GL 270
HAR 6TH ED
101241
LBSNAA

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी
L.B.S. National Academy of Administration
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE
पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या 101241
Accession No. [illegible]
वर्ग सख्या
Class No. 270
पुस्तक संख्या
Book No. Har 6th ed.

HISTORY OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

A HISTORY

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH

DURING

The Reformation.

BY

CHARLES HARDWICK, M.A.

LATE FELLOW OF ST CATHARINE'S COLLEGE, DIVINITY LECTURER AT KING'S COLLEGE, AND CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

SIXTH EDITION

BY

W. STUBBS, M.A.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1877.

[*All Rights reserved.*]

'Goo, lityll boke; be ferfull and quake for drede
For to appere in so hyȝ presence·
To alle folke that the seen or rede,
Submytte thyselfe with homble reverens
To be reformed, where men fynde offence;
Mekely requerynge, voyde of presomcyoun,
Where thou felyst to do correccyoun.'

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

TO

THE REV. G. E. CORRIE, D.D.

MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,

This Volume

IS INSCRIBED

WITH SENTIMENTS OF GRATITUDE, AFFECTION,

AND RESPECT,

BY

HIS FRIEND AND FORMER PUPIL.

PREFACE.

THE following Chapters are intended as the sequel and companion to 'A History of the Christian Church during the Middle Age.' The author had indulged the hope of giving this new portion to the public at a less distant interval, but found his progress constantly retarded by other duties and engagements.

In traversing ground which furnishes so many topics, always full of deep and sometimes melancholy interest to the student of Church-history, he was actuated by the principles which guided him throughout the composition of the previous volume. His earnest wish has been to give the reader a trustworthy version of those stirring incidents which mark the Reformation-period; without relinquishing his former claim to characterise particular systems, persons, and events, according to the shades and colours they assume, when contemplated from an English point of view, and by a member of the Church of England.

CAMBRIDGE, *February* 5, 1856.

This third edition is substantially a reprint of the second, which was published in 1865 under the editorship of the Rev. FRANCIS PROCTER. A few passages have been rewritten and the whole carefully revised.

WILLIAM STUBBS.

KETTEL HALL, *Oct.* 1872.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION . . . . 1—10

CHAPTER I.

THE *SAXON* SCHOOL OF CHURCH-REFORMERS, AND ITS PROPAGATION . . . . . 11—100

Germany . . . . . 11—72
Prussia . . . . . 73—74
Denmark, Norway, and Iceland . . . . . 74—78
Sweden . . . . . 78—82
Poland . . . . . 82—86
Bohemia and Moravia . . . . . 86—88
Hungary and Transylvania . . . . . 88—92
Spain . . . . . 92—96
Italy . . . . . 96—100

CHAPTER II.

THE *SWISS* SCHOOL OF CHURCH-REFORMERS, AND ITS PROPAGATION . . . . . 101—151

Switzerland . . . . . 101—121
France . . . . . 122—130
Scotland . . . . . 131—145
The Netherlands . . . . . 145—151

CHAPTER III.

PAGE
CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE SAXON AND THE SWISS REFORMERS . 152—164

CHAPTER IV.

THE ENGLISH AND IRISH REFORMATION . 165—249
England . . . . . 165—242
Ireland . . . . . 243—249

CHAPTER V.

SECTS AND HERESIES ACCOMPANYING THE NEW MOVEMENT . 250—273
Freethinkers . . . . . 250—251
First Race of Anabaptists . . . . . 252—258
Second Race of Anabaptists, or Mennonites . . . . 258—262
Socinians . . . . . 262—266
Schwenckfeldians . . . . . 266—268
Family of Love . . . . . 268—271
Brownists, or Independents . . . . . 271—273

CHAPTER VI.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION . . . 274—311
Mediating Party . . . . . 274—279
Council of Trent . . . . . 280—300
Inquisition . . . . . 301—302
Jesuits . . . . . 303—311

CHAPTER VII.

RELATIONS OF EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCHES . 312—319

CHAPTER VIII.

PAGE

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH, AND ITS RELATIONS TO THE CIVIL POWER . . . 320—354

Roman Communion . . . . . 320—327

English Communion . . . . . 327—339

Saxon Communion . . . . . 339—347

Swiss Communion . . . . . 347—354

CHAPTER IX.

STATE OF INTELLIGENCE AND PIETY . . 355—398

CHAPTER X.

GROWTH OF THE CHURCH . . . 399—413

A HISTORY

OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Reformation Period.

INTRODUCTION.

Anticipations of some mighty change:

THAT Europe would ere long be shaken by some purifying tempest was the general expectation of far-sighted men at the beginning of the sixteenth century. The scholar who was holding a familiar converse with past ages, or who noted from his cloister the portentous stillness which in spite of prevalent corruptions was pervading all the atmosphere of the Church, agreed in this foreboding with the politician who directed the affairs of nations, and mixed freely in the strifes and turmoils of the world. They could not, it is true, foresee the depth of the convulsion, nor the marvellous rapidity with which it would be propagated, nor the vast upheaving it would cause in every sphere of human thought. Much less could they divine the special nature of the instruments[1] whom GOD was shaping for the execution of His purpose. Yet their knowledge and experience told them that disorders such as they beheld in the administration of the Church had grown intolerable, and, unless a remedy were soon applied, might prove the ruin of the system which had fed them for so many years.

[1] The nearest guess, perhaps, was made in the following passage, written just before the birth of Luther: 'Ecclesiam per concilium reformare non poterit omnis humana facultas: sed alium modum Altissimus procurabit nobis quidem pro nunc incognitum, licet heu! præ foribus existat, ut ad pristinum statum ecclesia redeat:' see Hottinger, *Hist. Ecc.* sæc. xv. p. 413, quoted in *Middle Age*, p. 371, n. 3.

INTRODUCTION.

influences at work in producing them.

A number of converging trains[1] of influence had been lately rousing and enlarging the mind of Western Christendom. It could no longer be subdued by motives, or repressed by fetters, which had once been all-constraining. New importance was attached to individual freedom, and a higher value set on individual souls. The hazy light which floated over the institutions of the Mediæval period, adding to it much of its dignity, picturesqueness and romance, was giving way to fuller and more rational illumination: and as this increased the circle of its power, mankind grew more impatient of authority, and more inclined to question the traditions of their fathers. Every order of society was stirred: it silently drew up a catalogue of grievances[2], and watched its opportunity to clamour for redress. The feelings of the many were exasperated by the scandalous lives of the ecclesiastics. Members of the higher class resented their encroachments, envied their predominance, and thirsted for a part of their superfluous wealth. Those bishops even who were desirous to promote the better organization of their dioceses, felt themselves restrained by the corrupt examples and the arbitrary intermeddling of the popes: while in addition to this general want of confidence in the existing state of things, a party of doctrinal reformers was emerging, almost simultaneously, in very different quarters. It consisted of friars, clerics, monks and laymen, all perceiving more distinctly every day, that most of the practical corruptions on the surface of society had sprung from deeper causes than was commonly supposed, and therefore, that a reformation to be really efficacious

[1] *Middle Age*, pp. 415, 416.

[2] A specimen is found in the well-known *Centum Gravamina adversus sedem Romanam totumque ecclesiasticum ordinem* arrayed before the diet of Nuremberg in 1522. Erasmus writing (Dec. 12, 1524) to Duke George of Saxony, who was adverse to the Lutherans, did not hesitate to make this declaration: 'Cum Lutherus aggrederetur hanc fabulam [*i.e.* of indulgences], *totus mundus illi magno consensu applausit.* . . . Susceperat enim optimam causam adversus corruptissimos Scholarum et Ecclesiæ mores, qui eo progressi fuerant ut *res jam nulli bono viro tolerabilis videretur.*' *Epist.* lib. xxi. ep. 7 Lond. 1642. To the same effect writes Surius, a contemporary, and one of Luther's greatest enemies (in Gieseler, 'Vierte Periode,' p. 30, n. 17. Bonn, 1840, vol. v. p. 231. ed. Edinb.): 'In ipsis hujus tragœdiæ initiis visus est Lutherus etiam *plerisque viris gravibus et eruditis* non pessimo zelo moveri, planeque nihil spectare aliud quam Ecclesiæ reformationem, cujus quidam deformes abusus non parum male habebant bonos omnes.'

INTRODUCTION.

must commence with acts of daring, not to say of violence,—with rooting up the numerous aftergrowths of error, that had smothered, or at least obscured, the genuine dogmas of the Church.

Two possible methods of conducting a reformation.

As these convictions gradually became more definite and urgent, it was necessary to inquire respecting the machinery by which a reformation might be carried into effect. Two plans seemed possible: the one involving the co-operation of the pope and hierarchy, and through them extending to the whole of western Christendom; the other starting from the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of each particular state or nation, and removing the abuses which especially affected *it*. According to the first idea, the Roman pontiff, wielding as of old a spiritual supremacy, might constitute himself the head and leader of the rising movement. Foremost to acknowledge that 'many abominations had for a long time existed even in the holy see, yea, that all things had been grievously altered and perverted'[1], he might call together the most able representatives of the Church, inquire more narrowly into the growth of prevailing evils, disinter the ancient canons, above all, give new publicity to the neglected oracles of God, and ascertaining, by the help of sounder scholarship now happily revived, how far the faith and practices of Christendom had swerved from early standards, might exert the remnant of his power in every court of Europe to replace religion on a firmer basis, and to restore it to its pristine purity.

No chance of a reformation starting from the popes:

(1) If such a project may have fairly been considered within the bounds of possibility when Pius III. ascended the pontifical throne in **1503**, the hope of realizing it expired with his brief reign of six and twenty days[2]. It was agitated, for a while indeed, when Adrian occupied the place of Leo in **1522**; yet the 'reforming' pontiff (so he

[1] This was actually the admission of Adrian VI. in 1522. See his instructions to Francisco Chieregati, in Raynald. *Annal. Eccl.* ad an 1522. § 66. The abbé Rohrbacher in his *Hist. Univ. de l'Eglise Catholique* is unwilling to recognize the least corruption in the Mediæval Church, and professes to rectify the blunders of such men as Bossuet. who could not shut their eyes to the most patent facts of history. The language of Adrian is, however, a great stumblingblock in the way of M. Rohrbacher, owing to his exalted views of pontifical infallibility. See the opening of Liv. LXXXIV.

[2] Dollinger, *Ch. Hist*, IV. 229. Engl. Transl,

INTRODUCTION.

has been styled) had scarcely cherished the magnificent idea when he also was carried prematurely to his grave[1]. With these two slight exceptions, we shall find the Roman curia, throughout the first quarter of the sixteenth century, persisting in its resolution to discountenance all change whatever. Conscious though it afterwards became that reformation of some kind or other was inevitable, it manifested no activity until the slumbers of the Vatican were broken by the prospect of a general revolt. And as the pontiff would not himself institute reformatory measures, so would he not tolerate the schemes of other church-authorities. The 'constitutional' reformers, who inherited the feelings that found expression at Constance and Basel, were no less hateful in his eyes than Hussites or Waldenses. He construed every wish they breathed for the recovery of the Church into designs for circumscribing his jurisdiction, or draining his revenues. In **1460**, Pius II. had actually forbidden all endeavours to invoke the aid of councils under pain of damnation[2]. It was therefore not unnatural that many who sighed deeply over the degeneracy of Christendom should gradually lose faith in the pontifical authority, until they welcomed acts and agencies that once appeared abnormal, vicious and heretical.

whether we have respect to their official prejudices;

or their personal demerit.

This gradual loss of confidence was doubtless expedited by observing the personal demerit of the popes. Never had they, speaking generally, been so unworthy, so flagitious, and so despicable. When Luther was advancing to the highest academical distinction at Erfurt, the throne of St Peter, as men deemed, was still tenanted by Alexander VI.[3] whose crimes have always staggered the most ardent champions of the papacy. When Luther crossed the Alps in **1511**, himself, as he declares[4], the very 'maddest' of

[1] Sarpi, *Hist. du Concile de Trent*, Liv. I. c. 27. (I. 59 ed. Courayer.)

[2] *Bullarium*, ed. Cocquelines, III. pt. iii. 97.

[3] *Middle Age*, p. 339. Even Onuphrius Panvinius (the continuator of Platina), who thinks that the vices of Alexander were equalled by his virtues, characterizes him in the following terms: 'perfidia plusquam Punica, sævitia immani, avaritia immensa ac rapacitate, inexhausta parandi filio imperii per fas et nefas libidine....Mulieribus maxime addictus, ex quibus quatuor filios et duas filias tulit,' etc. *De Vit. Pontif.* p. 360. Colon. 1600.

[4] 'Sciat [i. e. lector] me fuisse aliquando monachum et papistam *insanissimum*, cum istam causam aggressus sum, ita ebrium, ita submersum in dogmatibus papæ, ut paratissimus fuerim omnes, si potuissem,

INTRODUCTION.

those devotees, he found that Julius II. the reigning 'representative of Christ,' bestowed his interest chiefly on the camp, and led his troops to battle[1]. These charges, it is true, do not apply to Leo X., who was remarkable for the polish of his manners, for his patronage of arts and learning, and for the graceful brilliance of his court: yet even he associated with men who ill disguised their infidelity, and though untainted by their vices, played the part of the magnificent prince, instead of the unworldly prelate[2]. He could, therefore, only smile or sneer[3] when he perused the protestations of 'brother Martin' against the impious sale of indulgences.

Further difficulties raised by their political insignificance.

Nor, had the popes been willing to promote a general reformation of the Church, could they have realized their wishes in the present state of European politics. Their standing, in relation to the civil power, was now no longer what it had been, when their edicts and anathemas found executioners in every province of the west,—when Innocent III. disposed of kingdoms, or when Hildebrand could terrify an emperor, and make him toil across the great St Bernard in the depth of winter to solicit the papal absolution. The nominal head of Christendom had shrunk at last into a cypher and a shadow. His reanimation was itself one consequence of the religious war that stripped him of the half of his possessions. When Charles and Francis wrestled for the sovereignty of Europe, Leo was in turn the tool of the stronger party. After witnessing the overthrow of his valiant Swiss at Marignano, he abandoned the imperial cause, and threw himself into the arms of Francis, crying 'Misericordia'[4]. So far was he at least from listening to the groans and clamours of his spiritual subjects, that while their remonstrances were grow-

occidere, aut occidentibus cooperari et consentire, si papæ vel una syllaba obedientiam detractarent:' Luther. *Opp.* ed. 1545. 'Præf.'

[1] Waddington, *Hist. of the Reform. on the Continent*, I. 58. Lond. 1841.

[2] Onuph. Panvin., as above, p. 369; cf. Roscoe's apology, in his *Life and Pontificate of Leo X.*, chap. xxiv.

[3] According to a contemporary, Bandello, the episcopal novelist (Pref. to *Novel.* xxv.), the pope observed 'che Fra Martino fosse un bellissimo ingegno, e che coteste erano invidie Fratesche.' Gieseler, v. 236.

[4] Ranke, *Popes during the Sixteenth Century*, I. 81, 82. 2nd ed. Lond. 1841.

INTRODUCTION.

ing louder every day, he was occupied with diplomatic arts and specious subterfuges for preserving to himself a wreck of his ancient independence.

Whether, then, we have regard to the hereditary prejudices of their station, to their personal demerits, or their inability to move the leading sovereigns of the west, we find no reason for expecting that reformatory measures would be instituted by the Roman pontiffs.

National as opposed to œcumenical reformation:

(2) The other course, as we have indicated, was to substitute domestic for œcumenical machinery, to make the reformation of each country a separate concern by laying greater stress upon the principle of nationality, as distinguished from that of papal universalism. This project, in addition to the scriptural and patristic arguments alleged in its behalf, accorded with the state of public feeling, as well as with the special circumstances of the times. A marked tendency in the same direction had in fact been already manifested in proportion as men felt the transforming influences of the fifteenth century. We trace it in the 'actions' of the council of Constance, where a deep distrust of ultramontane intermeddling prompted the idea of 'vote by nations'[1]. That idea was afterwards embodied still more fully in the 'Pragmatic Sanction' of Charles VII.[2], which formed the bulwark of the 'Gallican Liberties,' and which at one time Maximilian thought of introducing into Germany[3]. He also ventured to express a lively interest in the convocation of the anti-papal synod of Pisa[4] (**1511**), stating that as the court of Rome was backward, he would himself put an end to the delay; and therefore, in his capacity of 'steward and protector of the Church,' proceeded to convene 'the council of which she was greatly in need'[5]. Another striking indication of this forwardness in separate countries under the guidance of the civil power occurred in **1527** during the captivity of the pope. In a

[1] *Middle Age*, p. 332.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 338.
[3] Ranke, *Hist. of Ref. in Germany*, I. 270. 2nd ed. Lond. 1845.
[4] *Middle Age*, p. 340, n. 1.
[5] Ranke, *ibid.* It was on this occasion that the prelates wrote as follows (Nov. 12, 1511): 'Assurge, igitur, Cæsar Optime, adesto, vigila; labitur ecclesia, opprimuntur boni, impii efferuntur, mergitur justitia, colitur impietas, surgunt in sinumque recipiuntur infideles,' *etc.*: apud Richer. *Hist. Concil.* lib. IV. Part I. pp. 121, 122. Colon. 1681.

INTRODUCTION.

treaty then arranged between Henry VIII. and Francis I. it was provided that 'whatsoever by the cardinal of York, assisted by the prelates of England assembled and called together by the authority of the King, should be determined concerning the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in the said kingdom of England...should, the consent of the king being first had, be decreed and observed:' and corresponding stipulations were inserted in behalf of 'Francis and his clergy'[1].

the principle adopted in Germany,

In strict accordance with these tendencies, we find the chief reformers of Germany and England placing themselves in close alliance with the secular authority, as that which ought to guide and stimulate the new religious movement. Luther in his bold address[2] 'to the Christian potentates of the German nation' (June, **1520**) urged distinctly that as need required, and as the Roman pontiffs only hindered reformation, the 'secular sword' would be exerted lawfully in redressing grievances by means of what he termed 'a right free council.' He was contemplating, it is probable, the convocation of some body representing all the western churches: yet the principle he advocates would equally in his opinion justify the conduct of a synod whose proceedings were restricted to the German empire, and even to particular states. The English, among whom, in spite of the high-sounding legislation of the Tudors, church-authority was more clearly and consistently preserved, were taught to associate their reformation with the same idea of nationality. Thus in the preamble to the famous Act of Parliament[3] relating to appeals (**1532–3**), which proved the harbinger of more decisive measures, it is declared on the authority of 'sundry old authentic histories and chronicles,' that this realm of England is an empire made up of spiritualty and temporalty, and that it has here been customary, when causes 'of the Law Divine,' or 'of spiritual learning,' come in question, to decide them by consulting that 'part of the body politic called the spiritualty,

and still more intelligently by the English:

[1] Herbert's *Life of Henry VIII.* p. 209. Lond. 1672. The historian remarks: 'And here certainly began the taste that our King took of governing in chief the clergy.'

[2] *Schriften*, ed. Walch, x. 296 sq. It was written in German for the sake of reaching the public ear.

[3] *Stat.* 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12.

INTRODUCTION.

now being usually called the English Church...without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons.' And the same principle of action, variously applied, had been adopted in the other states and countries of the west. They all convinced themselves that it was now the first and paramount duty of 'every prince to redress his own realm'[1].

subject however for a while to the decisions of a general Council.

We should remark, indeed, that notwithstanding occasional expressions of impatience and distrust, the project of submitting the grievances of the reformers to a body fairly representing all the Latin Church, was not abandoned till it grew entirely visionary. Melanchthon and his friends affirmed[2] in **1530**, that with regard to most of the disputed points they acted but provisionally. Hermann, the archbishop of Cologne, whose 'Consultation' was the work of the same moderate school, looked hopefully as late as **1543** to some conciliar reformation: 'Which thinges nevertheless we set furth to be receyued and obserued of men committed to our charge, none otherwise than as a beginninge of so holie and necessary a thinge, vntil a general reformacion of congregacions [*i.e.* churches] be made by the holie empire, by a fre and Christian council, vniuersall or nationall'[3]. And even Philip the Magnanimous, who shewed himself peculiarly erratic, and impatient, more than others, of all spiritual authority, evinced a willingness in **1545** to stand by the determinations of such a body,—'a free, pious and general council'[4].

Reconciliation rendered hopeless.

As soon, however, as the members of the counter-reformation party had recruited their broken forces, and had published the elaborate decrees which are the fruit of their weary conferences at Trent, all hopes of peace, of

[1] In the 'Kinges Protestation agaynst the Pope,' A.D. 1536 (Fox, p. 1085, col. 2. ed. 1583), where this expression occurs, it is observed: 'They that be wisest do dispayre of a generall councel. Wherfore we think it now best that euery prince call a councell prouincial.' Cf. the reasons given at the same time (A.D. 1537) by the Germans, for not consenting to a proposed council to be held at Mantua. Le Plat, *Monumenta Concil. Trident.* II. 577. Lovan. 1782.

[2] Ranke, *Hist. Reform.* III. 286.

[3] *Consultation*, sign. Rr. ii. Lond. 1547. See also Bucer's kindred language in his *Scripta Duo Adversaria*, p. 255. Argentor. 1544.

[4] See, however, Credner's remarks on this profession in the 'Vorwort' (p. ccv.) prefixed to his edition of the *Reformatio Ecclesiarum Hassiæ*, Giessen, 1852.

unity, of reconciliation were utterly extinguished (**1563**). A synod, which the Romanist, however unhistorically, held to be a representation of the whole Church, having eventually obtained the formal sanction of the pontiff, was calculated to satisfy alike the Gallican and ultramontane theories of infallibility, and therefore claimed the homage of all Christians who recognized the jurisdiction of the Roman see. On the other hand, the different bodies of Reformers also went their way to strengthen their ecclesiastical organization, and developing the evangelic principles that drove them at the first into collision with the unreformed, gave character and permanency to their system by stereotyping their Confessions and other symbolical books. The breach was thus to all appearance made irreparable. Christendom that had for centuries been parted into East and West resolved itself still further; now presenting to the eye a motley group (we cannot say confederation) of national and local churches.

Loss and gain of Christendom.

Few perhaps of those who thoughtfully examine the modern history of Europe, will question that the great disruptions of the sixteenth century, though highly beneficial as a whole, entailed some formidable evils. The loss of that organic unity which served in by-gone ages as a powerful evidence in aid of Christian truth; the intermission of fraternal fellowship between communities related to each other not by blood and language merely, but, in some essential points, by creed; the sad dismemberment of families; the multiplication of parties, schisms and factions rising out of religious prejudice, and often issuing in religious wars; the growth of mental habits leading either to indifferentism on one side, or to interdicted speculations on the other; the diffusion of an egotistic, self-complacent and subjective spirit, making light of all ecclesiastical traditions and exciting controversies whose vibrations are still felt in almost every part of Europe;—these were some of the immediate, and it may be, necessary, accompaniments of struggles which then rose between the ancient and modern modes of thought, between the Mediæval and Reforming principles. But while confessing and deploring such results, we should, on the other hand, reflect that in the present stage of man's existence, great advantages must generally be purchased by corresponding sacrifices; and

INTRODUCTION.

that if we fairly balance gain with loss, the Reformation is to be esteemed among our very choicest blessings. It recovered what is even more precious than ecclesiastical unity,—the primitive and Apostolic faith. From it, accordingly, has dated a new era in the moral progress of the Western nations, and the spiritual development of man. It has, to some extent, replaced him in the liberty wherewith Christ had made him free. It has unloosed the trammels that oppressed not only his understanding, but his conscience. It has led to the rejection of that semi-Judaism in thought and feeling, which however it was overruled for good in training the barbaric nations of the north, was, notwithstanding, a melancholy relapse into the servile posture of the Hebrew, as distinguished from the free and filial spirit that should characterize the children of God. Above all, the Reformation vindicated for our blessed Lord the real headship of the Church, exalting Him as the One source of life and righteousness, and thereby placing saints, and priests, and sacraments, in their true subordination. Personal faith in Him, the Reconstructor of humanity, the living Way unto the Father, was now urged with emphasis unequalled since the age of St Augustine: and this quickening of man's moral consciousness imparted a new stimulus to individual effort. Doubtless many wild exaggerations followed, and still follow, in the track of the great movement, partly owing to the natural waywardness of men, and partly to the irrepressible force of the revulsion caused by hatred of the ancient superstitions; yet, in spite of all such drawbacks, it is manifest that the reformed are, as a rule, entitled to rank higher than the unreformed communities, surpassing these not only in the vigour of their intellectual faculties and their material prosperity, but also in the social, moral, and religious elevation of the people.

CHAPTER I.

THE SAXON SCHOOL OF CHURCH-REFORMERS, AND ITS PROPAGATION.

GERMANY.

GERMANY.

Early life of Luther, (b. **1483**):

To understand the nature of the Reformation as it rose and spread in Germany, we must become familiar with the life of him who was its centre and its chief. Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, a small town of Saxony, on the **10**th of November, **1483**. Like Hildebrand, whose reformations constitute another epoch in the annals of the Christian Church, he issued from the lower strata of society[1]. A childhood, saddened by the hardness of his lot, and the undue severity of his parents, ended in his transfer at the age of fifteen to the thriving school of Eisenach[2], where indigence compelled him not unfrequently to earn his bread by singing carols in the streets and neighbourhood. Yet no privations of this kind, however much they modified his natural temper, could depress the

[1] 'I am a peasant's son,' he says in his *Table Talk*, 'my father, my grandfather, and my great grandfather were genuine peasants (rechte Bauern).' Ranke observes that the family was from Möhra, a village in the Thuringian forest, not far from the spot where Boniface, the apostle of Germany, first preached the Gospel. *Reform.* Bk. II. ch. 1. (I. 316). Another form of the name was Lüder, out of which his enemies profess to have extracted the mystic number 666, the designation of the beast in the Apocalypse: cf. Audin, *Hist. de la Vie de Martin Luther*, I. 1, note. Paris, 1839.

[2] In the village school of Mansfeld, whither his parents removed soon after his birth, he was taught, among other things, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer, together with the Latin Grammar of Donatus. The year before (1497) Luther had been sent to a school of higher rank at Magdeburg, but was withdrawn, owing to the inability of his parents to maintain him there. At Eisenach he had relatives, who contributed slightly to his support. The best contemporary biographies of him are Melanchthon's *Hist. Vit. Martin. Luther.* ed. Heumann, 1741, and a second by Matthesius, *Historien von D. Martin Luthers Anfang*, etc. first published in 1565.

GERMANY.

Development of his character.

buoyant energies within him; and when arrangements had been made at length (**1501**) for sending him to the university of Erfurt, the leading features of his character were rapidly developed. In that large and sturdy frame, with appetites of corresponding vehemence, and passions ever calling loudly for restraint, there worked a spirit such as rarely tenants human flesh,—commanding, fierce, impetuous, dauntless, and indomitable, while maintaining what he felt to be the cause of truth and righteousness, and yet combining with these manlier elements an awful consciousness of his dependence upon God, and childlike singleness of purpose. Of his intellectual eminence a presage had been given at Eisenach, particularly by the force and eloquence of his compositions, both in verse and prose: but the superiority of his talents grew most apparent when, on entering at the university, he soon eclipsed his fellow-students, and astonished his instructors, by the rapidity with which he mastered all the ponderous learning of the schools. It seems that Aristotle, whom he afterwards abhorred[1], was one of the chief instruments in this evolving of his mental powers. He also read the other standard authors of the age, such as Thomas Aquinas[2], Duns Scotus[3], William of Ockham[4], Gabriel Biel[5], Peter D'Ailly[6], and Gerson[7]; last of all, proceeding to the investigation of the Holy Scriptures[8], which he studied with the help of the patristic commentators, more especially of St Augustine. His decided preference for the writings of this saint, a preference which involved considerations of the highest

[1] In a letter dated May 18, 1517 (ed. De Wette, I. 57), he spoke of Aristotle as then on the decline ('descendit paulatim'); and in 1520 he entirely abandoned the Aristotelic theory of substance and accident (*De Captiv. Babylon. Eccl.* Opp. II. fol. 263, b. Jenæ, 1600). He declared that the Western Christians were generally orthodox on the Eucharist, 'donec cœpit Aristotelis simulata philosophia in Ecclesia grassari.' At last, according to Erasmus (*Epist.* lib. xxxi. ep. 99), he denounced the whole of the Aristotelic philosophy as diabolical. Singularly enough the dialectics and physics of the Stagirite had been the subject of his first academical lectures.

[2] See *Middle Age*, pp. 267 sq.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 270.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 353 and n. 1.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 354 and n. 1.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 354, n. 2.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 358.

[8] On his 'discovery' of a copy of the Latin Bible (1503) in the university library at Erfurt, see Merle d'Aubigné's *Hist. of the Reform.* I. 208. Edinb. 1853, and Dr Maitland's *Dark Ages*, pp. 469, 505. Lond. 1845.

GERMANY.

Becomes a friar at Erfurt, **1505,**

moment in relation to the history of Christian dogmas, may be traced in some degree to his initiation, at Erfurt, into the order of Augustinian hermits or friars (**1505**). The natural bent of Luther's mind was certainly not in the direction of monasticism: he was social, cheerful, strongly sensuous, passionately fond of art and music, and himself no mean composer: yet on reaching his twentieth year he gradually became the victim of religious melancholy, which continued to hang over him and clouded all his being, until **1508**. His mental agitations were peculiarly intense and awful, bordering, it would seem, on actual delirium, when he felt himself impelled into the cloisters of the Augustinian convent[1]. A noviciate of one year gave ample promise of his diligence, humility and devotion. He resolved, with all the vigour of a dominant will, that if ascetic practices could open the gates of heaven to any, he for one would enter there[2]. But notwithstanding all such brave determinations, his disquietude went on increasing. As the lectures of the schools had failed to satisfy his yearnings after holiness, and could not draw him into closer communing with God, so neither did the self-inflicted privations of his cell. The Reformation that was destined to produce such mighty throes and conflicts in the whole of Christendom, was now foreshadowed in the night-long vigils of the penitent and terror-stricken friar. It is remarkable[3] that one of his first comforters was an aged inmate of the convent, who with great simplicity reminded him of the article of his creed, 'I believe in the remission of sins,'—expounding it in such a way as to bring out more consciously man's personal trust in a

[1] He had been brooding over the sudden death of an intimate friend (July, 1505) when he was overtaken in the mountains between Mansfeld and Erfurt by a terrific storm. His feelings were strongly excited by what he deemed the presence of a wrathful God, and he instantly made a vow to St Anne, that if he escaped he would enter a convent. On reaching Erfurt, he gave a farewell supper to his friends, and retaining only two books, his Virgil and Plautus, betook himself during the night of Aug. 17, 1505, to the place of his reclusion: cf. Waddington, I. 39 sq.

[2] Ranke, *Reform.* I. 319: Audin, *Hist. de Luther*, I. 88, 89. His treatise *De Votis Monasticis* was written about sixteen years after. He there says that he became a recluse half unwillingly, 'terrore et agone mortis subitæ circumvallatus.'

[3] Melanchthon, *De Vit. Luth.* p. 7.

GERMANY.

gratuitous redemption[1]. Hence the origin of the peculiar emphasis which Luther uniformly placed upon this doctrine all the rest of his life.

migrates to Wittenberg, **1508.**

In **1508** the scene of his activity was changed: John Staupitz, the provincial of his order, and his sympathetic guide, securing his appointment as philosophical lecturer in the university of Wittenberg, which had been founded by the elector Frederic, only six years before. He there took the degree of bachelor of divinity (**1509**), and henceforth his chief thoughts were concentrated on the study of the Bible[2]. What had most attracted him in it were the epistles of St Paul, with which he now associated[3] the anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine, and the sermons of John Tauler[4], his fellow-countryman. The hours that were not occupied in preparing his academic lectures, he employed either in preaching to his brother-friars, or in parochial work at Wittenberg[5]; and during this time his

[1] *Ibid.* The friar confirmed his interpretation by an extract from St Bernard. One passage in the Pauline Epistles (Rom. i. 17) caused Luther great perplexity while he was thinking out his doctrine of Justification. He had been taught to understand δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ of the 'active' righteousness in virtue of which God punished sinners; but he finally held it to mean His 'passive' righteousness, by which the God of mercy justified mankind through faith in Christ. As early as April, 1516, he was engaged in actual warfare against the scholastic 'opinion,' or rather 'error,' as he adds. See his Letter to George Spenlein (De Wette, i. 16 sq.), where he goes on to exhort his brother-friar in the following terms, and thus proves that his doctrine of Justification was already far developed: 'Igitur, mi dulcis Frater, disce Christum et Hunc crucifixum: disce Ei cantare et de teipso desperans dicere Ei: Tu, Domine Jesu, es justitia mea, ego autem sum peccatum Tuum: Tu assumsisti meum, et dedisti mihi Tuum: assumsisti quod non eras, et dedisti mihi quod non eram. . . . Igitur non nisi in Illo, per fiducialem desperationem tui et operum tuorum pacem invenies. Disce insuper ex Ipso, ut sicut Ipse suscepit te, et peccata tua fecit Sua, et Suam justitiam fecit tuam.' Gieseler, v. 221.

[2] In a letter dated March 17, 1509, Luther expressed a wish to enter more systematically on the study of theology, 'ea inquam theologia, quæ nucleum nucis et medullam tritici et medullam ossium scrutatur:' ed. De Wette, i. 6. He took his doctor's degree Oct. 19, 1512, and by that step considered himself bound especially to preach the Word of God: Melanchthon, *De Vit. Luth.* p. 22. He had been ordained priest in 1506. On the circumstances connected with his first celebration of mass, see Audin, i. 89, 90.

[3] Ranke (i. 323, note) has brought to light an interesting passage on this subject.

[4] See *Middle Age*, p. 356, and n. 6.

[5] He also acted for a while as deputy provincial of the Augustinians in the absence of Staupitz (Seckendorf, Lib. i. p. 20, col. 1), thus gaining

GERMANY.

mental conflicts, though still frequent, had considerably abated. One remarkable effect of Luther's growing influence in the university[1], was the dethronement of scholasticism both there and elsewhere. He shewed himself peculiarly hostile to the Mediæval theories of human merit, and refuted these by 'pointing, like the Baptist, to the Lamb of God, Who taketh away the sins of the world'[2]. It is, however, easy to detect in his mind, as in that of St Augustine, his great model, the temporary co-existence of divergent, and, in many cases, heterogeneous elements[3]. The Saxon friar clung at first to every thing he found in the existing practice and traditions of the Church: yet, meanwhile he was fostering principles which in their logical results were adverse to the ruling spirit of the Mediæval system.

attacks the doctrine of indulgences, **1517.**

It was only when the doctrine of indulgences was practically forced upon him, in its most obnoxious shape, that he began to see the real contrariety between it and his view of justification by faith. The series of propositions which he posted up, on the **31**st of October, **1517**, challenging 'a disputation for the purpose of explaining the power of indulgences,' evince[4] a stedfast resolution to assail the very strongholds of scholasticism,—its theory of penances and superabundant merits. In putting forth those ever-memorable questions, where the 'thoughts fly out from his mind like sparks from the iron under the

a deeper insight into the state of practical religion, as well as manifesting great aptitude for matters of business.

[1] He writes (May 18, 1517), 'Theologia nostra et S. Augustinus prospere procedunt et regnant in nostra universitate, Deo operante.....Mire fastidiuntur *lectiones sententiariæ*, nec est, ut quis sibi auditores sperare possit, nisi theologiam hanc, id est Bibliam, aut S. Augustinum, aliumve ecclesiasticæ auctoritatis doctorem velit profiteri:' ed. De Wette, I. 57. In other words, Luther exactly reversed the state of things which prevailed in the time of Roger Bacon: see *Middle Age*, p. 298, n. 2. In the same year (Sept. 4, 1517) he had published a long list of theses vindicating Augustinianism in its more stringent form, and insisting most emphatically on the moral impotence of man unquickened by the Holy Spirit: Löscher's *Reformations-acta*, I. 539 sq. Gieseler, V. 222.

[2] See Melanchthon's *Life*, as above, p. 12.

[3] *E.g.* when he visited Rome (1511), he tells us in the *Table-Talk*, that he climbed the Scala Santa on his knees in order to obtain the plenary indulgence attached to that act of penance: 'but a voice within him constantly reproached him, while he did so, crying, The just shall live by faith.'

[4] *Middle Age*, p. 411, pp. 430 sq.

GERMANY.

stroke of the hammer[1],' he was more especially stimulated by discovering that some of his own parishioners[2] had gone with the multitude to Jüterbock, a neighbouring town, where Tetzel, the Dominican friar, advertised his wares for sale[3]. Yet Luther was still very far from contemplating any rupture with the church-authorities. His animadversions were restricted to a class of topics on which several of the schoolmen had expressed themselves with freedom almost equal to his own. He even entertained a hope[4] that Leo X. would prove his patron, or at least discountenance the shameless traffic which he laboured to repress. And such a hope is quite accordant with the general tone of Luther's mind: for nothing can be more groundless than the idea that he was actuated by a revolutionary spirit, or had aught in common with the vulgar demagogue. He started with a feeling of the deepest reverence for all institutions which he had been taught to view as the depositories of Divine authority[5].

[1] Ranke, *Reform.* I. 340.

[2] See Luther's own statement in his treatise against Hans Wurst (1541): *Schriften*, ed. Walch, XVII. 1703. His earnestness was also shewn by the letter he addressed (Oct. 31, 1517) to Albert, archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg (De Wette, I. 68), where he speaks as follows of the practical effect of preaching the indulgences: 'in quibus non adeo accuso prædicatorum exclamationes, quas non audivi, sed doleo falsissimas intelligentias populi ex illis conceptas, quas vulgo undique jactant, videlicet, quod credunt infelices animæ si literas indulgentiarum redemerint, quod securi sint de salute sua; item, quod animæ de purgatorio statim evolent, ubi contributionem in cistam conjecerint; deinde, tantas esse has gratias, ut nullum sit adeo magnum peccatum, etiam (ut aiunt) si per impossibile quis matrem Dei violasset, quin possit solvi: item, quod homo per istas indulgentias liber sit ab omni pœna et culpa.'

[3] Audin's remark on these transactions has more than his usual amount of candour: 'C'était un métier honteux dont toute âme religieuse rougissait pour Tezel, et l'on comprend la colère de Luther contre ce vendeur de choses saintes,' *etc.* I. 124. It should be also added, that the papal nuncio Miltitz afterwards repudiated the extravagance of Tetzel, and censured him with great severity (Waddington, I. 193). Notwithstanding, the main principle on which indulgences were based, was reaffirmed by Leo X. (Löscher, II. 493).

[4] In the Preface to his works, written the year before his death, he says, 'In iis certus mihi videbar me habiturum *patronum papam*, cujus fiducia tum fortiter nitebar,' etc. Gieseler, V. 229.

[5] A remarkable instance of this may be seen in the letters which he wrote in 1517, when he sent (Oct. 31) copies of his theses on indulgences to Albert, archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg (De Wette, I. 67 sq.), and to his own diocesan, the bishop of Brandenburg. The latter conjured him, by his love for peace, to stop the agitation he was raising, and for a

GERMANY.

One of these he recognized in the Latin Church as governed by the pontiffs, and therefore it was only after painful struggles that he lost all faith in their uprightness, and had courage to repudiate their claims. His confidence appears to have been shaken first on noticing the ultra-Romanism of those who undertook the advocacy of the old abuses.

Controversy with Wimpina,

After skirmishing with Tetzel[1] and a more respectable scholar of the university of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Conrad Koch, surnamed Wimpina[2], Luther had to meet the formal charge of insubordination, brought against him by three ardent champions of the papacy. These were John Mayr of Eck, commonly known as Eckius[3], the vice-chancellor of the university of Ingolstadt, who from his eloquence and intellectual cultivation may be styled the Luther of southern Germany; Sylvester Mazolini da Prierio (Prierias[4]), a Dominican of Rome, and 'master of the sacred

Eck,

Prierias,

while he hesitated whether he should recal his work or not: 'Malo obedire quam miracula facere, etiamsi possem.' Letter to Spalatinus, ed. De Wette, I. 71: cf. Waddington, I. 85 sq., Stephen's *Essays in Eccl. Biogr.* I. 313 sq. 2nd ed.

[1] Tetzel's own production (Löscher, I. 484) is in answer to Luther's two sermons on indulgences, preached in German about the same period: cf. Seckendorf, Lib. I. p. 26, col. 1. As a Dominican, he was backed by all the influence of his order, so that for a time the disputation looked like a mere squabble between the Dominican and Augustinian friars. It might have been described far more accurately as a struggle between the Thomist champions of scholasticism and the new generation, who reverted directly to the Bible and the earlier Fathers.

[2] Wimpina was called in to his aid by Tetzel (Jan. 1518), at the suggestion of the archbishop of Mentz, who was profiting by the sale of the indulgences, and therefore felt that the attack from Wittenberg was levelled partly at himself. Luther ultimately (*Pref.* to his Latin works) charged on this prelate the whole blame of the disruption that ensued. Wimpina's *Disputationes* are printed in Löscher, I. 503 sq. He extolled the powers of the pope ('papa ea, quæ fidei sunt, solus habet determinare'), and even committed himself to the following statement (Disp. II. § 17): 'Docendi sunt Christiani, quod Ecclesia multa tenet ut catholicas veritates, quæ tamen sicut nec *in canone Bibliæ, ita nec a doctoribus antiquioribus ponuntur.*' Gieseler, v. 232.

[3] For his *Obelisci*, together with the *Asterisci*, which Luther published in reply to them, see Löscher, III. 333: cf. Seckendorf, Lib. I. p. 30, col. 2. Up to this time they were intimate friends; but after Eck's criticism had been circulated extensively (as he declared, contrary to his own wishes), he gradually became the chief antagonist of the reformer. On his high reputation as an academic, see Ranke, *Ref.* I. 444, 445, who adds (p. 449) that he, like Luther, was a peasant's son.

[4] His production (Dec. 1517) is entitled *Dialogus in præsumptuosas M. Lutheri Conclusiones:* Löscher, II. 12 sq., Seckendorf, p. 31. He

GERMANY.

and Hochstraten.

palace;' and an ignorant inquisitor, Hochstraten[1], professor of theology at Cologne, and the unblushing advocate of persecution. As the arguments which they advanced were ultimately based upon the despotism and virtual omnipotence of the popes, they had necessitated an inquiry on the part of Luther into wider regions than his thoughts had hitherto been traversing. At first he shewed his usual reverence for the character and jurisdiction of Leo X.[2]: but in the spring of **1518**, while these feelings were still dominant, we find him drawing a distinction[3] between the infallibility of Holy Scripture and that of the most able pontiff, and denying to the latter any authority to 'speak from himself alone,' independently of general councils, except indeed as the interpreter of the decrees which they had promulgated.

On the 7th of the following August (**1518**), Luther was cited to appear in Rome within sixty days, the charge against him now assuming, even in the highest quarters, the more serious form of heresy[4]: but owing to the gene-

defends all the worst extravagances of Tetzel, and in reference to the papal power maintains (1) that the Church of Rome is 'virtualiter' the Church Catholic, and (2) that the supreme pontiff is 'virtualiter' the Church of Rome. Luther declares in reply, that he knows of no form in which the Church exists 'virtualiter' except a council, repudiating the counter-theory by pointing to the 'monstrous' deeds of pontiffs, such as Julius II. and Boniface VIII. Gieseler, v. 232.

[1] Seckendorf, Lib. I. p. 38.

[2] Thus he ends his letter to the pontiff (dated Trinity Sunday, 1518) with the following passage: 'Prostratum me pedibus tuis, beatissime pater, offero, cum omnibus quæ sum et habeo. Vivifica, occide, voca, revoca, approba, reproba, ut placuerit: vocem tuam vocem Christi, in te præsidentis et loquentis, agnoscam,' etc.: ed. De Wette, I. 122.

[3] One of his main positions in answering Prierias is the well-known dictum of St. Augustine: 'Ego solis eis libris, qui canonici appellantur, hunc honorem deferre didici, ut nullum eorum Scriptorum errasse firmissime credam,' etc. (Ep. ad S. Hieronym. inter Hieron. *Opp.* IV. pt. II. p. 630, ed. Bened.) Gieseler, v. 233. But he expressed himself more clearly on this head (May, 1518) in his *Resolutiones Disputationum de Virtute Indulgentiarum.* Löscher, II. 183 sq., Seckendorf, Lib. I. pp. 33—37. This document, though forwarded to the pope (May 30) and his own diocesan (May 22), was not printed till the following August.

[4] This charge though hinted at before was first advanced distinctly in the papal brief of Aug. 27 (Löscher, II. 437) and drew from him the strongest declaration of his catholicity. He had in fact already anticipated it (Aug. 21, 1518): 'Hæreticus nunquam ero; errare disputando possum, sed statuere nihil volo, porro nec opinionibus hominum captivus fieri:' ed. De Wette, I. 133.

GERMANY.

Interview with Cajetanus.

rous interposition of his friends at Wittenberg[1], the task of judging him and thereby crushing the incipient reformation, was committed to the papal legate in Germany, the cardinal Thomas de Vio of Gaeta (hence called Cajetanus), who had made himself conspicuous both as a Dominican and as a defender of the *Summa* of Aquinas. Luther, armed with the safe conduct of the emperor Maximilian, met his adversary for the first time at Augsburg on the 10th of October[2]. He was then charged with contradicting a decision of Clement VI. respecting the meritorious treasury of the Church; and, secondly, with holding that faith in the efficacy of sacraments is always an essential precondition in order to receive the grace which they communicate,—this latter doctrine being one which the cardinal denounced as altogether novel, though he afterwards expressed his willingness to pass it over, provided Luther would abandon the first of his positions. That indeed was made the battle-field of three successive conferences. Unmoved alike by the paternal mildness of the legate and his dignified remonstrance, the accused persisted in repudiating the scholastic dogma of indulgences; and on the last of these occasions did not hesitate to question the binding force of many papal edicts, which he now subordinated more distinctly to the voice of Holy Scripture, to the ancient Fathers, the determinations of general councils, and even to the reason of the individual Christian, where he chances to have been more accurately informed[3]. To these and other arguments the cardinal

Real subject of dispute.

[1] Luther thus alludes to the intercession of the Elector Frederic, who seconded the general wish of the university: 'Scripsit mihi illustrissimus Princeps, se in causa mea egisse, ut legatus Cajetanus scripserit ad urbem pro mea causa committenda ad partes: et interim id me debere expectare. Ideo spero censuras non venturas esse. Displiceo autem multis, pluribus, plurimis.' Letter to John Lange, Sept. 9, 1518; De Wette, I. 141.

[2] See his letter to Spalatinus of this date (*Ibid.* I. 143); his other letters written from Augsburg (pp. 145—161); Seckendorf, Lib. I. pp. 45 sq., and Ranke, I. 428, 429. It was on this occasion that Staupitz on his arrival at Augsburg, partly through fear and partly through affection, released the friar from his vow of obedience: cf. Waddington, I. 159, 160. Luther regarded this as no friendly act, and spoke of it as his first excommunication. His old superior hesitated for a while, as he expressed it, 'inter Christum et papam' (De Wette, I. 558), and then finally abandoned him.

[3] He quotes a passage from the canonist Panormitanus in support of this last assertion. The whole passage is remarkable: 'Præterea, quam

GERMANY.

replied by peremptory orders, that Luther should at once recant[1] or come no more into his presence; and the culprit, apprehending that violence would be employed against him, escaped by night from Augsburg, after lodging an appeal to the Roman pontiff (Oct. **16**)[2]. Fresh machinery was soon, however, set in motion for reclaiming the erratic friar. On this errand, Charles von Miltitz, agent of the Elector Frederic at Rome, had been dispatched into his native country[3]. Nor could Leo have employed an apter instrument. The conduct of the nuncio breathed conciliation and forbearance. He admitted the existence of scandalous abuses in the administration of the Church; and finding on his interview with Luther, at Altenburg, Jan. **3**, **1519**, that he could not persuade him to publish any formal recantation of his vehement language, he was ultimately content to leave the controversy for the adjudication of some German prelate[4], only with the understanding that the two belligerent parties should be in the mean time bound to silence[5].

Further interview with Miltitz.

multæ decretales priores correctæ sunt per posteriores. Ideo et hanc forte [*viz.* an Extravagant of Clement VI.] pro tempore suo corrigi posse. Panormitanus quoque, Lib. I. de elect. C. *significasti*, ostendit in materia fidei non modo generale concilium esse super papam, sed *etiam quemlibet fidelem*, si melioribus nitatur autoritate et ratione quam papa, *sicut Petro Paulus*, Galat. II.:' De Wette, I. 151.

[1] His determination not to cry 'revoco' at the simple bidding of the legate is thus referred to in a letter dated Oct. 14 (De Wette, I. 161): 'Aber ich will nicht zu einem Ketzer werden mit dem Widerspruch der Meinung, durch welche ich bin zu einem Christen worden: ehe will ich sterben' *etc.*

[2] The title of the document is 'Appellatio a Pontifice male informato ad melius informandum' (Löscher, II. 484). He appears to have drawn it up in compliance with the wishes of his friends (see his letter to Cajetanus, Oct. 18: De Wette, p. 164). On his return to Wittenberg he prepared an appeal from 'the pope to a future council' (Löscher, II. 505), pleading the recent example of the University of Paris, 'adhæsurus Parisiensibus, in eventum quo hanc priorem appellationem de plenitudine potestatis, imo tyrannidis, refutaret papa.' Letter dated Oct. 31, 1518: De Wette, I. 166.

[3] The pope manifested a strong desire to conciliate the Saxons, by sending their Elector the golden rose (Ranke, *Ref.* I. 431); and it is probable that Miltitz was further influenced by remarking the almost universal popularity of the new movement. See the evidence collected by Gieseler, V. 242, ed. Edinb. (III. I. § 1. n. 37. ed. Bonn.)

[4] The archbishop of Trèves, who appears to have been a moderate man, was induced to undertake the task, but gave it up when the fresh complications arose soon afterwards.

[5] See Luther's letter to the Elector Frederic, written immediately after

GERMANY.

But this armistice, which seemed convertible into a lasting peace, was ere long broken by the entrance of another combatant. Andrew Bodenstein, or Carlstadt[1] (as he is more generally entitled from the name of his birthplace), was Luther's senior by some years, being already dean of the theological faculty at Wittenberg, when the latter took his doctor's degree. Although offended in the outset by the critical boldness[2] of the new professor, Carlstadt soon adopted most of his reformatory principles, and in the end having pushed them, through his want of intellectual balance, to the wildest consequences[3], grew notorious as an ultra-protestant, and a precursor of the German rationalists[4]. He was, however, one of Luther's bosom-friends[5] when he consented, in the summer of **1519**, to hold an amicable disputation at Leipzig[6], touching the contested doctrines of grace and human freedom. His opponent was no other than the erudite and brilliant Eck, whom we have seen already throwing down his gauntlet in behalf of the insulted schoolmen. Providence had so arranged, that at the very time when the electors of the empire were resolving, by their vote at Frankfort, to enlarge the vast dominions of Charles V. (June **28**), the theological disputants[7] had entered in their turn upon a series of questions

Carlstadt joins the Reformation.

Disputation with Eck at Leipzig, **1519.**

the interview: De Wette, I. 207. Gieseler, v. 242. He expresses deep regret for the violence of his language with regard to the Church of Rome: cf. Audin's denunciations of what he considers the hypocrisy of the reformer at this period (I. 233 sq.) with Waddington's account, I. 193 sq.

[1] See C. F. Jäger, *Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt:* Stettin, 1856.

[2] So we find Luther stating in 1516, when he proved that the treatise *De vera et falsa pœnitentia*, quoted in the middle ages as St Augustine's, was not really his: De Wette, I. 34.

[3] He was banished from Saxony in 1524, partly through Luther's influence. At Orlamünde, a parish connected with the university, he had broached most extraordinary opinions, especially with regard to the obligation of the Mosaic law (Ranke, *Ref.* II. 204), and we shall afterwards find him proceeding to still greater lengths.

[4] *e.g.* As early as 1520, 'he entertained doubts whether Moses was really the author of the books which bear his name, and whether the Gospels have come down to us in their genuine form.' *Ibid.* II. 20.

[5] See Luther's letter to him, written in the spring of 1519: De Wette, I. 249 sq.

[6] It appears that Eck had spoken to Luther on this subject during the diet of Augsburg (1518), and after agreeing that the disputation should be conducted in the most friendly manner, had published a schedule or prospectus containing thirteen theses, in January 1519 (Löscher, III. 210. Gieseler, v. 244).

[7] Their sessions lasted from June 27 to July 16: see Luther's letters,

GERMANY.

that were destined to modify even more directly the whole course of European history. Several days indeed were suffered to elapse before the interest of the audience was thoroughly aroused (the controversy in the hands of Carlstadt having reference chiefly to the Augustinian doctrine[1] of free-will and other like recondite topics): but in the morning of July 4, a deep sensation was produced in every quarter of the hall when Luther's thoughtful, resolute, and care-worn figure ascended the platform, and gave utterance to convictions hitherto but half developed even to himself. He had now reached the flower of manhood, being five-and-thirty years of age. Many circumstances had combined to point him out as the reformer of the German churches, and the vision of some sanatory movement[2], stretching far beyond the grievances discussed in mediæval synods, had been actually presented to his mind: yet at this period there is not the slightest evidence of his intention to stand forward and assume the office of a leader. The pacification that grew out of his recent interview with the nuncio, added to the public disgrace[3] of Tetzel, his antagonist, disposed him more particularly to repress or moderate his vehemence: and therefore when he joined the Wittenbergers on their way to the theological tournament at Leipzig, he still thought himself in full communion with the Latin Church, if not on the most friendly footing with the pontiff[4]. His impetuous spirit

Luther's part in the discussions.

written July 20 and August 15 (De Wette, I. 284 sq., I. 290 sq.), and a full collection of documents in Löscher, III. 215 sq., III. 292 sq.

[1] Carlstadt's great proposition was: 'Omne bonum opus totum est a Deo.' Eck's counter proposition was: 'Omne opus bonum esse a Deo, sed non totaliter.'

[2] Thus in his 'Responsio' to Prierias (1518), he makes the following statement (Löscher, II. 301; Gieseler, v. 236): 'Ecclesia indiget reformatione, quod non est unius hominis Pontificis, nec multorum cardinalium officium, sicut probavit utrumque novissimum concilium, sed totius orbis, imo solius Dei.' He adds, however: 'Tempus autem hujus reformationis novit solus Ille, Qui condidit tempora.' In 1519, writing to Christopher Scheurl (Feb. 20), he seems to have become more conscious of his mission, and more irreconcileably hostile to the papacy: 'Sæpius dixi, *hucusque* lusum esse a me: *nunc tandem seria* in Romanum pontificem et arrogantiam Romanam agentur:' De Wette, I. 230; Gieseler, v. 244.

[3] See above, p. 16, n. 3.

[4] Cf. n. 2. That his feelings continued to be more estranged in the interval appears from other letters; *e.g.* writing to Spalatinus, March 13, he lets fall this hint: 'Verso et decreta pontificum, pro mea disputatione, et (*in aurem tibi loquor*) nescio, an papa sit antichristus ipse, vel apostolus ejus.' Gieseler, v. 245. About a year later, the suspicion here

GERMANY.

had, however, been profoundly stirred, when he discovered that the points which Eck intended to reopen at this disputation included several which Miltitz had promised should not for the present be revived[1]. The irritation was again increased, when Eck, in the debate with Carlstadt, animadverted on certain arguments he had himself advanced respecting the nature of the primacy conceded to the Church of Rome[2]. On this absorbing question, therefore, turned the memorable struggle of July, **1519.** It ended by eliciting from Luther a distinct avowal on the following subjects;—that the Latin Church is not exclusively *the* Church; that Orientals[3], who have never recognized the papal monarchy, are not on that account ejected from the pale of Christendom; that the ascendancy at length obtained by Roman pontiffs is traceable to no Divine appointment in their favour, but to human laws and institutes; that the directing influence of the Holy Ghost is not of

New principles developed.

noticed had considerably ripened. He had read the treatise of Laurentius Valla, proving that the 'Donation of Constantine' (see *Middle Age*, p. 361, n. 2) was a forgery, which so exasperated him that he thought the papacy capable of all enormities: 'Ego sic angor,' he writes to Spalatinus, vigil. Matthiæ [Feb. 23], 1520, 'ut prope non dubitem papam esse proprie antichristum illum, quem vulgata opinione expectat mundus' (De Wette, I. 420). As Ranke, however, well remarks, Luther meant no more by this title than that 'the doctrine of the Church was corrupted, and must be restored to its original purity:' *Reform.* I. 457: cf. Audin, I. 259. He still spoke half respectfully of Leo X. considered in his personal capacity, and represented him (Oct. 1520) as 'a Daniel in Babylon:' De Wette, I. 498.

[1] This departure from the terms of the pacification seemed to justify his own share in the discussion. For instance, in writing to the Elector Frederic (March 13), he says that he had felt himself bound to remain silent on the disputed topics, so long as the opponents did the same, and then adds: 'Nun aber Doctor Ecke unverwarneter Sach mich also angreift, dass er nit mein, sundern der ganzen E. K. G. Universität zu Wittenberg Schand und Unehr suchen vermerkt wird' *etc.* De Wette, I. 237.

[2] Eck's 13th thesis was a denial of the proposition, 'Romanam Ecclesiam non fuisse superiorem aliis ecclesiis ante tempora Sylvestri,' which, as Luther wrote (De Wette, I. 261), 'extorted' from him a counter-thesis, denying to the papacy its claim of 'jus divinum.' Gieseler, v. 244. Audin's remark is therefore not exaggerated: 'Si Luther triomphe à Leipzig, il n'y a plus de papauté...si l'homme l'a fait, l'homme peut le défaire.'

[3] The importance of this distinction was manifested soon afterwards, when Luther (Nov. 7, 1519) quoted the Greeks as an authority for denying that purgatory is to be pressed as an article of faith; 'cum Græci illud non credentes nunquam sint habiti ob hoc pro hæreticis, nisi apud novissimos hæreticantissimos hæreticantes: De Wette, I. 367; Gieseler, v. 249.

GERMANY.

such a kind as to exempt the councils of the Church from possibility of error; and that one of these has erred in fact by censuring Huss, the great Bohemian reformer, some of the articles on which his condemnation rested being truly evangelical[1], and borrowed from the works of St Augustine. The mingled horror, indignation, and dismay of the schoolastics, who had listened to the statement of these novel truths, shewed that Luther's sin had now become unpardonable[2]. Instead of limiting his opposition to the gross excesses of the vendors of indulgences, instead of combating the authority of individual doctors, like Aquinas, he had openly impugned the jurisdiction and decretals of the popes, and gone so far as to question the infallibility of councils. He was accordingly retained in outward union with the pontiff by a very slender thread; and even that was to be severed, after some delay[3], by the condemnatory

Excommunication of Luther, **1520.**

[1] Löscher, III. 360. In Feb. 1520, Luther wrote to Spalatinus (De Wette, I. 425), that on reading the works of Huss, which now reached him from Bohemia, he was amazed at the correspondence of his own views with those of his precursor: 'Ego imprudens [*i. e.* without being conscious of it] hucusque omnia Johannis Huss et docui et tenui: docuit eadem imprudentia et Johannes Staupitz: breviter sumus omnes Hussitæ ignorantes: denique Paulus et Augustinus ad verbum sunt Hussitæ.' This affinity between his views and those of the Bohemians had already furnished matter for a controversy between him and Jerome Emser, a Swedish canonist, who lectured at Leipzig, and was present at the great discussion: see De Wette's note, *Luthers Briefe,* I. 337.

[2] Immediately after the dispute (July 23), Eck addressed a letter to the Elector of Saxony, urging him to resist the errors propagated by Luther, and to burn his books. He also elicited opinions condemnatory of the reformers from the universities of Cologne, Leipzig and Louvain (cf. Audin, I. 266 sq.), and finally went to Rome to stir up the pontiff against his old adversary (Waddington, I. pp. 244, 245). On the 26th of Feb. 1520, Luther writes to Spalatinus: 'Eccius Romam ivit imperaturus contra me abyssos abyssorum...Credo hominem totum in furiam versum' (De Wette, I. 421). Wrought upon by his representations, Leo X. appointed Eck his nuncio for carrying out the sentence of excommunication (June 15, 1520),—an appointment little calculated to allay the animosity of the reformers (Roscoe, *Life of Leo X.* II. 217, Lond. 1846; Gieseler, V. 266). The process by which the bull was manufactured is detailed in Ranke, *Reform.* I. 473 sq.

[3] See his letters to the emperor Charles V. (Jan. 15, 1520), to the archbishop Albert (Feb. 4), and to the bishop of Merseburg (Feb. 4), complaining that he could not obtain a fair hearing (De Wette, I. 392 sq.): and especially his famous letter to Leo X. written after Oct. 13, 1520, in Latin and German: De Wette, I. 497 sq. It is far from corresponding to Audin's description ('œuvre brutale, que ni Wiclif, ni Jean Huss, ni Jérôme de Prague, ni Arius, ni Pélage n'auraient osé tracer:' I. 274), being rather a most eloquent and biting satire on the court of Rome, partly

GERMANY.

bull of Leo, launched against him, June 15, 1520, and publicly burnt at Wittenberg in the following December[1].

Other doctrines propounded by the reformers.

In addition to these bold opinions on the subject of church-authority, at least so far as such authority was absolutely vested in the court of Rome, the Saxon reformers had already been compelled to systematize their teaching with respect to faith, to penitence, to justification and free-will. These doctrines were, in truth, most intimately bound up with their discussions from the very first. Desirous above all things of exalting Christ[2] as the Redeemer of the world, they lost no opportunity of preaching free salvation in His name. The eye or hand by which the blessing of forgiveness is appropriated[3], they held to be a true and lively faith, communicated supernaturally to the

concealed under professions of deference and respect. It was composed immediately after a last interview with Miltitz at Lichtenberg (Oct. 13; De Wette, I. 495), where, by invoking the mediation of Luther's brother Augustinians (Staupitz in the number), he flattered himself that he had cemented a reconciliation with the pope. Eck, however, arrived at Leipzig (Oct. 3) with the excommunicatory bull, while these negotiations were proceeding (De Wette, I. 491); and the result was, that Luther, after wavering for a moment, answered the papal fulmination in a strain that bordered upon absolute defiance.

[1] See *Middle Age*, p. 412. On Aug. 3, 1520, his mind was already made up. He wrote as follows to John Voigt, an Augustinian friar in Magdeburg: 'Nihil timemus amplius, sed jam edo librum vulgarem *contra Papam de statu Ecclesiæ emendando;* hic papam acerrime tracto, et quasi antichristum. Orate Dominum pro me, ut prosit verbum meum Ecclesiæ Suæ.' De Wette, I. 475: cf. p. 478. On the 17th of November he renewed his appeal to a future council, begging the German states to suspend their condemnation of him till he had been tried by fair judges, 'et Scripturis dignisque documentis convictus.'

[2] See Luther's remarkable language cited above, p. 14, n. 1.

[3] Thus in Luther's *Comment. on the Epist. to the Galatians*, which was in the press as early as May 16, 1519 (De Wette, I. 274), he writes (on II. 16), in opposition to the 'fides formata' of the schoolmen: 'Fides Christiana non est otiosa qualitas vel vacua siliqua in corde, quæ possit existere in peccato mortali, donec caritas accedat et eam vivificet; sed si est vera fides, est quædam certa fiducia cordis et firmus assensus quo Christus apprehenditur; ita ut Christus sit objectum fidei, imo non objectum sed, ut sic dicam, in ipsa fide Christus adest...Hæc vere sunt bona opera, quæ fluunt ex ista fide et hilaritate cordis concepta, quod gratis habemus remissionem peccatorum per Christum.' In his small treatise, *De Libertate Christiana*, of which he sent a copy to the pope in 1520, he handles the same topics, asserting that true faith cannot subsist together with works, but explaining this paradox as follows: '*h.e.* si per opera quæcunque sunt simul justificari præsumas.' He afterwards adds in reference to Christian works: 'Bona opera non faciunt bonum virum, sed bonus vir facit bona opera;' union with Christ being necessary to the production of real holiness.

GERMANY.

human spirit, acquiescing in the merciful purposes of God, and thus, in Augustinian phraseology, 'obtaining what the law enjoins.' So strong indeed was their conviction of man's actual and hereditary sinfulness, that language well-nigh failed them in describing his corruption and the impotence of all his spiritual and moral faculties until they are revivified from heaven. In other words, the Saxon reformers invariably directed their heaviest weapons at the current theories of justification, which ascribed undue importance to the human element, or factor, in the process by which man is reconciled to God. But while engaged in reasserting principles like these, they were at times betrayed, especially in the early stages of the Reformation, into distinct onesidedness, and even into serious errors[1]. Fresh from the perusal of the anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine, Luther more than once expressed himself in terms which almost did away with the necessity of repentance. His confusion may be further illustrated by the language of certain 'Paradoxes' which he offered to maintain against all comers at Heidelberg[2] (April **26, 1518**). One of these declared that 'free-will after original sin is a mere name' ('res est de solo titulo'),—thus verging far in the direction of fatalism[3], by representing man as entirely

Exaggerations.

[1] Thus, in 1524 (*Pref. to the New Testament*), Luther was disposed to estimate the worth of particular books of the Bible by the prominence with which they stated what he deemed *the* doctrine of Holy Writ. St John's Gospel was 'das einige zarte, rechte Hauptevangelium;' St Paul's epistles, especially those to the Romans, Galatians and Ephesians, together with the first of St Peter's, were the books that pointed men to Christ; in comparison of which, therefore, the epistle of St James might be neglected as an epistle of straw ('eine rechte ströherne Epistel gegen sie, denn sie doch keine evangelische Art an ihr hat'). It does not appear that this view was ever modified or retracted: Davidson's *Intr. to New Test.* III. 339. As early as 1520, when reasoning against the sacramental character of extreme unction, he seemed to have adopted an old suspicion respecting the Epistle of St James, as though it were unworthy of the spirit of an apostle: *De Captiv. Babylon. Eccl.;* Opp. II. fol. 284, Jenæ, 1600. See Gieseler, v. 263. For this he was severely rebuked by Henry VIII. in the *Libellus Regius adversus Martinum Lutherum hæresiarchum,* sign. t. 1. Lond. 1521: cf. Lee's *Inspir. of Holy Scrip.* p. 435, Lond. 1854.

[2] Waddington, I. 114 sq.

[3] As early, however, as 1527, some of the reformers abandoned this extreme position, partly owing to a controversy with Erasmus, of which more will be said hereafter. See the evidence fully stated by Laurence, *Bampton Lectures,* pp. 248 sq., pp. 282 sq., 3rd. ed.: cf. Möhler's *Symbolik,* I. 43 sq., 124 sq. Eng. transl. The latter disputant neglects to mention that Luther strongly recommended Melanchthon's *Loci Com-*

GERMANY.

passive under the influence of Divine grace: while others tended to beget a naked antinomianism, by stating that 'he is not justified who does many works, but he who without any work has much faith in Christ'[1].

Bucer (b. 1491)

A mind so resolute, capacious, and commanding soon attracted to itself disciples and auxiliaries. One whom he had gained on the occasion just referred to was Martin Bucer[2], a Dominican of Alsace, who on displaying more than ordinary talents was sent by his superiors to complete his studies in the chief school of the Palatinate.

and Melanchthon (b. 1497) join the Lutheran movement.

In the following summer (Aug. **25, 1518**), he was joined at Wittenberg by a more able and less vacillating colleague, Philip Schwarzerd, or Melanchthon, whose congenial spirit, while it freely yielded from the first to Luther's influence, reacted with no inconsiderable force on his instructor, and has left a deep impression on the whole of the Saxon theology. Melanchthon sat at Luther's side in the waggon that conveyed the disputants to Leipzig. He was then only two-and-twenty years of age, having been born at Bretten, a small town in the Palatinate, on Feb. **16, 1497**;

Melanchthon's character;

yet partly owing to his natural gifts, and partly to the careful lessons of John Reuchlin[3], his famous kinsman, he had made such great proficiency in rhetoric, in classical studies, and in Hebrew, as to be the pride and wonder of the university[4]. The steps by which an earnest scholar of this class had passed into the theological standing-ground

munes in their corrected form, and thus virtually, at least, retracted his own assertion of an irresistible Divine necessity.

[1] 'Non ille justus est qui multum operatur; sed qui sine opere multum credit in Christum.'

[2] Luther makes the following reference to him (Feb. 12, 1520), in writing to Spalatinus, 'Habes epistolam Bucerianam, fratris vel solius in ista secta [*i.e.* of the Dominicans] candidi, et optimæ spei juvenis, qui me Heidelbergæ et avide et simpliciter excepit atque conversatus fuit, dignus amore et fide, sed et spe:' De Wette, I. 412.

[3] See *Middle Age*, p. 361, n. 4, and Ranke's *Reform.* I. 297—305.

[4] Luther's notice of him written Sept. 9, a fortnight after his arrival, is highly interesting: 'Eruditissimus et Græcanicissimus Philippus Melanthon apud nos Græca profitetur, puer et adolescentulus, si ætatem consideres, cæterum noster aliquis, si varietatem et omnium fere librorum notitiam spectes, tantum valet non solum in utraque lingua, sed utriusque linguæ eruditione: Ebræas quoque non incognitas habet literas.' De Wette, I. 141. On Jan. 25, 1519, he was giving lectures in Hebrew: *Ibid.* p. 214. Döllinger (*Die Reformation*, I. 359 sq. Regensburg, 1851) has done far more justice to Melanchthon than to Luther.

GERMANY.

of Luther were not long nor arduous. After the disputation of Leipzig, we find him addressing a very temperate account of it to his friend Œcolampadius (Hausschein), a Franconian, who had also manifested leanings to the new opinions. He next espoused the cause of Luther with much greater warmth in a reply to the emphatic sentence[1] launched against him by the theological faculty of Paris (April **15, 1521**). But the sphere of thought for which Melanchthon shewed the greatest aptitude, was that of systematic theology[2], in which indeed it would be difficult to overrate the influence he exerted upon the mind both of Germany and of other European countries. This had been evinced especially by his *Loci Communes Rerum Theologicarum,* of which three editions appeared in **1521**[3]. Though considerably modified from time to time, it kept its old position as the text-book of the Lutheran divines, embracing a calm statement of their favourite points of doctrine, and a formal vindication of their system in the eyes of Christendom at large. One feature in this work is very noticeable,—*viz.* the array of scriptural proofs which it exhibits, indicating Melanchthon's determination that all arguments and all authority whatever ought to be subordinated to the written Word of God[4].

especially as a Divine.

But while the master-spirits of the Saxon reformation were proceeding hand in hand with their gigantic enterprise, 'a perfect model of true friendship,' one of them

[1] The title is *Adversus furiosum Parisiensium Theologastrorum Decretum Philippi Melanthonis* pro Luthero *Apologia*: Luther. *Opp.* II. fol. 427 sq. Jenæ, 1600. In fol. 428, b, we have this characteristic passage: 'Jam cum articuli fidei nulli sint, nisi quos præscripserunt sacræ literæ, cur impium est, vel a conciliis, vel ab universitatibus, vel a S. Patribus dissentire, modo a Scriptura non dissentiamus?' He had already contended for this view (Aug. 1519) in a small treatise *Contra J. Eckium:* Opp. ed. Bretschneider, I. 113.

[2] Cf. Ranke, *Reform.* I. 458. It is interesting to notice the terms with which Luther speaks of him in writing to Staupitz as early as Oct. 3, 1519: 'Si Christus dignabitur, multos ille Martinos præstabit, *diabolo et scholasticæ theologiæ* potentissimus hostis: novit illorum nugas simul et Christi petram: ideo potens poterit. Amen.' De Wette, I. 341, 342.

[3] 'It was originally a mere collection of the opinions (?) of the apostle Paul concerning sin, the law and grace, made strictly in accordance with those severe views to which Luther had owed his conversion.' Ranke, *Reform.* II. 40: cf. Gieseler, III. pt. 1. p. 100, n. 84. (v. 276, 277, ed. Edinb.)

[4] Cf. above, n. 1.

GERMANY.

peculiarly commissioned to abolish errors and give rise to holier impulses, the other, by a calmer and more philosophic process, disentangling truth from its perversions, and devising measures for its future conservation, letters of encouragement and even promises of active help came in from various quarters, and from men of very different temper. One of these was Ulrich von Hutten[1], who after distinguishing himself as a contributor to the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, the most crushing satire which an age of satirists has levelled at the champions of mediæval ignorance, put forth some dialogues against the crimes of the ecclesiastics and the scandals of the papal court[2]. As many of these libels were, however, calculated to excite political turbulence[3], going so far even as to advocate an armed resistance to the church-authorities, both Luther and Melanchthon openly renounced all friendship with their authors[4]. The great battle of the sixteenth century was in its earlier stages to be fought with other weapons.

Ulrich von Hutten (d. **1523**).

We have seen[5] how confidently Luther threw himself on the protection of the civil power in **1520**, urging, in the absence of general councils, a domestic reformation in each state. This German manifesto was succeeded by a work

Luther's treatise On the Babylonish Captivity, **1520**.

[1] It has been usual to rank this turbulent spirit (half soldier half scholar, with the chief promoters of the Reformation; but as Seckendorf observes (Lib. I. p. 131, col. 1), the service which he rendered to it was in reality not so great. His works have been collected by Münch, Berlin, 1821. See *Middle Age*, p. 361, n. 4, and Hallam's *Liter. of Europe*, I. 408 sq. Lond. 1840. Ranke (I. 462) mentions a satire which appeared in March, 1520, with the title *Der abgehobelte Eck*, surpassing, as he thinks, the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*.

[2] These appeared in 1520, the most envenomed being called *Vadiscus* or *Trias Romana*. In the same year (before Sept. 11) he wrote to Luther 'se jam et literis et armis in tyrannidem sacerdotalem ruere;' De Wette, I. 486: cf. p. 492.

[3] To such results they actually led in the case of Franz von Sickingen, another of the 'reforming' adventurers who made war upon the archbishop of Trèves, and was slain while defending one of his castles in 1523. He had more than once urged Luther to confide in his protection: *e.g.* in 1520. De Wette, I. 470, 475; Gieseler, v. 252.

[4] Thus Luther, after corresponding with them (cf. De Wette, I. 451, 469), expressed his strong repugnance to their scheme (Jan. 16, 1521). He is writing to Spalatinus: 'Quid Huttenus petat, vides. Nollem vi et cæde pro Evangelio certari: ita scripsi ad hominem. Verbo victus est mundus, Verbo servata est Ecclesia, etiam Verbo reparabitur: sed et Antichristus, ut sine manu cœpit, ita sine manu conteretur per Verbum.' *Ibid.* p. 543; Gieseler, v. 252.

[5] Above, p. 7.

GERMANY.

in Latin which he had composed with the intention of justifying his hatred of the schoolmen, and of stirring up the rest of Christendom to follow his example in breaking off the spiritual trammels of the papacy. The famous *Prelude on the Babylonish Captivity of the Church* was written in the autumn of **1520**. It is everywhere disfigured, more than other treatises of Luther, by the coarse denunciations and unseemly bitterness which characterize too great a portion of the polemical literature of the age[1]. We may describe it as a vigorous fulmination against the mediæval doctrine of the sacraments. Strictly speaking, he reduced the number of these holy ordinances from seven to two ('Baptismus et Panis')[2]; for although he concedes the name of sacrament to absolution[3] ('pœnitentia'), he denies it any outward or visible sign appointed by the Lord Himself. According to his view the sacrament of Baptism was the only one which had not been seriously corrupted[4] in the time of papal despotism. The Eucharist he argued ought to be administered under both kinds, departure from this primitive rule amounting to impiety[5]. He also entirely

Attacks the scholastic doctrine of the sacraments.

[1] 'If, at this great distance of time, we pick out of the writings of this individual many very harsh expressions, nay particular words which are not only coarse but absolutely gross, nothing of any moment can be proved or determined by such selection. Indeed the age in general, not only in Germany, but in other very highly civilized countries, was characterized by a certain coarseness in manners and language, and by a total absence of all excessive polish and over-refinement of character.' F. von Schlegel, *Phil. of History*, pp. 400, 401. Lond. 1847. The asperity of his denunciations had somewhat abated towards the close of his life: but in 1520 he was ready to defend it, by quoting the example of prophets, apostles, and the Lord Himself (De Wette, I. 499).

[2] 'Proprie tamen ea sacramenta vocari visum est, quæ annexis signis promissa sunt. Cætera, quia signis alligata non sunt, nuda promissa sunt. Quo fit, ut si *rigide loqui* volumus, tantum duo sunt in Ecclesia Dei sacramenta, Baptismus et Panis:' *Opp.* II. 285 b, Jenæ, 1600; Gieseler, v. 264. The latter name gave great offence to Henry VIII. whose *Libellus Regius* (in reply to Luther) is dated 'quarto Idus Julii,' 1521: see sign. c. 2. When questioned on this part of his treatise at Worms (*Opp.* II. fol. 417), he qualified his language by the clause 'licet non damnem usum et morem in sacramentis Ecclesiæ nunc celebratum.'

[3] Fol. 260 b.

[4] 'Benedictus Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Qui secundum divitias misericordiæ Suæ *saltem hoc unicum* Sacramentum servavit in Ecclesia Sua illibatum et incontaminatum a constitutionibus hominum:' fol. 270 b. He contended (fol. 271 a) that baptism is 'primum et fundamentum omnium Sacramentorum,' and according to his royal censor elevated it in such a way as to disparage penance (sign. i. 1).

[5] Fol. 262 b: cf. fol. 417 a. He does not, however, deny the *efficacy*

GERMANY.

repudiated the Thomist view of consecration, and put forth in opposition to scholastic dogmas on the real presence what may be regarded as an outline of the 'Lutheran' theory[1]. In every portion of the work he lays (as might have been anticipated) an unwonted stress on the necessity of faith,—the precondition or subjective ground without which sacraments are always inefficacious[2].

His theory of the Christian priesthood.

But another doctrine, more important still in many of its practical relations, was now pushed into unusual prominence,—the sacerdotal character of all the baptized. He touched this question, it is true, in other works[3] composed about the same period, yet the meaning of it does not seem to have been fully grasped until the prospect of his excommunication made him look it more directly in the face. He then contended that ordination does not confer an indelible or distinctive character, that all Christians are the priests of God; and not this only, but that every official priest is a mere delegate of the congregation, elected by

of the sacrament, even as administered under one kind, nor does he recommend the restoration of the cup by force.

[1] *e.g.* 'Esse videlicet verum panem verumque vinum, in quibus Christi vera Caro verusque Sanguis non aliter nec minus sit, quam illi [*i.e.* the Thomists] sub accidentibus suis ponunt.' At Worms he explained (fol. 417 a) that he had not condemned the opposite view absolutely, but had declared it to be no 'article of faith.' In his merciless reply to King Henry VIII. (dated July 15, 1522), he went much further, and denounced the doctrine of transubstantiation as impious and blasphemous (*Ibid.* fol. 528 b).

[2] Thus with regard to Baptism, he argues (fol. 270 b): 'Nam in hac [*i.e.* the Divine promise] pendet universa salus nostra; sic autem est observanda, ut fidem exerceamus in ea, prorsus non dubitantes nos esse salvos postquam sumus baptizati. Nam nisi hæc adsit aut paretur fides, nihil prodest baptismus, imo obest, non solum tum cum suscipitur, sed toto post tempore vitæ:' cf. fol. 266 b, where he speaks of the clergy as generally in a most perilous condition, and even as 'idolaters,' for losing sight of the necessity of faith in the Divine promise. Möhler (*Symbolik*, I. 288 sq. Engl. transl.) maintains the absolute need of this susceptibility in all persons whom the sacraments really benefit, and endeavours to make out that the Lutherans not only misrepresented the Schoolmen (cf. Ranke, *Ref.* I. 486, note), but were afterwards driven to a virtual readoption of the mediæval theory, viz. that 'sacraments confer grace' (p. 295).

[3] He had already touched upon it in his treatise *De Libertate Christiana* (cf. Waddington's remark, I. 256), and more distinctly in his *Address to the German nobles* (June, 1520: *Schriften*, ed. Walch, X. 296 sq.). In the latter we have the following inference from 1 Pet. ii. 5: 'Darum ist des Bischofs Weihen nichts anders, denn als wenn er an Statt und Person der ganzen Sammlung einen aus dem Haufen nehme, die alle gleiche, und *ihm befehl, dieselben Gewalt für die andern auszurichten.*' (Gieseler, V. 254.)

GERMANY.

them as their organ, and performing all his ministrations in their name[1]. He also stated his conviction that neither pope, nor bishop, nor any man whatever, has the least right to impose his constitutions on private Christians, except with their consent[2]; thus adding new importance[3] to the lay-element in the Church.

Popularity of his views.

The tendency of these opinions accorded so completely with the wants and wishes of the public mind in Saxony, that Luther had no immediate cause to fear the operation of the papal bull. As it was promulgated by Eck its able advocate, one town after another rose against it, or perused it with indifference and contempt[4]. The cause of the reformer was the cause of piety, of learning, and of freedom; it was also felt to be the cause of Germany[5]; and when at length the wise Elector Frederic[6] openly became its champion, influenced by the personal character of Luther, and in spite of a profound abhorrence of all heresy, it gained a vantage-ground from which it could not be dislodged by all the engines of the papacy.

Policy of Charles V.

Even if Charles V. had been more acquainted than he

[1] Fol. 282 b. This principle (on the carrying out of which see Ranke, *Ref.* II. 494) led him to maintain in the following year that the right of evangelical teaching appertains to all the faithful (Waddington, I. 393, 394). At Worms, however (*Opp.* II. fol. 418 a, Jenæ, 1600), when questioned on this point, he somewhat modified his language: 'Non autem omnes habent *usum et ministerium*, sed solummodo *ordinati* in hac potestate.' Henry VIII.'s critique has great force (sign. r. 2): 'Qua ratione Christiani omnes sacerdotes sunt, eadem etiam ratione reges sunt.'

[2] Fol. 273 b. He then draws this sweeping inference: 'Ideo orationes, jejunia, donationes et quæcunque tandem papa in universis Decretis tam multis quam iniquis statuit et exigit, prorsus nullo jure exigit et statuit, peccatque in libertatem Ecclesiæ toties quoties aliquid horum attentaverit.' (Gieseler, v. 262.)

[3] Cf. *Middle Age*, p. 324.

[4] See the evidence collected in Gieseler, v. 266, 267, n. 65. Still, as Ranke remarks (*Reform.* I. 477), the arms thus wielded by the pope had not lost all their ancient terrors.

[5] 'Relinquat Romanos Germania et revertatur ad primates et episcopos suos' (*Ibid.* I. 468), is a fair specimen of the state of public feeling.

[6] See respecting him the contemporary life by George Spalatinus, his chaplain (*Friedrichs des Weisen Leben*), reprinted at Jena, 1851. He first indicated some disposition to screen Luther from his enemies, Dec. 8, 1518; but on the 13th of that month (De Wette, I. 195) appears to have so far wavered that the reformer held himself in readiness to withdraw from the electorate into France:.....'dissensitque, ne tam cito in Galliam irem. Adhuc expecto consilium ejus.' It seems that he was finally confirmed in his devotion to the cause of Luther by a conversation which he held with Erasmus: Seckendorf, Lib. I. p. 125, col. 2.

GERMANY.

was with the workings of the German mind, it is not likely that the state of his other dominions, and his conflict with the French in Italy, would have allowed him to treat the Lutheran movement with a greater measure of forbearance. His present policy was to abstain from everything that might involve him in a quarrel with the pope[1]. To this result conspired the admonitions of Glapio his confessor, and the artifices of Aleander[2], the learned but unscrupulous nuncio, who took part in the execution of the bull of Leo X. Directed by their influence Charles convoked his first Diet at Worms, and introduced himself to the assembled states on the 28th of January, **1521**. As soon as the political business was concluded, Luther, in obedience to the summons of the emperor, determined[3] to present himself, and vindicate his cause before his enemies. His progress was a kind of triumph; it elicited the frequent sympathy and acclamations of his countrymen[4], and even as he entered Worms (April **16**), the crowd that flocked together gazed with deep emotion on the simple friar who had dared to call

Luther at Worms, 1521.

[1] On these political questions, see Ranke, *Reform.* I. 518 sq. 541. In spite, however, of the wish of Charles to gratify the pope, the states of the empire signified their impatience of the temporal power of Leo by drawing up a long list of *Gravamina:* see it in Luther's *Schriften*, ed. Walch, xv. 2058 sq.

[2] According to Audin and the school he represents, Aleander was 'un des plus habiles négociateurs de l'époque, une des gloires, en même temps, des lettres et de la science' (*Hist. de Luther*, I. 343): while others (following Luther himself) draw a very different picture: Seckendorf, p. 125, col. 1. Glapio acted more the part of a mediator, and was even suspected of leaning towards Lutheranism: *ibid.* pp. 143, 144; Ranke, *Reform.* I. 531, 532.

[3] As early as Dec. 21, 1520, and before the imperial summons (Nov. 28) was communicated to him by Frederic, he writes (De Wette, I. 534): 'Ego vero si vocatus fuero, quantum per me stabit, vel ægrotus advehar, si sanus venire non possem.' The elector declined to let him go (p. 542), until Luther urged him, Jan. 25, 1521. In this letter (p. 552), the reformer expresses a strong desire to prove his own innocence before the Diet; 'ut omnes in veritate experiantur, me hactenus nihil ex temeraria, indeliberata et inordinata voluntate, aut propter temporalem et sæcularem honorem et utilitatem, sed, quicquid scripsi et docui, secundum meam conscientiam, juramentum, et obligationem ut indignum doctorem sanctæ Scripturæ,' etc. On March 19 (?), in answer to a first summons (dated March 6), that he should proceed to Worms, not for re-examination of the questions at issue, but simply to give or refuse his retractation, he informed the elector (De Wette, I. 575), that such an errand was likely to be altogether bootless. At this time he confidently expected that, in spite of the imperial safe-conduct, he should share the fate of Huss.

[4] Waddington, I. 339.

GERMANY.

in question the supremacy of Rome. On the following day[1], he was conducted to the grand assembly of the empire. There we find him reaffirming what he had so often urged on previous occasions,—that unless he were convicted of heresy by texts of Holy Writ, he neither could nor would subscribe a recantation of his doctrines[2]. After some delay in which the efforts of an intermediate party had been fruitlessly employed to modify his views, he claimed the protection of his passport, and set out immediately on his return to Wittenberg (April 26). Relieved by his withdrawal, the adversaries of the reformation now proceeded to insist on the forcible execution of the papal bull, by which he was condemned. A struggle followed, during which it grew more evident that Aleander and the ultramontane party, whom he led, were still possessed of their old ascendancy among the princes of the empire[3]; and eventually, on May the 26th, an edict was extorted from the Diet, proclaiming the imperial ban against Martin Luther as a heretic and outcast from the Church of God. In this sentence every one of his protectors and adherents was equally involved; his writings were prohibited, and a censorship of the press[4] appointed to control the publication both of them and of all kindred works.

[1] De Wette, I. 587. The best authority for what follows is the *Acta* printed in Luther's *Works*, Jenæ, 1600, II. fol. 411 b, sq.: cf. Ranke, *Reform.* I. 533 sq.

[2] 'Hic Lutherus: Quando ergo serenissima majestas vestra, dominationesque vestræ, simplex responsum petunt, dabo illud, neque cornutum, neque dentatum, in hunc modum: Nisi convictus fuero testimoniis Scripturarum, aut ratione evidente (nam *neque Papæ neque conciliis solis credo*, cum constet eos errasse sæpius, et sibi ipsis contradixisse,) victus sum scripturis a me adductis, captaque est conscientia in verbis Dei, revocare neque possum neque volo quidquam, cum contra conscientiam agere neque tutum sit neque integrum. *Hie stehe ich. Ich kan nicht anders. Gott helff mir. Amen.*' *Ibid.* fol. 414 a. Gieseler, v. 273. It was on this occasion that Luther won the good opinion of Philip of Hessen, who said, 'If you be right, Sir Doctor, may God help you.' Ranke, *Reform.* I. 538.

[3] It is remarkable, however, that his persecutors despaired of accomplishing his condemnation, so long as all the members continued at the Diet. It is said that to give the edict an authority which it did not possess, they misdated it on the 8th instead of the 26th of May on which it was issued. Waddington, I. 367, 368, Pallavicini, *Hist. del Concilio di Trenti*, lib. I. c. 28. The document itself in its German form is given by Walch, Luther's *Schriften*, XV. 2264. The execution of the edict was far from general, many states suppressing it either from sympathy with Luther, or through fear of exciting turbulence among the people.

[4] In matters theological this censorship was awarded to the bishop in

GERMANY.

His retreat at Wartburg.

But Luther was not suffered to expire like Huss, whose course his own had hitherto so strikingly resembled. As he entered the Thuringian forest on his return from Worms, he was arrested[1] by some friendly horsemen, and transferred by a circuitous route to the secluded castle of Wartburg, which belonged to his unswerving patron, the elector of Saxony. In the disguise of Junker George, he was enabled to pursue his theological labours[2], and completed what has ever since been felt to be among his very best productions,—the translation of the New Testament[3] into the standard dialect of Saxony. His active pen was also keenly occupied in controversial literature[4]. Perhaps the boldest of his new essays was the answer to Catharinus[5], a young Thomist and Dominican, who ventured to defend the most extreme opinions on the papal supremacy. In this treatise,

Writes against Catharinus and others.

conjunction with the faculty of the Holy Scriptures in the nearest university.

[1] See his own account, dated May 14, in a letter to Spalatinus; De Wette, III. 7. His disguise appears to have been rendered complete: 'Ita sum hic exutus vestibus meis et equestribus indutus, comam et barbam nutriens, ut tu me difficile nosses, cum ipse me jamdudum non noverim.' The consternation which his disappearance caused among his friends and admirers is well expressed in a lament of Albert Dürer, quoted in Gieseler, III. 1, p. 95, n. 81 (v. 274, 275).

[2] 'Ego otiosus hic et crapulosus sedeo tota die: Bibliam Græcam et Hebræam lego. Scribo sermonem vernaculum de confessionis auriculari libertate: Psalterium etiam prosequar, et Postillas, ubi e Wittemberga accepero, quibus opus habeo, inter quæ et Magnificat inchoatum expecto.' De Wette, II. 6.

[3] The first edition appeared in September, 1522. The translation of the Old Testament was postponed (cf. De Wette, II. 123) for a short time, in order that he might consult his literary friends; but one part of it also appeared in 1523. The first complete edition of the Lutheran Bible, including the Apocrypha, was not published till 1534. Gieseler, v. 284. On the older German versions of the Scriptures, see *Middle Age*, p. 360, n. 2; and cf. *The Bible in Every Land*, p. 175, Lond. 1848, and Audin, *Hist. de Luther*, I. 496 sq.

[4] Besides those mentioned in the text, he wrote a fiery *Confutatio* of Latomus, a theologian of Louvain (*Opp.* II. fol. 379 sq. Jenæ, 1600). The epilogue (dated ex Pathmo mea, xx Junii, 1521) contains the following passage (fol. 411): 'Sola enim Biblia mecum sunt, non quod magni apud me pendatur libros habere, sed quod videndum, an dicta Patrum ab adversario bona fide citentur:' cf. De Wette, II. 17 sq. It is dedicated to his friend Justus Jonas, who had joined him at Erfurt, and shared his danger at Worms. Another work (cf. n. 2) was a treatise on 'Private Confession' (*Von der Beicht*), dedicated June 1, 1521, to Sickingen, and published in the following August or September (De Wette, II. 13). The object is to reform, not to abolish, the usage.

[5] Cf. De Wette, I. 569, 570, 582. The treatise itself is in his *Works*, as above, fol. 350 sq.

GERMANY.

while vigorously assailing the main position of his adversary, Luther did not hesitate to argue that the only notes or characteristics of a Christian church are the two sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist, and more especially the Word of God[1]. He also dedicated separate works to the denunciation of 'private masses[2],' and 'monastic vows[3],' the former being in his eye an impious mechanism for elevating the clergy, and the latter an invasion of Christian liberty, and one of the impostures by which Satan had propped up the current theory of human merit.

The furious vehemence that breathes throughout these treatises, an index of the mental tempest[4] in the midst of which they were composed, would naturally enkindle a desire in his more zealous followers to eradicate the system which had countenanced such vast and manifold enormities. The great reformer was himself indeed opposed to popular demonstrations which might lead to violent intermeddling with established usages, and so embarrass the civil power. But he soon found that he had been unconsciously stimulating passions which neither he nor his temperate col-

Carlstadt and the ultra-reformers.

[1] Fol. 356 b. He had also arrived at the conclusion that the 'synagogue of Papists and Thomists' was not the Church, but Babylon, 'nisi parvulos et simplices exceperis.'

[2] *Opp.* II. fol. 441 sq. This work, of which the German title is *Vom Missbrauch der Messen*, was dedicated to his brother-friars the Augustinians of Wittenberg, Nov. 1, 1521, but was not published till 'January 1522:' cf. De Wette, II. 106 sq. The Augustinians had already desisted from the performance of 'private' masses.

[3] *Opp.* II. fol. 477 b, sq. It was dedicated (Nov. 21, 1521) to his father: cf. De Wette, II. 100 sq. He had some time before made up his mind as to the lawfulness of marriage in the *secular* clergy, such as Carlstadt; but the members of religious orders who had bound themselves by special vows appeared to occupy a different position. He had soon afterwards (March 28, 1522) to deplore irregularities committed by several monks, who acted out his principles: 'Video monachos nostros multos,' he wrote to John Lange, one of the self-emancipated friars, 'exire nulla causa alia quam qua intraverant, hoc est, ventris et libertatis carnalis gratia, *per quos Satanas magnum fœtorem in nostri verbi odorem bonum* excitabit.'

[4] During his seclusion at Wartburg, Luther was assaulted by temptations to sensuality which he had scarcely known before: see his letters of July 13 and Nov. 4, 1521 (De Wette, II. 21, 89). So violent also were his mental agitations that, while occupied in preparing his treatise on the abuses of the mass, he believed that he was visited at midnight by the Evil Spirit, and constrained to hold a conference with him on that subject. Luther himself published a narrative of this interview in 1533: cf. Waddington, I. 398, 399; Audin, I. 421 sq.

leagues were able to control in Wittenberg itself. The leader of these ultra-reformers was Carlstadt. Regardless of all counsels which suggested the propriety of pausing till the multitude could be more thoroughly instructed in the nature of the change proposed, he altered[1] the Eucharistic office on his own authority, abolishing the custom of previous confession, administering the elements in both kinds, and neglecting most of the usual ceremonies. One important section of the German church who hitherto beheld the march of the reformers with unmingled sympathy, had now seen cause to hesitate and tremble for the issue. Their forebodings were increased on learning that the town of Zwickau in Misnia, which had also felt the impulse of the Lutheran movement, was already giving birth to the distempered sect of Anabaptists, whose fanaticism, it will be noticed[2] afterwards, imparted a distinctive shape and colour to the history of the times.

Rise of Anabaptism, 1521.

Exactly when these troubles were assuming their most formidable aspect[3], Luther reappeared at Wittenberg,

[1] See the account in Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschneider, I. 512. He had already attempted something of the kind in October, 1521, but did not carry out his plan fully until the next Christmas-day: Ranke, II. 19.

[2] See Chapter V. *On the sects and heresies accompanying the new movement.* The genuine representatives of the reformation at Zwickau were Frederic Myconius, a Franciscan priest, who became associated with Luther in 1518, and a second of his intimate friends, Nicholas Hausmann.

[3] Three of the leading Anabaptists, to escape from the police, took refuge in Wittenberg, at the very end of the year 1521. On the 1st of January, 1522, Melanchthon speaks of them as then present (*Works*, I. 533). He was himself, in the first instance, too favourably disposed towards them (*ibid.* I. 513: 'Magnis rationibus adducor certe, ut contemni eos nolim'). The point to which, after their prophetic gifts, they ventured to assign the chief importance, was a denial of infant baptism; and Melanchthon, perplexed by the paucity of direct scriptural proofs in its behalf, and by the doctrine of vicarious faith ('fides aliena') which seemed to be involved in the discussion, wrote to Luther at Wartburg for advice. The reply of the reformer is dated Jan. 13, 1522 (De Wette, II. 124 sq.); and though it did not absolutely denounce the Anabaptistic teachers, it suggested considerations fatal to their claims (in this letter we find early traces of the Lutheran theory respecting the infusion of faith into the soul of the infant candidate for baptism). Carlstadt, on the contrary, allied himself at once with the prophets of Zwickau, and, sheltered by their oracles, proceeded to the most fanatical lengths (Ranke, II. 24—26): Melanchthon, in the mean time, seeming paralysed and offering little or no resistance, even while students went away from the

GERMANY.

Luther's consternation,

(March **7, 1522**). He saw that nothing but his own personal influence could restrain or even regulate the torrent which was threatening to involve his work in the destruction he had planned for mediæval errors; and therefore in spite[1] of all the anxious fears of Frederic, who had little chance of screening him from the imperial ban, he vowed with characteristic heroism, that, cost him what it might, a vigorous effort must be instantly made to vindicate his teaching. It is highly probable that the intense emotion caused by these disorders at Wittenberg contributed in some degree to moderate the whole of his future conduct.

and reappearance at Wittenberg, **1522.**

He had now discovered that one tendency of the reforming movement which he headed, was to shake men's faith not only in what may be termed erroneous excrescences, but in the body of the truth itself; that intellectual, if not moral, licence would readily supervene on the removal of the ancient yoke; and that accordingly his followers must be guarded from the serious dangers which beset them, both on the right hand and on the left. He acted in this spirit when on Sunday, March **9, 1522**, he resumed his pastoral duties. Carlstadt was condemned to silence[2]; the apostles of Anabaptism were dismissed[3] in very coarse but truthful language; all the customary service was restored, except those passages in the Canon of the mass which plainly pointed to the notion of material sacrifice; the

university, urging that there was no longer any need of human learning. Gieseler, v. 278—281.

[1] See his very spirited letter to the Elector (March 5, 1522): De Wette, II. 137 sq.; Gieseler, v. 282, 283. The importance he attached to the present crisis was shewn in the following passage: 'Alles, was bisher mir zu Leide gethan ist in dieser Sachen, ist Schimpf und nichts gewesen. Ich wollts auch, wenn es hätte können seyn, mit meinem Leben gern erkauft haben' (p. 138): cf. Audin, I. 481 sq.

[2] Luther's own account of this step (March 30, 1522) is worthy of especial notice: 'Ego Carolstadium offendi, quod ordinationes suas cassavi, licet doctrinam non damnarim, nisi quod displicet in solis ceremoniis et externis faciebus laborasse eum, *neglecta interim vera doctrina Christiana*, hoc est, *fide et charitate*. Nam sua inepta docendi ratione eo populum perduxerat, ut sese Christianum arbitraretur per has res nihili, si utraque specie communicaret, si tangeret [*i.e.* the consecrated elements], si non confiteretur, si imagines frangeret. En malitiam Satanæ, *ut per novam speciem molitus est erigere ad ruinam Evangelii*:' De Wette, II. 177: Gieseler, v. 283. Cf. Waddington, II. 11, 12. The mystical turn of Carlstadt had already excited the distrust of his former colleague.

[3] See *Letters* of April, *ibid.* pp. 179, 181, and the fuller account of Camerarius, *Vit. Melanchthonis*, § 15.

GERMANY.

Eucharist was now administered under one or both kinds indifferently; and it is even noticeable in Luther's teaching from the pulpit, that he laid far greater emphasis upon the need of sobriety and Christian charity, as fruits and consequences of justifying faith[1].

Peasants' War.

A second cause, however, soon conspired to bring the Lutheran doctrines into fresh discredit. They were taking root[2] both far and wide, when elements of discord and insubordination, such as we already witnessed in the Bohemian Taborites, broke out into the Peasants' War[3] (**1524**). The leaders of this insurrection were tainted by the Anabaptist doctrines recently suppressed at Wittenberg, and some were probably instigated by the violent harangues of Carlstadt, and other preachers of his school[4].

[1] Cf. Ranke, II. 39, 40, Audin, II. 16 sq.; and especially the course of sermons which Luther preached at this juncture on masses, pictures, communion in both kinds, and other controverted subjects (*Schriften*, ed. Walch, xx. 1 sq.). He had now fairly apprehended a principle which afterwards served him on many trying occasions, viz. that all ecclesiastical rites and usages were legitimate, provided they did not contravene some clear statement of Holy Writ ('Quod ergo non est contra Scripturam, pro Scriptura est, et Scriptura pro eo:' De Wette, I. 128). On this principle he retained a large proportion of the mediæval usages (cf. his earliest liturgical regulations in Daniel's *Codex Lit. Eccl. Luther.* pp. 75—112). 'Fallitur mundus,' wrote Melanchthon soon afterwards (*Works*, I. 657), 'cum unum hoc agi a Luthero judicat, ut publicæ cæremoniæ aboleantur...Verum non de cæremoniis dimicat Lutherus, *majus quoddam docet*, quid intersit inter hominum justitiam et Dei justitiam.' On the contrary, it is quite clear that in the application and working out of his convictions, Luther was continually guilty of extravagance. Not long after his return to Wittenberg, he levelled a (German) tract against the whole hierarchy. This was followed by his 'Bull,' composed in a spirit as pontifical as that which had been manifested by any of his opponents. He soon afterwards put forth a sermon *De Matrimonio*, where his 'intempérance d'imagination' has furnished Audin (II. 33 sq.) with materials for a powerful onslaught. Luther was himself married June 2, 1525, and, as if desirous of adding one scandal to another, was married to the nun, Catharine von Bora, who had escaped two years before from a convent in Misnia: cf. Waddington, II. 117—127, with Audin, II. 254—277.

[2] The diffusion of the new opinions at this period in other European countries will, for the sake of clearness, be traced below.

[3] See Ranke's excellent sketch of this outbreak, *Reform.* Bk. III. ch. vi. A fermentation had been already going on for more than thirty years.

[4] On their expulsion from Saxony, both Carlstadt and the Anabaptist Thomas Münzer went into the district of the Upper Rhine. It is not quite clear, however, that the former, while proclaiming his new doctrine of the Eucharist, had circulated opinions directly tending to sedition: *ibid.* pp. 206, 222.

GERMANY.

They went so far indeed as to proclaim that unbelievers might and ought to be exterminated by the sword (one instance of their gross perversion of the Old Testament), and that a kingdom should meanwhile be founded in Germany, consisting only of 'the faithful[1].' Their social theories were no less extravagant, yet notwithstanding all the prejudices it was likely to offend, the new contagion spread with marvellous rapidity, and fixed itself especially in Swabia, Franconia, Thuringia, and Alsace. Although these startling tendencies may have been considerably strengthened by a misconception of the Lutheran opinions, it is certain that as soon as the insurgents had avowed their objects, Luther[2] shewed himself the most unflinching of their foes. He was no advocate of communism: he preached the sternest doctrines of obedience to the civil magistrate; and it was owing partly to his strenuous efforts that the south of Germany was rescued from the scourges of a general revolution. His influence had however been materially weakened by the recent course of politics, and in exact proportion as the hope of carrying out his reformations by the aid of the imperial legislature was shewn to be illusive[3]. He was, therefore, left without the power of

Luther's opposition to the insurgents.

[1] *Ibid.* p. 105. The author of these ravings was Münzer, the best account of whom is that of Strobel, *Leben, Schriften und Lehren T. Muntzers*, Nürnberg, 1795. The same writer in his *Beyträgen zur Literatur* (II. 7 sq.) has printed the twelve articles (drawn up perhaps by Heuglin) in which the peasants stated their demands and grievances (Feb. 1525). The desire of spiritual as well as social reformation was expressed, which indicates some admixture of religious elements.

[2] He had already warned the Elector Frederic, Aug. 21, 1524 (De Wette, II. 538 sq.); and his *Ermahnung zum Frieden auf die 12 Artikel der Bauerschaft in Schwaben* (*Schriften*, ed. Walch, XV. 58 sq.) appeared in May, 1525: cf. Melanchthon's letter to Spalatinus (April 10, 1525): *Opp.* ed. Bretschneider, I. 733. The insurrection was finally suppressed by the united arms of the reforming and unreforming states, one of the most active leaders being the Elector John the Constant of Saxony, who succeeded on the death of Frederic (May 5, 1525).

[3] A few days after Luther's return from his seclusion, the states of the empire met together at Nuremberg. With them Adrian, the new pope (elected Jan. 9, 1522), opened a negociation; and while admitting the extreme corruptions of the church (cf. above, p. 3, n. 1), was anxious above all things to secure the extirpation of Lutheranism. The Diet answered (March 6, 1523) by the *Centum Gravamina* (Brown's *Fasciculus*, I. 354 sq.), analogous to those drawn up at Worms (cf. above, p. 33, n. 1), and reflecting very strongly on existing church-abuses. They also took no steps for carrying out the damnatory edict of the former Diet. Afterwards, indeed, when Clement VII. succeeded Adrian (Nov. 19, 1523),

GERMANY.

guiding and counteracting many social impulses which his resistance to the papal despotism had stimulated into feverish activity; and henceforth our attention must be drawn to the conflicting operations of three different forms of thought: (1) the Mediæval or scholastic, (2) the Lutheran or reforming, and (3) the Anabaptist or revolutionary[1].

Seceders from the ranks of the reformers.

It was natural to expect that many persons, from their want of real sympathy with the dominant religion, would either directly or indirectly promote the objects of such men as Luther, till at last they were alarmed by the exaggerations of the ultra-reformers, and were driven, by the prospect of still wilder consequences, to revert in many particulars to their original position. By far the most distinguished member of this class[2] was Desiderius Erasmus[3] of Rotterdam (b. **1467**). He had preceded Luther in assaults on the scholastic methods; and the twenty-seven editions through which his principal satire (Μωρίας Ἐγκώμιον) passed during his own life-time furnish proofs of the enormous influence he exerted on the spirit of the sixteenth century. He was perhaps the ablest classic of his age, and had few equals in theology. He contended that

Erasmus (d. 1536),

and his influence.

and the states had reassembled at Nuremberg, it was decreed (April 18, 1524), among other things, that the edict of Worms should be vigorously executed, 'as far as might be possible,' and that the pope should immediately assemble a free synod for the determination of religious differences. The papal legate Campeggi, by a series of diplomatic manœuvres, was able at the same time to overthrow the Council of Regency, a majority of whom were favourable to the new doctrines. In consequence, however, of this act, a resolution was finally carried, to the effect that in the following November a meeting of the states should be convened at Spires, where lists of controverted topics should be openly presented and discussed by representatives of the different princes. But this 'general assembly' was vehemently opposed by the legate, and as positively forbidden by the emperor; and in the place of it a provincial congress, consisting of determined enemies of the reformation, met at Ratisbon (Regensburg) in June, 1524 (Ranke, II. 177 sq.), for the purpose of cementing a religious league, and of repressing the Lutherans. Hence originated the religious separation of the German sovereigns, which has never since been healed.

[1] Cf. Mr Hallam's remarks, *Lit. of Europe*, I. 482 sq. Lond. 1840.

[2] Other members of it, *e.g.* George Wizel (Wicelius), John Haner, John Wildenauer (Egranus), Crotus Rubeanus, Wilibald Pirkheimer, have been sketched by Döllinger, *Die Reformation*, I. 21 sq.

[3] See the life prefixed to Le Clerc's edition of his *Works* (from which Jortin's biography was mainly taken), and Müller's *Leben des Erasmus von Rotterdam*, Hamburg, 1828. Erasmus had many points of resemblance to Laurentius Valla; on whom see *Middle Age*, p. 361, n. 2.

GERMANY.

Christian knowledge should be drawn directly from the fountain-head of truth, the New Testament in the original[1]. He pointed to the vast superiority of the ancient Fathers as compared with the more popular authors of the Middle Ages[2]; and partly owing to his independent genius, and partly to the greater prominence which he assigned to doctors of the Eastern Church, his *Paraphrases* were the means of opening a new era in the history of biblical criticism. What Erasmus plainly wanted was religious depth and fervour, a deficiency that influenced not only the complexion of his scriptural exegesis, but the whole tone of his character. Ardently devoted to the interests of literature, he was unsparing in his censures of monastic ignorance and narrow-mindedness, inelegance and obscurantism: he was also conscious that a swarm of gross abuses[3] were disfiguring the administration and ritual system of the Church: he more than once had courage to proclaim the need of some extensive reformation, and even to avow affinity with Luther[4]: yet as soon as the defences of the papacy, which his own writings undermined, began

[1] Like Laurentius Valla, he pointed out numerous errors in the Vulgate, and to correct them set about the preparation of his Greek Testament (cf. *Middle Age*, p. 361, n. 5). The Complutensian Polyglott (*ibid.* n. 2) manifests the opposite tendency by altering the Greek Text, in some cases at least, so as to make it square with the Vulgate.

[2] In the *Dedication* to his paraphrase on the Epist. of St James (*Opp.* VII. p. 1115, ed. Le Clerc), he makes the following bold statement: 'Si a solo Thoma [*i.e.* from Aquinas] dissentirem, videri possum in illum iniquior. Nunc et ab Ambrosio, et ab Hieronymo et ab Augustino non raro dissentio, sed reverenter; in Thomam etiam candidior quam ut multis bonis et eruditis viris gratum sit: sed hanc reverentiam non opinor me debere Hugonibus aut Lyranis omnibus, etiamsi Lyrano [cf. *Middle Age*, p. 360] nonnihil debemus.' It is worthy of notice, that while the favourite Latin commentator of Erasmus was St Jerome, Luther's was St Augustine ('Augustino in scripturis interpretandis tantum posthabeo Hieronymum, quantum ipse Augustinum in omnibus Hieronymo posthabet'): Letter in De Wette, I. 40 (dated Oct. 19, 1516); cf. I. 52, where Luther adds (March 1, 1517) that a Christian is not truly wise who knows Greek and Hebrew, 'quando et beatus Hieronymus quinque linguis monoglosson Augustinum non adæquarit, licet Erasmo aliter sit longe visum.'

[3] See, for example, his *Colloquies* which appeared in 1522, and of which 24,000 copies were printed in the single year 1527 (Hallam, *Lit. of Europe*, I. 490); or his *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, published as early as 1503.

[4] Thus he writes to Zwingli (Aug. 31, 1523; Zwingl. *Opp.* VII. pt. 1, 308, Zürich, 1828): 'Lutherus scripsit ad Œcolampadium, mihi non multum esse tribuendum in iis, quæ sunt Spiritus. Velim hoc ex te dis-

GERMANY.

to shrink and totter, his timidity and want of earnestness were instantly betrayed[1]. We see him parting company[2] with men like Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Œcolampadius, whom he formerly esteemed the benefactors of their generation, and the harbingers of brighter days; and although his hatred of mere scholasticism continued to be no less deep and vehement, it was eventually overbalanced by the feelings of disgust with which he contemplated the advances of the Lutheran party. The last important service which he rendered was to strengthen[3] the bias of the elector Frederic in favour of their cause (**1520**). In **1524**. however, his neutrality was changing very fast into decided opposition. Little doubt existed on this point after the publication (in September) of his *Diatribe de Libero Arbitrio*[4], where he vigorously assailed the new opinions in a

His growing dislike of the reformers.

Controversy between him and Luther, **1524.**

cere, doctissime Zwingli, quis sit ille Spiritus. Nam videor mihi *fere omnia docuisse, quæ docet Lutherus*, nisi quod non tam atrociter, quodque abstinui a quibusdam ænigmatibus et paradoxis.'

[1] Perhaps fastidiousness and want of resolution would be fitter expressions; moreover it could hardly be expected that for the mere purpose of destruction Erasmus could join cordially with men whose moving principles were opposed to his own in such important points as that of free will. However he says of himself: 'Si corrupti mores Romanæ curiæ postulant ingens aliquod ac præsens remedium, certe meum aut mei similem non est hanc provinciam sibi sumere.' He had before stated in the same letter to the Cardinal Campeggi (Dec. 6, 1520): 'Siquidem ut veritati nunquam fas est adversari, ita celare nonnunquam expedit in loco...Quædam inter se fatentur theologi, quæ vulgo non expediat efferri' (*Opp.* III. pt. 1, 596).

[2] See Waddington's impartial account in ch. xxiii. Erasmus continued to exchange letters of frigid courtesy with Melanchthon after he had altogether broken with Luther. His last words respecting himself, written not long before his death at Basel (July 12, 1536), are very remarkable: 'Lutherana tragœdia intolerabili illum oneravit invidia. Discerptus est ab utraque parte, dum utrique studet consulere' (*ibid.* p. 206): cf. his *Epist.* lib. xv. ep. 4, and Luther's *Briefe*, I. 525, 526. Towards the close of his life he wrote a short treatise *De Sarcienda Ecclesiæ Concordia* with a pacific object, which elicited a reply from Latomus of Louvain: see Latom. *Opp.* fol. 172 sq. Lovan. 1579. His influence in promoting the English reformation will be noticed below.

[3] The Elector consulted him at Cologne (Nov. 5, 1520), on which occasion Erasmus declared: 'Lutherus peccavit in duobus, nempe quod tetigit coronam Pontificis et ventres monachorum.' On the same occasion he drew up a number of *Axiomata* (decidedly favourable to Luther), which, to the great annoyance of their author, soon afterwards appeared in print: Luther, *Opp.* II. fol. 314 a, Jenæ, 1600.

[4] The ostensible cause of his separation from the reformers was a quarrel with Hutten (cf. Luther's letter of Oct. 1, 1523; De Wette, II. 411, 412); but it is plain that other agencies (among the rest, the influence of Henry VIII. of England) impelled him to the composition of the

GERMANY.

quarter felt to be especially open to attack. He left the main positions of the Lutheran School untouched; he manifested no inclination to defend the pride, the profligacy, the impiety of the court of Rome or of the German ecclesiastics, but exhausted all his learned wit and metaphysical acumen, to disprove the tenet of necessity as advocated in the writings and discourses of the Saxon doctors. The reply of Luther, which appears to have occupied him till the following autumn[1], was entitled *De Servo Arbitrio.* It is throughout distinguished by his characteristic force and vehemence of tone; but argumentatively speaking is a failure. Every cloud of mystery enveloping the questions which he took in hand[2] continues to hang over them. The doctrine of God's absolute predestination, with its complementary doctrine of absolute reprobation, is restated in the most emphatic terms. The freedom of the human will, in any sense, anterior to the infusion of the supernatural gift of faith, is quite as positively denied; and even after such infusion, it is argued, that the spiritual acts of man are not properly and ultimately his, but rather manifestations of some independent energy within him[3]. The author notwithstanding has declared that by these statements he does not disparage the importance of good works, nor teach that God is in the least degree indifferent to the qualities of human actions. The rejoinder of Erasmus, entitled *Hyperaspistes Diatribes,* and put forth immediately afterwards[4]

treatise on Free Will. When it was published he wrote (Sept. 6, 1524) to his royal correspondent, 'Jacta est alea.' See Gieseler, v. 336.

[1] His own unwillingness to enter on the controversy, as stated in the Preface, may have contributed to this delay: *Opp.* III. fol. 161, Jenæ, 1603.

[2] Some of the mysteries were still further darkened by his own distinctions; *e.g.* fol. 189 b: 'Illudit autem sese *Diatribe* ignorantia sua, dum nihil distinguit inter Deum prædicatum et absconditum, hoc est, inter Verbum Dei et Deum Ipsum. Multa facit Deus, quæ verbo Suo non ostendit nobis. Multa quoque vult quæ verbo Suo non ostendit Sese velle. Sic non vult mortem peccatoris, Verbo scilicet. *Vult autem illam voluntate illa imperscrutabili.*'

[3] *E.g.* 'Obsecro te, an non nostra dicuntur quam rectissime, quæ non fecimus quidem nos recepimus vero ab aliis? Cur igitur opera non dicerentur nostra, quæ donavit nobis Deus per Spiritum? An Christum non dicemus nostrum, quia non fecimus Eum, sed tantum accepimus?' fol. 194 a.

[4] A second book more carefully written was published in the following year.

GERMANY.

(Feb. **20, 1526**), was characterized by all the vehemence and bitterness of Luther. With it ended, for the present, this interminable controversy; but not until Melanchthon[1] was at least persuaded that far greater caution would be necessary in his future disquisitions touching the freedom of the human will, and other kindred subjects.

Modification of Melanchthon's views.

In the mean while several states of Germany, determined to resist the progress of the new opinions, had constituted a religious league[2]. Their example was soon followed by negotiations of John[3] the Constant, elector of Saxony, and the landgrave Philip of Hessen[4],—two of the most powerful princes of the empire, and alike devoted to the cause of reformation. The treaty into which they entered is commonly called the 'League of Torgau,' where it was ratified, May **4, 1526**, although in truth concluded at Gotha in the previous February[5]. Other princes, more

Religious Leagues.

[1] Cf. above, p. 26, n. 3. In subsequent editions of the *Loci Communes* he altered or suppressed the very passages which Luther had cited triumphantly in his own behalf. The extracts given by Gieseler, III. ii. 191 sq. (ed. Bonn) shew a gradual change in the convictions of Melanchthon. In 1535 he denounces the 'stoical' notion of necessity, having learned in the mean time that the human will is a concurring party in the work of salvation, and possesses the power of resistance: 'Deus antevertit nos, vocat, movet, adjuvat, sed nos viderimus ne repugnemus. Constat enim peccatum oriri a nobis, non a voluntate Dei.' The edition of 1548 was still more explicit on this point (*ibid.* p. 223, n. 31). The language there used is constantly quoted afterwards in what was called the 'Synergistic controversy,' (touching the relation in which human liberty stands to free will),—a fierce discussion stimulated in 1555 by the treatise of John Pfeffinger, *De Libero Arbitrio*, which was answered by Nicholas Amsdorf. This controversy is intimately connected with two others branching out of the same ideas: (1) the *Majoristic*, commencing about 1554, between George Major (a divine of Wittenberg) and Amsdorf, on the question whether good works are necessary to salvation (see Gieseler, III. ii. 213 sq. ed. Bonn); (2) the controversy between Flacius Illyricus (an ultra-Lutheran) and Victorinus Stregel of Jena (circ. 1560), in which the former argued that original sin is 'quiddam substantiale in homine,' thus verging far in the direction of Manichæism (*ibid.* pp. 253 sq.).

[2] See above, p. 40, n. 3.

[3] He was more resolute and active in the cause of reformation than his brother (who died May 5, 1525), and began his reign by recommending Luther's *Postills* to the Saxon clergy, and urging them 'ut Verbum Divinum et Evangelium secundum verum et Christianum sensum prædicarent et interpretarentur:' Seckendorf, II. 48, col. 2.

[4] Luther and he had met at the Diet of Worms (1521), and in 1524 Melanchthon had completed his conversion to the side of the Reformers (*Opp.* ed. Bretschneider, I. 703).

[5] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 393.

GERMANY.

particularly those of Lower Germany[1], united in the compact, and on the 12th of June they all agreed at Magdeburg to stand by each other with their utmost might, in case they were violently assaulted 'on account of the Word of God or the removal of abuses.' In this temper they proceeded to the Diet of Spires, which opened a few days afterwards (June 25) with fresh discussions on the state and prospects of the German Church[2]. So prevalent was the desire among the representatives to extirpate ecclesiastical abuses that, in spite of vigorous efforts on the part of the clergy present, many salutary changes were recommended by the different committees. One of their reports insisted, for example, on the expediency of legalizing the marriage of the clergy, and of permitting the laity in future to communicate either in one or in both kinds. It was proposed, in like manner, that the stringent regulations respecting fasts and confession should henceforth be mitigated, that private masses should be all abolished, and that in the administration of Baptism and the Eucharist, the Latin and German languages should both of them be used. An order on the subject of preaching which had issued from the Diet of 1523 was now republished, with an augmentation savouring also of the Lutheran tenets, *viz.* that Scripture

Diet of Spires, 1526.

Project of reform.

[1] The treaty was signed by the dukes Ernest and Francis of Brunswick Lüneburg, duke Henry of Mecklenburg Schwerin, prince Wolfgang of Anhalt Cöthen and the Counts of Mansfeld Gebhard and Albert. The imperial city of Magdeburg was also admitted (June 14), and in the following September, Albert, duke of Prussia (formerly grand-master of the Teutonic order), followed their example: Luther's *Schriften*, ed. Walch, XVI. 532 sq. The cities of Nuremburg, Strasburg, Augsburg and Ulm soon afterwards gave in their adhesion. The cause of the allied reformers had been elaborately pleaded just before by Melanchthon and other Wittenberg divines, who undertook the task in obedience to the wishes of the Elector of Saxony, and sent their production to the diet of Augsburg (Nov. 1525). They contended (1) that it was lawful to abolish manifest abuses, without the permission, and even in spite, of the episcopal authorities: and (2) that it was lawful to continue the preaching of the new doctrines in defiance of the edict of the emperor: Waddington, II. 213.

[2] See all the Acts in Walch, XVI. 243 sq., and cf. Ranke, *Ref.* II. 397 sq. The place of the emperor, who found himself engrossed in the affairs of Italy, and in counteracting the influence of the 'sainte Ligue de Cognac' (May 22, 1526), was occupied by his brother the archduke Ferdinand. This prince, although decidedly opposed to the Reformers, was so alarmed by the rapid progress of the Turks into the territories of the king of Hungary, that he did not venture to execute the rigorous orders of the emperor.

GERMANY.

must be always expounded by Scripture. But these memorable resolutions of the empire were again defeated by the obstinate adherence[1] of Charles V. to the established usages of Christendom. At length indeed we see him driven, first, to the abandonment of his design for executing the anti-Lutheran edict of Worms by appealing to the sword, and secondly, compelled to sanction the great principle of domestic reformation, by tolerating the existing forms of worship and belief in single districts of the empire[2]: yet his failure to comply with the predominating wishes of this Diet was a very serious evil. It destroyed, perhaps for ever, the religious unity of the German states, and left the advocates of reformation, in the absence of all synods, to proceed in organizing ecclesiastical constitutions each one for itself.

Separate action of reforming states.

No sooner was this new machinery set in motion, than political circumstances tended for a while to favour its development. The emperor had been entangled on the one side in a quarrel with Clement VII.[3] which terminated in the storming of Rome (May 6, **1527**), and the surrender of the pontiff. On the other side, the fall of Lewis II.[4] king of Hungary and Bohemia, in his efforts to withstand the armies of the mighty Ottoman at Mohacz (Aug. 29, **1526**), diverted the attention of the archduke Ferdinand (brother and representative of Charles), who trusted to enlarge the

[1] He had issued an admonition from Seville (March 23, 1526), to certain princes and lords of the empire, bidding them to remain stedfast in the 'old faith,' and to use their influence for uprooting 'heresy.' He had also charged his commissioners at the diet to withhold assent from every resolution that ran counter to established practices: Ranke, *Ref.* II. 391, 406.

[2] The words of the Recess, derived from the report of a reformatory committee and accepted by the archduke Ferdinand, stand thus: 'für sich also zu leben, zu regieren und zu halten, wie ein jeder solches gegen Gott und Kais. Mt. hoffet und vertrauet zu verantworten.' See the whole of this important document in Walch's *Luther*, XVI. 266.

[3] The best account is in Ranke, *Ref.* Bk. IV. ch. iii. The state of feeling in the army is illustrated by the following passage: 'Soldiers dressed as cardinals, with one in the midst bearing the triple crown on his head and personating the pope, rode in solemn procession through the city, surrounded by guards and heralds: they halted before the castle of St Angelo, where the mock pope, flourishing a huge drinking-glass, gave the cardinals his benediction: they even held a consistory, and promised in future to be more faithful servants of the Roman empire: the papal throne they meant to bestow on Luther:' *ibid.* p. 449.

[4] *Ibid.* Bk. IV. ch. iv.

GERMANY.

honours of the house of Austria by establishing his pretensions to the vacant thrones. The months consumed in struggles for the gaining of these objects proved a breathing time to the reformers[1]. They argued that the right of adjusting controversies, which was felt to be inherent in the whole collective empire, had been now transferred to individual states; and on this ground it was that the Saxon 'visitors[2]' commenced their task in **1527.** The tenderness with which the leaders of it were disposed to handle the traditional usages of Christendom is everywhere apparent. While proclaiming with their former earnestness the doctrine of justification by faith, and thus repudiating the scholastic theories on human merit, and the efficacy of human ordinances, they laboured to suppress the controversies that still raged respecting minor questions, such as the authority of the pope or prelates generally. It seems to have become the foremost policy of Luther, quite as much as of Melanchthon, to subvert the Mediæval errors by implanting vital truths of Christianity[3] within the hearts

Saxon visitation, **1527.**

[1] Individuals among them, however, were cruelly handled, and even put to death for their opinions: *e.g.* a priest named Wagner (Carpentarius) was burnt at Munich (Feb. 8, 1527), and Leonhard Kaiser at Scherding, in the diocese of Passau (Aug. 18, 1527). Luther's epistle to the second of these martyrs (May 20, 1527) is printed in De Wette, III. 179. The beginning is highly characteristic: 'Captus est homo tuus vetus, mi Leonharde, sic volente et vocante Christo, Salvatore tuo, Qui etiam novum Suum hominem pro te tuisque peccatis dedit in manus improborum, ut sanguine Suo te redimeret in fratrem et cohæredem vitæ æternæ.' Sleidan also notices the death of two scholars at Cologne in 1529: *Reform.* p. 121 (Lond. 1689), and other instances of persecution are added by Ranke, *Ref.* III. 53 sq.

[2] Certain visitors were nominated by the elector to examine the moral and intellectual condition of each parish. The *Instructions* which were sent in their name to every clergyman in Saxony, drawn up by Melanchthon with the approval of Luther, are very remarkable (see them in Walch's *Luther*, x. 1902 sq.; cf. Seckendorf's account, Lib. II. sect. xiii. §§ 36, 37). Erasmus, struck by the moderation of these visitors, declares (*Epist.* Lib. xx. ep. 63): 'Indies mitescit febris Lutherana, adeo ut ipse Lutherus de singulis propemodum scribat palinodiam, ac cæteris [*i.e.* the Zwinglians and Anabaptists] habeatur ob hoc ipsum hæreticus et delirus.' This critique, however, rests on a complete misconception of Luther's principles. Provided institutions did not run directly counter to the Word of God, he was in favour of retaining them, or at least he viewed the retention of them as a matter of comparative indifference (cf. above, p. 39, n. 1). On the present occasion, it is true, he went as far as the utmost verge of moderation by allowing in some cases the administration of the Eucharist in one kind: but even this was quite consistent with his former opinions (cf. above, p. 30, n. 5).

[3] These feelings strongly manifested at the present juncture, gave

GERMANY.

of his fellow-countrymen; and seldom in the history of the Church have labours of this kind been followed by so large a measure of success. The other German states[1] in which the Lutheran tenets were adopted trod, with some occasional deviations, in the steps of Saxony.

But all of them ere long had cause to tremble for the safety of their institutions when the storms of war passed over, leaving Charles and Ferdinand at liberty again to vindicate the old opinions. A fresh Diet was convoked at Spires[2] for March **15, 1529**. On this occasion the imperial message, breathing anger and intolerance, added to the flames already burning among the adversaries of the Reformation, and impelled them to resume more vigorous measures. After a sharp struggle the pacific edict[3] of the former Diet of Spires (**1526**), by virtue of which important changes had been consummated in numerous provinces of Germany, was absolutely repealed (April **6**); and the reformers, pleading that such revocation violated both the laws of the empire and the sacred rights of conscience, fearlessly drew up the document[4] which has obtained for

New Diet of Spires, **1529.**

birth to Luther's *Catechisms* (the smaller a compendium taken from the larger). They were both written in German, but translated almost immediately into Latin. See them in F. Francke's *Libri Symbolici Eccl. Lutheranæ*, Pars. II. pp. 63—245, with the editor's prefatory observations, pp. XV. sq. The general adoption of them in schools led to their recognition as 'symbolical.'

[1] This was universally the case in Lower Germany (Ranke, *Ref.* II. 514). A different scheme (as we shall see hereafter) had been adopted by Philip the landgrave of Hessen, in a kind of Synod held at Homburg (Oct. 21, 1526). The proceedings were materially influenced by Francis Lambert, formerly a Franciscan at Avignon, whose sympathies, especially on the doctrine of the Eucharist, were strongly Zwinglian: see his *Epistola ad Colonienses* (relating to this synod), Giessæ, 1730, and the *Reformatio Ecclesiarum Hassiæ* (1526), ed. Credner, Giessen, 1852.

[2] For the chief transactions with regard to the Reformers see Walch's *Luther*, XVI. 315 sq.: cf. Ranke, *Ref.* Bk. V. ch. V.

[3] See above, p. 47, and n. 2. The emperor at the same time pledged himself to call a general council, or at least a national assembly very soon. Anabaptists were to be punished by death, and preachers were in future to follow the interpretation of Holy Scripture that was approved by the Church.

[4] It proceeded from the elector John the Constant of Saxony, the margrave George of Brandenburg, Ansbach and Culmbach, the dukes Ernest and Francis of Brunswick Lüneburg, the landgrave Philip of Hessen, and Wolfgang of Anhalt Cöthen. Fourteen of the cities also joined in this protest: Strasburg, Nuremburg, Ulm, Constance, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nördlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Issna, St Gall, Weissenburg and Windsheim. In answering the argument of the

GERMANY.

'*Protestants.*'

them and their posterity the name of *Protestants* (April 19). The resolution which they manifested at this crisis was indeed remarkable, sufficient even to convince the ministers of Charles V. that nothing but the convocation of some free council in Germany itself was likely to compose the multiplying discords.

The force, however, of such protests was materially abated by contentions in the camp of the reformers. Postponing, as before, the full consideration of the different causes which produced these subdivisions, it should here be noticed, that a movement, similar at first in spirit to the Lutheran, though of independent growth, had risen in the midst of the Helvetic confederacy. Its author was a parish-priest, Huldreich Zwingli. Instigated, it is possible, by Carlstadt, the evil genius of the Reformation, who, after taking refuge[1] in Basel (**1524**), assumed a posture of direct hostility to Luther and his school, the Swiss reformer had

Rise of Zwinglianism.

imperial party with respect to the interpretation of the Bible, they contended that so long as the Church itself was the subject of dispute, the best method of expounding hard texts of Scripture was to call in the help of clearer passages.

[1] Before he was compelled to quit Orlamiinde (cf. above, p. 21, n. 3), Luther paid him a visit, and preached with great vehemence against fanatics of every class (image-breakers included). He also condemned Carlstadt's teaching on the Eucharist, and by the deposit of a piece of gold pledged himself to confute any vindication of it which Carlstadt might publish. The ultra-protestant soon afterwards spoke of Luther in the most contemptuous terms, styling him, 'einen zweyfachen Papisten und Vetter des Antichrists:' Waddington, II. 90. This irritated Luther to write an *Epistle to the Strasburgers* (Dec. 15, 1524: De Wette, II. 577); and a short treatise *Against the Celestial Prophets* (Jan. 1525: Walch, XX. 186 sq.), in both of which he denounced the sacramental theories of his opponent. Carlstadt next apologized, recanted his erroneous tenets, and in the autumn of 1525 returned to Wittenberg. He seems, however, to have fallen back eventually on most of his old positions (? 1528: cf. De Wette, III. 549), and quietly withdrew to Switzerland, where he died, Dec. 24, 1543. The fullest biography of him is by Füsslin, Frankf. 1776.

[2] His views, of which more will be said hereafter, were developed in the *De Vera et Falsa Religione*, published in 1525. He differed in some shades from Carlstadt and others, but agreed with them substantially. Thus Carlstadt interpreted the words of institution δεικτικῶς (maintaining that our Lord while pronouncing them pointed to His own body); Œcolampadius then at Basel gave the literal meaning to ἐστί, but took the predicate τὸ σῶμά μου figuratively: while Zwingli construed ἐστί as equivalent to 'symbolizes' (significat): cf. Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, II. 296, 297, Edinb. 1852. In the *Fidei Ratio* which he addressed to Charles V. in 1530 (*Confess. in Eccl. Reform.* ed. Niemeyer, Lips. 1840,

elements are in no respect the media or conductors by which the Body and Blood of Christ are conveyed to the communicant; or in other words, that 'the sacrament of the altar' being designed to quicken our intellectual apprehension of spiritual things, there is in it 'only bread and wine, and not the very Body and Blood of Christ.' In opposition to this tenet of the *Sacramentarii*, Luther[1] taught, as one of the most central truths of Christianity, that nothing but the literal acceptation of our Saviour's language was admissible. Without defining accurately the manner of the Eucharistic Presence, he contended that the Body of the Lord was truly *there*, and absolutely refused to hold communion with all persons who insisted on resolving the words of institution into figures, or who construed them as nothing more than symbolical expressions pointing to the barely commemorative aspect of the Lord's Supper. To this divergency, which we shall see hereafter was connected

Luther's counter-statements on the Eucharist.

pp. 24 sq.), Zwingli took a somewhat higher ground in speaking of the sacraments, but still denied that the outward and visible sign is ever made the medium for conveying the inward and spiritual grace: cf. Gieseler, III. ii. pp. 154, 155, Bonn. 1852.

