

PETER MARTYR

DEPOSITED
BY THE COMMITTEE ON
Graduate Studies.

Ixm

1105.1926



ACC. NO.

DATE

not in acc. bk

PETER MARTYR; A STUDY IN ITALIAN INFLUENCE UPON THE
ENGLISH REFORMATION PRINCIPALLY IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

A Thesis.

Submitted to the

FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

AND

RESEARCH OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY.

In candidacy for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS.

by

Pascal Di Florio.

Montreal, April, 1926.

Chapter I.

1. Introduction: The Relative Historical Position of England in the First Half of the Fifteenth Century.

2. Martyr's Training: From 1424 to 1431.

3. The Oxford Disputation: 1431.

4. The Journey to Rome: 1432-1433.

PETER MARTYR: A STUDY IN ITALIAN INFLUENCE UPON THE
ENGLISH REFORMATION PRINCIPALLY IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

5. Influence of the Italian Renaissance upon the English Reformation.

6. Conclusion.

THE POLITICO-ECCLESIASTICAL CONDITIONS OF ENGLAND IN THE YEAR 1547

When Henry VIII died in 1547 and young Edward VI. ascended the throne, England had undergone a great change touching the final authority in civil and religious questions. The issue was whether the Pope or the King was to be the final authority in the realm. Henry settled the question in the beginning of the second half of his reign and the results were far reaching. Henry had been educated for the Church but upon the death of his father and brother, he married his sister-in-law, Catherine of Aragon, and ascended the throne with the brightest of prospects for his future and that of his kingdom. During the first half of his reign, he distinguished himself in the service of the church, and the Pope, in recognition conferred upon him the title of "Defensor Fidei."

The occasion for the revolt against Rome's supreme authority was afforded by Henry's quarrel with the Pope who refused to divorce him from his wife. There was a series of circumstances which led him to take such a step: the unprecedented event in the royal family, the death of seven out of eight children, gave him the feeling that he was in some way under the displeasure of God; the deep concern to have a male heir for the throne; the growing doubt as to the validity of his marriage, since no English king had ever married

his sister-in-law; and finally, having tired of Catherine, he asked the Pope to annul his marriage. But when the Pope refused to do so the struggle for royal or papal supremacy began. It culminated in 1532 when Henry, by Act of Convocation, had himself declared the supreme ruler of the Church of England. With this Act he destroyed both the spiritual and the temporal supremacy of the Pope and set up instead a "kingly papacy" from the jurisdiction of which the Church of England has not yet been able to "free itself completely." (1)

To maintain, as some do, that Henry's divorce was the cause of the Protestant Revolution in England is to display unpardonable ignorance with the many forces which had been at work before Henry ever thought of a divorce. These were as follows:

(a) the covetous exactions of the Church in the way of tithes and annates; (b) the corruption of the Church which is generally admitted; (c) the lay revolt against the Church as we learn from Pecock's "The Repressor;" (d) the influence of Lollardy which had been familiarizing people with the idea that salvation was not the property of the Roman Church only; (e) Christian Humanism with its liberalizing tendencies which had been widening man's outlook and silently undermining the Scholastic theology of the Church; (f) and Luther's vigorous attacks on the Papacy. These were the forces, rather than Henry's quarrel which produced the English Reformation.

(1) Pollardy, Thomas Cranmer, p.71, N.Y. 1904.

This conclusion is substantiated by the following:- The Bishop of London wrote to Wolsey that if Chancellor Dr. Horsey who was suspected of complicity in the murder of Richard Hunne "be tried by any twelve men in London, they be so maliciously set in favor-om haereticae pravitatis that they will cast and condemn any clerk though he were as innocent as Abel" (1)

The influences we have mentioned had been permeating the lives of the people and had brought into being two extreme parties, the Papists and the Reformists, whose religious conceptions were fundamentally different and yet both were prepared to act with violence or resist with stubborn resolution for their views. Between these two extremes stood the middle party which, although it clung with fondness to the old religious observances, nevertheless detested the abuses with which the clergy and the old religious rites were closely connected. A nation thus divided would only rally around some strong personality and for some great issue. Henry was fortunate to have possessed the former and to have championed the latter. As a king he had no divine prerogatives in his favour, being only the second king of the newly established Tudor dynasty. He therefore had to make his own way Through Parliamentary procedure ~~and made~~ it by attending the sessions of the Houses of Commons and of Lords and in both he became the recognized leader. He also stood forth as the champion of the great issue, England's freedom from foreign interference, and on this he united every

(1) Letters and Papers etc. 11.1 p.1.

party.

After the year 1538, Henry's supreme authority, civil as well as spiritual, was never openly questioned in the realm. It is true that he seemed to have drawn a distinction between the potestas jurisdictionis, which he claimed for himself, and the potestas ordinis, which belonged to the highest ecclesiastical court in England, nevertheless, it is also true that these technical distinctions in practice were almost completely disregarded, for the king in the newly formed church was the supreme head. His supremacy gave him no less than the "power of the keys." "He was," said Macaulay, "the pope of his kingdom, the vicar of God, the expositor of Catholic verity, the channel of sacramental grace. He arrogated to himself the right of deciding dogmatically what was orthodox doctrine and what was heresy, of drawing up and imposing confessions of faith and of giving religious instruction to his people. He proclaimed that all jurisdiction, spiritual as well as temporal, was derived from him alone.... He actually ordered his seal to be put to commissions by which bishops were appointed, who were to exercise their functions during his royal pleasure" (1) Henry's view in this matter was strongly supported by Archbishop Cranmer who played a very important part in cementing the union of the English Church and State.

(1) Macaulay: History of England, vol.1. p.51-2.

Henry, in the exercise of his arrogated power as the "Rightful and Supreme Head of the Church of England," forbade the payment of "Peter's Pence" (1) and of the "Annates" (2) to the Bishop of Rome and claimed same for himself; he compelled the English clergy to submit to his will by threatening them with "Praemunire" (3) he sold the monastic lands and appropriated the sums for his own use and for that of his courtiers; he used his authority to "redress ecclesiastical abuses," (4) he induced the Convocations of York and of Canterbury to declare that the Roman Bishop had no greater jurisdiction than any other; he devised the Ten Articles and issued Injunctions; and ordered that an English bible be placed in each church for the people's use. The Parliament of April -June 1539, made bold by these advances, introduced six religious questions for discussion. They were:-

1. " Whether there be in the sacrament of the altar transubstantiation of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of flesh and blood or not?"

2. " Whether priests may marry by the law of God or not?"

3. " Whether the vow of chastity of men and women bindeth by the law of God or not?"

4. " Whether auricular confession be necessary by the law of God

(1) Gee and Hardy, Documents illustrative of the Hist. of the Eng. Ch. p.20.

(2) Ibid. p. 209. (3) Letters and Papers v. 71.

(4) Gee and Hardy. Docuts. etc. p. 243.

or not?"

5. " Whether private Masses may stand with the Word of God ~~or~~
or not?"

6. " Whether it be necessary by the Word of God that the sacrament of the altar should be administered under both kinds or not?" (1)

In the discussion of these, the Bishops were of divided opinion while the lay members of the House of Lords were unanimously against them.

The counterpart to the Six Questions was the enactment of the Six Articles which ordered that there be no change from Mediaeval doctrines and that confiscation of property and capital punishment be imposed upon any delinquent.

The king, who in theology was no more advanced ~~than~~ the majority of his subjects, as seen from his doctrinal manual, -- "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," applied the " Six Articles " strictly against the religious innovators as he had done with previous Acts against the Papists.

At Henry's death in 1547, the Politico-Ecclesiastical conditions of England were the following:

1. The kingdom was free from papal interference, and the majority of the people clung to Mediaeval theology although they shared a common hatred against the clergy and the Papacy.

(1) Letters & Papers etc. xiv.i.p.489.

2. The king ^{was} the recognized supreme head in temporal and spiritual matters within the realm,

3. The kingly authority had undermined and subordinated every other authority, but Edward VI, who succeeded to the throne was only a child and therefore could not exercise the same powerful sway which his father had exercised. Besides, there were other forces at work:- an empty treasury and a debased coinage; a widespread dissatisfaction created by uncloistered monks and evicted tenants of monastic property; a silent, widely diffused movement favouring Evangelical Reformation; and a new nobility, which having arisen out of the Church's spoils, did not command hereditary respect. All these agencies were represented in the Council which gathered around young Edward.

It was in the middle of this political, social, and religious ferment that Edward VI, came to the throne; that a Council of Regency was appointed; and that his uncle was created Duke of Somerset and chosen Lord Protector.

During Edward's first year, a series of Injunctions were issued encouraging the clergy to preach against the judicial pretensions of the Bishop of Rome and exhorting people to read the Gospel in English.

The laws affecting treason were abolished, and a reformation of the Church of England, with Cranmer as Primate, now seemed inevitable. To accomplish this task, Parliament, through Cranmer,

invited some foreign Evangelical Reformers.

We know at least of six Italian divines who went to England and worked for the Reformation. They were Bizarro, who was for many years with the Earl of Bedford and wrote a number of books; M.A. Florio, a preacher to an Italian congregation in London, who endeavoured to detach his compatriots from the "dogmas, hypocrisy and tyranny of the pope"; Terentianus, a close friend of Bishops Jewel and Parkhurst, and a faithful messenger and attendant of Martyr; Tremellius, one of the most learned orientalists of his time, a friend of Archbishop Parker, a Cambridge professor, a prebendary of Carlisle, author of many works and translator of the famous Tremellius' Bible long used both in England and on the Continent; Bernardino Ochino, a prebendary of Canterbury, a preacher to an Italian congregation in London, author of the "Tragedie" (one of the theological masterpieces of the Reformation) and a great divine to whose theology Queen Elizabeth "confessed that she had been drawn." (1)

These theologians must have exerted considerable influence upon the English Reformation. But as information about their labours in England and their relations with the English Reformation is exceedingly scarce and difficult to obtain, and as they were all overshadowed by Peter Martyr, the greatest of them all, we shall speak in this thesis, ^{only} of Martyr's influence upon and contribution to the English Reformation.

(1) Lindsay, His. of the Ref. vol. 11. p. 358.

CHAPTER 11.

MARTYR'S TRAINING, FAME, FLIGHT, INVITATION TO ENGLAND.

Peter Martyr is the greatest of the Italian theologians which Italy gave to the Church of England in the middle of the sixteenth century. He was designated by Beza as a "Sphinx born out of the ashes of Savonarola." (1)

Peter Martyr Vermigli was born in Florence, (City of the Flowers) Italy, on the sixth day of September, 1500. His parents were Stephanus Vermigli and Maria Fumantina. The child's birth occurred on the nativity of the Virgin Mary and ^{it} was named by reason of a certain vow after the Milanese inquisitor, Peter Martyr, who had been slain by the Arians in "defence of the true faith." The boy received instruction first from his Mother, who being learned in the Latin tongue interpreted for him the Comedies of Terence from the original, and later from the excellent Latinist, Marcellus Vergilius. Early in life Martyr distinguished himself in learning, in incessant application for hearing and reading, and in his rapid progress. To avoid worldly perils, at the age of sixteen, he joined the Augustinian order, which was reputed for its severe discipline and ~~for the~~ study of Scriptures. His example was followed by his sister Felicitas, who joined the Virgins of the monastery of Saint Peter the Martyr.

(1) New Intern. Encyc., vol. XX. p. 513.

Thus the parents were left alone. **Stéphanus**, particularly displeased by his son's step, willed the bulk of his property to the "Hospital of the Poor," upon condition that there should be paid yearly to his son, so long as he lived, fifty crowns.

After three years in the college at Fiesole, Martyr, because of his learning and diligence, was sent to enlarge his learning at Padova in the monastery of St. John de Verdera. Here he spent eight years in the study of Philosophy, Arts, Greek language and Literature under the famous teachers and philosophers Branda, Genua, and others. ^{also} Here he exercised himself in reading, writing, meditating and disputing. At the early age of twenty-six, Martyr was honoured with the degree of doctor of divinity and was sent forth as a scholar and preacher. These gifts he displayed in the largest cities of Italy. Presently he was made abbot of Spoleto. Three years later, he was transferred to Naples where he assumed the principalship of the College of St. Peter ad Aram, - an office of very great dignity and profit, which he discharged with the highest integrity and impartiality. Here the light of the Gospel first shone into his soul. Although with scruples of conscience, he diligently perused the "Commentaries upon the Gospel" by Bucer; "True and False Religion" by Zwingli; and some books of Erasmus. Contemporaneously he belonged to a group of illustrious men and highly gifted women: Ochinus, Terentianus, Cusanus, Flaminius, the Duchess of

Ferrara, Victoria Colonna etc., who under the leadership of a Spanish Christian noble, Jouan Valdez, met with the avowed purpose of studying the Scriptures.

At this time Martyr developed a dangerous sickness and, being advised by his physicians, he left Naples. Out of respect, the "Fathers" chose him general visitor of the Order and later Prior of St. Fridian, a post which carried with it episcopal jurisdiction in the central part of Lucca. There he instituted an admirable school for the youth of the city, in which school Celsus, Tremellius and Laecicius, taught Greek, Hebrew, and Latin respectively, while Martyr daily interpreted St. Paul's Epistles. People from every part flocked to hear Martyr's exposition of the Epistles. Within the space of one year, according to Simler, no less than eighteen students, including Tremellius, Celsus and Zanchius, forsook the College and Popery and went abroad where they could practice and preach the Gospel freely.

Calumnies were soon framed and speedily spread, and being accused of heresy by his enemies, Martyr was summoned to Genoa that he might justify himself; but being aware of the hatred and treachery of his opponents, he settled his affairs and those of the college and departed for Pisa. Here he celebrated the Lord's Supper in company with certain Christian nobles; wrote to Cardinal Pole and to his College giving reasons for his departure; and returned the episcopal ring declaring "that hee would not can-

vert anie of the College goods unto his owne private uses" (1)
 Martyr, having had private conversations with Ochino, who was
 in a similar position, although summoned by the Tribunal of the
 Inquisition at Rome, induced him to leave Italy. The 25th day
 of August¹⁵⁴² Martyr left Italy, and after a long and dangerous
 peregrination across the Alps reached Zurich thence to Basle
 and to Strasburg where he remained for five years distinguish-
 ing himself as a teacher, scholar, and commentator of the Scrip-
 tures. At Strasburg he formed a lasting friendship with Bucer,
 and with a number of English notables:- Jewel, Nowell, Poinet,
 Grindal, Sandys, John Cheke, Rich. Morison, Sir Thos. Wroth,
 Sir Peter Carew, and others who attended his lectures on
 " Aristotle's ethics and the Book of Judges." (2)

At Strasburg, Martyr married ~~ance~~ ~~ann~~, Katherin Dampmartin.
 A few words about Katherin, who followed her husband to England
 and died there seven years later, will not be out of place here.
 Katherin loved God, her husband and her fellow-men. At Oxford
 she was loved as a benefactor and looked upon as a mother of the
 needy. So willingly and sacrificingly did she give herself to
 succour others that people thought she was "indued with some
 divine power." She died in the year 1553 and was buried in Christ
 Church, but under "Bloody Mary," by order of Cardinal Pole, her

- (1) Simler, Life and Death of Martyr, edited by A. Marten, 1583
 (2) Churton's, Life of Nowell, p.34, Oxford, 1809, cit. by Wood,
 Oxon., vol. p. 327 n.

body was dug up and cast into a dunghill, although no accusation was proved against her. The only justification for the strange indignity was that, being the wife of a heretic, she could not remain buried beside the body of St. Frideswide. In 1561, by virtue of the Queen's ecclesiastical commission, Katherin's remains were ^{again} dug up. This time her bones were mixed together with those of the Roman Catholic St. Frideswide in order that the former might secure a lasting resting place and the bones of the latter be no longer gazed upon by the superstitious as relics. (1) This singular event was joyfully commemorated with a number of Greek and Latin verses written upon the occasion and hung upon the doors of the Church and of the University. The following is a specimen translated from the Latin by Dr. Abbot:

" The Popish crew have evermore the female sex embraced:

How is it, that a woman's corse they have from the grave displaced? Thus if you ask, right readily my answer may be this: Their bodies dead they care not for; live ones they clip and kiss." (2)

Having said enough, for our purpose, of Martyr's doings at Strasburg, and having rehearsed in this apparent digression of English affairs, we are now in a position to speak of England and the part that Martyr played there at the beginning of the

(1) Strype's Life of Parker, vol. 1. p. 199-200.

