

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

1-1-1931

The Status of the Doctrine of the Eucharist during the English Reformation of the Sixteenth Century

Gustav F. Gehlhar

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gehlhar, Gustav F., "The Status of the Doctrine of the Eucharist during the English Reformation of the Sixteenth Century" (1931). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 575.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/575>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

*Presented
to the Faculty
of
L. Fuhringer.*

**The Status of the Doctrine of the Eucharist
during the English Reformation
of the Sixteenth Century**

**A thesis
presented to the faculty of
Concordia Seminary
St. Louis, Mo.
by**

Gustav F. Gehlhar

**in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of
Master of Sacred Theology 1931**

The Status of the Doctrine of the Eucharist
during the English Reformation
of the Sixteenth Century

Introduction.

- A. German Reformation.
- B. Swiss Reformation.

I. General Movements in England before 1563.

A. Movements away from Rome.

1. Earliest Movements.

- a. John Wyclif.
- b. The Lollards.

2. Religious Conditions before the Reformation.

- a. Cardinal Wolsey.
- b. Henry's Marital Problems.
- c. The English Pope.
- d. Thomas Cranmer.
- e. Thomas Cromwell.

B. Movements toward Protestantism in England.

1. Luther's Earliest Influence.

2. Men in England interested in Reformation.

- a. Tyndale.
- b. Frith.
- c. Fox.
- d. Barnes.
- e. Hooper.
- f. Latimer.
- g. Ridley.
- h. Cranmer.

II. General Movements considered in the Light of the Development
of the Doctrine of the Eucharist.

A. How these Movements in England Aided and Hindered the Development
of the Doctrine of the Eucharist.

1. The Catholic Element.

2. Under King Henry VIII.

3. Under King Edward VI.

4. Under Bloody Mary.

5. Under Queen Elizabeth.

B. How Movements from the Continent Aided and Hindered the Development
of the Doctrine of the Eucharist.

1. Lutheran Influence.

2. Decline of Lutheran Influence.

3. The Anabaptists.

4. The Sacramentarians.

5. The Swiss Influence.

6. Other Continental Influence

- a. Peter Martyr.
- b. Martin Bucer.
- c. Philip Melancthon.

7. Reformed Theologians.

C. How these Various Influences can be Traced in the Development
of the Doctrine of the Eucharist.

1. Unionistic Tendencies.

2. Various Confessions.

a. Wittenberg Articles.

b. Ten Articles.

c. Bishop's Book.

d. Thirteen Articles.

e. Sixteen Articles.

f. King's Book.

g. Book of Homilies.

h. Communion Service.

i. First Prayer Book.

j. Second Prayer Book.

k. The 42 Articles.

l. The 39 Articles.

The Status of the Doctrine of the Eucharist
during the English Reformation
of the Sixteenth Century

Introduction

All true religious reformation is the work of God and man. God uses human beings to reform mankind. Scripture teaches that divine Providence guides and directs all the actions of mankind, so that history becomes chiefly what it is as the result of divine guidance.

Men have not always recognized God's hand as he controls the events and affairs of the world, and thus God's original plans and intentions have been opposed and hindered. Now, it is noteworthy that every reformation is a success in as far as it has been carried out according to divinely appointed principles. It has been a failure in as far as such principles have been disregarded. Such is the declaration of the inspired Word.

The truth of this Word has been substantiated by the events of history. The religious reforms under the kings of Judah and Israel were a success in as far as they met the requirements of Jehovah.

The progress of later reformers depended upon the same principles. This is true especially of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. The reformers of this period worked in various countries, among various classes of people, under the most varied conditions, and as a result, they used entirely different methods in their reforms. In each instance the spiritual success of these reformers can be measured by the extent in which they followed the guidance of the Spirit of God.

In order to aid the description of the Reformation Movement of the church in England, we shall mention a few traits of the chief reformers of the Continent and indicate the general methods which characterized their type of reformation.

German Reformation

In Germany we meet the greatest religious reformer the world has ever produced, Dr. Martin Luther. His reforms were of a most thorough nature. He worked independently of the established Church of Rome, and yet his work was at all times of a conservative nature. The revolutionary spirit of Zwingli, the legalistic attitude of Calvin, the unionistic tendency of Cranmer, all these motives were foreign to the mind of Luther who under God's direction managed to accomplish the greatest Reformation ever undertaken by mortal man. Indeed, the results were so remarkable that we must admit, it was more the work of God than of man. Luther was undoubtedly the greatest theologian after the time of the Apostles. He had learned from personal experience what the law of God required; he had been convinced that man could never meet these requirements; he had also been permitted to find the true consolation in the Gospel.

Luther dared to stand before Prince and Pope with the fearless challenge! "Except I be convinced from Scripture, I cannot recant!" Thus Luther's whole reformation is characterized by a positiveness and a firmness which has its foundation on the immovable Word of God.

Luther never employed force of arms to spread his religion. Zwingli died on the battlefield fighting for his reforms. Cranmer legislated his religious reforms by means of the English Parliament.

Perhaps the greatest distinction between the Lutheran and the Reformed Church consists in the interpretation of the doctrine of the Eucharist. We quote the words of Dr. Wm. Moeller: "Luther's view was prompted by personal religious conviction. He saw in the Sacrament an act of God for the consolation of the forgiveness of sins. Zwingli never felt this religious need. He never understood Luther's position from a religious point of view. Therefore, he considered the partaking as an act of faith and confession!" *

* Dr. Wm. Moeller: History of the Christian Church. Vol. III, p. 85.

The Lutheran interpretation of the doctrine of the Eucharist has been declared the very heart of Lutheranism. Prof. Neve writes: "Stripped of Luther's conception of the real presence, the historical Lutheran Church goes out of existence. If this one doctrine is untenable, then a whole number of other tenets of Lutheranism, that are based upon the same principles must go, and historical Lutheranism is no more!" *

Swiss Reformation

The Swiss Reformation differs

fundamentally from the Lutheran Reformation. There is really no common ground between the motives and methods of the Swiss reformers and those of Luther. Luther is frequently represented in a standing posture holding a Bible, while Zwingli is pictured with a Bible in one hand and a sword in the other. These representations are really symbolical of their methods of reformation. The reforms of Zwingli and Calvin are primarily disciplinary, while those of Luther were evangelical.

The Reformed have always maintained that Luther did not proceed far enough in his reforms. Zwingli, their champion, has gone to such extremes that he has rightly been called a fanatical, religious revolutionist. It is for this very reason that Zwingli and Bullinger were feared and avoided in Germany by the Lutherans, and to the time of 1540, they were also dreaded by the conservative reformers of England. Zwingli considered Luther and the English reformers as tinged with Catholic doctrine, while Luther and the English reformers considered him a fanatic.

The Swiss reformers worked among a free, liberty loving nation. Although at Zwingli's time state and church were united, he soon succeeded in persuading his people that "the empire and the papacy

* Prof. Neve, Lutherans and Church Union. p. 14.

came from Rome!" Switzerland enjoys the distinction of having had the first free church in a free state, while in Germany even after the Reformation, the government appointed the pastors for the various congregations.

Zwingli's honesty and sincerity cannot be questioned. Fisher declares: "Zwingli was not a man to veil his opinions." * Zwingli was a rationalist as can well be seen from his rationalistic interpretation of the doctrine of the Eucharist. Luther's historic debate with Zwingli at Marburg in 1529 at least brought to light the vast difference which existed between the Lutheran and the Zwinglian interpretation. At this occasion Zwingli's and Luther's proposed solution of the difficulties involved in the interpretation of the Eucharist came before the eyes of the public. Luther presented the Scriptural view as depending on the communication of attributes and on the doctrine of Christ's sacramental presence in the Lord's Supper. Zwingli introduced his rationalistic, antiscritptural alloecosis, showing thereby that he had no true conception of the nature of the doctrine of Christ's person. After the debate Luther felt conscience bound to reject the hand of fellowship offered to him by Zwingli. That is evident from his words: "You have a different spirit from us!"

The Swiss Reformation was really a drama consisting of two distinct acts, each impressed with the personality of its respective Reformer. Zwingli had held a very crude and offensive view of the Eucharist. Even Calvin called his teaching "profane, false, and pernicious." Zwingli laid the foundation for the Reformed doctrine, but it remained for Calvin to refine and polish this rationalistic interpretation of the Eucharist which was then adopted by the Reformed Churches. The Cambridge Modern History (Vol. II, 349)

* Fisher, History of Doctrine. p. 290.

calls Calvin the real and personal cause of the Reformed Church.

While Zwingli had practically denied the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, Calvin claimed to believe in a real presence, but it was of a spiritual nature. Like Zwingli, Calvin did not understand the true nature of the doctrine of Christ's person and, therefore, could not offer a Scriptural interpretation of the Eucharist. Thus it was the doctrine of the Eucharist which eventually separated the Lutherans from the Reformed.

With this continental background in mind, we can more easily understand the development of the Eucharistic doctrine in England, because the reformers of England continually sought the advice of the reformers on the Continent, at times from Luther, at other times from the Swiss. Beginning with the period of Cranmer's life as Archbishop of Canterbury until the time of the adoption of the 39 Articles (1563), no doctrine was more discussed and more misunderstood. Confusion as to the interpretation of this doctrine led to persecution and bloodshed of both Protestants and Catholics.

In order to gain a better understanding of the development of this doctrine during the second and third quarter of the Sixteenth Century, we must consider the religious and political background of England in as far as it aided and hindered the work of the reformers.

I.

General Movements in England before 1563

England had experienced the influence of Christianity at a very early time, probably dating from the Second Century of our Christian Era. In the following centuries mission work was continued on the British Isles. British bishops were present at some of the church

conferences of the Fourth Century. Since the time of the Seventh Century Rome began to control church and state in England.

A
Movements away from Rome.

After the Norman Conquest in 1066, there was much strife for supremacy between the native rulers and ecclesiastical representatives from Rome. During these early centuries there were few significant changes in doctrine, but in 1213 the Council of St. John's Lateran declared that transubstantiation henceforth be proclaimed as a teaching of the Church.

John Wyclif

The first real English opponent of the Catholic Church in England was John Wyclif who is known as the "Morning Star" of the Reformation. He took a bold stand against papal control of the Church on English soil, declaring that Christ was the head of the Church and that the Pope was the Antichrist. His work was not merely of a criticizing, destructive nature, but he actually did strive to restore the original purity of doctrine. His translation of the English Bible from the Vulgate in 1382 was a great stride forward toward reformation. At this time Wyclif's influence was felt among the educated rather than among the common laity, because the common people were quite generally illiterate. Wyclif's followers, known as the "poor priests," were active in England with evangelical preaching among the common people during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.

Of special interest is Wyclif's position on the Eucharist. He had recognized that transubstantiation was a falsification of the Lord's Supper. His attitude called forth some bitter controversies with the mendicant friars of England. Wyclif deserves much credit

for his opposition to this Catholic dogma, but it is doubtful whether he held what was later considered the Lutheran view of the Lord's Supper. He did consider it a real means of grace, but he believed that an unbelieving priest could not carry out an effective administration of the Sacrament. At times he seems to have upheld the later Lutheran view of the essence of the Eucharist, and at other times he speaks of the bread and wine as being Christ's body "figuratively and spiritually!" It may be that he used these expressions to show that he believed in the real presence, but not in a corporal presence, such as the Catholic Church taught and believed. Wyclif publicly taught and confessed this view at Oxford in 1381. Here he also denounced transubstantiation as idolatry in English and Latin publications, but he seems to have made no attempt to separate himself from the established Church of England. J.R.Green calls Wyclif the first Protestant.