[1] See the germs of the Lutheran doctrine above, p. 31, n. 1. He had been strongly tempted at one time to adopt the symbolical interpretation of our Saviour's language (De Wette, II. 577, Gieseler, v. 338), but resisted what he thought would have been fatal to Christianity. His various treatises on the Eucharist as well as some by others of his party (*e.g.* Bugenhagen, Brentz and Schnepf) will be found in Walch, xx. Bucer, who tried to act as a mediator between the Swiss and Saxon schools on this question, regretted (in 1537) that any one had ever written against Luther, whose original impression was that Carlstadt wished to get rid of all 'externals' in religion, and who therefore in opposing him attributed too much to the outward part of the Lord's Supper. Luther was charged with holding the doctrine of 'impanation,' but repelled the charge by stating that he left the 'manner' of Christ's presence an open question (Walch, xx. 1012). 'Consubstantiation' is the term more commonly employed to characterize his own theory. In writing to the Swiss, however (Dec. 1, 1537: De Wette, v. 85), he puts the matter thus: 'Wir lassens göttlicher Allmachtigkeit befohlen seyn, *wie* Sein Leib und Blut im Abendmal uns gegeben werde, wo man aus Seinem Befehl zusammen kömmt, und Sein Einsatzung gehalten wird. Wir denken da keiner Auffahrt und Niederfahrt, die da sollt geschehen; sondern wir bleiben schlechts und einfältiglich bei Seinen Worten: das ist Mein Leib, das ist Mein Blut.' Melanchthon's views were, in the first instance, almost as rigorous as those of Luther. In 1529 he characterized the Zwinglian dogma as 'impium' (*Opp.* ed. Bretschneider, I. 1077), but he afterwards approximated more nearly to the standing-ground of Calvin and an intermediate school, who held at least the *virtual* Presence of Christ in the Eucharist: cf. below, p. 58, n. 1, and Gieseler, III. ii. 196.

GERMANY.

with very different conceptions of other doctrines of the Gospel, must be traced the alienation that grew up between the Saxon theologians (of Northern and Middle Germany) and the Swiss (including also parts of Southern Germany[1]). The incompatibility of their opinions was peculiarly apparent, when the landgrave Philip, anxious either to confirm his own belief respecting the Eucharist, or to strengthen the defences of the Reformation in its threatened conflict with the emperor, secured a meeting of the Protestant chiefs[2] at Marburg (Oct. **1, 1529**).

Conference of Marburg, **1529.**

This fruitless conference is on other grounds remarkable, as giving birth to the first series of dogmatic definitions (fifteen in number), on which the Articles and other symbolical writings of the Lutherans were generally modelled. Subscription to the series, as revised and augmented at the conference of Schwabach[3] (Oct. **16, 1529**),

[1] Especially the towns of Strasburg and Ulm, the former being chiefly influenced by the moderate teaching of Capito and, in part, of Bucer (see their writings on this subject in Walch's *Luther*, xx. 445 sq.); the latter by that of Conrad Sam. It was in Strasburg, however, that an intermediate party, with slight leanings in the direction of Zwinglianism, continued to exist; as we may judge especially from the *Confessio Tetrapolitana* (apud Niemeyer, pp. 740—770), which the reformers of that town, in conjunction with those of Constance, Memmingen and Lindau, presented to Charles V. at Augsburg (July 11, 1530). For the definition respecting the Eucharist, see pp. 760, 761.

[2] Ranke, *Ref.* III. 189 sq. These 'princes of the Word,' as a contemporary poet calls them (*Ibid.* p. 191), included Luther, Œcolampadius, Bucer, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Schnepf, Brentz, Hedio, Osiander, Justus Jonas, Myconius, Jacobus Sturm (of Strasburg), and others. Zwingli cleared himself from the suspicions which hung over his orthodoxy respecting the Divinity of our Blessed Lord; he also professed his agreement with the Wittenbergers on original sin and the effects of baptism. It was otherwise when the theologians entered on the fifteenth article of the series before them, that relating to the Eucharist. Both parties felt the difference to be fundamental, and they separated, not indeed without assurances of mutual charity, but with a firm conviction that their principles would not allow them to work together. Cf. Melanchthon's account (*Opp.* ed. Bretschneider, I. 1098 sq.) with Zwingli's (in Hospinian's *Hist. Sacramentaria*, II. 77 sq.). Luther despaired of the conference from the first: see his letter to the landgrave (June 23) in De Wette, III. 473, and others written immediately after the conference (*Ibid.* pp. 511 sq. 518, 520, 559). One addressed to John Agricola (Oct. 12) contains the following 'Postscript' of Melanchthon: 'Valde contenderunt ut a nobis fratres nominarentur. Vide eorum stultitiam, cum damnent nos, cupiunt tamen a nobis fratres haberi. Nos noluimus eis de hac re assentiri. Sic omnino arbitror, si res adhuc integra esset, non moturos amplius tantam tragœdiam.'

[3] See the XVII. Schwabach Articles in Walch's *Luther*, XVI. 681

GERMANY.

was made an indispensable condition of membership in the reforming league; and after undergoing, in the hands of Melanchthon, further modifications and additions, the seventeen Schwabach Articles, for the most part, reappeared in the Confession of Augsburg[1], presented to Charles V. on the 25th of June, **1530**, during the sessions of the Diet in that place. Restrained by the political ascendancy of anti-Lutheran influences[2], alarmed by aberrations of the Anabaptists, and discouraged also by the recent failure to appease the scruples of the Swiss, the authors and compilers of this manifesto exceeded even their characteristic moderation, both in what they have pretermitted, and in what they have advanced.

Augsburg Confession, **1530.**

It consists of two parts, the former having reference to articles of faith, and proving how very much the Lutherans

Its character.

778. Their spirit is essentially Lutheran throughout (cf. Ranke, III. 197). The immediate effect of this test was to exclude the cities of Ulm and Strasburg (cf. above, p. 52. n. 1) from the league; and at a meeting held at Schmalkald (Dec. 1529), the rest of the Oberländers followed their example.

[1] The fullest account of this document is in Weber's *Kritische Gesch. der Augsb. Confess.* It is analysed in Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, ch. II. The idea of presenting such an apology was suggested by Brück (Pontanus), senior chancellor of the elector of Saxony (March 14, 1530). He also took part in the work of revision, which continued for some time (till May 31). That it received during this interval the approbation of Luther, who remained behind at Coburg, is shewn by his note to the elector John (May 15, 1530). He remarks very characteristically, that he was not the man to improve upon it, 'denn ich so sanft und leise nicht treten kan.' When read before the states by Dr Bayer (the junior chancellor of Saxony) it bore the signatures of John, elector of Saxony; George, margrave of Brandenburg Ansbach; Ernest, duke of Lüneburg; Philip, landgrave of Hessen [who for the present surmounted his misgivings on the Sacramentarian controversy]; John Frederic, electoral prince of Saxony; Francis, duke of Lüneburg; Wolfgang, prince of Anhalt; the senate and magistracy of Nuremberg; and the senate of Reutlingen.

[2] To this new ascendancy contributed the retreat of the Turks, who had pitched their camp before Vienna itself (Sept. 20, 1529); the pacification of Italy and the investing of Charles V. (Feb. 24, 1530) with the insignia of the Roman empire at Bologna (see Ranke, *Ref.* Bk. v. ch. vii. viii.); but still more the absolute refusal of Luther to sanction the active resistance of the Protestants, on the ground that their religion ought not even to be defended by appealing to the sword (*Ibid.* III. 202 sq. De Wette, III. 560 sq.). He went so far so to dissuade the elector John (May 22, 1529) from entering into a fresh league with the landgrave Philip, because such a step would involve religious communion with many persons who were holding fundamental errors ('wider Gott und das sacrament'): De Wette, III. 455: cf. IV. 23 sq.

GERMANY.

held in common with the rest of Christendom[1]; the latter[2] stating on what scriptural and patristic grounds they had rejected certain errors and abuses. The general tone of this Confession is humble, modest, and apologetic: yet so violent were some of the opponents of the Reformation who had listened to the reading of it, that they urged the emperor to gird on his sword immediately and execute the edict of Worms. Instead of this, however, Charles adopted the advice of the more moderate members[3] of his party. He directed a committee of divines, then present at Augsburg, four of whom, Cochlæus, Eck, Wimpina, and Faber, were among the ablest champions of scholasticism, to write a confutation[4] of the Lutheran document. Their answer was eventually recited before the Diet on the 3rd of August; and soon after, on the opening of a conference (Aug. **16**) between the leading theologians[5] of each party, many of

Scholastic confutation of it.

[1] The adherents of the Confession did not hesitate to make the following declaration (§ XXII.) on this point: 'Hæc fere summa est doctrinæ apud nos, in qua cerni potest, nihil inesse quod discrepet a Scripturis, vel ab ecclesia Catholica, vel ab ecclesia Romana, quatenus ex Scriptoribus nota est' (or, as the last clause stands in Melanchthon's contemporary version, 'aus der Väter Schrift.').

[2] The second Part of the Confession is based on Articles drawn up by certain Lutheran divines who met the elector at Torgau on the third Sunday in Lent (1530), in anticipation of the Diet: cf. Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschneider, IV. 973: Gieseler, III. i. p. 246, n. 4.

[3] See the extracts in Gieseler, III. i. p. 250, n. 7, shewing that individual prelates were favourable to many of the changes introduced by the Lutherans, but could not endure the thought that these should emanate from an unauthorized friar ('hoc est turbare pacem, hoc non est ferendum').

[4] Printed in the Append. to Francke's *Libr. Symbol. Eccl. Luth.* pp. 24—69. For some analysis of it, see Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, pp. 26 sq. 2nd ed. It underwent great modification after the first draft was shewn to the emperor (July 13). Another confutation was published by Hoffmeister, an Augustinian friar, with the title *Judicium de Articulis Confess. August., quatenus scilicet a Catholicis admittendi sint aut rejiciendi*, Colon. 1559.

[5] The unreformed were represented by Eck, Wimpina and Cochlæus; the reformed by Melanchthon, Brentz and Schnepf. See the particulars of this attempt at mediation in Walch's *Luther*, XVI. 1668 sq. and Ranke, *Ref.* III. 306 sq. Melanchthon, much to his annoyance, was charged with treachery to the cause of the reformers, more especially on account of a concession by which he offered to subject them afresh to the jurisdiction of the bishops: cf. his letter addressed to Luther (Sept. I. 1530; ed. Bretschn. II. 336) with Luther's letter to him (Sept. 11: De Wette, IV. 162, 163). It is plain that the great reformer was vehemently opposed to very many of the concessions. The following are specimens: 'Summa, mihi in totum displicet tractatus

GERMANY.

the serious differences on points of doctrine were so far adjusted that the rest appeared to those engaged in it no longer incapable of reconciliation. Such hope, however, weakened by the opposition of the sterner Lutherans, vanished altogether, when Campeggi[1] the papal legate reasserted all the strongest arguments in favour of the jurisdiction of the Roman Church. Inflamed by his representations, and more conscious as the interviews proceeded that real harmony was unattainable, the Diet finally issued another edict enjoining the reformers, at least until a council could be summoned, to appoint no more married priests, to practise auricular confession with the same minuteness as in former years, to abstain from mutilations of the Canon of the mass and from all language tending to disparage private masses, and even to acknowledge that communion in one kind is quite as valid as in both[2]. A threat was at the same time suspended over them, importing that if they continued firm in their resistance after May **5, 1531**, the unreforming states would instantly adopt coercive measures.

Edict adverse to the Lutherans.

The necessity of acting still more vigorously in self-defence now led to the formation of the Schmalkaldic League[3] (March **29, 1531**), by which the Protestants bound

Measures in self-defence.

de doctrinæ concordia, ut quæ plane sit impossibilis, nisi Papa velit papatum suum aboleri' (Aug. 26: De Wette, IV. 147). 'Oro autem ut abrupta actione desinatis cum illis agere, et redeatis. Habent confessionem, habent Evangelium: si volunt, admittant; si nolunt, vadant in locum suum. Wird ein Krieg draus, so werde er draus; wir haben gnug gebeten und gethan' (Sept. 20: De Wette, IV. 171). We may not unnaturally suppose, that these and like expressions wrought a considerable change in Melanchthon. He soon afterwards indeed drew up his *Apology* for the Augsburg Confession (the second of the Lutheran symbolical books), departing far more freely from the mediæval modes of thought. See respecting it Francke, *Libri Symb. Eccl. Luth.* Proleg. c. iii.

[1] Ranke, *Ref.* III. 310. His opinion seems to have been that the controversy on matters of doctrine was chiefly, if not altogether, verbal (Gieseler, III. i. p. 260, n. 22): while Melanchthon assured him (ed. Bretsch. II. 170), that the reformers were continually incurring the hatred of many persons in Germany itself, 'quia Ecclesiæ Romanæ dogmata summa constantia defendimus.' It was on matters affecting the papal supremacy and the constitution of the Church that they ultimately fell off from each other.

[2] Ranke, *ibid.* The Recess of the diet, which dissolved in November, 1530, is given in Walch, XVI. 1925 sq.

[3] The jurists of Wittenberg laboured to abate the scruples still felt by many of the theologians with regard to the lawfulness of resisting the emperor, even in self-defence (Ranke, *Ref.* III. 348).

GERMANY.

themselves for six years to help each other in maintaining the distinctive ground which they had occupied in the Augsburg Confession. They next endeavoured to fortify their position by political alliances with France[1], and other powers antagonistic to the house of Austria. But their preservation at this juncture is mainly traceable to the Ottoman Turks[2], who in the summer of **1532** swept over the plains of Hungary with two hundred and fifty thousand men, and even climbed into the fastnesses of Styria, where they seem to have shaken for a moment the indomitable heroism of Charles V. himself. In order to enlist the arms of every German province in repelling these invaders, he opened fresh negotiations with the Protestants, whom he ultimately satisfied by promulgating the religious peace of Nuremberg[3] (July **23, 1532**). According to the terms of this first concordat, the existing state of things was to continue among those of the reformers who recognized the Confession of Augsburg, till the subjects in dispute could be authoritatively adjusted either in some 'general free council,' or in some future diet.

Peace of Nuremberg, **1532.**

Proposed council.

After the retreat of Solyman, the emperor attempted by all means to stimulate the reigning pontiff, so as to convoke the synod contemplated in the peace of Nuremberg. Although he made little or no progress during the pontificate of Clement VII., Paul III. (elected Oct. **13, 1534**) was more willing to start negotiations for this purpose with the Protestants[4]; and even when hostilities

[1] Ranke (in his *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*, I. 198, 199, Lond. 1852) observes that the French monarch was inclined to extend these negotiations to religious matters, and that he had invited Melanchthon to take part in a free congress of theologians, which was only defeated by the vigorous efforts of the Sorbonne. That Francis intended to use the religious differences of Germany as a weapon against Charles is clear; it was a fatal weakness in the reformers to call in French aid at all under the circumstances.

[2] Ranke, *Ref.* Bk. VI. ch. vi. Miller, *Hist. Philosophically Illustrated,* III. 19, 20, Lond. 1849. The second of these writers has drawn attention to the fact that Solyman's hostility was diverted from the German empire soon afterwards by his war with Persia, leaving the Protestants again at the mercy of Charles V.

[3] See the account of the negotiations in Sleidan, *Ref.* pp. 160, 161, Lond. 1689, and the documents in Walch, XVI. 2210 sq. John the Constant, elector of Saxony, died Aug. 16, 1532. His successor was John Frederic the Magnanimous.

[4] Clement VII. well knew that all the terms which he proposed would

GERMANY.

broke out again between the emperor and the French, he so far persisted as to make arrangements for the holding of a synod at Mantua[1] (May, **1537**). On the other hand, the Wittenberg divines could not regard a council constituted in the papal fashion as either 'free' or 'general,' and accordingly proceeded to restate the doctrines which they felt themselves constrained to vindicate at all hazards, in a formal manifesto entitled the *Schmalkaldic Articles*[2], from its reception by the members of the Protestant League (Feb. **1537**).

Continued hostilities.

Their opponents at the same time entered into a more formidable confederacy (the 'Holy League'[3], as it was called) including Charles V., Ferdinand, the elector of Mentz, the archbishop of Salzburg, the dukes of Bavaria, duke George of Saxony of the Albertine line (to be distinguished from the *Elector*, who was of the senior or Ernestine line), and duke Henry of Brunswick Wolfenbüttel. Counting as they did, however, on the help to be afforded by political adversaries[4] of the emperor, and also

be rejected: but his successor manifested more earnestness and equity (see Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschn. II. 962 sq.). Luther (June 16, 1532) mentions the earlier 'Articuli' of the papal and imperial nuncios: '...per quos Papa detulit nobis articulos quosdam de concilio celebrando, scilicet ut agatur in ea re secundum suum placitum et more priorum conciliorum, *h. e.* in quo damnemur et comburamur, sed verbis lubricis et tali Pontifice dignis:' De Wette, IV. 454. And we can hardly avoid drawing a conclusion from other passages of his letters (*e. g.* one written in the previous April or May, in conjunction with Bugenhagen), that he was now opposed to any conciliar determination of the subjects in dispute. On his interview with Vergerio at Wittenberg, November 7, 1535, see the various accounts in Waddington, III. 189 sq.

[1] See the bull in Raynald. *Annal. Eccl.* ad an. 1536, § 35. The same pontiff, two years later (1538), appointed a reformatory commission, which produced the famous *Consilium delectorum Cardinalium et aliorum prælatorum de emendanda Ecclesia*, printed in Le Plat's *Monum. Concil. Trident.* II. 596 sq. Lovan. 1782.

[2] This formulary was afterwards adopted as another 'symbolical' writing of the Lutherans. See an account of its history as well as the work itself, in Francke's *Lib. Symb. Eccl. Luth.* Part II. The original form of it was written by Luther himself in German (Dec. 1536), and submitted by him to his colleagues (p. vi.). Melanchthon signed it only with the following qualification respecting the pope (p. 40): 'De Pontifice autem statuo, si evangelium admitteret, posse ei, propter pacem et communem tranquillitatem Christianorum, qui jam sub ipso sunt, et in posterum sub ipso erunt, superioritatem in episcopos, quam alioqui habet, jure humano etiam a nobis permitti.'

[3] The documents in Walch, XVII. 4 sq.: cf. Leo, *Universalgeschichte*, III. 157, 158, Halle, 1838.

[4] Chiefly that of Francis I. and Henry VIII. the latter of whom,

GERMANY.

on the friendship of one section of the Swiss reformers[1], they were enabled to maintain their ground so firmly that fresh overtures were made by Charles to bring about, it possible, some lasting reconciliation.

Colloquy of Ratisbon, **1541.**

Never since the outbreak of the struggle did reformed and unreformed approximate so closely as at the Colloquy held in Ratisbon[2] (**1541**). The papal legate sent on this occasion was Gaspar Contarini, who on many subjects, more especially the doctrine of justification, had betrayed a leaning towards Protestantism; and as he found himself confronted by Melanchthon and others, all of whom evinced unusual readiness to make concessions for the sake of

as we shall see hereafter, opened negotiations with the Lutherans on both diplomatic and religious grounds.

[1] Luther himself, as early as Jan. 22, 1531 (De Wette, IV. 216), had manifested a more pacific disposition towards the moderate party of the 'Sacramentaries,' represented by Bucer (cf. above, p. 52, n. 1, respecting their *Confessio*). The four cities where they most abounded had in 1532 accepted the Augsburg Confession, and by establishing the *Concordia Vitebergensis* (May, 1536: see Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschn. III. 75 sq.), the two parties were drawn still more closely to each other. On this occasion the phraseology respecting the Eucharistic presence stood as follows: 'Cum pane et vino vere et substantialiter adesse, exhiberi et sumi Corpus Christi et Sanguinem' (at the same time denying the theories both of transubstantiation, of 'local inclusion in the bread,' *i. e.* impanation, and also of 'any lasting conjunction apart from the use of the sacrament'). In a new edition of the Augsburg Confession in 1540, Melanchthon went further still, and altered the authorized expressions, 'quod Corpus et Sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur in cœna,' into 'quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur Corpus et Sanguis Christi:' Leo, as above, p. 158. That his views never harmonized *entirely* with those of Luther on the subject of the Eucharist, is rendered probable by a statement recently brought to light in Ratzeberger's *Handschr. Gesch. iiber Luther*, etc. ed. Neudecker, Jena, 1850, pp. 85, 86, 94. He felt that Luther had written on the mysterious presence 'nimis crasse.' He was himself content, as he observes (*Opp.* VII. 343, ed. Bretschn.), with the 'simplicity' of the words of institution, adding very forcibly: 'Longe est alia ratio sacramentorum; ut in ipsa actione Spiritus Sanctus adest *baptismo* et est efficax in *baptizato*, sic cum sumitur cœna, adest Christus, ut sit efficax. Nec adest propter panem, sed propter sumentem.'

[2] The fullest collection of the Acts is that given in Bretschneider's *Melanchthon*, IV. 119 sq. The Protestant representatives nominated by the emperor were Melanchthon, Pistorius, and Bucer; their opponents being Eck, Julius Pflug and John Gropper. Eck was, however, kept in the background by Contarini, respecting whom see Waddington, III. 311 sq. The basis of the conference was an essay called the *Book of Concord*, or *Interim of Ratisbon* (*Melanchth.* IV. 190 sq.), the author of which is unknown. It consisted of a string of definitions, so constructed 'as to evade, as far as possible, the most prominent points of difference.'

GERMANY.

peace, a hope was entertained in almost every quarter, that the raging controversy was about to be composed. They actually arrived at an agreement (May **10**) on the state of man before the Fall, on free will, original sin, and lastly, on what was felt to be a turning-point in their discussions, on the justification of the sinner[1]: yet here even they perceived eventually that deeper sources of division existed in the ordinances and constitution of the Church as governed by the Roman pontiffs. Partly for this reason, and partly because the hotter spirits on both sides could not endure the thought of reconciliation[2], the proceedings of the Colloquy were altogether void of fruit.

An instance of the great rapidity with which the new opinions were diffused in many distant states occurred soon afterwards at Cologne, where Hermann[3] von Wied, the prince-archbishop, determined mainly by the arguments adduced at Ratisbon, had set on foot a vigorous reformation, and invited Bucer and Melanchthon to assist him in the carrying forward of his work[4]. Some kindred measures were advancing in other dioceses, when the sword of persecution was again unsheathed by Charles and his adherents. On the **18**th of September, **1544**, he concluded the peace

Hermann, Archbp. of Cologne.

[1] On this subject the collocutors arrived at the following conclusion: 'Firma itaque est et sana doctrina, per fidem vivam et efficacem justificari peccatorem. Nam per illam Deo grati et accepti sumus propter Christum...Et sic fide in Christum justificamur, seu reputamur justi, *i.e.* accepti, per Ipsius merita, non propter nostram dignitatem aut opera.' Cardinal Pole, among others, congratulated Contarini on this unison: see Ranke, *Popes*, I. 164, 165, by Austin, 2nd ed.

[2] Leo, as above, pp. 164 sq.

[3] One of the best accounts of him and the reformation which he headed is in Seckendorf, Lib. III. pp. 435—448. He struggled for some time against the papal excommunication launched in 1546, but was afterwards deposed, and died in seclusion, Aug. 13, 1552: Sleidan, *Ref.* pp. 340 sq., 573, Lond. 1689.

[4] See Melanchthon's letters (*Opp.* v. 112, ed. Bretsch.) on the construction of Hermann's *Einfältiges Bedenken*, etc., 1543, or, as the title stands in the Latin version of 1545, *Simplex et Pia Deliberatio*, etc. Either the German original, or this Latin version, was also translated into English in 1547, and (more correctly) in 1548. As a form of service it approximated closely to the 'order' of Nuremberg, composed by Luther in 1533. He was, however, dissatisfied with expressions in the work relating to the Eucharist, supplied, as it appears (Melanchthon, as above) by Bucer; on the ground that the author had avoided clear statements touching the real presence; 'von der Substanz (*i. e.* of the Eucharist) mummelt es, dass man nicht soll vernehmen, was er davon halte in aller Masse:' De Wette, v. 708.

GERMANY.

Renewed hostilities.

of Crespy with his rival Francis, which enabled him to concentrate his energies against the Protestants[1]. Their own divisions also tended to expose them still further to his violence. The cordiality of members of their League abated[2]; and as the controversy of Luther[3] with the Sacramentaries broke out afresh in **1544**, all hope of gaining positive assistance from the Swiss appeared to be cut off. The Romish party were moreover stimulated at this juncture by the convocation (Nov. **19**, **1544**) of the long expected council[4], which met at Trent in the following year; so that although another fruitless Colloquy was opened at Ratisbon[5] (Jan. **27**, **1546**), it grew apparent that the animosity of the imperial faction must ere long find vent in bloodshed.

Opening of the Council of Trent.

Death of Luther.

Luther[6] breathed his last at Eisleben, Feb. **18**, **1546**, the victim of a grievous malady that poured fresh drops of bitterness into the feelings of dissatisfaction and disgust with which he contemplated the present aspect of ecclesiastical affairs, particularly the development of Zwin-

[1] According to this treaty, the French were also pledged to assist in 'restoring the ancient religion and the unity of the Church.' Sleidan, as before, p. 336.

[2] *e.g.* Maurice, *duke* of Saxony of the Albertine line, which was Protestant after the death of duke George in 1539, having quarrelled with the elector (cf. Luther's letter of April 7, 1542, in De Wette, v. 456), seceded from the League, although promising to act with members of it in defence of their religion.

[3] His wrath expressed itself in what Melanchthon was constrained to call 'atrocissimum scriptum,'—the *Kurzes Bekenntniss vom Abendmahl* (Walch, xx. 2195 sq.), where he speaks of the Zwinglian party as 'soul-destroyers and heretics:' cf. Waddington, III. 227, 228.

[4] See below, on the *Counter-Reformation*, chap. VI.

[5] The leading champion of the anti-reformers was Cochlæus, who, after the death of Eck (Feb. 1543), had succeeded to his place. On the other side, Major and Bucer were the principal speakers. A *Verissima Relatio* of the proceedings, which lasted till March 20, was published immediately afterwards at Ingolstadt, by order of Charles V.

[6] Döllinger (*Die Reformation*, I. 349 sq.) has ransacked his letters for the sake of adding to the stock of evidence as to the wretchedness of his later years. Audin, with still greater spite, has written three chapters on his 'chagrins et souffrances,' his 'tentations et doutes,' and finally, on his 'derniers moments' (capp. xxii.—xxiv.) For a more truthful representation, see the documents in Walch, XXI. 274 sq. and Mohnike's collection entitled *Doctor Martin Luther's Lebensende* (written by eye-witnesses), Stralsund, 1817. Some additional light is thrown upon this as well as other portions of the life of Luther by Ratzeberger's *Gesch. über Luther und seine Zeit*,—written by an intimate friend, and recently edited in its genuine form by Neudecker, Jena, 1850.

glianism, and the encroachment of secular ideas into the province of religion. He held his principles, however, with unshaken earnestness, and found in them the consolations that sustained his drooping spirit, and the strength that finally enabled her to wing her way into a happier sphere of being. By his death at this new epoch in the German reformation he was spared from witnessing the horrors of the struggle known as the Schmalkaldic War. It was in truth a fresh crusade, the Roman pontiff granting plenary indulgences to all who might assist in the extirpation of the Lutheran 'heresy[1].' The proximate issues of the war were soon determined by the sanguinary defeat of the Protestants at Mühlberg (April 24, 1547), where John Frederic, the elector of Saxony, on whose sincerity, zeal, and courage they had long depended, fell into the hands of Charles V. Inflexibly attached to his opinions[2] he beheld his throne in the possession of his cousin Maurice, who had sided with the other party, while the emperor, for a season, had become the undisputed lord of Germany. The jealousy, however, that arose between him and the pope, conduced materially to the protection of the Protestants. Charles himself had, in the meanwhile, grown dissatisfied with the proceedings of the council of Trent. He contended that instead of rushing at once into anathemas against doctrinal aberrations, it should in the first place have addressed itself to the correction of practical abuses[3], even if in so doing it had trenched on the more extreme pretensions of the pontiff. On the contrary, Paul III., who was alarmed[4] by the gigantic growth of the imperial power, foreboded that some of his own prerogatives might also be assailed, if

Religious War.

Suspension of the Council.

[1] See Sleidan, *Ref.* Bks. XVIII. XIX.: Leo, *Universalgeschichte*, III. pp. 175 sq. The first blow was however struck by the League, in the hope of crushing Charles before his preparations were completed.

[2] He had succeeded his father John, who died immediately after the peace of Nuremberg (1532). His life was now spared at the intercession of the elector of Brandenburg, who remained neutral (Sleidan, pp. 427, 428), but he was, notwithstanding, compelled to renounce all claim to the electoral dignity, for both himself and his children. Maurice, who replaced him (cf. above, p. 60, n. 2), used his influence with Charles to beg off the landgrave of Hessen, who, accordingly, made his peace (June 19, 1547), but was detained a prisoner (*Ibid.* pp. 432, 433; Leo, p. 183). A fuller account of the whole proceedings is given by Rommel, in his *Philipp der Grossmüthige.*

[3] Sarpi, *Hist. du Concile de Trent*, I. 247, Amsterdam, 1751.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 387, 388.

GERMANY.

not entirely wrested from his grasp. Under the influence, therefore, of such motives, he availed himself of a pretext afforded by the spread of some contagious disease, in order to transfer the council from Trent to Bologna (March **11, 1547**), where he trusted that the emperor would not be able to bias the proceedings. On hearing of this transfer, Charles resented what he thought a fresh indignity[1], demanded that the representatives should all immediately revert to their old position in the Tyrol, and during the protracted negotiations[2] on this subject, and the consequent abeyance of synodic action, gave the Protestants an opportunity of recovering from their recent consternation. When all hopes of healing the divisions of the empire by the agency of general councils faded every day, a different project was suggested for that purpose. By an order issued at the Diet of Augsburg (May **15, 1548**), the Protestants were directed to adopt a new formulary of belief and worship, drawn up, at the command of Charles, by John Agricola, an old reformer and preacher at the court of Brandenburg, and two moderate prelates of the counter-reformation party[3]. This provisional arrangement, intended to expire when questions it concerned could be authoritatively handled in a council of the Western Church, was termed the *Interim*, or *Interim Augustanum*. Its tone and character were highly favourable to the mediæval notions[4], and as such it naturally proved distasteful to the great majority of Protestants. The emperor, it is true, endeavoured to facilitate their recognition of it, by prescribing

The Interim Augustanum, **1548.**

[1] He sent orders that the representatives opposed to this transfer of the council, chiefly Spaniards and others of his own subjects, should remain at Trent till they received further instructions: Sarpi, I. 488.

[2] *Ibid.* I. 502 sq. To fortify himself, the pope had in the meanwhile concluded a fresh treaty with Henry II. of France. *Ibid.* pp. 499, 500.

[3] See Gieseler's account of its origin and composition, III. i. p. 342, n. 1. Bucer was fetched from Strasburg to Augsburg with the hope of gaining his sanction to the scheme (Sleidan, as before, p. 454). This, however, he declined to give, notwithstanding the importunity of the elector of Brandenburg, who was anxious to effect a reconciliation. (*Ibid.* p. 458).

[4] Printed, in 1548, both in the German original and in a Latin version. It is now most accessible in Bieck's *Das dreyfache Interim*, Leipzig, 1721. Sleidan (pp. 458, 459) furnishes a summary of its contents. The two chief concessions which it made to the Reformers were the legalizing, for the present, of the marriages of such ecclesiastics as had already taken wives, and the toleration of communion in both kinds.

GERMANY.

(June 14) a *Formula Reformationis*[1] to the other party, his intention being to correct the most obnoxious class of practical abuses. But while these projects found a general acceptance in the non-reforming dioceses of the empire, the pope, as if desirous of adding to the complications and anomalies of the age, now raised his voice in condemnation of the scheme, alleging that Charles had overstepped his province in thus meddling with ecclesiastical affairs[2].

In the mean time, though the *Interim* was not without its advocates, particularly in Southern Germany, it roused a stormy opposition in some districts of the north[3]. The stricter Lutherans always viewed it in the light of an ungodly compromise: they went so far indeed as to withhold communion from members of their body who were tainted by the slightest contact with it. Illustrations of this firmness soon occurred, especially in Saxony, where Maurice the elector, while he did not absolutely reject the *Interim*, endeavoured, with the aid of his divines, to modify its operation[4] in such a way as to preserve the essence of the Lutheran doctrines, although associated with many of the ritual institutions handed down from the Middle Ages. A conforming party thus grew up in Wittenberg under the guidance of Melanchthon. From the disposition they evinced to treat one large cycle of ecclesiastical ordinances as indifferent or non-essential[5] (*ἀδιάφορα*), their controversy

The Interim Lipsiense *and its effect.*

[1] Printed several times, and (as Gieseler observes) with some additions of 1559, in Goldast's *Constit. Imper.* II. 325 sq.

[2] It was even imputed to him among other things, that the new manifesto contained doctrines at variance with decrees of the suspended council, on grave questions like justification and the authority of the pope (Raynald. *Annal. Eccl.* ad an. 1548, § 62; cf. Sarpi, I. 531).

[3] Sleidan, as before, pp. 460, 461: Gieseler, III. i. 356—360. Many of the leading divines (*e.g.* Musculus, Brentz, Osiander) were now driven out of the conforming states, and sought a shelter in countries to which the *Interim* did not reach, or where it was resisted by the Protestants.

[4] Maurice assembled a committee of divines and others at Meissen (July 1). Fresh meetings were afterwards convened until Dec. 22, when the *Interim Lipsiense* was accepted in the electorate of Saxony. It is printed in Bieck, as above, p. 62, n. 4.

[5] Thus at the conference of July 1, mentioned in the previous note, the theologians made the following statement: 'Si in rebus istis adiaphoris bono consilio eorum, quibus gubernatio Ecclesiarum commissa est, aliquid deliberatum fuerit, quod ad concinnitatem aliquam rituum, et ad bonam disciplinam faciat, in hoc concordiæ et bono ordini non deerimus. *Nam de rebus per se mediis non volumus quicquam rixari, quod ad externum attinet usum.*' In replying (April 16, 1549) to a letter

GERMANY.

with the other Lutherans[1] was entitled 'Adiaphoristic.' They form the earliest representatives of that gentler, and, on some occasions, over-pliant class of thinkers, who by preaching peace, allaying discords, and reducing irregularities, have exercised a very powerful influence on the spirit of the German reformation.

Reopening of the Council of Trent.

The death of Paul III. (Nov. **10, 1549**) presented a more favourable opportunity for trying to obtain a lasting settlement of the disputed dogmas. In pursuance of his object Charles prevailed on the new pontiff, Julius III., to re-establish[2] the council of Trent (May **1, 1551**). On this occasion also many of the Protestant communities were stimulated to draw up confessions of their faith, the prin-

Lutheran Confessions.

addressed to him by the consistory of Hamburg (*Opp.* ed. Bretschn. VII. 367) on this question, Melanchthon explains himself at length, and with his usual moderation.

[1] This party was headed by Flacius Illyricus, the Wittenberg professor of Hebrew, who, having associated at Magdeburg with others of the same school, denounced the present teaching of Melanchthon as a departure from the purity of the Lutheran Creed. The controversy lasted for several years, and in September, 1556, we find Melanchthon writing to Flacius (*Opp.* VIII. 841), and offering for the sake of unity to confess that he was in the wrong: 'Fateor etiam hac in re a me peccatum esse, et a Deo veniam peto, quod non procul fugi insidiosas illas deliberationes.' The 'Philippists' and 'Flacianists,' however, long continued to represent distinct shades of Lutheranism, the former predominating in the university of Wittenberg, the latter in that of Jena. The spirit of Melanchthon as distinguished from that of Luther is also traceable in Osiander, the reformer of Nuremberg, who, on being expelled from thence during the ascendancy of the *Interim*, was appointed to a professorship in Prussia at Königsberg. He there published two disputations, one of which, on the doctrine of justification, reaffirmed the views propounded by some of the older mystics, who had laid especial stress on holiness as the result of the inhabitation of Christ in all the faithful: *e.g.* 'Fides est justificans, cum tamen non fides, sed Christus fide comprehensus justificet. . . . . Justitia illa, quam fide apprehendimus, est justitia Dei, non tantum quia Deo est accepta, sed quia revera justitia Dei....Hæc justitia non confertur cuiquam, nisi prius ei remissa fuerint peccata per sanguinem Christi...Glacie frigidiora docent, nos tantum propter remissionem peccatorum reputari justos, et non etiam propter justitiam Christi per fidem in nobis inhabitantis.' A controversy on these topics continued to rage for some years after the death of Osiander (Oct. 17, 1552): see Gieseler, III. ii. pp. 275 sq.

[2] Sarpi, I. 542 sq. The Protestant princes, on being asked to submit to its decisions, would only consent on these conditions, (1) that subjects already determined at Trent should be reopened, (2) that the theologians of the Confession of Augsburg not only should be heard in self-defence, but should have the right of voting, (3) that the pope should not be the president, and should submit to the council like other persons (*Ibid.* p. 554).

GERMANY.

cipal being the *Confessio Saxonica*[1], an expanded form of that delivered to the emperor at Augsburg in **1530**, and the *Confessio Virtembergensis*[2], a document of kindred origin, and actually submitted to the council Jan. **24, 1552**. It seems, however, that the critical moment when the Protestants were in great danger of compromising their independence and of undergoing reabsorption into the dominant system of belief, was destined to behold their triumph and to set them free for ages.

Rescue of the Protestants.

The elector Maurice, who in earlier life had been the cause of their depression, suddenly took the field in their behalf[3] (March, **1552**). Allied with France and favoured by a fresh irruption of the Turks, the Protestants were ultimately enabled to extort from Charles and Ferdinand the memorable peace concluded in the diet of Augsburg[4] (Sept. **25, 1555**). It was there ruled that every land-proprietor should have the liberty of choosing between the 'old religion' and the 'new,' so far as this had been

Settlement of the Controversy.

[1] Printed in the *Append.* to Francke's *Lib. Symb. Eccl. Luther.* pp. 69 sq. Melanchthon, who composed it, states in his Preface, that it was meant simply as a 'repetition' of the Augsburg Formulary.

[2] In Le Plat, *Monum Concil. Trident.* IV. 420 sq. On its presentation see Sarpi, II. 104. The ambassadors of the elector of Saxony were introduced to the council on the same occasion (*Ibid.* p. 102); and certain of the Protestant theologians soon afterwards started for the Tyrol to vindicate their doctrines (*Ibid.* p. 112; Sleidan, pp. 529, 530).

[3] His ostensible object was the liberation of his father-in-law, the landgrave of Hessen, who was still unrighteously detained in captivity (cf. above, p. 61, n. 2). On the struggle which ensued see Leo, as before, pp. 186 sq., and Sleidan, bks. XXIV. XXV. The prelates all dispersed from Trent on hearing that Augsburg had fallen into the hands of Maurice (Sleidan, p. 547). Charles V. himself, who was an invalid at Innsbruck, escaped with difficulty across the Alps to Villach, accompanied by his brother King Ferdinand (*Ibid.* p. 560). He first, however, set the ex-elector, John Frederic, at liberty, and after the treaty of Passau (Aug. 2, 1552) the landgrave Philip was also released (*Ibid.* p. 573). Maurice in the following year (July 9) was killed in battle while fighting against the margrave Albert Alcibiades of Brandenburg, who would not be a party to the late pacification. His place was supplied by his brother Augustus.

[4] Sleidan, pp. 620 sq.: see also the documents adduced or pointed out in Gieseler, III. i. pp. 372 sq., and Leo's remarks on the decree, pp. 190 sq. Charles V., disgusted with this termination of the struggle, resigned his honours in the following year,—the empire in favour of Ferdinand, his own kingdom in favour of his son Philip II., and withdrew to a convent in Estremadura, where, however, till his death (Sept. 21, 1558), he manifested all his ancient zeal against the Reformation: see Stirling's *Cloister-Life of Charles V.*, 2nd ed. Two years later, when his presence was no longer absolutely needed to restrain and guide the counsels of the Saxon Protestants, expired Melanchthon (April 19, 1560).

GERMANY.

embodied in the Augsburg Confession; while his tenants and dependents, in conformity with the prevailing modes of thought, were all expected to abide by his decision and to follow closely in his steps. The two great parties in the German empire, having thus obtained a sort of equilibrium, were content for the remainder of the century to regard each other with comparative respect and outward toleration. Feelings of this kind were strengthened when, in spite of papal opposition, the succession of Ferdinand was finally recognized by the diet[1] (March **8, 1558**); for the new emperor, though always personally attached to the unreformed opinions[2], was in later years restrained not only by the spread of Lutheranism in many of his own territories[3], but still more by his continued misunderstanding with the pontiff. The same policy was cordially adopted by his son and successor Maximilian II. (**1564—1576**), who in his youth at least had shewn considerable predilection for some portions of the Protestant belief. It is plain, however, that towards the close of his administration, the efforts of the new army of papal volunteers[4], the Order of the Jesuits (founded in **1540**), had so far succeeded in many quarters, that symptoms of a counter-reformation grew distinctly visible. The long and comparatively peaceful reign of Rudolph II. (**1576—1612**), whose education had been guided by the Jesuits, was still further marked by these reactions. While the Lutheran doctors[5] were disputing with each other, or with followers of the school of Calvin, on the very deepest mysteries of Holy Writ; while they were fortifying their conclusions on

Commencement of reaction.

[1] The pope was offended on account of the 'religious peace,' against which indeed he had protested, and on that account declined to crown the new emperor. Hence the establishment of the principle, that personal coronation by the pope was not requisite: see Miller, *Hist. Philos. considered*, III. 131, 3rd ed.

[2] Yet even with regard to matters of religion he was far more independent than the papal court: *e.g.* he favoured the concession of the cup to the laity, clerical marriage, and the use of the vernacular in part of the church-service: cf. Leo, pp. 311, 342.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 325: cf. Raupach, *Erläutertes Evangel. Oesterreich*, I. 31 sq.

[4] See below Chap. VI. on '*the Counter-Reformation*' for some account of this new order, and its rapid progress in counter-working the reformers.

[5] Allusion has been made above to several controversies (pp. 44, 62, 63), especially to that respecting the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist (pp. 51, 60). On some new phases of the latter, and also on the numerous points where the disciples of Luther and Calvin were opposed, see below, Chap. III.

GERMANY.

these topics by the publication in **1577** of what they termed the *Formula of Concord*[1], their disciples were excluded step by step from hamlets, towns and districts[2], where not many years before they had outnumbered their opponents. Ancient jealousies were thus revived, and quarrels, hitherto but half-composed, were exasperated and extended, till the seeds of envy, hatred and fanaticism, disseminated with the largest hand in every part of continental Europe, sprouted forth into that crop of human misery and carnage which appals us in the history of the Thirty Years' War (**1618—1648**).

Before proceeding to indicate the various steps by which the Lutheran doctrines were diffused and ultimately established in very distant countries, it is desirable to pause a moment and sketch their progress through the several states, which in the sixteenth century constituted the Germanic empire.

Reformation in Electoral *Saxony;*

The soil in which those doctrines were first planted, and from which indeed they drew their principal support, was the electorate of Saxony, including[3] in the period now before us Osterland[4] and Thuringia, together with parts of Misnia and Franconia. All their leading towns were rapidly awakened and illuminated by the university of Wittenberg; and as early as the Saxon visitation[5] of **1527** the people had been for the most part Lutheranized. Saxony was thus ready to become a refuge and asylum for the persecuted Protestants of other countries, who also would naturally be strengthened in their faith by personal conferences with the religious chieftains[6]. *Ducal* Saxony, however, did not yield to the Reformation-movement until **1539**, when duke George, who corresponded with Erasmus, but continued all his life the bitter enemy of Luther, was

in Ducal *Saxony:*

[1] The aim and structure of this document, the last of the Lutheran 'symbolical books,' will also be most fitly considered in Chap. III.

[2] Leo, pp. 330 sq., Gieseler, III. i. pp. 403 sq.

[3] Seckendorf, Lib. II. p. 101, col. 2.

[4] Its chief towns were Jena, Altenburg and Zwickau.

[5] Above, p. 48.

[6] See Ranke, *Ref.* II. 89. He mentions the following more distinguished refugees: Eberlin, Stiefel, Strauss, Seehofer, Ibach from Frankfurt; Bugenhagen from Pomerania; Kauxlorf from Magdeburg, Mustæus from Halberstadt.

GERMANY.

succeeded[1] by his brother, the evangelical duke Henry, father of the great Maurice. Leipzig, Dresden and other influential towns were then converted, and the union of the duchy and electorate under Maurice tended to decide the triumph of the new opinions.

in Hessen:

From Saxony the agitation spread into the neighbouring states of Philip, landgrave of Hessen, whom we have already seen[2] promoting its extension with characteristic ardour. The university which he inaugurated at Marburg was the center of all his operations, and after two years they may be said to have been completed by the 'synod' held at Homberg (Oct. **21, 1526**).

in Bavarian *Brandenburg:*

In the Franconian or Bavarian principalities of Brandenburg the progress of the reformation was obstructed for a time by the unfriendly bearing of the margrave Casimir. He died, however, in the Hungarian campaign, and his brother George, succeeding to his inheritance[3], commended and established the doctrines of Luther in the provincial diet of Anspach (March **1, 1528**). His name is accordingly found appended to the Augsburg Confession[4]. On the contrary, some years elapsed before the reformation was publicly accepted in the *Electorate* of Brandenburg[5]. The wife of Joachim I. by reason of her leaning to the new opinions was forced to leave her home and seek a shelter in Saxony. Her son, however (Joachim II.), followed in her steps; and with the co-operation of the bishop of Brandenburg, Matthias von Jagow, who proclaimed himself a convert, lost no time in urging all his subjects to cast off the papal yoke (**1539**).

in Electoral *Brandenburg:*

in Lüneburg:

Lüneburg, a still more northern principality, had thrown itself into the cause of Luther as early as **1527**; the ducal edict of that year having, in conformity with the voice of the diet of Scharnebeck[6], enforced an evangelic style of

[1] It is observable that when duke George became convinced of the importance of the Lutheran movement and its growth among his subjects, he endeavoured, chiefly through the help of George Wizel (above, p. 41, n. 2), to occupy a middle place between reformed and unreformed. Seckendorf, Lib. III. pp. 208 sq.

[2] Above, pp. 45, 52.

[3] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 506 sq. His chief advisers were Hans von Schwarzenberg and George Vogler (the chancellor).

[4] Above, p. 53, n. 1.

[5] Seckendorf, Lib. III. pp. 234 sq.

[6] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 514, 515. The dukes of Lüneburg (as we saw, p. 53,

GERMANY.

preaching, while it left the ritual of the church comparatively undisturbed.

and other northern states:

Mecklenburg, Holstein, and Pomerania, had preceded[1] Lüneburg, in their adhesion to the Lutherans, and a prince of Anhalt, counting on the hearty acquiescence of his people, actually subscribed the Augsburg Confession in **1530**[2].

In **1535**, a second group of minor states were animated by enough of zeal and courage to declare themselves adherents of the Schmalkaldic League[3]. Of these the most important was Würtemburg, where duke Ulric entered vigorously upon the work of reformation in **1534**[4].

in Würtemburg:

and in the Palatinate:

Another great accession to the ranks of Lutheranism was Frederic, the elector Palatine, who had for many years indeed encouraged the diffusion of the new opinions, but hesitated in his formal abjuration of the Roman pontiff till **1546**.

In the case of the Palatinate, however, as in that of some few others mentioned in the present summary, the ultimate character of the established creed was rather

n. 1) subscribed the Augsburg Confession; and, as a specimen of the earnestness with which they adhered to it, the following passage is extracted from the 'Vorrede' of their *Kirchen-Ordnung*, put forth by the authority of Julius, duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg in 1569, and reaffirmed in 1615: '...dass es ein öffentlich Gezeugniss seyn sol, dass wir nach abtrettung von den Bäpstischen Irrthümben vnd Missbreuchen, von dem alten, rechten, warhafftigen, Apostolischen, Catholischen, Christlichen Glauben, nicht abgefallen...dass wir alle Rotten vnd Secten, *Zwinglianer, Schwenckfeldianer, Wiederteuffer*, vnd wie sie mehr Namen haben mögen, so dem Wort Gottes, vnd vnserer Christlichen Confession zu wieder, *verwerffen*, vnd vns allein zu dem reinen vnuerfelschten Wort Gottes, vermöge angeregter Christlicher Augspurgischer Confession, in allen Artickeln bekennen:' p. x. Hannover, 1853.

[1] See Wigger's *Kirchengesch. Mecklenburgs*, Parchim, 1840. The chief preachers were Slüter and Wöllens. Holstein, though belonging to the German empire, had been influenced chiefly through the medium of Schleswig, on both of which see Münter, *Kirchengesch. von Dänemark*, III. 562 sq. With regard to Pomerania, where a beginning was made in Treptow by Bugenhagen as early as 1520, see Medem, *Gesch. der Einführung der evangel. Lehre in Pommern*, Greifswald, 1837.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Seckendorf gives the list, Lib. III. p. 98. It includes two dukes of Pomerania, two princes of Anhalt, and count William of Nassau.

[4] See Hartmann, *Gesch. der Reform. in Würtemberg*, Stuttgart, 1835. The principal agents were Brentz, Schnepf, and Blaaren. Some other states were not decisively impressed till 1542; *e. g.* the duchy of Brunswick Wolfenbüttel, the county-palatine of Neuburg, and the duchy of Cleves: see Gieseler, III. i. pp. 319, 320 (ed. Bonn): to which the margraviate of Baden may be added.

GERMANY.

Swiss than Saxon, and as such will be considered afterwards[1].

in Bavaria and Austria:

The duchy of Bavaria[2], and even districts of Austria[3], Styria, Carniola and Carinthia, felt the quickening impulses communicated at this period to the central members of the German empire, though in them the civil power was always adverse to the Lutheran movement, and therefore at the close of the sixteenth century it was effectually counteracted.

Yet other countries, lying on the different outskirts of the empire, took their place among the earliest and most zealous champions in the cause of reformation. For example, in the province of East Friesland, Lutheran opinions had in **1519** begun to generate a strong and healthy fermentation, which enlarged its compass till with scarcely any struggle it penetrated almost every corner and possessed itself of nearly every parish[4] (**1527**).

in East Friesland:

and in

Silesia, in like manner, was peculiarly docile and susceptible. The bishop of Breslau, John Thurso, who died in **1520**, had been a regular correspondent of Erasmus, and had also extended his admiration to the Wittenberg reformer[5]. During the episcopate of his successor (Jacob of Saltza), who inherited his genial spirit, one of Luther's pupils, named John Hess[6], availed himself of his position

[1] See Chapter III.

[2] Gieseler, III. i. p. 401, n. 15 (ed. Bonn). Against this province, which already possessed a stronghold of Romanism in the university of Ingolstadt, were directed the first energies of the Jesuits on their counter-reformation.

[3] Cf. above, p. 66.

[4] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 515, 516. In the year 1528, the East Frieslanders had already published a full confession of faith. *Ibid.* The final organization of the reformers was much indebted to the Polish ecclesiastic Laski (or, as he was often called, John à Lasco), who having been shaken by an interview with Zwingli in 1524, abandoned all his dignities at home (1537), and settled at Emden, the capital of Friesland. From 1543 to 1548, when the operations of the *Interim* (above, p. 62) drove him thence (finally in 1550 to England), he had taken a prominent part in regulating the ecclesiastical affairs of the East Frieslanders. During this interval he drew up a new confession of faith almost entirely on 'Swiss' principles, which gave great offence to numbers of his flock, and also to his 'Lutheran' correspondents. Krasinski, *Ref. in Poland*, I. 251 sq. Lond. 1838.

[5] Luther wrote a consolatory letter to him in the year of his death: Waddington, II. 74.

[6] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 517 sq.

GERMANY.

as a leading parish-priest at Breslau (**1523**), and after a few years was able to secure the peaceful triumph of the new religion.

Reasons of this progress.

This gigantic progress[1] in all classes of society, and almost every quarter of the empire, is alone explainable on the hypothesis that men were thirsting for instruction which they could no longer find among the priests and prelates of their neighbourhood. Unhallowed motives may have sometimes mingled with religious in impelling them to recognize the Lutheran dogmas, and occasionally selfish, base or worldly considerations may have swayed them altogether: yet when due allowance has been made on all these grounds the solemn fact remains indisputable,—that a spirit of devotion far exceeding aught that we can trace in previous centuries had now diffused itself in Germany, and that its yearnings found their only satisfaction in the views of Christianity propounded by the Wittenberg reformers.

Effect of Luther's writings:

Nothing had more powerfully contributed to this result than Luther's own productions. He had every quality of thought, of feeling and of style, that characterizes authors who are destined to impress and elevate the multitude: he was homely, practical, and always perfectly intelligible; while the cogency of his arguments, the force and eloquence of his appeals, and his convulsive earnestness, electrified in almost equal measure both his readers and his hearers. It has been calculated that in one year (**1523**) as many as 183 books were published in his name[2]. A second agency by which the new opinions were extensively circulated were the thoughtful lectures of Melanchthon. Wittenberg had grown into a kind of literary metropolis, and in the crowd of students who frequented the class-room of its chief professor might be seen not only Germans of all

of Melanchthon's lectures:

[1] Some idea can be formed of this rapidity by reflecting that in the years 1523 and 1524, the principles of the reformation had been generally welcomed in large and distant towns like Frankfort-on-the-Main, Magdeburg, Ulm, Strasburg, Hall (in Swabia), Nuremberg, Hamburg, Bremen, and Stettin: see Gieseler, III. i. pp. 122—125 (ed. Bonn).

[2] Panzer, as quoted by Ranke, *Ref.* II. 90, 91. In addition to these works of Luther, 215 were published in 1523 by other persons in favour of the reformation, while not more than 20 can be enumerated on the opposite side. From the same year are dated the first Lutheran 'hymns,' which produced an immense effect. Art also was enlisted in the same service. After Lucas Cranach went to live at Wittenberg, woodcuts of his more polemical pictures were frequently inserted in Luther's works.

GERMANY.

countries, from the Baltic to the Tyrol, but Poles, Hungarians, Transylvanians, Bohemians, Danes, French, English, and even Greeks and Italians[1]. Still it may be doubted if the masses would have been so speedily propitiated in favour of the new opinions, had not other agents emanating from a different quarter added an especial impulse. These were members of the mendicant brotherhoods, whom pontiff after pontiff[2] had invested with that freedom of speech and elasticity of organization which converted them into the aptest instruments for aiding to dethrone their patron. Immediately after the promulgation of the edict of Worms, we find a host of itinerant friars[3], Dominicans, Augustinians, and, most of all perhaps, Franciscans, ardently declaiming in the cause of Luther: the only effect of their expulsion from one town or village being to scatter seeds of Protestantism in many others far and wide. Such desultory efforts were at length, however, superseded and forbidden when the different states, as we have seen[4], completed each one for itself the organization of their new religious systems, and thus checked the menacing preponderance of democratical ideas which the course of Luther's movement had been tending to produce.

and of the mendicant itinerants.

It is impossible to ascertain exactly, or to state in general terms, how far the 'old religion' kept its ground in those parts of Germany where both the government and a majority of the people had accepted Lutheranism. Still if we may argue from the application of one single test,—the measure of resistance offered to the *Interim*,—the reformation must have always been more deeply rooted in the north than in the south.

[1] See the interesting revelation in Ratzeberger, *Handschr. Gesch. über Luther*, etc. ed. Neudecker, Jena, 1850, p. 80.

[2] *Middle Age*, pp. 231 sq.

[3] The *Augustinians* of Misnia and Thuringia, many of whom were Luther's personal friends, were the first to join his party, and we soon hear of zealous Augustinians preaching at Magdeburg, Osnabrück, Antwerp, Ratisbon, Nuremberg and other distant places (cf. Ranke, *Ref.* II. 74). Of the more distinguished *Franciscans* we may mention Brismann, Frederic Myconius, Conrad Kling and Ægidius Mechler, Eberlin of Günzburg, Henry of Kettenbach and Stephen Kempen. The *Dominicans* had an able representative in Bucer: cf. above, p. 27. The *Carmelites*, or fourth order of friars, yielded Eck's favourite pupil, Urban Regius (König); while from the order of the *Præmonstratensian* Canons issued one of the most active of the northern reformers, Bugenhagen.

[4] Above, p. 48.

PRUSSIA.

WE now pass onward to review the bursting forth of Luther's spirit into states and countries not included in the limits of the German empire. One of these was eastern Prussia, subject to Albert, margrave of Brandenburg, in his capacity of grand-master of the Teutonic order[1]. During his stay at Nuremberg, **1522**, he was impressed by the discourses of Osiander, and in the following year was ready to admit the Lutheran preachers into his own territory[2]. By their influence the bishop of Samland, George Polentz[3], the earliest prelate who manifested a decided leaning to the Wittenbergers, promoted an efficient reformation. In **1525** the progress of the new opinions was so great that when the country was converted into a secular dukedom, the entire population signified their cordial acquiescence, and rejoiced to rank themselves among the followers of Luther. A German liturgy was soon afterwards introduced, adhering as closely as might be to the ancient forms[4]; the convents were changed into hospitals; and by the help of *Postills*, or expository discourses on the Epistles and Gospels, regularly sent from Wittenberg, the doctrines of the clergy were kept in general harmony with each other, and also with the tenets advocated in the Lutheran metropolis. It was only when he planted the university of Königsberg (**1544**) that Albert made provision for the future independence of the Prussian Church[5].

[1] *Middle Age*, p. 215. The political status of the Order had been changed, however, by the 'peace of Thorn,' 1466, in virtue of which the western, or best, portion of their territory had passed into the hands of Poland, and even the remainder was held of the Polish king as feudal lord. This modified supremacy was only resigned as late as 1666, while Prussia was not erected into a kingdom until 1701.

[2] See above, p. 46, n. 1. The preachers sent were Brismann and Amandus.

[3] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 526. The other bishop, Erhardt von Queis, bp. of Pomezania, afterwards joined the movement. One of the best authorities for the early church-history of Prussia, both before and since the reformation, is Hartknoch's *Preuss. Kirchenhist.* Frankf. 1686.

[4] Ranke, *Ibid.* p. 532. We gather from the same source that owing to the continued prevalence of Slavonic dialects (cf. *Middle Age*, p. 240), it was necessary to appoint interpreters ('tolken') to help the German parish-priests, by rendering their sermons into the ancient language of the country.

[5] The reforming party in Prussia was greatly strengthened in 1548 by

PRUSSIA.

Polish, or Western Prussia[1], together with the minor states[2] of Curland and Livonia, gradually underwent a similar transformation, owing partly[3] to their frequent intercourse with Wittenberg, and partly to the favourable influence of the Polish sovereign, Sigismund Augustus, who by granting plenary freedom of religion to the towns of Dantzig, Thorn and Elbing had facilitated the triumph of the Protestant opinions (circ. **1560**).

DENMARK, NORWAY, AND ICELAND.

It was very natural for Albert, duke of Prussia, to ally himself by marriage with the royal family of Denmark, since in **1526** that country also had received the Lutheran preachers, and evinced its resolution to stand forth in their defence. Upon the dissolution of the union of Calmar[4], by which Denmark, Sweden and Norway had been formerly linked together, Frederic I. duke of Schleswig-Holstein, occupied the throne vacated by the tyrant, Christian II.[5]

the arrival of multitudes of Bohemian brethren, who were ordered under most severe penalties to leave their country within forty-two days (May 4, 1548). Duke Albert offered them an asylum in his states, whither they migrated under the guidance of Matthias Sionius, the chief of the whole community. Krasinski, *Ref. in Poland*, I. 149, 150. Lond. 1838. On the early influence of Königsberg, see *Ibid.* p. 158.

[1] This province had submitted to the Polish king Casimir III. to escape from the oppressions of the Teutonic knights: Krasinski, I. 111.

[2] See Tetsch, *Kurländ. Kirchengesch.* Riga, 1767. Luther had addressed a circular letter to reformers in Riga and the neighbourhood as early as August, 1523 (De Wette, II. 374).

[3] Dantzig, roused by the example of Knade (1518) and other preachers, took the lead in casting off the Mediæval superstitions. The archbishop of Gnesen, John Laski, tried in vain to soothe the agitation, which issued in acts of violence. Five churches were seized by the reforming party, and given to those who favoured Lutheranism (Krasinski, as before, I. 112 sq.). After proceeding to greater lengths the popular movement was repressed under Sigismund I. (*Ibid.* pp. 119 sq.) by a sanguinary counter-revolution (1526). But the check thus given to the reforming doctrines was of short duration (*Ibid.* pp. 124 sq.). Their revival was mainly due to Klein, a Dominican, who lived in Dantzig till 1546.

[4] On the subject of this union, which lasted from 1397 to 1524, see Miller, *Hist. philos. illustrated*, II. 357 sq. 3rd ed. The agent, who dissolved it and liberated his country, was Gustavus Vasa, on whose achievements see Geijer, *Hist. of the Swedes*, ch. VIII. translated by J. H. Turner, and a *History of Gustavus Vasa* (anonymous), Lond. 1852.

[5] He once affected to embrace the Reformation (see Münter, *Kirchengesch. von Dänemark und Norwegen*, III. 19 sq. Leipzig, 1833); but whatever may have been his personal belief (pp. 84 sq.), his efforts chiefly

DENMARK, NORWAY, AND ICELAND.

(1523). One of the severe conditions pressed on their new monarch by the Danish hierarchy, had required that he should by no means tolerate those 'heretics of Luther's school'[1], whose efforts seem to have already won for them a band of followers anxious to subvert or revolutionize the church-establishment. Accordingly, although the personal convictions of Frederic sided with the advocates of reformation, whom he openly favoured in his other territories, he was under the necessity of pausing ere his plans were carried out. Some progress, it is true, was made in August, **1524**, when he put forth an edict guaranteeing to his subjects in the duchy of Schleswig the liberty of choosing their own religion[2]: for the Lutherans, encouraged by this public manifestation of the royal sympathy, advanced with greater boldness in his new dominions. Jutland was the province where their tenets, planted first at Wiburg by John Tausen[3], yielded the most plenteous fruit. In **1526** the king himself was no longer able to disguise his predilections, but passed over to the side of the reformers: and in the follow-

aimed at the depression of the ecclesiastics. See the constitutions which he published for this purpose in 1521: *Ibid.* pp. 41 sq. At his invitation the theological faculty of Wittenberg had dispatched to Copenhagen (Dec. 1520) a reformer named Reinhard, whose discourses being for the most part unintelligible to the Danes, were interpreted by a Carmelite of Helsingor, Paul Eliä (*Ibid.* pp. 20, 26). This remarkable Carmelite afterwards quitted the reformers, and reverted, like Erasmus, to his old position (*Ibid.* p. 167), on the grounds stated by himself in the following extract: 'Ab initio iis (*i. e.* Protestantibus) favere visus est, quando res e carpendis tantum abusibus cœpta fuit: et ubi ab indulgentiarum abusibus (unde cœpta est omnis tragœdia) ad ipsas indulgentias tollendas, a sacerdotum abusibus ad exterminandum ipsum sacerdotium, a sacramentorum abusibus ad ipsa sacramenta evertenda, *breviter ad ipsum Christi nomen ex orbe delendum* res cœpit progredi, retrocessit.' Quoted, from his *Confutation* of the Danish Confession, by Münter, as above, p. 442, n.—Christian I. rendered further service to the reformation by promoting the translation of the New Testament, the work being done by two of his nobles, Michelsen and Pedersen (*Ibid.* p. 84, pp. 128 sq.).

[1] Münter, III. 145.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 565. The closing words are remarkable: 'sondern ein Jeder sich in seiner Religion also sollte verhalten, wie er's gegen Gott den Allmächtigen mit reinem Gewissen gedächte zu verantworten.'

[3] He was born in Fühnen (1494), and after studying at Louvain and Cologne proceeded to Wittenberg, where the lectures of Melanchthon determined him to advocate the Lutheran doctrines (*Ibid.* p. 74), after his return to his convent at Antworskow in 1521. From Jutland the reformation was propagated next in Malmöe (1527), which so alarmed the bishops that they wrote in search of coadjutors to the anti-Lutherans of Germany (*Ibid.* pp. 188—197).

DENMARK, NORWAY, AND ICELAND.

ing year a diet held at Odense endeavoured to adjust the controversy which had been excited, by granting liberty of conscience to adherents of both parties[1]. While the German Protestants were drawing up their first Apology (**1530**), the Danes put forth a kindred manifesto[2] in the diet of Copenhagen. It consisted of forty-three articles, embracing a plain summary of scriptural truths, especially as they were held to have been misconceived or undervalued during the Mediæval period. Frederic died April **10, 1533**, and left the task of carrying out his reformations to his son, Christian III. This monarch had some years before been brought under the personal influence of Luther[3] while travelling in Germany, and therefore when his struggles with the partizans of his youthful brother John, and also of his exiled predecessor, Christian II., had resulted in the triumph of his arms[4], he earnestly promoted the ascendancy of the new opinions. The higher clergy, who had joined his rivals, were imprisoned and despoiled of their temporalities[5]: and on the **12**th of August, Christian III., in order to proclaim his absolute adoption of Lutheranism, was crowned[6] by Bugenhagen, whom he fetched from Wit-

[1] *Ibid.* p. 207. The bishops, who might be consecrated in future, were forbidden to fetch the pallium from Rome, and the marriage of the monks and clergy was legalized.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 299. They were already in possession of the Schwabach and Torgau Articles (see above, pp. 52, 54, n. 2), which explains the partial resemblance of the two Confessions. Although the Danes did not include the aberrations of Zwingli or the Anabaptists in their present censures, they held fast the 'Lutheran' tenets on all controverted points: *e.g.* Art. XXVIII. on the Eucharist. See the entire series, as above, pp. 308—317, and the troubles it excited, pp. 336 sq. The Augsburg Confession was finally accepted by the Danish duchies in 1562, and by the kingdom of Denmark in 1569: *Ibid.* p. 305.

[3] He had attended the memorable diet of Worms with his accomplished tutor John Rantzau, both of whom were filled with admiration of the great reformer (Münter, *Ibid.* p. 146).

[4] *Ibid.* p. 435. The part of John was taken almost entirely by the clergy, in the hope of counteracting the known tendencies of his brother. The revival of the claims of Christian II. was due to the commercial jealousy of the people of Lübeck, who felt that both Sweden and Denmark under the new régime would interfere with the ascendancy of the 'Hanseatic league:' cf. Miller, III. 113, 115.

[5] Münter, *Ibid.* pp. 448 sq. Most of the canonries and prebends, owing to the intercession of Luther, were not confiscated. *Ibid.* p. 450. The prelates, with one exception, were afterwards set at liberty, on the understanding that they should not oppose the Reformation: p. 458.

[6] pp. 500 sq. Luther's remark is (De Wette, v. 88): 'Pomeranus

DENMARK, NORWAY, AND ICELAND.

tenberg for that purpose. Under the same auspices the reformation was diffused through every part of Denmark. 'Bishops,' or, more strictly speaking, superintendents[1], were established in the ancient sees; the university of Copenhagen was re-organized[2]; the Lutheran forms supplied a model for the new liturgical regulations, and in **1538** the name of Christian III. of Denmark was inscribed among the warlike Protestants who banded together at Schmalkald[3].

The kingdom of Norway, absorbed by Denmark in **1537**, evinced no general disposition to imitate the policy of Frederic, so long as she continued in possession of her ancient independence. Very slight impressions had been made upon the coast at Bergen[4], where correspondents of the Hanseatic league kept up some intercourse with northern Germany. But after the accession of Christian III. the archbishop of Drontheim and his powerful partizans were all compelled to bow before the Danish influence[5]. Some of the refractory prelates were violently handled, others signified their readiness to be divested of their temporal jurisdiction, and ultimately contributed to the establishment of Lutheranism[6], according to the forms received already in the dominant country.

Iceland, also, after some resistance, followed in this track, the chief of the reforming party being the youthful Gisser Einarsen[7], elected to the bishopric of Skalholt in

[*i.e.* Bugenhagen] adhuc est in Dania, et prosperantur omnia, quæ Deus facit per eum. Regem coronavit et Reginam, *quasi verus episcopus*.' Most of the ceremonial was adapted from the 'Pontificale Romanum.'

[1] These were 'consecrated' by Bugenhagen (Sept. 2, 1537): *Ibid.* pp. 502, 503. The government of the Danish church was in future carried on by twelve of these 'bishops,' of which six were established in Denmark, four in Norway, and two in Iceland: while in the two duchies of Schleswig and Holstein the Lutheran consistories were substituted for episcopacy.

[2] Among other things three divinity-professors were appointed to lecture on the Old and New Testament and the Fathers: pp. 476, 477.

[3] p. 512.

[4] Münter, as before, p. 372: cf. p. 157.

[5] For an account of the struggle, see, as before, pp. 515 sq.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 526.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 534 sq. He was examined by the professors at Copenhagen, confirmed by the king, and ordained as 'bishop' or superintendent at the age of twenty-five. The leader of the anti-reformation party was John Aresen, bp. of Holum, who after the death of Einarsen in 1548 excited

DENMARK, NORWAY, AND ICELAND.

1540. His German education, partly carried on at Wittenberg itself, prepared him for the work confided to his hands; and, aided by the countenance of Christian III., the revolution which he wrought in his own diocese was propagated in the other districts of the island.

In spite of brief reactions in the sixteenth century, and of more vigorous efforts stimulated chiefly by the Jesuits in the seventeenth, all these countries have maintained their strictly Lutheran character.

SWEDEN.

THE same events that gave to Frederic the supremacy of Denmark placed Gustavus Vasa on the neighbouring throne of Sweden[1] (June 7, **1523**). But years before his elevation the reforming doctrines had been scattered at Strengness, in his native country, by students fresh from Wittenberg (**1519**). The chief of these were two brothers, Olaf and Lawrence Peterson[2], who on the outbreak of a persecution designed to extirpate the modern 'heresy,' experienced the protection of Gustavus. A disputation[3] was

the populace to rebellion, and was executed at Skalholt, Nov. 7, 1550: pp. 542—547.

[1] Frederic I. put forth a claim to the allegiance of the Swedes, but met with no encouragement (Geijer's *Hist. of the Swedes*, by Turner, p. 107). The history of the reformation in Sweden has been written by Dr Anjou, bishop of Wisby, and translated by Dr Mason, New York, 1859.

[2] Anjou, pp. 70—75; Geijer, p. 110. Their first antagonist was Bishop Brask of Linköping, who procured a brief from pope Adrian VI. to authorise the forcible repression of Lutheranism. He speaks in 1523 of the tendency of the new movement as 'contra decreta Sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ ac ecclesiasticam libertatem ad effectum, ut status modernæ ecclesiæ *reducatur ad mendicitatem et statum ecclesiæ primitivæ*.' *Ibid.* n. 1. Notwithstanding his protests, Gustavus patronized the two reformers, making the elder of them chief pastor at Stockholm, and giving the latter a professorship of theology at Upsala. One of their distinguished followers, Lawrence Anderson of Strengness, was at the same time elevated to the chancellorship. To him the Swedes were indebted for a translation of the New Testament.

[3] The disputants were Olaf Petersen and doctor Galle, provost of Upsala. Although Gustavus maintained that the changes which he contemplated would have reference chiefly to external matters ('de ritibus quibusdam ab hominibus inventis, præsertim immunitate prælatorum ecclesiæ:' cf. Gieseler, III. i. p. 482, n. 2), it is quite obvious, from the present string of questions, that nearly all the main points of Lutheranism were already mooted (Geijer, p. 110, n. 2). For this reason the Danish theologian Eliä now attacked both Gustavus and Petersen with great vehemence: see Münter, as before, III. 243 sq.

subsequently held (Christmas, **1524**) in order to prepare the church in general for the changes contemplated by the court. In **1526** we find the king himself discoursing[1] from his saddle on the uselessness of Latin service, and suggesting the abolition of monastic orders. Soon afterwards, on learning that his measures would provoke a spirited resistance, he convened a diet in Westerås, and threatened to resign his sceptre[2]. All the representatives, alarmed at the remembrance of the old oppressions of Christian II., besought Gustavus to continue as their leader, and even granted him the power of occupying the castles and strongholds of the bishops and of settling the future incomes both of them and of their canons[3]. He next asserted his entire supremacy[4] in matters ecclesiastical, appropriated to the service of the crown a large fraction of the clerical revenues, suppressed the monasteries[5], and restraining some of the extreme adherents of Lutheranism[6] as well as of the Mediæval tenets, organized the Swedish church in nearly the same form as that which we have seen adopted by Christian III. of Denmark. Lawrence Peterson, a preacher of moderate views, was made the 'archbishop' of Upsala: and in a second diet[7] held at Westerås in **1544**, the re-

[1] Geijer, p. 114.

[2] Geijer, pp. 115 sq.; Anjou, p. 192. There were present four bishops, of whom Brask was one. Alluding more especially to him Gustavus asked, Who would be the king of such mere creatures of the pope? (p. 117.)

[3] Geijer, p. 118; Anjou, pp. 202, 203. Another point conceded was, that preachers should have liberty to proclaim the pure word of God; and although the representatives of the burghers, miners and peasants, indicated little or no sympathy with this decree, or with the Lutheran movement generally, the barons added to the phrase 'pure word of God,' 'but not uncertain miracles, human inventions and fables, as hath been much used heretofore.'

[4] *E.g.* He did not scruple to adjudicate in spiritual causes, and he appointed and deposed ecclesiastics simply on his own authority. Two bishops whom he had deposed in 1523 retired to the Dales, and excited a rebellion (*Hist. of Gustavus*, as above, p. 118 sq.) They were eventually executed at Upsala, Feb. 1527. *Ibid.* p. 125.

[5] Geijer, p. 119.

[6] *E. g.* He advocated the retention of nearly all the ancient service-books and ceremonial, at least until the people could be better instructed in the elements of Christianity (*Ibid.* pp. 119, 125, 168); and this course was chosen by the clergy in a synod held at Oerebro in 1529. On their proceedings, which Geijer omits, see Baaz, *Inventarium Eccl. Suco-Gothorum*, pp. 239, Lincop. 1642; Anjou, pp. 255—262.

[7] Geijer, 127. In 1539 the king had grown dissatisfied with some of the superior clergy, and seemed desirous of substituting Presbyterianism

SWEDEN.

formation as moulded by his influence was at length established everywhere in Sweden. But changes based so generally upon the royal fiat were not likely to be carried out in peace, especially among a people, who have been with justice designated 'Frenchmen of the North.' Gustavus therefore had to quell a very formidable insurrection, headed by the peasant Nils Dacke and inflamed in East and West-Gothland by reactionary priests[1] (**1537—1543**). The reign of the distempered and ill-fated Eric[2], deposed in **1569** and ultimately poisoned, had been marked by no fresh phases in the aspect of the Swedish Church, excepting what may have been silently produced by his devotion to the Calvinistic tenets: but no sooner was the monarchy transmitted to his brother, than the ashes of extinguished controversies were all lighted up afresh. John was married to a Polish princess, who zealously adhered to the hereditary faith. He was moreover always fond of studying ancient literature[3], and longed to see the pictures which his warm imagination drew of early Fathers and of primitive Christianity displayed in actual life. Impelled by these ideas he arranged a new liturgy for Sweden (**1576**) in such a manner as to justify suspicions of his tenderness for Mediæval doctrines[4]. Anxious to propitiate the papacy on

in the place of the Episcopal form of government. George Norman, recommended to him by Melanchthon, was appointed as inspector-general of the whole clerical order (Geijer, p. 125; Anjou, p. 299). Sweden has, however, continued to be governed by an archbishop and thirteen bishops, on whose consecration see Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, I. 297, 298, 3rd ed., and especially the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for 1861.

[1] Geijer, pp. 125, 126.

[2] pp. 145 sq.; Anjou, p. 370. On his proposals for the hand of our Queen Elizabeth, see Geijer, p. 141. He was stimulated by Burrey, a French Calvinist, formerly his tutor.

[3] He had leisure for these studies during his imprisonment, which commenced Aug. 12, 1563. Of modern writers none struck him so much as the conciliatory Belgian, George Cassander (Geijer, p. 166; Anjou, p. 440), whose *Consultatio de Articulis Religionis inter Catholicos et Protestantes controversis* he afterwards (1577) caused to be printed at Stockholm.

[4] Cf. on these subjects Ranke, *Hist. of the Popes*, II. 83–87. Lond. 1841. The Liturgy of king John is in both Swedish and Latin. It was drawn up (according to Geijer, p. 160) by himself and his secretary, Peter Fechten, on the plan of the missal authorized by the Council of Trent, but with sundry omissions and modifications. It was published with a preface by the new archbishop, and as his work. One other bishop had also sanctioned it already, and at the diet of 1577 it was very generally

SWEDEN.

political[1] as well as on religious grounds, he did not scruple to dispatch an envoy to the court of Gregory XIII.[2], and even entrusted certain Jesuits[3] whom he invited from the Netherlands with the management of a college he had lately founded in Stockholm. In **1578** an able and accomplished member of that order, Anthony Possevin[4], arrived in Sweden for the purpose of completing what he hoped would prove the 'reconciliation' of the whole country. Lawrence Peterson, the venerable archbishop of Upsala, had died five years before this crisis (Oct. **1573**), and had been succeeded by a man of very different principles, Lawrence Peterson Gothus[5], his son-in-law, and no less willing than was the king to surrender the distinctive dogmas of the Lutherans for the sake of outward unity with Christendom at large. But exactly when all things favoured the belief that Sweden would ere long be subjected afresh to the dominion of the Roman pontiff, the capricious monarch suddenly changed his course and persecuted those whom he had recently caressed. Owing either to the efforts of the Protestants of other countries, or to the stiffness of the pope himself in holding back con-

adopted, not however without provoking a decided opposition from the bishops of Linköping and Strengness. The former of these was afterwards stripped of his episcopal vestments in his own cathedral for calling the pope Antichrist.

[1] Ranke, as above, p. 82.

[2] He actually requested that the pope would institute prayers throughout the whole world for the restoration of 'the catholic religion.' Among the conditions under which this change was to be wrought, he stipulated that the Eucharistic service should be in Swedish, that the laity should communicate in both kinds, and that no claims should be made by the ecclesiastics on those church-estates that had been confiscated: Geijer, p. 169.

[3] Their own account is still extant, and is used by Geijer. Two of their number arrived from Louvain in 1576, giving themselves out as evangelical preachers, and quoting the reformers as their own. The king ordered all the clergy of Stockholm to attend their public lectures, and himself took part in theological disputations, where the adversary of the pope was generally worsted. 'Progreditur tamen pater,' says the narrative, 'quotquot auditores veniant, insinuat se in familiaritatem aliquorum, nunc hunc, nunc illum, *dante Deo*, ad fidem occulte reducit:' p. 168, n. 4.

[4] Ranke, pp. 84, 85; Anjou, pp. 509 sq.

[5] After his nomination he subscribed seventeen articles, in which the restoration of the convents, the veneration of saints, prayers for the dead, and the reception of the Mediæval ceremonies were approved. He was then consecrated (1575) with great pomp: Geijer, pp. 167, 168.

SWEDEN.

cessions without which there was no prospect of conciliating the acquiescence of the Swedes, a second mission of the Jesuit Possevin resulted in his absolute discomfiture[1]. His colleagues were compelled to leave the country; and on the death of queen Catharine (**1583**) scarcely any vestige of the late reaction could be traced except in the perverse determination[2] of the king to force his own Romanizing liturgy on his unwilling subjects. It was formally revoked[3], however, in the famous 'Kirk-mote' held at Upsala in **1593** under the auspices of his brother Charles, duke of Südermanland; at which period also the Augsburg Confession[4] was solemnly adopted as the standard of Swedish orthodoxy, to the absolute exclusion of all other symbols.

POLAND.

Attention has been drawn already[5] to the progress of the Lutheran tenets in the western provinces of Poland. Their reception in those provinces had been facilitated by the influence of the Hussites, who, as we have seen[6], existed in considerable force, at least until the middle of the fifteenth century. The fermentation they produced was afterwards revived by the migration of a host of refugees whom Ferdinand extruded from Bohemia in **1548**. Owing to their close relationship and cognate language, these

[1] Ranke, p. 86. It is not improbable that the failure of some political schemes in which he had calculated on the papal co-operation may have tended to produce this sudden estrangement. This much is certain, that he issued a proclamation threatening to banish every Romanizer, and that some of the converts were very roughly handled: Geijer, p. 169.

[2] See Geijer, p. 170. 'Priests who refused to follow it were deposed, incarcerated, and driven into exile.'

[3] The Service-book introduced by Lawrence Peterson was now stamped with synodical authority, and Luther's short Catechism became again the recognized manual of instruction: Geijer, p. 184.

[4] Geijer, p. 184; Anjou, p. 594. Notwithstanding the bias of the duke himself in favour of Calvinism, the bishops and others who were present on this occasion proved their 'orthodoxy' by denouncing the followers of Zwingli and Calvin by name (*Ibid.* p. 185). When Charles afterwards ascended the throne (1599), he continued to labour hard in his study with the hope of reconciling the Lutheran and Calvinistic Formularies (*Ibid.* pp. 201 sq.), but was ultimately driven to confirm the Augsburg Confession in a royal assurance given at Upsala (March 27, 1607). His liberal spirit was, however, transmitted to his son, Gustavus Adolphus, the religious hero of the Thirty Years' War.

[5] Above, p. 74. [6] *Middle Age*, p. 410.

POLAND.

Bohemians were enabled to disperse[1] 'reforming' tenets far more widely than their German fellow-workers. Still a party tinctured with the Lutheran principles[2] had formed themselves into a secret society at Cracow long before the death of Sigismund I. (**1548**). The members of it were distinguished by their rank and learning; but the licence of their speculations very soon divided them from each other and propelled the more adventurous into wild and deadly errors. It was only after the accession of Sigismund Augustus (**1548**) that Protestantism according to its genuine form obtained a wider circulation among the Poles. This monarch was himself a fautor at least of the new opinions[3], and during his reign of four-and-twenty years they penetrated into all orders of society in spite of the most resolute opposition[4]. Their progress was, however,

[1] Krasinski, I. 336 sq.

[2] The Italian, Francis Lismanini, provincial of the order of Franciscans and confessor to Queen Bona, was the leading spirit of this club. He possessed a large library of anti-Romish books. Some of his fellow-members are enumerated by Krasinski, *Ref. in Poland*, I. 138 sq. At one of their meetings where religious subjects were discussed with the greatest freedom, a priest of Belgium, named Pastoris, to the horror of some others, attacked the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which had already been impugned elsewhere by Servetus. Hence the origin in Poland of the sect misnamed Socinians (*Ibid.* p. 140).

[3] In 1549 Calvin dedicated to him the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, urging him to proceed with the work of the Reformation: 'Agedum ergo, magnanime Rex, faustis Christi auspiciis, curam cum regia tua celsitudine, tum heroica virtute dignam suscipe; ut æterna Dei veritas, qua et Ejus gloria, et hominum salus continetur, quacunque imperium tuum patet, jus suum Antichristi latrocinio ereptum recuperet.' Laski, the Polish ecclesiastic (see above, p. 70, n. 4), on his return to his native country (Dec. 1556), repeated these exhortations, and strengthened them by letters from Melanchthon, and by presenting (a modified form of) the Augsburg Confession. The king, however, seemed unwilling to act decisively until the reformers could agree among themselves (Krasinski, I. 275): but still shewed his bias by appointing men who favoured the reformation to the vacant bishoprics (p. 414).

[4] This evinced its power especially in the synod of Petrikow (1551), where Hosius, bishop of Varmia (Ermland), who afterwards introduced the Jesuits into Poland (*Ibid.* pp. 406 sq.), advocated the most bitter persecution (*Ibid.* pp. 172 sq.): see his own *Confessio Catholicæ Fidei* at the beginning of his *Works*, Colon. 1584, and cf. Krasinski, I. 400 sq. On the contrary, the Polish diet which assembled in the following year manifested a decided leaning to the Protestants (pp. 186 sq.). But these afterwards suffered much by the secession of their champion Orzechowski (Orichovius), formerly a student at Wittenberg, who, 1559, after several oscillations, finally reverted to the Roman Catholic Church (*Ibid.* p. 198).

POLAND.

somewhat checked when at the death of Sigismund Augustus the crown of Poland became simply elective, and her sovereigns, mostly drawn from other countries, threw their weight into the Romish scale. At first indeed this change was scarcely sensible, the Transylvanian prince, Stephen Bathori[1], who was elevated to the throne in **1575**, proclaiming himself the friend of religious toleration: yet in the following reign of Sigismund III. crown-prince of Sweden[2] (**1587—1632**), his devotion to the Mediæval principles inherited from a Polish mother and his Romanizing father John, had strengthened the reactionary movement, which by gaining over the nobility and educational establishments resulted in the overthrow of Protestantism. Sigismund was materially assisted in this work by the untiring efforts of the Jesuits. But their triumph is perhaps still more attributable to the conflicts which distracted and disabled their opponents. During the brief interregnum that followed the death of Sigismund Augustus, the Polish diet resolved (Jan. **6**, **1573**) to maintain a reciprocal indulgence of all religious factions in the state, uniting, in a spirit of complete impartiality, to treat them all as 'Dissidents[3],' not because they had departed from some authorized doctrines, but merely as an indication that they disagreed among themselves. These 'Dissidents,' however, included not only the Romish party, and the three phases of 'orthodox' Protestantism, the Saxon, Swiss, and Bohemian (vulgarly called 'Waldensian'), but also a large body of 'Socinians[4],' many of them being Poles by nation, and

[1] The brief reign of Henry of Valois had intervened, extending only to four months of 1574. On the reign of Stephen, see Krasinski, II. 43 sq. Miller (*Phil. Hist.* III. 108) quotes him as saying that 'the Deity had reserved three things to Himself, the power of creating, the knowledge of futurity, and the government of the consciences of men.' He was, notwithstanding, a patron of the Jesuits, and founded, chiefly for them and their disciples, the university of Vilna (Krasinski, II. 53), besides winking at their persecution of the Protestants, pp. 58 sq.

[2] See Geijer, *Hist. of the Swedes*, p. 165: Krasinski, II. 91, 92. The reaction is again visible in the proceedings of the Romish synod held at Gnesen in 1589, where the most ultramontane principles are reaffirmed, with the sanction of pope Sixtus V. (*Ibid.* II. 96, 97).

[3] See *Jura et Libertates Dissidentium in Religione Christiana in Regno Poloniæ*, etc. pp. 7 sq. Berol. 1708, and Krasinski, II. 11 sq. The name 'Dissidents' subsequently meant 'Dissenters,' or sectaries distinct from the religious body authorized by the state.

[4] Cf. above, p. 83, n. 2, and below, chap. v. Lælius Socinus (the

POLAND.

the remnant refugees whose errors were not tolerated in the other parts of Europe. When the anti-Trinitarians began to celebrate their worship in several of the principal districts, Rakow[1] serving them as a metropolis, the indignation of all the Christian bodies turned against them; and it may have been the general feeling of alarm excited by their progress that induced the jarring confraternities of the reformers to neglect their minor quarrels and negotiate a peace. This object had in truth been gained already[2] by two of the contending parties, the Swiss and the Bohemians; and after some anxious correspondence[3] with the 'school of Wittenberg,' the Polish Lutherans yielded to the representations of the rest and were included in their union by the 'Consensus[4]' of Sandomir (April **14, 1570**). But notwithstanding the pacification thus effected,

elder Socinus) visited Poland in 1551, and appears to have determined Lismanini in favour of anti-Trinitarianism (Krasinski, I. 279). Soon afterwards (1556), Peter Goniondzki (Gonesius) openly asserted this heresy, combining with it a denial of infant baptism, which he also treated as a 'development' (p. 347). Others (many of them foreigners) followed in his steps (pp. 350 sq.). The 'Swiss' school of Reformers solemnly condemned these errors in 1563 (p. 359), but still their authors (called Pinczovians from the town of Pinczow where they flourished) were able to keep their ground. A few years later they divided among themselves, one party advocating 'Arianism,' the other naked 'Socinianism.' Faustus Socinus, nephew of Lælius, settled in Cracow (1579). His errors were embodied in the *Rakovian Catechism* composed by Smalcius and Moskorzewski, and published first in Polish (1605): *Ibid.* II. 357 sq.

[1] On its great importance as a school, see, as before, pp. 380 sq. It was, however, abolished in 1638, and in 1658 the Socinians were expelled from Poland by an edict of the diet.

[2] At the synod of Kozminek (1555); *Ibid.* I. 342, 343.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 368 sq.

[4] See the document, as confirmed by a subsequent meeting held at Vlodislav in 1583 (Niemeyer, *Confess. Eccl. Reform.* pp. 551 sq. and the editor's *Pref.* pp. lxix. sq.). On the doctrine of the Eucharist, which was a turning-point in their disputes, the following is their definition: 'Deinde vero quantum ad infelix illud dissidium de Cœna Domini attinet, convenimus in sententia verborum Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ut illa orthodoxe intellecta sunt a Patribus, ac inprimis Irenæo, qui duabus rebus, scilicet terrena et cœlesti, hoc mysterium constare dixit: Neque elementa signave nuda et vacua illa esse asserimus, sed simul reipsa credentibus exhibere et præstare fide, quod significant: Denique ut expressius clariusque loquamur, convenimus, ut credamus et confiteamur substantialem præsentiam Christi non significari duntaxat, sed vere in Cœna eo vescentibus repræsentari, distribui et exhiberi Corpus et Sanguinem Domini symbolis adjectis ipsi rei, minime nudis, secundum Sacramentorum naturam.' Cf. Krasinski, I. 381 sq.

POLAND.

there was still no cordial sympathy between the Saxon and the Swiss reformers. The divergences, which we shall trace at length hereafter in their fundamental principles, were fatal to all schemes for binding them together. As early as **1578** the Lutherans of Lithuania, who as Germans had a strong affection for the Augsburg definitions, laboured hard to dissolve[1] the union of Sandomir. Other machinations countenanced by eminent divines in Germany were set on foot with the same object, and although the spirit of dissension was occasionally checked[2] and softened, it could never be extinguished. The chief energy of both these parties was expended in unseemly acrimony, instead of wrestling with the errors of the anti-Trinitarian or the Romanist[3].

BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA.

The close affinity between the principles[4] of Huss and Luther would naturally promote an interchange of friendly offices among the schools which they had founded. Some of the Calixtines or Utraquists, who maintained a separate existence notwithstanding the occasional absorption of members of their confraternity into the Latin Church[5], had opened a correspondence with the Wittenbergers as early as **1519**; and although their doctrines did not seem entirely unexceptionable, Luther offered them the right hand of Christian fellowship[6]. He had still, however, no

[1] Krasinski, II. 77.

[2] As by the synod of Vlodislav mentioned in p. 85, n. 4. Several of the fresh discussions had reference to the way in which the outward and inward parts of sacraments are connected with each other. *Ibid.* II. 83 sq.

[3] One of the last attempts to draw them more nearly to each other was in the *Colloquium Charitativum* held at Thorn in 1645 (*Ibid.* II. 245 sq.: Niemeyer, pp. 669 sq.): but the theological faculty of Wittenberg dissuaded the Lutheran nobles of Poland from taking part in it, on the ground that the Confessions of the two great parties were incompatible.

[4] See above, p. 24, and n. 1: and *Middle Age*, p. 410, n. 6.

[5] *Middle Age*, pp. 409 sq.

[6] Ranke mentions notwithstanding, that the more rigorous section of them were hostile to Luther in 1526, when Ferdinand, on his election to the throne of Bohemia, gave full efficacy to the *Compactata* (see *Middle Age*, p. 409, n. 2). Still the number of the Lutheranized Calixtines was very considerable, and one effect of the Reformation was to draw them far more closely to the Brethren. Some of them eventually united them-

sympathy with 'Picards' (the Moravians, or United Brethren), stamping them as little better than heretics on account of their theory touching the manner of Christ's presence in the Eucharist[1] (**1520**). But two years later he saw cause to moderate his condemnation of them[2], and finally assisted in completing what he deemed the minor imperfections of their creed. In **1532** they published with the sanction of himself and other Wittenberg divines a formal statement of their tenets[3] in the shape of an *Apology* addressed to George, margrave of Brandenburg, which was followed in **1535** by the presentation of a regular *Confession* of faith to Ferdinand, king of Bohemia[4]. So decided were the leanings of this country in favour of the Reformation, that in **1546** an army of volunteers arrayed themselves upon the side of the elector of Saxony as he embarked in the Schmalkaldic war[5]. Accordingly, the overthrow of the Protestants entailed on them a series of most bitter persecutions. All who recognized the title 'Brethren' were ejected from Bohemia by a royal edict (May **4**, **1548**), and to the number of a thousand proceeded through Poland and Silesia in quest of the asylum granted them by Albert, duke of Prussia[6]. In the mean-

selves with the Swiss Confession. See the extracts in Gieseler, III. pt. i. pp. 444, 445.

[1] *Middle Age*, p. 410, n. 1, and Luther's *Schriften*, XIX. 554 sq., where he speaks of these Brethren as heterodox on other points as well ('etliche mehr Ketzerstück haben'): cf. also XIX. 1593 sq.

[2] The following characteristic passage occurs in a letter to Spalatinus (July 4, 1522; De Wette, II. 217): 'Picardi apud me legatos habuerunt, de fide sua consulentes. Inveni ferme omnia sana, nisi quod obscura phrasi et barbara utuntur pro Scripturæ phrasi. Deinde quæ me movent, sunt, quod, parvulorum baptismum nullius fidei et fructus asserunt, et tamen eos baptizant [cf. *Middle Age*, p. 294, n. 3], et rebaptizant ad se venientes ex nostris; deinde septem sacramenta ponunt. Nam cœlibatus sacerdotalis inter eos placet, cum non necessarium faciant, sed liberum. Adeo nusquam est in orbe puritas Evangelii. An et fidei et operum sanam habeant sententiam, nondum liquet, valde enim dubito: de Eucharistia nihil falsum video, nisi fallant verbis, sic nec de baptismo.'

[3] To this Luther himself wrote a preface (Walch, XIV. 306). On its literary history, see Niemeyer, *Confess. Eccl. Reform.* Præf. pp. XXXVI. sq., and Gieseler, III. pt. i. 440, n. 4.

[4] Printed in Niemeyer, as above, pp. 771 sq. Subsequently (1542), a deputation of them visited Luther, and completed this religious alliance. They were headed by George Israel, a pastor of great eminence, who afterwards, while in Poland, contributed largely to the establishment of the *Consensus Sendomiriensis*: see above, p. 85.

[5] See above, p. 61. [6] Above, p. 73, n. 5.

BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA.

time a majority of the Calixtines who were not included in this persecution grew dissatisfied with the imperfect freedom[1] which had been conceded to their forefathers. They determined to assume the standing-ground of Protestants, in spite of vigorous efforts of the Jesuits[2], who attempted by all possible means to isolate them, with the hope of thus facilitating their 'conversion.' In conformity with precedents already shewn in Poland[3], they now effected a religious union with the remnant of Bohemian Brethren, presenting the *Confession*[4] by which it had been ratified to Maximilian II. in **1575**, and subsequently in **1608** to Rudolph II. But although the pressure of political difficulties occasionally enabled them to wring concessions[5] from the imperial government, the influence of the counter-reformation party, and especially the machinations of the Jesuits, prevailed ere long in banishing every one of them who had the courage to avow his principles (**1627**). The author of this sentence was Ferdinand II.[6], who with equal rigour extirpated Protestantism, wherever he was able, from the rest of his dominions.

HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA.

Owing partly to the links of intercommunication furnished by 'Waldenses[7],' or, in later times, Bohemian brethren,

[1] The *Compactata*, as above, p. 86, n. 6.

[2] These had entered the country as early as 1552; see Balbinus, *de Rebus Bohem.* Lib. v. c. 12, and *The Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia* (anonymous), (Lond. 1845), I. 73 sq. The College called the 'Clementinum' was organized for them by the learned Canisius. At first they captivated the people by professing that their main object was to teach the sciences gratis.

[3] In the *Consensus Sendomiriensis:* above, p. 85.

[4] Printed in Niemeyer, as above, pp. 819 sq. The subscription to the *Epistola Dedicatoria* is as follows: 'Barones, Nobiles, Pragenses, et reliquæ civitates omnium trium Statuum regni Bohemici sub utraque communicantium;' the *three* Estates being the Saxons, Swiss and Bohemian Brethren: cf. *The Reformation, &c. in Bohemia*, I. 105 sq.

[5] *e.g.* A perfect religious equality was granted them in 1609, but the grant was soon rescinded.

[6] See Schiller, *Thirty Years' War*, pp. 60 sq. Lond. 1847; and in greater detail, *The Reformation, &c. in Bohemia*, I. 256 sq. His plans were formed in early life, while he was a pupil of the Jesuits at Ingolstadt.

[7] About 1315 we find as many as 80,000 Waldenses in Hungary: *Hist. of the Protestant Church in Hungary*, translated by Craig (Lond. 1854),

HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA.

partly to the force of national sympathy among the numerous Saxon colonists who had been planted for some years in Hungary and Transylvania, both of these distant regions felt the impulse of the Lutheran movement at a very early stage[1]. In spite of bloody persecutions instigated by the members of the hierarchy, the reformers were enabled to gain complete ascendancy in several towns and districts[2]. Many of the youths who flocked for education to the German universities had found their way to Wittenberg[3], and nearly all of them on their return attempted to diffuse the principles which they had learned from Luther and his colleagues[4]. After the defeat and death of Louis II. of Hungary in **1526**[5], the right of succession was vigorously disputed[6] by Ferdinand I. and John Zápolya, voyvode of Transylvania, both of whom endeavoured to secure the co-operation of the bishops by denouncing the promoters of religious change[7]. But, favoured by the long continuance of the civil war and the comparative impunity which it afforded, Lutheran tenets never ceased to root themselves more deeply in all quarters and in minds of every class. In Hermannstadt and other towns of Transylvania where the monks had clamoured for the execution of the penal

p. 16. Their descendants in Upper Hungary, Transylvania, Moldavia, and Wallachia were called Hussites, and their numbers were in all probability augmented by the followers of Huss (*Ibid.* pp. 18 sq.), with whom they had a manifest affinity.

[1] Merchants of Hermannstadt imported some of Luther's books, which they purchased at Leipzig fair, into Transylvania as early as 1521: and in the same year, George Szákmáry, archbishop of Grán, ordered a condemnation of similar books to be read from the pulpits of the principal churches of Hungary (*Ibid.* p. 33). Severe edicts were also issued against Lutheranism in 1523 and 1525, by the influence of other prelates: see Kibini, *Memorabilia Augustanæ Confessionis in Regno Hungariæ*, etc. I. 10 sq.

[2] Among other favourers was queen Mary, who had listened to the arguments of her chaplain, John Henkel: *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, p. 30. As usual, the preaching friars were efficient auxiliaries (*Ibid.* p. 36).

[3] See the list, as before, p. 38.

[4] To them is due the foundation of the flourishing High School at Oedenberg (*Ibid.* pp. 71, 95).

[5] See above, p. 47.

[6] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 476 sq. Among the supporters of Ferdinand was Peter Perényi, the first reforming magnate in Hungary. *Ibid.* p. 479.

[7] *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, pp. 42 sq. Ferdinand, in his edict given at Ofen, Aug. 20, 1527, complains that even Anabaptists and Sacramentarians (Zwinglians) were gaining ground.

HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA.

edicts, they were driven from their cloisters and threatened with death itself if they persisted in refusing to 'live according to the Gospel[1].' One of the more active propagandists in that region was John Honter[2], who on his return from Switzerland in **1533** established a printing-office at Cronstadt, and by it as well as by his exhortations from the pulpit laboured to disseminate the new opinions. In the meantime Hungary was profiting by the discourses of Matthew Devay[3], a favourite pupil of the Wittenberg reformers. He published in **1533** a Magyar translation of the Epistles of St Paul[4], which was followed three years later by a version of the Gospels; and in other ways contributed effectually to the enlightenment and moral exaltation of his countrymen. It seems that in the early part of the unbroken reign of Ferdinand (**1540—1564**), this influential reformer (called 'the Luther of Hungary') abandoned his original views[5] respecting the nature of the Presence in the Eucharist, and joined the standard of the Swiss (circ. **1544**). Chiefly in consequence of his defection, all the miserable altercations we have traced elsewhere had reappeared among his converts. The arguments of Lutheran polemics on the one hand, and the fulminations of the diet of Presburg on the other, strove in vain to check

[1] *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, p. 49. The monks and nuns either left the place, or laid aside the dress of their order in eight days.

[2] Gieseler, III. pt. i. p. 463: *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, p. 59.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 50 sq. He was more than once imprisoned before his second visit to Wittenberg (1536) and his ultimate establishment in the district between the Raab and the Balaton lake (1537).

[4] *Ibid.* p. 52. The whole of the New Testament appeared soon afterwards in Magyar (*Ibid.* pp. 58, 59), and in Croatian as early as 1562 (*Ibid.* p. 77).

[5] He had cordially accepted the Augsburg Confession in 1536: *Ibid.* Another of the waverers was the count Francis von Reva, who corresponded with Luther on this matter, and received his reply dated Wittenberg, Aug. 4, 1539: *Ibid.* pp. 56, 57. In proof of different tendencies five of the leading cities of Upper Hungary on this side of the Theiss were ready to avow their old devotion to Lutheranism, by drawing up (in 1549) the *Confessio Pentapolitana*, which is a mere extract from that of Augsburg, as modified by Melanchthon. It is printed at length in Ribini, as above, I. p. 78 sq. The earlier synod of Erdöd, held in 1545, is claimed by both parties: *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, pp. 61, 62. In 1563 party-spirit raged even more fiercely at the synod of Tarczal (*Ibid.* pp. 80, 81), and later in the century instigated the Wittenbergers to expel from their University no less than twenty-five Hungarian students who would not sign the *Formula Concordiæ* (cf. above, p. 67): *Ibid.* p. 107.

HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA.

the innovations of the 'Sacramentarians[1].' A rupture between the two Confessions grew inevitable; and after the middle of the sixteenth century, if we except the German residents, a great majority of the Hungarian reformers had evinced their bias for the Calvinistic dogmas. Their *Confessio Czengerina*[2] (drawn up at Csenger in **1557** or **1558**) is strongly marked by such peculiarities, while in **1566** they openly united themselves with the Swiss school[3].

It was different in the province of Transylvania, where Saxons formed the chief ingredient of the population. After the death of John Zápolya (**1540**), his widow, mainly through the favour of the Turks, succeeded in establishing the claims of her son who was a minor; and on finding that the reformation-party had become politically superior to their adversaries, granted like religious privileges to that class of them who recognized the Augsburg Confession[4] (**1557**). Similar concessions were at length extended to the Transylvanian followers of the Swiss. Nor was the toleration of the prince John Sigismund restricted to these three varieties of 'orthodox' Christianity. He afterwards included among 'authorized religions' that propounded by the anti-Trinitarians of Poland[5], who on failing to establish their principles in Hungary[6] retired into Transylvania[7], and infected nearly all the inhabitants of Clausenburg. Accordingly, as soon as the Jesuits were let loose on this divided province, under the patronage of Stephen

[1] They were as usual classed with Anabaptists: see Ribini, on the diet of Presburg, I. 70.

[2] Printed in Niemeyer, pp. 539 sq. On the mistakes of Bossuet respecting it, see Niemeyer's *Pref.* p. lxix. It is still the common Confession of the Reformed Hungarians.

[3] The Helvetic Confession which they now embraced had been printed at Torgau in 1556, and was already laid before a Convention of ministers at Débrécsin, in 1558: *Prot. Church in Hungary*, pp. 69, 85.

[4] The following extract from the royal edict is given by Gieseler from Benkö's *Transsilvania* (Vindebon. 1778): 'Ecclesias quoque Hungaricas in religione *cum Saxonibus idem sentientes* regina sub patrocinium recipit, et ministris illarum justos proventus integre reddi et administrari mandaturam se promittit.'

[5] See above, p. 84; and cf. Paget's *Hungary and Transylvania*, II. 502, Lond. 1839.

[6] Ribini, as before, I. 204 sq.

[7] An Italian, Blandvater, was their chief, and a synod held at Wardein openly repudiated the doctrine of the Holy Trinity: *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, p. 86.

HUNGARY AND TRANSYLVANIA.

Bathori[1] king of Poland (**1579**), they began to reap considerable harvests, and would probably have been still more successful, had they not been forcibly expelled[2] by a decree of December **16, 1588.** Their efforts at the same conjuncture were especially concentrated on the neighbouring states of Hungary[3], and with the old results.

SPAIN.

It was natural that a movement which convulsed the whole of Germany should be transmitted to the other territories of Charles V. In Spain, moreover, strong predispositions[4] in favour of the Reformation had existed for some time anterior to the breach between the pope and Luther, partly owing to the scandalous corruptions of the Spanish Church[5], and partly to disgust excited by the Inquisition[6], which had there put forth its most malignant energies. Accordingly, we find the writings[7] of the Saxon friar translated and distributed in the Peninsula as early as the date of his excommunication; papal briefs admonishing the state-authorities to check the new opinions on the threshold, and the watchful eye of the

[1] See above, p. 84, n. 1.

[2] *Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary*, p. 104.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 101 sq. According to the same authority (p. 73), when their extraordinary remedies began to be applied, 'only three families of the magnates adhered still to the pope. The nobility were nearly all reformed, and the people were, thirty to one, attached to the new doctrine.' In like manner we find Paul Bornemisze (*al.* Bornemissa), bishop of Weissenburg in Transylvania, quitting the country in 1556, on account of the almost universal prevalence of anti-Romish doctrines: *Ibid.* p. 69.

[4] Even Balmez, *Protestantism and Catholicity*, c. xxxvii. Engl. Trans., admits the existence of this feeling as well as the rapid spread of Lutheranism. See the evidence collected by De Castro, *Spanish Protestants*, passim, Lond. 1851, and M'Crie, *Hist. of the Reform. in Spain*, Edinb. 1829.

[5] See *Middle Age*, p. 348.

[6] See Llorente, *Historia crítica de la Inquisicion.* In its earlier form (cf. *Middle Age*, p. 290, n. 2), it had suppressed the Cathari of Spain, but was even more terrible when re-established in Castile (1478), for the purpose of detecting Jews (*Ibid.* p. 319: Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella*, ch. VII). On the outbreak of the Lutheran reformation (1521), the pope was under the necessity of revoking the mitigation of its severities, which he had before determined upon at the request of the Cortes: Ranke, *Ref.* I. 526.

[7] M'Crie, pp. 123, 124. These volumes, which included the *Commentary on the Galatians*, appear to have been supplied through Antwerp.

SPAIN.

inquisitor-general superintending their repression[1]. For a while, however, all such measures proved entirely ineffectual. Headed by two brothers, Juan[2] and Alfonso[3] de Valdés, the reforming school increased from day to day in numbers and importance. It had representatives among the retinue of Charles V. himself; and both in Seville and Valladolid the crowd of earnest Lutherans was so great that cells could hardly be at last procured for their incarceration. Seville owed its knowledge of the Lutheran doctrines to a native of Andalucia, Rodrigo de Valero[4], who suddenly abandoned a life of idle gaiety and dissipation, and devoted himself entirely to the study of the holy Scriptures and the interpretation of them to all persons who came within his reach[5]. He afterwards evinced the depth of his convictions by adhering to this course in spite of the Inquisitors, by whom he was eventually shut up in a monastery at San Lucar (**1541**). The most famous of his converts was doctor Juan Gil (Egidius), whose academical distinctions[6] induced the emperor to nominate

[1] De Castro, pp. 16, 17.

[2] Juan de Valdés was a jurisconsult highly esteemed by the emperor. He became secretary to the Spanish viceroy at Naples, where he also made numerous disciples, and died in 1540 (*Ibid.* pp. 17, 18, Ticknor, *Hist. of Spanish Literature*, II. 19). For a list of his writings, see De Castro, pp. 23, 24. The first in the series is entitled *Tratado utilisimo del Beneficio de Jesucristo.* M'Crie, (pp. 142 sq.) points out the mystical turn of his writings, which may be attributable to his acquaintance with the works of John Tauler, whom Luther also strongly admired: cf. above, p. 14.

[3] De Castro, pp. 25 sq. Alfonso was for some years secretary to the high chancellor of Charles V.: but there is great confusion between the acts and writings of the two brothers: *Ibid.* p. 26, M'Crie, p. 141, note. In a contemporary account of the diet of Augsburg (1530) in Walch's *Luther*, XVI. 912, mention is made of an Alphonsus 'Kais. Maj. Hispanischer Canzlar,' who informed Melanchthon in a friendly spirit that his countrymen were taught to regard the Lutherans as no better than infidels. The charges formally adduced by the inquisitors may be seen in Llorente.

[4] De Castro, pp. 26 sq.; M'Crie, pp. 146 sq.

[5] 'Whether he had any other means of instruction [than the Vulgate], or what these were, must remain a secret; but it is certain that he was led to form a system of doctrine not different from that of the reformers of Germany, and to lay the foundations of a church in Seville, which was Lutheran in all the main articles of its belief:' M'Crie, p. 147.

[6] De Castro, pp. 30 sq. He was educated at Alcalá, and promoted to the office of magistral canon (chief preacher) in the cathedral at Seville in 1537. Valero advised him to abandon the scholastic authors, and give himself exclusively to the study of the Bible. Respecting his more distinguished coadjutors, see M'Crie, pp. 154 sq., pp. 206 sq.

SPAIN.

him for the valuable bishopric of Tortosa (**1550**). His affection for Valero had not, however, escaped the eye of the Inquisitors. He was, accordingly, accused of Lutheranism, and lodged in prison till he had expressed his willingness to make a public abjuration[1] of some points alleged against him (Aug. **21, 1552**). But even this measure did not satisfy his persecutors, who restrained him from the exercise of all his ministerial duties, and condemned him to the dungeons of the 'Holy Office.' When he finally regained his liberty (**1555**) he settled at Valladolid. Some of the inhabitants of that city were devoted to the Reformation[2], and until his death in the following year, Egidius had the courage to avow himself a member of the Lutheran confraternity. Another of their leading pastors was Domingo de Rojas[3], a Dominican of noble birth, who circulated the productions of the Wittenberg divines, and also added to them many kindred writings of his own. By his exertions Agustin Cazalla[4], one of the court-preachers, who had been converted to the Lutheran creed while travelling in Germany, took up his residence at Valladolid; and favoured by his talents and authority the new opinions were diffused not only there, but in the neighbouring towns and villages[5]. Cazalla was, however, wanting in the courage of the Christian martyr: at the scaffold[6], with the 'sambenito' on his shoulders, he expressed a strong desire of reconciliation with the Church, and thus obtained a partial commutation of his sentence.

[1] See De Castro, pp. 34 sq., who throws new light on this subject. The applications for the vacant see of Tortosa furnish M'Crie with ample materials for reflecting at large on the 'duplicity, the selfishness and the servility of the clergy' (p. 163).

[2] It seems to have been planted there by Francisco de San Roman, a native of Burgos, who had spent his early years in Flanders (De Castro, p. 40, M'Crie, pp. 170 sq.). He learned to reverence Luther while resident at Bremen, and finally died a martyr's death (circ. 1545) at Valladolid.

[3] De Castro, pp. 114 sq.; M'Crie, p. 225 sq. He was educated by Carranza, the future archbishop of Toledo, respecting whom see below, p. 95, n. 5.

[4] De Castro, pp. 93 sq.; M'Crie, pp. 226 sq. His confessor in early life was the same Carranza. At first he was an active opponent of the Lutherans both in Germany and in Flanders.

[5] M'Crie, p. 231.

[6] De Castro, p. 96. He was allowed to be strangled and then burnt, instead of being burnt alive.

SPAIN.

It was on discovering the extensive propagation of the Lutheran doctrines that the efforts of the 'Holy Office' were now directed with redoubled zeal to the repression of all heresies and innovations. Charles V.[1], from his seclusion at Yuste, was continually advocating this repressive policy; and when his son Philip II. arrived in **1559** to take the government, it grew obvious that the days of Spanish Protestantism were numbered[2]. Philip has been termed the 'Nero of Spain[3].' His dark and saturnine fanaticism displayed itself in guiding the machinery of the Inquisition and extracting pleasure from the torment of his victims. Informations, arrests and *autos-de-fé* were multiplied[4], the sufferers being almost universally addicted to the principles of Luther[5], and embracing men and women

[1] De Castro, pp. 84, 85: cf. Stirling's *Cloister Life of Charles V.*, from which it appears that he never manifested the slightest inclination to relent.

[2] The Inquisitors had reserved a large number of Protestants, in order that their execution might signalize his return. He was accordingly present with his court at an *auto* held in Valladolid, Oct. 8, 1559, where many illustrious prisoners suffered at the stake (De Castro, pp. 110 sq.).

[3] *Ibid.* p. 120, where the parallel is drawn at length: cf. Schiller's portrait, *Revolt of the Netherlands*, I. 391, 392, Lond. 1847. De Castro (ch. XXII.) attempts to make out that the alleged unnatural hatred of Philip to his son, Don Carlos, originated in the prince's tenderness for Lutheranism.

[4] See M'Crie, pp. 239—336. Prescott's *Philip II.* Bk. II. ch. iii. Ticknor, *Hist. Span. Lit.* I. 427 sq.

[5] On the charge of Lutheranism brought against Carranza, archbishop of Toledo, see De Castro, ch. IX.—XII. This prelate had already distinguished himself in England by preaching down the Reformation, and also at the council of Trent: but the occurrence of Lutheran phraseology in his *Commentaries on the Christian Catechism*, printed at Antwerp in 1558, excited the suspicions of the Inquisition, and the hatred of his enemies, one of whom was the learned Melchior Cano. On the other hand, the *Catechism* obtained the approbation of certain deputies appointed to examine it by the Council of Trent: but their report was not ratified by the whole of that assembly. To escape from the violence of the Inquisition, Carranza next appealed to Pius IV., who, in spite of the murmurs of Philip, took the case into his own hands. Difficulties were, however, constantly thrown in the way of a decision till the accession of Gregory XIII., who ruled that the Spanish primate had drawn 'bad doctrine from many condemned heretics, such as Luther, Œcolampadius, Melanchthon,' &c., and called upon him to abjure the errors contained in sixteen propositions (*Ibid.* pp. 181, 182). Carranza read the abjuration provided for him, and died soon afterwards at Rome (May 2, 1576). See the *Vida de Bart. Carranza*, written by Salazar de Mendoza, a work which was kept back by the Inquisition, and published at last in 1788. He evidently believed that the prosecution of Carranza was suggested by the policy of

SPAIN.

of all ranks. In **1570** the work of extermination was completed. Before that date, however, many of the Spanish Protestants had found a quiet resting-place in other countries, in Germany, in Switzerland, in France, in the Netherlands, and more especially in England[1]. Francisco de Enzinas (otherwise called Dryander[2]) was an example of this class. He had pursued his studies in the university of Louvain[3], where, excited by the biblical writings of Erasmus, he prepared a Castilian version of the New Testament, which was published at Antwerp in **1543**. For some time he had cultivated the friendship of Melanchthon, and on being charged with heresy at Brussels escaped to Wittenberg. In **1548** he found his way to England, where the interest of archbishop Cranmer[4], to whom he was strongly recommended, soon installed him in the professorship of Greek at Cambridge.

ITALY.

The inability of the Reformation to strike its roots in Southern Europe was still further illustrated by its rise and fall in every part of Italy. When Luther called in question the established theories of human merit, the lite-

Philip II., or the rival hatred of Valdez. The propositions which he was made to abjure cannot be found in his suspected *Catechismo*.

[1] See M'Crie, p. 317. They formed a congregation in London during the reign of Elizabeth (p. 367); their pastor, after 1568, being Antonio del Corro (Corranus), whose orthodoxy was suspected (p. 372): cf. Parker's *Correspondence*, ed. P. S. p. 340, n. 1, and p. 476.

[2] Enzina = 'evergreen oak.' De Enzinas was accordingly styled Du Chesne by French writers, and Dryander by himself and others. On his translation of the New Testament and other attempts of the sort in Spain, see Ticknor, *Hist. Span. Lit.* I. 425. A large collection of the works of the Spanish reformers was printed between 1850 and 1865 under the title 'Reformistas Antiguos Españoles,' Madrid, ed. B. B. Wiffen.

[3] De Castro, pp. 37 sq., M'Crie, pp. 188 sq. He had two distinguished brothers, Juan and Jayme, both of whom were like himself devoted to Lutheranism. The former was put to death by the Roman Inquisition.

[4] M'Crie, p. 197. John Laski, or à Lasco, to whom he was previously known (p. 189), informs us that on July 19, 1548, Dryander was already in London, where he was preparing to take part in a religious conference: Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, p. 72, n. 2: 2nd ed. On June 5, 1549, we find him sending a Latin compendium of the Prayer-Book to Bullinger (*Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 350, Camb. 1846), and complaining of some parts of that formulary.

ITALY.

rature of that country had been for some years contracting a most sceptical and anti-christian tone[1]: but at the close of the reign of Leo X. the symptoms of improvement were becoming visible. A club, or confraternity, of devout scholars[2], to the number of fifty persons, and including Gaspar Contarini, Sadoleti, Giberto and Caraffa, all of whom were afterwards advanced to the rank of cardinal, was organized at Rome itself, under the designation 'Oratory of Divine Love.' There is indeed no evidence of a direct connexion between this body and the Lutheran movement[3]; but the fundamental doctrine of the Wittenberg reformer, that of justification by faith in Christ, was also the inspiring principle of Contarini and his friends. In the political troubles that befel the rest of Italy soon afterwards, one section of them had retired to Venice, where the spirit of devotion which hitherto animated them was strengthened by continued intercourse. Of fresh accessions to their body, none were more distinguished by their zeal and piety than Reginald Pole the English refugee[4], and Brucioli, the author of a new Italian version of the Holy Scriptures[5]. They had also an ally in cardinal Morone[6], archbishop of Modena: while similar principles were

[1] *Middle Age*, p. 352, n. 1; p. 355: Waddington, *Reform.* I. 57 sq.

[2] Ranke, *Hist. of Popes*, I. 135 sq. Lond. 1841.

[3] Luther's works, however, as well as those of Melanchthon, Bucer and Zwingli, were circulated in Italy at an early period, and read with great avidity: M'Crie's *Hist. of Reform. in Italy*, pp. 34 sq. Edinb. 1827. For Contarini's approximation to the Lutherans at Ratisbon, see above, pp. 58 and 59, n. 1. His own works have on this account suffered frequent mutilations: *e. g.* his treatise *De Justificatione* (cf. Ranke, *Ibid.* p. 206, note), and his treatise *De Potestate Pontificis* (cf. Twysden, *Vind. of Church of England*, p. 144, n. 5, Camb. 1847).

[4] He had visited Padua ('the Athens of Europe') as early as 1519, and had thus become acquainted with many of the Italian literati: see Phillips's *Life of Pole*. With regard to Contarini's teaching on the doctrine of justification, Pole declared that his friend had 'brought to light the jewel which the Church kept half concealed' (Ranke, *Popes*, I. 138); and Flaminio, another of their circle, stated the same doctrine exactly in the style of Luther (*Ibid.* p. 139).

[5] M'Crie, *Ref. in Italy*, pp. 54 sq. The New Testament appeared in 1530, and the remaining books in 1532.

[6] See an account of him in Schelhorn's *Amœnitates Literariæ*, XII. 537 sq. In 1557 he was imprisoned by order of Paul IV., and certain *Articles* brought against him proving his tendency towards Lutheranism. According to the third of the series (*Ibid.* p. 568), 'dixit Concilium Tridentinum quoad articulum justificationis esse retractandum,' and according to the eighth, 'tenuit, opera nostra, quantumcunque in gratia Dei facta, non esse meritoria.'

ITALY.

zealously diffused at Naples by the Spanish secretary Juan de Valdés[1] who died in **1540**. It was out of this evangelic movement that a very influential treatise on the *Benefit of Christ's Death* had issued in **1543**. By whomsoever written[2] it secured the powerful patronage of Morone[3], and must henceforth have contributed to the dissemination of a healthier spirit, not indeed identical with Luther's, but presenting very strong analogies to it. When the Inquisitor at length arose to counteract the spread of 'Lutheranism' in Italy, as many as forty thousand copies of this work, either in the original or in translations, fell into his hands.

But meanwhile other forms of thought[4], directly borrowed from the writings of the Wittenberg and Swiss divines, had gained extensive currency in districts lying far beyond the Alps. We find reformers taking shelter in the duchy of Ferrara[5], and even welcomed at the court. At Modena, Locarno, Milan, Lucca, Mantua, Siena, and still more at Naples[6], Luther had his correspondents and auxiliaries[7]. Bologna in like manner, notwithstanding its position in the Papal States, excited the congratulations of Martin Bucer[8] on the zeal and numbers of the converts; while in all the leading towns of the republic of Venice[9],

[1] Cf. above, p. 93, n. 2.

[2] The Italian original of this very scarce work was reprinted in 1855 with a learned *Introduction* by Mr Churchill Babington. The author was probably Aonio Paleario (della Paglia), a friend of Pole, Flaminio and others of that school. He was at last apprehended by the Inquisitors, and committed to the flames at Rome (1570). The Spanish form of the treatise *Del Beneficio di Giesu Christo Crocifisso*, referred to above (p. 93, n. 2), was in all probability one of the numerous translations of it, and may have been due to 'un monaco di San Severino in Napoli, discepolo del Valdes,' which explains the language of the Inquisitors cited by Ranke, *Popes*, I. 141, note.

[3] Ranke, *Ibid.* The same charge is brought against Morone in the proceedings mentioned above, p. 97, n. 6.

[4] Cf. M'Crie's classification, pp. 165, 166.

[5] Calvin himself was one of these (circ. 1535), and exercised great influence over the mind of the duchess: M'Crie, *Ref. in Italy*, p. 70.

[6] See the evidence collected by Gieseler, III. i. p. 498, n. 16 (ed. Bonn).

[7] M'Crie, pp. 75 sq.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 83.

[9] *Ibid.* pp. 89 sq. As early as 1528 Luther wrote (De Wette, III. 289): 'Lætus audio de Venetis quæ scribis, quod verbum Dei receperint. See also *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. pp. 357, 358. From the Venetian territory sprung Matthias Flacio (Flacius Illyricus, also called Francowitz), the chief compiler of the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis* (cf. *Middle Age*,

ITALY.

owing partly to the anti-Romish spirit that prevailed, and partly to the thriving commerce that expanded her intelligence and laid her open to suggestions from the neighbouring countries, 'Lutheranism' had won a series of brilliant victories (**1530—1542**). Two of its most active propagators in Italy at large were Bernardino Ochino[1] a capuchin, of small acquirements, but unwearying in devotion to the cause he had embraced; and Pietro Martire Vermigli[2], a canon-regular of the order of St Augustine and a very able scholar. The sermons of Ochino, who remained in outward communion with the Church, were interrupted (**1542**) by a message questioning his orthodoxy, and citing him before the Roman tribunals; on which he fled across the mountains to Geneva. Peter Martyr was ere long compelled to follow his example, seeking an asylum at Zürich and Strasburg; and after various fortunes both the exiles[3] went to England (**1547**), and became the guests of archbishop Cranmer. All the lamentable feuds which had divided the camp of the Reformers in other districts re-

p. 372, n. 3), and the *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses* (see Dowling, *Study of Eccl. Hist.* pp. 105 sq.). He became a pupil of Melanchthon, but was afterwards violently opposed to him: cf. above, p. 64, n. 1. Another of the Venetian reformers was Pierpaolo Vergerio, bishop of Capo d'Istria, who, after serving as papal legate in Germany (above, p. 56, n. 4), seceded to the Protestants in 1548, diffused their principles in the Grisons, and died at Tübingen in 1565 (M'Crie, pp. 378, 379). His brother Giovanni Battista Vergerio, bishop of Pola, also joined the Reformation (*Ibid.* p. 137).

[1] See M'Crie, pp. 108 sq.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 117 sq. He was called *Vermigli*, to distinguish him from a second Peter Martyr, a Milanese of Anghiera (hence Anglerius), who spent the greater part of his life at the court of Madrid. On the reformer see Schmidt's *Vie de Pierre Martyr Vermigli*, Strasburg, 1835.

[3] See Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 153, n.°; ed. Eccl. Hist. Soc. Their travelling expenses, of which a curious bill is preserved (*Archæologia*, XXI. 471), were paid by the privy council. Ochino, who had obtained a prebend at Canterbury (May 9, 1548), writes from London (July 17, 1548) to Musculus of Augsburg, denouncing the 'abominable Interim:' *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 335. Peter Martyr was made professor of divinity at Oxford in 1549: but both of them retreated on the accession of queen Mary, establishing themselves eventually at Zürich (M'Crie, p. 383). There, however, Ochino was charged with advocating anti-Trinitarianism and polygamy (*Ibid.* pp. 391 sq.), and after ineffectual attempts to find a shelter in other countries, died in Moravia (1564). Another of his fellow-countrymen, Jerome Zanchi, who was on the point of joining him and Peter Martyr on their visit to England (*Ibid.* p. 403), distinguished himself by his opposition to these errors, and by the general sobriety of his theological views (*Ibid.* pp. 390, 405).

ITALY.

produced themselves in Italy[1], where anti-Trinitarianism, as we encountered it in Poland[2], threatened to be also rife[3]. But few disciples, of either the orthodox or heterodox, were able to survive the barbarous activity of the Inquisition[4].

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 138 sq. The Italians, as a body, were most favourable to the Swiss.

[2] Above, pp. 84, 85.

[3] M'Crie, pp. 149 sq., pp. 385 sq. On the Socini (Lælius and Faustus), with whom Ochino was allied at Zürich, see below, Chap. v.

[4] See M'Crie's fifth chapter, on 'the Suppression of the Reformation in Italy.' The leader of the counter-movement, which began in 1542, was Cardinal Caraffa, afterwards Paul IV., whose nephew, Caraccioli, son of the marquis of Vico, was one of the most eminent of the Italian reformers.

CHAPTER II.

THE SWISS SCHOOL OF CHURCH-REFORMERS, AND ITS PROPAGATION.

SWITZERLAND.

SWITZERLAND.

Early career of Zwingli (b. 1484).

As Luther stands unrivalled in the group of worthies who conducted what is termed the Saxon Reformation, Zwingli's figure is originally foremost in the kindred struggles of the Swiss. He was born[1] on New Year's day, **1484**, and was thus Luther's junior only by seven weeks. His father was the leading man of Wildhaus, a parish in the Toggenburg, where, high above the level of the lake of Zürich, he retained the simple dignity and truthfulness that characterized the Swiss of olden times, before they were so commonly attracted from their native pastures to decide the battles of adjacent states[2]. Huldreich Zwingli, being destined for the priesthood, sought his elementary education at Basel and Bern, and after studying philosophy for two years at the university of Vienna, commenced his theological course at Basel under the care of Thomas Wyttenbach, a teacher justly held in very high repute[3]. At the early age of twenty-two, Zwingli was

[1] On the boyhood and early training of Zwingli, see Schuler's *Huldreich Zwingli*, Zürich, 1819. The best contemporary *Life* of him is by Oswald Myconius, the reforming preacher, who died at Basel in 1552. It is reprinted in Stäudlin's *Archiv für Kirchengesch.* Vol. I.

[2] Their services were especially solicited by the pope on one side, and the French on the other. Hence arose the custom of pensions by which a French party had acquired general ascendancy in Switzerland at the beginning of the sixteenth century: Ranke, *Ref.* III. 65, 66.

[3] He belonged to the same school as Erasmus, and besides inspiring his pupils with a love of classical literature, excited them against the more extravagant of the Mediæval notions. Zwingli says (*Opp.* III. 544, ed. Schuler) that he learned from Wyttenbach 'solam Christi mortem pretium esse remissionis peccatorum.'

SWITZERLAND.

His classical tastes.

appointed priest of Glarus (**1506**). He carried with him into his seclusion a passionate love of letters, and especially of that untrodden field of literature which was exciting the profoundest admiration of the age,—the classical remains of Greece and Rome. To these he long devoted his chief interest; for although he was not unacquainted with the writings of the Middle Ages, scholasticism had never any charm for him, and exercised but little influence on his mental training. Thus while Luther undervalued the wisdom of the heathen poets and philosophers, Zwingli venerated them as gifted with an almost supernatural inspiration[1].

His political principles.

At the same time other traits no less distinctive in his character were strongly brought to light. Zwingli was from first to last a genuine republican, not only by the accident of birth in the Helvetic confederacy, but as it seemed by an original instinct of his nature. Hence we find the pastor of Glarus busily engaged in politics, composing patriotic allegories[2] in denunciation of 'the foreigners,' taking the field with his courageous flock, and even present at the battle of Marignano, where his countrymen at last succumbed beneath the chivalry of France (**1515**).

Becomes a student of the Bible.

But in the meanwhile an important change was passing over the complexion of his private studies. In **1513** he applied himself with characteristic ardour to the cultivation of the Greek language[3], and accepting the principles of exegesis then advocated by Erasmus, resolved that the Bible, and especially the New Testament in the original, should be in future his great touchstone for determining

[1] Ranke, III. 63. Walter (Gualther), his son-in-law, whose *Apology* for him was prefixed to the edition of his works which appeared in 1545, has to answer the following charge among others: 'Quosdam ex Ethnicorum numero, homines impios, crudeles, horrendos, idololatras et Epicuri de grege porcos, *Sanctorum cœtui adnumeravit:*' sign. δ.

[2] These were entitled *Der Labyrinth*, and *Fabelgedicht vom Ochsen und etlichen Thieren*, written in 1510.

[3] 'Cœpi prædicare Evangelium,' he writes in 1523, 'antequam Lutheri nomen unquam audivissem. Atque in eum usum ante decem annos operam dedi *Græcanicis literis, ut ex fontibus doctrinam Christi* haurire possem:' *Opp.* (ed. Gualther, 1545), I. fol. 38 a. He did not indeed condemn the reading of the Fathers, himself studying Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine and Chrysostom, and, like Erasmus, feeling a strong preference for Jerome's commentaries. Still he spoke of brighter days not far distant when Christians would value nothing but the Word of God ('ut neque Hieronymus neque cæteri, sed sola Scriptura Divina apud Christianos in pretio sit futura'): *Ibid.* I. fol. 37 b.

SWITZERLAND.

the nature and the limits of religious truth. In all this process, notwithstanding some analogies, the course of Zwingli had diverged considerably from that of the Wittenberg reformer. Luther, as we saw, was forced into collision with the Church-authorities by an internal pressure of the conscience, a profound and overwhelming impulse of his moral sensibilities. Though disciplined to habits of submission, and by nature indisposed to break away from the traditions of the past, he was nevertheless unable to repress the storm of holy indignation that arose within him on beholding the practical substitution of man's righteousness for Christ's[1], of justification by the law for justification by faith. But if this error had been once corrected, Luther's quarrel with the dominant school of theologians would in all probability have ceased. Zwingli, on the contrary[2], had no such reverence for the Church, and no such bond of union with antiquity. His thoughts were for the most part circumscribed within his native mountains, and concentrated on the parish where his lot was cast. That joyous heart, of which his cheerful countenance[3] was the unfailing index, had been well-nigh unacquainted with the spiritual tempests in which Luther learned to fathom the abyss of human depravity, and tested the victorious power of faith: and therefore what the Saxon friar undertook as the result of holy impulses and spiritual intuitions, the Swiss clergyman was rather aiming to achieve by the employment of his critical and reasoning faculties. He rose at length to controvert established usages and dogmas of the Church, because he had not found them in his careful study of the Greek Testament.

Zwingli contrasted with Luther.

The Swiss reformer had thus many points in common with Erasmus, and accordingly as soon as the literary chieftain came to Basel in **1514**, frequent communications[4] passed between them. 'There is nothing,' wrote Zwingli, 'of which I am prouder than to have seen Erasmus.' But in **1516** he began to manifest far greater boldness than his learned correspondent[5]. Having been transferred to Ein-

His friendship with Erasmus.

[1] Cf. above, p. 39, n. 1. [2] Ranke, *Ref.* III. 96.

[3] 'Ingenio amœnus et ore jucundus supra quam dici possit erat,' is the description of him by Oswald Myconius. He had also a fine musical taste.

[4] See, for instance, Erasmi *Epist.* Lib. XXXI. ep. 52.

[5] Erasmus was, however, the chief agent in determining his course:

SWITZERLAND.

First reformatory efforts.