(2) Strype's Life of Parker, vol. 1. p. 201.

English Reformation.

With the death of Henry VIII. and the accession to the throne of England by Edward VI., a new religious era began for the realm. The Duke of Somerset, Lord Protector, and Archbishop Cranmer wishing, as far as possible, to keep the influence of the Pope out of England, and being desirous of bringing about a reformation in the established religion of the kingdom, to abolish ignorance, idolatry, and superstition, resolved to invite to England in the king's name, godly and learned evangelical foreigners. The first ~~foreigners~~ to be invited, ~~from~~ otherwise, were the two learned divines Ochinus and Peter Martyr, who left under the guidance of an English merchant, John Abell by name, who in turn had been entrusted by the English authority to provide the two theologians in question with attendants, guides, and all other necessary things they required:- horses, saddles, swords, books, clothes, petticoats, night-caps, gloves, garters, etc., and to see them to England. The party left Basel the 4th of November and reached London on December 20th. The total cost of the journey, according to the Bill of Expenses submitted to the Council for payment by John Abell; is 126 li., 7 s., 6 d. (1)

Ochino and Martyr were kindly received and entertained by Cranmer at the Lambeth Palace, "with all manners of courtesies." (2)

(1) See Bill of Expenses submitted to Parliament by Jn. Abell at end of Thesis.

(2) Simler op. cit.

The few months spent by these divines with the Archbishop were very significant, as the great Primate himself confesses, relative to the change of his views touching certain "papistical errors." (1)

During Martyr's stay at Lambeth, a rebellion, according to Strype, took place in Devon and Martyr was asked by Cranmer to address a sermon with the view of pacifying the rebels. In part, what he said was this; "God himself hath been so intent that the force of charity and the depth of love should intervene between the people and the magistrates.....Notwithstanding that our Lord wished that his disciples after the manner of the dove should live harmless lives, nevertheless he charged them that they should imitate the prudence of serpents whereby they should regulate and control their own actions after the precepts of holy writ and beware not to go astray after other councils as for instance, the sedicious councils of the Papists.

If you had been able, as prudent men,... to look far into the future you would have seen that all your enemies together..... confident in your dissensions have been planning to take up arms against your country... whereas if you had continued loyal they would never have even dreamt of being able to venture." (2)

(1) Works of Cranmer, vol.1. p.374, Par. Soc. 1844.

(2) Strype's Cran. Mem. vol.1.Bk.11, ch.X.p.267-8 our translation from the Latin.

Another sermon was written in Latin by Martyr and rendered into English by Cranmer's order. It was also against the rebellion in Devon. The sermon begins by reminding the people of the sorrow they all have in common because of their national trouble.

Archbishop Cranmer is made to say that he would prefer to keep silent at this time but ^{he} finds it impossible in view of the fact that all who once envied the realm, because of its wealth and of its force, now see it troubled and deformed. These changes which spell utter ruin and subversion have been brought about by malicious people who are procuring their own destruction as well as that of others. (1)

In the year 1548, about the beginning of March, Martyr, by the King's commandment, was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford while Ochino was made canon of Canterbury, with a dispensation of residence, each receiving a yearly pension of forty marks secured to them by letters-patent. (2)

Martyr began his work at Oxford with an exposition on 1 Corinthians ^{of Paul} as this Epistle offered him opportunities of discussing many of the papistical abuses and superstitions. At the outset, the papists manifested no open antagonism to Martyr's teachings. Some out of mere curiosity, frequented the lectures and even expressed admiration for the doctrine which Martyr taught. Others, especially the Masters of the Colleges, restrained the scholars from attending

(1) Strype's Mem. of Cran. vol.1., p. 267.

(2) Burnet, Reform. vol.1.p. 328 also Wood, Oxon. vol. 1. p.327.

Martyr's lectures and made no further stir for the time being.

At this juncture, news reached England regarding the miserable conditions of Germany as the result of the "Interim" which, with the exception of the marriage of priests and the communion in both kinds, reintroduced the doctrine of the Roman Church.

The Reformed Churches, therefore, were faced with inestimable difficulties. Divinity professors were asked to subscribe to

the Interim. Bucer refused to do so at the risk of his life and loss of his position. Martyr, ^{on} hearing of this, urged the

Archbishop to invite Bucer to England. This was done. In

December 1548, Martyr himself wrote to his dear friend pressing him to accept the invitation in view of the urgent need of learned Christian leadership. He said: "If you knew how great

is the scarcity in this country of those who are conversant with ecclesiastical order and government, you would, I am sure,

take compassion on the Lord's flock. Those who possess any

share of learning, ^[here Martyr exaggerates,] are either wholly opposed to religion; or

are actuated by any feeling for it, are either not engaged in the

sacred office, or are so cold as to altogether shrink from

the endurance of any labours or perils." (1)

If Martyr in this letter describes within ^{limits} the religious conditions

we are led to believe, as we shall show, that his presence

(1) Zur. Let., Let. CCXXV. p. 472. Parker Soc., Cambr., 1847.

and numerous activities must have meant not a little to the English Reformation.

A month afterwards, January 1549, Martyr wrote to Bucer and again urged him and Fagius to go to England where they were greatly sought for the universities. In his correspondence, Bucer had shown much concern for the other theologians of Strasburg. Martyr, therefore, in his reply assured him that provision would be made for them also. "I must go to London during this Lent, and I shall abide some days, as I am wont to do, with my Lord of Canterbury; at which time I will arrange matters for our brethren as I may think necessary, and will take care that you shall not have recommended them to me in vain." (1)

Bucer and Fagius arrived in London in April 1549, and were entertained at the Archbishop's Palace. There they found Doctor Peter Martyr with his wife and ~~his~~ attendant, Julius Terentianus, ^{and} Master Emanuel Tremellius with his wife and some other godly men.

At Oxford, as we have already noted, Martyr met with no open opposition from the Romanists. But this state of affairs could continue only as long as he adverted to the corruptions of Rome in a general manner. The clash was bound to come. It came when he began to discuss particular doctrines and phases

(1) Ibid. p. 476.

of the Roman Church, as he interpreted 1 Corinthians 11-26, (" For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come,") as a commemoration of the Lord's death and not as a sacrifice of Christ's body, as the Roman Church still maintains. It was then that the Papists rose up with an outcry and hotly defended what they termed the ancient opinions of the Church.

The accusations they brought against Martyr were these:- first, that " he impugned the doctrines of the forefathers;" second, that " he abolished^{ed} the Ceremonies well instituted;" and third, that " he prophaned the holy sacrament of the Altar." (5) These accusations were followed by secret preparations regarding a public disputation which was to be held between the Romanists and this disturber of the peace of the Roman Church in England. The Papists affixed placards to all the churches stating that the next day there would be a disputation against the presence of Christ's body in the holy Supper. On the appointed day, the ^{Oxford} auditorium was filled with students of all the colleges and ~~and~~ outsiders. All were ready to witness the greatest theological battle ever fought at Oxford and if need be, to make clamours and tumult, yea, and to fight too.

(1) Zur. Let. CCXLVlll. p.556.

(2) Strype's Ecc. Mem. Vol.11, 1., Bk.1, Chap.25, p.324-5.

(3) Simler, op.cit.

Meanwhile, Martyr was in complete ignorance of all these preparations. Some of his friends, moved at the unusual attendance of people, went to his home to inform him of the matter and urged him to remain there since his adversaries seemed undoubtedly minded to use force rather than argument. Martyr answered that he could not neglect ~~the~~ king's charge to lecture; that he had never been the author of tumults; that he would not give cause to his adversaries for disorder; and that there were undoubtedly members of his congregation who were expecting the usual lecture ^{and he could} ~~and he could~~ ^{not} ~~disappoint them~~. He, therefore, proceeded. Upon arrival to the lecture room, Dr. Smith's servant delivered a letter from his master to Martyr wherein Smith challenged him to a public disputation. Martyr was again urged by his friends to return home in view of the impending danger. But the lecturer being of the nature of a rock and endowed with the character of a martyr, as his name implied, refused to call off his usual lecture. In his firm determination to bear testimony to the truth, he went forward to ~~meet~~ his audience. Being openly challenged by his adversaries to dispute, he replied that he by no means declined ~~disputations~~, but that he had come thither not to dispute but to lecture and that with their permission, he would lecture first. The audience condescended to this and Martyr delivered his discourse with "singular doctrine and eloquence," and "incredible constancy and courage."

When the lecture was over, his adversaries, more stoutly than ever, urged him to dispute. But Martyr, amidst loud vociferations, still declined to discuss the said Sacrament, alleging that he was not sufficiently prepared, to which he received the reply that such could not be the case he having lectured a very short time before on the Lord's Supper. Thus pushed, he then responded that he could not dispute, even if he would, without the King's consent, as he discerned in such a step symptoms of sedition. Moreover, he thought that a lawful disputation required that there should be questions for discussion propounded, judges and moderators appointed, and notaries to register the arguments chosen. Lastly, he said, that it was already late in the day and that there was not enough time to discuss such an important question as the Lord's Supper.

The Papists would not have yielded to such reasons, if the Vice-Chancellor of the University had not stepped forward and submitted that both Smith and Martyr with some of their fellows should meet at his house to discuss the matter relative to the propositions which were to be debated, the time they were to be debated and the way they were to proceed at the disputation. Having spoken thus, the Bidells ^{of the University} were ordered to dismiss the people and trouble was averted.

Accordingly, Martyr accompanied by Sidall and Curtop and

some other friends met at the Vice-Chancellor's house with Smith, Cole, Oglethorpe and three other doctors of divinity.

After a long discussion Martyr succeeded in persuading his adversaries, first, to adopt for the disputation the order he had followed in his lectures; Second, that strange, barbarous, and ambiguous terms as "really," "substantially," etc., which were used by the schools, should not be used, and that they should confine themselves to the Scriptural terms, "carnally and corporeally; and third that the whole matter should be referred to the King's Majesty's Counsel for approval.

These questions agreed upon, the disputation was to take place, according to Simler, (1) on May 4th, 1548, but according to Martyr's published account of the disputation it was to be on the 28th of May, in the presence of the King's Commissioners who would govern the disputation. Smith, who had "endeavoured to raise a tumult and fearful of being called to account," fled to Scotland and then to Brabant before the time fixed for the discussion. On the appointed day the disputation was held and three of Smith's co-religionists appeared in his place, as the disputation was held.

(1) Josiah Simler, op. cit.

CHAPTER 111.

THE OXFORD DISPUTATION.

The Disputation of the Sacrament of the Eucharist was held at Oxford on the 28th of May, 1549.

The disputers for one side were Doctor Peter Martyr, assisted by Doctor Cartwright, and for the other side, Doctor Wm. Tresham, Doctor Chedse, and Master Morgan, M.A.

The disputation was held in the presence of the King's Commissioners:— Henry, bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Haines, dean of Exeter, Master Richard Morison, esquire, Christopher Nevinson, D.C.L. and Doctor Cox, Chancellor of the University of Oxford.

The questions set down to be disputed were three:—

1. " In the sacrament of the Eucharist, there is no transubstantiation of the bread and wine, into the bodie and bloud of Christ."
2. " The bodie and bloud of Christ is not carnallie and corporallie in the bread and wine; nor, as others speake, under the shewes of bread and wine."
3. " The bodie and bloud of Christ is sacramentallie conioined to the bread and wine." (1)

In the present chapter we should like to give an outline

(1) Martyr, Disputation of the Eucharist, trans. and Publ. by Anthonie Marten, 1583.

of the pros and cons of the famous disputation concerning the Sacrament, of the Eucharist, held at Oxford but this we cannot do on account of its length. We shall, however, give a brief resumé of Martyr's arguments, and this for the following reasons:—

First, because of the difficulty to secure a copy of the disputation. So far as we know there are extant Martyr's very rare account of the disputation and an outline of the debate giving Martyr's arguments only in John Foxe's, "Acts and Monuments," (1)

Second, because it is Martyr's most famous disputation. It marks Martyr's most outstanding life's event, with the possible exception of his forsaking of Roman Catholicism and escape from Italy.

Third, because it marks the opening of an era of both religious disputation and revolution — a revolution which unfortunately ended in a religious compromise with the "Elizabethan Settlement" in England.

Fourth, because it gives us an opportunity to observe the intellectual acumen and masterly knowledge which Peter Martyr had of this most fundamental and yet much disputed and misunderstood doctrine of Christianity.

The following is a summary of Martyr's arguments: (2)

- (1) Foxe; Acts and Monuments, vol.VI.pp.298 ff., Seeley, London 1858.
- (2) Apart from a few changes Foxe's outline has been followed. See Acts and Mon., vol.VI., p.299 f.

1. " In the sacrament of the Eucharist, there is no transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the bodie and bloud of Christ."

Martyr's Arguments upon the First Conclusion are the following:*

" The Scriptures," he said, " most plainly do name and acknowledge bread and wine. In the evangelists, we read that the Lord Jesus took bread, blessed it, brake it, and gave it to his disciples. St. Paul, likewise, doth oftentimes make mention of bread.

Ergo, We also, with the Scriptures, ought not to exclude bread from the nature of the Sacrament." This conclusion Martyr supported by quotations from some of the Fathers of the Church:

" Cyprian: 'As in the person of Christ, his humanity was seen outwardly, and his divinity was secret within: so, in the visible sacrament, the divinity inserted itself in such sort as cannot be uttered; that our devotion about the sacraments might be the more religious.' (1)

Ergo, as in the person of Christ, so in the sacrament, both the natures ought still to remain."

" Gelasius: 'The sacraments which we receive of the body and blood of Christ, are a divine matter; by reason whereof, we are made partakers, by the same, of his divine nature; and yet it ceaseth not still to be the substance of bread and wine.

And certes the representation and similitude of the body and

*References in this chapter are taken from Foxe.

(1) Cypri. in serm. De Coena Dom.

blood of Christ be celebrated in the action of the misteries!..
etc....(1)

Theodoret: ' Those mystical sacraments, after sanctification,
do not pass out of their own nature, but remain still in their
former substance, figure, and shape,' (2)

Ergo, Like as the body of Christ remaineth in him, and was
changed into his divinity; so, in the sacrament, the bread is
not changed into the body but both the substances remain.

Origen: ' If whatsoever entereth into the mouth, goeth down
into the belly, and so passeth through a man; even that meat,
also which is sanctified by the word^{of} God, and by prayers....
passeth into the belly, and so voideth through a man... For it
is not the outward matter of bread but the word that is spoken
upon it, that profiteth him which eateth it worthily.' (3)

Irenaeus: ' Jesus, taking bread of the same condition which is
after us... did confess it to be his body. And taking likewise
the cup, which is of the same creature which is after us.....
confessed it to be his blood.' etc... (4)

The arguments deduced from the foregoing statement of facts
by Peter Martyr relative to the first question under discussion
are:

- (1) Gelasius contra Euticheon. (2) Theod. Dial. 2: contra Eutich.
(3) Orig. on Matt. XV. (4) Irenaeus, lib. IV. contra Haeres.

1. " The bread in the sacrament is so changed into the body, as our bodies are changed when they are made incorruptible by hope.

But our bodies are not made incorruptible by changing their substance:

Ergo, No more is the bread changed into the substance of the body."

2. " Where bread leavened or unleavened is taken, there is substance of bread; and not accidents only.

In the sacrament, bread is received ~~either~~ leavened or unleavened.

Ergo, In the sacrament is substance of bread, and not accidents only."

3. " The body of Christ is named of that which is proportioned round, and is insensible in operation.

Accidents only of bread have no figure of roundness.

Ergo, the body of Christ is not named of accidents, but of very bread substantial."

4. " The words of the evangelist, speaking of that which Christ took, blessed, brake, and gave, do import it to be bread, and nothing else but bread.