Lord Cobham, one of Wyclif's successors who denied transubstantiation seems to have believed in the real presence, as the following confession seems to indicate: "I believe that the most worshipful Sacrament of the Altar is Christ's body in form of bread, the same body that was born of the blessed virgin Mary. As Christ while living on earth had both humanity and divinity, but the divinity veiled and invisible beneath the humanity, so in the Sacrament of the Altar is a true body and true bread, the bread which we see, and the body of Christ veiled beneath it which we do not see." *

The Lollards

In 1394 Wyclif's followers, known as the Lollards submitted a petition to the English Parliament which read as follows:

* Bridgett, History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain. p.55.

"The false sacrament of bread leads all men, with few exceptions, into idolatry: for they think that the body of Christ which is never out of heaven is by virtue of the priest's word essentially inclosed in a little bread which they show to the people!" *

Thus there was some difference of opinion also among Wyclif's followers as to the interpretation of the Eucharist. Some tried to maintain a real presence, while others, in their zeal to deny a corporal presence, denied also the sacramental presence.

Wyclif's followers had made a praiseworthy attempt at reform, but their influence seems to have been checked by persecution and by martyrdom. The organization did not cease entirely, because we hear about them again in the Sixteenth Century as opponents of papacy, and especially of the teaching of transubstantiation in 1539 when the Romish Six Articles were introduced.

Wyclif was indeed the "Morning Star" foreshadowing the great day of Reformation. Wyclif's high ideals were carried out in the German Reformation by Luther, far better than Wyclif could ever have wished and desired.

Religious Conditions before Reformation

It was nearly a century and a half after Wyclif's death before any further significant efforts were made toward a reformation. During all these centuries the Catholic religion of England had enjoyed the support and protection of the English government. The very fact that in 1394 the Lollards had submitted a request to Parliament, and that it had been rejected, shows that church and state were intimately connected. As long as the church controlled the state, and as long as the state submitted to the demands of the clergy, reformation in England must also include

* Bridgett. l. c. p. 55.

reformation of state. Rome used the English government to legislate laws favoring the established religion. To oppose the Church of Rome was identical to committing treason against the English state. The English government was duty bound to the Pope to persecute and execute all who stubbornly opposed the established Church. On account of this intimate connection existing between church and state, and on account of the great influence the Pope exerted over the English government, it became necessary in the English Reformation to apply methods different from those that had been used to reform Germany and Switzerland.

It is true that we find no great reformer in England during the Sixteenth Century who felt the urge of instituting a reformation as had been the situation in Switzerland. Nor do we find a man of the lion-hearted type of Luther who ventured to oppose church and state in order to accomplish his Reformation. The English Reformation had an entirely different beginning.

Cardinal Wolsey

In England the starting point seems to have been a certain notorious Catholic Cardinal named Wolsey. He had coveted the papal tiara and seems to have been possessed of the hope that he would some day become "the successor of St. Peter." In these hopes he seems to have been disappointed several times. Being of an exceedingly jealous disposition, he began plotting how he might humiliate the Pope at Rome. Wolsey was very influential at the court of Henry VIII. His advice was frequently consulted and followed. The time of Wolsey marks the beginning of farreaching political and religious complications in the life time of King Henry.

It had been the fond wish of Henry that he might have a male descendant as his successor upon the English throne. Henry's wife,

Catherine, of Spanish descent, had given birth to several children, but all had died in their infancy with the exception of Mary who was later known as Bloody Mary.

In the first decade of that Century, Henry had been persuaded to marry Catherine who had been the wife of his brother Arthur. Arthur had died after a few months of marriage. Their father, Henry VII., had not been willing to restore the dowry to Catherine's father, and for that reason had persuaded the younger son to take Catherine as wife. This required an ecclesiastical dispensation which the Pope granted after the papal requirement had been fulfilled.

Wolsey knew about this dispensation. He also hated Catherine because she had rebuked him for his dissolute life. He now saw an occasion whereby he might humiliate the Pope and free himself from this hateful woman. In addition to that, Wolsey noticed an opportunity through which he might benefit his King economically and politically, namely by suggesting to him a marriage with the ruling house of France. This would make Henry indebted to him and thus assure him a comfortable livelihood for the rest of his life. These advantages in the reach of an ambitious character like Wolsey called forth plans and schemes. These then finally developed into actions.

Turner writes (History, Vol. II, p. 146) that Wolsey avowed himself as the originator of the King's scruples in regard to his marriage with Catherine. It would have been in perfect consistence with his character to try to separate Henry from his lawful wife. In carrying out his secret plans, he reminded the King that he had married his brother's wife which was against the law of God. As an evidence of divine displeasure, he pointed to the fact that his wife had never given birth to a son who might eventually become his heir. The prospects for ever having a son from Catherine after twenty years

of marriage were poor indeed. In the year 1524 the King seems to have thought of the possibility at least that this was a divine judgment. However, his subsequent life in matrimonial ventures shows that Henry did not possess a praiseworthy character. After his lust had once been aroused, it led him from one vice to another. In 1526 he met the youthful Anne Boleyn whom he at once desired as his wife. Her sister, it is said, had previously been a mistress of Henry.

Henry's Matrimonial Problems

In 1527 Henry applied to Rome for a divorce, but the Pope was unable to favor Henry at once. since the Emperor Chas.V., a nephew of Henry's wife, had the Pope at his mercy. In the following year Pope Clement had permitted Wolsey, who was at this time again secretly aiding the Pope to gain his favor, and a few other papal representatives to examine Henry's case. Henry had been permitted to marry Anne Boleyn on Dec.15,1527, but his divorce was never to be granted by the Pope. Wolsey did not wish to assume any responsibility and, therefore, failed to act for the divorce. Then also, he feared Catherine would appeal to the Pope and present the decree of Julius II. which had pronounced her marriage legal. This she later actually did to Wolsey's great confusion.

In the meantime the plan of the marriage with France had failed. Such a union was no longer desirable since France had undergone a military disaster at Naples. On June 29.1529 Pope Clement had joined with the Emperor against Henry, indirectly at least, and had issued a notice that Henry's case was to be discussed at Rome in the presence of Henry and Catherine. This proved too much of a demand for Henry. He began to lose confidence in Wolsey who was not independent enough

to resist the Pope in open defiance. Both Wolsey and Henry knew only too well that the Pope would not consent to a divorce, and thus disgrace Henry's wife, the aunt of the Emperor. This, then, sealed the fate of Wolsey. He died as a prisoner in 1530 while he was being conveyed to London.

It was in July 1530 that the English Parliament finally mustered enough courage to demand a decision from the Pope in regard to Henry's divorce. The Pope's procrastination then led to the breach between England and Rome. Thus the first "away from Rome" movement in England was not of a religious nature, prompted for the sake of religious reforms, but the direct result of political complications which had been prompted by the ambitious Wolsey and had been acted upon by Henry, especially in connection with his divorce problem.

Henry was married for a second time in Jan. 1533 to Anne Boleyn. In Sept. of that year a daughter was born who later became Queen Elizabeth. In Jan. 1536 Catherine died having considered Henry her lawful husband to the very end of her life. In the same year Anne Boleyn who was now favoring the Protestant cause was executed at the command of the King because he had suspected her of unfaithfulness. Froude declares: "The tragedy of Anne Boleyn is one of the most mysterious problems in the history of England!" * Anne maintained her innocence to the very last. Possibly for that reason her spiritual advisor pronounced her innocent, in spite of her condemnation.

Henry's third wife whom he married in 1536 was Jane Seymour. She seems to have been the most beloved and honored of all of Henry's wives, by Protestants and Catholics alike. Unfortunately she died in childbirth. Her son who survived her became King Edward VI.

Before we proceed to mention the King's fourth wife, we must retrace our steps and discuss the political and religious leaders

* Froude, History of England. Vol. II. p. 503.

who assisted and influenced Henry during these years of his marital ventures. The Pope had never consented to sanction Henry's divorce from Catherine. On the other hand, he had declared the marriage with Anne Boleyn as void in July 1533, and had even threatened Henry with the ban in March of the next year.

The English Pope

As early as 1530 Henry had declared himself independent from Rome. Now he believed that someone ought to take the place of the Pope in England. He, therefore, asked Parliament in 1531 to transfer the papal prerogatives to him and henceforth consider him "the protector and lord and sole supreme head of the church!"

In 1534 a special law was enacted and enforced which was known as the Act of Supremacy. It obligated the clergy and the civil authorities to look up to Henry as the head of the church, but it also served as a symbol to designate independence from Rome. By this act no spiritual powers were actually taken from the clergy, but thereby the King received authority to establish doctrines and legislate laws for the church. All opposition to the Act of Supremacy was considered treason against the state. To be sure, Henry was never actually interested in religious reforms. He merely wanted to be called "Head of the Church." He may, therefore, be considered the self appointed Pope of England. Opposition to this "pope" was not considered heresy, but treason. It is for this reason that Henry persecuted Protestants and Catholics alike whenever they resisted his will. Henry did not actually undertake to control the church in England singlehandedly. He still consulted his spiritual advisors and especially the Archbishop of Canterbury. Originally Henry had been intended for the clerical profession. His father may have hoped that some day his younger son might become

Archbishop of Canterbury. The older son, Arthur, had received special training as future king of England. However, he had died in 1502 at the age of 15. Thus Henry's lifecalling was changed by the premature death of his older brother. Henry's training in theology proved of value to him at several occasions. He was able to show his clerical advisors at times that he knew more about theology than they themselves. Henry had at least gained enough respect for the Church that he thought it proper that some authority pronounce as null and void his former marriage with Catherine, although he had received a papal dispensation. In the meantime the Queen had appealed to Rome. On account of political intrigues the Pope was unable and unwilling to declare the divorce lawful. The King and his bishops were perplexed. They were greatly in need of an advisor. No one had the courage to offer such advice.

Thomas Cranmer

Now it so happened by chance that the King and his two chief counsellors, Fox and Gardiner, were lodging at the home of a nobleman whose sons happened to be pupils of a teacher, named Thomas Cranmer. In the summer of 1529 the plague, known as the "sweating sickness" had compelled Cranmer and his students to leave Cambridge. They preferred to remain at the home of their father where Cranmer continued to instruct them. It is here that Cranmer first came into contact with Henry VIII.. When Cranmer had heard of the divorce situation, he suggested that the question be submitted to the lawyers of the universities. This seemingly insignificant bit of advice proved as an important point of contact. It seemed a very favorable solution for the divorce situation. Henry immediately engaged Cranmer exclusively to study his divorce case. This marks the beginning of Cranmer's public activity in the interest of the state and church in England.

