "curious and carnal persons" had fallen from a one-sided view of the doctrines in question.²

The eighteenth article is manifestly intended to condemn the assertions of the Anabaptists,³ that provided men are sincere in following their own systems the rejection of the one Saviour of the world will not hinder their salvation.

The nineteenth is directed against another branch of the same faction,⁴ who, under the plea of internal illumination had dispensed with the moral law, and circulated opinions respecting it "most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture."

The twentieth article, while defining the Church⁵ in terms very similar to those employed in the seventh of the Augsburg Articles, proceeds to repel a prevalent objection respecting the infallibility of the particular Church of Rome.

The twenty-first article, "Of the Authority of the Church,"

¹ Many of the particulars of these disputes have been transcribed by archbishop Laurence, from a MS. in the Bodleian, and published under the title of "Authentic Documents relating to the Predestinarian Controversy." For still earlier traces of it, see Bp. Gardiner's "Declaration" (against George Joye), fol. li. seqq. Lond. 1546.

² The prevalence of these perversions is thus noted in the "Reformatio Legum": "Ad extremum in Ecclesia multi feris et dissolutis moribus vivunt, qui eum re ipsa curiosa sint, differti luxu, et a Christi Spiritu prorsus alieni, semper prædestinationem et rejectionem, vel, ut usitate loquuntur, reprobationem, in sermone jactant." Ibid. c. 22.

³ See above, p. 94: cf. "Reformatio Legum," which characterizes this error as "horribilis et immanis audacia." Ibid. c. 11.

⁴ See above, p. 95.

⁵ The Worcester prebendaries thought this definition imperfect on account of its silence touching the *oneness* of the Church, and the "continuous succession of the vicars of Christ." They admit that the Roman Church had erred in the "agenda" of religion, but not in the "credenda." fol. 80: cf. Reform. Leg. Ibid. c. 21.

was directed in like manner against the Romanizing party,¹ and though it claims for the Church the prerogative of acting as a witness and keeper of Holy Writ pronounces her incompetent to decree any thing at variance with that record.

The twenty-second article, "Of the Authority of General Councils," vindicates the right of the civil power in convoking such assemblies, from the later encroachments of the pope: and maintains that some of the councils reputed "general" at the time of the Reformation,² had actually fallen into error.

The twenty-third pronounces the doctrine of school-authors, concerning purgatory, image-worship, and other similar superstitions,³ to be follies and figments unsupported by holy Scripture, or rather repugnant to its teaching.

The twenty-fourth is manifestly levelled against the Anabaptist error, that every one who fancied himself called to the work of the ministry was bound to assume the office of a teacher in defiance of the authority of the Church. It is based on the fourteenth of the Augsburg articles.⁴

The twenty-fifth declares, in opposition to the Romanizing party, that the language of the public Service-Books should be intelligible to the body of the people.

The twenty-sixth article, "Of the Sacraments," had a two-fold application to the circumstances of the times. The first and second clauses were designed to limit the number of evangelical rites to which the term "sacrament" may be properly affixed, and to guard against the error of supposing that Baptism and the Eucharist produce their effects without any regard to the state of their subjects. The third clause is, on the contrary, directed like

¹ Joliffe against Hooper, fol. 82, 83.

² The "Reformatio Legum," is an excellent commentary on the meaning of this Article. It declares that we reverently accept the four great œcumenical councils, and defer to the decisions of many of the later synods, so far as they upheld the fundamentals of religion. De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica, c. 14.

³ Cf. Reform. Leg. de Hæresibus, c. 10, and Joliffe against Hooper, fol. 90. seqq. It is remarkable that the copy of this Article, as signed by the royal chaplains, (see above, p. 83) contains a censure of "praying for the dead," which had been subsequently dropped.

⁴ See above, p. 38: and comp. Reform. Leg. Ibid. c. 16.

the ninth of the Thirteen Articles, against the prevailing Zwinglian notion, that sacraments were no more than empty rites and external badges.¹

The twenty-seventh, which is included in the fifth of the Thirteen Articles, maintains, in opposition to the sectaries of the day,² that the validity of sacraments is unimpaired by the personal unfitness of the clergy.

The twenty-eighth, "Of Baptism," is a continuation of the censure which had been passed with reference to both the "sacraments of the Gospel" in Article XXVI. It distinctly affirms that baptism is far more than a professional badge or barely outward symbol, and proceeds to vindicate "the custom of the Church" in her retention of *infant* baptism.³

The twenty-ninth, "Of the Lord's Supper," while avoiding the errors of the Zwinglian School, condemns the opposite dogma of a physical transubstantiation in the elements, as repugnant to the Word of God, and as inconsistent with the true humanity of our Saviour and his local residence in heaven.⁴

The thirtieth article, like the third in the Second Part of the Augsburg Formulary, affirms the perfection of the one sacrifice which our Lord offered on the cross, in reply to the current mis-

¹ This intention is clearly established by the testimony of the "Reformatio Legum." In speaking of the "heresies" then current, it observes; "Magna quoque temeritas illorum est, qui sacramenta sic extenuant, ut ea pro nudis signis, et externis tantum indicibus capi velint, quibus tanquam nobis hominum Christianorum religio possit a cæteris internosci, nec animadvertunt quantum sit scelus, hæc sancta Dei instituta inania et credere." Ibid. c. 17: cf. Bp. Latimer's Remains, 252; ed. P. S.

² The same authority speaks of Anabaptists, who separated from the Lord's Table on the plea that they were deterred, "vel ministrorum improbitate, vel aliorum fratrum," c. 15. Luther (as quoted by Dr. Hey, ix. 255.) says of them: "Anabaptistæ propter hominum vitia vel indignitatem damnant vetum baptisma." cf. Alley, Poore Mans Librarie, i. 241, b.

³ Ibid. c. 18. "de Baptismo," where we have a glimpse of certain errors rising, it would seem, out of an opposite quarter. One of them attributed the effects of baptism to a physical virtue in the element employed; a second absolutely denied the possibility of salvation without the intervention of the sacrament.

⁴ Cf. Reform. Leg. Ibid. c. 19.

belief touching the *repetition* of that offering in "the sacrifices of masses."

The thirty-first article is aimed at the mediæval error which regarded the marriage of the clergy as absolutely sinful.⁴

The thirty-second and thirty-third relate to the internal discipline and usages of the Church, which had been made the subject of vehement disputation in the reign of Edward VI.⁵ The former denounces the excommunicate as unfit for the society of Christians; the latter declares that "traditions," or ecclesiastical rites and customs, may not be violated by any at the mere impulse of his "private judgment." It is observable that the language of the second of these laws is borrowed from Art. V. of the Thirteen Articles.

The thirty-fourth simply authorizes the use of the First Book of Homilies, which had been circulating with the royal sanction since 1547.

The thirty-fifth, in like manner, authorizes and commands the Ordinal and the Service-Book which had been previously put forth "by the king and the parliament," in 1550 and 1552.

The thirty-sixth, "Of Civil Magistrates," is directed partly against the Romanizing faction who continued to assert the supremacy of the pope,⁶ and partly against the Anabaptists, who impugned the rights of the civil power and the lawfulness of war.⁴

The thirty-seventh and the thirty-eighth are levelled at the same revolutionary spirits, the one proscribing their notion of a community of goods, the other refuting their scruples on the subject of taking oaths.⁵

The four remaining articles, three of which were drawn from the Augsburg Confession, are condemnatory of four other notions zealously inculcated in the reign of Edward VI. by the Anabaptist teachers.⁶ The first determines, that the resurrection of the dead will extend also to the body, and has not been already finished in the quickening of the soul. The second, that the spirit does not perish with the body, and is still possessed of its

¹ Cf. the third of the "Six Articles," 72, note (7.)

² See above, p. 100, note (2.)

³ Reform. Leg. Ibid. c. 21.

⁴ Ibid. c. 13. See above, p. 95.

⁵ Reform. Legum, c. 14, and c. 15.

⁶ See above pp. 95, 98: and compare Reform. Leg. Ibid. c. 12.

former consciousness in the state of separation; the third, that the heretical fable of the "Millenarii" is repugnant to the Word of God; the fourth, that to believe in the ultimate recovery of all men is a false and deadly notion.

Having thus shown in detail the intimate bearing of the XLII. Articles on the circumstances of the times in which they were compiled, it remains for us to consider the amount of the *authority* by which they could originally challenge the adherence of the Church.

This consideration will resolve itself into an inquiry which has been the cause of vehement debates among the historians of the period:

Were the Articles of 1552 ever formally submitted to the English Convocation, or were they circulated during the brief remainder of this reign on the sole authority of the royal council?

The latter view has been adopted by writers of opposite theological opinions, as well as of considerable weight in all questions of this nature,¹ and therefore is entitled to a full and impartial examination. They rest it mainly on the fact, that the registers of the Convocation, which had been summoned for March 19, 1552,² (*i. e.* in modern language 1553,) contain no mention of the Articles; being "but one degree above blanks," and "scarce affording the names of the clerks assembled therein."³

So long, however, as we may explain the absence of this public testimony, either on the supposition of carelessness in the time of Edward, or of deliberate mutilation in the following reign, it will create no absolute presumption against the synodical authority of the Articles. The Convocation *may* have been "barren," (to use Fuller's phraseology), because its proceedings were either unre-

¹ Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, i. 388. 3rd ed.; Burnet, iii. 361. seqq.; Lamb, *Historical Account of xxxix. Articles*, 4, 5.

² Wake, *State of the Church*, 598; yet he adds in the next page, that the Convocation actually *met* on the 2nd of March.

³ This is the statement of Fuller, (*Church Hist.* 420, 421. fol. ed.,) who had the opportunity of examining the records, and Heylin (i. 256.) so far agrees with him, remarking that "the acts of this Convocation were so ill kept, that there remains nothing on record touching their proceedings, except it be names of such of the bishops as came thither to adjourn the house."

ported or subsequently destroyed, and therefore we cannot follow him in drawing the conclusion that it had "no commission from the king to meddle with Church-business."

But it is alleged, in the second place, that the title prefixed to the Articles of 1552 betrays a like want of ecclesiastical sanction. They are merely said to have been agreed on "by the bishops and *other learned men*, in the synod at London" ("inter episcopos et *alios eruditos viros*):" whereas, in the subsequent promulgation of them in 1562, they are described as "agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces and the *whole clergy*," &c.

The apparent vagueness of the former statement is not, however, unparalleled in the contemporary records of the Church, even when no doubt can possibly exist touching the convocational authority of the document to which that language is applied.^a The argument drawn from this source must therefore be deemed as inconclusive as the one adverted to above.

A third reason for disputing the synodical approbation of the Articles is based upon the language of Cranmer and Philpot, when questioned on this very subject at the opening of the reign of Mary.

It has been already noticed, that when the Articles were published in 1553, they appeared both in a separate form and in the company of a certain "Catechism." Of this second work a complaint was introduced by Weston (the prolocutor of the Convocation, which had assembled in the following autumn), to the effect

^a Heylin has struck out a theory by which this language is readily explained, but the theory is itself altogether conjectural; unless indeed he was alluding to the commission for framing ecclesiastical laws (see below, p. 110). He thinks that the lower house of Convocation, to whom the Articles were submitted, "had devolved their power on some grand committee, sufficiently authorised to debate, conclude, and publish what they had concluded in the name of the rest." i. 257.

A somewhat kindred solution has been proposed by Dr. Cardwell, who, while admitting the synodical authority of these Articles, supposes that the sanction of the upper House was given, if not directly, at least by delegation; and that this sanction was considered to involve the ratification of the whole synod. *Synod.* i. 4, 5.