Ergo, The substance of the bread is not excluded out of the sacrament."

5. " Chrysostom: ' Christ in giving bread and wine, said, do this in remembrance of me.' (1)

Cyril: ' He gave to them pieces or fragments of bread...In bread we receive his precious body, and his blood in wine.' (2)
Ergo, By these doctors, it remaineth bread after consecration."

6. " The analogy and resemblance between the sacrament, and the thing signified, must ever be kept in all sacraments. In the sacrament of the Lord's body this analogy or resemblance cannot be kept, if bread be transubstantiated:

Ergo, The substance of the bread must needs remain in the sacrament."

" The major of this argument is "proved by Augustine who saith: ' Sacraments must needs bear a similitude of those things where- of they are sacraments, or else they can be no sacraments.'

7. The minor of argument six is thus proved:

" The resemblance between the sacrament and the body of Christ is this, that as the properties of bread and wine do nourish outwardly, so the properties of the body of Christ do nourish spiritually.

Without the substance of bread and wine, there is no resemblance of nourishing;

Ergo, Without the substance of bread and wine, the analogy could not hold."

(1) Chys. 1. Cor.11, Hom.27.

(2) Cyril in Joan. lib.1V. cap.14.

8. " Again, another resemblance... or analogy of this sacrament is this: That as one loaf of bread, and one cup of wine, containeth many corns, and many grapes; so the mystical congregation containeth many members, and yet maketh but one body. Without the substance of bread and wine no such resemblance or similitude of conjunction can be presented: Ergo, Without the substance of bread and wine the analogy of this spiritual conjunction cannot hold."

9. " Every sacrament consisteth in two things, that is, in the signifying, and the thing signified.

Without the substance of bread and wine, in the sacrament, there is nothing that signifieth in the sacrament.

Ergo, The substance of bread and wine, in the sacrament, can in no wise be transubstantiate from their natures."

The minor is thus proved:

" There is no signification in any sacrament without the elements.

The substance of bread and wine is the element of this sacrament.

Ergo, Without the substance of bread and wine, there is no similitude nor signification in this sacrament."

The adversaries base their transubstantiation on the literal sense of Christ's words: " This is my body."

A literal exposition of these words is false. That they are

to be taken figuratively and spiritually is proved:

"First, by the words of the Scriptures". (1) " Do this in remembrance of me." (2) " Until I come." those words would be nonsensical if he were here. (3) " The breaking of the bread, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (4) "This cup is the New Testament" which words must necessarily mean, " This cup doth signify the New Testament. (5) " My words be spirit and life. The flesh profiteth nothing."

Second, by ^{the} nature of a sacrament." The words of Christ:

" This is my body, " cannot be literally expounded without a trope, as the nature and property is to bear a sign or signification of a thing to be remembered, which thing, after the substantial and real presence is absent.

Third, by the testimonies of the Fathers." Thus they spoke:

Tertullian, " 'This is my body;' that is to say, this is a figure of my body." (1)

Augustine, " Christ gave a figure of his body." (2)

" He did not doubt to say, 'This is my body; when he gave a sign of his body." (3)

Jerome, " Christ represented unto us his body."

Ambrose, " As thou hast received the similitude of his death; so thou drinkest the similitude of his precious blood."

(1) Tertul. Contra Marc. lib.IV. (2) Aug. Ps.111.

(3) Aug. Contra Adabantum Manichoeum, cap.12.

(4) Ambros. de Sacr. lib.IV. cap.4.

10. " The death of Christ is not present really in the sacrament, but by similitude.

The precious blood of Christ is present in the sacrament, as his death is present.

Ergo, The precious blood of Christ is not present really in the sacrament."

II. "The bodie and bloud of Christ is not carnallie and corporallie in the bread and wine; nor, as others speake, under the shewes of bread and wine."

The arguments adduced by Peter Martyr in support of the second conclusion are these:

1. " The true natural body of Christ is placed in heaven. The true natural body of man can be but in one place at once, where he is.

Ergo, The true natural body of Christ can be in no place at once, but in heaven where he is."

The major and minor premises are respectively proved by the Scriptures which read: " Jesus was taken up to heaven." " I leave the world and go to my Father." " Many shall say in that day, Lo, here is Christ, and there is Christ; believe them not." And by St. Augustine who asserts that the glorified body as a true body can only be in one place. "Propter veri corporis modum." (1)

(1) Aug. ad Dardanum.

2. " Every true natural body requireth one certain place.

Augustine saith, Christ's body, is a true natural body.

Ergo, Christ's body requireth one certain place."

3. " Augustine giveth not to the soul of Christ to be ⁱⁿ more places at once but one. (1)

Ergo, Much less is to be given to the body of Christ, to be in more places at once, but one."

4. " The nature of the angels is not to be in divers places, but they are limited to occupy one certain place at once. (2)
Ergo, The body of Christ being the true natural body of a man cannot fill divers places at one time."

5. " Whatsoever is in many and divers places is God.
The body of Christ is not God, but a creature.
Ergo, The body of Christ cannot be in more places together."

6. " We must not so defend the divinity of Christ, that we destroy his humanity. (3)
If we assign to the body of Christ plurality of places, we destroy his humanity.
Ergo, We must not assign to the body of Christ plurality of places."

7. " Whatsoever is circumscribed...cannot be dispersed in more places at once.
The body of Christ is a thing circumscribed.

(1) Ibid. (2) Basilus de Spirit. Sanct. cap.22.

(3) August.

Ergo, The body of Christ is not dispersed in more places at one time."

8. "Every quantity...is circumscribed in one particular place. The body of Christ had dimensions, and is a quantity. Ergo, The body of Christ is circumscribed."

The major is proved by Cyril: 'Whatsoever is understood to be a body the same is verily in a place, and in magnitude and in quantity. And if it be in quantity, it cannot avoid circumscription.' (1)

9. "If Christ had given his body substantially and carnally at supper, then was that body either passible or impassible. But neither can you say that body to be passible or impassible, which he gave at supper.

Ergo, He did not give his body substantially and carnally at supper."

The minor is thus proved: " If ye say, it was passible, Augustine ... saith. 'Ye shall not eat this body which you see, nor drink the same blood which they shall shed that shall crucify me.' And if ye say it was impassible," the words of the evangelist: " Eat, this is my body which shall be given for you, " (2) are against it.

10. " Bodies organical, without quantity, be no bodies. The Pope's doctrine maketh the body of Christ in the sacrament to be without quantity.

(1) Cyril, de Cren. lib.11. p.245.

(2) Aug. In Ps.XCVIII.

Ergo, The pope's doctrine maketh the body of Christ in the sacrament to be no body."

11. " All things which may be divided, have quantity.

The body in the pope's sacrament is divided in three parts.

Ergo, The body in the pope's sacrament hath quantity, which is against their own doctrine."

12. " No natural body can receive in itself, and at one time, contrary or divers qualities.(1)

To be in one local, and in another place no local; to be in one place in quantity, and in another place without quantity; in one place circumscribed, in another place incircumscribed, is for the natural body to receive contrary qualities.

Ergo, The body of Christ cannot be in one place local, and in another not local; in one place with quantity, in another without quantity, as our adversaries affirm."

13. " The wicked receive not the body of Christ.

The wicked do receive the body of Christ if transubstantiation be granted.

Ergo, Transubstantiation is not to be granted in the sacrament."

The major is proved thus:

" To eat Christ is to have Christ dwelling and abiding in him.

The wicked have not Christ dwelling in them.

Ergo, The wicked eat not the body of the Lord."

(1) Viril. contra Eutichen. lib.viv.

Since Cyprian saith: " The eating of Christ is our abiding in him." (1)

14. " The holy Ghost could not come, if the body of Christ were really present.

That the Holy Ghost is to come is most certain.

Ergo, It cannot be, that Christ himself should be here really present."

The major is proved by John XVI., " Unless I go from you the Holy Ghost shall not come."

111." The bodie and bloud of Christ is sacramentallie con-
ioined to the bread and wine."

Martyr's arguments and authorities in defense of the last conclusion are:

" If the wicked, and infedels, do receive the body of Christ, they receive him either with sense, or reason, or faith.

But they receive him neither with sense, reason, nor with faith.

Ergo, Wicked men and infedels receive in no wise the body of Christ."

For the declaration of the major, if it be maintained that the body of Christ in the sacrament is not sensible to senses nor is it perceived by reason because this sacrament exceedeth reason, we answer": 'Nec fides habet mortum, ubi ratio prae-
bet experimentum': and if ye say that they receive him with faith, how can that be, seeing infedels have no faith?"

The teaching of the papists as to eating of the body of Christ in the sacrament is both strange and differs with the Scriptures and the Fathers of the Church.

They teach that although wicked persons and infedels receive with their mouths and with their senses " the accidents of bread, and thus imagine a certain body of Christ " yet they do not receive " the effect of the sacrament." They eat, say the papists, " the matter of the sacrament," but " it giveth them no nourishment nor life, nor maketh them partakers of his spirit and grace." Now, this teaching is contrary to the:

1. Scriptures: " He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him." John IV.

It therefore appears that the Scriptures by the " eating of Christ's flesh" mean "to believe in Christ's passion; which none can do but only the faithful."

2. Fathers of the Church. They declare that:

" The eating... of his flesh, is a certain desire to abide in him." " None eateth of this lamb, but such as be true Israelites, that is, true Christian men." " As meat is to the flesh, the same is faith to the soul, the same is the word to the spirit."

Cyprian, " And therefore doing this we whet not our teeth to bite but with pure faith we break the holy bread and distribute it." (1)

Augustine, " It may not be said, that any such do eat the body of Christ, because they are accounted among the members of Christ, and members of a harlot, etc...When Christ saith, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him'... For Christ so spake these words, as if he should say; he that dwelleth not in me, and in whom I dwell not, let him not say nor think, that he eateth my body, or drinketh my blood." (1)

" To drink is to live." Again, " Why preparest thou thy belly and thy teeth? Believe and thou hast eaten" etc. These, in brief, are Martyr's arguments.

We shall not make any comments on the disputation, nor on the intellectual resources and controversial mastery of Peter Martyr, but we will reproduce a part of Dr. Richard Cox's oration which was delivered at the close of the discussion in question, and will let it speak for itself. Dr. Cox spoke as follows:-

Viri Oxonienses, peregrinus quator dimidiatos dies in excutiendis duabus quaestionibus, de Transubstantiatione scilicet, et Reali Praesentia corporis christi in Sacramento. Magno fuit nobis oblectamento haec Disputatio: atque utinam per tempus licuisset omnia quae hic dici possent, audivisse. Quod optabamus id successit; ut quieta esset Disputatio, Auditores ita etiam

(1) Aug. de Civ. lib. XXI. C. 15.

Sedati. Spero Veritis imbibendae avidi. Qui fabulam peragebant, et utrinque disserebant, suo officio diligentissime perfuncti sunt, nec meritis laudibus fraudandi. Viri nostri, hoc est, Angli et Oxonienses, praeterquam quod Conscientiae suae negotium egerunt, etiam haud minimum decus huic Academiae attulerunt, quod in tanta causa non subterfugerint, quo minus palam testarentur, pro eruditionis suae modulo, et dono a Dei benignitate sibi impartito, et quid animi in hisce controversiis haberent, et quibus rationibus et authoritatibus huc perpellerentur.

Pulcherrime sane sibi datam provinciam obierunt.

Caeteri vero docti et boni viri, qui in ijs tantis rebus tacerunt, nescio quo pacto, suo silentio negationis notam sibi inusserunt, Petrus autem, et merito Petrus, propter constantiae suae firmitatem; Martyr et merito Martyr, propter innumera quae nunquam non profert, de veritate testimonia, multam apud nos, ed apud pios omnes inire debet hoc tempore gratiam.

Primum, quod immensos labores exantlarit, in sustinendo Disputationum onore, Nam si ne Hercules quidem contra duos, quid Petrus solus contra quoscunque.

Deinde quod Disputationem instituerit, vanos vanorum hominum sermones repressit, qui de eo invidiosa atque odiosa sparserant: nimirum aut nolle, aut non audere sua defendere. Postremo, quod summorum Magistratum, atque adeo Regiae Majestatis, expectationi optime responderit, dum non solum Christi doctrinam, ex ipis vivis

fontibus Dei propinaverit Acadomiae, sed neque quenquam
 (quantum in ipso situm fuit) fontes aut turbare aut obstruere
 permiserit. (1)

The adversaries overcome by the truth, spread many false and feigned reports of the Oxford Disputation. Because of this and because of the earnest desire of his friends, Martyr published the disputation in a treatise which appeared with the testimony of the King's Commissioners. And as he had triumphed in the field of controversy, so with the only accurate account of the disputation, he triumphed in " the printing office, in the suffrage of history and in the opinion of posterity." (2)

(1) Strype, Memorials of Thos. Cranmer, vol.11.p.848-9.

(2) Dixon's History of the Church of England, vol.111.p.118.

CHAPTER IV.

"WAS THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRESENCE EVER QUESTIONED,
IN ENGLAND, BEFORE MARTYR WENT TO OXFORD?"

Dixon in his history of the Church of England maintains that the Roman Catholic doctrines of the presence and of transubstantiation had never been questioned in England before Peter Martyr's time. In this chapter we shall examine Dixon's statement which we reproduce now. "The universities," said Dixon, "were made to ring with the combat of commissioned divines; the mediaeval theology was formally assailed in her most sacred seats; and, when Peter Martyr at Oxford, at Cambridge, Ridley, Perne, or Madew, thundered in the schools, it was noted by the discerning that now within the realm for the first time in the age, the great Catholic doctrine of the Presence, or rather the received explanation of the nature of the Presence in the Sacrament, was put under question by men reputed learned. In particular, the exploits of Peter Martyr in that university which has been often thought less luminous than her sister, kindled in the deeper obscurity a beacon or a conflagration which struck more sensibly the eyes of the observers." (1)

(1) Dixon's History of the Church of England, vol.3, p.110, Frowde Lond.1902.

In substance, Dixon here asserts that the Catholic doctrine of the Presence or rather the received explanation of the nature of the Presence in the Sacrament, had never been questioned in England, by learned men, before Martyr went to Oxford. To substantiate his statement, Dixon cites a number of authorities which we shall quote at some length.(1)

Bishop Gardiner said in 1551, at his trial, that at the time when he preached his famous sermon on St. Peter's day, in 1548, "the very Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament and mass was not in any controversy among learned men." In this he was confirmed by his witnesses.

Dr. Bricket said that at that time, "There was no controversy or contention among learned men of the Presence; for the king had sent forth a proclamation that no man should speak unreverently of the same, otherwise than the Scriptures should bear."

Richard Bruern of Christ's Church said that, "when the controversy of the Sacrament began, he knew not, but he did not remember any that did openly read, teach or dispute of it in Oxford till Peter Martyr began."

Hugh Weston declared; "There was no contention of the Presence among learned men within their realm until Peter Martyr began to preach it at Oxford."

White, then of Winchester, testified that, "since Wyckliff's time, (who afterwards reconciled himself) no

(1) Dixon, History of the Church of England, vol.111, p.110n.

learned man had called the Presence in question, till Peter Martyr in his lectures in Oxford called the thing in question. Before that, the doctrine was received, acknowledged and agreed upon by the whole clergy and temporality learned of this realm, and by acts of Parliament and Synods established, and by the prelates and other learned men set forth in books and open sermons."

John Young, fellow of Trinity said that, "Before the time when Gardiner preached his sermon, there was no controversy in Cambridge among learned men of the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, but it was known and taken universally for a true Catholic doctrine."

To the above witnesses who testified about the Catholic doctrine of the presence and the accepted explanation thereof, at Cardiner's trial, adduced by Dixon, we shall add a few more which are given by John Foxe in, "Acts and Monuments," Vol. VI.