Cranmer was subsequently sent on various political missions. At one occasion he was sent to Rome as a representative of Henry. Thus Cranmer like Luther had seen Rome, but it is doubtful whether Cranmer's impressions and experiences had been as unpleasant as those of Luther had been. On one of his trips as ambassador of Henry to the Emperor, Cranmer visited in Germany. Incidentally he had an opportunity to observe the progress of the Reformation. It is here that he married the Lutheran niece of Osiander.

Cranmer as Archbishop

In 1533 while yet in Germany, Cranmer received the notice from Henry that he had been appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury. After much hesitation he finally, but unwillingly accepted the appointment.

One of his first acts as Archbishop was to pronounce valid the divorce of Henry from Catherine (May 23.1533). The King could hardly have chosen another archbishop who would have favored and served him more faithfully than did Cranmer. Cranmer did not believe it possible that the King could greatly err in the administration of his office as king and head of the church.

In speaking of Cranmer's participation in Henry's divorce affairs, the Encyclopedia Britannica declares: "In the whole proceeding the Archbishop's subserviency was pitiable. It is difficult to acquit him of the graver charge of knowingly pronouncing an unrighteous sentence!" Luther gave utterance to a similar judgment by advising that rather than submit to a divorce, the Queen should be willing to suffer execution at the hands of the King.

Cranmer was supposed to be the King's chief advisor, but his main work seems to have been to excuse the conduct of Henry.

Fortunately he managed to retain the King's confidence, though should he ever have crossed his plans, it would have meant his immediate execution. It is evident from Cranmer's actions that he worked independently of Rome, but depended entirely on Henry as the head of church and state.

Up to this time Cranmer had been considered a member in good standing in the Catholic Church. The Pope's attitude toward him was gradually beginning to change. Now there were also other Catholic clergymen who wanted to be free from the authority of the Pope, but otherwise wished to retain the form and essence of the Catholic teaching. They were opposed to the Pope, but were not in favor of reform. It was this Catholic element which was able to keep Henry loyal to Catholicism until his end in 1547.

Thomas Cromwell

Another influential leader, much interested in Henry's welfare and most zealous in his opposition to the Pope, was Thomas Cromwell. In 1535 Henry had appointed Cromwell vice regent in ecclesiastical matters. This was a position superior even to that of the Archbishop. The following year Cromwell was sent to Germany with Barnes to prevent Germany from uniting with France. Melanchthon had dedicated a commentary to the honor of Henry which may have flattered the King and may have given him hope for a political union with Germany which he much desired at that time. Henry saw the advantage of gaining Germany as an ally in his opposition to Rome.

In his estimation of Cromwell's character, Froude says: "It was his chief object to unite England with the Lutherans, while Chas. V. was anxious to keep them apart!" *

The efforts of Cromwell did not assume a religious, but rather

* Froude, l.c. Vol. III, p. 411.

a political character. For seven years Cromwell was a statesman of great influence with the King. He was considered the universal authority to whom all state officials looked for advice. Of him Jacobs says: "It is quite evident that Cromwell was not interested in theology, but in politics. He wanted to offer England an opportunity to defy Pope and Emperor!" *

In order to carry out these ideals, Cromwell planned to bring about the marriage of Henry with Anne of Cleves, a Lutheran sister in law of the Elector of Saxony. This would unite the two countries and increase the influence of England which at the time of 1538 was in great need of such power and prestige.

Henry's last wife, Jane Seymour, had died during childbirth in 1537. Henry was, therefore, easily persuaded to marry again. A marriage was soon arranged by ambassadors who had been sent to Germany. The prospective Queen, whose beauty had been the subject of much discussion at Henry's court, arrived on English soil Dec. 29. 1539. The King had gone to meet her, but was much disappointed in his expectations. It had proved a most unfortunate match. The new Queen was not at all polished in court etiquette. Not her beauty, but her lack of beauty was most conspicuous. The King would gladly have sent her back, but he thought it too late now. The marriage took place, but due to incompatibility, the King felt the necessity of seeking a divorce. A divorce was granted within six months after marriage. Thus Anne of Cleves had been disgraced, the Elector had been insulted, and Henry had been humiliated.

Cromwell's Fall

Cromwell's plans had come to naught. His undertaking, though political in nature, was considered not only

* Jacobs, The Lutheran Movement in England. p. 180.

treason, but heretical since he had planned to unite Catholic England with Protestant Germany. Thus a combination of several causes finally led to Cromwell's downfall. The marriage project had failed. Henry had been disappointed and humiliated. The father of Henry's new prospective wife was Cromwell's personal enemy. Cromwell had accepted bribes. Without the King's knowledge he had carried on political correspondence with Germany. Unfortunately at this time the Catholic element had gained the upper hand in England and had legislated the Six Articles of 1539 which became the scourge of all Protestant reformers.

Although a politician of first rank, it may be said in a modified sense at least that Cromwell was suffering for the cause of the Reformation. Cromwell claimed to be a Protestant and died outside of the Catholic Church. He was beheaded July 28.1540.

In a manner Cromwell stood alone in the last years of his life. The Romish party hated him as their greatest enemy. The Protestants did not regard him as their constant friend. The common people did not favor him on account of his heavy taxations.

Moeller gives the following estimation of his work as a reformer: "He was the instrument which made the Church of England so securely a part of the state that it could not release itself from its embrace!" Although by no means guiltless, Cromwell's fate seems hard indeed. His efforts at least urged on the "movement away from Rome!"

With all these various political intrigues, with all this religious confusion, with all the heterogeneous elements of influence from the religious and political factions in England, some striving to uphold the authority of the Pope, others considering Henry the Pope, and still others favoring neither Henry nor the Pope, it was

* Moeller, l. c. p. 204.

impossible for any of the English reformers to carry out a "clean cut" reformation. England had its reformers, but not one of them was able to undertake this herculean task to cleanse England with one sweeping effort from all the superstitions and abuses of Romanism.

B
Movements toward Protestantism in England.

In the midst of this political and religious conglomeration we find a few distinct traces of effort toward reformation at a very early time. The followers of Wyclif were at this time not influential enough to start any definite movements toward reform.

Luther's earliest
Influence

The first influence came from Germany.

although Germany had not sent out any missionaries to spread Lutheran doctrine. In fact, before 1520 the Lutherans did not exist as an independent church organization. Up till that time they were merely scattered individuals who sympathized with the Wittenberg Monk who had dared to oppose the Pope. And yet, writes Froude: "In 1519 there was scarcely a village from the Irish channel to the Danube in which the name of Luther was not familiar as a word of hope and promise!" *

The Christian Church, suffering under the tyranny of Rome was praying and hoping for deliverance. In due time this deliverance did appear, but there were gradual steps of preparation and numerous indications showing that Antichrist should lose his influence and be revealed as the son of perdition.

* Froude, l.c. Vol. II, p. 40.

Erasmus had introduced a "new learning" at Cambridge in 1511, but he himself never "broke away" from the Catholic fold. In addition to that, a new current of thought, strange and powerful in influence, had taken possession of the younger generation at Cambridge and Oxford.

In Mch. 1521 Archbishop Warham wrote to Cardinal Wolsey complaining that the heresies of Luther were eagerly being read and adopted at Oxford. Soon Luther's publications were outlawed. A public proclamation was made to hinder this heretical movement and to burn all heretical books. King Henry wrote to the Princes of Saxony demanding that they repress and check the progress of this new and dangerous sect.

The progress of the truth could not be hindered. In 1528 several men, students and teachers, of Cambridge and Oxford formed societies in which they met to study Scripture in preference to the Sentences of the Fathers. In addition to this, they studied Luther's publications and undertook little missionary enterprises such as visiting the unfortunate in prisons and the sick in the hospitals. By way of ridicule, the enemies of the Reformation called these groups "Germany!"

Men in England
Interested
in Reformation

At this time such names as Bilney, Robert Barnes, Hugh Latimer, Miles Coverdale, and John Clark were associated with this movement. Bilney had written a letter in 1528 describing his conversion from Catholicism. Miles Coverdale was later active as a translator and publisher of the Bible. Of Clark it is said that he lectured privately and disputed publicly on Luther's principles and on Scripture until 1528 when he died in prison. Thus Lutheranism daily increased at the universities. Teachers and students showed great interest in the movement toward a reformation.

Wm. Tyndale
John Frith

At this time we also find Tyndale at work with his translation. John Frith had been associated with him for some time until both of them had been expelled from Oxford in 1521. Then Tyndale went to Hamburg where he continued his work unmolested.

Loescher considers Tyndale a Lutheran, although he had advised Frith to desist from controversy in regard to the presence of Christ in the Sacrament in order to avoid a division among the reformers. It is certain that Tyndale was more of a Lutheran than a Zwinglian. although his intimate friend, John Frith, inclined more toward Zwinglianism in the Eucharistic interpretation.

Burnet states that Frith has the distinction of having been the first of the English reformers to write against transubstantiation. He then proceeded to show that a corporal presence was not at all necessary since the elements remain bread and wine. (History of the Reformation, Vol. I, p. 273f.)

In opposition to Zwingli, Frith maintained that John 6 could not possibly deal with the Sacrament of the Altar. He believed that the elements were merely mystical signs of Christ's body and blood. He tolerated the Lutheran view of the real presence because he had been convinced that it did not lead men to practise gross idolatry, as he believed was true in the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. It seems that he preferred to hold a mediating position between the Lutheran and Zwinglian view, declaring that he considered it a part of speculation to define the presence in the Eucharist. While upholding such an opinion, he was condemned as a heretic and burned at Smithfield July 4. 1533. Burnet remarks that it was the last execution perpetrated directly by the clergy. Henceforth Parliament took over the treatment and judgment of heretics. (Burnet l.c. Vol. 1. p. 2

John Fox

One of these early reformers who deserves some attention on account of his inclination toward Lutheranism is Fox. In 1535 he was a brilliant and admirable court preacher in England. His famous dictum: "Time and I will challenge anyone in the world" (Jacobs l.c.p.58) shows that he possessed a good deal of courage and selfconfidence. Unfortunately he failed to gain the confidence of Melanchthon and the Elector. They feared that his high powered oratory was serving the cause of Henry rather than the cause of the Reformation. Henry had sent him together with Barnes and Heath to Germany in 1536-1537 to take part in a doctrinal discussion in order to unite England and Germany against Catholicism. Actually very little was accomplished.

In 1538 Luther had written a last letter to Bishop Fox in regard to further movements toward a united reformation. Luther seems to have held Fox in great esteem. There is no doubt that his early death in 1538 proved a great loss for the cause of Lutheranism in England.

Robert Barnes

Undoubtedly the most intimate English friend of Luther and Melanchthon was Robert Barnes. In 1528 he had fled to Wittenberg, and three years later he had published 19 Theses together with a preface written by Bugenhagen. Two of them are of special interest here. The Ninth reads: Communion must be administered under both forms. The Eleventh declares: The true body of Christ is in the Sacrament of the Altar.

Luther did not hesitate to tell Barnes that he considered Henry the Pope of England. It was necessary that Barnes know this attitude of Luther because Barnes had served as mediator in all the important movements toward Lutheranism in England until the time of 1540 when

Barnes was executed by Henry. He had taken part in arranging the marriage of the King with Anne of Cleves. In 1536 he had been one of the delegates to Germany, and two years later he had helped to bring about the Lutheran conference in England.