Establishes himself at Zürich, **1519.**

siedeln[1] in the autumn of that year, he laboured to divert his people[2] from the grosser forms of image-worship and other like corruptions, and even wrote to his diocesan, the bishop of Constance, urging the necessity of minor reformations. Two years later he was appointed to a preachership in the collegiate church of Zürich (Jan. 1, 1519) where he found a more appropriate arena for his eloquence, and where his force of character at once exalted him to the position he retained during the rest of his life. His efforts had at this period a threefold tendency,—to vindicate the absolute supremacy of Holy Scripture, and establish what he deemed a juster method of interpretation[3]; to purify the morals[4] of the citizens; and to recall the Swiss confederation to those principles of independence on which it had been founded. In the spring of 1519 some correspondence took place between the Zürichers and Leo X. respecting a Franciscan friar[5] who had ventured to reopen the dis-

Opp. I. fol. 55 b, ed. Gualther. He had learned from a poem of his friend that Christ was the true 'Patron' of the sinner and the helpless. 'Hunc enim vidi unicum esse thesaurum pii pectoris, quin cœpi scriptis Bibliorum Sacrorum veterumque patrum diligentius intendere, certius quiddam ex his de divorum intercessione venaturus. In Bibliis Sacris plane nihil reperi. Apud quosdam veterum de ea re inveni, apud alios nihil.'

[1] His removal to this lonelier district ('Eremitorium') was chiefly caused by the hatred of the French party in Glarus: cf. p. 100, n. 2: but it must have conduced to the development of Zwingli's principles by securing him more leisure for reading and reflection. According to a letter of Capito (quoted in *Middle Age*, p. 412, n. 5), he was then meditating on a plan 'de pontifice dejiciendo.'

[2] Waddington, II. 271, 272. In a passage cited by Gieseler (III. i. p. 139, n. 29, ed. Bonn.; v. 304, ed. Edinb.) he declares that as early as this period (1517) he plainly told the cardinal of Sitten (Sion) 'dass das ganze Papstthum einen schlechten Grund habe, und das allweg mit gwaltiger heiliger Schrift.'

[3] Instead of preaching exclusively from the select passages of Holy Scripture contained in the 'Lectionarium,' he expounded whole books, beginning with St Matthew ('idque absque humanis commentationibus ex solis fontibus Scripturæ Sacræ'): *Opp.* I. fol. 37 b, ed. Gualther. In his *Architeles* (an apologetic treatise, dated Aug. 23, 1522), he mentions the order in which the other books were taken, and gives his reasons for adopting it: *Ibid.* I. fol. 132 b.

[4] His friend Oswald Myconius (*Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ*, Tiguri, 1524, pp. 5, 6) enlarges on the moral and spiritual improvements he effected; and his own personal character, which after early youth had been most exemplary (cf. *Opp.* I. fol. 227 a), added force to his exhortations.

[5] See, respecting this 'Tetzel of Switzerland,' Waddington, *Ref.* II. 272, 273. One of his earliest opponents was Bullinger, dean of Bremgarten, whose son Henry became distinguished as a Swiss reformer, and

SWITZERLAND.

graceful traffic that drew forth the animadversions of Luther in **1517**. The obnoxious agent was immediately withdrawn, and so amicably, that the Swiss reformer, who directed the resistance of his fellow-townsmen, still continued to enjoy a pension given him by the pope[1]. In the following year, however, his harangues at Zürich had induced the cantonal authorities to publish a decree enjoining that pastors should henceforth have perfect liberty to preach all doctrines that could claim the warrant of the Holy Scriptures, and thus threatening to precipitate a crisis very near at hand[2]. The fermentation spread from day to day in all the orders of society. Accordingly, in **1522**, a formal charge was made against the innovators[3] by the bishop of Constance, and substantiated before the chief authorities of the canton, but without eliciting a favourable answer.

His rapid movements and success.

We may ascertain the very quick development of the reforming tenets at this epoch from the *Sixty-Seven Articles*[4], or propositions, which Zwingli offered to maintain

has left an account of the circumstances in his *Hist. of the Reformation* (reaching to 1532): ed. J. J. Hottinger, I. 17 sq. From this period Zwingli was suspected of 'Lutheranism' (cf. *Opp.* I. 37 b sq. ed. Gualther), although he seems to have proceeded very independently: above, p. 102, n. 3. He wrote, for instance, in 1523 (*Opp.* I. 38 a): 'Nec ignoro Lutherum multa adhuc dare infirmis, ubi aliter posset, *in quibus* ei non subscribo, ut in sermone *De decem Leprosis* audio (non enim legi) eum aliquid tribuere confessioni auriculari,' *etc.*

[1] It amounted to 50 gulden, and was granted, ostensibly at least, to encourage him in the prosecution of his studies: but one object of his patron may have been political, *viz.* to command the services of such a man in the struggle of the papacy against the French. He openly resigned it in 1520. His importance was felt to be so great that even after the Reformation was fairly commenced pope Adrian wrote him a cajoling letter (Jan. 23, 1523), preserved in Bullinger (as above), I. 83. The same feeling had induced the legate (1518) to appoint him as one of the acolyth-chaplains of the pope: see Waddington, II. 278.

[2] Ranke, *Ref.* III. 73.

[3] Many of the Zürichers violated the rule of fasting in the Lent of 1522, which was the original cause of the bishop's interference. Zwingli's letter giving an account of the circumstances is printed in the new edition of his works (III. 7 sq.). He next justified the conduct of the innovators in a vernacular treatise entitled *Von Erkiesen und Fryheit der Spysen*, and very soon afterwards (cf. D'Aubigné's note, *Ref.* II. 533, Edinb. 1853) broke through the law of celibacy by marrying a widow of Zürich, Anna Reinhardt; not, however, making his marriage public till April, 1524. This fact throws light upon the movement which he headed in the summer of 1522, for the sake of inducing the Diet and the bishop of Constance to legalize the marriage of priests: see his *Works*, I. fol. 110 sq. ed. Gualther.

[4] Printed in both German and Latin by Niemeyer, *Libr. Symb.*

SWITZERLAND.

before the senate and people of Zürich as early as January **1523**. His triumph, in the estimation of his audience, was complete, since all the main positions he advanced were absolutely undisputed[1]. Acting on the principle that every Christian congregation and community is competent to regulate its own affairs[2], the men of Zürich afterwards proceeded with a large amount of unanimity to place themselves beyond the jurisdiction of the bishop (Oct. **28**), and organize a system of Church-government in accordance with the new convictions. The obvious effect of their proceedings was revolutionary. While the Saxon doctors were content with the removal of such practices as ministered to superstition or were calculated to obscure the memory of Christ, the Zwinglians soon became persuaded that ritual of all kinds was adverse to the freedom and simplicity of the Gospel[3], interfered with rather than promoted the edification of the worshipper, and therefore ought to be curtailed at least in every one of those particulars which 'have no ground or warrant in God's Word[4].' The leading

pp. 3 sq. In the July of the same year he published, also in German, a very copious exposition of those Articles, which was rendered into Latin by his schoolfellow and ardent coadjutor, Leo Judæ (*Opp.* I. fol. 3—fol. 109, ed. Gualther).

[1] His chief opponent was John Faber, the vicar-general of the bishop of Constance, and originally favourable to the Reformation, but now a vigorous advocate of Mediævalism: see, for instance, a philippic of Justus Jonas (Tiguri, 1523) entitled *Adversus Joannem Constant. Vicarium, scortationis patronum,* etc. Several members of religious orders had also begun to assail Zwingli as early as 1519, and were not silenced until their foundations were converted into schools (1524).

[2] See Ranke, *Ref.* III. 79 sq. The inhabitants of the canton were prepared for these changes by the discourses of Zwingli, of the abbot of Cappel and of Conrad Schmid, and still more by Zwingli's *Brevis et Christiana in Evangelicam doctrinam Isagoge* (*Opp.* I. fol. 264 sq. ed. Gualther), written originally in Swiss-German (1523), and circulated by the authority of the canton.

[3] *e.g.* Zwingli makes the following statement in the *Ratio Fidei,* addressed to Charles V. in 1530 (Niemeyer, p. 31): 'Credo cerimonias, quæ neque per superstitionem fidei neque verbo Dei contrariæ sunt (*quanquam hujusmodi nescio an quæ inveniantur*) per charitatem tolerari, *donec lucifer magis ac magis allucescat,* posse,' *etc.* Ebrard (*Das Dogma vom heiligen Abendmahl,* Frankf. 1846, II. 58 sq.) has endeavoured to defend Zwingli against the charge of revolutionizing the ritual system: Calvin, it is urged, was the real culprit.

[4] Hence the simplification, amounting almost to the annihilation, of their ancient liturgy: see Daniel's *Codex Liturg. Eccl. Reform.* Proleg. pp. 5 sq., and the formularies which he prints. At Easter, 1525, as

SWITZERLAND.

characteristics of the Mediæval system, which, after its theory of human merit, had most excited the hostility of Zwingli, were the use of images and the established doctrine of the Mass[1]. He dedicated a separate treatise[2] to the latter of these topics, examining the structure of the Eucharistic office, and evincing his desire to see it utterly abolished, rather than amended or recast. A vigorous adversary of these changes had to be encountered in the bishop of Constance[3], who endeavoured to regain his hold upon the Zürichers in **1524**; but those whom he addressed were deaf to his expostulations, as well as to remonstrances that issued from the other cantons[4]. Zwingli had, in truth, become the oracle of the whole community.

Œcolampadius (b. 1482) and the reformation at Basel;

Meanwhile a kindred agitation was proceeding in the most enlightened spot of Switzerland,—the university and town of Basel[5]. Its chief author was John Hausschein, or Œcolampadius, whom we saw in correspondence with Melanchthon as early as the disputation of Leipzig[6]. On the recommendation of Capito[7], another of his friends, he was advanced in **1515** to a preachership in the cathedral of Basel, and numbered in the brilliant circle of divines and scholars who rejoiced in the society of Erasmus[8]. This

Ranke also remarks (III. 88), the Mass was reduced to 'a regular love-feast.'

[1] These points were especially considered in the *Isagoge*, above mentioned, fol. 274 b sq.

[2] *De Canone Missæ Epichiresis* (dated Oct. 9, 1523); *Ib.* fol. 175 b sq.

[3] Waddington, *Ref.* II. 303, 304.

[4] The most decided antagonists were those of Lucern, Freyburg and Zug (*Ibid.* pp. 295 sq.).

[5] The fullest account is given by J. J. Herzog, *Das Leben Johannis Œkolampads und die Reformation der Kirche zu Basel*, Basel, 1843.

[6] Above, p. 28: Herzog, I. 107.

[7] Herzog, I. 118. Wolfgang Capito himself had quietly sown the seeds of Reformation in Basel, where he became professor of divinity. He afterwards belonged to the intermediate school of Strasburg (cf. above, p. 52, n. 1, and Jung's *Gesch. der Reform. der Kirche in Strasburg*, I. 86 sq.), where he died in 1541. In 1537 he dedicated a treatise entitled *Responsum de Missa, Matrimonio et jure Magistratus in religione* to Henry VIII. of England, on which see archbishop Cranmer's letter to the author in Cranmer's *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, I. 192. Capito was backed in his reformatory efforts by Hedio, who also migrated to Strasburg.

[8] Erasmus taught him 'to seek for nothing but Christ in the Holy Scriptures' (Herzog, I. 121), and while preparing the first edition of the New Testament, employed him in comparing the quotations there made with the Hebrew original (*Ibid.* 120).

SWITZERLAND.

position he exchanged in **1518** for another preachership at Augsburg[1], but on finding it beyond his powers, he modestly retreated to a convent at Altomünster in the diocese of Freising (April **23**, **1520**). At first he was resolved to spend his days in private study and devotion[2], but the preference he had learned to cherish for the doctrines of the Wittenberg reformers made him more and more an object of suspicion[3], and eventually induced him to revisit Basel (Nov. **16**, **1522**). He now proceeded, after his re-establishment in the university, to place himself in close relation with Zwingli[4], who was making rapid strides in the adjoining canton. For some time the work of reformation at Basel was thwarted by the opposition of the bishop and one party of the academics. It advanced, however, in the senate[5], who not only recognized the principle that Œcolampadius was at liberty to preach whatsoever was commanded, or repudiate whatsoever was condemned, in Holy Scripture, but permitted disputations[6] to be held in which a number of the Mediæval tenets were openly impugned (**1523**, **1524**). A similar tendency of public feeling was soon afterwards betrayed at Bern[7], whose citizens at first regarded Luther and his writings with distaste approaching to abhorrence. Softened by the eloquence of Sebastian Meyer and Berchthold Haller, many of them were prepared to follow in the steps of Zürich, when a demonstration of the anti-reforming party, planned by Eck, the indefatigable foe of Luther, was arranged, at a general assembly of the Swiss cantons, to be held at Baden[8] (May **16**, **1526**).

and Bern.

[1] Herzog, I. 132 sq.

[2] *Ibid.* I. 143 sq.

[3] The general tone of his sermons was in favour of the Lutherans, and a treatise adverse to the practice of compulsory confession (*Ibid.* I. 175) added to the indignation of his brother-monks. In April 1522 (some time after his flight), we find him with Francis von Sickingen at Ebernburg, where he continued preaching the reformed opinions till November.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 212 sq.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 280 sq. At this period (1525) Wycliffe's *Trialogus* (see *Middle Age*, p. 387) was published at Basel, and could not fail to make a deep impression.

[6] *Ibid.* I. 234 sq. One of the reforming challengers was William Farel, a French exile, of whom more will be heard hereafter: see p. 113.

[7] See Kuhn's *Reformatoren Berns in XVI. Jahrhundert*, Bern, 1828.

[8] Herzog, II. 4—20. The invitation proceeded from the diet of Lucern (March 23): Bullinger, as above, I. 337.

SWITZERLAND.

Disputation at Baden, 1526.

The object of the chief promoters was to counteract the power of Zwingli. He, however, did not answer[1] to the challenge; and accordingly the principal burden[2] of the disputation was imposed on Œcolampadius, who contested the established doctrines of transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, the intercession of the Virgin and the saints, the use of images, and purgatory. Eck was no less energetic on the other side, defending his positions with great learning and acumen; and after eight and twenty days, the audience being strongly in his favour, a decree, subscribed by nine out of the twelve cantons who recognized the meeting, was drawn up in condemnation of the Zwinglian movement. Still, in spite of this very serious check, the Reformation was, in the course of the three following years, established by various agencies not only in Appenzell, Mühlhausen, Biel, Schaffhausen, Constance, St Gall, Glarus and Toggenburg, but also in the haughty state of Bern, and finally in Basel[3]. Of the five cantons where it was resisted no less vigorously, the principal was Lucern, from which a bosom-friend of Zwingli, Oswald Myconius[4], had been forcibly expelled (**1522**). In April, **1529**, their hatred of the Reformation urged them to conclude a treaty with the house of Austria, and the bitter conflict[5] that ensued could only be decided on the sanguinary field of Cappel, where Zwingli, true to all his patriotic and military principles, was left among the slain[6] (Oct. **11**, **1531**).

Ascendancy of the reformers in many cantons.

[1] He had been warned that his life was in danger (*Opp.* ed. Schuler, VII. 483): cf. Waddington, II. 313. See his allusions to the Disputation (*Opp.* II. fol. 114, ed. Gualther) and various tracts and letters on the subject (*Ibid.* fol. 565—fol. 601).

[2] One of his chief coadjutors was Haller of Bern (Herzog, II. 10); while Eck was supported by John Faber (above, p. 106, n. 1).

[3] On the political rivalries contributing to the success of the Reformation in those cantons, see Ranke, *Ref.* III. 107, 108. The Bernese were considerably influenced by a disputation (the counterpart of that held at Baden), which was opened on the 7th of January, 1528: cf. Waddington, II. 331 sq. Haller was the chief representative of the Reformers, but was reinforced by Zwingli, Œcolampadius and a host of other theologians (Herzog, II. 62). Bucer was among them. After a feeble resistance the ten *Theses Bernenses* (Niemeyer, p. 15) were accepted by the vast assemblage as portions of the future creed of the community.

[4] Above, p. 101, n. 1. He ultimately succeeded Œcolampadius at Basel.

[5] See Ranke's full account, Bk. VI. ch. II. IV.

[6] 'He was found dying by two common soldiers, who exhorted him to

SWITZERLAND.

Before this crisis in the fortunes of his country he had learned to systematise the doctrines of the early Swiss reformers, more especially in his well-digested *Commentary on True and False Religion*[1], which appeared in **1525** to the delight of his disciples. Notwithstanding all the heavy charges[2] brought against him then and afterwards, it seems impossible to convict him of departure from the central verities of Christianity, such as the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Personality of the Holy Spirit, and other tenets of that class. But with respect to the condition of the human subject, and the application to him of the means vouchsafed for his recovery, Zwingli was at variance with all other branches of the Christian Church. He modified the doctrine of original sin[3] to make it harmonize with the rest of his theological system. Deeply conscious of the absolute sovereignty of God[4], he shrank from every form of thought and practice that appeared to

Zwingli's doctrinal aberrations.

confess himself to a priest, or, as it already seemed too late for that, at least to receive the blessed Virgin and the saints into his heart. He made no answer, and only shook his head; they did not know who he was; they thought him some obscure "stubborn heretic," and gave him a death-stroke.' *Ibid.* p. 406.

[1] *Opp.* II. fol. 158 b—fol. 212 b: ed. Gualther. It is a system of theology arranged under twenty-nine heads, and is said to have been composed in fulfilment of a promise he had made 'multis trans Alpes doctis piisque hominibus, quorum nonnulli multa mecum de plerisque fidei rebus coram contulerant.'

[2] *e.g.* At Marburg he had to satisfy the Lutherans respecting his belief in the Divinity of our blessed Lord (above, p. 52, n. 2), and Walter (Gualther) in the elaborate *Apology* prefixed to his works was under the necessity of repelling the charge of Nestorianism which some had brought against him (sign. γ 5).

[3] See his *Declaratio de Peccato Originali:* Opp. II. fol. 115 b sq. He did not deny that the contagion, whatever it might be, extended to all (cf. his Reply to Eck's *Propositiones*, Ibid. II. fol. 578 b): but maintained that its *damnatory* effect was certainly removed in the case of such children as were born of believing parents, and probably in the case of others. Walter, his apologist, writing after the doctrine of original sin had been restated in the most rigorous form by Calvin (*Instit.* lib. III. c. 23), is anxious to reduce the amount of divergency as far as possible (sign. ε 3). But see Zwingli's own defence: *Opp.* II. 89 b, 90 sq. His notions on this subject were closely connected with difficulties relating to infant baptism and the salvability of the heathen: cf. Laurence, *Bampton Lect.* pp. 295 sq., Oxf. 1838.

[4] See Herzog, I. 317. With this conviction is to be associated his doctrine of predestination (see his *Ratio Fidei*, in Niemeyer, p. 19), which he derived rather from the nature of God than of man, and which in fact bordered on the heathen view of a philosophical necessity: cf. Hagenbach, II. 260, Edinb. 1852.

SWITZERLAND.

His theory of the Sacraments.

be resolvable into the worship of the creature, and in this way had been driven to disparage all external agencies and media instituted for the culture of the human spirit, and as such entitled to respect and reverence. Zwingli was persuaded that the grace of God is always given to man *immediately*, without the intervention of church, or priest or sacrament. He therefore held that Baptism[1] was no means of grace, but merely the external badge of membership in a community, the sign that he was formally devoted to the service of Christ, or the certificate of spiritual life, which if at all imparted, was imparted independently of the material element. Prolonged discussions with the Anabaptists[2], who had found their way to Switzerland[3] as early as **1525**, had only tended to develope these ideas, and consequently it is difficult to screen their author from the charge of insincerity when he accepted Luther's definition[4] at the conference of Marburg (**1529**). The same conception of the sacraments was even more explicitly avowed when Zwingli turned to the examination of the Eucharist[5]. As

[1] He wrote a formal treatise *De Baptismo* (*Opp.* II. 56 b sq.), and handled the subject in many other places, *e.g.* in the *De Vera et Falsa Religione* (Ibid. fol. 199 sq.). In the first he writes 'Baptismus fœderis vel pacti signum est, non in hunc finem institutum, ut eum qui baptizari solet justum efficiat vel fidem baptizati confirmet. *Impossibile enim est ut res aliqua externa fidem hominis internam confirmet et stabiliat*' (fol. 63 b).

[2] See especially his *Elenchus contra Catabaptistas*, II. fol. 7 sq. He thought that the defence of infant baptism was much simplified by dissociating it from all idea of remission of sins (cf. II. 121 b), and thus represented the baptism ordained by Christ as standing on the same level with John's baptism (II. 74, 200).

[3] Herzog has given interesting accounts of their conferences with Œcolampadius at Basel: I. 301 sq., II. 75 sq.

[4] Zwingli there signed the following statement (Seckendorf, Lib. II. p. 138, col. 1): 'Baptismum esse sacramentum ad fidem a Deo institutum et præceptum, *non nudum signum* aut tesseram professionis Christianæ, sed et *opus Dei*, in quo fides nostra requiritur et per quam regeneramur.' For this and other reasons Luther was persuaded that the Swiss reformer had acted dishonestly: cf. Dyer, *Life of John Calvin*, p. 181, Lond. 1850.

[5] 'Nihil ergo eorum, quæ externa sunt, fidem firmare vel nos in illa certiores reddere potest. Quod idem simili ratione de Eucharistia quoque, vel Cœna Domini pronunciamus:' *Opp.* II. 63 b. Cf. above, p. 50, n. 2, and Zwingli, *De Vera et Falsa Religione* (II. fol. 202—fol. 216). In this treatise he refers (fol. 209 a) to Wycliffe and the Waldenses as also holding the opinion that 'est'='significat' in the words of institution: and some of his recent biographers (cf. Gieseler, III. i. p. 192, n. 27, ed. Bonn.) assert that even while at Glarus he was acquainted with their

SWITZERLAND.

he dissociated all idea of spiritual blessing from the act of baptism, so the consecrated Bread and Wine had in his theory no more than a mnemonic office, putting him in mind of Christ and of his union with a Christian body, but inoperative altogether beyond the province of the intellect. This theory, at first elaborated by the criticism of the sacred text, was afterwards supported by recondite speculations on the nature of the Saviour's glorified humanity[1]. Like Carlstadt, he contended that the Body of Christ being now locally in heaven cannot be 'really' distributed to faithful souls on earth: which drew from Luther[2], now become the furious enemy of both, the counter-argument, that the humanity of Christ in virtue of its union with the Godhead is exalted far above all natural existences, and being thus no longer fettered by the sublunary conditions of time and space may be communicated in and by the Eucharistic elements.

Continuation of his work.

The fall of Zwingli, instantly succeeded as it was by the death of Œcolampadius[3], seemed at first a fatal blow

writings, and also with the work of Ratramn (*Middle Age*, p. 167). He certainly implies at the opening of the present section that he had arrived at his new theory some time before he published it to the world. Œcolampadius, who adopted substantially the same view as the result of his discussions with the Anabaptists (Herzog, I. 320 sq.: II. 93—115, 222 sq.), expounded it with so much critical ability that Erasmus, writing to Pirkheimer (June 5, 1526), said he would himself have regarded it with favour 'nisi obstaret consensus Ecclesiæ.' He supposed, however, that the doctrine of the Swiss did not exclude the idea of a spiritual, or virtual presence of Christ ('modo adsit in symbolis gratia spiritualis'): and Walter, the apologist of Zwingli, is anxious to establish the same construction ('Verum Christi Corpus credimus in Cœna sacramentaliter et spiritualiter edi, a *religiosa fideli et sancta mente*:' Præf. sign. δ 5). If Zwingli ever held this view of 'spiritual manducation,' he must have embraced, or developed it, only a short time before his death. The passage of his writings most in favour of it has been referred to above, p. 50, n. 2.

[1] See, for instance, the chapter 'De Allœosibus duarum Naturarum in Christo,' in his *Exegesis Eucharistiæ Negotii ad Martinum Lutherum* (1527); *Opp.* II. fol. 351 b sq.

[2] See, for instance, his *Grosses Bekenntniss* (Walch, XX. 1180 sq.), where he denounces the Zwinglian hypothesis as absolutely 'diabolical' and as a freak of the unsanctified reason of its author: cf. below, Chap. III., on later phases of this controversy.

[3] He died at Basel, Nov. 24, 1531. In the October of the previous year he had been visited by a deputation of Waldenses, who were desirous of knowing more about the Reformation: see Herzog's *Romanische Waldenser*, pp. 333–376, Halle, 1853. Among other things Œcolampadius told them that the Swiss Reformers attached less importance to the

SWITZERLAND.

to their party: but ere long the vigorous efforts of two able followers, Henry Bullinger and Oswald Myconius, were successful[1] in replacing it to some extent upon its former basis. Fresh auxiliaries were also unexpectedly arriving. Hitherto the reformation had penetrated those cantons only which were peopled by the German-speaking Swiss: but in the year preceding the death of Zwingli a profound impression had been made at Neufchâtel by William Farel[2], a Frenchman, who proceeded with the same impulsive zeal and eloquence to rouse the slumbering spirits of Geneva. He had actually succeeded in compassing the overthrow of papal power[3] (Aug. 26, 1535), when a second of his countrymen, the doctor who was afterwards to give an appellation to no inconsiderable party in the Western Church, appeared on the same arena.

William Farel.

John Chauvin, Cauvin or Calvinus[4], was a Picard

John Calvin (b. 1509).

Apocalypse, the second and third epistles of St. John, the second of St. Peter, and the Epistle of St. Jude, than to the other writings of the Sacred Canon.

[1] On the vicissitudes which it had to encounter, see Hess, *Lebensgesch. Bullingers*, Zürich, 1828 sq. Bullinger afterwards enjoyed a high reputation among some of the English Reformers, partly owing to the generosity with which he had entertained the Marian refugees at Zürich, and partly on account of his anti-Romish and anti-Lutheran writings. Many of his communications on these subjects will be found in the *Zurich Letters* and the *Original Letters* published by the Parker Soc.

[2] He was a native of Gap, in Dauphiné (b. 1489), and on being expelled from France by the denunciations of the Sorbonne, he went to Basel (cf. above, p. 108, n. 6), and afterwards diffused the principles of the Reformation as far as Moutiers in Savoy. The fullest life of him is by Kirchhofer, Zürich, 1831: cf. Ranke's *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*, I. 205 sq. Lond. 1852.

[3] The nature of the constitution of Geneva facilitated this result. It was formed of three distinct powers, (1) that of the prince-bishop, who was non-resident, (2) that of the duke of Savoy, who had acquired the vice-regency, (3) that of the burgesses, who at this period were generally republican in their tendencies, and as such had cultivated the friendship of the Swiss, especially of Bern, in order to counterbalance the encroachments of the bishop and the duke (Gaberel, *Hist. de l'Eglise de Genève*, I. 62, Genève, 1853). Farel, on arriving there (1532), produced credentials with which the Bernese had furnished him, and although he was expelled in the first instance, he returned under the same protection at the end of the following year (1533), and accompanied by Viret and Froment, pushed the reformation with the greatest vigour. At length, after considerable turbulence, the council of Two Hundred published an order proclaiming the adoption of the reformed religion based upon the Gospel (Gaberel, I. 162–168).

[4] Three *Lives* of Calvin, written from different standing-points, are (1) by Henry (a German evangelical), Hamburg, 1835–1844, (2) by

SWITZERLAND.

born at Noyon, July **10, 1509**, his father being one of the notaries in the ecclesiastical court of that place, and secretary to the bishop. At the age of fourteen he indicated a precocious aptitude for classics, dialectics and philosophy, under the tuition of Mathurin Cordier (Corderius) at the High-School of Paris, and subsequently entered the universities of Orleans and Bourges, in both of which he studied jurisprudence also with singular devotion and success[1]. His mind, however, had already been directed to the higher fields of theological investigation[2], and on the death of his father he not only gave himself entirely to these studies, but cast in his lot with an obscure and struggling confraternity at Paris who were bent on expediting reformations in the Church. Yet, notwithstanding the acuteness of his moral instincts and the general severity of his character[3], Calvin proved himself deficient in that Christian heroism[4] which is everywhere conspicuous in the history of the Wittenberg reformer. When the prospects of his party had been darkened in the French metropolis, chiefly through the violence and indiscretion[5] of the members, he fled with some of his companions to Basel (Oct. **1534**).

His Institutio, **1536.**

It was there, in the society of Bucer, Capito, and other

Audin (a French ultra-montanist), Paris, 1841, and (3) by Dyer, our impartial fellow-countryman, Lond. 1850. The most favourable of his earlier biographers was Beza, his disciple and successor at Geneva.

[1] At the age of twenty-one the University of Orleans invited him to give his judgment touching the divorce of Henry VIII. (Dyer, p. 8). He pronounced *against* the lawfulness of marriage with a brother's widow.

[2] He was originally destined for holy orders, and his father accordingly secured him a chaplaincy in the cathedral of Noyon before he was twelve years old. Somewhat later (in 1527, when Calvin was eighteen) he was presented to a living, for although not of age to be ordained, he had received the tonsure, and was thus thought capable of holding it, and even of preaching occasionally (*Ibid.* p. 7). One of these preferments he afterwards sold, to the disgust of Audin (I. 63). He traced his own 'conversion' to a sudden call of God (see the account in his *Preface* to the *Comment. on the Psalms*): but we may fairly suppose that it was accelerated by his intercourse at Bourges with Melchior Wolmar, the German professor of Greek: Dyer, p. 9.

[3] Thus at school he never joined in the amusements, and much less the follies of the other boys, and even reprimanded them with severity ('severus omnium in suis sodalibus censor,' according to Beza).

[4] In the *Preface* above cited he confesses: 'Ego qui natura timido, molli et pusillo animo me esse confiteor.'

[5] On the posting up of anti-papal placards at Paris (Oct. 18, 1534) by some of the more intemperate reformers, see Dyer, pp. 29 sq.

SWITZERLAND.

kindred spirits, that he finished the original draft[1] of the *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, ere long advanced to the position of a text-book for the Calvinists in every part of Europe. In it, as finally expanded and revised, they found a masterly statement of their views of Christianity. The work is divided into four books, the *first* relating to our knowledge of God as the Creator; the *second* to our knowledge of Him as the Redeemer; the *third* to the conditions on which man receives the grace of Christ, and the effects that follow such reception; and the *fourth* to the external media and supports by which he is united to the Christian community, and afterwards retained in his connexion with it. In handling these great questions at the age of twenty-seven, the author shews that he had already[2] grasped the leading thoughts that enter into the construction of the system of theology with which his name has ever been associated; for all his bold conceptions of original sin, election[3], reprobation, church-polity, corrective discipline, and even his peculiar doctrine of the sacraments, are there consistently advanced, although it may be not completely balanced, rounded, and matured.

His originality and speculative genius:

In all this treatise, more especially if we compare it with Melanchthon's *Loci Communes*, we discern not only the effect produced on Calvin by his legal education, but the workings of an independent mind. With him begins the second generation of reformers. While accepting most of the conclusions of Erasmus and the Wittenberg divines, he could by no means view them as indisputable. A course of laborious study concentrated on the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures had been spent in verifying those conclusions, in determining the place of single doctrines in relation to the rest, and in binding all of them together in a modern *Summa Theologiæ*. The speculative and dictatorial

[1] The oldest Latin edition now extant is dedicated to Francis I., and in a copy before the present writer, the dedicatory letter bears date 'Basileæ, Calend. Augusti, an. 1536' [*not* 1535], but Henry (followed by Dyer) makes it probable that the *Institutio* had already appeared in French.

[2] One of the minor changes in subsequent editions was the withdrawal of passages that spoke, as he believed, too freely in favour of religious toleration (Dyer, p. 34).

[3] Archbp. Laurence seems to overstate his case when he endeavours to shew (*Bampton Lectures*, pp. 347 sq. Oxf. 1838) that Calvin's original idea of election differed from his later: cf. Dyer, as above, p. 34, note.

SWITZERLAND.

element in Calvin's genius had betrayed itself in his contempt for the dogmatical decisions of the Church, and his presumptuous undervaluing of the terminology, if not the doctrines, of the ancient creeds[1]. There was accordingly a special fitness in the theatre on which he had been called to act[2]; for as the civil constitution of Geneva had been recently subverted, the principles of government which he adduced were calculated to attract republican sympathies by giving laymen fresh importance in the administration of church-affairs, while, on the other hand, he carried with him a body of religious doctrine that controlled and even captivated for the moment by its novelty, compactness and concinnity of form.

adapted to the Genevese.

His temporary banishment, 1538.

At first, however, the extreme severity[3] of the Calvinistic discipline was more than his new flock would tolerate. Both Farel and himself were banished (May 22, 1538), after they had fully carried out their principles and

[1] He was accused of Arianism as early as 1536 (Dyer, pp. 68 sq.), and Lutheran writers (*e. g.* Gerhard, *Loci Theolog.* II. 1431 sq. Jena, 1625) stigmatized the 'Calviniani' most severely. Bp. Bull has also vehemently impeached his orthodoxy on the same subjects, because he had spoken of the Nicene prelates as 'fanatici,' and characterized expressions like 'Deum de Deo, Lumen de Lumine,' *etc. as mere* βαττολογία: *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, Sect. IV. cap. I. § 8 (p. 255, ed. 1703). Still his writings and conduct seem to prove that although he disparaged the terms 'Trinity' and 'Person,' and would not subscribe to the three Creeds upon the ground that to impose them on the conscience of individuals is an act of tyranny (Dyer, p. 70), it would be unjust to rank him either with Tritheists, Arians or Socinians. His own appeal was to the *Catechismus Genevensis*, of which he was himself the author: see it in Niemeyer, pp. 126 sq.

[2] After his departure from Basel (perhaps at the close of 1535), he had visited Ferrara (see above, p. 98, n. 5), and also his native town (Dyer, p. 36). It was then his intention to settle at Basel or Strasburg, but owing to the wars between France and the emperor, he was compelled to adopt the circuitous route through Savoy and Geneva. On reaching the latter place (towards the end of August, 1536: cf. Gaberel, *Hist. de l'Eglise de Genève*, I. 202), Farel, in a moment of so-called inspiration, threatened him with the curse of heaven, if he refused to share the task of carrying out the reformation.

[3] *E.g.* The preachers quoting 1 St. Peter iii. 3, would not allow the adorning of brides 'plicatura capillorum' (Ranke, *Civil Wars, &c. in France*, I. 214, note). Graver subjects of contention immediately arose (Dyer, pp. 74 sq.), and it is probable from a MS. *Vie de Farel* (Ranke, as before), that Anabaptists circulated immoral principles, thus aggravating the licentiousness of the Genevese. The subsequent struggles of Calvin with the 'Patriots' of Geneva, as they called themselves, or 'Libertines' as he nicknamed them, fill many pages of his biography.

SWITZERLAND.

also planted them securely in Lausanne[1]. Their chief crimes[2] were that they resisted the magistrates of the republic, who would fain have brought some features of their ritual into harmony with that of Bern, and ultimately refused to administer the Holy Communion to the Genevese until the city manifested a more docile spirit, and was purged from its more scandalous corruptions. Calvin now betook himself to Strasburg, where he was advanced to a professorship of theology, and where he also acted as the pastor of the French congregation. At the same time he established more intimate relations with the German Protestants, especially[3] with Bucer and Melanchthon. His leisure hours at Strasburg were generally devoted to his favourite studies: and to them accordingly we owe the earliest of those *Commentaries*, which, in spite of all their blemishes, have elevated Calvin to the foremost rank of biblical divines. His growing reputation soon inspired the Genevese with a desire to reinstate him as the spiritual head of their republic. Troubles also had befallen them[4]; and it was felt in many quarters that their obstinate resistance to the godly discipline of the reformers had provoked the indignation of Heaven[5].

[1] This was the effect of a disputation (Oct. 1, 1536) in which Calvin, Farel and Viret were conspicuous. On the last of these reformers, see Jacquemont's *Viret, Reformateur de Lausanne*, Strasburg, 1836.

[2] See Dyer, pp. 79 sq. Gaberel, I. 218 sq. A synod held at Lausanne in mid-lent, 1538, was adverse to Calvin and Farel, who thereupon carried their appeal in person to another meeting of Swiss Reformers, held at Zürich (April 29). A reconciliation was here effected between the rival ministers of Bern and Geneva, but in spite of the remonstrances of the Bernese ambassadors addressed to the Council of Geneva (May 22), the general assembly of this latter place determined on the banishment of the refractory ministers.

[3] He met both of these divines at the diet of Ratisbon (1541), whither he had been sent as the 'Lutheran' representative of the Strasburgers. The contrast between himself and Melanchthon is forcibly shewn by one of his letters to the Wittenberg professor on the subject of the *Interim:* Calvin, *Epist.* CXVII.: cf. *Epist.* CXLI. He seems to have had a higher opinion of Luther (see Dyer, pp. 182 sq.), and even on the much disputed doctrine of the Eucharist, he was during his residence at Strasburg suspected by the Swiss party of 'Lutheranism:' *Ibid.* p. 401.

[4] Gaberel (ch. IX.) gives an account of 'Genève pendant l'exil de Calvin.' Some French and other ecclesiastics assisted the ex-bishop, Pierre de la Baume, in his attempts to re-enter his old diocese, and through the treachery of the 'first syndic' of Geneva, their scheme was at one moment not unlikely to be realized.

[5] Ranke, *Civil Wars &c. in France*, I. 215: cf. Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Pref. ch. II. § 3

SWITZERLAND.

His return to Geneva,

and the vastness of his influence.

Calvin, therefore, was invited by the Council to return, and after hesitating for a while arrived at Geneva on the 13th of September 1541. Henceforth his power[1] was not less Hildebrandine than his temper and capacity. The exercise of spiritual jurisdiction was absolutely vested in a consistory, of which he was himself the standing president, and whose decisions, often harsh and merciless[2], were guided by his sovereign will. Nor was the dogmatism of Calvin limited to the minute republic of the Genevese. His rugged spirit chafed continually amid the controversies that distracted western Christendom[3]; and foreign states, in admiration of his wondrous power and learning, did not scruple to receive direction from his lips[4]. Although he found himself unable to compose the

[1] The ecclesiastical code, on which it was founded, and in which we recognize the hand of the accomplished lawyer, was, to use the expression of M. Gaberel (I 266) 'un phénomène législatif, dont l'équivalent ne se présente que chez les Spartiates et les Hébreux.' It will be hereafter considered more particularly in the chapter *On the Constitution and Government of the Church.*

[2] The case of the Spanish physician, Servetus (Miguel Servede), who was burnt at Geneva (Oct. 27, 1553) for publishing and defending anti-Trinitarian and Pantheistic errors, is fully examined by all the three biographers above mentioned, p. 113, n. 4: cf. also *Quarterly Review*, No. 176, pp. 551 sq. The instances there quoted of divines who justified and even applauded Calvin's conduct in this tragedy, may be augmented by the name of Field, who in his treatise *Of the Church* (I. 288, ed. Eccl. H. S.) alludes to 'the just and honourable proceeding' against Servetus. The truth is, what are now called the principles of *toleration* were not understood by any of the great religious parties. Beza on this occasion put forth an elaborate treatise *De Hæreticis a civili Magistratu puniendis*, to shew that such punishment ought in certain cases to be capital.

[3] See, for instance, his *Antidoton adversus Articulos Facultatis Theologicæ Sorbonicæ*, in reply to twenty-five Articles of doctrine issued in 1542; or his *Defensio sanæ et orthodoxæ Doctrinæ de Servitute et Liberatione humani Arbitrii*, directed against a work of Pighius on this subject, and published at Geneva, 1543. He also levelled tracts at Anabaptists, Libertines, and finally at 'Nicodemites' (temporizing Frenchmen, who although reformers at heart, complied with Romish rites and customs, thus going to Christ secretly, and in the spirit of Nicodemus). In addition to these struggles he had numerous controversies more personal in their nature, *e. g.* with Sebastian Castellio (Dyer, pp. 168 sq.), who adopted loose opinions touching some portions of Holy Scripture; and with Jerome Bolsec, who had ventured to impugn the Calvinistic theory of predestination (*Ibid.* pp. 265 sq. pp. 388, 389). Castellio afterwards revived the predestinarian controversy (*Ibid.* pp. 440 sq.).

[4] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Pref. ch. II. § 4 (I. 133, 134, notes: Oxf. 1841). On his correspondence with Cranmer respecting a 'General Reformed Confession of Faith,' see Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, pp. 71, 72,

SWITZERLAND.

scandalous contest of the Lutheran and Zwinglian doctors, he at length succeeded in establishing a theological concordat between the French and German cantons of Switzerland; and thus, with the cooperation of the mild and moderate Bullinger, consolidated the Helvetic reformation. The document by which this union was achieved is known as the *Consensus Tigurinus*[1] (**1549**). It is devoted chiefly to the question of the sacraments, and must have tended to invest those institutions with a somewhat higher dignity in the opinion of the Swiss reformers. Calvin viewed them not as merely outward badges of Christianity, but as 'organs'[2] in the hands of God Himself, by which it often[3] pleases Him to operate with saving efficacy on the spirit of the faithful recipients, or by which at least He certifies them that they really belong to Him. But Calvin's rigorous doctrine of predestination, and the absolute inadmissibility of regenerating grace, compelled him always to restrict the possible benefit[4] of the sacraments to one peculiar class of subjects; other Christians, or the

The Consensus Tigurinus, **1549**;

by which the Swiss doctrine of the Sacraments is modified.

notes; and Dyer, pp. 290—295. He was also called in to arbitrate respecting the 'Troubles of Frankfort' (1555), on which occasion he manifested very little sympathy with the English Prayer-Book (*Opp.* VIII. 98). His influence in determining the future course of Knox in Scotland will be traced below: pp. 138 sq.

[1] Printed in Niemeyer, pp. 191 sq. On its history and composition, see the editor's *Præf.* pp. xli—xlv.

[2] In § VII. they are called 'notæ ac tesseræ Christianæ professionis et societatis,' but in § XIII. it is added, 'Organa quidem sunt, quibus efficaciter, ubi visum est, agit Deus; sed ita, ut totum salutis nostræ opus Ipsi uni acceptum ferri debeat.' In § XVII. the 'Consensus' repudiates 'illud Sophistarum commentum, quod docet Sacramenta novæ Legis *conferre gratiam* omnibus non ponentibus obicem peccati mortalis:' thus alluding to a phrase which afterwards entered largely into discussions on this subject. Calvin's own favourite mode of representing the sacrament of baptism in particular was to view it as *obsignatory* of blessings which already appertained to the recipient as a child of grace: *e. g.* 'Semper tenendum hoc principium est, non conferri baptismum infantibus, *ut filii Dei fiant et hæredes;* sed quia *jam eo loco et gradu censentur apud Deum*, adoptionis gratiam baptismo *obsignari* in eorum carne.' See other passages in Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus*, I. 466, 467, Schaffhausen, 1846.

[3] 'Utilitas porro, quam ex Sacramentis percipimus, ad tempus, quo ea nobis administrantur, *minime restringi* debet' *etc.* § XX.

[4] 'Nam reprobis peræque ut electis *signa* administrantur; *veritas* autem signorum *ad hos solos* pervenit:' § XVII. The same idea is stated in § XVI.: 'Nam quemadmodum non alios in fidem illuminat quam quos præordinavit ad vitam; ita arcana Spiritus Sui virtute efficit, ut percipiant electi quæ offerunt Sacramenta.'

SWITZERLAND.

non-elected, being, in his view, partakers of no more than the material element. His doctrine of the Eucharist is particularly observable, because it rises[1] far above the low and frigid theories of his predecessor, Zwingli. While contending no less strenuously that Christ, as to His natural Presence, is in heaven[2], he taught that there is, notwithstanding, in the Eucharist, a mystical Presence of the Lord; His glorified humanity, though locally absent, being virtually, and *in effect*, communicated for the sustenance of the faithful, simultaneously with the participation of the outward elements[3].

Geneva after Calvin's death.

The physical and intellectual activity of Calvin only terminated with his death (May **27, 1564**). The mantle of his office, and to some extent his autocratic spirit, then descended upon Theodore de Bèze, or Beza, under whom[4] Geneva for a while continued to preserve its high celebrity as one stronghold of the Reformation. Thither fled a multitude of refugees from Italy[5] and other countries, where the champion of the new opinions could no longer hold his ground. Its influence also was peculiarly felt in France[6], with which it was united in close relations, not only by the ties of language and geographical position, but still

[1] On the transition from the Zwinglian to the Calvinistic doctrine, compare the *Formula Concordiæ* (of the Lutherans): Part II. cap. VII. § 4.

[2] § XXV.

[3] This view is not so positively stated in the 'Consensus' as in Calvin's *Institutio*, lib. IV. c. 17, passim. It reappeared in all the later Calvinistic confessions, *e.g.* the 'Helvetica posterior,' the French (see especially Art. XXXVI.: Niemeyer, p. 325), the Belgic and the Scottish, and was also very emphatically advanced in the *Consensus Sendomiriensis* (above, p. 85, n. 4).

[4] The best modern life of him is Schlosser's *Leben des Theod. de Beza*. After a youth spent in dissipation he visited Geneva and came under the mighty influences of Calvin, by whose exertions he was made professor of Greek at Lausanne (Nov. 6, 1549). He afterwards (see below, pp. 127, 128) took an active part in the struggles of the French Protestants, returning to Geneva not long before Calvin's death. He kept up a correspondence with the Puritans in the Church of England, writing very freely to Grindal bishop of London against the sacerdotal vestments and other regulations of the Prayer-Book: see Strype's *Life of Grindal*, pp. 112—114: Lond. 1710.

[5] Gaberel among the 'Pièces Justificatives' appended to Vol. I. has given a list of Italian refugees beginning at the year 1550: pp. 170 sq.

[6] See, for instance, the original correspondence that passed between the French Protestants and the 'vénérable compagnie' of ministers at Geneva, from 1561 to 1564, in Gaberel, as above, pp. 80 sq.

SWITZERLAND.

more in virtue of the Gallican sympathies which it derived from Farel, Calvin, Beza, Viret, and their coadjutors.

It appears, however, that if we except a small accession to their numbers which the Swiss reformers gained from Savoy[1], Calvin's death may be regarded as the culminating point of the religious system he had founded. The great counter-movement, of which traces were discerned in other countries[2], penetrated almost every canton of the Helvetic confederacy. Its leader in this region was Carlo Borromeo[3], archbishop of Milan (**1569—1584**), who combined, as it would seem, a spirit of profound devotion with abhorrence of the Calvinist, and of all other adversaries of the Roman pontiff[4]. Under his patronage[5] the Order of the Jesuits was established in Lucern and Freyburg, bands of Capuchins began to wander in the districts where the reformation was but half-established; and a college[6], organized at Milan for the purpose, constantly supplied them with a higher class of priests than could be trained in Switzerland itself. The spirited reaction thus commenced was afterwards promoted by the formation of the Golden League[7] of **1586**, in which the Romish cantons bound themselves to stand by each other in defending their position against the Calvinistic party: while at the commencement of the following century, the Genevese and their immediate neighbours had to tremble for their lives and liberties no less than for their religion, owing to the inroads of the duke of Savoy and the titular bishop of Geneva, the ascetic François de Sales[8].

Commencement of reaction; under Carlo Borromeo (d. **1584**),

and François de Sales (d. **1622**).

[1] See J. J. Hottinger, *Helvet. Kirchengesch.* III. 887 sq. Zürich, 1708.

[2] Above, p. 66.

[3] For the most favourable picture of him, see Sailer, *Der heil. Karl Borromeus*, Augsb. 1823. His writings, from which extracts are there given, were chiefly ascetical. His great anxiety in carrying out the 'reformations' ordered by the Council of Trent was shewn in the series of provincial synods which he held at Milan (1565–1582): Labbe, XV. 242 sq.

[4] The '*Case of a Minorite Friar* [addicted to Protestantism] who was sentenced by S. Charles Borromeo to be walled up, and who having escaped was burnt in effigy,' has been edited by the Rev. R. Gibbings (Dublin, 1853) from 'records of the Roman Inquisition.'

[5] Cf. Hottinger, as above, pp. 907 sq.

[6] The difficulties he found in realizing this project (1579) are described by the continuator of Fleury, *Hist. Eccles.* liv. LXXV. ss. 33 sq.

[7] Hottinger, III. 931 sq.

[8] See De Marsollier, *Vie de S. François de Sales*, Paris, 1747.

FRANCE.

FRANCE.

THE patriarch of the reformers in this country was Jacques Lefèvre[1], who was born in Picardy, at Estaples. When Luther was arraigned before the Diet of Worms, Lefèvre was already verging on the age of seventy. He had travelled far and wide, especially in Italy, where he experienced the fresh impulses that followed the revival of ancient literature. As early as **1512** he was persuaded by his study of St Paul's Epistles that the received opinions touching human merit were at variance with the genuine form of Christianity; and his friend Briçonnet[2], bishop of Meaux, arriving at the same conclusion, ventured for a while to undertake the reformation of that diocese. But although the monarch, Francis I., was not politically adverse[3] either to the Lutheran movement or to the kindred agitation that sprang up in his own dominions, the ancient dogmas, in so far as they are separable[4] from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiffs, found a number of unflinching advocates in the college of the Sorbonne, which constituted the Theological faculty of Paris. Luther's *Prelude on the Babylonish Captivity*, when submitted[5] to these doctors in **1521**, had been proscribed as blasphemous and heretical; and two years later, the proceedings of Briçonnet

[1] De Félice, *Hist. of the Protestants of France*, I. 2 sq. Lond. 1853. Ranke, *Civil Wars*, &c. I. 189 sq.

[2] Besides enlisting Lefèvre ('Jacobus *Faber* Stapulensis') in this work, he made use of the services of William Farel (above, p. 113), of Gerard Ruffi or le Roux (see Schmidt's *Gérard Roussel*), and for a short time of Calvin himself (Dyer, p. 20). At length, however, when the storm increased, Briçonnet 'took shelter in his mystic obscurity:' Ranke, as before, p. 194.

[3] Ranke, *Ibid.* pp. 195, 196. He declared in negociating with the Lutherans (above, p. 56, n. 1) that he had only put to death a few fanatics, who were bent on exciting a sedition in his capital: Smedley, *Hist. of the Reformed Religion in France*, I. 33, 34, Lond. 1832. Melanchthon, whom Francis invited (1535) to assist in the direction of ecclesiastical affairs, had already (in 1534) corresponded with Guillaume du Bellay, and drawn up a *Consilium de moderandis controversiis religionis...ad Gallos:* Opp. ed. Bretsch. III. 741 sq. The elector of Saxony, however, refused his consent (Aug. 24, 1535): *Ibid.* II. 909, 910.

[4] While repudiating the ultra-papal claims (cf. *Middle Age*, p. 338), and n. 2), the doctors of the Sorbonne had no sympathy with any teaching that opposed the notions of the schoolmen, especially of Aquinas.

[5] On his probable motives in allowing his dispute with Eck to be referred to them, see above, p. 20, n. 2. Melanchthon (as we have seen, p. 28) defended him against their *Determinatio*.

having been exposed before the same tribunal, vigorous measures[1] were instituted in the hope of strangling the new brood of 'vipers' at their birth. Yet even at this period the reformers had secured an able protectress in the literary and eccentric Margaret of Angoulême[2], sister of the reigning monarch and grandmother of Henry IV. When she was married in **1527** to Henry d'Albret, king of Navarre, the petty district of Béarn became a refuge of the persecuted, many scholars of distinction being thus from time to time attracted to her court. Partly through the influence she exerted, and still more from a desire to counterwork the policy of his great rival Charles V., her brother had grown anxious to cement political connexions with the Protestants of Germany[3]; but in **1534**, the tempest that drove Calvin[4] and some others like him into Switzerland, was almost fatal to the progress of the new opinions. The barbarous persecution that cut off so many of their leading representatives extended also to the peaceful Vaudois[5] of Provence, whose massacre in **1545** is one of the most sickening passages among the blood-stained annals of that region. Still in spite of manifold reverses, some perhaps attributable[6] to

[1] On the earlier executions, see De Félice, I. 10 sq. The noblest victim of the Sorbonne was Louis de Berquin, who was a friend of Erasmus, and translated some of the minor works of Luther and Melanchthon into French. He was burnt Nov. 10, 1529.

[2] Also known as Margaret of *Valois*, and therefore not unfrequently confounded with the more notorious Margaret of Valois, the first queen of Henry IV. The *Lettres de Marguerite d'Angoulême* have been collected by M. Génin (Paris, 1841), but neither they nor the editor's *Notice* have enabled us to understand her character. Her poem entitled *Le Miroir de l'Ame pécheresse*, which excited the indignation of the Sorbonne (Génin, p. 111), was very acceptable to the Protestants; while another work, the *Heptameron*, a collection of licentious tales (professedly in imitation of Boccaccio's *Decamerone*), represents her in a far more equivocal light: cf. Génin, pp. 93 sq.; De Félice, I. 22 sq. On her deathbed she signified her cordial adherence to the religion of her forefathers.

[3] Above, p. 122, n. 3.

[4] Above, p. 114, and n. 5.

[5] They had fallen under suspicion by joining in the deputation sent to Basel in 1530 (see above, p. 112, n. 3). On the 28th of April, 1545, the towns of Merindol and Cabrières, with twenty-eight villages, were literally destroyed; the number of the slain being estimated at four thousand. Although Francis may not have directly authorized these atrocities, they went unpunished: De Félice, I. 44 sq.; Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, pp. 193–197.

[6] This was fully admitted by John Sturmius, writing from Paris (March 4, 1535) to Melanchthon (ed. Bretsch. II. 855); and Ranke (I. 198)

FRANCE.

the lawless zeal of the reformers, some to the confusion of their cause with that of Anabaptism, and the rest to the inexorable hostility[1] of the Parisian doctors, they had risen to no small importance in the state[2] when Francis was in 1547 succeeded by his son Henry II. It was the reign of this dissolute monarch, married to a niece of pope Clement VII., Catharine de' Medici, that witnessed the formation of two parties[3] headed by the rival families of Guise and Bourbon, and associated afterwards with the great religious movements of the day. The policy of Henry was however still more uniformly hostile to the Protestants than that of his predecessor. He determined that no deviation[4] from the ruling faith should be permitted in his kingdom; edicts[5] in denunciation of 'heresy' were multiplied, and the registers of the Sorbonne abound with evidence of the alacrity then manifested by the doctors to repress all forms of innovation[6]. But neither calumnies, nor gibbets, nor the sword, were found sufficient for this purpose. In the hour of greatest danger, the reformers had the courage to assemble and complete the organization of their new religious system[7]. Hitherto they had been little more than scattered units animated by a common hatred of the Mediæval errors and corruptions, and so far as they professed to recognize a human leader symbolizing with the Wittenberg divines. But in 1555 the 'Christaudins,' 'Lutheriens' or 'Faithful' of Paris, formally accepted the Genevan discipline projected by their able fellow-countryman, and four years later, when this organization was adopted in other places, published with his sanction a

conjectures that the Anabaptist fanatics were mixed up with some of the commotions that arose in Paris.

[1] *E.g.* they absolutely rejected Melanchthon's *Consilium* (above, p. 122, n. 3), and thus placed themselves in direct antagonism to the court, by whom that document was favourably received: see Seckendorf, Lib. III. pp. 104–106.

[2] De Félice, I. 52; Ranke, II. 233, 234.

[3] Miller, *Hist. philos. illustrated*, III. 77.

[4] Ranke, *Civil Wars*, &c. I. 226 sq. He was warmly supported by the constable Anne de Montmorency and the cardinal of Lorraine, son of the duke of Guise.

[5] On the extreme severity of the 'edict of Chateaubriand' (June 25, 1551), see Smedley, I. 56–58.

[6] Many of the culprits (as in Germany, above, p. 72) were members of religious orders.

[7] De Félice, I. 69 sq. Smedley, I. 62, 76–82

FRANCE.

Confession[1] of their faith in forty Articles (May, **1559**). Its character, as might have been anticipated, is strictly Swiss or Calvinistic.

At this epoch the reformers numbered in their ranks a fraction of the chief nobility, and even members of one royal house: the principal being Anthony of Bourbon, king of Navarre, together with the queen Jeanne d'Albret; his brother Louis, Prince of Condé; the Admiral de Coligny; and his brother, the seigneur d'Andelot. During the reign of Francis II., as well as that of his father, Henry, the faction of the Guises was upon the whole predominant, deriving fresh importance from the king's marriage with their relative, Mary Queen of Scots; while the Bourbon family attempted to advance its interest by invoking the co-operation of the Protestants, or Huguenots[2], as the new religionists began at length to be entitled. The ambitious and astute queen-mother, Catharine de' Medici, is said to have formerly evinced a bias in their favour; Coligny and the other leaders of the party had hoped to find in her a second Esther[3]; but on falling under the influence of the Guises, she became estranged from them, averse to their opinions, and indifferent to their sufferings. Plots[4] had given rise to counterplots, by which the leading Bourbons[5]

[1] See it in Niemeyer, pp. 311 sq. and among the 'Pièces Justificatives' appended to Gaberel's *Hist. de l'Église de Genève*, as before. The Latin version of it was made in 1566 (Niemeyer, pp. 327 sq.). In Art. v. the Three Creeds are accepted 'pour ce qu'ils sont conformes à la Parole de Dieu,' and in Art. vi. the compilers declare 'Détestons toutes sectes et hérésies, qui ont esté reietées par les saints Docteurs, comme saint Hylaire, saint Athanase, saint Ambrose, saint Cyrille.' The articles, or canons, of discipline were also forty in number.

[2] The common derivation of the name is from Eidgnots or Eignots (=Eidgenossen), the 'confederate' party at Geneva, who entered into an alliance with the Swiss cantons against the duke of Savoy (above, p. 113, n. 3): but Beza, writing when the sobriquet was introduced, informs us that it originated at Tours in 1560, and was used to characterise the nightly gatherings of the Protestants, who bore some resemblance to Huguet the wild huntsman of popular superstition: cf. Ranke, I. 259, note.

[3] De Félice, I. 91.

[4] One of the worst is known as the Huguenot 'conspiracy of Amboise' (1560), designed to rid the kingdom of the Guises, without attempting any thing against the royal family. The chief mover was Geoffrey de la Barre, a friend of Calvin, which led to the implication of Calvin in the business: see Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, pp. 478–480.

[5] See the narrative in Smedley, I. 140 sq. At the same juncture the cardinal of Lorraine resolved to force every Frenchman at the peril of

FRANCE.

were eventually left at the mercy of their adversaries, when the early death of Francis conduced to their deliverance. Since the Guises were not members of the royal family, they could not lawfully aspire to the regency constituted during the minority of Charles IX.; and therefore, at the impulse of wounded pride, ambition, and fanaticism, they entered on a course of policy that plunged the nation into one of those politico-religious wars from which it suffered till the close of the sixteenth century.

During the brief interval which followed the death of Francis II. and the temporary depression of the Guises, the Huguenots secured a very large accession to their numbers[1]. Enthusiastic agents were continually training at Geneva under Calvin's own eye[2], prepared whenever opportunity was offered to go forth and circulate the principles which they had gathered from his lectures. So very influential grew his followers in France, that Catharine, who was elevated to the regency, now felt herself constrained to treat them with some show of deference. She had even signified a wish to bring about the reconciliation of the two religious parties[3], and on the proposition of the Huguenot leaders, Coligny and the prince of Condé, it was determined that an amicable meeting[4], of the nature of a synod, should take place at Poissy on the 9th of September, 1561. The Romish party, who assembled in considerable numbers, were confronted by Calvin's chief

his life to sign a creed which he called the 'Huguenot's Rat-Trap,' drawn up by the Sorbonne in 1542: De Félice, I. 108: cf. above, p. 118, n. 3.

[1] De Félice, I. 114, 115. They were spreading most in Poitou, Saintonge, Aquitaine, Provence, Languedoc, Dauphiné, and especially in Normandy.

[2] Dyer, p. 485.

[3] She was influenced, doubtless, by the deliberations of the Estates which opened Dec. 13, 1560. Religious questions occupied a large portion of the time, and indicated unmistakeably that many changes would be acceptable even to the moderate Romanists: see Ranke, I. 277 sq.

[4] Many of the French prelates viewed the conference with suspicion, thinking that it would proceed to the determination of matters which ought rather to be settled at the Council of Trent. The fears of this party would be much increased when they read the letter addressed by Catharine to the pope (Aug. 4, 1561), suggesting numerous relaxations of the church-law in favour of the separatists. The whole of this remarkable document, which is ascribed to Montluc, the 'reforming' bishop of Valence, is in De Thou (Thuanus) *Hist. sui Temporis*, lib. XXVIII. c. 6.

disciple, the accomplished Theodore Beza[1], and by other ministers and lay-deputies of the Huguenots: the main subjects of discussion being the doctrine of the Eucharist, and what was even more difficult, the jurisdiction and authority of the Church. The principles of the Swiss reformers were also ably advocated by Peter Martyr[2], who arrived from Zürich while the Colloquy was proceeding (Sept. **21**); but if we except the clear reiteration of Calvin's language on the virtual, as distinguished from the physical, manducation of Christ through the reception of the consecrated elements[3], no present good resulted from the labours of this meeting[4]. It had little or no force in checking the disastrous outbreak of hostilities. Although an edict was promulgated in January **1562**[5] removing all the penalties that heretofore had been suspended over their religious exercises, the massacre of several Huguenots at Vassy (March **1, 1562**), while unarmed and congregated in the act of worship[6], roused their brethren into fury: they demanded the immediate punishment of the duke of Guise by whom that outrage had been fully sanctioned, if not directly instigated. Many towns immediately declared their sympathy with the Huguenots, and others were induced, ere long, to take up arms in their behalf. Beza[7]

[1] See the account in Schlosser's *Leben des Theodor de Beza*, pp. 101 sq., Dyer's *Life of Calvin*, pp. 488 sq., and Smedley, I. 161 sq.

[2] Bullinger also had been consulted by Beza respecting the language he should employ: Dyer, p. 488.

[3] 'In the commission, to which the most learned and moderate men on the Catholic side were appointed, they actually agreed to a formula concerning the spiritual reception through faith, which was satisfactory to both parties.' Ranke, *Civil Wars*, &c. I. 294: cf. Smedley, I. 195. This formula, however, was rejected by the other prelates to whom it was referred, and still more absolutely by the Sorbonne.

[4] One inauspicious consequence to the Huguenots was the secession of king Anthony of Navarre, who had been for some time oscillating between contradictory views of the Eucharist (Ranke, I. 309; De Félice, I. 145 sq.). He died very soon afterwards, and his wife, who continued to be one of the most zealous reformers, brought up their son (the future Henry IV.) in her principles.

[5] Ranke, I. 297. The Huguenots on receiving this indulgence had to 'bind themselves by a solemn oath to teach no other doctrines than those contained in the books of the Old and New Testaments, and in the Creed of the Council of Nicæa, to submit to the municipal law, and not to hold their synods without permission from the royal officers.'

[6] See Smedley, I. 219 sq.; De Félice, I. 150 sq.

[7] Like other ministers he not only maintained that war was lawful, but enjoined it as a duty under present circumstances; *i.e.* in order to

SWITZERLAND.

who remained in France for some time after the Colloquy of Poissy, was actively engaged among the combatants, inspiring his disciples with fresh courage, and assisting at the councils of their military leaders, Condé and Coligny. The first battle was now fought at Dreux[1] (Dec. **19, 1562**), and though contested obstinately on both sides, resulted in the overthrow and dispersion of the Huguenots. They were, however, liberated from this new embarrassment immediately afterwards by the assassination of the duke of Guise[2], and the conclusion of the peace of Orleans, which was followed by an edict of Pacification published at Amboise March **19, 1563**, and promising religious liberty[3] to Calvinists, although the measure of it was much inferior to what they had previously enjoyed.

This settlement accordingly became a mere suspension of hostilities: it gave the combatants on either side a breathing-time, which they employed in preparations for a longer and a bloodier conflict (**1567—1570**). One act of violence[4] was rapidly succeeded by another; the atrocious pictures of the ordinary civil-war were darkened in this case by deeds of private vengeance[5] and the outburst of

liberate the crown from the Guise party as well as to assert the binding force of the edict of January. This justification appeared satisfactory to Philip, landgrave of Hessen, and also to the Queen of England: Ranke, I. 318, 319. On Elizabeth's manifesto in favour of the Huguenots (or, more correctly, against the Guises), see Smedley, I. 243, 244. In the wars that followed, the Huguenots received material support from foreign Protestants.

[1] Ranke, I. 320 sq.

[2] The assassin was a fanatical Huguenot named Poltrot de Merey. On the question touching the complicity of the Calvinistic leaders in this act, see Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, pp. 506—508.

[3] They were guaranteed the freedom of public service only in those towns and cities which were in their hands on March 7, 1563; one place being moreover allotted in every bailiwick, outside of which they were permitted to hold their religious meetings: Ranke, I. 326, 327. Coligny expressed his strong dissatisfaction on learning the terms of the treaty as negociated by Condé: De Félice, I. 169.

[4] The enormities committed are chargeable almost equally on both factions. De Félice, in particular, laments the relaxation of discipline among the Huguenots, and also their fanatical outrages. 'They broke the consecrated vessels, mutilated the statues of the saints, and scattered their relics. These excesses produced in the hearts of the Catholics a rage which it is impossible to describe.'

[5] Soon after the battle of St Denis (Nov. 10, 1567), which proved fatal to the Constable Montmorency, his place was supplied by the youthful Duke of Anjou. Under him the war was reopened (March 13,

fanaticism, regardless of all discipline, and deaf to all the gentler instincts of humanity; and when at length the tempest seemed to be exhausted[1], and the Huguenots again assembled in great numbers at the French capital, the transient calm was broken by the shrieks and execrations rising from the diabolical massacre, that was perpetrated under the guidance of Catharine de' Medici, on the morning of St Bartholomew[2] (Aug. **24, 1572**). By it there fell in Paris, according to the most moderate calculation, two thousand Protestants, and in France at large as many as twenty thousand. The noble-hearted Coligny perished in this number, while the two young cousins, Henry prince of Condé and Henry of Navarre[3], escaped with difficulty; both of them compelled to purchase safety by the temporary abjuration of their faith.

But after the Calvinistic party rose again, and proved its heroism at the siege of La Rochelle, the new monarch, Henry III., who succeeded in **1574**, saw reason for increased alarm at the predominance of the Guises. The ecclesiastical predilections of this family, no less than their political interests, were more and more identified with the advances of an ultra-Romish faction in the state; and therefore, instead of uniting with the feeble king in his pacificatory measures, they finally proceeded to negotiate a League[4] with Philip II. of Spain, in order to secure the extirpation of reformed opinions, not in France only, but in the Netherlands. Their attitude became in truth so menacing as to drive the king into open war with them, and ultimately to effect a reconciliation between himself and the political Huguenots[5] (**1589**). Immediately after-

1569) by a victory over the Huguenots at Jarnac, where Condé their general was taken prisoner, and assassinated with the approbation of the duke: Smedley, I. 322, 323. Henry of Navarre was henceforth recognized as 'Protector' of the Huguenots.

[1] The peace of St Germain-en-Laye was concluded Aug. 8, 1570, and provided that the Huguenots should be in future unmolested on account of their religion: *Ibid.* I. 343, 344.

[2] See the excellent narrative in Ranke, *Civil Wars*, &c. II. 1—51: and cf. Audin, *Hist. de la Saint-Barthélemy*, Paris, 1826. The horror which the massacre excited in England is well expressed by Sir Thomas Smith, in Smedley, II. 55.

[3] Henry of Navarre was not restored to the Huguenots till 1576: on his escape see Smedley, II. 133. His cousin died prematurely in 1588.

[4] On its origin and character see Ranke, II. 137 sq.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 225 sq.

FRANCE.

wards Henry was assassinated[1], and notwithstanding the papal interdict against the Bourbons[2], his crown descended to their branch of the royal family as represented by the protestant Henry of Navarre, whose struggles with the League were only terminated four years later by his own abandonment of protestantism[3] (June **25, 1593**). He did not, however, withdraw his sympathies entirely from his old adherents; and accordingly, while the principles on which he governed France were tending to bind up her wounds and silence many of her wildest factions, they had also the effect of vindicating in some measure the forgotten liberties of the Gallican Church[4]. The perfect freedom of the Huguenots in matters of religion was also guaranteed in the celebrated document[5] entitled, from the place of its publication, the 'Edict of Nantes,' and solemnly declared to be perpetual and irrevocable (**1598**).

[1] The assassin was Jacques Clément, a Dominican of Sens, on whom see Smedley, II. 273 sq.

[2] See the imperious bull of Sixtus V. (Sept. 9, 1585) in Goldast, *Monarch. Imperii*, III. 124. On its arrival in Paris, Pierre de l'Estoile (*Mémoires*, p. 299, ed. Petitot, 1825) remarked the general indignation with which it was received by the Parliament, one member going so far as to recommend that it should be burnt 'en presence de toute l'Eglise Gallicane.' Henry IV. was exempted from its operation with some difficulty by Clement VIII. (Sept. 17, 1595).

[3] He seems to have been determined chiefly by political considerations (cf. Ranke, II. 339 sq.), which led him, as he pleaded, 'to sacrifice his convictions to his duty.' He was influenced doubtless by his friend and minister, the duke de Sully (Baron de Rosny), who although a Calvinist, belonged to a lax or 'liberal' section of the party. Their principles are indicated by the following extract from the *Mémoires de Sully* (IV. 47, Paris, 1827): 'Si les protestans ne croient pas tout ce que les catholiques croient, du moins ceuxci ne peuvent-ils nier que nous ne croyons rien qu'ils ne croient comme nous, et que ce que nous croyons renferme ce que la religion Chrétienne a d'essentiel; le Decalogue, le Symbole des Apôtres et l'Oraison Dominicale étant le grand et général fondement de notre commune croyance. En voilà assez.' Henry had a very different adviser, and the Huguenots a very different champion, in Philippe de Mornay (seigneur Duplessis), a learned and zealous reformer: see De Félice, I. 263 sq. One of his most celebrated works (1598) is entitled, *De l'institution, usage et doctrine du Saint Sacrement de l'Eucllaristie en l'Eglise Ancienne.*

[4] There was already in France a considerable party adverse to those decisions of the Council of Trent which related to the constitution of the Church and its reform: see Ranke, I. 332.

[5] See, respecting it, Benoist, *Hist. de l'édit de Nantes*, Delft, 1693.

SCOTLAND.

THE fears that Scotland entertained of her immediate neighbour, had for centuries induced her rulers to negotiate alliances with France[1]. At the beginning of the Reformation-period this connexion led to the ascendancy of French interests in the government; and in proportion as Henry VIII. of England advocated his selfish scheme for expediting the union of the two crowns, the leaders of the Scottish nation had been still more under the necessity of looking to their continental friends for counsel and support. The second queen of James V. of Scotland was Mary of Lorraine, a daughter of the duke of Guise, whose family we saw identified with projects aiming at the extirpation of the Huguenots, and the establishment of ultra-Romanism[2]. It was accordingly to be expected, that during the minority of the daughter of James V., the celebrated Mary Queen of Scots, by whom he was succeeded in **1542**, and also after the marriage of this princess to the dauphin in **1558**, the foreign influence would not only continue to prevail, but throw up barriers in the way of those who undertook to urge the reformation of the Scottish Church.

Yet, notwithstanding the resistance thus offered by political arrangements, Scotland was ultimately shaken in its turn by the great convulsions of the sixteenth century. It is possible that some faint echoes of the Lollard doctrines[3] lingered here and there; but he who first disseminated the characteristic tenets of the Lutherans was Patrick Hamilton. His name occurs among the earliest entries at the Hessian University of Marburg[4]. On returning to his

[1] At first the influence of the French was employed in mediating between England and Scotland, but after 1346 they frequently instigated the Scots to invade the neighbouring kingdom.

[2] Above, pp. 126, 129.

[3] Respecting the 'Lollards of Kyle,' who to the number of thirty persons were cited before the King and his Council in 1494, see Knox, *Hist. of the Reform. in Scotland* (reprinted for the *Wodrow Society*, Edinb. 1846), I. 7 sq. The tenth and eleventh articles would be especially obnoxious to the authorities: 'That everie faythfull man or woman is a preast:' 'That the unctioun of kingis ceassed at the cuming of Christ' (p. 9). Knox welcomed these precursors on the ground that God had thereby retained within the realm 'some sponk of His light, evin in the tyme of grettast darkness:' p. 10.

[4] Above, p. 68; cf. Ranke, *Ref.* II. 539.

SCOTLAND.

native country, where he enjoyed the rank of titular abbot of Ferne[1], we find him preaching with considerable freedom and effect against the practical corruptions of the Church, ascribing them to serious errors in the general teaching of the clergy, and propounding the ideas he had imported from Germany on the nature of baptism, faith, free-will, penances, auricular confession and purgatory. He was also charged with holding that the popes are 'Antichristian,' and that every priest has been invested with as much authority as they.

Opinions of this startling character excited the abhorrence of the ecclesiastical rulers[2], and brought their chief abettor to the stake (March **1, 1528**). The same hostility was afterwards manifested by the parliament of Scotland, when 'the smoke of Patrick Hamilton having infected as many as it blew upon'[3], a rigorous act was passed (June **12, 1535**) 'against those who hold, dispute or rehearse, the damnable opinions of the great heretic Luther'[4]. But this fulmination also proved inefficacious:

[1] According to Mr Laing, the editor of Knox, Hamilton 'was not in holy orders' (I. 14, n. 3); yet the contrary is plainly stated in John Frith's contemporaneous preface to *A Brief Treatise of Mr Patrike Hamilton, called* Patrike's Places: 'who, to testifie the truth, sought all meanes, and tooke upon him Priesthode (even as Paule circumcised Timothy, to wynne the weake Jewes,) that he might be admitted to preache the pure Word of God' (*Ibid.* p. 20): cf. Spotswood, *Hist. of the Church and State of Scotland*, pp. 62, 63, Lond. 1677; Calderwood, *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland* (reprinted for the *Wodrow Soc.* Edinb. 1842), I. 73 sq.; and P. Lorimer, *Precursors of Knox* (including Patrick Hamilton, Alexander Alane, or Alesius, and Sir David Lindsay), Lond. 1857.

[2] Their sentence is given by Calderwood, I. 78 sq., as well as a 'Letter Congratulatorie' from the 'Master and Professors of Theology at Louvain' (April 21, 1528), commending their orthodoxy and promptness in despatching the misbeliever. The same doctors mention that England, 'the next neighbour' of the Scots, was then altogether free from heresy, owing partly to 'the working of the bishops, among which Roffensis [*i. e.* Fisher of Rochester] hath shewed himself an Evangelicall Phœnix,' and partly to the influence of the King (Henry VIII.), who was 'another Mattathias of the new law' (p. 82).

[3] The author of this expression was 'a meary gentillman, named Johnne Lyndesay, famylliar to Bischope James Betoun' (Knox, I. 42), who had observed that after Hamilton's death the new opinions spread with great rapidity. Respecting the principal sufferers, of whom a majority seem to have been mendicants, see Calderwood, I. 86 sq.

[4] This, according to Bp. Keith, *Hist. of the affairs of Church and State in Scotland*, I. 27 (reprinted for the *Spottiswoode Society*, Edinb. 1844), was in ratification of proceedings which began ten years before. Five years later a reformatory act was passed (March 14, 1541), requiring

SCOTLAND.

the German theology was more and more insinuated into the understandings of the thoughtful and the hearts of the devout; the cleric, monk and friar whom it had impressed, were half-unconsciously creating a predisposition for it in the feelings of their flock and neighbourhood; and after England consummated her quarrel with the papacy in **1534**, and had begun to manifest decided leanings towards Lutheranism, a shelter was provided there for such of the reforming propagandists[1] as could hold their ground no longer in the sister kingdom. By this means the progress of the reformation in Scotland was made to coincide with the growth and diffusion of a spirit less opposed to union with the English. In **1543** their monarch opened fresh negotiations[2] with the view of facilitating such a union, and of thereby strengthening the foundations of the Church in Britain. At first the regent[3], with one section of the Scottish nobility, less favourable to the French connexion,

'all archbishops, bishops, ordinaries and other prelates, and every kirkman in his own degree, to reform themselves, their obediences and kirkmen under them, in habit and manners to God and man,' etc. *Ibid.* p. 29. Other evidence exists to shew that on the death of James V. (1542) the need of reformation was more generally felt; *e. g.* it was allowed by the parliament (March 15, 1543) that all persons might have 'the Holy Writ, to wit, the New Testament and Old, in the Vulgar tongue, in English or Scotch, of a good and true translation,' &c. *Ibid.* p. 89.

[1] Of this number the more influential were (1) the Dominican, Alexander Seaton, who became chaplain to the duke of Suffolk (Calderwood, I. 87 sq.); (2) Alexander Ales (Alesse, Alesius, or Alane), a canon and priest in St Andrews, whom we find disputing in the English convocation (?) as the guest of Cromwell in 1536 (*Ibid.* I. 93 sq.: cf. Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, p. 38), and afterwards installed as professor of divinity at Leipzig, where he died March 17, 1565; (3) Sir John Borthwick, who had been cited before the authorities in 1540, for contending, among other things, 'that all these heresies, commonly called the *heresies of England*, or at the least the greatest or most part of them ...are to be observed of all faithful Christians, as most true and conformable to the law of God' (Calderwood, I. 114 sq.). Borthwick was received with open arms by Henry VIII., and sent on an embassy to the German Protestants: cf. Keith, as above, p. 20, n. 1.

[2] His design was to effect a match between the prince of England (the future Edward VI.), and the young queen of Scotland: see Carte, *Hist. of England*, III. 171, Lond. 1752. After the failure of this negotiation the 'English' party, some of whom were pensioners of Henry VIII., continued to possess considerable influence.

[3] This was the earl of Arran, the second person in the realm, who seems to have been originally well disposed towards the reformation: Keith, I. 91 sq. Hence Knox (I. 125) speaks of his 'defection from Christ Jesus' in 1545.

SCOTLAND.

and more jealous of the power then wielded by clergymen in general, and particularly by cardinal Beatoun, 'the Wolsey of Scotland,' were not unwilling to discuss the overtures of Henry VIII.; but the ungracious form in which they were advanced was ultimately fatal to the project. Beatoun's, or the 'French,' party was now reconciled to the antagonistic faction headed by the weak and wavering regent[1], and in **1545** the cardinal thought himself in a position to proceed in extirpating all the numerous forms of misbelief that menaced what he deemed the interests of the true religion.

It was during the persecutions instigated by this able, powerful and misguided prelate[2] that a cleric, destined to be known as *the* reformer of his countrymen, appeared on the arena of Scottish history. John Knox[3] was born at the village of Gifford, in East Lothian (**1505**). After completing his elementary education at Haddington, Knox was sent to the university of Glasgow[4] (**1522**). About **1530** he was admitted to the order of the priesthood, and connected, it is probable, with some religious establishment not far from his native village, of which he seems to have remained an inmate upwards of ten years. The speculations of the Schoolmen that occupied his principal thoughts while he resided in the University, were now exchanged for the commentaries of St Jerome and the various works of St Augustine. By the latter he was gradually induced to contemplate the Christian religion under aspects which had hitherto escaped his notice. He became dissatisfied with the empty ritualism and frigid uniformity of public worship; the wealth, the luxury, the ambition of

[1] On thus changing sides, the 'Governor,' Arran, vindicated his orthodoxy by complaining that 'heretics more and more rise and spread within this realm, sowing damnable opinions contrary to the faith and laws of Holy Kirk, acts and constitutions of this realm.'

[2] For a good sketch of cardinal Beatoun, see Lodge's *Portraits*, I. 99–111, Lond. 1849. Although like other prelates of the period, he professed himself in favour of reformation so far as the lives of the clergy were concerned (p. 107), he was himself guilty of the grossest irregularities: cf. Keith, I. 112, 113, and the editor's notes.

[3] His biography has been written at great length by M'Crie, 2nd ed. Edinb. 1840: cf. *Quarterly Review*, IX. 418 sq.

[4] Here he studied under the celebrated John Major, principal regent and professor of philosophy and divinity, 'whose wourd then was holden as an oracle in materis of religioun' (Knox. I. 37: cf. M'Crie, I. 7 sq.).

ecclesiastics roused his fiery and impulsive temper into absolute hostility; and when George Wishart[1], who became acquainted with the English reformation[2] at Cambridge (**1543**), was barbarously put to death (March **1, 1546**), the sentiments of Knox[3] were such as led him to avow his perfect sympathy with the reformers. Beatoun, the chief promoter of this execution, was himself murdered[4] on the **29**th of the following May by certain zealots, who contended that persons guilty of flagrant crimes against the laws of God and of society had justly forfeited their lives, and therefore might be put to death by any private individual. With these murderers Knox proceeded to ally himself in the most public manner, by taking refuge with them in the town of St Andrews[5] (April **10, 1547**); and

[1] Knox, I. 125 sq., Calderwood, I. 186 sq. The latter speaks of him as not only 'singularlie learned in divinitie and humane sciences,' but also as 'cleerlie illuminated with the spirit of prophecie.' Bp. Keith also judges Wishart favourably, but his editor (I. 103, 110), relying on information subsequently brought to light, contends that the 'martyr' was 'a most active conspirator against the cardinal,' by whom he was accordingly apprehended and destroyed. On the other side, see the reply of Knox's editor, I. 536, who maintains that Wishart's character was 'irreproachable.'

[2] He seems to have been residing at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in 1543, after visiting other places in England, between that year and 1538. For the Articles brought against him and his Answers, see Knox, I. 155 sq.

[3] See his own allusion to the intercourse between them (I. 137), where he says that he 'had awaited upoun him carefullie from time to time,' apparently in the strange capacity of sword-bearer: Keith, I. 104, note. In 1544 Knox is said to have abandoned all idea of acting as a priest, and engaged himself as tutor in the family of Hugh Douglas of Long-Niddry.

[4] Knox, I. 171 sq., Keith, I. 107 sq. The former characterizes the tragedy in a marginal note as 'the godly fact and woordis of James Melven' (the chief murderer): p. 177.

[5] See his own account, I. 185. He first thought of visiting 'the schooles of Germany,' adding in a parenthesis, 'Of England then he had no plesur, be reassone that the Paipes name being suppressed, his lawes and corruptionis remaned in full vigour.' While taking refuge at St Andrews, Knox received what he calls his 'first vocatioun by name to preache.' The caller was John Rough, or Rowght, who himself retired to England before the capitulation of the fortress, and settling on a benefice at Hull, was burnt in the reign of Mary: Calderwood, I. 251. The vehement boldness of Knox even in his first preaching is most characteristic. In throwing out his challenge to the 'Romane Kirk,' he says, 'I no more dowbt but that it is the synagog of Sathan, and the head thairof, called the Pape, to be that man of syne, of whome the Apostle speakis, then that I doubt that Jesus Christ sufferred by the procurement of the visible Kirk of Hierusalem:' *Hist. of Reform.* I. 189.

SCOTLAND.

when the fortress, after a vigorous resistance, finally capitulated to the French (July **30**), he was transported in the forty-second year of his age to Rouen, and detained among the other prisoners until February, **1549**.

It was at this conjuncture that the English Privy Council, anxious to secure fresh links of union with the Scots, appointed Knox to a preachership at Berwick-on-Tweed[1]. They afterwards went so far as to enrol him in the list of the royal chaplains[2] (Dec. **1551**), and even recommended him for the bishopric of Rochester, apparently upon the ground that his impetuosity might drive the cautious primate[3] into more decisive measures. Knox, however, felt that reformations such as had been consummated by a Cranmer and a Ridley were too sensitive in dealing with the ancient formularies[4], and therefore he steadily declined the honours offered him in England, which he quitted altogether as soon as the fires of Smithfield had been lighted up under queen Mary[5]. His principal retreat was at Geneva. There he found himself connected with the celebrated teacher whose congenial spirit instantly commanded his respect; and excepting the interval of six months when his consistent hatred of the English ritual makes him

[1] Early in the year 1550 he came into collision with Tunstall, bp. of Durham, who tried to curb his immoderate zeal in denouncing the 'idolatry of the mass.' Hence originated his treatise called *A Vindication of the doctrine that the Mass is Idolatry* (Works, ed. Laing, III. 33–70). It was delivered by him at Newcastle, April 4, 1550, before the Council of the North for public affairs, and in the presence of Tunstall.

[2] In this capacity he was consulted (Oct. 1552) respecting the revision of the Articles of Religion: see Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, p. 75.

[3] See the letter of Northumberland to Cecil (Oct. 28, 1552) in Tytler's *England under Edw. VI.* &c. II. 142. It was suggested that he would prove 'a whetstone to quicken and sharp the bishop of Canterbury, *whereof he hath need.*'

[4] What he most of all disliked in the Prayer-Book was the rubric on kneeling at the Holy Communion, and it was probably in deference to his scruples that the Declaration on this subject was added in October, 1552 (cf. Knox's *Works*, ed. Laing, III. 80). Yet the concession does not appear to have satisfied him: cf. *Ibid.* p. 279.

[5] See his *Godly Letter to the faithful in London, Newcastle*, &c., and his *Admonition to the Professors of God's truth in England* (*Ibid.* III. 165 sq., 263 sq.). His editor allows (p. 256) that the 'obnoxious terms applied to Queen Mary and to her husband, as well as to Gardiner, Bonner and the marquess of Winchester, may have contributed, in no small degree, in evoking that spirit of persecution which has so indelibly stamped the character of blood on her reign.'

SCOTLAND.

figure in the controversy called the 'Troubles of Frankfort'[1], he continued in immediate communication with the Genevese reformer. Partly owing to this intercourse extending more or less[2] over five years, and partly to the natural texture of his genius, Knox was, on his ultimate return to Scotland (May 2, 1559), fully penetrated by the Calvinistic principles.

The English throne was now in the possession of Elizabeth, whom Knox had irreconcileably offended by a savage treatise written at Geneva in 1558, 'against the monstrous Regiment of Women'[3]. The revolutionary tendency of his ideas, both civil and religious, were also most distasteful to archbishop Parker[4] and the leading statesmen of the sister country, so that speaking generally the Scottish reformation, in all the later stages of its progress, was dissociated more and more completely from the English. In the absence of Knox, the party whom he represented seem to

[1] He was invited to Frankfort by the Marian exiles in September, 1554, and repaired to that city in the following November. On the troubles that ensued, see Dyer's *Life of Calvin*, pp. 421 sq., Calderwood, I. 284 sq. Knox absolutely refused to administer the Holy Communion according to the English service-book. He was, however, vigorously resisted by Cox (the future bishop of Ely), who arrived at Frankfort March 13, 1555, and soon afterwards forced him to retire. Bishop Ridley, just before his martyrdom, deplored the captious and innovating spirit of Knox, asking why he will not follow 'the sentence of the old ancient writers;' and adding, 'From whom to dissent without warrant of God's Word, I cannot think it any godly wisdom' (Dyer, p. 434).

[2] In the autumn of 1555 he landed near Berwick, and spent the winter in Edinburgh, disseminating his principles in private: in the following summer he established himself with his wife and mother-in-law (Mrs Bowes) at Geneva. In 1557 his prospects seemed to brighten at home, but on arriving at Dieppe, he judged it prudent to retreat once more.

[3] The author had in his eye the Queen of Scotland as well as Queen Mary of England. On the accession of Elizabeth he was induced to lay aside a 'Second Blast' on the same question, and even wrote to Cecil from Dieppe (April 10, 1559), offering to exempt Elizabeth from the operation of his arguments, provided she could be brought to confess 'that the *extraordinarie dispensatiun* of God's great mercie maketh that lawful to her, which both nature and God's law doth denie unto all weomen:' Calderwood, I. 435: cf. another of Knox's apologies to the Queen in his *Hist.* II. 28 sq.

[4] Thus in writing to Cecil, Nov. 6, 1559, he prays that God may preserve the Church from such a visitation as Knox had attempted in Scotland, 'the people,' he adds, 'being orderers of things:' *Correspondence*, ed. P. S. p. 165.

SCOTLAND.

have enjoyed a large amount of toleration[1]: their numbers had accordingly increased, and certain of the aristocratic leaders called the 'Lords of the Congregation'[2] had sufficient influence to intimidate the government. But on his reappearance in Scotland[3] it was thought expedient to pursue a more repressive line of policy[4]; while the reformers on the other side were loud in their petitions and remonstrances, thus threatening to precipitate the crisis already near at hand. A sermon preached by Knox at Perth[5] immediately after his return, aroused the ire of what he terms a 'rascal multitude' against the use of images (June 25). One act of violence and insubordination was followed by another, and in many places their iconoclastic fury hurried men into still more unjustifiable excesses. It was made the very foremost duty of 'professors' to eradicate idolatry, and this, the wilder spirits urged, could only be effected by demolishing the abbeys and the other 'places and monuments thereof'[6]. Mary of

[1] They seem to have even considered the Queen-regent as their friend, addressing their petitions to her, and receiving friendly answers. Her ultimate estrangement from them was due partly to their own violence, and partly to the urgent remonstrances of her French relatives, the duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine. Respecting her character, see Spotswood, pp. 148, 149.

[2] The name of 'Congregation was taken up by the Professors' in 1558 (Calderwood, I. 327), a 'Band' having been signed at Edinburgh in the preceding year (Dec. 3, 1557), by which the adherents of it, headed by the earl of Argyle, formally renounced 'the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abominatioun and idolatrie therof.' It is very remarkable, that this congregation of 'the lords and barons professing Christ Jesus' determined to use the English Prayer-Book: *Ibid.* p. 328: cf. Keith, I. 155, n. 1, Knox, I. 275, n. 6. The English Liturgy, however, was soon afterwards replaced (1564) by the *Forme* used in the English congregation at Geneva, as approved by Calvin in 1556: see the edition of it by Cumming, Lond. 1840.

[3] He had been burnt in effigy at the Cross of Edinburgh in 1556, and in 1558 published at Geneva his *Appellation from the cruell and most unjust sentence pronounced against him by the false bishops and cleargie of Scotland* (in Calderwood, I. 347–411).

[4] *E.g.* The preachers who disobeyed the Regent's citation, to appear before her on the 10th of May, were denounced rebels: *Ibid.* I. 441, Keith, I. 189.

[5] On its reception of the reformed doctrines, see Calderwood, I. 438 sq., and on the storms that followed, Keith, I. 189 sq.

[6] Although Knox was not directly the instigator of the barbarous havock that arose in 1559, his sermons could not fail to rouse the passions which led to the perpetration of it. He excused himself at Perth by urging that the demolition of the churches was the work 'not of the gentilmen, neyther of thame that war earnest professouris, bot of the

Guise, the queen-regent, was naturally appalled on hearing of these sad occurrences: she placed herself immediately at the head of the troops and issued forth to quiet the insurgents[1]; but her presence added fresh intensity to a rebellion which her recent policy had doubtless very much exasperated.

According to the principles of Knox and his allies, a disaffected people may actively resist the government of the country whensoever it is guilty of serious maladministration, and especially if the religion which it patronizes be antagonistic to their own convictions. By propounding this doctrine he conciliated a large band of followers, some disgusted like himself with the corruptions of the age and fervently desirous of promoting a spiritual resuscitation, others influenced mainly by political aversion to the government or by their patriotic dread of France, whose dauphin had recently obtained the matrimonial crown of Scotland[2] (**1558**). By enlisting every species of jealousy and disaffection, Knox was able, on the **28**th of August, **1559**, to send a favourable report[3] of his advances to his

raschall multitude:' *Hist.* I. 322: cf. *Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXXXV. 148 sq.

[1] Knox, I. 324, Keith, I. 193. The former has printed (pp. 326 sq.) two letters addressed (1) to the Queen-regent, and (2) the nobility of Scotland, by the 'Congregation of Christ Jesus;' little calculated to promote a pacification. Accordingly, in a very short time the 'professors' of Perth 'resolved to resist,' and were aided by 'the professors of the west:' Calderwood, I. 451 sq. On the last day of May (1559), the whole body of reformers entered into an engagement ('Band') 'to concur and assist together in doing all thingis required of God in His Scripture, that may be to His glorie; and at thair haill poweris to distroy, and away put, all thingis that dois dishonour to His name, so that God may be trewlie and puirlie wirschipped,' *etc.* Knox, I. 344. On the 21st of October they proceeded to suspend the Queen-regent 'from authoritie within Scotland,' 'for the preservatioun of the commoun-wealth, and for that her synnes appeared incurable:' *Ibid.* p. 443.

[2] Calderwood, I. 416. Francis II., husband of Mary queen of Scots, died after a reign of seventeen months and in his seventeenth year (Dec. 5, 1560).

[3] Calvin's reply to this communication (*Epist.* CCLXXXV.) is dated Nov. 8. It is characterized by more than his usual 'moderation and good sense' (Dyer, p. 471). Although Knox was writing amid the thunders of the French cannon, he asked his correspondent to decide whether the children of papists and excommunicated persons should be admitted to Baptism? Calvin answered in the affirmative, provided suitable sponsors could be found; thus running counter to Knox's own impression, and also to that of the English Puritans: cf. Whitgift's 'Table of dangerous doctrines,' prefixed to *The Defense*, ed. 1574.

SCOTLAND.

correspondent at Geneva; and in the spring of the following year the 'Lords of the Congregation' concluded a treaty[1] with the sister kingdom, in virtue of which an English fleet blockaded Leith, while English troops were occupied in counteracting the reinforcements which had been lately sent across from France. The flames of civil war thus kindled and fomented were raging in all quarters when Mary of Guise expired at Edinburgh (June **10, 1560**). Her death became the signal for negotiating terms of peace, and so gigantic had been the march of revolution and reform, that on the **17**th of the following August, the '*Confession of Faith* believed by the Protestants of the realm of Scotland'[2] was submitted to the Parliament, and ratified without a struggle[3].

We may now inquire more closely into the organization of the new ecclesiastical establishment, and ascertain the special character of the dogmas promulgated in the new Confession. Its compilers seem to have convinced themselves that they were standing in relation to the Mediæval Church in the exact position which the Hebrews occupied with reference to the old inhabitants of Canaan. For this reason, had the more enthusiastic 'professors' been allowed to follow out their principle unchecked, no trace of Mediævalism would have survived in Scotland. As it was, such

[1] See respecting this treaty, which was concluded on Feb. 27, 1560, Keith's tenth chapter. Elizabeth was influenced by her antipathy to Mary, Queen of Scotland, and her dread lest the predominance of a Romish faction in the sister-kingdom might lead to her own deposition. The plea she put forward was that Scotland ran the risk of becoming subject to the French: see the 'contract' as subscribed at Berwick, in Knox, II. 45 sq. The Scottish 'lords and barons' next entered into a fresh contract (April 27, 1560), 'for expulsioun of the said strangeris, oppressouris of our libertie, furth of this realme, and recovery of oure ancient fredomis and liberteis:' basing this patriotic movement on a wish 'that the treuth of Goddes Word may haif free passage within this realme, with due administratioun of the sacramentis and all thingis depending upoun the said Word:' *Ibid.* pp. 61 sq.

[2] Printed in Knox, II. 95 sq. from the original edition.

[3] The Earl Marischall, Wm. Keith, voted in favour of the Confession chiefly on the following ground: 'Seing that my lordis Bischoppis, who for thair learing can, and for the zeall that thei should bear to the veritie, wold, as I suppose, ganesay any thing that directlie repugnes to the veritie of God; seing, I say, my lordis Bischoppis heir present speakis nothing in the contrair of the doctrine proponed, I can nott but hold it to be the verie trewth of God, and the contraire to be deceavable doctrine.' *Ibid.* p. 122. Two acts of Parliament were immediately added, (1) against the Mass, (2) for abolishing the jurisdiction of the pope.

SCOTLAND.

traces were but indistinct, and very few in number. Knox and his coadjutors acting on the persuasion that they were themselves exclusively the 'Congregation of Jesus Christ,' denounced the elder race of clergymen as 'the generation of Antichrist,' as 'pestilent prelates and their shavelings'[1]. Hence the constitution of the reformed community, in order to avoid the slightest contact or alliance with the past, renounced not only the traditions relating to public worship[2], but ere long proceeded to discard the government of bishops. They did not, it is true, originally in their 'First Book of Discipline'[3] accept the Calvinistic hypothesis, which levelled all distinctions in the order of the ministers, and went so far as to associate laymen with them in the regulation of the church-affairs: but the disparity which they continued for a while, by granting larger jurisdiction to the class entitled 'superintendents'[4], presented little more than

[1] In a manifesto with this title (*Ibid.* I. 335), Knox and his followers sent the clergy what he calls 'sum declaratioun of our myndis:' 'Yea, we shall begyn that same warre which God commanded Israell to execut againis the Cananites; that is, contract of peace shall never be maid, till ye desist from your oppin idolatrie and crewell persecutioun of Godis childrein.'

[2] Even the modern Liturgy which they accepted at the hands of Calvin (above, p. 138, n. 2) did not restrict the minister to the use of the very words of the prayers, and therefore was preparing the way for its own abrogation. The feelings of Knox and his party with respect to ancient ritualism, will be gathered from a passage like the following, which occurs in the letter addressed to 'their brethren, the bishops and pastors of God's Church in England,' in behalf of the earliest race of Puritans (Dec. 27, 1566; Knox's *Works*, II. 545, 546): 'If surplice, corner-cap and tippet have been the badges of idolaters in the very act of their idolatry, what hath the preachers of Christian libertie, and the rebukers of superstition to do with the dregs of that Romish Beast? Yea, what is he that ought not to fear, either to take in his hand, or on his forehead, the prints and marks of that odious Beast?' Even James VI. (afterwards James I. of England) in characterizing the Kirk of Scotland as the sincerest kirk of the world on account of its abrogation of festivals, &c., adds: 'As for our neighbour Kirk in England, their service is an evil said mass in English: they want nothing of the mass but the liftings.' See Russell's *Church in Scotland*, II. 28, note, Lond. 1834.

[3] Reprinted in Knox's *Works*, II. 183 sq.

[4] Respecting them, their 'dioceses,' and the mode of their election, see the *Book of Discipline*, Ibid. pp. 201 sq. Knox has also given us the form employed on the appointment of John Spotswood (father of the archbishop), who was nominated as 'superintendent' of Lothian in July, 1560, and admitted to the office on the 9th of March, 1561: *Ibid.* pp. 144 sq. Two bishops, Alexander Gordon of Galloway, and Adam Bothwell of Orkney, conformed to the new régime: Keith, I. 250, n. 1.

SCOTLAND.

the shadow of episcopacy[1]. After lasting in this form thirty years it vanished altogether, when the parliament accepted the Presbyterian models chiefly through the representations of Andrew Melville[2] (**1592**).

In matters of doctrine, if we recollect how furious was the storm in which the Scottish reformation had been cradled and how absolute was the fanaticism of many of its chief promoters, the tenacity with which it clung to the more cardinal points of Christianity appears almost miraculous. The truth is that John Knox, like other leading spirits of the age, has to be studied under very different, and, as it would seem, irreconcileable aspects. In the wilder passages of his life we hear him execrating misbelief and misbelievers in a strain of harshness bordering on brutality; but there were moments when amid the lull of controversy he retreated to his closet[3], communed deeply with

[1] By the Scottish people the superintendents were called 'tulchan' bishops, a tulchan being a calf's skin stuffed with straw, in order to make a cow give her milk freely. In the short Life of archbishop Spotswood prefixed to his *History* (Lond. 1677), it is incorrectly stated that his father 'exercised fully the power and discharged faithfully the office of a bishop, though under another name.' Episcopacy in the proper meaning of the term was not re-established till Oct. 21, 1610, when the archbishop of Glasgow and two bishops were consecrated in London (Spotswood, p. 514), and proceeded to reorganize all the ancient Scottish sees (1612): the Parliament at the same time rescinding the statute of 1592 which had established 'Presbyterianism.'

[2] Knox, who died Nov. 24, 1572, had acquiesced in the progressive development of his modified episcopacy, and in the concession of greater privileges to the 'Superintendents:' cf. Spotswood, p. 260, who gives the conclusions of a church-convention held at Leith, Jan. 12, 1572, restoring the ancient titles of 'archbishop' and 'bishop,' and in other ways departing from the First 'Book of Discipline.' Melville, however, after associating for some time with Beza at Geneva, returned to his native country in 1574, and during the next twenty years assailed the shadow of Scottish prelacy with unremitting vigour: cf. M'Crie's *Life of Andrew Melville*, Edinb. 1824, with the contemporary accounts of Spotswood. The *Second Book of Discipline*, which is mainly due to Melville's influence, was drawn up as early as 1578 (Spotswood, pp. 289 sq.), but though inserted in the registers of the General Assembly in 1581, it could not obtain the parliamentary ratification until 1592. Very interesting revelations on the acts of the General Assembly from 1560 to 1618 are preserved in the *Book of the Universal Kirk of Scotland*, published for the *Bannatyne Club*, 1839—1845.

[3] See, for instance, his *Briefe Sommarie of the Work* by *Balnaves on Justification* (written on board the French galley in 1548), *Works*, III. 13 sq., and his treatise *On Predestination*, published at Geneva in 1560. Yet even in the latter of these works the polemical element preponderates throughout. It is an *Answer to a great nomber of blasphemous cauillu-*

himself and God, and after patiently investigating the mysterious problems of the Bible, reasoned with comparative sobriety upon the nature of the means to be adopted in transmitting 'Christ's Evangel' to posterity. Accordingly the first *Confession* indicates no wish whatever to break away from the traditional terminology of the Church[1], so far as concerns the doctrines of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation and Atonement of the Saviour, and the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. Its language with respect to original sin, election, good works and other topics belonging to the same category, is in unison with the teaching of the Genevese reformer[2], rather than with corresponding definitions of the English Articles which Knox had once at least been able to subscribe[3]. The statement 'Of the civil magistrate' is characterized by greater moderation than the history of its chief compiler would have led us to expect[4]. It reprobates all opposition to the powers that be, asserts that kings and other rulers have been entrusted 'chiefly and most principally' with 'the reformation and purgation of religion,' and declares that 'whosoever deny unto them their aid, counsel and comfort, while the princes and rulers vigilantly travail in the executing of their office, that the same men deny their help, support and counsel to God.' But this Confession is still more remarkable for the comparative sobriety and elevation of the statements it put forward on the doctrine of the Sacraments. These are two in number, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and are so

tions written by an Anabaptist. He imputes the authorship of many of these cavillations to Calvin's enemy, Castellio (see above, p. 118, n. 3), and others to Pighius, 'that pestilent and peruers Papist' (p. 58. ed. 1560).

[1] *e.g.* in speaking of General Councils (cap. xx.), it begins: 'As we do nott raschelie dampne that whiche godlie men assembled togidder in General Counsallis, lauchfullie gathered, have approved unto us,' &c.

[2] The same leaning was manifested by the formal recognition of Calvin's Catechism, in the 'Buke of Discipline:' *Ibid.* II. 210.

[3] Above, p. 136, n. 2.

[4] In 1563 when Knox was called before the royal Council, and charged with seditious practices, he defended himself by urging that he always inculcated these principles. Yet on the same occasion 'directing his speech to the Queen with a wonderful boldness, he charged her in the name of the Almighty God, and as she desired to escape His heavy wrath and indignation, to forsake that idolatrous religion which she professed, and by her power maintained against the statutes of the realm.' Spotswood, p. 188.

SCOTLAND.

efficacious in sealing the assurance of the union which subsists between the Head and members of the Christian body that the authors of the manifesto[1] 'utterlie dampne the vanitie of those that affirme sacramentis to be nothing else but naked and bair signes.' 'By baptisme,' they continue, 'we ar ingrafted in Christ Jesus to be maid partakaris of His justice, by the whiche our synes are covered and remitted;' while 'in the Supper, rychtlie used, Christ Jesus is so joyned with us, that He becumis the verray nurishement and foode of our saullis'[2].

This Confession, and the Book of Discipline by which it was accompanied, became the standard of Scottish orthodoxy, to the exclusion of all other symbols. For as soon as the widowed queen, after an absence of thirteen years, had been invited to return from France (**1561**), the bolder class of preachers ardently declaimed against the celebration of the Mass in her presence, and occasionally assailed her with the vilest epithets. Knox himself contended that idolatry in the queen, as in all others, ought to be regarded as a capital offence[3]; and when at length the horrible

[1] Cap. xxi.

[2] After stating that they repudiate transubstantiation, their formulary proceeds: 'And yit, notwithstanding the far distance of place whiche is betwix His Bodye now glorifeid in heavin and us now mortall in this earth, yit we most assuredlie beleve, that the bread which we break is the communioun of Christis Body, and the cupp which we bliss is the communioun of His Bloode. So that we confesse and undowttedlye beleve, that the faithfull, in the rycht use of the Lordis Table, so do eatt the Body and drynk the bloode of the Lord Jesus, that He remaneth in thame and thai in Him; yea, that thai ar so maid flesche of His flesche, and bone of His bones, that as the Eternall Godheid hath gevin to the flesche of Christ Jesus (which of the awin conditioun and nature was mortall and corruptible) lyfe and immortalitie, so doeth Christ Jesus, His flesche and bloode eatten and drunken by us, give to us the prerogatives:' p. 114.

[3] See his own full report (*Works*, II. 425 sq.) of the discussion between himself and secretary Lethington at the General Assembly held in June, 1564. Lethington concedes that 'the idolater is commandit to dey the deith,' but next inquires 'by whome?' 'Be the peopill of God' is Knox's answer, quoting the Old Testament. 'But thair is no commandiment gevin to the peopill,' said the Secretary, 'to punisch thair king gif he be ane idoliter.' To which Knox answers, 'I find no moir privilege grantit unto kingis be God, moir than unto the peopill, to offend Godis majestie;' p. 441: cf. pp. 442, 443, where he endeavours to refute 'the judgementis' of Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer, Musculus and Calvin on this subject. In his treatise *On Predestination*, Knox has not only justified the execution of Servetus (pp. 206 sq.), but has given such a definition of 'blasphemy' (p. 209) as would involve nearly all persons differing

SCOTLAND.

murder of the earl of Darnley, her husband, excited still more odium against the crown, partly on the ground that Mary was thought to have been herself accessory to the murder[1], and partly that she had been leaguing with her uncles for the extirpation of the Protestants[2] in Scotland and elsewhere, she was no longer able to withstand the machinations of her disaffected subjects. They ultimately shut her up in Lochlevin Castle, and forced her to abdicate (**1567**) : the crown descended to her infant son : and under four successive regents, of whom the Earl of Murray, who had long been recognized as the leader of the reformation-party, was the first and chief, their principles were deeply rooted, and, ere long, were almost universally diffused. The last hope of the minority, who looked with favour on the Mediæval system, perished when the ill-starred Mary queen of Scots exhausted her full cup of sufferings on the English scaffold (Feb. **8, 1587**).

THE NETHERLANDS.

In Scotland we have seen the Reformation introduced as the result of a successful opposition to reputed tyranny and mal-administration of the civil power. The same phenomena occur in one important section of the Spanish Netherlands, where the resistance had been also mainly stimulated by religious principles derived from the great doctor of Geneva. Numerous predispositions, it is true, existed in the country, long before the seven United Provinces had courage to defy the despotism of Spain; and organized

from himself in the same awful charge, and thus necessitate their extirpation.

[1] It is impossible to enter here upon the vexed questions connected with the life of Mary queen of Scots. Two of the more recent historians of the period, Tytler (*Hist. of Scotland*, Vol. VII.), and Chalmers (*Life of Mary*), have again undertaken her defence: while a majority of the 'Presbyterian' writers, from Knox to M'Crie, are equally persuaded of her guilt.

[2] See above, pp. 126 sq. The brutal assassination of Rizzio, who appears to have been a pensioner of the pope, was stimulated partly by a wish to frustrate the intended persecution (M'Crie's *Life of Knox*, II. 145 sq.), and it is remarkable that one of the few learned champions of Mediævalism in Scotland, John Black, a Dominican, was also murdered at Holyrood House on the same night (March 8, 1565—6): cf. Appendix, No. IV. of the new edition of Knox, II. 592 sq.

NETHERLANDS.

their new republic. Early in the fifteenth century a school of pious mystics represented by such men as Thomas à Kempis[1] had revived a genuine spirit of devotion in their own immediate neighbourhood; while Wessel, acting under the protection of the bishop of Utrecht, anticipated most of Luther's favourite conclusions[2]. Hatred of the pope and hierarchy had been afterwards excited[3] in the Netherlanders on hearing of the butcheries perpetrated by the Inquisition in Spain[4]; and when Erasmus of Rotterdam began as early as **1500** to expose the ignorance and vices of the age, his works would naturally be read by many of the educated class in Holland. That reforming principles had been already introduced in **1521** is obvious from the fact that Charles V. republished Luther's condemnation in his patrimonial territories, and charged his subjects, under heavy penalties, to banish and discountenance the writings 'of the said Luther, whether in Latin, Flemish, or any other modern language[5].' Adrian VI., the 'reforming' pontiff, was himself a native of Utrecht[6], and his acquaintance with Erasmus favoured the idea suggested by his previous conduct that he would resolutely take in hand the purification of the western Churches; yet so far was he from manifesting any love of Lutheranism, that, on ascending the pontifical throne, he threatened to become its bitterest enemy[7]. After his death the movement was still more vigorously resisted in the Netherlands; the penal edicts which the emperor had not sufficient strength to

[1] See *Middle Age*, p. 348.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 360 and n. 1.

[3] Miller, *Phil. Hist.* III. 46.

[4] The emperor Maximilian, who had been connected with the Netherlands by his marriage with Mary of Burgundy, put his son Philip the Fair in possession of those provinces in 1494. Philip was married two years later to a daughter of Ferdinand of Spain; and thus the future emperor Charles V., their son, born at Ghent, Feb. 24, 1500, was lord of the kingdoms of Spain, of the two Sicilies, of the New world, and of the Netherlands.

[5] See the manifesto in Brandt's *Hist. of the Reform. in and about the Low Countries*, I. 40 sq., Lond. 1720.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 46.

[7] For instance, he wrote to Erasmus (Nov. 1, 1522), urging him to enter the lists against the Wittenberg reformers (*Ibid.* p. 47). We afterwards find him consulting Erasmus touching the best means of checking the new movement. His correspondent told him that although the Wycliffites had been apparently crushed in England by resorting to the arm of the civil power, the present malady had penetrated too deep to be cured, either by cutting or by burning (*Ibid.* p. 49).

NETHERLANDS.

execute in Germany were mercilessly carried out in his hereditary dominions; and although the successive representatives of the crown, Margaret of Savoy, who died in **1530**, and his own sister Mary, widow of the king of Hungary[1], had mitigated these severities, and even shewn some bias for the new opinions, it has been asserted that no less than fifty thousand persons[2] were put to death on religious grounds during the reign of Charles V. But in this frightful number we must reckon Anabaptists of almost every class who swarmed especially in Holland, Friesland and Brabant, and whose fanatical outrages[3] appeared in many instances to justify the stringent line of policy adopted for their extirpation.

The principles of 'orthodox' reformers were originally in strict accordance with the school of Wittenberg[4], but in the Netherlands, as in many other districts, the Lutheran modes of thought were gradually replaced by those of

[1] Above, p. 89, n. 2: cf. Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* II. 367 sq., Leipzig, 1804.

[2] This is the lowest calculation: Schröckh, II. 356. Grotius raises the number to 100,000. Prescott (*Hist. Philip II.* Bk. II. c. 1) shews that the lower estimate is a monstrous exaggeration, and points out that the frequent renewal of the edicts, nine times during Charles's reign, intimates the lax way in which they were executed. One of the first preachers of reformation was the pastor of Mels near Antwerp (Brandt, I. 51), and as early as 1525 converts abounded in other parts of Brabant (*Ibid.*). Executions for religion now became very numerous, and in 1536 the Englishman, William Tyndale, who had translated the New Testament into his mother tongue and printed it in 1525, was strangled and burnt at Vilvorde, near Brussels. A life of him is prefixed to his writings as collected for the *Park. Soc.* 1848 sq. The influence he exerted in Belgium is shewn by the three books which Latomus (the Louvain controversialist) wrote against him: Latom. *Opp.* fol. 183—fol. 195, Lovan. 1579.

[3] See below, Chap. V. After the reduction of Münster, and the dethronement and barbarous death of the Anabaptist 'king,' in 1535, the edicts of Charles V. increased still further in severity (cf. Brandt, I. 79 sq.): the theological faculty of Louvain exercising a proportionate vigilance in the censorship of the press (*Ibid.* p. 85), especially with regard to versions of the Bible which had appeared in Low-German as early as 1525.

[4] Luther's *Epistle to the Christians in Holland and Brabant* (De Wette, II. 362) was written immediately after the death of the first two martyrs, who suffered at Brussels (July 1, 1523). See also his letter to the Antwerp converts (De Wette, III. 60), warning them, in 1525, against a new phase of Anabaptism, the sect of the 'Libertines' ('ein leibhaftiger Rumpelgeist'). A good specimen of the reformed theology of Holland in its Lutheran stage is furnished by the *Layman's Guide* of John Anastasius, on whom see Brandt, I. 96—99.

NETHERLANDS.

Calvin[1], owing chiefly to the circumstance that not a few of the later teachers had been influenced by the Huguenots of the adjoining kingdom. When Charles V. discovered that his ordinary measures had all failed to crush the innovating spirit of his subjects, he determined to invoke the help of the Spanish Inquisitors[2] (**1550**). Emboldened by the progress of his arms in Germany, he lost no time in raising up this merciless tribunal; and Philip II., whose bigotry indisposed him to moderate its operation, found a number of most willing instruments among the Netherlandish prelates[3], particularly in Granvella[4], the cardinal bishop of Arras, an able and astute administrator. Two years after his accession to the helm of government, the Protestants, who ran a constant risk of being confounded with Anabaptists, endeavoured to disarm the hatred of himself and of his royal master, by drawing up a regular confession[5] of their faith in thirty-seven Articles (**1562**).

[1] Gieseler (III. i. 559, n. 14[b]) quotes the following passage from a letter of Viglius van Zuichem (president of the supreme court at Brussels), dated May 23, 1567: 'Confessioni autem Augustanæ [*i. e.* of Augsburg] paucissimi eorum adhærent, sed Calvinismus omnium pene corda occupavit...Ostio per Lutheranos semel patefacto ad ulteriora errorum dogmata omnes prope progrediuntur:' cf. Brandt, I. 215, 239, respecting controversies between the two bodies at Amsterdam in 1566, and at Antwerp in 1567.

[2] Brandt, I. 88 sq.: cf. Schiller, *Revolt of the Netherlands*, I. 394 sq., Lond. 1847.

[3] The number of these he increased (in 1559) from four to seventeen (Brandt, I. 133), and thus offended the nobles by adding to the importance of the clergy. This was one of the chief political causes of the revolt of the Netherlands. But if it be remembered that the provinces so called were really a bundle of states without political or ecclesiastical unity, Philip's design of forming a national church cannot be condemned. The bishoprics already existing were Utrecht, Arras, Tournay and Cambray: the first subject to the archbishop of Cologne, the three others to the archbishop of Rheims. Both the metropolitans were outside the jurisdiction of the lord of the Netherlands. For these Philip substituted three archbishoprics and fourteen bishoprics. It was the anomalous condition of ecclesiastical affairs that left the way open for the propagation of heresy as well as reformation.

[4] See Schiller's sketch of him, as above, I. 419 sq.

[5] The Latin version of it, with the title *Confessio Belgica*, is printed in Niemeyer, pp. 360 sq. Before 1562 they had made use of the formularies of faith and worship drawn up for their fellow-countrymen who took refuge in London during the time of Edward VI., and assembled under the ministry of John Utenhovius, a nobleman of Ghent: see the important communication of Martin Micronius, another refugee, in *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. pp. 570 sq. These formularies were Flemish translations of works which had been compiled partly by John Laski for

NETHERLANDS.

The project was originated in **1559** by Guido de Bres, a Walloon, who, from both his position and the manner in which his own convictions were matured, had naturally adopted the French Confession as the basis of his work[1]. He thereby fixed the Calvinistic principles[2] in Holland.

In the meantime Granvella could not be induced to mitigate the rigours of his administration; the number of the disaffected was accordingly increased, atrocious persecutions not unfrequently embittering the feelings of the nobles[3], while they ultimately goaded others into overt acts of lawlessness and rapine[4]. The leaders of the movement were now ready to accept the contumelious name of 'Gueux'[5], entered into a confederacy[6] for checking the advances of the Inquisition (**1566**), met in public for the

the benefit of the East-Frieslanders (cf. above, p. 70, n. 4), and partly by Martin Micronius himself: see Niemeyer's *Præf.* p. lii.

[1] Brandt, I. 142. The original French draft of the Confession was examined and revised by Adrian Saravia and others. In 1566 it was more solemnly accepted in a synod of the reformers held at Antwerp, where the celebrated Francis Junius (Du Jon) appears to have been employed in criticizing it. 'Nevertheless,' adds Brandt, 'the Dutch reformed skreened themselves sometimes behind the Ausburgian Confession, because it was not so disagreeable at court as the French or Calvinian, since the latter sect was supposed to be more addicted to tumults and uproars than the Lutheran.'

[2] The organization of the Church on the Genevan model was not, however, accomplished till 1573: see Brandt, I. 308. In the following year the first *provincial* synod held at Dort enjoined that the *Heidelberg Catechism*, which is also Calvinistic in its character, should be taught in all churches jointly with the *Belgic Confession: Ibid.* p. 311. In 1577 appeared a body of canons and ecclesiastical laws, which are printed in Brandt, *Ibid.* I. 318 sq.

[3] It was in 1563 when the Prince of Orange and the counts Egmont and Horn all ventured to remonstrate against the policy of Granvella. In the following year they effected his removal (Brandt, I. 145) without destroying his influence. At this time, however, they had not openly espoused the cause of the reformers, but seem to have cherished a project for uniting the hostile religious parties, chiefly by the aid of the learned and conciliatory George Cassander, a native of Flanders, who died in 1566 (*Ibid.* p. 146: cf. above, p. 80, n. 3). Philip II. answered this proposal by sending peremptory orders (1565) for the execution of the canons recently framed at Trent (Brandt, p. 153).

[4] On the iconoclastic tumults of 1566, see Brandt, I. 191 sq., and compare the apology of the reforming party, *Ibid.* p. 258.

[5] See Schiller, I. 495 sq.; Brandt, I. 167. The word, which may have been corrupted from the Dutch 'guits,' is retained in French, and signifies 'beggar.'

[6] Brandt, I. 162. It was formed in the house of Philip van Marnix (Feb. 26, 1566).

NETHERLANDS.

celebration of their worship, and only waited till a favourable opportunity occurred for breaking off the heavy yoke of the oppressor. But their patience was exhausted during the administration of the duke of Alva, who appeared among them at the head of a Spanish army, and proceeded with the work of violence and bloodshed. It was in the midst of these terrible disasters that William prince of Orange openly espoused the cause of Protestantism[1], or rather that of civil and intellectual freedom. Aided by a host of coadjutors, none of whom excelled the ever-active Philip van Marnix[2], lord of St Aldegonde, he took the field in **1568**. At first the heroism of their party was ineffectual, but in **1579** it had so far prospered in its desperate struggle as to consummate the independence of Holland by rending the seven northern provinces from their connexion with the other ten. In those perhaps the Protestant doctrines, harmonizing more completely with the wants and genius of the people, had been more disseminated from the very first; and it is certain that towards the close of the century they had become predominant[3] in every quarter, chiefly owing to the foundation of the University of Leyden[4], and of other educational establishments in which the new opinions were exclusively maintained.

The other provinces might have also followed their example, had not a succeeding Spanish governor, the duke

[1] Still he does not appear to have been actuated by strong religious convictions. 'He defended the rights of the Protestants, rather than their opinions, against Spanish oppression; not their faith, but their wrongs had made him their brother:' Schiller, I. 408.

[2] On this eminent person and his times, see Wilhelm Broes, *Filip van Marnix*, Amsterdam, 1840, and three articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1854, Tome VI. pp. 471 sq. One of his more distinguished publications is entitled *Tableaux des Differens de la Religion* (La Rochelle, 1601), where he examines the arguments adduced by the two great parties of the day in favour of their respective creeds.

[3] As early as 1581 the exercise of the Romish religion was formally interdicted in Holland: Brandt, I. 377.

[4] One of its first luminaries was Adrian Saravia, the bosom-friend of Hooker, who was appointed to the professorship of divinity in 1582, but afterwards compelled to throw himself on the protection of the English Church, owing to his strong convictions respecting episcopacy, which he put forth, in opposition to Beza, in his *De diversis Gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii* (Opp. ed. 1611). A second luminary was Francis Junius (above, p. 149, n. 1), who, after distinguishing himself as a biblical scholar at Heidelberg, became divinity professor at Leyden in 1592: see the autobiography prefixed to his *Works*, Geneva, 1613.

NETHERLANDS.

of Parma, laboured to divert the movement[1], by enlarging the political rights of the inhabitants on the express condition that they should henceforth enlist with him in counteracting the advance of misbelievers. Traces of reaction accordingly grew more visible from day to day until the efforts of the Jesuits finally succeeded in re-establishing the papacy not only at Tournay, Lille, and many other places on the French border, but in districts where the opposite party had once threatened to preponderate,—the rich and populous cities of Flanders and Brabant.

[1] See the convention made at Arras (May 17, 1579), in Dumont, *Corps Universel Diplomatique*, v. pt. i. 350. On the murder of the prince of Orange (July 10, 1584), the sovereignty of the Netherlands was offered by his disconcerted party first to the king of France, and next to Queen Elizabeth. Although the latter would not accept the proffered dignity, she sent auxiliaries in 1586 under the Earl of Leicester, who soon obtained enormous influence even in the conduct of ecclesiastical affairs: see Brandt, i. 403 sq.; Carte, *Hist. of England*, iii. 598 sq. Thus he who proved himself at home, according to Fuller, the 'patron-general of the non-subscribers,' insisted while in Holland on the most rigorous adherence to the Belgic Confession: Brandt, i. 405. He was recalled in 1588 (*Ibid.* p. 423), the year when English politicians were relieved from the necessity of entering into alliances with foreign Protestants by the defeat of the Invincible Armada.

CHAPTER III.

CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE SAXON AND THE SWISS REFORMERS.

Two great schools of continental Reformers.

THE progress of the continental Reformation, to say nothing for the present of the various shades of Anabaptism and of other wild and revolutionary sects, developed two distinct types of doctrine, both of which, in all their leading characteristics, have been transmitted from that period to our own. They are conveniently distinguished as the Saxon and the Swiss, or, in more technical phraseology, as 'Lutheran' or Protestant and 'Calvinistic' or Reformed. The earlier struggle of the schools embodying these varieties of faith, of feeling and of worship, has been noted in the previous chapters, and in tracing their propagation through the different states of Europe, many an instance of unseemly altercation and collision was presented to our view. For example, when their founders were reluctantly drawn together at Marburg (**1529**), for the purpose of adjusting, as far as might be, the divergencies in their respective confessions, Luther was persuaded more and more that the two schools were actuated by a very different spirit[1], and that reconciliation was impossible.

[1] 'Ihr habt einen andern Geist als wir:' cf. Daniel's *Codex Liturg. Eccl. Reform.*, Proleg. p. 3, Lips. 1851. On the whole history of this important Conference, see Schmitt's work, entitled *Das Religions-gespräch zu Marburg*, Marb. 1840. On the interviews relating to the Eucharist, a full account is given by Ebrard (*Das Dogma vom heiligen Abendmahl*, II. 311 sq. Francof. 1846), whose work, however, as Kahnis (*Die Lehre vom Abendmahle*, p. 340, Leipzig, 1851) complains, is not so much a history as 'an apology for the doctrine of the Reformed.' The version of the latter will be found in the treatise just cited, pp. 374 sq. It was not unnatural for Romanists of the age to make use of these quarrels of the reformers as an argument in condemnation of the numerous changes they had wrought. Bossuet's *Variations* is the most successful of the later attempts that have been made with the same object; but the Jansenist controversy in his own communion was sufficient proof

The doctrine of the Eucharist one chief subject of contention.

The turning-point of all their controversies was the doctrine of the Eucharist, which also furnished one of the main criteria for determining how other subjects, more or less vitally connected with it, had been contemplated by the writers on both sides of the discussion. It is true that Bucer and the school of Strasburg in submitting the *Tetrapolitan Confession*[1] to the emperor Charles V., as well as in their subsequent acts of mediation, were disposed to underrate the magnitude of the controversy, and even to represent it as little more than verbal; but so long as it continued in its original shape, the disputants were plainly justified in ascribing to it vast importance. During the lifetime of Zwingli the question to be solved was, whether Christians might regard the consecrated elements as media or conductors, really and truly uniting them with Christ, or whether the thing signified being absolutely incapable of association with the outward sign, the Eucharist was merely an external badge of membership in some confederation called the Church.

How modified by Calvin.

At length, however, when Calvin had transferred the disputations into far loftier ground[2], the combatants with greater reason might have been expected to lay down their

that storms are not rendered impossible even when the doctrine of papal or conciliar infallibility is admitted.

[1] Above, p. 52, n. 1. Schenkel, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus*, § 46 (I. 535 sq., Schaffhausen, 1846), has investigated the principles of this mediating party ('die Vermittler'): cf. Ebrard, II. 367 sq. and Kahnis, pp. 382 sq. Bucer's ultimate position seems to have been as follows: 'Quod Corpus Christi vere et substantialiter a nobis accipiatur, cum sacramento utimur: quod panis et vinum sint signa exhibitiva quibus datis et acceptis simul detur et accipiatur Corpus Christi:' it being added by way of qualification, 'panem et corpus uniri non per substantiarum mixtionem, sed quatenus datur cum sacramento, id quod sacramento promittitur, *h. e.* quia uno posito aliud ponitur. Nam quoniam utrimque in eo consentiatur, quod panis et vinum non mutentur, ideo sacramentalem ejusmodi conjunctionem sese statuere.' Schenkel, *Ibid.* p. 545, n. 3. On these grounds rested the *Concordia Vitebergensis* (1536): see above, p. 58, n. 1. The tenacity with which Bucer clung to his quasi-Lutheran theory in opposition to John Laski and others, who symbolized more fully with the Swiss, is seen in the angry letter of Martin Micronius, dated London, Oct. 13, 1550: *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 572; cf. *Ibid.* p. 652.

[2] See above, pp. 119, 127. It is worth observing, that Calvin speaks in no measured terms of Zwingli's aberrations on the doctrine of the sacraments: *e. g.* in writing to Viret (1542) he characterizes the original dogma of the Zürich reformer as 'profana,' and in a letter to Zebedæus (1539) as 'falsa et perniciosa.' Other passages of the same kind are collected in Gieseler, III. pt. ii. p. 171, n. 44 (ed. Bonn).

arms, and even to embrace each other. Partly owing to the influence exercised by the conciliatory Bucer, but still more to Calvin's reputation and his powerful arguments, the leading Swiss divines[1] had gradually receded more and more from the position occupied by Zwingli, till the controversy was no longer touching the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, nor of His actual communication then and there to every faithful recipient. So far the Lutheran and Calvinist were now agreed: yet while the former taught that Christ was present in the elements and so connected with them after consecration, that even the wicked to their detriment became partakers of His glorified humanity, the latter contended no less strenuously that Christ is not communicated *in* or *through*, but rather *with* the consecrated Bread and Wine; the union of the outward and inward parts of the sacrament being always conditioned by the faith of the recipient, and the communication of Christ to the believing soul effected only in a mystical or supersensuous way by some specific action of the Holy Ghost[2]. Nor could the Eucharistic controversy[3] be long restricted to the *how;* polemics felt themselves conducted further in the logical development of their ideas, and henceforth they enquired more narrowly into the *what*. That Christ was verily and indeed communicated somehow or other to the faithful, and communicated in virtue of some connexion with the elements themselves, had been conceded alike in Switzerland and Germany; but when it was demanded whether the thing communicated was

[1] The Zürichers at first demurred and the Bernese continued their opposition still longer: see Thomas, *La Confession Helvétique*, pp. 98 sq., Genève, 1853: Ebrard, as above, II. 484 sq. The *Confessio Helvetica Posterior* composed by Bullinger in 1562, and avowedly in more general harmony with the Augsburg Confession, was formally accepted by the Swiss in 1566, and thus constituted the last of their symbolical books (in Niemeyer, pp. 462 sq.). For its declaration 'De Sacra Cœna Domini,' see pp. 518—523.

[2] The following extract from a *Confessio Fidei de Eucharistia*, drawn up by Farel, Calvin and Viret, and signed by the Strasburgers, Bucer and Capito, is a remarkable proof that the *humanity* was then deemed the inward part of the Eucharist: 'Vitam spiritualem, quam nobis Christus largitur, non in eo duntaxat sitam esse confitemur, quod Spiritu Suo nos vivificat, sed quod Spiritus etiam Sui virtute carnis Suæ vivificæ nos facit participes, qua participatione in vitam æternam pascamur:' quoted in Schenkel, I. 565, n. 1.

[3] Ebrard, II. 526.

the corporal matter of our Saviour's glorified humanity (the Lutheran hypothesis), or whether it was the complex Person of the Christ, Divine no less than human (which the Calvinist as vigorously maintained), the disputants had launched on questions full of the profoundest mystery, because relating to the mode in which the properties of the Godhead and the manhood coexist and interpenetrate each other in the undivided Christ[1].

Melanchthon's aversion to rigorous definitions.

Of those who shrank from the discussion of the awful topics thus propounded, none was more conspicuous than Melanchthon[2]. Satisfied on reaching the conclusion that Christ is truly present in the Eucharist, and that His presence is most truly efficacious in all persons who faithfully receive Him, the devout Reformer invariably discouraged those ulterior speculations, and at length, when he had partially succeeded at Wittenberg itself, attempted to cement a union with his fellow-workers in Switzerland. It was in the execution of this purpose that, having obtained the sanction[3] of Luther, he published in **1540** a new edition of the Augsburg Confession, known as the *Confessio Variata*, where, together with some subordinate changes on other topics, he hoped to state the doctrine of the Eucharist in such a manner as to reconcile the more judicious members of the two great parties. Ere long, however, many of the sterner Lutherans were prepared to combat such modification on the ground that it amounted to a virtual surrender of the truth delivered to the ancient Church. Their opposition was confirmed by the intemperate fulminations which Luther had himself[4] put forth not long before his last illness, with the hope of crushing every remnant of those Zwinglian errors that continued to deny the doctrine of the real presence. According to the same objectors, Melanchthon so far wavered on the subject[5] as to justify a

His consequent unpopularity.

[1] On the opening of these questions by Zwingli, see above, p. 112.

[2] Above, p. 58, n. 1.

[3] 'Dass diese *Variata* bloss die Geltung einer Privatschrift gehabt, ist eine Chimäre.' Ebrard, II. 526. Respecting the motives of Melanchthon for advocating the change, see Francke's *Libr. Symb. Eccl. Luther.*, part I. Proleg. p. xxviii. n. 13, and for Luther's position with respect to it Ebrard, II. 473 sq., Kahnis, pp. 390 sq.

[4] Above, p. 60, n. 3.

[5] That Melanchthon was in truth dissatisfied with the rigorous definitions of the Wittenbergers is next to certain. In addition to the passages quoted above, p. 58, n. 1, we find him writing as follows: 'Egoque, ne

strong suspicion that he would eventually recede still further from the principles of his great colleague; and his fresh compliance[1] with the *Leipzig Interim*, though it related to a different class of questions, naturally tended to diminish their respect for him, and shook their faith in his consistency. The death of Luther in the midst of these conflicting elements relaxed the powerful ties that hitherto had bound his followers into one community. The Philippists, or party favourable to Melanchthon, who appear to have been most numerous in the Electorate of Saxony[2], were now publicly charged with holding too elastic notions on the hierarchy and ritual of the Church[3], with modifying some of Luther's fundamental principles touching the relation of the grace of God to human freedom[4], and most of all with manifesting partial sympathy for Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist, on which account they were at last entitled 'Crypto-Calvinists.'

It seems that hatred of Melanchthonism was secretly at work in stimulating a revival of this latter controversy, which took place in **1552**. The author of the new commo-

longissime recederem a veteribus, posui in usu sacramentalem Præsentiam, et dixi, datis his rebus, Christum vere adesse et efficacem esse. *Id profecto satis est* [cf. Hooker's *Eccl. Pol.* v. LXVII. 2]. Nec addidi inclusionem, aut conjunctionem talem, qua affigeretur τῷ ἄρτῳ τὸ σῶμα, aut ferruminaretur, aut misceretur. Ego vero realem (conjunctionem) pono, hoc est, ut signis positis adsit vere Christus efficax:' quoted, with other like passages, in Schenkel, I. 553, n. 1: cf. Kahnis, pp. 389 sq. Calvin, however, at a critical juncture, strove in vain to draw from him a confession that they held precisely the same doctrine: see Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, pp. 409, 410. The most important difference between them was, that Calvin's theory of the Eucharist was traversed by his other theory of absolute predestination, which Melanchthon strongly repudiated: see Thomas, *La Confession Helvétique*, p. 105, and below, p. 161.