Robert Willanton declared, "That at the time the said bishop did preach, there was no contention nor controversy, of the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, among learned men." (1)

George Bullock declared, "That, to his knowledge there was no controversy, nor yet contention openly spoken or preached against the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, of learned men at the time that said bishop

(1) Foxe, vol.VI, p.206.

preached within the university of Cambridge.(1)

Christopher Malton said, "That the opinion against the Presence of the Body of ~~the~~ Christ to be in the Sacrament, was not, in our time openly taught by reading or preaching in Oxford, until February last."(2)

John Redman, doctor of divinity, stated, "and as concerning the presence of Christ's body in the Sacrament... that so far as he doth now remember, the said bishop of Winchester spoke none otherwise, in that point, than is.... in writing declared. An that at that time...there was no contention or controversy in that matter, amongst prelates or learned men of this realm."(3)

Bishop Stephen Gardiner, in the additional articles which he presented to the commissaries or judges delegate said, "That the truth of Christ's most precious body and blood in the Sacrament of the altar hath not been, nor was impugned, by any famous clerk, or yet by any named learned man in any part of all Christendom, either in the Greek or in the Latin church, by our time.....but only by Oecolampadius, Zuinglius, Vadianus and Carlostadius, the impugning whereof was most manifest error; and, in England, no learned man named had, or yet did openly defend or favor that error. (4)

(1) Foxe, vol.VI, p.226.

(3) Ibid. p.239.

(2) Ibid. p.231.

(4) Ibid. p.126.

"George, Bishop of Chichester," testified that, in foreign countries, he did not know of any learned man who had "impugned the truth of the sacrament of the altar,... saving that he knoweth that Bullinger and Musculus have written against the truth of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament; and though he taketh these for learned men, yet he doth not assent to their doctrine in this matter of the sacrament." Further on, he said that since Gardiner's preaching on St. Peter's day, "My Lord of Canterbury hath made a book on the verity of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament; and that the bishop now of London, did openly impugn the verity of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, in the Parliament of Westminster; from both whose learning and judgments in this matter, this deponent doth dissent, although he taketh them for learned men." (1)

"Thomas, Bishop of Norwich," said that when he "departed out of England, in ambassade to the Emperor, last, he knew no learned man in England that did openly favor and defend that error, saving that Wyckliff and Huss and Berengarius had impugned the truth of Christ's most precious body and blood to be in the sacrament." "But now of late, since his return, he hath seen books that have been made here in England by those that have the name of learned men, in favor of that error." (2) Bishop Thomas here undoubtedly refers to Peter Martyr who had published in book form, with a

(1) Foxe, vol.VI, p.240f
 (2) Ibid. vol.VI, p.241

dedication to Cranmer, the lectures which had stormed the schools of Oxford. and to Cranmer, who had published his, "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament."

The testimonies quoted above agree with Dixon's statement relative to the doctrine of the real presence, namely, that with the possible exception of Wyckliff, the Catholic doctrine of the presence or explanation thereof had never been questioned nor publicly disputed in England by learned men until the time when Peter Martyr lectured in 1548 at Oxford.

Two questions arise from the conclusion just reached and demand our careful consideration in view of its ambiguous phraseology.

1 - The "Catholic doctrine of the Presence or rather the received explanation of the nature of the presence in the Sacrament." It seems to us that the, "Doctrine of the Presence" is not the same as, "the explanation of the nature of the Presence," as Dixon states. For we hold: First, that members of congregations belonging to the same denomination may believe in the same presence of Christ and yet may give a different explanation of it. This is illustrated by the vehement debate which the Dominicans and Franciscans had at the Council of Trent, (1545-1563). The difference of opinion was not over the presence in the sacrament but in the explanation or modes of existence in the sacrament. The Dominicans distinguished two modes of the Saviour's existence, (a), a heavenly

and natural presence, (b) a sacramental and peculiar presence. The Franciscans differed from the Dominicans' explanation and held that the distinctions drawn between the heavenly and sacramental presence did not exist and that the divine power could cause the same body to exist substantially in many places. We, therefore, have the Dominicans maintaining that transubstantiation consisted in the forming of Christ's body out of the bread while the Franciscans held that the substance of the bread was succeeded by the body of Christ. The Council of Trent, therefore, decided the disputation in terms which left freedom for difference of interpretation: "per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiae panis in substantia corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiae vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus."; (1) Second, we hold that two Christian denominations may believe in the presence of Christ in the sacrament of Eucharist but they may differ as to the explanation of it. Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism, both believe in the Presence but they differ as to how Christ is present. Hence we have the respective explanations in what are called the doctrines of Transubstantiation and of Consubstantiation. We, therefore, maintain against Dixon that the doctrine of the presence is not the same as, "the received explanation of the nature of ^{the} Presence

(1) Decrt. De Euchar. C.4. Cited by Dixon, Hist. of the Ch. of England. Vol. III, p. 512.

although the two in common parlance are often identified and interchangeably used.

2 - "Learned men." Practically every witness at Gardiner's trial, as we have already seen, declared that up to the time when Gardiner preached on St. Peter's day, "no learned man" in the realm of England had disputed, impugned or rejected, the doctrine of the presence. The question, therefore, arises, "who were learned men?" Not Vadianus, not Carlostadius, neither Oecolampadius nor Zuinglius, nor Wyckliff, as we have already seen, nor Thomas Cappel, John Taylor, doctor of divinity, John Lambert, Anne Askew, etc., as we shall see presently. None of these were learned men, and yet, strange to say, we are told by the same witnesses, whose testimony we have recorded, that Bullinger, Musculus, Peter Martyr and Cranmer were, or at least had the name of learned men. What was it, we may ask, that prompted some of the witnesses in question to apply the appellation, "Learned men" to the last-mentioned names and to deny it to the first-mentioned? We submit that, whatever the title, "Learned men" may have meant, if it was applicable to Musculus and Martyr, Bullinger and Cranmer, it must have similarly have been applicable to Zuinglius, Wyckliff, etc. because these also possessed learning and fame of international character.

The general conclusion reached, we repeat it, is that the Catholic doctrine of the presence, or rather the received

explanation of the nature of the sacrament had never been questioned by learned men in England until the coming of Peter Martyr to Oxford.

We have settled the question touching the meaning of the phrase, "learned men". We have also shown that the Catholic doctrine of the presence is not the same as the "received explanation" of the nature of the presence in the sacrament. It now remains to be shown whether it is the "Doctrine of the Presence" or the "accepted explanation of the nature of the sacrament," that is, Transubstantiation, which had never been questioned before Martyr taught divinity at Oxford.

We submit that the persons who testified at Bishop Gardiner's trial by "the Presence" and Dixon by "The great Catholic doctrine of the Presence, or rather the received explanation of the nature of the Presence in the Sacrament" must have meant - if they meant anything at all - either that it was the doctrine of the presence or that it was the received explanation thereof, namely, Transubstantiation, which had never been put under question until Martyr disputed at Oxford, and Ridley, Perne and Madew disputed three weeks later at Cambridge. We observe that:

(A) The doctrine of the Presence had been questioned before the disputations were held at Oxford by Martyr and at Cambridge by Ridley, Perne and Madew by Act of Parliament and by individuals. (a) By Act of Parliament. In the

year 1540 the "Six Articles" were presented to the English Parliament. The first of these Articles reads: "That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar by the strength and efficacy of Christ's mighty word (it being spoken by the priest), is present really under the form of bread and wine the natural body and blood of Our Saviour, Jesus-Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary." (1) This article, passed by Act of Parliament, constituted *prima facie* evidence that some person or group of persons had doubted the presence of Christ in the Sacrament.

(b) The doctrine of the Presence had been questioned by individuals.

1 - John Lambert published a treatise upon the Sacrament addressed to King Henry VIII. In this book the author wrote: "Christ is so ascended bodily into heaven, and his holy manhood thither so assumpt, where it doth sit upon the right hand of the Father...that by the infallible promise of God, it shall not, or cannot, from thence, return before the general doom... And as he is no more corporally in the world, so can I not see how he can be corporally in the Sacrament, or his holy supper." (2)

Notwithstanding, Lambert believed in the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament "in a certain manner," to wit, "In this do we see, that both Christ and Augustine would have Christ's words to be understood spiritually and not

(1) Foxe's - Acts and Mon. vol.5. p.262. Seely, Burnside, Lond. 1828

(2) Ibid. p.237.

carnally, figuratively and not literally... And what else is this but that "Christ ordained and willed his body and blood to be spiritually eaten and drunken?" (1) "The sacrament of Christ's body and blood is therefore called his body and blood, because it is thereof a memorial, sign, sacrament token, and representation, spent once for our redemption... Thus, O most gracious and godly prince! do I confess and acknowledge that the bread of the sacrament is truly Christ's body, and the wine to be truly his blood, according to the words of institution of the same sacrament; but in a certain wise, that is to wit, figuratively, sacramentally or significatively." (2)

2 - Thomas Cappes of St. Magdalen in Old Fish-Street, at the time of the publication of the Six Articles, in 1541, was persecuted for saying "That the sacrament of the altar was but a memory and a remembrance of the Lord's death." (3)

3 - John Taylor, of Saint Catherine's, doctor of divinity, the same year of the publication of 'the Whip with Six Strings', 1541, "presented for preaching at St. Bride's in Fleet Street" declared that "it is as profitable to a man to hear mass and see the sacrament as to kiss Judas' mouth, who kissed Christ our Saviour." (4)

(1) Ibid, p.246-7.

(2) Ibid. p.249.

(3) Ibid, p.447.

(4) Ibid. p.248

4 - Anne Askew, in 1546 on the words: "This is my body," declared that Christ in giving unto his disciples the bread to eat "as an outward sign or token to be received with the mouth, he minded them in perfect belief to receive that body of his which should die for the people, and to think the death thereof to be the only health and salvation, for our souls. The bread and the wine were left us for a sacramental communion, or a mutual participation of the inestimable benefits of his most precious death and bloodshedding, and that we should...be thankful for that most necessary grace of our redemption. For,...he saith...'This do ye in remembrance of me, yea, so oft as ye shall eat it or drink it.' Else should we have been forgetful of that we ought to have in daily remembrance, and also have been altogether unthankful for it." (1) She died a martyr.

5 - Bishop Gardiner wrote to the Lord Protector in 1547, saying: "And yet, Bale, the noble clerk, would have Anne Askew, blasphemously denying the presence of Christ's natural body to be taken for a saint." (2)

From these testimonies, it is clear that the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Presence had been questioned in England before Edward VI. came to the throne and Peter Martyr to Oxford.

(B) "The doctrine of the explanation of the nature of the Sacraments" or of Transubstantiation had been questioned before Peter Martyr's coming to England.

{1} Ibid. p.543
 {2} Foxe's Acts and Mon. vol VI. p.31

1 - According to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, the doctrine of the Presence - the belief that "the Body and Blood of the God-man are truly, really, and substantially present " (1) in the Eucharist for the feeding of the believers' soul constitutes the "fact" and "central dogma" (2) of the Presence whilst "the Totality of Presence, Transubstantiation, Permanence of Presence and the Adorableness of the Eucharist, etc," are considered allied dogmas which are connected and go to make up the central dogma. Now, in our foregoing division, we have seen that the Catholic doctrine of the Presence was rejected, and with it, therefore, the dogma of Transubstantiation, as the latter had formed a part of the former since the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, i.e., before the coming of Peter Martyr to Oxford.

2 - Moreover, we know that Wycliff had rejected the dogma of Transubstantiation, that is, "the transition of one thing into another in some aspect of being" (3), one hundred and sixty-five years before the coming of Martyr to England.

The following are some of Wycliffe's articles bearing on the subject under consideration, condemned at London, in 1382, by the Convocation of Canterbury in a session held at Blackfriars: (a) "That in the Sacrament of the altar, the material substance of bread and wine remains after consecration. (b) That Accidents remain not without a subject in the same sacrament. (c) That Christ is not in the Sacrament of the altar essentially, truly and really in his own corporal presence". (4)

(1) R.C. Encyc. vol. V. p.573.N.Y. 1909

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid. p.579.

(4) Roll Series, Fasc. Ziz, 277-282. Cited by Gee and Hardy, Doc. Illust. of the Hist. of Eng. Ch.p. 108f.

3 - We know that the explanation of the nature of the sacrament, or Transubstantiation, was questioned before the death of Henry VIII, because of the "Six Articles" which were passed by Parliament, as we have already seen. We know this also because of 'A Proclamation Concerning the Irreverent Talkers of the Sacrament' issued during the first year of Edward VI's reign, which reads: "Act and estatute" passed "against those who do contempn, despise or with unsemely and ungodly words deprave and revile the holy sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord... Which persons, not contented reverently and with obedient faith t'accept that the said sacrament, according to the saying of St. Paul, 'the bread is the communion' ...'of the body of the Lord; the wine', 'the partaking of the bloud of Christ...and that the body and bloud of Jesu Christ is there; which is our comfort, thanksgiving, love-token of Christ's love towards us, and of ours as his members within ourself, search and strive unreverently whether the body and bloud aforesaid is there really or figuratively, locally or circumscriptly, and having quantity and greatness, or but substantially and by substance only or els but in a figure and manner of speaking; whether his blessed body be there, head, leggs, armes, toes, and nails, or any other ways, shape and manner, naked or clothed; whether he is broken or chewed, or he is always while; whether the bread there remaineth as we se, or how it departeth; whether the flesh be there alone, and the

bloud, or part, or each in other, or in th' one both in th' other but only bloud; and what bloud; that only which did flow out of the side, or that which remaineth; with other such irreverence, superfluous and curious questions, which how and what and by what means and in what forme, may bring into theim, which of human and corrupt curiosity hath désire to search out such mysteries as lyeth hid in the infinite and bottomless depth of the wisdom and glory of God, and to the which our humain imbecillity cannot attain; ... to th' intent that further contention tumult and question might not rise amonges the king's subjects, the king's highness, ... straitly willeth and commandeth, that no manner person from hence forth do in any wise contentiously and openly argue, dispute, reason, preach or talk, affirming any more termes of the said blessed sacrament than be expresly taught in the holy scripture and mentioned in the foresaid act." (1)

In the light of the foregoing, it follows that whatever meaning one may attribute to the statement: "The great Catholic Doctrine of the Presence or rather the received explanation of the nature of the Presence in the Sacrament", "it must be conceded that that statement or doctrine had been questioned and even rejected, by some people, before Martyr went to Oxford. This was unquestionably known to Gardiner, otherwise, what would he mean

(1) Wilkins, Concilia, vol. IV. p. 18-9, London 1737.

by saying: "And yet, Bale...would have Anne Askew blasphemously denying the presence of Christ's natural body to be taken for a saint?"

We submit that these "learned men" who testified at Bishop Gardiner's trial must have known that the doctrine of the presence had been questioned before 1548. To admit that they were ignorant of the 'Six Articles' passed under Henry VIII., of Lambert's views, of Askew's martyrdom and of, 'A Proclamation Concerning the Irreverent Talkers of the Sacrament' issued during the first year of Edward VI.'s reign, would be to attribute to them inconceivable ignorance, inconsistent with their intellectual qualifications and with their status in the realm as very prominent citizens and ecclesiastical leaders whose business it was to know the law touching religious questions. We, therefore, conclude that the witnesses in question, prompted by denominational interest and with the view of kindling popular hatred against Martyr, must have lied intentionally. (1) This being so, Dixon's statement: that "the Catholic doctrine of the Presence, or rather the received explanation of the nature of the Presence in the sacrament" had never been questioned in England by men reputed ^{learned} before Martyr went to Oxford, is false.

Martyr's presence at Oxford marked a new era of comparatively free religious disputation (2); it marked a

(1) See p. 54, number 5.

(2) Dixon. Hist. of the Ch. of Eng., vol.3. p. 110.

forward step in the emancipation of thought and language from the subtleties of Scholastic Theology; but it did NOT mark the beginning of the attack upon the doctrine of the presence or its received explanation of the nature of the sacrament, because it had been questioned before, and we have proved it.