Barnes was a sincere man, but one of his weaknesses seems to have been his rashness. He did not hesitate to confess the truth, nor did he shrink from rebuking Henry for seeking a divorce from Anne. It is generally believed that this rebuke brought about his execution. With his death England lost another ardent supporter of Lutheranism. Luther pays him a noble tribute in the words: "Our good, pious table companion and guest of our home, this holy martyr, St. Robertus!"

John Hooper

Among the later reformers we have John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester. He had been a diligent student of Lutheranism, but due to later Zwinglian influence, he had become Reformed. In 1539 he had been compelled to flee to the Continent. There he met Bullinger and became one of his most intimate friends. Under the reign of Edward VI. he returned to England, a staunch advocate of Zwinglianism. The more conservative reformers in England considered him a religious fanatic. Hooper has often been called "the father of the Puritans!"

Hooper's attitude over against the Lutheran view of the Eucharist can be learned from a letter to Bullinger, dated Jan. 25. 1546. In speaking of the Count Palatine who had recently introduced Lutheranism, he remarks: "He has fallen from popery into the doctrine of Luther who is in that particular more erroneous than all the Papists!" *

In his puritanic tendencies Hooper was encouraged by the Scotch reformer, John Knox, who had been liberated from the French galleys in 1549 at the request of the English Parliament after he had served

* Jacobs, l. c. p. 207.

for two years. Both Hooper and Knox fought for "Biblical Purism" as advocated by the Swiss reformers in order to cleanse the Church from "idolatry." Knox as well as Hooper held the Reformed view of the Eucharist. Knox has the distinction of having been the first to substitute common bread for wafer bread in the Lords Supper. It was some time later that this custom was sanctioned by the King.

Hooper maintained his Reformed view to the time of his martyrdom in 1555. Burnet records his words: "The very natural body and blood of Christ is not really and substantially in the Sacrament of the Altar!" *

Although he had held a false view in regard to the Eucharist, Hooper deserves credit for his firm stand against transubstantiation and for his willingness to suffer martyrdom as a testimony of his inmost conviction.

Bishop Bonner who was the scourge of the martyrs under Bloody Mary had tried every possible device to compel Hooper to recant. With every new attack of Bonner, Hooper became the firmer in his convictions and the more anxious to seal his confession with his own blood.

Hugh Latimer

Latimer was another of the martyrs who suffered death by execution at the hands of Bloody Mary. In 1552 Latimer had made the confession: "I say there is none other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence. The same presence may be called a real presence, because to the faithful believer there is the real and spiritual body of Christ, which thing I rehearse here, lest some sychophant or scorner should suppose me with the Anabaptist to make nothing else of the Sacrament but a bare sign!" **

*Burnet, History of the Reformation. Vol. III, 362.

**Sinclair, Leaders of Thought in the English Church, p. 44.

At the same time he denounced papal mass as an abomination because he believed that with one sacrifice Christ had wrought a full reconciliation. When the judgment of condemnation was pronounced upon Latimer in Sept. 1555 for denying transubstantiation, he confessed: "Bread is bread, and wine is wine; there is a change, it is true; the change is not in the nature, but in the dignity!" *

Latimer's sincerity cannot be questioned. When the Six Articles were introduced in 1539, he resigned his bishopric in preference to supporting the heresy of transubstantiation. In that respect he possessed more of a heroic character than his contemporary and friend Cranmer. His firmness and tenacity in his view regarding the Eucharist, even in the face of martyrdom, shows that in this age of confusion and doctrinal indifference, there were yet a few leaders in England who were brave enough to uphold their own principles and defend their convictions.

Bishop Ridley

Bishop Ridley was a fellow martyr of Latimer.

Under Edward VI. Ridley had been appointed Bishop of London. It was due mainly to Ridley's influence that Cranmer changed his own view on the interpretation of the Eucharist, after that inclining toward the Reformed view. Ridley was generally more careful in his doctrinal debates than Cranmer. Pollard quotes his words from 1448: "The bread remains bread after the consecration; still the bread of the Communion is not mere bread, but bread united to the divinity!" **

Ridley together with Cranmer and Latimer had been challenged to a debate at Oxford which took place Apr. 14-20. 1554. Ridley led the dispute against transubstantiation although his two companions were

* Froude l.c. Vol. VI. p 358.

**Pollard, Cranmer and English Reformers, p. 218.

also expected to defend their views before the papists. Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester, is recorded to have said of these so-called heretics: "Latimer leaneth on Cranmer, Cranmer on Ridley, and Ridley on the singularity of his own wit!" *

Ridley's confession at the time of his condemnation Sept. 30, 1555 reads as follows: "Christ is not the Sacrament, but really and truly in it, as the Holy Ghost is with the water at Baptism, and yet is not the water!" **

There can be little doubt that Ridley wished his view of the Eucharist to be distinguished from the rationalistic interpretation as put forth by the Swiss. Ridley may not have intended to deny the actual presence of Christ in the Sacrament, but he did not wish to be identified with the Lutheran view of the Sacramental presence. (Innes, Cranmer and the Reformation in England. p. 134).

Thomas Cranmer

The guiding star of the English Reformation was Thomas Cranmer. After his appointment as Archbishop, he had made various attempts to bring about a reform in the church in England.

Cranmer is the only one of the reformers who did not take a firm and definite stand which he supported at all times and maintained to the end of his life. His enemies have rightly accused him of having held three different views in regard to the Eucharist.

Remarkable as that may seem, it can be explained at least in part. Cranmer occupied the thankless position of mediator between the Romish, Lutheran, and Swiss theologians. Being of a receptive nature and submitting quite readily to external influence, we have in Cranmer what may be termed a human barometer indicating

*Gairdner, The English Church of the Sixteenth Century. p. 338.

**Froude, l. c. Vol. VI. p. 358.

the influence of the various religious views as they gained the upper hand in England and then gradually gave way to the more powerful currents of thought.

England may be looked upon as the religious "melting pot" in which all these religious elements were gradually combined to form the Anglican Church.

It seems that Cranmer never actually held an independent view of the doctrine of the Eucharist. Either he was influenced by the Romanists, or by the Lutherans, or by the Reformed. At the end of his life he seems to have held a rather definite view. It was neither Catholic, nor Lutheran, nor Swiss, but rather a combination of all three.

In a general way it may be stated that after 1538 Cranmer took a definite stand against transubstantiation. In that year he wrote to Cromwell: "As concerning Adam Damplic of Calais, he utterly denieth that ever he taught or said that the very body and blood of Christ was not presently in the Sacrament of the Altar and confesseth the same to be there really, but he saith that the controversy between him and the prior was because he confuted the opinion of transubstantiation and therein, I think, he taught but the truth" *

In the previous year Cranmer was equally as far removed from supporting the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist. This is testified to by his letter to John de Watt: "Unless I see stronger evidence brought forward than I have yet been able to see, I desire neither to be the patron nor the approver of the opinion maintained by you. I am plainly convinced.....that the cause is not a good one" **

* Pollard, l. c. p. 234.

** Pollard, l. c. p. 234.

Then he also uttered the remarkable confession concerning the real presence which he later denied. He says: "The doctrine of the real presence is evidently and manifestly proved in the passages of Scripture and handed down to us by the fathers themselves, as men of apostolic character from the very beginning of the Church!" *

There can be little doubt that Cranmer knew and probably believed for some time in the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence until the year 1548. He himself distinguished between transubstantiation and the view of the real presence as taught and believed by the Lutherans. Many of Cranmer's biographers maintain that Cranmer never held the Lutheran interpretation. They point to the dialogue between Thomas Martin, a zealous Roman Catholic civilian, and Thos. Cranmer. The debated words are given in the form of a dialogue which follows: Martin: "You Master Cranmer have taught in this high Sacrament of the Altar three contrary doctrines of the Sacrament, and yet you pretend in every one Verbum Dei!" **

Cranmer: "Nay, I taught but two contrary doctrines of the same!" **

After some discussion about Cranmer's publication of the Catechism of Jonas, Martin continues: "Then from a Lutheran you became a Zwinglian which is the vilest heresy of all in the mystery of the Sacrament!" **

Cranmer: "I grant that I believed otherwise than I do now, and so I did until my Lord of London, Dr. Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctrine drew me quite from my opinion!" **

This whole defence of Cranmer seems somewhat ambiguous. Possibly he did not maintain the Lutheran view of the real presence for any length of time. Although he does state that he held two contrary

* Pollard, l. c. p. 234.

** Todd, The Life of Archbishop Cranmer. Vol. II. p. 438f.

views, he does not deny, upon further accusation, that he had ever held the Lutheran view. In fact, he was utterly unable to deny that he had ever favored the Lutheran view. His publication of the Catechism of Jonas had identified him with the Lutheran cause. In the eyes of the public, before the Zwinglians and before the Romanists, he was a Lutheran.

In 1547 Bullinger wrote: "This Thomas has fallen into so heavy a slumber that we entertain but very cold hope that he will be roused even by our most learned letter, for lately he has published a Catechism in which he has not only approved that foul and sacreligious transubstantiation of the Papists in the Holy Supper of our Savior, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him well grounded, perspicuous, and lucid!"*

Thus we are not far from the truth by assuming that at least for a time between the years 1538-1548 Cranmer was inclined to favor the Lutheran view of the Eucharist.

Beginning with Dec. 1548 he seems to have begun to lean toward the Swiss theologians. He later admitted that this change had been forced upon him by Ridley. Already as early as 1546 Ridley is said to have called Cranmer's attention to a treatise of Rabanus Maurus in which he had combated the opinion of Paschius Radbert who in the Ninth Century for the first time had given expression to the doctrine of a change of substance of the consecrated elements. This was practically transubstantiation, though up till that time the expression had not been invented. (Collette, Life, Times and Writings of Thomas Cranmer. p. 280). The commonplace book of Cranmer which is still extant shows that he had studied the view of Maurus quite extensively.

* Pollard, l. c. p. 209.

After Ridley had cleansed Cranmer's mind completely from the Catholic idea of the Eucharist, Cranmer also began to waver as to the Lutheran view. In 1548 Dec.14-17 Cranmer made some public statements in a debate before Parliament which were immediately looked upon as favoring the Swiss. Soon after this Traheron wrote: "Cranmer and Ridley argued so well on behalf of the Zwinglian view that truth never obtained a more brilliant victory. I perceive it is all over with Lutheranism, now that those who were considered its principal supporters have altogether come over to our side!" *

Peter Martyr wrote to Bucer in a similar vein stating that the Reformed had gained the upper hand, that Catholic transubstantiation had failed, that now really the only point of debate was the nature of the presence, but that also here the Reformed would soon have all in their favor.(Pollard,l.c.p.217).

A brief report of Cranmer's view has come down to us. It reads: "Our faith is not to believe him to be in bread and wine, but that he is in heaven; this is proved by Scripture and doctors till the Bishop of Rome's usurped power came in. I believe that Christ is eaten with the heart. The eating with the mouth cannot give us life, for then would a sinner have life. Only good men can eat Christ's body, and when the evil eateth the Sacrament, bread and wine, he neither hath Christ's body nor eateth it!"*

On Dec.28.1549 Traheron wrote to Bullinger: "You must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist together with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the other bishops who heretofore seemes to be Lutherans!" **

Cranmer may have held a Reformed view of the Eucharist during the last five years of his life.