^b See above, p. 55; and compare "British Critic" for 1829; vi. 84.

that "it bore the name of the honourable synod, although, as he understood, *put forth without their consent.*" Philpot,¹ who was present as archdeacon of Winchester, explained at some length in what way "it might be well said to be done in the Synod of London," although the members of the present house "had no notice thereof before the promulgation." According to his view the clergy had authorised certain persons to make ecclesiastical laws,² and had concentrated in this committee their own synodical rights: but Cranmer in his "Disputation at Oxford," in April, 1554, appears to have given a somewhat different solution. When charged by Weston with publishing "a Catechism in the name of the Synod of London," he replied,³ "I was ignorant of the *setting to of that title*; and as soon as I had knowledge thereof, I did not like it; therefore, when I complained thereof to the council, it was answered me by them, that the book was so entitled, because it was set forth *in the time of the Convocation.*" Both these testimonies, however, agree in denying that the *Catechism* in question had ever been formally submitted to the synodical revision of the clergy: and if the *Articles* are necessarily implicated in the disclaimers here adduced, we are compelled to accept the hypothesis that they were put in circulation by the civil power without obtaining the approval of the Church.

But no such necessity exists for involving any more than the *Catechism* itself, within the purport of Weston's censure. The *Articles*, as we have seen, were an independent publication,⁴ and although they were associated in some of the early copies with a more extensive work, there is not enough reason for believing that they were originally regarded as a mere appendage to it.⁵ While it is declared to have been put forth "by *certain* bishops and

¹ Fox, 1410. The date was Oct. 20.

² He must have alluded to the Commission appointed in 1551 to draw up the "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.*"

³ Cranmer's Works, iv. 64, 65.

⁴ See above, p. 86, and note (1).

⁵ See Bp. Maddox, *Vindication of the Church of England*, 309. ed. 1733. The only instance where the two works *seem* to be actually united is found in the language of Cranmer above quoted, p. 84, note (2), but this does not imply more than their publication in the same volume, which we have seen was not unusual.

other learned men,"¹ *they* claim to be the work of "*the bishops,*" and to have been agreed on by the Church assembled in Convocation. And as a further corroboration of the distinctness existing between these two contemporary publications, it is remarkable that notwithstanding the many animadversions² which the *Catechism* excited in the reign of Mary, the *Articles* are never once treated, in all the surviving records, as if they had been published *unfairly*, or rather the assailant of the former work, appears to acknowledge the authority which *they* had repeatedly assumed. We may, accordingly, conclude in this case as in others, that no adequate reasons have been urged for denying the synodical approbation of the latter *Formulary of Faith*.

But, on the other hand, there is *positive* proof that it was submitted to the southern Convocation in the year 1552, and if not actually debated in that body, at least very generally sanctioned and subscribed.

The language of the title in every existing copy of the *Articles* has expressly affirmed their ratification "in the last synod of London." They are publicly recited as possessing this authority on their subsequent revival and enactment in the Convocation of

¹ See the Royal Injunction prefixed to the *Catechism* of Edw. VI. (ed. P. S.). The date is "20 Maii, anno regni 7," (i. e. 1553). It is probable that Weston alluded to this expression when he spoke of the *Catechism* as claiming to have been set forth by *Convocation*: for there is no statement of that kind in the work itself, although Mr. Lathbury (145, 146) affirms that it was so sanctioned in 1552. A very competent writer in the "*British Critic*" for 1829, (vi. 85, 86), to whom this part of our inquiry is much indebted, has shown cause for suspecting that the *Catechism* censured in the reign of Mary, was *not* the one usually called the *Catechism* of Edw. VI., but some other book with which we are now unacquainted. Still the evidence seems slightly to preponderate in favour of the identification. It is not very improbable that such a manual was printed in September 1552, and that a royal injunction to schoolmasters was prefixed to a *subsequent* edition in the spring of 1553. Strype thinks that the injunction for printing it was *suspended* in order that it might be submitted to the following Convocation.

² Two instances are given above, p. 110. A third is supplied by the account of Bp. Ridley's Examination (Fox, 1449), who distinctly disclaimed the authorship of the "*Catechism,*" but admitted with regard to the *Articles*, "They were set out, I both willing and consenting to them. Mine own hand will testify the same."

1562,¹ and it is almost incredible that such an assumption should have been allowed to pass unchallenged, especially by men like archbishop Parker, and in the midst of a critical synod, if the document were not really invested with the sanction which it claims. Our belief in the veracity of this language is still more strongly established by a communication from the visitors to the Vice-Chancellor and Senate of Cambridge² (June 1, 1553), in which they speak of the Articles as having been prepared by good and learned men, and agreed upon *in the synod of London*: and also by a contemporary letter³ of Sir John Cheke to Bullinger (June 7, 1553), where he informs his correspondent that the *Articles of the synod at London* were then published by the royal order.

If further evidence be needed in support of their convocational authority, it may be gathered out of the memorials of a controversy on the subject of the clerical vestments⁴ in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. When certain ministers of London disputed the "tradition" of the Church, and exposed themselves to the censure of the Article for securing a public agreement on this and other similar questions, it was urged against them by an advocate of order,⁵ that many of their number had actually sub-

¹ Reg. Convocat. in Bennett, Essay on the Thirty-Nine Articles, 167: "Ulterius proposuit (i. e. the Prolocutor) quod *Articuli in Synodo Londoniensi tempore nuper regis, Edw. VI.*" (ut asseruit) *editi,*" &c.

² "Cum antea in reintegranda religione multum denique regis Majestatis autoritate et bonorum atque eruditorum virorum judiciis sit elaboratum, et de *Articulis quibusdam in synodo Londoniensi, A. D. 1553, ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem conclusum, equissimum judicavimus eosdem regia autoritate promulgatos et omnibus episcopis ad meliorem dioceseos sue administrationem traditos, vobis etiam commendare et visitationis nostræ autoritate præcipere, etc.*" From a MS. in C. C. C. quoted by Dr. Lamb, Historical Account, 4, 5, note. This Convocation is placed in the year 1553, because it continued until April 1. It assembled in the early part of the month preceding, and therefore in what was (according to ecclesiastical computation) the year 1552.

³ Original Letters, ed. P. S. 142.

⁴ "An Answer for the Time," printed in 1566, with other Tracts on the same question. It seems to have first arrested the attention of Archbishop Wake, (State of the Church, 599, 600.) A copy is in the Cambridge University Library, marked G. 6, 84.

⁵ 151—153. The Examiner appeals to "the determination of this Church

scribed the Edwardine Formulary in the Convocation of 1552, and had consequently departed from their own pledge by "breaking the traditions and ceremonies of the Church." The reply of the puritan to this charge is a full admission of the truth, that many of the clergy, who were thus disaffected, had set their hands to the 33rd of the XLII. Articles in common with the rest, but had done so with the limiting condition that nothing was to be ordered by the Church repugnant to the Word of God.

Such then being the natural deduction from all the surviving evidence, it is desirable to indicate the process which had been *most probably* adopted in the composition and ratification of the Articles. They were first drawn up by Archbishop Cranmer very early in 1551, and circulated by him among the other prelates till the May of the following year. On the 2nd of that month he was asked by the council, "whether they had been set forth by any *public authority*," and this question naturally suggests the idea that some intention then existed of submitting the Articles to the notice of the Convocation, which had been recently dissolved (April 16.) Whether that intention was executed or not we have no means of ascertaining; but in the interval which elapsed from the inquiry of the council till the autumn of the same year, the Formulary was made to undergo a still further examination. We lose sight of it until the 24th of November, when it was finally sent back to the royal council, but it seems to have continued in their hands till the opening of the Convocation in the March of 1552. If actually *discussed* at this time either in one or both of the houses, the debate was very speedily conducted to an amicable issue; for on the 1st day of the following month, the synod was itself dissolved, and the royal order for the printing

in Englande, both agreed vpon in Kyng Edwardes dayes, and also testified and *subscribed by themselves*, who nowe woulde gaynsay their owne doynge then." He adds, "The wordes which the *whole sinode* were well pleased withall and whereunto all the cleargies handes are set to be these," (quoting the 33rd of the XLII. Articles.) The remark of the "Answerer" is as follows:—"The Articles of the sinode haue such conditions annexed to them, that *wee nede not feare to subscribe to them againe,*" &c.

¹ Wake, State of the Church, 598.

of the Articles appeared on the 20th of May.¹ They were thus "prepared by the authority of the king and council, agreed to in Convocation, and there subscribed by both houses; and so presently promulgated by the King's authority, according to law."²

But this, like many other of the salutary fruits which had ripened in the reign of Edward, was soon to be crushed and buried under the force of the violent reaction produced by his early death. The young monarch breathed his last, July 6, 1553, and the Convocation which assembled on the 6th of October was either "so packed or so compliant," that only six members of the lower house³ objected to reaffirm the corporal presence in the Eucharist, and to join in denouncing the obnoxious "Catechism," alluded to above. In the course of the ensuing year the great body of the people were "reconciled" to the see of Rome, and Cardinal Pole,⁴ as *legatus à latere*, convened the two houses of Convocation, and ministered the pontifical absolution, which they received on their bended knees. A fresh and impetuous vigour was thereby injected into the proceedings of the counter-reformation movement: and among the first things which were pressed on the notice of the intruding prelates, were the "pestilent books of Thomas Cranmer, late Archbishop of Canterbury."⁵ In the enumeration of those public Formularies of Faith which had been so extensively indebted to his learning, there is no particular mention of the XLII. Articles; yet they are doubtless to be reckoned in the list of "the other books as well in Latin as in English, concerning heretical, erroneous, or slanderous doctrine." Though not formally abolished, it would seem, by the acts of any future Convocation, they were in truth altogether superseded by the revival and ascendancy of the Romanizing

¹ This general view of their history and ultimate ratification in the synod, accords with the able Article in the *British Critic*, alluded to above.

² Wake, 600.

³ Wilkins, iv. 88.

⁴ In his Decree on the Reformation of England, dated Feb. 10, 1556, he lays it down as his future object, "ut in hoc legationis munera perseveremus, ut ea, quæ jam in ejusdem unitatis negotio confecta erant, magis stabilirentur, utque ecclesia hæc Anglicana, quæ ob præteriti schismatis calamitatem in doctrina et moribus valde deformata esset ad veterum patrum et sacrorum canonum normam reformaretur." *Le Plat, Monument*, iv. 571

⁵ Wilkins, iv. 96: cf. the "Proclamation for the restraining of all books and writings against the pope," &c. *Ibid.* 128, 129.

party. An example of this virtual suppression is supplied by a series of Articles,¹ (fifteen in number,) which were sent on the 1st of April, 1555, to the University of Cambridge, accompanied by the injunction of the Chancellor (Gardiner,) that no one should be allowed to graduate until he had proved the integrity of his faith by subscribing the new test of doctrine; and in the last year of the reign of Mary the zeal of the houses of Convocation was conspicuously expressed in compiling a number of dogmatic definitions, which are described as "the last of the kind that were ever presented in England by a legal corporation in defence of the popish religion."²

¹ *Ibid.* 127, 128. In the Injunctions of Pole for the diocese of Gloucester the clergy are ordered, when there is no sermon, to read some portion of the "Necessary Doctrine," until such time "as Homilies by th' authoritie of the synode shall be made and published for the same intent and purpose." *Ibid.* 146, 148. A small catechism in English and Latin was also in contemplation. *Ibid.* 156.

² Fuller, *Church History*, Bk. ix. p. 55. The first three are affirmations on the nature of the Eucharist, the fourth on the papal supremacy, and the fifth on the propriety of committing ecclesiastical judgments to the pastors of the Church, instead of leaving them in the hands of laymen. Wilkins, iv. 179, 180.

CHAPTER VI.

THE ELIZABETHAN ARTICLES.

THE proclamation of Elizabeth, on the 17th of November, 1558, was one of the most memorable epochs in the annals of the English Church. During a long and eventful reign she presided over the completion of the work, which had been founded by her father and her brother, and promoted the restoration of the breaches it had suffered in the days of her sister Mary.

