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Introduction

For a true understanding of many of the early sixteenth century interludes it is essential to know the religious doctrine that prompted their composition. This doctrine, based on Martin Luther's teachings, the reformers called the "new learning." It was popularized in England by Luther's books and by William Tyndale's translations and treatises. Just as the early morality plays of the fifteenth century show a close connection with the popular moral treatises of the time, so these early sixteenth century religious interludes reflect the teachings of the moral treatises of the "new learning." It will be the object of this dissertation to analyze from the popular treatises the two systems of salvation behind the morality plays of the late fifteenth century and the interludes and dialogues of the early sixteenth and to demonstrate the relationship of play to treatise.

Such an analysis will lead to a better understanding of the nature and purpose of the early sixteenth century religious interludes. Perhaps it will prevent such irrelevant criticism as one editor writes about the reform interlude Lusty Juventus:

[This is certainly a piece of rather heavy and tedious morality, replete with good instruction, but didactic to a fault. It is deficient in the curious allusions, which abound in other productions of the same kind; and even that mysterious character, Abominable Living, whose introduction promises some amusement and illustration, moves off the scene almost immediately after her first]
appearance, while Little Bess, whose entrance might have been a vehicle for some diverting or sentimental situation, does not "come on" at all.]*

This play is not "didactic to a fault"; rather, it would be at fault if it were not didactic, as its purpose was to instruct man in the way of salvation. Its function was not to amuse with the antics of Abominable Living or the story of Little Bess. These interludes, like Everyman, were treatises in the manner of a moral play. Their message was one of life or death for the souls of the audience; their duty was not to amuse the audience by expanding the role of sinful characters. These reform interludes showed a new way to salvation, one which was opposed to the Catholic system of the early moralities. It was their purpose to show man the way through the "empty hands of faith," as opposed to the way of works. Their nature must be studied in the light of their purpose. We might ask for more art in the presentation of their doctrine, but we cannot ask them to abandon their raison d’être.

The doctrinal system described as Lutheran represents chiefly the early beliefs of the German reformer when he was breaking with the Catholic Church and during the decade immediately thereafter. These doctrines were made popular in England by Tyndale's

* W. Carew Hazlitt, A Select Collection of Old English Plays, (London, 1874), II, 44. It is not clear whose comment this is, as the edition is printed with "the notes of all the commentators and new notes."
translations and treatises published between 1525 and the year of his martyrdom, 1536. There has been no attempt in this study to trace the development of Luther's thought in the more conservative last ten years of his life. His early doctrines, representing an emotional rebellion against the Roman Church, are the ones which may be found in the plays and dialogues considered in this dissertation. Although, as we shall see, there is some deviation from the Lutheran system as the century progresses, essentially the early doctrines remain the power behind the new learning.

The term "new learning," as used at first against the religious reformers and finally by them to describe their system, must be distinguished from the same term used concerning such men as Colet, Erasmus, and More to describe their humanistic learning. The religious "new learning" represented an evangelical, emotional religion rather than a rationalistic, humanistic reform such as the Oxford Reformers advocated. The study of the Scriptures in the light of faith was sufficient; the ancient classics of the "Gentiles" could add nothing which was essential for man's salvation.

The dates of the plays range from the late fifteenth century into the first few years of the reign of Elizabeth early in the latter half of the sixteenth century. The difficulty of dating these early plays makes it hard to be exact in the limits of the period treated.
CHAPTER I

THE MEDIEVAL SYSTEM OF SALVATION AS PRESENTED
IN THE POPULAR LITERATURE OF THE TIME

There are a great number of sources from which the analysis
of what was deemed necessary for men's salvation before the
Reformation might be taken. Literature "for their soul's need,"
as Albert C. Baugh reminds us, was extensive and varied. We
might have chosen the early thirteenth century Ormulum, the dia-
logue called Vices and Virtues, Piers Plowman, the fourteenth
century poem Death and Life, the Lay Folks' Catechism, John
Mirk's Instructions for Parish Priests, Robert of Brunne's
Handlyng Synne, the Aynebite of Inwit, the Speculum Vitae, the
Prick of Conscience, the Northern Homily Cycle, the Cursor
Mundi, Chaucer's Parson's Tale, Caxton's Royal Book, or the late
fifteenth century Doctrinal of Sapience, or many others. There was
no shortage of doctrinal writings designed to teach men what they
must believe and do to be saved. One author of the time wrote:

"Ther beþ so manye bokes & tretees of vyces and vertues
& of dyuerse doctrynes, þat þis schort lyfe schalle raþere
haue anende of any þe manne, þanne he maye owþere studye
hem or rede hem."

We shall take our analysis of the medieval system of salvation
from the popular vernacular treatises, sermons, and morality
plays, rather than from the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, the learned Latin *Summa* of Aquinas, or the commentaries on the *Sentences* by Duns Scotus. As a typical and extensive example of the treatises we shall use *The Book of Vices and Virtues*, a fourteenth century English translation of the *Somme le Roi* of Lorenz D'Orleans; as representative of the sermons we shall examine a mid-fifteenth century collection called *Jacob's Well*; and as a doctrinal morality play we shall analyze *Everyman*.

G. R. Owst sees these treatises as the offspring of the medieval pulpit and has found evidence of the process of transformation from sermon to treatise in the case of the metrical *Sermo de Festo Corporis Christi*. In the oldest version of the text the title "Sermo" stands above a Latin text from Psalm lxxvii, 25; in a later version the title "Sermo" has disappeared but the text remains; in the latest version the title "Sermo" and the text are missing and the homily has become a tract—*de festo Corporis Christi*. Owst sees the reverse process also in operation, particularly in an account, in the same manuscript as *de festo Corporis Christi*, of the seven miracles of the body of Christ taken from Brunne's *Handlynge Synne* and given a formal sermon ante-theme and ending of its own. In this chapter we shall also be able to demonstrate a close connection between these two—the treatise and the sermon—and the morality plays of the fifteenth century.
These numerous treatises, which may be termed "salvation literature," were the result of the Church's requirements for the education of the laymen as first laid down in the Constitutions of the Council at Lambeth (1281) by Archbishop of Canterbury, John Peckham, and later recapitulated by Thorsby of York in 1357, and Arundel of Canterbury in 1409. 6 Thorsby's Instructions for the people was put into English by John de Taystek, a monk of St. Mary's Abbey at York, in 1357, and is known as the Lay Folks' Catechism. 7 Here the priests are instructed to teach the layman, for "no creature might come to ilk blisse / withouten knawing of god as that clerk techis":

And forthi that mikill folke now in this world
Ne is noght wele yno gh lered to knawe god almighten,

And perauentre the defaitor in thaime,
That has thaire saules to kepe, and suld teche thame,
Als prelates, parsons, vikers, and prestes
That er halden be dette for to lere thame. (pp. 2, 4)

What the priest should teach the layman is given in a discussion and analysis of the Pater Noster, the Ten Commandments, the Seven Sacraments, the Seven Virtues, and the Seven Vices.