[1] Above, p. 63.

[2] The opposite party ('Flacianists,' above, p. 64, n. 1) seem to have been strongest in ducal Saxony (that is, the States of the Ernestine dukes) and the north of Germany. In 1557 they called upon Melanchthon to revoke his errors, and from the record of the fruitless negotiations that passed between him and them, we ascertain the more prominent subjects of complaint (*Opp.* ed. Bretschn. IX. 23 sq.): 'Rejiciantur omnes contrarii errores Papistarum, *Interimistarum*, Anabaptistarum, Sacramentariorum ... Ex articulo de justificatione tollantur omnes corruptelæ, pugnantes cum sincera doctrina Apostolica et Augustana confessione, præcipue *corruptelæ de necessitate operum ad salutem*.... Ne fiat conciliatio cum Papistis de cæremoniis, *etc.*'

[3] See above, pp. 63, 64, and p. 57, n. 2.

[4] Above, p. 45, n. 1.

tion[1] was Joachim Westfal, one of the Lutheran ministers at Hamburg. He began with an assault on the *Consensus Tigurinus*[2], the joint work of Bullinger and Calvin. At first indeed the Swiss divines made no reply to his production; but the barbarous conduct of some ultra-Lutherans[3] in refusing an asylum to John Laski, or A'Lasco, and a number of religious emigrants who had accompanied him from England (Sept. **1553**), on the outbreak of the Marian troubles, roused the indignation of the Genevese reformer; and the controversy[4] that ensued, though modified occasionally by the gentleness of Bullinger, could only tend to widen and perpetuate the breach that yawned between the two great parties of the day. Until this period Calvin seems to have believed himself in general harmony[5] with the adherents of the Augsburg Confession: he had lived on friendly terms with them at Strasburg, and had never openly renounced their fellowship: but so violent was the feud excited by the works of Westfal and his numerous abettors, that when Calvin came to Frankfort in **1556**, he was observed to stand aloof entirely from the Lutheran ministers[6]. Laski also, who for many years had mingled freely in the Eucharistic controversy[7], laboured to promote a better understanding between

Fresh outbreak of the Eucharistic controversy.

Calvin separates from the Lutherans.

[1] See the account at length in Ebrard, II. 536 sq., and Dyer, pp. 402 sq., and cf. the remarks of Kahnis, pp. 403 sq.

[2] Above, p. 119. He also directed his attack against Peter Martyr, whose work *De Sacramento Eucharistiæ* had appeared at Zürich in 1552. Peter Martyr's determined hostility to the Augsburg Confession, and to Lutheranism in general, afterwards induced him to migrate from Strasburg to Zürich: cf. *Zurich Letters*, ed. P. S. II. 48, 111.

[3] The refugees, one hundred and seventy-five in number, were driven by stress of weather into the Danish port of Helsingör (Oct. 13), but the magistrates compelled them to re-embark, on finding who and what their leader was (cf. above, p. 70, n. 4). Some German towns followed this example. At length the sufferers found a resting-place at Dantzig.

[4] The various works in reply to Westfal are enumerated by Gieseler, III. ii. p. 218, n. 18 (ed. Bonn).

[5] Cf. Ebrard, II. 545.

[6] Dyer, p. 438.

[7] He was considerably at variance with Bucer on the subject in 1550 (above, p. 153, n. 1), and in 1552 appeared at London his *Brevis et dilucida de sacramentis Ecclesiæ Christi tractatio*, where, in compliance with the wish of Calvin, he expresses himself favourably on the subject of the 'Consensus Tigurinus:' see 'Epistola ad Regem' prefixed to the treatise, sign. *6. His account of the Lutheran doctrine will be found on fol. 36 b. Fourteen years later (1566) he put forth a tract in conjunction with Valerandus Pollanus, Robert Horn and others, for the purpose of defending

the hostile confessions[1]. He was driven to desist, however, when Brentz[2], an ultra-Lutheran of Würtemberg, required that Calvinists should not only sign the Augsburg formulary, but profess their faith in what had now become a cardinal tenet of the Saxon school, the omnipresence of Christ's glorified humanity.

During the next ten years the Eucharistic quarrel was still more embittered, and the alienation rising out of it and other like disputes grew almost universal. This melancholy result appeared from the continuous struggles of the two great parties even in remote districts, such as Hungary[3] and Sweden[4], but particularly in one German province that became notorious for the acrimony of its theological disputations,—*viz.* the Palatinate. Perhaps there is no country where the Reformation gained a footing that experienced so many alternations of worship and belief[5]. In sixty years it twice adopted Lutheran tenets and twice relinquished them for the conclusions of the Genevese reformer. We have seen[6] that, notwithstanding the diffusion of reforming modes of thought, the Roman pontiff was not actually dethroned in the Palatinate till 1546. The agents then employed were, for the most part, in

The stormy controversies in the Palatinate.

himself and them against the charge of deviating on the subject of the Eucharistic presence from the statements of the Augsburg Confession. The title begins *Purgatio Ministrorum in Ecclesiis Peregrin. Francofurti*, etc. Basil. 1566, mense Decembri.

[1] Dyer, p. 437.

[2] See Ebrard's chapter entitled 'Brenz und die Ubiquität' (II. 646 sq.). The necessity of believing in the ubiquity of Christ's glorified Body was involved in many of Luther's arguments as early as 1525, but the first writer who insisted upon it as an article of the faith was Timann, a minister of Bremen (1555). It may be said to have been fully developed in the treatise of Brentz (1561) entitled *De Personali Unione duarum Naturarum in Christo et ascensione Christi in cælum ac sessione Ejus ad dexteram Dei Patris, qua vera Corporis et Sanguinis Christi præsentia in Cœna explicata est et confirmata.*

[3] Above, p. 90.

[4] Above, p. 82. With respect to Poland, see p. 83, n. 3, pp. 85, 86, and for a specimen of the state of feeling in the northern states of Germany, p. 68, n. 5, where the word 'Zwinglianer' is meant to designate the Swiss school in general.

[5] Schiller, *Thirty Years' War*, p. 37, Lond. 1847. After the last of these changes, which were all effected arbitrarily by the civil power, the Calvinistic teachers that were given to the elector Frederic IV., at the age of nine years, 'were ordered, if necessary, to drive the Lutheran heresy out of the soul of their pupil with blows.'

[6] Above, p. 69: cf. Ebrard, II. 577.

alliance with Melanchthon; and accordingly his modified opinions on the Eucharist and other subjects, as expressed in the *Confessio Variata*, had obtained a general currency. Being himself a native of the district, he was much respected in the university of Heidelberg, which he visited in **1557**, and thereby strengthened[1] the impression which the fame of his piety and writings had produced. But in the following year, the ultra-Lutherans, who misconstrued his unwillingness to speak distinctly on the Eucharistic question, repeated the attempts to undermine his influence[2]. Loud in their assertions that the orthodoxy and integrity of the Reformation were in danger, they prevailed in gaining the ear of the elector Otho Henry (**1556-1559**), and on the arrival of Heshus, whom he nominated general-superintendent of the Church in the Palatinate, the old materials of controversy were all lighted up afresh[3]. The 'Crypto-Calvinist' selected for attack was one of the deacons of Heidelberg, William Klewitz (Klebitius). There is perhaps nothing in the earlier phases of the quarrel, sickening as they often are, that matches the extreme acerbity of the present combatants; and Frederic III., who succeeded Otho in **1559**, exerting what was now an ordinary stretch of the prerogative, endeavoured to suppress

[1] Ebrard, II. 580.

[2] They seem to have been instigated more especially by the proceedings of a Conference held at Frankfort in 1558, when, stung by the reproaches of the anti-reformation party, the Protestant princes determined to publish a decree (March 18), enjoining all persons to hold fast by the Augsburg Confession, and at the same time adding determinations on certain points then controverted. Respecting the Eucharist it is decreed, 'dass in dieser, des Herrn Christi, Ordnung seines Abendmals er wahrhaftig, lebendig, wesentlich und gegenwärtig sey, auch mit Brod und Wein, also von ihm geordnet, uns Christen sein Leib und Blut zu essen und zu trinken gegeben, und bezeuget hiermit, dass wir seine Gliedmassen seyen, applicirt uns sich selbst und seine gnädige Verheissung, und wirkt in uns:' see Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschn. IX. 489 sq. One of the princes who subscribed this pacificatory document was Christopher, duke of Würtemberg; but as if to shew that he believed it condemnatory of Zwinglians and Calvinists, he proceeded to banish them from his territories. At the same time John Frederic, duke of Saxe-Gotha, placed himself at the head of the extreme Lutherans, and published a *Confutatio* (Jena, 1559) of the chief 'corruptelæ' and sectarians of his age, including both the 'Synergistic' or 'free-will' party and the Zwinglians.

[3] On a contemporary dispute at Bremen, between Timann (above, p. 158, n. 2) and Hardenberg, a Crypto-Calvinist, and its connexion with the present troubles, see Ebrard, II. 582 sq. Melanchthon died in the midst of this 'rabies theologorum' (April 19, 1560).

Triumph of modified Calvinism.

the furious agitation by displacing both the leaders, and enjoining silence on the rest. He afterwards proceeded to evince a bias for the ritual and dogmatic system of the Calvinists, although discarding not a few of the more startling peculiarities[1] developed by the writers of that school.

Under his auspices the *Heidelberg*, or *Palatine, Catechism*, so deeply cherished and so widely circulated by the moderate Calvinists of later times[2], was given to the public. The compilers of it were Olevianus and Ursinus, the former symbolizing with the doctor of Geneva, the latter with Melanchthon. They availed themselves of the existing catechisms, especially of one arranged by Calvin for the members of his flock, and of a second which had been constructed by John Laski in **1553**. Yet notwithstanding these affinities the work has steered away as far as possible from speculative topics, while in its exposition of the Eucharist it has retained the middle place marked out by the *Confessio Variata*[3]. In the following reign, however, that of Louis IV., which commenced in **1576**, these changes were as suddenly reversed by the establishment of ultra-Lutheran tenets. Ministers suspected of a leaning either to the modified principles of Melanchthon, or still more to Calvinism, were very roughly handled, being driven from their parishes, and even chased across the frontiers. The persecution raged till **1583**, when Frederick IV., the new elector, determined to fetch back the exiles, and revive the interdicted usages and doctrines. Calvinism, in its most rigorous form, was subsequently taught from every pulpit; and at the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War, the south of Germany exhibited the shocking spectacle of Lutherans and Reformed recoiling from each other, in the hour of need, with hatred scarcely less implacable than that which animated both of them in the hostility they bore to Rome[4].

Further vicissitudes.

Fresh divergencies

For, as the century advanced, these two great parties

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 598 sq.

[2] It is said to combine 'l'intimité de Luther, la clarté de Mélancthon, et le feu de Calvin:' Thomas, *La Confession Helvétique*, p. 113: see it (German and Latin) in Niemeyer, pp. 390 sq., with the editor's *Præf.* pp. lvii sq. The compilers seem to have followed the order of the Epistle to the Romans, omitting ch. ix.–xi.

[3] Niemeyer, pp. 409–411; Ebrard, pp. 604 sq.

[4] Schiller, *Thirty Years' War*, p. 38.

found their principles diverging more and more, and even threatening to result in a complete antagonism. Postponing for the present the investigation of their numerous liturgical differences, which nevertheless had been produced in a considerable measure by their different conceptions of the Eucharist[1], we may observe again that they regarded the most central dogma of the Incarnation from two distinct points of view[2]. The Lutherans, to establish their peculiar ideas of ubiquity, had dwelt with special emphasis upon the *union* of Divine and human in the Person of the Christ; the Calvinists, in order to evade the force of such an argument, as uniformly placed a greater stress on the *distinctness* of the Natures. Thus the former were exposed to charges of Eutychianism; the latter of a tendency in the direction of Nestorianism. But though such formidable accusations frequently recurred, they were outnumbered by a second class of controversies, relating either to Calvin's dogma of predestination abstractedly considered, or to its effect in traversing the sacramental tenets[3] advocated by himself and members of his party. Melanchthon who on other points has been suspected of approximating closely to the Genevese reformers, was on this entirely at variance with them[4]. And the opposition which he offered accordingly to the *Consensus Tigurinus* was perpetuated and intensified by the more rigorous followers of Luther. So long indeed as Calvin seemed to take his stand in the position occupied by St Augustine, he was uniformly treated with respect; but no sooner was it made apparent that, through his identifying the grace of regeneration and the grace of perseverance, he limited the efficacy of sacraments to the particular class of Christians destined to be ultimately saved, than feelings of disapprobation, bordering

between the two rival schools:

respecting the Incarnation;

Predesti-

and the bearing of this upon the efficacy of Sacra-

[1] See Kahnis, *Die Lehre vom Abendmahle*, p. 424.
[2] Above, pp. 112, 116.
[3] Above, p. 119, and n. 2.
[4] Hence when Calvin forwarded the 'Consensus Tigurinus' to him, he refused to endorse it (see Ebrard, II. 530): and the 'Consensus Genevensis,' drawn up by the Swiss during the controversy of Calvin with Bolsec (above, p. 118, n. 3), was equally distasteful to Melanchthon. 'A cet égard,' says Thomas, *La Confession Helvétique*, p. 105, 'c'est lui, parmi les Réformateurs, qui s'éloigna le plus de Calvin dont il se rapprocha tellement sur d'autres points.' According to the same writer Bullinger himself 'Melanchthonized' on the subject of predestination; pp. 141, 142.

on disgust, found utterance in the public manifestoes of the Lutherans, as well as in the writings of their principal divines[1].

Final settlement of Lutheran doctrines.

These feelings are betrayed especially in the *Formula Concordiæ*, the last in order of the Lutheran Confessions, or symbolical books. On the death of Melanchthon in **1560**, the party who were treading in his footsteps and abstaining, like himself, from arbitrary speculations on the nature of the presence in the Eucharist, had constantly exposed themselves to the assaults of more decided Lutherans[2].

[1] Thus to take the case of baptism as handled by Gerhard (*Loci Theol.* IV. 816, Jenæ, 1623). After quoting an objection of the Anabaptists, he says that it was borrowed from Beza and his party, 'qui statuunt infantes quosdam, absoluto Dei decreto rejectos, non regenerari, etiamsi millies baptizentur.' In the name of the Lutherans, however, he declares: 'Sed cum hoc errore nobis nihil est commercii, qui infantes etiam reprobos, *h. e.* eos qui progressu ætatis a gratia excidunt, et æternum pereunt, atque hoc modo se reprobos esse ipso actu ostendunt, vere per baptismum regenerari dicimus.' As early as 1569 the *Kirchen-Ordnung* of Brunswick and Lüneburg (pp. 64, 65, Hannover, 1853) rebuked certain 'Calvinisten' for their teaching on the subject of infant baptism, particularly for representing that sacrament as little more than *obsignatory of grace already communicated to the elect;* (baptismum sane jam non pro medio ullo nostræ salutis, sed pro obsignaculo potius habere nos, oportet intelligamus, nedum ut per baptismum primum omnium Christo Domino inseramur,' is, for example, the view of Laski, *De Sacramentis Ecclesiæ*, fol. 10 b, Lond. 1552). The Saxons even proceeded further, and in a series of *Articuli Visitatorii* issued at the close of the century, described the general teaching of the Calvinists on infant baptism as 'falsa et erronea' (Francke's *Libri Symbol. Eccl. Lutheranæ*, Pars III. Append. p. 119). The following are specimens of the tenets there censured: 'Non omnes, qui aqua baptizantur, consequi eo ipso gratiam Christi aut donum fidei, sed tantum electos. . . . . Electos et regenitos non posse fidem et Spiritum Sanctum amittere aut damnari, quamvis omnis generis graudia peccata et flagitia committant.'

[2] One of the last persecutions inflicted by the ultra-Lutherans occurred in Saxony itself (1574). The elector Augustus had been induced chiefly by the arguments of Peucer, son-in-law of Melanchthon, to adopt the Calvinistic statements respecting the Eucharistic presence, which were formally accepted by the 'Consensus Dresdensis' (Oct. 1571). As soon, however, as the 'Crypto-Calvinists' expressed themselves more plainly in their *Exegesis perspicua Controversiæ de Cœna Domini* (1574), many of their leaders were imprisoned, and others had to seek for safety in flight: see Giesecler, III. ii. p. 267. (ed. Bonn). After these reverses, 'Philippism,' or 'Crypto-Calvinism,' was principally found in the Palatinate, in Nassau, and in Anhalt. The principles which it continued to avow are stated at length (1579) in the *Repetitio Anhaltina* (Niemeyer, pp. 612 sq.), 'extructa super fundamentum S. Literarum, juxta consensum totius orthodoxæ antiquitatis, et scholasticorum sinceriorum, cum quibus consentit et Lutherus, ubi hunc locum [*i. e.* respecting the hypostatic union] ex professo et solide tractat.'

Controversies which then raged in many quarters, most of all in the distracted Church of the Palatinate, were pouring rancour into these deplorable divisions; and it was accordingly made obvious that, unless some measures were devised for settling the more prominent and irritating questions of the day, the mighty system raised by Luther and his coadjutors was in danger of exploding. Three persons now came forward to superintend the work of pacification[1]. They were Andreä, chancellor of the university of Tübingen, Chemnitz, the most able theologian in the north of Germany and ecclesiastical superintendent of Brunswick, and Chytræus, a professor in the university of Rostock. After several interruptions they completed their task at Bergen near Magdeburg in **1577**, from which circumstance the Formula of Concord has been termed the 'Book of Bergen.' It consists of two parts, (1) the 'Epitome' or outline of the Christian faith, according to the views of Lutheran orthodoxy, and (2) the 'Solida Declaratio,' a lucid and elaborate exposition of the former. In this treatise, coloured as it is by all the disputations[2] of the period, we behold the full development of Lutheran tenets under a scholastic and coherent shape, not only as they stand contrasted with Tridentine Romanism and Anabaptism of every hue, but also as distinguished from the characteristic features simultaneously brought out in the productions of the Swiss reformers. The *Book of Concord,* where the

[1] See Anton's *Gesch. der Concordienformel*, Leipzig, 1779, and Francke's *Præf.* to the third part of the *Libri Symbolici Eccl. Luther.*, where the work is printed at length.

[2] Thus of the eleven chapters contained in the 'Epitome,' the first, *De Peccato Originis*, is meant to vindicate the truth against Flacius Illyricus (above, p. 45, n. 1); the second, *De Libero Arbitrio*, against the Synergistic party (above p. 45, n. 1) and others, who appeared to swerve in the direction of Pelagianism; the third, *De Justitia fidei coram Deo*, against Osiander and his school (above, p. 64, n. 1); the fourth, *De bonis Operibus*, with reference to the Majoristic controversy (above, p. 45, n. 1); the seventh, *De Cœna Domini*, against the Sacramentarii (Zwingli, Calvin and the rest); the eighth, *De Persona Christi*, against the same; the eleventh, *De æterna Prædestinatione et Electione Dei*, against the same (the object being to establish a distinction between the præscience of God and His predestination, and to affirm the *conditional* character of the Divine decrees). To which is added, in the form of an Appendix, a condemnation of heresies and sects which had never embraced the Augsburg Confession,—Anabaptists, Schwenkfeldians, new Arians, and Antitrinitarians.

various symbolical writings of the Saxon school had been combined in **1580**, was not indeed accepted with absolute unanimity in all the states and churches which continued to revere the memory of Luther[1]. Still the principles consolidated in the formulary of this period will be found to have exercised a very general sway in Lutheran communities at the conclusion of the sixteenth century.

[1] *E. g.* The Formula of Concord was not received in Denmark, see Munter, III. 304, note. The feelings it excited in the several states of Germany may be inferred partly from the names of the subscribers (Francke, III. pp. 15 sq.), and partly from evidence collected in Gieseler, III. ii. pp. 302 sq. (ed. Bonn). An illustration of the way in which it was regarded by the reforming party in the Netherlands, is furnished by Brandt, I. 364, 365.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ENGLISH AND IRISH REFORMATION.

ENGLAND.

ENGLAND.

Henry VIII. and Luther.

In **1521** the English monarch forwarded to Rome a copy of the treatise he had just completed in refutation of 'Martin Luther the heresiarch[1].' On this occasion, Clerk, the envoy[2] who presented the sumptuous manuscript to Leo X., expatiated on the perfect orthodoxy of his countrymen and their entire devotion to the Roman pontiff;—little dreaming that in the course of the next thirty years an era fatal to the old opinions would have dawned on every shire of England as on other parts of Western Christendom, and least of all anticipating that one of the prime movers in the changes then accomplished would be Henry VIII. himself, who in return for his chivalrous vindication of the schoolmen had been dubbed 'Defender of the Faith[3].'

[1] Above, p. 30, n. 2: cf. Audin's narrative in his *Hist. de Henri VIII.* I. 259 sq. Paris, 1847. The zeal of the monarch was inflamed and his arguments supported by the leading prelates of the day. Thus Fisher bp. of Rochester preached at St Paul's (May 12, 1521) 'again y^e^ pernicious doctryn of Martin Luther;' his sermon professing to have been 'made by y^e^ assyngnement of y^e^ moost reuerend fader in God y^e^ lord Thomas cardinal of York' [*i. e.* Wolsey]. Two years later appeared the same prelate's more elaborate defence of Henry VIII. entitled *Adsertionis Lutheranæ Confutatio*, and also Powel's *Propugnaculum*, the title of which characterizes Luther as an infamous friar and a notorious 'Wicklifist.' On subsequent passages between the two chief antagonists, Henry VIII. and Luther, see Waddington, II. 107 sq.

[2] In 1523 we find him made bishop of Bath and Wells (see Godwin, *De Præsulibus Angliæ*, p. 387, Cantab. 1743); and afterwards among the prelates who subscribed the English Articles of 1536. His 'Oratio' before the pope is prefixed to the original edition of the *Libellus Regius*. For other proofs that England was supposed to be uncontaminated by heresy as late as 1528, see above, p. 132, n. 2.

[3] See the bull of Leo X. by which this title was conferred (Oct. 11, 1521) in Wilkins, *Concil.* III. 693. The title itself, however, was not new,

ENGLAND.

Lollardism comparatively inoperative.

There is good reason[1] for concluding that throughout the dark and troublous period called the 'wars of the Roses,' a few scattered seeds of Lollardism continued to bear fruit in the remoter parts of England; nor after the accession of Henry VII., when the authorities in Church and State obtained more leisure for pursuing their repressive policy, could the elements infused into society by Wycliffe and his colleagues be entirely trodden out[2]. It is remarkable, however, that the rise, the progress, and the final triumphs of the English Reformation, were not sensibly affected by his principles. They may have, doubtless, given birth to certain undercurrents of religious feeling which predisposed one fraction of the English people to accept the new opinions: the circulation also of the Wycliffite versions of Holy Scripture, and of tracts like those preserved in the 'Poor Caitif',[3] may have shaken here and there the confidence which men had formerly reposed in the established errors and abuses: yet the impulses by which this country was aroused to vindicate its independence of all foreign jurisdictions, to assert the ancient faith, and to recast the liturgy and other forms of public worship, are not traceable to any of the feverish

having been applied to previous kings, *e. g.* to Henry IV. (1411); *Ibid.* III. 334.

[1] The fullest, if not always the fairest and most critical, account is that of Foxe, *Booke of Martyrs*, pp. 658 sq. Lond. 1583. Many of his examples in the reign of Henry VI. are taken from the diocese of Norwich.

[2] Thus in 1485 several persons were burned at Coventry for holding Lollard doctrines (*Ibid.* pp. 777, 778): and in 1521 (to pass by other cases of persecution in the interval) a considerable number of what were termed 'knowne-men,' or 'just-fastmen' (*Ibid.* p. 820), were driven to recant or else put to death at the instigation of John Longland, bishop of Lincoln (*Ibid.* pp. 821—837). The term 'knowne-men' was applied by the Lollards to themselves from 1 Cor. xiv. 38: see Pecock's *Repressor of overmuch blaming of the Clergy*, Part I. ch. xi. p. 53, ed. Babington, in *Chronicles and Memorials*, &c. Among other grounds on which they suffered the following is very noticeable: 'Some for reading the Scriptures or treatises of Scripture in English; some for hearing the same read.' Foxe maintains that all these victims were uninfluenced by the writings of the Wittenberg reformer (p. 819). See other evidence of the same purport in Burnet's *Hist. of the Reformation*, I. 27 sq. Lond. 1681. Colet, in his famous Sermon, 'made to the Convocation at Paulis' (Knight's *Life*, p. 298, Lond. 1724), writes in 1511: 'We are also now a dayes greued of heretykes, men mad with merueylous folysshenes: but the heresies of them are nat so pestilent and pernicious vnto us and the people, as the euyll and wicked lyfe of prestes.

[3] See *Middle Age*, p. 420.

ENGLAND.

Agencies at work in producing the English reformation.

agitations which the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries produced. The real causes of the change, however mixed and multiform they may have been, are all resolvable into three descriptions:

First, the feelings of distrust, and ultimately of resentment, which had been awakened and exasperated by the follies, schisms and usurpations of the papacy[1],—a class of feelings frequently appearing in transactions of the older English parliaments[2], but never suffered to explode until the crown, on the humiliation and extinction, by the wars of the Roses, of the older nobility, had found itself in a position to withstand the judgments of the spiritual courts and fix a limit to the vast predominance obtained by the superior ecclesiastics[3].

Secondly, the higher standards of intelligence and piety prevailing in the English universities[4], especially among

[1] See above, pp. 3–6, and *Middle Age*, pp. 321 sq.

[2] Numerous instances have been collected by Twysden, *Hist. Vindication of the Church*, pp. 79 sq. Camb. 1847.

[3] See above, p. 6. In 1516 a sermon was preached by Kederminster, abbot of Winchcombe, in which he endeavoured to establish the exemption of the clergy from the punishment of the secular judicature,—an effort which after some controversy induced the king to reassert his own supremacy in most decided language: cf. the account in Burnet, I. 13 sq., who is mistaken, however, where he says that the abbot published a book ('mist avant un lieu d'un décret' is the language of the *Law Report* to which the historian himself refers). Another illustration of the way in which the jurisdiction of the temporal courts was reasserted may be seen in the case of Richard Hunne (1516); Burnet, *Ibid.* The same tendency is still more manifest in a scarce tract (? written at first in Latin by bishop Fox in 1534), which seems to have appeared just before the final act of separation from Rome, with the title *A treatise concernynge the diuision bitweene the spirytualtie and temporaltie* (Camb. Univ. Libr. AB, 13, 6): while the translator of the *Constitutions Prouincialles and of Otho and Octhobone* (1534) is under the necessity of declaring in his *Preface* that the document is 'nat put forthe to bynde any of our most gracious soueraygne lorde the kynges subiectes.' 'For the clergy of this realme (whome comenly we have vsed to call the churche, or the spiritaltie) without thassent of y^e^ kynges hyghnes, the nobilite and comens of this realme, *haue neuer had*, ne yet haue, any iuste and lawful power to make any constitutions or lawes ouer any of our sayde soueraygne lorde the kynges subiectes.' This translator nevertheless declares himself an adversary of the 'new lerning lately sprongen.'

[4] Erasmus himself visited Oxford as early as 1497, where he made the acquaintance of Colet, Linacre, Sir Thomas More and others. He subsequently became the Lady Margaret professor of divinity and also professor of Greek at Cambridge, under the auspices of Fisher, president of Queens' College (1505-1508), and bishop of Rochester (1504-1535). Another Cambridge worthy was George Stafford, whose lectures in divinity had pro-

ENGLAND.

that class of students who imbibed the literary tastes, and with them the reformatory spirit, propagated by Erasmus.

Thirdly, the direct influence which had been exerted by the circulation in England of Lutheran tracts[1] and other publications tending to produce analogous results.

Their modes of operation.

The first of these three causes would naturally operate most in the immediate atmosphere of the court. It was, however, by no means restricted to that narrow circle: it affected also a large knot of bishops[2], who, while they abandoned their belief in the papal supremacy almost without a scruple, could see nothing to amend in other dogmas authorized, or commonly advocated, in the whole of Western Christendom. The second cause was felt especially among the thoughtful and more earnest class of academics[3], whose extended knowledge of antiquity had strengthened their distaste for mere scholasticism, had

duced a mighty change in the course of study pursued by Latimer: see the account prefixed to Latimer's *Remains*, p. xxvii. ed. P. S.

[1] As early as 1520 Polydore Vergil mentions the importation of a great number of 'Lutheran books' (*Hist. Angl.* Lib. XXVII. p. 57: this part of the work is misplaced in the Leyden edition of 1651). In 1521 Cardinal Wolsey issued a mandate 'de extradendis M. Lutheri libris;' see Wilkins, *Concil.* III. 690 sq. and Audin, *Hist. de Henri VIII.* I. 275. Other proceedings of the same kind were instituted in 1526, and one of Wolsey's latest admonitions to his royal master was 'on God's name, that he have a vigilant eye to depresse this newe sorte of Lutherans;' Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey*, p. 272, new ed. Lond. 1852.

[2] The bishops with the exception of Fisher acquiesced in all the earlier changes brought about under Henry VIII. In the words of Pugin, *Earnest Address on the Establishment of the Hierarchy* (Lond. 1851), 'the remonstrance' of Fisher was 'unsupported by his colleagues' (p. 2), and 'a catholic nation' was 'betrayed by a corrupted catholic hierarchy.' Some of them evinced no ordinary share of zeal and learning in defence of their new opinions. See, for instance, Bp. Gardiner's 'oration' (1535) *De Vera Obedientia* (in Brown's *Fasciculus*, II. 802 sq.: cf. Maitland's *Essays on the Reformation*, No. xvii. No. xviii. respecting the Preface), and Bp. Tunstall's remarkable sermon against the papal supremacy (1539), reprinted in 1823. The former of these prelates very stoutly defends the title 'summum in terris caput Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ' as applied to Henry VIII., laying special stress, however (p. 810), on the phrase *in terris*, and also on the epithet *Anglicanæ*.

[3] Above, p. 167, n. 4. At the close of the 15th century, Dean Colet, whose life by Knight presents an excellent picture of this class of minds, revived the practice of lecturing at Oxford on Holy Scripture instead of the Schoolmen (cf. Luther's method, above, p. 15, n. 1). He was also thoroughly Erasmian in his advocacy of the Greek language; and Henry VIII. rendered valuable service to the same cause by a mandate which he transmitted to Oxford in 1519: see Warton, *Engl. Poetry*, III. 5, 6, Lond. 1840.

widened the horizon of their theological studies, and impelled them to more sedulous investigation of the Bible and the Early Fathers. Such pursuits, however, had not seriously weakened their attachment to the hierarchy, the service-books, or ritual institutions of the English Church. The third of these causes, harmonizing it would seem with trains of thought and feeling already generated by the Lollard movement, was more popular in its form and sometimes threatened to be democratic in its growth and operation. It would act most beneficially indeed so long as it gave prominence to sacred truths which had been grievously displaced or half-forgotten during the inertness of the Middle Ages; but its balance was destroyed, and therefore it became the parent of disorder and confusion, when it afterwards endeavoured to effect the violent eradication of whatever had been associated in the public mind with superstitions and abuses.

General characteristics of the Reformed Church of England.

Out of these threefold agencies, combined as they have been and modified through combination, rose the complex structure known as the 'Reformed Church of England,' whose eventful history has therefore ever since exhibited the operation of various elements, instinct with life and spirit, but imperfectly adapted and attempered to each other. The Reformers based their work upon the principle that Christian nations, and consequently national churches, do not owe allegiance, as a matter of Divine right, to any foreign potentate whatever[1];—thus recovering[2] on the one side the idea of royal supremacy as it was

[1] See above, p. 7.

[2] Gardiner in his *De Vera Obedientia* (Brown, II. 808) has many striking observations on this point: *e. g.* 'Nam quemadmodum apud jurisconsultos, ut loquuntur ipsi, jurisdictiones interdum variæ ab eodem manantes non se invicem perimunt, sed mutuis auxiliis consistentes concurrunt: sic quod Apostolis et iis, qui in eorum locum succedunt, regimen Ecclesiæ committitur, nulla in parte id quod ante a Deo principibus commissum est, tollere, minuereve censeatur. Neque minor sane est parochi cura parochianorum, quod curare etiam debet episcopus, nec episcopi jurisdictio ideo nulla putetur, quod superiorem agnoscat archiepiscopum.... Quemadmodum itaque iis suo quisque munere fungens, non detrahere sibi invicem, sed auxiliari videtur, sic quod Apostolis, et qui in eorum locum succedunt, regimen Ecclesiæ commissum reperitur, id quod antea a Deo principibus commissum est, haudquaquam tollitur.' He afterwards asks (p. 811): 'Quoties autem legimus causas hæreseos apud Cæsares et principes agitatas, ipsorumque examine discussas fuisse? Si antiquas retro principum leges excutiemus, quam multas

ENGLAND.

exercised of old by men like Constantine, Justinian or Charlemagne, and on the other side maintaining the competency of domestic synods to correct all deviations from the ancient faith which may exist within the limits of their own jurisdiction. The Reformers, in the second place, secured the oneness of the Modern with the Mediæval church of England by preserving the continuity of its organization, by unbroken ties of holy orders, by innumerable traditions of thought and sentiment, of faith, of feeling and of ritual, such especially as the Prayer Book has retained in common with the service-books of other churches. In the third place, the Reformers openly directed their appeal to the intelligence and reasoning powers no less than to the conscience of the individual churchman, affirming the necessity of personal faith in God and personal fellowship with Christ, the new Man from heaven, insisting on the right of each who has been gifted with the critical faculty to ascertain the real basis of his creed, and thus connecting a revival of religion with the growth of intellectual freedom and the onward march of man and of society.

Proximate cause of the movement.

The Reformation in this country did not spring, like the analogous events of Germany and Switzerland, from any single leader, though it also was considerably affected in its earlier stages by the force of one great impulse. To understand the proximate causes of the change, we must revert to a collision that commenced in **1527** between the English monarch and the pontiff touching the Romish doctrine of divorce[1]. The eldest son of Henry VII., prince Arthur, was married Nov. **14, 1501**, to Catharine, daughter

reperiemus ad religionem et Ecclesiam pertinentes ipsorum regum jussu et autoritate latas, promulgatas, ac demandatas executioni?'

[1] The following extract is taken from an *Apology for king Henry VIII.*, written in 1547 by William Thomas: 'For, incontinently after Campegio's departure [Oct. 1529], the kynge assailed in conscience of his first divorced matrimonye, both by the law of God, and also by the publique consent of the whole church of England, and hys barons and hys commons, proceded unto his second matrymonye, without further bribe or sute unto the pope, so that Clement seyng hys lyne broken, and the fish escaped with the hooke or bayte, like a mad ragyng dog vomited his fulminacions, and by consistorial sentence excommunicated both kynge and country; affirmyng that the kynge began to rebell against the Romayne see, for none other reason but because hys holy fatherhed woulde not graunte hym the licence of the new mariage.' Quoted in Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey*, p. 143, Lond. 1852.

ENGLAND.

of Ferdinand king of Aragon. The prince[1], however, died in the following April, and his thrifty father, unwilling to restore the dowry of so great an heiress, succeeded in procuring a bull of dispensation[2] from pope Julius II. (Dec. **26, 1503**) for the sake of marrying Catharine to his other son, the future Henry VIII. The parties were accordingly affianced, and their nuptials ultimately solemnized (June **3, 1509**), soon after the accession of the royal bridegroom to the throne of his father (April **22**). One daughter, Mary, born on the **18**th of Feb. **1516**, was the sole surviving issue of the union; and for this cause either alone, or as combined with others[3], it was rumoured in the summer of **1527** that Henry had become dissatisfied with his position, and intended to divulge his scruples to the pontiff in the hope of obtaining an immediate divorce. The tedious negotiations that ensued were still further complicated by manœuvres of cardinal Wolsey[4] on the one side and of

Marriage of Henry VIII.

Project of divorce:

[1] That the marriage was never actually consummated is urged by Roman-catholic historians: *e.g.* Audin, *Hist. de Henri VIII.* I. 53. It is so stated by King Ferdinand; Pocock, *Records of the Reformation*, II. 426.

[2] Reprinted in Audin, I. 513, 514. The ostensible object of the pope was to cement a union between the kingdoms of Spain and England. But for some cause or other Henry VII. afterwards changed his mind, and before the prince was old enough to ratify the contract, forced him to declare against it. The marriage was accordingly suspended till the death of Henry VII., which occurred April 21, 1509.

[3] Many persons, as Dodd remarks (*Church Hist.* ed. Tierney, I. 176, Lond. 1839), believed that Anne Boleyn, whom Henry afterwards married, 'stood behind the curtain all the while;' but the same writer proceeds to state that in his opinion other motives had 'concurred to carry on the divorce.' Wolsey is very often charged with being the real instigator of it (see Turner, *Modern Hist. of England*, II. 146 sq. Lond. 1828, and the note in p. 118 of Cavendish, *Life of Card. Wolsey*, Lond. 1852); while Cardinal Pole unhesitatingly affirms that the idea was originally suggested to Henry by certain obscure divines whom Anne Boleyn sent to him for that purpose: cf. Audin, I. 387. The spirit in which Henry commenced the process may perhaps be more truly gathered from the answer he addressed to Clerk, bishop of Bath: 'The bull is good or it is naught. If it be naught let it be so declared; and if it be good, it shall never be broken by no ways for me.' Turner, *Ibid.* p. 162.

[4] Whatever may have been Wolsey's first impressions, a long letter which he wrote Dec. 5, 1527, contains the strongest arguments that could be urged in favour of the divorce (see it in Burnet, 'Records,' Vol. I. No. III. Lond. 1681). Partly through his efforts and partly through those of Gardiner who went to Rome upon the same business, the pope was actually induced to admit the justice of Henry's cause and thus to recognize the invalidity of the marriage (July 23, 1528); though his dread of the emperor soon afterwards constrained him to repudiate the admission: cf. Turner, I. 223, 257, on the one side, with Audin, I. 456, on the other.

ENGLAND.

Catharine's imperial nephew Charles V. upon the other. But Henry had at length the satisfaction of ascertaining that his case would be adjudged in London, Wolsey and another legate, the cardinal Campeggio[1], being the appointed arbitrators. After fresh evasions and delays, both Catharine and himself appeared in open court[2] at the house of the Black Friars, June **21, 1529**. It was now currently reported that some regular sentence of divorce was on the eve of publication; but on the **23**rd of July, Campeggio alleging the practice of the Roman consistory, adjourned the court for vacation until the following October, and in the mean time Catharine had received express permission from Clement VII.[3] to carry her appeal to Rome[4].

its failure.

The spirit of the English monarch was by nature vehement and boisterous, fiery and impatient of control. He had preserved, however, a large amount of moderation[5] during the years already wasted in the prosecution of his object, yet no sooner did he hear of the last formidable obstruction than the storm of his displeasure burst, and

[1] Henry had in 1524 conferred on him the bishopric of Salisbury (Godwin, *De Præsulibus*, p. 353, Cantab. 1743); and on other grounds it was expected by the courtiers that his judgment would be favourable. He arrived in England at the close of September, 1528.

[2] See the full and interesting report in Stow's *Annales*, pp. 540 sq. Lond. 1631. The King's principal advocate was Sampson, afterwards bishop of Chichester, and author in 1535 of a short treatise *De Vera Obedientia Regi præstanda* (in Brown's *Fascic.* II. 820). On the side of Catharine, the leaders were Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and doctors Standish and Ridley, the last being uncle of the great reformer (Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey*, p. 127, Lond. 1852). The archbishop, Warham, who had originally objected to the marriage, yielded when the dispensation was issued, and afterwards inclined to the side of Catharine.

[3] Clement, during his struggle with Charles (above, p. 47), earnestly implored the help of Henry VIII., but the latter excused himself upon the ground that the war between the emperor and the pope was 'not for the faith, but for temporal possessions.' Turner, II. 104, note.

[4] Dodd, I. 196, note. In the same work will be found, 'Appendix,' No. XIX. the bull of Clement (March 7, 1530), forbidding Henry to contract a second marriage, until the first shall have been judicially and properly annulled, as also No. XXXIV. the definitive bull (March 23, 1534) declaring the original marriage to be valid. A large number of documents on the History of the Divorce are given in the Appendices to Burnet; by Mr. Pocock in his *Records of the Reformation*, Oxford, 1870; and by Theiner in his *Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum*, Rome, 1864.

[5] *E.g.* at the outset of the negotiations he declared that having had patience for eighteen years, he would 'stay yet four or five more.' Turner, II. 162.

ENGLAND.

Fall of Wolsey.

lighted irretrievably upon the head of the favourite, Wolsey[1]. It is a remarkable symptom of the times that in disgracing his old minister, Henry VIII. had the boldness to employ a weapon which had been provided to his hands among the ancient statutes of the realm,—one of the acts of *Præmunire*[2], which required that no papal bull should be executed in England till the royal licence was obtained; whereas the lawyers in conducting the impeachment most unscrupulously contended that the cardinal in exercising his legatine functions had omitted to obtain such licence, and had therefore placed himself within the range of a tremendous penalty.

Rise of Cranmer.

A progress made by Henry at this juncture was the means of introducing to his notice the man who was to take the most prominent, if not the most influential, place in the earlier proceedings of the English Reformation. Thomas Cranmer[3] was born at Aslacton in Nottinghamshire, July **2, 1489.** At the age of fourteen he proceeded to Jesus College, Cambridge, where after passing through the ordinary course of study[4] he applied himself in **1519**[5]

[1] See Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey*, pp. 158 sq. Lond. 1852. Although his property was confiscated, he was left in possession of the sees of York and Winchester: see Herbert's *Life of Henry VIII.* p. 57, Lond. 1672.

[2] Stat. 16 Rich. II. c. 5, in Stephens' *Eccl. Statutes*, I. 89 sq. The effect of the enactment (*Ibid.* p. 94, n. 1) was to put the persons attainted in a writ of *præmunire* out of the King's protection, thus disabling them from having any action or remedy by the King's law or the King's writs, and confiscating all their lands and tenements, goods and chattels to the Crown. In the present case, however, Wolsey was provided with the King's licence under the great seal, and therefore one main charge of his accusers fell entirely to the ground (Cavendish, p. 196). He was at last accused of a treasonable correspondence with foreign states (Turner, II. 297), and died on his way to London, Nov. 29, 1530.

[3] See Strype's *Memorials of Archbp. Cranmer* (ed. E. H. S.), Oxf. 1848—1854, and Le Bas, *Life of Archbp. Cranmer*, Lond. 1833.

[4] According to Strype, he was 'nursled in the grossest kind of sophistry, logic, philosophy moral and natural: not in the text of the old philosophers, but chiefly in the dark riddles of Duns, and other subtile questionists.' In 1511 he seems to have formed his great acquaintance with the writings of Erasmus (p. 3).

[5] Long before this date (circ. 1514) he married, and forfeited his fellowship at Jesus College, to which he had been elected in 1512. He was restored, however, on the death of his wife, which occurred within one year afterwards. On graduating in divinity, he was made 'prælector theologicus' of his college. Some additional light is thrown upon Cranmer's boyhood by the narrative of his secretary, Ralph Morice, used occasionally by Strype, and of which an extract is printed in the *British*

ENGLAND.

to a closer examination of Holy Scripture, and advanced to the degree of doctor of divinity in **1523**. When Henry, five years later, had determined to consult the principal universities at home and on the continent[1] in order that he might if possible be armed with verdicts in his favour, Cambridge was included in the list, and Cranmer's name among the doctors chosen to discuss the problem. He did not, however, join in the proceedings[2], owing to his absence from the university: but in **1529** on meeting Gardiner and others of the royal retinue at Waltham in Essex[3] he expressed himself so clearly on the subjects uppermost in the mind of all, both canonists and courtiers, that Henry was induced to send for him[4] and ultimately acted on his counsels. These were that the final adjudication of the controversy should be guided by the verdicts of the universities, without submitting it afresh to the chicanery of pontiffs like Clement VII. The Cambridge doctor then

His opinion touching the divorce.

Magazine, Vol. XXXVI. pp. 165—169. Much of the archbishop's diffidence and timidity is traceable to 'a marvellous severe and cruell schoolmaster.'

[1] Cavendish, *Life of Wolsey*, pp. 119, 120; who adds that 'diverse commissioners were incontinent appointed to this matter, who were divided as some to Oxonforde, some to Cambridge, some to Lovaine, some to Paris, some to Orleaunce, some to Bononye, and some to Padway, and so forthe.' Eight of these foreign determinations, bearing date 1529 and 1530, are printed in Burnet, 'Records,' Vol. II. No. XXXIV.: cf. Dodd, I. 200 sq. Turner, II. 174, note, on the question as to whether any of the universities were blinded by bribes.

[2] Le Bas, I. 32. For documents relating to the decisions of the English Universities, see Burnet, 'Records,' Vol. III. No. XVI. and Dodd, I. 369 sq.

[3] See the printed account of Morice, as above, p. 167. After informing us that 'Dr Stephens [Gardiner], the King's secretary, and Dr Fox, almosyner to the King,' were 'the great and only chief doers of the King's said cause at that time,' he adds that they and Cranmer were 'of old acquaintance, and meeting together the first night at supper, had familiar talk concerning the University of Cambridge, and so entering into further communication, they debated among themselves that great and weighty cause of the King's divorcement.' It would seem, however, that the plan had been suggested to the king by Robert Wakefield and considered by the bishops as early as 1527. See J. H. Blunt, *Reformation of the Church of England*, Oxford, 1869, pp. 129, 132.

[4] Strype, I. 6. Cranmer was now consigned to the hospitality of Thomas Boleyn, earl of Wiltshire, a distinguished scholar and correspondent of Erasmus, and father of Anne Boleyn, the next queen of Henry. He there composed his earliest treatise on the great question of the day, contending that marriage with a brother's widow is contrary to the law of God. The work, however, appears to be lost: see Dr Jenkyns' *Pref.* to his edition of Cranmer's *Remains*, p. viii. Oxf. 1833.

ENGLAND.

proceeded to develope his ideas on the papal supremacy, concluding that in cases like the present where the dispensation was believed to be at variance with the word of God, and the decisions of Councils and Fathers, it must be treated as completely null and void. He next consented to appear as one of the advocates of this principle at Rome itself[1], where he resided with the king's ambassador in **1530** for the sake of mastering the repugnance, or of quieting the apprehensions of the pope.

Cranmer becomes archbishop:

The death of archbishop Warham, which occurred August **23, 1532**, resulted in Cranmer's elevation to the primacy of England. At first indeed he hesitated[2], owing partly to his constitutional diffidence and partly to his foresight of the dangers that were thickening on his path; but on the **30**th of March, **1533**, he was consecrated at St Stephen's, Westminster. Soon afterwards (May **23**) he ventured to assert the independence of the English Church more plainly by pronouncing that the marriage of Henry with Catharine of Aragon had been invalid from the very first[3]. These symptoms of hostility to Rome had been accompanied by a series of parliamentary enactments[4],

[1] Strype, I. 17 sq. In July, 1532, we find him at Nuremberg (Seckendorf, lib. III. p. 41, col. 1) labouring to win over the Lutheran princes who had hitherto been adverse to the project of his royal master (Le Bas, I. 40, 41).

[2] Strype, I. 31 sq. Le Bas, I. 51 sq.: cf. Dodd, I. 212 sq. Before his consecration, where, according to the Mediæval form, he had to take an oath of fidelity to the pontiff, he stated in the most public manner under what limitations he recognized the jurisdiction of the Roman Church. See the documents in Strype, I. Append. No. v. sq. One of the limitations stood as follows: 'Et quod non intendo per hujusmodi juramentum aut juramenta, quovismodo me obligare, quominus libere loqui, consulere, et consentire valeam, in omnibus et singulis, reformationem religionis Christianæ, gubernationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, aut prærogativam coronæ ejusdem, reipublicæve commoditatem, quoquomodo concernentibus,' *etc.*: cf. Gardiner's view of the same oath, *De Vera Obedientia*, p. 819.

[3] See the sentence in Wilkins, III. 759. Henry had been already married privately to Anne Boleyn (Jan. 25, 1533). Cranmer was not present at the ceremony (see Strype, I. 35, n.[m]), but on the 28th of May he gave sentence in confirmation of the marriage. The fact that the princess Elizabeth was born on the 7th of the following September has naturally created a presumption adverse to the character of the new queen. For examples of the state of public feeling when the marriage was announced, see *Original Letters*, ed Ellis, II. 41 sq. Lond. 1825.

[4] *Stat.* 23 Hen. VIII. c. 20 (A.D. 1531); 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12 (A.D. 1532); 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20, c. 21 (A.D. 1533).

ENGLAND.

breach with Rome.

which not only forbade the payment of annates to the pope, and all appeal to his tribunals, but in **1534** entirely extirpated his jurisdiction with regard to other matters.

We have seen that long before this rupture numerous indications had been given of Henry's purpose to curtail as far as possible the privileges of the ecclesiastics[1], and the stirring circumstances in which he had been placed would naturally suggest the thought of dealing a still heavier blow. Accordingly we find him ready to maintain as early as **1531** and during the primacy of Warham[2], that all the members of the English priesthood in admitting the claims of Wolsey to the exercise of legatine functions had so acted as to have incurred the penalty of Præmunire. This penalty, however, with his characteristic insincerity, the monarch now proposed to mitigate[3] on the payment of exorbitant fines and with the understanding that his ecclesiastical supremacy should in future be more plainly recognized by all orders and estates of Englishmen. In furtherance of the latter object he assumed the title 'sole protector and supreme head of the Church[4].' But members of Convocation who manifested very slight reluctance with regard to other changes would not tamely acquiesce at once in this exorbitant demand of Henry. The subject was repeatedly discussed in the southern province (**1531**), and after a debate of three days, it was determined that the title 'Supreme head on earth of the Church of England' could only be accepted with the limiting condition 'so far as may be consistent with the Law of Christ'[5] ('quantum

Depression of ecclesiastics.

Title of Supreme Head.

[1] Above, p. 167, n. 3.

[2] On Warham's opinion touching the royal supremacy, see Strype, I. 29, 30.

[3] See Burnet, I. 106 sq., Dodd, I. 232 sq. The province of Canterbury paid £100,000, and that of York, £18,840.

[4] Kings were in olden times not unfrequently spoken of as 'patroni' of the Church. The writers in behalf of the 'Gallican Liberties' have especially drawn attention to such expressions, and have pointed out cases where the King was called 'chef terrien de l'esglise,' 'chef-protecteur,' and the like. See Twysden, *Vindication of the Church*, pp. 125 sq. Such titles were, however, open to objections on the score of profanity; and with regard to that of 'supreme head,' queen Elizabeth formally disclaimed it, substituting for it 'supreme governor:' cf. Article XXXVII. of 1562 with Article XXXVI. of 1552, and see *Zurich Letters*, ed. P. S. I. 24, 33. Archbp. Parker (*Correspondence*, p. 479) still 'feared the prerogative was not so great as Cecil's pen had given it her.'

[5] See Burnet, I. 112, 113, and Dodd, p. 234, with the editor's note.

ENGLAND.

Modified relations of the Church and civil power.

per Christi legem licet'). The act of Parliament[1], however, by which this title was secured to Henry VIII., in **1533**, materially determined the future conduct and complexion of the English Reformation. It vested in the crown one class of rights and functions which the Roman pontiff and his agents had previously usurped, though not indeed without continual murmurs, expostulations and rebuffs. Ecclesiastics were constrained in future to acknowledge the ultimate jurisdiction of domestic courts[2]: they were to recognize no earthly sovereign, master, or superior, beyond the confines of the English monarchy: they were disabled from meeting in their convocations, or provincial synods, until the metropolitans who summoned them obtained a special licence from the crown[3].

The acknowledgement of the title thus modified was made in the convocation of Canterbury, March 22, and in that of York, May 4, 1531. Fitzherbert, Coke and other lawyers maintain that the enactment passed at this juncture (1534: *Stat.* 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1) to confirm Henry's view of the royal supremacy, was but *declaratory* of the old common law of England: see Bramhall, *Just Vindication*, Works, I. 151, 152, Oxf. 1842. And that the subversion of all church-authority was not contemplated, is obvious from the fact that the oath of supremacy was now taken by Fisher of Rochester, and in all probability by Reginald Pole.

[1] This is the celebrated Act known as the 'Submission of the Clergy,' (*i. e.* their submitting to be prosecuted under the *præmunire*): see *Stat.* 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19; in which it is observable that the limiting clause 'quantum per Christi legem licet' had been fraudulently suppressed.

[2] Polydore Vergil, the Italian, who was then archdeacon of Wells (*Angl. Hist.* lib. XXVII. p. 86*, Lugd. Batav. 1651), refers to these changes in the following words: 'Interea habetur concilium Londini, in quo Ecclesia Anglicana formam potestatis nullis ante temporibus visam induit. Henricus enim rex caput ipsius Ecclesiæ constituitur, eique ob id munus primi fructus omnium sacerdotiorum vacantium ac eorundem decimæ quotannis perpetuæ assignantur [26 Hen. VIII. c. 3]. Item causarum modus ponitur, ut reus primo provocare deberet ad episcopum, deinde ad archiepiscopum, et postremo ad ipsum regem [*i. e.* in Chancery, or to a Court of Delegates appointed by the King, *Stat.* 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, § 4]; quo sic in ulla administratione rerum, quæ ad Ecclesiam pertinerent, Romani pontificis auctoritate minime opus foret.'

[3] On the early records of the Convocation, see *Middle Age*, p. 240, n. 1, and Lathbury's *Hist. of the Convocation*, 2nd ed. Anterior to 1533 (*i. e.* to the passing of the *Stat.* 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19), the archbishop of each province could assemble his provincial synod at his pleasure, the sovereign also having the right to summon the clergy of both provinces by a royal writ to parliament; and likewise to direct the summoning of the convocations by the archbishops. The latter was indeed thought by some to be an infringement of the liberty of the Church (see an example belonging to the fourteenth century in Carte, *Hist. of England*, II. 333), but still the mandates of the king were continually issued. In 1533 it

ENGLAND.

It is indeed unquestionable that Henry VIII., although he fortified his chief positions by adducing precedents from Mediæval history, was nevertheless outstripping all his English predecessors, and was bent on stretching the royal prerogative as far as ever he was able[1]. The plainest indication of this tendency was given when he appointed Thomas Cromwell, a politician trained under the eye of Wolsey, to be his own vicegerent, or vicar-general, in ecclesiastical matters (**1535**). Still in **1534** when the extravagant pretensions of the papacy were openly called in question and submitted to the test of Holy Scripture, Henry was inclined to pay more deference to the English convocations than to the English parliament; regarding the inquiry as ecclesiastical or spiritual, and therefore being anxious to secure the co-operation not only of the church-legislature, but of all the other institutions which were thought to represent that branch of 'the body politic' called 'the spirituality'[2]. Actuated by such feelings he consulted both the southern and northern convocation, the universities, the cathedral chapters, and the conventual establishments, all of which with only a few dissentient[3]

The change not subversive of synodal action.

was determined (1) that convocation can only be assembled by the king's writ; (2) that before proceeding to 'attempt, alledge, claim, or put in ure, or enact, promulge or execute any new canons, constitutions, ordinance provincial or other,' an additional licence must be obtained from the crown; (3) that such canons and constitutions must be formally sanctioned by the same authority.

[1] Thus in the *Stat.* 26 Hen. VIII. c. 1, the parliament empowered him to visit, repress and reform 'all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be, which *by any manner spiritual authority or jurisdiction* ought or may lawfully be reformed,' &c. Visitors (like the 'Missi' of Charlemagne) were appointed under this act, and during their visitation the bishops were restrained from the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction (see the document in Wilkins, III. 797). At the same time Commissions were issued by the king to some of the bishops, possibly to all, empowering them to exercise jurisdiction within their dioceses: one of many illustrations of the temporary confusion produced in men's minds respecting the nature, source and limits of spiritual and secular authority: cf. Cranmer's *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, II. 101, 102. Two years later (*Stat.* 28 Hen. VIII. c. 10) the 'oath of supremacy' was drawn up, and all officers, civil and ecclesiastical, the clergy at their ordination, and members of the universities about to graduate, were compelled to take it, under pain of treason: cf. the expanded form of the oath in *Stat.* 35 Hen. VIII. c. 1. § xi.

[2] See the extract given above, p. 7.

[3] One of these dissentients was the venerable Fisher, bp. of Rochester, who was beheaded soon afterwards (June 22, 1535) upon a charge of high

ENGLAND.

voices answered, that the Roman pontiff was not authorized by Holy Scripture in putting forth his claim to jurisdiction within the realm of England[1]. In **1534**, however, the Reformation was still barely dawning on the country. Those who led the anti-papal movement had no very clear intention of proceeding further, so as to remove the mass of errors and abuses handed down from the Middle Age. The first act of Parliament 'concerning restraint of payments' to the see of Rome, declares[2] that 'our said sovereign the king and all his natural subjects, as well spiritual as temporal,' continued to be 'as obedient, devout, catholic and humble children of God and holy Church as any people be within any realm christened;' and for several years after this enactment few and fitful are the auguries of reformation visible in that quarter. The archbishop, it is true, had himself broken through the law enforcing clerical celibacy, and had married for his second wife (**1532**) the niece of Osiander, the distinguished Lutheran of Nuremberg[3]; yet little or no evidence exists to prove that when

Reformation at first confined to the rejection of the papacy.

treason. His main crime was that he refused to be sworn to an oath in conformity with *Stat.* 25 Hen. VIII. c. 22, binding him to maintain the succession of Ann Boleyn's children, and thereby declaring the absolute nullity of Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon. The next victim of that act was Sir Thomas More, beheaded July 6, 1535. See Burnet, I. 155 sq., Audin, II. 126—180, Turner, II. 370 sq. Both of them, as we know from one of Cranmer's letters, written in their behalf (Strype, I. 339, 340), were willing to be sworn to the oath itself, but would not accept the preamble.

[1] See the documents in Wilkins, III. 748 sq. Rymer's *Fœdera*, &c. XIV. 487 sq. ed. 1728. Hall, the chronicler, in speaking of these enactments and decrees, gives utterance to a feeling which must have been very general: 'By the which,' he says, 'the pope, with all his college of cardinals, with all their pardons and indulgences, was utterly abolished out of this realm. God be everlastingly praised therefore:' cf. Dodd's method of accounting for the acquiescence of the English people, I. 243, 244.

[2] *Stat.* 23 Hen. VIII. c. 20: cf. 25 Hen. VIII. c. 21, § xix. where it is affirmed that the country had no intention 'to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church, in any things concerning the very articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom.' The same feelings are more largely expressed in bp. Tunstall's letter to Pole (dated July 13, 1536: Burnet, Vol. III. 'Records,' No. LII.), with reference to the cardinal's harsh and unscrupulous treatise, *De Unitate Ecclesiastica* (1535); on the history of which, see Schelhorn, *Amœnitates Hist. Eccl.* I. 11—190, Francof. 1737.

[3] See above, p. 175, n. 1, and Le Bas, I. 47. In 1534 he privately sent for her to England, where she remained till 1539.

ENGLAND.

the papal supremacy was abolished either he[1] or any of the king's advisers were contemplating deeper changes in the ecclesiastical system of the realm. The alienation of Erasmus[2] from the continental reformers must have also operated powerfully among his friends in England, counteracting numerous tendencies to reformation which he may have excited there, and more especially augmenting the distrust of Lutheran principles.

Rise of a Lutheran party.

A party favourable to such changes did, however, gradually emerge and rise into importance. The same year that witnessed the commencement of Henry's negotiations with the pontiff (**1527**) was marked by the appearance of a small cluster of students at Oxford[3], fascinated by the German theology. They seem to have been principally inmates of Corpus Christi College, which may therefore be regarded as the cradle of the new generation of reformers. At Cambridge also men like Thomas Bilney[4], who was charged with Lollardism and burnt in **1532**, betrayed a growing predilection for the new opinions. One characteristic of this party was their wish to see the study of the Bible generally revived: and on the appearance of Tyndale's version[5] of the New Testament, notwithstanding all

Circulation of the Scriptures.

[1] For example, Cranmer participated in the condemnation of John Frith, who was burnt at Smithfield, July 4, 1533. 'His said opynyon,' writes the archbishop (June 17), 'ys of suche nature that he thoughte it not necessary to be beleved as an Article of our faythe, that ther ys the very corporall presence of Christe within the Oste and Sacramente of the Alter, and holdethe of this poynte muste [most] after the opynion of Œcolampadious' [above, pp. 107 sq.]: *Original Letters*, ed. Ellis, II. 40, Lond. 1825. Many of Frith's writings were published in Vol. III. of the *Works of the English and Scotch Reformers*, ed. Russell, Lond. 1829. He also distinguished himself by his denunciations of the received doctrine of purgatory in reply to Sir Thomas More's *Supplication of the poor silly souls puling out of Purgatory*, which in its turn was an answer to the lampoon entitled *The Supplication of the Beggars* by Simon Fish (reprinted, from Foxe, in Dodd's *Ch. Hist.* II. 419 sq.).

[2] See above, pp. 43 sq.

[3] The predilection for Lutheranism was nowhere shewn more strongly 'than in the Cardinal's College, and particularly by the members who had been received into it from Cambridge [cf. Le Bas, *Life of Cranmer*, I. 30]. Among these members, John Clark had a right of claiming the precedence:' Fiddes, *Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, p. 416, Lond. 1724. They studied Luther's own books.

[4] The fullest account of him is by Foxe, pp. 998 sq. ed. 1583. Bilney seems to have exerted great influence on the training of bishop Latimer, and also of archbishop Parker. He was first prosecuted for heresy in 1527, before Tunstall, then bishop of London, but escaped by recanting.

[5] See above, p. 147, n. 2. His translation, of which two Gospels

ENGLAND.

attempts to put it down[1], the fermentation which had hitherto existed chiefly in the Universities was rapidly diffused through all classes of society. It is remarkable that one of the first overtures made by Henry to the German princes, who upon the basis of the Confession of Augsburg had entered into an alliance known as the Schmalkaldic league, occurred in the eventful year **1534**. His main object was undoubtedly political[2], yet, by inviting Melanchthon more than once to England[3], he manifested a less warlike disposition than his previous fulminations would have led us to expect. In the same year also Cranmer actually prevailed upon the convocation of Canterbury to join him in requesting that Henry would authorize an English version[4] of the Bible for general distribution,—one example where the various lines of thought, the Mediæval and Reforming, promised to converge and harmonize more fully.

appeared at Hamburg in 1524, is reprinted in Bagster's *English Hexapla*, from the Worms edition of 1526.

[1] *E. g.* A royal proclamation was issued in 1530 'for dampning of erronious bokes and heresies and prohibitinge the havinge of Holy Scripture translated into the vulgar tonges of Englische, Frenche or Dutche,' *etc.* (printed in *Notes and Queries*, 1st S. VII. pp. 422, 423). Before this date, however, constant efforts had been made to suppress all copies of Tyndale's translation (Foxe, p. 1077). Of the first edition (1525), which contained 3000 copies, only one is at present known to exist. But from that time until the year 1611, when our authorized version was put forth, no less than 278 editions of the Bible and New Testament in English issued from the press: *Bible of Every Land*, p. 163.

[2] Strype, *Eccl. Memor.* I. 225—228, Lond. 1721.

[3] 'Ego jam alteris literis in Angliam vocor,' writes Melanchthon in March, 1534: *Opp.* ed. Bretsch. II. 708. See other exemplifications of this friendly feeling in Laurence, *Bampt. Lect.* Serm. I. n. 3: and cf. Ratzeberger's contemporaneous *Handschrift. Gesch. über Luther*, &c. pp. 79, 80, Jena, 1850.

[4] Le Bas, I. 106: and, on later translations, see Anderson, *Annals of the English Bible*, Lond. 1845. The archbishop divided Tyndale's translation of the New Testament into nine or ten parts, distributing these among the bishops for correction, and receiving favourable answers from most of them, Gardiner in the number. On the other hand, Stokesley, bishop of London, who had already shewn his anti-reformation bias, refused to make his contribution, on the ground that the reading of the Scriptures was injurious to the laity; it 'doth nothing else but infect them with heresy.' The court perhaps shared this feeling, since Cranmer's design appears for the present to have miscarried. The whole Bible in English was, however, privately published by Coverdale in the following year (1535). In the June of 1536, the Convocation repeated their request to Henry, and in 1537 we find Cranmer presenting to the monarch with his approbation an English Bible 'of a new translation and

ENGLAND.

Anabaptism.

But in order that the future course of our inquiry may be cleared and simplified, it must be carefully remembered that in England, as in continental states, a revolutionary party had been fostered in the very shadow of the Reformation. They are distinguished for the most part by their general name of Anabaptists[1]. Many of their tenets coincide with extreme positions of the Lollards, and it is consequently hard to say, in the case of England, how far the startling eccentricities that meet us at the very outbreak of the Reformation were of native growth, or were imported by the Anabaptist refugees from Germany and the Netherlands. As early as **1536** the southern convocation[2], which assembled on the 9th of June, had found it necessary to deal with this class[3] of questions among others. The manifesto then authorized may be regarded as the starting-point of the English Reformation, and is certainly a faithful index of the sentiments that actuated the more zealous and intelligent members of the Church. It is entitled *Articles to stablyshe Christen quietnes and unitie amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions*[4]. After much discussion[5],

First series of Articles.

a new print,' usually entitled Matthew's Bible, but in reality the work of Tyndale, Coverdale and Rogers. Two years later (1539) the same version considerably revised was issued with an able *Preface* by Cranmer himself, and is therefore commonly known as 'Cranmer's,' or 'The Great Bible.' This publication was fully sanctioned by the crown, but in 1542, when the anti-reformation party obtained a fresh ascendancy at court, an act of Parliament was passed (34 and 35 Hen. VIII. c. 1), interdicting the perusal of the New Testament in English to women and artificers, 'prentices, journeymen, serving men of the degree of yeomen or under, husbandmen and labourers.

[1] Traces of them in England occur as early as 1536. In 1538 a royal commission was directed against them (Oct. 1: Wilkins, III. 536), and Stow (p. 576) mentions the capture and execution (Nov. 27) of 'Dutch Anabaptists.' At a later period of the reign of Henry, and in that of Edward, swarms of them crossed the channel, 'evil disposed people,' affirming 'that England is at this day the harbour for all infidelity:' see a letter of Sir Thomas Chamberlayne, dated Brussels, June 7, 1551, in Tytler's *England under Edw. VI.* &c. I. 379, 380.

[2] Latimer, appointed to the see of Worcester (Aug. 1535), now appears among the leading prelates favourable to reformation (cf. above, p. 167, n. 4). He preached the sermon at the opening of the Convocation (*Sermons*, pp. 33 sq. ed. P. S.), by the appointment of Cranmer.

[3] See the list of 'mala dogmata' in Wilkins, III. 804.

[4] Reprinted, with collations of the different texts, in Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, Appendix I.

[5] There is great uncertainty as to whether the debate reported in Foxe, pp. 1182 sq., took place on this occasion or in the following year (1537).

ENGLAND.

managed on the one side by the primate and on the other by Stokesley bishop of London, Henry himself through his vicegerent interposing not a few suggestions[1], a compromise appears to have been effected between the two great parties in the house; for with the almost solitary exception of Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, the leading representatives in convocation eventually subscribed the formulary[2]. The names of Lee, archbishop of York, and Tunstall, bishop of Durham, are also included in the list as third and fifth subscribers. It is, however, next to certain, that the northern province, where the great majority of the people were averse to all dogmatic changes, and even to the abolition of the papal monarchy[3], had not assented to the Articles of **1536**. On the contrary, some of the bolder malcontents, both priests and laymen, hearing that 'several bishops had made a change in the fundamental doctrines,' laboured to excite an insurrection, which could only be appeased by announcing that such alterations were regularly effected, and by exhibiting the autograph subscriptions of the church-authorities[4].

Character of the new formulary.

This document, if we consider it as a whole, retained

Baker, *Notes on Burnet* (of which extracts are printed in the *British Magazine*, xxxvi. 179), is of opinion that the meeting there alluded to was a mere 'convention of bishops and divines,' intrusted with the preparation of the *Institution of a Christian Man*. Ales or Alane (see above, p. 133, n. 1), who took part in the proceedings till silenced by Cranmer (Foxe, p. 1184), published an account of his discussion with Stokesley. The title is *On the auctorite of the Word of God, against the Bishop of London*, said by the translator to have been the work of 'Alexander *Alane* Scot' (there is a copy in the Bodleian Library).

[1] Hardwick, as above, pp. 39—41.

[2] A facsimile of the signatures is prefixed to Vol. I. of Dodd's *Ch. Hist.* ed. Tierney. Cromwell, as the representative of Henry, is the first subscriber.

[3] Wilkins, III. 812: Strype's *Eccl. Mem.* I. 247, 248, Lond. 1721.

[4] Hardwick, as above, p. 50. The agitation in Lincolnshire may have been exasperated by bp. Longland's mandate (Wilkins, III. 829) enjoining the clergy to avoid controversial topics, and to preach four times a year, 'secundum Articulos, qui nuper per serenissimam regiam majestatem, ac *totum hujus regni Angliæ clerum in Convocatione sua* sanciti fuere.' On earlier symptoms of rebellion in the North, see Turner, II. 296, 297. The Yorkshire and Cumberland rebels, who were headed by Robert Aske and others, called their movement 'an holy and blessed pilgrimage,' or 'the pilgrimage of grace,' and were at one time so formidable as to make Henry think of reuniting himself with Rome (*Ibid.* p. 474, n. 21). On their dispersion in the spring of 1537, very many of the leaders were put to death (Dodd, I. 266, 267), including the three abbots of Fountains, Jervaux and Rievaux.

ENGLAND.

the animus of the Middle Ages. Some indeed of the objectors noticed that allusion had been only made to three sacraments[1], *viz.* baptism, penance, and the Eucharist[2]: yet these are all handled precisely in the Mediæval fashion. Touching the doctrine of justification[3], which appears to have been already made a subject of dispute, the synod has attempted to preserve a middle course, between the Lutheran hypothesis on one side, and those schoolmen who refused to sever the idea of remission of sins from that of Christian holiness or renovation. In the second division of the formulary, consisting also of five articles, the judgment of the Church is added with respect to what are there entitled 'laudable ceremonies.' It includes a brief discussion of the reverence paid to images, of the invocation of saints, and also of the doctrine of purgatory, which was now beginning to encounter a determined opposition from the more advanced reformers[4]. The result however was,

[1] Hall's *Chron.* fol. 228, ed. 1583. On the probable reasons which made the Convocation abstain at this time from definitions respecting the four subordinate 'sacraments,' see Jenkyns, *Pref.* to Cranmer's *Works*, pp. xvi. xvii.

[2] Cranmer's 'judgment of the Eucharist' was further indicated in 1537 by his strong disapprobation of a work on the subject presented to him by the Swiss scholar, Joachim Vadianus. The doctrine it maintained was Zwinglian: see Cranmer's letter to the author, *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 13. After praising Zwingli and Œcolampadius, so far as they had assisted in correcting 'papistical and sophistical errors and abuses,' he adds: 'I wish that they had confined themselves within these limits, and not trodden down the wheat together with the tares; that is, had not at the same time done violence to the authority of the ancient doctors and chief writers in the Church of Christ.'

[3] Nicholson, of Southwark, who printed 'Lutheran' works, put forth, in 1536, a 'Treatyse of Justification by faith only.' In the same year Bucer's *Metaphrasis* (on the Epistle to the Romans) was dedicated to archbp. Cranmer with a eulogistic preface (Argentorat. 1536). Archbp. Laurence has pointed out (*Bampt. Lect.* p. 201, Oxf. 1838) that the definition in Art. v. of 1536 is borrowed from Melanchthon's *Loci Theologici;* but he fails to observe how the following part of the sentence, '*that is to say*, our perfect renovation in Christ,' betrays the touch of another school of theologians.

[4] See above, p. 180, n. 1, respecting Frith. Latimer also in his Convocation sermon, p. 50) has some caustic sentences against those 'that begot and brought forth our old ancient purgatory pick-purse.' The sermon is indeed one of the best commentaries on the Articles put forth immediately afterwards, and it is manifest that the preacher if he had been permitted would have advanced far less cautiously than some of his brother prelates. Very similar enormities were brought to light as far back as 1511 in the famous Convocation sermon of Dean Colet: see Knight's *Life of Colet*, pp. 289 sq.

ENGLAND.

that these traditions were in substance and effect to be perpetuated, after the more flagrant and blasphemous abuses of them had been carefully pruned away.

Suppression of the religious houses.

Among the signatures appended to these Ten Articles were found the names of certain abbots and priors, who may be regarded as the last examples of a race devoted to annihilation. The work had been commenced by Wolsey[1], who, under the protection of papal as well as royal licences, dissolved no less than thirty religious foundations, chiefly for the purpose of endowing colleges at Oxford and at Ipswich. The idea of a more extensive measure of confiscation, or rather diversion of monastic property to the general uses of the Church, which had been contemplated by Wolsey, seems to have been taken up by his master, with a special reference to his own necessities. Cromwell, in his capacity of vicar-general, undertook a visitation of all the monasteries in **1535**: and, as many charges of shameless immorality were brought against the inmates, more especially of the smaller houses, an act of Parliament[2]

[1] Herbert's *Life of Henry VIII.* pp. 146, 147. The best materials for a history of the series of confiscations that ensued are in *Three chapters of Letters relating to the suppression of Monasteries*, Lond. Camd. Soc. 1843: cf. Dodd, I. 251—294. Wolsey in 1529 had obtained very large powers of dealing with the monastic property for the purpose of founding bishoprics. In 1532 Henry had obtained a bull from the pope for the erection of six new bishoprics to be endowed by the suppression of religious houses (Burnet, I. 121), and ten years later five additional sees were founded at Chester, Gloucester, Peterborough, Bristol and Oxford: see *Stat.* 34 and 35 Hen. VIII. c. 17, § iii. Westminster was to be added to the list, and Thomas Thirleby was actually consecrated bishop, Dec. 9, 1540; but the foundation was soon afterwards deemed unnecessary. This, however, was a small fraction of Henry's scheme, as we find from the draft of a bill preserved in the *Letters* just cited, pp. 263, 264, where he contemplated the erection of nine additional bishoprics. He also converted fourteen abbeys and priories into cathedral and collegiate churches, placing a dean and chapter in each. These were Canterbury, Rochester, Westminster, Winchester, Bristol, Gloucester, Worcester, Chester, Burton-on-Trent, Carlisle, Durham, Thornton, Peterborough and Ely, hence entitled 'of the new foundation.' Another of his projects (*Ibid.* p. 262) as corrected in his own handwriting was to devote the spoils of the monasteries to religious, charitable, and literary uses, that 'Godes worde myght the better be sett forthe, chyldren broght up in lernying, clerces nuryshyd in the universities, olde servantes decayd to have lyfynges, allmeshousys for pour folke to be sustaynyd in, reders off Grece, Ebrew, and Latyne to have good stypende' &c. &c. But the 'great spoiler' was a 'small restorer;' and it seems most probable that the larger measure for forming new sees was Wolsey's, the smaller act of justice Henry's own.

[2] 27 Hen. VIII. c. 28. The number of religious houses now dissolved

ENGLAND.

was passed in **1536** transferring such of them to the crown as were not above the annual value of £200. The larger houses were at this time mentioned honourably, as if they had continued to fulfil the purpose of their institution: yet in the brief interval of four years they also were discorporated and dissolved[1], their treasures thrown into the royal coffers, and their lands all parcelled out among the friends of Cromwell, or the tools and favourites of the court. A few voices, bishop Latimer's[2] among the rest, were raised in deprecation of these sweeping measures, to secure, if possible, that some of the religious houses might be spared, and dedicated to pious uses.

Advance of the reformers:

In the mean while reformation, as distinguished from such wanton acts of demolition, had effected some measurable progress by the putting forth of the *Bishops' Book* or 'Institution of a Christen Man'[3], drawn up by a committee of prelates and divines in **1537**. It comprises an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria, and also of the much-contested doctrines of justification and purgatory. The compilers at the same time felt themselves under the necessity of discussing other points to which the novel aspect and position of the English church imparted great significance. They contended, for example, that the fabric of the papal monarchy was altogether human; that its growth was traceable partly to the favour and indulgence of the Roman emperors, and partly to ambitious artifices of the popes themselves; that just as men

their relation to the Roman church.

was 376, their annual revenue about £32,000. In this case, however, the grantees, or purchasers of the suppressed convents, were bound to keep hospitality there as in former times.

[1] *Stat.* 31 Hen. VIII. c. 13. By this enactment the total number of suppressed monasteries was augmented to 645, the yearly income of which, together with that of colleges, chantries and other establishments also dissolved, was not much less than £160,000, a sum exceeding the third part of all the ecclesiastical revenues of the kingdom. Twenty-seven mitred abbots were by the same change excluded from the house of Lords, thus effecting an important alteration in the political constitution of England: see Miller, *Hist. Phil. illus.* III. 218.

[2] *Remains*, p. 411, ed. P. S. So far from relenting in this particular, the English monarch by act of Parliament 37 Hen. VIII. c. 4 secured that the few remaining chantries and even the colleges for learning should be placed at his disposal.

[3] Printed in *Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the reign of Henry VIII.* Oxf. 1825.

originally made and sanctioned it, so might they, if occasion should arise, withdraw from it their confidence, and thus reoccupy the ground on which all Christians must have stood anterior to the Middle Ages. It was, nevertheless, admitted in this formulary, that the Roman church[1] was not unchristian, but that in connexion with other national and independent communities it entered into the formation of the universal brotherhood, which Holy Scripture terms the Church.

Conferences with the Lutherans:

Allusion has been made already[2] to the friendlier disposition manifested by Henry and the leading members of his council in reference to the progress of the Lutheran movement. In the December of **1535** two envoys[3], bishop Fox and doctor Heath, whom he dispatched to Saxony, had interviews on matters of religion with some of the more influential of the Wittenbergers[4]. This discussion was prolonged into the following April; and although the disputants were still unable to agree entirely, their negotiations were reopened under favourable auspices in **1538**. On the last occasion three German delegates were sent across to England[5] (May **12**). Many conferences took place by order of Henry VIII. himself, the doctrines of the English church being represented by a select committee of divines. The most pacific member of this body was the primate, whose convictions with regard to many, if not most of the disputed points, approximated[6] to the views maintained by the disciples of Luther and Melanchthon. In

how frustrated.

[1] See especially pp. 55, sq. The moderation of this statement is remarkable as compared with the atrocious bull of excommunication launched by Paul III. Aug. 30, 1535 (Wilkins, III. 792 sq.; cf. Turner, II. 469).

[2] Above, p. 181.

[3] See Strype, *Eccl. Mem.* I. 225 sq.

[4] Two of these were Pontanus (see above, p. 53, n. 1) and Francis Burckart (Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretsch. II. 108), who insisted on subscription to the Confession of Augsburg as a preliminary to the admission of the English monarch into the Schmalkaldic League. To this requirement Henry objected 'unless certain things in their Confession and Apology should by their familiar conferences be mitigate.' Luther and Melanchthon were both present at interviews held in Wittenberg during January 1536, *Ibid.* III. 26: cf. III. 104, n. 2.

[5] Respecting them and the fruit of the negotiations that ensued, see Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, pp. 56 sq.

[6] See his letter of Aug. 23, 1538, written a short time before the return of the German 'Orators,' in his *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, I. 263, 264.

ENGLAND.

the end, however, he was unsupported by his episcopal colleagues, who, mainly owing to the influence of Gardiner[1] and Tunstall[2], clung with great tenacity to some 'abuses' which were most obnoxious to the German envoys. It was indeed quite obvious that Henry for the present had resolved to countenance no further relaxations either in the ritual or in the dogmatic system of the Church. A brief period of reaction[3] was commencing. The negotiations with the German envoys, to say nothing of the prejudices raised in many quarters by the dissolution of the monasteries and by other acts of violence, had thrown fresh light on the essential contrariety between some aspects of the 'old' and 'new learning'[4]; and bishop Gardiner was not the man to overlook the slightest reflux of the tide, or waste an opportunity that promised to advance the interests of his party. This able ecclesiastic had invariably opposed the Wittenberg reformers, his antipathy increasing rather than abating after his return from diplomatic missions on the continent, by which he had obtained a clearer insight into the development of Protestantism. Content with the extrusion of the Roman pontiff[5], he adhered on other subjects to the

Slight reaction,

headed by Gardiner.

[1] Gardiner had consistently opposed the negotiations throughout: Strype, *Eccl. Mem.* I. Append. No. LXV.

[2] See the 'King's Answer,' written with Tunstall's help, to the German ambassadors on the taking away of the chalice, against private masses, on the celibacy of the clergy, &c., in the Addenda of Burnet, I. No. VIII. (pp. 347—360).

[3] This reaction may be said to have culminated (1543) in the *Stat.* 34 and 35 Hen. VIII. c. 1, enjoining that recourse must be had to the catholic and apostolic Church for the decision of controversies, denouncing Tyndale's 'false translation' of the Bible, restricting the use of the New Testament in English to one class of the community (above, p. 181, n. 4), and abolishing all books that comprised any matter of Christian religion, Articles of Faith, or Holy Scripture, contrary to the doctrine set forth *sithence* A.D. 1540, or to be set forth by the king. The influence of the same reactionary school is visible in *The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man* (also printed in *Formularies of Faith*, Oxf. 1825). It is a revised edition of the *Bishops' Book*, above, p. 186, sanctioned by Convocation and enjoined by royal mandate.

[4] These became the recognized expressions for characterizing the 'Mediæval' and 'Reforming' parties: *e. g.* Cranmer (*Works*, I. 375, ed. Jenkyns) speaks of 'the best learned men reputed within this realm, some favouring the *old*, some the *new* learning, as they term it (where indeed that which they call the old is the new, and that which they call the new is indeed the old).'

[5] Above, p. 163, n. 2: to which may be added a vigorous sermon preached on the papal supremacy in the following reign (1548). Gardiner

ENGLAND.

dogmas of the stricter class of schoolmen; and accordingly, as soon as he beheld the growth in England of religious novelties that threatened to produce a revolution in the church-establishment, his energies were all employed[1], and often unscrupulously misdirected[2] to evade, postpone or counterwork a movement which he dreaded.

It is probable[3] that the ascendancy at court of Gardiner and others like him led to the enactment of the statute of the 'Six Articles'[4] (**1539**), 'for the abolishing of diversity of opinions;' or, in different words, for punishing with death, and otherwise, all persons who might dare to call in question some of the more startling of the Mediæval dogmas. Cranmer[5] argued boldly, but in vain, against the passing of this brutal measure: still its operation seems to have been checked[6], in part at least, as early as the following year. Indeed the personal influence of the primate shewed itself in nothing more conspicuously than in the charm which he exerted on the boisterous and intractable

Checked, however, by Cranmer.

became master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, as early as 1525, and held the office till 1549. In 1538, seven years after his elevation to the see of Winchester, he was elected chancellor of the University (see Godwin, *De Præsulibus*, p. 237, and notes).

[1] A good example of his controversial powers is furnished by his *Declaration* (against George Joye: cf. Maitland's *Essays on the Reformation*, pp. 4 sq.), Lond. 1546.

[2] Gardiner is charged with taking part in the persecution of Ann Askew, who was tortured and burnt in 1545. Foxe, pp. 1234 sq. ed. 1583. On her case, however, see J. H. Blunt's *Reformation of the Church of England*, p. 539; Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, VII. 63, 64; Froude, *Hist. of England*, IV. 497.

[3] Strype's *Cranmer*, I. 160. The king was displeased with Cranmer and others of his school (according to Strype) 'because they could not be brought to give their consent in the parliament that the king should have all the monasteries suppressed to his own sole use.' The charge recently brought against Cranmer to the effect that he among other courtiers sought to enrich his family by the spoils of the church, is fully examined in Mr Massingberd's *English Reformation*, Append. E, 2nd ed.

[4] 31 Hen. VIII. c. 14. The Articles were first 'resolved by the Convocation.' They enforce a belief (1) in the physical change of the Eucharistic elements, (2) in the doctrine of concomitance, or the non-necessity of communion in both kinds, (3) the sinfulness of marriage after receiving the order of priesthood, (4) the absolute obligation of vows of chastity, &c., (5) the scripturalness and efficacy of private masses, (6) the necessity of auricular confession (*i. e.* compulsory).

[5] Herbert's *Life of Henry VIII.* p. 512: see also Mr Scudamore's vindication of Cranmer on this subject: *England and Rome*, p. 255, Lond. 1855.

[6] Maitland's *Essays*, as above, No. XII.

ENGLAND.

nature of his sovereign. Notwithstanding the ability and astuteness of Gardiner his rival, the archbishop never lost[1] his hold on the affections of the English court; and to the influence that he wielded there we must ascribe the public traces of a Reformation-spirit which occur at no distant intervals until the close of the present reign. For instance, in **1541** and **1542** we find[2] him superintending a revision of the Service-books and advocating the general use of Homilies for the instruction both of 'ignorant preachers' and of their flocks. In **1544** a *Litany*[3] appeared in English under the same auspices; and as it was expressly meant by the compilers to direct and elevate the public worship of the Church, they must have recognized in its establishment the triumph of one fundamental principle on which the

Further traces of progress.

[1] See, for example, Strype's *Cranmer*, I. 261 sq.

[2] Strype, *Eccl. Mem.* Bk. I. ch. 50. In a session of the southern convocation (March 3, 1541: Wilkins, III. 861, 862) it was decreed that the 'Use' of Sarum should in future be observed by all clerics in the province of Canterbury. Immediately afterwards (1541) appeared a new edition of the 'Pars Estivalis' of the Sarum Breviary, entitled 'Portiforium...nouiter impressum et a plurimis purgatum mendis' (Libr. Queens' Coll. Camb. K, 17, 28). In 1542 the archbishop notified the king's pleasure (Feb. 21: Wilkins, III. 863) 'that all mass-books, antiphoners, portuises [breviaries] in the Church of England should be newly examined, corrected, reformed...' and that after ejecting 'superstitious orations, collects, versicles,' &c. their place should be supplied by services 'made out of the Scriptures and other authentic doctors.' Portions of the Bible in English were also ordered to be read. And it is further manifest from the proceedings of Convocation in 1547 (*Ibid.* IV. 15, 16), that new Service-books had been actually prepared by order of that body during the reign of Henry VIII. Homilies of some kind or other appear to have been also drawn up and submitted to the Convocation of Canterbury. Such perhaps were the *Postils on the Epistles and Gospels*, edited and in part composed by Richard Taverner (1540), clerk of the Signet to the king (ed. Cardwell, 1841). Two of these *Postils* have reappeared in the authorized Homilies for the Passion and the Resurrection. The Lutheran tendencies of the editor were shewn as early as 1536, when at Cromwell's order he translated the 'Augsburg Confession' and the 'Apology' for it, 'whiche booke,' he says (fol. 2) 'after the judgement and censure of all indifferent, wyse and lerned men, is as fruitfull and as clerkly composed as euer booke was' &c.

[3] The basis of this formulary, which is almost identical with the present Litany, was furnished by a Mediæval English Prymer (see *Middle Age*, p. 420), some additional hints being drawn apparently from Hermann's 'Consultation' (above, p. 59, n. 4, and cf. Procter, *On the Prayer-Book*, pp. 253 sq.). In the *King's Primer* set forth (1545) by Henry 'and his clergy to be taught, learned and read, and none other to be used throughout all his dominions,' the Litany was also incorporated. See the *Three Primers*, ed. Burton, Oxf. 1834, and Maskell's *Dissertation*, prefixed to Vol. II. of the *Monumenta Ritualia*, Lond. 1846.

Reformation was to be conducted, *viz.* the use of 'such a tongue as the people understandeth.' It is true that efforts of this kind were often neutralized in practice by the opposition or inertness of the anti-reformation school, yet all of them were clearly pointing onwards in the same direction, and were thus preparing the way for deeper changes,—changes that could only be effected when a kindlier spirit had begun to breathe in the immediate neighbourhood of the throne.

Political struggles under Edward VI.

Edward VI., the child of Henry's third wife, Jane Seymour, was acknowledged king of England, Jan. **28, 1547**, when only nine years old. Although his natural gifts[1] were such as to exalt him far above the ordinary conditions of childhood, he must always have been swayed in a considerable measure by his guardians and advisers. Two of these were his maternal uncle Seymour, duke of Somerset[2] ('the Protector'), and Dudley, duke of Northumberland, whose struggles for ascendancy indeed are one great feature in the political annals of his reign. By the mysterious fall[3]

[1] See the sketch in Lodge's *Portraits*, I. 169 sq. Lond. 1849. Extracts are there given from the private Journal of Edward. On the general character of his education, see Strype's *Life of Sir John Cheke* (one of his first tutors), best edition, Oxford, 1820. The council of regency included Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and Tunstall, bishop of Durham, both of whom, like the other prelates, took out royal commissions, as in the reign of Henry VIII. (above, p. 178, n. 1), empowering them to exercise coactive jurisdiction in all causes cognizable by the spiritual courts. The practice was, however, immediately afterwards discontinued.

[2] Seymour, then earl of Hertford, was declared 'Protector of the king's realms and governor of his person' on the 1st of Feb. 1547, and in the following month became 'master of all the deliberations of the council, and in effect the sole director of the affairs of the kingdom:' Carte, III. 204. It was owing chiefly to his influence that objections urged by the princess Mary, as well as by Gardiner, Bonner and Tunstall, in the hope of arresting all immediate change, were absolutely overruled. See, for instance, the royal *Injunctions* of 1547, in Wilkins, IV. 3–8, by which, among other important regulations, a threat was suspended over all persons who 'let (*i.e.* prevented) the reading of the Word of God in English.'

[3] See Turner, *Modern Hist.* III. 281 sq. Somerset appears to have been a rapacious, unprincipled man, who was determined to hold power by pushing the Reformation, while Northumberland made use of religious war-cries chiefly to subserve his private schemes, and ultimately avowed himself in favour of the Mediæval system: see Strype's *Cranmer*, Append. to Bk. III. No. LXXIII. (III. 462), where he warns the people just before his execution (Aug. 22, 1553) against 'thes sedycyouse and lewde preachers that have opened the booke and knowe not how to shutt yt.'

ENGLAND.

of the Protector and his execution (Jan. **22, 1552**), the youthful monarch was eventually transferred into the hands of Northumberland, a statesman who employed his talents chiefly in the aggrandizing of himself; and who, by the marriage of his son Guildford Dudley to Jane Grey[1] the great-granddaughter of Henry VII. (May, **1553**), obtained the sanction of his royal master to a visionary project for diverting the succession to the crown[2] in favour of his own connexions.

State of parties in the Church.

But while projects of this kind were occupying the minds of English politicians, a far mightier agitation had begun to heave within the bosom of the Church. At the accession of king Edward, it was manifest that the ecclesiastics, whom his father had in vain[3] attempted to unite by legislative pressure, consisted of two great parties, one of which (the Mediæval) as represented by Gardiner[4], bishop of Winchester, was adverse to all further changes; while the members of the other (the Reforming) party were as anxious to move freely onwards and complete the work they had inaugurated in the former reign. This second

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 230 sq. Edward's health had already begun to fail in the spring of 1552.

[2] A written agreement, determining Jane's succession and displacing the two princesses, Mary and Elizabeth, was signed by nineteen lords of the council and five judges. Cranmer, who at first objected, was eventually brought over and subscribed among the rest (cf. Strype's *Cranmer*, Bk. III. ch. 1). A legal deed was afterwards drawn up, to which the young king attached his signature (June 21) fourteen days before his death: Turner, *Ibid.* pp. 333, 334. Queen Jane was accordingly proclaimed July 10, 1553: see the notes in Nicolas, *Literary Remains of Lady Jane Grey*, Lond. 1825.

[3] See the remarkable speech addressed to them not long before his death, in Stow, *Annales*, p. 590.

[4] This prelate had fallen under the displeasure of Henry VIII., and his name was accordingly not included in the council of regency. When the royal *Injunctions* of 1547 (above, p. 191, n. 2) appeared, Gardiner refused to promise obedience, and was committed to the Fleet, Sept. 25, where he remained till Jan. 7 of the following year (Carte, III. 214). He was ultimately deposed, for non-conformity, Feb. 14, 1551, Bonner bp. of London having already shared the same fate, Sept. 21, 1549 (cf. Turner's remarks, III. 316, 317). Another influential leader of the anti-reformation party was cardinal Pole, whose quarrel with his relative Henry VIII. on the divorce-question had compelled him to live on the continent. Turner (III. 254 sq.) charges him with instigating a formidable insurrection that occurred in 1549; but cf. Dodd, II. 25, note. Cranmer's elaborate *Answer to the Fifteen Articles of the Rebels* is printed in Strype, Vol. II. App. No. XL.

ENGLAND.

class, however, must be carefully subdivided. Laying out of the question a multitude of revolutionary spirits, Anabaptists and other sectaries who started up afresh at the beginning of the new reign[1], the party in the Church that favoured progress was composed of elements in some degree at variance with each other. One active section of the church-reformers, constituting what may be entitled the first race of Puritans, embraced opinions such as we have traced in those parts of Switzerland[2] in which the principles of Zwingli and Œcolampadius had taken root. They bore the general name of 'Sacramentaries;' and some of their brother-reformers, both here and on the continent, did not scruple to place them in the same class with Anabaptists[3]. On the other hand, the more conservative among the reforming theologians of this country manifested a growing bias for the Saxon as distinguished from the Swiss theology. During the first two years of Edward VI., archbishop Cranmer may himself perhaps be termed the leader of this school. He was never, it is true, a servile follower of the Wittenberg divines[4]. The vigour of his

Affinities with the Swiss;

and Saxon Theology.

Cranmer's views at this period.

[1] Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, pp. 89 sq. On the various shades of Anabaptism, and also on the 'Family of Love,' see below, chap. v.

[2] See above, pp. 105 sq. Calvin does not appear to have been generally known in England until the close of Henry's reign. A list of books prohibited in 1542 as given by Burnet, Vol. I. 'Records,' p. 257 (ed. 1681), is augmented by Baker (*Brit. Mag.* XXXVI. 395), and in the latter catalogue we find *The Lytell Tretyse in Frensche of y^e^ Soper of the Lorde made by Calluyn*, and also *The Works euery one of Calluyn.*

[3] Thus in the *Postils* edited by Taverner (above, p. 190, n. 2) we have the following passage: 'Beyng ones admonyshed of my errour, I wol not obstinately defend the same, but submyt my selfe to the iudgement of the churche which I wold hartely wyshe that other wold do the same. Then these diuerse sectes of Anabaptistes, of Sacramentaries, and of other heretiques shulde not thus swarme abrode. Then shuld the Christen church be in much more quiet then it is:' p. 229. (Cf. the particulars furnished at this period by the letters of Richard Hilles to Bullinger, *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. pp. 208, 221, 266.) In like manner the first statute of the new reign, 1 Edw. VI. c. 1, contains heavy censures of all persons who 'unreverently speak against the blessed sacrament in sermons, preachings,...rhimes, songs, plays or jests,' (cf. Lamb's *Collection of Letters*, &c. p. 85, Lond. 1838), proceeding at the same time to legalize communion under both kinds in conformity with a unanimous decree of convocation (Dec. 2, 1547: Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 37). Carte (III. 219) sees a further proof of the 'moderation' of the English Church in a proviso there inserted, declaring that this change is 'not to be construed to the condemning of the usage of any church in foreign countries.'

[4] Richard Hilles (a Zwinglian) in writing to Bullinger, June 4, 1549, was able to report that the prelates seemed, 'for the present at least, to

ENGLAND.

reasoning faculties secured a large amount of independence to the measures he adopted: his exalted station in the Church and his profound respect for the decisions of antiquity had equal force in urging him to modify the wilder and more democratic tendencies of Lutheranism: yet, in so far as he had points of contact on doctrinal questions with the reformers out of England, Cranmer was at first disposed to side most cordially with it. No better illustration of this leaning can be offered than a treatise published with his sanction in **1548**, and commonly entitled Cranmer's *Catechism*[1]. It is for the most part borrowed from a German catechism, and through the medium of a Latin version made in **1539** by Justus Jonas the elder, one of Luther's bosom-friends. The sacred topics there discussed embrace the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Decalogue and the doctrine of the Sacraments, all of which are handled in the characteristic manner of the Wittenbergers. For example, the first and second commandments are consolidated into one; penance or absolution is still regarded as an evangelical sacrament; while the expressions bearing on the nature of the Eucharistic presence leave no doubt that Cranmer and his friends were not unwilling to accept the Lutheran hypothesis[2].

Publication of the Homilies;

The same desire to cleave as far as might be to existing usages and other traditions of the past, was shewn in the proceedings instituted, or more strictly recommenced[3], on

be acting rightly;' and then adds, with a spice of sarcasm, 'for the preservation of the public peace, they afford no offence to the Lutherans, pay attention to your very learned German divines, submit their judgment to them and also retain some popish ceremonies:' *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 266.

[1] *A short instruction into Christian Religion*, Oxf. 1839. The Latin form of the Catechism is also printed in the same volume: cf. Köcher's *Catech. Gesch. der Reform. Kirchen*, pp. 61 sq., Jena, 1756. The chief English variations in the work are an additional discourse against the worshipping of images (cf. the *Mandatum* in Wilkins, IV. 22), and an exhortation to prayer. In Cranmer's dedication of it to Edw. VI. (also printed in his *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, I. 326—329) he expresses his anxiety to have the youth of England 'brought up and tended in the truth of God's holy Word.'

[2] The only apparent symptom of misgiving is one that has been noticed by Le Bas (I. 312) where the English speaks of our 'receiving' the Body and Blood of Christ, the Latin of the 'presence;' but this variation might really have been accidental.

[3] Above, p. 190, n. 2.

ENGLAND.

gradual construction of the Prayer-Book.

the accession of king Edward, for the authorizing of Homilies[1] to be read in churches every Sunday, and also for translating, expurgating and recasting the various Service-books[2] of Sarum, Lincoln, York and Bangor, so as to compile one 'Use' that should in future be the vehicle of worship to all members of the English Church. The whole of these proceedings were conducted under the general direction of archbishop Cranmer; still, as he was only one of a select committee to whom the task of redistribution and revision was consigned, his influence may, or even must, have been considerably modified by the suggestions of the other members[3]. Their first production was an English *Order of the Communion*[4], which in **1548** was grafted on the Latin office for the Mass; and it is noticeable that some few elements of the additional service have been borrowed from the well-known 'Consultation' of Hermann, archbishop of Cologne, compiled in **1543** with the assistance of Bucer and Melanchthon. But this meagre

[1] The *First Book of Homilies* (twelve in number) appeared in 1547. Three at least, including that *Of the Salvation of Mankind*, or Justification, appear to have been written by Cranmer himself, while those 'Of the Misery of all Mankind,' and 'Of Christian Love and Charity,' were the work of Bp. Bonner and his chaplain: see *Pref.* to the Cambridge edition, 1850, p. xi. The same purposes would be subserved by the royal *Injunctions* of 1547 (Wilkins, IV. 4), directing the clergy to provide, 'within three months after this visitation, one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume in English; and within one twelve-months next after the said visitation, the *Paraphrasis* of Erasmus also in English upon the Gospels;' both of these being set up in churches for the use of the parishioners.

[2] Richard Hilles makes the following comment (June 4, 1549) with regard to the prevailing animus of those who arranged the new Communion Office: 'We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg churches and some of those in Saxony; for they do not yet feel inclined to adopt your rites [*i. e.* of the Swiss] respecting the administration of the sacraments:' *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 266.

[3] Some of these 'notable learned men' were Day bp. of Chichester, Goodryke bp. of Ely, Skyp bp. of Hereford, Holbeach bp. of Lincoln, Ridley bp. of Rochester, Thirleby bp. of Westminster [see above, p. 185, n. 1], May dean of St Paul's, Taylor dean (afterwards bp.) of Lincoln, Haines dean of Exeter, Robertson afterwards dean of Durham, Redman master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Cox afterwards bp. of Ely: see Procter *On the Prayer-Book*, p. 23, n. 2.

[4] Printed in Wilkins, IV. 11 sq., together with a sober proclamation issued with the hope of checking some of the hotter spirits: cf. Procter, pp. 325 sq., where the parallel passages of Hermann will be found at length.

ENGLAND.

and incongruous form of service was only tentative, being ere long superseded and eclipsed by the appearance of the noblest monument of piety, of prudence and of learning, which the sixteenth century constructed, *viz.* the 'Book of Common Prayer.' Materials for some work like it which had been brought together during the reign of Henry VIII. were reproduced[1] in **1547** at the request of the lower house of convocation (Nov. **22**); and after a protracted conference held at Windsor in the summer of **1548**, the arduous task of the committee seems to have been completed. They agreed, with few exceptions[2], in recommending the *First Prayer Book of Edward VI.*, which was accordingly submitted for approval to the convocation and the parliament[3], and ultimately used in almost every parish of the king's dominions[4], 'England, Wales, Calais and the marches of the same' (Whitsunday, June **9**, **1549**). Before the date of its publication an important change had been effected in the views of Cranmer touching the vexed question of the Eucharist,—a question which, as we have seen, was underlying all the controversies of the Reformation period.

Further changes in Cranmer's view of the Eucharist.

[1] See above, p. 190, n. 2. While the work of revision was proceeding, it was found necessary to repress a number of liturgical innovations: see, for instance, 'A proclamation against those that do innovate, alter, or leave done, any rite or ceremonie in the church of their private authority,' &c. Wilkins, IV. 21. Preachers in like manner were restrained or silenced: *Ibid.* p. 27.

[2] Dodd, whose list of commissioners is somewhat different from the one above quoted, contends (II. 28 sq.) that the minority of the bishops were opposed to the revision. He seems to attribute its general adoption to the fact that the Prayer-Book carried 'a pretty good face and varied very little, only in certain omissions, from the Latin Liturgy.'

[3] Thus in rebuking Bonner, bishop of London, for his negligence, and charging him to 'see to the better setting out of the Service-Book within his diocese,' the king's council remind him (July 23, 1549) that 'after great and serious debating and long conference of the bishops and other grave and well-learned men in the Holy Scripture, one uniform Order for common prayers and administration of the sacraments hath been, and is most godly set forth, not only by the common agreement and full assent of the nobility and commons of the late session of our late parliament, but also by the like assent of the bishops in the said parliament, and of all other the learned men of this our realm in their synods and convocations provincial:' Wilkins, IV. 35. After such testimony it is quite amazing to find a writer like Mr R. J. Wilberforce (*Principles of Church Authority*, p. 264, 2nd ed.) declaring that the statements respecting the convocational authority of the Prayer-Book 'are so loose and vague as to prove nothing.'

[4] The 'Act for Uniformity of Service,' &c. was passed Jan. 15, 1549 (*not* 1548): see *Stat.* 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 1.

ENGLAND.

Hitherto the English primate had maintained in a most public and coercive form[1] that, after the consecration of the elements, the outward and inward parts of the sacrament are so identified, that all who receive the one are thereby made partakers of the other, yet with the invariable proviso that the faithless and impenitent receive a curse and not a blessing. But as early as December, **1548**, when a discussion was held upon the subject anterior to the passing of Edward's Act of Uniformity (Jan. **15**, **1549**), he appears to have receded far from this position[2], and to have adopted the hypothesis of a virtual as distinguished from a local presence of Christ's glorified humanity, in close resemblance to that section of the Swiss reformers who had acquiesced in Calvin's method of explaining the mysterious Presence. In this view concurred the able and devoted Nicholas Ridley, who had acted for some time as chaplain to the archbishop[3], and was now promoted to the see of Rochester (Sept. **4**, **1547**). Yet neither of them, as we may conclude with certainty from their adoption of the First Prayer-Book of Edward, was inclined to question that the Body and Blood of Christ were in some way or other communicated

Ridley on the same question.

[1] See, for instance, his opinion touching the proceedings against Lambert, 'a Sacramentary,' and others, in Le Bas, I. 182 sq., and his strong censure of Zwingli, above, p. 184, n. 2. One of the earliest proofs of his departure from the mediæval tenets respecting the *sacrificial* character of the Eucharist, is found in the *Queries concerning the Mass* (at the beginning of 1548): *Works*, II. 178 sq., ed. Jenkyns.

[2] The following account of this important disputation is given by Bartholomew Traheron in a letter addressed to Bullinger and dated London, Dec. 31, 1548: 'On the 14th of December, if I mistake not, a disputation was held at London concerning the Eucharist, in the presence ('in consessu') of almost all the nobility of England. The argument was sharply contested by the bishops. The archbishop of Canterbury, *contrary to general expectation*, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinions upon the subject' [*i. e.* the Swiss opinion in its modified form and as about to be restated in the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549]. The same writer goes on to mention that the bishop of Rochester (Ridley), who had rejected the dogma of transubstantiation as early as 1545, on reading the work of Ratramn (*Middle Age*, p. 167), defended the same position, and that the result was a 'brilliant victory of the truth.' But the bias of Traheron is discernible in the next sentence where he adds, that 'it is all over with *Lutheranism*' ('video plane actum de Lutheranismo'); and it is even probable that he misunderstood some parts of the disputation, for in a hurried postscript appended to his letter by John ab Ulmis we read, 'The foolish bishops have made a marvellous recantation.'

[3] See Gloucester Ridley's *Life of Ridley*, Lond. 1763; and cf. the notes in Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biography*, Vol. III. 1 sq.

ENGLAND.

to the faithful in connexion with the Eucharistic elements[1]. The animus of that Service-book[2] was primitive and even Mediæval; very much of the material was drawn directly from the older Offices, and in the portions where new elements of thought are visible, the sources which supplied them were the Breviary of cardinal Quignones[3], recommended by pope Paul III., and still more the Consultation of archbishop Hermann of Cologne. For instance, the Baptismal office was indebted very largely to this formulary, and through it to one of Luther's compilations[4], made as early as **1523**.

Dissatisfaction with the Prayer-Book.

Such peculiarities, however, proved offensive to one party in the Church of England. They manifested what was held to be unjustifiable tenderness for 'Popery,' and countenanced, in some degree, those 'Lutheran' rites and tenets[5], which by the extreme reformers began to be esteemed of kindred origin. The fall of Somerset[6], at the same conjuncture, tending to revive the hopes of Gardiner

[1] *E. g.* Ridley states the matter thus (in his *Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper*, Works, ed. P. S. pp. 10, 11): 'The controversy no doubt which at this day troubleth the Church (wherein any mean [*i.e.* moderately] learned man, either old or new, doth stand in) is not, whether the holy sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ is no better than a piece of common bread, or no; or whether the Lord's table is no more to be regarded than the table of any earthly man; or whether it is but a bare sign or figure of Christ and nothing else, or no. For *all do grant* that St Paul's words do require that the bread which we break is the partaking of the Body of Christ,' &c.

[2] It is printed in parallel columns with the later versions of the Prayer-Book, in Keeling's *Liturgiæ Britannicæ;* Lond. 1842. Cardwell's *Prayer-Books of Edward VI.* Oxford, 1852. It is also published by the Parker Society, and in a volume by itself by H. B. Walton, Oxford, 1870.

[3] His reformed *Breviary* was first printed in 1536. In the title it professes among other things to be 'ex sacra et canonica Scriptura... accurate digestum.'

[4] See *Das Taufbüchlein verdeutscht durch D. Martin Luthern* (1523) in Daniel's *Codex Liturg. Eccl. Luther.* pp. 185—201.

[5] See above, p. 195, n. 2, p. 197, n. 2, for the remarks of Hilles and Traheron, both of whom were opposed to 'Lutheranism.' Subsequently it was the fashion to class Lutherans with 'semi-papists' and 'Ecebolians:' *e. g. Zurich Letters*, I. 169, II. 261, 262. The latter term was derived from a sophist of Constantinople (Socrat. *Hist. Eccl.* III. 13): *ὅστις τοῖς ἤθεσι τῶν βασιλέων ἐπόμενος ἐπὶ μὲν Κωνσταντίου διαπύρως Χριστιανίζειν ὑπεκρίνατο· ἐπὶ δὲ Ἰουλιανοῦ γοργὸς Ἕλλην ἐφαίνετο· καὶ αὖθις μετὰ Ἰουλιανὸν Χριστιανίζειν ἤθελε· ῥίψας γὰρ ἑαυτὸν πρηνῆ πρὸ τῆς πύλης τοῦ εὐκτηρίου οἴκου, πατήσατέ με, ἔβόα, τὸ ἅλας τὸ ἀναίσθητον· τοιοῦτος μὲν οὖν κοῦφος καὶ εὐχερὴς Ἑκηβόλιος.*

[6] Above, p. 191, n. 2.

ENGLAND.

and other Mediævalists, conduced ere long to the advancement of the same party; for the vigorous measures taken by the Council[1] to defeat the machinations and reduce the power of the reactionary school, gave courage to those ardent members of the Church who laboured to effect still deeper changes. Fresh ideas on the nature of the Eucharist were also found to harmonize imperfectly with portions of the ancient ceremonial, and indeed with nearly all the genius of the church-system.

Hooper and his tendencies:

One of the more prominent leaders of the school in which this spirit was fermenting, is John Hooper[2]. On graduating at Merton College, Oxford, in **1518**, he removed to Gloucester, where he seems to have entered a Cistercian convent, but revisited the theatre of his early studies at the outbreak of the Reformation. He soon became addicted to the 'new learning,' and his bold denunciation of abuses rendered him an object of suspicion to the heads of colleges. On the passing of the Act of Six Articles (**1539**), he felt himself unable to maintain his ground at Oxford, and accordingly retired to Zürich, where the influence of Henry Bullinger was then predominant. By friendly intercourse with this accomplished theologian, Hooper's views of Christian doctrine had been brought into complete accordance with the Swiss theology[3]; and as he was animated by fervent piety and indefatigable zeal[4], it followed that

he migrates to Zürich.

[1] *E. g.* A royal order was issued (Dec. 25, 1549) complaining that 'dyvers unquyette and evill disposed persons sithence the apprehension of the duke of Sommersett, have noysed and bruted abrode, that they sholde have agayne theire olde Lattenne service, ther conjured bredde and water, with suche lyke vayne and superstitiouse ceremonies, *as thoughe the settinge forthe of the saide boke* [*i.e.* the 1st Prayer-Book] had bene th'onlie acte of the saide duke.' To prevent the fulfilment of this prophecy the king goes on to give directions for the surrender of 'all antiphoners, missales, grayles, processionalles, manuelles, legendes, pies, portasies, jornalles, and ordinalles after the use of Sarum, Lincoln, Yorke or any other private use,' &c. Wilkins, IV. 37, 38. On the havoc that ensued, see Maskell, *Monum. Ritual.* I. pp. clxxiii. sq.

[2] See the biographical notices prefixed to both his *Early* and *Later Writings*, ed. P. S. 1843 and 1852.

[3] He was still at Zürich in 1547 when he published *An answer unto my Lord of Winchester's book, entitled A Detection of the Devil's Sophistry* [written by Gardiner in 1546], *wherewith he robbeth the unlearned people of the true belief in the most blessed sacrament of the altar.*

[4] He shewed this immediately after his return from Switzerland, by preaching vigorously against the Anabaptists: see his letter to Bullinger (June 25, 1549, in *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 65: cf. p. 87), and his

ENGLAND.

His great influence at court.

the principles he had imbibed were rapidly disseminated in his own country, when he ventured to return in **1549**. While Cranmer, whose irresolution had grown offensive to Northumberland[1], appears to have remained in comparative seclusion, Hooper and his friends were loudly pressing on the court[2] the absolute necessity of further and more sweeping changes. It was owing in no small measure to his representations that the ardour shewn already in abolishing images[3] and other 'monuments of idolatry,' was now directed to convert the altars into tables[4], at the same time changing the position of these latter in such a way as to destroy 'the false persuasion which the people had of sacrifices.' Bishop Ridley, now translated to the see of London (April **1, 1550**), had himself conspired with Hooper in the prosecution of this object[5]; but, a different class of controversies being opened[6] on the designation of Hooper

Removal of stone-altars.

treatise entitled *A Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ*, levelled at the same class of misbelievers (1549), in *Later Writings*, pp. 1 sq.

[1] See above, p. 136, n. 3.

[2] His seven Sermons on Jonah, 'made and uttered before the king's Majesty and his most honourable Council,' were printed in 1550: *Early Writings*, pp. 431 sq. At the same time Burcher, one of his admirers, wrote to Bullinger (Dec. 28, 1550): 'Hooper is striving to effect an entire purification of the Church from the very foundation:' *Original Letters*, p. 674.

[3] One of Edward's *Injunctions* in 1547 (Wilkins, IV. 7) required the removal and extinction of 'all shrines, covering of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindles or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition; so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass-windows,' &c. This mandate was reiterated early in the next year, Feb. 21, 1547 (=1548): (*Ibid.* 22). Gardiner's view of the matter may be seen in his Letter to Ridley (June 10, 1549); Ridley's *Works*, Append. IV. ed. P. S.

[4] See his fourth Sermon, as above, p. 488. 'As long,' he contended, 'as the altars remain, both the ignorant people and the ignorant and evil-persuaded priest will dream always of sacrifice.'

[5] Thus Hooper himself writes to Bullinger (March 27, 1550): 'There has lately been appointed a new bishop of London, a pious and learned man, if only his new dignity do not change his conduct. He will, I hope, destroy the altars of Baal, as he did heretofore in his church when he was bishop of Rochester. I can scarcely express to you, my very dear friend, under what difficulties and dangers we are labouring and struggling that the idol of the mass may be thrown out;' *Original Letters*, p. 79: cf. a previous letter, p. 72. For Ridley's *Injunctions* (1550), see his *Works*, pp. 319 sq. His great objects were to secure uniformity and to turn the simple 'from the old superstitious opinions of the popish mass.' He also published 'reasons why the Lord's Board should rather be *after the form* of a table than of an altar;' *Ibid.* pp. 321—324: cf. Heylin, *Hist. of Reform.* ed. Robertson, I. 201 sq.

[6] Strype has a long chapter (*Memorials of Cranmer*, Bk. II. ch. xvii.)

ENGLAND.

Vestment-controversy.

to the bishopric of Gloucester, it was felt that some restraint must be imposed upon his revolutionary tendencies. The bishop of London argued 'most urgently and pertinaciously' in favour of the mediæval vestments, while the bishop-designate as pertinaciously refused to wear them till he was eventually committed to the Fleet by the authority of the Privy Council[1] (Jan. **27, 1551**). The feud was, however, suspended for the present by Hooper's nominal compliance[2], and his consecration followed on the 4th of March, **1551**.

Hooper's objections to an early series of Articles.

But this controversy on the number, shape and colour of the clerical vestments did not furnish the only source of bickering and recrimination. It is now established[3] that before the close of **1549** a series of Articles of Religion had been drawn up and circulated by archbishop Cranmer for the purpose of testing the orthodoxy of all preachers and lecturers in divinity. Three of these Hooper deemed exceptionable, when they were offered to him for subscription in the spring of **1550**[4]. He objected to the first because it made use of the expression 'sacraments confer grace[5],' which he would fain have altered into 'seal'

on 'Hoper's troubles:' cf. the reformer's own account in a letter to Bullinger (Aug. 1, 1551): *Orig. Let.* p. 91.

[1] 'Upon a letter from the archbishop of Canterbury, that Mr Hoper cannot be brought to any conformity, but rather persevering in his obstinacy *coveteth to prescribe orders and necessary laws of his head;* it was agreed that he should be committed to the Fleet:' MS. Council Book, quoted in Strype's *Cranmer* (ed. E. H. S.), II. 217, n. [b]. The archbishop had previously spoken against him (he writes, *Orig. Let.* p. 81) 'with great severity on account of my having censured the form of the oath' (meaning the adjuration 'by God, the saints and the holy Gospels').

[2] His own expressions are remarkable: 'As the Lord has put an end to this controversy, I do not think it worth while to violate the sepulchre of this unhappy tragedy.' *Orig. Let.* p. 91. Richard Hilles, in writing from London, March 22, 1551, informs Bullinger that Hooper had 'yielded up his opinion and judgment' on certain 'matters of indifference,' and had preached in the Lent of that year 'habited in the scarlet episcopal gown' [*i.e.* chimere], some of the bystanders approving, others condemning the costume: *Ibid.* p. 271.

[3] See Hooper's letter to Bullinger, Dec. 27, 1549, *Orig. Let.* p. 71. This statement is repeated p. 76, where he also speaks of the archbishop and five bishops as 'favourable to the cause of Christ,' and holding 'right opinions' on the Eucharist.

[4] He was nominated to the bishopric of Gloucester May 15, 1550, and on the 28th of the same month Micronius gives an account of his exceptions in writing to Bullinger from London. He adds, 'what will be the result, I do not know:' *Orig. Let.* p. 563.

[5] See above, p. 119, n. 1, p. 162, n. 1, which shew the source and nature

ENGLAND.

or 'testify to' the communication of grace; the second, because it exacted absolute conformity to the Book of Common Prayer[1]; and the third, because by it he was required to signify his approbation of the English Ordinal[2].

Arrival of foreign refugees.

A different class of agencies meanwhile contributed to stimulate the feelings of dissatisfaction that gave birth to animadversions of this nature. The Interim[3] of **1548** and other causes had driven from their homes a multitude of foreign Protestants, who after ascertaining the propitious turn that church-affairs were taking in most parts of England, hastened to avail themselves of Cranmer's hospitality. Three of the more eminent[4] of these refugees were Laski, Bucer and Peter Martyr, all of whom, in various measures and in different connexions, we have seen advancing the reformatory movements of the age. While Laski[5] was permitted to officiate as the superintendent of the French,

of his scruples. It is remarkable, that although the phrase 'conferre gratiam' is not used in the present English Articles with reference to the sacraments, it *does* occur in the *Heads of Religion* (a series of twenty-four articles compiled by Parker and his friends in 1559: Strype's *Annals*, I. 216, 217). We there find 'Baptisma et Eucharistiam, *quibus confertur gratia* rite sumentibus.' And Hooper himself (singularly enough) in one of his *Later Writings*, p. 45, employs the same phraseology: 'they (*i.e.* sacraments) are such signs as do exhibit and *give* the thing that they signify indeed.'

[1] Alluding, of course, to the First Book of Edward VI. which was peculiarly distasteful to him. 'I am so much offended with that Book, and that not without abundant reason,' are his words in writing to Bullinger, March 27, 1550, 'that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the Church in the administration of the Supper:' *Original Letters*, p. 79.

[2] In the letter just quoted he declares that he had brought forward many objections against the form of Ordination, 'on which account,' he adds, 'I have incurred no small hostility:' p. 81. The work had only just been completed (Feb. 28, 1549=1550) by a committee of bishops and others, and was not indeed appended to the Book of Common Prayer until 1552 (*Stat.* 5 and 6 Edw. VI. c. 1, § 5).

[3] Above, pp. 62, 63.

[4] Other influential foreigners with 'Swiss' leanings, were Dryander (above, pp. 96), and Ochino (above, p. 99). On the contrary Paul Fagius (Phagius), promoted to the Hebrew professorship at Cambridge, where he died (Nov. 15, 1549), and Peter Alexander, whom the primate employed as one of his secretaries, held 'Lutheran' principles like those of Bucer: cf. Strype's *Cranmer*, Bk. II. ch. xiii. and notes in the E. H. S. edition (II. 143, 144).

[5] Above, p. 70, n. 4. Laski's first visit to England in September, 1548, lasted six months. He returned in the spring of 1550 and commenced his ministerial labours in the following July.

ENGLAND.

Belgian, Italian and German Protestants, who celebrated their religious worship[1] in the metropolis (**1550**), Bucer was appointed to the theological chair at Cambridge (**1549**), and Peter Martyr to the corresponding post at Oxford (**1549**). As might have been predicted, these three scholars now disseminated the peculiar modes of thought and feeling which they had imported from the continent, agreeing in their estimate of many subjects then contested, and in others manifesting all their characteristic varieties. For instance, Bucer was a moderate 'Lutheran,' and as such decided in his opposition to the school of Hooper[2], and the advocate of loftier views respecting the Eucharist[3]. Peter Martyr, on the contrary, had always sided with the Swiss in their comparative depreciation of the sacraments[4], and afterwards evinced his strong antipathy to the Confession of Augsburg[5]: while Laski, whose predilections and aversions,

Peculiar opinions of their leaders.

[1] See the king's letters patent (July 24, 1550) authorizing their assembly and appointing a 'superintendens' and four 'ministri,' who were to be allowed 'suos libere et quiete frui, gaudere, uti, et exercere ritus et ceremonias suas proprias, et disciplinam ecclesiasticam propriam et peculiarem:' Wilkins, IV. 65; cf. *Original Letters*, pp. 567 sq., from which we learn that Ridley was a strong opponent of this scheme, while Cranmer favoured it.

[2] Thus Burcher writes to Bullinger, Dec. 28, 1550, while the controversy about the vestments and other topics was still pending: 'Hooper has John à Lasco and a few others on his side; but against him many adversaries, among whom is Bucer; who, if he possessed as much influence now as he formerly did among us, it would have been all over with Hooper's preferment, for he would never have been made bishop:' *Original Letters*, p. 675.

[3] See above, p. 153, n. 1. Burcher writing (May 30, 1549) soon after the arrival of Bucer and Fagius prays that they may not 'pervert' the archbishop, 'nor make him worse.' *Orig. Let.* p. 652. It is also worth noting that Bucer adhered to the expression 'conferre gratiam' (cf. above, p. 201, n. 5), which he uses, *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 477.

[4] Strype, *Cranmer*, Bk. II. ch. xiv. gives a full account of Peter Martyr's disputation on the Eucharist at Oxford, May, 1549. His own report, with an epistle to the reader, was published immediately afterwards, and in recounting the nature of the struggle to Bucer (June 15), he expressed his fear lest the German professor should condemn the positions he had there advanced (*Ibid.* Vol. II. p. 164). The bishops, in 1550, would not allow his treatise on the Eucharist to be circulated in English (*Orig. Let.* p. 561). In 1552 (June 14), he wrote an important letter to Bullinger informing his correspondent that the doctrine of the sacraments was then exciting great controversy in the Church of England, many persons hesitating 'an *gratia conferatur* per sacramenta:' see remarks upon it, as edited in 1850, in a *Letter to the Rev. W. Goode* (the editor) by Mr Massingberd, Lond. 1850.

[5] Above, p. 157, n. 2.

ENGLAND.

so far as we can gather, coincided on the whole with those of Peter Martyr and the Swiss divines, had shewn himself more tolerant of others, if not absolutely in favour of reunion with the moderate section of the Lutherans[1]

Revision of the English Prayer-Book:

Owing to these various causes, partly to the spirit which had been diffused by Hooper and his followers, partly to religious scruples ventilated in the writings and disputations of continental refugees, the Prayer-Book had been scarcely put in circulation, when attempts were made to subject it to fresh examination and revision. It is possible that some promoters of the scheme were influenced chiefly by the fact that here and there a non-reforming clergyman[2] would seek to justify his preaching on the Eucharist, if not on other subjects, by adducing in his favour the authority of the Prayer-Book. They were anxious, therefore, to procure the introduction of such changes as would simplify their controversy with the Mediævalist; and both the tone and wording of the Act[3] of Parliament, by which their criticism was ultimately sanctioned, harmonize with this construction of the motives then prevailing. Still of those who welcomed the revision of the Prayer-Book, many persons were unquestionably actuated by dislike of what was plainly stated in the older offices and rubrics. In the southern convocation of **1550**[4], doubts were uttered as to the propriety of retaining so many holy-days[5]; indications

probable reasons for that step.

[1] Above, p. 157.

[2] Such appears to have been part of Gardiner's policy: see Cranmer's *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, III. 93, 99, and other places.

[3] *Stat.* 5 and 6 Edw. VI. c. 1. The fifth section begins: 'Because there hath arisen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid Common-service in the Church heretofore set forth, divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause; therefore, as well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof, as for the more perfection of the said order of Common Service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same prayers and fashion of service more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God,' &c.

[4] Heylin, I. 227, 228, ed. Robertson. The acts of the Convocation, he observes, were in his time very imperfect.

[5] Some of these had been abrogated in 1536, on the ground that 'the nomber was so excessyvely growen, and yet dayly more and more by mens devocyon, yea rather supersticyon, was like further to encrease.' By the *Stat.* 5 and 6 Edw. VI. c. 3, where a special list was authorized, it is enacted that 'none other day shall be kept and commanded to be kept holy-day, or to abstain from lawful bodily labour.' See the notes in Stephens, *Eccl. Stat.* I. 333 sq.

ENGLAND.

were not wanting of antipathy to some of the mediæval vestments, or the postures and the place of the officiating minister; while other representatives appear to have criticized the general structure of the Eucharistic office, and to have animadverted on the form of words employed in the distribution of the elements. Unhappily the records of the English convocation at this crisis were found most meagre and imperfect, even by those who had the opportunity of consulting them before the disastrous conflagration of St Paul's in **1666**; but the few scattered notices of what occurred in **1550** serve to throw some gleams of light upon the course adopted afterwards. The lower house of convocation was reluctant[1] to proceed with a revision of the Prayer-Book. On the contrary, the court and more especially the king himself[2], were urgent in demanding it. The fiery sermons of John Knox[3], and the obtrusive letters of Calvin[4], represented in the strongest colours that the Service-Book, as it then stood, was so deeply penetrated by the taint of Popery, that the genuine worship of God was not only darkened, but well-nigh destroyed: while congregations of foreign Protestants[5] exhibiting a nuder and

Reluctance of the Convocation.

[1] 'Answer was made, that they had not yet sufficiently considered of the points proposed, but that they would give their lordships some account thereof in the following session.' Heylin, *Ibid.* p. 228.

[2] The feelings of Edward or his chief advisers may be gathered from the following extract. It occurs in a letter of Peter Martyr to Bucer (dated Jan. 10, 1551) in Strype's *Cranmer*, Append. LXI. (II. 663): 'Conclusum jam est in hoc eorum colloquio, quemadmodum mihi retulit reverendissimus [*i. e.* Cranmer] *ut multa immutentur.* Sed quænam illa sint, quæ consenserint emendanda, neque ipse mihi exposuit, neque ego de illo *quærere ausus sum.* Verum hoc non me parum recreat, quod mihi D. Checus indicavit; si *noluerint ipsi*, ait, efficere, ut quæ mutanda sint mutentur, *rex per seipsum* id faciet: et cum ad parliamentum ventum fuerit, ipse *suæ majestatis* authoritatem interponet.'

[3] See above, p. 136.

[4] His first letter, written on the appearance of the *Order of the Communion* (1548), which Coverdale translated into both German and Latin, was addressed to Somerset Oct. 22, 1548 (*Epist.* pp. 39 sq. ad calc. *Opp.* IX. Amstelod. 1667: Henry, *Leben Calvins*, II. App. pp. 26 sq.). After reflecting on the 'oratio pro defunctis,' he adds: 'Sed obstat invictum illud argumentum, nempe cœnam Domini rem adeo sacrosanctam esse, ut ullis hominum additamentis eam conspurcare sit nefas.' Calvin afterwards wrote to the king and council (April 10, 1551), urging them 'to proceed,' and subsequently warned the primate against the corruptions still remaining in the Prayer-Book (*Ibid.* p. 61).

[5] Some of these (in London) were under the supervision of Laski, see above, p. 202, n. 5. About the close of 1550 appeared the *Forma ac ratio*

ENGLAND.

Committee of Divines.

more simple ritual, where the practice of kneeling, for example, at the Eucharist was discontinued[1], must have generated a desire in sympathetic minds for corresponding usages. The pressure of these feelings expedited the nomination of a committee of divines, with Cranmer at their head, to undertake the work in question. Some of the proceedings opened in the autumn of **1550**, and Bucer and Peter Martyr were desired to criticize the first Prayer-Book. They forwarded their 'censures'[2] to the primate early in January, **1551**; and throughout this year, especially towards its close, repeated traces of discussion on the doctrine of the Eucharist[3] continue to be visible: and even after the passing of the second Act of Uniformity (April **6, 1552**), by which compliance with the regulations of the new Prayer-Book was exacted from all clergymen, additional obstacles were thrown into the way of its publication[4]. It finally came into use Nov. **1, 1552**, when Ridley officiated at St Paul's cathedral.

Nature of the changes.

Many of the changes that resulted from the criticism of the revisers may be traced directly to the animadversions offered by that school in England who had sympathized

tota ecclesiastici Ministerii which he made use of in public worship (cf. above, p. 148, n. 5). Another congregation of foreigners was tolerated at Glastonbury, where many artizans who fled from Strasburg to escape the operation of the *Interim* had settled in 1550. (Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 286 sq.) Their minister was Valerandus Pollanus (Pollen or Pullain), who published in self-defence a *Liturgia Sacra, seu Ritus Ministerii in ecclesia Peregrinorum* etc. (London, Feb. 23, 1551=1552). Both it and the *Liturgia Peregrinorum Francofordiæ* (ed. 1555) appear to be cognate (if not identical) translations from the reformed services of Strasburg.

[1] See Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 279, 280; Heylin, I. 225.

[2] Strype, II. 200 sq., 307 sq., 346 sq. Bucer died in Cambridge, on the 28th of February, 1551: see *Orig. Lett.* pp. 490, 495: *De Obitu M. Buceri epistolæ duæ*, Lond. 1551: cf. Lamb's *Collection of Letters* &c. p. 155. His *Censura super libro Sacrorum...ad petitionem R. Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis...conscripta*, printed among his *Scripta Anglicana* (Basil. 1577), is dated Jan. 5, 1551. On the Latin versions employed by these two reviewers, who did not understand English, see Procter, *On the Prayer-Book*, pp. 65, 66.

[3] Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 354 sq.

[4] Some of the ultra-reformers (*e.g.* Knox, above, p. 136, n. 4) were so vehemently opposed to the practice of kneeling at the reception of the Eucharistic elements, that nearly six months after the book was sanctioned in parliament the council stopped the publication of it for the purpose of appending an explanatory *Declaration* to the Communion-Service. On the after-history of this Declaration, see Procter, p. 57, n. 2; p. 140.

ENGLAND.

with bishop Hooper and admired the worship of the French and German refugees. The vestments, for example, were in future to be simplified; the formula of exorcism and other usages connected with the administration of baptism and the visitation of the sick were discontinued; and although some hints of great and lasting value were borrowed[1] from the service-books then used in congregations of the foreigners, the committee do not seem to have been actuated in the choice of these by any servile deference[2] either to the Saxon or to the Swiss divines. With reference to some indeed of the disputed questions[3] no concession could be drawn from the commissioners, because they felt that relaxation where the voice of Scripture and Antiquity was unequivocal would have involved a dereliction of their sacred trust. The only office in which change of doctrine seems to be at all discernible is that which had peculiarly excited the displeasure of one section of the Church,—the office for the Holy Communion. Nor is it probable that variations would have been there adopted, if the structure had not been repugnant to the new convictions of the principal revisers. We have seen the primate gradually abandoning his former tenets with respect to the nature of the Eucharistic presence, even at the time when he was actively engaged in the construction of the First Prayer-Book. Frequent conversations with John Laski[4], and prolonged

Cranmer's ultimate views on the Eucharist.

[1] More especially, the idea of inserting the Introductory Sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession and Absolution at the beginning of the Daily Service, and of reciting the Decalogue in the Office for the Holy Communion: cf. Procter, pp. 45 sq.

[2] See the language of Peter Martyr, above, p. 205, n. 2, and cf. the extracts adduced by Laurence, *Bampton Lect.* pp. 246, 247, Oxf. 1838.

[3] It was during the eventful spring and summer of 1552 that doubts arose in some quarters whether grace be really communicated through the sacraments (see above, p. 203, n. 4), and whether infants are regenerated before baptism or not. Peter Martyr himself was in favour of modifying the formularies so as to express the views he held in common with Calvin, *viz.* that baptism was no more than the visible *seal* of blessings already imparted to the children of believers, or in a still higher sense, to the elect; but he goes on to mention that no little displeasure was excited against him because in this view he 'altogether dissented from Augustine.'

[4] See above, p. 157, n. 7; and Jenkyns's *Pref.* to his edition of Cranmer, *pp.* lxxix. *sq.*, where it is shewn that Cranmer's abandonment of 'Lutheranism' in this particular was completed at the beginning of 1550. The very deep interest which the question was then exciting manifested itself not only in disputations such as those above mentioned (p. 206), but in the closets of the principal scholars of the day. Thus

ENGLAND.

examination, under like influence, of Scriptural and patristic authorities, had ultimately induced him to look with favour on the 'Calvinistic' hypothesis; and when, in **1550**, he came down into the lists to wrestle with the champions[1] of the higher doctrine, it was obvious that his principles, in this particular at least, had reached their full development (**1550**). As Cranmer had devoted long and patient study to the Eucharistic controversy, so he wrote upon it with no ordinary power and precision. Still his treatises being from the nature of the case destructive and polemical[2], it is easier to determine how much he had repudiated than how much he was prepared to welcome and retain. He vigorously denounces four positions[3], (1) that

Dr John Redman, master of Trinity College, Cambridge, who had taken part in compiling the First Prayer-Book, stated on his death-bed (Nov. 1551), that 'he had studied of that matter [*i. e.* transubstantiation] this xii. yeres, and did find that Tertullian, Irenæus and Origen did playnly write contrary to it, and in other ancient writers it was not taught nor maynteyned.' Thomas Lever the author of this account (printed in *British Magazine*, xxxvi. 402, 403: cf. Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 358 sq.) goes on to say that Mr Yonge, distinguished by his zeal for Mediævalism, and who 'was aforetime as redy and willinge to have died for the Transūb. of the sacrament as for Christ's Incarnacōn,' now purposed 'to take deliberacōn, and to studye after a more indifferent sort, to ground his judgment better then upon a common consent of manye, that have borne y^e^ name of y^e^ church.'