CHAPTER V

MARTYR'S OTHER ACTIVITIES

Martyr, by the winning of the Oxford Disputation, had administered a great blow to the Papists and ipso facto, had become their worst enemy. They, therefore, sought opportunity to get rid of him. To certain insurrections, in different parts of England, caused by the enclosures of lands and oppressions inflicted upon the poor, a religious colour was given. The passions of the multitude were excited and turn^d against the advocates of reformed opinions; armed mobs demanded re-establishment of the Roman Catholic rites and of the Mass; a peasant insurrection near Oxford rushed about the streets, threatening Protestants with death. Martyr, among others, was specially singled out for vengeance. The cry: "Death to Peter Martyr", was frequently heard from the infuriated mob. He had to suspend his lectures. The crowds still threatened. His friends, fearing his house might be assaulted, sheltered his wife and conveyed him to London.

The young king felt greatly concerned about Martyr. Upon hearing of his successful escape to London, he granted him an audience at Richmond where he received him with marks of highest regard and promised him the first canonry of

Christ Church. Soon the troops dispersed the "factionous visitants" of Oxford and Master Peter returned to resume his labours.

During the turbulent year of 1549, Martyr published one of his best writings: "Tractio de Sacramento Eucharistiae". This book was dedicated to Archbishop Cranmer, the "sanctior, doctior, et firmior", (1) defender of evangelical truth and of the eucharistic sacrament. This work is divided under four headings: First, the discussion of the commonly accepted explanation that, 'Bread and wine is transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ'; Second, the examination of another affirmation which states that the bread and wine is to be retained in the sacrament because the elements have, "adjoinedly, naturally, corporally, and really, the true body and blood of Christ"; Third, the consideration of what others have said on the subject, namely that the elements of bread and wine are joined together only sacramentally, that is, by "signification and representation"; Fourth, the conclusion showing that the second and third views tend more to piety in this "sacramental affair". (2)

The resourceful Papists, seeing that they had not succeeded in confounding Martyr with arguments nor in getting rid of him by the instigation of insurrections,

(1) Strype's, Ecc.Mem. vol. 11.1, p.307
 (2) Strype's, Op.Cit. p. 307-8

resorted to calumnies and defamations.

Doctor Tresham, in his writings, bespat ^{neither} angrily the king's divinity professor by calling him, "Pseudo-Martyr, a doting old man, subverted, impudent, and the famous master of errors." And yet ^{neither} he nor his co-Papists had been able to convict him of error. He added that Martyr had fled from Italy to "Germany to obtain the more licence for his lust, and that he might enjoy his adultery,(1),alluding to his wife. But the language of Tresham is inconsistent with Martyr's intellectual and moral qualities.

Doctor Richard Smith also accused Martyr of inconsistency in doctrine and character by saying that,"Peter Martyr, at his first coming to Oxford, taught of the Eucharist, as Dr. Smith now doth. But when he came once to the court, and saw that the doctrine misliked them that might do him hurt in his living, he anon after turned his tippet and sang another song". (2)

Archbishop Cranmer replied to Smith's accusation, vindicating Martyr's character: "Of M. Peter Martyr's opinion and judgment in this matter, no man can better testify than I; For as much as he lodged within my house long before he came to Oxford, and I had with him many conferences in that matter, and know that he was then of the same mind that he is now, and as he defended after openly at Oxford, and hath written in his book. And if

(1) Strype's, Op.Cit.Bk.11,Chap.17.

(2) Cranmer's works, Vol.IV,p.373-4,Parker Soc.,Camb.1844

D. Smith understood him otherwise....it was for lack of knowledge." Nor is this all, for he has misunderstood also "My book of the catechism, and, therefore, reported untruly of me." "Now after that Doctor Smith hath thus unduly belied both me and Master Peter Martyr, he falleth into his exclamations, saying: 'O Lord, what man is so mad to believe such mutable teachers, which change their doctrine at man's pleasure, as they see advantage and profit? They turn, and will turn, as the wind turneth'."

"Do you remember, Master Smith, the fable, how the old crab rebuked her young, that they went not straight forth; and the common experience, that those that look asquint find fault with them that look right? You have turned twice and retracted your errors, and the third time promised, and breaking your promise, ran away. And find you fault with me and Master Peter Martyr, as though we, 'for men's pleasures turn like wind, as we see advantage? Shall the weathercock of Paul's, that turneth about every wind lay the fault in the church, and say that it turneth?But as for Doctor Peter Martyr, hath he sought to please men for advantage? Who, having a great yearly revenue in his own country, forsook all for Christ's sake, and for the truth and glory of God came into strange countries where he had neither land nor friends....?" (1)

(1) Cranmer's Works, vol.1, p.374-5, ...

On the 20th of January, 1550, Martyr and his wife took up residence in the canonry of Christ Church. The presence of Doctors Martyr's and Cox's wives in any college or hall in Oxon was, previous to their dwelling there, an unheard of thing. Because of this, among other reasons, the indignant Papists frequently disturbed Martyr at night and broke the windows of his lodgings which faced Fish Street. It was on account of these annoyances that he moved to the lodgings of the second canonry in the cloister and built a 'fabric of stone' two storeys high in the garden in order that he might study unmolested. It was here that he partly composed his Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

Apart from the duties already mentioned, Martyr had others imposed on him. This we learn from a letter he wrote to Bullinger dated June 1, 1550; "I will explain to you in a few words the kind of employment in which I have been engaged. In addition to my daily expositions of St. Paul, which of themselves would almost entirely occupy the time of anyone who should employ himself upon them as they deserve, a new burden has been imposed upon the university by laws lately enacted by the king's majesty. For it is decreed that public disputations upon theological subjects should be held frequently, that is, every alternate week, at which I am required to be present and

to preside. Then in the king's college, wherein I reside, theological disputations are held every week, which inasmuch as all persons are freely admitted to hear them, may in like manner be called public; and over these I am appointed moderator, as over the others. I have therefore a continual struggle with my adversaries who are indeed most obstinate.... Satan is very subtle in his attacks upon godly exertions." (1)

In the light of this letter, it would be impossible for anyone to determine Martyr's influence on the English Reformation, and yet who does not know what a powerful influence a chairman or moderator may exert at a debate and during a creative and formative period of thought? About this time John Hooper, who had been in Europe where he had met with the chief reformers, returned to England and was made Bishop of Gloucester. By reason of certain scruples of conscience which he made against the wearing of the old pontifical vestments and the ^{oath} customarily taken, he repaired to the Archbishop, desiring him that he be excused.

To bring this question to a close, the Archbishop decided to consult the most learned men of the realm. Accordingly, he wrote to Bucer, John à Lasco, and Peter Martyr. In substance, the three theologians expressed the same views relative to the episcopal vestments. We

(1) 3 Zurich Lett. let. 228, p.481-2.

shall here give the substance of Martyr's letter to Hooper on the matter. Martyr begins by expressing his delight in the singular and ardent desire of Hooper to bring the Christian religion back to its primitive purity and simplicity, which is indeed what they had used while at Strasburg. Thus far they were agreed and prayed God that Hooper might continue to grow in the spirit of Christian purity and simplicity. Nevertheless, Martyr could not agree, "that the use of garments was destructive," or that garments were in their own nature contrary to the word of God." He thought that the use of vestments was entirely ἀσχετόν. And as indifferent things are sometimes taken away so they might sometime be retained in use; "And if he (Martyr) had thought this were wicked, he would never have communicated with the Church of England." For men like Hooper who knew Martyr, this must have been a very strong argument.

Further, Martyr thought that if by the continued use of the habits they could more easily preach the Gospel, they were justified to retain them until such times when the Gospel would be preached and take root, for then, men would be "better and more easily persuaded to let go the outward customs. But now, when a change is brought in of the necessary heads of religion, and that with so great difficulty, if we should make these things that are indifferent to be impious, so we might alienate the minds

of all; that they would not endure to hear the solid doctrine and receive the necessary ceremonies". (1) England owes much to you but you had better take heed lest by unreasonable and too bitter sermons you may become a hindrance to yourself. "Besides,....by looking upon these indifferent things as sinful and destructive, we should condemn many Gospel-churches, and too sharply tax very many which anciently were esteemed most famous and celebrated. (2)

The following are a few of Hooper's objections to the use of vestments with Martyr's replies.

Objection 1 - The use of vestments called back again the priesthood of Aaron.

Reply 1 - "The Apostles for peace-sake, commanded the Gentiles to abstain from blood and fornication; which were Aaronical customs; and so are tithes for the maintenance of clergy....There are not a few things that our church hath borrowed from the Mosaical decrees; the festivals of the Resurrection, of the Nativity, of Pentecost, and of the death of Christ, are all footsteps of the old law; and are they therefore to be abolished."

O. 2 - The use of vestments are inventions of AntiChrist.

(1) Strype's Ecc. Mem. Bk. 2. Chap.17 - p.304-5

(2) Ibid. p.305.

R. 2 - I cannot see why things used by the popish religion should not be used by us. "We must take heed that the church of God be not pressed with too much servitude, that it may not have liberty to use anything that belonged to the Pope. Our ancestors took the idol temples, and used them for sacred houses to worship Christ. And the revenues that were consecrated to the Gentile gods, and to the games of the theatre, and of the vestal virgins, were made use of for the maintenance of the ministers of the Church; when these before had served not only to Anti-Christ, but to the Devil" (1). John wore a mitre at Ephesus and Cyprian had episcopal garments.

O. 3 - The people are moved to admire the garments, thus their minds are turned away from the more serious things.

R. 3 - The common use of the vestments will take away the admiration. Moreover when moved with admiration we are, "carried to think of divine things."

O. 4 - "Whatsoever was not of faith was sin."

R. 4 - "To the clean all things are clean."

Also, "every creature of God is good."

(1) Ibid. p. 305-6

O.5 - "We ought to have express Scripture for what we do in holy things."

R.5 - This would be acceptable as a general thing in matters of faith, but "indifferent things cannot defile those who act, with a pure motive." On the whole, we think that Martyr's replies were both sound and forceful. After much resistance, Hooper "Submitted to consecration with the legal ceremonies (March 8, 1551)" (1).

MARTYR AND THE REVISION OF THE FIRST ENGLISH PRAYER BOOK.

The first English Prayer Book was published and approved by Act of Parliament the year 1549. It did not have a long life because it satisfied neither the Papists nor the Reformers. Calvin in one of his letters to Cranmer deplored the vestiges of papistical superstitions which the Book contained. He wrote: "It is more than ridiculous in thee to approve of such an absurdity. But the excellent Peter Martyr will suggest a better course to thee, and I am glad that thou consultest him." (2) "About the time that Calvin's letter was received a group of bishops such as those of Canterbury, York, London, Ely, etc., were already proceeding with the important work of revising the Prayer Book. To this end, they asked for the assistance

(1) Encyc. Brit. vol. 23. Art. Hooper. 11th Edition.

(2) Calvin, Epist. p. 134-5. Cit. Dixon, Church of Eng. vol. 3. p. 274.

of the two foreign divines, Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr. The bishops furnished each of the two divines with a copy of the Prayer Book and asked them to amend the same and forward their suggestions. Accordingly, Bucer wrote and sent his "Centures" and Martyr his "Annotations."

At the time Bucer sent his "Centures" to his bishop, he forwarded likewise a copy to his friend Martyr, who on account of his deficient knowledge of the English language, had been furnished with an inadequate Latin translation, by Cheke, of the Book of Common Prayer. Upon reading certain suggestions which had been made by Bucer, Martyr, to his great chagrin, became aware that, because of the faulty Latin version provided him, he had missed noting several points deserving emendation. He therefore, hurriedly collected them into articles and forwarded them with an explanatory note to the Archbishop stating that he fully agreed with Bucer's suggestions and if the bishops saw fit the emendations should be effected.

At the same time, he informed Bucer in a letter dated 1551, of what he had done. In it, Martyr deplores deeply the faultiness of Cheke's translation given him to use and tells him that in his former "Annotations" he himself had noticed most of the points noted by him and expresses his great surprise that Bucer, in his "Centures", had missed

noting the important doctrinal point touching the "Reservation of the Host" for the Communion of the sick. He said "Et cum, propter ignotam, mihi, linguam, fuisset data versio D. Cheeki legenda, ut potui de ea colligere, annotavi quae digna correctione visa erant. Sed quia in versione mihi tradita, complura deerant, ideo multa praeterii, de quibus in meis annotationibus nihil dixi." Further on he continues, "In prioribus autem adnotationibus omnia ferme, quae te offenderunt, a me fuerunt adnotata. Exemplum quidem ad te nunc mitterem; sed non habeo ita descriptum, ut illud possis legere. Tantum sum miratus, quomodo praeterieris de Communione aegrotorum id reprehendere, quod statum est, si eo die fiat, quo in Dominico habetur coena Domini, tum Minister partem ciborum secum deferat. Atque ita Communione in domo aegrotantis administret. Qua in re id me offendit, quod ibi non repetunt, quae praecipue ad coenam Domini pertinent; cumque, ut tu quoque sentis, arbitror, verba coena magis ad homines, quam aut ad panem, aut ad vinum pertinere. Monui omnino mihi videri, ut coram aegroto, et simul cum eo communicantibus, omnia, quae ad coenam Domini necessario requiruntur, et dicantur, et agantur. Et sane mirandum est, quomodo ea, conspectu aegroti, verba dicere graventur, qui maxime utilia sunt, cum inutiliter eadem repetere velint, quando inter

communicandum in Templo vinum in poculo deficere contigerit, cum homines qui adsunt, et sacramenta sumunt, illa iam audiverint. Haec sunt, quae putavi alicujus momenti, et cur omiseris, non satis intelligo." (1)

In the foregoing, Martyr refers to the "Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament" and the practice connected with it of preserving a portion of the consecrated elements for the communion of the sick. He suggested the abolition of this practice because it was inconsistent with what the officiating minister did in church when the wine failed and because it nourished superstition. His suggestion was accepted by those in charge of reforming the First Prayer Book; reference to the Reservation was omitted in the Second Prayer Book, and a new form was provided for the administration of the Eucharist in the home of the sick. Many theological battles have since been fought on that question, but as yet, matters have not been changed in the English Prayer Book. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI. provided that "if on the same day," the sick person wished to receive the communion, "there be a celebration of the holy Communion in the church, then shall the Priest reserve (at the open Communion) so much of the sacrament of the body and blood, as shall serve the sick person." "But if the day be not appointed for the

(1) Strype's Cranmer vol.2. p.899. Oxford 1840.

open Communion in the church; then,...the Curate shall come and visit the sick person aforenoon." "And if there be more sick persons to be visited the same day that the Curate doth celebrate in any sick man's house, then shall the Curate, (there) reserve so much of the sacrament of the Body and Blood, as shall serve the other sick persons"(1)

At the revision of the Prayer Book in 1552, all mention of Reservation was omitted, and the following Rubric enjoining the celebration of the Communion according to a new form was inserted. "But if the sick person be not able to come to the church, and yet is desirous to receive the communion in his house, then he must give knowledge...to the Curate, and having a convenient place in the sick man's house...the Curate...shall there minister the holy communion." (2)

Martyr's suggestion found expression in what became, and still is, the XXVIII Article of the Church of England, (one of the XLII Articles drawn up in 1553,) which said that "The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not commanded by Christ's ordinance, to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped." (3)

There are writers who have endeavoured to belittle the influence of Bucer and of Martyr with reference to the altering of the First English Prayer Book. Bucer, they say,

(1) The Liturgies of Edward VI. p.141 -3. Parker Soc.Camb.1844.

(2) The two Liturgies of Edward VI. p.317.

(3) Ibid. p.534.

died shortly after he wrote the "Centures", and with his death, his influence ended. As for Martyr, he did not know much English. Such being the case, his opinions would not have much weight. But could not one have a fair knowledge of a language and yet not be able to speak it? Are there not many intelligent foreigners to-day in Canada who after four or five years' residence, read and understand English well and yet cannot speak it? May not this have been the meaning of Martyr's phrase: "Et cum, propter ignotam mihi linguam, fuisset data versio D. Cheeki legenda?"