The popular treatise, The Book of Vices and Virtues, covers extensively the required matters of instruction for the laymen and the unlearned priests. 8 It treats all the suggested topics in the Lambeth Constitutions except the Sacraments, which are mentioned
but not discussed in detail, and in addition treats the Pater Noster, which had not been in the Constitutions but which was considered helpful to salvation. The order is as follows:

The Ten Commandments
The Articles of the Faith (Creed)
The Seven Deadly Sins
Virtues, beginning with an "Ars Moriendi"
The Pater Noster
The Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the related Virtues.

The first two matters are quickly dealt with in the first nine pages, but the analysis of the Sins extends to fifty-five pages. The seven sins have many branches each, and each branch has many twigs. For example, the sin of Pride, "the wikkid roote," has the following seven branches: "vntrewpe"; "despit"; "souquyderie, þat clerkes clepen presumpcion, þat is ouerboldenesse"; "couetise or fool desir, þat clerkes clepen ambicioun"; "veynglorie"; "ypocrisie"; and "wikked power." And "eueriche of þes braunches hap many smale twigges wexynge out of hem." The first branch, "vntrewpe," is further divided into three twigs: "vileyne," which is "euele"; "wodnesse," which is "wors"; and "reneie," believing not as a Christian should] which is "allwerworst." Each of these twigs is discussed at length and it is shown how a man may sin in these numerous ways. Similarly there are three twigs of "despite," the second branch of pride, seven of "presumption," three of "veynglorie," and three of "ypocrisie" (pp. 15-22). All this analysis is of the first sin of Pride. The other sins are analyzed
in as much detail, especially that of Avarice, which has ten branches, that, in turn, have from four to seven twigs each (pp. 30-42). Under the twigs the author gets down to particular sins such as murder, prostitution, simony, usury, substitution of inferior goods, apostasy, oppression of the poor, wicked games, profanity, waste of time, etc. In addition, the sixth deadly sin of Lechery is broken down even further; it "is departed in many bracheces as after pe staates of persones pat doth it, and euere it clymbe th vpper and vpper and alwey wors and wors" (p. 44).

There are listed fourteen combinations of persons beginning with unbound persons, and ending with prelates (pp. 43-46). The higher the personages the worse the sin. Why this minute examination of every aspect of sin? It was simply that knowledge of sin was necessary to proper shift:

who-so wolde wel studie in pis boke, it myȝt profiten hym, and he myȝt lerne and rekene alle manere of synnes and to schryue hym wel, for þer may no man schryue hym wel ne kepe hym fro synne but he knowe hem. (p. 68)

The sacraments are not discussed at length in The Book of Vices and Virtues, but the whole system of instruction was aimed at preparing man for the one sacrament of penance. This sacrament had assumed the paramount place in the scheme of salvation. The other sacraments were necessary and effective in attaining salvation, but the real business of the clergy and the Church was to see that man repented, confessed, and obtained absolution. The
message of the sermons was "Do penance!" The "wages of sin is death" became the "wages of not doing penance is death." Man must know each sin and all its branches and twigs as well as all the circumstances pertaining to the sin, which might change a venial to a deadly sin. The priest or confessor must also know all about sins and the penance required by the particular circumstances of each sin. However, the layman received extra credit if he instituted the confession of his sins properly instead of depending on the confessor to draw out the sins by questions. So it behooved all to know sin and to spend much time contemplating their sins and the circumstances attending them.

Not only must man know all about sin, but he must confess each and every sin, forgetting none upon pain of damnation. One sermon, in a fifteenth century collection, tells of a poor man who was unable for shame to confess one deadly sin which the devil had tempted him to commit in his thoughts. He died and the next night he appeared in the churchyard to the curate as a horrible monster and said that he had been condemned for that one sin. 12

In the next chapter we shall see that Luther rebelled against this emphasis on particular or individual sins and felt that contemplation of one's sins only led to delight in more sins rather than to true contrition for those past. Curiously, the author of the late fourteenth century treatise, The Cloud of Unknowing, advocating
mystical contemplation as the path to salvation and union with God, also suggests that thinking on individual sins tends to separate man from God. He is using the Virgin Mary as an example of one who has been called to the contemplative life, but who is separated from God by an awareness of her sins:

But what serof? Cam sche serfore doun fro be heigt of desire into be depnes of hir sinful liif, & serchid in be foule stynkyng fen & donghille of hir synnes, serching peim up bi one & bi one, wip alle circumstaunces of hem, & sorowed & weep so upon hem ich one bi hem-self? Nay, seylyr sche did not so. & whi? For God lete hir wite by his grace wip-inne in hir soule pat sche schuld neuer so bryng it aboute. For so migt sche sonner haue reisid in hir-self an ablenes to haue ete synnid, pen to haue purchase in pat werke any pleyn forguevenes of alle hir synnes.

This was, of course, advice for the contemplative life, which was considered superior to the active life; but with Luther, the layman in the active life was better off not to think on the individual sins but to assume that, if he had a contrite heart, God would forgive him all his sins even if he could not remember each one with all the circumstances. The practical effect of such a change in teaching would be a drastic reduction in the importance of the clergy in the scheme of salvation. In the field of literature the practical result would be the rise of a new set of treatises, sermons, plays—the "salvation literature" of the early sixteenth century.

The Book of Vices and Virtues has a section on the art of
dying well. A man must learn to die if he expects to die well, as "Wise Catoun" has said. To a good man death is the "ende of all cruel and a bigynnynge of alle goodnesse" (p. 70). Man may learn of good and evil by projecting himself out of life into death and contemplating the tortures of Hell, the pains of Purgatory, and the delights of Heaven (pp. 70-71). This contemplation will help him to hate sin and live a good life which in turn will assure a good death.

The Art of Dying or the Ars Moriendi tradition was extended outside the church instructions to include much ritual and ceremony, many set prayers to particular saints, and special questions to be put to the dying. Caxton's The Arte & Crafte to Knowe Well to Dye (1480) is an abridged treatise intended to teach man how to die. It sets forth these steps: 1. a praising of death, and how man ought to die gladly, 2. the temptations that come especially to a dying man, 3. the questions which must be asked him, 4. instructions to be made to the sick, 5. remembrance of what God has done for him, and 6. certain orisons for the sick to say, or to be said before the dying. The passion of Christ can save the dying, says Caxton, but immediately he quotes St. Isadore as saying that the following verse has so much virtue that if the dying can manage to say it three times he may be assured that his sins are forgiven:
Diripuisti domine vincula mea tibi sacrificabo hostie
laudis / et nomen offi inuocabo. That is to saye /
Lorde thou haste broken my bondes. I shall sacrificce
to ye an hostie of pystyn g / and shall call on ye name
of our lorde. 14

Then follow prayers to the Virgin Mary, the angels, the apostles,
the martyrs, the virgins, and the saints—all to be said three
times by the sick, or before him if he is too weak. By this pro-
cedure the dying shall be saved. So important is the spiritual aid
to the dying that the Pope, says Caxton, has ordered spiritual
medicine to be administered before bodily medicine. This spirit-
ual medicine of the church is the sacrament of extreme unction
without which a man will die in damnation. The attendant of the
dying is urged not to give the sick man too much encouragement
of recovery lest he not be moved to true contrition for his sins.
The dying man is to be urged to submit to "our moder holi
chyrche" and if he cannot manage true contrition for his sins, he
is to be frightened into repentance by a listing of the horrors that
await him:

And also oughte to be shewed to the seke person e ye
grete perille that myghte falle & come to hym. Not-
wythstondynge though he therby sholde be a ferde. For
better it is that by fere and holsome drede he have
compunction and be saued than by blaudysshyng dyssolu-
cyo's or by conforte noyous he be dampned. 15

This instruction is an example of what Luther objected to--
attrition as a substitute for true contrition.
Caxton lists further necessities for the art of dying well: the images of the crucifix, of the saints, and of "our blessed lady." Holy water should be sprinkled "to the ende that the deuyllys be putte abacke fro theym."16 "And there oughte neuer to be broughte to theyr remembrance the carnalle frendes / ne wyf / ne chyldren / ne rychesses. ne other goodes temporell, but onely as moche as the spyrytuelle helthe of the seke persone demaundeth & requyreth."17 Later in the chapter these same temporal "goodes" will be encountered in the morality play Everyman, as characters who refuse or are unable to accompany the hero on his journey.

In the prayers for the dying no one is overlooked in asking help against Satan and his devils, who are swarming around the sick man striving for possession of his soul. After prayers to Mary, St. Michael, the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost, aid is invoked of these:

holy angelles of god / The archangellys. The Vertues. The potestates / The domynacyons. The trones. The cherubyns / And the syraphyns / . . . The patryarckes / and the prophetes / The aposteles and euangelystes / The martyres and confessours / The monkes and heremytes / The vyrgynes and the wydowes. The chyldren and the Innocentes. . . . alle prestes and dekens / And of theym of all degrees of the chirche catholyke.18

In these prayers the disposition of the sick man is important so that "to euery persone that wel and surely wyl deye is of necessitye that he lerne to deye / or the deth come and preuente hym."19
Many of the prayers and ceremonies prescribed for the dying in the *Ars Moriendi* tradition went beyond what was recommended by the Church. John Myrc’s *Instructions for Parish Priests* gives the prescribed procedure in the sacrament of extreme unction.

The man who refuses this sacrament dies in damnation. To him who will accept the sacrament, the priest is to ask a series of questions such as "Art þow fayn, my broþer, say, / Þat þow dyest in crysten fay?" and "Be-leuest þow with ful gode devocyon / On ihesu crystes passyone?" The answer being "ýe," the man is to hold up both hands

\[\text{And þonke Criste of alle hys sondes,} \\
\text{And praye hym, for hys moder sake,} \\
\text{Þat he wolde þy sowle take} \\
\text{In-to hys honde and hys kepynge,} \\
\text{And saue hyt from þe fowle þynge.} \]

If the sick man asks for the Sacrament of the Altar, he is to be obliged unless he is so sick that there is danger that he will vomit up the holy eucharist, in which case he is to be told that the desire for the sacrament will be sufficient (p. 61). The priest is to ask the sick whether he is sorry for his sins “not onely for drede of deth or any otherayne, but rather more for love of god & rightvnesse & for the due orde & charitte by whiche we be boundene to love god aboue alle thynge & of all thise thynges thowe askest forgivevenes of god?” This is true contrition, but, as has been seen in Caxton’s *Arte & Crafte to Knowe Well to Dye,*
if contrition is not present then attrition or fear of Hell and its
punishments is better than nothing. Luther objected to this practi-
cal solution of the frequent lack of true contrition as being con-
ductive to a low moral standard. In Myrc's Instructions the prayer
to be said by the sick, or for the sick, is limited to the "Deus
meus, deus meus, misericordia mea" which ends with the "In
manus tuas domine commendó spiritum meum" to be addressed to
God in His perfect trinity without reference to the many interces-
sors of the Ars Moriendi tradition. Nor is there any mention of
the holy water to hold the devils back. That the devils were
thought of as actually present, however, may be seen from the
pictures of them crowding around the sick bed in many of the
woodcuts accompanying the Ars Moriendi treatises.

The Book of Vices and Virtues next turns to the seven gifts
of the Holy Ghost which include the three divine virtues: belief,
hope, and charity, and the four cardinal virtues: prudence,
temperance, strength, and justice. Of these charity or love is
the chief virtue and the four cardinal virtues are but "foure
maneres of love." Belief is, of course, faith; however, the em-
phasis is not put on faith but on charity or love. The Holy Ghost,
by the gift of the virtues, "be seuene giftis, doþ away and
destroyþ be seuene dedly synnes and setteþ in þe herte and
noresscheþ be seuene vertues" (p. 125). It is interesting to note
that here is given the doctrinal basis for the classic conflict of the
vices and virtues for the soul of man, which is the chief subject
matter of the Morality plays. It is an actual struggle of the Holy
Ghost for the soul of man, using the seven virtues as weapons
against the Devil and his seven vices.

In the discussion of Prowess, which displaces sloth, the author
of the *Vices and Virtues* discusses the two kinds of good life recog-
nized by the Church. There are those that will "kepe hem from
grete synnes, do penaunce, yeue almesse, holde pe comaundermentes
of God and holy chirche, and wel it likep hem jif pei mowe at pe
laste be saued" (p. 162). "Pes ben in good staate and wel mowe
be saued." This is the active life. There are others who are
called by a special gift of God to the contemplative life. To them
no treasure of the earth may be compared with "loue of God,"
"pees in herte," and "loye of conscience." This contemplative
life "entended to no ping in pis world but to loue God and serue
hym and knowe hym, and peryfore sche is idele as to workes of
pis world and al a-slepe, but sche is wel wakre wip-ynne in herte
to penke on God and to loue hym, and desirep no ping but onliche
to see hym and to haue hym, and for pat sche forget alle oþere
þinges so pat sche is y-raunesched and is y-sett on God and
desirep to be departed from þe bodi, þat is dedliche, for to be
euermore wip Ihesu Crist" (p. 220). Those entering the contem-
plative life should have been well proved in the virtues of the active life before seeking the higher life, but "Pe giftes and pe vertues pat we han spoken of tofore in his boke belongen to pe first life, pat is cleped actif" (p. 221). The next two virtues, "pe gifte of vnderstondynge and pe gifte of wisdom," belong to the contemplative life. By grace man is given the spiritual light which "purgepe vnderstondynge of a man or womman of pe derknesses of vnknowe pinges & pe tecches of synne" (p. 221).

By this spiritual light man is purged of the "tecches" of the worst sin, the sin which makes beasts of men, that of lechery.

There follows in the Book of Vices and Virtues a discussion of the seven states of chastity which may be both within marriage and in the single state. In the state of marriage man may "wel wynne pe coroune of ioye," sometimes even obtaining more thanks from God than some virgins, but "neuer pe later pe virgines han a speciale coroune aboue pe coroune of ioye pat is comune to alle pe halewen, for pe virgines han a special victorie of here flesche for to pursue pe lambe wher pat euver he gote, to whom pei be wedded" (p. 260). Chastity in the clergy is essential. Luther rejected this ideal of chastity and glorified the married state for both laymen and clergy. Likewise he made an effort to combine the contemplative and the active life into one for all men. Laymen, too, might be given the spiritual inner light which would enable
them to know God and to judge of the correct interpretation of the Scriptures. This belief represents a further step in the direction of elevating the position of the layman in religion and lowering that of the clergy.