* Pollard,l.c.p.217.

**Pollard,l.c.p.216.

Cranmer's Martyrdom

In the months just previous to his execution, the Catholic clergy forced Cranmer to sign seven recantations of his heretical views of which six have been preserved. Those must have been some bitter, heartrending hours when Cranmer realized how he had gradually developed his view from Catholicism through Lutheranism and finally to that of the Reformed, and that now at the end of his life he had been compelled to recant his whole system of teaching. And yet in the hour of death, in the face of eternity, he perceived that he had committed a grievous offence by submitting again to Catholicism after he had been thoroughly convinced of its heresies. Before the visible flames of his funeral pyre had been brought into existence, the invisible flames of his conscience became so painful and so oppressive that they now produced in Cranmer his noblest and grandest recantation. During the last moments of his earthly sojourn he was granted the permission to address the assembled audience which was composed almost exclusively of Catholics.

After having offered a prayer for himself, he began with the words: "As for the Pope; I refuse him as Christ's enemy and Antichrist with all his false doctrine, and as for the Sacrament....!" He was not permitted to continue. Cole, a papist, who had charge of the ceremony of execution shouted: "Stop the heretic's mouth. Take him away!*"

This noblest of all recantations proved too much of a surprise for the bloodthirsty Papists. Gladly would they have spared his life longer in order to torture and take revenge on such a stubborn, deceptive "heretic!"

However, Cranmer's hour had come. Willingly he advanced to the stake, ready to atone for his crimes, and joyful that he might

*Pollard, l. c. p. 381.

suffer for the cause of the Reformation which at all times had been nearest and dearest to his heart.

We do not know what his final view of the Eucharist may have been. Perhaps he may have confessed the Lutheran interpretation as he had learned to esteem and confess it in previous years. It may be that he would have confessed the view he had adopted during the last years of his life. Although the Swiss theologians claimed him as a Zwinglian, Cranmer undoubtedly did believe in a presence and in all probability in a spiritual presence of the Sacrament. He held a Reformed view, but it differed somewhat from that of Zwingli and Calvin.

Thus Cranmer had played his roll in the drama of the English Reformation. To this day his influence is evident in the confessions of the Church of England.

II

General Movements Considered in the Light of the Development of the Doctrine of the Eucharist

In considering the lives and accomplishments of these various English reformers and then summing up the results which they actually attained individually and collectively, the thought naturally comes to our minds that their achievements were really of a very insignificant nature. Not one of the English reformers exerted enough of an individualistic influence in the sphere of his activity to stamp his personal character on the Church of England. Not one of the English reformers measures up to the great German Reformer. Even Zwingli and Calvin, though they were prompted by rationalistic motives, were greater reformers than any of the English theologians.

A

How these Movements in England Aided and Hindered the Development
of the Doctrine of the Eucharist

We shall not judge the English reformers too harshly or criticize them too severely. In estimating the results of their efforts, we must bear in mind that these men were working under immense handicaps. It is true that in a general way the whole civilized world of that time was subject to papacy. This was the situation of Germany and Switzerland as well as of England. However, England was more completely under the control of Rome than either Switzerland or Germany. In all these countries church and state were connected, but the relation existing between church and state in England was much more intimate than it had been in either of the other countries. Very early in the Sixteenth Century persecuted English Protestants had fled to the Continent and had found refuge in the domain of some less devout Catholic ruler.

The Catholic Element

On account of this close relation between church and state in England, this country remained a stronghold of Papacy for at least quarter of a century after Germany and Switzerland had thrown off the shackles of Rome. During all these years the majority of the clergy wanted to remain within the fold of the Catholic Church. The average layman was generally in favor of the established religion, although ignorance in regard to the teaching was as widespread as its religion. The laymen were not expected to understand the Latin Mass. The English clergy, whose ignorance and immorality was as notorious as that of Germany at the beginning of the Reformation, found it much easier to submit blindly to the dictates of the Pope and his English representatives than to oppose him. However, there were a few individuals who protested. Among these were the so-called reformers.

There can be little doubt that one of the greatest hindrances to reformation in England was the native English clergy which had become so accustomed to submitting to the demands of the Pope that any change whatever amounted to heresy, and heresy must be exterminated by fire.

These unprincipled hirelings were not so willing to burn for opposing the papacy. Many of them may never have had an opportunity to become acquainted with the undefiled truth. To them Catholic doctrine was truth in spite of the abuses connected with it.

Then also the fact that the English population had grown up under Catholic customs such as mass, penance, auricular confession, transubstantiation, and other perversions made it especially difficult to win the people from their erroneous views. To them Catholic teaching must be truth because the "representative of Christ" had interpreted and established the articles of faith. Quite naturally the laymen would be less intelligent than their clergy. It was the intention of Rome to keep its people in spiritual ignorance in order to be able to control them the more easily and completely. When finally the reformers did begin to object to Catholic abuses, the English people generally were not able to judge for themselves whether a doctrine was truth or falsehood. And yet especially England was in great need of a thorough reformation. The leaders were corrupt and cared not for reform. The common people were not capable of understanding the issues involved. It was, therefore, the duty of the reformers to testify against the Catholic abuses and to instruct the common man. This required an immense amount of time and patience. Now the reformers did some diligent and faithful work in protesting against falsehood and in confessing what to them seemed the truth. They might have succeeded much sooner had it not been for the fact that church and state were so closely bound together.

King Henry VIII.

Henry had freed himself from the jurisdiction of Rome and had placed himself at the head of the English Church without even making the slightest attempt to reform this religious organization. Henry has correctly been called the greatest hindrance to the reformation of the church in England. His really thorough training in the traditional theology as revealed in his tract against Luther and then also in other writing made an impression on the English theologians. They in turn extravagantly flattered his theological abilities and thus encouraged Henry's indifference to reform.

Cranmer had tried to influence him at various occasions and might have succeeded more readily, had it not been for the Catholic clergy who were constantly opposing the reformers, slavishly flattering Henry's abilities as a theologian, and also otherwise maligning the cause of the Reformation.

Henry knew very well that his Catholic advisors were corrupt and dishonest. He knew also that they were opposing Cranmer by unfair means. With an air of indifference Henry seemed to connive at the immoral lives and corrupt ideas of his clergy because he himself was leading a dissolute life.

Cranmer was also partly at fault since he considered it his duty to excuse the weakness of his sovereign rather than to reprove him on account of his vices. Thus Henry was encouraged to harden his heart against the cause of the Reformation and to hinder it as often as it benefited his political plans. Though at times it seems that Henry wished to aid the work of the Reformation, it was only then when he could benefit himself financially and politically. At other times he persecuted the reformers as though they were the most despicable heretics.

King Edward VI.

After Henry's death the Reformation in England received a new impetus. Henry's young son, Edward VI,, had been trained and educated under the direction of Archbishop Cranmer. Since Edward was only ten years of age at the time of his accession in 1547, the evangelically minded Duke of Somerset(Earl of Hertford)became his Protector and directed the affairs of the state for the benefit of the reformers. Under Edward's reign for the first time Catholic authority was completely disregarded. In place of the sacrifice of mass and transubstantiation, the Lord's Supper was administered in both kinds. This was really the most important period for the development of the Reformed view of the Eucharist.

The English Reformers and the King himself now invited foreign clergymen to aid them in establishing what later became known as the Church of England. It may, therefore, be considered the formative period of the Eucharistic doctrine in the Church of England. Catholic opposition did manifest itself, but the Protestant government managed to keep this opposition down to a minimum. Thus the years 1547-1553 were especially favorable to the English Reformation.

Bloody Mary

Now to be sure, these five years of Protestant dominion were not sufficient to destroy completely the strong Catholic element. A temporary misfortune suddenly overtook the reformers with the termination of the brief reign of Edw. VI..In 1553, to the regret of the reformers and the joy of the Catholics, Mary, a faithful child of the Pope, began her bloody regime by reestablishing the Church of Rome on English soil. This was temporarily a severe blow to English Protestantism.

There were several reasons why Mary should favor Romanism and persecute Protestantism. Cranmer, the leader in church affairs at the time, had pronounced her an illegitimate child. Her mother had

remained a devout Catholic to the end of her days. Mary herself, it is said, had mass read to her privately at all times, even under the reign of Edward VI. when the Catholic religion was considered outlawed. It is difficult to understand how a woman could become so cruel as to cause the death of almost 300 Protestant men and women.

Now it is true that in addition to her inborn hatred for the reformers, Mary had her own peculiar troubles. She had married Philip of Spain in order to have a Catholic descendant who might be her successor. Several times she had expected to give birth to an heir, but had been hopelessly deceived. In her despair she became all the more desperate. At such times her spiritual advisors, especially Bonner, directed her thoughts to cruel persecution and bloodshed of the Protestants. This fact is a shameful blot on the character of the leaders of the Catholic Church in England. However, Mary's persecutions were a hindrance to reform for a time only. In reality this proved a blessing in disguise. As in all religious persecutions, so also in the persecutions under Mary, the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the Church.

The Protestants fled to other countries, especially to Switzerland and were there strengthened in their Protestant views. Those who had remained behind and had managed to save their lives were gradually realizing that Papacy was making a last desperate but hopeless attempt. Even the people who had been favorably inclined toward Romanism now learned to abhor it.

We quote a fitting remark from Froude: "The Catholics were permitted to continue their cruelties till the cup of iniquity was full, till they had taught the educated laity of England to regard them with horror and till the Romanist superstition had died amidst the execrations of the people of its own excess!" *

* Froude, l. c. Vol. VI. p. 495.

On Nov. 18. 1558 the reign of terror and the reign of the Pope came to a much desired termination. On that day Queen Mary breathed her last. A few hours later Pole, the Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury, whom Parker his successor has called the "hangman and scourge of the Church of England" also passed away after three years of servile employment under the Pope.

Queen Elizabeth

When Queen Elizabeth took over the crown, it was not necessary for her to make any special effort to restore Protestant customs and order of service. English laity and clergy had become so disgusted with Catholicism that the natural religious trend was directed toward Protestantism. Indeed, Elizabeth at first seemed very indifferent toward religious matters. For the present time it seems to have been a wise policy to take such an attitude. It may be for that reason that historians have called her "an atheist and a maintainer of atheism" (P. Smith, The Age of the Reformation, p. 324).

It was not long, however, before Catholics noticed that Elizabeth inclined more to Protestantism than to Catholicism. At the time of her accession there was an intense struggle for creeds. It was a difficult matter to decide which leaders she should favor. She loved the old ritual, but dared not favor Catholicism. As a matter of fact she had been educated as a Protestant, and one might reasonably expect that she would favor Protestantism. As a wise politician she had taken time to study the religious problems of her day and had learned that a noncommittal attitude in regard to the Eucharist would serve as an aid in restoring and maintaining peace in her kingdom. Her famous statement about the Eucharist bears testimony of her indifference in religious matters. It reads: "Christ was the word that spake it; he took the bread and brake it; and what his word did make it, that I believe and take it!" *

*Dubbs Leaders of the Reformation p. 152.