Yet the calm and calculating spirit, that appeared in her public measures on the subject of religion, was far from satisfying the hopes of the crowd of sanguine exiles, whom the news of her establishment on the throne brought back to the shores of Britain.¹ The pulpits were all silenced by a royal order;² the service of the Church was still used in Latin,³ excepting "the Gospel and Epistle of the day" and "the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue:" a majority⁴ also of the state-council, as constituted by the Queen herself, were in favour of the "older learning," and all things betokened her desire to conciliate the affections of the country, and to repress the indiscretion of the more ardent spirits both upon the right hand and the left. Bacon, the lord-keeper,⁵ announced to the Parliament in the name of his royal mistress, "that no party-language was to be kept up in this kingdom, that the names of heretic, schismatic, papist and such like were to be laid aside and forgotten: that on the one side there

¹ Their dissatisfaction is well illustrated by the Letters of Bp. Jewel, written at this period to some of his foreign friends.

² Dec. 27, 1558. Wilkins, iv. 180.

³ This practice continued till June 24, 1559, except in the case of the Litany, which was said in English on the 1st of January preceding.

⁴ Turner, Hist. of England, iii. 507 (note).

⁵ D'Ewes' Journals of Parliament, 12.

must be a guard against unlawful worship and superstition, and on the other, things must not be left under such a loose regulation as to occasion indifferency in religion and contempt of holy things."

Much, however, as this kind of policy was calculated to perplex the reforming party, it was no proof either of vacillation or of fear in the mind of the cautious monarch. She had firmly purposed at the outset of her reign, and while the festivities of the coronation were proceeding, to attempt the revival of the public worship, as it was celebrated in the time of Edward; and the enumeration of the perils she was going to encounter, when fully set before her by Sir Wm. Cecil,¹ only deepened her previous resolutions and invigorated all her measures.

One of the earliest examples of discernment in the choice of her advisers, and the brightest omen of her ultimate success, was the nomination of Matthew Parker to the archbishopric of Canterbury.

By nature as well as education, by the ripeness of his learning, the sobriety of his judgment, and the incorruptness of his private life, he was eminently fitted for the post of presiding over the Church of England in that stormy period of her being; and though unable to reduce the conflicting elements into rest and harmonious co-operation, the vessel which he had been called to pilot was saved, almost entirely by his foresight, from breaking upon the rock of mediæval superstitions, or from drifting away into the opposite whirlpool of lawlessness and unbelief.² Like Cranmer, his illustrious predecessor, whom he valued so highly, that he "wolde as moche rejoyce to wynne" some of his lost writings as he "wolde to restore an old chancel to reparation,"³—he was intimately acquainted with the works of the ancient Church, and uniformly rested his vindication of our own upon its cordial adherence to

¹ See the statement in Burnet, v. 450—454.

² "These times are troublesome. The Church is sore assaulted; but not so much of open enemies, as of pretended favourers and false brethren, who, *under cover of reformation*, seek the ruin and subversion both of learning and religion." Strype, Parker, 433: ed. 1711. In writing to Cecil he prays that God may preserve the Church from such a visitation as Knox had attempted in Scotland. State Papers, Domestic, Nov. 6, 1559.

³ Parker to Cecil, Aug. 22, 1563; in Strype's Cranmer, Appendix, No. XC.

the primitive faith and the practice of the purest ages. "His great skill in antiquity," (to quote the language of his biographer, Strype) "reached to ecclesiastical matters as well as historical; whereby he became acquainted with *the ancient Liturgies and doctrines of the Christian Church in former times*. He utterly disliked, therefore, the public Offices of the present Roman Church, because they varied so much from the ancient." And in his last will Parker has himself declared,¹ "I profess that I do certainly believe and hold whatsoever the holy Catholic Church believeth and receiveth in any Articles whatsoever, pertaining to faith, hope and charity, in the whole sacred Scripture."

Under the guidance, therefore, of this calm and venerable primate we may proceed with the history of the Articles of Religion, tracing them out of the obscurity into which they were thrown by the death of Edward, and noting the modifications which they subsequently underwent during the Elizabethan period of the Church.

The Formulary of 1552, having passed the houses of Convocation, and remaining (so far as we can judge) unrevoked in the time of Mary, might have been at once propounded for the subscription of the clergy, as a test of the purity of their faith. But no attempt of this kind appears to have been made at the opening of the new reign, nor indeed for a long time after the general restoration of the Prayer-Book. The Articles for the most part continued in the background,² till they were discussed by the

¹ Strype, Parker, 530.

² Ibid. 500, and Appendix, No. C.

³ They are referred to, however, in the following passage of a document presented to the Queen, A. D. 1559, by some of the refugees, in answer to the charge that "their doctrine was nothing but heresy, and they a company of sectaries and schismatics;" "Although in this our Declaration and Confession we do not precisely observe the words, sentence, and orders of *certain godly Articles by authority set forth in the time of King Edward* of most famous memory . . . yet in altering, augmenting or diminishing, adding or omitting, we do neither improve [*i. e.* call in question], nor yet recede from any of the said Articles, but fully consent unto the whole, as to a most true and sound doctrine, grounded upon God's Word, and do refer ourselves unto such Articles there as in our Confession, for shortness' sake, we have omitted." Strype, Annals of Reform. i. 115; who gives one or two specimens of "the Confession," and adds (116) that "on the back-side of this Paper are writ these

houses of Convocation in 1562; and even after they had been thus authoritatively remodelled, *subscription* to them was required only in the year 1571, by a canon of the Convocation' assembled at that period, and by a contemporary enactment of the civil legislature.

During the interval, however, which elapsed from the accession of Elizabeth to the latter date, the bishops had provided another independent test of doctrine, which for the sake of distinctness we may entitle the "Eleven Articles of Religion." It was compiled in 1559, under the eye of archbishop Parker,³ with the sanction of the other metropolitan and the rest of the English prelates; and the clergy were required to make a public profession⁴ of it, not only upon admission to their benefices, but twice also every year, immediately after the Gospel for the day, it was designed to further "uniformity of doctrine," and appointed to be taught and holden of all parsons, vicars, and curates, as "well in testification of their common consent in the said doctrine, to the stopping of the mouths of them that go about to slander the ministers of the Church for diversity of judgment, as necessary for the instruction of their people."⁴

According to Collier's description these Articles were "drawn

words by *Grindal's* hand, (as it seems) *Articuli Scripti anno primo Regine nunc.*" The whole may be seen in a MS. belonging to C. C. C. (cxxi. § 20), and containing the signatures *George Hovy, John Ploughe, John Opynshaw*. The authors of it allude to the public Disputation at Westminster which began on the last day of March, 1559, and the document was, consequently, drawn up after that date.

¹ Wilkins, iv. 275, "de Cancellariis," etc.: cf. "English Review," III. 165 seqq., where it is shown that occasional instances occurred in which men suspected of heterodoxy were called upon to subscribe as equivalent to recantation.

² Strype, Annals, i. 220, ed. 1725.

³ Hooper seems to have considered this kind of acquiescence far more stringent than subscription: "Subscribing privately in the paper I perceive little availeth. For notwithstanding that, they speak as evil of good faith, as ever they did before they subscribed." Strype's *Cranmer*, App. XLVII.

⁴ Wilkins, iv. 195, seqq. This document is reprinted below, Appendix, No. IV. It was first published by Richard Jugge (the Queen's Printer) in 1561, and is said to exist in MS. among the treasures of C. C. C.

upon a *very near resemblance* with those published in 1552;¹ while granting that there is some truth in his statement, with respect to their general spirit, an examination of the document itself must demonstrate how far it has varied from all the anterior models.

The *first* article is almost verbally drawn from the first of the XLII., laying down the necessity of a belief in the Holy Trinity in Unity. The *second* affirms the sufficiency of Scripture, for establishing the verity of the Gospel, and for the confutation of "all errors and heresies;" while it recognises the three catholic Creeds as summaries of the principal articles of our faith. The *third* acknowledges "the Church to be the Spouse of Christ, wherein the Word of God is truly taught, the sacraments orderly ministered according to Christ's institution, and *the authority of the keys duly used:*" adding, with the 33rd of the older Articles, that every national Church may change its ritual institutions. The *fourth* excludes all from any office or ministry, either ecclesiastical or secular, who have not been lawfully thereunto called by the high authorities. The *fifth* asserts the royal supremacy, as expressed in an act of parliament, and as explained by her Majesty's "Injunctions." The *sixth* denies the papal monarchy, on the ground that it is contrary to Scripture and to the example of the primitive Church. The *seventh* acknowledges the English Prayer Book to be "agreeable to the Scriptures," and "catholic, apostolic, and most for the advancing of God's glory." The *eighth* declares that exorcism, oil, &c., do not pertain to the substance of the sacrament of baptism, and that they have been reasonably abolished. The *ninth* denies that "private masses" were ever used amongst the fathers of the Primitive Church, and proceeds to declare that the doctrine of a propitia-

¹ II. 463. A much nearer affinity is found between the Edwardine Formulary and a Latin series of XXIV. Articles, described by Strype as "The Articles of the Principal Heads of religion prescribed to ministers:" Annals, I. 216, 217. They seem to have been drawn up by the Archbishop and his friends, along with the XI. Articles in the year 1559 (Ibid. 215.) but he apparently failed in procuring the sanction of the Crown for their circulation among the clergy. They are important, however, as contemporary illustrations of the XXXIX. Articles, and will be hereafter employed for that purpose.

tory sacrifice in "the mass" for the quick and dead and "as a mean to deliver souls out of purgatory," is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance nor grounded upon "doctrine apostolic." The *tenth* maintains the right of the people to communion under both kinds; and from the language of our Saviour's institution, and the practice of the ancient "doctors of the Church," condemns the withholding of the "mystical cup," as "plain sacrilege." The *eleventh* disallows the extolling of images, relics, feigned miracles, and other superstitions, on the ground that they "have no promise of reward in Scripture, but contrariwise threatenings and maledictions," and exhorts all men on the contrary to a diligent cultivation of good works.

It does not appear that this Formulary had been put in circulation by the authority of the royal council; and as the houses of Convocation did not assemble until the year 1562, it was destitute of all ecclesiastical sanction, excepting so far as the consent of the bishops involved the acquiescence of the lower clergy. Issuing, however, as it did, from the press of the Queen's printer, and being enforced by episcopal injunctions upon the whole body of incumbents, it claims to be regarded as a public manifesto, and as an authentic record of the teachings of the Church through the interval which elapsed from the time of its appearance to the revival of the longer Articles in the ensuing Convocation. At a much later period (in 1566) it was prescribed *verbatim* to the Church of Ireland, "by order and authority as well of the Right Honourable Sir Henry Sidney, General Deputy, as by the Archbishops and Bishops, and other her Majesty's High Commissioners for causes ecclesiastical in the same realm,"² and was the only domestic Formulary, with the exception of the Irish Prayer Book, which the sister Church appears to have recognised, until the "Articles of Religion" were agreed on by the Convocation of 1615.

¹ This document was printed at Dublin, by Humfrey Powel, Jan. 20, 1566, and may be seen at length in Dr. Elrington's "Life of Usher:" App. xxiii.—xxix.

² The English Articles of 1562 were subscribed in the mean time, at least in some few cases (Mant, I. 382, 2nd ed. ;) but compare Elrington's Usher, ubi sup. 42, 43.

With regard to our own country, the "Eleven Articles" were intended as a merely provisional test, and consequently began to be superseded,¹ at least on this side of the channel, when the Articles of the synod of 1562 were absolutely enjoined upon the clergy by the canons of 1571.

To the compilation, therefore, of this document our thoughts are now specially directed.