The "jifte of wisdom" is the last rung in the ladder of perfection, and it is given to the contemplative life only. By this gift man becomes one with God and delights in God's commandments in addition to knowing God which is the "jifte of vnderstondyng." Because of man's sinful nature, however, even the contemplative cannot taste of the full sweetness of God until after the death of the body (pp. 272-3).

In The Book of Vices and Virtues there is a complete outline of the Church's way to salvation. The same material may be found in numerous other treatises both in prose and in meter, with many variations. The medieval sermons, to which we shall now turn, went over the very same subject matter fitting it into the conventional sermon pattern, adding chiefly a text and exempla. As a comprehensive course of ninety-five sermons on this salvation scheme, the mid-fifteenth century sermon collection, Jacob's Well, 21 will be used to illustrate further the medieval system of salvation.

In the first sermon the preacher lays out the allegorical pattern of his entire undertaking and promises to "laboure to 3ou
lxxxix. dayes and v., ere it be performyd" (p. 4). His purpose is "to makyn a depe welle" of a "schelde pytt" which is the body of man or as the doctors call it the "pytt of lust." This pit is so shallow that it has no natural spring to receive the water of grace, but it does have "v. entrees, þat arn þe v. bodily wyttes" by which the streams of the great curse enter into the pit. The waters of the great curse must be bailed out of the pit by the "scope of penaunce" and the "wose be-nethe, þat is, þe vij. dedly synnes" must be caste out by the "skeet of contricyoun," the "skauell of confessioun," and the "schouele of satisfaccyoun" (p. 2). Then the "v. watyratys, þat is, youre v. wyttes, muste be stoppyd, þat þe watyr of þe grete curs and þe wose of dedly synnes entre nogt in-to youre pytt azyn" (p. 2).

The pit then must be dug deeper with the spade of "clennesse," and the sand and gravel, which are the circumstances of sin, must be "castyn out." With the spade of "clennesse" man must continue to dig in the "ground of vertewys" until he reaches the "vij. sprynges of watyr of grace, þat is vij. giftes of þe holy gost." Then he is to level the ground with "þe leveell of equyte" and pave it with "þe courblys of þe artycles of þe feyth" (p. 3). For mortar he will use sand, which is the memory of his sin, mixed with the water of weeping and the lime of the burning love for Christ. By the plumb line of truth he will use the mortar to set the stones, which are the works of faith.
To get out of the well man must have the ladder of charity, one side of which is love of God and the other love of man. The "nethyr" stake of the ladder is "dreed of þe doom" and the "ouyr" stake is the hope of bliss. The remaining stakes of the ladder will include the ten stakes of the ten commandments; the seven of the deeds of "mercy bodyly" and the seven of the deeds of "mercy gostly"; others, which are praising and thanking God, prayers, the Ave Maria; and lastly the seven highest stakes for the seven petitions of the Pater Noster.

To draw up water of grace out of this deep well, man must have a windlass, the mind; a rope, his belief or faith; and a bucket, his desire for goodness. The rope must be "threfold to-gedere in on, in feyth, hope, & charyte."

And, be þe wyndas of þe mynde, wyth þis roop made myȝty in thre lynkes, schal be turnyd vp þe bokett of þi desyre in goodnes, fylled wyth watyr of grace, to contemplacyoun in heuenly thinges, in whiche contemplacyoun þou schalt, in þe bokett of desyre, drinke þi fylle of þe sweet watyr of grace. (pp. 3-4)

It should be noted that into this elaborate allegorical scheme, the author has fitted his discussion of the required instruction: the seven deadly sins, the seven virtues, the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, the articles of the Faith, the Ten Commandments, the Sacraments, and the Works of Mercy. 22

Each sermon has its exemplum or sometimes more than one. These tales of wonder are supposed to illustrate the points under
discussion, but at times they seem to be added chiefly for relieving
the audience from an unending stream of instruction. Many of
them are highly allegorical and bring to mind the morality plays,
which will be taken up later in this chapter to complete the pre-
sentation of the medieval system. For instance, to illustrate
the need for the sacrament of penance, the preacher tells the story
of the clerk who, to escape the tempest raging about him, went to
the house of Righteousness, to the house of Truth, and to the
house of Peace, but none would receive him. Peace advised him
to find her sister Mercy, who saved him from the storm on the
promise that he would do deeds of mercy thereafter. The moral
is that Righteousness, Truth, and Peace cannot help the sinner
unless he appeal to the court of Mercy which is penance, contri-
tion, confession, and satisfaction. He must go to the spiritual
judge, the priest, and confess and do penance to be saved. Very
little would be required to turn this exemplum into a morality play
on the all-important sacrament of penance. This sacrament,
stressed in the first part of Jacob's Well as a remedy for the
various sins, was the chief concern of the clergy and the laymen
in working out the salvation of the latter. Reflecting this fact,
the treatises and sermons were aimed at this sacrament as the
principal means of attaining heaven. Chaucer's Parson's Tale
is a sermon on penitence or penance, and the analysis of the
seven cardinal vices, each with its remedying virtue, is given as the first cause of contrition: "a man shal remembre hym of his synnes." A knowledge of sin was essential to this powerful sacrament.

In addition to the usual instructions called for in the Lambeth Constitutions, Jacob’s Well includes a sixty-page discussion of the articles of the curse of excommunication taken from Canon Law and from the decrees of councils held on English soil. It will be seen that Luther objected to the use of the curse for purposes other than to save the soul of the sinner. In a later chapter, John Bale’s condemnation of the abuses of the curse in his play King Johan will show the "new-learning" rebellion against one part of the medieval system. The author of the sermons in Jacob’s Well has made the foul water in the shallow pit of man’s body the poisoned and corrupt water of the curse, which must be scooped out by penance. If man is deep in sin, however, "the watyr of the gret curs, wyth onye of his streyms, pat is, wyth onye of his artycles, flowyth out of holy cherche, & be the entre of malyce & wyckyndes, brekyth in-to hym pat is lowe & depe in synne, the sentence of pat curs drenchyth hym, & perysschyth his soule" (p. 6). Man should be thankful when the priest teaches him the articles of the great curse for

as a swerd, smytyn a dedly stroke, departytyh the soule fro the body, & sleeth pat persone whom he so dedly wound-
yth; Ryȝt so, þe swerd of holy cherche, þat is, þe sentence of þe grete curs in ony of his articyles, smyteth & sleeth hem þat ben gylyt þere-in; for it de-partyyth god from hem, þat is þe lyf of here soule as a swerd de-partyyth þe body fro þe soule of hem þat he dedly woundyth. (p. 8)