The time of Elizabeth was rather a literary than a religious age. The spirit of Renaissance seems to have gained the upper hand over the spirit of Reformation. In fact we can say that when Elizabeth came to the throne, the religious development had already reached its highest point. The doctrinal status of the Eucharist that was adopted by the Church of England had been established before the time of Bloody Mary. It merely remained for the Protestant reformers under Elizabeth to recast former confessions into what was called the 39 Articles. In 1563 they became the official doctrinal statement of the Anglican Church. To this day it is principally this confession which forms the doctrinal basis for the Anglican Church.

B

How Movements from the Continent Aided and Hindered
the Development of the Eucharistic Doctrine

The doctrinal basis of the Anglican Church is not exclusively the work of English reformers. The great part of the Anglican Confessions were formulated by English theologians who were aided by reformers from the Continent.

Lutheran Influence

The claim is frequently made that at one time England was very nearly Lutheran. This was the time of Henry VIII.. Even before the time of Cranmer's appointment as Archbishop, English theologians had visited Germany and had discussed plans for reform. Tyndale had been in Germany as early as 1524. At Hamburg he had become acquainted with Luther's writings though he had never really wished to be identified with the Lutheran cause.

Then in 1529 Cranmer had come under Lutheran influence. His marriage with Osiander's niece no doubt did much to cement his friendship

with German reformers, but his letters to Osiander show that he always considered the German leaders too violent in their methods.

Robert Barnes the chief English Lutheran had fled to Wittenberg in 1528. It was largely through his efforts that conferences were arranged between English and German theologians. Henry himself desired such conferences, but merely for the sake of furthering his own political ventures. On the other hand Barnes stressed the doctrinal union. His English assistant was the court preacher Fox.

In Aug. 1535 Christopher Mount had been sent to Germany to keep the princes from uniting with France. In Sept. Fox was sent on a similar mission. Henry had declared that he might sign the Augsburg Confession if it would be possible to institute a debate in order to come to an agreement.

Cromwell who was working at Henry's side presented what seemed to him a grand plan for a "Foedus Evangelicum" which was to unite all the great reforming nations of Europe. (Froude, l.c. Vol. II, 391.).

Melanchthon had also written several flattering letters to Henry urging him to reform the doctrine of England and then asking him to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession. Thus he assured him that a beneficial union could be established between England and Germany. Henry had invited Melanchthon to come to England in 1535, and also Cranmer had extended several invitations which he never accepted. In 1535 Henry had sent his delegates including Barnes, Fox, and Heath. Discussions were carried on during the first four months of 1536. In that year also Melanchthon had dedicated a commentary to Henry.

By Mch. 20 the conference in Germany had discussed all articles except Communion in both kinds, marriage of priests, papal mass, and monastic vows. (Reu, The Augsburg Confession, p. 190). The English and German representatives had come to an agreement, but since the

final decision rested with Henry, this acceptance was merely tentative.

As a result of this discussion 16 Articles were formulated on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. These were also called the Wittenberg Articles. They show to what extreme limits the Lutheran theologians would go in order to favor the English wherever possible. However, no doctrinal concessions were made.

It is claimed by many historians that these Wittenberg Articles formed the basis of the Ten Articles which were placed in the Bishop's Book in 1537. Jacobs believes (p.104) that the Sixteen Articles inspired no enthusiasm either among Catholics or among Lutherans. We may credit them with having given an impetus to further reformation plans.

In 1537 a committee assembled at Cranmer's home. Among those present were two Romanists, Fox and Cranmer favoring Lutheranism, and Latimer who took an indifferent attitude. Most of the work came from the pens of Cranmer and Fox and was known as the Bishop's Book. It has been classed as the highest achievement of English Lutheranism under the reign of King Henry. We quote Wordsworth's estimation (Eccl. Biogr. Vol. III, p. 317): "It is altogether an illustrious monument to the achievements of Cranmer and his colleagues against the intrigues and opposition of a party, formidable at once for their zeal, number, and power!" *

Also Froude pays the high compliment: "In point of language beyond all question, it is the most beautiful composition that has as yet appeared in the English language!" **

In 1538 a Lutheran delegation was sent to England to further the Lutheran cause and pave the way for a union. Henry's political predicament again prompted him to seek an alliance with Germany.

* Jacobs, l. c. p. 104.

** Froude, l. c. Vol. III, p. 229.

The Lutherans were really not very willing to waste more time at what seemed to them a useless task as long as Henry's main considerations were of a political nature. When he promised to show his zeal for reform, the Lutherans were again drawn into the controversy. The King preferred to have them send Melanchthon, but the German theologians knowing his weakness, sent in his stead Burkhart and Myconius with the nobleman Boyneburg. They knew they could depend on these men because they were not unionistically inclined.

At this meeting another 16 Articles were produced and presented to the King. When the English theologians hesitated to condemn the abuses, the Lutherans refused to subscribe to these Articles. It was believed that these Articles had been lost until in 1833 when Jenkyns found 13 of them and published them(Reu, l.c.p.192.).

Disappointed and deceived the Lutherans left Germany without having come to a better understanding for a union. In the following year the Six Articles which had been introduced by the Catholic party favoring transubstantiation and communion under one kind were enforced. As a result the Lutheran movement in England practically came to a standstill until after the death of Henry.

Henry did make another weak attempt to satisfy the Lutherans by sending Barnes in 1539 to tell them that everywhere toleration was practised and that the Lutherans need not fear England on account of the Six Articles. In 1540 the divorce of Henry from Anne of Cleves caused a permanent breach between Lutheran Germany and England.

The execution of Cromwell, the martyrdom of Barnes, and the death of Fox foreboded a dark future for the cause of Lutheranism in England in the year 1540. These may be considered the first important events leading to the decline of Lutheran influence in England.

**Decline of Lutheran
Influence.**

In answer to the question why the Church of England did not become Lutheran although in 1538 it was brought very close to Lutheranism, Jacobs declares: "The true answer is: a wicked ruler interfered within a sphere that did not belong to him and abruptly terminated the measures of the true representatives of the church which early indicated the readiness to accept the Lutheran Confessions!" *

Undoubtedly that was the foremost reason why Lutheranism failed to take root in England in 1538. Ten years later, after the death of Henry, the Lutherans had another opportunity to win England over to their cause. The papal tyrant, Henry who had been their chief opponent had passed out of existence. With his death England was, so to say, an open field that might submit to any form of Protestantism.

Sad to say, conditions had changed in Germany since 1538. Luther had died in Feb. 1546. The Elector of Saxony, the greatest figure in the Reformation next to Luther, had been imprisoned Apr. 24. 1547. Two months later the Landgraf of Hesse met a similar fate. In a short time Chas. V. introduced the Augsburg Interim and thus again restored the abominations of papacy. The Interim was to Germany at this time what the Six Articles had been for England in 1539.

The only staunch defender of Lutheranism was the Elector. He refused to give up the Augsburg Confession and preferred rather to suffer Martyrdom than to sign the Interim. When the Elector was again freed, he was hailed as the father of the country and as the defender of the Augsburg Confession. Even the fainthearted Melancthon who had forsaken pure Lutheranism congratulated him.

Now England was losing confidence in the Lutheran theologians.

* Jacobs, l.c.p. 136.

mentally, considered by some as Luther's successor, could not be trusted. Many of the remaining theologians did not have the courage to oppose the Interim and had fled from Germany to avoid persecution. With such a state of affairs in Germany, it would have been impossible for the remaining native Lutherans to win England over for Lutheranism. Just at that moment when England was most in need of the firm spiritual support of the Lutherans, Germany itself was spiritually at a low ebb. That unfortunate religious condition in Germany brought about the doom of Lutheranism in England.

One noteworthy attempt was yet made by English theologians and especially by Cranmer in the First Book of Common Prayer. Just previous to that time Cranmer had published Jonas' Catechism which clearly set forth the Lutheran view of the Eucharist. Therefore, a Lutheran tendency was noticeable in this Prayer Book which had been published in the autumn of 1548.

The book was of a devotional nature and was not intended to present any definite system of doctrine. In fact the author, Cranmer, seems to have attempted to be as indefinite as possible. P. Smith (l.c.p.312) believes that it was doctrinally a compromise between Lutheranism, Romanism, and Calvinism. There is some truth in the statement, but the opinion of Klotsche (Christian Symbolics) that the First Prayer Book has a Lutheran character seems to state it more accurately.

The book was later attacked by Gardiner a papist that it taught the Catholic view of the Sacrament. In view of such criticism Pollard (l.c.p.237) believes that this Prayer Book embodies a compromise on the Eucharist between the views of Cranmer and the Catholics. The phraseology seemed to favor both views although a discussion on transubstantiation had intentionally been omitted.

the elements were still described as bread and wine after the act of consecration. Pollard presents another view: "The book was neither Roman nor Zwinglian and still less Calvinistic; for this reason mainly it has been called Lutheran!" *

The Calvinistic Hooper describes the book as "very defective and of doubtful construction and in some respects manifestly impious!" In speaking at this time about the ambiguous position of Cranmer, Dryander a Reformed theologian from the Continent writes: "The reason for this obscurity is that the bishops could not for a long time agree among themselves respecting this article (on the Eucharist)"*

We may be charitable in assuming that Cranmer did make an honest effort to present the truth as he then saw it. From his previous contact with Lutherans, he had learned the Lutheran view. Had it not been for unfortunate developments in Germany and England, Cranmer might even yet have maintained the Lutheran view to his end. It is not a question as to whether he wished to be identified with Lutheranism or not. The point is: Did he ever hold the Lutheran view of the Eucharist? There we must answer in the affirmative.

This then brings to a conclusion the Lutheran influence in the history of the Church in England. Lutheran publications had been used until this time and were used even later, but henceforth there was no personal contact with Lutheran reformers that might influence the formation of the Eucharistic doctrine in England.

In summing up we may state that the uncompromising Lutheran position against Unionism both aided and hindered the progress of reformation in England. The Lutheran contact produced a salutary influence in as far as it stressed Biblical principles in opposition

* Pollard, l. c. p. 220.

to tradition and rationalism. However, this same influence was not ready to advance its cause by compromising. In fact, the Lutherans refused to join with England except on a doctrinal basis. Had the Lutherans submitted to a union, the English Church might have become Lutheran in 1540, but it is questionable what sort of Lutheranism this would have resulted in for Germany. It was against Lutheran principles to unite except on a doctrinal basis. Germany could not unite with England without harming the very soul of Lutheranism.

Anabaptists

Before proceeding to discuss the influence which the Swiss theologians exerted on the English Reformation, we must retrace our steps to the time when Lutheranism first began to influence England. It was in 1534 when another religious element found entrance into England, known as Anabaptist. This sect seems to have come from Holland and Germany. Both Luther and Zwingli had already met with their opposition. The Articles of 1536 mention their "detestable heresies and utterly to be condemned.