[1] His *Defence of the true and catholic doctrine of the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ* is among his *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, II. 275 sq. He had probably in his eye Bishop Fisher's treatise *De Eucharistia contra Johan. Œcolampadium*, but still more Gardiner's *Detection of the Devil's Sophistrie*, published in 1546. The archbishop's work was answered (1) by Smythe, late regius professor of Divinity at Oxford, who had written two works on the controversy as early as 1546, and (2) by Gardiner himself in his *Explication and Assertion of the true Catholic Faith touching the most blessed Sacrament of the Altar* (1551). Cranmer now replied, in his *Answer unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation devised by Stephen Gardyner late bishop of Winchester, &c.* (ed. Jenkyns, III. 25 sq.), which was followed by Gardiner's rejoinder in Latin, *Confutatio Cavillationum quibus sacrosanctum Eucharistiæ sacramentum ab impiis Capharnaitis impeti solet*, published at Paris in 1552, under the name of Marcus Antonius Constantius, a divine of Louvain. Cranmer was preparing a second reply just before the death of Edward VI. (Jenkyns's *Pref.* p. xcvii.).

[2] 'What,' he asks in the preface to his *Defence* (II. 289), 'what availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages and such other like popery, so long as two chief roots remain unpulled up?' These 'roots of the weeds,' are the doctrine of transubstantiation and 'the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and dead.'

[3] *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, II. 308 sq.

after the consecration of the elements there is no other substance remaining but the substance of Christ's flesh and blood; (2) that the very natural flesh and blood of Christ, which suffered for us on the cross and ascended into heaven, is also really, substantially, corporally and naturally, in or under the accidents of bread and wine; (3) that evil and ungodly men receive the very body and blood of Christ; and (4) that Christ is offered daily in the mass for the remission of sins, and that the merits of His passion are thereby distributed to the communicants. He argued[1] that Christ is figuratively in the bread and wine, and spiritually in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine; but, on the other hand, contended that our blessed Lord is really, carnally and corporally in heaven alone, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

Throughout these controversies Cranmer uniformly maintained that his belief[2] was grounded on the Word of God ('wherein can be no error')[3], and confirmed by the unanimous testimony of the Primitive Church. His reverence for the Holy Bible and the witness of Antiquity is visible indeed where some expressions which escaped him in the heat of controversy, have departed from the language of the ancient standards. Thus when he objected to the phrase 'real presence'[4], it is obvious from the context that his animadversions were directed against the notion of a merely physical and organic presence[5]; when he speaks as

[1] *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, II. p. 401.

[2] Thus in the very title of his *Defence*, he adds, 'grounded and stablished upon God's most holy Word and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the Church.' Towards the close of the same work he distinguishes between the verdict of the Apostles and Primitive Fathers and the 'new devices' which the writers of the Middle Ages introduced, adding (p. 463) with respect to the Communion Office in the English Prayer-Book (*i. e.* the First Book of Edward VI.): 'Thanks be to the eternal God, the manner of the Holy Communion, which is now set forth within this realm, is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with St Paul, and with the old primitive and apostolic Church.' See also his remarkable appeal, with reference to his teaching on this and other subjects, uttered just before his death. *Ibid.* IV. 126.

[3] *Answer to Richard Smythe's Preface; Ibid.* III. 3.

[4] For example, in the Preface to his *Defence*, p. 289 and elsewhere.

[5] Perhaps Bp. Ridley, who had materially influenced the development of Cranmer's ideas on this question, is one of the best expositors of his meaning. In the 'last examination before the commissioners' (Ridley's *Works*, ed. P. S. p. 274), there is a debate respecting this use of the word 'real.' Ridley's conclusion is as follows: 'I answer, that in the

ENGLAND.

though the elements were simply figures of an absent Saviour, quickening men's belief in Him and symbolizing His flesh and blood, there is no lack of passages in which the Eucharist is also represented as the means by which some vast and supernatural blessing is communicated to the spirit[1] of the faithful recipient.

the Communion Service.

Such was probably the state of mind in which the archbishop and some of his more active coadjutors now resolved to modify the structure of the Eucharistic office in the first Edwardine Prayer-Book. They approached the task allotted to them under strong excitement, not indeed persuaded that the office then in use was absolutely[2] unjustifiable, but prompted by a gradual modification of their own feelings and ideas to alter some particulars which gave a handle to objections on the one side, and offended scru-

sacrament of the altar is the natural Body and Blood of Christ *vere et realiter*, indeed and really, for spiritually, by grace and efficacy; for so every worthy receiver receiveth the very true Body of Christ. But if you mean really and indeed, so that thereby you would include a lively and a moveable body under the forms of bread and wine, then, in that sense, is not Christ's Body in the sacrament really and indeed.'

[1] Thus at the opening of his *Defence* he has in his mind the aberrations of a party by whom the Eucharist 'hath been very lightly esteemed, or rather contemned and despised, as a thing of small or of none effect' (p. 292), as well as of the opposite party by whom that holy institution was 'abused.' In p. 306, he asks: 'What thing then can be more comfortable to us than to eat this meat and drink this drink? Whereby Christ certifieth us, that we be spiritually and truly fed and nourished by Him, and that we dwell in Him, and He in us. Can this be showed unto us more plainly than when He saith Himself, He that eateth Me, shall live by Me? Wherefore whosoever doth not contemn the everlasting life, how can he but highly esteem this sacrament?' In pp. 437, 438 it is affirmed, 'Forasmuch as the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper do represent unto us the very Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, by His own institution and ordinance; therefore, although He sit in heaven at His Father's right hand, yet should we come to this mystical bread and wine with faith, reverence, purity and fear, as we should do, if we should come to see and receive Christ Himself sensibly present. For unto the faithful, Christ is at His own holy table present with His mighty Spirit and grace, and is of them more fruitfully received than if corporally they should receive Him bodily present...And they that come otherwise to this holy table, they come unworthily, and do not eat and drink Christ's flesh and blood, but eat and drink their own damnation; because they do not duly consider Christ's very flesh and blood which be offered there spiritually to be eaten and drunken, but despising Christ's most holy Supper, do come thereto as it were to other common meats and drinks, without regard to the Lord's Body, which is the spiritual meat of that table.'

[2] See Cranmer's language just cited, n. 1 above: and cf. above, p. 205.

ples on the other. And the changes ultimately brought about are found to correspond with this construction. To say nothing of the less material additions, substitutions and suppressions, the new office omitted the formal invocation (ἐπίκλησις) of the Holy Ghost upon the elements, converted the prayer of oblation into a thanksgiving, and replaced the ancient words made use of at the delivery of the elements, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ,' &c. by 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee.' In the last example, the old formula was quite compatible with a belief in transubstantiation: the new formula, on the contrary, was made consistent even with the lax hypothesis of Zwingli. Yet the various modifications thus effected wrought no very serious changes in the character of the Prayer-Book. It was still, in all its leading features and in the great bulk of its materials, an accumulation of ancient wisdom, a bequest of ancient piety: it was the form of words and bond of faith uniting English worshippers with saints and martyrs of antiquity; it was 'the Primitive Church speaking to the generations of these latter days'[1].

General Confession of Faith.

Allusion has been made already to a series of Articles[2] which Cranmer had begun to use in his own province as early as **1549**. A test of this description had become more needful in proportion as the growth of the Reforming party excited deadlier opposition, and as members of it were themselves developing eccentric institutions and irregular modes of action. The Prayer-Book, it is true, supplied one valuable test of orthodoxy, and one powerful instrument for steadying the belief as well as guiding the devotions of the English people: but in order to secure an adequate amount of harmony in preachers, lecturers and others similarly occupied, the want of something more concise in shape and definite in phraseology was felt by many of the English prelates. There is reason to believe that such a manifesto would have been regularly authorized soon after the accession of King Edward, had not

[1] Professor Blunt's *Four Sermons*, pp. 95 sq. Camb. 1850.

[2] Above, p. 201. These were possibly the same as the string of Articles sent to Gardiner (July 8, 1550), from the Privy Council: see the royal order for subscription in Wilkins, IV. 63.

ENGLAND.

Cranmer[1] cherished an idea of drawing the continental Protestants together, and uniting them in one communion with the English Church. This fusion was in truth attempted[2], in some measure, as early as **1538**, when certain Lutherans were invited to discuss the controversies of the day with a select committee of English prelates and divines, and on the subsequent revival[3] of the scheme the Articles drawn up on that occasion might have furnished a convenient basis for the conferences. Melanchthon, who was then the medium of communication, was also requested[4] to attend the congress of **1548**. He seems, however, to have treated the idea as visionary and impracticable, owing probably to the experience he had gathered after sharing in the failures of like projects on the continent. For Cranmer did not limit his invitations to one school of theologians[5]. Bucer, Fagius, Peter Martyr, Laski, Dryander, Calvin and Bullinger were all solicited to aid in the adjustment of disputed questions, more especially of that

[1] The credit of the plan, however, seems to be Melanchthon's: see Laurence, *Bampt. Lectures*, pp. 222 sq.

[2] See above, p. 187.

[3] Melanchthon wrote in favour of it to Henry VIII. March 26, 1539, and again in 1542, expressing himself as follows on this last occasion: 'Quod autem sæpe optavi, ut aliquando auctoritate seu regum, seu aliorum piorum principum, *convocati viri docti de controversiis omnibus libere colloquerentur*, et relinquerent posteris firmam et perspicuam doctrinam, idem adhuc opto.' See other evidence to the same effect in Laurence, as above, pp. 224 sq.

[4] Cranmer in writing to John Laski (July 4, 1548: *Works*, ed. Jenkyns, I. 330) urges him to bring Melanchthon with him ('si ullo modo fieri poterit'): and a letter written to Melanchthon himself (Feb. 10, 1549 =1550: *Ibid.* I. 337) repeats the invitation: 'Multi enim pii doctique viri partim ex Italia [*e. g.* Peter Martyr and Ochino], partim ex Germania [*e.g.* Bucer and Fagius] ad nos convenerunt et plures quotidie expectamus, cujus ecclesiæ chorum si ipse tua præsentia ornare et augere non gravaberis, haud scio qua ratione gloriam Dei magis illustrare poteris.' As late as March 27, 1552, the same point is pressed in another letter of great interest (*Ibid.* I. 348), from which we learn that the 'causa sacramentaria' was still agitated, and that Bullinger had been invited.

[5] See Laski's letter to Hardenberg (July 19, 1548) of which an extract is printed in Jenkyns's *Cranmer*, I. 330 n. [a]. Cranmer himself, writing to Laski in the same month (as above, n. 4), gives the following account of his motives in planning the conference, and of his wishes with respect to the management of it: 'Cupimus nostris ecclesiis veram de Deo doctrinam proponere, nec volumus cothurnos facere aut ambiguitatibus ludere; sed semota omni prudentia carnis, veram, perspicuam, sacrarum literarum normæ convenientem doctrinæ formam ad posteros transmittere,' *etc.*

ENGLAND.

which in the Reformation-period was the source of many others,—the doctrine of the Eucharist.

Compilation of the Articles of Religion.

Occasional notices importing that such a conference, though postponed from time to time, had not entirely vanished from men's thoughts are traceable[1] until the spring of **1553**. Yet long before this date effectual measures had been taken by the English primate and his friends to remedy the inconvenience that resulted from the want of some authorized Confession. It is also most remarkable that notwithstanding the decided bias of one party in favour of the Swiss divines, the model chosen for the guidance of the compilers was a Lutheran document, the celebrated Confession drawn up at Augsburg in **1530**, or rather a string of Articles[2] derived from it, with sundry adaptations and expansions, during the visit of the Lutheran envoys in **1538**. Accordingly, the animus of the English series published in **1553** is found to be accordant in the main[3] with Saxon rather than with Swiss theology.

Animus of the compilers.

The object of archbishop Cranmer, who had been formally instructed by the court in **1551** to undertake the framing, or at least re-casting[4] of this manifesto, was to bring about, if possible, 'a godly concord in certain matters of religion.' The Church of England, we have seen already, was divided into angry factions. Gardiner and his allies, exasperated by the quick development of reform-

[1] The last trace occurs in a letter from Cranmer to Calvin (dated March 20, 1552=1553): *Works*, I. 346.

[2] The 'Thirteen Articles' of 1538 are reprinted in Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, Append. II.: cf. pp. 61 sq. of the same work.

[3] The chief exception is in the 29th Article of the series ('Of the Lordes Supper'), where the idea of a 'reall and bodilie presence (as thei terme it) of Christes fleshe and bloude' is rejected. Still even here it is remarkable that the authorized series did not like Hooper's (below, n. 4) proceed to the formal rejection of 'any maner of corporall, or locall presence of Christ in, under, or with the bread and wine.'

[4] It is now almost certain that a series of Articles analogous to those compiled in 1551 and 1552, had been already circulated by individual bishops on their own authority. Such may have been Cranmer's series of which mention is made above, p. 201. Such were unquestionably the Articles used by Hooper in visiting his dioceses, as we know from the '*Responsio venerabilium sacerdotum Henrici Joliffe et Roberti Jonson*, sub protestatione facta, ad illos Articulos Joannis Hoperi, episcopi Vigorniæ nomen gerentis' *etc.*, published at Antwerp, 1564. Out of nineteen Articles animadverted upon by the prebendaries in 1552, ten coincide with the Latin Articles authorized in the following year: cf. the English Articles in Hooper's *Later Writings*, ed. P. S. pp. 120 sq.

ENGLAND.

ing principles, no less than by the arbitrary deprivation of members of their party[1], were devoted even more entirely to the Mediæval doctrines. Ridley, and some others like him, manifested their sobriety by counterworking this reaction on the one side, and allaying the immoderate vehemence[2] of the extreme reformers; while a motley group of Anabaptists[3], openly impugning the most central verities of Holy Scripture, and even substituting the distempered ravings of their own imagination for the oracles which it delivers, threatened to produce an utter revolution both in faith and worship. Hence the order, form and colour of the Forty-two articles, which after they were made to undergo successive modifications[4] at the hands of Cranmer and his coadjutors, and also of some other scholars and divines, were finally remitted to the royal Council Nov. **24, 1552.** The work continued in their custody until the following March, when at the meeting of the southern

[1] Respecting Gardiner himself and Bonner, see above, p. 192, n. 4. Day of Chichester and Heath of Worcester had also been imprisoned on the same charge of non-conformity: but the deprivation of Tunstall, bishop of Durham, not unfriendly to a moderate reformation, was both harsh and ill-advised. It is ascribable to the rapacity of the duke of Northumberland, who hoped to profit by the spoils of the bishopric. See Massingberd, *English Reformation*, pp. 393, 394, 2nd ed., and Robertson's note on Heylin, I. 290.

[2] See, for instance, his remarks on Knox, above, p. 137, n. 1. But one of the best means of ascertaining the degree of restraint exerted on the ultra-reformers is supplied by Hooper's English Articles (above, p. 213, n. 4) as compared with the authorized series. The same cautious spirit must have dictated the withdrawal of the phrase 'prayers for them that are departed out of this world' from the list of scholastic figments reprobated by Hooper, and even from the Latin version of the Articles as they stood in Oct. 1552: see the collation in Hardwick's *Hist.* p. 304.

[3] That these and other sectaries (of whom more will be said in Chap. v.) continued to increase during the reign of Edward VI. is obvious not only from such startling narratives as that of Martin Micronius (Aug. 14, 1551: *Original Letters*, p. 574), but the royal commission of Jan. 18, 1551 (Wilkins, IV. 66), and other evidence of the same kind.

[4] On the 2nd of May, 1552, we find the royal Council asking of the primate whether the Articles 'delivered to the bishops' in the previous year 'had been set forth by any public authority' (Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 366), referring perhaps to a design of submitting them to the convocation which was dissolved just before (April 16). Having been returned by the Council to the archbishop, he sent a revised copy of them to Cheke and Cecil (*Ibid.* Append. lxvi.). In the following month six of the royal chaplains including Knox (above, p. 136), reported on them to the Council: and the last corrections of Cranmer were made between Nov. 20 and 24 in the same year (Strype's *Cranmer*, App. lxiv.).

ENGLAND.

convocation, it seems to have been formally submitted[1] to the upper, if not also to the lower house, and ordered to be generally circulated in the month of May[2]. But before the country-clergymen could be induced to welcome this manifesto, its effect was nullified by the untimely death of Edward, who expired on the 6th of July, 1553, not having completed his sixteenth year. Among his last 'memorials'[3] he charged the country to persist in its adherence to the principles of the Reformation, at the same time urging the importance of organizing the ecclesiastical system more efficiently, and enjoining for this purpose the completion of a new code of laws[4], to which the industry of certain commissioners was devoted concurrently with the arrangement and revision of the Forty-two Articles.

Death of Edward VI.

Yet after a brief interval, during which the sceptre had been forced into the pure and guileless hands of Lady Jane Grey[5], the reformation-party was exposed to a succession of calamities, and even ran the risk of perishing entirely. The new queen, Mary, had inherited from Catharine of Aragon a cordial hatred of religious innovations. She had also been harshly treated in the previous reign[6], and consequently her accession was an augury of

Accession of Mary.

[1] On this vexed question, see Hardwick's *Hist.* pp. 106–112. The convocation was actually summoned to meet March 19, 1552=1553, and its sessions continued until April 1.

[2] This is stated in the first edition (English and a separate work) printed by Grafton 'mense Junii, 1553,' with the title *Articles agreed on by the bishops and other learned men in the synod at London, &c.*

[3] Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 435.

[4] The *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (ed. Cardwell, Oxf. 1850) originated in the *Stat.* 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 11, which empowered the king to appoint thirty-two persons 'to compile such ecclesiastical laws as should be thought by him, his council and them, convenient to be practised in all the spiritual courts of the realm.' No such body, however, seems to have existed until Nov. 11, 1551, when a smaller committee was nominated, consisting of Cranmer, Peter Martyr and six others: see Wilkins, IV. 69, and Cardwell's *Pref.* pp. vii. viii. Still, as their work was not completed within the years mentioned in the Act of 1549, the hope of gaining for it the sanction of the legislature was deferred and ultimately defeated. Its present worth arises from the fact that 'including within it matters of doctrine as well as of discipline, it may be considered as exhibiting the mature sentiments of archbishop Cranmer and the avowed constitution of the Church of England at that period.' Cardwell, p. 10.

[5] Above, p. 192.

[6] See Turner, *Modern Hist.* III. 318 sq. When she was examined before the Council (March 18. 1551=1552) and expressed her resolution to adhere to her convictions, Edward VI. made the following entry in his

ENGLAND.

Counter-reformation.

good to all the Mediævalists, announcing that the triumph of their party was at hand. On the meeting of parliament Oct. 5, 1553, four days after the queen's coronation, the proceedings opened with high-mass in Latin[1]; while the convocation of the southern province, with Weston as the prolocutor, lost no time in re-affirming the scholastic theory of transubstantiation[2]. The facility with which the members of this body now reverted to their old position, or at least repudiated some of the more sweeping changes of the former reign, appears to prove that as those changes grew in number and in violence, a vigorous reaction had been working in the soul of the community. It should be also borne in mind, that when the convocation met, the leading prelates[3] favourable to the Reformation had been arrested on the charge of treasonable practices, while others had absconded here and there in order to avoid the same treatment. The reformers were accordingly paralysed by fear and overwhelmed by dark forebodings. But although the Mediæval rites and doctrines were thus re-introduced by the dictation of the civil power[4], without

journal: 'Here was declared, how long I had suffered her mass in hope of her reconciliation; and how, now being no hope, which I perceived by her letters, except I saw some short amendment, I could not bear it.'

[1] Dodd, II. 56. In a contemporary *Admonishion to the Bishoppes of Winchester, London and others* (dated Oct. 1, 1553 and probably by Bale) we find a notice of similar restorations: 'Boner hath set up agayne in Paules Salesburi latin portace [the Sarum Breviary], wherof the lai men vnderstandeth no word, and God knoeth no more do the greater parte of the portas-patterers:' sign. A iii (copy in Camb. Univ. Lib. AB, 13, 1).

[2] Wilkins, IV. 88. Dodd, II. 58, note. The five members of the lower house who dared to controvert the decision of the assembly were Haddon, dean of Exeter, Philpott, archdeacon of Winchester, Philips, dean of Rochester, Aylmer, archdeacon of Stow, and Cheney, archdeacon of Hereford.

[3] Coverdale of Exeter and Hooper of Gloucester were first silenced (in August) by the arbitrary fiat of the council, and then imprisoned. Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, Holgate of York, and Farrer of St David's shared the same fate, and as the rest of the prelates either absconded or conformed, Taylor of Lincoln and Harley of Hereford were the only members of the Reformation-party in the House of Lords at the beginning of October, and they both were deprived and died soon afterwards.

[4] Mary's absolutism in these particulars was certainly not less emphatic than that of her father and brother. See, for example her instructions to Bonner (March 4, 1554) in Wilkins, IV. 88 sq., where among other things she orders 'that by the bishop of the diocese an uniform doctrine be set forth by Homilies, or otherwise, for the good instruction and teaching of all people; and that the said bishop and other persons aforesaid, *do compel* the parishioners to come to their several churches and there devoutly to hear Divine Service, as of reason they ought.'

ENGLAND.

provoking any serious struggle, it was not so manifest that England would compose a quarrel with the papacy[1], which had now lasted twenty years. The queen on her accession felt herself obliged to use the title 'head of the church,' and Gardiner, the life and mainspring of the anti-reformers, had contributed as much as any other prelate to the independence of his country. But a mediator whose religious principles and social position fitted him to smoothe away obstructions, and to reconcile conflicting interests, was then living at a monastery on the borders of the Lago di Garda. This was Cardinal Pole[2], who after corresponding with the queen and others on the prospect of their re-absorption in the Church of Rome, had ventured across the channel, November **20, 1554**. On his arrival, Gardiner and the rest had all determined to abandon their old convictions on the subject of the papal monarchy. A formal reconciliation[3] was accordingly produced in parliament, and subsequently in both houses of convocation, Pole comparing England to the prodigal son, who having wasted all her substance, was at length returning to her Father's house,—to what he deemed the center of ecclesiastical unity provided in the see of Rome.

Reunion with the see of Rome.

[1] Mary herself (whose letter to Pole of Oct. 28, 1553, is reprinted in Dodd, Append. xx.) expresses her persuasion that the existing parliament would not assent to the recognition of the papal authority. The following is a specimen of her reasoning: 'Itaque veremur ne, pertinacius quam desideraremus, insistant et urgeant, ut titulum supremi capitis ecclesiæ continuemus et assumamus: quod si fiat, habeo quod respondeam et excusem, nempe, me semper professam veterem religionem, in ea fuisse edoctam et enutritam, in eo velle perseverare usque ad ultimum vitæ spatium; nos nihil contra conscientiam posse consentire; titulum illum non convenire regi' *etc.* In a subsequent letter (Nov. 15, 1553) she hints that her subjects as then disposed would rather take the life of Pole than suffer him to enter the kingdom as papal legate, 'tantum abest ut vel auctoritatem aut obedientiam debitam ecclesiæ et sedi apostolicæ sint approbaturi et recogniturí,' *etc.* *Ibid.* p. ciii.

[2] See above, p. 97, p. 192, n. 4, Phillips' *Life of Reginald Pole*, 2nd ed. Lond. 1767, and Neve's *Animadversions* upon it, Oxf. 1766. Turner has also a good chapter (Bk. II. ch. xiii.) on Mary's earlier ecclesiastical measures.

[3] Dodd, II. 62 sq. The cardinal referred especially to the destruction of the religious houses and the confiscation of church-property. Yet, in order to secure the allegiance of the spoliators the pope was under the necessity of confirming them in their possession of the abbey and chantry-lands. See the bull of Julius III. (June 28, 1554) in Wilkins, IV. 102, and *Stat.* 1 and 2 Phil. and Mary, c. 8.

ENGLAND.

Repressive policy.

It is remarkable that one of the first petitions[1] in the lower house of the new convocation (1554) prayed for the destruction of the 'pestilent book of Thomas Cranmer made against the most blessed sacrament of the altar,' and of other works composed in favour of the recent changes. Gardiner was now indeed as eloquent in his eulogies of popery as he had once been vehement in the denunciation of the papacy. Re-established as the chancellor of the university of Cambridge, he insisted on the application of new tests[2] by which he might exclude those members who abetted the reforming principles. Nor was the zeal of Gardiner and his faction limited to arguments and tests of doctrine. At the very opening of the new reign, the foreign refugees were ordered to 'avoid the realm' within twenty-four days 'upon pain of most grievous punishment by imprisonment and forfeiture, and confiscation of all their goods and moveables'[3]. The same determination to establish uniformity of faith and worship led to the extrusion of a multitude of Englishmen belonging to all ranks and orders of society, and numbering, it is said, as many as eight hundred souls[4]. One section of them fled to Switzerland,

Flight of some Reformers.

[1] Wilkins, IV. 95 sq. The petitioners urge this point and others on the ground that the bishops were manifesting a 'godlie forwardness...in the restitution of this noble church of England to her pristine state and unitie of Christ's church, which now of late years hath been grievously infected with heresies, perverse and schismaticall doctrine sowne abroad in this realme by evil preachers, to the great loss and danger of many soules.'

[2] See the list of Articles forwarded by him (April 1, 1555) in Wilkins, IV. 127, 128, and on the subscriptions of the Senate, cf. Lamb's *Collection of Letters*, &c. pp. 172 sq. Lond. 1838.

[3] Wilkins, IV. 93. To this order the misfortunes of Laski and his friends are traceable (see above, p. 157). Utenhovius (above, p. 148, n. 5) in his *Simplex et fidelis narratio de instituta ac demum dissipata Belgarum, aliorumque peregrinorum in Anglia, ecclesia*, etc. (Basil. 1560), thus alludes to their extrusion: 'Papismus per sororem suam Mariam... reducitur, aut potius retrahitur, tanta celeritate et crudelitate, ut ministerium nostrum publice amplius cum salute ecclesiæ obire integrum non esset,' p. 20.

[4] Heylin, II. 171, 175. Mr Massingberd (*Engl. Reform.* p. 423, 2nd ed.), relying on Spanish authorities, appears to make the total number of exiles far greater. He speaks of 'a cause for which three hundred persons gave their bodies to be burned, and no fewer than thirty thousand endured exile and the spoiling of their goods.' Several Spanish writers, *e. g.* Ribadeneyra (*Hist. Eccl. de Inghilterra*, lib. II. c. 17) and Salazar de Mendoza (*Vida de Bart. Carranza*, p. 28) mention thirty thousand; but this number includes many foreigners who had found refuge in England,

ENGLAND.

where they were hospitably entertained at Basel, Aarau, Zürich and Geneva, while the rest obtained a like asylum at Wessel, Emden, Strasburg and Frankfort. Common sufferings failed, however, to unite these bands of exiles, or subdue the elements of jangling and repulsion which had threatened to dissever their community at home. The more extreme reformers, liberated from episcopal jurisdiction, were resolved on their establishment at Frankfort[1] (**1554**) to modify, if not to supersede, the English Prayer-Book, on the ground that even after the elaborate revision of it, made only two years before, it had remained 'a huge volume of ceremonies,' and was still debased by frequent dregs and vestiges of popery. The scruples of these disaffected spirits were increased by Calvin's censure[2] of the Prayer-Book. Knox became their favourite minister[3]; and it is probable that he would have acquired still greater influence, had he not been forcibly restrained[4] on the ar-

'Troubles of Frankfort.'

and also those that were reconciled by penances. The prodigious number of persons dealt with in different ways by the Inquisition, or by a system like the Inquisition, while the theories of persecution had influence, would be incredible, if it were not so well attested as it is. Some of the principal English refugees were bishops Coverdale (rescued from the flames by the intercession of the king of Denmark), Poynet, Barlow, Scory and Bale, five deans, four archdeacons, together with a large number of the clergy who became distinguished in the following reign; *e.g.* Grindal, Sandys, Jewel, Pilkington, Nowell, Whittingham, Lawrence Humphrey and John Foxe: see the list in Strype's *Cranmer*, III. 38, 39.

[1] The original authority is *A brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort* (published in 1575, and reprinted in 1846 by Petheram). The author was either Whitehead or Whittingham, more probably the latter: cf. Heylin, II. 176 sq., and Dyer's *Life of Calvin*, pp. 421 sq. Sandys, Grindal, Haddon and other exiles then at Strasburg remonstrated (Nov. 23, 1554) with the innovators (*Troubles*, p. xxii. ed. 1575), but in vain.

[2] A description of the Liturgy was drawn up in Latin by Knox, Whittingham and other ultra-reformers, and sent to Geneva at the close of 1554. Calvin's answer 'somewhat resembling the Delphic oracles' (Twysden, *Vindication*, p. 156) is dated Jan. 18, 1555. He writes (*Epist. et Responsa*, p. 98): 'In Anglicana Liturgia, qualem describitis, multas video fuisse tolerabiles ineptias. His duobus verbis exprimo, non fuisse eam puritatem quæ optanda fuerat; quæ tamen primo statim die corrigi non poterant vitia, quum nulla subesset manifesta impietas, ferenda ad tempus fuisse...Quid sibi velint, nescio, quos fæcis papisticæ reliquiæ tantopere delectant.'

[3] Above, p. 136.

[4] On the representations of Cox, the senate of Frankfort ordered all the English residents to conform to the Prayer-Book: on which the malcontents retired, some, as John Foxe, to Basel, and the main body with John Knox to Geneva, where (as Heylin expresses it, II. 182), 'they rejected the whole frame and fabric of the Reformation made in England.'

ENGLAND.

rival of dean Cox (March **13, 1555**), an able champion of the English formularies. The chief authors of the agitation now retreated to Geneva: yet the controversy they had opened, or at least exasperated, when they stigmatized the Liturgy as 'superstitious, unpure and unperfect,' never ceased to rankle in men's minds, until one party of the exiles whom they had infected, reproduced their accusations in this country. But while minor troubles were perplexing many an earnest refugee at Frankfort and elsewhere, the leaders whom he left in England had been called to undergo a sharper trial, and to water their abundant labours with their blood. The zeal of Mary in the cause of Rome was ere long fired into fanaticism by her marriage with a gloomy bigot, Philip II. of Spain[1] (July **25, 1554**). She had moreover been provoked by the disloyal virulence of the extreme reformers[2], and on one occasion had

Commencement of persecution in England.

[1] See above, pp. 95, 148. The first intimation of a wish to exterminate the reformers appeared in the discussions of the Council in the following October: see Tierney's note on Dodd, II. 101. On May 24, 1555 (*not* 1554 as in Wilkins, IV. 102), the king and queen required Bonner to go forward with the persecutions, and even Pole, amiable as he was in private life, 'authorized, encouraged and commanded them.' See Turner, *Modern Hist.* III. 456 sq., and the constitutions drawn up in the Convocation of Canterbury (Jan. 1558: Wilkins, IV. 155 sq.) where the bishops of Lincoln and Ely were ordered to hold a yearly inquisition in the Universities and to execute the barbarous constitution of archbp. Arundel 'De Hæreticis.' Pole moreover issued an express commission for the same purposes (March 28, 1558; Wilkins, IV. 173). Gardiner's death on the 12th Nov. 1555, prevented him from joining in the later atrocities: but his loss was more than supplied by the Spanish ecclesiastic, Carranza (above, p. 95, n. 5), whom Philip sent before him into England for the purpose of assisting in the work of extermination, and who became in fact soon afterwards confessor to the queen: Massingberd, p. 430.

[2] On Knox's *Blast* and other writings in favour of rebellion, see above, p. 136, n. 5, and p. 137. Some 'honest citizens,' so Foxe terms them, prayed in public that 'God would either turn the queen's heart from idolatry or shorten her days,' a form of prayer which was specially reprobated in *Stat.* 1 and 2 Phil. and Mary, c. 9. The laxity of principle that characterizes 'Puritan politics' during the reign of Mary and the fresh ascendancy of 'antichrist' is mercilessly exposed in Dr Maitland's *Essays on the Reform.* pp. 85—195. The violence of the language employed in prayers, such for instance as a man like Becon addressed to the Almighty, has few parallels in the literature of any period: *e. g.* 'That Thy blessed worde may haue the more free passag, take away from vs those Idolatrus Massmongers, those idle latyne Mumblers, those shauen Madianites, those Lordly loyterers, those Wolues, those Theues, Robbers, and Murtherars, which do nothyng elles than poyson Thy flocke, whom Thy most dere Sonne purchased withe Hys most Precious dere hearte bloode' &c.

ENGLAND.

been made to tremble for her safety by an insurrection of the populace under Wyatt, whose chief war-cries were destruction to the pontiff and confusion to the Spanish match[1]. Yet provocations of this kind will never be allowed to palliate the dark atrocities[2] by which they were succeeded. During the next four years as many as two hundred and eighty eight persons, of all ranks and orders, perished at the stake, the greater part for their abandonment of Mediævalism and their adherence to the doctrine of the English Reformation[3]. Four of these were bishops, Hooper, Farrer, Ridley and Latimer, all of whom confronted the devouring flames with earnestness and heroism worthy of the noblest cause (**1555**). Another of the leading victims his tormentors had determined to reserve until the spring of the following year. But Cranmer did not emulate the constancy[4] which signalizes nearly all the English martyrs of that period. From the day[5] when standing in his prison-tower at Ox-

Martyrdoms.

Ibid. p. 194. How different the spirit shewn by Ridley in a letter written just before his martyrdom! He breathes the following prayer in passing for the happy delivery of the queen who was supposed to be near to her confinement,—'partum reginæ quem Deus pro Sui nominis gloria dignetur bene illi fortunare' (*Works*, ed. P. S. p. 394).

[1] Turner, III. 425 sq., Dodd, II. 88 sq., where the question as to Elizabeth's implication in these movements is discussed.

[2] Tierney (note on Dodd, II. 103) is himself appalled by the recital of them. 'New commissions,' he says, 'were issued, new barbarities were enacted, and a monument of infamy was erected, which, even at the distance of three centuries, cannot be regarded without horror.' Still it must be borne in mind that these persecutions were confined to the Southern and Midland counties. The North was almost entirely exempt, owing to the clemency of Heath, archbp. of York, and Tunstall, bishop of Durham.

[3] The numbers vary slightly, but 288 is the aggregate obtained by Cecil (Lord Burghley): Turner, III. 453, n. 16. Foxe, whose list is analyzed by Dr Maitland (pp. 576 sq.) makes the number 277. The first victim was Rogers who was burnt as early as Feb. 4, 1555. On the state of religious feeling that prevailed among these sufferers, see *The Letters of the Martyrs*, collected by Coverdale in 1564, and reprinted at London, 1837. Compare, on the conduct of the persecution and behaviour of the victims, Maitland's *Essays on the Reformation*, pp. 396—492.

[4] When urged to flee on the accession of Mary, he boldly answered that he would hold his ground: 'Constantia usus Christiano præsule digna, vita constitui potius quam regno, hoc in tempore cedere:' Godwin, *De Præsulibus*, p. 141, Cantab. 1743.

[5] For the particulars of his first condemnation as a heretic (April 20, 1554), see Strype, *Cranmer*, III. 122 sq. Nearly one year and a half elapsed anterior to his final trial before the commissioners of the pope and the queen (Sept. 12, 1555): see Strype, *Ibid.* pp. 209 sq. On the 4th of Dec. sentence of deprivation was issued against him at Rome, and

ENGLAND.

ford, he witnessed the immolation of his chief companions, Ridley and Latimer (Oct. **16**), we notice that his mental vigour had been almost paralysed. A series of disgraceful artifices on the part of his assailants finally extracted from him the most abject recantation of his principles, particularly of his writings on the Eucharist, in which he most of all departed from the Mediæval Church; yet when he saw that nothing but his blood would satisfy the malice of the persecutor, all his manliness of soul appears to have returned. His execution (March **21, 1556**), which some had hoped, while it was consummating his own ignominy, might prove the death-blow of his party, had very different consequences. It evinced that notwithstanding his deplorable relapses he had never entirely lost his hold upon the truths which he had lived to vindicate, and thus Cranmer's memory was in part retrieved amid 'the fires of his martyrdom.' The morning after this tragedy was perpetrated at Oxford had been chosen for the consecration of Reginald Pole to the archbishopric of Canterbury. Pole did not however long enjoy his dignities[1], expiring on the **18**th of November, **1558**; and, what is still more noticed by the annalists of the time, his royal mistress also breathed her last not many hours before him (Nov. **17**)[2], and at the early age of forty-three.

Impolicy of persecution.

Had Mary and her counsellors abstained from persecution it is not unlikely that their principles would have been permanently re-established in all parts of England. The impetuous zeal with which the Reformation was hurried on during the last years of her predecessor, alienated the affections of one thoughtful class of Englishmen who

executed at Oxford Feb. 14, 1556. Before parting with his crosier he appealed to a General Council. One of the best narratives of what followed is in Le Bas, *Life of Cranmer*, II. 228 sq. See also Dean Hook's account in the *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*.

[1] One of these, the office of legatus à latere, was taken from him by Paul IV., with whom he had been placed in competition for the popedom. Another legate, cardinal Peyto, was appointed in his stead (June 20, 1557) to the annoyance and disgust of Mary, yet when Peyto died in the following spring, Pole was reinstated. One of the reasons alleged for his suspension was, the firm determination of the pontiff to repress all quasi-Lutheran tendencies like those which had appeared in the 'Oratory of Divine Love,' of which Pole was formerly a member: see above, p. 97; Heylin, II. 195, 215, 216, and Turner, III. 475, 476.

[2] Stow, *Annales*, p. 634, says, 'the same day.'

ENGLAND.

concurred in many of the earlier changes. And the conduct of the cardinal himself had on the whole been tending to reconcile this party to the older forms of worship and belief. He understood their wants, and sympathized with many of their wishes[1]. On the doctrine of man's justification, for example, he was occupying ground analogous[2] to that which Luther endeavoured to reclaim from the encroachments of the schoolmen. Yet the policy of Mary's government, which seemed to grow more harsh and merciless in proportion to the number of its victims[3], had defeated the great objects of the counter-reformation party. It was also currently believed that such despotic cruelty was largely owing to the readmission of the pontiff, or suggestions of the Spaniards who held office in the court; and therefore the whole nation seemed to breathe more freely when the news was circulated that the princess Elizabeth, whose former detention in the Tower[4] had excited their condolence, was securely placed upon the throne.

Early measures of Elizabeth.

Elizabeth, now twenty-five years of age, was the daughter of Anne Boleyn, and as such her fortunes had been long associated with victories and reverses of the great religious movement. For some time, however, she delayed to manifest her predilections. All the mediæval rites[5] were celebrated on the day of her coronation (Jan. **12, 1559**), and Cecil, who immediately became her principal adviser, had himself occasionally conformed to the established worship in the previous reign. Their efforts were at first directed to the mitigation of religious acrimony[6]. With this object

[1] For example, in the legatine synod which he held (Dec. 16, 1555) it was ordered that the New Testament should be translated into English (Wilkins, IV. 132): cf. his *Reformatio Angliæ* (1556), Rom. 1562, *passim*.

[2] See above, p. 59, n. 1; p. 97, n. 4.

[3] Thus at Canterbury itself five persons were burnt alive on the 10th of November, a week before the death of Pole.

[4] Singularly enough, she seems to have owed her safety, in part at least, to the policy of Philip: Miller, *Hist. phil. illust.* III. 226, 230. Cf. Mr Robertson's note in his edition of Heylin, II. 260, with respect to Gardiner's hostility.

[5] On her own conformity during the reign of her sister, see Heylin, II. 261; Dodd, II. 119. As early, however, as Christmas Day (1558) she had ordered Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle, not to elevate the Host in her presence: Heylin, II. 272, and note. The same bishop officiated at her coronation, his brother-prelates declining to recognize her title.

[6] The new state-council contained a mixture of reformed and unreformed, the latter preponderating: see Camden, *Annales*, pp. 2, 3, Lugd.

ENGLAND.

all the pulpits of the kingdom were reduced to silence[1]; party names were interdicted; warnings were addressed to those who on the one side favoured 'superstition,' and to those who on the other were inclined to laxity, or disregarded holy things[2]. But in the spring of **1559** it grew apparent that Elizabeth was determined at all risks[3] to brave the indignation of the pontiff[4], even while foreseeing that the powers whom he had rallied in the hope of conquering the world afresh, might all be turned against her. In resisting such a foe, she counted not only on her personal popularity, but on the deep repugnance felt by many of her subjects to reunion with the Roman see.

Batav. 1623, and Turner, III. 507, n. 45. Yet Cecil and Bacon were the most intimate advisers.

[1] The royal order is dated Dec. 27, 1558 (Wilkins, IV. 180). It proves that the Reformers were again emerging from their concealment; and the same is visible in the records of the southern convocation, when the lower house (Feb. 1558—1559), by way of protest reaffirmed the old opinions. *Ibid.* p. 179.

[2] See Bacon's speech at the meeting of parliament, Jan. 25, 1559, in D'Ewes, *Journals*, &c. p. 12.

[3] An important '*Device for Alteration of Religion*, in the first year of Queen Elizabeth,' is printed in Burnet, 'Records,' Part II. Bk. III. No. 1. The dangers likely to ensue are stated and discussed with great calmness, apparently by Cecil and Sir Thomas Smith. The first of them runs as follows: 'The bishop of Rome, all that he may, will be incensed, he will excommunicate the Queen's highness, interdict the realm, and give it in prey to all princes that will enter upon it; and stir them up to it by all manner of means.' The sixth is more remarkable as shewing how thoroughly these statesmen realized the difficulties of the position: 'Many such as would gladly have alteration from the Church of Rome, when they shall see peradventure that some old ceremonies be left still, for that [because] their doctrine, which they embrace, is not allowed and commanded only and all other abolished and disproved, shall be discontented and call the alteration a *cloak'd Papistry*, or a mingle-mangle' (p. 328, ed. 1683). In the solution of this latter difficulty he foreshadows the whole course of their administration (p. 330), 'Better it were that they [the ultra-reformers] did suffer, than her highness and commonwealth should shake or be in danger; and to this they must well take heed that draw the Book,' [meaning probably the revision of the Prayer-Book].

[4] She announced the fact of her accession to the pope as well as to the other continental potentates. But Paul IV. replied that she was illegitimate, that by ascending the throne without his sanction she had insulted the authority of the apostolic see, &c. Heylin, II. 268, Dodd, II. 120 with Tierney's note. The natural result was that she instantly ordered Carne, the English ambassador, to return from Rome: and when Pius IV. manifested a more conciliatory spirit two years later, (see Ch. Butler's *Historical Memoirs of the Catholics*, I. 152, 153) the golden opportunity had passed.

ENGLAND.

Re-establishment of the royal supremacy.

The first proceedings[1] of the legislature, though some were strongly adverse to the papal claims, provoked no formidable opposition, if we except the bill in which it was proposed to reinvest the crown with the ecclesiastical supremacy[2] enjoyed by Henry VIII. and Edward. The proposal was, however, finally accepted, in spite of numerous scruples[3], rising from a total misconception of its purport and effect. The same measure made it lawful to the queen and her successors to constitute ecclesiastical commissions[4] for correcting and repressing every kind of schism and misbelief, provided always that nothing should from henceforth be accounted heresy, but what had been so adjudged 'by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four general councils or any of them, or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the high court of parliament of this realm, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation.'

Definition of heresy.

The Elizabethan Prayer-Book.

The next important measure was an act for legalizing the Book of Common Prayer, and for establishing religious

[1] *E. g. Stat.* 1 Eliz. c. 3, 'for recognition of the Queen's highness to the imperial crown of the realm,' and 1 Eliz. c. 4, 'for the restitution of the first-fruits to the crown' (above, p. 177, n. 2): Mary having relinquished her claim to these latter.

[2] *Stat.* 1 Eliz. c. 1. The title is very remarkable: 'An Act to restore to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign powers repugnant to the same.' In Caudrey's case (Coke's 5th *Report*, p. 8), it was contended that this was not a statute introductory of a new law, but declaratory of the old, 'which,' as Mr Stephen remarks (*Eccl. Stat.* I. 353), 'is true with regard to a general right of jurisdiction in the crown over the state ecclesiastical: but it does not apply to the entire statute.'

[3] Elizabeth tried to soften these by laying aside the title 'Supreme Head' (above, p. 176, n. 4), and still more pointedly in the *Injunctions* which she issued during the same year (Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, I. 200). It was there declared that she did not challenge any more authority than 'under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms,' which is still further explained in Art. XXXVII. as modified in 1562. The oath of supremacy, however, as enjoined in sect. xix. of this enactment was refused by all the Marian bishops, except Kitchen of Llandaff. See Heylin, II. 293, 294 on their deprivation and subsequent treatment. Bonner was the only prelate who experienced any thing like undue severity.

[4] Sect. xviii. and sect. xxxvi.

ENGLAND.

uniformity[1] in all parts of England. Changes[2] were, however, introduced into that formulary, partly for the sake of adding to the ceremonial[3] which had been considerably reduced in the later years of Edward, and still more with the intention of correcting errors not unlikely to be prompted by his second Prayer-Book, with respect to the specific nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist[4].

Character of archbp. Parker.

The predilections of the court, as manifested in these changes, were still further shewn by nominating Matthew Parker for the new archbishop of Canterbury. Elected by the chapter of that cathedral (Aug. **1, 1559**), and regularly[5] consecrated at Lambeth on the **17**th of the following December, he proceeded with a happy mixture[6] of pru-

[1] *Stat.* 1 Eliz. c. 2. The Preamble refers to the act of Mary's 'parliament by which the Prayer-Book had been taken away, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion.' In sect. xiv. all persons, 'having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent,' are enjoined 'to resort to their parish church or chapel accustomed...and then and there to abide orderly and soberly during the time of the common prayer, preaching, or other service of God,' under certain penalties.

[2] See Procter, pp. 54 sq. A disputation was held at Westminster March 30, 1559, in order to prepare the way for the introduction of the reformed service-book, which was ordered to be used on 'the feast of the nativity of St John Baptist' (June 24): see the particulars in Cardwell's *Conferences*, ch. I. II.

[3] By *Stat.* 1 Eliz. I. c. 2, sect. xxv., the 'ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof,' were restored as in 2nd year of Edw. VI.

[4] The sentences employed at the distribution of the elements (above, p. 210) by the two Edwardine Prayer-Books were now combined; 'lest, under the colour of rejecting a carnal, they might be thought also to deny such a real presence as was defended in the writings of the ancient Fathers:' Heylin, I. 287. For the same reason the 'Declaration on Kneeling' (above, p. 206, n. 4) was dropped, much to the discontent of some reformers: see *Zurich Letters*, I. 180, ed. P. S.: and cf. *Ibid.* p. 165.

[5] On the 'Nag's-Head' fable and other objections to the 'succession' of the English bishops, see Le Courayer, *Validity of the Ordinations of the English*, new ed. Oxf. 1844. Haddan's notes on Bramhall's *Works*, Oxford, 1842–5; and *Apostolical Succession*, Oxford, 1869; also Bailey, *Ordinum Anglicanorum defensio*, London, 1870. The consecrators of Parker were Barlow, Scory, Coverdale and Hodgkin (suffragan of Bedford). On his biography in general, see Strype's *Life of Parker* and his own *Correspondence* printed by the Parker Society.

[6] It is curious to notice how the Romanist Dorman, in his *Disproufe of M. Nowelles Reproufe* (Antwerp, 1565) acknowledges that Parker, Guest (of Rochester), and Cheynie (of Gloucester) were men 'in all respectes (heresye set aparte) worthy to beare the office off true bishoppes in Christes churche' (fol. 103 b). He also adds that Parker was nicknamed 'Matthewe mealmouthe,' a 'Lincewolsy bishoppe,' &c. The

dence, gentleness and firmness to reorganize the body over which he had been summoned to preside. He shewed himself the great conservative spirit of the English Reformation[1], sheltering many a treasure from the general wreck of ancient literature entailed by the destruction of the monasteries, and importing the same thoughts and feelings into his arrangements for securing the stability of religion. Parker had remained in England during the reign of Mary. He was, therefore, less addicted than some others whom he styles 'Germanical natures'[2], to the models of religious worship they had studied on the continent. His enemies indeed have censured him as little better than a Lutheran[3], owing to the views he held on controverted subjects, more especially on the doctrine of the sacraments. Yet he was Lutheran only in so far as Luther had revived the doctrine of the Early Church, and 'followed the examples of the ancient and worthy Fathers'[4].

The religious peculiarities of the exiles.

The new primate was, however, scarcely seated on his throne at Canterbury, when the troubles that were destined to embarrass all the rest of his career, began to peep above the surface. The exiles who had hastened home on hearing that the storm of persecution was exhausted by the

queen also thought him on some occasions 'too soft and easy,' while divers of his brethren (*Correspondence*, p. 173) noted him 'too sharp and too earnest in moderation, which,' he adds, 'toward them I have used and will still do, till mediocrity shall be received amongst us.'

[1] His opinion of men like Knox is cited above, p. 137, n. 4: cf. his *Correspondence*, p. 435.

[2] *Correspond.* p. 125.

[3] See Dorman, *Disproufe*, as above, where he says that this was the case with respect to the Eucharist: fol. 52 a: and in *Heads of Doctrine* (above, p. 201, n. 5), he revived the expression 'conferre gratiam' (so obnoxious to the Calvinists) in describing the efficacy of both the sacraments. Together with Cox of Ely he defended the use of a crucifix or cross, in the Queen's chapel: see *Zurich Letters*, I. 67, 68, II. 41, 43.

[4] See Parker's *Correspondence*, p. 111: cf. his last will in Strype's *Life*, Append. No. c. Another scholar of like mind was Edmund Geste (Guest), who having remained in England during the Marian troubles, was promoted to the see of Rochester (Jan. 1559 = 1560), and afterwards to that of Salisbury. On him devolved the principal burden of revising the Prayer-Book, owing to Parker's illness. See his *Life*, by H. G. Dugdale, Lond. 1840, where his *Treatise againste the prevee Masse in the behalfe and furtheraunce of the mooste holye Communyon* (Lond. 1548), and other pieces, are reprinted. Parker must have also found a zealous fellow-worker in Alley, bp. of Exeter, who took an active part in the synod of 1563. His opinions may be gathered from the *Poore Man's Librarie*, a large collection of theological miscellanies, Lond. 1565.

ENGLAND.

death of Mary, were in many cases[1] strongly tinctured by the characteristic doctrines of the Swiss. The violence of ultra-Lutherans[2] in the north of Germany had driven many of them into the arms of Bullinger and Calvin. Accordingly, when the earliest manifesto[3] of this party was drawn up in the spring of **1559**, to answer the 'vain bruits of the lying Papists,' they could boast that its compilers 'had not departed in the slightest degree from the Confession of Zürich[4].' But although these Articles were mainly in accordance with the formulary of **1552**, they do not appear to have been satisfactory either to the English primate or to the court; for in the same year a totally different list[5] (eleven in number) was published by authority, and appointed to be 'holden of all parsons, vicars and curates,' in attestation of their general agreement with each other.

Their speculative theology.

The former series entered somewhat largely on a class of speculative topics[6] which had been discussed indeed by all successive ages of the Church remarkable for intellectual activity, *viz.* the truth of God's fore-knowledge and the

[1] The chief exceptions seem to have been those (like Young, afterwards archbishop of York) who took refuge at Wesel: see Soames, *Elizabethan Religious History*, pp. 20, 21. Lond. 1839.

[2] On the persecution of Laski and his friends, see above, p. 156: and the contemporary narrative of Utenhovius, as above, p. 218, n. 3.

[3] Some account of it is given by Strype (*Annals*, I. 115, ed. 1725). It professes to adhere very closely to the Edwardine Articles of 1552, and does so in discussing many of the principal topics. The article on predestination (§ 3) is much fuller; that on justification is almost entirely new; while prefixed to the articles on 'the civil magistrate' (§§ 20—22) is an earnest disavowal of any sympathy with books like that of Knox (above, p. 137). Sandys, in writing to Parker, April 30, 1559, mentions that the authors of this series intended to publish their work 'so soon as the parliament is ended,' adding, 'I wish that we had your hand unto it:' Burnet, 'Records,' Part II. Book III. No. II. The entire document is still among the MSS. of Corpus Chr. Coll. Camb. No. CXXI. § 20. Parker alludes to it in his *Correspondence*, p. 66, and as late as 1566, applies to Cecil for the manuscript (*Ibid.* p. 290).

[4] So Jewel writes to Peter Martyr April 28, 1559: *Zurich Letters*, I. 21.

[5] Printed in Wilkins, IV. 195 sq., and Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, Append. No. IV. It must have been published at the very end of 1559, since Parker was not consecrated till Dec. 17.

[6] Strype, *Annals*, I. 116, where, however, the whole of the Article on Predestination is not printed. The compilers lay great stress upon this doctrine, adducing the authority of St Augustine to the same effect, yet freely admit the dangers which may follow from one-sided apprehension of it, and concede that 'in this our corrupt age,' it ought to be handled sparely and circumspectly.'

ENGLAND.

ground of His predestination, as those doctrines bear upon the parallel truths of human freedom and of moral responsibility. In the reign of Henry VIII. such questions had been very warmly agitated[1] here as well as on the continent: they also taxed the spirit of the Marian martyr[2], while in hourly expectation of his summons to the stake: but at the opening of the new reign, after many of the refugees had learned to systematize their tenets by continued intercourse with leading Swiss divines, the controversy on predestination and the points immediately connected with it had begun to occupy a central place in their theology, and even threatened here and there to swallow up all other Christian doctrines[3].

Revision of the Articles.

On the contrary, the Articles of 1559 abstained from such disputes, restricting their definitions to the fundamental verities embodied in the creeds, or to those controversies where the Church of England was completely at issue with the Romanists. And when it was at length proposed to reconsider the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI., on the assembling of the first Elizabethan Convocation

[1] See especially bp. Gardiner, *Declaration* (against George Joye), fol. xxxix. and *passim*. In fol. lxxiiii. he writes: 'The true teachynge of Christes Churche abhorreth necessitie, and yet worshyppeth for moost certayne truthes Goddes prouidence, election, and predestinacion, whereby we be taughte that God is auctor of al our helth, welth and saluacion, the cyrcumstaunce of which workyng in God in his election and predestinacion, althoughe it be as impossible for mans wit to frame with [*i.e.* make consistent with] our choyse and free wyll as to deuise how a camell shulde passe through the eye of an nedle without makyng the nedles eye bygger or the camell lesse; yet that is impossible for man is not impossible for God.'

[2] See Laurence, *Authentic Documents relating to the Predestinarian Controversy*, Oxf. 1819. The prisoners in the King's Bench disagreeing on the doctrine, one of them, Bradford, prepared a statement which he submitted to Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer, then imprisoned at Oxford. Ridley alone seems to have replied to the inquirers, but his 'godly and comfortable treatise,' as Coverdale terms it, is no longer extant. Immediately afterwards he wrote to Bradford: 'Sir, in those matters I am so fearful that I dare not speak farther, yea almost none otherwise than the text doth, as it were, lead me by the hand:' *Works*, ed. P. S. p. 368.

[3] In Haweis' *Sketches of the Reformation*, p. 95, Lond. 1844, an account is given of a clergyman whom Parker charged not to preach controversial sermons on the Divine Counsels; whereupon the zealots rebuked him, arguing that predestination, 'as the only doctrine of salvation,' ought to be preached everywhere, and before all audiences. The excessive rigour of this school, and their doctrinal aberrations, have been exposed in an adverse spirit by Heylin in his *Historia Quinqu-Articularis*.

ENGLAND.

(Jan. **1562—3**), the changes introduced bear witness to the presence of the same controlling spirit[1]. Instead of drawing hints from the Helvetic Confessions, Parker had recourse to one of Saxon origin[2], distinguished for its moderation, and actually presented by the state of Würtemberg to the assembled council of Trent (**1552**). As finally remodelled at this time, and regularly sanctioned by the convocation of the southern province[3], the Articles had undergone important modifications[4]. The statements of the Church were amplified on certain doctrines, more especially those in which her teaching had been misrepresented; other subjects were omitted altogether, owing partly to the disappearance of the forms of misbelief at which they had been levelled, and partly to a manifest anxiety of the compilers to abstain, as far as might be, from scholastic questions: while in reference to the Eucharist[5], of which the statement may in every case be taken

Nature of the changes.

[1] This remark may be extended to the Second Book of Homilies, prepared perhaps during the reign of Edward VI., and published by authority in 1563: although a greater portion of the material out of which the book was framed is traceable to foreign sources.

[2] Above, p. 65. Some light is thrown upon this question by the fact that immediately after the accession of Elizabeth, a party of the English reformers were anxious to adopt the Augsburg Confession (see Strype's *Annals*, A.D. 1558, pp. 53, 174, Lond. 1725), and in the following year they had succeeded in persuading the Queen to make overtures for joining the Schmalkaldic League: see Jewel's letter to Peter Martyr (April 28, 1559): *Zurich Letters*, I. 21; cf. pp. 54, 55, and II. 48.

[3] Although the northern convocation does not appear to have exerted any direct influence on the compilation of these Articles, and may not have formally accepted them till 1605, the archbishop of York, and the bishops of Durham and Chester, subscribed in the synod of the southern province on this occasion. See Lathbury, *Hist. of Convoc.* pp. 165, 166, 1st ed., and Bennet *On the XXXIX. Articles*, p. 206, who makes it very probable that the northern clergy were consulted by the archbishop at the beginning of Feb. 1562(=1563).

[4] See them detailed at length in Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, pp. 125 sq.

[5] The exiles, on presenting their Articles of Christian Doctrine in 1559 (above, p. 228, n. 3), expressed themselves at considerable length on the 'Lordes Supper' (Art. XIV.: *MS.* p. 155): '...in the due administracion of this holie supper we do not denye all maner of presence of Christes bodie and bloude, neither do we thinke or saie, that the holie sacrament is onely a nakid and a bare signe or figure in the which nothing elles is to be receyued of the faithfull but common bread and wyne...yet we do not alow the corporall, carnall and real presence which they teache and maynteyne.' Their position is, affirmatively speaking, that 'to the beleuer and worthie receyuer is verily given and exhibited whole Christ, God and man, with the frutes of His passion.' Some of them, however, were dissatisfied

ENGLAND.

as one of the best criteria for deciding the special character of all confessions issued at this period, the Church of England occupied a more distinct and independent place than in the previous list of Articles. The Romish theory of transubstantiation was repudiated quite as strongly as before: the theory, alike of Romanist and Lutheran, touching the manducation of our Lord's Body by the wicked, was no less obnoxious to the majority of the synod[1]: yet in order to establish a position equally removed from Zwingli's, they determined that the Body of Christ is after a heavenly manner given, taken and eaten in the Lord's Supper, and at last withdrew a clause[2] which in the former Articles denied the possibility of 'the reall and bodilie presence (as thei terme it) of Christes fleshe and bloude,' upon the ground that His humanity is locally restricted to the place of His glorification.

Opening of the ritualistic controversy.

The proceedings of the synod threw fresh light upon the tendency of public feeling and the relative strength of parties then existing in the Church of England. For example, overtures[3] were made in order to effect, if possi-

with the changes made in 1563. For example, Humphrey and Sampson writing to Bullinger (July, 1566), and pointing out the 'blemishes that still attach to the Church of England,' complain: 'Lastly, the Article composed in the time of Edward VI., respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the real presence in the Eucharist, and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect:' *Zurich Letters*, I. 165. Cf. the analogous complaints on the withdrawal of the Declaration about kneeling, above, p. 226, n. 4.

[1] It is a remarkable symptom that this article was, notwithstanding, dropped in the printed copies, and not restored till 1571.

[2] Dorman, in his *Disproufe of M. Nowelles Reproufe* (1565), insists more than once on the divisions among the English prelates on this subject (fol. 53 a, fol. 103). In 1571, however, Parker seems to think that no material difference had been perpetuated: *Correspond.* p. 379. One of them, Cheynie, bp. of Gloucester, openly defended the doctrine of Luther (*Zurich Letters*, I. 185, 186) as late as 1567: cf. Strype, *Annals*, I. 563.

[3] See the account in Strype's *Annals*, ch. XXIX. (I. 335 sq. ed. 1725). Sandys, then bishop of Worcester, mooted the question respecting the sign of the cross: but the greater part of the objections issued from the lower house, where the paper of reformanda was subscribed by dean Nowell, the prolocutor, and thirty-two other members. One of their proposals was to modify the thirty-third article, which had just been approved by the convocation. And even after this project failed, another motion, aiming at nearly the same objects, was introduced into the lower house (Feb. 13), and lost by only one vote. 'Those that were for alterations,' writes Strype, 'and for stripping the English Church of her cere-

ENGLAND.

ble, some sweeping changes in the ceremonial as enjoined by the Elizabethan Prayer-Book, and the Act of Uniformity. Many of the exiles, unaccustomed for some years to services which if consistently performed would bear frequent resemblance to the ritual of the Middle Ages, lost no time in circulating threats or murmurs or misgivings. The administration of the sacraments was thought to 'savour altogether of Lutheranism'[1]: the champions of the Prayer-Book were reputed a 'papistical'[2] or at the least a 'Lutherano-papistical ministry'[3]. The earliest censures of these disaffected churchmen contemplated more especially the use of the cross in baptism, 'all curious singing and playing at the organs,' copes, surplices, saints' days, caps and gowns, and most of all perhaps the practice of kneeling at the sacrament. Nor was the disaffection limited to some of the more ignorant or clamorous members of the 'Swiss' party. It is painful to record that several[4] of the most able

General spread of disaffection.

monies and usages then retained and used, were such (as I find by their names subscribed) as had lately lived abroad:' p. 337.

[1] *Zurich Letters*, II. 159; the author of this expression being George Withers, who was then a great champion of the non-conforming or disaffected churchmen: see Soames, *Elizab. Hist.* pp. 57 sq.

[2] Parker and Burghley were stigmatized as such: Parker's *Correspond.* p. 479. The archbishop remarks, however, 'If I, you, or any other, named great papists, should so favour the pope, or his religion, that we should pinch Christ's true Gospel, woe be unto us all.'

[3] Grindal and Horne, writing to Bullinger and Gualter (Feb. 6, 1567), declare that the adoption of the authorized vestments, contrary to their own wishes and convictions, was the only means of preserving the Church from 'a papistical, or at least a Lutherano-papistical ministry:' *Zurich Letters*, I. 177, cf. *Ibid.* II. 143. Gualter, in writing to Beza (July 23, 1566), speaks of the English clergy in general as 'wolves, papists, Lutherans, Sadducees and Herodians' (*Ibid.* II. 125).

[4] *E. g.* Miles Coverdale, bishop of Exeter in the time of Edward, was not allowed to re-enter his diocese on this account. See the biographical notice prefixed to his *Remains*, ed. P. S. 1846. Thomas Sampson, dean of Christ Church, and Lawrence Humphrey, president of Magdalene College, Oxford, Thomas Lever of Cambridge, and John Foxe the 'martyrologist,' are other examples of the same inflexibility, and were fellow-sufferers of Coverdale (see Soames, pp. 29 sq. pp. 74 sq.). But besides these open adversaries of the ritual, a large proportion of the bishops taken from the refugees had similar objections. Grindal bp. of London, Pilkington bp. of Durham, Horne bp. of Winchester, are some of the chief members of the class (Soames, pp. 21 sq.). Even Jewel at first agreed with Peter Martyr in terming the vestments 'relics of the Amorites:' see Le Bas, *Life of Jewel*, pp. 74 sq. It is also obvious that of the clergy who had licence to preach (about one-third of the whole body), very many were swayed by the same antipathies: Soames, p. 32.

ENGLAND.

scholars and most energetic preachers,—men whose hearts were overflowing with affection for their parishes, whose name is still revered among the worthies of their generation, and whose writings still inform and edify the Church,—were victims of these petty scruples, and must therefore be in part responsible not only for the agitations of that age, but also for the mightier tempests which eventually broke upon their country, levelling alike the altar and the throne. Yet Parker, on the other hand, how much soever he might sympathize with tender consciences, could not be forced from his position. He saw at once the revolutionary nature of the movement[1], and supported[2] by the Queen and Cecil (now lord Burghley) was resolved to offer it the most decided opposition[3]. What is generally known as the 'vestment-controversy' may be said to have reached its highest point in **1566**, about which time the mal-contents were branded with the name of *Puritans*, or *Precisians*. Not a few of the church authorities, who heretofore had winked at non-conformity, avowing that they held their places chiefly for the sake of keeping out objectionable ministers[4], were now resolved to execute the law. They

[1] See his *Correspondence* as early as 1566, pp. 284, 285. The mutual counteraction caused by these disputes was also painfully present to his mind: *Ibid.* pp. 61, 321.

[2] See the royal *Advertisements* (1564) in Wilkins, IV. 247 sq., and the *Proclamation against the despisers or breakers of the orders prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer* (1573). *Ibid.* pp. 278, 279.

[3] *E. g.* in his *Articles to be inquired of within the diocese of Canterbury* (1569): *Ibid.* pp. 257 sq. The lawlessness with which he had to struggle may be gathered from an official paper in Strype's *Life of Parker*, p. 152. The first specimen runs as follows: 'Some say the service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some say the same in a seat made in the church, some in the pulpit with their face to the people; some keep precisely the order of the Book, others intermeddle psalms in metre; some say with a surplice, others without a surplice.' Yet these were only the beginnings of disorder: for even Mr Marsden, *Hist. of the Early Puritans*, admits, pp. 54, 55 (Lond. 1850), that the extravagance afterwards displayed by some of the party, 'almost defies exaggeration. Every form of Church-government, and every distortion of Christian doctrine, had for a while its boisterous advocates.'

[4] Such for instance was the plea of Grindal and Horne (*Zurich Letters*, I. 177). When the latter of these prelates gives a living to Humphrey, after his liberation from the restraint in which he had been placed for non-conformity, Jewel refused to institute him (Le Bas, pp. 155 sq.), and subsequently made himself peculiarly obnoxious to the Puritans (*Ibid.* 198). On Grindal's further reasons for compliance see Strype's *Life of Grindal*, p. 135.

ENGLAND.

were convinced that Puritanism when fully grown would prove itself the natural enemy of episcopacy, and would destroy all kinds of organization, where the people were not virtually supreme[1]. This inference was supported by the fact that some of the more advanced leaders of the Puritans refused to countenance the public worship, and at last departed altogether from the communion of the Church[2] (**1567**).

Origin of Anglo-Romanism.

Meanwhile the opposite (or 'Romanizing') party had been thrown into a similar agitation, and resolved to follow the example of the early Puritans. A section of the Marian ecclesiastics, it is true, had already been deprived[3] on their declining to accept the oath of supremacy or sanction the new Prayer-Book (**1559**); but the great body of them still adhered to their positions, either from self-interest or from higher motives, until **1570**. In that year originated the Anglo-Roman schism. The pontiff (Pius V.) had hitherto restrained his indignation in the hope of winning back the Queen and her advisers by a gentler process, but his patience was at length exhausted. A bull of excommunication[4] was posted on the gates of London-house, denounc-

[1] The rapidity of this development is seen in a joint-communication of the two archbishops Parker and Sandys (1573), where they declare that 'in the platform set down by these new builders we evidently see the spoliation of the patrimony of Christ, a *popular state to be* sought. The end will be ruin to religion and confusion to our country.'

[2] See Haweis' *Sketches of the Reformation*, p. 189, and *Zurich Letters*, I. 201.

[3] On the bishops, see above, p. 225, n. 3: and Parker's address to them (March 26, 1560): *Corresp.* p. 111. The entire number who ceased to minister was one hundred and eighty-nine: Strype's *Annals*, I. 171, 172, Dodd, II. Append. No. XLIV.: cf. *Zurich Letters*, I. 66. Some withdrew to the continent, especially to Louvain, while others who nominally conformed appear to have read the services at church, and said mass in private houses: Rishton, the continuator of Sanders, *De Origine ac progressu Schismatis Anglicani*, p. 292, Colon. 1585.

[4] Printed in Wilkins, IV. 260, 261, and Camden's *Annales*, pp. 183 sq. Lugd. Batav. 1625; but differently dated in the two copies. It was really issued April 27, 1570. The following is among the charges brought against Elizabeth: 'libros manifestam hæresim continentes toto regno proponi, impia mysteria et instituta ad Calvini præscriptum a se suscepta et observata etiam a subditis servari mandavit.' Camden goes on to say (p. 186) that this bull was obnoxious to the more sober 'Pontificii,' 'qui prius privatim sua sacra intra parietes satis secure coluerunt, vel recepta in Ecclesia Anglicana sacra sine conscientiæ scrupulo adire non recusarant.' On the general question of the schism produced in 1570, see Fulwood's *Roma Ruit*, Append. pp. 314–318, Camb. 1847.

ing vengeance on Elizabeth, and commanding all her subjects to violate their oaths of allegiance, under pain of sharing in the like anathemas. In connexion with this wrathful manifesto, a rebellion[1] was again fomented in the northern shires of England: priests and Jesuits[2] educated on the continent, especially at Douay[3], were sent over in great numbers with the twofold object of exciting political troubles and disseminating the peculiar dogmas of Tridentine Romanism. Accordingly the English statesmen were disposed henceforth to handle them more roughly[4]. Some indeed of those who cherished an affection for the old learning gradually accepted the principles of the Reformers, and their reabsorption would perhaps have been facilitated if the English Church had not been torn by scandalous divisions[5]. For the patience of the rulers in both Church and State continued to be largely taxed by the advances of refractory spirits, who, although they did not openly abandon the established worship nor reject the definitions of Christian doctrine promulgated in the

[1] The best account is that of Stow, *Annales*, pp. 663 sq.

[2] As early as 1568 the members of this order had begun to infest the Church of England under the disguise of Puritanical ministers, their objects being to divide and so to conquer: see the case of Thomas Heath as taken from the register of the see of Rochester, in Dugdale's *Life of Edm. Geste*, pp. 46, 47.

[3] On the Romish 'Colleges founded abroad,' see Dodd, Part IV. Art. III. From the continuator of Sanders we learn that before 1585 as many as 300 'seminary priests' had been supplied by the establishments at Douay and Rome for 'missionary' work in England. Many of these Anglo-Romanists had been distinguished members of the English universities, *e. g.* Harding (Jewel's antagonist), Stapleton (author of the *Promptuarium Catholicum*), and cardinal Allen, the mainspring of the movement (Soames, pp. 92 sq.).

[4] Thus Burghley writing soon after the horrid massacre of St Bartholomew (above, p. 129), complains (Sept. 11, 1573) of being 'bitten with a viperous generation of traitors, papists, and I fear of some domestic hidden scorpions.' Executions were, however, almost unknown till after this date. They became more frequent on the discovery of Babington's plot for the assassination of queen Elizabeth (Carte, III. 600 sq.), which also led to the execution of her rival, Mary queen of Scots (1587). In the following year a heavier blow was inflicted on the Romanists by the destruction of Philip's grand *Armada*, which aimed at nothing less than the subjugation of England for the pope.

[5] Thus archbishop Parker, in deploring the Romeward tendencies of certain persons in 1572, was of opinion that the change was brought about in part at least, 'by the disordered preachings and writings of some Puritans, who will never be at a point:' *Correspond.* p. 392.

ENGLAND.

Progress of the Puritans.

Articles, were drifting more and more from their original position.

Shielded, in some measure, by the profligate earl of Leicester[1], and despairing, as they urged, that reformation would originate in high quarters, they put forward a sarcastic *Admonition to the Parliament*[2] (**1572**); in which among denunciations of the Prayer-Book[3] and the hierarchy[4] they proceeded to recommend the institution of a new church, whose 'holy discipline' should copy the presbyterian models then exhibited in Scotland and Geneva. Two great champions who had measured swords already in the pulpits, schools, and lecture-rooms of Cambridge, now stood forward to assail and to defend the English Church, its government, its service-books, and general organization. These were Thomas Cartwright[5] and John Whitgift[6], the latter being urged to undertake the office, and assisted in discharging it, by Archbishop Parker[7], whom he ultimately

[1] See above, p. 151, n. 1. His intense dislike of the archbishop is shewn in Parker's *Correspond.* p. 472.

[2] The first Admonition, written chiefly by John Field and Thomas Wilcox, appeared in 1572, after the Parliament was prorogued. In a letter of Beza's appended to it, the Genevese reformer insisted on the importance of pure 'discipline' as well as pure doctrine.

[3] The ritual portion of it is denounced throughout, and even the body of the work is stigmatized as 'that prescripte Order of seruice made out of the masse-booke,' sign. A. iiij. ed. 1572. Hence the origin of Puritan substitutes for the Prayer-Book, on which see Procter, pp. 83 sq.

[4] The bishops are declared to be the 'cheefe cause of backewardnesse and of all breache and dissention,' sign. A. They are also told that their 'kingdom must downe, hold they neuer so hard.'

[5] Cartwright (the T. C. of Hooker) became fellow of St John's College in 1560, and of Trinity College three years later. In 1570 he was appointed to the Margaret professorship, but deprived in the following year when Whitgift was vice-chancellor. In 1573 he wrote his *Replie* to Whitgift's *Answere* to the Admonition, which is printed at length in Whitgift's *Defense* (1574). In 1575 and 1577 Cartwright proceeded with the controversy in his *Second Replie*. He was now absent from England, at Geneva and elsewhere, till 1585, when on venturing home he experienced many acts of kindness from his former adversary, then archbishop of Canterbury.

[6] See Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, which together with his Lives of Parker and Grindal is full of materials for the history of this critical period.

[7] Soames, p. 174. Parker died soon afterwards, May 17, 1575, so hateful to the Puritans that, under the Commonwealth, colonel Scott one of the regicides converted the chapel at Lambeth where he was buried 'into a hall or dancing-room.' His remains were also exhumed, the leaden coffin sold, and the bones buried in a dunghill: *Ibid.* p. 206, note. They were recovered and reburied at the Restoration.

ENGLAND.

succeeded in the primacy of England (**1583**). Cartwright's violence suggested similar attacks[1], and Whitgift's bold defence of his position was the means of rallying some of the dispirited ecclesiastics and opening the eyes of all to the insidious and volcanic agencies by which they were surrounded[2].

Martin Marprelate controversy.

The principles involved in these disputes on church-organization and church-ritual were most clearly brought to light in what is called the 'Martin Marprelate' controversy[3], which originated in a series of scurrilous libels (**1588**), where the queen, the bishops, and the rest of the conforming clergy, were assailed with every kind of contumely.

Puritanical tendencies of the Parliament.

It was in the House of Commons that the advocates of sweeping changes found their principal supporters during the reign of Elizabeth. There as early as **1570**[4] bold attempts were made to modify the offices of the

[1] *E. g.* the famous *Book of Discipline* (1589) by Walter Travers, who was for some time Hooker's coadjutor at the Temple and his theological opponent.

[2] The great production on that side of the controversy is Bancroft's sermon preached at St Paul's cross in Feb. 1588=1589. In it he maintained that bishops were as an order superior to priests and deacons, that they governed by Divine appointment, and that to deny these truths was to deny a portion of the Christian faith. On the effect produced by it see Heylin's *Hist. of Presbyter.* p. 284.

[3] Several of the tracts produced by these discussions have been reprinted by Petheram. Respecting others see Maskell's *History of the Martin Marprelate controversy*, Lond. 1845. The question as to the authorship of the tracts is still undetermined. Penry, Throgmorton, Udal and Fenner are commonly said to have taken an active part. That many of the Puritans sympathized with them is plain from the treatises themselves: Maskell, pp. 216 sq.; cf. Marsden, *Early Puritans*, pp. 198 sq. on the other side. In Bishop Cooper's *Admonition to the People of England* (a sober reply to the earlier pamphlets, which appeared in 1589) the wide diffusion of their principles is equally manifest: 'Who seeth not in these dayes, that hee who can most bitterly inueigh against Bishops and Preachers, that can most boldely blaze their discredites, that can most vncharitably slaunder their liues and doings, thinketh of himselfe, *and is esteemed of other*, as the most zealous and earnest furtherer of the Gospel,' p. 2: cf. the Royal proclamation (Feb. 13, 1588 =1589), in Wilkins, IV. 340, and Bacon's *Works*, III. 135 sq. ed. 1765.

[4] See Strype's *Annals*, II. 63 sq., Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, p. 151. The Queen had in 1566 expressed her determination to resist such intermeddling (cf. Parker's *Correspond.* p. 291); and in the slight modifications of the Articles made by Convocation in 1571, no reference was made to the proceedings in the House of Commons, nor to the act of the same year, 13 Eliz. c. 12, by which subscription to that formulary was exacted from all candidates for holy orders.

ENGLAND.

Church, and even to reject those Articles of Religion that sanctioned the Homilies, the Ordinal and the ecclesiastical 'traditions.' The restraining of the Queen's prerogative was commonly associated in men's thoughts with the advancement of the Puritanic interest, and hence it is most probable that half compliance with their scruples was covertly intended by the framers of the celebrated act of Parliament requiring 'ministers of the church to be of sound religion'[1]. Under Grindal, who succeeded Parker in the primacy (**1575**), the relaxation of church-discipline was most deplorable[2], owing to either his latent sympathy with Puritanism or the excessive gentleness of his disposition. Whitgift was accordingly compelled to act with an amount of firmness that too often wore the aspect of severity. He enforced subscription[3] to the Articles and also to the Prayer-Book: he revived the court of High Commission[4] as it had been instituted in the first year of queen Elizabeth: he carried out the mandates of the crown for checking the irregular action of ministers and other members of the Church who met together periodically 'for the exercise called prophesying'[5]. By this vigorous course

Whitgift's primacy, and its effects.

[1] This is the act referred to in the previous note: cf. *Hist. of the Articles*, pp. 149, 226 sq. The Puritans construed it in such a manner as to exempt themselves from one class of Articles, swearing to those 'which only concern the confession of the true faith and the doctrine of the sacraments:' but the Convocation of the same date required subscription equally to the entire series.

[2] Fuller, who is certainly not inclined to press severely on Grindal, complains of his extreme laxity towards the close of his life: *Ch. Hist.* Bk. IX. p. 138. Parkhurst, bishop of Norwich, was another illustration of the same spirit. Cecil writes of him to Parker as early as Aug. 12, 1561: he 'is blamed even of the best sort for his remissness in ordering his clergy. He winketh at schismatics and Anabaptists, as I am informed. Surely I see great variety in ministration. A surplice may not be borne here. And the ministers follow the folly of the people, calling it charity to feed their fond humour. Oh, my lord, what shall become of this time?' Parker's *Correspond.* p. 149. Yet similar complaints were still uttered in 1593 by Bancroft in his *Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline*, p. 249, Lond. 1593.

[3] See the *Articles touching preachers*, &c. (1584) in Wilkins, IV. 307, and, on the archbishop's difficulties, his letter (May 9, 1584) to Sir Christopher Hatton, in Nicolas's *Life of Hatton*, pp. 371, 372, Lond. 1847.

[4] Martin Marprelate's indignation at this step may be seen in Maskell as above, pp. 143 sq.

[5] Elizabeth's prohibition of these preachings and prayer-meetings is dated May 7, 1577: Wilkins, IV. 289. Many of the bishops (*e. g.* Grindal and Parkhurst) had formerly recommended such 'exercises.' But although

ENGLAND.

of policy, pursued for many years, he was enabled to rescue the Church of England from the yoke of 'the pretended holy discipline.' More than once indeed, the current both of theological literature and of popular feeling had been turned in the direction of Geneva; but when Bancroft was advanced to the archbishopric of Canterbury in **1604**, the apprehensions caused by such a tendency were calmed and dissipated. That important section of the Church who viewed episcopacy as Divinely ordered and as therefore absolutely binding on all Christians, had obtained a fresh predominance, which, notwithstanding many conflicts and reverses, they preserved throughout the following century.

Doctrinal characteristics of the Elizabethan period.

Amid the 'disciplinarian' troubles which had led to this result, the special dogmas of the English Church were brought less frequently[1] on the arena of polemical discussion. It is obvious that the type of the theology prevailing in the Universities and thence diffused into the country-parishes, was strongly Augustinian, owing either to the deference which the Latin Church had always yielded to the great doctor of Hippo, or in many cases to the influence exercised by continental theologians, who in spite of all their independence were deeply tinctured by the Augustinian spirit. Bullinger[2] and Calvin may be cited as examples of the latter class; and the one-sidedness[3] which characterizes some of their conceptions of Christian doctrine was betrayed by not a few of their disciples in this country. That one-sidedness, indeed, although not entirely irreconcileable with our own Articles of Religion, was continually abated here by the unspeculative tone and unpolemical statements of the Liturgy,—a species of corrective, which if felt at all, was far less operative in other communities; and therefore as

they might in some instances lead to the edification and instruction of the audience, they were easily convertible into occasions for assailing the established usages of the church and for reflecting on the government: see Soames, pp. 160, 224, 226, Marsden, pp. 104 sq.

[1] Bp. Carleton in his *Examination* (cf. Bp. Montague's *Appeal*), pp. 8, 121, Lond. 1626, and other writers of more recent times (*e. g.* Marsden, pp. 205 sq.) have very much overstated their case when they maintain that no quarrel was moved 'against the doctrine of our Church' during the Elizabethan period.

[2] His 'Augustinianism,' however, was in form much milder than that of Calvin: above, p. 161, n. 4.

[3] See above, pp. 119, 161, 162.

ENGLAND.

long as men embraced the Prayer-Book cordially, their theological opinions were less likely to be marked by those extravagancies[1] of thought and feeling which had grown too general on the continent. But, on the other hand, it should be recollected that many of the earliest race of Puritans abhorred the teaching of the Prayer-Book. In their *Admonition* it is said to be 'full of abominations,' one passage of the Ordinal they branded as 'ridiculous and blasphemous,' and even that portion of the Church's mind which is transmitted in the Articles, they did not think above suspicion. Some, for instance, were considered 'lame' or mutilated[2], others 'eyther too sparely or else too darkely set downe'[3]. As in the Prayer-Book they objected to the supplication that 'all men may be saved'[4], so in the Articles they sighed for more distinct assertions of their favourite dogma, that all Christians added to the number of the elect, on falling into sin, must of necessity be rescued from the consequences of their fall[5]. In spite, however, of these scruples not unfrequently repeated, it is certain that the public formularies were thought by a majority of English churchmen to be reconcilcable with the *Institutio* of Calvin[6], which accordingly became a sort

Puritanic objections to the Formularies.

English 'Calvinism.'

[1] That such extravagancies did find their way into England is plain, however, from the passages collected in Heylin's *Hist. Quinqu-Articul. e. g.* Part III. ch. xvii. § 4. The sternest advocate of them was William Perkins, whose '*Armilla Aurea*, containing the order of the causes of salvation and damnation,' appeared in 1592.

[2] See above, p. 230, n. 5 on the feelings excited by the modification of the Article on the Lord's Supper. George Withers in writing to the prince elector Palatine (before 1567) remarks: 'I will not touch upon the doctrine of our church, which, though sound in most respects, is however *lame* in others:' *Zurich Letters*, II. 162.

[3] Cf. Whitgift's remarks upon this passage in his *Answere*, pp. 298, 299, Lond. 1573.

[4] See Whitgift's *Defense*, p. 739, Lond. 1574.

[5] The authors of the *Seconde Admonition*, p. 43, Lond. 1573, after denouncing some of the bishops for their tyranny and 'flat heresie in the sacrament,' add that 'some be suspected of the heresy of Pelagius.' 'For the first, that is, concerning the sacrament, the bishops are notoriously knowne which erre in it, and for free-will not onely they are suspected, but others also. And indeede the booke of the *Articles* of Christian religion speaketh very daungerously of falling from grace,' *etc.* This objection to the sixteenth Article frequently recurs.

[6] Hence the name 'Calvino-papistæ,' which the non-conforming Puritans applied to other churchmen: Stapleton, *Promptuar. Cathol.* Part I. p. 285, Part III. p. 116, Colon. 1594. On the vast authority of Calvin see Hooker's ironical note on *A Christian Letter* (Works, I. 139, n. 33,

ENGLAND.

of oracle and text-book for the students in the Universities. The same is true of Bullinger's productions, more especially the *Decades*, which as late as **1586** were recommended[1] by the southern convocation with the hope of facilitating the preparation of young curates who were still unlicensed to preach. Even Whitgift himself and his more active coadjutors, though sympathizing more with St Augustine than with any of the modern divines[2], were strongly adverse to those views of Christianity which represented all mankind as equally embraced within the circle of God's love and pity, which insisted on some kind of freedom in the human will as necessary to the constitution of a moral agent, and urged the possibility of spiritual suicide in those who had once become partakers of regenerating grace.

Commencement of reaction.

The Lambeth Articles[3], approved by the Archbishop on the **20**th of November, **1595**, are rigorous statements of the very opposite conclusions. Yet the changes which this formulary underwent[4], as well as the resistance it eventually

Oxf. 1841), where he ends by asking 'Doe we not daily see that men are accused of heresie for holding that which the Fathers held, and that they neuer are cleere, if they find not somewhat in *Calvin* to justify themselues?'

[1] 'Every minister having cure, and being under the degrees of master of arts, and bachelor of law, and not licenced to be a public preacher, shall before the second day of February next provide a Bible, and Bullinger's Decads in Latin or English and a paper book,' *etc.* Wilkins, IV. 321.

[2] That there was no disposition to accept every thing that bore the name of either Calvin or Luther, is seen from Whitgift's letter to the canons of Lincoln (June 29, 1590), where he blames the dean of that establishment (Griffin) for using language which appeared to attribute actual sinfulness to Christ, although the same language might be found in 'Luther, Calvin and some others,' whom, the primate and his colleague add, 'we also in our judgments do therefore mislike:' Nicolas's *Life of Hatton*, p. 487. Whitgift on a different occasion stated that 'the doctrine of the Church of England did in no respect depend upon them.' Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 441, Lond. 1718.

[3] This manifesto is ultimately traceable to a controversy at Cambridge between Whitaker, the regius professor of divinity and Baron (Baro) the Lady Margaret professor: the latter of whom was compelled to withdraw for teaching among other things, that 'Christ died sufficiently for all,' and maintaining that the denial of this doctrine is contrary to the Articles: see Hardwick's *Hist.* ch. vii. The ulterior question *Cur fructus mortis Christi ad omnes Adami posteros non perveniat*, is discussed by Baro in another tract (*Camb. Univ. MSS.* Gg. I. 29, fol. 46 b sq.).

[4] See Hardwick as above, Append. v. Expressions in the original draft which were 'ad mentem Calvini' were changed into others 'ad mentem Augustini.' Hutton, archbishop of York, who suggested an alteration in Art. VI. observed that as it stood it was opposed to St Augustine, who did

ENGLAND.

encountered[1], furnish proofs that England was producing a new race of scholars and divines, who, in proportion as they disengaged themselves from foreign ties and modern influences, proceeded more directly to the source of sacred literature, and raised their 'scheme of divinity upon the noble foundations of the Fathers, the Councils, and the ecclesiastical historians'[2].

Before the expiration of the sixteenth century, Hooker had completed his immortal treatise *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* in which the choice thoughts and language and the masterly arguments are scarcely more impressive than the spirit of humility and reverence which is breathed in every chapter. Overal had now succeeded Whitaker at Cambridge, where without materially receding from the principles of St Augustine, or exposing himself to the reproach of semi-Pelagianism, he advocated doctrines virtually extruded from the Calvinistic system; while Andrewes, not inferior in the depth and area of his learning, nor the lustre of his piety, to any worthies of the bygone generations, had become the champion of the English priesthood and the favourite preacher at the court. The spirit of destruction which in the second quarter of the century effected wonders in condemning creature worship, in uprooting theories of human merit, and expelling popery, was now at length succeeded by a deeper, calmer, more constructive spirit,—one whose mission, while it counteracted errors on the right hand and the left, was more especially to vindicate and prove the catholicity of the Church[3].

not consider that the 'regenerate' or 'justified' were necessarily the 'elect:' 'Reprobi quidem vocati, justificati, per lavacrum regenerationis renovati sunt, et tamen exeunt.' Strype's *Whitgift*, p. 461. Hooker's view of the Lambeth Articles may be seen in his *Works*, I. p. cii. and elsewhere; Saravia's in Strype's *Whitgift*, Bk. IV. Append. xxiv.; and Andrewes', in his *Minor Works*, pp. 294 sq., Oxf. 1846.

[1] They never obtained a synodical sanction in this country, and even Whitgift instructed the university of Cambridge to regard them as 'the private judgments' of the compilers: Strype, p. 462.

[2] The expression of Young, bishop of Rochester, in 1600, when he ordained the future archbishop Laud: see Le Bas, *Life of Laud*, p. 6, Lond. 1836. Men were in truth becoming sick of those 'compendiums and abbreviatures' which had been fashionable for a time in the universities, —a 'course of sums and commentaries,' which in the words of Bacon (*Works*, I. 126, ed. 1765) 'is that which doth infallibly make the body of sciences more immense in quantity and more base in substance.'

[3] This twofold aspect of the Church of England and the middle place

IRELAND.

It is remarkable that a country which had been, ostensibly at least, deprived of its political independence by the force of papal instruments, should afterwards become extravagant in its devotion to the pontiffs. At the expiration of nearly four centuries from the conquest under Henry II., English monarchs still continued to govern with the title 'lords' of Ireland. But in **1541** this title was exchanged for 'King,' in order to assert the plenary jurisdiction of the dominant country, and obliterate all traces of connexion with the Church of Rome. For after Henry VIII. had consummated his quarrel with the pontiff in **1534**, he lost no time in causing every part of his dominions to recognize his own ecclesiastical supremacy. This recognition was formally completed by the Irish Parliament[1] in **1537**, but one large section of the clergy, instigated by messages from the pope[2], and headed by Archbishop Cromer of Armagh, determined to resist the operation of the measure. On the other hand, Henry VIII. secured to himself an energetic fellow-worker, by the nomination of George Browne[3], provincial of the English Augustinian friars, to the see of Dublin (March, **1535**). Instead, however, of attempting the enlightenment of Ireland through the medium of the native language, it was now the obvious policy

which it has occupied between the Mediæval and the merely Protestant systems, has occasioned some perplexity to our continental neighbours both Romanist and Reformed. Thus Gieseler (III. ii. p. 26): 'So bildete sich die Englische Episcopalkirche, welche sich von den Irrthümern der Römischen Kirche trennen, aber das Katholische Priesterthum nicht fahren lassen wollte, und welche in Folge davon in eine schwankende Mitte zwischen Katholicismus und Protestantismus gericth, indem sie bald die heil. Schrift als alleinige Quelle der Lehre anerkannte, bald auch der Tradition der ältern Kirche ein gesetzgebendes Ansehen zuzugestehen sich genöthigt sah:' cf. Möhler's *Symbolik*, II. 132 (Eng. Trans.), where he speaks of 'internal self-contradiction' as 'carried to the extremest pitch.'

[1] *Stat.* 28 Hen. VIII. c. 6 [Ireland]. The Preamble begins: 'Where divers good and wholesome laws and statutes be made and established within the realm of England for the adnulling and utter taking away of appeales in cases spiritual from the Bishop of Rome and see apostolike,' &c.

[2] The agents of the pontiff also stimulated some of the disaffected chieftains to recover the importance of their families by rising in behalf of the papal claims.

[3] See the *Reformation of the Church in Ireland...set forthe in the life of George Browne*, printed in *The Phœnix*, I. 120 sq., Lond. 1707.

IRELAND.

of the government to Anglicize the country[1], by directing that spiritual promotions should be given only to such as could speak English, and that English should be taught in all the parish-schools[2]. The ignorance of the people, which is said to have been extreme, would hardly be corrected by such projects, while on the other hand their nationality was wounded more and more.

Throughout the reign of Henry VIII. the ecclesiastical affairs of Ireland observed the same general course which we have noticed in the sister-country. Certain images and relics[3] that ministered to superstition were banished from the churches. Monasteries[4] were dissolved in spite of earnest representations pointing out the benefits which they conferred on almost every order of society. But on the accession of Edward VI. no progress in the way of spiritual and moral reformation is distinctly visible. A new Irish primate, Dowdall[5], who had been appointed in **1543**, was secretly devoted to the papacy, and adverse to all changes both in dogma and in ritual. His influence, it is true, was somewhat counteracted by the efforts of archbishop Browne, and when the viceroy, Antony St Leger, in a meeting of ecclesiastics held at Dublin (March **1, 1551**), enjoined the use of the First Edwardine Prayer-Book, on the ground[6]

[1] Mant's *Hist. of the Church of Ireland*, I. 123, Lond. 1841.

[2] Archbp. Browne's Letter to Cromwell (Sept. 6, 1535), *Ibid.* p. 115. The same animus is shewn in the phrase '*Church* of England and Ireland,' which began to be used in 1538: *Ibid.* p. 145. Cf. *Stat.* 1 Edw. VI. c. 1, § 7, which enjoins that the communion shall be administered 'under both kinds' to 'the people within the *Church* of England and Ireland.'

[3] *Ibid.* I. 125, 141.

[4] The first onslaught was made in 1537. *Stat.* 28 Hen. VIII. c. 16 [Ireland]: see the particulars in Mant, I. 155 sq.

[5] Primate Cromer died March 15, 1543. For some account of his successor see James Ware, *Hist. of the Irish Bishops*, in Vol. I. of his *Hist. and Antiq.* pp. 91 sq., Dublin, 1764. Dowdall, although professing to be somewhat in favour of the reformation, was afterwards deprived for non-conformity, Oct. 20, 1551, and the primatial jurisdiction transferred to the see of Dublin. The new archbishop of Armagh was Hugh Goodacre (consecrated Feb. 2, 1553); but he died six months after.

[6] See the royal order in Mant, I. 195. John ab Ulmis writing from England (May 29, 1551: *Original Letters*, p. 433, ed. P. S.) was probably influenced by the appearance of this order when he spoke as follows: 'With respect to the Irish, Welsh, Manksmen, and those of Jersey and Holy Isle, you must have the same persuasion of them as of the English, namely, that all these islands entertain right opinions as to religion.'

IRELAND.

that it was 'the Liturgy and prayers of the Church translated into our mother-tongue,' one section of the bishops acquiesced in the arrangement. The new service[1] was accordingly celebrated for the first time at Dublin (Easter-day, **1551**) in Christ-Church cathedral. During the same year instructions had been also given for rendering the whole Prayer-Book into Irish[2]; but this reasonable plan, which might hereafter have produced a deeper change in the religious history of Ireland, was defeated for some cause or other.

One of the foremost champions in the ranks of the reformers was John Bale[3], originally a Carmelite friar, whom Edward VI. promoted to the see of Ossory, and who was consecrated Feb. **2, 1553**. His bold and energetic operations[4] were, however, speedily interrupted by the death of his royal patron, an event which, as we saw above, reversed the sweeping measures contemplated on both sides of the channel. Mary's policy in Ireland, as in England, was directed to the restoration of the papal monarchy[5]; and with it rose again the ritual and doctrinal system of the Middle Ages. Where the progress made by the reformers had been slight and superficial, there was

[1] A copy of the Prayer-Book as thus authorized for the use of the Irish Church is in the Library of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. 'does not appear to have been ordered for the observance of the Irish Church during the short period that the king survived its enactment.' Mant, I. 258.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 204. The difficulties in respect of language were felt to be so great that arrangements were made at the same time for translating the Prayer-Book into Latin for the use of those ecclesiastics and others who did not understand English: see *Original Letters and Papers* (connected with the Irish Reformation), ed. Shirley, pp. 47, 48, Lond. 1851. The same project was revived in the second year of Elizabeth, it being alleged that the Irish language was difficult to print and that few persons could read the Irish characters: *Stat.* 2 Eliz. c. 2, s. xv. [Ireland].

[3] See the biographical notice prefixed to his *Select Works*, ed. P. S. 1849.

[4] See his own account in the *Vocacyon of John Bale to the bishoprick of Ossorie*, printed in the *Harleian Miscellany*, VI. 437 sq.

[5] This restoration was effected in Ireland by the *Stat.* 3 and 4 Phil. and Mary, c. 8 [Ireland], 'repealing statutes and provisions made against the see apostolick of Rome, sithence the twentieth year of king Henry the Eighth, and also for the establishment of spiritual and ecclesiastical possessions and hereditaments conveyed to the laity.' Two years before (1554) the restored primate Dowdall, acting under a royal commission, deprived the archbishop of Dublin together with three other prelates favourable to the Reformation: Mant, I. 235, 236.

IRELAND.

hardly any symptom of resistance to the counter-reformation: and in the reign of Elizabeth, while the commissioners whom she appointed to examine the spiritual condition of the English dioceses[1] were enabled to report most hopefully, the news transmitted from the sister-island[2] gave but little satisfaction to the government. It is remarkable, however, that notwithstanding the general disaffection of the clergy, only two[3] out of the whole number of the Irish prelates openly refused to acquiesce in the Elizabethan reformation. By the influence of this body, the enactments of their English colleagues were synodically accepted[4] in **1560**, so that the connexion which had been already formed between the two Churches was now rendered still more intimate. For several years after the accession of Elizabeth it was the custom even of the Romish party[5] to frequent the services of the Church: but active emissaries of the pontiff soon endeavoured to reduce this number of conformists; and when Pius V. had launched his damnatory bull[6] in **1570**, secessions from the Church became more frequent, and the bias of the Irish more decidedly in favour

[1] See Jewel's *Works*, ed. Jelf, VIII. 128 sq.

[2] Thus the lord deputy, the Earl of Sussex, writes to Cecil, July 22, 1562: 'Our relygyon is so abused, as the papysts rejoyce, the newters do not myslike changes, and the fewe zelouse professors lamente the lacke of pyete. The pepell withowt dysciplyne, utterly voyde of relygyon, come to divine servyce as to a May game. The mynysters for dishabylite and gredynes be had in contempt; and the wyse fere more the impieti of the licentiouse professers than the superstityon of the erronyouse papists:' *Original Letters* (relating to Ireland), edited by Shirley, pp. 117, 118, Lond. 1851. The difficulties of the Irish problem had already been presented to Elizabeth's advisers ('Ireland also will be very difficultly stayed in the obedience, by reason of the clergy that is so addicted to Rome'): Burnet, 'Records,' Bk. III. No. I.

[3] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, I. 425, 3rd ed.; Mant, I. 278. The question of the real adhesion of the majority of Irish prelates on this occasion has been debated recently by Dr Maziere Brady and Dr A. T. Lee; and it would certainly seem probable, the evidence being of an unsatisfactory character, that in those parts of Ireland which were less amenable to English Jurisdiction, the assent of the bishops was of the most "economical" description. However on the vacancy of the sees the English ministers appointed men attached to the reformation; and as many of these vacancies did not occur until after 1570, the pope also nominated. Hence although the deprivations on Elizabeth's accession were very few, a double succession of prelates, in many of the sees, followed the creation of the schism.

[4] Elrington, *Life of Ussher*, p. 42, Lond. 1848, the reference being to the synodal recognition of the English Prayer-Book.

[5] Mant, I. 159.

[6] Above, p. 234.

IRELAND.

of the 'old' opinions. Many of the ultra-papists did not scruple to negotiate a union with the king of Spain[1] in order to promote the re-establishment of Mediæval tenets. Their schism was thus promoted by the growth of principles that led to civil insubordination, and that ere long issued not unfrequently in acts of absolute rebellion.

The Irish Church had meanwhile been enfeebled like its English sister by domestic quarrels and perplexities. The new primate, Adam Loftus (Lofthouse), consecrated in March, **1563**, and transferred to Dublin in **1567**, was actuated by the strong antipathies[2] which we have noticed in Elizabethan prelates of the dominant country: and the impulse thus communicated by him in the course of his long and active administration gave the Irish reformers the severe and somewhat Puritanic character, which they retained until the following century. In one respect their system differed widely from the English: for while the latter had endeavoured to fence in the truths which had been vindicated, by compiling the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and exacting subscription from all candidates for holy orders, the short series of eleven Articles[3] drawn up

[1] Thus in 1568 the titular bishops of Cashel and Emly were sent by certain confederated rebels to the pope and Philip II. of Spain, imploring help against Elizabeth: Mant, I. 286. Another of the chief agents of the Romish party was Richard Creagh, a native of Limerick, who is said to have returned from the continent 'non sine liberalissima Pii Pont. Max. [*i. e.* Pius V.] munificentia, ut et oves suas in Hybernia e truculentissimorum luporum ac leænæ faucibus everteret, atque eis officiose ac pie præesset.' Roth, *Analecta*, quoted in Palmer, as above, I. 428. At the close of the sixteenth century O'Neal, earl of Tyrone, headed a most formidable rebellion in which he was supplied with funds by the court of Spain, and instigated by the indulgences and benedictions of the pontiff, who moreover sent him a consecrated plume composed of what was gravely termed the feathers of the Phœnix: Mant, I. 286.

[2] Thus he writes to Cecil (July 16, 1565) in the following urgent terms: 'O what inconvenience were it to thrust owt of ther livings and ministery so many godly and learnid preacheres, only for this, that they will not be lyke the papistes, the professed ministers of Sathan and Antichrist, in supersticious and wicked order of apparell and outward sheawe.' He then begs Cecil to 'remove and quight take awaye all the monuments, tokenes and leavings of papistrye; for as longe as any of them remaynes, there remaynes also occasion of relapes unto the abolishyd superstition of Antichrist:' *Original Letters*, ed. Shirley, pp. 214 sq. Brady, bishop of Meath, appears to have taken the other side in the controversy. He thus reflects on the primate in a letter addressed to Cecil (Sept. 14, 1566: *Ibid.* p. 272): 'If he saie I haue drawen backward, I onlie saie againe he hath drawen *to fast forward*.'

[3] See above p. 228.

IRELAND.

by Parker in **1559** continued to pass current as a test of Irish orthodoxy, having been put in circulation for that purpose by the deputy and the bishops in **1566**, when it was ordered to be read by all incumbents 'at their possession-taking, and twice every year afterwards'[1]. The want of some closer and more comprehensive test was never satisfied until the Dublin Convocation of **1615** put forth a longer series of Articles[2], although the formulary of the sister-island may have been occasionally adopted by individual prelates.

When efforts were eventually made to prosecute the Irish reformation more independently of England, it is obvious that the general theology of the Irish Church was very strongly Augustinian, if not absolutely Calvinistic in its character. The Lambeth Articles, in which those tendencies had reached their highest point in England, were accepted by the Dublin Convocation of **1615**, and engrafted on the new formulary[3]. The most gifted advocate of such opinions[4] was a nephew of the Irish primate, James Ussher, who in critical acumen and in general scholarship was second to no worthy of the times in which he flourished. At the early age of nineteen he was deemed a match for one of the most learned Jesuits who assailed the doctrines of the Reformation, and when he was at length promoted to the chair of theology in the newly founded college at Dublin[5], his fame went on increasing, and his principles were rapidly diffused among the clergymen of Ireland.

Nothing can however be more unsatisfactory than the

[1] The series has been reprinted from the original edition in Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, App. pp. xxiii. sq.

[2] See Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, ch. viii.

[3] Even the modifications introduced into the Lambeth series for the sake of preserving the Augustinian distinction between the grace of regeneration and the grace of perseverance are dropped in the Irish formulary. Thus it is maintained (Art. XXXVIII.) that 'a true liuely iustifying faith and the sanctifying spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanisheth away in the *regenerate*, either finally or totally,' while the corrected Lambeth proposition says, 'non evanescit in *electis*.'

[4] See Elrington's *Life of Ussher*, accompanying the new edition of his *Works*.

[5] The building, after many obstacles, was commenced March 13, 1591 (=1592), and James Ussher was one of the first three scholars: Mant, i. 320. The first provost after the honorary appointment of archbishop Loftus was Hooker's antagonist, Walter Travers.

IRELAND.

picture[1] of religion and its ministers presented to us at the death of Queen Elizabeth. Among the crowd of evils under which the country laboured, we may mention that the plan for printing the New Testament in the vernacular language was not realized[2] till **1602**, while the translation of the Prayer-Book, though completed at an earlier date, obtained no public sanction, and was therefore very seldom if ever used. In such a state of mal-administration it is scarcely matter of surprise that Bacon found the Irish people so degraded; 'blood, incontinency, and theft' being 'not the lapses of particular persons, but the very laws of the nation,' and presenting what he deemed insuperable barriers to the progress of 'religion reformed.'

[1] Spenser, the author of the *Faerie Queene*, in his *View of the State of Ireland*, written about 1595, reflects in the strongest terms both on clergy and people: and Sir Francis Bacon, referring to the same period in his *Considerations touching the Queen's service in Ireland*, gives the same verdict.

[2] The translation was suggested as early as 1571, when queen Elizabeth provided a printing press and a fount of Irish types. In 1585 Walsh, bishop of Ossory, was murdered in his own house, while engaged in the prosecution of the work (Mant, I. 294). The prelate who eventually carried it through the press was Daniel or O'Donnell, archbishop of Tuam. Among other hints given by Bacon for the advancement of piety he mentions 'the recontinuing and replenishing the college begun at Dublin, the placing of good men to be bishops in the sees there, and the taking care of the versions of Bibles and catechisms and other books of instruction into *the Irish language*:' Works, III. 215, Lond. 1765.

CHAPTER V.

SECTS AND HERESIES ACCOMPANYING THE NEW MOVEMENT

FREE-THINKERS.

THE seeds of scepticism, disbelief, and speculative licence, had been scattered here and there as early as the fourteenth century by William of Ockham and that class of schoolmen who embraced the 'nominalistic' principles as modified in some of his productions[1]. At the middle of the following century a stronger impulse was communicated in the same direction by the literati of southern Europe[2], owing partly to the feverish thirst which had been there excited for the works of Greek philosophers, and partly to a predilection felt in several quarters for the wild and mystic Cabbala of the Jews. No sooner, therefore, was the pressure of the papal yoke abated[3] than multitudes of free-thinkers, who had hitherto been yielding a hollow and occasional compliance with the ritual institutions of the Church, began to ventilate their theories more publicly, and even went so far as to establish independent organizations, with the hope of leavening the whole of western Christendom. Their fundamental tenet was the self-sufficiency of human reason, or the right of private Christians to determine, each one for himself, the course to be pursued

[1] See *Middle Age*, p. 353.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 355. John Sturmius, in a scarce epistle 'Ad Cardinales Delectos' (Argentor. 1538), sign. D, 2, makes the following complaint on this subject: 'Nam quid potest ibi syncerum dici ubi pro religione superstitio, pro Divina sapientia hominum philosophia, pro Christo Socrates, pro sacris Scripturis Aristoteles atque Plato in Ecclesiam irruperunt? Neque hæc ita intelligi velim, quasi reprehendam philosophiæ studium... sed sic se res habet, ut nisi divinitatis cognitio præmonstratrix, mens ipsa hominis errans et vaga ad loca spinosa deviaque deducatur.'

[3] 'The dam, which for so many centuries had repelled human understanding from truth, was too suddenly torn away, for the outbreaking torrent not to overflow its appointed channel.' Schiller, *Hist. of Revolt of the Netherlands*, p. 382, Lond. 1847.

FREE-THINKERS.

in all religious matters: little or no deference being paid to formularies, creeds, and immemorial usages of the Church, nor even to the voice of Holy Scripture, where its oracles appeared at variance with those inspirations which were held to flow directly from the source of light and wisdom to the individual spirit.

The promoter of such lawless speculations, it is true, was frequently excited, in the first instance, by the Reformation-movement. He accompanied it so long as it accorded with his notions, or held forth a prospect of complete emancipation from authority; but when he ascertained its real character, especially the strong determination it continued to evince in favour of the absolute supremacy of an objective revelation, as distinguished from his dreamy self-reliance, and onesided spiritualism, he seems to have been immediately converted into one of its implacable opponents: while the leaders of the movement, although differing from each other on some minor topics, uniformly[1] saw in him the special instrument of Satan for corrupting, thwarting, and discrediting the work which they were straining every nerve to carry out.

[1] See, for instance, Luther's behaviour on the appearance of Anabaptism, above, pp. 37, 38. The innovators were at first treated with more tenderness in Switzerland (above, p. 111): yet Zwingli afterwards wrote vehemently against them in his *Elenchus contra Catabaptistas*, and Bullinger in his *Adversus omnia Catabaptistarum prava Dogmata*, ed. Tiguri, 1535. The former is even said to have urged the magistrates of Zürich to punish them capitally (using the expression 'Qui iterum mergit, mergatur:' see Brandt, *Hist. of Reform. in Low Countries*, I. 58). Hooper in like manner was an energetic opponent of them (above, p. 199, n. 4). The denunciations of John Knox are no less clear and frequent: 'Sone after that God had sowen his good sede, began the deuill to sowe the cockell and darnell, I mean the pestilent secte of anabaptistes, whose frutes did sodeinly appere to the great slander of Christes Euangill, and to the grief of many godly heartes:' *Answer to a great nomber of blasphemous cauillations* (1560), p. 408. While Ridley in a letter to Bradford, not long before his martyrdom, supplies the following additional testimony: 'Whereas you write of the outrageous rule that Satan, our ghostly enemy, beareth abroad in the world, whereby he stirreth and raiseth up so pestilent and heinous heresies, as some to deny the blessed Trinity, some the Divinity of our Saviour Christ, some the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, some the baptism of infants, some original sin, and to be infected with the errors of the Pelagians, and to rebaptize those that have been baptized with Christ's baptism already; alas, Sir, this doth declare this time and these days to be wicked indeed!' *Works*, p. 367, ed. P. S.

ANA-BAPTISTS.

FIRST RACE OF ANABAPTISTS.

The great majority of these revolutionary spirits were at first distinguished by the general name of Anabaptists[1], owing to the prominence they gave to their denial of the Church's teaching on the efficacy of infant-baptism[2], and their consequent reiteration of the sacred rite in cases where it was administered in childhood. But this feature of their system can hardly be regarded as its principal characteristic. The first race of Anabaptists who sprang up, as we have seen, while Luther was concealed at Wartburg (**1521**), under the guidance of an obscure draper of Zwickau, named Claus (Nicholas) Storch, were animated by a deep conviction that the kingdom of Christ would be ere long established visibly on earth, and that the subjects of it, guided by a light within them, would be all exempted from human laws and human magistrates, and even raised above the elementary stages of religious knowledge furnished by the holy Scriptures. Thus, apart from minor aberrations which this picture served to stimulate, the Anabaptist opened his career with three main principles of

[1] So general was the term that John Gastius, whose work *De Anabaptistarum Exordio* etc. appeared at Basel in 1546, makes mention of *seven* distinct sects (pp. 496 sq.).

[2] Cf. above, p. 37, n. 3. We see from evidence there adduced how difficult the question of infant-baptism appeared at first sight even to one of the most thoughtful of the Reformers. Zwingli also confesses (*Werke*, II. i. 245, new ed.) that for some time before he wrote (1525), he had been the victim of like misgivings: cf. above, p. 111, n. 2. Bucer even seems to have felt at one period that infant-baptism might be placed among the 'res non-necessariæ' (*Scripta Duo Adversaria*, pp. 142, 145, Argentorati, 1544); but afterwards when pressed by his opponent he maintained the following ground (p. 248): 'Baptisma infantium et ab Apostolis acceptum fuit, ut vetustissimi Patres affirmant, et certo concluditur ex Scripturis' *etc.* It should also be remembered that some of the sectaries themselves estimated the effects of baptism very highly when it was administered to conscious and believing subjects: see *Der Wiedertäufer Lehr und Geheimniss aus heil. Schrift widerleyt*, durch Justum Menium (1530) in Luther's *Works*, Wittenberg, ed. II. 292, and Mohler's *Symbolik*, II. 162, Lond. 1843. Schenkel in like manner (*Das Wesen des Protestantismus*, I. 462 sq., Schaffhausen, 1846) adduces extracts to shew that Servetus held the most ultra-Mediæval opinions in this matter. Still their general leaning was in the very opposite direction: sacraments being treated as 'nothyng els than outward sygnes of our profession and felowship, as the badges of capitaines be in warre.' Hermann's *Consultation*, sign. t, viii. Lond. 1547.

ANA-BAPTISTS.

action. Placing himself in the position[1] of the Israelites of old, he laboured to subvert existing institutions for the sake of realizing his visions of a Millennial kingdom. In anticipation of that kingdom he subordinated the written Word of God to inspirations of the individual preacher[2]. And as one example of his disregard for old traditions he rejected infant-baptism on the ground that it was quite superfluous, if not utterly absurd.

The Peasants' war[3] which broke on many parts of Germany in **1524** afforded an example of the way in which these principles might be applied. But long before a check was given to their extravagancies in that country, the fermentation they produced had spread on every side, and roused the indignation both of civil and ecclesiastical authorities[4]. The emissaries of Anabaptism found their way to Switzerland[5] in **1525**, and in Sweden had created serious disturbances as early as the autumn of **1524**[6]. It was not, however, till a party of them rose in Holland and Westphalia, when they were established in the town of Münster[7], that the ultimate tendencies of their opinions were fully brought to light. At the beginning of **1534** that city swarmed with Anabaptists, and so formidable

[1] Ranke, *Reform.* III. 566, who shews that the idea of introducing the millennial reign by force was adopted gradually. The imaginations of the Anabaptists would be stimulated by the version of the Hebrew prophets, which appeared under the auspices of Hetzer and Johannes Denk as early as 1527, *i. e.* five years before Luther's version was completed.

[2] The insufficiency of the Bible was one of the first points agitated by the prophets of Zwickau (Ranke, II. 22), their reasons being that the written word was inefficacious ('unkräftig'), and therefore that men are to be taught only by the Spirit: see Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschn. I. 534. This belief in a continuous inspiration of the *same kind* as that vouchsafed to the founders of Christianity induced Nicholas Storch to appoint twelve apostles from among his own followers, some being of his own trade. The more intelligent of that number were Marcus Stubner and Martin Cellarius, students from Wittenberg: always, of course, excepting the erratic Carlstadt.

[3] Above, pp. 39, 40.

[4] Ranke, III. 570 sq.

[5] Above, p. 111.

[6] Geijer, *Hist. of the Swedes*, by Turner, p. 112. The two emissaries were Knipperdolling, afterwards one of the leaders of the sanguinary fanatics of Münster, where his bones are still kept in an iron cage in the church-tower, and Melchior Rink, a disciple and colleague of Thomas Münzer: above, p. 40, n. 1.

[7] On the troubles that ensued see Brandt, *Reform.* I. 61 sq.; Ranke, III. 573 sq.; and Jochmus, *Gesch. der Kirchen-reformation zu Münster und ihres Untergangs durch die Wiedertäufer*, Münster, 1825.

ANA-BAPTISTS.

was their influence that in the month of February they possessed themselves of the supreme power by substituting for the old authorities a number of their own fraternity, chiefly peasants and unlettered artisans. Such of the inhabitants of Münster as demurred to these proceedings and afterwards refused to abjure their baptism were ruthlessly ejected in the depth of winter, every street re-echoing the fanatic cry, 'Out with the ungodly.' But the bishop of Münster, aided by some neighbouring princes, instantly resolved to strike a blow for the recovery of his jurisdiction. The city was beleaguered on all sides (May, **1534**); while John Bockhold of Leyden, an adventurer who had gradually been elevated at the instigation of Anabaptist 'prophets' to the rank of 'king of Sion,' inspired his frantic followers with a hope that God would signally interpose for the confusion of their enemies. This hope, however, was eventually disappointed. The fortifications of the town were stormed on the **24**th of June, **1535**; an awful carnage followed, and many leaders of the revolution shared the fate of their king, being tortured to death with red-hot pincers in the market-place of Münster. It is worthy of remark that in the rescue of the city from their dominion, Reformer and Romanist were fighting side by side,—a fact which tended in some measure to promote a better understanding between the two Confessions, or at least to shew the strong aversion of the Lutheran states to Anabaptist doctrines.

These doctrines had in truth assumed the most flagitious character. They may have been advocated here and there by simple-hearted Christians, who, captivated by the bright ideal of a Christian Church which filled the earliest dreams of Anabaptism, yielded their assent to its erroneous dogmas, without plunging into all the depths of immorality[1]; but the influence of that system on the many was disastrous and disgusting. It became, as modified by John of Leyden, a revolting compound of fanaticism and sensuality. The Bible was the only book there tolerated, and that on the condition that the orthodox interpretation

[1] Thus in the *Layman's Guide* of John Anastasius (Brandt, I. 99), the writer while deploring the errors of the Anabaptists, allows that even in Holland, 'some of them lived unblameably and died bravely for the articles which they believed to be Divine.'

ANA-BAPTISTS.

must be sought exclusively among the Anabaptist 'prophets'[1]. All who were admitted to the 'true baptism' had every thing in common. They were incorporated into a fraternity that was to constitute the germ of the Millennial kingdom; and in their monarch they accordingly beheld the representative of God Himself, the lord of all the earth. Yet these exalted visions had no power to check the outburst of the basest and the coarsest passions[2]. On the contrary, they served to madden and intoxicate their subjects. The abolition of all oaths and vows resulted in a general disregard of social and domestic obligations, and the union of depravity and bloodshed which appals us in the history of the Münster Anabaptists has scarcely any equal in the registers of human crime.

One result of their suppression in that city was the gradual abatement of their vehemence in preaching doctrines adverse to the general order of society. But in the meanwhile their feverish and unbridled speculations, varying often from each other, and related only by the wild confusion of ideas common to the great majority, had forced them into more direct collision with the central dogmas of the Church. Some of their extravagancies are most apparent as we trace the progress of the English reformation, which after the catastrophe of Münster, had begun to be affected by the Anabaptist leaven[3]: but they meet us also more or less in every district of the continent in which the same religious spirit was fermenting. Guided

[1] Ranke, III. 583.

[2] *Ibid.* 587 sq.

[3] See above, p. 182, and n. 1. The proclamation of 1538 adverts to their heresies in general terms; but two years later (see *Stat.* 32 Hen. VIII. c. 49, § 11) the following points are specified as held by persons then excluded from the king's pardon: 'That infants ought not to be baptized, and if they be baptized they ought to be rebaptized when they com to lawfull age: That it is not leafull for a Christen man to beare office or rule in the Commen 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 substaunce of our blessed lady: That Synners aftre baptisme cannot be restored by repentaunce: That every maner of Death, with the tyme and houre thereof, is so certainely prescribed, appointed and determyned to euery man of God, that neither any prince by his sworde can altre it, ne any man by his owne wilfulnes prevent or chaunge it: That all things be common and nothing severall.' Owing to this rigorous policy of Henry VIII., the Anabaptists made small progress in this country during his reign: but on the accession of Edward, they abounded in the south of England, more especially in Kent

ANA-BAPTISTS.

by their special hatred of all Lutheran tenets, one class of Anabaptists argued strongly for the freedom of the human will, rejected the doctrines of original sin[1] and the atonement, and even urged the competence of man to earn his own salvation by a course of virtuous living[2]. They assailed the common formula by which salvation was attributed to 'faith only'[3]. They rejected all the sterner views of God's predestination: they believed in the defectibility of Divine grace[4]. The agitation of these questions seems to have propelled another section of the Anabaptists into the denial of our blessed Lord's Divinity[5],—a phase of misbelief which will be noticed more at length hereafter.

In the former party the prevailing tone of thought was strongly rationalistic: but a second school was more inclined to mysticism. They started from a deep conviction

and Essex: *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. p. 87. On the character of their tenets, see Hooper's letter (June 25, 1549), *Ibid.* pp. 65, 66: and Lewis, *Hist. of the Rise and Progress of Anabaptism in England*, Lond. 1738.

[1] In addition to the authorities cited above, p. 251, n. 1, and p. 252, n. 1, see Hermann's *Consultation*, Lond. 1547, sign. t, iiii. sq. Writing of the Anabaptists he says: 'Bicause they admitte not original sinne, they also refuse the baptisme of chyldren, and in as muche as in them lyeth, they drawe awaye the moste parte of men from God and eternall saluation:' sign. t, vii; cf. v, ii. In like manner the eighth of the English Articles of 1552 complains 'that the Anabaptistes doe now a daies renue' the heresy of Pelagius. See also the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, De Hæresibus, c. 7, Oxon. 1850.

[2] One of the stoutest advocates of this view was Johannes Denk, a young and learned Anabaptist, whose doctrines were diffused in two or three years in the Rhine-district, in Switzerland, in Franconia, in Swabia, and even as far as Moravia: see an article by Heberle, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1855, 4tes Heft, pp. 817 sq. As Ranke had already observed (*Reform.* III. 559), 'the basis of his doctrine is, that God is love; which, he said, flesh and blood could never have understood, had it not been embodied in certain human beings, who might be called divine men, or the children of God. But in one of them, love was supremely exemplified;—in Jesus of Nazareth. He had never stumbled in the path marked out by God: He had never lost his unity with God: He was a Saviour of His people, for He was the forerunner of all those who would be saved. This was the meaning of the words, that all should be saved by Christ.'

[3] Möhler, on this account, welcomes them as to some extent among his own fellow-workers in demolishing Lutheranism: *Symbolik*, II. 165, Engl. transl.

[4] See a forcible statement of their reasons in John Knox's *Answer to a great nomber of blasphemous Cauillations*, &c. (1560), pp. 236 sq.

[5] The followers of Johannes Denk may be quoted as examples: see above, n. 2.

ANA-BAPTISTS.

that humanity was now degenerate and corrupt, but argued[1], that as the taint of evil is restricted to the 'flesh,' it cannot penetrate into the better and more spiritual province of man's being. In spite however of these dualistic distinctions, they felt that harmony can be effected between the two component elements of human nature. The task of bringing it about they allotted to the Saviour: and as it would seem, in order to secure that He should Himself be altogether sinless, they maintained that His humanity was peculiar[2], not consisting of flesh and blood which He derived from the substance of the Virgin. Their views respecting predestination were most rigorous[3], and they even pleaded that a man who is indeed regenerate[4] is exempted from the possibility of sinning, and remains the temple of the Holy Ghost whatever be the quality of his outward actions. One or both these schools were also 'universalists[5],' *i.e.* contended for the restoration of all things, and even for the ultimate conversion of the Evil Spirit. Others advo-

[1] Ranke, III. 563.

[2] See, for instance, Hooper's treatise (1549) entitled *A Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ*, Later Writings, ed. P. S., where this Docetic view is refuted. Joan of Kent was burnt for holding it (May 2, 1550). The heresy is thus stated in the *Reformatio Legum Eccl.* c. 5: 'Alii Eum sic Deum judicant ut hominem non agnoscant, et de corpore nugantur de cœlo Divinitus assumpto, et in virginis uterum lapso, quod tanquam in transitu per Mariam quasi per canalem aut fistulam præterfluxerit.'

[3] '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.' *Original Letters*, ed. P. S. pp. 65, 66.

[4] See, for instance, the propositions maintained by Champneys in Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 92, 93, ed. E. H. S. *Augsburg Confession*, Part I. Art. XII. and *Reform. Leg. Eccl.*, de Hæresibus, c. 9. The natural consequence of this tenet was 'antinomianism.' To shew the great variety of strange opinions that now agitated the Church, it is stated in the same chapter of the *Reformatio Legum* that other Anabaptists held an opposite view, *viz.* that sin after baptism, or regeneration, is possible, and when committed, absolutely unpardonable.

[5] 'Nec minor est illorum amentia, qui periculosam Origenis hæresim in hac ætate nostra rursus excitant; nimirum omnes homines (quantumcunque sceleribus se contaminaverint) salutem ad extremum consecuturos, cum definito tempore a justitia Divina pœnas de admissis flagitiis luerint.' *Reform. Leg.* c. xi. They sought to establish their theory on the terminability of future punishment partly by referring to abstract ideas of God and partly by broaching new interpretations of the word 'eternal' and other scriptural phraseology. See Heberle's article, above cited, pp. 826 sq. In p. 830, note, the arguments are summed up as follows: 'Gott könne und möge nicht ewig zürnen; so heisse *ewig* nicht immerwährend, sondern lang.'

ANA-BAPTISTS.

cated[1] the materialistic notion that souls will sleep throughout the interval between death and judgment. Others went so far[2] as to defend polygamy, as well as the community of goods, impugned the lawfulness of oaths and warfare, and denied the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate. Their unworthy speculations touching the authority of the Bible, the nature and efficacy of the sacraments, the office of the Church, the jurisdiction of the clergy, and all species of ecclesiastical discipline, we gather with sufficient clearness from the facts adverted to above. In short, if Anabaptism had prevailed, it would have reared its throne upon the ruins of all ancient institutions, and have trampled under foot the Word of God itself.

SECOND RACE OF ANABAPTISTS, OR MENNONITES.

Ere long, however, a new body of extreme reformers issued from obscurity, and occupied a prominent place in the commotions of the period. Unlike the earlier race of Anabaptists, they possessed a single leader, a more uniform and definite system of opinions, and an organization more coherent and compact. Their founder was a clergyman of Wittmarsum in Friesland, named Menno Symons or Simonis, who, after devoting a considerable time to the study of the New Testament[3], and the works of the Reformers, abandoned his pastoral duties at the age of forty (**1536**), and became the founder of a sect in Holland over whom he continued to preside till June **13, 1561.** Although his followers have in vain attempted to establish their antiquity[4] and independence of the Anabaptists

[1] *Reform. Leg.* c. xii. [2] *Ibid.* c. xiii.—xv.

[3] Among other lives of him there is one by a preacher of the Mennonite community, *Menno Symonis geschildert*, von B. K. Roosen, Leipzig, 1848. The best sources for their general history are found in Schyn's *Hist. Christianorum, qui in Belgio fœderato Mennonitæ appellantur*, Amstelodami, 1723; the same writer's *Hist. Mennon. plenior Deductio*, 1729; and Menno's *Works* (in Dutch), collected in 1646. After 1570 the Dutch name for the sect was 'Doopsgezinden'=Dippers.

[4] Thus Schyn (*Deductio*, c. 1) wishes to connect them with the early Christians, who are said to have rejected infant-baptism 'ex institutione Domini nostri Jesu Christi, exemplisque Apostolorum,' and also with the Waldenses. The resemblance in the latter case is not entirely destitute of point: see *Middle Age*, p. 294, n. 3, and for Peter of Bruis, *Ibid.* p. 290, n. 3.

MENNONITES.

proper, it must be at once conceded that the principles of the sect are free from nearly all the dark fanaticism which stains the records of the older party. The chimeras, rising out of their belief in a Millennium, were gradually exploded; and so far from advocating the idea of a continuous 'inspiration,' the Mennonites had soon grown notorious for their strict and even servile deference to the phraseology of the Bible. Menno, while distinguished for his zeal and industry, was far less cultivated than some other leaders of the period, and the practical bent of his own mind induced him to disparage human learning, to ridicule 'the wisdom of the worldlings,' and especially to throw aside a large proportion of the theological terminology then current in the schools[1]. It was impossible, however, for this system to maintain its ground, unless provided with some formal statement of the doctrines it was aiming to disseminate. Accordingly, in Menno's life-time, he contrasted portions of his own teaching with the corresponding dogmas of the Roman and Reformed communities[2]; and after his death the 'Confession of Waterland' drawn up in **1580** by two Mennonite preachers, Ris and Gerard, was accepted in many questions as the public test of orthodoxy[3]. It commences with a vague expression of belief in the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and Incarnation, and then determines that the *guilt* of Adam has not been transmitted to his progeny, although some taint of sinfulness was through his fall ingrained into the several members of the human

[1] See Menno's *Works*, pp. 666 sq., and other passages quoted in Gieseler, III. ii. p. 94, n. 8 (ed. Bonn). For example, they were opposed to all definitions respecting the Holy Trinity, and to such words as *ὑπόστασις* and 'Persona.' The same aversion to dogmatic statements, couched in phraseology not found in the holy Scripture, is still manifest even after they had been compelled to publish a confession of their faith (1580): cf. Schyn, *Deductio*, p. 82, where such words as *ὁμοούσιος* are repudiated, 'quia sacra Scriptura ea haud novit, et periculosum est de Deo aliis ac Scripturæ verbis loqui.' A similar feeling urged them to denounce the use of oaths &c., which they thought in violation of the letter of the Bible, to adopt the washing of the brethren's feet as an indispensable ceremony, and to reject infant-baptism as both 'superstitious and antichristian:' see Menno's *Works*, p. 882.

[2] The treatise was entitled *Van het rechte Christen geloove*, and appeared in 1556. The Lutherans he charges with holding that faith is alone necessary to salvation, and with gross departures from the moral law: the English and Zwinglians with serious errors respecting the Incarnation, with teaching that there are 'two Sons in Christ.'

[3] The Latin form in Schyn, *Hist. Christianorum*, etc. pp. 172 sq.

MENNONITES.

species, so as to disturb, without destroying, the equilibrium of the will[1]. The death of Christ is viewed as a propitiatory sacrifice, of which the benefits extend to all mankind without exception, he only failing in the end to profit by it, who through wilfulness refuses to embrace the offered mercy, and so dies incorrigible[2]. The faith which in their system constituted the subjective ground of pardon and justification, is a faith that 'worketh by love,'—a faith that leads men to participate in that true righteousness, which Christ, through the co-operation of the Holy Spirit, will infuse into the Christian soul[3]. Of such members, and of such alone, the Church of God consists, according to its proper definition[4]. It is also capable of being recognized by certain visible badges or mnemonic actions, called the sacraments, in respect of which Menno's language is in harmony with that of Zwingli and the earlier Swiss reformers[5]. Owing to his theory of original sin, no place was left for infant-baptism; but the ostensible ground, on which that usage was at first rejected both by him and by his followers, is said to be the absence of direct and unequivocal warrants in the writings of the New Testament[6]. Unlike the more fanatic race of Anabaptists, who considered that every Christian was entitled to assume the functions of a teacher, Menno entrusted the government of the system he had founded to a regular ministry, with strict injunctions that the several ordinances they prescribed should always be deducible from the letter of the Word of God[7]. But the connexion of Menno's principles with

[1] This appears to be the right interpretation of Art. IV. and Art. V. when taken together: cf. Möhler, II. 181, 182.

[2] Art. VII. The following extract will shew the nature of their tenets on the Divine decrees: 'Omnes, qui pœnitentes et credentes gratiosum istud Dei in Christo beneficium admittunt aut accipiunt, atque in ea perseverant, sunt et manent per Ejus misericordiam electi, de quibus Deus ante jacta mundi fundamenta decrevit, ut regni et gloriæ cœlestis participes evaderent.'

[3] Art. XX., Art. XXI. The difference, at least in phraseology, between the Mennonite and the Lutheran is here complete: cf. above, p. 259, n. 2.

[4] Art. XXIV.

[5] See Art. XXX. sq., and above, pp. 111 sq.

[6] Above, p. 259, n. 1.

[7] 'In hac sua sancta Ecclesia Christus ordinavit Ministerium Evangelicum, nempe doctrinam Verbi Divini, usum sacrorum Sacramentorum, curamque pauperum, ut et Ministros ad perfungendum istis ministeriis; atque insuper exercitium fraternæ allocutionis, punitionis et tandem

MENNONITES.

those of Anabaptism is betrayed at least in one particular, —in his speculations touching the nature of the civil and spiritual authorities, and their relation to each other. He taught obedience[1], it is true, to every officer of state in all things not actually prohibited by the Word of God; but so adverse in his eye were civil functions to the genius of the Gospel, and so incompatible with a belief in the reality of that spiritual kingdom which our Lord has constituted in the Church, that earnest Christians, he contended, could not with a safe conscience undertake the duties of the secular functionary, and were more especially precluded from engaging in all kinds of war.

The Mennonites[2] were broken, during the lifetime of their founder, into two parties, (1) the Waterlanders, or 'coarse' Mennonites, who afterwards became the leading sect, and flourished in that district of North Holland whence their name has been derived, and (2) the 'refined' Mennonites, who were chiefly Flemings, Frieslanders, and Germans; each of these again comprising a separate confraternity. They were all for some years exposed to sharp and sanguinary persecutions, chiefly owing to their reputed connexion with the earlier race of Anabaptists: but in Holland most of them were able to elicit some favours from William, prince of Orange, and ultimately obtained a formal toleration in **1626**. A few offshoots of the sect are also traceable in other regions, in Switzerland, in the Palatinate, and even in Moravia, from whence, after being

amotionis eorum, qui in impœnitentia perseverant: quæ ordinationes in Verbo Dei conceptæ solummodo juxta sensum ejusdem Verbi exequendæ sunt.' Art. xxv.