The curse separates the man who is under it from God and all the saints, from the help of the passion and death of Christ, from all the sacraments and suffrages of Holy Church, and from the prayers of all Christian men in Heaven and on earth. Those who are "gylyt in þe articyles of þe sentence," until they repent and confess are "cursyd in slepyng, in wakyng, in stondyng, in syttyng, in going, in lyggyng, in spekyng, in silence, in etyng, in drynkyng, & in all here werkyng" (p. 9). The author tells the tale of one Ode, who was cursed for not dreading the "censure of holy cherche." His servant went for "leechcraft" but his master died while he was gone. The servant had a vision of his master's trials after death as a result of being censured by "holy cherche." At midnight the "feendys" came into the cottage where the servant rested, bringing with them a burning chair in which the king of fiends sat. The soul of Ode was brought before him crying horribly with pain. The prince of fiends addressed Ode saying that since he loved ease and luxury during his life, he would be "bathyd, & boyled, & sodyn, in pycche & oyle all sethyng ouer þe fyir." The soul roared in pain and the devil caused it to be laid on a burning "grydell ouer brennyng wylde fyir." When Ode was
all "for-roystyd, fryed, & scaldyd, & thus for-brent, he roryd as a
deuyl for peyne," and said:

I forsake my cristendam, I forsake all holy cherche, &
alle þe sacramentys!

Since Ode had been a glutton in his life, the devil made him drink
"reed brennyng metal moltyn, tyl it ran out of his nose, eyjin, &
erys." Then Ode said:

Cursed be god in heuen, . . . I curse hym / I forsake
hym / I forsake al þe mede of his passioun & of his
deth! / I curse, & I forsake marie, his modyr! / I
curse, & I forsake alle þe seyntys! / I curse, & I
forsake, al þe helpe of prayers / & al þe helpe & mede
of gode werkys in heuen & in / erthe!" (p. 10)

With these words, he turned "al blak lyche þe feend" and the master
fiend kissed him and called him one of them. The ground opened
up and the fiends threw him down into the pit of hell. When the
servant went home, he found his master Ode as "blak as pych."
The terrifying moral of this story is that if man does not heed the
articles of the curse, he will be bathed in burning pitch and oil,
roasted in fire, made to drink boiling metal, and cast into Hell's
pit.

These articles of the curse must be "schewyn" four times a
year by order of "holy cherche." "And þise artycles, if it were
nedeful, schulde be schewyd solemnely, þat is, wyth cros standyng,
wyth bellys ryngynge, wyth candelys brennyngé, & after-ward
quenchyd" (p. 13). The form of the curse is given in many of
the treatises on sin and varies somewhat as to expression, but essentially the content is the same. The curse in Jacob's Well will illustrate the thoroughness with which man is damned when he is in "pe peryle of pe synne & of pe articles of pe gret curs."

Be pe authoryte & powere of almyghty god, fadyr & some & holy goest, and of pe gloryous mayde marie, modyr of god, oure lord ihesu crist, & of seynt Mychel archaungyl, & of alle archaungelys & aungelys; be pe auctoryte of seynt Johun baptyst, & of all holy patriarkys & prophetyys, and of pe holy apostlys Petyr & powle, & seynt Johan pe euangelyst; be pe auctoryte & powere of pe blyssed marterys, Steuen, laurence, & seynt Tomays, & of alle holy martyres, & of alle holy confessourys; be pe auctoryte & powere of pe blyssed maydenys Katerine, Cristine, & Margarete, & of alle holy maydenys, & of alle holy sayntes, fat is for to seye, be pe auctoryte & power of all holy cherc in heuen & in erthe, we denounce & schewe acursyd in pe sentens of pe gret curs, fat is to say, we schewe hem damnyd & departyd fro god, and fro alle prayerys & suffragys of holy cherc, and fro alle pe sacramentyys. And we schewe hem to be takyn to pe powere of sathun, pe fend, to deth, & to dampnacyoun of body & of soule, tyl pei come to amendement by verry penaunce, & ben / asoyled. (pp. 13-14)

The threat of such a terrible curse by all that men held sacred tended to add to the importance of the already primary sacrament of penance by which the curse might be lifted. The author of the sermons continues, giving some of the articles of the curse which are to be avoided. They include every type of sin conceivable from personal and private sins to social, legal, political, and religious sins. The religious sins include: depriving a church of any right or privilege, having intercourse with the excommunicated or interdicted, stealing church property, burning
churches, dragging out of a church anyone who has sought asylum, accumulating prebends, practicing witchcraft or heresy, hindering the gathering of tithes, deducting the cost of labor before tithing, prosecuting men of the church for carrying tithes from the fields, hindering the jurisdiction of prelates, withholding church property, forbidding subjects to trade with church people, burying an excommunicated person, failing to stir those who are shrived to pay tithes, insulting or robbing a priest, tithing falsely, infringing on the rights and privileges of the church, and exacting taxes from the church and its ministers. This list of sins against the church and the clergy shows the curse used in the manner condemned by Luther, for the protection of the property and rights of the church rather than for the correction of individual souls. The section on the articles of the great curse is concluded by an exemplum showing the marvelous power of the curse:

In an abbey of seynt bernard were many flees. bernard acursyd hem, and, on be morwe, be fleas were dede. Syth curse sleth flees, pat dedyn no synne, rathere curse sleth body & soule pat synnen in endles peyne. Perfore amendyth jou pat ben gylyt pere-in. (p. 64)

There were two reasons that man was in trouble when he was excommunicated: 1. because of his sins and 2. because of the curse of "holi cherche." However, the second of these causes tended to be emphasized, and the magical power of the curse to
damn the enemies of the church was great, as may be seen from
the case of these unfortunate fleas that had committed no sin.

Besides the all-important sacrament of penance, baptism was
also necessary for salvation. The infant dying before he was
baptized may not go to heaven. The priest should teach the mid-
wives the correct formula for baptizing so that they can do it
properly. From St. Gregory’s Dialogues, comes a story of a
midwife “eat loste a chylde, bope soule & life.” When the
child was born the midwife saw that it would die; so she quickly
baptised it thus:

    God and seynt Ione

    Crysten þe chylde, bope flesse and bone.

When they tried to bury the infant in the churchyard, the priest
asked about the christening and the midwife repeated her baptism
of the child.

 þan seyd þe preste, “God and seynt Iame
þyue þe bope sorow and shame,
And Crystys malysum haue þou for-þy,
And alle þe ouþer þat were þe by!
YN euyl tyme were þou bore,
For yn þy defaute, a soule ys lore.

In the sacrament of baptism the form was all-important, for if
the words were said in the wrong order, the ceremony was nought
and must be repeated. Myrc writes in his Instructions:

    But þef cas falle thus,
    þat he þe wordes sayde a-mys,
In nomine filij & patris & spiritus sancti. Amen.
Or any oþer wey but þey set hem on rowe,
As þe fader & þe sone & þe holy gost,
In nomine patris & filij & spiritus sancti. Amen.
If hyt be oþer weyes I-went,
Alle þe folgyþe ys clene I-schent;
Penne moste þou, to make hyt trewe,
Say þe serues alle a-newe,
Blesse þe water & halowe þe font,
Ryght as hyt in bok stont. (p. 19)

Baptism cleanses man of original sin; it is his "charter of
ryȝt / Pat fordophe Adams plyȝt." It "fro the fende . . . byeþ
þe fre, / And defendeþ þe þyn erytage." The sacrament of
Confirmation is the Bishop's confirming man's christening "Pat
hyt be sekyr / To fende vs ægens þe fendes bekyr."