Though "many popishly-affected priests still kept their hold by their outward compliances,"² the majority of the Church had cordially acquiesced in the changes resulting from the accession of Elizabeth, and the appointment of Archbishop Parker. The labours of the royal commission, deputed in 1559 to visit the whole of the English diocesses, had largely contributed to this object, at one time by confirming the mind of the waverer, and at another by silencing the "recusant," who either questioned the supremacy of the Queen, or rejected the English Service-Book. Jewel, who was himself one of the most zealous members of the commission, wrote an account of his progress to Peter Martyr,³ November 2, 1559: "Every where," he says, "we found the minds of the multitude sufficiently alive to religion, and that even where all things were supposed to be most difficult and disheartening. Still it is incredible what a harvest, or rather what a wilderness of superstition had shot forth again during the darkness of the Marian period.—The cathedrals were no better than dens of thieves.—If we had to encounter obstinacy and malice in any quarters, it was entirely among the priests, and especially those who had once been of our own way of thinking. I suppose they are now disturbing all things, in order that they may not seem to

¹ Among the "Ordinances" of Archbishop Parker in 1564, is one relating to this Formulary, which was regarded by him as an authority co-ordinate with the Articles of 1562; for after enjoining the clergy to read the Book of Articles, "without notings or expoundings as theye be sett owte in the English Tongue twyse in the yere," he adds, "That they reade also the Declaration for the unitye of Doctrine sett owte for the same purpose." Strype, Parker, App. xxviii., 48.

² Strype, Parker, 91, ed. 1711. The number who refused to admit the English Prayer Book was one hundred and eighty-nine. Annals, i. 171, 172.

³ Works, viii. 128—130, ed. Jelf. The whole letter is curious.

have changed their minds without sufficient consideration. But let them create as much confusion as they like: we have in the mean time ejected them (conturbavimus) out of their sacerdotal office."

As a natural result of these cogent measures, and of the growing bias of the Church at large in favour of the Reformation, her representatives in the earliest of the Elizabethan synods were agreed in their hostility to the errors which had been revived in the previous reign; however much they differed from each other in their view of the truth itself, and of the manner in which the Romanizing tenets should be thwarted and replaced. A royal brief for summoning the convocations of Canterbury and York was issued Nov. 11, 1562, and the day appointed for their meeting was Jan. 12, 1563,¹ or, in the language of ecclesiastical computation, 1562.

During this interval, and it may be for some time anterior, the archbishop of Canterbury had been sedulously engaged in revising the Edwardine Articles, with the intention of submitting them to the synod as the basis of the Formulary of Faith about to be considered. He was probably assisted in this work "by his constant friends, bishops Grindal (of London), Horn (of Winchester), and Cox (of Ely)." They chose for the subject of revision the *Latin* Articles of 1552; and it is interesting to find that the result of their criticism is preserved among the manuscripts of archbishop Parker.² We are in this way enabled to describe the changes

¹ The Council of Trent was sitting at the same time, see above, p. 92, note (3.) Its twenty-second "action" commenced, Sept. 17, 1562, by publishing the doctrinal decree on the "sacrifice of the mass;" and while the English Convocations were assembled, a warm contest was proceeding between the Italian bishops on one side, and the French and Spanish on the other, touching the extent of the papal power. Sarpi, ii. 568—570. The same spirit of national independence, exhibited by the French prelates on this occasion, had been witnessed in the autumn of 1561, at the "Colloquy of Poissy," where an attempt was made to conciliate the Huguenots by means of a national synod, and without the aid of the Roman pontiff. Fleury, Hist. Eccl. liv. clvii. s. 1—27; Bossuet, Variations, liv. ix. s. 90. In a contemporary letter of Parker to Cecil, we see the interest felt by the English with regard to the fruits of this "Colloquy," (State Papers, Domestic, Aug. 11, 1561.)

² Dr. Lamb, in 1829, published, among other documents, an exact copy of

introduced into the present Articles of Religion far more exactly than our authorities have permitted in tracing the compilation of the documents which have already passed under our notice.

It is very observable in the outset how the prelates who took part in this work of remodelling the Articles of 1552 have betrayed the same *Lutheran* leanings which appear in the earlier reformation, and especially in the language which had been adopted from the Saxon Formularies into the corresponding works of the Church of England. A large portion of the changes in dogmatic points which are found on comparing the Elizabethan Articles with those in the reign of Edward, may be traced to a Lutheran document which had been framed in accordance with the confession of Augsburg in 1551.¹ It is entitled the "Confession of Wirtemberg," and was presented by the ambassadors of that state to the Roman Synod of Trent.² From it is derived the clause in our second Article, touching the eternal generation and consubstantiality of the Son; the agreement being absolutely verbatim.³ The same is true of the third Article, "Of the Holy Spirit," which has no equivalent in the Edwardine series, but exists entire among the Wirtemberg Articles.⁴ An appendix to the sixth of our present list, affirming that those books are to be reputed as component parts of the Sacred Canon, of whose authority there has never

the Latin Articles of 1562, as presented by Parker to the Convocation. It contains also the marks of numerous corrections which the Formulary had itself experienced, while under the notice of that body.

¹ See it at length in Le Plat, Monum. iv. 420 seqq. The resemblance of our own to this Formulary was first pointed out in Laurence's Bampton Lect., 40, and notes. It professes to be in exact accordance with the Augsburg Articles; and although designed for the single state of Wirtemberg, will be found to be a compendium of the "Repetitio Confessionis Augustanæ," drawn up at the same period by the Saxon Churches, for presentation at the Council of Trent (Franke, Libri Symbol. 69—116).

² Sarpi, ii. 104, ed. Courayer.

³ "Credimus et confitemur Filium Dei, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, ab æterno a Patre suo genitum, verum et æternum Deum, Patri suo consubstantialem." De Filio Dei. For the corresponding English Articles, see App. No. III.

⁴ "Credimus et confitemur Spiritum Sanctum ab æterno procedere a Deo Patre et Filio, et esse ejusdem cum Patre et Filio essentia, majestatis, et gloria, verum ac æternum Deum." De Spiritu Sancto.

been any doubt in the Church, is manifestly copied from the same quarter.¹ The tenth Article² on "Free Will," the new portion of the eleventh³ on "Justification," and the twelfth⁴ on "Good Works," though not actually agreeing to the letter with the language of the same Formulary, are no less obviously adapted from it; while the disputed clause of our twentieth Article⁵ (about which more will be said hereafter) is allied to the statement of the Wirtemberg theologians respecting the judicial functions of the Church.

But besides the important elucidations derived from this foreign source, the copy of the Formulary as submitted by archbishop Parker to the acceptance of the Synod, in 1562, exhibited a variety of other changes.

He introduced the twenty-ninth and the thirtieth of our present set, the former being directed against a prevailing error on the manducation of our Lord's body by the wicked,⁶ the latter affirming the scripturalness of communion in both kinds. The fifth and twelfth on "the Holy Spirit" and on "Good Works" respectively, which have been traced to the Wirtemberg Confession, were also entirely new in the list of Elizabethan Articles. They were

¹ "Sacram Scripturam vocamus eos Canonicos libros veteris et novi Testamenti, de quorum autoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est." De Sacra Scriptura.

² "Quod autem nonnulli affirmant homini post lapsum tantam animi integritatem relictam, ut possit sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus, ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac præparare, haud obscure pugnat cum Apostolica doctrina, et cum vero Ecclesiæ Catholicæ consensu." De Peccato.

³ "Homo enim fit Deo acceptus, et reputatur coram eo justus, propter solum Filium Dei, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, per fidem." De Justificatione, and still more closely in the statement, "De Evangelio Christi."

⁴ "Non est autem sentiendum, quod iis bonis operibus, quæ per nos facimus, in judicio Dei ubi agitur de expiatione peccatorum, et placatione divinæ iræ, ac merito æternæ salutis, confidendum, est. Omnia enim bona opera, quæ nos facimus, sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini judicii ferre." De Bonis Operibus.

⁵ "Credimus et confitemur quod . . . hæc Ecclesia habeat jus judicandi de omnibus doctrinis, etc. . . . Quod hæc ecclesia habeat jus interpretandæ Scripturæ." De Ecclesia. Bishop Short seems to question the resemblance in this last case: Hist. of the Church, 325 (note*), 2nd. ed.

⁶ This article, as we shall see hereafter, disappeared in the printed copies.

clearly designed to complete the dogmatic statements of the Church in opposition to the Arians and the Solifidians, at that time rampant on all sides.

In addition to the amplifications above mentioned in the second, fifth, and eleventh of the XLII. Articles, with the view of guarding the truth more closely from its contemporary assailants,—the fifth was also *enlarged* by an enumeration of the canonical books, the sixth by appending a statement as to the present obligation of the moral law; which was however taken from the nineteenth of the same series. A fuller statement on the freedom of the will and its forfeiture at the fall of Adam, was introduced into the old article relating to that question. The twenty-sixth was now made to deny distinctly that Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are “Sacraments of the Gospel;” the thirty-third underwent a similar enlargement, by declaring the authority of a national Church to ordain and abolish ceremonies; the thirty-fourth, by a specification of the Homilies (excepting that against Rebellion, which was published afterwards); the thirty-sixth, by an exposition of the sense in which the royal supremacy is accepted in matters ecclesiastical. In almost every one of these amplifications¹ we may discern the natural product of the times, and also a further corroboration of the views propounded in our last chapter,—that the Articles were primarily intended as negations of existing errors, “wherewith this Church (alas!) was almost overgone.”²

The same will be equally observable with respect to the *substitutions*, which occur in the copy of the Articles revised by archbishop Parker, and afterwards sanctioned in the Synod. Certain dogmas which are in the twenty-third Article denounced as fictions of the “schoolmen,” are significantly described in 1562 as “*doctrina Romanensium*;” the use of any other than the vernacular tongue in the celebration of Divine worship is far more strongly interdicted; the baptism of infants is declared to be not only tenable, as the early Articles implied, but “most agreeable to the

¹ Other additions only verbal deserve to be carefully noted: *e. g.* in the Article “*de Prædestinatione*” the Edwardine reading is “*decrevit eos quos elegit*,” the Elizabethan, “*decrevit eos quos in Christo elegit*.”

² Bp. Ridley, in Strype’s Annals, i. 260.

institution of Christ³; transubstantiation is now said to “overthrow the nature of a sacrament;”⁴ yet while the Romish error was rejected, a paragraph was added to vindicate the truth from the opposite perversions, for it declares that “the Body of Christ is after a heavenly manner given, taken, and eaten in the Lord’s Supper.” The lawfulness of clerical marriage is *positively* asserted, in the place of the former affirmation that no commandment could be urged *against* it: the Ordinal is mentioned by itself, and defended from the cavils⁵ of the Recusant party, to the effect that since the accession of Elizabeth all who had been consecrated or ordained, according to this form, had no *legal* claim to be regarded as the clergy of the Church of England.

The other modifications of the Articles as they stand in the copy of the Primate, may be classed under the head of *omissions*. These also were both numerous and important.

Four Articles were dropped entirely: (1) the tenth, on “Grace,”—part of its phraseology being transferred to Article X. of the new series; (2) the sixteenth, on “Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,”—from a reluctance, it may be, to define the exact nature of this sin, or from the disappearance of the sect against which it had been levelled; (3) the nineteenth, on the obligation of the moral Law,—part of it being incorporated in the seventh of the new Articles; (4) the forty-first against the “Millenarii,”—probably on account of the suppression of the teachers who had formerly used the millenarian hypothesis⁶ as the plea for lawlessness and crime.

¹ This very point had been strongly urged by Beza at the recent “Colloquy of Poissy” (above p. 123, note 1), and had excited the deepest indignation. Fleury, liv. clvii. s. 6.

² In repealing the Prayer-Book, Queen Mary had also mentioned the Ordinal by name; but on the accession of Elizabeth, when the Prayer-Book was restored, the Ordinal was not so specified, being regarded as a part of the former. On the ground of this omission, it was urged by Bonner and others of his party, that ordinations which had been made since the year 1559, according to the Edwardine form, were in the eye of the law defective. See Courayer, “On English Ordinations,” 126 seqq. Oxf. 1844.

³ Some, however, denounced the hypothesis *in toto*. See a contemporary account of the “Millenaries,” in Alley’s “Poor Mans Librarie,” i. 222 seqq.

Among the minor omissions may be noticed a passage in the Article respecting the Holy Scriptures, which was dropped, it would seem, on the ground that toleration ought in no wise to be conceded to any ecclesiastical usage which may appear to oppose the injunctions of the Bible. A passage in the Article on Predestination, which affirmed that "the Divine decrees are unknown to us," was in like manner abandoned. The Article "Of the sacraments," in addition to certain other changes, no longer included a remark on the phrase "*ex opere operato*," which had been formerly censured upon the ground that it was unknown to Holy Scripture and engendered a superstitious sense. The omission of it was perhaps due to the explanations both of the Council of Trent,¹ and of private writers,² as to the precise mode in which they were *now* not unwilling to employ it.