As early as 1524 they had been active in Holland. Due to their fanatical and radical opinions, they were avoided and hated alike by religious and civil authorities. They despised liberal arts, destroyed all books except the Bible, and abolished civil government, saying that they would extirpate the ungodly and set up the kingdom of Zion.

In 1538 a royal commission was issued to check the progress of these radicals. Unfortunately their fanaticism was identified with Protestantism. The Romanists could not neglect calling Henry's attention to such an identification. Thus the Protestant movement unjustly suffered on account of these fanatics. Zwingli's revolutionary

concerned with the Eucharist, but they generally hindered the progress of the reformation and in their falsely directed zeal actually aided the Catholic element of England.

Sacramentarians

In 1538 we meet with another tendency, that of the Sacramentarians. A certain clergyman named Nicholson, later called Lambert, had unlawfully started a debate with Taylor a Romanist who was supporting transubstantiation as a dogma of England. The reformers, fearing that this would lead to some serious trouble, sent him to the Archbishop who questioned him concerning his views. Finally Henry also became interested in the case. After repeated effort Cranmer was unable to persuade Lambert to desist from his denial of the real presence. Under the influence of Catholic clergy, Henry passed an unjust judgment and condemned Lambert as a heretic. On Nov. 22. 1538 he was burned at Smithfield for having denied the corporal presence in the Sacrament.

An act of this nature would naturally fill the hearts of the Protestants with fear and dread. It required a special measure of courage to proceed with reform when the fate of Protestants was so rashly and unjustly decided upon. Such acts of cruelty would also inspire the papist party with new hopes and urge them on to persecute and hinder the work of Lutherans in England at this time.

Thus the burning of Lambert, insignificant as it may seem among the Titanic events of that age, undoubtedly cast a dark shadow upon the work of the Reformation. It may have inspired others to have desired martyrdom, but the real age of martyrs did not appear until the time of Bloody Mary.

Froude(l.c.Vol.III,334) enumerates the following religious bodies which were exerting an influence in England in 1539: Romanists, Anglicans, Zwinglians, Anabaptists, Sacramentarians, and Lutherans.

Swiss Influence

When Lutheranism began to weaken in Germany and England, the Swiss element became strong on English soil. It was not at all such a difficult task for the Swiss to gain a foothold in England after the Lutherans had prepared the way for reforms. The field really should have belonged to the Lutherans, but since they were unable to take possession of it in 1548, the Swiss took advantage of the situation. Now it is true that Swiss influence had been felt in England even before this time.

The martyrdom of Frith in 1533 and that of Hooper in 1555 shows that there were also English Reformed who were willing to suffer martyrdom for their religious convictions. We do not know whether Frith had ever personally met the Swiss theologians, but of Hooper we can say with certainty that he had been on most intimate terms with the Swiss leaders since 1540. In 1549 he had returned to England, a true disciple of Bullinger.

Of the Swiss theologians Zwingli himself was never directly in contact with the English Reformation. His successor Bullinger and later John Calvin helped to bring the Reformed influence to England. Moeller(l.c.Vol.III,p208)declares that by 1547 the publications of Bullinger, Zwingli, and Calvin appeared in English translations side by side with the writings of the Lutherans.

England could not turn to Germany for spiritual aid and, therefore, sent urgent invitations to the Reformed theologians of the Continent. Calvin had sent his advice to Cranmer by letter in 1549. Again in 1551 he wrote to Geneva urging Cranmer to use all his energy to eradicate

the last traces of superstition. In addition to that he had also written to King Edward for the same purpose. At about this time Bullinger also wrote from Zurich encouraging Dr. Cox at Oxford to oppose and help to do away with popish ceremonies.

In reply to the request sent to foreign theologians Peter Martyr, Ochino, Tremellus, Dryander, and John a Lasco came to England. On account of the Interim in Germany, Fagius and Bucer from Straszburg also decided to go to England in 1548. Melanchthon had received several invitations, but he refused to leave Germany on account of the great need of the Saxon Lutherans.

Peter Martyr.

Martyr was an Italian by birth. When he had come to England in 1547, Cranmer appointed him regius professor of divinity at Oxford. The same position was occupied at Cambridge by Bucer after 1548.

Martyr had written to Bucer asking him to come and help reform England. He complained that the learned English opposed what he considered true religion. We can well understand that Martyr would meet with opposition at Oxford. The state had forbidden students to attend his lectures on the Eucharist. The Catholic theologians publicly challenged him to a debate which took place May 17.1549. For the time being Martyr seems to have been defeated, but the Papists were soon afterward expelled, and Calvinists took their place.

On June 20., 24., and 25. similar disputations were conducted at Cambridge on transubstantiation and related topics. Thus we see how energetic efforts were made at the universities to revolutionize the entire system of religious teaching with special stress placed on the doctrine of the Eucharist.

Dixon tells us that Peter Martyr had come to the Zwinglian view after he had passed from Romanism to Lutheranism. (Hist. of Church of England, Vol. II, p. 521.).

Having been a friendly rival of Bucer on the Continent, Martyr corresponded quite freely with him. In 1548 Martyr wrote to Bucer: "Transubstantiation might be exploded, but the difficulty of the presence still remains!"*

Another letter of Burcher to Bullinger dated Oct.29.1548 leads us to the conclusion that for a time at least Martyr was considered a Lutheran. Burcher writes: "The Archbishop of Canterbury, moved no doubt by the advice of Peter Martyr and other Lutherans etc."**

This is also the opinion of Loescher who claims that he supported the Lutheran proposition: "Corpus et sanguis Christi non est carnaliter aut corporaliter in pane et vino, nec ut alii dicunt sub speciebus panis et vini!" ***

In June of that year he expressed some doubt in a letter to Bucer and asked for his opinion whether he was correct in believing that we receive Christ's body "vere", but only "animo et fide", denying "corporalem praesentiam respectu panis". Bucer answered him on June 20. stating that he should have denied only the "localiter", not the "corporaliter esse" and then have added "vere exhiberi". Bucer also told him that he who denied the "realiter" and "consubstantialiter" and taught that the body was inclosed in heaven simply furthered the profanation of the Sacrament. (Loescher, l.c. p.24ff).

This will show how the leaders themselves who occupied first position as theologians in England were in serious doubts as to the interpretation of the Eucharist. Bucer who at this time had attempted to set Martyr aright soon began to waver in his own interpretation.

* Dixon, History of the Church of England. Vol. II. p.547.

** Jacobs, l.c. p.208.

*** Loescher, Historia Motuum. On Bucer, p.24.

Martyr himself soon succumbed to the Zwinglian view. In Jan. 27. 1550 he wrote to Bullinger: "The labor of the most reverend Archbishop is not to be expressed. For whatever has hitherto been wrested from them (bishops), we have acquired solely by the industry and activity and importunity of this prelate!" *

Incidentally this also shows Cranmer's tendencies at this time. He had begun to introduce the Reformed views of the Eucharist, but he depended on the influence of his imported and foreign theologians.

Martin Bucer

A word must yet be said in regard to Bucer. Moeller (l.c. Vol. III, p. 83) tells us that as early as 1524 he had favored the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist. Bucer had been at Straszburg when Hoen's representative Rode arrived with a new interpretation of the Eucharist. It seemed so reasonable to Bucer that he began to favor it at once. Zwingli himself had just adopted this view in 1523. It seems, therefore, that Bucer did not get his first Reformed impressions about the Eucharist from Zwingli, but from the messenger of the Dutch lawyer Hoen whose rationalistic interpretation was then adopted by Zwingli and favored by Bucer.

Loescher informs us that in 1528 Bucer had publicly denied the real presence as maintained by the Lutherans. A few years later when he intended to become the great religious compromiser between the Lutherans and the Swiss, he was more careful in his choice of expressions. In 1529 he assumed a mediating position between "Corpus Christi substantialiter adest et proprie comeditur ore" and "Corpus Christi non adest substantialiter nec proprie comeditur ore." Thus he had fallen out of favor with the Swiss, and had also lost the confidence of the Lutherans. Henceforth Bucer considered it his lifework to harmonize the Zwinglian and the Lutheran interpretation.

* Sinclair, l.c. p. 17.

In the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 he accepted the real presence and even admitted that the unworthy received the Sacrament to their condemnation. In 1541 he wrote several letters to Italian Protestants showing that he was acquainted with the Lutheran view of the real presence, but also declaring that he considered Luther and Zwingli extremists in their Eucharistic views.

While in England in 1550, he published his *Confessio de Coena* which still gave evidence of his mediating tendencies. He rejected "carnaliter et realiter", but stated that "realiter et substantialiter" might be omitted, but not denied. Such was his position on the Eucharist till the time of his death.

Loescher passes a very charitable judgment on his character in stating that Bucer actually believed he could bring about a basis on which he could unite the Lutheran and the Reformed view of the Eucharist which might be accepted by both parties. Bucer failed to see that such an undertaking was an utter impossibility. Thus Bucer may be called a real compromise theologian.

Melanchthon

Melanchthon and Bucer were at this time considered the representatives of Continental Lutheranism. It is true but sad that these two so-called leaders of Lutheranism aided the Reformed and had turned traitors to Lutheranism after 1546. Melanchthon had no distinctive interpretation of his own on the Eucharist. He wanted to evade the controversy rather than solve the problem.

We quote Stahl (*Die Lutherische Kirche und Union*, p. 111): "Melanchthon's conception of the general presence of Christ in the Supper is after all Calvinistic doctrine not openly expressed. There is no middle doctrine between Lutheranism and Calvinism. As soon as the Lutheran view is abandoned, the Reformed view is the only view that is left."

Calvin, Bucer, Melanchthon mark only different theological types of the Reformed doctrine! *

Reformed Theologians.

The remaining important theologians who came over from the Continent at this time were representatives of the Reformed view. This element finally triumphed by persuading the compromise theologians and the native leading English theologians to accept the Reformed interpretation of the Eucharist.

As evidence of this change of theological attitude in England, we note the Reformed character of the Second Prayer Book. As the First Prayer Book had given evidence of Lutheran tendencies, so the Second was manifestly intended to favor the Reformed. Such men as Cox, Bucer, Martyr, and Ridley all exerted their Reformed influence on this Book which has become one of the confessional standards of the Anglican Church.

Pollard has the following to say about the changes that were made from the First Prayer Book: "The changes affected between 1549-1552 were designated to facilitate an accommodation with the Reformed Church abroad." **

As regards the influence of Bucer in the formation of this work, Pollard declares: "His opinions prevailed only as far as they coincided with those of Cranmer and Ridley to whom was due the chief share in the compilation of the Second Book of Prayer." ***

The sacramental presence was henceforth denied which showed the increasing influence of Swiss views. Perhaps this may have progressed beyond Cranmer's original program of reform, but it was now too late.

* Neve, l.c.p.40.

** Pollard, l.c.p.274.

***Pollard, l.c.p.271.

He had asked the Reformed for aid and advice and was, therefore, obliged to submit and adopt their peculiar rationalistic view of the Eucharist. Collette tells us: "The best and most certain proof of the Primate's (Cranmer's) perfect renunciation at this date, both of Romish and Lutheran tenets, connected with the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is his completed Book of Common Prayer" *

Thus we see how the Reformed finally triumphed over the Lutherans and gave the Church of England a Reformed character in the doctrine of the Eucharist which to this day has distinguished it from the Catholic as well as from the Lutheran Church.