The Sacrament of the Altar, or of the Holy Eucharist, or
the Lord's Supper as it became known to the reformers, was
next in importance to the sacrament of penance. A belief in the
real, actual presence of Christ's body in the elements of the
sacrament was required for salvation:

Also we schewyn acursyd alle þo þat beleuyn noȝt on
þe sacrament of þe awtere to be goddys flesch & his
blood in lyknesse of bread & wyn. 27

And again:

Þys, oght to beleue, euery crysten man,
And lerne þe beleue of one þat kan,
'Pat þe bred þat sacred ys
At þe auter, ys Goddys flessh:'
Boþe fleshe and blode þer ys leyd,
Purgh þe wurdes þat þe prest haþ seyd,
'Pat lyȝte with-ynne þe vyrgyne Marye,
And on þe rode for vs wulde deye,
For who so beleue nat clere
yn þe sacrament of þe autere,
He shal neuer þe blys a-byde,
For no þyng þat may betyd.28

Robert Brunne, after stating the above doctrine, gives an account of a miracle which proved to a skeptical man that the real presence was there in the elements of the sacrament:

whan þe vble was on þe auter leyd,
And þe prest þe wurdes had seyd,
Alle þre þoȝt þan verylyk,
Before þe prest, þat a chylde lay quyk.
Yn feyre forme of fleshe and blode;
Þys say þey þre, þere þey stode.
whan þe prestte shulde parte þe sacrament,
An aungel dowun from heuene was sent,
And sacryfyed þe chylde ryȝt þare;
As þe prest hyt brak, þe aungel hyt share;
Þe blode yn-to þe chaleys ran
Of þat chylde, boþe God and man.
Þys man þede to þe heyȝest degre,
To houzel hym, as fyl to be;
Hym þoght þe prest broȝte on þe pateyn
Morselles of þe chylde alle newe sleyn,
And bedde hym a morsel of þe fleshe
with all þe blode þer-on alle fresshe.
Þan gan he cry, with loude steuene,
"Mercy! Goddyys some of heuene!
Þe brede þat y sagh on þe auter lye,
Hyt ys þy body; y se hyt with ye.
Of þe brede, þurgh sacrament,
To fleshe and blode hyt ys alle went;
Þys y beleue, and euer y shal;
For verryly we se hyt alle." (pp. 313-314)

It was decreed that every man should receive the Sacrament of the Altar once a year.29

The priest was to blame who through ignorance did not sing many masses, for "many soule myȝt be saued / with þe messe
The mass became a means of releasing souls from purgatory as well as saving souls before death. Robert Brunne tells a tale of a priest who was served by a strange man every time he went to bathe in a nearby stream. When he tried to repay the man with loaves of bread, he discovered that the man was the soul of a dead man condemned to be a servant until he should be released from purgatory. He asked the priest to sing sixty masses for him to release his soul to the joy of heaven. If he did not appear after the sixty masses, the priest was to assume that he had been released. As he did not appear again, the priest assumed that his sixty masses had lifted his soul from the pain of purgatory. From this tale the moral is drawn

\begin{verbatim}
Pat hyt ys grete charyte,
Messes for the dede to synge,
Fe soules oute of pyne to bryngge.
\end{verbatim}

There follows a tale of a good friar who sang a soul out of purgatory with only two masses (pp. 324–327). From Bede, Robert Brunne tells a story of how an Abbot's mass-singing made the fetters fall off a knight in prison, "For no hyng hap powere / Azens pe sacrement of pe autere" (p. 330). However, this sacrament "helpe nat yet a-lone, / But deuoute ofrynges also
echone; / Alle pat we ofre at pe messe, / Alle oure saluacyun
hyt ys; Nat onely for to saue bo pat dede beh, / But bo quyke
also hyt sauep and redep" (p. 332). Offerings are important to
the mass as presents to God to obtain his mercy--a kind of "divine commerce" or an exchange of material gifts from God. 32

The conception of the mass as a good work (a certain number of such works would buy so much forgiveness or benefit) offended Luther and the reformers. The rich could pay for thousands of masses and assure the souls of their loved ones, as well as their own souls, a short stay in purgatory. For example, thousands of masses were bought for the soul of the late King Henry VII by his dutiful son.

Luther also objected, as will be seen in Chapter II, to considering the sacrament of the body of Christ as a sacrifice offered each time by the priest. An instance of this belief may be found in the early fourteenth century Lay-Folks Mass-Book 33 in which a participant in the mass at one point is instructed to repeat a prayer beginning thus:

God resayue þi seruyce
And þis solempne sacrifice,
for þo prest & for vs alle,
þat now are here, or here be shalle,
þis messe to here or worship do,
Þo sakring to se, or pray þer-to. (p. 26)

There was a great emphasis on the form of the sacraments, on how the elements were handled and administered. In Myrc's Instructions For Parish Priests minute advice is given concerning the conduct of the mass. The altar cloths are to be clean and hallowed; the candle is to be of wax, and the bread of wheat; the
wine is not to be sour, and the tails of the words are not to be cut in the reciting (p. 58). If a drop of blood fall on the corporax, the priest is to "Sowke [suck] hyt vp a-non-ryjt, / And be as sorry as sou myzt, / Be corporas after bow folde, / A-monge be relekus to be holde" (p. 59). If it fall on anything else he must lick it up and shave the place, burn the shavings, and put the ashes among the relics. If a fly or gnat fall into the cup, the priest must swallow the pest, but if he is afraid of vomiting thereby, he must take it out, wash it over the chalice, and burn it (pp. 59-60).

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

From these sermons and treatises it remains to turn to a third medium of popular instruction in the matters of salvation, the drama. The cycle or mystery plays will not be considered here, but will be discussed later in relation to the plays of John Bale. Although there was some doctrine in them, their chief function was to teach the Bible stories to the people. The morality plays, on the other hand, were essentially doctrinal and attempted to teach in dramatic form exactly what the Church had ordered the priests to teach from the pulpit. G. R. Owst, in his chapter on "Sermon and Drama," traces the realism (in the modern sense) of the morality play and its allegorical method to
the sermons of the middle ages. He finds close parallel treat-
ments of death and the vanity of worldly affairs in the sermons
and in such morality plays as The Pride of Life and Everyman
(p. 527). It is also possible to demonstrate a remarkable simi-
arity between the "treatise" and the morality plays. Since Owst
has already marked the closeness of the sermons and the treatises
in Preaching in Medieval England (Ch. VII), this similarity is not
startling but is nevertheless interesting. For the purpose of such
demonstration the two plays Everyman and Mundus et Infans will
be used. They both date before the Reformation (printed 1509 and
1522, respectively).