The effect, therefore, of this criticism of Parker and his colleagues was *first*, to add four Articles, *secondly*, to remove an equal number, and *thirdly*, to modify by enlargement or subtraction, as many as seventeen of the remainder. No higher proof can be found of the caution with which all these changes were conducted than the very general adoption of them by the Synod to whom they were next submitted.

It assembled on the day appointed in the royal brief (Jan. 12, 1563,) and on the following day, after a solemn service at St. Paul's cathedral, lost no time in proceeding to the business for which it had been convoked. The primate of all England presided, with the following bishops at his side:—Edmund (Grindal) of London, Robert (Horne) of Winchester, William (Barlowe) of Chichester, John (Scory) of Hereford, Richard (Cox) of Ely, Edwin (Sandys) of Worcester, Roland (Merick) of Bangor, Ni-

¹ See Sarpi, i. 423, 424, and Courayer's excellent annotations.

² The following specimen occurs in Joliffe against Hooper, while commenting on this Article:—"Quod enim dicimus gratiam et remissionem peccatorum in nobis fieri *ex opere operato*, nihil est aliud quam eam fieri in nobis, non propter opus, aut meritum hominis operantis, sed propter opus Christi per visibile aliquod sacramentum largientis gratiam: veluti cum infans baptizatus justificatur, non per ullum opus suum, aut suscipientis, aut ministri, sed per ipsum opus operatum, hoc est, per ipsum baptismi sacramentum, gratiam et remissionem peccatorum assequitur, propter Christum in illo sacramento operatum." fol. 173, b.

cholas (Bolingham) of Lincoln, John (Jewel) of Salisbury, Richard (Davis) of St. David's, Edmund (Guest) of Rochester, Gilbert (Berkeley) of Bath and Wells, Thomas (Bentham) of Coventry and Lichfield, William (Alley) of Exeter, John (Parkhurst) of Norwich, Edmund (Scambler) of Peterborough, Thomas (Davies) of St. Asaph, Richard (Guest) of Gloucester and commendatory of Bristol.³ The opening speech of Parker congratulated the Synod on the arrival of this opportunity for promoting the reformation of the Church, and signified the zeal of his royal mistress, as well as of the nobles, in forwarding the happy execution of his wishes. He then gave the usual order to the lower house touching the election of their Prolocutor, and on the 16th of January⁴ they presented Alexander Nowel, the dean of St. Paul's, to serve them in that capacity. On the 19th the Synod reassembled at Westminster, instead of the more usual place of meeting in the chapter-house of St. Paul's cathedral. The prolocutor in the name of the clergy, who were generally warm in the cause of reformation, carried up a report to the bishops, in which he stated that "The Articles published in the Synod of London, during the reign of Edward, had been handed to a committee of the lower house, in order that they might weigh and reconstruct them (if such changes were thought proper,) in time for the following session."⁵ In the mean while the bishops had begun to deliberate on the same absorbing topics; and as the primate would naturally take the lead, it is probable that he submitted a copy of the Articles, as they had been revised by his own hand, for the approval of his brother prelates. On the 20th, the 22nd, the 25th, and the 27th of January,⁴ we may detect other traces, though generally faint and scanty, of the disputations which the pro-

³ Strype, Parker, 121. It may be observed, that the Original Registers of this Convocation are not extant, having been destroyed in the fire of London, 1666. An important extract, entitled "*Acta in superiore Domo Convocationis anno 1562*," is however most fortunately preserved, (Strype, Annals, i. 315. Bennet, Essay, 165 seqq.) This paper not only assists us in tracing the Articles through the upper House of Convocation, but also illustrates the proceedings of the lower during the same period.

⁴ Strype, Parker, *ibid.*

⁵ Bennet, 167.

⁴ Strype, Parker, *ibid.*

jected Formulary was exciting in the upper house: and on the 29th, at an early session in St. Paul's,¹ a further discussion "respecting some of the Articles," resulted in their unanimous subscription by all the assembled prelates.

One at least of the copies which had been sanctioned by the upper house of Convocation, is the Latin Manuscript of Archbishop Parker adverted to above. The signatures which it contains are manifestly *autographs*; and as prelates of the province of York are included in the number of subscribers,² we might infer that this was the actual copy transmitted for the approval of the clergy at that time assembled in the northern Convocation. But a formidable doubt has been thrown on the authority of the Parker MS. by collating a portion of its contents with an extract from the register of this Convocation, as made in the time of Archbishop Laud, and attested by a public notary for the satisfaction of his accusers.³ Besides exhibiting a different version of the article "On the Authority of the Church," the extract from the original record belonging to the see of Canterbury, has preserved a list of the assentient prelates, varying in some points from that in the Manuscript of Archbishop Parker:⁴ and to in-

¹ Inter horas 8^{ma} et 9^{ma} ante meridiem. Bennett, *ibid*.

² They are Thomas (Young) of York, James (Pilkington) of Durham, William (Downham) of Chester.

³ He was accused of forging the contested clause in Art. XX., and after appealing to four printed copies of the Articles, one of them as early as 1563, and all containing the passage which the Puritans dislike, he added, "I shall make it yet plainer: for it is not fit concerning an Article of Religion, and an Article of such consequence for the order, truth, and peace of this Church, you should rely upon my copies, be they never so many or never so ancient. Therefore, I sent to the public records in my office, and here under my officer's hand, who is a public notary, is returned to me the twentieth Article with this affirmative clause in it, and there is also the whole body of the Articles to be seen." Romaine, II. 83 (quoted by Bennett, 166.) The copy, thus taken before the destruction of the records, is said to be still extant; Bennett made use of it, and has printed it in his "Essay," 167—169.

⁴ The Parker MS. has the subscriptions of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Chichester, Ely, Worcester, Hereford, Bangor, Lincoln, Salisbury, St. David's, Bath and Wells, Coventry and Lichfield, Exeter, Norwich, Peterborough, and St. Asaph, besides the three above mentioned belonging to the other province. The copy of the

crease the perplexity of the question the *two* sets of episcopal signatures are said to have been appended to the Articles on the same day and in the same place.

If one may lawfully hazard a conjecture in the midst of these clashing statements, is it not possible that after the house of bishops had subscribed the copy of the primate on the 29th of January, it was forwarded to the northern Convocation, (without waiting for the criticism of the lower house, who continued their discussions for another week); and that on its return it was deposited as a private paper with the rest of the Parker Manuscripts, where it has remained till the present day; while the copy of the Articles as they stood when finally authorised by the whole Synod on the fifth of the following month, found its place among the records of Convocation in the registry appertaining to the see of Canterbury, at the Cathedral of St. Paul's?

But if reasons⁴ do thus exist for disputing the authority of the Parker Manuscript, or even for rejecting the claims which have been put forth on its behalf to be regarded as the ultimate form in which the Articles were left at the rising of the Synod, it is, notwithstanding, a most valuable guide in tracing the course of their further progress, and the nature of the changes impressed upon them during the deliberations of the house of bishops.⁵

When first exhibited by the primate, about the 19th of January, they were forty-two in number, but on the 29th, which is the date

record produced by Archbishop Laud omits the three northern prelates, and also those of Chichester, Worcester, and Peterborough. The second includes the Bishop of Rochester, but it has been doubted whether he actually *subscribed* or not (Bennett, 184;) while the Bishop of Gloucester, though present at some meetings of the synod, appears to have finally dissented. (Strype, *Annals* i. 563.) The bishopric of Oxford was not full, and Kitchen of Llandaff (from whatever cause) took no part in the proceedings.

¹ See more on this subject in Bennett, c. VIII., and Strype, Parker, 319, 320, where it is argued that this MS. as well as a second of 1571, are no more than "first schemes or draughts preparatory." The fact of their being left in the *private* library of Parker, the variety of corrections in the documents themselves, and the absence of all mention of royal approbation, form the principal arguments of those learned antiquaries.

² These alterations are distinguished in the MS. by the marks of a red minium pencil, and by the Archbishop's own hand-writing. Dr. Lamb, *Hist. Account*, 17.

of the subscriptions, three whole articles had been erased. These were the thirty-ninth, the fortieth and the forty-second of the Edwardine series, all bearing on speculative points which had been opened by the Anabaptists; and as the errors of this sect were no longer menacing the very being of the Church, there was not the same urgent reasons for proscribing them in detail. Another omission was made in the article respecting our Lord's "Descent into Hell," which had rested in the Formulary of 1552 upon the well-known language of St. Peter. The allusion made to a particular text was now altogether abandoned, we may conjecture, on account of the animosity excited by the disputes which this question had engendered in some districts, more especially in the diocese of Exeter.¹ A third important erasure was in the article respecting the Lord's Supper," which had been almost entirely recast by the

¹ Among the papers of Alley, bishop of that see, which had been drawn up for the synod of 1562, there is one relating to this very subject. After expressing his desire that the clergy might all preach one kind of doctrine, and not inveigh against each other, he proceeds: "First, for matters of Scripture, namely, for this place which is written in the epistle of St. Peter, that *Christ went down into hell, and preached to the souls that were in prison*. There have been in my diocese *great invectives between the preachers*, one against the other, and also partakers with them; some holding, that the going down of Christ His soul to hell, was nothing else but the virtue and strength of Christ His death, to be made manifest and known to them that were dead before. Others say, that *descendit in inferna* is nothing else but that Christ did sustain upon the cross the infernal pains of hell. . . . Finally, others preach, that this article is not contained in other symbols, neither in the symbol of Cyprian, or rather Rufine. And all these sayings they ground upon Erasmus, and the Germans, and especially upon the authority of Mr. Calvin and Mr. Bullinger. The contrary side bring for them the universal consent and all the Fathers of both Churches, both of the Greeks and the Latins. . . . Thus, my right honourable good Lords, your wisdoms may perceive, what tragedies and dissensions may arise for consenting to or dissenting from, this article." See Strype, *Annals*, i. 348, ed. 1725; and for some notice of a warm controversy at Cambridge on the same question in 1567, *Life of Parker*, 258. In the curious volume of theological Miscellanies by bishop Alley, entitled "The Poore Mans Librarie," (Lond. 1565), he declares at large the opinions and judgments as well of the olde Fathers as of later writers, concerning this article of faith," (Tom. ii. fol. 72—77). He concludes by saying, "One thinge I would wishe, that neither this article, nor any other conteyned in the symbole, commonly called *Symbolum Apostolorum*, shoulde be lightlye shaken of, but to be beleued as they stande there."

Archbishop, before the meeting of the Synod. One of the altered sentences together with a long paragraph into which it was engrafted, disappear in the printed Articles; and even were there no evidence surviving to illustrate the reasons of the change, we should naturally assign it to some disagreement of the prelates on the doctrine thus abstracted. But the history of the Elizabethan period can supply us with abundant elucidations of the controversy arising out of the present article. The clause which was finally rejected by the Synod, was susceptible of a Zwinglian interpretation,—appearing to deny the presence of our Lord *in any way whatever*; and this would doubtless be one reason for the change in the eyes of many of the prelates.¹ It opened also a further question, which was then occupying and inflaming the discussions of sundry continental theologians,²—whether the humanity of the Lord can be so dissociated from His Divine nature, as to be in no sense present in many places at one and the same time. Whatever may have been the number of voices on either side of these stirring questions, the result was the same as in the disputations on the descent of our Lord into Hades; for the paragraph which had been the moving cause of the controversy, was at last altogether withdrawn. Its erasure afforded a fresh example of the latitude and forbearance which had been more or less exercised by the Church in all her synodical decisions; and if some have condemned this hesitating silence as a guilty abandonment of the truth, it will be justified, in respect of a large class of questions, by an appeal to the history of the Councils, and nowhere so fully as in the records of the contemporary council of Trent.