[1] Art. xxxvii. After stating that we must pray for those in authority, and pay taxes &c. without murmuring, the article proceeds: 'Potestatem hanc politicam Dominus Jesus in regno Suo spirituali, Ecclesia Novi Testamenti, non instituit, neque hanc officiis Ecclesiæ Suæ adjunxit: neque discipulos aut sequaces Suos ad regalem, ducalem, vel aliam vocavit...sed passim ab Eo (Cui voce e cœlo audita auscultandum erat) vocantur ad imitationem inermis Ejus vitæ et vestigia crucem ferentia; et in Quo nihil minus apparuit, quam mundanum regnum, potestas et gladius. Hisce omnibus igitur exacte perpensis (atque insuper, non pauca cum munere potestatis politicæ conjuncta esse, ut bellum gerere, hostibus bona et vitam eripere etc. quæ vitæ Christianorum, qui mundo mortui esse debent, aut male aut plane non conveniunt), hinc a talibus officiis et administrationibus nos subducimus.'

[2] The authorities for the subsequent history of the Mennonites are as above, p. 258, n. 3. Cf. Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* III. 136, sq.

MENNONITES.

roughly handled, they were all extruded by Ferdinand II. in **1622**, and driven into Hungary and Transylvania.

SOCINIANS.

The same initial impulse, that gave birth to all the varied and conflicting forms of Anabaptism, stimulated somewhat different tendencies in persons whom we may consider the precursors of the Unitarians, or Socinians. They constitute the rationalistic party of that stirring epoch. What the Anabaptist had been anxious to effect by the remodelling of social life, the Antitrinitarian for the most part dreamed of doing by the expurgation of theology[1]. Devoted in some cases to the study of the pagan writers, and exulting in the consciousness of intellectual freedom, he either overleapt or trampled underfoot those ancient boundaries by which the supernatural elements of Christianity were fenced from the intrusions of irreverent criticism. At first, however, some of the promoters of the heresy were actuated by reasons which contained a very large admixture of the Anabaptist spirit. John Denk[2], whose writings more than those of any other person influenced the development of the rationalistic phase of Anabaptism, had impugned the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and laboured to establish a belief in the simple manhood of our blessed Saviour. Others, who were also ranked with Anabaptists, pushed their speculations into the same mysterious provinces,

[1] See Trechsel's works *Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier* (1st Book, including Servetus and his predecessors, Heidelberg, 1839: 2nd Book, extending as far as the elder Socinus, Heidelberg, 1844). Möhler (*Symbolik*, II. 322) contends with justice that Socinianism 'bequeathed to a later period the work of its own consummation, namely, the entire abandonment of those elements of supernaturalism, which in its origin it had not wholly rejected:' but when he urges that Socinianism itself is a legitimate product of the Reformation, he forgets the real parent and the circumstances of the birth. Socinianism, as modified by the Socini, came from Italy, where long before the outbreak of the Lutheran movement, scepticism and infidelity had been most rife: see above, p. 96. Zanchi, himself an Italian (above, p. 99, n. 3) complained to Bullinger, when writing from Chiavenna, of the heterodoxy of his countrymen on these subjects, and used to say, 'Hispania [the birth-place of Servetus] gallinas peperit, Italia fovet ova, nos jam pipientes pullos audimus:' quoted in Gieseler, III. ii. p. 62, n. 6 (ed. Bonn).

[2] Above, p. 256, n. 2. Hetzer, one of Denk's associates, espoused the same tenets and was executed in 1529 at Constance.

SOCINIANS.

adopting[1] in one case the misbelief of Arius, in a second that of Sabellius, in a third that of Photinus. Among the earliest works in which the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was openly assailed is the *De Trinitatis Erroribus* of an Aragonese physician named Servede[2] (Servetus), which appeared in **1531**. Its author had accompanied Charles V. to Italy in **1529**, and in the following year took up his residence at Basel, where he allied himself with the Reformers. The notions which he there elaborated spread in many quarters, and more especially infected a considerable number of persons in Lombardy[3], all of whom were dissatisfied with the present aspects of religion, and anxious to reform the Church by striking at the root of creeds and catechisms, as well as by repudiating infant-baptism and the current views on justification. Of these misbelievers the greater part, including Bernardino Ochino[4], were gradually ejected by the Inquisition, and betaking themselves to Switzerland procured a shelter in the Grisons, at Zürich, and also at Geneva[5], in which town Servetus after many wanderings[6] was at last committed to the flames upon a charge of blasphemy (Oct. **27**, **1553**). Meanwhile a fresh asylum was discovered by the leading spirits of this school in some of the chief towns of Poland. A literary club[7], of which the president was an Italian, Lismanini, provincial of the order of Franciscans, seems to have been the first arena where the doctrine of the Holy Trinity was openly

[1] Trechsel, as above, Bk. I. § I.

[2] See references, as above, p. 118, n. 2.

[3] Trechsel, Bk. II. p. 391. The doctrines rejected by these Antitrinitarians were said to have been imported into Christianity 'per philosophos Græcos.'

[4] Above, p. 99, n. 3, and Trechsel, Bk. II. pp. 221 sq.

[5] A community of Antitrinitarians began to form in Geneva as early as 1542, which was the year when the Inquisition instituted its first proceedings against them: Trechsel, Bk. II. p. 280.

[6] After leaving Basel he travelled in France under the name of Michael de Villeneuve, settling at last in Vienne, where he published (1553) his *Christianismi Restitutio: totius ecclesiæ apostolicæ ad sua limina vocatio* etc. This work abounds in wild and impious speculations, and exposed the author to the officers of the Inquisition, from whom, however, he escaped and fled for refuge to Geneva. A similar execution took place at Bern in 1566, when John Valentinus Gentilis was beheaded for uttering Antitrinitarian doctrines. See the contemporary narrative of Benedict Aretius, entitled *Valent. Gentilis justo capitis supplicio Bernæ affecti brevis historia*, Genevæ, 1567.

[7] Above, p. 83, n. 2, and p. 84, n. 4.

SOCINIANS.

called in question, and the agitations thus occasioned were aggravated during the visit of another Italian, Lælius Socinus[1], in **1551**. But the latter had suggested rather than avowed the heresy with which his name was afterwards associated, leaving his nephew, Faustus Socinus[2], who settled at Cracow in **1579**, to fix the special character of the Unitarian creed, to harmonise discordant views with reference to the nature and the offices of Christ, and thus by giving to their system a colder tone and a more critical direction, to separate it altogether from the feverish agitations of the day.

Among the principal characteristics of Socinianism, as represented in his works and those of his immediate followers[3], we notice the comparatively high position there awarded to the teaching of the Bible[4]. Some inaccuracies they granted may have crept into it here and there, but only with respect to smaller matters which in no degree abate its paramount authority[5]. Yet this admission in the judgment of Socinians was compatible with a denial of

[1] He was a native of Siena, but fled from Italy in 1547. He afterwards travelled in Switzerland, France, England and Belgium, and was in Poland during part of the year 1551 and again in 1558. His chief residence however was at Zürich, where he managed to conceal his heretical opinions, and died May 14, 1562.

[2] He survived till 1604. See the short *Life* by a Polish knight, Przypcovius, prefixed to the *Works* of Faustus Socinus (in two volumes, folio), Irenopoli, 1656; and Toulmin's *Memoirs of the Life, Character, &c. of Faustus Socinus*, Lond. 1777. The expulsion of the entire sect from Poland in 1658 and the 'establishment' of Socinianism in Transylvania have been noticed already, p. 85, n. 1, and p. 92.

[3] Their writings are all collected in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, quos Unitarios vocant*, Irenop. 1656. That which approaches most nearly to the character of a symbolical book is the *Racovian Catechism;* above, p. 85, and Toulmin, pp. 258 sq.

[4] For example, Faustus Socinus declares (Opp. II. 362) that he regarded 'God only as his Instructor, and the sacred Scriptures as his only guide:' see other passages to the same effect in Toulmin, pp. 162 sq. The authority of the Bible as a genuine revelation is also strongly affirmed in his (unfinished) *Lectiones Sacræ;* Opp. I. 290, col. 2, where he even urges that 'reason' can hardly be adduced in opposition to Divine truths, 'cum Christiana religio non humanæ rationi ullo pacto innitatur, sed tota *ex voluntate Dei pendeat, et ex ipsius patefactione.*'

[5] Thus with regard to the alleged discrepancies in the Gospels, Socinus wrote as follows (*De Auctoritate S. Scripturæ*, Opp. I. 267, col. 1): 'Dico igitur, quod attinet ad repugnantias aut diversitates, quæ in Novi Testamenti scriptis inveniantur, nullam esse, quæ aut non videatur quidem vera, sed tamen non sit, aut non in re sit parvi, seu potius nullius momenti.'

SOCINIANS.

our blessed Lord's Divinity. They looked upon Him as a man, although, as it was acknowledged, not a *mere* man, seeing that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and therefore may be called, and is, the Son of God[1]. Before entering on His public labours, He was thought to have been elevated into the immediate presence of God Himself, in order that He might be there invested with authority; and as the high reward of the obedience which He shewed in His capacity of Pattern-man, of Teacher, and of Legislator, He was finally admitted to a share of the Divine sovereignty, and made in one sense equal with the Father. For this reason we may fairly be required[2] to offer Christ a secondary kind of adoration, provided only that it never trenches on the worship which we pay to God Himself. Socinus in like manner denied the personality and proper Godhead of the Holy Spirit, and betrayed inadequate conceptions touching the nature and efficacy of Divine grace. Original sin[3] had not been recognized in the construction of his system: neither did he view the death of Christ as in any way conducing to the re-establishment of those relations between God and man which are subverted by iniquity. Christ, it is conceded, by virtue of His bright example urges men to acts of self-denial and the practice of repentance, and by His powerful intercession helps them to subdue the evil tendencies of their nature; but every trace[4] of mediation and satisfaction being

[1] See, for instance, the chapter of the *Racovian Catechism*, 'De Cognitione Christi,' where examples will be found of that shallow and in many cases violent criticism, by which the principal texts declaring our Saviour's pre-existence and Divine nature are explained away.

[2] The strong convictions of Socinus on this point are fully stated in his controversy with a section of his followers who were distinguished as the 'Non adorantes:' see the *Disputatio inter F. S. et Christianum Francken, de honore Christi* (Opp. II. 767 sq.; cf. Toulmin, pp. 332, 333), and more especially *De Jesu Christi invocatione* etc., a disputation between Socinus and Francis David, superintendent of the Unitarians in Transylvania (Opp. II. 709 sq.).

[3] Opp. II. 540, 541.

[4] Thus the *Racovian Catechism* in cap. viii. ('De Morte Christi'), after pointing out how the death of Christ was necessary in order to teach us how to die and to confirm the promise of God to man, asks the question: 'Nonne est etiam aliqua alia mortis Christi causa?' To which the answer is, 'Nulla prorsus: etsi nunc vulgo Christiani sentiunt, Christum morte Sua nobis salutem meruisse, et pro peccatis nostris plenarie satisfecisse, quæ sententia fallax est, et erronea, et admodum perniciosa:' cf. Toulmin, pp. 178 sq.

SOCINIANS.

thus obliterated, the justification of the sinner is ascribed to a forensic act of God, by which he graciously remits the penal consequences of transgression to all persons who, from faith in Christ as the Revealer, have fulfilled the precepts of the moral law[1]. The teaching of Socinus on many kindred questions (such, for instance, as the doctrine of the sacraments[2]) may be inferred from what is known already of his system. In one respect he seems to have originated a theory widely different from that of the rationalistic school of Anabaptists, whom at other times he followed. He affirmed the ultimate annihilation of the damned; whereas they commonly explained[3] the word 'eternal' in such a manner as to warrant a belief in the corrigibility and therefore in the actual restoration of all created beings.

SCHWENCKFELDIANS.

The founder of this sect of mystics was Caspar Schwenckfeld[4], a Silesian noble, born in **1490**. At the earliest outbreak of the Reformation, he allied himself with Lutheranism, contributing to the success which it experienced in his neighbourhood. His mind, however, was ill-balanced, hasty and fanatical; and perplexed by the portentous aspects of the Eucharistic controversy which opened in **1525**, he fancied that the true solution of the mystery[5] involved in our Saviour's language was communicated to himself by a particular revelation. According to his view the sacraments are not media or conductors by which God imparts to man the supernatural gifts of grace; but, on the contrary, these gifts come down into the soul of

[1] See Möhler's investigation of this point (II. 340, 341), where he rejoices to find Socinus refuting 'the Protestant doctrine on faith and works.'

[2] See his treatise *De Ecclesia*, Opp. I. 350, 351.

[3] Above, p. 257, n. 5.

[4] See J. Wigand, *De Schwenckfeldismo*, Lipsiæ, 1587, and Erbkam, *Gesch. der protestant. Sekten in Zeitalter der Reformation*, Hamburg, 1848, pp. 357 sq.

[5] Erbkam, p. 360, where an account is given of his intercourse with Luther and Bugenhagen at Wittenberg on the sacramental question. His own leanings were then in the direction of Zwinglianism, for in his interpretation of the 'words of institution,' he made τοῦτο the predicate ('what bread is, that is my Body, *viz.* food').

SCHWENCK-FELDIANS.

the regenerate *immediately*, or rather spring up in it, owing to the inhabitation of the Word of God, who therefore can dispense with[1] the external Word contained in holy Scripture, as well as with all other species of 'creaturely' intervention. The root of these notions lay in wild and half-Docetic views respecting the Incarnation of our blessed Lord. Schwenckfeld, it is true, defended himself against the imputation of denying the humanity entirely; but he nevertheless persisted in affirming that the flesh of Christ is not the flesh of a created being[2]; that the mortal nature He inherited from His Virgin-mother was only the transient form assumed by a humanity which came from heaven, and had its origin in God the Father; and that in His present state of glorification, His whole being is so deified, that even the human nature is properly Divine, though not confounded altogether with the Godhead[3]. Christ, the Logos, having thus entered into the line of humanity, and invested it with an ineffable glory, is the life and sustenance of all regenerate spirits, dwells in them continually, becomes to them the root of righteousness, and so prepares them for a full participation of the Divine essence and perfections.

Although the author of these transcendental tenets had numerous followers in Silesia, he was himself compelled to quit the country in **1528**. We next find him consorting with various sections of the Anabaptists[4], and occasionally with

[1] He declares that the 'almighty eternal Word proceeds out of the mouth of God directly and immediately, and not through the Scripture, external Word, sacrament or any other created thing ('kreatürlichkeit') in earth or heaven:' see the German original in Gieseler, III. ii. p. 104, n. 5 (ed. Bonn). He rejected the Lutheran view of justification on the same ground, as too historical, resting too much on promises contained in a cold and lifeless document: *Ibid.* p. 109, n. 10. Bp. Alley was probably referring to this peculiarity when he spoke of 'Swinckfeldians and other fantasticall heades, which do depraue the holye Scripture:' *Poore Man's Librarie*, I. 171, a. Lond., 1565; cf. John Knox's account of his interview with an Anabaptist in London 'the winter before the death of king Edward:' *Answer to a great nomber of blasphe nous Cauillations*, &c. pp. 405 sq.

[2] See Dorner's investigation of this dogma in his *Entwicklungs-gesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi*, pp. 207 sq. Stuttgart, 1839, and Hahn's *Schwenckfeldii sententia de Christi Persona*, Vratislav. [Breslau], 1847.

[3] His own explanations may be seen in his *Confession*, of which extracts are printed in Gieseler, as above, pp. 104—108.

[4] Ranke (*Reform.* III. 563) thinks it highly probable that Schwenckfeld's influence contributed largely to the development of the more

SCHWENCK-FELDIANS.

Swiss Reformers; yet none of them appear to have entirely satisfied his theory of religion. About the year **1540**, when the chief positions he had occupied were understood by the Reformers, Schwenckfeld was denounced as a Eutychian heretic[1]; and in spite of all the sympathy which he exacted here and there by his unblemished life and earnestness of purpose, these denunciations were continually repeated[2] after his death, which took place on the **10**th of December, **1562.**

FAMILY OF LOVE.

A coarser species of fanaticism is traceable to one David George[3], or Joris, a native of Delft in Holland, who was born as early as **1501**. In **1536** he made himself conspicuous by laying claim to special revelations, and attempting to compose the differences which separated the two branches of Dutch Anabaptism[4]; and soon afterwards proceeded with untiring diligence to organize a system of his own. Three years later he was driven out of East Friesland, and ultimately to Basel, where, assuming a new name, he passed, until his death, in **1556**, as one of the Reformers. The main peculiarity of this adventurer consisted[5] in affirm-

mystical forms of Anabaptism (see above, pp. 257, 258), according to which the body of Christ was not created, but derived from heaven. And it is certain that Melchior Hoffmann, who headed this party until his imprisonment at Strasburg (1533), acknowledged Schwenckfeld as his coadjutor.

[1] See, for instance, Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschn. IX. 324 sq. In the Kirchen-Ordnung of Brunswick (cited above, p. 68, n. 5) the 'Schwenckfeldianer' are denounced with other misbelievers.

[2] Thus, their errors are solemnly repudiated in the Appendix to the *Formula Concordiæ* (Francke, *Libri Symbol. Eccl. Luther.* Part III. pp. 214, 215). In addition to the points above mentioned, they were charged with holding that a man truly regenerate can fulfil the whole law, that a Church cannot exist without active power of excommunication, and that ministers cannot officiate rightly who are not truly renovated, just and pious.

[3] See the *Historia vitæ, doctrinæ ac rerum gestarum Davidis Georgii hæresiarchæ*, by Nicolas Blesdyk, his son-in-law, Deventr. 1642, and a still earlier *Life* (German and Latin) composed in 1559 'durch den Rector und die Universität einer löblichen Stadt Basel.' His name was perpetuated in *Davidistæ* and *Davidians*, of which the former occurs in the *Liturgia Peregrinorum Francofordiæ* (ed. 1555), and the latter in Becon's *Works*, ed. P. S. p. 415. A more contemptuous title of the sect was 'Davists.'

[4] Brandt, *Reform.* I. 74 sq.

[5] His works are all in Dutch (the principal being *T' Wonderboeck*,

ing that he was the second David, in whom as the Messiah, born after the Spirit, ancient prophecy would reach its true accomplishment. The Word of God, he argued, was in him exhibited with all its spirituality; and therefore he was sent into the world to raise men out of their subjection to the introductory œconomies, such as had been instituted under the Old and New Testaments: and thus securing for his followers a complete emancipation from every phase of legalism, he preached a new and higher dispensation which was to be characterised by perfect righteousness and perfect love. But long before the death of David George, the principles of these Libertines, as they were now occasionally styled, had found a second advocate in Henry Niclas, or Nicholas, born at Amsterdam. Quitting his birthplace in **1533**, he fled, on the suppression of the Münster Anabaptists, to Emden in West Friesland, where he undertook, in a series of fantastic publications, to combat all existing varieties of religion[1], whether Romish or Reformed, and thus establish what he termed the Family of Love[2]. After the Low Countries[3], England was the theatre in which this sect appears to have obtained the greatest number of adherents. As early as **1552** it gained a footing

FAMILY OF LOVE.

published in 1542, and again, with additions, in 1550): see extracts and references in Gieseler, III. ii. p. 54, n. 9 (ed. Bonn). On his 'life and doings,' see *The Displaying of an horrible sect of grosse and wicked Heretiques, naming themselues the Family of Loue*, &c. by J. R. [John Rogers], Lond. 1579, sign. A iiii. sq.

[1] 'Henrie gaue himselfe to writing of bookes, which he put in print, especially one among the rest, which was the chiefe, called *The glasse of righteousnes* the lesse: for he compiled two bookes of that title, wherein he certifieth his Familie of loue, that they must passe foure most terrible castels ful of combersome enemies, before they come to the house of loue: the first is *John Caluine*, the seconde the Papistes, the third *Martin Luther*, y^e^ fourth y^e^ *Anabaptists:* and passing these daungers they may be of the familie, else not: this is testified by a man of credite, one *Adrian Gisling*, who did read the same in a Dutche booke' &c. Rogers, *Ibid.* A iiii. b.

[2] One of those which rendered him notorious was entitled *Euangelium Regni, the Gospel and ioyfull message of the kingdome.* See the large extracts from it in Knewstub's *Confutation of monstrous and horrible heresies, taught by H. N. and embraced of a number, who call themselues the Familie of Loue*, London, 1579. Another work 'translated out of Base Almain' and circulated in England, was the '*Memorabilia Opera Dei:* certaine wonderfull Works of God which hapned to H. N. even from his youth,' &c., 'published [without date] by Tobias, a Fellow Elder with H. N. in the Household of Love.'

[3] See Brandt, *Reform.* I. 105.

FAMILY OF LOVE.

in Kent[1], and notwithstanding the strenuous efforts of Cranmer and the royal Council, was extensively propagated in some other districts. In the reign of Mary, traces of it were detected in the town of Colchester[2], in the Isle of Ely, and in various districts of the Eastern Counties; and more than once during the reign of Elizabeth[3] it threatened to diffuse itself in all parts of England, culminating about the year **1579**. The main positions of the sect as modified by Henry Niclas were substantially the same as those already noticed. It shewed itself a compound of principles derived from the more mystical schools of Anabaptism and of the most sweeping Antinomianism. Relying on a series of special revelations, the Familists explained away the 'letter of the Bible;' affirming, for example[4], that the birth of Christ 'of the Virgin Mary out of the seed of David,' means only the promulgation of 'pure doctrine out of the seed of love.' Although the conduct of some members was apparently correct and irreproachable[5], 'divers fell

[1] Strype's *Cranmer*, II. 410, ed. E. H. S.

[2] See the remarkable narrative of William Wilkinson, entitled *A Confutation of certaine Articles deliuered vnto the Familye of Loue, with the exposition of Theophilus, a supposed Elder in the sayd Familye vpon the same Articles*, Lond. 1579, ☞ iii. sq. [For the use of this and other scarce tracts relating to the Familists, the writer was indebted to Dr Corrie, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge.]

[3] For a royal proclamation 'against the Sectaries of the Family of Love' bearing date Oct. 3, 1580, see Wilkins, IV. 297. 'In many shires of this our countrie,' writes Rogers (*Pref.* A iii. b), 'there are meetings and conventicles of this familie of love, and into what number they are grown, my heart reweth to speake,' &c.: cf. Parker's *Correspondence*, ed. P. S. pp. 61, 321, and Stowe's *Chron.* p. 679, the latter of whom narrates 'the disclosing of Dutch Anabaptists.'

[4] See the form of abjuration in Wilkins, IV. 296. The numerous points contested by the Familists may be inferred from the running titles in Wilkinson's *Confutation* (see n. 2), 'No Church,' 'No Truth,' 'No Baptisme,' 'No Ministrie,' 'Of uniting into God,' 'Blasphemy,' 'H. N. Da[vid] Ge[orge] his scholler,' 'H. N. an heretique,' 'No learning,' 'H. N. must be beleued,' 'Reuelations,' 'Of Shrift,' 'Gospel a literal seruice,' 'Scripture learned,' 'Religion dissembled,' 'Libertie to sinne,' 'Libertines,' 'Lyfe proveth not Religion,' 'Triall by Scripture,' 'Heretickes punished.'

[5] This is reluctantly admitted, for example, by Wilkinson, in his *Epistle Dedicatorie;* and in 'the judgement of a godly learned man, W. C.,' prefixed to Knewstub's work (as above, p. 269, n. 2), we have the following passage: 'But howsoever they seduce some goodly and zealous men and women of honest and godly conuersation, placing them at the porch of their Synagogue, to make a shewe of holinesse, and to stand there as baites and stalles to deceive others: yet alas who can

into gross and enormous practices; pretending in excuse thereof that they could, without evil, commit the same act which was sin in another to do[1].' On this account especially they were exposed to the tribunals of the bishops and the civil magistracy, and in the course of the next generation the sect appears to have gradually died out[2].

FAMILY OF LOVE.

BROWNISTS, OR INDEPENDENTS.

Robert Browne[3], although he did not graduate in Cambridge, was a member of Corpus Christi College. There, attracted by the zeal and talents of Thomas Cartwright, he allied himself with the earlier race of English Puritans, and swelled the clamour they were raising against the liturgy, the ritual and the organization of the Church[4]. As early as **1571**, the founder of the Brownists, then domestic chaplain to the duke of Norfolk, refused to sign those Articles of Religion[5] which related to public worship and ecclesiastical government. In **1581** the violence of his invectives against the whole church-system led to his temporary incarceration at Norwich. About the same time he put forth a *Treatise on Reformation without tarrying for any*[6], which brought him once more under the sentence of the magistrate, and after his dismissal he reverted

without blushing vtter the shame that is committed in the inwarde roomes, and as it were in the heart of that Synagogue of Satan?'

[1] Such is the confession of William Penn (*Pref.* to the *Journal of George Fox*, I. 7, 8, Lond. 1852), who finds, however, many germs of truth among the mystics of the sixteenth century.

[2] One of their last assailants was Henry More, in his *Mystery of Iniquity*, *e. g.* pp. 187, 188, Lond. 1664.

[3] On the founder of Brownism and its early fortunes, see Neale, *Hist. of the Puritans*, I. 374 sq. Lond. 1732; Heylin, *Hist. of the Presbyterians*, pp. 295 sq. Oxf. 1670; and Hanbury's *Hist. Memorials relating to the Independents*, I. 18 sq. Lond. 1839. Fuller (*Church Hist.* Cent. XVI. pp. 166 sq. Lond. 1656) may also be consulted. Browne, he says, returned from Zealand 'with a full crie against the Church of England, as having so much of Rome, she had nothing of Christ in her discipline.'

[4] See above, pp. 233 sq.

[5] Neale, I. 280.

[6] In 1582 appeared at Middleburg, where the press was unrestrained, *A Book which sheweth the Life & Manners of all true Christians*. Browne, the author, seems to have been already on the Continent. In 1584 he retreated to Scotland, and perhaps in 1585 to England: Hanbury, p. 23.

BROWNISTS.

to his former courses, traversing the country and denouncing bishops, vestments, ecclesiastical courts, and other matters then distasteful to the Puritans[1]. He next attempted to establish a separate congregation, where his principles might be fully carried out; but on perceiving the approach of danger he fled with some of his admirers to Middleburg, near Flushing, where a party of Englishmen united in acts of worship on the model recommended by himself and Cartwright[2]. He did not, however, experience the satisfaction he expected, and about **1585** we find him in his native country, where he was reconciled to the community he formerly maligned, and instituted to the rectory of Thorpe-Achurch, near Oundle in Northamptonshire (**1591**)[3]. But his conformity was not fatal to the sect he had established. Many of his followers continued to meet together in various parts of England[4], and after being persecuted with great severity, were driven across the Channel, and settled at Amsterdam and other parts of Holland about the year **1595**[5].

The controversies of this body with the English theologians did not involve discussions of specific dogmas. They held[6] indeed that the church-system was full of

[1] It is to this period that John Prime refers in his *Exposition and Observations vpon Saint Paul to the Galathians* (Oxf. 1587), pp. 248, 249, writing of 'Brown that shameles reuiler of our sacraments, a railer at our ministerie, that saucy reproacher of the state and parliament by name, and the very divider, as much as in him lieth, of the body of Christ which is His Church.'

[2] A new Prayer-Book, derived from the Genevan form of Calvin, was drawn up ostensibly for the sole use of this body of Nonconformists in 1586: see P. Hall's *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, Vol. I. Bath, 1847.

[3] Browne was excommunicated by Lindsell, bishop of Peterborough, about 1590, and so great an impression did this act make upon him that he sought for readmission to the Church. It is thought by some, however, that his conformity was hollow, and that his subsequent preferment was due to the influence of Thomas Lord Burghley, afterwards Earl of Exeter, his patron and kinsman. He died at last (1630) on his way to Northampton gaol, whither he was committed for a breach of the peace. Heylin, p. 297.

[4] Sir Walter Raleigh (quoted in Neale, I. 543) estimated their number in 1592 at 20,000, dispersed chiefly in Norfolk and Essex.

[5] Brandt, *Reform.* I. 479, who gives the eleven Articles alleged by the Brownists in justification of their schism. On their previous sufferings see Neale, I. 379, 389, 545 sq.

[6] See, among other evidence, a controversy between Francis Johnson, a Brownist, and H. Jacob. Jacob's chief work is entitled *A defence of the churche and ministery of Englande*, Middleburg, 1599. Johnson

BROWNISTS.

'antichristian abominations,' that the Prayer-Book was substantially the pope's mass-book, that ordination according to the present form was blasphemous, and therefore that the Church of England had entirely forfeited its Christian character: yet one ground on which they rested their secession was the principle that every congregation of Christian men constitutes a Church, of which all the members are equal, and equally entitled to govern and instruct themselves. Hence their preachers were simple delegates of the congregation made and unmade by the popular voice, and only authorized to minister within the limits thus prescribed to them. These democratic elements, inherent more or less in the constitution of Reformed communities, at length obtained a perfect mastery in England during the time of the Great Rebellion.

published an answer in the following year. In George Gyfford's *Short Reply vnto the last printed books of Henry Barrow and John Greenwood, the chief ringleaders of our Donatists in England* (Lond. 1591), we have other indications of the state of feeling among these early Nonconformists. Two of the charges brought against them are as follows (p. 97): 'That ye say the best part of the booke of common praier is no better then a peece of swines flesh, and abomination to the Lord.' 'That ye say the greatest minister hath no more power to binde or loose the least member, than the said member hath to binde or loose him; and so with the Swinckfeldians, destroy the whole power of the ministry:' cf. *Egerton Papers* (ed. Lond. Camd. Soc. 1840) pp. 166 sq.

CHAPTER VI.

THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.

MEDIATING PARTY.

WHILE some who had originally embraced the principles of Luther were disposed to push them into scandalous consequences, and while others used them as a cloak of heresy and a pretext for the wildest innovations, a different party, hovering on the opposite borders of the Reformation-movement, shewed a very keen desire to check the progress of confusion, and if possible to re-establish concord in those quarters where the central facts and verities of Christianity were held alike by all the combatants.

Erasmus and his principles.

At the head of this mediating school[1] was Desiderius Erasmus, whom we saw[2] allied with the Saxon and Swiss Reformers in the opening stages of their work, but afterwards recoiling from many of their positions and evincing no wish to break entirely from the Mediæval system. The plan of reconciliation he propounded was of course provisional, designed to terminate as soon as the prevailing doubts could be authoritatively settled by the convocation of a council fairly representing all branches of the Western Church. Till then at least he pleaded for much greater latitude in points of doctrine[3]; he recommended the curtailment of those rites and usages which gave offence

[1] See Tabaraud's *Hist. critique des projets formés depuis trois cents ans pour la réunion des Communions Chrétiennes* (Paris, 1824), ch. ix.

[2] Above, p. 43, and n. 2. The treatise there referred to seems to have been his commentary on the 83rd Psalm, which he dedicated under the title *De amabili Ecclesiæ Concordia Liber.* Tabaraud, p. 288.

[3] He dwells on the same topic in an epistle written 'ad J. Carondiletum, archiep. Panormitanum' as far back as 1522 (*Epist.* Lib. XXVIII. Ep. 8): 'Imo hoc demum est eruditionis theologicæ, nihil ultra quam *sacris literis* proditum est definire, verum id quod proditum est bona fide dispensare. Multa problemata nunc rejiciuntur ad synodum *οἰκουμενικήν*: multo magis conveniebat quæstiones ejusmodi in illud rejicere tempus, cum sublato speculo et ænigmate videbimus Deum de facie.'

MEDIATING PARTY.

to the Reformers and ministered to superstition; but was, notwithstanding, anxious at all hazards to reduce the vehemence of controversy and preserve intact the visible unity of Christendom.

Wizel.

Another of these moderators was George Wizel[1] (Vicelius), who as early as **1525** officiated as a Lutheran pastor, but abandoned his calling at the end of six years, apparently through apprehension lest some branches of the 'new learning,' and more especially the doctrine of justification as stated by the Wittenbergers, might issue in licentiousness of life and civil anarchy. In **1533** he published[2] his *Methodus concordiæ ecclesiasticæ*, and subsequently in **1564** a kindred work entitled *Via Regia*. His object was to bring about a general pacification, by recalling men to the more earnest study of the Bible and the earlier Fathers, instead of the Mediæval class-books then current in the schools[3]; by using the vulgar tongue in public worship; by reducing the number of private masses; by reforming the whole system of indulgences; by forbidding all direct addresses to the saints; by expurgating the legenda; and in other ways conciliating the moderate party of Reformers, so as to attract them into union with the system from which they had been deeply alienated, if not forcibly expelled.

his chief suggestions.

But one of the most active, candid, and intelligent

[1] See Neander's *Comment. de G. Vicelio*, Berol. 1839.

[2] Tabaraud, pp. 295 sq. Both these treatises (with others by the same writer) are reprinted in Brown's *Fasciculus*, II. 703 sq. In his *Adhortatio ad Concilium* (*Ibid.* p. 783), he expresses a hope that the schism will be quickly healed: 'Nec diffido facile reduci posse, si amputentur modo superstitiosa, inutilia, perniciosa, immodica, idque dolenter magis, quam inimice. Audio undique qui percupiant redire, si non ita deterrerent odiosa offendicula.'

[3] Thus he commences his *Methodus Concordiæ* (in Brown, p. 752) as follows: 'Ecclesia contra concedat aliquid parti, in excussione dogmatum, quæ vocant scholastica, quibus multi tragicum hoc et immane sæculum acceptum ferunt. Nam si moderni theologi prisca theologia contenti esse quam recentem excogitare maluissent, vix fuisset tot hæresibus pressa Ecclesia. Carere ea absque detrimento potest multis vocum inanitatibus, quas sæculis aliquot præter necessitatem invenit monastica atque academica scientia, et inventas imprudenter ingessit quorundam fastus, adeo ut carnificinæ simul et gehennæ tradatur ovicula Christi, quæ illas non certo crediderit. Suaserim itaque sobrietatem iis, qui e scholis supersunt. Ineant obsecro cum animo suo rationem, quam minime Christianæ professioni congruat, non solum novum docendi genus invehere, verum etiam nova quædam docere quæ nescivit antiquitas.'

MEDIATING PARTY.

Cassander.

advocates of reconciliation was George Cassander[1], born in the Low Countries (**1515**). To this object he devoted his whole life, in spite of the continual animadversions which his writings elicited from both the parties whom he wished to mollify and reunite. His principal work was undertaken at the request of the emperor Ferdinand I., who, finding himself comparatively independent of the Papal court[2], attempted to propitiate his Lutheran subjects in the closing year of his reign (**1564**). With this object he employed Cassander, then engaged at Duisburg on a similar errand[3], to draw up a summary of Christian doctrine, in the order of the Augsburg Confession, so as to mark those articles in which there was a prospect of agreement. Hence the famous *Consultatio de Articulis Religionis inter Catholicos et Protestantes controversis*, where Cassander, resting[4] on the Holy Scriptures as the basis of belief, and reverting to the Fathers of the first six centuries for the exposition of all doubtful texts, proposes to relinquish the erratic speculations of later theologians, together with those portions of the liturgy and discipline of the Church that swerved from ancient models. He next suggests the application of his general principle to many of the topics then dividing Christians from each other, and even dares

[1] Tabaraud, p. 299. Cassander's collected *Works*, of which many had been condemned at the council of Trent, were published in Paris, 1616.

[2] Above, p. 66.

[3] While the guest of William, duke of Cleves, he examined the whole question of infant-baptism, with especial reference to the arguments of the Anabaptists. See two treatises on this subject in his *Works*, pp. 703—779.

[4] 'Divina Scriptura, tanquam certissima quædam regula, veteres in controversiis, quæ statim post Apostolorum discessum extiterant, dijudicandis usi sunt: sed sæpe in his contentionibus evenit, ut de sensu et intelligentia harum Divinarum literarum non conveniret, ac non paucæ controversiæ ortæ sint, quarum in iis Divinis literis non tam certa et aperta explicatio reperiebatur. Quare semper necesse fuit ad consensum universalem vetustissimarum Ecclesiarum, tanquam ad publicum et firmissimum testimonium vivæ apostolicæ doctrinæ et veræ scriptorum apostolicorum intelligentiæ provocare, quod et hodie usu venire videmus ...Elucet autem hoc publicum Ecclesiæ testimonium maxime in iis scriptoribus atque scriptis, quæ fuerunt ab ætate Constantini usque ad ætatem Leonis, vel etiam Gregorii.' *Præf.* The same principles had been already (1561) enunciated in his *De Officio pii Viri in hoc Ecclesiæ Dissidio*, which being published anonymously was attacked by Calvin on the supposition that its author was Baudouin (Balduinus), the celebrated lawyer.

to ask for a considerable limitation of the functions exercised by Roman pontiffs[1].

MEDIATING PARTY.

In addition to these formal measures for securing the unity of Western Christendom, there had always been a party, who, without being fully conscious either of their opposition to the Mediæval tenets or of their close approximation to the ground of the Reformers, acted for a while as moderators between the two great bodies in collision. Of these we saw a bright example in Gaspar Contarini[2]. Lasting benefits resulted from his efforts at the Colloquy of Ratisbon, and his conciliatory spirit was shared by a large circle of acquaintance, embracing among others Reginald Pole. To their writings may be added those of John Wild[3] (or Ferus), a learned Franciscan who died at Mentz, Sept. 3, 1554. His sermons, and still more his numerous exegetical treatises, all savour strongly of the Lutheran spirit; or rather they shew that he was able to return by independent processes to fountains from which many of the Lutheran tenets were immediately derived.

Contarini.

John Ferus.

While points of contact were thus multiplied in one direction, other theologians who had no sympathy whatever with the Lutheran movement were stimulated by it to withdraw the more extravagant positions of the school-

Correctives of Eck, Emser, and the rest.

[1] In noticing this point, Tabaraud remarks (pp. 304, 305): 'Parmi les abus manifestes qui avoient servi de prétexte au schisme, et qui contribuoient à l'entretenir, on doit mettre en première ligne la puissance exorbitante du pape, porté à cette époque à un excès, qui faisoit gémir les bons catholiques.' Other mediators are mentioned by this writer, among the rest Beatus Rhenanus, and later in the century Martin Fumée. A work of different character, but purporting to aim at the same results, was the *De Strategematibus Satanæ in Religionis Negotio*, by a native of Trent, Aconzio (Acontius), who relinquished Romanism in 1557, and taking refuge in England dedicated his production to queen Elizabeth (1565). He outraged his patrons, however, by the extreme 'liberalism' of his suggestions, and was excommunicated by Grindal on suspicion of 'anabaptistical and Arian' tendencies. Strype's *Life of Grindal*, p. 45, Lond. 1710.

[2] Above, pp. 58, 97, 98. He also assisted in drawing up a reformatory scheme in 1538: see above, p. 57, n. 1.

[3] See Dieterich, *Dissert. Histor. de Joanne Fero, monacho et concionatore Moguntino, teste veritatis Evangelicæ*, Altorf. 1723, and (the continuator of) Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.* liv. CL. ch. lxviii.; the latter of whom observes: 'Quelques-uns de ses traitez ont été corrompus par les Protestants, et ses ouvrages n'ont pas été agréables à la congrégation de l'*Index*.' On the 16th of June, 1559, his Commentary on St Matthew was suppressed by order of the doctors of the Sorbonne (*Ibid.* liv. CLIV. ch. liii.), 'parcequ'il contenoit beaucoup d'erreurs, et même des heresies.'

MEDIATING PARTY.

men, and assist in the diffusion of intelligence and the promotion of administrative reforms. Confronted by ardent preachers of the 'new learning,' the champions of scholasticism looked out for engines of defence analogous to those by which they were assaulted. Eck, at the suggestion of Campeggio, aimed at counteracting the influence of Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* by putting forth in **1525** a rival publication, entitled *Loci Communes contra Hæreticos*[1]. Emser, who was also conspicuous for his hatred of the Lutherans, undertook in **1527** a new translation of the Bible[2] into German, with the hope of satisfying wants expressed in every quarter: while vernacular treatises, such as that of Berthold[3], bishop of Chiemsee, which appeared in **1528**, evince the clear determination of some prelates to keep pace with the necessities of the age, and furnish what they deemed the best corrective of those doctrines which the Wittenbergers were disseminating in all quarters through the agency of the press.

Occasional attempts at Reformation by means of synods.

The same determination was in other provinces combined with strenuous efforts to remove at least a portion of the gross abuses in the manners of the clergy and their general administration of church-affairs,—abuses which had proved so scandalous to laymen, and had given to the Reformer his chief pretext for opening an assault on the ecclesiastical system. This necessity, as we have seen, was felt occasionally by popes themselves[4], and councils in like manner entered here and there upon the same course of action. Thus, a synod of the province of Sens, held

[1] First printed, and dedicated to Henry VIII. of England in 1525, *i.e.* four years after the corresponding work of Melanchthon. A fourth edition enlarged and amended appeared at Tübingen in 1527, and was especially directed 'adversus Lutheranos.'

[2] Cf. Audin, *Hist. de Luther*, I. 493 sq.; Waddington, *Reform.* II. 19 sq. It was very little more than a fraudulent reprint of Luther's version. In 1534 the counter-reformation party obtained another German Bible (based upon the Vulgate) from the pen of Dietenberger, a Dominican of Mentz; and in 1537 Eck issued his translation, following the Vulgate for the Old Testament, and Emser's Lutheran version for the New: being prompted, as he says in the Preface, solely by a wish to counteract 'viele falsche Dolmetschungen.'

[3] The title is *Tewtsche Theologey* (reprinted at Munich, 1852). It was probably meant to rival the mediæval treatise *Eyn teutsch Theologia*, which Luther edited at the very outbreak of the Reformation: see *Middle Age*, p. 357, n. 4.

[4] Above, p. 3, p. 57, n. 1.

MEDIATING PARTY.

at Paris (1528), and most violent in its condemnation of Lutheranism[1], confesses the existence of corruptions[2]. Some restraints are placed upon the dress and conduct of ecclesiastics; ministers and people are charged to be decorous in the celebration of public worship; images of a lascivious or unscriptural character are interdicted, and the credulity of those who thirsted for new miracles rebuked. All music adverse to devotion is excluded from the churches, and directions given in order to secure the better execution of parochial ministrations, as well as more exemplary and efficient preachers[3]. Similar injunctions were promulgated at the same period by the French clergy assembled in the council of Bourges[4]. But a council gathered in **1536** by Hermann, archbishop of Cologne, who himself, as we have seen, became eventually a convert to the Lutheran doctrines, was exclusively devoted to the reformation of the clergy and the disciplinary system of the Church[5]. In every part of their acts we may discern how great had been the pressure of the times[6], and how

[1] *e. g.* 'Unum illud videmus in primis hactenus observatum ab iis, qui propagandis hæresibus animum intenderint, ut ea sibi dicenda putent, quæ maxime placitura videantur; quo prurientes multitudinis aures demulceant, et a severioribus patrum avertant institutis. Hac ratione Mahometica quondam pestis invaluit. Hoc aucupio Lutherus,' *etc.* Labbe, XIV. 455.

[2] See the 'Decreta morum,' as above, 465 sq.

[3] § XXXVI., where it is significantly added: 'Quod si secus fecerint, aut si populum more scurrarum vilissimorum, dum ridiculas et aniles fabulas recitant, ad risus cachinnationesque excitaverint: aut, quod deterius est, si prælatis Ecclesiæ, principibus, sacerdotibusque detraxerint, ac tandem populum ab obedientia superiorum retraxerint, eumdemque ab solutione decimarum ac aliorum, ad quæ jure Divino et positivo sunt omnes obstricti, abalienaverint; nos volumus tales tam ineptos et perniciosos concionatores ab officio prædicationis suspendi,' etc.

[4] Labbe, XIV. 426 sq. [5] *Ibid.* 484 sq.

[6] Among other striking proofs of this, the clergy are incited (Pars II. c. 5) to the constant reading of the Bible ('nunquam a manibus eorum liber legis, hoc est Biblia, deponatur'). Then follows a promise to undertake the revision of the Breviary. 'Nam cum olim a sanctissimis patribus institutum sit, ut solæ Scripturæ sacræ in Ecclesia recitarentur, *nescimus qua incuria acciderit*, ut in earum locum successerint alia cum his neutiquam comparanda, atque interim historiæ Sanctorum tam inculte ac tam negligenti judicio conscriptæ, ut nec auctoritatem habere videantur, nec gravitatem. Deo itaque auctore, deque consilio capituli nostri, ac theologorum, aliorumque piorum virorum reformationem breviariorum meditabimur:' Pars II. c. 6; cf. c. 11. This project for revising the Breviary was elsewhere carried out in the same year by cardinal Quignones, who published under the authority of Clement VII.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

considerable was the fraction even of those adhering to distinctive doctrines of the Mediæval Church, who had been elevated by the moral agitations of that epoch, and made alive to the necessity of promoting domestic reformations in each country.

Importance of the agitation for a general Council.

But these measures, instituted here and there in separate provinces of Christendom, and with a view to the redress of local grievances, were all at length compounded into one grand effort by the convocation of the Council of Trent. Here it is that the machinery was provided for working out the counter-reformation; here it is that all the Churches in communion with Rome determined the last development of their principles, and here the canons and decrees were framed, which fastened on those Churches their peculiar characteristics, and stereotyped their aberrations from the primitive and apostolic faith.

Length of the delay.

The convocation of a general council had been long demanded in all parts of western Christendom[1]. But the pontiffs, either entangled in political affairs, or trembling lest the scenes of Basel and Constance might be re-enacted under less favourable circumstances, and their own prerogatives impugned with even greater freedom, suffered all the most critical years of the controversy to expire without acceding to the urgent wishes of their subjects. The bull of Paul III., convoking such a synod and fixing its precise

the first edition of his *Breviarium Romanæ Curiæ, ex sacra et canonica Scriptura, necnon Sanctorum historiis summa vigilantia decerptis, accurate digestum:* cf. above, p. 198. Part VI. of the above council contains, in twenty-seven chapters, the temperate directions of Hermann and the other prelates for the due 'ministration of the Word.'

[1] See above, p. 8 and n. 2, p. 57. The project for convening a council to be held at Mantua (May 23, 1537) being found abortive, the pope was induced to convene another at Vicenza (May, 1538): but not a single prelate came. Jealousies that now sprang up between the pope and emperor (above, p. 61), stopped all further progress till May, 1542, when the results of the first colloquy of Ratisbon (above, p. 58) alarmed the papal consistory (cf. Ranke, *Popes*, I. 201 note) and led to more serious negociations. The bull, on the authority of which actual proceedings were taken, is dated Nov. 19, 1544. On the general history of those proceedings, see Sarpi [*al.* Pietro Soave Polano], *Historia del Concilio Tridentino* (translated into French, with critical and other notes, by Courayer, Amsterdam, 1751); and Pallavicini's *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*, best edition, Roma, 1665. Ranke, *Popes*, III. 304 sq., has a valuable 'Criticism of Sarpi and Pallavicini.' The best edition of the Decrees themselves is in the *Libri Symbolici Eccl. Catholicæ*, ed. Streitwolf and Klener, Gottingæ, 1846.

locality, was only promulgated May 22, 1542, and even then, as new obstacles continued to emerge in various quarters, the first session was not actually held until the 13th of December, 1545, two months before the death of the great Wittenberg reformer, and soon after the massacre of four thousand Vaudois[1], who had ventured to express their sympathy with the reforming movement. COUNCIL OF TRENT.

As soon as the proceedings opened[2], it was obvious that the representatives, though mostly Italians, were men of different schools: and all the early sessions witnessed to the difficulty they experienced in coming to a definite agreement on questions of the day. At length, however, it was ruled[3] that in choosing their terminology, a charitable regard should be always had to the discordant sentiments of both parties, and that certain questions should thus continue open, in order that the whole energy of the council might be concentrated on the various forms of misbelief which they were more especially engaged in controverting. It was also ruled, after many struggles, that questions of faith and practical reforms connected with them, should be discussed concurrently. Hence the ultimate form of the transactions issued by this council. The decrees on doctrine appear either as dogmatic treatises ('Doctrinæ'), or as short and pithy propositions ('Canones'). The former often represent the Romish doctrine with considerable fulness; the latter are denunciations of all classes of opponents: while intermixed with both of these we find a number of 'Decreta de Reformatione,' *i.e.* ordinances relating to the ritual, discipline, and general organization of the Churches in communion with the Roman pontiff. *Discordant elements at Trent.* *Order of proceedings.*

The chief promoters[4] of the council, anxious to make

[1] Above, p. 123, and Sarpi, I. 209, ed. Courayer.

[2] The Gallican bishops, for example, seconded by Spaniards and a few Italians, proposed at the outset to modify the title of the Council by adding the words 'Ecclesiam universam *repræsentans*,' after the precedents of Basel and Constance (Sarpi, I. 241). At the fourth session there was a hot contest between the Franciscans and Dominicans on the 'immaculate conception' of the Virgin: *Ibid.* pp. 313 sq.

[3] *Ibid.* II. 30. This resolution was prompted by a violent dispute of the Franciscans and Dominicans respecting the manner of our Lord's Presence in the Eucharist.

[4] These were, of course, the papal legates, cardinal John del Monte (afterwards pope Julius III.), the cardinal-priest of Santa Croce, named

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Authority of Scripture and tradition.

their work as full and systematic as possible, commenced the more important business by determining the canon of Holy Scripture. This subject was accordingly opened at a congress held Feb. **22, 1546**, and two decrees relating to it promulgated at the fourth session (April **8**). It was then decided[1] by a vast majority of the representatives (between sixty and seventy in number) that unwritten traditions, which have been received either from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the impulse of the Holy Spirit, and continuously transmitted in the Church, are all to be accepted with respect and veneration equal to that which other Christians claim for Holy Scripture. On proceeding to a kindred topic, that respecting the several books which form the Canon, there was less unanimity; some[2] desiring that no catalogue whatever should be published, others that distinctions should be drawn between

Marcellus Cervinus, and the cardinal-deacon, Reginald Pole, who however did not rejoin the Council in 1546, on the plea of ill health: cf. Ranke, *Popes*, I. 208, 209, and note. The pope's instructions to these legates may be seen at large in Raynaldus, *Annal. Eccl.* ad an. 1545, § 47.

[1] '. . . . perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ab ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante, quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt; orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam veteris, quam novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor; necnon traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tamquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.' For a Lutheran refutation of this article, see the elaborate work of Chemnitz, *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, Part. I. pp. 5—96, Francof. 1578. One of the few opponents of it in the synod was Nachianti (Naclantus), bishop of Chiozza, who went so far as to affirm that the placing of Scripture and traditions on the same level was impious: see Sarpi, I. 293, together with Courayer's note, and Mendham's *Memoirs of the Council of Trent*, pp. 59, 60, Lond. 1834.

[2] Sarpi, I. 263, 267. At the same time was published a *Decretum de editione et usu sacrorum librorum*, asserting the 'authenticity' of the Vulgate version, correctly printed (cf. Mendham, p. 67); 'et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat.' Then follows a warning against all new interpretations and all doctrines of development, ut nemo suæ prudentiæ innixus, in rebus fidei, et morum ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ pertinentium, sacram Scripturam ad suos sensus contorquens, contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum patrum, ipsam Scripturam sanctam interpretari audeat; etiamsi hujusmodi interpretationes nullo umquam tempore in lucem edendæ forent.' The lame attempts of Möhler to reconcile this decree with any freedom of inquiry

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

canonical and deutero-canonical writings, while a third party, which eventually prevailed, contended for the importance of publishing a list of books, but were averse to the proposed distinctions.

Decree on Original Sin:

This twofold edict, which on its appearance seems to have startled all the Christian world, the pontiff[1] in the number, may be said to have determined the character of all future business: and the ultra-montane prelates, flushed with their successes, lost no time in handling the chief dogmas in respect of which Reformers were unanimous in their belief that the Scholastics had departed from the Holy Scriptures and were swerving fast in the direction of Pelagianism. These were the dogmas of original sin and justification. The decree relating to the former was read in the fifth session (June **17**). Instead[2] of laying down a full and scientific exposition of the doctrine which, it was discovered, the feelings of the present meeting could not bear, the prelates confined themselves to the publication of five anathemas, stating what original sin is not. Four of these are levelled at the tenets of Anabaptists or extravagant Reformers; while the last condemns the doctrines of the Saxon school, according to which sin is not entirely extirpated by the grace of baptism, but only 'shaven, or not imputed'[3].

on Justification.

The subject of justification, which had been the source of many earlier controversies at this period, was encumbered by far greater difficulties. It therefore occupied the synod until Jan. **13, 1547**, when an elaborate decree was promulgated, in sixteen chapters and thirty-three canons; all of them plainly tending to magnify the human element or factor in the process of salvation, and one in particular anathematizing those who might demur to the assertion,

or any scientific exegesis of the Bible may be seen in his *Symbolik*, II. 60 sq.: cf. Sarpi, I. 274–276.

[1] Sarpi, I. 286.

[2] Cf. Möhler's apology, I. 66, 67.

[3] 'Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini nostri gratiam, quæ in baptismate confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat, aut etiam asserit non tolli totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet, sed illud dicit tantum radi, aut non imputari; anathema sit.' Sess. v. § 5. See Chemnitz, *Examen*, 'De reliquiis peccati originalis,' Part. I. pp. 103 sq. The Council grants, however, that there is in the regenerate a concupiscence (or 'fomes'), inclining to sin, but not sinful. On the connexion of this decree with the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, see Sarpi, I. 312 sq., Pallavicini, Lib. VII. c. 7

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

that the good works of the justified man, as wrought by him through the help of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, do truly deserve increase of grace and eternal life[1]. According to the Tridentine doctors, faith is the beginning, root and basis of justification, and is essential to all further progress; yet it only becomes efficacious when love has been conjoined with it, as the animating and plastic principle. Justification in like manner has two aspects, one negative, the other positive: it is both forgiveness of sins and sanctification[2]. By it the union of the will of man with all forms of evil is annihilated, so that righteousness becomes inherent in the soul of the believer, who can by the grace of God fulfil the law, and be restored to the original freedom of humanity. As the Spirit of Christ has been transfused into his spirit, he feels himself entitled to pass onward from the thought of some initial righteousness, gratuitously imputed to him, and reposes on a conviction that he will be at last accepted and rewarded, *because* the righteousness of Christ is so appropriated as to produce in him a righteousness which he can truly call his own.

Effect of this decree.

On the contrary, some influential members of the council[3], approximating closely to the tenets of the Lu-

[1] Sess. VI. can. XXXII. The next canon publishes the anathema against all who think that this tenet derogates in any measure from 'the glory of God or the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord:' see also cap. viii. where an explanation is offered of the phrase 'justificari gratis.' Chemnitz (Part. I. p. 205), makes the following remark respecting this theory of human merit: 'Concilium igitur Tridentinum dicit, bona renatorum opera vere promereri vitam æternam. Atque ita simpliciter repetunt et stabiliunt scholasticorum commenta de merito condigni; quod scilicet renatorum opera in hac vita in charitate facta, ex condigno mereantur vitam æternam: hoc est, quod vita æterna ex debito justitiæ Divinæ retribuenda sit bonis operibus.' On the other hand, the Council was far from sanctioning the notion that man is at all able of himself to reach the state of justification 'sine prævenienti Spiritus Sancti inspiratione:' see Can. I. II. III.

[2] 'Quamquam enim nemo possit esse justus, nisi cui merita passionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi communicantur: id tamen in hac impii justificatione fit, dum ejusdem sanctissimæ passionis merito per Spiritum Sanctum caritas Dei diffunditur in cordibus eorum, qui justificantur, atque ipsis inhæret: unde in ipsa justificatione cum remissione peccatorum hæc omnia simul infusa accipit homo per Jesum Christum, Cui inseritur, fidem, spem et caritatem:' cap. vii.

[3] On the various discussions, all of which turned in reality upon the truth or falsehood of opinions held by men like Gaspar Contarini, see

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

theran, drew, as he did, very sharp distinctions between imperfect righteousness inwrought into the human spirit, and that perfect righteousness which is freely attributed to man in virtue of his incorporation into Christ, the second Adam. This party was, however, silenced by a large majority, while the leaders of the Reformation-movement, who had anxiously observed the course of the proceedings, were horror-struck by the denunciations of their favourite dogma. It was also ruled[1] on the same occasion that no living man may presume to rank himself among the number of those who have been predestinated to eternal life, in such a way at least as to infer his impeccability or the certainty of his recovering from the consequence of any sin he may commit; and further[2] that the grace of justification is lost not only by open infidelity where faith itself has perished, but also by each act of deadly sin.

Discussions on the Sacraments.

The prelates next determined to treat upon the doctrine of the sacraments, in order as before to meet objections urged by the Reformers against the number, nature, and effect of those ordinances. Thirty canons[3] were accord-

Sarpi, I. 335 sq. From the account of Laurentius Pratanus, written on the spot (among Le Plat's *Monum. ad hist. Concil. Trident. spectant.* VII. pt. II. p. 21), we learn that some of the representatives extolled 'the virtue of faith' in a wonderful manner, especially Richard Pates, sometime bishop of Worcester, and the Neapolitan bishop of Cava. Pole also warned the assembly not to reject an opinion simply because it was held by Luther (Ranke, *Popes*, I. 204): and even Seripando, who, as general of the Augustinian friars, had no love for the Wittenberg deserter, shewed a strong leaning to the same side (*Ibid.* p. 205).

[1] Cap. xii., this clause however being added: 'nam, nisi ex speciali revelatione, sciri non potest, quos Deus Sibi elegerit.' The tenderness of the Council in speaking of predestination is explained by the circumstance that many of the leading representatives were strongly Augustinian in their views. See an account of the warm discussions on this subject in Sarpi, I. 367 sq.

[2] Cap. xv.

[3] Of these, thirteen relate to sacraments in general (which are declared to be seven in number and no more): fourteen to baptism; and three to confirmation. The sixth of the first series is as follows: 'Si quis dixerit sacramenta novæ legis non continere gratiam quam significant; aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre; quasi signa tantum externa sint acceptæ per fidem gratiæ, vel justitiæ, et notæ quædam Christianæ professionis, quibus apud homines discernuntur fideles ab infidelibus; anathema sit:' cf. above, p. 119, n. 2; Chemnitz, *Examen*, 'De Opere operato,' Part. II. pp. 24 sq., and Möhler, *Symb.* I. 288 sq. Another canon of the series (§ XI.) denounces those who affirm

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

ingly compiled and read at the seventh session (March 3); but the labours of the representatives had not extended far beyond the questions relating to baptism and confirmation when reports of a contagious disease afforded a convenient pretext for translating the council to Bologna[1] (March 11).

Disciplinary reforms.

Before this time, however, something was effected in the cause of reformation[2], agreeably to principles laid down at the commencement of the business. The need of such reforms was shewn to be most urgent by representatives of the imperial party; and several of the Spaniards, whom we shall hereafter see defending the inherent rights of bishops, did not hesitate to speak most freely on these topics, and even to reflect on the dictation of the Roman pontiff and his legates[3]. But, owing to the dexterity of the latter, and the vast preponderance of Italians in the synod, all discussions of this class were so guided or diverted as to save the grandeur of the papacy[4]. The non-residence of bishops, one of the main

that the intention of the minister ('intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit ecclesia') is not required for the efficacy of the sacrament: cf. Chemnitz, as above, pp. 30 sq., and for the disputes to which this canon gave rise in the council, see Sarpi, I. 430 sq.

[1] Above, p. 62. The 'Bulla facultatis' (Feb. 22, 1547) is reprinted in *Libri Symb. Eccl. Cathol.* ed. Streitwolf, II. 43, 44; but there is little doubt respecting the insincerity of the pontiff: see Mendham, as before, p. 119, and p. 121, note.

[2] The opening sentences of the first 'Decretum de Reformatione' deserve notice: 'Eadem sacrosancta synodus, eisdem præsidentibus, et apostolicæ sedis legatis, *ad restituendam collapsam admodum ecclesiasticam disciplinam*, depravatosque in clero et populo Christiano mores emendandos, se accingere volens, ab iis, qui majoribus ecclesiis præsunt, initium censuit esse sumendum. Integritas enim præsidentium salus est subditorum.' *Libr. Symb. Eccl. Cath.* II. 30.

[3] The very important letters and papers of Vargas, a doctor of law, who attended the council in behalf of the emperor, furnish curious matter in illustration of this point as of many others. See respecting them Mendham's *Memoirs of the Council of Trent*, p. 144, note. Vargas complains bitterly of the papal legates, and declares that the mainspring of all the business was at Rome: 'A titulo de dirigir, los legados del papa se applican todo el concilio assi: y ninguna cosa se haze, ni propone, ni discute, ni difine, sino lo que ellos quieren, *segun el orden que de Roma tienen*, y cada hora se les embia. Los prelados que el papa tenia aqui *salariados* no lo podian negar, y se dolian dello con los otros hombres pios:' ed. Le Vassor, p. 15, Amsterdam, 1699.

[4] Thus the Preface to the second 'Decretum de Reformatione' ends with the significant clause: 'Salva semper in omnibus sedis apostolicæ auctoritate.' The account of Massarello, secretary of the Council (see

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

sources to which the heresies and other evils of the age were not unfrequently ascribed, was made the subject of a decree in the sixth session (Jan. 13); and just before the transfer of the council a series of new regulations was drawn up in condemnation of pluralities, episcopal and otherwise, and with a view to the correction of abuses and anomalies in the general administration of the Church.

Suspension of the Council.

Many of the prelates[1], satisfied already that the more important business of the council was all planned at Rome, were strongly adverse to a project of translation, which would bring them nearer to the pontiff, and in obedience to the wishes of the emperor continued to withhold their sanction[2]. It also happened that the quarrel between these potentates was more and more embittered during the next few years. Partly therefore to intimidate the pope, and partly to extinguish feuds now raging in all districts of the German empire, Charles V. determined to put forth a scheme of mediation called the *Interim Augustanum*[3] on his own authority (May, **1548**): while the king of France, who from political rivalry espoused the quarrel of the Roman curia, was no less desirous[4] of producing a considerable circumscription of the ultra-papal claims.

Resumption of business.

The Council of Trent continued in a state of absolute suspension till March **14**, **1551**, when the new pontiff, Julius III., himself employed as chief legate in the former

Mendham, *Pref.* ix. x.), is to the same effect. Writing on the 8th of Feb. 1547, he observes: 'Sed id imprimis attendendum est, quod, licet aliqui dixerint, quod Concilium non potest facere reformationem...hoc verum non est, quia concilium hoc legitime congregatum omnia potest in his, quæ *sibi a sua Sanctitate demandata sunt*, in aliis autem nihil potest...In his autem quæ Concilium non potest, et proprie spectant ad pontificem, asserunt legati, se paratissimos futuros mediatores, ut sua Sanctitas ea concedat, quæ a sua Sanctitate petuntur:' in Raynald. *Annal. Eccl.* ad an. 1547, § 31.

[1] A brief account of all the 'fathers' who had taken part in the proceedings up to this time, is given in the *Libri Symb. Eccl. Cathol.*, as before, II. 50 sq.

[2] About one-third of the prelates actually remained at Trent for some months, and negotiations were opened with the pontiff in order, if possible, to bring the council back.

[3] See above, p. 62.

[4] His instructions to the French ambassadors at Bologna (Aug. 12, 1547) are printed in Le Plat, *Monum.* III. 647 sq.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

business of the meeting, made arrangements[1] for its re-establishment at Trent; and the proceedings were accordingly resumed, at this time with the full concurrence of the emperor, although in spite of angry protests from the king of France[2], who threatened even to convoke a national synod. The first important subject which occupied the representatives was the mysterious and much-contested doctrine of the Eucharist. In reference thereto it was finally decided at the thirteenth session (Oct. **11, 1551**), that after the consecration of the elements, our Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man, is verily, really and substantially contained under the species of bread and wine[3]; that each element contains the same as both together do; that in the consecration of these elements, there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of Christ's body, and a conversion of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood, so as to justify the use of the term 'transubstantiation;' that the highest form of worship ('Latria') is therefore rendered by the faithful to the sacrament of the altar. With respect to the communicants it is decided

Decree on the Eucharist:

[1] See the 'Bulla Resumptionis' in *Libr. Symb. Eccl. Cath.* II. 59 sq.

[2] A misunderstanding had arisen between Henry II. of France and Julius with reference to the duchy of Parma. Accordingly, Amyot was dispatched to Trent in order to protest against the whole proceedings of the 'convention.' The letters which he bore denied that the council was general, and therefore urged that neither the king nor his people would be bound by its decisions: 'imo vero se testari palam ac denuntiare, ad eadem se remedia ac præsidia descensurum, si necesse videretur, quibus majores sui, Francorum reges, in re consimili causaque uti consuevissent; nec sibi quidquam antiquius fore, secundum fidei ac religionis integritatem, libertate et incolumitate Ecclesiæ Gallicæ.' See the whole document in Le Plat, IV. 241. This threat appears to have mollified the pontiff: Sarpi, II. 6.

[3] Cap. i. Courayer (on Sarpi, II. 46) remarks on this chapter: 'Si par ces termes *réellement et substantiellement* le Concile n'a voulu établir qu'une présence effective et véritable, sans en déterminer la manière; c'est la doctrine de l'Antiquité, et plusieurs Protestans l'ont reconnu avec sincerité. Mais si par le terme de *présence substantielle* on a voulu nous faire entendre une présence *corporelle et organique*, c'est ce que ni la raison ni l'autorité ne nous permettent de croire.' That the latter was the view intended by the ruling spirits of the Council is obvious from the language of the *Catechismus Romanus*, which they authorized by anticipation. It is there stated (Part. II. c. iv. qu. 27), 'Jam vero hoc loco etiam a Pastoribus explicandum est, non solum verum Christi corpus, et quidquid ad veram corporis rationem pertinet, *veluti ossa et nervos*, sed etiam totum Christum in hoc sacramento contineri.'

COUNCIL OF TRENT

that no man who is conscious of deadly sin should approach the holy Eucharist without previous confession and absolution; and that while even the impenitent receive Christ sacramentally, and those who communicate in will receive Him spiritually, the highest order of communicant is he who receives both sacramentally and spiritually, in faith, and will, and act[1]. This decree, extending to eight chapters, is accompanied by eleven canons, which anathematize[2] the Lutheran and Calvinistic tenets, as well as the more lax hypothesis of Zwingli and the aberrations of Anabaptism.

on Penance.

The next subject treated by the prelates under the head of Christian doctrine refers to 'the sacrament of penance.' It is maintained (Nov. **25, 1551**) that this ordinance was instituted by our Lord Himself; that in its nature and design it is distinct from baptism; that it is composed of three parts or acts, contrition, confession, and absolution; that in it the priest is empowered to exercise the functions of a judge[3], allotting to the sinner special acts of prayer and mortification, in the hope that he may thus regain the purity communicated to him at his baptism; and further that the outward part or sign of the sacrament is contained in words by which the sentence of absolution is pronounced. It had been previously determined[4] that contrition, which is necessary to the efficacy of this sacrament, consists of inward sorrow and abhorrence of the sin committed; yet that even the imperfect stage of it, which the scholastics termed attrition, as arising merely from the natural sense of shame or servile

[1] 'Tertios porro sacramentaliter simul et spiritaliter; hi autem sunt, qui ita se prius probant et instruunt, ut vestem nuptialem induti, ad Divinam hanc mensam accedant:' cap. viii.

[2] Thus the first 'canon' classes together all those who affirm that Christ is only present 'in signo vel figura [the Zwinglian hypothesis] aut virtute' [the Calvinistic hypothesis]: and in 'canon II.' all those who demur to the idea of any physical change in the elements without denying the real presence [the Lutheran hypothesis]: cf. can. VIII.

[3] Cap. vi. Some further light is thrown upon this office by the ninth 'canon:' 'Si quis dixerit, absolutionem sacramentalem sacerdotis non esse actum judicialem, sed nudum ministerium pronuntiandi vel declarandi remissa esse peccata confitenti, modo tantum credat se esse absolutum; aut sacerdos non serio, sed joco absolvat; aut dixerit, non requiri confessionem pœnitentis, ut sacerdos ipsum absolvere possit; anathema sit.' See Courayer's note on Sarpi, II. 65.

[4] Cap. iv.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

dread of punishment, may, where it operates in excluding the wish to sin, be welcomed as a gift of God, and may 'dispose' the sinner to obtain forgiveness through the sacrament of penance[1]. It is also granted that satisfaction, or those penalties for sin imposed on the offender by himself or by the priest in order to avert its temporal consequence, is only made availing through the satisfaction of Christ from whom 'all our sufficiency proceeds[2].' After a fresh series of anathemas, fifteen[3] in number, levelled at all persons who venture to dispute the truth of any of these positions, the sacrament of extreme unction is defined in three chapters and protected by another list of corresponding fulminations.

Extreme Unction.

Arrival of German Protestants.

At the fifteenth session (Jan. 25, 1552), where the doctors had intended to adjudicate upon the 'sacrifice of the mass' and the 'sacrament of orders,' the course of proceeding was changed to allow a hearing to certain envoys from Maurice of Saxony and the duke of Würtemberg, who had appeared at Trent, to plead the cause of Lutheranism before the members of the council[4]. They spoke most freely on some points of reformation, to the

[1] '...declarat non solum non facere hominem hypocritam, et magis peccatorem, verum etiam donum Dei esse, et Spiritus Sancti impulsum, non adhuc quidem inhabitantis, sed tantum moventis, quo pœnitens adjutus viam sibi ad justitiam parat. Et quamvis sine sacramento pœnitentiæ per se ad justificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat, tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in sacramento pœnitentiæ impetrandam disponit.' The same chapter repels as calumnious the accusation that 'Catholic writers' have ever taught 'sacramentum pœnitentiæ *absque bono motu suscipientium* gratiam conferre.' The improvement of the tone of Romish theologians with reference to 'attrition' is conceded by Chemnitz: Part II. p. 207.

[2] Cap. viii.; yet even here we notice the old disposition to place man's sufferings in the same line with Christ's, and lose sight of the distinction between suffering from the consequence of sin and suffering in the cause of Christ: 'Accedit ad hæc, quod, dum satisfaciendo patimur pro peccatis, Christi Jesu, Qui pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, ex Quo omnis nostra sufficientia est, conformes efficimur: certissimam quoque inde arrham habentes, quod si compatimur et conglorificabimur.'

[3] One of the most unblushing is the sixth: 'Si quis negaverit, confessionem sacramentalem vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure Divino: aut dixerit, *modum secrete confitendi soli sacerdoti*, quem Ecclesia Catholica *ab initio semper observavit*, et observat, alienum esse ab institutione et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum: anathema sit.'

[4] See above, p. 65 and *Libri Symb. Eccl. Cathol.* II. 87 sq. for the 'safe conduct.'

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Fresh suspension of the Council.

great delight of the more timid representatives[1]; but the sudden outbreak of the war in Germany, and the continual altercations that arose between the imperial and the papal authorities, induced the legates to procure a fresh suspension of the business: which accordingly took place on the 28th of April, **1552**. In this second period of the council, as in that already noticed, a few questions of administrative reform had been discussed and carried, the principal relating to the rights, the functions and the jurisdiction of bishops.

On the death of pope Julius III. the choice of the cardinals lighted on Marcellus II.[2], from whose character all friends of reformation were prepared to augur that a limit would be placed, in his pontificate, to the abuses and distractions by which the Church of Rome was grievously afflicted. Marcellus died, however, on the twenty-second day after his election, leaving the tiara to a very different wearer, one who from his vigorous intellect, the general severity of his rule, and his intractable temper, revived the picture of those earlier pontiffs, who had founded and cemented the towering edifice of Roman despotism. Paul IV. was always actuated by hatred of the emperor[3], whom he regarded as the patron of heretics and the opposer of Italy. Political events, however, soon compelled him to

Character and policy of pope Paul IV.

[1] Thus Vargas (as translated by Le Vassor, *Lettres et Mémoires*, p. 468) has the following notice of them, Jan. 24, 1552: 'Les envoiez du duc Maurice de Saxe, et ceux du duc de Virtemberg ont dit aujourd'hui fort au long en pleine congrégation ce que nous n'osons pas dire nousmesmes sur le chapitre de la réformation' etc. The legates had, however, been instructed beforehand by the pontiff to prevent all fresh discussion of doctrines (Mendham, p. 159), and when the Würtemberg ambassadors remonstrated on the unfairness of subjecting their creed to merely papal judges, they were only met by renewed demands of submission. (*Ibid.* pp. 160, 161.)

[2] See Ranke, *Popes*, I. 284 sq. He was the cardinal of Santa Croce, the second legate at the opening of the Council of Trent.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 291. The Neapolitan house of Caraffa from which he sprang had always sided with the French party against the Spanish and Germans, and, in addition to this hereditary hatred, Paul IV. believed that the growth of Protestantism was mainly due to the conduct of Charles V., who favoured the reformers out of jealousy to himself. When Charles retired to the convent, in 1556, the pontiff was somewhat relieved: yet his violent and domineering temper continued to be always visible. For instance, he imprisoned cardinal Morone on a charge of heresy (above, p. 97, n. 6), and deprived cardinal Pole of his legateship (above, p. 222, n. 1), for similar reasons.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

renounce his thought of vengeance[1], but only left him greater liberty for indulging his second passion, which was to restore the Roman curia to its old predominance among the western potentates. Caraffa, it is true, had little or no faith in diets, colloquies, or general councils[2]. He, therefore, aimed at compassing his object either by acts of autocratic violence, or by adding to the outward pomp and decency of worship, or by correcting some administrative abuses that came under his immediate notice. This pontiff breathed his last on the **18**th of August, **1559**; and as his death was followed by fresh clamours of the Romish states demanding the completion of the works inaugurated by the recent council, the next pontiff, Pius IV., from policy as well as principle became alive to the importance of yielding to the public voice[3]. Accordingly, after a suspension of ten years, a council naming itself œcumenical again assembled at Trent, Jan. **18, 1562.**

Third convocation of the Council.

Refusal of Reformers to accept it.

But the proceedings of this body had lost their former interest in the eyes of the spectators and dissentients. It is true 'safe conducts[4]' were extensively offered to the continental Protestants; our queen Elizabeth[5], and even the czar of Muscovy himself[6], were urged to send their delegates and share in the deliberations; yet as neither

[1] Ranke, *Popes*, I. 310.

[2] When the necessity of consulting a general council was suggested to him, he was transported with rage, and would not endure the thought of discussing religious questions 'in the midst of the Lutherans,' adding: 'Que c'étoit une chose fort inutile d'envoyer dans les montagnes une soixantaine d'évêques des moins habiles, et une quarantaine de docteurs des moins éclairés, comme on avoit fait déjà deux fois, et de croire que ces gens-là fussent plus propres pour réformer le monde, que le vicaire de Jésus-Christ assisté de l'avis de tous les cardinaux qui sont les colonnes de toute la Chrétienté,' &c. Sarpi, II. 153.

[3] See the 'Bulla Celebrationis' in *Libr. Symb. Eccl. Cath.* II. 95 sq., and Ranke, *Popes*, I. 334. Pius IV. seems to have acted on the advice or at the impulse of his nephew, Carlo Borromeo.

[4] *Libr. Symb.* II. 105 sq.

[5] See Le Bas, *Life of Bishop Jewel*, pp. 113 sq., and Jewel's *Epistola ad D. Scipionem* (Works, IV. 1093 sq. ed. P. S.). Scipio was a Venetian who wrote to Jewel, expressing his regret and amazement that the English had declined to send an ambassador to Trent. Cf. the reasons alleged by the Princes 'of the Augsburg Confession' in Le Plat, *Monum.* IV. 57: [archbp. Parker's] *Godly and necessarye Admonition of the Decrees and Canons of the Council of Trent*, London, 1564: and Geddes, *The Council of Trent no free assembly*, London, 1697.

[6] Sarpi, II. 207.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Pius nor his chief advisers ever dreamed of proposing to reopen those discussions which had ended, through one-sided advocacy, in a sweeping censure of the Reformation and its champions, we shall scarcely wonder that these invitations were disregarded by the whole body of Reformers. Elizabeth of England took her place among the multitude of Christians in east and west, who then and afterwards repudiated the authority of the council as neither holy, free, nor general. Its later course indeed had only an occasional reference to matters lying beyond the jurisdiction of the pontiff. The great bulk of mediæval doctrines as recast or vindicated in the earlier sittings of the conclave had during the interval of ten years been commonly accepted by the counter-reformation party[1].

Struggle on the question of episcopacy.

It was, however, made apparent when the prelates reassembled that the task of settling the dogmatic points remaining open, but still more of framing rules of discipline that might possess an absolute and universal authority, was beset with most gigantic difficulties. As soon as ever the proceedings were resumed[2], the Spanish section of the representatives contended that bishops are not simply nominees or vicars of the pope, but that episcopal authority no less than papal rests on a Divine appointment; thereby impugning, half unconsciously, the very foundation of that autocratic system which had been gradually consolidated in western Christendom since the days of Hildebrand and Innocent III.[3] Amid the agita-

[1] Ranke, *Popes*, I. 335 and note.

[2] The first resistance of the Spaniards was offered to the phrase 'proponentibus legatis ac præsidentibus,' at the reading of a decree for the continuation of the council (Jan. 18, 1562). The archbishop of Granada (Guerrero) headed this opposition: see Sarpi, II. 261. On the 11th of March twelve articles of reform were submitted for examination, when the same prelate opened the question whether residence was binding on bishops by the Divine law. He affirmed that it was so, on the ground that episcopacy is a Divine institution. The papal legates, on the contrary, dreaded nothing more than that claims to the *jus Divinum* should be conceded to any save their master: and the article which gave rise to the contest was for the present withdrawn. See the disputes at length in Sarpi, II. 286 sq, 328: and cf. Mendham, pp. 248 sq.

[3] 'This assertion [of the original authority of bishops] struck at the very root of the whole ecclesiastical system. The independence of the inferior authorities of the church, which the popes had so carefully laboured to keep down, must have been restored by the development of this principle.' Ranke, *Popes*, I. 337.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Reforms suggested by the emperor.

tion of these questions envoys came from Ferdinand, the emperor, to press for changes equally distasteful in some quarters, and especially to members of the Roman curia. He resolved to second the general wish of his own subjects, by suggesting[1] that the nomination of the cardinals should be reformed in order to secure the appointment of more exemplary pontiffs. He insisted on the desirableness of administering the cup to laymen, of permitting priests to marry, of relaxing the laws on fasting, of erecting schools, of purifying the breviary and other service-books, of circulating more intelligible catechisms, and of reforming convents. When the cardinal of Lorraine appeared at the head of the French prelates, he supported these Germanic propositions[2], pleading more especially for communion in both kinds: and therefore, had the principle of 'vote by nations' been adopted at this juncture, it is not unlikely that the Romish system would have undergone considerable changes. Still we must remember that the Spaniards, though distinguished by their anti-papal boldness and their clear convictions on the subject of episcopacy, united with the Italians in denying the propriety of all concessions to the moderate school of the Reformers, and that both in the numerical preponderance of the papal partizans, and in their diplomatic artifices, the Roman curia still preserved abundant means for warding off the blow by which its independence had been threatened.

When the council proved peculiarly intractable[3], when

[1] See the propositions in Le Plat, *Monum.* v. 264 sq., and Ranke's remarks on them, *Ibid.* p. 338, note.

[2] See the *Mémoire* in Le Plat, iv. 562; Sarpi, ii. 322, 357, 519 sq. To add to the confusion, the Spaniards and French reopened the old quarrel as to the supremacy of a general council, and the duty of the pontiff himself to bow to its decisions.

[3] 'The French jested about the Holy Ghost being brought to Trent in a knapsack. The Italians talked of Spanish eruptions and French diseases, by which all the faithful were visited in turn. When the bishop of Cadiz said, that there had been renowned bishops, aye, and fathers of the church, whom no pope had appointed, the Italians broke forth in a general outcry, insisted on his departure, and talked of anathema and heresy. The Spaniards retaliated the anathema on them. Sometimes mobs assembled, shouting Spain! Italy! Blood flowed in the streets, and on the ground consecrated to peace.' Ranke, *Popes*, i. 340; Mendham, pp. 251, 252. Owing to this riotous spirit no session could be held from Sept. 17, 1562, until July 15, 1563.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

the position of affairs looked almost desperate, and no other expedient was at hand for quieting a turbulent section of the doctors there assembled, the pontiff sought relief in private negotiations[1], with the emperor, with Philip II. of Spain, and also with the family of Guise who then directed almost entirely the counsels of the French monarch. So very skilful were these fresh manœuvres, that without conceding aught by which the papal power would be materially abridged, the several courts were soon induced to interpose and check the zeal of their own representatives. As soon as this had been effected[2] the more trying business of the council was resumed, and brought to a more amicable close. In reference even to the question of episcopacy[3], the Spanish bishops ultimately yielded, only with the understanding that the words of the decree should be so chosen as to leave them at liberty to reproduce their arguments at any future time. Similar adroitness was exhibited in stifling or restraining fresh discussions, while the members of the council finally

The pope has recourse to private negotiations:

their effect.

[1] Ranke, *Ibid.* pp. 344 sq.

[2] Morone, who had been the pope's agent in mollifying the emperor, left Innsbruck, June 25, 1563, after a visit of nearly two months.

[3] The revised form of the seventh canon as introduced Oct. 30, 1562, was as follows: 'Si quis dixerit, non fuisse a Christo Domino institutum, ut essent in Ecclesia catholica episcopi, ac eos, cum in partem sollicitudinis a Pontifice Romano, Ejus in terris Vicario, assumuntur, non esse veros et legitimos episcopos, presbyteris superiores, et eadem dignitate eademque potestate non potiri, quam ad hæc usque tempora obtinuerunt: anathema sit.' Mendham, p. 248, note. To this the archbishop of Granada and others wished to add a clause, affirming that the episcopate was of Divine right. The pope had endeavoured to parry this blow, by declaring that 'bishops held the principal place in the church, but in dependence upon the pope.' This, however, did not satisfy the champions of episcopacy, who remained immoveable until July, 1563; and in the end, the canon was pared down and resolved into the two following ('De Ordine,' can. VII. VIII.), so as to evade the question touching the Divine institution of bishops and their absolute dependence on the pope: 'Si quis dixerit, episcopos non esse presbyteris superiores; vel non habere potestatem confirmandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illis esse cum presbyteris communem: vel ordines ab ipsis collatos sine populi vel potestatis sæcularis consensu aut vocatione irritos esse; aut eos, qui nec ab ecclesiastica et canonica potestate rite ordinati nec missi sunt, sed aliunde veniunt, legitimos esse verbi et sacramentorum ministros; anathema sit. Si quis dixerit, episcopos qui auctoritate Romani pontificis assumuntur, non esse legitimos et veros episcopos, sed figmentum hominum; anathema sit.' The vagueness and ambiguity of this language elicited the special praise of the Jesuit Lainez: Mendham, p. 262: cf. above, p. 281, n. 2.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

proceeded in the same spirit to deliberate on their definitions of Christian doctrine.

The question touching the propriety of administering the Eucharist in both kinds[1] had been warmly discussed and absolutely closed on the eve of the twenty-second session (Sept. **16, 1562**), when the majority voted that it should be left for the pope to act therein as he judged best. On the following day (Sept. **17**) the council promulgated its decision with reference to the sacrifice of the Mass: contending among other things, that as the same Jesus Christ, who once offered Himself upon the cross, is there contained, and immolated without shedding of blood ('incruente') in the Christian sacrifice, this latter is truly propitiatory, and that by it we obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need[2]. It was also ruled that masses may be offered not only for the sins and wants of Christians while on earth, but also for those who having departed this life are still in need of purification. At the same time numerous regulations were drawn up, providing for a better celebration of this sacrifice, and in other ways contributing to bring about more decency and reverence in public worship[3].

Decree on the sacrifice of the Mass:

The discussion of the 'sacrament of orders,' which came next in point of time, occasioned, as we saw[4], the most intemperate controversies. At last, however, a decree was promulgated (July **15, 1563**) affirming the reality of a visible priesthood which consists of different grades, and

on Orders:

[1] The 'Doctrina de communione sub utraque specie, et parvulorum' was issued July 16, 1562; but whether the chalice might in certain cases be conceded, was still a subject of discussion: see Sarpi, II. 339 sq., and the 'Decretum super petitione concessionis calicis' in *Lib. Symb. Eccl. Cath.* I. 84.

[2] Cap. ii. where it is added: 'Una enim eademque est hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, Qui Seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa. Cujus quidem oblationis cruentæ, inquam, fructus per hanc incruentam uberrime percipiuntur: tantum abest, ut illi per hanc quovis modo derogetur.' The meaning of this decree is further illustrated by the third (of nine) 'canons,' which as usual follow the decree: 'Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis, et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere: anathema sit.'

[3] See the 'Decretum de observandis et evitandis in celebratione missæ,' *Libri Symb. Eccl. Cathol.* I. 82 sq.

[4] pp. 293, 295.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

has been gifted with peculiar and indelible characteristics. Bishops, it was also granted, are in some respect successors of apostles[1], and as such they occupy a chief place in the orders of the hierarchy, are superior to priests, and execute specific functions, as ordination and confirmation. The four dogmatic chapters bearing on these topics are accompanied by eight canons, where anathemas are hurled at many of the continental theories with reference to the nature of the ministerial office and the need of ordination[2]. A different series of resolutions, which appeared at the same time, promoted additional reforms among the bishops and clergy[3]. Some of those indeed were miserably insufficient in the eyes of the 'reforming' states, especially the French[4], whose ambassador spoke as usual with the greatest freedom on the subject; but their protests being ultimately overruled, the legates once again resolved to expedite the business of the council, and avert, if possible, all future outbreaks of rebellion.

on Matrimony:

In the 24th session (Nov. 11) a decree was issued on the subject of marriage, which, it is alleged on the authority of 'universal tradition,' should be ranked among 'the sacraments of the new law,' while fresh anathemas were pronounced on various misbelievers, and especially in condemnation of those who objected to the compulsory celibacy of regulars and ecclesiastics[5].

[1] Cap. iv.: 'Proinde sacrosancta synodus declarat, præter ceteros ecclesiasticos gradus, episcopos, qui in Apostolorum locum successerunt, ad hunc hierarchicum ordinem præcipue pertinere:' evading the question, however, touching the mode in which authority has been transmitted to them.

[2] One has been cited above, p. 295, n. 3. Another runs in this wise 'Si quis dixerit, non esse in Novo Testamento sacerdotium visibile e externum; vel non esse potestatem aliquam consecrandi et offerend verum Corpus et Sanguinem Domini, et peccata remittendi et retinendi sed officium tantum, et nudum ministerium prædicandi evangelium; ve eos, qui non prædicant, prorsus non esse sacerdotes; anathema sit;' can I. cf. Chemnitz, *Examen*, Part. II. pp. 239, 240.

[3] *Libri Symb. Eccl. Cathol.* II. 119 sq.

[4] Sarpi (II. 558 sq.) gives a full account of their 'Articles of Reforma tion' submitted to the council at the beginning of 1563, and also of th protestation of Du Ferrier (III. 118 sq.), and its consequences (pp. 159 sq.).

[5] 'Si quis dixerit, clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos, vel regulares, castitatem solemniter professos, posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse, non obstante lege ecclesiastica, vel voto; et oppositum nil aliud esse, quam damnare matrimonium; posseque omnes

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

on Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, &c.

The last session was opened Dec. 3, and on that and the following day the body of Romish doctrine may be said to have been perfected. Decrees were published respecting purgatory, the invocation of saints, the worship of images and relics, and the granting of indulgences. Of purgatory almost nothing is defined[1], except that such a state or place exists, and that the souls detained therein are really aided by the suffrages of the faithful and the sacrifice of the Mass. The invocation of saints is justified upon the ground that holy men departed continue to offer up petitions for us, and that it is good and useful to desire their sympathy and ask them for the benefit of their intercessions[2]. Images, those doctors argued, ought to receive due veneration; not because they have any Divinity or virtue in them, but because, by honouring them, the honour is reflected or transmitted from them to those beings whom they represent: while pardons or indulgences are justified, and said to have been always granted, because the Church originally received the power of so acting from Jesus Christ Himself, and because indulgences must prove highly serviceable to the Christian. Yet with reference to all these controverted topics[3], considerable care is manifested by the council to banish some of the more

contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voverint, habere donum; anathema sit; cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos supra id, quod possumus, tentari:' can. IX.

[1] The *Catechismus Romanus* (Part. I. cap. VI. qu. 3) supplies the deficiency as follows: 'Præterea est Purgatorius ignis, quo *piorum animæ* ad definitum tempus *cruciatæ* expiantur, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur.'

[2] 'Illos, vero,' it is added, 'qui negant sanctos, æterna felicitate in cœlo fruentes, invocandos esse; aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare; vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam; vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi; vel stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare; impie sentire;' cf. Chemnitz, *Examen*, Part. II. p. 136 sq.

[3] Thus with regard to indulgences the decree continues: 'Abusus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, et quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab hæreticis blasphematur, emendatos et correctos cupiens, præsenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quæstus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in Christiano populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse. Ceteros vero, qui ex superstitione, ignorantia, irreverentia, aut aliunde quomodocumque provenerunt; cum ob multiplices locorum et provinciarum apud quas hi committuntur corruptelas commode nequeant specialiter prohiberi, mandat omnibus episcopis, ut diligenter quisque hujusmodi abusus ecclesiæ suæ colligat, eosque in

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

scandalous practices which had been frequent, if not general, in the period just preceding. The only point in which the vehement protests of Reformers were entirely inefficacious, was the absolute supremacy of the Roman pontiff. That, although the limitation of it had been foremost in the thoughts of many persons by whom the council was promoted, is not sensibly reduced in any one of the decrees[1]. On the contrary, the life of Christendom, so far as it depended on the see of Rome, was thereby made to centre more and more completely in the person, will, and wishes of the popes. The oscillations of that mediating party, who were anxious in the early stages of the Reformation to profit by the zeal and learning of such men as Luther, were seldom visible after the promulgation of the rigorous edicts fabricated in the middle of the sixteenth century. Still these edicts wrought a multitude of changes which imparted new vitality to the administrative system of the Romish Church. Discipline was often re-established in the diocese, the convent, and the parish. Pluralities were all discountenanced; appeals and dispensations made less frequent and practicable. A higher class of seminaries was established for the moral and intellectual training of the clergy; stricter rules were now drawn up for the direction of their lives and ministrations; while the articles of faith[2], to be hereafter pressed upon the conscience

The papal monarchy untouched.

Practical reforms.

prima synodo provinciali referat, etc.:' cf. Chemnitz, Part. III. pp. 43 sq. One more decree was added on the same occasion, 'De delectu ciborum, jejuniis et diebus festis.'

[1] See above, p. 286, n. 4. On the last day but one of the meetings a special provision (c. XXI.) was inserted with the same object: 'Postremo sancta synodus, omnia et singula, sub quibuscumque clausulis et verbis, quæ de morum reformatione atque ecclesiastica disciplina, tam sub fel. rec. Paulo III. ac Julio III. quam sub beatissimo Pio IV., pontificibus maximis, in hoc sacro concilio statuta sunt, declarat, ita decreta fuisse, ut in his *salva semper auctoritas sedis apostolicæ* et sit, et esse intelligatur.' *Libr. Symb. Eccl. Cathol.* II. 214. The feelings of the majority were further shewn by committing to the pontiff the formation of a *Catalogus Librorum prohibitorum*, the preparation of a *Catechism* (the *Catechismus Romanus*, which appeared under his auspices in 1566), and the purification of the *Breviary* and *Missal:* cf. Mendham, pp. 320 sq.

[2] A short summary of this was furnished by what is often called the Creed of Pius IV., or '*Forma Juramenti Professionis Fidei*, a cathedralibus et superioribus ecclesiis, vel beneficiis curam animarum habentibus, et locis Regularium et Militiarum præficiendis, observanda:' in *Libr. Symb. Eccl. Cathol.* I. 98—100.

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

of the pastor and expounded to his flock, were often less erratic, impious and revolting, than the speculations of some Mediæval doctors[1].

Confirmation of the proceedings.

Before quitting Trent, the members of the council[2] in one body formally affixed their signatures to the official acts. On that occasion the number amounted to two hundred and fifty-five, of whom four were papal legates, two cardinals, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, one hundred and sixty-eight bishops, thirty-nine proctors of absentees, seven abbots, and seven generals of religious orders. Nothing will more satisfactorily evince the party-bias under which the whole of the proceedings were conducted, than the fact that of this number one hundred and eighty-nine were Italians, some of them mere creatures, not to say stipendiaries, of the Roman curia. On the 6th of January, **1564**, the decrees of the council were confirmed by a papal instrument[3], which gave the only sanction that was wanting to render the decisions valid in the eyes of those who recognized the infallibility of the pontiff. But although a large majority of Christians in the Romish

[1] 'I hold it,' says Ranke (*Reform.* I. 268, note), 'to be the fundamental error of Möhler's *Symbolik*, that he considers the dogma of the council of Trent as the doctrine from which the Protestants seceded; whilst it is much nearer the truth to say, that it was created by a reaction of Protestantism.'

[2] See the subscriptions in *Libr. Symbol.* II. 220 sq., and a brief account of the 'fathers,' 'orators' (ambassadors), and divines, who took part in some or all of the proceedings during this last period of the council, *Ibid.* pp. 224 sq.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 232 sq.: cf. Sarpi, III. 203 sq. This 'bulla confirmationis' absolutely inhibits all private interpretations of the synodal acts, and reserves the privileges of sole expositor to the Roman see: 'Ad vitandum præterea perversionem et confusionem, quæ oriri posset, si unicuique liceret, prout ei liberet, in decreta concilii commentarios et interpretationes suas edere: apostolica auctoritate inhibemus omnibus, tam ecclesiasticis personis, cujuscumque sint ordinis, conditionis et gradus, quam laicis, quocumque honore ac potestate præditis, prælatis quidem sub interdicti ingressus ecclesiæ, aliis vero, quicunque fuerint, sub excommunicationis latæ sententiæ pœnis, ne quis sine auctoritate nostra audeat ullos commentarios, glossas, annotationes, scholia, ullumve omnino interpretationis genus super ipsius concilii decretis quocumque modo edere, aut quidquam quocumque nomine, etiam sub prætextu majoris decretorum corroborationis aut executionis aliove quæsito colore, statuere. Si cui vero in eis aliquid obscurius dictum et statutum fuisse, eamque ob causam interpretatione aut decisione aliqua egere visum *fuerit; ascendat ad locum, quem Dominus elegit*, ad sedem videlicet apostolicam, omnium fidelium magistram, cujus auctoritatem etiam ipsa sancta synodus tam reverenter agnovit.'

communion were thus obliged to acquiesce in all the edicts of this synod, it was found distasteful in some quarters, and has never yet been able to command a plenary obedience from the Gallicans of France[1].

INQUISITION.

In executing the mandates of the pope and his Tridentine doctors, several prelates of the age displayed no ordinary zeal and vigilance, and reaped on every side a harvest of 'conversions.' For example, six provincial councils[2] held at Milan under Carlo Borromeo[3], between the years **1565** and **1582**, abound with indications of the new and better spirit which had permeated many dioceses in communion with the Roman pontiff. Yet the brilliant victories of the counter-reformation party are frequently ascribable to different agencies. These were, first, the Inquisition, and secondly, the order of the Jesuits. At the time when they were both called into existence and proceeded at all hazards to repel and counterwork the enemies of Rome, the pope was actually dethroned in more than half of Europe. The various provinces of Scandinavia and Great Britain were entirely lost, a large majority of the German states, which had been influenced exclusively by Wittenberg divines, and very many of the Swiss cantons, roused by emissaries from Zürich on the one side and Geneva on the other, had declared themselves uncompromising foes of Mediæval tenets; in Ireland, in Bohemia and Moravia, in Poland, Hungary, and Transylvania, nay, the Netherlands and France itself, the same discordant elements were now everywhere at work, and threatened to produce an utter abnegation of the papal supremacy.

Beginning of the reaction against Protestantism.

We have seen already how these elements were counteracted and suppressed in Spain[4], in Italy[5] and other provinces of Europe[6], where popes and emperors had full sway, and dared to execute the ancient edicts[7] for exterminating schism and misbelief. It was pope Paul IV.,

Modifications of the Inquisition.

[1] See Courayer's *Discours Historique* on this subject, at the end of Sarpi, III. 225—243.

[2] Labbe, XV. 242. 337, 365, 408, 556, 706.

[3] See above, p. 121.

[4] Above, pp. 92, 95.

[5] Above, pp. 99, 100.

[6] Above, pp. 147, 148. On the occasional reappearance of Inquisitors in Germany and France at the early stages of the Reformation, see Limborch, *Hist. of the Inquisition*, Bk. I. ch. XXVIII., Lond. 1731.

[7] See *Middle Age*, p. 290, and n. 2.

INQUISITION.

whose ardour, while he was yet a cardinal, led to the erection of a fresh tribunal for the whole world, analogous to that which had consumed so many holocausts of Moors and Jews and Protestants in the peninsula of Spain. The bull[1] which authorized this institution was published July **21, 1542.** The immediate consequence in Italy was a general reign of terror, in the midst of which a large band of academics and reformers fled and sought a home beyond the Alps, especially in Switzerland. Hence a leading principle of the Inquisitor was that 'to heretics, and especially to Calvinists, no toleration must be granted[2].' When cardinal Caraffa was himself exalted to the papal chair (**1555**), the rigours of the Inquisition were, if possible, intensified[3]. To him is also due the publication of a fuller *Index librorum prohibitorum*[4] (**1559**), by which he

[1] Six cardinals (of whom the future pontiff, Paul IV. was one) were then made inquisitors-general 'in all Christian nations whatsoever.' The following is the substance of their instructions as abridged by Limborch (*Ibid.* ch. xxix.: Vol. I. p. 151): 'To proceed without the ordinaries, against all hereticks, and suspected of heresy, and their accomplices and abettors, of whatever state, degree, order, condition, and pre-eminence, and to punish them, and confiscate their goods: to depute a procurator-fiscal, notary and other officials necessary to the aforesaid affair: to degrade and deliver over to the secular court by any prelate deputed by them, the secular and regular clergy in holy orders: to curb opposers, to call in the assistance of the secular arm, and to do everything else that should be necessary: to substitute everywhere Inquisitors, with the same or a limited power: to take cognizance of appeals from other Inquisitors to them: to cite, forbid and absolve, in the court and out of it, simply or conditionally, from all ecclesiastical sentences, censures and punishments, all that should appeal to them.'

[2] See Caraffa's rules in Ranke, *Popes*, I. 212, 213.

[3] His peremptory bull of March 1, 1559, is printed at length in Raynald. *Annal. Eccl.* ad an. 1559, § 14.—Another proof of his disposition was shewn in the establishment of the festival of San Dominico in honour of the great Inquisitor (Ranke, *Ibid.* I. 314): cf. above, p. 291, n. 3.

[4] The first of these *Indices* appeared in 1549, under the auspices of the papal legate at Venice, Joh. della Casa: but its effects were slight compared with those produced by the edict of Paul IV. See it with notes among the *Works* of Vergerius (I. 236). The immediate consequences of it are thus described by a contemporary, Natalis Comes, quoted by Gieseler, III. i. p. 510, n. 35 (ed. Bonn.): 'Tanta concremata est omnis generis librorum ubique copia et multitudo, ut Trojanum prope incendium, si in unum collati fuissent, apparere posset. Nulla enim fuit bibliotheca vel privata vel publica, quæ fuerit immunis ab ea clade, ac non prope exinanita.' See more on these subjects in Mendham's *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*, &c., 2nd ed. Lond. 1830: and a modern apology for the Inquisition in Balmez, *Protestantism and Catholicity*, c. XXXVI., Eng. transl.

JESUITS.

hoped that he should be enabled to dry up the main sources of heretical pravity, if he could not stifle every whisper which was raised against the pontiff and the schoolmen. In a constitution[1] of Pius V. (**1566**), a fresh demand was made of absolute obedience to the mandates of the Inquisitor-general: princes, judges, and all secular magistrates, were earnestly implored to lend their help, and, under the succeeding popes[2], the organization of this merciless tribunal was still more developed, and treatises[3] drawn up for the instruction of the various officials now employed in carrying out its sanguinary objects. Yet the harshness and inhumanity of these measures often issued in their own defeat. A few southern states of Christendom alone accepted the intervention of the 'Holy Office;' the rest excluding it either from religious principle, or from a dread lest the atrocities which it perpetrated should provoke a general rising of their subjects and imperil the established forms of faith and worship.

Meanwhile, however, the current of the Reformation was retarded, and occasionally reversed, by the untiring efforts of the Jesuits. The founder of this body, it is true, himself took part in the remodelling of the Inquisition[4], but the principles on which his followers acted were persuasive and pacific. Ignatius Loyola[5] (Inigo Lopez de Recalde), the youngest scion of a noble Spanish house, was born in the province of Guipuscoa (**1491**), and educated at the court of Ferdinand the Catholic. Though not untainted by the vices of his age and station, Ignatius, even in his early manhood, and when thirsting for the reputation of the perfect soldier, gave some passing intimations of his future destiny[6]. By nature ardent, visionary, and

Ignatius Loyola (d. **1556**):

[1] Limborch, *Ibid.* I. 152, 153. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 153 sq.

[3] Two of these were the *Light of the Inquisition*, by Bernard of Como, with annotations by Francis Pegna (Rom. 1584), and in the following year Eymeric's *Directory of the Inquisitors*, with the commentaries of Pegna. Other works relating to the subject will be found in a collection entitled *Tractatus Illustrium Jurisconsultorum de Criminalibus Inquisitionis*, Venet. 1584.

[4] Ranke, *Popes*, I. 211.

[5] See the earliest *Lives* of him in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Jul. Tom. VII. pp. 634 sq.; and cf. Is. Taylor's *Loyola and Jesuitism in its Rudiments*, Lond. 1849, and Busz, *Die Gesellschaft Jesu*, Mainz, 1853.

[6] He actually composed a romance of chivalry, the hero of which was the first Apostle: Ranke, *Popes*, I. 182.

JESUITS.

his conversion.

romantic, all these tendencies were strengthened in him and developed during a long illness caused by wounds which he received in defending Pampeluna against the French in **1521.** The tales of chivalry, by which his youthful imagination had been fired, were then exchanged for the *Legenda Aurea*, and other writings more or less distinguished by the same phantastic spirit. Stimulated by the glowing and unworldly pictures there presented, he resolved to dedicate himself in future to the service of religion, and emulate the deeds of Christ, St Francis, and St Dominic[1]. Accordingly on his recovery he tore himself away from all his kindred and associates; he visited the hermits in the solitudes of Montserrat; on the eve of the Annunciation, **1522**, he suspended his lance and shield before a wonder-working image of the Virgin[2], abandoning thereby a temporal for a spiritual knighthood; and as he was more and more convinced of the enormity of moral evil, his austerities became more rigorous, and his self-reproaches more emphatic and enduring. Yet unlike the Wittenberg reformer, who was then secluded also, in the castle of Wartburg, Ignatius Loyola had only a slender knowledge of the Scriptures; he had never been distinctly pointed to the way of reconciliation with God, nor to the real source of spiritual manliness and grace. When consolation came at last, its origin

[1] 'Aderat interim Divina misericordia, quæ ex lectione recenti his cogitationibus alias subjiciebat. Cum enim vitam Christi Domini nostri ac sanctorum legeret, tum apud se cogitabat, secumque ita colligebat: Quid si ego hoc agerem, quod fecit beatus Franciscus? Quid si hoc, quod beatus Dominicus?' *Acta antiquissima*, as above, § 2.

[2] All this was conceived in the spirit of ancient chivalry: 'Itaque statuit ad arma sua (ut inter milites dicitur) vigilias agere tota nocte una neque sedens neque jacens, sed vicissim stans et flexus genua ante altare Dominæ nostræ Montis Serrati, ubi vestimenta sua deponere statuerat, et Christi arma induere' etc.: *Ibid.* § 17. To this period it is usual to refer the composition of his extraordinary *Exercitia Spiritualia* (often printed), the idea of which was suggested by a similar work of Garcia de Cisneros (Ranke, *Popes*, I. 232, note). The Exercises occa-

at Jc
at Babylo
cises, in order that the spirit may be thus thoroughly concentrated on itself, and the religious fancy stimulated to higher measures of ecstatic contemplation. The work, however, is comparatively speaking unenthusiastic, which has led to the hypothesis that the first draft of Ignatius Loyola was materially altered in subsequent revisions.

JESUITS.

was in a series of reveries and visions[1], where, as he believed, the very deepest mystery of the Christian faith was sensibly revealed to him, and so imprinted on the soul that neither life nor death could afterwards obliterate the image, nor disturb the secret current of his joy.

Formation of a society of spiritual knights.

After wandering in this mood as far as Jerusalem (**1523**), in the hope of there accelerating the conversion of infidels, Ignatius went to Barcelona, to Alcala, and finally to Paris (**1528**), where he thought to qualify himself for more efficient public teaching by a regular course of study. Such a course, however, proved distasteful to him[2], and instead of falling cordially into the habits of the university, he laboured with no ordinary tact to spread his own enthusiastic and ascetic principles among the more able of his fellow students. Two whom he especially influenced[3] were Faber, a Savoyard, and Xavier, a native of Navarre, and in their society it was that, in a cell of the college of St Barbara at Paris, he suggested and discussed the first idea of the 'Company of Jesus[4].' When matured[5], their chivalrous project was to sacrifice their lives in absolute poverty at

[1] Thus at Manresa, where he repeated the ascetic practices in which he engaged at Montserrat, 'he stood fixed on the steps of San Dominico and wept aloud: for he thought in that moment the mystery of the Holy Trinity was visibly revealed to him. The whole day he spoke of nothing else.' *Ibid.* I. 188. A similar vision with similar effects appeared to the abbot Ralph of Fountains: see Dugdale, *Monast.* v. 304, new ed.

[2] 'Quoties audiebat magistrum prælegentem, tam multis interturbabatur spiritualibus rebus, ut audire attente non posset.' *Acta antiquissima*, § 82. This eccentricity, which in Spain exposed him to the suspicion of 'Lutheranism,' was still objectionable in the eyes of the authorities. He completed his college course, however, learning Latin, graduating in philosophy, and studying theology under the care of the Dominicans.

[3] See Ranke's description, as above, pp. 192 sq. Excepting Faber all the earliest converts were Spaniards, *e.g.* Salmeron, Lainez and Bobadilla.

[4] The name (in Spanish, Compania de Jesus), when first chosen, was designed to mark the spiritual knighthood of the members. 'Placuit omnibus,' writes one of the biographers of Ignatius Loyola (*Acta Sanct.* Jul. Tom. VII. p. 471), 'ut a militari vocabulo Societas Jesu (suis enim cohortibus milites, quas vulgo Societates seu Compagnias appellant, ab ipsis fere ducibus nomen indunt) appellaretur.'

[5] In 1534, the year when the papal supremacy was destroyed in England, Ignatius and his party met in the crypt of the church of Montmartre, on the feast of the Assumption, and after receiving the Eucharist from Faber, already a priest, bound themselves together by a solemn oath and completed their dedication to the service of Christ and of the Virgin.

JESUITS.

Jerusalem for the conversion of the Saracens, and the edification of Christians; or should obstacles arise and frustrate this intention, they vowed to place themselves unreservedly at the disposal of the pope for any kind of service he thought proper to enjoin.

Change in its destiny.

In the beginning of **1537**, we find Ignatius Loyola with eight of his companions at Venice[1], ready to embark upon their eastern pilgrimage. But the outbreak of hostilities between the Turks and Venetians made it necessary to abandon their idea of labouring in Palestine. Meanwhile they associated themselves with Caraffa, who had lately taken part in founding the confraternity of Theatins[2], and entering into priest's orders, opened their sacred warfare in the bold and indefatigable spirit of their leader, by preaching penitence and practising such acts of self-renunciation as were then almost unknown in the luxurious towns of Lombardy and central Italy. In **1543**, the new order received the unconditional approbation of the pontiff[3]. He saw in it the aptest instrument which that age supplied for warding off the bold aggressions on his own supremacy[4].

[1] There the members of the nascent order remained a year, working in parties of three each, for the conversion of profligates.

[2] This order, which arose in 1524, under the auspices of Gaetano da Thiene and Caraffa, was intended to meet the cry for some thorough reformation of the clergy: see Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres Religieux*, IV. 76 sq. The members were priests bound by monastic vows, and pledged to the duties of preaching, administration of the sacraments, and visiting the sick. Many of their sermons were delivered in the open air. The Barnabites, founded at Milan in 1530, were a kindred order: Helyot, *Ibid.* IV. 106 sq., Paris, 1792.

[3] See the various documents in *Litteræ apostolicæ, quibus Institutio, Confirmatio et varia Privilegia continentur Societatis Jesu*, Antverp. 1635. As early as Sept. 27, 1540, the pontiff confirmed the rules of the order, but limited the number of members to sixty. Of these, Ignatius was elected president, or general, with the most arbitrary powers, so that the fortune, person, and conscience of the whole fraternity were placed in his hands, and the one principle of action in the Jesuit was simple and unreasoning obedience. As one of this order boasted in the following century: 'Volvitur et revolvitur hominis unius nutu Societatis universæ tanta moles, moveri facilis, difficilis commoveri' (quoted in Gieseler, III. ii. p. 603, n. 2, ed. Bonn).

[4] Thus in the *Formula Vivendi* of the order, as approved by the pope (*Litteræ apostol.*, as above, pp. 9 sq.), the general statement of obedience to him, as the 'Vicar of Christ,' is heightened by the following passage: 'Ad majorem tamen nostræ Societatis humilitatem [self-surrender and the suppression of all human instincts being among its first principles], ac perfectam uniuscujusque mortificationem, et voluntatum nostrarum

JESUITS.

Characteristics of the Society.

The Jesuits by their rules were secularized far more than any of their predecessors. They were liberated from offices of common worship, which not only absorbed the time of a conventual order, but seriously impaired the force and freedom of its action on the world around it: while their zeal was uniformly directed to three objects made imperative by the moral agitations of that epoch,—plain and earnest preaching, the work of guiding and relieving consciences by means of the confessional, and most of all the superintending of educational establishments and otherwise securing the affections and co-operation of the young[1].

Its rapid progress in the south of Europe.

Of all the marvels that distinguish the Reformation-period, the progress of this Order is among the most extraordinary. In Spain, in Italy, in Portugal, a crowd of enthusiastic converts flocked to it from all gradations of society[2]. Schools and colleges, under the management of Jesuits, were built, enlarged, and multiplied continually. In some of these the learning was at first directly secular; but the spirit of Ignatius Loyola, sobered with the lapse of years, was ever present in such gifted teachers as Lainez and Canisius; operating with unwonted power upon the feelings and imaginations of the pupils, and establishing in every province a kind of 'spiritual standing army,' which

abnegationem summopere conducere judicavimus, *singulos nos ultra illud commune vinculum speciali voto astringi*, ita ut quidquid modernus et alii Romani Pontifices pro tempore existentes jusserint, ad protectum animarum et fidei propagationem pertinens, et ad quascunque provincias nos mittere voluerint, sine ulla tergiversatione aut excusatione, illico, quantum in nobis fuerit, exequi teneamur; sive miserunt nos ad Turcas, sive ad quoscunque alios infideles, etiam in partibus, quas Indicas vocant, existentes, sive ad quoscunque hæreticos seu schismaticos, seu etiam ad quosvis fideles.' The speeches of Lainez, their second general, at the Synod of Poissy and the council of Trent, are specimens of the earnest but unscrupulous way in which this pledge had been redeemed: see Sarpi, II. 234 sq., 339 sq. ed. Courayer.

[1] Cf. Ranke's remarks, I. 199, where he truly adds: 'Thus, out of the visionary schemes of Ignatius, arose an institution of singularly practical tendency; out of the conversions wrought by his asceticism, an institution framed with all the just and accurate calculation of worldly prudence.'

[2] This rapid influx of converts necessitated a development of the constitution of the Order. It consisted finally of four classes, noviciates or scholastici, coadjutors, professors of the three vows, and professors of the four vows. Of these the coadjutors were the most influential, being composed of learned priests who were expressly devoted to the education of the young: cf. Ranke, *Popes*, I. 222.

JESUITS.

was ready at the shortest notice to do battle for the 'old religion,' and to propagate whatever might seem true and fitting to the pope.

When the founder of this mighty system breathed his last in **1556**, the company had possessed itself of thirteen provinces[1], besides the Roman, seven belonging to Spain and Portugal and their colonies. Yet no very marked successes had hitherto attended its operations either in France, in Germany, or in the Low Countries. The first establishment of Jesuits at Vienna[2] dates from **1551**, thirty members of the order having arrived in that year under the auspices of the king of the Romans, Ferdinand, who, on ascertaining the meagreness of the theological education then received by his clergy, placed the management of the university in the hands of Le Jay, an active and accomplished Jesuit. About the same time other lodgments[3] were effected at Cologne and Ingolstadt, from whence the emissaries issued with incredible rapidity, to labour with their wonted fervour and success[4]. In the third quarter of the sixteenth century, owing largely to such efforts, the tide of Reformation was beginning to be turned[5], in Bavaria, in the Tyrol, in parts of Franconia and Swabia, in southern Austria, and in the Rhenish provinces; while members of the Company of Jesus were actively at work, from time to time, in Sweden[6], Poland[7], Hungary[8], Bohemia and Moravia[9], in Switzerland[10], in the Netherlands[11], and in Great Britain[12].

Penetrates into Germany and other countries.

Controversies between Jesuits and Dominicans:

But as all these victories of the counter-reformation party were facilitated by dissensions in the camp of the Reformers, so the mightiness of the reaction was itself diminished in proportion as the youthful fervour of the

[1] Ranke, *Popes*, I. 235.
[2] *Ibid.* II. 26.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 27 sq. Some few of the early race of teachers were furnished by the 'Collegium Germanicum' which was founded at Rome by Julius III. in 1552: but the majority were Spaniards and Italians, who 'conquered the Germans on their own soil, in their very home, and wrested from them a portion of their own country' (p. 36).
[4] *E. g.* in one district of Germany 'fourteen cities and market-towns, and above two hundred villages, containing in all 62,000 souls, were brought back to the catholic faith' in the single year 1586 (*Ibid.* p. 126).
[5] Above, p. 66.
[6] Above, pp. 80, 81.
[7] Above, p. 84.
[8] Above, p. 92.
[9] Above, p. 87.
[10] Above, p. 121.
[11] Above, p. 151.
[12] Above, p. 235.

JESUITS.

Jesuits evaporated, or was spent in mutual quarrels and domestic factions[1]. One of the disputes in which they were entangled by the theologians of their party, and which threatened more than once to bring them under the heavy lash of the Inquisitors, had reference to the long-contested doctrines of grace and free-will[2]. Ignatius Loyola was himself a Thomist, and, as such, he had commended to their special reverence the elaborate writings of Aquinas[3]. But when feuds arose between the Jesuits and that order (the Dominican) of which he was esteemed the greatest luminary, his writings began to be disparaged by authorities of the former body, and at last their general, Aquaviva, openly departed from several of his main positions[4]. The

[1] One of these was due to the circumstance that in the early years of the Order a vast preponderance of the abler members were of Spanish extraction. Accordingly the fifth general, Aquaviva, who was a Neapolitan (elected 1581), had to struggle with a large body of discontented subjects: Ranke, *Popes*, II. 292 sq.

[2] As early as 1560 the Jesuits of Cologne, in their *Censura de præcipuis Doctrinæ Cœlestis Capitibus*, Colon. 1560, had given utterance to Pelagian or semi-Pelagian sentiments: see Chemnitz, *Theologiæ Jesuitarum præcipua Capita*, Lips. 1563.

[3] See *Constitutiones*, Part. IV. c. 14 ('In theologia legetur vetus et novum Testamentum et doctrina scholastica divi Thomæ'). Lainez had already in a *Declaratio* of 1558 appended other instructions, authorizing the 'Master of the Sentences' (Peter Lombard), and any other divine whose work the general might deem 'his nostris temporibus accommodatior.' The pontiff also, Pius V., shewed a bias in the same direction, by censuring in 1567 the Augustinian (anti-Jesuit) teaching of Bajus at Louvain: see the condemned propositions in Leydecker, *Histor. Jansenismi*, pp. 278 sq. Traj. ad Rhenum, 1695. On the other hand the theological faculty at Louvain, in 1586, condemned the teaching of the two Jesuits Less and Hamel, who, as they avow, in order to keep as far as possible from the standing-ground of the Reformers, had adopted principles hardly distinguishable from those of Pelagius. It is worthy of remark that, on the same occasion, the University as positively condemned the lax opinions of these Jesuits touching the inspiration of Holy Scripture, into which also they were drawn by their desire to oppose the Protestants at every turn: see the condemned propositions in Serry, *Hist. Congregationum de Auxiliis divinæ Gratiæ sub Clement. VIII. et Paul. V.*, pp. 11 sq., Lovan. 1700: and Mr Lee's *Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, pp. 438, 439. Perhaps the most able and candid of the Jesuit controversialists, in the second half of the sixteenth century, is Robert Bellarmine, a Tuscan, who died Sept. 17, 1621. His *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianæ Fidei* (best edition, Venet. 1596) has ever since kept its ground among standard polemical treatises: see *Vita del Card. Bellarmino*, by Giacomo Fuligati, Roma, 1624.

[4] The *Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum* drawn up under his authority appeared at Rome in 1586. It was denounced in Spain as 'el mas peli-

JESUITS.

plea put forward was, that more recent doctors had improved upon Aquinas, had elucidated many points which he was forced to leave in comparative obscurity, and, what was more important still, had furnished them with sharper and more serviceable weapons for assaulting both the Saxon and Swiss Reformers. This controversy, which ere long resolved itself into a struggle between the Jesuits and Dominicans, attained its highest point during the sixteenth century, when Molina, of the Company of Jesus and professor in the university of Evora in Portugal, published his treatise entitled *Liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, Divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione, concordia* (**1588**). The author ventures to reject the Augustinian theory of predestination[1], asserting that events do not happen because God foreknows them, but rather that God foresees them because they will happen: while, in reference to the human aspect of this question, he contends that man is able to do good works without any assistance beyond the general gifts of God in nature[2], but that having raised himself by his inherent faculties so as to perform some elementary acts of penitence and faith, he then receives the supernatural grace of sanctification. The work of his acceptance is thus made so far Theandric, that Divine and human elements co-operate in nearly equal proportions. As these thoughts were running counter to the general stream of theology, reformed and unreformed, the Jesuits found it no easy matter to survive the storms they had excited, particularly in Spain[3], where the Dominicans were able to invoke the succour of the Inquisition, and were in other respects a formidable body. At last appeals were made to Rome itself, Oct. **9**, **1596**, on which the controversy

Growth of semi-Pelagianism.

The controversy undecided.

groso, temerario y arrogante que jamas havia salido in semejante materia:' Ranke, *Popes*, II. 304, note.

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 306, 307.

[2] Thus the second of the extracts made by the *Congregatio de Auxiliis* in 1597 (Serry, as above, pp. 241 sq.) runs as follows: 'Potest homo per vires naturæ cum solo concursu generali Dei assentiri mysteriis supernaturalibus sibi propositis et explicatis (qualia sunt Deum esse triunum in personis, Christum esse Deum, et similia), tanquam a Deo revelatis, actu mere naturali.'

[3] Ranke, II. 308 sq. 'From that time a complete division arose between the two orders. The Dominicans would have nothing more to do with the Jesuits, a large majority of whom, if not all, took part with Molina.'

appeared to have assumed an almost national character; the French siding with the Jesuits, and the Spaniards with their adversaries: while the pontiff, trembling lest he should offend either of these parties, and so deprive the papacy of its most learned and devoted champions, resolved[1] to leave the question altogether in suspense. He thereby illustrated two important truths, which are indeed emphatically urged upon our notice by the history of the Reformation, (1) that even the most rigorous institutions are unable to eradicate those principles of the human heart and understanding which issue in religious differences; and (2) that the most despotic rulers have been forced to admit the necessity of granting, with respect to one mysterious class of topics, a considerable latitude of belief.

JESUITS.

[1] The first suspension took place after Clement VIII. had attended 'sixty-five meetings and thirty-seven disputations on all the points which could possibly come under discussion.' *Ibid.* p. 314. The subject was reopened under Paul V., whose leaning clearly was against the Jesuits, but after fresh discussions he also had not the courage to condemn them: *Ibid.* p. 365.

CHAPTER VII.

RELATIONS OF EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCHES.

Depression of the Eastern Church.

THE Reformation being in its essence a product of the moral and intellectual re-awakening that dates from a revival of letters, a more earnest application to the study of the Bible, and the general deposition of the schoolmen, was restricted to those countries which had felt the impulses of the preparatory movement. Few if any changes were accordingly effected by it in the eastern provinces of Christendom. The Turks were absolute masters of the patriarchate of Constantinople[1]; from the capture of Otranto, in **1480**, they never ceased to trample on the rights of their Christian subjects, and struck terror into all the nations of the West[2], until their overthrow and permanent humiliation at the battle of Lepanto, in **1571**: while Russia, destined to become the leading province of the 'orthodox' communion, was at present too far removed from western influences[3], and had been too recently eman-

[1] Some light is thrown upon the current doctrines of the Greek church, as explained to the Muhammedans at this period, by the two *Confessions* of Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople: in *Libr. Symbol. Eccl. Orientalis*, pp. 1—23, ed. Kimmel, Jenæ, 1843.

[2] For example, as late as 1566, archbishop Parker drew up a '*Form to be used in Common Prayer*, every Sunday, Wednesday and Friday, through the whole realm: to excite and stir all godly people to pray unto God for the preservation of those Christians and their countries, that are now invaded by the Turk in Hungary and elsewhere:' *Liturgical Services*, ed. P. S. pp. 527—535: cf. Parker's *Correspond.* p. 289.

[3] The discovery by English mariners of a way to the White Sea (1553) led to the first intercourse between Russia and this country (Turner's *Modern Hist. of England*, III. 298 sq. 2nd ed.). On the mischances that befel the ambassador sent to the court of Philip and Mary in 1556, 'with certaine presents and gifts, as a manifest argument of a mutuall amitie to be made and continued betweene their Maiesties subiects, for the commodities of both realmes and people,' see Stow's *Annales*, p. 629. So little cultivated were the Russian clergy of this period

cipated from the iron bondage of the Tatars, to assist in settling the momentous questions that were stirred among the Wittenberg Reformers.

Correspondence between Constantinople and Wittenberg.

Still the Easterns of the border-lands could not be ignorant of these mighty agitations[1], nor the Westerns indifferent as to the condition of their Christian brother at a distance, and the verdict he might be inclined to pass on them and their proceedings. As early as **1525**, the archduke Ferdinand directed his confessor[2] to collect authentic information respecting the religion of the Muscovites: and, on the other hand, Melanchthon, who had Greeks among his auditors[3] and corresponded with members of the Greek church[4], determined to make the patriarch of Constantinople acquainted with the genuine principles of Luther[5] as contained in the Augsburg Confession,—a measure which, to the annoyance of the Romish party[6], led to the formation of more amicable relations than had hitherto subsisted (**1559**). In **1573**, the emperor Maximilian II. appointed a Protestant ambassador at Constantinople, who took with him for his chaplain a Greek scholar of con-

that, according to Levesque (quoted in Miller, *Phil. Hist.* III. 100), 'three persons only among them were acquainted with the Latin language, and none of them had any knowledge of the Greek, though they belonged to the Greek Church.' A great change, however, was produced in all quarters during the reign of Michael, the founder of the Romanoff dynasty.

[1] For example, a letter quoted in Gieseler, III. i. p. 467 (ed. Bonn), note, mentions that as early as 1543, Wallachia, then subject to the Turks, had manifested a disposition to receive the doctrines of the Reformers which passed over to them from Transylvania: 'Et quod mireris, Valachia quoque Transsylvaniæ vicina et Turcis subjecta evangelium recepit. Tam Vetus quam Novum Testamentum sua lingua in Corona, Transsylvaniæ civitate, impressa sunt.'

[2] This was John Faber (the Swiss polemic, above, p. 106, n. 1), whose account is preserved in the *De Russorum, Moscovitarum et Tartarorum Religione*, Spiræ, 1582, and reprinted (in English) by Mr Palmer, in his *Dissertations on subjects relating to the 'Orthodox' or 'Eastern-Catholic' Communion*, pp. 32 sq. Lond. 1853.

[3] Above, p. 72.

[4] See Martin Crusius, *Turco-græcia* (a collection of important documents in illustration of this chapter), p. 543, Basil. 1584.

[5] The translation of the Confession into Greek was made in 1551 by Paul Dolscius: cf. Melanchthon's *Works*, ed. Bretschn. IX. 921. It was afterwards translated into modern Greek by Michael Cantacuzenos, and also into the language of Georgia by order of a prince of that country.

[6] Cf. Krasinski, *Reform. in Poland*, II. 134, note. Lond. 1840.

siderable reputation, Stephen Gerlach, afterwards professor at Tübingen. By him the patriarch Jeremiah was invited to examine the Augsburg Confession, and overtures were actually made in order to cement a lasting union between the Greeks and Protestants. Jeremiah, it is true, was driven from his patriarchal throne while the correspondence was proceeding, yet he continued the interchange of letters with the Tübingen divines till **1582**, at which date their communication ceased, without, as it would seem, producing any positive or permanent results[1].

Attempted union of Greeks and Protestants in Poland.

The same disposition to establish an alliance with the Greeks was shewn by king John of Sweden, whom we saw negotiating[2] for a kindred purpose with the Jesuits and the Roman see. This project also was entirely fruitless. At the close of the century, however, a new scheme for bringing about the fusion of the members of the Greek church and the Protestant confessions in Poland was commenced with somewhat fairer prospects of success. The three Reformed communions, Saxon, Helvetic, and Bohemian, had already established a temporary pacification[3] by the union of Sandomir (**1570**), and in **1599** it was arranged that representatives of these bodies should meet some Greek priests at Vilna[4] to discuss the terms of a confede-

[1] See the whole correspondence in *Acta et scripta theologorum Wittebergensium et patriarchæ Constantinopolitani de Augustana Confessione*, Wittenberg. 1584. The renewal of this kind of intercourse through the agency of Cyril Lucar, who became patriarch of Alexandria in 1602, belongs to the next period of Church-history: cf. Smith's *Collectanea de Cyrillo Lucari*, Lond. 1707, and Neale's *Eastern Church*, 'Alexandria,' II. 356—455.

[2] Above, pp. 80, 81. 'The King,' says Geijer (p. 169), 'now turned his thoughts to a junction with the Greek Church, but he finally adhered to his own scheme of religion, of which he considered his new Liturgy the proper expression.'

[3] See above, pp. 85, 86.

[4] Krasinski, *Reform. in Poland*, II. 139 sq. Lond. 1840. They were impelled to this measure chiefly by the persecutions to which all of them were exposed, owing to the predominance of Romish influences under Sigismund III. The chief agent on the part of the Reformers was Turnowski, superintendent of the Bohemian Brethren. One of the preliminary questions he proposed for discussion ran as follows: 'Whether, according to the precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ, they would unite in love, and for mutual advice and assistance in common injuries and affairs against Antichrist and his servants, with those who, being satisfied with the true Word of God, submitted entirely to its rule and doctrine, considered Christ as their Pastor and the sole Head of the Church, received the sacraments according to His institution, admitted

racy, religious and political, against the servants of the 'Roman Antichrist.' On assembling (May **24**), the harmony of the proceedings was at first interrupted by the protests and unbending attitude of Isaac, the hegumenos of the convent of Dubno and Gedeon, who asserted that the only hope of union was for Protestants to abandon their 'heresy' and pass over to the Greek church: but four days later, certain articles, eighteen in number, which they all expressed their willingness to adopt, were drawn up as the preliminaries of the union, provided the consent of the patriarch of Constantinople were not finally withheld. The points here shewn to have been held in common by the Greeks and Protestants are these[1]: That the Scriptures are the source of truth and of the doctrine of salvation: that God is one in essence and three-fold in person: that the three Divine Personalities are consubstantial and co-equal, according to the Nicene Creed: that the summary of the Apostolic faith, called *symbolum*, contains the marrow of true religion: that Christ, who is begotten of the Father before all worlds, truly became man and was born into the world for our salvation: that by offering Himself to God the Father for us, He in His death made a perfect atonement for our sins: that God is neither the cause nor maker of evil: that all men are conceived and born in sin: that pardon is extended to those who repent and are truly converted: that faithful Christians are obliged to the performance of good works: that Christ alone is the Head of the Church, visible as well as invisible: that a regular ministry is needed in the Church of God for dispensing the Word and sacraments: that the marriage of the clergy is not prohibited: that infants ought to be baptized: that the Eucharist is to be administered to all the faithful in both

Doctrinal points of contact.

the authority of the first uniform œcumenic councils, and considered the holy doctors, whose writings agree with the Scriptures, as teachers sent by God, and very useful for the edification of the Church?' *Ibid.* p. 142.

[1] *Ibid.* pp. 148—150. Ten clergy of the Greek Rite were present on this occasion. It was during the oppressions that suggested the combined action of Greeks and Protestants that Cyril Lucar, who afterwards, as Mr Neale has worded it, 'was led to assimilate fearfully with Calvinian doctrine' (*Alexandria*, II. 360), came to Poland as legate of Meletius Piga, patriarch of Alexandria, to assist in counteracting the advances of the Romanists (*Ibid.* p. 362). He gained his livelihood at Vilna by teaching Greek.

kinds: that the Scriptures are silent touching any purgatory for the purification of souls after death: that Christ having gone up to heaven in His body sitteth at the right hand of the Father, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead: that as the happiness of the faithful is everlasting, so is the punishment of the damned interminable.

Points of difference.

On other subjects, such for instance as the procession of the Holy Spirit, or the invocation of saints, the worship or veneration of icons and relics, and the main principles of divine service, the differences appeared almost irreconcileable: yet, in order to facilitate the work of union, it was proposed to hold annual synods, alternately Protestant and Greek, for the discussion of these remaining articles[1]. But no reasoning could induce the Greek divines to enter fully into such discussions until they had consulted the Eastern patriarchs, especially the mother-see of Constantinople; and though nothing definite has been recorded of the answers forwarded by these authorities, we argue from the permanence of the division, that they were unfavourable to the project. The two communities, however, entered on the same occasion into a political compact for the mutual defence of their rights and liberties against the violent manœuvres of the Romish party.

That party had indeed been gaining fresh predominance[2] in the reign of Sigismund III., who, aided by Possevin, the accomplished Jesuit whom we saw at work in Sweden[3], and by other members of the Company, expended his chief energies not only in retarding the advance of Protestantism, but in promoting the absorption of his 'orthodox' subjects into the church of Rome. One leading principle of action was to distribute all his public appointments exclusively among the Romanists[4]; and the threat of banish-

[1] *Ibid.* p. 150.

[2] See above, p. 84, and n. 2. The fury of his zeal is shewn by the circumstance that Nicephorus, a legate of the patriarch of Constantinople, who vehemently resisted the royal attempts to Romanize the Poles, was seized and strangled: Neale, as before, II. 362.

[3] Above, p. 81.

[4] This principle had been already (1568) suggested from Rome to one of his predecessors in order to eradicate the Protestants more speedily. The Polish monarch was exhorted to declare 'nullis se deinceps vel honores vel præfecturas vel quæcunque tandem alia munera publice

ment from the senate, added to the constant importunities of Sigismund, ultimately[1] drove a number of the Polish prelates in Lithuania to abandon the Greek Rite, and seek communion with the Latins, on the basis formerly established at the council of Florence[2]. Such was the origin of the Polish Uniates[3]. They admitted the orthodoxy of the clause *Filioque*, they assented to the Romish view of purgatory, and acknowledged the supremacy of the pope: retaining, however, the Slavonic language in the celebration of public worship, together with the ancient ritual and discipline of the 'Greek' churches[4]. The union was consummated in a synod held at Brest in Lithuania, Oct. **6, 1596**, when the metropolitan of Kieff, and the other prelates who assented to the measure, excommunicated all persons who ventured to impugn it, or impede its operation.

Polish 'Uniates.'

Not content with large advantages thus gained in Po-

mandaturum, nisi qui Christum aperte confessus fuerit et omni perfidiæ sive Lutheristicæ sive Calvinisticæ sive Anabaptistarum nuntium remiserit:' quoted in Ranke, *Popes*, II. 379, note.