It is further argued that the alterations to the Prayer Book in question had been agreed upon before the foreign professors were consulted. Again, one might ask, is it conceivable that those in charge of the revision of the said book would neglect the learned suggestions they might obtain from two of the greatest divines in the realm? And then, Martyr's own words bear a contrary meaning for he wrote to Bucer: "Et gratias deo ago, qui occasionem suppeditavit, ut de his omnibus Episcopi per nos admonerentur." (1)

About the time of the completion of the Second Book of Common Prayer and before the setting forth of the XLII Articles, Martyr wrote to Bullinger, "The Book or Order of Ecclesiastical Rites and the Administration of the Sacraments

(1) Srype's, Cranmer, Lett. 61. p. 899. Oxford 1840.

has been reformed...all things have been removed from it which could nourish superstition...The chief reason, that prevented the other things which were purposed from being effected, was the matter of the sacrament; not truly as far as regards transubstantiation...either in the bread or in the wine...but whether grace is conferred by virtue of the sacrament...There have been some who have altogether affirmed that doctrine...that grace is conferred by the sacraments" and therefore are not even, "willing to grant that little children are justified or regenerated before baptism." There have been others who "clearly saw how many superstitions that sentence would bring with it" and therefore resisted it" holding that nothing more is to be granted to the sacraments than to the external word of God." "On account of this, no little displeasure is stirred up against us. But when we come to their reasons, there are none which have not been answered. The only ground they hold against us is that we altogether dissent from Augustine."(1)

MARTYR AND THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES.

Martyr's influence, as far as we have been able to discover, was confined to the sacraments. The church had officially held that the sacraments were a channel through

(1)Bradford's Writings. Let. June 14. 1552. p.403f. Park Soc.

which divine grace and forgiveness were imparted. But with the revision of the Prayer Book in 1552 and the drawing up of the Forty-two Articles in 1553, a substantial change was effected. In this change, Martyr played an important part being one of the committee charged with the drawing up of the Forty-two Articles.

We have detected his influence upon the following:

1 - Article XXVIII. of the Church of England, as we have shown above and part of Article XXIX of the XLII Articles with reference to the Reservation of the Sacraments. It reads: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not commanded by Christ's ordinance, to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped." (1)

2 - Article XXVII of the XLII. reads: "They that receive baptism rightly are GRAFTED into the church...they are VISIBLY signed and sealed." Martyr wrote to Bullinger with reference to baptism of children and said: "Those"(children) "are also VISIBLY INGRAFTED into it." (2) For him the sacraments had no inherent magical power. "Sacramenta sunt...Signa efficacia... quibus potenter, et not vulgariter, Spiritus Domini in nos agat. (3)

(1) The two Liturgies of Edward VI. p.534.

(2) Martyr to Bullinger, June 14, 1552, Bradford's Writings. p.404

(3) Martyr's Loci Comm. IV.10f.691.Coll.1 2.Cit Gorham. Redpath Tracts XC. p.22

3- Article XXIX of the XLII. In this Article were denied both the doctrines of Transubstantiation and of the real and corporal presence in the Eucharist. It was done by using Peter Martyr's argument of "circumscrip locality," that is, "the body of Christ is in heaven and therefore cannot be in any other place" (1). The article reads: "Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood, cannot be proved by holy writ; but it is repugnant to the plain words of scripture and hath given occasion to many superstitions. For as much as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one, and the selfsame man, cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place; therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world; a faithful man ought not, either to believe, or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." (2)

Martyr, much to his credit, supplied the Church of England with the argument of "circumscrip locality" at a very

(1) Martyr's Oxford Disp. Cit. Dixon Church of Eng. vol. 3. p. 524.

(2) The Two Liturgies of Edward VI. p. 534

critical time, when the Dominicans and the Franciscans were greatly agitating the doctrine of Transubstantiation in vehement debates at the Council of Trent, and the mode of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament. However, Martyr's argument mitigated against the view of the Dominicans and of the Franciscans, as we have observed in our discussion of Dixon's statement of the Presence, and maintained, in general terms, a sacramental grace effected by faith in Jesus Christ.

MARTYR AND THE 'REFORMATIO LEGUM ECCLESIASTICUM'

At the last Parliament of the year 1551, it was resolved that a commission of thirty-two persons should be nominated to examine the ecclesiastical laws and to compile a manual containing such laws as might be conveniently and advantageously practised within the realm, in all the spiritual courts. The new collection of laws was to replace the papal decrees and popish ordinances. The commission chosen was made up of bishops, theologians, civilians and lawyers,(1) It was to be divided into four groups and each group was to be made up of two apiece of every sort". This commission was found to be too large and had to be reduced more than once but Martyr was kept on it from first to last, for this reason, it would be fair to say that his influence and even contribution in the compilation of the monumental production in question must not have been insignificant.

(1) 3 Zur. Lett. let 231. p. 503.

Cardwell, in his preface to the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticum" tells ^{us} that a copy of the manuscript of the ecclesiastical laws which belonged to the Archbishop fell afterwards into Foxe's possession; wherein there was much of Cranmer's as likewise of Martyr's handwriting.(1) He also states that "the MS. of Archbishop Cranmer...is now preserved together with the rest of the Harleian collection in the British Museum," and that it contains...various supplements and suggestion of Peter Martyr...It had...many of its clerical errors corrected and titles supplied for all the separate chapters, partly from the pen of the archbishop and partly from that of Peter Martyr"(2) To this, Burnet adds that "the seventh chapter entitled :- 'de Proscriptionibus' is all written by Peter Martyr".(3) We, therefore, conclude with Cardwell's words:"We may infer from some changes made in the commissioners, and still more from the evidence afforded by our MS. that the archbishop and Martyr took the whole responsibility upon themselves, employing Dr.Haddon to see that their sentiments were expressed in proper language".(4)

"The Reformatio Legum" was published in the year 1553.

(1) Cardwell. Pref. to Ref. Leg. Ecc. p.4. Ed.1850.

(2) Ibid. Pref. p.6.

(3) Burnet, Hist. of Reformation. Vol.3 Bk.4. p.399-400.

(4) Cardwell. Op. Cit. Pref. p.VIII.

The year 1553, in spite of some great achievements was nevertheless a year of deep sorrow and of disaster both for Martyr, who lost his beloved wife, and for the Reformation, in the death of Edward VI. and the ascent to the throne by Mary. With Mary, pure religion was banished; laws enacted under Edward relative to religion were abrogated; many good men were cast into prisons; teachers of religion were forbidden to carry on their function of teaching; protestant foreigners were banished. The papists again came to the front. They had demonstrations of joy, exhorted each other to defend Mary's cause. They dug out, as it were, "from their graves their vestments, chalices and portasses, and began mass with all speed." At night, they had a public festival and threatened flames, hanging, the gallows and drowning to all the gospellers (1). Martyr was made prisoner in his home for six weeks and his life was threatened. Fortunately, Terentianus and his friend, Whittingham, conceived the project of presenting a petition to the Queen and Council in which they stated that Martyr had been invited to England from Strasburg by Edward VI.; that during the last year he had been recalled by the magistrates of Strasburg but the king refused him leave; that he had committed no offense against the Queen, the laws and the realm; that if any one had any

(1) 3 Zurich Lett. 1et.182.p.369.

charges against him, he was prepared to meet them; and that he, perceiving that the Queen had no longer occasion for his service, therefore, requested ^{that} licence be granted to him to leave the kingdom. As a result, he was privileged to go to London and defend himself.

About that time, the papists had circulated false reports stating that Cranmer had reintroduced the mass and other popish rites. Thereupon he went to London to deny the rumour where he also declared that he with Martyr, if the Queen gave him leave, would prove that the whole doctrine and order of religion appointed under Edward VI. was purer and more in conformity with the scripture than anything that England had known in the thousand years past. While Martyr was waiting for the disputation and for the passport, Cranmer urged him to leave England as soon as possible. Should he fail to secure his passport, he must consult his safety by flight, as no justice could be expected from their adversaries. Presently, Cranmer and certain bishops were imprisoned and Martyr to the surprise of all, five days after, received his leave to depart. Remembering the words of the Archbishop and persuaded by his friends, he left England on a ship to Antwerp. There, met by his friends,

with a wagon, he was brought to Strasburg under cover of darkness. He was received with great joy and restored by the senate to his previous post. But galled by the spirit of controversy which had arisen over his differing with the Lutheran Confession of Faith and receiving the offer of Pellicano's post, by the senate of Zurich, he departed from Strasburg for Zurich in July 13, 1556.

CHAPTER VI

MARTYR'S LAST YEARS

The last years of this "Hero of the Reformation" were years of honour and of usefulness, as we shall show presently. It is to be noted, first of all, that the year Martyr was invited to Zurich, a law had been passed forbidding admission to any foreigner for that year. In the case of Martyr, the law not only made him an exception to the rule, but declared him a 'free citizen'. He was received by Jewel, who has been called "Martyr's Jewel", by the senate of the school, by the ministers of the city and by his old friend Bullinger with whom Martyr and his household (Julius, Julius' wife and child) resided until he married Catherina Merenda.

Martyr with the accession of "Bloody Mary" to the English throne, had been forced by circumstances to abandon England - the land of refuge; the land where he experienced the deepest sorrow in the death of Bucer and of his own wife and in the imprisonment and execution of his beloved Archbishop; the land where he accomplished most for Christ and His kingdom; - that England, he never forgot. Martyr spent his last years at Zurich, but we

know far more of his relations with England and Englishmen, during that time, than his doings at and relations with Zurich and the Zurichers. It is with these relations, kept up by Martyr with England and her citizens that we are concerned in this chapter. We shall, show, first, that Martyr was consulted by English reformers on very many important questions and his opinions were received and highly thought of. Second, we shall note the deep regret and great loss felt by England with Martyr's death.

First, With Mary's Proclamation and restoration of Roman Catholicism in England, friends and leaders of the reformation had to accept either imprisonment or exile. Many English reformers chose the more promising road to exile and gathered at Strasburg where Peter Martyr, himself, had taken refuge. It is interesting to remind ourselves of the fact that Martyr's home at Strasburg, before 1547, was a centre where many English notables, as we saw in our second chapter above, met to hear and discuss theological questions, and after 1553, "became a rallying place for a number of English exiles" (1), as Jewel, Cox, and many others who were hospitably received.

We have also noted that Cranmer had been sent to the "tower" by order of Mary, five days before Martyr left England. The year 1555, the Archbishop wrote from

(1) Dict. Nat. Biog., Art. Vermigli.

prison to his bosom friend, Martyr, expressing the hope that he might outlive his imprisonment in order to answer a book on the Eucharist full of "subtilities, and juggling, tricks, and ravings" (1) by Marcus Antonius. But Cranmer died a martyr's death without being able to fulfil his heart's desire. Thereupon, Martyr, the "surviving and learned friend" of the Archbishop, being "thought the fittest man to succeed Cranmer in this province" was "solicited by many English friends, by letter and word of mouth" to refute Marcus Antonius' book and also Gardiner's second book on the corporeal presence in the sacrament, the latter being considered the final word on the subject. Indeed it was boasted that, now that Cranmer was dead, "no one would dare to encounter Gardiner's second book.(2)

In the year 1558, Martyr put forth his answer. The book under the title: "Defensio Doctrinae veteris et Apostolicae de S.S. Eucharistia Sacramento", reached England at a very opportune time. In it, the author defended, first, the arguments which the reformers had used and which Gardiner pretended to have refuted; second, those rules which Cranmer put forth in his tract of the sacrament; third, the answers whereby the arguments of the adversaries were usually refuted; fourth, the just and true interpretation of certain passages out

(1) 3 Zurich Lett.let.XVIII.p.30

(2) Strype's, Memorials, Bk.2, chap.25.p.371 f.

of the Fathers' writings, which Gardiner and his companions had ignorantly or intentionally misconstrued (1). Martyr, upon the occasion of the publication of this book, wrote to Calvin saying that he had "unravelled and refuted all the sophisms and tricks" of the papists. Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne of England about this time.

Elizabeth in her youth had imbibed Reformation ideas and had been attracted to Ochino's and Martyr's theology, as we have remarked elsewhere. The Italian divine, cognizant of these facts and impelled by the desire for the restoration and progress of Protestantism in the English realm, wrote a letter in December, 1558, to the Queen in which he exhorted her to take courage and urged her to work for the Reformation: "Wherefore girde your-selfe with good courage unto that holie worke which all good people doe expect of you, feare nothing at all the deceits of the diwell, the impediments of wicked persons, nor yet the meakenesse of woman kind. God shall put awai all these thinges with one breath of his mouth. In the meane time verilie it shall be my part and such as I am to desire of God in our daily devoute praires that he will first graunt unto your Maiestie that you may thoroughly perceive all that good is^{by} your own wit and understanding, secondly, that wholesome and profitable counsels may by others be suggested unto you; further

(1) Ibid.p.377

that you may receive those things that shall be rightly shewed you; and finally that in whatever you shall undertake, God will graunt you fortunate and happie successe. These praires do I dailie make unto God for you most gracious Ladie, and do promise that while I live I will never cease from these praires." (1)

Together with this letter, Martyr sent a copy of his book, "Defensio Doctrinae" etc. and both were gladly received and eagerly perused by the Queen. "The Queen of her own accord", wrote Jewel to Martyr, eagerly perused both your letter and the book itself, and wonderfully commended both your learning and character in general; and that your book was made so much of by all good men, that I know not whether anything of the kind was ever so valued before". (2)

In the year that Queen Elizabeth succeeded to the throne, Thomas Sampson, who expected to be recalled to England and chosen bishop, wrote to Martyr asking for advice regarding the supremacy of Christ as opposed to the supremacy of the king over the Church of England, also with reference to discipline, civil burdens, election of bishops, etc. "I entreate you", he wrote, "for Christ's sake, my excellent father not to refuse me an answer to these inquiries. 1. How ought we to

(1) Martyr's Writings, Coll. and Publ. by Anthony Martin, 1583.
 (2) Zurich Lett. let. 23.

act with respect to allowing or disallowing the title of 'after Christ the supreme head of the Church of England, etc?'" All scripture seems to assign the title of head of the church to Christ alone. II. In case the Queen should invite me to any ecclesiastical office, as the government of a church, can I accept...appointment with a safe conscience?" Sampson thinks not: (a) because a bishop or pastor through want of discipline cannot discharge his office properly; (b) because there are too many civil burdens as 'first fruits', 'tenths' etc.; (c) because the bishop's election and dresses are undemocratic and superstitious. "I deposit, my father, with all simplicity, with yourself alone the secrets of my heart; and I entreat you....to return me an answer as soon as possible, as to what you think I ought to do in this case. Tell me also, what you would urge in addition for the furtherance of the reformation." (1)

In the year 1558, Christopher Goodman also submitted to Martyr's "paternal correction and judgment, certain propositions" (2) which we reproduce in substance.(3)

1. Is a tender aged boy, son of a deceased king to be regarded as a rightful heir to and magistrate of a kingdom and, therefore, to be obeyed?

(1) Zur.Lett.let.1.p.1-2

(2) 3 Zur.Let.363,p.768

(3) 3 Zur.app.let.352,p.745-7

2. Can a female "rule a kingdom by divine right" and transfer the right of sovereignty to her husband?

3. Are people to obey a magistrate who enforces idolatry?

4. If a religious nobility resists an idolatrous sovereign which side should the people take?

These propositions had already been submitted to Calvin but Goodman was not satisfied. Martyr's opinion and not Calvin's was to be final. This is the way Goodman concludes his letter to Martyr. "I only proposed to your consideration what seemed to me proper to be done in this business, but leaving it as I ought to you alone".⁽¹⁾ Such was the confidence which Goodman had in Martyr's judgment.

In 1559, Grindal was offered the office of bishop but, according to Burnet, he did not approve of the Queen's taking away the estates of the bishoprics, and giving them parsonages instead. He thought this was the patrimony of the inferior clergy so he did not see how priests could be supplied, if the parsonages were given to the bishops. He had also a doubt concerning the popish vestments. Therefore he wrote Martyr for advice. Similarly, in another letter shortly after, he asked whether the popish priests, upon their changing again, should be received and continued in their functions, or whether because of their instability and late cruelty

(1) 3 Zur.Let.363.

ought they not to be persecuted. To both letters Martyr replied, "that for the taking away of the bishops' estates, and giving them parsonages for them they could neither hinder nor help it; but they ought out of them support the clergy that laboured in those parishes. For the habits, he confessed, he did not love them, for while he was canon in Oxford he never would use the surplice; he thought they ought to do what they could to get them to be laid aside; but that, if that could not be done, he thought^{it} might do more good, even in that particular, by submitting to it and accepting a bishopric, which might give him an interest to procure a change afterwards. As for the popish priests, he advised the forgiving all that was past; and the receiving them, according to the practice of the primitive church, in the returning of the Arians to the orthodox body. But they were to watch over them and to instruct them". (1)

Martyr's answer arrived after Grindal had been consecrated bishop; nevertheless, it must have been of great satisfaction to him to know that so highly esteemed a friend approved the resolution he had adopted.