The remaining alterations of the upper house were limited to

¹ Dorman, who wrote his Proof" in 1564, alludes to this controversy in the "new Church," as he calls it, affirming that while some, like Guest (of Rochester), preached for the "Real presence," and others, like Grindal, denied it, Parker clung to the Lutheran tenet of consubstantiation (*Strype, Annals*, i. 334). It is probable that all these statements are somewhat exaggerated; but Nowel in his "Confutation of Dorman," does not deny that disunion existed on the subject, fol. 362. The article of the French Confession which the Calvinists exhibited at the Colloquy of Poissy (1561), has some points of parallelism with the English statement, as it was first introduced into the synod. *Confess. Fid. Gallicant*, Art. xxxvi. ed. Niemeyer, 1840.

² See Le Bas, *Life of Jewel*, 129, 130.

single phrases, yet nearly all of them are worthy of some passing notice. The eighth article of the elder series had read in one version of *ἐπιτήδευμα σαρκὸς* the word "studium" only, and the omission had not been observed by Archbishop Parker; but "carnis" was not subjoined in the Synod for the sake of completing the sense.¹ In the title of the fifteenth article Parker had retained "in Spiritum Sanctum," but his phrase was subsequently underscored in the Manuscript, and the words "after baptism" introduced. In the twenty-second of the Edwardine Articles "verbo Dei" was substituted for "verbis Dei:" in the margin of the twenty-ninth a passage of St. Augustine, which had been there cited, was verified by a reference to the treatise² out of which it was taken: and in the thirty-third on "Traditions Ecclesiastical," "temporum" was added after "regionum," to make the statement of the principle still more comprehensive.

The effect of these further modifications reduced the number of the Articles to thirty-nine; and in the form which it assumed at this period,³ the document seems to have reached the lower house of Convocation. We have already seen that they manifested a peculiar zeal for the revival of the articles of 1552,⁴ and

¹ In the English Articles of 1552, the passage stood correctly, "The desire of the flesh."

² The reference was "super Joann. Tract. 26," which afterwards gave rise to some "nibbling." See Strype's Parker, 331, 332.

³ It may be remarked on taking leave of the Parker MS. that the following statement is appended to this copy of the Articles: "Hos Articulos fidei Christianæ, continentes in universum novemdecim paginas in autographo, quod asservatur apud Reverendissimum in Christo patrem dominum Mattæum Cantuariensem archiepiscopum, totius Angliæ primatem et metropolitānum (then follows an enumeration of the Articles in each page,) nos archiepiscopi et episcopi utriusque provinciæ in sacra Synodo provinciali legitime congregati, recipimus et profitemur, et ut veros atque orthodoxos, manuum nostrarum subscriptionibus approbamus, vicesimo nono die mensis Januarii anno Domini secundum computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo secundo, et illustrissimæ Principis Elizabethæ Dei gratia Angliæ, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ reginæ, fidei Defensoris, etc. dominæ nostræ clementissimæ, anno quinto." The subscriptions are then added, as enumerated above, p. 128.

⁴ A list of "Matters to be moved by the clergy in the next parliament and synod," which Strype has printed in his "Annals," i. 317, seqq. appears to have proceeded from some of the more zealous reformers. It includes the

had proceeded to organize a committee, under the sanction of the bishops, for considering if any changes were needed before these Articles were republished. The 20th of January was appointed for the bringing up of their report into the other house, and if this order was punctually obeyed, the criticism would be under the notice of the bishops during the whole of their own deliberations. It is now impossible to ascertain the amount of the changes which are due to the influence of this committee; but a comparison of the first edition of the Articles in 1563 with the Manuscript containing the episcopal signatures, must convince us, that with the exception of the disputed clause in the twentieth article, and the total disappearance of the twenty-ninth, entitled "Impii non manducant," &c., the lower house of Convocation had implicitly accepted the copy which received the approval of the bishops. At the session of the 5th of February, the prolocutor⁴ and six of his clerical brethren were summoned into the presence of Grindal (acting in the stead of the Archbishop,) and questioned respecting the "Book of Doctrine" which had been lately forwarded from the bishops to be subscribed by the lower clergy. The prolocutor in reply exhibited a copy of the Articles, remarking that they had already passed the inferior house, and were signed by some of the members, but added the request, that an order might be issued from the prelates, enjoining subscription upon all. On this account it was decreed unanimously that the names of all persons who continued in the list of the non-subscribers at the next session of the Synod should be noted by the prolocutor, and proscribed as delinquents. Many fresh names accordingly seem to have been added before the day when the Convocation reassembled (Feb. 10;) and as no further mandate was issued

following note, among others:—"Certain Articles containing the principal grounds of Christian religion are to be set forth, in which also is to be determined the truth of those things which in this age are called in question. Much like to such Articles as were set forth a little before the death of King Edward. Of which Articles the most part may be used with additions, and corrections as shall be thought convenient."

⁴ The only information obtainable respecting these proceedings, is derived from the extracts, published by Bp. Gibson in his "Synodus Anglicana," 206, seqq. (above, p. 129, note;) and as they belong to the journals of the upper house, the light thrown by them on the lower is casual and indirect.

after the 12th of this month, for the sake of ascertaining the backward subscribers, it is probable that all had now signified their assent either in person or by proxy.¹

When the labours of the Synod² were thus brought to a happy termination, at least so far as the Articles were concerned, we might have expected to follow them at once to a meeting of privy council, to witness their final approbation by the Queen. But a considerable time had elapsed,³ it may be a whole year, when an edition of them was published by the royal printer, declaring that they had received her Majesty's approval, after she had read and examined them in person.⁴ Sir Edward Coke has stated that they were ratified at this period in the most formal manner, viz. : by passing under the great seal of England;⁵ but no cause has ever been assigned for the delay which intervened before the publication of the work itself. There can be no doubt, however, in the absence of the Manuscript thus finally approved by the crown, that the most authentic representation of the Articles is to be sought in the Latin text, as it was printed under the auspices of the Queen. It alone was legally binding on the clergy, being in-

¹ A list of subscribers has been published in Strype, Annals, i. 327—329; but there seems no sufficient ground for supposing that it is a full and authentic copy, (cf. Dr. Lamb's Hist. Acc. 20 seqq., Bennett, c. vi. *passim*.) The number of representatives in the lower house was one hundred and forty-four, twenty-two deans, fifty-three archdeacons, twenty-four prebendaries (or proctors of chapters,) forty-four proctors of the diocesan clergy, and one precentor (St. David's.) All the signatures in Strype amount to ninety-one "propiis manibus," and fifteen others, "per procuracionem."

² Though the northern Convocation had no direct influence in the compiling of the Articles, its concurrence appears to have been implied in the signatures of the Archbishop of York and his suffragans. The document was set forth by the authority of both Convocations, that is, by a national synod. See Lathbury, Hist. of Convoc. 165, 166.

³ See Bennett, c. xvii. Others make the interval nearly a year: e. g. Cardwell's Synod. 38.

⁴ The language is very remarkable:—"Quibus omnibus Articulis serenissima princeps Elizabetha Dei gratia Angliæ Franciæ, et Hiberniæ regina, fidei Defensor, etc., per seipsam diligenter lectis et examinatis regium suum assensum præbuit."

⁵ Instit. Part iv. c. 74, quoted by Bennett, 220.

vested with the concurrent sanction both of the ecclesiastical and the civil powers.¹

Now it is remarkable that this copy has altogether omitted one of the new articles² (the twenty-ninth in the Manuscript of Archbishop Parker,) and still more, that it contains the affirmative clause respecting the authority of the Church. Whether these changes were made at the instance of the lower house, *after* the Parker Manuscript had been signed by the bishop,³ or whether they proceeded from the royal council at the command of the Queen herself,⁴ they indisputably exist in the original edition which was circulated as authentic in the Church of England. One of the discrepancies indeed was very speedily adjusted, for the twenty-ninth article appears in all the copies of 1571, whether English or Latin; it has therefore been comparatively unnoticed by those who have handled the present subject; but the conflicting versions of the twentieth article, and the stress that was subsequently laid upon the points which are there either asserted or

¹ See Dr. Cardwell's remark, Synod. i. 38, 39.

² Bennett argues that it *had* passed the Convocation, but was subsequently withdrawn, (see below, 137, note 4,) through tenderness towards the Romanising party, who had not yet seceded from the Church. In the following Convocation, (1571,) this secession was taking place, and, therefore, the same need of forbearance no longer existed; 233, 234.

³ With respect to the clause in Art. xx., it is evident from the existence of a similar passage in the Wirtemberg Confession of 1551, from equivalent affirmations in Art. xxxiv., and the undisputed sequel of Art. xx., as well as from the language of the puritanical party in the earlier Elizabethan period, that no ground was then existing for its deliberate omission from the new Formulary of Faith. See the language of Fox, in Strype's Annals, i. 326. It was not till the time of Charles I. that the controversy respecting it was distinctly raised, or its obnoxious character discerned.

⁴ Cardwell's Synod. i. 39. This view is urged by Dr. Lamb, 34, 35, and receives some degree of probability from what happened during an interview between Parker and Cecil in 1571, (Strype's Parker, 331, 332,) where the Treasurer had called in question the lawfulness of the quotation made in the 29th Article from the writings of St. Augustine. His own scruples or his gentleness in dealing with the Romanising party might have thus occasioned the withdrawal of the Article from the Convocation Records; and the example given by Mr. Soames (Elizabeth. Hist. 222, 223, notes) demonstrate that such acts of interference were not uncommon at the time.

omitted, have produced the very warmest disputations in the succeeding history of the Church.¹

The nature and amount of the evidence both for and against the authority of the paragraph in question,² may be concisely stated thus :

It is *not* found

(1) In the Latin Manuscript of archbishop Parker, which had been signed by himself and a large majority of the bishops, on the 29th of January, 1563.

(2) In the *English* version of the Articles, as they were printed by Jugge and Cawood, in 1563.

(3) In the *English* Manuscript, signed by the bishops in the Convocation of 1571.

(4) In one Latin and one English edition, of Jugge and Cawood, in 1571.

On the other hand, it *is* found

(1) In the *Latin* edition of Reynold Wolfe, 1563, as authorised by the Queen.

(2) In two or more English editions of Jugge and Cawood, 1571.

(3) In six or more English editions from 1581 to 1628, and in all subsequent copies.

(4) In the transcript made in 1637 from the original copy of the Articles, as it was deposited in the registry of the see of Canterbury.

The weight of the Manuscript testimony against the disputed clause depends altogether on the *assumption* that the documents in the Library of archbishop Parker were the ultimate form which the Articles had taken when they were finally submitted to

¹ One of these may be read in the Life of Heylin, who took the question of Church-authority as the subject for an exercise in the schools. His opponent was the Professor himself, (Dr. Prideaux.) Life of Heylin, xcii., xciii. prefixed to his "History of the Reform." ed. E. H. S.

² It begins at the opening of the 20th Article, and runs in the following terms: "Habet Ecclesia ritus [sive ceremonias] statuendi jus, et infidei controversiis auctoritatem; quamvis." The two words in brackets do not appear in the original Latin edition, nor in the transcript made in 1637, from the Convocation-Records.

the Crown; but (as Bennett and Strype¹ have argued in detail) an assumption of this kind is precluded by the slovenly condition of the manuscripts themselves, by their place in a *private* repository, and above all, by their want of the public tokens, invariably found in the acts and instruments which have received the royal approbation. With regard to the early *printed* copies where the paragraph is also wanting, they are more than counterbalanced by the authority of the rest in which it did actually exist. On one side is the Latin text of 1563, the very first publication of the Articles, issuing from the press of the Queen's printer, and containing her emphatic sanction; on the other, is an *English version* laying claim to no kind of authority, either civil or ecclesiastical, and if made, as there is reason to believe, from the Manuscript of archbishop Parker, it could possess no higher value than the Manuscript itself. But even if we might allow that the printed evidence is *equal*, the fact of this clause appearing in the record as examined and attested by a public notary in 1637, is conclusive that it was actually inserted as early as the year 1563.