[1] The first step in the work of 'reconciliation' was to assemble the clergy at a synod in 1590 (Krasinski, II. 135). But as this measure was abortive, Possevin and Scarga, another Jesuit in the confidence of Sigismund, won over four Greek bishops and the metropolitan of Kieff, who carried their plan of a re-union in a second council held also at Brest or Brzesz in Lithuania, Dec. 2, 1594. Deputies were then sent to Clement VIII., who received them with open arms: and so far as their party extended the reconciliation was completed in the following autumn. But the greater part of the Greek nobility, with prince Constantine Ostrogski, palatine of Kieff, at their head, protested; and 'the prince assembled a numerous meeting of the nobility and clergy adverse to Rome, at which the bishops, who had brought about the union, were excommunicated.' *Ibid.* pp. 137, 138: cf. the Russian account in Mouravieff, *Hist. of the Church of Russia*, pp. 139 sq. Oxf. 1842.

[2] See *Middle Age*, pp. 366 sq.

[3] 'From this time,' says Mouravieff (p. 142), 'began the hard and long-continued struggle of orthodoxy against the Unia in all the Polish and Lithuanian provinces, and the persecutions of the Western Church, and more particularly of the civil government, against those who refused to betray the faith of their ancestors.'

[4] Krasinski, II. 137. Mouravieff's account is rather different: 'The conventicle of the Uniates and the Romans, after having solemnly confirmed their first agreement for a union, which was sealed by the joint celebration of the liturgy in the same church, pronounced a similar sentence of excommunication [see note 1, above] against the orthodox; and thus the Church of Little Russia was divided into the Orthodox and the Uniate, both preserving, however, the same form, not only of external rite in the celebration of Divine service, but even of doctrine: for Rome at first allowed the Creed without alteration, and required nothing but the one capital point of submission to the pope:' p. 142.

Romish attempts on Russia.

land, the indefatigable emissaries of the Roman pontiff turned their thoughts to Russia, in the hope of compensating for the heavy loss he had sustained in other parts of northern Europe. John (Ivan) the Terrible had, as early as the middle of the sixteenth century, endeavoured to brace up the discipline of the Russian church, and regulate the lives of her ecclesiastics by convoking the important council of the 'Hundred Chapters'[1] (**1551**): and the Russian prelates, about the same time, published their first anathema against a band of interlopers who appear to have been introducing Lutheran tenets[2] from adjacent parts of Lithuania. They were also most emphatic in their censures of the Latins[3], whom they found endeavouring to seduce both flocks and pastors from their old allegiance. But when John soon afterwards became entangled[4] in sanguinary contests with Stephen Bathori, king of Poland, he resolved to extricate himself by calling in the aid of foreign powers, and was brought by this means into communication with pope Gregory XIII. By him the Jesuit Possevin was dispatched to the arena of dissension in the capacity of a mediator, and having negotiated a peace between the combatants, on terms disadvantageous to the Russians, he proceeded to urge upon the czar the desirableness of recognising the supremacy of the pope and bowing to the judgments of the council of Florence. John, however, and his subjects were equally deaf to such proposals[5] both on this and on subsequent occasions.

Foundation of the Russian patriarchate.

It was towards the close of the sixteenth century that an event occurred in Russia which materially affected the Muscovite church in its relation to those other communities in which the Greek Rite still continued to prevail. Since the fall of Constantinople, the metropolitans of all

[1] Mouravieff, pp. 103—105.

[2] 'About this same time Macarius [metropolitan of Moscow] presided at another synod of less note, which condemned the beginning of a heresy which was creeping in amongst us from Lithuania. Their rejection of the canons and ordinances of the Church, her ceremonies and icons, and their questioning the Divinity of the Saviour, discovered the guilt of Backsheen and his little knot of followers.' Mouravieff, p. 108: cf. the translator's note.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 112.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 121.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 122. A similar mission of Comuleo to Moscow in 1594 shared the same fate: Ranke, *Popes*, II. 400.

Russia, though appointed by a synod of their own bishops and confirmed by no foreign see, had notwithstanding been regarded by themselves and others as dependent on the patriarchate of Constantinople[1]. But in **1588** a project was devised for bringing this old dependence to a close. It was determined by the czar, in concert with the Eastern churches and with the special cooperation of Jeremiah II., patriarch of Constantinople, that as 'old Rome' had fallen a prey to heresy, and as the calamities of the age required such modification, a new patriarchate[2] should be instituted in Russia, so as to preserve inviolate the hierarchical arrangements of ancient Christendom. Yet with regard to the domestic organization of the Russian church, the change was little more than nominal. Job, the first patriarch (**1587—1606**), exercised no other spiritual functions than had always appertained to Russian metropolitans, while he stood on precisely the same footing with reference to the civil power[3].

[1] See *Middle Age*, p. 120.

[2] Mouravieff, ch. vi. In Appendix I. (pp. 289—324) this writer gives a full account of 'the coming of the patriarch Jeremiah into Russia' (1587), when the change of government was planned and executed. The final consent of Jeremiah is thus expressed (pp. 302, 303): 'Of a truth the Holy Spirit abideth in your religious tsar, his thought has been inspired from God; and so also has this proper way of bringing it about. Since Old Rome has fallen through the Apollinarian heresy [this charge resting on a fanciful connexion between the views of Apollinaris respecting the Person of Christ and the Western custom of using unleavened bread in the Eucharist], and Constantinople, which is New Rome, is in the possession of the unbelieving Turks, the children of Hagar, the great kingdom of Russia has surpassed all others put together in piety, and your Orthodox sovereign is named throughout all the world as the sole pattern of a Christian king. Therefore, by the providence of God, and by the prayers of the most immaculate Virgin, and the intercession of the great wonder-workers, Peter, Alexis and Jonah, and by the advice of the tsar, let this great work be accomplished.'

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 131, 132.

CHAPTER VIII.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AND ITS RELATIONS TO THE CIVIL POWER.

ROMAN COMMUNION.

ROMAN COMMUNION.

THE fresh humiliations that continually befel the Eastern patriarchs at the commencement of this period wrought no very sensible effect on the internal economy of churches subject to their jurisdiction. Nor was Rome herself impelled by any of the sweeping changes, that now wrested from her grasp one half of her dominions, to remodel the constitution of the papacy, or lessen the exorbitance of her demands. She still affected a position immeasurably higher than the rest of the 'Apostolical sees;' she claimed to be the mother and the mistress of all churches. While oriental Christians, in like manner, occupied their ancient ground with reference to the civil power, treating it as divinely instituted, and ascribing to the Christian monarch almost sacerdotal attributes, the opposite tendency was still betrayed by the adherents of the Roman pontiff, who argued that after the Mediæval hierarchy obtained its full development, the secular power had been subordinated to the spiritual, and the popes entrusted with a moral jurisdiction over all the nations of the globe.

Permanence of Roman assumptions.

If we confine our thoughts, in the first place, to the internal organization of the church, we find that Luther's violent assaults upon the papacy were all converted into opportunities for reiterating its most arrogant assumptions. An inmate of the papal palace[1], for example, whom we

[1] This was Sylvester Mazolini, on whom see above, p. 17. Ranke (*Ref.* I. 470, 471) draws attention to another of his tracts entitled, *De Juridica et irrefragabili veritate Romanæ Ecclesiæ Romanique Pontificis*, in which these sentiments occur; *e.g.* in cap. iv. we have the following: 'Etsi ex jam dictis constat Romanum præsulem esse caput orbis uni-

ROMAN COMMUNION.

Language of its apologists.

saw in **1517**, among the pamphleteers who laboured to suppress the nascent Reformation, was ready to contend that the Roman pontiff is the sole infallible arbiter of controversies, and resolver of all spiritual doubts; that his monarchy, as foretold by Daniel, is the only true monarchy; that he is the foremost of all hierarchs and the father of all temporal princes; that he is head of the whole world, nay, is himself virtually the whole world. In reference to the question of indulgences[1], the same writer did not scruple to argue that, although the Bible was silent respecting them, the practice rested on authority still 'greater,'—the authority of the Roman Church and Roman pontiffs. Hence all other species of jurisdiction in matters spiritual was said to flow from the pope as from the single representative of Christ on earth. Bishops, in particular, whose office was originally viewed as resting on Divine appointment, were esteemed by partizans of the papacy among its delegates and vicars: and Lainez[2] openly avowed at the council of Trent in **1562**, that to acknowledge the immediate derivation of their authority from Christ himself would be subversive of the argument that pontiffs have the right to censure and displace them in virtue of some Divine prerogative, and are at liberty to intermeddle in the administration of their dioceses.

versi, quippe qui primus hierarcha et princeps sit omnium spiritualium ac pater omnium temporalium principum, tamen quia adversarius negat eum esse ecclesiam catholicam virtualiter aut etiam esse ecclesiæ caput, ea propter ostendendum est quod sit caput orbis et consequenter orbis totus in virtute.' See also an account of Eck's treatise, *De Primatu Petri*, Ibid. p. 472.

[1] 'Veniæ sive indulgentiæ auctoritate Scripturæ nobis non innotuere, sed *auctoritate Ecclesiæ Romanæ, Romanorumque Pontificum, quæ major est.*' see his *Dialogus* in Löscher, *Reformations-acta*, II. 31, and compare Wimpina's language above, p. 17, n. 2.

[2] 'Il vint ensuite à condamner ceux qui soutenoient que les Evêques avoient reçu quelque pouvoir de Jésus-Christ, *parceque ce seroit dépouiller l'Eglise Romaine du privilège qu'elle avoit*, que le Pape fût le chef de l'Eglise et le vicaire de Jésus-Christ. Il dit, qu'on savoit fort bien ce qui avoit été déclaré par l'ancien canon, *Omnes sive patriarchæ*, que ceux qui usurpoient les droits des autres Eglises commettoient une injustice, mais que ceux qui violent les privilèges de l'Eglise Romaine étoient hérétiques; et il finit cette première partie en disant, qu'il y avoit une contradiction évidente à reconnoitre le Pape pour chef de l'Eglise, et son gouvernement pour monarchique, et à soutenir en même tems, qu'il y avoit dans l'Eglise *une puissance ou une jurisdiction qui venoit d'un autre que de lui:*' Sarpi, II. 500, ed. Courayer. On the reply of the archbishop of Paris, see *Ibid.*, pp. 504 sq.

ROMAN COMMUNION.

The vigorous resistance[1] of French and Spanish prelates on the same occasion was, we saw, defeated, or at least evaded for the present: the papal monarchy came out of the great struggle as dominant as before: yet nothing then determined could extinguish the old feeling of independence which had broken out in earlier periods of the history of the Church. It is, therefore, obvious, that in the Roman communion itself, two opposite theories of church-government continued to be tolerated, (1) the autocratic, or Ultra-montane, (2) the constitutional, or Gallican. According to the former, the Roman pontiff is verily the life as well as centre of all Christendom, the universal pastor, the bishop of bishops, the immediate and supreme judge of all the faithful; though condescending for their welfare to distribute portions of his power and privileges among the various orders of the hierarchy. He is not indeed secured by this hypothesis against the possibility of sinning, and may therefore be convicted of profaneness, and even of atrocious conduct, in dealing either with a local church, or with the individual members. Still, whenever he pronounces on controversies of faith, it is maintained that he cannot err[2]: and that in virtue of his intellectual exaltation above the common failings of humanity, he constitutes the pillar of catholic truth; the mandates which he issues must be dutifully received by all the faithful, since communion with him is essential to membership in the Church, and therefore to communion with our blessed Lord Himself.

Two opposite ideas respecting the possessor of infallibility:

(1) Ultra-montane theory:

(2) Gallican theory.

According to the constitutional, or Gallican view[3], the ultimate and infallible authority on religious matters is not

[1] Above, pp. 293, 294.

[2] It is most remarkable, however, that one at least of these unerring judges has declared that popes are not infallible. Adrian VI. published the following disclaimer in 1522: 'Dico primo, quod si per Ecclesiam Romanam intelligat caput ejus, puta pontificem, certum est quod possit errare etiam in iis quæ tangunt fidem, hæresim per suam determinationem aut decretalem asserendo. Plures enim fuerunt pontifices Romani hæretici.' *Comment.* in *Lib.* IV. *Sententiarum*, Quæst. 'de sacra Confirmatione,' Rom. 1522, fol. xxvi. b.

[3] Among the most able exponents of the Gallican doctrines are (1) Bossuet, in his *Cleri Gallicani de Ecclesiastica potestate declaratio* (Œuvres, vol. XXX. 1 sq. Paris, 1825), and in his great work *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani de ecclesiastica potestate* (Ibid. Voll. XLVII—XLIX.), and (2) Pereira, in his *Tentativa Theologica*, translated from the Portuguese by Landon, Lond. 1847.

ROMAN COMMUNION.

the Roman pontiff, but a council adequately representing the whole Church. Such councils, it is argued, may degrade the pope, if he should violate the ancient creeds, or should be guilty of serious maladministration. Yet, with small regard to the coherence or consistency of their principles, this school of Romanists believe in the necessity, under all circumstances, of adhering to the see of Rome and to the rightful pontiff, as the visible centre of unity appointed by God for the consolidation and guidance of the whole Church.

The possible effect, however, of this fundamental difference as to the real seat and organ of infallibility was for the present obviated by the peaceful termination of the council of Trent. Both parties then obtained the satisfactory fulfilment of their own conditions, and accordingly bowed to verdicts of a synod which they held to be of œcumenical authority, and ratified by the explicit confirmation of the pontiff[1].

Effects of the Council of Trent on Church-organization.

From the date of its reception in various countries, the organization of the Romish church, where every species of abuse had hitherto prevailed[2], was brought into general harmony with the spirit and decrees of the Tridentine doctors[3]. The monstrous evils that originated in non-residence and in pluralities, episcopal as well as sacerdotal, were considerably diminished: the ordinary jurisdiction of metropolitans and of bishops was vindicated, with regard to the mendicant and monastic confraternities, and other

[1] Thus Melchior Canus, bishop of the Canaries, and one of the most able theologians of the Reformation-period, declares expressly: 'Concilium generale, confirmatum auctoritate Romani pontificis, certam fidem facit Catholicorum dogmatum. Quam quidem conclusionem ita exploratam habere opus est, ut ejus contrariam hæreticam esse credamus:' *De Locis Theologicis*, lib. v. c. 4: cf. Bellarmin. *Disput.* 'de Conciliis et Ecclesia,' lib. II. c. 2.

[2] See, for example, the confessions of the *Consilium delectorum Cardinalium*, etc. (1538), in Le Plat, *Monument.* II. 598. In reflecting on the utter unfitness of ecclesiastics in general, the authors of this document remark: 'Hinc innumera scandala, hinc contemptus ordinis ecclesiastici, hinc Divini cultus veneratio non tantum diminuta, sed etiam prope jam extincta.' When such admissions were found inconvenient, the report of the Cardinals was thrust into the catalogue of prohibited books: see Mendham's *Literary Policy of the Church of Rome*, pp. 48, 49.

[3] See also the decrees 'De Reformatione' in *Libr. Symb. Eccl. Cath.* Tom. II.

ROMAN COMMUNION.

bodies who had armed themselves with numerous privileges and exemptions; while a far higher standard of clerical education was generally established, and greater caution manifested in conferring holy orders. Convents were subjected to stricter regulations; the concubinage of clerics more vigilantly suppressed. Provincial synods[1], held triennially, and diocesan synods every year, contributed to brace up the decaying discipline of the Church, to shame the indolent and luxurious ecclesiastics, to diminish scandals, to adjust disputes, and most of all to generate afresh the feeling of mutual confidence which had been grievously shaken by the agitations of the times.

The Pope and the Emperor.

But while the Mediæval hierarchy was thus reformed and reconstructed under pontiffs who themselves more commonly reflected the earnest and decorous spirit of the age, the problem which attempted to harmonize their vast pretensions with the independent action of the civil power and the advance of individual freedom, was no nearer its solution[2]. Long before the outbreak of Lutheranism, the common feeling in Germany was, that some analogy existed between the papal and imperial jurisdiction, the one embracing all the 'holy Roman church,' the other all the 'holy Roman empire'[3]. But when the French and Eng-

[1] The following chapter is important and suggestive (*Ibid.* pp. 155, 156): 'Provincialia concilia, sicubi omissa sunt, pro moderandis moribus, corrigendis excessibus, controversiis componendis, aliisque ex sacris canonibus permissis, renoventur. Quare metropolitani per se ipsos, seu, illis legitime impeditis, coepiscopus antiquior intra annum ad minus a fine præsentis concilii, et deinde quolibet saltem triennio post octavam Paschæ Resurrectionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi, seu alio commodiori tempore pro more provinciæ non prætermittat synodum in provincia sua cogere: quo episcopi omnes, et alii, qui de jure vel consuetudine interesse debent, exceptis iis, quibus cum imminenti periculo transfretandum esset, convenire omnino teneantur. Nec episcopi comprovinciales prætextu cujuslibet consuetudinis ad metropolitanam ecclesiam in posterum accedere inviti compellantur....Synodi quoque diœcesanæ quotannis celebrentur: ad quas exempti etiam omnes, qui alias, cessante exemptione, interesse deberent, nec capitulis generalibus subduntur, accedere teneantur; ratione tamen parochialium aut aliarum sæcularium ecclesiarum, etiam annexarum, debeant ii, qui illarum curam gerunt, quicumque illi sint, synodo interesse. Quod si in his tam metropolitani quam episcopi, et alii supradicti negligentes fuerint, pœnas sacris canonibus sancitas incurrant:' cf. *Middle Age*, p. 342.

[2] See *Middle Age*, pp. 243—256, pp. 321 sq.

[3] Ranke, *Reform.* I. 60, who shews that the papal power was commonly esteemed the higher, and that one main difference between them arose from a belief that the papal enjoyed already the universal recogni-

ROMAN COMMUNION.

lish monarchs began to realize the growing vigour of their nations, and came forward to assert with greater boldness that each was in itself an empire owing no kind of deference, or allegiance, to the foreigner[1]; and when the pontiff, on the other hand, consulted his convenience by passing over, at the slightest provocation, from one party to another[2], and absolved the subjects of his enemy from their oaths of allegiance, men were driven to inquire more closely into the nature of the union between Church and State; and their inquiry often issued in the absolute rejection of the ultra-papal claims. We saw numerous instances of this in tracing out the general progress of the Reformation.

Papal connivance at the absolutism of the Crown.

In many cases, however, the ecclesiastics of separate countries suffered grievously from the operation of special concordats then established at their expense between the monarch and the pope:—a measure which directly tended to depress the clergy, just as, in former times, their exaltation sprang occasionally from the wish of sovereigns to use them in correcting the aggressive power of feudalism, and

tion of the Romano-Germanic world, which the imperial had not been able to obtain (p. 58). After the commencement of the Reformation the inherent disparity of the two jurisdictions was strongly urged by the advocates of ultra-Romanism. Thus Mazolini (as already quoted, p. 320, n. 1) affirmed that temporal jurisdiction was a sub-delegation of the papal ('quæ respectu papæ est subdelegata subordinata:' cf. Ranke, *Ibid.* p. 471), and that the emperor with all laws and all Christian people, can effect nothing contrary to the will of the pope. Aleander, in like manner, who had been entrusted with the execution of the papal edict against Luther, hinted that the pope could depose the emperor, and could say to him 'Du bist ein Gerber.' Ranke, *Ibid.* p. 478.

[1] Cf. the language of the English parliament, above, p. 7. And that such ideas were not produced by the Lutheran movement is manifest from a letter of Tunstall to Henry VIII. (Feb. 12, 1517), at the time when Maximilian proposed to resign the empire to the English monarch: 'Oon of the cheffe points in the election off th' emperor is that he which shal be electyd must be off Germanie subgiet to [the] empire: wheras your Grace is not, nor never sithen the Cristen faith the kings of England wer subgiet to th' empire. But the crown of England is an empire off hitselff mych bettyr then now the empire of Rome: for which cause your Grace werith a close crown.' *Original Letters*, ed. Ellis, I. 136, Lond. 1825.

[2] Above, p. 5. Zwingli had noticed this fact, and charged the pope with being at the bottom of all the wars between France and the emperor (*Opp.* I. 776, ed. Gualther): 'Quum videt sibi imminere Cæsarem, adhæret Gallo: quum sentit Gallum sibi fore superiorem, deficit ad Cæsarem: atque hæc omnia agit sub titulo Christi et pacis.'

ROMAN COMMUNION.

so to balance them against the lay-lords. In France, where the Pragmatic Sanction was superseded by the Concordat in 1516[1], the pope recovered the supreme ecclesiastical legislation and some portion of his old revenues: while the equivalent of the crown enabled Francis I. to make gigantic strides in humbling the French ecclesiastics, and threatened to reduce them into absolute subjection. His kingdom reckoned at that time ten archbishoprics, eighty-three bishoprics, five hundred and twenty-seven abbacies, to all of which the sovereign, by this new Concordat, won the almost unrestricted power of nomination[2]. And the same unscrupulous disregard of the domestic liberties of the Church, and the distribution of its revenues, will be found to characterize the papal policy in other countries during the first half of the sixteenth century. Adrian VI., for instance, went so far as to grant the dukes of Bavaria[3] one-fifth of all the revenues of the Church in their territories, and even sanctioned their exercise of some important branches of spiritual jurisdiction. In **1534**, when Europe was beginning to cry out most loudly for some reformation of abuses, Clement VII. is reported to have given *in commendam* to his cousin cardinal de' Medici all the benefices of the whole world that might fall vacant during the next six months, with a permission to appropriate the fruits of them to his own use[4]. Charles V., in like manner[5], when his coffers were exhausted, armed himself with papal licences, in order that he might seize on some of the revenues

[1] See *Middle Age*, p. 338.

[2] Ranke, *Civil Wars and Monarchy in France*, I. 125, 126. To shew the utter thraldom of the French Church at this period, it is recorded that in the following reign the king's mistress, the duchess of Valentinois, held in her own hands the distribution of all ecclesiastical benefices (*Ibid.* I. 230).

[3] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 174, 175.

[4] Sarpi, I. 451: cf. Courayer's note. Even if there be considerable exaggeration in this account, we have abundant evidence of the facility with which the popes either alienated church-property themselves, or winked at the alienation of it by others. The suppression of monasteries in England was first made under papal sanction (above, pp. 185, 186), and the lay-impropriators were confirmed in their possession of the church-lands by a bull of Julius III. (above, p. 217, n. 3). In France as late as the pontificate of Pius V., he authorized spoliations, which brought a million and a half of livres to the treasury. Ranke, *Popes*, II. 66.

[5] Herbert's *Life of Henry VIII.* p. 588, Lond. 1672.

ROMAN COMMUNION.

of the Church; but left the work of spoliation to his son, Philip II.

At length, indeed, the pontiffs receded from the more extravagant positions, in virtue of which they justified their ancient intermeddling with the temporalities of foreign churches; but only to inflict still heavier blows upon the monarchs of all future ages. The Jesuits, who were straining every nerve to reinvest their patron with absolute supremacy in Christendom, determined to oppose the new reactions in favour of the royal power, by arguing that it stands on ground completely different from the papal. The latter, it was urged, is due to an original Divine appointment; while the secular authority is only derived from God by an indirect process,—through the medium of society[1]. The people were thus held to be the ultimate source of temporal jurisdiction, and the true depository of the right of government. In other words, the progress of democracy was stimulated under the very shadow of the papal monarchy, and by its boldest champions; in order that the civil power might be more readily subordinated to the spiritual, and the sovereign pontiff be enthroned at an immeasurable height above all other functionaries.

The Jesuits, preachers of democracy.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

In all countries that threw off the Roman yoke, there was at first some vacillation and uncertainty respecting the minister of ordination, the court of ultimate appeal in spiritual matters, and the general constitution of the

[1] See the discussion of this subject in Balmez, *Protestantism and Catholicity*, c. li. (Engl. transl. pp. 254 sq.). The aim of Suarez and Bellarmine, according to this writer, was to shew that there was neither in Scripture nor tradition 'the least foundation for establishing that civil power, like that of the sovereign pontiffs, has been instituted in a special and extraordinary manner' (p. 257). 'At first sight,' he continues (p. 258), 'their language appears exceedingly democratical, from their frequent use of the words *community, state, society, people;* but on examining closely their system of doctrine, and paying attention to the expressions they use, we perceive that they had no subversive design, and that anarchical theories never once entered their minds.' What they aimed at was 'to protect society against the disorder of despotism, without rendering it at the same time refractory or turbulent.' His conclusion is not to be overlooked: 'The independence of the Church is thus established upon a solid basis.'

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

Church[1]. Whereas the former tendency had been to raise the hierarchy above the jurisdiction of the crown, the present by the natural vehemence of reaction was to render the secular principle itself predominant, and make the clergyman ascribe his status either to the pleasure of the sovereign, or the vote of parliaments and diets. Misgivings were accordingly expressed in some quarters lest a regal or imperial papacy should be substituted for the ancient thraldom, lest the banishment of Romanism should clear a way for the ascendancy of Byzantinism[2], and lest the Church itself should be resolved into a function or department of the State.

Permanence of the English hierarchy.

The special circumstances under which the English Reformation started were likely to evolve and strengthen these Byzantine tendencies; and some examples have, in fact, been noticed of the way in which they left an impress on the proclamations of the sovereign and the statutes of the realm. In this country, however, as the old episcopal organization was preserved inviolate, the succession of ministers was also uninterrupted, and the spiritualty continued to form a separate estate[3]. Parker was felt to occupy substantially the same position as Warham, and

[1] 'The notions of many of the Reformers in Britain, as well as on the Continent, at an early period of their progress, were extremely confused, owing to their having been so long accustomed to identify the validity of all spiritual function, in the clerical order, with the pretensions of the Roman see:' Russell, *Church in Scotland*, I. 165: cf. Geijer, *Hist. of the Swedes*, p. 125, and above, p. 178, n. 1.

[2] Cf. *Middle Age*, pp. 49, 50. The term 'Byzantinism' is preferable to the modern 'Erastianism,'—an appellation derived from the Græcized form of Lieber, the name of a Heidelberg physician, who was born in 1524. His main principle, which has been shared by very few even of those who do not differ widely from him on some other points, was that the source of all pastoral authority is the civil magistrate, who, whether Christian or not, possesses an inherent right to nominate and commission teachers of religion, and is under no necessity of admitting the least difference between priests and laymen. In 'Byzantinism' on the contrary, the king was invested with almost spiritual functions, *because* he was a Christian, standing to the Church in the same relation as David, Hezekiah, or Josiah stood to the Theocracy of old (cf. Carte's *Life of Ormond*, I. 39). It is remarkable that some modern zealots who have been most vigorous in their denunciation of 'Erastianism' lose sight of this distinction, proceeding on a supposition that the civil power is essentially unspiritual, if not altogether anti-Christian, and thus unconsciously falling into the errors of the Mennonite and other Anabaptists: see above, p. 261, and n. 1.

[3] See above, p. 7.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

hierarchical ideas were thus transmitted, with few modifications, from the Mediæval to the Modern Church of England. The primates, in conjunction with their comprovincials, were still centres of ecclesiastical order. The old canon-law, except in those particulars where it had been traversed by recent enactments, was and is the standard according to which proceedings in the church-courts are regulated; and indeed the sole material change affecting the internal polity of the Church related to appeals from the metropolitan-tribunals, which could no longer be carried out of the island to the Roman pontiff[1], but must pass directly upwards to the king, who, by his delegates, had now the privilege of final adjudication. This peculiarity, although by no means unprecedented in the earlier history of the Church[2], must have materially influenced the position of the English ecclesiastics, and their relation to the civil power. It was subversive of a state of things in which the clerks and priesthood generally had, more or less, been severed and exempted from the common laws of the realm, in which a foreign jurisdiction was allowed to overrule the sentence of the home-tribunals, and various usages and maxims were tolerated 'in derogation of the regality of our lord the king'[3]. Yet where civil and ecclesiastical courts existed side by side, where secular and spiritual judges were both recognized, there is always a large class of mixed questions in which

Considerable increase of the royal power.

[1] See above, p. 177. In the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (respecting which, see above, p. 215, n. 4) the following regulation was drawn up on the order of appeals: 'Ab archidiaconis, decanis, et his, qui sunt infra pontificiam dignitatem et jurisdictionem ecclesiasticam habent, ad episcopum liceat appellare, ab episcopo ad archiepiscopum, ab archiepiscopo vero ad nostram majestatem. Quo cum fuerit causa devoluta, eam vel *concilio provinciali* definiri volumus, si gravis sit causa, vel a *tribus quatuorve episcopis*, a nobis ad id constituendis:' *De Appellationibus*, cap. XI.

[2] *E. g.* The Donatists, after having been heard by Melchiades, bishop of Rome, A.D. 313, and again by the council of Arles, A.D. 314, obtained a personal hearing, A.D. 316, from Constantine. Mr Wilberforce, *Principles of Church Authority*, p. 174, 2nd ed., who draws attention to these facts, endeavours to avoid their force by urging that the emperor 'only confirmed that which had been decided by the Church.' On the real principles involved in such appeals, see Bishop Gardiner, as above, p. 168, n. 2; p. 169, n. 2; and Van Espen's treatise 'De recursu ad Principem,' in his *Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum*, Tom. x. 1 sq. Venet. 1781.

[3] See Ross, *Reciprocal Obligations of the Church and the Civil Power*, pp. 135, 136, Oxf. 1848, and *Middle Age*, pp. 249, 250.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

the two authorities touch, and interpenetrate in such a manner, that it is not easy to prevent them from usurping one upon the other. This was felt especially at the period of the Reformation, when the fresh resistance of English monarchs to the ultra-papal usurpations[1] involved, among its natural consequences, the depreciation of all branches of ecclesiastical power. The sovereign who repudiated the verdicts of the Roman see gave utterance to his vehement antagonism by assuming to himself the designation, 'head of the Church'[2]:—a title, in the propriety of which, when somewhat modified, his subjects, both the spiritualty and temporalty, were finally induced to acquiesce. But the limits of this headship were not rigorously defined. The clergy, in particular, viewed it chiefly as a claim to the external government, or direction, of all orders both in Church and State. This qualification they secured by introducing the clause, 'as far as the law of Christ allows,' into the form by which they recognized the king's supremacy; and when Elizabeth ascended the throne, she was immediately induced to publish an Injunction explanatory of the sense in which men swore allegiance to

Ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown.

[1] 'Whatsoever power our laws did divest the pope of, they invested the king with it: but they never invested the king with any spiritual power or jurisdiction, witness the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, witness the public Articles of our Church, witness the professions of King James, witness all our statutes themselves, wherein all the parts of papal power are enumerated, which are taken away—his "encroachments," his "usurpations," his "oaths," his "collations, provisions, pensions, tenths, first-fruits, reservations, palls, unions, commendams, exemptions, dispensations" of all kinds, "confirmations, licences, faculties, suspensions, appeals," and God knoweth how many pecuniary artifices more; but of them all there is not one that concerneth jurisdiction purely spiritual, or which is an essential right of the power of the keys; they are all branches of the external regiment of the Church, the greater part of them usurped from the crown,' &c. Bramhall, *Schism Guarded*, Part I. Disc. IV. *Works*, II. 458, 459, Oxf. 1842. It should moreover be carefully borne in mind that the legislature in the first year of Elizabeth restored the Church of England *not* to the condition in which it stood at the *death* of Henry VIII., when the ecclesiastical power had been still further limited, but as he left it in the 25th year of his reign. A contemporary defence of the Church-system, as thus restored, is furnished in *An Answeare made by Rob.* [Horne] *bishoppe of Wynchester to a Booke entituled* The Declaration of suche scruples and staies of conscience, touchinge the Othe of the Supremacy, as M. John Fekenham by wrytinge did deliuer unto the L. Bishop of Winchester, with his Resolutions made thereunto: Lond. 1566.

[2] See above, p. 176, and n. 4.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

the sovereign as the 'supreme governor' of the Church of England[1]. She there claims no more than the authority, 'which is, and was of ancient time, due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall, or ought to have, any superiority over them.' And one of the Articles of Religion[2] intended, in like manner, to satisfy 'the minds of some slanderous folks,' declares that 'we give not our princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the sacraments, ...but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly princes, in holy Scripture, by God Himself: that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.'

In some particular branches, it is true, the powers now exercised by English monarchs threatened to exceed[3] those

[1] In the first of the *Injunctions* of 1559, she requires that 'all deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars, and all other ecclesiastical persons shall faithfully keep and observe, and as far as in them may lie, shall cause to be observed and kept of other, all and singular laws and statutes made for the restoring of the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical, and abolishing of all foreign power, repugnant to the same:' calling upon them at the same time to maintain 'that the Queen's power within her realms and dominions, is the highest power under God:' and in the accompanying *Admonitions to simple men deceived by malicious* (quoted in the text) she adds: 'If any person that hath conceived any other sense of the form of the said Oath, shall accept the same Oath with this interpretation, sense, or meaning, her Majesty is well pleased to accept every such in that behalf, as her good and obedient subjects, and shall acquit them of all manner of penalties contained in the said Act, against such as shall peremptorily or obstinately take the same Oath.'

[2] In Hooper's series the article stood as follows: 'The King's majesty of England is to be taken and known as the only and supreme magistrate and power of the Church of England and Ireland;' and in the authorized article of the same period (1552) its form was: 'The king of Englande is supreme head on earth, nexte vnder Christe, of the Churche of Englande and Irelande:' but as early as 1559 the *Heads of Doctrine* substituted 'supremus Gubernator hujus regni,' etc. See Hardwick's *Hist. of the Articles*, pp. 322, 398.

[3] See above, p. 178, and n. 1. It is highly probable, however, that in acknowledging the crown as the ultimate source of episcopal authority (cf. *Reformatio Legum*, 'De officio et jurisdictione,' p. 200, Oxf. 1850), the English prelates, reforming and non-reforming, had reference to matters not purely spiritual, but 'those which the laws of the kingdom an-

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

privileges which had been claimed by Christian princes and parliaments during the Middle Ages; but, in substance, nearly all the changes now enacted were restorations of the ancient laws and usage of the Church, and the legitimate consequence of protests which had scarcely ever died away in any part of Christendom. The placing of ecclesiastics had, for instance, been the immemorial right and privilege of the crown[1]. The nomination of the leading bishops[2] by the court had also been virtually an act of royal patronage ever since the reign of Constantine; and after the pope began to lavish the bishoprics and other benefices of this country on 'aliens,' the freedom of episcopal elections[3] was still further violated by the English monarchs: while, in reference to the ultimate determination of church-doctrine, there was no lack of precedents[4] in which it was devolved by sovereigns on

nexed to the episcopal office, viz. the civil institution of ecclesiastical courts, the privileges attached to the episcopal character as lords of parliament, the civil penalties which then followed excommunications, legal protection to their ordinations, and other episcopal acts.' Ross, as before, pp. 94, 95: cf. the statements respecting the nature and limits of the royal supremacy in the *Necessary Doctrine*, pp. 286—289, Oxf. 1825.

[1] Hence archbishop Chichely could speak to Henry V. (March 6, 1427), of 'the chirch of your lond, of the wich God and ye, gracious lord, have maked me governor:' Duck's *Life of Chichele*, p. 35, Lond. 1681. Archbishop Laud inculcates the same principle (*Remains*, II. ii. 68, Lond. 1700): 'Our being bishops *jure Divino* takes nothing from the king's right or power over us. For though our office be from God and Christ immediately, yet may we not *exercise* that power, either of order or jurisdiction, but as God has appointed us; that is, not in his Majesty's or any Christian king's kingdoms, but by and under the power of the king given us so to do.'

[2] See *Middle Age*, p. 51 and n. 4.

[3] At first, indeed, the papal interference was rejected by affirming the ancient right of election. The parliament of 25 Edw. III. (1350) ordained 'al honur de Dieu et profit de la dite eglise d'Engleterre, qe les franches elections des erceveschees, eveschees, et tutes autres dignites et benefices electifs en Engleterre se tiegnent desore en manere come eles feurent grantes par les progenitours nostre dit seignur le roi et par les auncestres dautres seignurs foundes' (Stephens, *Eccl. Statutes*, I. 62): but in the age immediately preceding the Reformation, the episcopal appointments were for the most part in the hands of the Crown (*Middle Age*, p. 341, and n. 5).

[4] See above, p. 329, n. 2. So infrequent were appeals to Rome before the time of king Stephen, that Henry of Huntingdon makes the following statement (*Hist.* lib. VIII. p. 395, Francof. 1601): 'Anno decimo sexto, Tedbaldus Cantuariensis archiepiscopus et apostolicæ sedis legatus tenuit concilium generale apud Londoniam in media Quadragesima [1151], ubi

committees of divines who had been called together by a royal writ.

Appointment of bishops.

In the election and confirmation of bishops, certain changes then effected in the statute-law of England are worthy of especial notice. While canonical forms were seemingly retained with all their old precision, the appointment of the English prelates was in reality transferred entirely to the crown. On the occasion of a vacancy, it was enacted in 1533, that the king might grant[1] to deans and chapters of cathedral churches a licence under the great seal, 'as of old time hath been accustomed,' empowering them to proceed to an election in due form; yet, on the other hand, this congé d'eslire was uniformly accompanied by a letter missive[2] containing the name of the person whom alone they should elect; their only option being either to obey the king, or incur 'the dangers, pains and penalties of the estatute of Provision and Præmunire'[3]. The fact of such election was then to be signified to the archbishop of the province by means of 'letters patents,' requiring and commanding him to confirm[4] the choice that had been made, and to invest[5] and consecrate the person so elected to his future office, and 'to give and use to him all such benedictions, ceremonies, and other things requisite for the same, without any suing, procuring,

rex Stephanus et filius suus Eustachius et Angliæ proceres interfuerunt, totumque illud concilium novis appellationibus infrenduit. In Anglia namque appellationes in usu non erant, donec eas Henricus Wintoniensis, dum legatus esset, malo suo crudeliter intrusit. In eodem namque concilio ad Romani pontificis audientiam ter appellatus est.'

[1] *Stat.* 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20. § 4.

[2] The language is of this kind: 'We have been pleased, by these our letters patents, to name, and recommend him unto you, to be elected and chosen:' cf. Stephens, *Ibid.* p. 155, n. 4.

[3] *Stat.* 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20, § 7.

[4] Among the various instruments exhibited in the process of confirmation (Stephens, p. 157, n. 2), one is a 'Citatio contra oppositores' by which the archbishop notifies the day of confirmation, and cites 'omnes et singulos oppositores (si qui sint) in specie, alioquin in genere qui contra dictam electionem, formam ejusdem, personamve in hac parte electam, dicere, objicere, excipere, vel opponere voluerint:' proceeding as before on the hypothesis that the election was bona fide.

[5] *Ibid.* § 5. The act of investiture had formerly been a fruitful source of revenue to the popes, who had received out of England 'in the forty years last past, an hundred and sixty thousand pound sterling...an incredible sum.' Twysden, *Vindication*, p. 112, Camb. 1847.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

and obtaining, any bulls, letters, or other things, from the see of Rome, for the same in any behalf.'

On the accession of king Edward VI., a further change was made in reference to the same weighty matters. The appointment of bishops was, by act of parliament, confided absolutely to the crown[1], upon a plea that the capitular elections 'be in very deed no elections, but only by a writ of congé d'eslire, have colours, shadows, or pretences of elections, serving, nevertheless, to no purpose, and seeming also derogatory and prejudicial to the king's prerogative royal.' By this measure, the English usage was entirely assimilated to the German of the tenth century, and the French of the sixteenth; the higher patronage of the Church relapsing altogether by an overt act of the legislature to the hands of the civil power. This right of collation was, however, nominally relinquished in the reign of Mary[2], and with reference to England, queen Elizabeth made no effort to revive and re-establish the enactment of her brother, so that the statute of **1533** continues to determine the practice of the English Church in the election of her bishops[3].

Calling of Councils.

Another point on which the civil and ecclesiastical authorities had always been divided, was the right of convening synods, and the operation of the laws and canons there enacted and promulged. In England, it had long been customary for individual bishops to meet in synod with the clergy of their dioceses, and for archbishops to convoke provincial councils at their pleasure; while the king himself, could by writ direct the clergy of the two provinces to meet in their separate convocations, or sum-

[1] *Stat.* 1 Edw. VI. c. 2. 'It hath been supposed by some, that the principal intent of this act was, to make deans and chapters less necessary, and thereby to prepare the way for a dissolution of them.' Burn, in Stephens, as before, p. 294, n. 1.

[2] *Stat.* 1 Mar. Sess. II. c. 2. The whole of the act 25 Hen. VIII. c. 20, was also repealed by 1 and 2 Phil. and Mary, c. 8; but being expressly revived by 1 Eliz. c. 1, s. 7, it re-established the method of election and confirmation, and indirectly repealed 1 Edw. VI. c. 2. In the case of Ireland, it is very remarkable that the *Stat.* 2 Eliz. c. 4 [Ireland] re-enacts for that country the English *Stat.* 1 Edw. VI. c. 2, thus abolishing the congé d'eslire, with the avowal, that to the crown 'appertaineth the collation and gift of all archbishopricks and bishopricks and suffragan bishops within this her highness' realm:' Stephens, I. 401.

[3] Cf. Carte, *Hist. of England*, III. 215, 216.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

mon the representatives of the spiritualty to parliament through the writs addressed to the several diocesans; the latter custom had however been long disused[1]. In 1533 important modifications were introduced into the system of the Church with reference to these questions. Diocesan synods, it is true, remained exactly on their ancient footing[2]; but it was declared that the 'Convocations' of the Clergy 'is, always hath been, and ought to be assembled only by the king's writ;' that is, they were no longer permitted[3] to meet and legislate until the metropolitan who summoned them was armed with a specific authority from the crown; while legal force was given to none of their constitutions, *in foro exteriori*, until a second, or confirmatory, licence was obtained from the same quarter. Notwithstanding, it is manifest, from the whole course of procedure in the Reformation-movement, that enactments of this kind were never intended[4] to supersede the councils of the Church, nor to transfer the right of judging, in religious controversies, to the secular tribunals. The object of that policy was to draw men's thoughts completely from the see of Rome, to satisfy the monarch that the English clergy were more than 'half his subjects,' and to establish the competency of domestic judicatures, in spiritual as in temporal matters[5]. Accordingly,

'*Convocations.*'

[1] See above, p. 177, n. 3.

[2] The following is the recommendation of the *Reformatio Legum* ('De Ecclesia et Ministris ejus,' c. xix.) with reference to them: 'Quilibet episcopus in sua diœcesi habeat synodum, in qua cum suis presbyteris, parochis, vicariis et clericis, de his agat rebus quæ pro tempore vel constituenda sunt vel emendanda. Etenim aptissima profecto medicina synodus est ad castigandam negligentiam, et tollendos errores, qui subinde in ecclesiis per diabolum et malos homines disseminantur; fietque ut per hujusmodi synodos conjunctio et charitas inter episcopum et clerum augeatur et servetur.'

[3] *Stat.* 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19.

[4] One of the best proofs is in the *Reformatio Legum*, as before, c. xviii.: 'Si contigerit in Ecclesia gravem aliquando exoriri causam, quæ sine multorum consilio episcoporum haud facile possit finiri, tum archiepiscopus, ad cujus provinciam ea causa pertinet, suos episcopos ad provinciale concilium evocabit.....Verum concilia hæc provincialia sine nostra voluntate ac jussu nunquam convocentur.'

[5] The clearest proofs of this are furnished by the well-known preamble to *Stat.* 24 Hen. VIII. c. 12 ('For the restraint of Appeals'): cf. above, p. 7. In the *Necessary Doctrine* (or King's Book), the sovereign professes to act 'with the advice of our clergy' (*Formularies of Faith*, Oxf. 1825, p. 215), 'which doctrine also,' he adds (p. 216), 'the lords both spiritual and temporal, with the nether house of our parliament,

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

Permanence of synodal action.

when the papal yoke was utterly broken off, with their own formal co-operation, there was no jealousy expressed with reference to the action of the church-legislature, and no disposition to invoke the help of other than ecclesiastics in deciding questions of Christian doctrine. The first series of Articles[1] drawn up to establish unity, and to avoid contentious opinions, was submitted to the southern convocation, and also carried with it the formal sanction of the northern prelates. And when, in **1540**, it was thought desirable to compile a book[2] containing the 'principal articles and points of our faith, with the declaration of other expedient points, and also for the lawful rites and ceremonies and observations of God's service within this realm,' the work was to be executed by 'the archbishops and sundry bishops of both provinces, and also a great number of the best learned, honestest, and most virtuous sort of the doctors of divinity.' Directions for the purging and remodelling of the ancient service-books[3] proceeded

have both seen and like very well.' And in the *Institution of a Christian Man* (Ibid. pp. 107 sq.), where the subject of episcopal authority is discussed, one branch of the jurisdiction committed to ecclesiastics (priests and bishops), 'by the authority of God's law, is to make and ordain certain rules or canons concerning holy days, fasting days, the manner and ceremonies to be used in the ministration of the sacraments, the manner of singing the psalms and spiritual hymns (as St Paul calleth them), the diversity of degrees among the ministers, and the form and manner of their ornaments, and finally concerning such other rites, ceremonies and observances as do tend and conduce to the preservation of quietness and decent order, to be had and used among the people when they shall be assembled together in the temple:' p. 110. So long as the Church 'was subject to infidel princes,' it is said that 'constitutions and canons' were enacted by bishops and councils 'with the consent of the people.' 'Insomuch that kings and princes, after they had once received the faith of Christ, and were baptized, considering the same to tend to the furtherance of Christ's religion, did not only approve the said canons, then made by the Church, but did also enact and make new laws of their own, concerning the good order of the Church, and furthermore did also constrain their subjects, by corporal pain and punishment, to observe the same' (*Ibid.* p. 113). And then follows a clear distinction between the powers and privileges granted to ecclesiastics by the civil ruler, and what is transmitted to them by 'the authority of God and His Gospel.'

[1] Above, pp. 182, 183.

[2] See *Stat.* 32 Hen. VIII. c. 26. Twysden, who draws attention to this act (*Vindication*, p. 138), and also to the language of *Stat.* 2 and 3 Edw. VI. c. 1, with reference to the Liturgy, concludes that 'the King, in composing this book, did not assume to himself, or the parliament attribute unto him, any other than assembling of the bishops and other learned men together, to take their consultations.'

[3] Above, p. 190, n. 2.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

from the southern convocation, with the acquiescence of the crown. To this body the work was finally submitted for their approbation[1]. The Articles of Religion were, in like manner, authorized, and afterwards revised by them[2], and therefore the document was entitled, 'Articles, whereupon it was agreed *by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy, in the convocation:*' while at the very opening of the seventeenth century, the principle of synodal action was re-affirmed in the most emphatic manner. The **139**th of the canons of **1603**, which form the standard of ecclesiastical law in dealing with all persons over whom the church-courts exercise their ancient jurisdiction, determines, under a penalty of excommunication, that the sacred synod of this country, 'in the name of Christ and by the king's authority assembled, is the true Church of England by representation;' and the last canon strongly censures all 'depravers of the synod' as then congregated[3].

Confiscation of church-property.

The practical working of the Church of England, though affected in no very sensible degree by other modifications, was severely crippled and retarded at the Reformation by the loss of her chief revenues. That the hierarchical element in the state had for some years been threatening to wax predominant[4], and that a reduction of

[1] Above, p. 196, n. 3: cf. p. 205.

[2] Above, pp. 214, 229, 237, n. 4. To archbishop Parker the Church is indebted for the *Forma sive descriptio Convocationis celebrandæ*, which still regulates the proceedings of the southern convocation. He has also left us some account of the clergy assembled in the 'convocation-societies' (*Correspond.* p. 173, ed. P. S.): 'I see some of them to be *pleni rimarum, hac atque illac effluunt*, although indeed the Queen's majesty may have good cause to be well contented with her choice of the most of them,' &c. He then adds, 'though we have done amongst ourselves little in our own cause, yet I assure you our mutual conferences have taught us such experiences, that I trust we shall all be the better in governance for hereafter.' The letter is addressed to Cecil, and dated April 14, 1563.

[3] See *Homilies, &c.*, p. 684, Camb. 1850.

[4] 'When the clergy in a kingdom are really (and not upon the feigned pretences of sacrilegious persons) grown to that excessive grandeur, that they quite overbalance the laity, and leave the commonwealth neither sufficient men nor sufficient means to maintain itself; it is lawful by prudent laws to restrain their further growth, as our ancestors and all the nations of Europe have done, by prohibiting new foundations of religious houses, and the alienation of lands to the Church, without special licence...But eradication, to pluck up good institutions root and branch, is not reformation, which we profess, but destruction.' Bramhall,

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

its influence might be found expedient and desirable, is suggested by the fact, that, during the reign of Henry VII., the spiritual members of the house of peers outnumbered the lay-lords: while a very considerable proportion of the landed property had passed into the hands of ecclesiastics, or at least of them and of monastic establishments. When, therefore, the cupidity of an English monarch prompted him to spoil the latter by confiscating the possessions of religious houses[1], the policy of the court not only satisfied the anti-papal spirit of the times, but tended to restore a somewhat juster balance in the general distribution of property. Henry, it is true, professed his willingness to give the Church a fair equivalent, by appropriating some at least of the monastic endowments to the founding of new bishoprics[2], and so augmenting the proportion of the lords spiritual. This and other kindred projects were urged upon his notice by some of his 'reforming' council: but the splendid scheme which had been devised was most inadequately carried out. A public benefit was sacrificed to his extravagance, or the aggrandizement of needy favourites who assisted in the work of spoliation.

Appropriations and impropriations.

It should not, however, be forgotten, that the enormities thus perpetrated by Henry VIII. were, in a large degree, retributive. The monastic institutions of this country fattened on the property of clerics: they had frequently obtained permission either from the lords of the manor, from the crown, the bishops, or the court of Rome, to appropriate[3], and attach to their own society, the tithes of the parochial benefices, on the understanding that they made themselves responsible for the due performance of all pas-

Just Vindication, Disc. II.: *Works*, I. 119, Oxf. 1842: cf. Twysden, *Vindic.* pp. 2—5, Camb. ed.

[1] Above, pp. 185, 186. The present valuation of the property then alienated from the Church is little short of a million sterling (cf. Ross, as before, pp. 289, 290), while, as fifty thousand persons were connected with the monastic establishments, the vagrancy and beggary produced must have been enormous.

[2] Above, p. 185, n. 1.

[3] The theory, however, that the Norman Conquest was the occasion on which tithes were taken from the parochial Saxon clergy and given to the Norman monks (notes in Stephens on Stat. 15 Ric. II. c. 6; and 4 Hen. IV. c. 12) is quite untenable: for at that date tithes were not universally secured to the parochial clergy, nor was the custom of appropriation largely introduced before the reign of Stephen. See Johnson's *Canons*, II. 41, 89, &c.

toral functions. For this purpose, one of their own body, or, more commonly, a secular priest ('vicarius'), was entrusted with the supervision of such parishes, receiving for his stipend only a fraction of the revenues, and too often manifesting a proportionate inattention to the poor as well as to the offices of worship. At the Reformation, all rectorial tithes which had been thus 'appropriated' to religious houses (male and female also) were, under the name of 'impropriations[1],' entirely diverted from the parish, and bestowed upon the courtiers of Henry VIII., who treated them like other pieces of secular property. Yet, as alienations of the former class were by no means limited to England, so neither can the second be regarded as legitimate consequences of the English Reformation.

ENGLISH COMMUNION.

SAXON COMMUNION.

Difference between the English and foreign Reformers.

In all those branches of the Church we have been just considering, it was commonly believed that the spiritual authority confided to ecclesiastics had originated in the Apostolic age, and been transmitted to them by Christ Himself through an unbroken series of ordainers. The pastors were thus held to be invested with a sacred character, which entitled them to special deference, and which made them independent of their flocks. But, on the continent, the modes of thought were often widely different. The ultimate power of calling and ordaining was there vested in the church collective, so that ministers became the organs and representatives of the whole body, acting in its name, as well as for its benefit. In other words, as all the faithful are true priests, the nomination of particular teachers is merely to avoid disorder, and implies in the minister no more than a conventional authority depending on the will of the congregation.

But this principle, avowed in most emphatic terms by Luther[2], and by Zwingli also, at the outset of their

[1] See Kennett's *Case of Impropriations, and the augmentation of vicarages, &c.* Lond., 1704.

[2] Above, p. 31: see also *Luther's Lehre von der Kirche*, by Julius Köstlin, Stuttgart, 1853, where a chapter (§ 4) is devoted to the relation of the 'universal priesthood' to the office of preaching. One of Luther's special writings on the subject appeared in 1523, with the title *De in-*

SAXON COMMUNION.

Regular ministers appointed.

labours[1], was considerably modified in course of time, and as experience inculcated on its authors the necessity of curbing the extravagances of the individual spirit[2], and suggested that the faithful were not so taught of God as to be ripe for their ideal constitution. Hence, in Saxony itself, as early as the Visitation of **1527**, measures were adopted for securing to the Lutheran body a compact and systematic organization of its own. In that country, and indeed all others, where the civil power was found propitious to the Reformation, a close alliance was cemented between it and the 'new learning[3].' Pastors were accord-

stituendis Ministris Ecclesiæ (addressed to the senate of Prague, as a dissuasive against 'papistical orders'): *Opp.* II. fol. 545 sq. Jenæ, 1600. Luther there distinguishes clearly between the universal right to teach, and the universal exercise of the right: affirming that authority for that purpose is conveyed only to one class of Christians, 'qui vice et nomine omnium, qui idem juris habent, exequatur officia ista publice, ne turpis sit confusio in populo Dei, et Babylon quædam fiat in ecclesia, sed omnia secundum ordinem fiant' (fol. 553, a). In the same manner he frequently declared that some outward 'call' is necessary to the assumption of public ministrations. That call of God, however, might be formally made either through the senior members of the church, through the secular, or the ecclesiastical authorities (see Köstlin, p. 74), but in every case it amounted only to the delegation of an individual possessing the very same inherent rights which are diffused in the whole community: cf. Mohler, *Symbolik*, II. 91 sq.

[1] *E. g.* in the *Architeles* (as above, p. 104, n. 3), he writes, 'Non unius esse videtis aut alterius de Scripturæ locis pronunciare, sed omnium qui Christo credunt.'

[2] There can be little doubt that many of the Anabaptists, as well as some preachers who excited the Peasants' War, had been themselves stimulated by the theories of the continental Reformers respecting the nature of the ministerial office: above, pp. 36—38. The turning-point in Luther's own mind seems to have been his reappearance at Wittenberg in 1522. In the following year, when writing to the Bohemians (as above, p. 339, n. 2), he had matured his plans for the providing of ministers where episcopal ordination was impossible or undesirable: 'Convocatis et convenientibus libere quorum corda Deus tetigerit, ut vobiscum idem sentiant et sapiant, procedatis in nomine Domini et eligite quem et quos volueritis, qui digni et idonei visi fuerint. Tum impositis super eos manibus illorum qui potiores inter vos fuerint, confirmetis et commendetis eos populo et ecclesiæ seu universitati, sintque hoc ipso vestri episcopi, ministri seu pastores. Amen:' *Opp.* II. fol. 554 b. At Wittenberg, in May, 1525, the Lutherans determined to give ordination themselves, Melanchthon justifying this, on the ground that the bishops neglected their duties: Ranke, *Ref.* II. 266.

[3] 'If,' says Ranke (*Ibid.* II. 488, 489), 'these ideas, which we may describe as ecclesiastically democratic, afterwards triumphed in other countries, it was because the new church rose in opposition to the civil power; its real root and strength were in the lower classes of the people. But it was far otherwise in Germany. The new churches were founded

SAXON COMMUNION.

ingly placed in all the parishes of Saxony; over each small group of these, a 'superintendent[1]' was appointed, either on the election of his brother-ministers, or by the nomination of the civil power: while judicial functions, and the privilege of general direction in church-matters, were confided to a consistory[2], which, in Wittenberg itself, was composed of eight members, two being professed theologians, and two doctors of law. The enactment of like measures, in other parts of northern Europe, gave the Lutheran polity those special characteristics in which it differs from the system afterwards organized by Calvin at Geneva.

Indeed, as soon as the first vehemence of the Saxon movement was expended, and the Wittenbergers had established their positions with regard to what they deemed the ultimate source of spiritual authority, they manifested less and less desire to raise the edifice of the Reformation on a purely democratic basis[3]. It was then at least conceded

under the protection, the immediate influence, of the reigning authorities, and its [? their] form was naturally determined by that circumstance.'

[1] The regulations respecting superintendents were made as early as the Saxon visitation of 1527, and were chiefly meant to furnish an organization analogous to that which obtained under the episcopal system.

[2] See Richter's collection of *Kirchenordnungen;* his *Gesch. der evangel. Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland*, Leipzig, 1851, and Stahl's *Kirchenverfassung der Protestanten*, Erlangen, 1840. These consistories were in fact reproductions of the old episcopal courts and synods. The earliest rose at Wittenberg itself in 1539, with limited powers, so as not to interfere with the Visitors who had been appointed to superintend the settlement of the Reformation in Saxony. According to one of Luther's epistles (De Wette, v. 329) that consistory was to have reference 'ad causas matrimoniales (quas hic ferre amplius nec volumus nec possumus) et ad rusticos cogendos in ordinem aliquem disciplinæ et ad persolvendos reditus pastoribus,' &c. But the ultimate constitution of the body was definitively arranged in 1542 (see the regulations in Richter's *Kirchenord.* I. 367 sq.), when it was entrusted with the guardianship of true doctrine, the arrangements of public worship, and the supervision of morals both of pastors and of congregations.

[3] Thus while Melanchthon argues (in 1537) for the right of the laity to assist the presbyters in determining Christian doctrine, he limits the exercise of the right to those who are competent to form a judgment ('idoneos ad judicandum'); and then proceeds to state his views more fully: 'Nec debet esse [*i.e.* ecclesia] δημοκρατία, qua promiscue concedatur omnibus licentia vociferandi, et movendi dogmata, sed ἀριστοκρατία sit, in qua ordine hi, qui præsunt, episcopi et reges communicent consilia, et eligant homines ad judicandum idoneos. Ex his satis intelligi potest, cognitionem de doctrina pertinere ad Ecclesiam, *i. e.* ad presbyteros et principes: sed principes, re cognita et judicata, jam custodes esse externæ disciplinæ, et executores sententiæ synodi.' *Opp.* ed. Bretschn. III. 468,

SAXON COMMUNION.

everywhere that some order of ministers was necessary to the being, growth and conservation of the Church, not only for the sake of concord and decorum, but to drive the 'doctrine of the Scriptures into the hearts of men, that so present and future generations may be replenished with it[1].'

Church-temporalities.

Nor can any of the Saxon leaders be convicted of uttering violent theories in reference to the temporalities of the Church. Luther uniformly and emphatically opposed the secularization of monastic property[2], on the ground that it had been originally dedicated to God for the support of public worship, and that piety forbade the alienation of it from that object. He pleaded also for the augmentation of poor benefices, by transferring to them a portion of the funds derived from richer parishes.

Church and State.

All modifications of this kind he was desirous of entrusting to the secular magistrate, one of whose duties, he declared, is the protection of the Church from every species of rapacity, as well as from erroneous teaching and superstitious practices. Yet, in return for such general patronage and protection, the Wittenbergers never dreamt of placing themselves under the absolute guidance and dictation of the civil power in spiritual matters. They drew the sharpest possible distinction[3] between the secular and ecclesiastical administrations, averred that the same person ought not to be at once a bishop and a prince, and even went so far as to maintain that one of the fundamental errors of the papacy was the amalgamation of temporal and spiritual offices. Still, the lack of ancient precedents in vindication of the orders and position of the Lutheran pas-

470. A few years later the right of congregations to elect their own pastors was practically denied, but they were still permitted to exercise a veto where the appointment of the patron was distasteful to them: *Ibid.* IV. 544.

[1] Ranke, *Ref.* II. 495.

[2] *Ibid.* II. 500; III. 519, 520: cf. also Bucer's *Scripta Duo Adversaria*, p. 253, Argentor. 1544.

[3] Thus Luther writes to Melanchthon (July 21, 1530; De Wette, IV. 105): 'Primum cum certum sit, duas istas administrationes esse distinctas et diversas, nempe ecclesiasticam et politicam, quas mire confudit et miscuit Satan per papatum; nobis hic acriter vigilandum est, nec committendum, ut denuo confundantur:' see the formal statement to which this letter has reference in the *Confessio Augustana*, Part II. Art. vii.

SAXON COMMUNION.

tors, and, most of all, those trying circumstances under which the great religious peace[1] was ultimately confirmed at Augsburg in **1555**, seriously facilitated the encroachments of princes[2] in the petty states of Germany; so that while, in some particulars, the civil magistrate did no more than regain his rightful jurisdiction[3], he in others not unfrequently usurped ecclesiastical powers and privileges that were originally confided to the church-authorities, especially to the bishops.

Lutherans dissatisfied with their organization.

Both Melanchthon and Luther had foreseen this evil, as among the possible developments of the constitution they had given to the reformed community. They were conscious that a gap existed, yet had no power to fill it up. The former expressed himself with peculiar warmth on this subject[4] as early as **1530**, and repeatedly signified his

[1] Above, p. 65. Hence arose the saying, 'Cujus est regio, illius est religio.'

[2] It is interesting to observe the way in which Melanchthon, as early as 1540, justified the nomination of pastors by the secular magistrate. He says that bishops were always called and elected in the primitive Church 'per populum, *i.e.* honestissimos homines in singulis ordinibus:' and then adds: 'Sic nunc vocantur ministri in nostris ecclesiis vel per principes, vel per senatum in rebuspublicis. Et est pia et justa vocatio. Princeps et Senatores dupliciter habent jus vocandi: primum quia præsunt, et vult Deus gubernatores curare ministerium Evangelii: deinde quia sunt præcipua membra ecclesiæ.'

[3] Gerhard (*Loci Theologici*, 'De Ministerio Ecclesiastico,' § 112) maintained, however, in reference to this subject, that the assumption of episcopal rights had been in practice considerably moderated: 'Tamen exercitium eorum ita temperant, ut quædam capita ipsimet non adtingant, sed Ecclesiæ ministris relinquant, utpote prædicationem Verbi et sacramentorum administrationem, potestatem clavium, examen eligendorum ministrorum, eorum ordinationem *etc.*; quædam per Consistoriales et Superintendentes peragunt, utpote ecclesiarum visitationem, causarum ecclesiasticarum, ad quas etiam matrimoniales spectant, dijudicationem *etc.*; quædam sibi solis immediate reservent, utpote constitutionum ecclesiasticarum promulgationem, synodorum convocationem *etc*; quædam denique cum consensu Ecclesiæ administrent, utpote electionem et vocationem ministrorum.'

[4] In writing to Camerarius, Aug. 31, 1530, at a time when the hostile Confessions approximated closely to each other (cf. above, p. 54, n. 5), he says: 'Quanquam, ut ego quod sentio dicam, utinam, utinam possim non quidem dominationem confirmare, sed administrationem restituere episcoporum. Video enim, qualem simus habituri ecclesiam, dissoluta πολιτεία ecclesiastica. Video postea multo intolerabiliorem futuram tyrannidem, quam antea unquam fuit:' *Opp.* II. 334. Luther often expressed himself to the same effect in the closing years of his life: *e.g.* 'Satan pergit esse Satan. Sub papa miscuit Ecclesiam politiæ; sub nostro tempore vult miscere politiam Ecclesiæ' (De Wette, v. 596).

SAXON COMMUNION.

readiness to adopt[1] an episcopal organization, nay, even to accept the papacy as a human institution, provided the members of the hierarchy would consent to a reform of the erroneous doctrines then prevailing in the Church. He felt[2] that institutions which came down with the sanction of the Fathers were established with a pious object, and having proved, in early times, most serviceable to the cause of Christianity, ought not to be abandoned, except for very urgent reasons. But beyond this point Melanchthon was unwilling to proceed: while others, in the second generation of Lutheranism, were inclined to reject episcopacy altogether, as synonymous with spiritual domination, and betrayed considerable impatience even of the consistorial authority[3].

The form, however, which the church-constitution of Saxony presented on the appointment of superintendents had rendered it more capable of accommodation to the wants of countries where the bishops were not adverse to the Lutheran movement. Of this we saw examples in Brandenburg, and Prussia, in some parts of which episcopacy lingered until **1587**. On the other hand, it was violently suppressed in Denmark as early as **1536**, the king

Church constitution in Denmark;

[1] See above, p. 57, n. 2, and Seckendorf, Lib. III. p. 258.

[2] 'Hac de re in hoc conventu [*i. e.* at Augsburg] sæpe testati sumus, nos summa voluntate cupere conservare politiam ecclesiasticam, et gradus in ecclesia factos etiam humana auctoritate. Scimus enim bono et utili consilio a Patribus ecclesiasticam disciplinam hoc modo, ut veteres canones describunt, constitutam esse.... Porro hic iterum volumus testatum, nos libenter conservaturos esse ecclesiasticam et canonicam politiam, si modo episcopi desinant in nostras ecclesias sævire ('so die Bischöfe unser Lehre dulden und unsere Priester annehmen wollten'): *Apologia Confess.* Cap. VII. Art. XIV. § 23—§ 27. Writing to Camerarius (Sept. 4, 1530: *Opp.* II. 341), Melanchthon speaks again both for himself and Luther, and urges that they had no desire to abolish episcopacy: 'Semper ita sensit ipse Lutherus, quem nulla de causa quidam, ut video, amant, nisi quia beneficio ejus sentiunt se episcopos excussisse, et adeptos libertatem minime utilem ad posteritatem. Qualis enim cedo futurus est status ad posteros in ecclesiis, si omnes veteres mores sint aboliti, si nulli certi sint præsides?'

[3] Thus the Flacianists, or anti-Melanchthon party, complain in 1561 of various encroachments on the liberty of individual ministers and members. Flacius apprehends on the one side the establishment of an imperial papacy ('ein kaiserlich Papstthum'), and on the other denounces the assumptions of the consistories, who had begun to cripple the action even of the superintendents: 'Præcipitatur religio et ecclesia in extremum periculum tyrannidis paucorum Consistorialium' (quoted in Gieseler, III. ii. p. 374, n. 30, ed. Bonn).

SAXON COMMUNION.

and his reforming council then, as it would seem, arriving at a strong conviction[1] that the words 'bishops' and 'presbyters' are interchangeable in Holy Scripture, and imply no more than preachers and ministers of the Word. Tausen accordingly began to ordain[2] such ministers; and the government established at Wittenberg was eventually introduced with little or no opposition; the Danish superintendents, though nominally elected, being, in fact, appointed by the sovereign[3].

in Sweden;

In Sweden, on the contrary, the old episcopal arrangements have been all perpetuated. The royal authority appears to have been exerted there as absolutely as in the neighbouring state of Denmark[4]; and Gustavus Vasa, while plundering churches on the one side, and repressing the more zealous of the Lutheran prelates on the other, threatened, in **1539**, to constitute the Swedish Church entirely on the presbyterian model. He refused, at the same conjuncture, to designate the bishops according to their ancient titles. But the brief reaction that arose in favour of Mediævalism, and shewed itself especially in the liturgic zeal of a succeeding monarch, re-established for a while the ancient services, and aided in maintaining an episcopal succession that has still its centre in the archbishop of Upsala[5].

and in Hessen.

But while Lutheranism was, in the north of Europe, proved to be compatible with ancient hierarchical ideas, it had been presented in a very different shape to one important district of Middle Germany. Philip, landgrave of Hessen, acting on the advice of Francis Lambert, a native of Avignon, convoked a synod at Homburg as early as **1526**, in order that, as no more general settlement of the controversy could be obtained, he might determine the future constitution of the Church in his own principality[6]. Starting from the ground that all genuine Christians are

[1] 'Veri episcopi sive presbyteri, quæ voces sunt prorsus synonymæ, nihil aliud sunt quam concionatores et Verbi divini puri ministri:' see the Articles of 1530 in Münter, *Kirchengesch. von Dänemark*, III. 315, Leipzig, 1833.

[2] *Ibid.* III. 263—265.

[3] *Ibid.* III. 503.

[4] Geijer, *Hist. of the Swedes*, pp. 125 sq.

[5] See above, p. 79, n. 7, and the authorities there cited.

[6] Cf. above, p. 49, n. 1.

SAXON COMMUNION.

sharers in a common priesthood, and as such are authorized by the Word of God to sit in judgment on articles of faith, as well as on the public ritual, this meeting had proceeded to frame a system of belief and practice for itself on purely democratic principles. They retained the name of 'bishops,' it is true, but only in the general sense of minister and overseer[1]. They voted that each congregation should in future elect, and also, if necessary, should depose[2] its own 'bishop,' because the privilege and duty of judging the 'voice of pastors' appertained to the community. They invited all persons who were disquieted in conscience, to come and unburden their grief either to the 'bishop,' or to any pious and discreet member of the congregation[3], that from such they might obtain the comfort of God's holy Word. The right of excommunicating and absolving[4] they affirmed to be inherent in every saint, who has enrolled his name in the congregation, and submitted to its rules. They prohibited the study of canon-law[5] at the Hessian university of Marburg. They made provision for the founding of town and village-schools, in which the Bible should be read twice every day[6]. In each year it was determined that all congregations, represented by the 'bishop' and lay-deputies, should assemble in general synod, to hear complaints and to unravel difficulties: while three visitors were to be chosen at the same time who might perambulate the country, for the sake of ascertaining

[1] 'Præmonemus autem, ne quis putet nos per *episcopos* alios intelligere quam ministros Verbi Dei: sic enim ab apostolis quorum doctrinam sequimur vocati sunt.' *Reform. Eccl. Hassiæ*, p. 3, ed. Credner, Giessen, 1852.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 36, 'quod ad eam spectet judicare de voce pastorum.'

[3] This confession was meant to precede communion: 'si desolutæ sunt eorum conscientiæ, laudamus et consulimus, ut adeant episcopum, vel illius adjutorem, aut aliquem ex piis doctisque fratribus, confitentes peccatum suum, et audituri ab eis Verbum sanctum:' *Ibid.* p. 5.

[4] The administration of church-discipline had presented great difficulties to the early Reformers, so that Luther in 1543 was favourable to the plan here adopted, *viz.* for the sentence to proceed from a vote of the congregation. Thus he writes to a friend in ducal Saxony (De Wette, v. 551): 'Placet exemplum Hassiacæ excommunicationis: si idem potueritis statuere, optime facietis. Sed Centauri et Harpyiæ aulicæ ægre ferent.' Ultimately, however, the sentence of excommunication proceeded from the consistories.

[5] *Reform. Eccl. Hassiæ*, p. 43.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 43, 44.

the condition of the Church, and transmitting a report to the next synod[1]. With regard to the qualifications of the ministers, it was ruled that any citizen of irreproachable life and competent learning might be selected without regard to his profession or employment[2]. Thus, an extraordinary measure of self-government in the several congregations, a vigilant supervision of the whole body, and a rigorous code of discipline, were some of the more remarkable features in this novel constitution.

SAXON COMMUNION.

SWISS COMMUNION.

The same ideas were more fully carried out in those communities who followed in the steps of Calvin, or were organized under his own immediate superintendence: the chief difference in their practical effects arising from the circumstance that, in Hessen, the civil power was always favourable to the Reformation, while in those countries, where the polity of the Church had followed purely Calvinistic or Genevan models, either the civil rulers and nobility had been utterly opposed to the religious agitation, or else the previous state of feeling had been adverse to monarchical forms of government. In the case of Zürich and the other German-speaking cantons of Switzerland, Zwingli's aim was to engraft the institutions of his new Church on the pre-existing republicanism[3]. He started from the ground, that sovereignty, in spiritual as in temporal matters, is vested in the civic authorities of each community ('gemeinde'), and that all which Holy Scripture teaches of the Church is predicable of small societies like it. From this community, as represented in the Grand Council, is derived the power to minister in sacred things; for Zwingli was soon driven by the rise of Anabaptism to

Zwingli's ideas on church-organization.

[1] See Ranke's remarks, *Ref.* II. 487, 488, where he adds: 'The ideas are the same on which the French, Scotch, and American(?) churches were afterwards founded, and indeed on which the existence and the development of North America may truly be said to rest.'

[2] 'Cives pii et docti ac irreprehensibiles, cujuscunque artis sint, in episcopos eligi possunt.' *Ref. Eccl. Hass.* p. 38.

[3] See Lavater, *De ritibus et institutis Eccl. Tigurinæ*, 1559, and Ranke, *Ref.* III. 79, 80. The second of these writers draws attention (p. 77) to the early intercourse which took place between Zwingli and Lambert, the founder of the Hessian polity.

SWISS COMMUNION.

insist upon the absolute necessity of some external call[1]. Like others of the Reforming party, he argued in favour of each congregation electing its own minister: yet, in order to restrain plebeian and fanatic spirits, he would have the chief management, or initiative of such elections, committed to persons of learning and experience; and the issue was, that a veto only remained in the hands of the populace. Hence the church-organization of Zürich, as regulated under the eye of Zwingli, was popular, without becoming absolutely democratic: it contained a blending of the old episcopal constitution[2], or, more strictly speaking, elements akin to those of the Lutheran consistory, while professing to derive all power from the concurrence of the people. The character and position of its framer would alone suggest the inference, that he acted uniformly in correspondence with the secular authorities: indeed, the Church and State of Zürich were, to his mind, nothing but two different aspects of the same institution[3].

[1] *Opp.* II. fol. 52 sq. ed. Gualther. On fol. 53 b he proceeds to the question respecting the appointment of ministers. The freedom of election, he says, was lost during the Middle Ages: 'Quis enim ignorat omnium fere ecclesiarum et pastorum electionem penes episcopos illos mitratos et fastu turgidos?' Plebeian elections, however, seemed unadvisable, and he accordingly added (fol. 54 a): 'Divinæ ergo ordinationi et institutioni pristinæ nihil perinde consentaneum videtur, quam si universa fidelis alicujus populi ecclesia simul cum doctis aliquot piisque episcopis vel aliis viris fidelibus et rerum peritis pastorem aliquem deligat?'

[2] See Ebrard's eulogy of it, in *Das Dogma vom heil. Abendmahl*, II. 63, note. Still it is indisputable that Zwingli had no wish to elevate the ministers above their flocks; for he always denied to the former the right of excommunication, assigning that prerogative to the civil magistrate, as the organ by which the wishes of the community were carried into effect. Accordingly the church at large was considered as ultimately the excommunicator. Œcolampadius endeavoured to establish a different principle at Basel when he proposed to vest the power of excommunication in the ministers, but was forced to abandon his scheme soon afterwards (see Herzog, *Das Leben Joh. Œcolampads*, II. 192 sq., Basel, 1843). At the close of his life, however, Zwingli had somewhat modified his ideas. He supposed, in 1530, that the civil magistracy might fail in its duties, and then the Church was at liberty to resume the right of excommunication: 'Ob aber die Oberkeiten ihr Amt nit thun weltind, alsdann mögind die gmeinen Kilchen sich ihres Gwalts ouch gebruchen mit dem Bann, damit die Kilchen rein und ungeärgeret bliebe:' quoted in Gieseler, III. ii. p. 382, n. 42.

[3] Thus, for example, he writes in his treatise *De Eucharistia* in 1525 (*Ibid.* p. 380, n. 39): 'Ita enim factum est, ut quicquid Diacosii [the Grand Council of the canton] cum Verbi ministris ordinarent, jam dudum in animis fidelium ordinatum esset. Denique Senatum Diacosiorum

SWISS COMMUNION.

Calvin and the General polity.

An opposite tendency, however, shewed itself ere long in that part of Switzerland where Calvin's influence grew predominant. If fully and consistently carried out, his principles would have resulted in the establishment of a Theocracy, or would, at least, have elevated[1] the spiritual above the secular magistrate; for, while accepting the protection of the latter, Calvinism denied his right to intermeddle otherwise in the administration of church-affairs. The novel institutions of Geneva were cradled in the midst of revolution: anarchy prevailed in every quarter of the new republic; and the relaxation of morals, especially in the chief town and its vicinity, had reached a fearful and flagitious height. It was under these circumstances[2] that Calvin entered on the work of Reformation. He laboured to produce in men a deeper reverence for religious acts and persons, to make them conscious of the mystic union that subsists among all true believers, and especially to invest the doctrine of the visible Church with new significance, on the ground that it is instituted, not as any mere conventional establishment, but for the training and maturing of human souls in faith and holiness[3]. The government of this Church, the guardianship and definition of its doctrines, and the administration of

adivimus, ut Ecclesiæ totius nomine, quod usus postularet, fieri juberent, quo tempestive omnia et cum decoro agerentur...Sic utimur Tiguri Diacosiorum Senatu, quæ summa est potestas, Ecclesiæ vice.'

[1] The spirit of Calvinism in this single particular resembles that of Romanism, while the Lutheran, Zwinglian, and, to some extent, the Anglican polities, all savour of Byzantinism. In his *Institutio*, lib. IV. c. 11, § 4, Calvin writes as follows: 'Non magistratus, si pius est, eximere se volet communi filiorum Dei subjectione, cujus non postrema pars est, Ecclesiæ ex Verbo Dei judicanti se subjicere: tantum abest ut judicium illud tollere debeat... Imperator bonus intra Ecclesiam, non supra Ecclesiam est.' In the previous section he draws the sharpest distinction between ecclesiastical and civil power, but insists on the importance of their harmonious cooperation: 'Sic conjunctæ debent esse operæ, ut altera sit adjumento alteri, non impedimento.' The Genevan reformers were thus the deadly enemies of Erastianism (see above, p. 328, n. 2): and indeed one of the first assailants of Erastus himself, was Calvin's colleague and successor, Theodore Beza, whose tract *De vera excommunicatione et Christiano Presbyterio* appeared in 1590.

[2] See Hooker's narrative, prefixed to the *Ecclesiastical Polity*: 'The reason,' he says, 'which moved Calvin herein to be so earnest, was, as Beza himself testifieth, "For that he saw how needful these bridles were, to put in the jaws of that city"' (I. 138, ed. Keble).

[3] Although Möhler thinks the Genevese reformers 'inexhaustible in their own self-contradiction,' he does Calvin justice in this particular (I. 126, 127).

SWISS COMMUNION.

corrective discipline, the Genevese reformer placed entirely in the hands of ministers, associated with certain lay-elders[1], who were chosen to represent the various congregations. For them he claimed both legislative and judicial functions, on the ground that such functions had been exercised by the Church in primitive and apostolic times. The ministers in Calvin's system were nominally elected by the people[2], and ordained by the presbytery[3]. They were all of equal rank and jurisdiction, such equality being, as he contended, in strict accordance with the verdict of Holy Scripture, in which the officers of the Church, whom Christ designed to be perpetual[4], are all represented as occupying the same level, and invested with the same authority. The judgment of an assemblage of these pastors, or church-synod, was esteemed so highly[5], that regular synodic action was of the very essence of the Calvinistic system. It was determined[6], that the first judica-

[1] 'Duo autem sunt [*i. e.* of church offices] quæ perpetuo manent, gubernatio et cura pauperum. Gubernatores fuisse existimo seniores ex plebe delectos, qui censuræ morum et exercendæ disciplinæ una cum episcopis præessent.' *Instit.* lib. IV. c. 3, § 8. The care of the poor was entrusted to deacons (*Ibid.* § 9), who thus became permanent 'church-officers.'

[2] After insisting on the requisite conditions in those who are to be either 'episcopi,' deacons, or lay-elders, he adds (*Ibid.* § 15): 'Habemus ergo, esse hanc ex Verbo Dei legitimam ministri vocationem, ubi ex populi consensu et approbatione creantur qui visi fuerint idonei. Præesse autem electioni debere alios pastores, ne quid vel per levitatem, vel per mala studia, vel per tumultum a multitudine peccetur.' The practical result, however, was, that pastors were elected by their colleagues, the people retaining a veto: while the secular authority was allowed to interpose in their confirmation, and also deputed two of four commissioners, who inspected them and their proceedings every year.

[3] Ordination was so important in Calvin's view as to become quasi-sacramental: 'Sacramenta duo instituta, quibus nunc Christiana Ecclesia utitur. Loquor autem de iis, quæ in usum totius ecclesiæ sunt instituta. Nam impositionem manuum, qua ecclesiæ ministri in suum munus initiantur, ut *non invitus patior vocari sacramentum*, ita inter ordinaria sacramenta non numero.' *Ibid.* lib. IV. c. 14, § 20.

[4] See his distinctions, *Instit.* lib. IV. c. 3, § 1. In § 8 he adds significantly: 'Cæterum quod episcopos et presbyteros et pastores et ministros promiscue vocavi, qui Ecclesias regunt, id feci ex Scripturæ usu, quæ vocabula ista confundit: quicunque enim Verbi ministerio funguntur, iis titulum episcoporum tribuit.'

[5] 'Nos certe libenter concedimus, si quo de dogmate incidat disceptatio, nullum esse nec melius nec certius remedium, quam si verorum episcoporum synodus conveniat, ubi controversum dogma excutiatur.' *Ibid.* lib. IV. c. 9, § 13.

[6] See the *Ordonnances ecclésiastiques de l'église de Genève* (published in 1541) in Richter's *Kirchen-ordnungen*, as before, I. 342 sq.

tory should consist of twelve lay-elders and six ministers, Calvin himself contriving always to occupy the presidential chair. To this body, known as the Consistory, was entrusted the direction of religious and moral life in the whole community, together with the right of excommunication. Its proceedings, based on theocratic notions, most of which had been derived from the Old Testament, were uniformly characterized by great severity[1]; for Calvin, who was virtually the head and spirit of the whole system, determined, above all things, to restore the ancient discipline of the Church, and in particular to exclude notorious sinners from that service which he held to be the crowning act of evangelic worship,—the reception of the Eucharist.

SWISS COMMUNION.

The unrelenting sternness of his administration led, as we have seen[2], to his temporary banishment; and, on his return, he had to struggle with a multitude of 'Libertines,' who were continually goaded and embarrassed by the heavy yoke which he imposed. One section of them attempted to carry an appeal from the decisions of the Consistory to the council of Two Hundred, in which the temporal supremacy was lodged. But Calvin had sufficient influence to repress these outbreaks of rebellion. He contended that, in spiritual things, the Council was itself amenable to the Word of Christ, and that His Word was most authoritatively interpreted by members of the consistorial synod[3]. The ascendancy obtained by this

Depression of the civil power.

[1] See for example, Dyer's *Life of Calvin*, pp. 144 sq. Ranke (*Civil Wars, &c. in France*, I. 217, 218) gives the following summary: 'The strongest fetters of discipline were laid upon outward conduct; the expenses of clothing and of the table were confined within certain limits; dancing was prohibited, and the reading of certain books, such as *Amadis*, forbidden; gamblers were seen in the pillory with the cards in their hands. Once a year an examination took place in every house, to ascertain whether the religious precepts were known and observed; mutual imputations of failings, which the members of the council observed in one another, were permitted at their sittings. No indulgence was known for transgression: a woman was burnt for having sung immodest songs; one of the most distinguished of the citizens was compelled to kneel in the great square, with an inverted torch in his hand, and publicly to entreat forgiveness, because he had mocked the doctrine of salvation, and personally insulted the great preacher. In accordance with a requisition of an assembly of the people, adultery was made punishable with death: and the man who suffered for it, praised God, in dying, for the strict laws of his native city.'

[2] Above, p. 116.

[3] Ranke, as above, pp. 220, 221.

SWISS COMMUNION.

dictation, which is illustrated in the civil code he was commissioned to draw up, had armed the government of the Genevese reformer with corporal penalties: and many were the victims crushed, or silenced, by his terrible tribunals.

Development of the Calvinistic polity:

The limited area of the territory, where Calvin's power was thus supreme, had checked the full development of his principles in reference to the constitution of the Church. In addition to the consistory, it is true, there was established at Geneva another body, called the 'Venerable Company,' with jurisdiction embracing contiguous congregations, and so extending farther than that of single consistories: but it was left for other states, in which the discipline of Calvin was received, to carry out the organization by framing the higher class of judicatories, known as the provincial and the national synods. These existed in the Netherlands, in France, and finally in Scotland. The ecclesiastical government[1] of the last had been uncertain and precarious till the Second Book of Discipline obtained the parliamentary ratification in **1592**. At the outbreak of the Reformation prelacy was furiously subverted; but the tendency of thought seemed in the direction of a Lutheran rather than a Calvinistic polity. Superintendents[2] began to be nominated as early as **1561**, their field of action being coextensive with the ancient Scottish diocese; and in connexion with 'ministers' and 'readers' who were now subordinated to them, the chief local direction of ecclesiastical affairs was confided to their hands. The English Bishops also were esteemed their brethren[3], notwithstanding the obnoxious titles which they bore. At length, however, the

in Scotland.

[1] See, in addition to the authorities quoted above, p. 141, Bp. Sage's *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, Lond. 1695 (reprinted by the *Spottiswoode Society*).

[2] That quasi-episcopal powers were granted to these officers, is obvious from the *First Book of Discipline*, as above, p. 141, n. 4. They were not only to preach themselves thrice a week at least, but to provide ministers, or, in any case, readers for all the congregations. They were to try the life of ministers as well as of the people, and redress the various grievances that came under their notice. This pre-eminence of jurisdiction Knox and others meant to be perpetuated, as Dr Cook, the author of the *Hist. of the Reformation in Scotland* (Edin. 1811), himself allows: II. 417.

[3] See the letter addressed, in 1566, by 'the superintendents, ministers and commissioners of the Church within the realm of Scotland,' (in Knox's *Works*, II. 545, ed. Laing), where, as Russell (*Hist. of the Church in Scotland*, I. 250, Lond. 1834) pointed out, the true reading is that now given, and not 'the superintendents *with other* ministers,' &c.

SWISS COMMUNION.

pre-eminence awarded to the superintendents grew intolerable in the eyes of the more zealous members of the Kirk. An agitation was set on foot by Andrew Melville, after his return from the continent (**1574**), in order to assimilate the Scottish polity in all its parts to that which Beza, after Calvin, administered at Geneva. Its fundamental characteristic was, that no distinctions, in the rank of pastors, are authorized by Holy Scripture, and therefore that prelacy, or the superiority of any office in the Church above presbyters, ought to be denounced as unholy, and resisted as tyrannical. The manifesto, which gives utterance to these principles, is the *Second Book of Discipline.* Yet the way to such conclusions was already opened by the earliest ordinances of the Scottish reformation. The ultimate church-authority then established was the General Assembly[1], or, in Calvinistic phraseology, the National Synod, in which all the ministerial representatives were of equal authority: the superintendent, or, as he was styled in **1572**, the 'bishop'[2], having no official pre-eminence above the simple presbyter. Hence the shadow of episcopacy that survived till **1592** derived its mission, orders, and jurisdiction altogether from a presbyterian source: and hence the new arrangements made at that epoch were no more than the legitimate consequence of principles inherent in the creed of Knox and his Genevan associates.

The Scottish Kirk, in common with all those who drew

[1] See *Book of the Universal Kirk of Scotland*, ed. Bannatyne Club, 1839—1845.

[2] At this epoch there was some prospect of restoring a modified episcopacy (see Sage, as above, pp. 185 sq.). Two of the resolutions passed in the convention at Leith are as follow: 'That ministers should receive ordination from the bishop of the diocese, and where no bishop was as yet placed, from the superintendent of the bounds: That the bishops and superintendents, at the ordination of ministers, should exact of them an oath for acknowledging his Majesty's authority, and for obedience to their ordinary in all things.' Still it must be granted, that one moving cause of this new arrangement was a desire to adopt titles known to the constitution of the country, in order that the transfer and inheritance of the church-estates might be simplified. A solemn declaration was made at the same time, reassuring the people that a return to the ancient style of archbishops, bishops, deans, chapters, and the like, did not imply the least countenance of popery or superstition; and that the articles agreed upon were merely of the nature of an Interim, 'until farther and more perfect order be obtained at the hands of the king's Majesty's regent and nobility.' *Ibid.* p. 204. To the Presbyterian party this Interim ended in 1592: to the Episcopalian in 1612.

SWISS COMMUNION.

their teaching from Geneva, shewed a like impatience of state-patronage and secular intermeddling[1]; while ecclesiastical censures were as loudly fulminated, and the sword of excommunication in constant use.

[1] The following specimen (quoted in Russell, II. 55, 56) is taken from a remonstrance of Andrew Melville, addressed to king James in 1596: 'We must discharge our duty, or else be enemies to Christ and you. Therefore, Sir, as diverse times before, so now I must tell you, that there are two kings and two kingdoms. There is Christ and His Kingdom, the Kirk, whose subject king James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a head, nor a lord, but a member: and they whom Christ hath called and commanded to watch over His Kirk, and govern His spiritual kingdom, have sufficient authority and power from Him so to do; which no Christian king should control nor discharge, but fortify and assist; otherwise they are not faithful subjects to Christ. Sir, when you were in your swaddling clouts, Christ reigned freely in this land, in spite of all His enemies. His officers and ministers convened and assembled for ruling of His Kirk, which was ever for your welfare also, when the same enemies were seeking your destruction; and have been by their assemblies and meetings since terrible to these enemies, and most steedable [helpful] for you. Will you now, when there is more than necessity, challenge Christ's servants, your best and most faithful subjects, for their convening, and for the care they have of their duty to Christ and you, when you should rather commend and countenance them, as the godly kings and emperors did? The wisdom of your Council, which is devilish and pernicious, is this, that you may be served by all sorts of men, to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant.'

It is curious to observe that the English Puritans held the same doctrine. Cartwright declares, in his *Reply to Dr Whitgift's Answer* (pp. 180, 181), that the civil magistrates 'must remember to submit themselves unto the churche .... to throw doune their crownes before the churche, yea, as the prophet speaketh, to licke the dust of the feete of the churche.'

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE STATE OF INTELLIGENCE AND PIETY.

ALTHOUGH the Reformation of the sixteenth century has contributed in no small measure to develop all the nobler faculties of man, and thereby inaugurated a new phase of European civilization[1], its primary effect was not propitious[2] to the cultivation of polite literature and gave no healthy impulse to the arts and sciences. The agitations, in the midst of which it flourished, interfered with the repose of students, or, converting some into ecclesiastical polemics, made them concentrate their chief attention on the primitive records of the Church,—the Fathers, Councils, Canonists, and Historians. We accordingly meet with few, if any, classical scholars in the latter half of the century, who proved themselves a match either in erudition or in elegance for giants like Erasmus, Ludovicus Vives, or Jean Budé (Budæus). Italy itself, which formed the cradle where the literature of ancient Greece had been revived,

Decline of polite literature.

[1] Few writers question the reality of this change; but Balmez, in his *Protestantism and Catholicity compared*, has laboured to establish that Europe suffered grievously even in its moral and social relations from the progress of the Lutheran movement. His main positions are, that European civilization had reached all the development that was possible for it before the rise of Protestantism; that Protestantism perverted the course of civilization, and so produced immense evils; and that all the progress, or apparent progress, which has since been effected, is made in spite of Protestantism.

[2] Döllinger (*Die Reformation*, I. 418 sq.) has consequently some reason on his side when he infers from evidence there collected, that the Reformation was not so exclusively the friend of literature as some have represented, 'It is generally believed,' says Warton (*Engl. Poetry*, III. 13, ed. 1840), 'that the reformation of religion in England, the most happy and important event in our annals, was immediately succeeded by a flourishing state of letters. But this was by no means the case:' cf. Hallam, *Lit. of Europe*, I. 464 sq., Lond. 1840, and Roscoe's *Life of Leo X.* II. 237 sq., Lond. 1846.

could hardly boast of one Hellenist at the close of the present period[1].

Nor can this decline be ascribed entirely to the barbarous intermeddling of the 'Holy Office' and the consequent flight of scholars from the southern to the northern states of Europe. England[2], which had often furnished an asylum to such fugitives, was, generally speaking, in the same condition. The decline of taste is indicated most of all by the degenerate character of the Latinity, and the undue attention commonly bestowed on the less cultivated authors; while Greek, which at the opening of the sixteenth century, had, in spite of its alleged connexion with heretical doctrines[3], captivated a large class of students, now receded for a time and fell into comparative oblivion.

These facts, however, cannot, in the present instance,

[1] Ranke, *Popes*, I. 493. 'It is true,' he writes, 'that another Aldus Manutius appeared at Rome, and that he was professor of eloquence; but neither his Greek nor his Latin could win admirers.' In other European countries *some* progress was visible in the second half of the century; as the names of Henry Stephanus (Estienne), Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon will sufficiently indicate.

[2] See Warton, as above, pp. 14, 15. On p. 16 we have the following evidence from the founder of Trinity College, Oxford: 'He [cardinal Pole] advyses me to order the Greeke to be more taught there than I have provyded. This purpose I well lyke: but I fear the *tymes will not bear it now*. I remember when I was a young scholler at Eton [circ. 1520], the Greeke tonge was growing apace; the studie of which is now a-late much decaid.' Luther himself regretted this unreasonable neglect of classical authors: cf. J. J. Blunt, *Reform. in England*, p. 104, 6th ed.

[3] Priests in their confessions of young scholars, used to caution them against learning Greek: 'Cave a Græcis ne fias hæreticus.' And Erasmus, who mentions this and other like facts, had the greatest difficulties in obtaining currency at Cambridge for his edition of the Greek Testament. On the other hand, the following picture of a French savant, Duchâtel (Castellanus), will both exhibit the voracity of students at this period, and the fastidiousness of their taste: 'Duchâtel retrouva, dans l'emploi de lecteur, les loisirs qu'il avait eus à Bâle lorsqu'il remplissait les fonctions de correcteur dans l'imprimerie de Froben. Il les consacra, n'en laissant rien perdre, à relire les anciens auteurs Latins et Grecs et à se perfectionner dans toutes les études. Suivant le conseil de Platon, qui recommande aux gens studieux de ne remplir leur estomac qu'une fois par jour, il mangeait, à huit heures du matin, un morceau de pain, ne buvait à ce repas qu'un verre de vin, et dînait à cinq heures. Il donnait trois ou quatre heures au sommeil, et le reste de ses nuits au travail. Le matin, il étudiait les philosophes et les mathématiciens; dans l'après-midi, les historiens et les poëtes. Pour ses études nocturnes, il réservait la Bible, qu'il lisait en Hébreu durant deux heures, et les interprètes du Nouveau Testament, entre lesquels il préférait saint Jérôme, *trouvant que saint Augustin est un sophiste de mauvais goût*, qui ne sait pas trop sa grammaire.' Haurćau, *François Ier et sa Cour*, pp. 219, 220, Paris, 1855.

be regarded as the omens of returning barbarism or symptoms of intellectual poverty and weakness. Men's thoughts were feverishly intent on moral and religious, to the disregard of literary and scholastic questions. Yearnings were excited in their spirits, which could find no satisfaction in the cloudy reveries of Christian Platonism, nor in the frigid reasonings of Aristotle: and it was only when the Reformation was established, when the controversies it provoked were losing their original freshness and intense attraction, that the study of the pagan authors was more generally resumed, and sacred images replaced more freely[1] by conceptions borrowed from the Greek mythology or the writings of philosophers who shed imperishable lustre on the speculations of the ancient world.

This decline no proof of intellectual degeneracy.

The Reformation, itself one product of the intellectual enlightenment which sprang up in the former period[2], was in turn the parent of a moral, social, and religious revolution. It allied itself, indeed, with the great Biblical movement of the age preceding; but, as the necessities of the case required, its progress rather coincided with the practical and mystical, than with the critical direction of that movement[3]. When Luther burst the fetters that once held him in complete subjection to the papacy, the Western Church was lamentably fallen: it was ignorant, disordered, and demoralized. So deeply rooted was this feeling in the hearts of men, that numbers who had little or no personal affection for the author of Protestantism regarded his first onslaught with unqualified approbation[4]. Reforms of some kind or other were felt to be imperatively needed, and the sanguine therefore hoped that Luther was himself the man whom Providence had now commissioned for restoring to the Church of God her ancient characteristics. 'Before the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresy,' is the confession of the prince of Romish controversialists[5], 'according to the testimony of persons then alive,

Need of some moral revolution.

Testimony of Bellarmine;

[1] See Warton, III. 396 sq., on what he terms the 'fresh inundation of classical pedantry.'

[2] See *Middle Age*, pp. 360, 361.

[3] 'Der Zusammenschluss jener biblisch-praktischen und dieser mystischen Richtung ist das schöpferische Prinzip der Reformation geworden:' Dorner, *Entwickelungs-gesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi*, II. 452, Berlin, 1853.

[4] Above, p. 2, n. 2.

[5] Bellarmin. Concio XXVIII.; *Opp.* VI. 296, Colon. 1617; cf. above, p. 3, n. 1.

there was almost an utter abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical courts; in morals there was no discipline, in sacred literature no erudition, in Divine things no reverence. Religion was on the point of vanishing from the earth.' And similar witness had been borne already by another polemic who was struggling to resist the onward march of the Reformers; 'I have frequently avowed,' he writes[1], 'that the discipline of the Church is ruined; that morals are corrupted; that the lives of great men and of the clergy are defiled by licence, by avarice, by ambition; that learning is utterly neglected, or else pursued only in a sordid and godless spirit, which is the reason why our pulpits are now filled by such ignorant, absurd, and silly preachers. I have complained also more than once that the cure of souls is disregarded; that parishes are abandoned; that the great aim now is to get possession of sinecure benefices; and that there is no end of calumnious lawsuits and disgraceful traffickings in order to obtain

and of Barth. Latomus.

[1] Barthol. Latomus, in his controversy with Bucer, printed in Bucer's *Scripta Duo Adversaria*, Argentorat. 1544, p. 27. It was not unnatural for Bucer to draw the following inference from such admissions (p. 216): 'Non docetur ergo neque regitur a Spiritu Sancto vestra Ecclesia, hoc est, cœtus vestrorum prelatorum, qui novas illas et peregrinas invexerunt doctrinas atque ceremonias.' Cf. above, p. 323, n. 2, where many of the prevalent corruptions are traced by the Roman cardinals to the excessive laxity and ignorance of ecclesiastics. Duchâtel (the French scholar mentioned above, p. 356, n. 3) was deterred from entering into holy orders by the same causes: 'Non semel mihi ingenue confessus est,' writes his biographer (*Ibid.* p. 218, note), 'ut, si suo genio obsequi sibi integrum fuisset, sagatam quam togatam vitam, militarem quam ecclesiasticam *in qua plerosque fere omnes flagitiose versari videbat*, sequi maluisset.' And Luther's *Preface* to his *Catechismus Minor pro parochis et concionatoribus* tells the same distressing tale: 'Miserabilis illa facies, quam proxime, quum Visitatorem agerem [A.D. 1527], vidi, me ad edendum hunc catechismum simplicissime et brevissime tractatum coegit. Deum immortalem! quantam calamitatem ibi vidi: vulgus, præsertim autem illud, quod in agris vivit, item plerique parochi, adeo nullam Christianæ doctrinæ cognitionem habent, ut dicere etiam pudeat. Et tamen omnes sancto illo Christi nomine appellantur, et nobiscum communibus utuntur sacramentis, quum Orationem Dominicam, symbolum Apostolicum et Decalogum non modo non intelligant, sed ne verba quidem referre possint. Quid multis moror? nihil omnino a bestiis differunt. Jam autem quum Evangelium passim doceatur, illi vel maxime Christianorum libertate fruuntur (Und nun das Evangelium kommen ist, dennoch fein gelehret haben, aller Freiheit meisterlich zu missbrauchen). Quid hic Christo respondebitis, episcopi, quibus illa cura est Divinitus demandata? *Vos enim estis, quibus vel solis illa Christianæ religionis calamitas debetur*, etc.: in Francke's *Libr. Symbol. Eccl. Lutheran.* Part II. p. 63.

admission to the priesthood. Accordingly from these evils greater still have issued, and do issue. Feuds have risen in the Church amounting almost to barbarity, religion is corrupted, ignorance of the Gospel is most rife, the ancient discipline is relaxed, all strength of principle is gone, and conduct is grown impious: there is contempt of God, contempt of magistrates, abhorrence of the priests; and, in a word, the mass of crimes and vices is so huge that, in our day, we find the burden almost intolerable.'

Consequent importance of reverting to the ground of Apostolic preachers.

In such a state of morals and religious intelligence, it seemed to be the foremost duty of each Christian pastor to impress again upon his flock the alphabet of the Gospel, rather than to follow in the wake of timorous and half-hearted chieftains like Erasmus, with a hope that the diffusion of politer literature would issue in the spiritual exaltation of society. The chief aim accordingly was to preach what the apostles and evangelists had preached at first, to Jew and Gentile, Greek and Roman,—'Jesus Christ, and Him as crucified.' This verity became to all Reformers the substance of their choicest homilies, the centre, life and marrow of their theological system[1]. The image of the Crucified was ever printed on their hearts[2]: by it they stirred their audience to a deeper hatred of sin, and warmed in them an earnest and abiding love of the Almighty. While the general tendency of thought had been among the Orientals to lay stress on the Prophetic character of Christ, to worship Him as the great source of supernatural light and wisdom; while the Latins of the Middle Age adored Him chiefly as the King, incarnate,

[1] Thus, for example, Oswald Myconius urged in his address *Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ* (Tiguri, 1524, p. 20): 'Prædicare enim Evangelium, quid aliud est quam prædicare Christum pro salute nostra crucifixum? Quem si populo sic præscripsissent, non potuissent certe vel de meritis operum, vel de satisfactionibus, vel de intercessione sanctorum dicere. Ex missa non fecissent sacrificium. Idola in templa Christianorum nunquam intrusissent: nihil immutassent de iis quæ Christus statuit.'

[2] See the fine passage in the English *Homilies*, pp. 425 sq., Camb. 1850. The vicarious nature of Christ's mediation is illustrated as follows in the same document (p. 487); 'For upon Him, He [God the Father] put our sins, upon Him He made our ransom: Him He made the mean betwixt us and Himself, whose mediation was so acceptable to God the Father, through His profound and perfect obedience, that He took His act for a full satisfaction of our disobedience and rebellion, whose right eousness He took to weigh against our sins, whose redemption He would have stand against our damnation.'

crucified, and risen, as the Sovereign and the Judge whose visible dominion coincided with the limits of the papal monarchy, new aspects of His character grew more familiar at the time of the Reformation. In asserting the malignity of evil and the moral impotence of man regarded in himself, the leaders of that movement pointed more distinctly and more uniformly to the Priest, the Substitute, the Reconciling-Victim.

Preaching of Christ the Crucified:

Thus the Wittenberg Reformer had been driven, through despair of his own efforts, to cry out as early as **1516**[1]: 'Thou, Lord Jesus, art my Righteousness, but I am Thy sin: Thou hast taken mine, and given me Thine:' confessions which may be regarded as the prelude and epitome of all his future teaching on the justification of the sinner. Zwingli, notwithstanding the divergencies in his mode of training, and the difference in his natural temperament, had started from the same profound conviction. 'The death of Christ, and that alone,' he argued, 'is the price paid for the remission of sins[2].' In other words, the sharp distinction thus established between the righteousness of God and man, between the salutary work done in us and the salutary work done for us, was a leading characteristic of Reformed theology.

[1] Above, p. 14, n. 1. In 1531 we find both him and Melanchthon stating their convictions on this subject with remarkable clearness (Melanchthon's *Works*, II. 501 sq.). The latter writes (to Brentz): 'Ideo non dilectio, quæ est impletio legis, justificat, sed sola fides, non quia est perfectio quædam in nobis, sed tantum quia apprehendit Christum: justi sumus non propter dilectionem, non propter legis impletionem, non propter novitatem nostram, etsi sint dona Spiritus Sancti, sed propter Christum, et Hunc tantum fide apprehendimus.' While Luther adds a postcript: 'Et ego soleo, mi Brenti, ut hanc rem melius capiam, sic imaginari, quasi nulla sit in corde meo qualitas, quæ fides vel caritas vocetur, sed in loco ipsorum pono Ipsum Christum et dico: Hæc est justitia mea; Ipse est qualitas et formalis, ut vocant, justitia mea, ut sic me liberem ab intuitu legis et operum; imo et ab intuitu objectivi istius Christi, qui vel doctor vel donator intelligitur; sed volo Ipsum mihi esse donum et doctrinam per Se, ut omnia in Ipso habeam.'

[2] See above, p. 101, n. 3. In like manner he declares (*Fidei Ratio*, in Niemeyer, p. 19): 'Scio nullam aliam esse expiandorum scelerum hostiam quam Christum, nam ne Paulus quidem pro nobis est crucifixus: nullum aliud pignus Divinæ bonitatis et clementiæ certius esse ac indubitatius, nihil enim æque firmum ac Deus est: et non est aliud nomen sub sole in quo nos oporteat salvos fieri quam Jesu Christi. Relinquuntur ergo hic cum operum nostrorum justificatio et satisfactio, tum sanctorum omnium, sive in terra sive in cœlis degentium, de bonitate et misericordia Dei expiatio aut intercessio.'

It was not, indeed, alleged that previous generations had been wholly ignorant of such distinctions, or had ever ventured openly to impugn the doctrine of gratuitous justification by faith in Christ[1]. Yet the Reformers were unanimous in believing that, if not denied, this verity had, in later times, been so grievously displaced and so completely pushed into the back-ground, as to exercise far less than its original influence on the life and character of Christians. They felt that a large group of human and angelic mediators had been practically interposed between the worshipper and Christ Himself. They had experienced how ideas of superabundant merit in the saint and his prevailing intercession, had so filled the spirit of the destitute and the sin-stricken, that Christ was virtually excluded, and His mediating sacrifice constructively denied. The blessed Virgin, and a multitude of others whom the popular imagination had located in the heavenly palace, were thus either exalted into rivalry with the King of saints Himself, or made to intercept His glory from the worshipper. But in countries where the principles of the Reformation were adopted, all created mediators were dethroned, disparaged, or forgotten. Saints and priests and sacraments became at once subsidiary and ministerial; a wall of partition, which had separated Christ from the believers, and reduced them all into the servile state of Hebrews, was now broken down afresh; and in the consciousness of spiritual freedom which this thought of a gratuitous mercy had inspired, all notions of sufficiency, of human merit, of an adequate or a superfluous satisfaction, were utterly rejected. The 'ancient writers and best expositors' had taught that Christ alone is 'the Author and Giver of remission of sins, justice, life and eternal salvation to all believers; which thing,' it was contended, 'is so proper and peculiar unto Him, that no part or portion thereof may be, in any respect, imparted unto others without manifest sacrilege and blasphemy[2].' *as the sole Mediator.*

[1] See, for instance, Cranmer's *Notes and Authorities on Justification*, Miscellaneous Writings, ed. P. S. pp. 203 sq. In the Homily *Of Salvation*, he writes to the same effect: 'And after this wise, to be justified only by this true and lively faith in Christ, speaketh all the old and ancient authors, both Greeks and Latins' (p. 23, Camb. 1850).

[2] Bp. Woolton's *Christian Manual*, p. 5, ed. P. S. 1851: cf. Zwingli's

Personal religion:

A second feature of the 'new learning' was hardly less remarkable when traced into its practical consequences. The Reformation insisted, with unwonted emphasis, upon the fact, that man's religion is a personal concern; that his future destiny will be determined by the issues of a judgment which must bring him face to face with God, the Searcher of all spirits; and that he will not only be there dealt with as an isolated individual responsible for all his faculties of soul and body, but that his condition will be rendered irreversible by death, which fixes an eternal gulf between the justified and the condemned[1]. So long as men continued to believe in purgatory, the most careless trusted that, even if impenitent when he died, he might be corrigible hereafter, and might pass eventually into the circles of the blessed; that the offerings of survivors might really turn to his advantage; and therefore that he need not be deterred from his unholy habits by the prospect of the worm that never dieth, and the fire unquenchable.

how influenced by a belief in purgatory,

It is true, the doctors of the Mediæval church[2] had drawn distinctions between the temporal and eternal consequences of sin, and had sometimes impressed on their disciples the idea that purgatory was reserved for none, except that section of Christians, who, though justified, had not at death entirely liquidated the debt of penance which

language, above, p. 103, n. 5. 'Oh!' says the English Homilist (p. 328), 'that all men would studiously read and search the Scriptures. Then should they not be drowned in ignorance, but should easily perceive the truth, as well of this point of doctrine, as of all the rest. For there doth the Holy Ghost plainly teach us, that Christ is our only Mediator and Intercessor with God, and that we must seek and run to no other.'

[1] *E. g.* Latimer declares in his 4th sermon before Edw. VI. (*Sermons*, p. 162, ed. P. S.): 'There is but two states, if we be once gone. There is no change. . . .There are but two states, the state of salvation and the state of damnation. There is no repentance after this life, but if he die in the state of damnation, he shall rise in the same: yea, though he have a whole monkery to sing for him, he shall have his final sentence when he dieth.' The Homilist, in like manner, after quoting passages from the Fathers, urges the same thought on the attention of his audience: 'Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory out of our heads; neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers: but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven, or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption' (p. 339).

[2] See *Middle Age*, pp. 308, 426, 427, 3rd edition.

had been entailed by their misdoings; but so lax and scandalous was their theory with respect to the conditions on which eternal consequences of sin may be remitted, that multitudes were still satisfied with vague professions of regret or passionate self-reproaches on their death-bed, trusting for the rest to the effects of prayers and offerings made in their behalf by others, to grants of indulgences, and, most of all, to special masses duly celebrated by the chantry-priests. It may be also granted, that the council of Trent[1] did something to remedy this flagrant evil, by publishing more accurate definitions respecting penance: yet the source of the disorder was unhealed. The re-assertion of a purgatorial fire[2], from which escape may be facilitated by vicarious services, was ever tempting man to postpone the settlement of his account with God to an indefinite future; or in cases where the standard of religious earnestness rose higher, the ideas from which that dogma sprang were tending to produce a habit of mind in which the Christian rather studies to propitiate a Master, or disarm an angry and avenging Judge, than to be active from a principle of gratitude, holy from a love of holiness, unworldly from an aspiration to be Christ-like. The devout Reformer, on the contrary, looked up to God as to a reconciled Father. Conscious on the one hand, that he could never satisfy Divine justice by his self-inflicted torments, and that, on the other hand, no fellow-mortal could be substituted in his place or alter the relation in which he stood to the Almighty at the hour of dissolution, he took refuge in the hope set before him in the Gospel, he put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his incorporation into the New Man from heaven, he found 'wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption.'

and vicarious offerings.

But this principle of personal faith in Christ the Mediator, was, in the system of the continental Reformers, closely interwoven with a second,—the sacerdotal character of every Christian. Luther so exalted the benefits of baptism[3] as to recognize in it the special agent by which God

Sacerdotal character of all the baptized:

[1] Above, p. 290, and n. 1.

[2] See above, p. 298, n. 1.

[3] Even where he was most vehement in his denunciations of papal tyranny and mechanical forms of worship, in his *Prelude on the Babylonish Captivity of the Church*, he expressed himself with great emphasis

imparts His choicest blessings and invests the human soul with new and nobler characteristics. From that time forward the baptized is consecrated to the Christian priesthood, and is entitled to all privileges that flow from union with God in Christ. He is taught of God, his body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, and he alone is truly 'spiritual.' 'We have,' the potentates of Germany are reminded[1], 'we have one baptism and one faith, and that is it which constitutes us spiritual persons. The unction, the tonsure, the ordination, the consecration conferred by a bishop or a pope may make a hypocrite, but never a spiritual man. We are all alike consecrated priests at our baptism, as St Peter says, Ye are priests and kings; and if that consecration by God were not upon us, the unction of the pope could never constitute a priest. If ten brothers, sons of a king, and, having equal rights to the inheritance, should

as stated by Luther:

on this subject (cf. above, p. 30, n. 4): 'Baptismi sacramentum, etiam quoad signum, non esse momentaneum aliquod negotium, sed perpetuum. Licet enim usus ejus subito transeat, tamen res ipsa significata durat usque ad mortem, imo resurrectionem in novissimo die' (*Opp.* II. fol. 273 a, Jenæ, 1600). . . .'Nunquam fit baptismus irritus, donec desperans redire ad salutem nolueris: aberrare quidem poteris ad tempus a signo, sed non ideo irritum est signum. Ita semel es baptizatus sacramentaliter, sed semper baptizandus fide, semper moriendum, semperque vivendum' (fol. 273 b). . . .'Hanc gloriam libertatis nostræ, et hanc scientiam baptismi esse hodie captivam, cui possumus referre acceptum, quam uni tyrannidi Romani pontificis? qui, ut Pastorem primum decet, unus omnium maxime debuit esse prædicator et assertor hujus libertatis et scientiæ, sicut Paulus,' *etc.* . . .'Quis dedit ei potestatem captivandæ hujus nostræ libertatis, per baptismum nobis donatæ?' (*Ibid.*)

[1] See the whole of this remarkable (German) tract, in Walch's edition of his *Works*, x. 296 sq. It is Luther's first assault on the despotic 'walls' built up by 'Romanists,' to keep the temporal ruler and his subjects under the direction of the spirituality; and the main object is to depress the papal power by shewing that all Christians without exception, if true to their sacred calling, are alike 'spiritual' men. He repeated his assertions in the tract, *De instituendis ministris Ecclesiæ* (cf. above, p. 339, n. 2): *e.g.* 'Sacerdos namque in Novo præsertim Testamento non fit, sed nascitur, non ordinatur, sed creatur. Nascitur vero non carnis, sed Spiritus nativitate, nempe ex aqua et Spiritu in lavacro regenerationis. Suntque prorsus omnes Christiani sacerdotes, et omnes sacerdotes sunt Christiani. . . .Porro hanc sequelam esse fidelem et probam: Christus est sacerdos, ergo Christiani sunt sacerdotes, patet ex Psal. xxii., Narrabo nomen Tuum fratribus meis. Et rursus, Unxit Te Deus, Deus Tuus, oleo præ participibus Tuis. Quod fratres Ejus sumus, non nisi nativitate nova sumus. Quare et sacerdotes sumus, sicut et Ipse; filii, sicut et Ipse; reges, sicut et Ipse. Fecit enim nos cum Ipso consedere in cœlestibus, ut consortes et cohæredes Ejus simus, in Quo et cum Quo omnia nobis donata sunt' (*Opp.* II. 548 b, 549 a, Jenæ, 1600).

choose one from among them to administer the kingdom for them, they would all be kings, but one alone the minister of their common power. So is it in the Church.' Impelled by this conviction, scandalized by the mal-practices of clergymen and monks, and, at the same time, smarting under the severe denunciations of the pontiff, the Wittenberg reformer made no effort to distinguish[1] clearly between the rights and privileges which constitute the sacerdotal character of Christians generally, and the authority transmitted from our blessed Lord Himself to one special order of Christians who officiate in His name, and for the edification of His people. Luther seems indeed to have convinced himself that these two ideas are utterly incompatible. He was unable to perceive that, in the Hebrew Church, the priesthood was, in one sense, granted to the whole community; they were 'a kingdom of priests,' and yet the Aaronic ministrations were not thereby superseded,—which at least was calculated to suggest the possibility of analogous institutions in the Christian Church itself. A bright but vague ideal had possessed the ardent imagination of Luther and his followers. They trusted that the time had come when Christians, rescued from the papal tyranny, would be capable of larger measures of self-government than were hitherto enjoyed, that worldliness and self-indulgence, hypocrisy, irreverence, and ecclesiastical ambition, would be banished from the midst of them, that the Church would re-appear in its true character as a holy and a happy brotherhood, where all the members find their pleasure in offering up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

Want of clearness in his ideas.

We saw that as the Reformation proceeded[2], this vague and transcendental theory of the Church was considerably modified on the continent, and in England it had never many advocates or admirers. The recognition of all Christians, as exalted by their fellowship with Christ to be both kings and priests to God, was there associated with firm belief in the Divine appointment and authority of the ministerial office[3]. The faithful were instructed to obey their

English modification of the doctrine.

[1] Cf. Mr Derwent Coleridge's *Scriptural Character of the Church*, Serm. x.

[2] Above, pp. 340, 343, 347.

[3] For example, Cranmer's *Catechism* of 1548 (respecting which see

spiritual pastors and masters, not as officers whom they had chosen for their representatives, but who were placed over them by the Lord, and gifted with specific powers and privileges in virtue of their ordination.

Effect of the Reformation upon morals:

But neither in this country, nor in continental Europe, was the promulgation of the 'new learning' at once followed by results which satisfied the ardent wishes of its friends, and silenced the ungenerous cavils of its enemies. That some improvement was visible in the morals of the populace is confidently stated by one class of writers[1]: yet

above, p. 194) contains the following passage on this subject: 'After Christes assention the apostelles gaue authoritie to other godly and holye men to minyster Gods worde, and chiefely in those places wher ther wer Christen men alredy, whiche lacked preachers, and the apostles theim selues could not longer abide with them. For the apostles dyd walke abrod into diuerse partes of the worlde, and did studye to plant the gospel in many places. Wherefore wher they founde godly men, and mete to preache Gods worde, they layed their handes vpon them, and gaue them the Holy Gost, as they theimselues receaued of Christ the same Holy Gost, to execute this office. And they that were so ordeyned were in dede, and also were called, the ministers of God, as the apostles theimselues were, as Paule sayeth vnto Tymothy. And so the ministration of Gods worde (which our Lord Jesus Christ hymselfe dyd first institute) was deryued from the apostles vnto other after theim, by imposition of handes and gyuynge the Holy Ghost, from the apostles tyme to our dayes. And this was the consecration, ordres, and vnction of the apostles, wherby they, at the begynnynge, made byshopes and pryestes; and this shall continewe in the churche euen to the worldes ende. And what soeuer rite or ceremonye hath ben added more than this, commeth of mannes ordinaunce and policye, and is not commaunded by Goddes worde. Wherefore, good children, you shall gyue due reuerence and honour to the ministers of the churche, and shal not meanely or lyghtly esteme them in the execution of their office, but you shall take them for Gods ministers, and the messengers of our Lorde Jesus Christe. For Christ himselfe saieth in the gospel, He that heareth you, heareth me. And he that dyspiseth you, dyspiseth me. Wherefore, good children, you shal stedfastly beleue al those thinges, whiche suche ministers shall speake vnto you from the mouth and by the commaundement of our Lorde Jesus Christ. And what soeuer they do to you, as when they baptyse you, when they gyue you absolution, and dystribute to you the bodye and bloude of our Lord Jesus Christe, these you shall so esteme as yf Christe hymselfe, in his awne person dyd speake and minister vnto you...And on the other syde, you shall take good hede and beware of false and priuye preachers, whiche pryuely crepe into cities, and preache in corners, hauyng none authoritie, nor being called to this office. For Christe is not present with such prechers, and therefore dothe not the Holy Gost worke by their preching,' *etc.*: pp. 196, 197. On Cranmer's vacillation respecting the minister of ordination in 1540, and his subsequent firmness, see Mr Harington's *Succession of Bishops in the Church of England.*

[1] *E. g.* Oswald Myconius, *Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ*, pp. 5 sq., Tiguri, 1521.

the measure of it did not correspond[1], in the opinion of reforming chieftains, to the vast importance of the truths now rescued from oblivion. What constituted the strength of the Reformers constituted also the peculiar weakness of their cause. They gave unwonted prominence to a class of doctrines which, if fairly apprehended, must result in the formation of a high and noble character; but doctrines, at the same time, easily capable of distortion and perversion. Thus the advocate of the 'new learning' was driven to confess[2] that 'many lip-gospellers and protestants have commonly in their mouths Jesus Christ, His Gospel and faith, and yet so live that the name of Christ and his Gospel is evil spoken of'...'Most part of mortal men,' he added[3], 'now-a-days, have no regard at all of temperance and sobriety, but give themselves to rioting and surfeiting, and run headlong into all kind of mischief, having no fear of God before their eyes: they follow their filthy lusts, they snatch, they steal, they swear and forswear, they lie, they deceive, and, to be short, do all things saving that which is lawful. And yet, in the mean time, they will needs be accounted Christians, and gospellers, and earnest favourers of true religion.' 'It happened now, as when the central truths of Christianity were promulgated at the first: men turned the grace of God into lasciviousness, and, boasting of emancipation from the ancient yoke, converted their abandonment of popery into pretexts for unchristian living[4]. In some cases, doubtless, the exaggera-

Lawlessness of nominal Protestants.

[1] It is plain from Luther's writings that he expected great results and was bitterly disappointed. See the admissions collected by Döllinger, *Die Reformation*, I. 318 sq., 412 sq. On one occasion Luther went so far as to declare that, morally speaking, the change had been for the worse: 'Der Teufel fähret nun mit Haufen unter die Leute, dass sie unter dem hellen Lichte des Evangelii sind geiziger, listiger, vortheilischer, unbarmherziger, unzüchtiger, frecher und ärger, denn unter dem Papstthum:' *Werke*, ed. Walch, XIII. 19.

[2] Bp. Woolton, *Christian Manual*, p. 23, ed. P. S.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 141, 142.

[4] Thus Erasmus writes (1523) in his bitter *Spongia Adversus Hutténicas Adspergines* (cf. above, p. 43, n. 4): 'Sunt quidam indocti, nullius judicii, vitæ impuræ, obtrectatores, pervicaces, intractabiles, sic addicti Luthero, ut nec sciant, nec servent quod Lutherus docet. Tantum Evangelium habent in ore, negligunt preces et sacra, vescuntur quibus libet, et maledicunt Romano Pontifici: *sic Lutherani* sunt.' Luther himself draws a like picture in 1529, but lays the blame on his predecessors (De Wette, III. 424): 'Miserrima est ubique facies ecclesiarum,

tion of the Reformers, in establishing their favourite dogmas, led to a one-sided apprehension of religious truth. The doctrine of gratuitous redemption and the efficacy of faith were sometimes urged with such exclusive vehemence as to do away with the necessity of holiness. Luther's doctrine of the Church was plainly calculated to engender self-assertion; and this, in ordinary minds, would often pass into an overweening self-conceit, if not into presumption, arrogance and carnal self-complacency. The guidance of the Christian pastor was rejected, not, as in the former age, because the secularity of his spirit and his stolid ignorance both rendered him contemptible, but because it was concluded from the theory of the universal priesthood, that the power of judging and displacing teachers was inherent in all Christians.

Reformed doctrine of good works.

In the great majority, however, the neglect of holy

rusticis nihil discentibus, nihil scientibus, nihil orantibus, nihil agentibus, nisi quod *libertate abutuntur*, non confitentes, non communicantes, *ac si religione in totum liberi facti sunt:* sic enim papistica neglexerunt, nostra contemnunt, ut horrendum sit episcoporum papisticorum administrationem considerare.' Or, to take another instance, we find the primate of Sweden writing in the following terms (1553: in Gieseler, III. i. 486, ed. Bonn): 'Habemus hoc sæculo, gratia Dei singulari, purum Ejus verbum et lucem Evangelii clarissimam, qua illuminati a tenebris Papistarum liberamur, in fideque salvifica conservamur, servientes Deo juxta patefactam Ejus voluntatem. Sed, proh! dolor, multi nostratium hoc minime considerantes vix audire purum Verbum Dei gestiunt: tantum abest, ut vitam suam juxta idem verbum instituant. . . .Reliqui fructum nullum, prædicato Evangelio, ostendunt, licet ejus prædicatione videantur delectari: verum (quod magis dolendum est) *sub libertate Evangelii* licentiam peccandi studiosius sectantur multi, quasi finis prædicati Evangelii sit, eaque libertas Christiana, ut liceat homini Christiano, adhuc peccatori, agere quæ lubet.' On the 'relaxation of morals' in England, see J. J. Blunt, *Reform.* pp. 156, 157, 6th ed.; Haweis, *Reform.* (from the contemporary pulpit), pp. 127—164; although it should be added, that many of the same, and even greater, vices had been fearfully prevalent anterior to the Reformation. Abundant evidence of this will be found in the *Sermones declamati coram alma Vniuersitate Cantabrigiensi*, by Stephen Baron, a provincial of the Minorites, and confessor to Henry VIII. They were published, circ. 1520, several years before the rupture with the papacy.

[1] Cf. above, pp. 26, 43, 44. Audin (*Hist. de la Vie de Martin Luther*, I. 264), who is desirous of proving that the success of the Reformers was due to the laxity of their teaching, parades the following extract from a contemporary letter: 'Nec enim vult Lutherus quemquam de actionibus suis admodum anxium esse, siquidem ad salutem et æternitatem promerendam fidem et sanguinem Christi sufficere. Lasciviant igitur homines, obsonentur, pergræcentur in Venerem, in cædes, in rapinas, ut libet, efferantur.'

living was in absolute defiance of the sermons and example of the chief Reformers. 'We mean nothing less,' they pleaded[1], 'than to reject or take away good works and honest actions.' They would hear no longer, it is true, 'of beads, of lady psalters and rosaries, of fifteen O's, of St Bernard's verses, of St Agathe's letters, of purgatory, of masses satisfactory; of stations and jubilees, of feigned relics, of hallowed beads, bells, bread, water, palms, candles, fire, and such other; of superstitious fastings, of fraternities or brotherhoods, of pardons, with such like merchandise;' all these having been 'so esteemed and abused to the great prejudice of God's glory and commandments, that they were made most high and holy things, whereby to attain to the everlasting life, or remission of sin[2].' But the depreciation of such observances and institutions which were held to be commandments of men, had not unfrequently imparted greater emphasis to exhortations of Reformers in behalf of God's commandments. These, they urged, were followed from a principle of faith, have been ordained 'as the right trade and pathway unto heaven[3];' obedience to these was the criterion by which genuine Christians might be known, and on the measure and degree of that obedience would depend the measure and degree of future blessedness[4].

Confession.

Erasmus appears to have forgotten statements of this kind when he imputed moral laxity to some of the Reformers[5], and ascribed the rapid victories of their cause to

[1] Woolton, *Christian Manual*, p. 32.

[2] *Homilies*,' 3rd part of the Sermon of Good Works,' p. 58.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 60.

[4] *E.g.* in the *Apologia Confessionis*, cap. III. Art. VI. (Francke, Part I. p. 96) it is declared: 'Talia opera vituperare, confessionem doctrinæ, officia caritatis, mortificationes carnis, profecto esset vituperare externam regni Christi inter homines politiam. Atque hic addimus etiam de præmiis et de merito. Docemus operibus fidelium proposita et promissa esse præmia. Docemus bona opera meritoria esse, non remissionis peccatorum, gratiæ aut justificationis (hæc enim tantum fide consequimur), sed aliorum præmiorum corporalium et spiritualium in hac vita et post hanc vitam, quia Paulus inquit: Unusquisque recipiet mercedem juxta suum laborem. Erunt igitur dissimilia præmia propter dissimiles labores.'

[5] Cf. Audin, as above, I. 264. The only point where real ground for censure is discoverable, related to the way in which some continental Reformers spoke of matrimony. Carlstadt, supposing that the Mosaic law was valid on that subject, seems to have advised a man to marry two

the indulgent doctrines which it sanctioned. Even with regard to the disuse of the confessional, his charges are considerably exaggerated. Luther[1], on the continent, and Latimer[2], in England, were decidedly in favour of the practice of confession, provided only it did not embrace minute descriptions of particular failings, and was limited to urgent cases, where the conscience was oppressed by special difficulties. As soon, however, as confession ceased to be compulsory, the influence of the priesthood was proportionally diminished. The proud and profligate, the careless, worldly and rapacious, on the sudden abolition of ancient checks, were seen in their true colours; while the growth of spiritual freedom and the copious circulation of religious knowledge, rendered such direction less desirable, in the case of ordinary Christians.

Study of the Bible.

This conviction, that all members of the Church were free, had access to the oracles of God, and were invested with the right of ascertaining the true basis of their belief, had generated even in the laity an ardent and insatiable longing for ecclesiastical literature. To gratify this thirst, they had recourse to Holy Scripture, which, both in the original and in translations, now began to be diffused in every quarter with astonishing rapidity. Erasmus, who conducted the biblical as well as literary movements of the age, commences a new period in the history of sacred

wives (Ranke, *Ref.* II. 204): and as late as 1539, Luther, Melanchthon, Bucer and others, took part in a reply to the petition of Philip, landgrave of Hessen, by which they connived at his secret cohabitation with a concubine, under the title of a lawful wife, while his true wife was still living: cf. Bossuet, *Variations*, liv. VI. ch. 2—10.

[1] Tholuck thus alludes to the opinion of the Wittenberg Reformer (*Predigten über das Augsburgische Glaubensbekenntniss*, p. 198. Halle, 1850): 'Diese Beichte und Absolution, wo Priester und Sünder sich allein gegenüberstehen, und über ihnen kein anderes Auge, als das Auge Gottes, diese Beichte, von der Luther schreibt: "Wenn tausend und abertausend Welten mein wären, so wollte ich alle lieber verlieren, denn dass ich wollte dieser Beichte das geringste Stücklein eines aus der Kirche kommen lassen,"—die ist gefallen!'

[2] After reflecting on the practice of the 'papists,' who required a particular enumeration of sins, Latimer proceeds as follows (*Remains*, p. 180, ed. P. S.): 'But to speak of right and true confession, I would to God it were kept in England; for it is a good thing. And those which find themselves grieved in conscience might go to a learned man [cf. p. 13, where it is 'some godly minister'], and there fetch of him comfort of the Word of God, and so to come to a quiet conscience. . . .And surely it grieveth me much that such confessions are not kept in England, &c.'

scholarship[1]. Following freely in the steps of Laurentius Valla and emulating the zeal of Jacques Lefèvre, the patriarch of French reformers, he directed his critical acumen to the elucidation of the sacred text with a sagacity and independence hitherto but rarely witnessed in the schools and cloisters of Western Christendom. After the publication of his Greek Testament and Paraphrases, a number of more earnest followers caught his literary spirit, and proceeded with the work he had inaugurated. Luther[2] and Melanchthon, Zwingli and Bullinger, Calvin, Beza, and Castellio, all accepted, in a greater or less degree, the sober, critical, and grammatical methods of interpretation which he ventured to revive. Some of his principles of exegesis were also shared at the beginning of the century by cardinal Cajetanus[3], and subsequently by the Jesuit Maldonatus[4], so that henceforth the study of the sacred text was prosecuted more successfully among the Romanists as well as the Reformed. Hebrew, at the same time, had been gradually admitted to a place in the affections of the learned theologian[5]. It was no longer associated with over-fondness for the Jews[6]; and in the noble outbreak of enthusiasm that possessed a multitude of the Reformers, all

[1] See above, p. 41, and Davidson's *Sacred Hermeneutics*, pp. 182 sq. Erasmus's edition of the Greek Testament was at length eclipsed by the labours of Robert Stephanus (Estienne), who printed three editions in 1546, 1549 and 1550, and endeavoured to establish a text on more critical principles by registering the various readings in his margin.

[2] Luther expressed his contempt for allegories and for Dionysius the Areopagite ('plus Platonisans quam Christianisans') at a very early period: *Opp.* II. fol. 282 a, Jenæ, 1600. About the same time (1521) he rejected the theory of a four-fold sense in Holy Scripture, 'quadrigam illam sensuum Scripturæ, literalem, tropologicum, allegoricum, et anagogicum.' 'Nonne impiissimum est,' he adds (*Ibid.* fol. 243 b), 'sic partiri Scripturas, ut literæ neque fidem neque mores neque spem tribuas, sed solam historiam jam inutilem?'—alluding to the mediæval couplet;

'Litera gesta docet, quid credas Allegoria,
Moralis quid agas, quo tendas Anagogia.'

[3] The freedom of this scholar (who died in 1534) amounted sometimes to irreverent licence. In that respect he far exceeded Luther (cf. above, p. 26, n. 1), and was attacked severely by Ambrosius Catharinus, one of Luther's antagonists: cf. Simon, *Hist. Critique des principaux Commentateurs*, p. 537, Rotterdam, 1693.

[4] *Commentarii in* IV. *Evangelistas*, Pont-à-Mousson, 1596: cf. Simon, p. 618.

[5] On the history of the printed text of the Old Testament, see Davidson, *Bibl. Criticism*, I. 137 sq., Edinb. 1852.

[6] See *Middle Age*, p. 361, n. 4.

who had the leisure and the means recurred directly to the fountains[1] of the Old as well as of the New Testament.

Translations of the Scriptures.

The masses were, however, indebted of necessity to vernacular translations. These accordingly sprang up in every country which had felt the genial impulse of the Reformation[2]. As soon as Luther's version of the New Testament was circulated in Northern and Middle Germany, it caused a vast vibration in all ranks and orders of society. In the language of a strenuous adversary[3], 'even shoemakers and women read it with feverish eagerness, committed parts of it to memory, and carried the volume about with them in their bosoms.' Boys are said, in like manner, to have been so devoted to the study of it, that they often quoted texts with greater ease than 'theologians of thirty years' standing.' An equal measure of enthusiasm was afterwards excited in all parts of England. Men had not indeed been wholly ignorant[4] of the facts of sacred history, nor of the leading doctrines of the Gospel: but the prospect of exchanging human and derived for heavenly streams of knowledge, and the spiritual satisfaction, which had flowed from deep acquaintance with 'the true

[1] Thus the Florentine, Petruccio Ubaldini, who visited this country in the reign of Edward VI., remarks of the English people: 'The rich cause their sons and daughters to learn Latin, Greek and Hebrew; for since this storm of heresy has invaded the land, they hold it useful to read the Scriptures in the original tongue:' Von Raumer, *Hist. of the* XVIth *and* XVIIth *centuries, illustrated by original documents*, II. 74, Lond. 1835: cf. Oswald Myconius, *Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ*, p. 19.