In 1559, Sampson was offered the office of bishop but he seemed to hesitate both to accept and to reject it. Thereupon, Martyr wrote: "You are afraid of both sides, for if you reject the ministry, you seem to let

(1) Burnet, Reformation, vol.3, Bk.4.

go an opportunity of directing things in a proper manner; while if you undertake the offered function, you have just and good cause to fear lest you should appear to assent to those ordinances, which not only impair and weaken the pure worship of God, but also corrupt and marvellously bring it to decay.... But will anyone who is somewhat instructed in religion, when he sees you a messenger of Christ and zealous trumpeter of the gospel, arrayed in vestments, praying at an altar before the image of the crucifix, repeating holy words and distributing the sacraments - will any one...not think that these rites are not only tolerated, but also approved by you? Whereby no credit will be given you hereafter, when you teach otherwise...Truly if we hated superstitions from the heart we should endeavour by all means that their very vestiges should be rooted out...wherefore, my very dear brother (1) in Christ... I give you two pieces of advice: first, that you still retain the function of preaching, and cease not both in public and private, to defend the truth of doctrine, and to declare against rites which are full of offence and occasions of falling. The other is, that you abstain from the administration of the sacraments until these

(1) Some think that this letter, and the following, which we shall cite, were addressed to Grindal and not to Sampson. The internal evidence is against this view. For our purpose, whether Grindal or Sampson received the letters, the influence of Martyr remains.

intolerable blemishes be removed. By these means the opportunity for doing good will not be lost, neither will you confirm others in their superstition by your example!"(1) Martyr in this letter seems to contradict the advice he had previously given to Grindal but it is to be noted that the tenor of the advice is not against vestments, as such, but against one arrayed in vestments and bowing before an image or a crucifix.

On November 4, 1559, Martyr addressed another letter to Sampson saying: "There seems no reason why you should trouble yourself about impropriations; for you have nothing to do with the question, whence or how the queen may choose to afford a maintenance or stipend either to the bishop or the parochial clergy..With respect also to wearing the round cap or habit at other times besides that of divine service, I think that you ought not to contend more than it is necessary; for superstition does not seem to have anything to do therein. But in regard to the use of garments as HOLY in the ministry itself, seeing they have a resemblance to the mass, and are mere relics of popery... where altars and images are retained, I...maintain, as I have also written you in another letter (he refers to the one above quoted) that you must by no means officiate." (2) It is impossible to record the

(1) 2 Zur.Let.XI., July 15, 1559.

(2) 2 Zur.Let.XIV.

many ways in which Martyr helped the English Reformation. Another example will suffice.

In 1561, the English Church asked him if he approved the mode in which the Lutherans administered the sacraments. He replied that "since there is no agreement between them and us in any of both sacraments, we knowe not why you should from thence take baptisms unto your children." (1) Martyr, judged by these letters, must have had the precious faculty, especially needed in time of transition, to perceive what was essential and what was not; when to submit and obey and when to stand firm. Again Martyr's judicious suggestions must have meant much to the English reformers during the formative years, of the Reformation in England.

In the same year in which Martyr wrote to the English Church, he was officially re-invited (2) to England at the Queen's suggestion by the Earl of Bedford and by Thomas, Duke of Norfolk, but Martyr, on account of his advanced age, weak constitution and long journeying, felt constrained to decline the invitation. He died in Zurich in the next year, November 12, 1562, upon return from France where he had taken a prominent part at the conference held at Poissy. Martyr's last hours are described in the following manner by his best

- (1) Martyr's Works, Let. 46, collected by Anthony Marten, 1583
- (2) Zur. Let. 34, n.; 2 Zur. Let. 26.

biographer, Josiah Simler; "But before he should die, some of us his friends being present with him...hee lay certaine space meditating with himselfe; then turning unto us, he testified.. that hee acknowledged life and salvation in Christ alone, who was given by the father an onelie Saviour unto mankinde; and this opinion of his hee declared and confirmed with reason and wonder of the scriptures; adding at the last, This is my faith, In this will I die; but they, which teach otherwise, and drawe men in anie other way, God will destroy them. And after he had thus spoken, hee reaching out his hande everie one particularlie; Fare ye wel (saith hee) my brethern and deere friends..... hee gave up his spirit verilie with so great a quietness as hee seemed not to die but to fall asleepe." (1)

Second, Deep sorrow and great loss were felt with Martyr's death.

The best way of showing the sorrow and loss felt by (a) Protestantism in general and (b) the English Reformers, in particular, upon Martyr's death, is to reproduce contemporary historical evidences.

(a) The great theologian Haller, in a letter to Zanchius, expresses Protestantism's deep sorrow at Martyr's departure in the following terms: "Martyr was not only a beacon and a pillar of our church but of the entire communion

(1) Josiah Simler, Life and Death of Peter Martyr.

of the faithful. So vast was his wisdom and knowledge; such were his dignity and kindliness that everybody admired and loved him. Who would be so mad as not to deplore with his whole being the loss of such a man?" (1)

(b) Among the many English reformers and citizens who lamented Master Peter's death, we shall give a few quotations which express in general terms, the sorrow shared by those who had known Martyr personally or through his writings.

1. Bishop Jewel, in 1563, wrote to Bullinger, "Though grief for Peter Martyr is unavailing, yet there is something pleasant, I know not why, even in the very feeling of sorrow. Alas, he was one who, from the greatness of his talents, the variety of his attainments, his piety, his morals, his life, seemed worthy of never being taken away from us." (2)

2. Bishop Sampson, on July 26, 1563, declared to Bullinger; "There was One, not long since at Zurich, into whose bosom I could pour out all my cares. His remains are now with you. Zurich, therefore often comes into my mind." (3)

3. Folkerheimer wrote to Simler from London on March 15, 1563: "I have resolved not to write anything about Master Peter Martyr, for this reason, that I am so affected by

(1) Vermigli's Cred. vol. 3, p. 5, publ. B.R.I., Claudiana Flor. 1883.

(2) Zur. Let., let. 54.

(3) Zur. Let., let. 58.

the loss of that man, that it seems very difficult for me to make mention of him either in conversation or even by letter without tears. Oh! that 5th of February when our horses tired out as well as ourselves, we hastened up to London to the meeting of parliament. Oh! how sad, how mournful did that day prove to us, which announced the death....of so great a man! We certainly do not regard with sufficient gratitude the exertions and studies of ~~Master~~ Martyr." (1)

Zurich, to perpetuate the memory of Martyr, produced a silver medal bearing Martyr's effigy. Many of these medals were sent to the numerous friends which he had made in England. Jewel and Parkhurst each received one of these from Simler and in their acknowledgement of the same, and of Martyr's biography which he had sent them, they expressed the hope that he would take care that all of Martyr's writings should be published.

Jewel wrote, "I have received from you a silver image of that excellent old man, Peter Martyr, with an account of his life and death. In the figure, indeed, although there is in many respects an admirable resemblance (to the original) yet there was a something, I know not what, in which I was unable to perceive the

(1) 3 Zur.Lett.,let.41.

skill of the artist. And what wonder is it - whenever I look around me, I can scarcely believe (him) ever to have existed?...Should you publish the writings of Peter Martyr, you will confer a benefit on the Church, and satisfy the expectations of many good men who desire it." (1)

Parkhurst wrote: "I send you, according to your request, two letters written to me by Peter Martyr; should I find more, I will send them...For the silver(image of Peter) Martyr I sent a golden Elizabeth. You are right in preparing an edition of the works of Martyr; for you will thus deserve well of all pious persons, and perform a most useful service to the Church of Christ. May the Lord prosper your undertaking and bring it to a happy issue!" (2)

Such is the indelible impression that Peter Martyr Vermigli, "the sphinx born out of Savonarola's ashes", the first teacher of theology upon the principle of the Reformation at Oxford University, (3) and one of the greatest Heroes of the Reformation, produced upon his contemporaries.

(1) Zur.Lett.let.56, March, 23, 1653.

(2) Zur.Lett.let.62, Feb. 17, 1564.

(3) Gorham, Redpath Tracts, XC, p.4-5, London, 1903.

CHAPTER VII.

CONCLUSION: INFLUENCES OF PETER MARTYR UPON THE ENGLISH
REFORMATION.

It was perhaps during England's most critical period, (a period of political, social and religious revolution,) that this great Italian Reformer was invited to England with the avowed purpose of effecting a reformation based upon Evangelical principles in the Church of England. To determine exactly what influences Martyr exerted is an impossible task for three reasons. First, because of the lack of historical material available on the subject; second, because of the extreme difficulty in determining the psychological conditions under which he spoke; third, because of the impossibility of knowing the psychological impressions, seldom recorded, which he must have produced upon the beholders, hearers and readers. We can, however, in the light of our study, point to certain influences which he exerted.

1. Martyr exerted advisory and exhortatory influence upon the English Reformation. The reader will remember the sermon which he addressed at Cranmer's suggestion, to the rebels of Devon, with the view of quelling the rebellion; the influence which he exerted in persuading Bucer and Fagius to go to England where they were sought after to lecture in Cambridge University; the sound and practical advice which he gave to

Hooper on the highly important and later keenly debated question touching the Episcopal vestments.

Again, it will be recollected how Martyr was consulted, even after he left England, upon every important question touching the English Reformation and the judicious advice, coupled with words of exhortation, he often gave to his inquirers. First, upon Queen Elizabeth's accession to the throne, Sampson expected the offer of a bishopric. Meanwhile, being troubled by the phrase, "Christ, the Supreme Head of the Church" which seemed to stand in opposition to "King or Queen, the Supreme Head of the Church of England" and by certain rules regarding church polity, he wrote Martyr for advice. Second, Goodman submitted to Martyr's "paternal correction and judgement certain propositions" relative to a boy king, a female ruler, transference of the divine right of a queen to her husband, obedience or resistance to magistrates enforcing idolatry etc. Third, Bishop Grindal requested his judgement referring to the Queen's taking away the estates of bishoprics and to the priests who had left the Reformers to rejoin the Papists and were then wanting to return. Should they be received? Similar questions had been asked by Sampson and others and to all he gave his advice. The English Divines must have felt not only the need of Martyr's counsel but also of his presence, otherwise how can we explain Bishop Sandys' exclamation: "How much injury England

is now receiving by your absence, as to the affairs of the Church and religion." (1)

11. Martyr exerted his influence upon the ritual and the polity of the Church of England.

1. The ritual of the Church of England. We have already noted the advice which Martyr gave to the Father of Non-Conformity, Hooper, relative to the use of Episcopal vestments. To this, must be added the forceful way in which he charged Bishop Sampson "neither to appear arrayed in vestments in the distribution of the Sacrament," reminding him that he himself had refused to wear the white surplice while canon of Oxford, nor to pray at an altar before the image of the crucifix. But on the contrary, he urged him to labour for the abolition of those papistical vestiges which were rooted in superstition.
2. The polity of the Church of England. Martyr's influence is also found in the monumental production of the "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticum." An examination of Cranmer's manuscript of "Reformatio Legum" reveals, according to Cardwell and Burnet, that it contains much of Martyr's handwriting in the way of suggestions, corrections and substantial contributions. Knowing as we do that Cranmer and Martyr were ^{the} only two members of the original committee, who laboured to produce the Ecclesiastical Laws and knowing that they had more or less the same intellectual ability and knowledge of church polity, it is reasonable

(1) Zur. Lett. let. 31.

to conclude that Martyr's influence in the compilation of the masterly production of "Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticum" was similar to that of Cranmer himself.

111. Martyr influenced certain articles of faith of the Church of England . With the possible exception of Cranmer , Martyr was the most outstanding Protestant Divine in England. Martyr was Bucer's equal in range of knowledge but ^{he} had proved to be his superior in method of explanation and logical presentation of scriptural teachings. (1) Martyr opened the great era of public theological disputations in England. He debated against the "Roman Catholic doctrine of the Presence" and Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Altar at the Oxford Disputation and came out triumphantly. He presided over and took part in many other theological discussions held regularly in connection with the University, so that his influence must have been significant. Otherwise, why should the Papists have hated him as they did and endeavoured to belittle and bespatter his intellectual and moral qualities? Because he was a foreigner? But so were Fagius, Bucer, and Ochino. Because he was bitter against the Papacy? This is contrary to what we know of his calm, collected and not spiteful nature. The great hatred of his opponents, therefore, must rather be sought in the realm of theological disputations in which he had administered the Roman

(1)(1) Young, Life and Times of Palearius, vol.1.chap. on Peter Martyr, London, 1860.

Church such a defeat that she never recovered and for which her members never forgave him. So much for Martyr's theological influence in general. He was also instrumental in bringing about substantial doctrinal changes connected with the Sacraments.

1. The revision of the First Edwardine Prayer Book. According to a letter to Bucer, Martyr had noted in his "Annotations" most of the points to which the former had taken exception: "In prioribus autem adnotationibus omnia ferme, quae te offenderunt, a me fuerunt adnotata," and had submitted them for consideration to Cranmer and those in charge of the revision of the Prayer Book. Further, he had objected to the "Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament" and recommended its abolition, and as we have seen his recommendation was adopted.

2. The Forty-two Articles. (a) The Sacrament of Baptism which he held to be a visible sign whereby the baptized was ingrafted and sealed into the Church as opposed to the conception that Baptism confers grace and washes away sin.

On this subject Martyr's opinion is still authoritative.

This is proved by the following incident: The Rev. George C. Gorham, B.D., had been a Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, for eighteen years. He was offered the vicarage of Bramford, in Speke, Devon, but the Bishop of Exeter refused it to him on the ground that he declined to admit that "every infant is absolute-

ly and unconditionlly regenerated by the Holy Spirit in and by water baptism duly administered"(1) Thereupon Gorham appealed taught that to Martyr who had "Per Spiritum nos in unum corpus baptizari, Prius, ergo, efficitur Spiritus Sancti opera, ut abeamus in membra Christi"(2); (b) The Sacrament of the Eucharist which he maintained to be none other than "Evangelium" and "Verbum visibile" And further the argument of "circumscribed locality" which he supplied to deny the "Corporal Presence of Christ" and "Transubstantiation" in the Eucharist. Martyr thus influenced the Prayer Book of 1552 and the Forty-two Articles and through them the present Prayer Book and Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.

IV. Martyr exerted his influence upon the English Reformation with his writings. We remember Martyr's account of the Oxford Disputation, the only recognized correct account of it; his learned "Commentaries on the Bible," which were sought and widely read; his "Defensio Doctrina...de Eucharestia Sacramento," a powerful answer to Marcus Antonius' and to Gardiner's books in which the Reformed English views of the Eucharist had been bitterly attacked. These important writings, to say nothing of the others, (see list in Appendix), must have influenced English thought. Indeed if Bishops Jewel and Parkhurst in their letters

(1) Redpath Tracts, vol.XC. p.B2, 1553.1558.

(2) Martyr, Loci Comm.IV:9. cited by Gorham, Redpath Tracts, vol.XC., p.14.

to Simler expressed, even in a small degree, the desire of the English Church for Martyr's writings, we **may** conclude that most of the Protestant leaders of England must have read Martyr's writings, in part or in toto, and must have been influenced by them.

V. Martyr must have exerted a moral influence upon^{the} English Reformation. Martyr possessed strong moral qualities and deep learning. In Italy he had been recognized as a powerful orator, as an outstanding scholar and as a wise organizer and chief of his Order. From the world's standpoint he had achieved national fame and had yet a brighter future before him. Nevertheless, because of his religious convictions, he forsook all and went into exile for the sake of his conscience and the Gospel knowing that he would have to endure discomfort, privation and even starvation.