It may have been the production of the Synod before the Articles were forwarded to the Queen, or it may have been afterwards interpolated while in the hands of the royal council; but the argument of Bennett has at least established its claim to be regarded as a portion of the authoritative copy which found its way into the archiepiscopal registry at St. Paul's, and perished in the fire of 1666. That record was quoted by archbishop Laud, and by other writers of his age, in terms the most positive and explicit, at a time also when it was open to the view of his bitter rivals, nay, in the hands of his infuriated enemies, and yet "not one of them ever ventured to question the truth of the assertions, or attempted to invalidate the proofs on which his defence had rested."²

After these remarks on the compilation and integrity of the

¹ See references above, p. 131, note 1, and cf. British Critic for 1829; 96, 97.

² British Critic, as above referred to, 96. Attention is there drawn to the further statement of Archbishop Laud, that the contested clause was also found in the Articles subscribed by the *lower house* in 1571. The stoutest opponents of its genuineness in later times were Collins, in his "Priestcraft in Perfection," 1710, and an anonymous writer (perhaps the same Anthony

Articles put forth in 1563, we may proceed to investigate the changes that befel them in the rest of the present reign.

On the assembling of Convocation in 1571 they were brought into the form which they have retained from that day till our own, and were then for the first time offered as a test to every candidate for Holy Orders.

During the interval, however, they had been frequently produced in debates of the civil legislature, where an attempt was made by sundry of the commons to compel the subscription of the clergy. On the 5th of December, 1566, we read¹ that "the bill with a *Little Book* printed in the year 1562,² (which was the fourth or fifth of her majesty's reign) for the sound Christian religion, was read the first time." The book, it is universally allowed, was a copy of the Articles of Religion, and in all probability the second English edition, which had been printed in small octavo, by Jugge and Cawood.³ It is again mentioned in the "Journals of Parliament," on the 10th of December, when the bill which attempted to give it a wider currency in the Church, was read the second time.⁴ On the 13th of December, they appear again, the bill for the "Articles of Religion" being then passed at the third reading.⁵ On the next day it was forwarded to the House of Lords, but for reasons which no one is able to assign precisely, it was there "steyed by commandment from the Queen." The primate and other bishops appear to have been very desirous of accelerating its progress in the upper house, as we may judge from a petition⁶ "exhibited to the Queen's Majesty the 24th of Decembre,

Collins) in a work entitled "Historical and Critical Essay on the XXXIX. Articles" (in reply to Bennett), 1724.

¹ D'Ewes, Journals of Parliament, 132, Lond., 1682.

² More correctly, 1563; for although the Articles were agreed on in 1562, the first known edition of them was not printed till the following year. Bennett, 255, 256.

³ It is reprinted in Dr. Lamb's publication. Although the 29th Article is wanting, the number is made "nine and thirty," by dividing the 6th Article into two portions.

⁴ D'Ewes, ubi sup.

⁵ Ibid. 133.

⁶ In Bennett, 258—260. It is interlined in the handwriting of archbishop Parker, and is written in the name of "the Archebyshope and Bysshops of both the Provinces."

anno 1566." While striving to enkindle the royal zeal in behalf of the measures which had been lately originated by the commons, they declare, that "thapprobation of thies Articles by your Majestie shal be a verie good meane to establyshe and confirme all your Highnes subjects in one consent and unities of true doctrine, to the great quiete and safetie of your Majestie and this your realm; whereas now for want of a playn certaintie of Articles of Doctrine by law to be declared, great distraction and dissention of myndes is at this present among your subjects, and dailie is like more and^{more} to encrease, and that with verie great daunger in policie, the circumstances considred, if the said Boke of Articles be now steyd in your Majesties hand or (as God forbid) rejected." Notwithstanding this earnest petition, the Queen was immoveably resolved, that proceedings upon spiritual matters should not emanate from the House of Commons. Her feelings at this time accorded with the message she is said to have sent on a similar occasion, when projects relating to the Church were strenuously revived in 1571,—"she approved their good endeavours, but would not suffer these things to be ordered by parliament."¹

But the principle which prompted this language appears to have speedily relaxed: for after the same measure had been introduced afresh into the House of Commons (April 6, 1571,) and from thence transmitted to the Lords (May 3,) the opposition of the Queen gave way, and the bill² "for the ministers of the Church

¹ D'Ewes, 185.

² Stat. 13 Eliz. c. 12. It enacts "by the authority of the present parliament, that every person under the degree of a bishop, which doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's holy Word and Sacraments, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than the form set forth by parliament in the time of the late king of most worthy memory, King Edward the Sixth, or now used in the reign of our most gracious sovereign lady, before the feast of the Nativity of Christ next following, shall, in the presence of the bishop or guardian of the spiritualities of some one diocese where he hath or shall have ecclesiastical living, *declare his assent, and subscribe to all the Articles of Religion, which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted, entitled, "Articles whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord God, one thousand five hundred sixty and*

to be of sound religion" received her wavering assent,¹ on the 29th of the following month. We may imagine that the fear which had been recently awakened by the excommunicatory bull,² combined with the displeasure of the council on witnessing the daily secessions from the Church³ at the beck of the Roman pontiff, had some weight in diminishing the hostility of the Crown to this kind of parliamentary legislation: for it is clear that nothing but the strongest motive could have urged a sovereign like Elizabeth to resign what she always regarded as her first and indisputable right. And when it is borne in mind that the series of measures, in which the bill for enforcing the Articles stood foremost,⁴ proceeded from the democratic party, who were now fast growing in the Commons, our wonder at the final acquiescence of the Queen is only the more augmented. One of the main promoters of this Act was "an ancient gentleman of hot zeal,"

two, according to the computation of the Church of England, *for the avoiding of the diversities of opinions and for the establishing of consent touching true religion: put forth by the Queen's authority.*" It is enacted further, that a testimonial of such assent and subscription shall be procured from the bishops, and read together with the Articles in Church. The "said Articles" are also ordered to be subscribed in the presence of the ordinary, and publicly read in Church by every one at his admission to a benefice.—Disputes have arisen as to the particular edition of the Articles referred to in this Act (see Dr. Lamb's Hist. Acc. 26, British Critic, as above, 96, 97;) and also as to the purport of the phrase, "the said Articles" just quoted. On this latter point more will be found hereafter in the chapter on "Subscription."

¹ On the first of May, the Lords had returned answer to a deputation from the Commons, that "the Queen's Majesty, having been made privy to the said Articles, liketh very well of them, and mindeth to publish them and have them executed by the bishops, by direction of her Majesty's regal authority of supremacy of the Church of England, and *not to have the same dealt in by parliament.*" D'Ewes' Journals, ubi sup.

² See it in Camden's Annales, Eliz. 183; ed. 1625.

³ This was the origin of the Anglo-Romish schism. See Fullwood's "Roma Ruit," Appendix (A.,) 317, 318, new ed. 1847. The number of secessions was increased by enforcing subscription to the Articles; for until the work of Fran. à Sancta Clara in 1634, no one attempted to reconcile them with the Tridentine definitions.

⁴ In the original "Journal-Book," it is called Bill A, being one of a series of measures "touching Religion and Church government." D'Ewes, 185.

named Strickland,¹ who was not only bent upon further changes in the Offices of the Church,² but ventured even to recommend a fresh Formulary of Faith, after the model of the foreign Confessions.³ He was seconded by another Puritan of the name of Wentworth; and when they waited upon the Archbishop of Canterbury with a draft of their new version of the Articles, it was immediately observed that they had struck out all mention of the Homilies, the Ordinal, and other matters relating to the hierarchy, authority, and ceremonial of the Church. The primate, naturally startled by this change, desired an immediate explanation; upon which Wentworth declared that certain subjects had been dropped because he had no time "to examine them how they agreed with the Word of God;" and after Parker had suggested that he should "refer himself wholly to the bishops" in the determination of such points, he answered, "No! by the faith I bear to God, we will pass nothing before we understand what it is, for that were but to make you popes; make you popes who list, for we will make you none."⁴

The language of the puritanical party upon this and similar occasions would seem to favour a supposition derivable from the wording of the Act itself, that in the confirmation of the Articles by parliament in 1571, it was designed to enforce subscription *only* to such statements as embraced the fundamental verities of the faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments; and the organization of a plan for some new Confession among the warmest promoters of the measure may be deemed in some way corroboratory of the same hypothesis. But as this question will be hereafter resumed, when we come to consider the history of Subscription and the force

¹ Strype, Annals, II. 63, 64. "The Queen liked not all these proceedings, reckoning it struck at her prerogative. . . . So that during the time of Easter, in the holy-days, Strickland, for his exhibiting a bill for the reformation of ceremonies, and his speech thereupon, was sent for before the Lords of the Privy Council; and required to attend upon them." Ibid. This opened the question of the royal prerogative.

² The "sour leaven" had already begun to work at Cambridge. See Dr. Lamb's "Collection of Letters," &c., 356.

³ Strype, *ibid.* 66.

⁴ D'Ewes, 239; Strype, Annals, II. 67. Wentworth's "freedom" afterwards brought him into the custody of the sergent, in 1575.

which lawyers have generally assigned to the statute of 1571, we may in the mean time endeavour to ascertain the proceedings of the Convocation, which sat in connexion with the Parliament when the Articles were thus repeatedly canvassed.

The opening sermon was preached by Dr. Whitgift, who dwelt upon the authority of synods, upon vestments and ecclesiastical decorations, and also on the enemies of the Church, which he divided into Puritans and Papists.¹ As no allusion was made by the preacher to a contemplated revision of the Articles, it is probable that the design arose entirely out of the agitation which was soon after excited in the House of Commons. On the 7th of April, however, being the day of the second session, an order issued from the primate,² enjoining that the members of the lower House "who had not formerly subscribed the Articles of Religion, agreed on in the year 1562, should subscribe them now, or upon their absolute refusal or delay (if such persons existed) that they should be wholly excluded from the House." In obedience to this order the "Book of Articles" was read aloud and personally subscribed by the members of both Houses; but no more is heard of it till the following month, when the Commons had brought their discussions to a close, and the bill for legalizing the Articles of Religion was already handled by the peers. As a consequence, it would seem, of this measure, and for the sake of multiplying copies which might lay claim to the sanction of the Church and also correspond with the specification of the bill in requiring the use of the Articles in *English*, the bishops undertook a further revision, and minutes to the following effect were inserted in the register of Convocation,³ at its fifth session (May 4):

"That when the Book of Articles touching doctrine shall be

¹ Bennet, 262.

² *Ibid.* Dr. Lamb thinks this order was directed against Cheynie, Bishop of Gloucester, who was excommunicated for non-attendance at the synod, and afterwards absolved in the person of his proxy; but the terms of the order confine it to the members of the *lower* House. Camden speaks of Cheynie as "most addicted to Luther," probably on account of his doctrine of the eucharist and his retention of pictures in churches. He refused to subscribe the Articles, in 1562. Strype, *Annals*, i. 563.

³ Bennet, 262, 263.

fully agreed upon, that then the same shall be put in print by the appointment of my Lord of Sarum [Jewel], and a price rated for the same to be sold."

"Item, that the same being printed, every bishop to have a competent number thereof, to be published in their synods throughout their several dioceses, and to be read in every parish-church four times a year."

The ensuing session (May 11), which was at Lambeth, and strictly private, is said to have been occupied in deliberations respecting the Book of Articles;² and this surmise is considerably strengthened by the fact, that on the same day an English Manuscript, belonging to the Library of archbishop Parker,³ was signed by the primate and ten of his comprovincials.⁴ The subject might possibly have been resumed on the 23rd of May, when the prelates are said to

¹ Archbishop Parker had before enjoined the reading of them *twice* a year (Strype's Parker, App. p. 48), together with the "Declaration" above mentioned (p. 120), which was also to be read *twice*. Grindal, A. D. 1571, makes the same order with regard to the "Articles" (Cardwell's Docum. Annals, i. 370), and enjoins the use of them (A. D. 1576) when there was no sermon (*Ibid.* i. 401). They were also ordered to be read twice a year as late as the time of Charles II. (*Ibid.* ii. 308).