[2] See Hallam's *Lit. of Europe*, I. 525 sq., II. 137, 138, Lond. 1840.

[3] Cochlæus, *De Actis et Scriptis M. Lutheri*, ad annum 1522, fol. 50 b. He adds: 'At jam dudum persuaserat Lutherus turbis suis, nullis dictis habendam esse fidem, nisi quæ ex sacris literis proferrentur. Idcirco reputabantur catholici ab illis ignari scripturarum, etiamsi eruditissimi essent theologi. Quinetiam palam aliquando coram multitudine contradicebant eis laici aliqui, tanquam mera pro concione dixerint mendacia aut figmenta hominum.' Speaking of the new generation of theological students, he continues: 'Quod si quis novitatibus eorum contradiceret, mox prætendebant lectionem Græcam vel Hebraicam, aut aliquem ex vetustissimis auctoribus, et confestim plenis convitiorum plaustris invehebantur in Græcarum et Hebraicarum literarum ignaros theologos, quos odiose sophistas, asinos, porcos, animalia ventris, et inutilia pondera terræ vocitabant, superaddentes etiam ronchos et cachinnos immodestissime.' See a disputation between this writer and Alexander Ales, which appeared in 1533 with the title *An expediat laicis legere Novi Testamenti libros linguâ vernaculâ?* (copy in the Camb. Univ. Libr. AB, 13, 5).

[4] See *Middle Age*, pp. 420 sq.

and lively Word of God contained in holy Scriptures, gave an impulse hitherto unprecedented to the circulation of religious literature[1]. The times, moreover, had so far altered that the price of Tyndale's version of the New Testament, which first appeared in **1525**, was forty-fold less than that of Wycliffe a century before[2].

One effect of circulating the Bible.

Yet in all countries where the holy Scriptures were thus freely circulated, such publicity entailed, as might have been expected from the nature of the fermentation, a fresh crop of feuds and controversies. To say nothing of unseemly brawlings and contentions prevalent in the ecclesiastical order, laymen were so far interested and excited by the struggles between the 'old' and 'new learning,' that almost every house was now divided in opinion, while the taverns echoed with religious war-cries, and irreverent disputations. 'I am very sorie to know and heare,' says Henry VIII.[3] at the close of his reign, 'how unreverently that most precious jewell the Word of God is disputed, rimed, sung and jangled in every ale-house and taverne, contrary to the true meaning and doctrine of the same.' A spirit had, in fact, been raised, which, if perverted, would impel the ignorant and self-conceited to assume a right of judging in all matters of faith, would sow the seeds of an ecclesiastical revolution, and ultimately precipitate the fiery, sanguine, and ill-balanced reader of the Bible into every species of fanaticism. We saw this melan-

[1] Above, p. 181, notes 1 and 4. Udal in the 'Preface vnto the Kinges Maiestie' (Edw. VI.), prefixed to his edition of *The first tome or volume of the Paraphrases of Erasmus* (1551), alludes to the reaction against the reading of the Bible in English, which had occurred during the later years of Henry VIII., and congratulates his successor as 'the faythful Josias, in whose tyme the booke of the lawe is found out in the house of the Lord, and by the King's injunction read in the hearing of all the people.' According to him, 'As the winnower pourgeth the chaffe from the corne, and the boulter tryeth out the branne from the meale; so hath Erasmus scoured out of all the Doctours and commentaries vpon Scriptures, the dregges whiche through the faulte of the times or places, in whiche those writers liued, had setled itselfe emong the pure and fyne substaunce.'

[2] J. J. Blunt's *Reform. in England*, p. 109, 6th ed.

[3] Stow's *Annales*, p. 590, Lond. 1631: cf. above, p. 372, n. 3. In the Homily *Against Brawling and Contention*, p. 135, we have a graphic picture of the strifes then raging in England with reference to certain questions, not so much pertaining to edification as to vain-glory. The taunts thrown out were such as the following: 'He is a Pharisee, he is a gospeller, he is of the new sort, he is of the old faith, he is a new-broached brother, he is a good catholic father, he is a papist, he is an heretic.'

choly result in the projection of lawless and distempered sects who followed closely in the track of the Reformers.

The Press. The same remark is applicable to other products of the press. This instrument had been as cordially[1] used on one side, as it was suspected and disparaged on the other. While the Romanists attempted, not in vain, to strangle it[2] by means of the Index and Inquisition, the Reformer welcomed it as one of God's best gifts, and as the aptest and most powerful handmaid of the Gospel. The number of Lutheran publications, we have seen[3], was really prodigious. Bibles, commentaries, sermons, hymns, and catechisms, a learned and elaborate history[4] of the Church, regarded from the standing-ground of Luther, swarms of popular tracts, the work of writers thoroughly in earnest and passionately devoted to the cause they had espoused; these all, combined with formal treatises on vexed questions of the period, were transmitting the distinctive doctrines of the Reformation into regions far beyond the personal influence of their authors. Nor were such the only kind of publications which contributed to its success. Ballads, pasquils, satires, ribalds full of pungent humour

[1] *E.g.* Justus Jonas writes in his philippic *Adversum Joannem Fabrum ... pro conjugio sacerdotali* (Tiguri, 1523):... 'in quem potissimum usum Deus in hoc sæculorum fine, in his novissimis diebus *Typographiæ* divinum artificium protulit. Vides linguas, Græcam, Latinam, Hebraicam, breviter omne eruditionis genus servire Evangelio:' sign. A iii. b. He then adds triumphantly: 'Eliminata est barbaries, profligati e theologorum scholis sophistæ, asseritur quotidie magis ac magis syncera Theologia et puritas Evangelii.'

[2] See above, pp. 98, 301.

[3] Above, p. 71.

[4] This was the work commonly known as the *Magdeburg Centuries*, the extensive character of which is indicated by the title of the original edition: *Ecclesiastica Historia*, integram Ecclesiæ Christi ideam, quantum ad Locum, Propagationem, Tranquillitatem, Doctrinam, Hæreses, Ceremonias, Gubernationem, Schismata, Synodos, Personas, Miracula, Martyria, Religiones extra Ecclesiam, et statum Imperii politicum attinet, secundum singulas Centurias perspicuo ordine complectens &c.: in thirteen volumes, folio, each embracing one century, Basel, 1559—1574. One of the chief contributors was Matthias Flacius Illyricus (above, p. 98, n. 9). To the *Catalogus Testium* of the same writer John Foxe was largely indebted for materials in compiling *Actes and Monumentes of Christian Martyrs* and *Matters ecclesiasticall*, of which the first edition is dated 1563. The great work of Illyricus and his friends gave rise to the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Cæsar Baronius, a member of the Oratory, which appeared at Rome, 1588—1607, for the purpose of counteracting the effects of the *Magdeburg Centuries:* see Dowling, *Introd. to Eccl. Hist.* p. 123.

and sarcastic virulence, effected quite as much as the homily and the prayer-book. Erasmus[1] himself opened these attacks as early as 1500, to the joy of all who were disgusted with the ancient reign of ignorance and immorality; and his imitators, during the next fifty years, were almost innumerable[2]. The tone, however, of such publications gradually became more scurrilous and offensive. They decried the Roman pontiffs, it is true, with irresistible audacity: they poured abundant ridicule on errors, foibles, and absurdities of the Mediæval period: but even if we make considerable allowance for the greater coarseness of the generation in which these missiles were projected, the violence and levity of their spirit, and the ribaldry, approaching to profaneness[3], which they sometimes manifested in discussing the most sacred topics, must have rather tended to generate contempt for all sacred things and persons, than promoted the spiritual and moral elevation of the reader. It should also be observed that, as the sixteenth century advanced, the circulation of godless and immoral books became enormous, satisfying the most ardent friends of Reformation, that the benefits aris-

Abuses of the Press.

[1] 'The lively Colloquies of Erasmus, which exposed the superstitious practices of the papists, with much humour, and in pure Latinity, made more protestants than the ten tomes of John Calvin:' Warton, *Engl. Poetry*, III. 8, Lond. 1840. Roger Ascham, on the other hand, when noticing the importation of foreign literature into England remarks: 'Ten Sermons at Paules Crosse doe not so much good for mooving men to true doctrine, as one of these [Italian] bookes does harme with inticing men to ill living.... More papists be made by your merry bookes of Italy than by your earnest bookes of Louvain:' *Ibid.* p. 372. See Ascham's *Scholemaster*, ed. Mayor, pp. 80, 81.

[2] See, for instance, above, p. 29, p. 193, n. 2.

[3] Dr Maitland has called attention to this aspect of the great religious movement in his *Essays on the Reformation*, No. XI—No. XIV. After speaking of the genuine Reformers, he adds (p. 226): 'There were, at the same time, other partizans of the Reformation, very noisy and very numerous, of quite a different spirit, whom, to say the least, they did not keep at a proper distance, or repudiate with sufficiently marked detestation. I mean those who used a jeering scoffing humour, to turn the ministers and the services of religion into ridicule,—men who employed themselves in raising a laugh against popery, at whatever expense, and in providing for the eyes and ears of even the rude multitude who could not read, gross and profane pictures, jests, songs, interludes,—all in short that could nurse the self-conceit of folly, and agitate ignorance into rebellion against its spiritual pastors and teachers.' For a specimen of the ballads *against* the Reformation, see Strype's *Cranmer*, Append. No. XLIX.

ing from the press were not unmixed with serious, though it might be, unavoidable calamities[1].

Sermons. But owing to the cost of books, and the comparative ignorance of the multitude, the press did not contribute so directly to the triumphs of the 'new learning,' as the oral admonitions and denunciations of Reformers. The lecture-room effected much[2]: the pulpit more. Throughout the Mediæval period, preaching had grown less and less frequent, and the quality of the sermons more insipid and unspiritual[3]. But when Luther's manly voice was heard at Wittenberg, and when his Postills, which united, to a singular extent, the qualities of vigour, fervour, and simplicity[4], were rapidly dispersed and reproduced in every province where the Lutheran theology had been accepted, it was felt that a new era was commencing, and that powerful springs of action had been touched in many a bosom which was hitherto estranged from God, or was at least impervious to the higher and more spiritual doctrines of the Gospel. In this respect, as in many others, the counter-reformation party were themselves vastly benefited by the example of their enemies[5]. They grew

[1] Thus, Edward Topsell, preaching at the close of Elizabeth's reign, has echoed the complaints of previous writers: 'We have heresy and blasphemy and paganism and bawdry committed to the press, to be commended in print: there is no Italian tale so scurrilous, or fable so odious, or action so abominable, but some have ventured to defend it:' in Haweis, *Sketches of the Reformation*, p. 148, Lond. 1844. Ascham (*The Scholemaster*, pp. 81, 82, ed. Mayor, 1863) shews, however, that in the times of 'Papistrie,' such books as *Morte Arthur*, full of 'mans slaughter and bold bawdrye,' had been by far the most popular. 'I knowe,' he continues, 'when God's Bible was banished the Court, and *Morte Arthure* receiued into the Princes chamber.'

[2] See above, p. 71. [3] *Middle Age*, pp. 421, 422.

[4] It is interesting to observe what was Luther's own idea of good sermons. Ratzeberger (*Handschrift. Gesch.* p. 87, Jena, 1850) has preserved an anecdote where the great reformer delicately reflects on Bucer for preaching only to the learned: 'Aber wann ich uf die Cantzel trete, so sehe ich was ich fur Zuhörer habe, denen predige ich, was sie verstehen können; dan die meistere unter ihnen sind arme leyen und schlechte Wenden' [the aboriginal inhabitants of the district]. He goes on to compare simple and natural discourses to a mother's milk, which weeping children always prefer to syrups and other sweetmeats.

[5] See above, p. 279, notes 3 and 6. In the 'Præfatio' to the *Catechismus Romanus* it is stated: 'At vero, cum hæc Divini Verbi prædicatio nunquam intermitti in Ecclesia debeat, tum certe *hoc tempore* majori studio et pietate elaborandum est, ut sana et incorrupta doctrina, tamquam pabulo vitæ, fideles nutriantur et confirmentur.' A

more conscious that the older class of sermons would no longer satisfy their audience, and a new race of preachers was accordingly produced, especially among religious orders[1], the Jesuits, the Theatines. the Barnabites, and the Oratorians, who were then established in the hope of remedying the past neglect and utter worldliness of ordinary ecclesiastics.

Importance of preaching.

The number and the length[2] of sermons at this period shews the deep conviction which men had as to the might and efficacy of the agent. A few of the more eminent Reformers, such as Hooper, Gilpin, and Jewel, are said to have preached once, or even twice a day: some of the parochial clergy were no less energetic: and where the Friar proved unfavourable to the 'new learning,' itinerant preachers corresponding to him in the main, were dispatched into remoter districts, to occupy the places of the ancient 'limitors[3].' Laymen[4] also, who possessed an adequate amount of learning and sobriety were, on applying for a licence, occasionally permitted to go forth on the same errands, till at length, by all these agencies, the prominent doctrines of the Reformation were most fully known, if not sincerely cherished, and consistently obeyed.

Standard of clerical education.

The troubles of the age, as we have seen, were not propitious to the growth of general literature. This cause had most seriously affected not a few of the educational estab-

fair specimen of these controversial sermons is supplied in Stapleton's *Promptuarium Catholicum, ad instructionem concionatorum contra hæreticos nostri temporis*, Colon. 1594.

[1] Above, p. 306 and n. 2. On Philip of Neri, who founded the 'Congregatio Oratorii' in 1564, see *Acta Sanctorum*, Maii. Tom. VI. pp. 460 sq.

[2] Cf. Ratzeberger, as before, p. 88, where he mentions that the pastor of Wittenberg (Bugenhagen) always preached more than one, often more than two hours.

[3] See Mr Haweis' chapter on 'the itinerant preachers:' *Sketches of the Reformation*, pp. 84—108. Two of the more interesting characters among them were Gilpin and Bradford. On the latter high praise was bestowed by his contemporaries: 'In this preaching office, for the space of three years, how faithfully Bradford walked, how diligently he laboured, many parts of England can testify. Sharply he opened and reproved sin, sweetly he preached Christ crucified, pithily he impugned heresies and errors, earnestly he persuaded to godly life:' *Ibid.* pp. 92, 93.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 102, 103.

lishments designed for training Christian scholars, and the ministers of religion. The English mind was in particular unsettled by the frequent alterations of the public faith and worship[1]. The unscrupulous seizure of church-property, and the menace that was constantly suspended over the revenues of colleges and universities, had there tended to discourage many a student who was hoping to advance his fortune by attaining academical distinctions[2]. It was somewhat different in communities of continental reformers. Conventual property had been applied, at least in Saxony and Würtemberg, to literary and religious purposes[3], and several flourishing universities sprang up to vindicate the Reformation from the charges it incurred in certain quarters,—of lowering the standard of sacred literature. Still it must be granted that a large proportion of pastors in the sixteenth century, in reformed as well as unreformed communions, were ill-educated, drawing their meagre stock of knowledge, not from the original sources, but from text-books, commentaries, and compendiums of such modern divines, as Eck and Melchior Canus on the one side, or Melanchthon, Bullinger, and Calvin on the other.

[1] Warton, III. 14 sq.

[2] 'The common ecclesiastical preferments were so much diminished by the seizure and alienation of impropriations [cf. above, pp. 337, 338], in the late depredations of the Church, and which continued to be carried on with the same spirit of rapacity in the reign of Elizabeth, that few persons were regularly bred to the Church, or, in other words, received a learned education:' *Ibid.* p. 18. The writer mentions, for example, that 'about 1563 there were only two divines, and those of higher rank, the president of Magdalen college and the dean of Christ Church, who were capable of preaching the public sermons before the University of Oxford.' And archbishop Parker (*Correspond.* ed. P. S. p. 370) found it difficult in 1570 to meet with any divine at Cambridge, able and willing to fill the office of Lady Margaret's professor. 'Look,' cried Bernard Gilpin, an Oxford-man, preaching in the reign of Edward, 'look at the two wells of this realm, Oxford and Cambridge: they are almost dried up:' one reason being that noblemen rewarded 'servants with livings appointed for the Gospel' (Haweis, p. 59). Thomas Lever at the same period utters similar complaints touching the state of Cambridge, his own university: 'There was in the houses belonging to the University of Cambridge two hundred students of divinity, many very well learned, which be now all clean gone, house and man, young toward scholars and old fatherly doctors, not one of them left' (*Ibid.* p. 61). The impropriators were also, in his mind, the cause of this declension, 'great thieves which murder, spoil and destroy the flocks of Christ' (p. 63). See other curious information touching the condition of the clergy at this period in the *Pref.* to the English version of Bullinger's *Decades*, ed. P. S. 1849.

[3] Gieseler, III. ii. pp. 425, 426 (ed. Bonn).

Schools:

Although the dissolution of religious houses involved not only the temporary depression of sacred literature in general, but the loss of the monastic schools, that second loss was neither so wide nor so grievous as might appear at the first glance. Such institutions had, for many years, been rapidly declining; and when Erasmus opened his unsparing warfare on the monks and friars, in whom he saw the natural enemies of elegance and erudition, it was felt that other establishments must be constructed for communicating secular and sacred knowledge, and reduced into more perfect harmony with modern wants, and the increased capacities of the age. Accordingly more grammar-schools had been erected and endowed in England during the thirty years preceding the Reformation than in three centuries before[1]. In Germany also, the first wish of those who headed the reforming movement was to institute a far larger number of town and village schools. They bore in mind a hint of Gerson[2], that the 'reformation of the Church, to be effectual, must begin at the children.' Luther[3] had proceeded in this spirit as early as **1524**. He then urged the subject of religious[4] education on the notice

Reformed,

[1] Knight, *Life of Colet*, pp. 100 sq., Lond. 1724: where it is remarked, 'This noble impulse of Christian charity in the founding of grammar-schools, was one of the Providential ways and means for bringing about the blessed Reformation.'

[2] *Middle Age*, p. 417, n. 2.

[3] In writing to Strauss (April 25: De Wette, II. 504, 505) his words are: 'Cæterum oro, apud tuos urgeas causam istam juventutis instituendæ. Video enim Evangelio impendere maximam ruinam, neglectu educandæ pueritiæ. Res ista omnium maxime necessaria est:' cf. above, p. 346. Hooper, at a later period, presses the same point in England (*Early Writings*, p. 508, ed. P. S.): 'I would likewise pray and admonish the magistrates to see the schools better maintained: for the lack of them shall bring blindness into this Church of England again.' The *Stat.* 1 Edw. VI. c. 14, entitled 'The Act for Chantries Collegiate,' which was opposed by Cranmer among others (see Stephens, *Eccl. Stat.* I. 294, n. 3), from a wish to keep church-property out of the hands of lay plunderers, hinted at the desirableness of converting these foundations 'to good and godly uses, as in erecting of grammar-schools to the education of youth in virtue and godliness, the further augmenting of the Universities, and better provision for the poor and needy:' but nearly all the revenues thus made available were swept into the royal coffers: cf. *Ibid.* p. 301 note, and J. J. Blunt, *Ref.* p. 319.

[4] The idea of disjoining secular and religious education had not occurred to any class of the Reformers. All the schoolmasters in England, for example, were placed under the jurisdiction of the bishops: see Elizabeth's *Injunctions* (1559), §§ 40—42. One of the first advocates of the

of the magistrates in every part of Germany, imploring them to devote a number of pious imposts, which had formerly been levied on their people, to the general diffusion of sacred knowledge among the poor. 'Our system,' he contended[1], after dwelling on the social advantages of the Reformation, 'is so much improved, that more may now be learned in three years, than could hitherto be found in all the schools and cloisters.' 'Herewith,' concludes the author, 'I commend you all to God's grace, that He may soften and inflame your hearts, to the end that ye may earnestly take charge of the poor, miserable, and neglected youth, and, by God's help, instruct and aid them towards a holy and Christian ordering of the German people, in body and soul, with all fulness and overflowing, to the praise and honour of God the Father, through Jesus Christ our Saviour.'

and Romish.

But the annals of this period everywhere attest that the Reformers, anxiously devoted as they were to the instruction of the young, had to encounter a most formidable class of rivals[2] in the Order of the Jesuits. The reaction which eventually issued in the restoration of the pontiff to his ancient honours may be traced, in almost every case, to the untiring energy, and the consummate skill, with which the tenets of Tridentine Romanism had been insinuated by able followers of Ignatius Loyola into the minds of their pupils.

Contempt of the clergy.

One of the main causes which retarded the advance of education, in the lower ranks of life, was the unpopularity of clerics. We have already noticed instances of this antipathy in various parts of Europe. Nor can it, in fairness, be regarded as the product of the moral revolution which had given fresh importance to the laity, and urged them to assert their spiritual independence. Long before[3] the

opposite theory was Lord Herbert, who at the beginning of the next period contended, that from the time when children went to school they should have *two* masters, one for lessons, the other for manners and morals, and that each of these should keep strictly to his own province.

[1] See this remarkable address at length in Walch, x. 532 sq. The title is *An die Rathsherren aller Städte Deutschlandes dass sie Christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten sollen.*

[2] See above, p. 88, n. 2; 307, 308.

[3] *Middle Age*, pp. 241, 242, 348—350, and above, pp. 357, 358. In the case of England the evidence is irresistible. Dean Colet, in his

earliest dawn of Reformation, the excessive levity and irreverence, the pride, extortion and unchastity of those

famous sermon preached before the Convocation, in 1511 (Knight's *Life*, pp. 273 sq.), draws a dark picture of clerical immorality. 'Hath nat this vice [of carnal concupiscence] so growen and waxen in the Churche as a fludde of theyr luste? so that there is nothynge loked for more diligently, in this moost besy tyme, of *the most parte* of pristes, than that that dothe delite and please the senses? They gyue them selfe to feastes and bankettynge: They spend them selfe in vaine bablyng: They gyue them selfe to sportes and plays: They apply them selfe to huntynge and haukynge. They drowne them selfe in the delytes of the worlde. Procurers and fynders of lustes they set by,' &c. On the irreverent mode in which Divine worship was celebrated, and the filthy condition of the churches and the mutilations of the service, Stephen Baron, the Cambridge preacher (as above, pp. 368, 369, n. 4), has numerous passages: *e.g.* after dwelling on the dignity of the priesthood and the sanctity of their ministrations, he exclaims (fol. 22 b.): 'Sed proth pudor, si considerentur altaria multis in ecclesiis, inuenientur ibi tobalee [altar-cloths] sordidissime, pulueribus et stercoribus vel auium vel murium plene: corporalia vero nigra et feculenta, indumentaque sacerdotalia lacerata; et cuncta, ut sic dicam, deturpata. Ecclesiastici quoque viri, Christiani ministri, a potentibus et popularibus contemptui habentur *etc.* . . .Quot insuper scurrilia verba, *sincopationes omissionesque in orationibus et Divino officio!*' And the same humiliating view is satirically presented in the *Colyn Cloute* of John Skelton, poet-laureate in the early years of Henry VIII., and himself for some time a parochial clergyman. The whole poem (ed. Dyce, I. 311—360) is a fearless onslaught on corruptions then prevalent in the Church, friars and bishops included: *e.g.*

'And howe whan ye gyue orders
In your prouinciall borders,
As at *Sitientes* [the first word of the Introit of the Mass on the Saturday before Passion Sunday]
Some are *insufficientes*,
Some *parum sapientes*,
Some *nihil intelligentes*,
Some *valde negligentes*,
Some *nullum sensum habentes*,
But bestiall and vntaught;
But whan thei haue ones caught
Dominus vobiscum by the hede,
Than renne they in euery stede [place],
God wot, with dronken nolles [heads],
Yet take they cure of soules,
And woteth neuer what thei rede,
Paternoster, Ave, nor Crede;
Construe not worth a whystle
Nether Gospell nor Pystle;
Theyr mattyns madly sayde,
Nothynge deuoutly prayde;
Theyr lernynge is so small,
Theyr prymes and houres fall
And lepe out of theyr lyppes
Lyke sawdust or drye chippes.
I speke not nowe of all
But the *moost part in generall.*

who should have been ensamples to their flock, were rendering the parochial clergy, in too many cases, a legitimate object of suspicion, and exposing them to satire, hatred, and contempt. When Luther visited Rome in **1511**, his mortification was intense on finding himself associated with monks and clerics who had so little regard for decency, that even the most solemn offices of worship were celebrated with contemptuous haste, and made the subject of profane caricatures[1]. This frightful blasphemy produced a similar effect upon the spirit of Erasmus[2]; and when the pope was ultimately constrained to undertake some reformation of the Churches subject to his jurisdiction, the committee of inquiry ventured to report[3], that most of the prevailing scandals were attributable to the irreverence of the clergy, and to the contempt with which the sacerdotal order was too commonly regarded.

Social position of the clergy.

On the other hand, it is quite obvious from the records[4] of the sixteenth century, that the Reformation was unable to effect an instantaneous change in these particulars. It produced a bright succession of noble-hearted pastors who retained their Christian fervour and integrity amid a crooked and rapacious generation: yet, regarded as a whole, the ministers of Reformed communities, though less obnoxious to the censures and abhorrence of their flocks, continued to be worldly-minded, and as such were held in general disrepute. England, for example, still abounded with pluralists[5], who fattened on the fruits of three or more benefices.

[1] Waddington, *Reform.* I. 59, 60.

[2] See the extract from his letter, in *Middle Age*, p. 352, n. 1, where he declares that he was himself an ear-witness.

[3] Above, p. 323, n. 2.

[4] See abundant evidence from the contemporary pulpit collected in Haweis, pp. 63 sq. One of these passages may be taken as a summary of the whole: 'The churches are full of Jeroboam priests—I mean the very refuse of the people, in whom is no manner of worthiness, but such as their greedy Latrones, *Patrones* I would say, allow of—I mean their worthy paying for it; and then a quare impedit against the bishop that shall deny him institution' (p. 72).

[5] Among other evidence we find Fagius and Bucer writing with considerable bitterness on this subject to their continental friends (Gieseler, III. ii. pp. 19, 20 ed. Bonn). The former observes: 'Interim tamen habent magnas, multas et pingues prebendas, et sunt magni domini: satis esse putant, in conviviis et colloquiis posse aliquid de Evangelio ungari, captiosas et curiosas quæstiunculas movere, cui vitio video Anglicam gentem admodum obnoxiam.'

Absentees[1] were thus made numerous in the same proportion. Many of the lay-patrons whose property was charged with the support of the extruded monks, in order to save their pensions[2], had installed them in the parish-churches, for the ministry of which they were unqualified: while numbers of the smaller benefices were held by incumbents whose ignorance was only exceeded by their want of earnestness and sympathy with their parishioners. Generally speaking, therefore, the social position of ordinary ecclesiastics was lamentably depressed. As in the period just preceding the Reformation, their character was lowered in the eyes of laymen by concubinage and unchastity, so now they felt themselves degraded, in a different form, by ill-assorted alliances. Marriage with ecclesiastics was long deemed censurable, or at least equivocal[3], and hence the fear of rejection in the higher circles of society impelled the clergyman to seek companionship in quarters where the female mind was wanting in delicacy, elevation and intelligence. Some tokens of improvement had, however, grown more visible in England with the progress of the sixteenth century. The clerics had more frequently graduated at the universities, and were less wretched in their social status. The lay-impropriators, having found at length that ministers who are inordinately poor are often,

Clerical marriages.

General improvement in England.

[1] The following extract from a letter of the bishop of Carlisle [Best], to Cecil, written in 1563, is one specimen of the disastrous consequences: 'By the absence of the Deane of Carlill, Mr Doctor Smyth, their churche goeth to decay: their wodes almost destroide, a great parte of the livings under color conveyed to their kynsmen, themselves takyng the profitts, and that for three or four score years, their statutes appointing but onlie twenty-one. Where for reparations is allowed yerlie a hundred pounds, there nothyng done. No residence kept; no accompts; the prebendaries turning all to their oune gayne; which when I go about to reforme in my visitation, can take no place, because they are confederate together, and the losses their oune. Three of them are unlearned, and the fourth unzealous. Breeflie the city is decaed by them, and God's truth sclanderyd.' *Queen Elizabeth and her Times* (original letters), ed. Wright, i. 149, Lond. 1838.

[2] Thus Bucer complains (as above p. 382, n. 5): 'Et primores quidem regni multis parochiis præfecerunt eos, qui in cœnobiis fuerunt, ut pensione eis persolvenda se liberarent, qui sunt indoctissimi, et ad sacrum ministerium ineptissimi:' cf. J. J. Blunt's *Reform.* p. 163.

[3] Cf. Haweis, p. 77, who remarks with justice, 'The queen grossly insulted the primate's wife, after accepting her hospitality; her neighbours at Worcester behaved in the same way to the wife of bishop Sandys. The wife of a martyred bishop was living at the time in extreme poverty.'

in the same proportion, noisy and disaffected, were less open to the charge of arrogance and rapacity. Popular contempt had also been succeeded by a greater measure of respect and reverence. The number of pluralists and non-residents was considerably diminished; and if the force of Whitgift's administration[1] had not been weakened by internal discord, and resisted by the scruples of the Puritanic faction, it is not unlikely that the clerics of the Church of England would have risen at once into the social rank, and been invested with the influence, which they ultimately attained.

Character of men's devotion.

But while the issues of the Reformation were thus favourable as a whole, to the diffusion of a higher order of intelligence; while, in spite of serious drawbacks and reverses, which had been entailed on the great movement by the scandals and immorality of the times preceding, it was elevating the standard of religion, banishing a multitude of abject superstitions[2], and expanding all the faculties and energies of man, its operation, in a different province of his being, was no less powerful and remarkable. It changed the character of his devotion, making worship far more

[1] A statistical return from the different dioceses of England and Wales in 1603 enables us to speak with some precision on this subject (Haweis, pp. 306, 307). The number of parishes in both provinces was then 8806; the number of ecclesiastics doubly beneficed, 801; the number of persons licenced to preach 4793. The same table informs us how many of the parishes were 'impropriate,' and how many of the clergy were non-graduates. The aggregate number of Recusants (Romish and Reformed) in both provinces was 87,014.

[2] Many of these, however, lingered both in the Reformed and in the unreformed communities. A belief in witchcraft, for example, still prevailed in almost every quarter. See a vast collection of charms &c. in Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, Lond. 1584: the collector, however, himself denying that the Evil Spirit has any power to control the course of nature. Both the Romanist and Reformer seemed anxious now and then to elicit a knowledge of the unseen, and a corroboration of the truth of their special doctrines, from persons who were held to be under the tyranny of Satan: see on the one side Sully's *Mémoires* (IV. 498 sq., Paris, 1827), where a Jesuit is the questioner, and on the other, *The ende and last confession of mother Waterhouse* (1566), who, to the satisfaction of her prosecutors, acknowledged that Satan would not allow her to pray 'in Englyshe but at all times in Laten.' Several of the London ministers, in like manner, were deluded in 1574 by 'a maid which counterfeited herself to be possessed by the devil:' cf. Parker's letter to Cecil in *Queen Elizabeth and her Times*, as above, I. 509. The terrors, generally excited by the approach of 1588, 'the year of marvels,' 'the grand climacteric of the world,' are sketched in Smedley's *Reform. in France*, II. 229 sq.

simple, rational, and profound, and, at the same time, furnishing the worshipper of ordinary intelligence with a number of fresh auxiliaries, superior both in tone and in matter to the manuals of the former age. The Mediæval 'Horæ' was converted into the Reformed 'Orarium'[1]: and of other English books, which had been given to the public prior to **1595**, more than eighty are classified under the general head of 'Praiers'[2]. Some of these collections of devotional exercises embrace nearly all the states, conditions, and emergencies of human life. The same spirit was also strongly manifested in numerous volumes of sacred poetry that issued from the English press in the Elizabethan period[3]. Hymns and metrical psalms had now, indeed, become the popular vehicles of private and public worship; the new impulse being given by the courtier Clement Marot[4], whose embellished version of parts of the Psalter, after winning for itself the patronage of the French aristocracy, was eagerly adopted, in **1553**, by Calvin, for the public worship of the Genevese, and even grew into a model for religious versifiers in some other countries[5]. But the primary aim and leading element of public worship at this period was instruction in the principles of Christianity, rather than æsthetic and unreasoning devotion. The prayers were now translated into tongues 'understanded of the people;' and the place of the officiating minister was, at the same time, so regulated, that the worshippers might listen to the supplications which he offered, and intelligently follow him throughout

[1] See on this subject Mr Clay's 'Preface' to the *Elizabethan Private Prayers*, ed. P. S.

[2] Preface to Bull's *Christian Prayers and Holy Meditations* (ed. P.S.), p. iv.; which is a favourable specimen of that class of writings. Many of the Prayers are from the older English Primers, others from the *Excitationes animi in Deum* of Ludovicus Vives, translated and enlarged by Bradford. A fair specimen of practical and devotional theology in England is, *A Progress of Piety*, by John Norden (ed. P. S.), an Elizabethan layman.

[3] Warton remarks (*Engl. Poetry*, III. 403, ed. 1840) that 'more poetry was written in the single reign of Elizabeth than in the two preceding centuries.' Of this no inconsiderable proportion was religious: see specimens in the two parts of *Sacred Poetry*, published by the Park. Soc. in 1845, and Warton, III. 146 sq.

[4] Warton, *Ibid.* III. 142. Beza took part in the completion of the work, when the whole Psalter was published at Strasburg in 1545.

[5] On the English versions, see Warton, III. 146—163; and Procter. *Prayer-Book*, pp. 174 sq.

the services[1]. The generation had gone by, when it was deemed enough for Christians to be present at a solemn and imposing spectacle. The clergyman was now the leader of the people, not their agent or their substitute. In some, indeed, of the extreme reformers, there was cause for apprehensions of an opposite character. The principle of reverence had been so far shaken, and the gratification of the thirst for homiletic teaching was so far predominant, that offices of worship now began to be relatively disparaged[2]: yet, until the close of the sixteenth century, all communities of Christians retained at least the rudiments of a liturgic form of service, or, in other words, were not dependent solely on extemporaneous effusions of the individual minister.

Rites and ceremonies in the Swiss communion.

In the Swiss communion, and still more among the English Puritans who sympathized entirely with the doctors of Scotland and Geneva, the leaning was in the direction of extreme simplicity, or rather nudity, of ceremonial[3]. The ear, and not the eye, was recognized as the great channel of religious edification. An idea had been imbibed and fostered, half-consciously in many instances, that grace being always communicated from God directly to the human spirit, we are not to look for it in connexion with earthly media, and therefore that outward rites, except for purposes of order and decorum, are to be eschewed as hindrances and clogs, instead of being welcomed as so many helps and incentives to devotion. Guided by

[1] Thus, in the *Reform. Eccl. Hassiæ* (1526), p. 9, ed. Credner, it is enjoined with this object that public worship shall not be celebrated in the choir, but in the body of the church; yet in the English Prayer-Book of 1552, notwithstanding Bucer's dislike of chancels, the service was to be conducted in that part of the church, chapel or chancel where the people may best hear; and in 1559, in 'the accustomed place...except it shall be otherwise determined by the ordinary.'

[2] Lord Bacon (*Of Church Controversies*, Works, III. 145, Lond. 1765) saw reason to complain of these extravagances: 'We see wheresoever, in a manner, they find in the Scriptures the Word spoken of, they expound it of preaching: they have made it, in a manner, of the essence of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to have a sermon precedent: they have, in a sort, annihilated the use of Liturgies and forms of Divine service, although the house of God be denominated of the principal, *domus orationis*, a house of prayer, and not a house of preaching,' &c.: cf. Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* Bk. v. ch. xxi. sq, and an account of the Puritan substitutes for the Prayer-Book in Procter, pp. 83 sq.

[3] See above, p. 106, n. 3.

this sweeping principle, and recoiling from all contact with the ancient services, which they had felt to be in many ways unscriptural and unedifying, Zwingli and the German-speaking Swiss reduced the ceremonial worship of the sanctuary as far as possible, retaining 'a few simple and moderate rites, in perfect harmony with Holy Scripture'[1]. They drew up a new form of baptism[2], and anxious, above all things, to extrude the thought of sacrifice from the Eucharist, proceeded to replace the Mediæval ordinances by a love-feast[3], pleading the example of the primitive Christians. Pictures of all kinds were banished from the churches, on the ground that they were 'idols,' or had ministered to 'idolatry.' Organs too were silenced, in **1527**, from a notion that the use of them could be no longer reconciled with apostolic practice[4].

Church-music.

Past abuses may have, doubtless, tended to propel men, by the force of natural revulsion, into this excessive

[1] The following extract from the second Helvetic Confession (in Niemeyer, pp. 530, 531) is a good specimen of their line of argument: 'Veteri populo traditæ sunt quondam cæremoniæ, ut pædagogia quædam, iis qui sub lege veluti sub pædagogo et tutore quodam custodiebantur, sed, adveniente Christo liberatore, legeque sublata, fideles sub lege amplius non sumus (Rom. viii.), disparueruntque cæremoniæ....Proinde Judaismum videremur reducere et restituere, si in ecclesia Christi, ad morem veteris ecclesiæ, cæremonias ritusque multiplicaremus.... Quanto magis accedit cumulo rituum in Ecclesia, tanto magis detrahitur non tantum libertati Christianæ, sed et Christo et Ejus fidei: dum vulgus ea quærit in ritibus, quæ quæreret in solo Dei Filio Christo per fidem. Sufficiunt itaque piis pauci, moderati, simplices, nec alieni a Verbo Dei ritus.' The same feeling prompted Zwingli to depreciate the special observance of the Lord's day: 'Fidelis enim dominus est et sabbati:' *Opp.* I. 332, ed. 1829. Luther, on the other hand, advocated such observance, but treated the festival as one of human or ecclesiastical institution: 'non est immutanda temere hæc innoxia veterum consuetudo jam recepta.' See the whole exposition in his *Catechism. Major*, Part I. Præcept. III.

[2] See the earliest form drawn up by Leo Judæ (1523) in Daniel's *Codex Liturg. Eccl. Reform.* pp. 106 sq., and Zwingli's own form (1525), *Ibid.* pp. 112 sq.

[3] Above, p. 106, n. 4. Hence his followers boasted that while the Lutherans with their German mass, their German psalms, their church-music and old ceremonies, were introducing a new phase of popery, ('zu eines nüwen oder veränderten Babstthums Anfang angericht'), Zwingli had abolished all such things, 'die ersten Kilchen wieder ze bringen:' quoted in Gieseler, III. i. p. 167, n. 93 (ed. Bonn. v. 324. ed. Edinb.).

[4] See passages in Daniel, as above, *Præf.* p. 18. Oswald Myconius, in like manner, had asked some years before: 'Organa vero, quid aliud quam hominum mentes jam in Deum erectas dementant?' *Ad Sacerdotes Helvetiæ*, p. 16, Tiguri, 1524: see also the *Reformatio Eccl. Hassiæ*, p. 7.

scrupulosity: for it was now felt, in various parts of Christendom, that church-music, such, at least, as had been current in the previous age, was so fantastic and so void of feeling, as to be no longer compatible with genuine devotion. In the Roman Church itself, the choral services were on the very point of being interdicted[1], owing to this scandalous vitiation of the art of music, when the genius of Palestrina rescued it from its degeneracy, and made it one of the most powerful and pathetic instruments for heightening the tone of worship. But the sternness and severity of the Swiss reformers could not tolerate the use of artistic auxiliaries. The singing, even of metrical hymns, was long unsanctioned in the ordinary congregations of Zürich[2]: the conviction there being, that Christians meet together only for the purposes of prayer and preaching. These, with public confession of sins which followed after the sermon, and with occasional administration of the Eucharist, which took place at separate congregations six times in the year[3], completed the monotonous cycle of their public worship. When, however, the main characteristics of the Church of Zürich were afterwards transmitted to Geneva[4], the ser-

[1] Ranke, *Popes*, I. 509, 510: cf. above, p. 279. One member of the commission nominated by Pius IV. to determine whether music was to be permitted in the churches or not, was Carlo Borromeo; the choral service as then performed seeming more calculated 'à chatouiller les oreilles qu'à élever l'esprit à Dieu:' Godeau, *Vie de S. Charles Borromeo*, p. 120.

[2] 'Morem cantandi multis de causis Ecclesia Tigurina non recepit, tempus sacris destinatum cœtibus duntaxat auscultationi Verbi Dei et precibus impendens:' Lavater (as before, p. 347, n. 3), p. 42. At the date however of the second Helvetic Confession (1562), the use of music was contemplated, or not absolutely condemned: 'Cantus, quem *Gregorianum* nuncupant, plurima habet absurda: unde rejectus est merito a nostris et pluribus ecclesiis. Si ecclesiæ sunt, quæ orationem fidelem legitimamque habent, cantum autem nullum habent, condemnari non debent. Non enim canendi commoditatem omnes habent ecclesiæ. Ac certum est, ex testimoniis vetustatis, ut cantus usum fuisse vetustissimum in orientalibus ecclesiis, ita sero tandem receptum esse ab occidentalibus.'

[3] See Lavater, as before, p. 23. Before these solemnities he adds (p. 52), 'habentur sermones ad populum de dignitate et usu Eucharistiæ: item quo pacto se quisque ad percipiendas sacras has epulas præpararo debeat.'

[4] See *Les Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques de l'Eglise de Genève* (1541), in Richter, *Kirchen-ordnungen*, I. 342 sq. The holy Communion was then administered four times a year, on the Sunday after Christmas, at Easter, on Whitsunday, and the first Sunday in September.

vices, in the latter place, were somewhat more diversified: for, in the Calvinistic provinces of Switzerland, as well as in France, in Scotland, and the Netherlands, although organs had been silenced[1], several hymns in metre[2] were appointed to be sung at every congregation. The same ideas, we saw above, are traceable in all the Hessian churches at an early period; they eventually predominated also in the troubled towns of the Palatinate.

Rites and ceremonies in the Saxon communion.

Meanwhile, a very different spirit had pervaded all the Lutheran regulations for conducting public worship. 'On ceremonies,' wrote Melanchthon[3], 'Zwingli has expressed himself in the true Swiss fashion, that is, most barbarously, in wishing to have them all abolished.' The Saxons also, it is true, were adverse to those rites of Mediævalism which clashed with the express injunctions of Holy Scripture; but wherever any usage of the Church was free from such objection[4], they as uniformly pleaded either for its absolute adoption in their own services, or at least for its suspension in the catalogue of things indifferent. Hence the aspect of their public worship, at the death of Luther, bore in Saxony, at least, a strong resemblance to the system of the Middle Ages[5]. Pictures, organs, altars,

[1] Cf. Daniel, as before, pp. 18—22.

[2] Above, p. 385: and Richter, I. 347.

[3] *Works*, II. 193, ed. Bretschn. He was referring to the passage in Zwingli's *Ratio Fidei*, quoted above, p. 106, n. 3.

[4] Above, p. 39, n. 1. Daniel, admitting that Luther has indulged in violent phraseology with reference to many of the church-traditions, shews that such extravagances were only occasional and inoperative: 'Sed quæ Lutherus, effervescens in dicendo, stomacho sæpe iracundiaque vehementius ebulliit, in Cinglio ac Calvino circumspectio et accurata consideratio excogitavit, subtilis et frigida argumentatio probavit, peracre judicium pronuntiavit. Quibus causis factum est, ut Lutherus cultum Romanum longa consuetudine corruptum et depravatum reformare studeret et corrigere, Reformati [*i. e.* Zwinglians and Calvinists] abolere gestirent et obliterare, ne odor quidem ejus relinqueretur.' *Præf.* as above, pp. 3, 4.

[5] The following is Luther's own version of the matter, in April, 1541 (De Wette, v. 340): 'Es sind, Gottlob, unsere Kirchen in den *Neutralibus* so zugericht, dass ein Laie oder Walh oder Spanier, der unsere Predigt nicht verstehen könnte, wenn er sähe unser Messe, Chor, Orgeln, Glocken, Caseln, etc., würde er müssen sagen, es wäre *ein recht päpstisch Kirche*, und kein Unterschied oder gar wenig gegen die, so sie selbs unter einander haben.' Gieseler, who quotes this passage (III. ii. p. 402, n. 20), traces the later modifications in the service partly to the Adiaphoristic controversy (above, pp. 63, 64).

and vestments, were generally retained[1]. The new Baptismal Office[2] on the one side, and the German Mass-book[3] on the other, were avowedly nothing more than simplifications and corrections of corresponding Latin services, with which the Saxon people had been familiar from their childhood. As one instance of this predilection for the usages of former times, the custom of elevation[4] in the Eucharist was not itself relinquished till **1543**. Luther also was constant in his advocacy of music, painting, and architecture, not only as considered in themselves, but in their application to religious objects. 'I am not one of those,' he writes[5], 'who fancy that the Gospel has superseded or placed its ban upon the fine arts, whatever some misguided spirits may have represented. On the contrary, I would fain see all the arts, and music more especially, devoted to the service of Him who has given and created them.'

In Lutheran churches, a distinction had been clearly drawn between the homiletic and liturgic parts of public worship, and exalted views there taken of the Presence in the Holy Communion led to the continual celebration of it, and invested all the ritual adjuncts of the service with peculiar dignity[6]. A similar remark is applicable to another class of regulations. In Switzerland, although

[1] These peculiarities did not escape the keen eye of bishop Gardiner. Speaking of images, he writes in a letter to Ridley: 'Wherein Luther (that pulled away all other regard to them) strove stoutly, and obtained, as I have seen in divers of the churches in Germany of his reformation, that they should (as they do) still stand:' Ridley's *Works*, ed. P. S. pp. 496, 497.

[2] See above, p. 198.

[3] Printed from the first edition in Richter's *Kirchen-ordnungen*, I. 35 sq.

[4] In the *Deutsche Messe* the reason alleged for retaining it is 'dass es fein mit dem deutschen Sanctus stimmet, und bedeut, dass Christus befohlen hat, sein zu gedenken. Dann gleichwie das Sacrament wird leiblich aufgehaben, und doch drunter Christus Leib und Blut nicht wird gesehen, also würd durch das Wort der Predigt seiner gedacht und erhaben, dazu mit Empfahung des Sacraments bekannt und hochgeehrt.' On the final reasons for the change, see Melanchthon's letter (June 18, 1544): *Works*, v. 420.

[5] *Works*, ed. Walch, X. 1723: and cf. Daniel, *Codex Liturg. Eccl. Lutheranæ*, Pref. pp. 14, 15.

[6] See the *Deutsche Messe*, passim. In addition to double service every day, three services were provided on the Sunday, the holy Communion being always celebrated at the second.

ecclesiastical festivals were nominally observed[1], regard was seldom had by preachers, in their choice of subjects, to the order of the Christian seasons: while the Lutheran church conformed, almost punctiliously, to old arrangements[2], moderating, it is true, the number of festivities, but clinging to the cycle of epistles and gospels, and adapting sermons then delivered to the thoughts which had been naturally suggested by the fresh recurrence of particular celebrations.

Rites and ceremonies in England.

It is, however, in the service-books of England, that the old materials of public worship, and the usages of ancient Christendom, have been most delicately criticized, and most extensively preserved. The various offices of the Church were then translated into the vernacular language; doctrines, inconsistent with the Word of God and the received interpretation of antiquity, were carefully weeded out; some points of ritual which had proved offensive to the English taste[3], as being too luxuriant or too histrionic, were reduced into sobriety; expressions, capable of superstitious or profane meanings, were corrected, and replaced by others more conducive to religious fervour and the edification of the multitude: yet no wish was mani-

[1] Daniel, *Cod. Lit. Eccl. Reform.* Præf. pp. 23—26. The number was gradually reduced to five or six festivals in honour of our blessed Lord.

[2] 'Accepit igitur ut pretiosum κειμήλιον ab antiqua ecclesia *annum ecclesiasticum*, ita tamen ut et deminueretur festivitatum numerus ac rescinderetur, quæ originem suam et quasi sedem non haberent in Scripturæ sacræ historia sed in apocryphis et Legendis. Porro laudanda est doctrinæ perpetuitas et constantia, quæ conspicitur in veterum Pericoparum comprobatione. Nam annus ecclesiæ cum pericopis suis tam arcte cohæret, ut alterum sine altero vix manere et perseverare possit: dein apud Lutheranos pericopa adjungit festivitati suæ auctoritatem et fidem, ne ἄγραφος videatur. Non recedit denique Lutheri ecclesia, nisi articuli fidei qui vocantur primarii ac fundamentales alia jubeant, ab laudabili antiquorum consuetudine:' Daniel, *Eccl. Luther.* Præf. pp. 18, 19, where a full account is added of the Lutheran holy days and seasons.

[3] While thus modifying the ceremonial worship of England, the compilers of the Prayer-Book state expressly, 'In these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe any thing but to our own people only: For we think it convenient, that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries.'

fested to renounce communion with past ages by repudiating hymns and creeds and prayers, the chastened collect and impassioned litany of our forefathers in Christ. Such of them as needed reformation were reformed and expurgated; they were not contemned, anathematized, and cast away. The gloomy and severe, the overscrupulous and revolutionary spirits were reminded in a Preface, found in all editions of the Prayer-Book, that some degree of ceremonial is absolutely necessary: 'and if they think much, that any of the old do remain, and would rather have all devised anew, then such men granting some ceremonies convenient to be had, surely where the old may be well used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old, only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly[1].'

Modifications in the reign of Edward.

In the earlier stages of the Reformation, the prevailing modes of thought, with reference to the Mediæval usages, resembled what we have remarked in Lutheran communities[2], and the bulk of the English people, conscious of the close affinity between the old and new ritual, cheerfully conformed to the doctrinal modifications then established[3]. But when Hooper had returned from his retreat in Zürich[4], fascinated by the Zwinglian usages, and when misgivings of a similar kind were freely ventilated in the neighbourhood of the court[5], and, under certain modifications,

[1] Cf. Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. xxviii. § 1, who remarks, in meeting the charge that our Liturgy is too near the Papists', and too different from that of other reformed churches: 'Where Rome keepeth that which is ancienter and better, others whom we much more affect leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble them whom we love.'

[2] This relationship, indeed, was urged in condemnation of the chief reformers by the Zwinglian party: see above, p. 193, n. 4; p. 195, n. 2; p. 198, n. 5.

[3] See Dodd's account, *Ch. Hist.* II. 28 sq.

[4] Above, p. 200. In an *Epistle*, dated Sept. 6, 1550, and prefixed to his *Sermons upon Jonas*, 'Early Writings,' P. S. p. 440, after urging the king and his council not to be terrified by the prospect of 'sedition and tumults,' he proceeds: 'Most gracious king and noble councillors, as ye have taken away the mass from the people, so take from them her feathers also, the altar, vestments and such like as apparelled her; and let the holy communion be decked with the holy ceremonies that the high and wise Priest, Christ, decked and apparelled her in first of all.' If the bishops should prove refractory, he recommended the royal council to 'do with them as the mariners did with Jonas' (p. 442).

[5] Hooper preached the sermons above mentioned before the king and council on the Wednesdays during Lent in 1550; Ponet (Poynet) preaching on the Fridays. When the course was finished the two preachers

infused into the mind of some of those ecclesiastical dignitaries who were ardently devoted to the cause of reformation, the ruling spirit was considerably changed. Fresh projects were devised in order to accomplish a more thorough simplification of public worship, and the result was a revision of the English service-books. No disposition, it is true, was manifested by the prelates to reduce the English ritual into conformity with the Helvetic: such a step would have involved an utter discerption of it, or rather its annihilation; but the growth of scruples, touching the propriety of particular features in the office for the Holy Communion, impelled one section of the church-authorities to countenance the project of revision. It is highly probable, that some of the continental refugees, who symbolized more fully with the Swiss than with the Saxon theologians, may have stimulated this new measure[1]. It is also probable, that the forms of worship[2] they now celebrated in London, may have here and there supplied a model for the imitation of their English neighbours. But, however this may be, a series of long discussions and delays resulted in the authorizing of the second Prayer-Book of king Edward, by which the aspect of public worship was materially altered through the further pruning of the ceremonial. The church-walls, the windows and the niches, had been purged already of all figures which were held to favour superstition or idolatry[3]; many 'ornaments'[4] had been defaced; some crosses had been broken down; the shrines contain-

were respectively offered the bishoprics of Gloucester and Rochester: cf. above, pp. 200, 201, where attention is directed (p. 201, n. 1) to Cranmer's inflexibility in opposition to Hooper.

[1] See above, pp. 202, 205.

[2] See above, p. 205, n. 5; 'Comparatively little of the Prayer-Book,' as Professor Blunt observed, 'is of the date of the Reformation itself: for though some foreign Liturgies of the day did certainly supply a contingent—these, however, be it observed, not themselves compiled irrespectively of the older ones—still the staple of the Prayer-Book was ancient, most ancient, lost in antiquity:' *Sermons*, p. 95, Camb. 1850.

[3] Above, p. 200, n. 3.

[4] Brokes (Brokys), intruding bp. of Gloucester, who preached before Queen Mary in 1553, alluded to what he considered a general decay of religious feeling, and attributed it to 'the defacing of churches, in spoiling their goods and ornaments, the breaking down altars, throwing down crosses, casting out of images, the burning of tried holy relics...change in altars, change in placing, change in gesture, change in apparel' (quoted by Haweis, p. 115).

ing relics had been plundered, and vessels for the celebration of the mass abstracted by unauthorized rapacity[1], or surrendered to the crown. The stone-altars[2] also, thus dismantled, had been subsequently replaced by wooden structures, standing table-wise, and sometimes actually transferred, like a domestic table, into the body of the church[3]. But on the appearance of the new service-books, the changes went still further. All the Mediæval vestments were authoritatively proscribed, with the exception of a surplice for the priest, and a rochet for the bishop at the Holy Communion; while the place of the minister, who before officiated always in the choir, was now to be determined by the size and other circumstances of the church, at the discretion of the ordinary. As might have been anticipated from the previous state of feeling, the extreme Reformers were in the habit of overstraining these concessions. Chancels[4] they regarded with peculiar aversion. The white vestment[5] seemed irreconcilable with

[1] 'Besides the profanation of churches,' writes Strype (*Cranmer*, II. viii. pp. 89, 90, ed. Eccl. H. S.), 'there prevailed another evil, relating also to churches, viz. that the utensils and ornaments of these sacred places were spoiled, embezzled, and made away, partly by the churchwardens, and partly by other parishioners. Whether the cause were, that they would do that themselves, which they imagined would ere long be done by others, viz. robbing of churches; which it may be, those that bore an ill-will to the Reformation might give out, to render it the more odious. But certain it is, that it now became more or less practised all the nation over, to sell or take away chalices, crosses of silver, bells and other ornaments.' He then gives a letter (April 30, 1548) from the council to the archbishop requiring him to inhibit the practice.

[2] Above, p. 200. Ridley's exhortation was that, 'for the sake of godly unity, the curates, churchwardens and questmen, should set up the Lord's board after the form of an honest table, decently covered, in such place of the quire or chancel as shall be thought most meet by their discretion and agreement, so that the ministers with the communicants may have their place separated from the rest of the people; and to take down and abolish all other by-altars or tables:' *Works*, p. 320, ed. P. S.

[3] See Maitland, *Reformation*, pp. 303 sq.

[4] Bucer and Hooper, much as they had been opposed on other subjects, were agreed on this: see the *Censura*, c. 1, in Bucer's *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 457. Hooper's theory is as follows (*Early Writings*, pp. 491, 492): 'But this I would wish that the magistrates should put both the preacher, minister and the people in one place, and shut up the partition called the chancel, that separateth the congregation of Christ one from the other, as though the veil and partition of the Temple in the old law yet should remain in the Church; where, indeed, all figures and types ended in Christ.'

[5] *Ibid.* p. 479, where the preacher adds: 'It is rather the habit and vesture of Aaron and the Gentiles than of the ministers of Christ.'

apostolical simplicity, and they accordingly varied from the rubric, by occasionally substituting in its place their ordinary gown[1] at the celebration of the Lord's supper. 'Bread, wine, a table, and a fair table-cloth'[2], were all that Hooper and his party were desirous of preserving; their object being to retain 'the perfection of Christ's institution,' and to do nothing which 'had not God's Word to bear it'[3].

Restorations under Elizabeth.

In the reign of Mary, which had for a time been checking the development of these ideas, all things were reduced, as far as possible, into their former places; while the elevation of Elizabeth to the throne was calculated to produce a mixed effect on the appearance of the English churches, and the character of public worship. Her chief advisers manifested little or no sympathy with continental theologians, or at least in ritual matters, as in doctrine, sided rather with the Lutheran[4] than with the Swiss Reformers. Hence, although the interdicts of Edward were reissued so as to displace a large majority of the altars, and eject all images and paintings that were deemed propitious to the reign of superstition, the old vestments[5] were now authorized afresh and other changes introduced, which plainly indicate a leaning towards the position assumed by the Reformers in the first Edwardine Prayer-Book.

[1] See Haweis, p. 116.

[2] Speaking of the outward preparation of the minister, Hooper declares (*Ibid.* p. 534): 'If he have bread, wine, a table and a fair table-cloth, let him not be solicitous nor careful for the rest, seeing they be no things brought in by Christ, but by the popes; unto whom, if the king's majesty and his honourable council have good conscience, they must be restored again, And great shame it is for a noble king, emperor, or magistrate, contrary unto God's Word, to detain and keep from the devil or his minister any of their goods or treasure, as the candles, vestments, crosses, altars! For if they be kept in the Church as things indifferent, at length they will be maintained as things necessary.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 335.

[4] Above, pp. 227, 229, 231.

[5] Cf. above, p. 232, and n. 3. The Elizabethan Puritans at first objected most to 'the cap, the surplice and the tippet,' the use of which alone appears to have been pressed by the authorities: but all the other vestments were equally prescribed in the new edition of the Prayer-Book and the Act of Uniformity. Hence in *An Answere for the Tyme*, put forth in 1566, [copy, with other kindred tracts, in the Camb. Univ. Lib. G, VI. 84] the writer sums up his grievances as follows: 'Cope, surplese, starch-bread [wafers], gospelers, pistlers, kneling at communion, crossing at baptisme, baptisme of [by] women, cap, tippet and gowne: *Item;* by authoritie of parliament, albes, alters, vestments, &c. these few things are more then may well be borne.'

Permanence of two parties in the English Church.

Yet, owing to the scruples generated in the school of Hooper, and still more to new antipathies which some of the Marian exiles had brought back with them from Switzerland, the English Church continued to be torn by hostile factions[1], which allowed her little rest for the remainder of the century. On the one side, public worship was conducted so as to exhibit principles like those of Parker, Whitgift, Hooker, and Saravia; on the other, it was made to harmonize with the ideas of Whittingham, of Cartwright, and of Walter Travers. Here the feeling was, that innovations had been carried to the utmost verge of Christian prudence: there, that all which had been hitherto accomplished should be welcomed only as the starting-point of more decisive measures, or, in other words, the Reformation must itself be thoroughly reformed. The disposition, on the one side, was to commune freely with the past, to recognize the visible continuity of the Church as an organic system, even where its life was paralyzed by grievous errors and corruptions, and to estimate alike the excellencies and demerits of our Christian predecessors in a large and generous spirit, from a consciousness that, where the tares had been most thickly scattered, wheat continued to grow up among them, and repay the culture of the Husbandman. Whereas, the rival theory of the Church denied this visible continuity, or, at the most, concluded that religion had for ages found its only shelter from the violence of Antichrist, in the recesses of some Alpine valley, or the bosom of some persecuted sect,—conclusions which impressed their author with the deepest hatred of all Mediæval forms of worship as connected in his mind with the ascendancy of anti-christian influences. On the one side it was felt that church authority, at least

[1] 'Descenderant Angli in partes: aliis cordi erat, ut, servata apostolicæ ecclesiæ atque Anglicanæ cohærentia et antiquæ disciplinæ virtutibus recte æstimatis, Anglia Christiana, *non in Romana sed in catholica religione* constanter perseveraret; alii impetum suum convertebant in majorum instituta totamque Angliam Calvino vindicare studebant.' Daniel, *Codex Liturg. Eccl. Reform.* p. 295. He then adds in a note: 'Quo factum est ut Anglicana Ecclesia, Rebeccæ consimilis, in utero ferat prolem gemellam, sed valde disparem atque pugnacem. Et necessitate quadam versabatur in controversia ac contentione usque dum eventum habuerit vaticinium: "Duæ gentes in utero tuo et duo populi ex ventre tuo dividentur, populusque populum superabit et major serviet minori."'

as to its spiritual properties, had been transmitted through a line of bishops, who were therefore specially entrusted with the exposition of Christian truth, as well as with the conservation of Christian order: on the other, such authority was held to be the voluntary gift of each congregation; and accordingly the favourite model of government was that which left no room for prelates, by investing all the ministers with equal rank and jurisdiction. Like differences are often traceable in their mode of handling some of the more vital principles of Christianity, though these divergencies were never marked so strongly in the sixteenth as in the following century. With lax ideas respecting the dogmatic statements of the œcumenical councils, such as we have seen in Zwingli and in Calvin, also grew a tendency to innovate upon the ancient terminology of the Church in speaking even of the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation of our blessed Lord; while the profound relationship which many of the opposite school had traced between this latter doctrine, rightly apprehended, and the orthodox view respecting the efficacy of the sacraments, was overlooked, if not entirely contradicted, in the writings of the English Puritans.

But notwithstanding these intellectual conflicts and this busy strife of tongues, itself, with all its melancholy consequences, a plain index of reviving thought, of manliness and Christian fervour, truth, in the more personal and practical bearings of it, went victoriously upon its mission: it continued to exalt, invigorate, and humanize: it furnished nurture to a multitude of thirsting spirits; it was ever the support, the joy, the solace of the simple-hearted and uncontroversial. Many a parish in the distant nooks of England, which had never been disturbed by vestment-troubles, nor the boisterous sermons of some disaffected churchman, was administered by pastors whose prime object was the edification of the souls committed to their keeping, and the glory of the Lord, to whom they must hereafter give account of all their Christian talents. Many a church, despite the outbreaks of irreverence on the one side, or the vestiges of superstition on the other, had been cleansed and garnished with affectionate care, and won the praises of the passing traveller by the chastened beauty of its ornaments. And many a household,

tended by such pastors, and excited in the way of holiness by worshipping in such well-ordered sanctuaries, became the favourite haunt of angels, and the centre of religious blessing to the neighbourhood: their sons grew up like the young plants, their daughters were like polished corners of the temple.

CHAPTER X.

GROWTH OF THE CHURCH.

THOSE agencies which operated so powerfully in narrowing the field of general study had prevented the expansion of the Church of Christ beyond her ancient limits. There was now indeed a keener and more stirring sense of the importance of the Gospel, and the vastness of the human family for whose illumination it was promulgated: but the various sections of the Western Church were so completely occupied until the middle of the sixteenth century with their own domestic conflicts, with promoting the purification of their doctrine or establishing fresh bulwarks for their self-defence, that nearly all the missions of this period were 'home-missions,' instead of being aimed at the conversion of the heathen. *Paucity of Missions.*

The miserable remnant of the Jews who lingered in the Spanish peninsula, were subjected, as in the former period[1], to most brutal persecutions: and in Germany the hatred of their race was no less deep and universal, being stimulated, more especially, by machinations of the rude Dominicans at Cologne[2]. *Jews.*

The menacing attitude of the Turks was, on the contrary, a source of daily terror to the western potentates[3], and the necessity of wrestling with their armies on the battle-fields of Europe had precluded all endeavours to subdue them by the peaceful weapons of the Gospel. Pious *Turks.*

[1] See *Middle Age*, pp. 318—320.

[2] The members of this order, satirized so mercilessly in the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum*, had even the ingenuity to invent a legal authority for their persecution of the Jews. 'They declared that it was necessary to examine how far the Jews had deviated from the Old Testament, which the emperor was fully entitled to do, since their nation had formally acknowledged before the judgment-seat of Pilate the authority of the imperial majesty of Rome:' Ranke, *Reform.* I. 260.

[3] See above, p. 312.

men were rather bent on praying for their ruin and confusion[1]. An apparent exception to this warlike policy is found in the alliance for a while cemented between Francis I., 'the most Christian' monarch, and the sultan Soliman, the Magnificent; but its object was avowedly political[2], intended to promote the balance of power or complicate the quarrel with the emperor by bringing in the hordes of barbarians on Germany; and accordingly, so far from leading to the extension of Christianity, it might itself be properly regarded as one symptom of religious indifferentism or of irreligious treachery to the common interests of Christendom. The followers of Islam had also, notwithstanding the terrific outbreaks of fanaticism among themselves[3], as well as their habitual hatred of the Christians, shewn occasional tendencies to modify the stern traditions of their sanguinary forefathers.

Religion of Akbar.

At the court of Akbar, who presided over the Muhammedan empire in the north of Hindustan, from **1555** to **1605**, appear the representatives[4] of nearly all the known

[1] Thus, in the English *Form* of 1566, above cited, we have the following specimen: 'The Turk goeth about to set up, to extol, and to magnify that wicked monster and damned soul Mahumet, above Thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, Whom we in heart believe, and with mouth confess to be our only Saviour and Redeemer. Wherefore awake, O Lord our God and heavenly Father, and with thy fatherly and merciful countenance look upon us Thy children, and all such Christians as are now by those most cruel enemies invaded and assaulted: overthrow and destroy Thine and our enemies,' &c. p. 535.

[2] Thus, in speaking to the Venetian ambassador, in 1535, Francis gave the following account of his policy: 'I cannot deny that I wish to see the Turk appear powerful at sea; not that I am pleased with the advantages they obtain, for they are unbelievers and we Christians, but because they keep the Emperor occupied, and thereby confer greater security upon other potentates.' In Ranke's *Civil Wars &c. in France*, I. 144, 145, Lond. 1852. 'If,' reflects the historian, 'a new epoch had once been marked by the fact that Philip the Fair [*Middle Age*, p. 253] exploded the institutions in which all Christendom had united for the conquest of the Holy Land, it was a second great step in the same course when Francis I. even entered into alliance with the very power whose hostility was in the highest degree dangerous to Christendom.'

[3] Thus the Sultan Selim, who headed the Sunnite faction, whether Turkish subjects or otherwise, opened his war against the Persians, who are of the opposite faction (Shiites), by causing all the members of this latter party, within his territories, to be put to death in one day: Ranke, *Reform*, I. 249.

[4] See the interesting paper by Captain Kennedy, entitled *Notice respecting the Religion introduced into India by the Emperor Akbar*, among the *Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay*, II. 242 sq. Lond.

religions of that age,—Jews, Christians, Brahmans, and Parsees, as well as both sections of Mussulmans, the Sunnites and the Shiites. Yet none of these varieties of human thought could, either singly or compounded, satisfy the speculative mind of the Mogul. His 'philosophical' advisers were triumphant, who persuaded him that Deism, represented with as much of nudity as the weakness of mankind could bear, is *the* religion, which alone commends itself to reason and the purer instincts of humanity; while 'the means of attaining to future bliss are comprised in the following virtues, liberality, forgiveness and forbearance, chastity, devotion, temperance, fortitude, gentleness, politeness, acting so as to please God and not man, and resignation to the will of God[1].' Akbar ultimately assumed the title[2] of 'God's vicegerent,' the 'Apostle and perfect Messenger;' but although the system which he organized could boast of numerous followers during his own lifetime, it soon withered when Islamism was again acknowledged as the religion of the state: and after the lapse of fifty years, no trace of it was visible[3].

1820; and Manouchi's account of Akbar in his *History of the Great Mogul*. It is almost certain that this emperor was at one time strongly impressed in favour of the Gospel, as presented to him by Jesuit missionaries (Hough's *Hist. of Christianity in India*, II. 271 sq. Lond. 1839): but after wavering for some years, he resolved to set on foot a composite religion of which he should himself be the acknowledged head. 'My people,' he says (*Ibid.* p. 276), 'are a strange medley of Muhammadans, Idolaters and Christians. I am resolved to bring them all to one opinion. I will join the baptism of the one, and the circumcision of the other, to the worship of Brahma. I will retain the metempsychosis, plurality of wives, and the worship of Jesus Christ. Thus compounding my religion of those points which are most agreeable to the professors of the respective sects, I shall be able to form them into one entire flock, of which I myself shall be leader and head.'

[1] Akbar's advocate in one of the dialogues above cited argued in favour of this simple creed, from the diversities and contradictions observable in the various systems of theology. 'When the religion of one prophet has been embraced, and when the worship of God and the knowledge of truth has been established, according to his doctrine, another prophet arises who divulges a new doctrine and new precepts. Hence mankind become perplexed, and they know not whether to consider the first prophet a liar, or to conclude that religions must change after certain periods of time. But truth is immutable, and admits of no variation or inconsistency' (p. 257).

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 254, 259.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 267. 'It cannot be doubted,' says Kennedy, 'that its failure was occasioned principally by that pertinacity with which the

Christianity in India.

Some earlier agitations[1] that sprang up in other realms of heathenism had synchronized still more remarkably with the reforming movement of the west; yet none of them was, in the least degree, attributable to Christian impulses. The Church, however, was not without her native congregations even in the distant towns and villages of India. To pass over the remains of the Nestorian and Latin missions[2] which had once held out the promise of evangelizing every corner of that dark and populous region, there was still the confraternity known as 'Christians of St. Thomas[3],' whose settlements extended for 120 Indian miles below Goa, on the coast of Malabar, and inland as far as the southernmost extremity of Hindustan: another settlement surviving on the opposite coast, at St. Thomas's Mount, in the neighbourhood of Madras. This venerable church, retaining its connexion with the Nestorian patriarch of Mosul, and numbering two hundred thousand souls, excited the amazement of the Portuguese discoverers who had left the Tagus, in **1502**, on a commercial enterprise. But other feelings afterwards succeeded, when the Portuguese were able to assume an attitude of independence, and converted Goa into the metropolis of their extensive empire. Instead of propagating Christianity among the heathen natives, the archbishop of Goa determined to correct the errors of the 'church of Malabar[4],' and, most of all, to place it in subjection to the Roman pontiff. A sharp struggle now ensued; but, after the bishop of the Indian Chris-

'Christians of St Thomas.'

Conflict with Rome.

Muhammadans and Hindus have at all times resisted every innovation in their respective religions.'

[1] On the composite religion which Baba Nanuk now established in the Punjab with the hope of binding together Muhammadans and Hindus, see Cunningham's *Hist. of the Sikhs*, Lond. 1849.

[2] See *Middle Age*, pp. 216—218.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 28, and Hough's *Hist. of Christianity in India*, I. 32 sq. On the kindred encroachments of the Portuguese in Abyssinia, see *Middle Age*, p. 315, n. 5.

[4] The first assault was made in 1545 by a Franciscan of the name of Vincent, whose chief policy was to educate some of their priests in his own doctrines and so influence the community (Hough, I. 247). This attempt failed, however, and was not repeated for some years, at the end of which the Jesuit missionaries circumvented Mar Joseph, the bishop. He was then sent to Rome in triumph and there consecrated afresh to the see of Angamale: but failing in his engagements with the pontiff he was apprehended in compliance with an order of pope Pius V. (Jan. 15, 1567), and shipped off to Portugal (*Ibid.* p. 260).

tians had been cajoled into obedience, and then forcibly extruded from his see, the council of Diamper[1] (Udiampoor), in **1599**, completed, for a time at least, their 'reconciliation' with the papacy. A multitude of their ancient writings were then committed to the flames[2]; the Syriac service-books were all remodelled in accordance with Roman usages; their canon of the New Testament Scriptures, hitherto defective[3], was completed by the same authority; and, until the middle of the following century, when the Portuguese had, in their turn, been humbled and excluded by the Dutch, the 'Christians of St. Thomas' were all constrained to recognize the jurisdiction of the Latins. At that crisis, however, we are told, one half of them fell back into their ancient isolation.

Mission-work of Xavier,

Meanwhile a vigorous effort had been made by worthier missionaries of the Roman church, assisted by the greatest maritime power of Europe, to carry the religion of the cross into remoter strongholds both of Brahmanism and Buddhism. This great project dated from the landing of Francis Xavier[4], at Goa, on the 6th of May, **1542**. The

[1] See Geddes, *Hist. of the Church of Malabar with the acts and decrees of the Synod of Diamper*, Lond. 1694, and Hough, as above, II. 1—132, with the documents in Appendix A. Some of the chief points in which the Christians of Malabar had previously differed from their Romish invaders were the following: They rejected the papal supremacy and paid allegiance to the patriarch of Babylon (Mosul). They condemned the adoration of images, but venerated the symbol of the cross. They had not heard of masses for the dead, of purgatory, or of extreme unction. They repudiated auricular confession, and the constrained celibacy of ecclesiastics. They regarded the Eucharist as an oblation, and solemnly offered the elements upon the altar, yet, as one of their assailants urged, 'their books contained enormous errors against this holy sacrament, errors that shew that the heretics of our own time [*i.e.* the European Reformers], who have revived all the ancient heresies and forgotten errors, derived their doctrines from this source' (Hough, II. 14). They held three sacraments,—ranking orders with baptism and the Eucharist. But whether they were Nestorian in their tenets respecting the Person of our blessed Lord is far from certain. Buchanan, *Christian Researches in Asia*, p. 126, maintains that their descendants at least are orthodox on this subject. The result of their treatment by the Portuguese seems to have been to break off their connexion with the Nestorians and throw them into union with the Jacobites. See Neale, *Eastern Ch.* Intr. I. 151.

[2] Hough, II. 72.

[3] The second epistle of St Peter, the second and third of St John, the epistle of St Jude, and the Apocalypse were wanting in their Syriac version: see Geddes, as above, p. 135, where other less important variations are noticed.

[4] See Tursellinus, *De Vita Fr. Xaverii, qui primus e Societ. Jesu in*

friend and first disciple of Ignatius Loyola, and like him strongly tinged with old ideas of chivalry and self-devotion, the ardent Jesuit soon exchanged his residence in Portugal, to which he was invited by king John III., for distant fields of missionary labour, in the hope of gathering millions of his fellow-men into the fold of Christ, and of the Roman church. His apostolic tenderness, his zeal, his heroism, his abundant labours, sufferings, and success, in the discharge of his adventurous calling, earned for him the title of 'Apostle of the Indies.' Many of the narratives respecting him are, it is true, most grievously disfigured, either by the fraud or by the credulity of their compilers[1]: but when due allowance has been made for fable and exaggeration, the career of Xavier stands almost unparalleled in the history of Christian missions. On reaching Goa, he discovered that religion was already at the lowest ebb among the Portuguese settlers, many of whom had virtually abandoned their profession, and sunk down into the heathen level of impurity and licence[2]. Xavier, therefore, with the sanction of the bishop, opened his crusade by preaching the necessity of reformation to the European Christians. After spending a portion of each day in visits to the hospitals and prisons, where his earnest and unselfish spirit won the heart of every inmate, his practice was to walk through the streets of Goa with a bell in his hand, imploring all the fathers of families, for the love of God, to send their children and their slaves to him for catechetical instruction: and such wonderful effects were thus produced by his impulsive fervour, that a change was soon apparent in the conduct of the whole population, more especially the young[3].

India et Japonia evangelium propagavit, Rom. 1594: Bouhours, *Vie de S. François Xavier*, reprinted at Louvain, 1822; *Lettres de F. Xavier*, Bruxelles, 1838: Hough, *Hist. of Christianity in India*, Bk. II. ch. iii.

[1] For instance, on the stupendous miracles attributed to him, but not mentioned in his own correspondence, see Grant's *Missions to the Heathen*, Append. No. XXI.

[2] 'Mais, ce qui doit paroître plus étrange, les Portugais vivoient eux-mêmes plus en Idolâtres qu'en Chrétiens:' Bouhours, p. 69; cf. Hough, I. 173 sq.

[3] 'Les enfans s'assembloient en foule autour de Xavier, soit qu'ils vinssent d'eux-mêmes par une curiosité naturelle, soit que leurs pères les envoyassent, par le respect qu'ils avoient déjà pour le saint, tout vicieux qu'ils étoient. Il les menoit à l'église, et là il leur expliquoit le

When Xavier had devoted six months to the promotion of these objects, and had meanwhile gained a meagre knowledge of one or two Indian languages, he started on his earliest mission to the Paravars,—a miserable people, near Cape Comorin, who had been rescued by the Portuguese from their Moslem taskmasters, and thus propitiated in favour of Christianity[1]. Subsisting there on rice and water, like the very poorest of the natives, Xavier exercised his missionary duties with the same devotion and success that marked his triumphs over the degenerate Portuguese at Goa. He instructed all the children whom he gathered round him in some elements of Christian truth[2], and then charged them to diffuse this knowledge, far and wide, among their parents, friends, and neighbours. Fifteen months were occupied in pressing forward the conversion of the Paravars, when the devoted missionary retraced his steps to Goa, in the hope of gaining fresh assistance, and, at the same time, carried with him a band of children to be regularly educated for the Christian ministry[3]. His sojourn in the Portuguese colony was not of long continuance: for, early in **1544**, we see him hastening back into the south of India, now supported by three European colleagues. Each of these had a station assigned him on the coast, while Xavier himself resolved to penetrate alone into adjacent provinces. The kingdom of Travancore immediately excited his peculiar interest, and the population, as if moved by one great impulse, signified their willing-

among the Paravars;

in Travancore;

symbole des apôtres, les commandemens de Dieu, et toutes les pratiques de piété qui sont en usage parmi les fidèles': *Ibid.* p. 73. Among other occupations which he engaged in while at Goa, he assisted in the organizing of a seminary for the education of heathen orphans ('the college of St Paul').

[1] Several of them had already been baptized (Bouhours, p. 76), but had no knowledge of Christian doctrine, 'faute de gens qui les instruissent.'

[2] These were contained in his version of 'The Words of the sign of the Cross,' the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, &c. (Bouhours, p. 176, Hough, I. 177), which he made the children learn by heart. The whole account of his dealing with neophytes is preserved in the 14th *Lettre*. In one passage he remarks that 'the astonishment, both of the neophytes and the pagans, is great when they perceive the sanctity of the Christian law, and its perfect conformity with reason.'

[3] Bouhours, p. 101. During his absence the work of keeping alive what he had taught was committed to some of the more intelligent converts, who thus form a species of catechists: Hough, I. 180.

ness to entertain his offers, or rather to accept the faith he had commended to their best affections by his enterprising zeal and self-forgetting labours[1]. On a subsequent voyage to this district he saw reason to infer from adverse winds that the Almighty was intending him for other fields of

at Malacca. duty[2]; and at length was carried eastward as far as Malacca, where the thriving trade of Portugal had also given rise to an extensive settlement. There, as at Goa, Xavier commenced his ministry by urging on the Europeans the profound importance of religion[3], and afterwards proceeded

and elsewhere. to reap a further harvest of conversions at Amboyna[4]. But other places where he touched were less susceptible of Christian influences; and in the islands of Del Moro[5] and at Java[6] his life was more than once seriously imperilled.

Mission to Japan. It was in the summer of 1547, that Xavier, while resting at Malacca, had frequent interviews with Anger[7], a native of the island of Japan, who, having wasted all the morning

[1] The following extract from one of his letters will prove that he was at first unacquainted even with the language of the natives: 'Vous pouvez juger quelle vie je mène ici, par ce que je vais vous dire. Je n'entends point la langue de ces peuples, ils n'entendent point la mienne, et je n'ai point de truchoman. Tout ce que je puis faire,' he adds, 'est de baptiser les enfans et de servir les malades, qu'on entend très-bien sans le secours d'aucun interprète, pour peu qu'on voye ce qu'il souffrent' (Bouhours, p. 105). He also made a most profound impression on the whole country by heading them when terrified by the invasion of an army of savage marauders (the Badages): Hough, I. 183, 184. He had shewn a like heroism in rescuing his Paravar converts from the same danger.

[2] Bouhours, p. 136.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 156, 157. 'Avant que d'entreprendre la réformation d'une ville toute corrompue il s'employa quelques jours uniquement au service des malades: il passa plusieurs nuits en oraison, et il fit des austérités extraordinaires.'

[4] Here also the Portuguese had a garrison, and Christianity was not unknown: *Ibid.* p. 165. The same results followed at Ternate: p. 175.

[5] When dissuaded from his purpose to visit this group of islands, whose inhabitants bore the worst possible character, Xavier exclaimed: 'Quoi! Celui Qui a soumis le monde entier à l'empire de la croix par le ministère des apôtres, ne pourroit pas y soumettre un petit endroit de la terre! Les seules îles du More n'auroient point de part au bienfait de la Redemption!...Je puis tout en Celui Qui me fortifie, et de Qui seul vient la force des ouvriers evangéliques.' *Ibid.* p. 182. Animated by this spirit, he landed on a coast where the bodies of some Portuguese, who had been recently massacred, were lying in their blood, and continued in the island three months.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 189. [7] *Ibid.* pp. 228 sq., Hough, I. 197 sq

of his life in dissipation and frivolity was, at the age of five-and-thirty, tortured by a wounded conscience. He had sought in vain for comfort from the heathen priesthood, and was finally determined by the hint of some Portuguese trader to set forth upon a voyage to Malacca in the hopes of benefiting from the counsel of the far-famed missionary. Under Xavier's guidance he became a Christian. He then proceeded for complete instruction to the Jesuits' college at Goa, where he was joined by Xavier, with whom he resolved, if possible, to organize a mission for his native country. A supply of European auxiliaries, attracted by the forcible appeals[1] that were circulated far and near by Xavier and his friends, had, in the mean time, enabled him to complete his own arrangements for the conduct of the Indian missions. He accordingly embarked for Japan, in April, **1549**, with three companions, one of them his favourite convert. On their voyage they were detained for some months at Malacca, but reached the place of destination, Kagósima, in the following August. The mission-work was instantly commenced[2], and, during the next two years, the patience, love and energy of Xavier were rewarded by the formation of a small community of Christians, which was made the starting-point of further acquisitions in the next half century. He then returned to Goa; but the same unquenchable desire to spread a knowledge of the Christian faith impelled him to resume his apostolic labours, that the banner of the cross might also be unfurled afresh upon the soil of China[3]. This, however, might not be. The ardent missionary fell a victim to the climate. He was left behind, at his own request, upon the isle of Sancian, within sight of that gigantic empire whose conversion had long occupied his thoughts; expiring of malignant fever at the early age of six-and-forty (**Dec. 2**,

Projected mission to China.

[1] *e. g.* In one of Xavier's letters, he declares: 'Il me vient souvent en pensée de parcourir les académies de l'Europe, principalement celle de Paris, et de crier de toutes mes forces à ceux qui ont plus de savoir que de charité: Ah! combien d'âmes perdent le Ciel, et tombent dans les enfers par votre faute!'

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 284 sq. Xavier's first object was to gain a more adequate knowledge of the language, and with the aid of his Japanese convert he circulated a small catechism, in which he explained the leading facts and doctrines of Christianity.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 394 sq.

1552). The only witness of his mortal agonies was a Spanish outcast, who afterwards recollected how the fragments of some hymn or prayer were ever falling from the lips of Xavier even in the midst of his delirium.

But while other and less worthy hands proceeded with the Indian missions of the Portuguese, attempts were made to carry out the plan for circulating further knowledge of the Gospel in the various provinces of China. Some advances are ascribable to earlier bands of Jesuits who had reached that country from Macao, but Ricci's name is properly associated with the opening of their regular missions. He[1] was an Italian by birth, who, having been incorporated into the order of the Jesuits, was sent out to India, and at the age of thirty was attached to one of the embassies which proceeded from Macao to the coast of China (1582).

Ricci in China.

His principles of action.

The policy of Ricci differed much from that of Xavier. Instead of carrying his appeals at once to the emotional province of man's nature, preaching of repentance and of faith in Christ the Mediator, he strove, at first[2], by a profuse display of learning, especially of Mathematical science, to disarm the prejudices of the Chinese literati; regarding such a course as the more likely to enlist the sympathy of the natives in favour of the Christian faith. The dogmas he was going to propound were, as he hinted, only the revival and completion of ideas already current in the writings of Confucius[3]. Ricci meanwhile had consorted freely with the natives, adopted their costume, and studied all the leading features of the national

[1] Soe Schröckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* III. 676 sq., and the original account in Possinus, *Hist. Soc. Jesu*, Part v. Tom. I. pp. 213 sq. Tom. II. pp. 515 sq.

[2] *e. g.* The following statement is made in the second volume of the work just cited, p. 516: 'Primo quidem Riccius nonnihil ipsi [*i.e.* a native enquirer] de mathematicis tradebat disciplinis: deinde aliquod doctrinæ Christianæ caput explicabat....Paucis mensibus ita profecit, ut de arte numerandi, quam algebram vocant, commentarios ediderit in lucem, multis eruditorum laudibus ornatos.'

[3] *Ibid.* p. 552: 'Negabat religionem, quæ unum sine consorte Deum doceret, peregrinam esse: hanc probabat fuisse a Sinensibus philosophis et eorum principe Confucio traditam, sed obliteratam paulatim temporum vitio; restitui tantummodo a Christianis et instaurari, additis de Christo, quæ Confucius, quingentis ante Christum annis natus, rescire non potuerat.'

character. At last, when he concluded that his work of preparation was sufficiently advanced, and that he had no longer any cause to apprehend hostility in the highest quarters, he entered vigorously upon his proper task of making known the special doctrines of the Gospel. Churches were now gathered with remarkable facility; and, at the death of Ricci, in **1610**, the Chinese mission promised to extend itself among all ranks and orders, and to leaven the whole mass of the surrounding population. But the policy of its founder, as pursued into its consequences by less scrupulous disciples, issued in a series of unholy compromises, which were fatal to the reputation, and at length to the vitality, both of this and of other missions planted by the Jesuits.

Mexican

The supremacy which Portugal obtained in many districts of the East, had found its parallel in the victorious march of Spanish conquerors in North and South America. We saw[1] that the enormous wrongs, inflicted by the empire which they raised in Mexico, began to be abated when a party of Franciscans, who had followed in the bloody track of conquest, succeeded in reconciling the Aztec population to the Christian faith. This work was finished in the second quarter of the sixteenth century; but a longer interval elapsed before a church was fully organized[2] among the remnant of Peruvians who survived the butchery of Pizarro and his sanguinary comrades. In the end, however, an archbishopric was placed at Lima, the metropolis; with jurisdiction reaching to the six dioceses of Peru, and also to the neighbouring states of Chili, which were now reduced into a like subjection to the majesty of Spain. The agents here engaged in the conversion of the natives were chiefly furnished by religious orders, so that these eventually obtained immense authority in the Spanish settlements of South America.

and Peruvian Missions.

Jesuits in Brazil

On the coast of Brazil[3] the Portuguese had gained

[1] *Middle Age*, pp. 316, 317.

[2] Fabricius, in his *Lux Evangelii* (ch. XLIX.), gives a list of authorities respecting the introduction of Christianity into this and other parts of South America. For central America, see Fancourt's *Hist. of Yucatan*, pp. 130 sq. Lond. 1854.

[3] See Southey's *Hist. of Brazil*, Lond. 1810; and Wittmann's *Gesch. der Cathol. Missionen*, II. 486 sq. Augsburg, 1850.

themselves a footing as early as **1504**. Their colony, however, was comparatively neglected until **1549**, in which year were laid the foundations of Bahia (San Salvador): and the new governor, accompanied by a troop of Jesuits, manifested some anxiety to wean the natives from a state of cannibalism, and so conciliate their affections in behalf of Christianity.

and Paraguay.

A fresh detachment of the same intrepid order was invited from Brazil to aid in the evangelizing of the Spanish settlement in Paraguay (**1586**). While other tribes of South America possessed a very scanty knowledge of the Gospel, and its hold upon them was proportionally slight, the present mission was distinguished by its growth and vigour. So triumphant was the progress of the Jesuits, and so absolute was the control they exercised upon the spirit of the native heathen, that the whole appearance of the country underwent a rapid change[1]. Their general policy was to humanize a people hitherto most savage and nomadic in their habits, with the hope that by making them 'reasonable creatures' they might prepare them to be afterwards made true Christians. Yet notwithstanding all the brilliant consequences of these measures in the first generation, it was soon discovered that their practical effect had been to mould the natives of Paraguay into a principality of Jesuits, deeply tinctured with all kinds of superstition, rather than to found a Christian church upon the Apostolic model.

Calvinistic Mission to Brazil.

Of the few missions to the heathen[2], which continental Reformers had enough of breathing-time to set on foot, the most remarkable[3] proceeded to the coast of South America. Excited by the current stories touching the resources of Brazil, a French knight of Malta, named Villegagnon, had conceived the project of planting a colony there to rival

[1] See Charlevoix, *Hist. du Paraguay*, Paris, 1756, and a sketch of the system there adopted by the Jesuits in Grant's *Missions to the Heathen*, Append. No. XXII.

[2] In Europe itself heathenism was not yet eradicated. Thus in Lithuania (see *Middle Age*, pp. 312, 313) serpent-worship continued to be rife; and Gustavus Vasa was under the necessity of sending a mission into Lapland, where the people clung almost entirely to the ancient superstitions: see Brown's *Propagation of Christianity among the Heathen since the Reformation* (only Protestant missions), I. 10, Lond. 1823.

[3] See the narrative at length in Brown, I. 2—9.

that from which so many galleons had come back with treasures to the court of Portugal. The author of this project represented himself as highly favourable to the Huguenots, and having won the patronage of their great champion, the admiral Coligny, secured through him the approbation of king Henry II. It was a day of trouble and perplexity; fresh storms were blackening the horizon of Protestantism in France; and partly, therefore, to provide some quiet refuge from the persecutor, and partly to disseminate a knowledge of the Christian faith, in countries where the Gospel had hitherto made little or no progress, Huguenots came forward in great numbers, and the ships of the adventurer were filled with sanguine colonists (**1556**). On their establishment at Rio Janeiro, they were joined by other volunteers of like spirit, and also by two ministers and twelve students from Geneva, whom Villegagnon had invited over to assist in purely missionary enterprises. But this expedition to 'Antarctic France' was ere long miserably defeated by the tergiversation of the leader. Influenced, it is said, by the cardinal of Lorraine, Villegagnon rapidly receded from the terms on which his expedition started: he declared his strong aversion to Genevan doctrines, and even went so far as to prohibit the religious meetings of his Huguenot confederates. Some of them he afterwards banished from the fort, but finding that the other colonists were still bent on holding communication with them, he determined, in January, **1558**, to send them back to France; entrusting to the master of the vessel a formal charge of heresy, which had been lodged against the Swiss ministers, and requiring him to call upon the magistracy of France for their immediate execution. The voyage home was rendered horrible by the incessant leakage of the ship, and by extremities of famine such as none may read without a shudder. At length, after an almost incredible series of disasters, the small party landed near Hennebon; yet Providence so ordered, that the malice of Villegagnon was never gratified by hearing that the objects of his persecution had been committed to the flames. The French judges, on the contrary, acquitted them with manifest tokens of commiseration: while the colony itself, which they had laboured to

establish and evangelize, was afterwards completely ruined by the inroads of the Portuguese.

English Colonies.

It was during the palmy days of Queen Elizabeth, that our European neighbours trembled as they marked the proud advances of the maritime power of England. At the close of **1580**, Drake returned in triumph from his perilous voyage round the world. A closer intercourse had now been opened with the northern and the southern seas; and deeper knowledge of the frightful degradation wrought by gentilism is frequently associated, in the chronicles of English mariners[1], with keener sense of missionary duties. 'Compassion of poore infidels captived by the deuill, tyrannizing in most wonderful and dreadfull manner over their bodies and their souls'—was henceforth held to be a leading motive in the genuine colonizer.[2] Accordingly when projects were devised for planting English settlements in various districts of America, the hope of raising both the temporal and the spiritual condition of the natives was put prominently forward; while earnest individuals, such as Hariot[3], one of Ralegh's colleagues in Virginia, found their labours not entirely unrewarded. The first baptism[4] of a native has been placed on record in **1587**. Though Ralegh was himself most unsuccessful in his colonizing schemes, he always manifested a warm interest in the progress of the Gospel, and presented as a parting gift to the Virginia Company, the sum of one hundred pounds 'for the propagation of the Christian religion' in that settlement[5] (**1588-9**).

First establishment in India.

The thoughts of England had been meanwhile turning eastward, as she listened to the story of adventurous mer-

[1] See the deeply interesting revelations in Hakluyt's *Voyages*, Lond. 1598 sq.

[2] *Ibid.* III. 184, 185, and Anderson's *Hist. of the Church of England in the Colonies*, &c. I. 73 sq. Lond. 1845. In one of Hakluyt's own 'Epistles Dedicatorie,' he rejoices that some natives of the far-off east had found their way to England: 'For mine own part, I take it as a pledge of God's further fauor both vnto vs and them; to them especially vnto whose doores I doubt not *in time shal be by vs caried the incomparable treasure of the trueth of Christianity and of the Gospell*, while we vse and exercise common trade with their marchants.'

[3] Anderson, I. 93; cf. p. 96, note, where Wood's mistakes respecting Hariot are corrected.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 98.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 101.

chants who had penetrated overland as far as India; and after the return of Lancaster, the first of her commanders who opened a highway to the east, by sailing far beyond Cape Comorin, her enterprise received fresh impulses, and a more practical direction. The English flag waved freely in those harbours where it had been destined to achieve a marvellous predominance, and thereby to entail upon the English Church unparalleled responsibility; for the last day of the year **1600** witnessed the concession of a royal charter to the 'Governor and Company of merchants of London trading to the East Indies.'

THE END.

INDEX.

A.

ACONTIUS, 277, n. 1
Adiaphoristic controversy, 63, 64; 389, n. 5
Admonition to the Parliament, 236; *Second Admonition*, 240, n. 5
ADRIAN VI. (pope), 146; on the need of reforms, 3, and n. 1; premature death, 4; rejects the claim of papal infallibility, 322, n. 2; alienates the temporalities of the church, 326
AGRICOLA (John), 62
AKBAR, his eclectic system of religion, 400, 401
A'LASCO (see *Laski*)
ALBERT (archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg), 16, n. 2
ALBERT (margrave of Brandenburg), 73
ALEANDER, 33, and n. 2; 324, n. 3
ALES (Alesius, or Alane), 133, n. 1; 182, n. 5; 372, n. 3
ALEXANDER (Peter), 202, n. 4
ALLEY (bp.), 227, n. 4
Altars (stone), 200; 394, 395
AMSDORF (Nicholas), 45, n. 1
ANABAPTISM, rise of in Germany, 37, and n. 3; rise of in Switzerland, 111; rise of in England, 182, 193; universally denounced by the Reformers, 251, n. 1; general account of, 252—262; progress in England, 255
ANASTASIUS (John), 147, n. 4
ANDERSON (Lawrence), 78, n. 2.
ANDREÄ, 163
ANDREWES (bp.), 241, n. 4; 242
Anhalt, reformed, 69
Appeals, English laws respecting, 177, n. 2; 329, and n. 1; ancient practice, 332, n. 4
Appropriations, 338
AQUAVIVA (Jesuit), 309, and n. 4
ARESEN (John), 77, n. 7
Articles (of 1536), 182—184; XIII Articles (1538), 187, n. 5; 213; VI Articles (1539), 189; a new series drawn up by Cranmer (1549), 201; XLII Articles (1552), 213, 214; attempt of the Swiss refugees to introduce a fresh series, 228; XI Articles (1559), 228; revision of the XLII Articles, 229; further revision (1571), 237, n. 4; Puritan exceptions to, 230, n. 5; 238, n. 1; 240; Lambeth Articles, 241; Irish Articles, 247
ASCHAM (Roger), 375, n. 1; 376, n. 1
ASKE (Robert), 183, n. 4
ASKEW (Ascough, Anne), 189, n. 2
Augsburg, confession of, 53—55; *Apology* for, 54, n. 5; modification of, 58, n. 1; 83, n. 4; 155; translated into English, 190, n. 2; into Greek, &c. 313, and n. 5
Augsburg, peace of, 65, 66
AUGUSTINE (St), his teaching distinguished from that of Calvin, 161, 162; 241, n. 4; 242
Austria, reformation in, 66, 70
AYLMER (bp.), 216, n. 2

B.

BACON (Sir Nich.), 223, n. 6; 224, n. 2
BACON (Lord), 249, and n. 1
Baden, reformed, 69, n. 4
BALE (bp.), 216, n. 1; 218, n. 4; 245
BANCROFT (archbp.), 237, n. 2; 238, n. 2; 239
Baptism (infant), difficulties respecting, 37, n 3; 207, n. 3; 252, n. 2
BARLOW (bp.), 218, n. 4; 226, n. 5
Barnabites, order of, 306, n. 2
BARO (Prof.), 241, n. 3
BARONIUS (card.), 374, n. 4
BARON (Stephen), 367, n. 4; 380, n. 3
Bartholomew, (St), massacre of, 128, 129

Bavaria, reformation in, 70
Beatoun (cardinal), 134, 135
Bellarmine (cardinal), 309, n. 3; 357
Bellay (Guillaume du), 122, *n.* 3
Berquin (Louis de), 123, n. 1
Berthold (of Chiemsee), 278
Beza (Theodore), 120, and n. 4
Bible, Luther's version of, 35, and n. 3; Danish version of N. T. 74, n. 5; Swedish version, 78, n. 2; Hungarian version, 90, n. 4; Spanish version, 96; Italian version, 97; Irish version, 249, and n. 2; version by the German Anabaptists, 253, n. 1; anti-Lutheran versions, 278, and n. 2
Bible, special study of, 14, 28, 36, 42, 93, 102, 103; 132, n. 4; 168, n. 3; 180; 194, n. 1; 279, n. 6; 370 sq.
Bible, reading of, prohibited, 147, n. 3; 181, n. 1, 4; 191, n. 2
Bilney (Thomas), 180, and n. 4
Bishops' Book, 186
Bishops, regulations respecting at Trent, 286, 287, 293, 295, n. 3; 323; retained in Sweden, 79, n. 7; 345; and for a time in Prussia, 344; in England, 328; mode of their appointment in France, 326; in England, 332—334, and in Ireland, 334, n. 2; number of, increased in England, 185, n. 1; 338; feelings of Melanchthon respecting, 344, n. 2
Black (John), 145, n. 2
Blandvater, 91, n. 7
Bohemia, reformation in, 86—88
Bohemian Brethren, 73, n. 5; 83, 84, 88
Boleyn (Anne), 171, n. 3; 175, n. 3
Bolsec, 118, n. 3
Bonner (bp.), 191, n. 2; 192, n. 4; 195, n. 1; 216, n. 1, 4; 220, n. 1
Bornemisze (Paul), 92, n. 3
Borromeo (Carlo), 121, 301
Borthwick (John), 133, n. 1
Bourbon, family of, 124, 125
Bradford (John), 377, n. 3; 385, n. 2
Brady (bp.), 247, n. 2
Brandenburg (Bavarian) reformed, 68
Brandenburg (Electoral) reformed, 68
Brask, 78, n. 2
Brazil, missions to, 409, 410
Brentz, 51, n. 1; 158
Bres (Guido de), 149
Briçonnet, 122
Browne (archbp.), 243, 244
Browne (Robert), founder of a sect, 271, 272; its principles, 272, 273
Brucioli, 97
Brunswick, reformed, 69, n. 4
Bucer, joins himself to Luther, 27, 59, 62, n. 3; tries to mediate between the Saxon and Swiss reformers, 153; his final tenets on the Eucharist, 153, n. 1; connexion with England, 184, n. 3; 202, 203, 206; his death, 206, n. 2
Bugenhagen (*al.* Pomeranus), 51, n. 1; 69, n. 1; 72, n. 3; 76
Bull (Henry), 385, n. 2
Bullinger (Henry), 104, n. 5; 113, and n. 1; 199, 239, 241
Burcher, 200, n. 2; 203, n. 2
Burckart (Francis), 187, n. 4
Byzantinism, 328, and n. 2

C.

Cajetanus, 19; 371, n. 3
Calixtines, 86, 87
Calvin (John), his life and writings, 113—121; his orthodoxy questioned, 116, n. 1; his relations with the German reformers, 117, n. 3; 157, 158; and with the Zwinglians, 119, 120; his sacramental tenets, 119, 120; opposed to Zwingli on the Eucharist, 153, n. 2; ultimate points of divergency from Lutheranism, 161, 162, and n. 1; his works prohibited in England, 193, n. 2; opinions on the English Prayer-Book, 205, and n. 4; 219, n. 2; influence of his *Institutio* in England, 240, 241; ideas on church-constitution, 349—352; on church-ritual, 388, 389
Calvino-papistæ, 240, n. 6
Campeggio (papal legate), 40, n. 3; 55, 172
Capito, 107, n. 7
Caraffa (cardinal), 97; 100, n. 4; 306 (see also *Paul IV.*)
Carlstadt, 21, 37; 38, n. 2; 55, n. 1
Carne, 224, n. 4
Carranza (archbp.), 94, n. 3, 4; 95, n. 5; 220, n. 1
Cartwright (Thomas), 236, and n. 5; 271
Cassander (George), 80, n. 3; 149, n. 3; his attempts at mediation, 276
Castellanus (Duchâtel), 356, n. 3; 358, n. 1
Castellio, 118, n. 3
Catechismus Romanus, 299, n. 1

CATHARINE (of Aragon), 170, 171
CATHARINUS, 35; 371, n. 3
CAZALLA (Augustin), 94
CECIL (lord Burghley), 214, n. 4; 223; 224, n. 3; 232, n. 2; 233; 235, n. 4; 238, n. 2
Centum Gravamina, 2, n. 2; 40, n. 3
Chancels, 386, n. 1; 394
CHARLES V., 21, 32, 33, 47, 59, 64, 65, and n. 3, 4; 95, 146, 147; 172, 326
CHEKE, 191, n. 1; 214, n. 4
CHEMNITZ, 163
CHENEY, 216, n. 2; 226, n. 6; 231, n. 2
China, missions to, 407, 408
CHYTRÆUS, 163
CLARK (John), 180, n. 3
CLEMENT VII. (pope), 172, and n. 3; disposal of church-endowments, 326
CLERK (John, bp.), 165, and n. 2; 171, n. 3
Clergy, their general condition, 358, 377, 378, 381—383
Cleves (duchy of), reformed, 69, n. 4
COCHLÆUS, 54; 60, n. 5; 372, n. 3
COLET (dean), 167, n. 4; 168, n. 3; 184, n. 4; 380, n. 3
COLIGNY, 125, 129
Communion in both kinds, 30, and n. 5; 37, 39; 193, n. 3; 294, 296
Concord, Book of, 163, 164
Concordia Vitebergensis, 58, n. 1
CONDÉ, prince of, 125, 128, and n. 5
Confessio Augustana (see *Augsburg*)
——— Belgic, 148, and n. 5
——— Bohemian, 87, 88,
——— Czengerina, 91
——— Danish, 76, and n. 2
——— Gallican, 124, 125 and n. 1
——— General, projected, 211, 212
——— Helvetic, 91, n. 3; 154, n. 1; 387, n. 1
——— or *Repetitio Anhaltina*, 162, n. 2
——— Pentapolitana, 90, n. 5
——— *Saxonica*, 65
——— Scotch, 140
——— *Tetrapolitana*, 52, n. 1; 153
——— *Variata*, 58, n. 1; 155 sq.; 159
——— *Virtembergensis*, 65, 230
——— Waterland, 259
Confession (private), 369, 370
Confirmation of Bishops, 333, and n. 4
Congé d'eslire, 333, 334
Consensus Dresdensis, 162, n. 2
Consensus Genevensis, 161, n. 4
Consensus Sendomiriensis, 85, 86
Consensus Tigurinus, 119, 157; and n. 7; 161, n. 4; 197, n. 2
Consilium delectorum cardinalium, 323, n. 2
Consistories, Lutheran, what, 341; Calvinistic, what, 350, 351
Consubstantiation, 51, n. 1
CONTARINI (Gaspar), 58, 97; 277
Convocations, English, 177, and n. 2; 178, 334—337
COOPER (bp.), 237, n. 3
CORRANUS, 96, n. 1
Council (General), feelings of Reformers respecting, 8; 25, n. 1; 274
Council of Trent (see *Trent*)
Councils, reforms attempted in, 278, 279; regulations respecting, 324, n. 1; 335, and n. 2, 4
COVERDALE, 216, n. 3; 218, n. 4; 221, n. 3; 226, n. 5; 232, n. 4
COX (dean and bishop), 219, and n. 4
CRANMER (Thomas), early life, 173, 174; becomes archbishop, 175; writes on behalf of More and Fisher, 178, n. 3; second marriage, 179; early opinions on the Eucharist, 180, n. 1; 184, n. 2; efforts for the circulation of the Scriptures, 181, n. 4; opposes the 'Six Articles,' 189; influence on the accession of Edward, 191, n. 1; sides with the Lutherans, 194; modification of his views on the Eucharist, 196, 197; draws up a series of Articles, 201; entertains foreign reformers, 202; ultimate views on the Eucharist, 207—210; attempts to draw together all reformers, 211, 212; share in compiling the XLII Articles, 214, and the *Reformatio Legum*, 215, n. 4; is imprisoned, 216, n. 3; condemnation of his writings, 218; his death, 221, 222; on apostolical succession, 365, n. 3
CROMER (archbp.), 243, 244, n. 5
CROMWELL (Thomas), 178; 183, n. 2; 185
Crypto-Calvinists, 156; 162, n. 2
Curland, reformed, 74

D.

Davidists, 268, n. 3
DENK (John), 253, n. 1; 256, n. 2; 262
Denmark, reformation in, 74—77
DEVAY (Matthew), 90
Dissidents (Polish), 84, and n. 3

DOWDALL (archbp.), 244; 245, n. 5
DRYANDER, 96, and n. 2, 4

E.

Ecebolians, 198, n. 5
ECK, 17, and n. 3; 21, and n. 6; 24, n. 2; 54; 60, n. 5; 108, 278
EDWARD VI. (of England), 191, and n. 1; death of, 215
EINARSEN (Gisser), 77, 78
ELIÆ (Paul), 74, n. 5; 78, n. 3
ELIZABETH (of England), her ecclesiastical policy, 223, sq.; excommunicated by the Pope, 234; invited to the Council of Trent, 292
EMSER, 24, n. 1; 278
England, church of, principles on which it was reformed, 7; constitution of, 327—339
England, reformation in, 165—242; general characteristics of, 169, 170; type of its theology, 239—242; two-fold aspect of, 242, n. 3
Episcopacy (see *Bishops*)
ERASMUS, character and writings, 41—45, 146; preference of St Jerome, 42, n. 2; disputation with the Lutherans, 43, 44; his influence in England, 167, n. 4; his *Paraphrase*, 195, n. 1; 373, n. 1; his attempts at mediation, 274, 275
Eutychianism, 328, n. 2
Eric, 80, and n. 2
Eucharistic Controversy, 153, sq.; 206

F.

FABER (Jesuit), 305, and n. 5
FABER (John), 54; 106, n. 1; 109, n. 2; 313, n. 2
FAGIUS (Paul), 202, n. 4; 203, n. 3
Familists (see *Love*).
FAREL (William), 113; 122, n. 2
FARRER (bp.), 216, n. 3; 221
FERDINAND (emperor), 66; 294
FERUS (John), 277
FISH (Simon), 180, n. 1
FISHER (John, bp.), 165, n. 1; 167, n. 4; 168, n. 2; 172, n. 2; 176, n. 5; 178, n. 3; 208, n. 1
FLACIUS (Illyricus), 45, n. 1; 64, n. 1; 98, n. 9; 156, n. 2; 163, n. 2; 344, n. 3; 374, n. 4
FLAMINIO, 97, n. 4
Formula of Concord, 67, 162—164
FOX (bp.), 167, n. 3; 187
FOXE (John), 218, n. 4; 219, n. 4; 232, n. 4; 374, n. 4
FRANCE, reformation in, 122—130
FRANCIS I. (of France), 5; 57, n. 4; 60; 122; 123, n. 5
Frankfort, Troubles of, 118, n. 4; 137, and n. 1; 219, and n. 1
FREDERIC (elector), 14, 19, n. 1; 32, and n. 6; 33, n. 3; 40, n. 2
Freethinkers, in the Reformation period, 250, 251
Friars, preachers of the Reformation, 72
Friesland, reformation in, 70
FRITH (John), 180, n. 1

G.

Gallicanism, 130, and n. 4; 176, n. 4; 281, n. 2; 294, 322, 323
GARDINER (bp.), 168, n. 2; on the royal supremacy, 169, n. 2; 181, n. 4; 183, 188, and n. 1; 189; 192, and n. 4; 199, n. 3; 200, n. 3; 208, n. 1; 217, 218; 220, n. 1; 229, n. 1
GASTIUS (John), 252, n. 1
Geneva, civil constitution of, 113, n. 3
GENNADIUS (patriarch), 312, n. 1
GENTILIS (John Valent.), 263, n. 6
GEORGE (David), 268, 269
GERLACH (Stephen), 313, 314
Germany, reformation in, 11—72
GIL (Juan), 93
GILPIN (Bernard), 377, 378, n. 2
GLAPIO, 33, and n. 2
GOODACRE (archbp.), 244, n. 5
GRANVELLA, 148, 149
Greek Church, intercourse with the Protestants, 313; points held in common, 315, 316; points of difference, 316
Greek language, study of, 356, n. 2, 3
GREY (Lady Jane) 192, and n. 2
GRINDAL (archbp.), 218, n. 4; 219, n. 1; 232, n. 3, 4; 233, n. 4; 238, and n. 2
GUERRERO (archbp. of Granada), 293, n 2
GUEST (bp.), 226, n. 6; 227, n. 4
Gueux, 149
GUISE, family of, 124, 126, 129, 145, 295

H.

HADDON, 216, n. 2; 219, n. 1
HALLER (Berchtold), 108, 109, n. 3
HAMILTON (Patrick), 131, 132
HARIOT, his conduct in Virginia, 412

HARLEY, (bp.), 216, n. 3
Head of the Church, 176; 225, n. 3; 330
HEATH (archbp.), 187, 221; n. 2
Heidelbery Catechism, 160
HENKEL (John), 89, n. 2
HENRY IV. (of France), his abandonment of Protestantism, 130, and n. 3
HENRY VIII. (of England), friendship with Erasmus, 43, n. 4; leagues with the continental reformers, 57, n. 4; controversy with Luther, 165; 'Defender of the Faith,' 165, and n. 3; on Greek learning, 168, n. 3; marriage and divorce, 170—175; favours some reformation, 181, 186, 187
HERMANN (archbp. of Cologne), 59; his *Consultation*, 59, n. 4; 195; 198; 279
HESHUS, 159
HESS (John), 70
Hessen, reformed, 68; peculiarities of the reformation, 345, 346
HETZER, 253, n. 1
HILLES (Richard), 193, n. 3, 4
HODGKIN (suffragan bp.), 226, n. 5
HOFFMANN (Melchior), 267, n. 4
HOOKER (Richard), 236, n. 5; 237, n. 1; 241, n. 4; 242
HOLGATE (archbp.), 216, n. 3
Holstein, reformed, 69
Holy League, 57
Homilies (English), 190, n. 2; 195, n. 1; 230, n. 1
HONTER (John), 90
HOOPER (bp.), life and character, 199—202; objects to certain Articles, 201; controversy with Joliffe and Jonson, 213, n. 4; his own series of articles, 214, n. 2; is imprisoned, 216, n. 3; death, 221; on schools, 379, n. 3; as a preacher, 377; 392; on church-ritual, 395, and n. 2
HORNE (bp.), 232, n. 3, 4; 233, n. 4
Huguenots, meaning of the word, 125, n. 2
HUMPHREY, 218, n. 4; 232, n. 4
Hungary, reformation in, 88—92
HUNNE (Richard), 167, n. 3
HUSS, 24, n. 1
HUTTEN, Ulrich von, 29, and n. 4; 43, n. 4

I.

Iceland, reformed, 77, 78
Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, 281, n. 2; 283, n. 3
Impropriations, 338, 339; 382, n. 4; 383
Independents (see *Browne*)
Index Librorum Prohibitorum, 299, n. 1, 302
India, Christianity in, 402—406
Inquisition, Spanish, 92 sq.; 146, 148, 149
Inquisition, Roman, revived, 302, 303
Institution of a Christen Man, 186
Interim, 62, 63; 70, n. 4; 72, 202
Investiture of bishops, 333, and n. 5
Ireland, reformation in, 243—249; its theology Calvinistic, 247, 248
Italy, reformation in, 96—100

J.

Japan, mission to, 406, 407
JEREMIAH I. (patriarch), 314
JEREMIAH II. (patriarch), 319, and n. 2
Jesuits, order of (see *Loyola* Ignatius), their vast influence in counteracting the reformers, 308, 380; absolute devotion to the pontiff, 306, n. 4; theological laxity, 309, and n. 2; controversy with the Dominicans, 308—311; preachers of democracy, 327; their extensive missions, 403, sq.
JEWEL (bp.), 218, n. 4; 232, n. 4
Jews, persecution of, 399
JOHN (elector), 45; 61, n. 2
JOHN FREDERIC (elector), 61, and n. 2; 65, n. 3; 159, n. 2
JOHN (King of Sweden), 80—82
JONAS (Justus), 106, n. 1; 194; 374, n. 1
JON (du, *or* Junius), 149, n. 1; 150, n. 4
JORIS (see *George*, David)
JOYE (George), 189, n. 1
JULIUS III. (pope), 287; 326, n. 4

K.

KEDERMINSTER (abbot of Winchcombe), 167, n. 3
King's-book, 188, n. 3
KITCHEN (bp.), 225, n. 3
KLEBITIUS (Klewitz), 159
KNIPPERDOLLING, 253, n. 6
Knowne-men, 166, n. 2
KNOX (John), life and character, 134—145; residence in England, 136; intimacy with Calvin, 136, 137; 139, n. 3; Ridley and Parker's dislike of him, 137, n. 1, 4; his *Blast*, 137; displaces the English Liturgy, 138, n. 2; 219, n. 4; not opposed to 'superin-

tendents,' 142, n. 2; character of his theology, 142, 143; on Anabaptism, 251, n. 1

L.

LAINEZ (Jesuit), 295, n. 3; 305, n. 3; 306, n. 4; 307; 309, n. 3; 321
LAMBERT (Francis), 49, n. 1; 345
Lambeth Articles, 241; 248, n. 3
Lapland, new mission to, 410, n. 2
LASKI (Joh.), 70, n. 4; 83, n. 3; 148, n. 5; 157, 158, 202; 205, n. 5
LATIMER (bp.), 167, n. 4; 182, n. 2; 184, n. 4; 186, 221
LATOMUS (Barth.), 358, and n. 1
LEFEVRE (Jaques), 122
LEICESTER, Earl of, in the Netherlands, 151, n. 1; champion of the Puritans, 236
LEO (Judæ), 105, n. 4; 387, n. 2
LEO X. (pope), 5; 22, n. 4; 24, n. 2; 165
LEVER (Thomas), 232, n. 4; 378, n. 2
LEYDEN (John of), 254
LISMANINI (Francis), 83, n. 2; 263
Litany (English), 190
Livonia, reformed, 74
LOFTUS (archbp.), 247
Lollards, 131, n. 3; 166, n. 2; 169, 182
LONGLAND (John, bp.), 166, n. 2
Love, Family of, its history and principles, 268–271
LOYOLA (Ignatius), his life and character, 303—307
LUCAR (Cyril), 314, n. 1; 315, n. 1
LUNEBURG, reformed, 68
LUTHER, early life of, 11—15; first conceptions of the doctrine of justification, 13, 14, and n. 1; his preference for St Augustine, 14, 15, and n. 1; originally devoted to the papacy, 4, n. 4; 5; his address to the *Christian Potentates*, 7, 364; controversy with Tetzel, 15—17; with Wimpina and others, 17; interview with Cajetanus, 19; disputation at Leipzig, 21—24; excommunication of, 24; some of his tenets at this period, 25—27; treatise on the *Babylonish Captivity*, 30, 31; controversy with Henry VIII., 26, n. 1; 32, n. 1; 165; 168, n. 1; subsequent reconciliation, 187; summoned to Worms, 33; retreat at Wartburg, 35, 36; reappearance at Wittenberg, 38; marriage, 39, n. 1; moderation in his sentiments, 39, n. 1; 48, and n. 2; views on the Eucharist, 51, and n. 1; opposed to a compromise with the papacy, 54, n. 5; 56, n. 4; feelings towards the Sacramentaries, 58, n. 1; 60; his death, 60, and n. 6; number and effect of his publications, 71; his correspondence with the Bohemian Brethren, 87, and n. 2; general theory of the church, 339, sq.; on the sacerdotal character of all the baptized, 363—365; on confession, 370; on sermons, 376, n. 4; on schools, 379, 380; on church-ritual, 389, sq.
Lutheranism, branded as semi-popery, 197, n. 2; 198; 232; 387, n. 3.

M.

Magdeburg Centuries, 374, n. 4
MAJOR (George), 45, n. 1; 60, n. 5; 163, n. 2
Marburg, conference of, 52; 151, n. 1
MARCELLUS (pope), 291
MARGARET (d'Angoulême), 123, and n. 2
MARNIX (Philip van), 150
MAROT (Clement), 385
Martin Marprelate, controversy, 237
MARTYR (Peter, surnamed Vermigli), 99; 157, n. 2; connexion with England, 202, 203, 206, 207, n. 3; 215, n. 4
MARY (queen of England), 215; suppresses the reformation, 215; 216, n. 4; 217, n. 1; death, 222
MARY (queen of Scots), 131; 139, n. 2; 145
MATTHIAS (von Jagow), 68
MAURICE (elector), 60, n. 2; 61, n. 2; 65, and n. 3
Maximilian I. (emperor), his conduct in ecclesiastical affairs, 6, and n. 5
Maximilian II. (emperor), 66
MAZOLINI (see *Prierias*)
Mecklenburg, reformed, 69
MELANCHTHON, his early life, 27, 28; perplexed by Anabaptism, 37, n. 3; his opinions modified by Erasmus, 45, n. 1; views on the Eucharist, 51, n. 1; 58, n. 1; 155; his conciliatory policy, 54, n. 5; 57, n. 2; 58, 63; 64, n. 1; his death, 65, n. 4; invited into England, 181, and n. 3; 212; conference with English envoys, 187; on bishops, 344
MELVILLE (Andrew), introduces 'Pres-

byterianism' into Scotland, 142, and n. 2; 353, 354
MENIUS (Justus), 252, n. 2
MENNO (Symons), and the sect of Anabaptists (Mennonites), 258—261
MEYER (Sebastian), 108
Mexico, Christianity in, 409
MICRONIUS (Martin), 148, n. 5; 153, n. 1; 201, n. 4
Millennium (of the Anabaptists), 252, 255, 259
MILTITZ, 16, n. 3; 20
MOLINA (Jesuit), 310
Monasteries, suppression of, in England, 185, 186; consequent loss of church-temporalities, 338, and n. 1
MONTLUC, 126, n. 4
Moravia, reformation in, 86—88
MORE (Sir Thomas), 167, n. 4; 178, n. 3; 181, n. 1
MORNAY (Phil. de), 130, n. 3
MORONE (cardinal), 97, 98; 295, n. 2
MYCONIUS (Oswald), 101, n. 1; 104, n. 4; 109, 113
MYCONIUS (Frederic), 37, n. 2
Münster, Anabaptists of, 254, 255
MUNZER (Thomas), 40, n. 1; 253, n. 6
Music, ecclesiastical, 387—389

N.

NACHIANTI (Naclantus), 282, n. 1
Nag's Head Fable, 226, n. 5
Nantes, Edict of, 130
Necessary Doctrine, 188, n. 3
Netherlands, reformation in, 145—151; sovereignty of, declined by Queen Elizabeth, 151, n. 1
NICLAS (NICHOLAS, Henry), 269, 270
Nicodemites, 118, n. 3
NORDEN (John), 385, n. 2
NORMAN (George), 79, n. 7
Norway, reformation in, 77
NOWELL (dean), 218, n. 4; 231, n. 3

O.

OCHINO (Bernardino), 99; 100, n. 3
ŒCOLAMPADIUS, 28; 50, n. 2; reformer of Basel, 107, 108; 348, n. 2; intercourse with Erasmus, 107, n. 8
OGLETHORPE (bp.), 223, n. 5; 383, n. 1
Oratorians, order of, 377, n. 1
Organs, 232, 387; 389, n. 5
ORZECHOWSKI, 83, n. 4
OSIANDER, 64, n. 1; 73; 163, n. 2; 179
OVERAL (bp.), 242

P.

Palatinate, the, reformed, 69; religious troubles in, 158—160
PALEARIO (Aonio), 98, n. 2
PALESTRINA, 388
Paraguay, Jesuits established in, 410
PARKER (archbp.), character of, 226, 227; his consecration, 226, n. 5; suspected of popery, 232, n. 2; on Romeward tendencies, 235, n. 5; forebodings of, 234, n. 1; his death, 236, n. 7; on synodal action, 337, n. 2
PARKHURST, (bp.), 238, n. 2
PATES (Rich.), 284, n. 3
Paul III. (pope), excommunicates the English, 187, n. 1
PAUL IV. (see *Caraffa*), 222, n. 1; 224, n. 4; 291
PEASANTS' WAR, 39, 40
Peru, Christianity introduced into, 409
PETERSON, 78, 79
PEYTO (cardinal), 221, n. 1
PHILIP (landgrave of Hessen), 34, n. 2, 45; 49, n. 1; 52; 65, n. 3; 127, n. 7; 369, n. 5
PHILIP II. (of Spain), 65, n. 4; 95; 220
PHILIPS, 216, n. 2
Philippists, 64, n. 1
PHILPOTT, 216, n. 2
Picards, 87, and n. 2
PILKINGTON (bp.), 218, n. 4; 232, n. 4
PIUS IV. (pope), 224, n. 4; 292; 'creed' of, 299, n. 2
PIUS V. (pope), 234; 246, 247, n. 1; 309, n. 3; 326, n. 4
POISSY, colloquy of, 126, 127
Poland, 73, n. 1; reformation in, 82—86; growth of Socinianism, 85, 86; points of contact between Polish Reformers and Greeks, 314—317; Polish Uniates, 317
POLE (Reginald), 59, n. 1; 97, and n. 4; 171, n. 3; 176, n. 5; 179, n. 2; 192, n. 4; 217; 220, n. 1; 222; 281, n. 4; 284, n. 3
POLENTZ (George), 73
POLLANUS (Valerandus), 157, n. 7; 205, n. 5
Pomerania, reformed, 69, and n. 1
POMERANUS (see *Bugenhagen*)
PONTANUS, 53, n. 1; 187, n. 4
POSSEVIN (Anthony), a Jesuit, 81; his

labours in Poland and Russia, 316, 318
POYNET (bp.), 218, n. 4
POWEL, 165, n. 1.
Pragmatic Sanction, 6, 326
Præmunire, writ of, 173, n. 2; 333
Prayer-Book (English), construction of, 195, 196; revised, 204 sq.; nature of the changes, 206, 207, 210; restored under Elizabeth, 225; hateful to the Puritans, 240
——— (Irish), 245
Preachers, 72, 377
Predestinarian Controversy, 44, 45, 229; 285, n. 1; 309—311
Press (the), its influence, 374, 375
PRIERIAS, 17; 320; 324, n. 3
Primers (English), 190, n. 3
Prophesyings, 238, and n. 5
Protestants, origin of the name, 50
Prussia, reformed, 73
Puritan Politics, 220, n. 2
Puritans, first race of, 193; 230, n. 5; 233, n. 3

Q.

QUIGNONES (cardinal), 198; 279, n. 6

R.

RALEGH (Walter), a supporter of missions, 412
Racovian Catechism, 85; 264, n. 3
Ratisbon, colloquy of (1541), 58; second colloquy (1546), 60
Recusants, number of, in England, 384, n. 1
REDMAN (John), 207, n. 4
Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, 215, n. 4
Reformation, necessity of, conceded, 2, n. 2; 3; 357—359; loss and gain of, 9, 10; causes of its rapid spread in Germany, 71, 72; agencies at work in England, 167, 168; effects on literature, 355 sq.; on morals, 366 sq.
Refugees (English), during the Marian troubles, 218, and n. 4; 219
REGIUS (Urban), 72, n. 3
REINHARD, 74, n. 5
RICCI (Jesuit), his missionary labours, 408
RIDLEY (bp.), dislike of Knox, 137, n. 1; on the Eucharist, 197, and n. 2; 198, n. 1; on stone-altars, 200; opposed to the foreign congregations in London, 203, n. 1; on the 'real presence,' 209, n. 5; on predestination, 229, n. 2; on Anabaptism, 251, n. 1; his moderation, 214; 220, n. 2; death, 221
ROGERS, 221, n. 3
ROJAS (Domingo de), 94
Romanism (Anglo,) origin of, 234
Romanism (Irish), 247, and n. 1
Rome, church and bishop of, opposed to reformation by synods, 4; character and position of the popes at the outbreak of the Reformation, 4, 5; claims of, unmodified by the Reformers, 320, and by the Council of Trent, 321, 322; relations of the pope to the Emperor and other monarchs, 324, 326
ROUGH (Rowght, John), 135, n. 5
RUDOLPH II. (emperor), 66
Russia, church of, 312, and n. 3; 318, 319; establishment of the Russian patriarchate, 318, 319; Lutheran interlopers, 318, n. 2

S.

Sacramentarii, 51; 58, n. 1; 89, n. 7; 91; 163, n. 2; 193, and n. 3; 197, n. 1
SALES (François de), 121
SALTZA (Jacob von), 70
SAMPSON (bp.), 172, n. 2
SAMPSON (dean), 232, n. 4
SANDYS (archbp.), 218, n. 4; 219, n. 1; 228, n. 3; 231, n. 3; 235, n. 1
SARAVIA (Adrian), 149, n. 1; 150, n. 4; 241, n. 4
Saxony (ducal), reformed, 67
Saxony (electoral), visitation of, 48, 340; settlement of the reformation, 67
Schmalkaldic Articles, 57
Schmalkaldic League, 55; 187, n. 4; 230, n. 2
Schmalkaldic War, 61, 87
Schools, 379, 380
Schwabach Articles, 52, and n. 3
SCHWENCKFELD (Caspar), founder of a sect, 266; its principles, 266, 267; 272, n. 6
SCORY (bp.), 218, n. 4; 226, n. 5
Scotland, reformation in, 131—145; relations with France, 131; and England, 133; church-polity of, 352—354
SEATON (Alex.), 133, n. 1

Seminary priests, 235, n. 3
SERIPANDO, 284, n. 3
SERVETUS, 118, n. 2; 263
Service-Books (English), reformed, 190, n. 2; 194—196; destruction of the unreformed, 199, n. 1; Sarum Use restored, 216, n. 1; ritual changes in, 391 sq.
SICKINGEN (F. von) 29, n. 3; 108, n. 3
SIGISMUND (Augustus, of Poland), 83, and n. 3
SIGISMUND III. (of Poland), 84, 316
Silesia, reformation in, 70
SKELTON (John), 380, n. 3
SMITH (Sir Thomas), 224, n. 3
SMYTHE (Dr), 208, n. 1
Socinianism, early traces in Poland, 84—86; general account of, 262—266
Sorbonne (college of), 28, 122, and n. 4
Spain, reformation in, 92—96
Spires, reformatory diet of (1526), 46, 47; new diet of (1529), 49
SPOTSWOOD (John), 141, n. 4
STAFFORD (George), 167, n. 4
STAUPITZ (John), 14; 19, n. 2
STEPHEN (Bathori, of Poland), 84, and n. 1; 92, 318
STOKESLEY (bp.), 181, n. 4; 183
STORCH (Nicholas), 252
STREGEL (Victorinus), 45, n. 1
STURMIUS (John), 123, n. 6; 250, n. 2
Submission of the Clergy, 177, n. 1
Superintendents, substituted for bishops, 77; 141, and n. 4; 142, n. 2; 203, and n. 1
Supremacy, royal, meaning of in England, 176, 177, 225, 329—332
Sweden, reformed, 78—82
Switzerland, reformation in, 101—121
Synergistic Controversy, 45, n. 1; 163, n. 2
Synods, diocesan, their advantages, 324, n. 1; 335, n. 2; Calvinistic, 350, 352

T.

TAUSEN (John), 75
TAVERNER (Richard), 190, n. 2; 193, n. 3
TAYLOR (bp.), 216, n. 3
Testament (see *Bible*)
TETZEL, 16; 17, n. 1
Theatins, order of, 306, and n. 2
THIRLEBY (Thomas, bp.), 185, n. 1
Thomas, St, Christians of, 402
THURSO (John), 70
TUNSTALL (bp.), on the imperial rights of England, 325, n. 1; his collision with Knox, 136, n. 1; his sermon against the pope, 168, n. 2; letter to Pole, 179, n. 2; subscribes the Articles of 1536, 183; opposes the German envoys, 188, and n. 2; his deprivation, 214, n. 1; no persecutor, 221, n. 2
TRAHERON (Barthol.), 197, n. 2
Transylvania, reformation in, 88—92; growth of Socinianism, 91; 265, n. 2
TRAVERS (Walter), 237, n. 1; 248, n. 5
Trent, Council of, 60, 61, 64; its vast importance, 280; discordant elements in 281; order of proceedings, 281; decree on Scripture and Tradition, 282; on original sin, 283; on justification, 283, 284; conflicting views, 284, and n. 3; council transferred to Bologna, 286; suspension, 287; business resumed, 287, 288; decree on the Eucharist, 288, 289; on Penance, 289, 290; on extreme Unction, 290; arrival of German Protestants, 290; fresh suspension, 291; third convocation, 292; previous disciplinary reforms, 286, 287, 291; struggle respecting the Divine right of episcopacy, 293, 296, 297; and practical reforms, 293, 299, 323; decree on the sacrifice of the Mass, 296; on Matrimony, 297; on Purgatory, &c., 298; papal monarchy untouched, 299; 300, n. 3; signatures to the Acts of the Council, 300
Turks, 46, n. 2; 47; 53, n. 2; 56, n. 2; 65; 312; 399, 400
TYNDALE (Wm.), version of the Bible, 147, n. 2; 180, and n. 5; 181, n. 1

U.

Ultramontanism, 322
Unuates, 317
Universities, 378
USSHER (James), 248
UTENHOVIUS (John), 148, n. 5; 218, n. 3

V.

VADIANUS (Joachim), 184, n. 2
VALDES, 93, and n. 2, 3; 98, and n. 2
VALERO (Rodrigo de), 93
VARGAS, 286, n. 3
VASA (Gustavus), 74, n. 4; 78 sq.
Vaudois (see *Waldenses*)

VERGERIO, 56, n. 4; 98, n. 9
Vestment controversy, 201
Vestments, 394, 395, and n. 5
Vicars, 339
Vulgate, Tridentine decree respecting, 282, n. 2

W.

Waldenses, 88, and n. 7; 112, n. 3; 123; 258, n. 4
Wallachia, reformation in, 313, n. 1
WALSH (bp.), 249, n. 2
WARHAM (archbp.), 172, n. 2; 175
Waterlanders, 261
WESTFAL (Joachim), 157
WESTON, 216
WHITAKER (Dr), 241, n. 3
WHITGIFT (archbp.), 236; the vigour of his administration, 238, 384; character of his theology, 241, and n. 2
WHITTINGHAM, 219, n. 1, 2
WILD (see *Ferus*)
WIMPINA, 17, 54
WISHART (George), 135, and n. 1, 2
Witchcraft, 384, n. 2
WITHERS, (George), 232, n. 1
WIZEL (Wicelius), 41, n. 2; 68, n. 1; his attempts at mediation, 275
WOLMAR (Melchior), 114, n. 2
WOLSEY (cardinal), 165, n. 1; 168, n. 1; 171, n. 3; 173; 185
Würtemberg, reformed, 69
WYATT, 221
WYCLIFFE, 108, n. 5
WYTTENBACH, 101, n. 3

X.

XAVIER (Jesuit), 305; his missionary labours, 403—407

Y.

Year of Marvels, 384, n. 2
YOUNG (archbp.), 207, n. 4; 228, n. 1

Z.

ZANCHI, 99, n. 3
ZWINGLI, on the Eucharist, 50, and n. 2; character and writings, 101—112; friendship with Erasmus, 103; diverges from Luther, 103; 104, n. 5; marries, 105, n. 3; establishes the Swiss reformation, 107; his main principles, 106, 107, 109, 112; his ideas on church-constitution, 339, 347, 348; on church-ritual, 387

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय
L.B.S. National Academy of Administration, Library
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE
101241
यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।
This book is to be returned on the date last stamped

दिनांक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.

GL 270
HAR 6TH ED

101241
LBSNAA

10124

270
Har
6th ed.

अवाप्ति संख्या
ACC. No. ~~JD 187~~...

वर्ग संख्या
Class No.....

पुस्तक सं.
Book No.....

लेखक
Author Hardwick, C.

शीर्षक
Title A history of the Christian church.

270
Har
6th ed.

~~JD 187~~

LIBRARY
LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 10124

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.

Help to keep this book fresh, clean & moving