C

How these Various Influences can be Traced in the Development of the Doctrine of the Eucharist

Although historians and dogmaticians agree that it is most difficult to trace the degree of influence the various religious leaders exerted on the development of the Eucharist, it is at least possible to draw some general conclusions which show at the various stages of the development of the Eucharistic doctrine when these various religious denominations were most influential in the formation of the theology of the Church of England.

Unionistic Tendencies

We must bear in mind that the leading theologians in England were of the type of Bucer and Melancthon in as far as they were compromise theologians. Their unionistic tendencies differ not in kind, but in degree. The whole political background of England favored this type of theology. The compromise

* Collette, The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer. p. 282.

theologians were spared while those who held "extreme" views in the interpretation of the Eucharist were executed at random.

The chief exponent of Unionism in England was Cranmer, but we shall try not to judge him too harshly. Had he been of the heroic type of Luther, he might have lost his life in the early years of his archbishopric. Cranmer was not a compromise theologian by choice, but of necessity. We cannot and shall not attempt to excuse his weakness, but we shall try to offer an impartial, charitable explanation.

Cranmer was naturally timid. As long as he had someone at his side to advise and support him, he showed remarkable courage, but in his religious attitude he seems to have been at all times swayed by his environment. He lacked Luther's rugged faith in the written Word. If Cranmer had founded his reformation on the Word of God as Luther had done and had then showed that with him religion was a matter of conviction, he would have been truly a noble character. As long as Cranmer had the ideals of Lutheranism before him, his reformation made admirable progress. When the unionistic indifferentism of Bucer influenced him, Cranmer foresook his Lutheran ideal and submitted to Reformed influence.

Cranmer never did favor the extreme Reformed theology of Zwingli, and for that reason he inclined more toward the views of Calvin. During the first period of Reformed influence the Zwinglian element was most prominent in England, but the 39 Articles which were published in 1563 show that Calvinism had by that time displaced the extreme Zwinglian interpretation of the Eucharist. In fact it was Calvin's system of theology which gave to the Reformed Church "cohesion of doctrine and firmness of polity (Concordia Cyclopedia). The Reformed Church of England is essentially Calvinistic and

differs from the Reformed Church of the Continent only in that it maintains the Episcopal form of church government.

In the early years of the Reformation Cranmer had strived for the ideal. Nothing could have pleased him more than to have been able to unite with Germany under the leadership of Luther. Cranmer recognized in Luther a leader whose firm stand on Scripture would also have a beneficial influence in the Reformation of England.

Unfortunately for the English Reformation, the Lutheran principles were utterly opposed to the unionistic tendencies of Cranmer. Had Germany submitted to a union without a doctrinal basis, England might have fared better, but surely Lutheranism would have suffered beyond description.

Since Cranmer could not affect a union with the Lutherans, he looked around for other Protestants who might aid him in his reforms. The Swiss were only too willing to gain a foothold on English soil. It did not require much urging to bring them over from the Continent. These Swiss representatives, though not as unionistically inclined as Bucer, were nevertheless willing to unite with England provided England would adopt their view of the Eucharist.

Their influence was so mighty over Cranmer that he seemed to have forgotten most of his Lutheranism at the time of his execution when he was accused by the Catholic clergy under Bloody Mary that he had held three different views of the Eucharist during his lifetime. At that time Cranmer claimed that he had held only two distinct views, meaning possibly the Catholic and the Reformed. We may assume that after Cranmer had called in the Reformed theologians, his Lutheranism was gradually and slowly, but surely, being discarded.

In 1552 Cranmer made one more vain attempt to unite all Protestants. After this failure to assemble the representatives from all Reformed

foreign churches, no such an attempt was ever made again by the Church of England(Sinclair, l.c.p.20).

Various Confessions.

As evidence for a religious development in the doctrine of the Eucharist from Catholicism to Lutheranism and from Lutheranism to the Reformed view, we shall name the confessions which were produced at the time of the English Reformation.

Wittenberg Articles

The first confession which resulted from the combined effort of English and Lutheran theologians in 1536 was known as the Wittenberg Articles or the Repetito Augustanae. It was really a variation of the Augsburg Confession in which concessions were made to favor the English as far as possible without changing any of the Lutheran doctrines.

Ten Articles

Although neither party became very enthusiastic about this so-called compromise, the Wittenberg Articles were used in the same year by the English in the formation of a confession known as the Ten Articles. Pollard(l.c.p.103) claims that the King himself had drawn up these Articles which were then corrected by Cranmer. Jacobs(l.c.p.88) considers them a confusion of Catholic and evangelical doctrines. In all probability Cranmer had now abandoned the Roman dogma of transubstantiation, but he still believed in the real presence as is borne out by his letter to Watt a Zwinglian(Pollard, l.c.p.121).

Jacobs remarks that Article IV deals with impanation. The words read: "Under the form and figure of bread and wine, the very selfsame body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ is verily, substantially, and really contained and comprehended." *

*Jacobs, l.c.p.93.

Ranke claims that the first five of the Ten Articles have their origin in the Augsburg Confession or in publications related to it (Wittenberg Articles). (Jacobs l.c.p.96.). Also these Ten Articles accomplished little or nothing.

Bishop's Book

In 1537 several English theologians representing Catholic and Lutheran views came together at Cranmer's home to produce what was known as the Bishop's Book. This work constitutes the climax of Lutheran influence in England under Henry. Jacobs believes that the Book is in part a paraphrase of Luther's Small Catechism. It seems that also the Ten Articles and the Augsburg Confession were used as sources. The Book was published in Sept.1537.

Thirteen Articles

In 1538 a Lutheran delegation had been sent to England to continue the doctrinal discussions that had been begun two years previously. The result of this meeting was the writing of the Thirteen Articles. Reu(The Augsburg Confession,p.190) believes that they were based on the Sixteen Articles of Wittenberg. They were of no great importance except in so far that they were used in the formation of the 42 Articles of 1553. These Thirteen Articles terminated the Lutheran influence in England until the time of the First Prayer Book in 1549.

Six Articles

In 1539 the anti-Reformation confession known as the Six Articles was introduced by the English Catholics and sanctioned by Henry. For the time being all reformation movement ceased.

King's Book.

This appeared in 1543. In distinction to the Bishop's Book, this Book enjoyed the King's sanction. The treatise

on the Sacrament of the Altar is much more elaborate than it had been in the Bishop's Book. In the same year Cranmer issued a pastoral to the clergy requesting that for an entire year they should avoid discussion of such doctrines as had previously been debated on. Such a request served to increase confusion and indifference.

Book of Homilies

In harmony with his attitude Cranmer issued his first Book of Homilies in 1546 without even referring to the Sacrament of the Altar.

Communion Service

In Mch. 1548 a new order of Communion Service was published, but the interpretation of the Sacrament of the Altar still remained an open question. The Eucharist might be administered in both kinds, but no mention was made as to the proper interpretation.

First Prayer Book

Finally in 1549 Cranmer issued the First Prayer Book which again showed his tendencies toward Lutheranism. Langstaff (Holy Communion in Great Britain and America, p.8) makes the statement that the most important change in the outward administration of the Eucharist until 1549 had been that the Latin language had been completely supplanted by the English. The words used in the Prayer Book in the act of consecration still show that Cranmer wanted to maintain the real presence. They read: Grant that "they may be to us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved son Jesus Christ!"

Second Prayer Book.

In the Second Prayer Book which appeared in 1552 as the work of several theologians including Cranmer, a

special effort was made to avoid the Lutheran interpretation. The words of consecration were changed so as to give evidence of a Reformed view. They read: Grant that "we receive these thy creatures of bread and wine (and thus) may be partakers of thy most blessed body and blood!"

The words of distribution also manifest a Reformed spirit: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving. Drink this in remembrance of Christ's blood that was shed for thee and be thankful. (Jacobs, l. c. p. 241.).

42 Articles

In the following year Ridley and Cranmer published the 42 Articles. Reu believes that the Thirteen Articles of 1538 and the Wittenberg Articles of 1536 were again consulted and used. Jacobs gives us the following information about their origin! The first outlines were made by Cranmer in 1551. Then they were circulated among the clergy, enlarged and revised, and finally issued for the public in 1553. At that time they were known as the 42 Articles of 1552 because they had been published privately in that year!*

39 Articles

In 1562 after some more revision and change the 42 Articles were issued as the 39 Articles. They were sanctioned by Parliament in 1571. Henceforth the clergy were obligated to subscribe to and adopt them.

Article 29 dealing with the Eucharist reads: "Corpus Christi in multis et diversis locis eodem tempore praesens esse non potest.... non debet quisquam fidelium carnis eius et sanguinis realem et corporalem praesentiam in Eucharisto vel credere vel profiteri!"

*Jacobs, l. c. p. 322.

The Calvinistic view of the Eucharist is thus established as a fundamental article in the basic confessions of the Church of England. One significant change was made in the revision of these articles as it appears in the 39 Articles of 1562. The declaration against the corporal presence in the Sacrament is omitted. The reason for this change is unknown, but it is believed that it was made at the request of Queen Elizabeth in order to favor the Catholics and to win over the Lutherans if at all possible.

Such was the status of the doctrine of the Eucharist in 1562 when the 39 Articles were published and adopted as the first confessional standard of the Anglican Church.

Thus we have traced the doctrine of the Eucharist as it developed in England through the confessions which have been produced by English theologians in conjunction with Catholics, Lutherans, and Reformed. Each of these denominations has contributed more or less, but the Reformed theologians finally succeeded in making the Church of England a Reformed denomination.

Thus the doctrine of the Eucharist developed in the midst of the most varied political and religious complications. As found in the Anglican Confessions this doctrine is the result of the combined efforts of English and Continental theologians. In a word, it may be called a product of rationalism, unionism, and doctrinal indifferentism.

Book of Martyrs, Foxe.

Lives of British Reformers. (Presbyterian Publication, a collection).

Dixon, History of the Church of England. Vol. II, V.

Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II.

Froude, History of England. Vol. II, III, VI.

Smith. P., Age of the Reformation.

Burnet. G., History of the Reformation. Vol. I. and III.

Moeller. Wm., History of the Christian Church. Vol. III.

Tschackert., Entstehung der Lutherischen und Reform. Kirchenlehre.

Dorner, Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie.

Bridgett, History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain (Catholic).

Langstaff. J. B., The Holy Communion in Great Britain and America.

Neve, Lutherans and Church Union.

Jacobs, The Lutheran Movement in England.

Loescher. E. V., Historia Motuum.

Klotsche, Outlines of the History of Doctrine.

Klotsche, Christian Symbolics.

Innes. A. D., Cranmer and the Reformation in England.

Pollard. A. F., Cranmer and English Reformers.

Dubbs, Leaders of the Reformation.

Gairdner. J., The English Church of the Sixteenth Century.

Collette. C. H., The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Cranmer.

Sinclair. W. M., Leaders of Thought in the English Church.

Todd. H. J., The Life of Archbishop Cranmer. Vol. I and II.

Reu. M., The Augsburg Confession.

Concordia Cyclopedia.