² Bennet, 263.

³ An exact copy is contained in Dr. Lamb's publication, No. iv. It was probably a transcript from the *Little Book* (see above, p. 140), amended so as to become the "book imprinted" of Stat. 13 Eliz. c. 12, which would not receive the royal assent till the close of the parliament and convocation. At any rate, the variations between it and the printed copies of 1571 imply that some further revision of it took place after the 11th of May. Bennet, 311—315. The same learned writer shows that the "Canons" of this year were, in like manner, authoritatively modified, *after* the subscriptions of the bishops were appended, 345, 346.

⁴ These were Robert (Horne) of Winchester, John (Scory) of Hereford, Richard (Cox) of Ely, Nicholas (Bollingham) of Worcester, John (Jewel) of Salisbury, Edmund (Guest) of Rochester, Nicholas (Robinson) of Bangor, Richard (Curteis) of Chichester, Thomas (Cooper) of Lincoln, William (Bradbridge) of Exeter. They describe themselves, "We, the archbishops and bisshoppes of *eiher* Province of this realme of Englande," &c., intending, it may be, to forward a copy of the document to the northern convocation. They also mention the Articles as "thirty-eight" in number, two, viz. the 35th and 36th (respecting the Homilies and the Ordinal), being in this copy united in one Article.

have had another meeting of two hours' duration, and when they might have sanctioned the few emendations of the Articles, which had been meanwhile introduced into both the Latin and the English texts;¹ but no further trace of their proceedings has been hitherto detected, and the Convocation was itself dissolved on the 30th of the same month.

It is natural to expect that the Articles, in their finally revised condition, would be submitted to both houses of the Synod and again regularly subscribed. Such indeed is implied in the language of the royal ratification, which was appended to editions, both English and Latin, put forth in the same year.² But as the original copy or copies of this work have altogether perished, like that of the previous Convocation, we cannot ascertain the precise number of signatures by which it was ultimately approved. Bennett³ has indeed called attention to a copy of the Latin edition of 1563, accompanied by names of the lower House, who had subscribed the Articles of Religion in the course of the present year; but the time at which those signatures had been made was probably the earlier part of April, when (as we have seen) the members of the lower House had been all ordered to subscribe on pain of exclusion from the Synod. Still, the fact that the whole of the 29th Article, as well as a number of minor changes, was now to be absolutely enforced upon the clergy, would weigh as a reason for submitting the Formulary to their approval when the task of revision was completed; so that, however much we may desiderate the original document, there can be little or no doubt of the ultimate acceptance by the Church of the particular version of the Articles which were eventually ordered to be "holden and executed" by the ratification of the Queen.

It is remarkable that neither this royal sanction, nor the canons passed in the present Synod, providing⁴ that candidates for holy or-

¹ Bennett, chap. xxii. *passim*.

² The Latin, "apud Johannem Dayum, typographum. An. Domini, 1571:" the English, "at London in Powles Churchyard, by Richarde Iugge and Iohn Cawood, Printers to the Queenes Maiestie, in Anno Domini, 1571."

³ Chap. xx.

⁴ "Quivis minister Ecclesiæ antequam in sacram functionem ingrediatur, subscribit omnibus Articulis de religione Christiana, in quos consensus est in synodo; et publice ad populum, ubicunque episcopus jusserit, patefacit con-

ders shall henceforward sign the Articles, make the slightest allusion to the Act of parliament by which they had been previously incorporated into the statute-law of England. This silence, on the part of Queen Elizabeth is to be explained by her unflinching belief in the boundless prerogative of the Crown; and on the part of the clergy, by their disinclination to recognise the difference which had been drawn in the recent Act, between the doctrinal and the other Articles: they both unquestionably foresaw, with more or less distinctness, that the intermeddling of such a body, in questions of this kind, would foster the growth and ultimate predominance of the democratic element in the Church, and end (if not providentially counteracted) by imperilling alike the altar and the throne.

So far, indeed, was the Convocation of 1571 from bending under the puritanical storm which was now raging in all quarters, that the Articles issued from the last revision without suffering the threatened mutilation, or any considerable change. The twenty-ninth (as we have already noticed) was now inserted in every copy; and the clause affirming the authority of the Church,—though wanting in the draft which had been subscribed by some of the bishops, as it was also in the *English* edition of 1563, upon which that Manuscript was modelled¹—is found in all the English copies of this date, which have any claim to be regarded genuine.² It is

scientian suam, quid de illis Articulis, et universa doctrina sentiat." Cardwell, Synod. i. 120. And in the famous canon, "Concionatores," after declaring, that preachers shall never teach any thing as matter of faith excepting that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected out of the same doctrine, it is added: "Et quoniam Articuli illi religionis Christianæ, in quos consensus est ut episcopis in legitima et sancta synodo, jussu atque auctoritate serenissimæ principis Elizabethæ convocata et celebrata, haud dubia collecti sunt ex sacris libris Veteris et Novi Testamenti, et cum cœlesti doctrina, quæ in illis continetur, per omnia congruunt . . . quicumque mittetur ad docendum populum illorum Articulorum auctoritatem et fidem, non tantum concionibus suis, sed etiam subscriptione confirmabunt." Ib. 127. Cf. "Articuli per archiepiscopum etc. in Synodo," 1584, ib. i. 141.

¹ Bennett, 330.

² Ibid. c. xxiv. This point is proved from a minute correspondence between an English copy (in Bennett's work marked E) and the language of a letter of Archbishop Parker (dated June 4, 1571, *i. e.* immediately after the

wanting indeed in one *Latin* edition of 1571, printed by John Day, although it appears to have existed in other copies¹ in the same language, of the same date, and from the same press; so that whether we attribute the omission to accident or design, to the intrigues of Leicester² and the puritan party, or to the timidity of the editor³ appointed by the Synod to superintend the publication of the Articles, there can be little doubt of its approval at that time, and none of its present obligation.⁴

The rest of the changes which appear in the authorized versions of this period will be hereafter exhibited in detail:⁵ it is sufficient to observe at present, that they leave the original purport of the Articles altogether unaffected, and are either emendations in the wording of the titles, or corrections in the English draft from the older Latin copy, or explanations of a few words which were capable of misconstruction. The only positive *addition* is in the list of apocryphal books, which now for the first time appeared at the end of the sixth Article.

But a more important subject belonging to this stage of our inquiry, is suggested by the existence of the Articles both in English and in Latin. *Are the two versions equally authentic, or, in the*

close of the convocation). In *this* edition, authenticated by the allusion of the primate, the disputed clause is found.

¹ *e. g.* in the Latin edition, by John Day, printed in Bp. Sparrow's "Collection," which differs in three other material particulars from the extant copy of Day's edition.

² Fuller speaks of him as the "patron-general of non-subscribers."

³ *i. e.* Bishop Jewel (see above, p. 145). This is the supposition of Mr. Soames, Elizabethan Hist. 152. If any such omission was made by that prelate, he clearly exceeded the powers which had been granted by the synod: for so far from constituting him an irresponsible reviser, the order was that his duty of editor should commence "when the Articles shall be fully agreed upon."

⁴ The disputed clause occurs in the English copy of the Articles subscribed by Convocation in 1604, and therefore in the series contemplated by the 36th canon.

⁵ See Append. No. III., where the Articles, in this their final shape, are printed at length in Latin and English, by the side of the Forty-two Articles, together with collations of the most authentic copies of 1563.

event of a discrepancy¹ between them, can either be regarded as the paramount record?

This question has been so clearly and summarily stated by Dr. Waterland in his "Supplement to the Case of Arian Subscription," that we cannot return a more satisfactory answer than by adopting his cogent language: "As to the Articles, English and Latin, I may just observe for the sake of such readers as are less acquainted with these things; *first*, that the Articles were passed, recorded, and ratified in the year 1562, and *in Latin only*. *Secondly*, that those Latin Articles were revised and corrected by the Convocation of 1571. *Thirdly*, that an authentic English translation was then made of the Latin Articles by the same Convocation, and the Latin and English adjusted as nearly as possible. *Fourthly*, that the Articles thus perfected *in both languages* were published the same year, and by the royal authority. *Fifthly*, subscription was required the same year to the English Articles, called the Articles of 1562, by the famous act of the 13th of Elizabeth.

"These things considered, I might justly say with Bishop Burnet, that the Latin and English are both *equally authentic*. Thus much, however, I may certainly infer, that if in any places the English version be ambiguous, where the Latin original is clear and determinate; the Latin ought to fix the more doubtful sense of the other, (as also *vice versa*,) it being evident that the Convocation, Queen, and Parliament intended the same sense in both."²

In the whole course of the investigation which the language of Waterland so aptly closes, one thought must have been peculiarly impressed on the mind of every reader, as to the strong and uniform connexion subsisting between the Articles which we are now called upon to subscribe, and the actual state of the Church at

¹ A few such variations have been pointed out: *e. g.* in the ninth Article, the English, "for them that believe and are baptized" = the Latin, "*renatis et creditibus*;" and just before, the English, "there be no condemnation" = the Latin, "*nulla propter Christum est condemnatio*." Similarly, in the twelfth Article, the English, "follow after justification" = the Latin, "*justificatos sequuntur*."

² Works, II. 316, 317. Oxf. 1843.

the time of their compilation. This fact, so steadily attested by contemporary writers, to say nothing of the evidence supplied by the title of the document itself, cannot fail to have modified our views of its character as a standard of Christian truth. It was manifestly *designed* to be pacificatory, and at the same time polemical: it strove either by silence or by general statements of doctrine to calm the feverish speculations of the clergy upon a host of debateable questions; while on the other hand it provided a test by which the advocates of absolute errors, whether Romish or Anabaptist, Zwinglian or Puritanical, were excluded from the office of teaching within the jurisdiction of the English Church. To appeal, therefore, to the Articles of Religion as the one single measure of truth, or as a full and formal body of theology, sufficient for all times, is to forget the circumstances of the age in which they were produced;—it is to mistake what are justly regarded as a strong though modern bulwark, for the whole of the venerable fortress in which the ark of God is treasured.¹

Such has never been the language of those who in the period of the Reformation, as well as in the later crises of the Church, have stood forward as our champions against error on the right hand and the left. *Their* views of the nature and design of the Articles are in harmony with the memorable words of Bishop Pearson, who like the prelates of the Elizabethan age, while encountering the emissaries of Rome, had also to contend with an opposite party who desired the “reformation of the public doctrine.”² After observing that on the puritanical hypothesis the book of Articles was, from the nature of the case, *defective*, he adds: “It is not, nor is pretended to be, a complete body of divinity, or a comprehension and explication of all Christian doc-

¹ It is worthy of note that in the year 1675, during the discussions on the Test-Bill, Lord Shaftesbury (the profligate leader of what were then called the “low-churchmen”) demanded in the house of peers, “How *much* is meant by the Protestant Religion?” Whereupon several bishops explained, “that the Protestant Religion is comprehended in the Thirty-nine Articles, the Liturgy, the Catechism, the Homilies, and the Canons of the Church of England.” Lord Campbell’s “Lives of the Chancellors,” III. 323: cf. the language of the prolocutor in the Convocation of 1689; Cardwell’s Hist. of Conferences, 445, Oxf. 1841.

² No necessity of Reformation; Minor Works, II. 169; ed. Churton.

trines necessary to be taught; but *an enumeration of some truths, which upon and since the Reformation have been denied by some persons; who upon their denial are thought unfit to have any cure of souls in this Church or realm; because they might by their opinions either infect their flock with error, or else disturb the Church with schism, or the realm with sedition.*”¹

After the above illustrations of the origin of the Articles, we shall next endeavour to describe the formation of one or two kindred documents,—which serve to throw light on the subject of our present inquiry; and then trace the various attempts which have been made in succeeding times either to change its contents or to unsettle its authority.

Answer to Burges, *ibid.* II. 215.