The title page of Everyman gives the following full title for
the morality: Here begynneth a treatyshe how ye hys fader of
heven sendeth dethe to somon euery creature to come and gyue
a counte of theyr lyues in this worlde and is in maner of a morall
playe. It is indeed a "treatise," teaching in abridged form the
necessary matters for salvation which had been treated in Somme
le Roi and its many descendants, the latest of which was Caxton's
Royal Book (1486). As the play begins, God is angry with men
because they "use the seven deadly sins damnable, / As pride,
covetise, wrath, and lechery." "Envy" makes them eat each
other up: "sloth" is not mentioned. God sends his messenger
Death to summon Everyman to give an account of his life at judg-
ment day. The messenger or the Prologue has already given the audience the moral of the play: the transitory nature of man's life and how he should prepare for the sudden ending of life. Similarly The Book of Vices and Virtues warns man that "his life nys but deep" (p. 68). It is "but a passyng tyme" and man must learn to die if he is to live well. Knowing this "pe depe fat is nygh and fat ouer al awaitpe pe synful man and womman scholde make hem bi resoun to go schryue hem hastiliche, for pei ne witen not pe poynct ne pe houre ne pe day fat depe wole come, fat ofte and many tymes stelps sodeynliche vpon pe synful whan he takepe lestete hede, and certes who-so wiste what day he scholde deye he wolde haste to make hym redy per-to" (V. and V., p. 175).

Thus Everyman is suddenly summoned, and he prepares himself for death, not directly, for he has not given the proper thought to the matter during his life. Rather by trial and error he eliminates the false ways to salvation—Fellowship, Kindred, and Riches—and finally comes to the true way through Good Deeds and her sister Knowledge. How much better if he had heeded the treatise-lore and prepared himself often by shrift for the death that was sudden and inevitable!

In the play God is angered because men have not used properly the "beynge that I them haue lent." Death asks Everyman "What, wenest thou thy lyue is gyuen the, / And thy worldely gooddes also?" The same theme occurs again and again in the
treatises. Abraham, Job, and David made good use of "pe goodes pat God hadde lent hem" by helping their neighbors, and so they helped buy their own salvation (V. and V., p. 76). It is thus with the other goods such as "fairenesse of body, douȝtynesse, strenghe, swiftnesse," etc.; God lends them that they may be used to serve Him or to help men (V. and V., p. 77):

And but he vse hem trwly he schal be in pe more peyne and turment, for straigtly he mote acounte and zelde rekenynge to God at pe day of dome of al pat he hap ydo, and of pat pat he hap y-wonne of pe goodes pat God lent hym in erpe to multiplien and vsen in his seruyse. (V. and V., p. 78)

The man who lives in sin is "Godes pef"

pat his lorde goodes, pat bel but y-lent to hym to wynne and pryue wiþ hem—as ben pe goodes of kynde, of grace and of fortune, wher-of hym bihoueþ zelde a-count and resoun riȝt straiteliche—he hap euel and foliliche dispended in shrewed wise and al y-sett at pe hasarde. (V. and V., p. 172)

So in the play, Everyman is summoned; he must account and yield reckoning of the goods lent him. The Book of Vices and Virtues analyses the different kinds of goods and shows, what Everyman shows, that there are true goods and false goods as far as man's salvation is concerned. The "goodes of Fortune" include precious jewels, riches, and honors; they are the goods of this world, the "smale goodes." The "myddel goodes" are those of "kynde and of techyng" such as "fairenesse of body, douȝtynesse, strenghe, swiftnesse, meke and bonere [humility and courtesy?], cler wyt, good vnderstondynge, gret memorie" and the virtues of good
manners and good learning. These "myddel goodes" are not the "verrey goodes" either. The true good is Grace, or "vertue," or "charitie." It is called Grace, "for it gyeu my lif and helpe to pe soule;" it is called "vertue" "for it araye and honoure pe soule wiþ good werkes and goode maneres;" and it is called "charitie" "for it ioyne pe soule to God and make hire al one wiþ God" (V. and V., p. 78). It will be remembered that Everyman did not use his "goodes of Fortune," his riches, to serve God or to help his neighbor, so that they worked his damnation rather than his salvation:

Goodes.
Nay evry man I synge an other songe
I folowe no man in suche vsages
For and I wente with the
Thou sholdes fare moche the worse for me
For because on me thou dyd set thy mynde
Thy rekenyng I haue made blotted and blynde
That thynke accounte thou can not make truly
And that hast thou for the loue of me.
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. From The Book of Vices and Virtues it has been seen that some men like Abraham and Job have used riches to help obtain salva-
tion, "but hard hit. For moche liȝter it is to leue and forsake alle pe goodes of pe world for pe loue of God at ones, þan to holde hem and not loue hem" (p. 77). Goods tells Everyman: "My condycyon is mannes soule to kyll / If I saue one a thousande I do spyll."

From the "smale goodes" Everyman turns for help to the "verrey good" of his Good Deeds, who is very weak and burdened down with his sins. Good Deeds would accompany him but she cannot stand. However, she sends Everyman to her sister Knowledge and so puts him on the right road to salvation. The character Knowledge has occasioned much critical comment as to the exact meaning of the word "knowledge" here intended. L. V. Ryan, in an article in *Speculum*, "Doctrine and Dramatic Structure in Everyman," 1957, says: "Doctrinally, the character represents the only kind of knowledge that can profit Everyman in his condition--awareness of and acknowledgment of his sin--for she offers to lead him out of his misery by taking him 'To confessyou that clensyng ryuer.'" 37 He states further that "the dialogue shows what she stands for, and the Eickerlijc-Everyman controversy has demonstrated that Knowledge here means 'contrition' or, better, 'acknowledgement of one's sin.'" 38 A close reading of the treatises of the time shows that knowledge means knowledge and not contrition or acknowledgement of one's sins, in spite of Ryan's
opinion to the contrary. It is quite true that knowledge often meant acknowledge in the medieval treatises and sermons as well as in the sixteenth century writings. However, it is also used to mean knowledge in the sense of acquaintance with truths in the same period. Already from The Book of Vices and Virtues, it has been shown that "per may no man schryue hym wel ne kepe hym fro synne but he know hem," i.e., his sins (p. 68). This treatise also says that a man not only must know what sin is, "but a man kunne knowe al on ernest and juge what is good and what is euele, and pat he kunne departe pe verrey good fro pe myddel good, and pe grete good fro pe litle good" (p. 74). A knowledge of the sins is essential and so is a knowledge of the virtues.

In the sermon collection Jacob's Well the author goes to great length to present the articles of the great curse so that man might have a knowledge of them. He also calls the "gyste of knowynge, of kunnyinge" the third gift of the Holy Ghost (p. 275). If man have this gift of knowing, he sees himself "wel wrecchyd & synfull," and he "moornyst" and "wepyst sore" so that the "watyr of terys flowyn out of pe welle" and he is then blessed with grace. This "gyste of grace" is "knowynge pe-self," and it brings on "wepyn in vj maners" which is contrition (p. 275). If a man receive this third gift of the Holy Ghost, "pat is, pe gyste
of knowynge," he knows himself in order to forsake his sins, "to
gouerne" himself in "vertewys," "to encresyn in grace," and to
come to "endles ioye" (p. 279). Ryan would make the character
Knowledge mean "contrition," but here we see that the author of
Jacob's Well says that contrition, or the weeping and mourning
for one's sins, comes after the "jyfte of knowynge, of kvnynge."