Could any Englishman -- knowing what Martyr had sacrificed in the way of position, fame, and honours in Italy and witnessing the collected, courageous and scholarly way in which he faced his adversaries-- have escaped from being influenced? Moreover, he made known the papal temporal and spiritual tyranny, (of these he spoke as one having authority,) and thus he helped to check the pro-papal propaganda of those who wished to see, at least, the spiritual supremacy of the Pope re-established in England. So that if the proverb, that "actions

speak louder than words,"be true,then it follows that the life of this voluntary exile for freedom of thought and conscience,coupled with his speech must have nerved many souls, put to shame many indifferent ones and encouraged all to stand firm for the civil and spiritual supremacy of their country as opposed to the supremacy of Rome which spelled tyranny.It was primarily because of this moral force which Martyr,more than any other,must have supplied,at first,that Sir Cheke and Archbishop Cranmer "encouraged the resort of...foreign protestants to England" and that Edward VI. was "solicitous for the welfare and comfort of learned refugees."(1) Martyr, like many other foreign divines,bore with patience the insults of the Papists and the inconveniences of manners,customs and climatic conditions of England that he might give to others the liberty of the Gospel which he himself had found and learned to love.

In the light of the foregoing,we conclude that Peter Martyr's influence,and therefore the Italian influence,upon the English Reformation was significant and far-reaching.

(1) Writings of Edward VI.p.9f.,London,1840.

THE BILL OF EXPENCES ATTENDING THE JOURNEY OF PETER MARTYR
AND BERNERDINUS OCHIN, FROM BASIL TO ENGLAND? IN 1547.....

Laud Deo. 1547.

MONEY layd out by me John Abell for Bernerdinus Ochino and
Petrus Martyr, from the 4th of November at Basell untill
the 20th of December that they came to London.

	Guldibat. oz.		
Payd for cloth for a cloke and for a cote, for boot, hose, and for a hooke for Bernerd- inus at Basell.....	8	4	0
Payd to a taylore for fustyan and lynning for a doublet for Bernerdinus, and for mak- yng of hys cloke, cote, etc.....	3	0	2
Pd to the skyher for furr for hys cote and furryng it.....	3	3	0
Pd for a petycote and for a payr knytt hose for hym.....	1	9	0
Pd for a payer of botes for hym.....	2	0	2
Pd for a peyer bogetts and looks for them..	2	1	1
Pd for a sadle for hys horse.....	1	11	0
Pd for a hatt and glovys for hym.....	0	9	3
Pd for a sworde gyrdell and mendyng hys s sworde.....	0	8	1
Pd for our expencys from Basell to Argentine for our horsemeat &c, at Argentine.....	4	6	2
Pd for mendyng of sadelle & pylions at Argentine.....	0	7	1
Pd for books for Bernerdinus at Basell as apperyth particulerlye by a byll thereof delyv'd to my lord of Canterburys.....	40	7	0
Pd for the works of S. Augustine, Cyprian, and Epithanius for Petrus Martyr at Basell.....	13	8	1
Pd for botes & spores &c for Petrus Martyr.	2	11	0
Pd for two daggers &c. for Bernerdinus & P Marter.....	1	12	0
Pd for a payer furryd glovys for P. Marter..	0	13	0

Guld. batz. oz.

Pd for a peticote, glovys, & nyght cap for julius.....	1	11	3
Pd for 2 horse for Bernerdinus & Petrus Marter.....	36	12	0
Pd for 2 horse for ther servants.....	40	7	0
Pd by that I gave to two pencyoners of Argentine for conducting us two dayes jorney & for other expencys in the ways.	12	4	0
Pd for a vessell for ther books and for packyng them.....	1	4	2

Sma

180 1 2

Laus Deo.

Sma 180 guldens 1 batz 2 oz. aft 15 batz for the gulden, facit 127 crones of the sum & 15 batz 2oz reckonyng aft; 23 batz for the crone.....	117	15	2
---	-----	----	---

Pd more for our expensys & for our guyded fro Argentine to London 83 crones of the sum.....	83	0	0
---	----	---	---

Sma 200 crones of the sun & 15 batz 2oz at 6s the li. s. d. pece, facit.....	60	4	Ost
---	----	---	-----

Mony layd out by me John Abell for Ber-
nerdinus & Petrus Marter sens ther
comyng to London the 20th of December,
1547.....

li. s. d.

Payd for two payer of hose for Bernerd- inus & Petrus Marter.....	0	11	4
--	---	----	---

Pd for a payer nether stocks for ther servant.....	0	2	0
---	---	---	---

Pd for 3 payer of shooe for them & ther servant.....	0	2	4
---	---	---	---

Pd for 2 nyght cappes of vellvet for them.....	0	8	0
---	---	---	---

Pd for 2 round cappes for them.....	0	6	0
-------------------------------------	---	---	---

Pd for 2 payer of tunbrydg knyves for them.....	0	2	8
--	---	---	---

	li.	s.	d.
Pd for 2 payer garters of sylke riband.....	0	2	6
for ryband for a gyrdell for Petrus Marter.	0	1	2
for 2 payer of glovys for them.....	0	1	0
Pd for ther sop' & brekefast yt nyght & mornynge that they came to London.....	6	10	5
Pd for Potycary ware for them and sending ther gere to Lambeth.....	0	1	10
for the frayght of Petrus Marters fryfate of books from Argentine to Andwerp 12 dollers.....	2	12	0
for the frayght of the same dryfate from Andwerp to London.....	0	4	4
for the frayght of Bernerdinus dryfate of books fro Basell to Andwerp 17 1/2 dollers.	3	15	2
for the frayght of the said dryfate from Andwerp to London.....	0	7	9
Pd for ther horsemeat untill two of them were sold & two delyv'd to ther svants.....	2	8	6

	li.	s.	d.
Sma.....	11	17	0
Sma of the other syde	60	04	6
Sma tot'.....	72	61	6

Wherof I have R. for two of the said horses
sold in Smythfield..... 4 13 6

So ther remanynyth herof due to me lXVlj.li.Vll s. Vl d.

	li.	s.	d.
Delyv'd also by my lord of Canterburge comandment to Julius & Peter Marter's s'vant at hys going o' french 30 crones at 6 s the pene, fecit.....	9	66	0

	li.	s.	d.
Delyv'd also to Julius by my lord of Canterburge comandment a byll to recyve at hys comyng to Argentine.....	30	00	0

	li.	s.	d.
More for to be allowyd for my costes in rydyng to Argentine at Basell cs for thes two men.....	20	00	0

Sma..... 59 li. 6 s. 0 d.

Sma totall of all the charges layd out by me
John Abell amountyth as apperyth by this bill..126 li.7.s.6d.

Memorandu that I have also wrytten to my factor at
Argentine to delyv' to the said Julius if he shall
nede as mych moneye more as he shall thinke necess
ary to pay the charges of the comyng downe of ther
wyffe.

It may please my lords of the Counsell to
consyder my hynderance & losse of tyme about myne owne
busyness sith I want about this.

li.

Indorsed "John Abell 126
Petro
D.Brnard."

a
Ashmole's MSS.No.826.

Reference;Archaeologia, Vol.XXI, pages 471-3 London 1823.

MARTYR'S WRITINGS. (X)

Comment. in Epist. S. Pauli ad Romanos, Basle, 1558.

(Trans. into English by H.B. London, 1568)

Comment. in priorem ad Corinth Epistolam, Zurich, 1579.

(Written at Oxon and dedicated to Edward VI.)

Defensio doctrinae veteris & Apostolicae de Sacramento Euchar-

istiae advers Steph. Gardiner i, sub nomine M.

Antonii Constantii, Zurich, 1558, London, 1562.

Tractatio de Sacramento Eucharistiae habita Oxoniae, cum jam

absolvisset interpretationem XI. Capitis prioris

Epistolae ad Corinthios (trans. into English, London, 1562)

Disputatio de Eucharistiae Sacramento habita in Schola Theol.

Oxon. trans. into English, London, 1562. (Marten 1582)

Comment. in Genesim. Tig. 1560.

Comment. in lib. Iudicium, London, 1564. (trans. into English)

Comment. in lib. duos posteriores Legum, Heidelberg, 1599.

Comment. in Samuelis Prophetae libros duos, Tig., 1595.

Loci Communes sacrarum literarum. (trans. into English by Marten)

Tig. 1583, fol.

De Libero Arbitrio. Tig., 1587. fol.

De Providentia & Praedestinatione, Tig., 1587. fol.

An Deus sit causa. & author peccati Tig., 1587. fol.

An Missa sit sacrificium, Tig. 1587, fol.

Theses propositae ad disputandum publice in Schola Argentinen-
sis.

1543.

(X) In some cases place and year of publication cannot be
ascertained.

Oratio de Utilitate & Dignitate sacri ministerii, London, 1587.

De Morte Christi, London, 1587, fol.

De Resurrectione Christi, London, 1587, fol.

Sermo in XX cap. John, London, 1583, Translated into English.

Exhortatio ad sacrorum literatum studium. Translated into English.

Oratio quam Tigurii primum habuit, cum in locum Conradi Pellicani succēdit. Translated into English.

Adhortatio ad caenum Domini Mysticam. Trans. into English.

Epistolae Theologicae.

Preces ex Psalmis Davidis desumptae. Tig. 1566. Trans. into English by Glenham.

De Votis monasticis & caelebati.

Defensio sacerdotum sui contra D. Smithaei, etc. Basle 1659.

Aristotalis Ethicae cum illis in Sacra Scriptura collatae, etc
Comment. in Lament. Jer. Prophet. Stukins, Zurich.

Epistle to Edward Lord Protector of England, London 1550.

(translated by Marten)

The use and abuse of dancing. Trans. by J.R., publ. at London.

An exposition of the creed. trans. by T.E., pub. at London.

Una semplice Dichiarazione sopra in XII. Articoli della Fede Basle, 1551.

Dialogue de utraque in Christo natura, Zurich, 1561.

Epistolae duae ad Ecclesias Polonicas de negotio Stancariano Zurich, 1551.

Chorus alternatim Canentius, 1563.

Questions proposées & Résolués, 1571.

Epistres....a quelques Fidèles touchant leur abjuration, Geneva, 1574.

^ Zurich Letters. Parker Soc., Cambridge, 1840, f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Archivio Storico Italiano, vols. ix and x., Firenze, 1846.

Archæologia, (vols.1-30) J.B.Nichols, London, 1827.

Bayle, Pierre: Dictionnaire Historique et Critique, Maizeaux,
1760, Autrecht.

Burnet, Gilbert: History of the Reformation. Oxford, 1829.

Burnet, Gilbert: Thirty-Nine Articles of the Ch. of Eng. Oxford. 1845.

Book of Common Prayer of the Ch. of Eng. Oxford press.

Benrath, Karl: Bernardino Ochino, Carter, N.Y. 1877.

Clarendon, Edward H: History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in
England, 7 vols., Oxford, 1849.

Cooper, Charles H: Athenae Cantabrigienses 2 vols., Camb., 1858.

Cambridge Modern Hist. vols.2., Cambridge, 1907.

Carrick, J.C: Wycliffe and the Lollards, Clark., Edin., 1908.

Collier, Jeremy: Ecclesiastical History, 9 vols., London, 1850.

Cardwell, Edward: Documentary Annals, 2 vols., Oxford, 1844.

Cardwell, Edward: Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws, Oxford, 1850.

Dictionary of National Biographies, London, 1899.

Dixon, R.W: History of the Church of England, 6 vols., Oxford, 1895.

Foxe, John: Acts and Monuments, 8 vols., Townsend, London, 1843-9.

Froude, Jas. A: History of Eng., 12 vols., London, 1856-70.

Fuller, Thos: Church History, 6 vols., London, Oxford, 1845.

Gardiner, Samuel: History of England, 10 vols., Longman, London, 1884.

Gairdner, James: *A History of the English Church*, 1902.

Hook, Walter H: *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, Bentley,
London, 1860.

Hastings, James: *Encyclopaediae of Religion and Ethics*, Edinburgh, 1812.

Inne, A.D: *Cranmer and the English Reformation*, Scribners, N.Y. 1900.

Lingard, John: *History of England*, 13 vols., Sampson, Boston, 1855.

Luttrell, Narcissus: *A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*,
6 vols., Oxford, 1857.

Lichtenberger: *Encyclopedie des Sciences Religieuses*, Sandoz,
Paris, 1880.

Lechler, Prof: *John Wycliffe and his English Precursors*, T.S. London.
1884.

Mosheims, J.R: *Ecclesiastical History*, 4 vols., London, 1841.

MacLain's Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, 2 vols., Harper, N.Y. 1856.

Milner, Joseph: *History of the Church of Christ*, Cadell, 1834.

Macaulay, T.B: *History of England*, 4 vols Harper, N.Y. 1849.

McCrrie: *Progress and Suppression of Reformation in Italy*, Philadelphia
1856.

Marten, Anthony: *Vermigli Life and works*, sec. Part, 1583.

Narratives of the Reformation, Camden Society, London, 1860.

Nuova Ontologia, 5th Series, Rome, 1906.

New American Cyclopaedia, Appleton, N.Y., 1863.

Ochino, Bernardino: *Dialoghi Sette*, Bibl. Riforma Italiana, vols. 5,
Claudiana, Firenze, 1884.

Pollard, A.F: *Thomas Cranmer*, Putman, N.Y. 1904.

- Ranke, Leopold: History of England, 6 vols, Oxford, 1875.
- Ranke, Leopold: History of the Popes, 3 vols., Murray, London, 1841.
- Remains of Latimer, 2 vols., Parker Soc., Cambridge, 1845.
- Rie's Cyclopaedia, Longman, London, 1819.
- Ridley, Gloucester: Life of Dr. Nicholas Ridley, Whiston, London, 1763.
- Symond, John, Addington: Life of Michelangelo Buonarroti, London, 1893.
- Strype, John: Ecclesiastical Memorials, 4 vols. Oxford, 1822.
- Strype, John: Cranmer's Memorials, 2 vols., Oxford, 1840.
- Strype, John: Life of Parker. Oxford, 1821.
- The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, Funk, NY: 1911.
- Brown, R: Venetian State Papers, vols.v., Longman, Lond., 1875.
- Vermigli P.M: Credo e Catechismo, Bibl. Riforma Italiana, Firenze, Claudiana, 1883.
- Writings of Bradford, Parker Society, Cambridge, 1853.
- Writings of Edward VI, London, 1840.
- Wood, Anthony: Athenae Oxon., 4 vols., London, 1813-20.
- Wycliff, John: De Eucharestia, Loserth, London, 1892.
- Wilkins, David: Concilia, 4 vols., Parker Soc., Cambridge, 1844.
- Works of Cranmer: 2 vols., Parker Soc., Cambridge, 1844.
- Wriothesley: Chronicles, 2 vols.
- Zurich Letters: 4 vols. Parker Soc., Cambridge, 1845-7.
- Young: Life and Times of Paleario, 2 vols., London, 1860.
- Redpath Tracts, Tract.XC., London, 1903.

Simler, Josiah: Life and Death of Peter Martyr, Marten, 1583.

Gee and Hardy: Documents Illustrative of the History of the
English Church, MacMillan, London, 1896.

Comba, E: I Nostri Protestanti, 2 vols., Claudiana, Firenze, 1895.

Chiminelli, P: The Baptists in Italy, Nashville, Tenn. 1923.

La Fortuna di Dante etc., Bilychnis, Rome, 1921.

Contributo Italiano alla Riforma Religiosa in
Europa, Bilychnis, Rome, 1924.

Jahier, A: Riformatori e Riformati Italiani, Claudiana, Firenze, 1925.

Fasulo, A: Primato Papale etc., Bilychnis, Roma, 1924.

Letters and Papers of Henry VIII., vols. II. i., V. XLV.

"Rivista Cristiana," Claudiana, Firenze, 1874-1905.

"Bilychnis", Rome, 1900-1925.

Fisher, H.A.L: Political History of England, vol. v. NY. 1925.