The Book of Vices and Virtues makes it even clearer that the gift
of knowledge must precede contrition: "Now take good heed how
pe first degree of mekenesse is for to knowe his pouerites and his
defautes" (p. 130). Knowing his faults, however, is not enough:
"Perfore is pe secunde degree to fele and complayne his defautes
and his pouerite" (p. 130). After man knows his sins and feels
sorry for them, "pe pridde degree of mekenesse is his synnes
beknowe [confess or acknowledge] and wiþ good wille schryue
hym and purge his herte" (p. 130).

In the Royal Book, which, like The Book of Vices and Vir-
tues, is also a translation of the Somme le Roi but later in date,
Caxton analyzes the virtue of meekness or "hemylyte" in words
even closer to those in Everyman:

Now vnderstonde well how the fyrst degree of humylyte
knoweth his poverite / his synnes / and his defautes.
For lyke as sayth saynt Bernarde humylyte is ye vertue
yt maketh a man to mespryse and despyse hymself / 
and holde hym for vyle wha he knoweth hym self verayly.
This knowleche growth of the .iii. rotes tofore sayd.
But ther ben somme that knowe well theyr defautes and
theyr synnes / and theyr pouertees / but they fele theym
not. (xxxxxix)
The second degree of "humielyte," he continues, is to "complayne" and "to fele," his faults; the third degree is to "confess deuoutelye." Here we find Caxton, not only separating knowledge of one's sins from contrition for them, but also using the word "knowleche" for the knowing-of-one's sins. Contrition and confession come after this "knowleche."

In Everyman the character Knowledge offers to be the guide of Everyman in his search for salvation, and Good Deeds says:

And whan he hath brought you there
Where thou shalte hele the of thy smarte
Thâ go you w† your rekenynge & your good dedes togyder
For to make you loyfull at herte
Before the blessyd trynamte.

Knowledge takes Everyman where he may heal his "smarte," first to Confession, then to scourging of his body in penance. Next she presents him with the "garment of sorowe" or "contracyon," which "getteth forgyuenes." Everyman is elated and says: "now haue I on true contracyon." Knowledge, as the guide and counselor of the hero, is a broader character than "contrition" or "acknowledgement of one's sin" could be. She is the ""fyfte of knowynge, of kunynge," the third gift of the Holy Ghost, which leads man, through knowledge of his sins, to weeping and mourning for them or to true contrition.

Another aspect of her character may be seen from Caxton's discussion of the goods of Fortune in the Royal Book. He writes
that the wise man is the one "whome ye holy ghoost enlumyneth by veray knowleche / that oueral knoweth and can decerne what every thynge is worth" (lxiii). The primary lesson of the play Everyman is that man must know the true goods from the false goods in order to obtain salvation. After the hero has been deserted by the false goods, the character Knowledge shows him the path to salvation by leading him to true contrition and confession to the priesthood. She then shows him the remaining duties to holy church and advises him to go to priesthood for the "holy sacrament and oynement togyder."

Ryan says that the character Knowledge means "'contrition' or, better, 'acknowledgement of one's sin.'" If he uses "acknowledgement of one's sin" in the sense of knowing-one's-sin, then he is seemingly unaware of the implication of his own terms, for knowing-one's-sin is knowledge. It has been shown above that, to the medieval preacher and treatise writer, knowing-one's-sin brings on sorrow or contrition, but is not the same thing as contrition. Knowledge was one of the most important conceptions of the medieval system. It included knowledge of God, of His nature, of His benefits, of His punishments, and of His law, as well as a knowledge of oneself, of one's sins, and of the virtues which countered these sins. Reginald Pecock, Bishop of St. Asaph and of Chichester, in The Reule of Crysten Religioun, lists as the
four things necessary for man's "good living" "knowing, louyng, good werkis aftir hem worching and grace." In his analysis of good living he says that love precedes good works, and knowing precedes love. The knowledge of the contemplative life is higher than that of the active life and is known as the gift of understanding and wisdom. Caxton, again using the word knowleche in the Royal Book (cliii), writes of the "yefte of sapyence," which is the seventh rung of the ladder of perfection:

... The gyfte of sapyence maketh to fele & knowe god by taste / then sapyence is none other thynge but a sauery knowleche / whiche is wt sauoure & grete delyte of herte ... 

The morality plays, like the treatises and sermons, were written for the express purpose of propagating the body of knowledge deemed necessary by the Church for man's salvation. What would be more appropriate than to have a character Knowledge to guide and counsel Everyman in his journey to salvation? Caxton used "knowledge" in this sense; why should the author of Everyman be limited to the meaning "acknowledge" for the word "knowledge"?

There are further similarities between Everyman and the treatises, particularly The Book of Vices and Virtues and Caxton's Royal Book. The chief emphasis in Everyman is on the ability of Good Deeds to help the hero, to accompany him on his journey to the other world, and to plead for him with God at the day of doom. This is also a prominent doctrine in the treatises. The
Book of Vices and Virtues quotes "oure lord in holi writ" as saying "'Pou schalt not brynge to-for me empty honden'" (p. 242).

God shuts the gate on those who come with empty lamps:

He comeþ wip empti honden to-fore God þat þat wole secche hym wip-oute makyng a present of goode workes to hym, and þerfore ægens suche schitteþ þe þætæ, þat bidden hym and bringe nouȝt, and her-of haue we ensample in þe gospel þat seil þe þætæ was y-schit ægens þe foles maidenes þat brouȝten empti laumpes . . . (p. 242)

Everyman must be shriven of his sins in order for his Good Deeds to be revived enough to go with him on his journey. The treatise of Vices and Virtues, like Everyman, teaches that it is dangerous to postpone one's confession because the help of one's good works is lost:

Þey seie þe grete goodes þat þey haue loste bi here synne, þe goodes wip-outen ende and þe gosteliche goodes, . . . al þis may wynne ægen þorwe schrift, a moche foole were he þat ne hastede not to recouere al þis. (p. 175)

There is no question of baptism in Everyman, the assumption being made that he has been baptised and freed of original sin when a baby as almost everyone was in the Christian west. He had been baptised and probably confirmed in his youth, but he had fallen into sin after baptism as everyone did. The problem, then, was to free him of his accumulated sin so that he would be in a state of grace in which his good works might be used in his defense before the great judge. For this cleansing, Knowledge leads him to the three effective sacraments of the Church—pen-
ance, the "holy sacrament," and "oynement" or extreme unction.

These sacraments are the property of the Church, and may be received only through her priesthood. Though Everyman at this point in his life needs only these three sacraments, the play makes Five Wits laud all seven of the Church's sacraments in treatise fashion:

The blyssyd sacramentes .vii. there be
Baptym confyrmacyon with preesthode good
And ye sacrament of goddes precous flesche & blod
Maryage the holy extreme vnccyon and penaunce
These seuen be good to haue in remembraunce
Gracyous sacramentes of hye deuynyte.

Here is treatise instruction which is not called for by the dramatic action of the play. Five Wits instructs further in explaining the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the altar:

For preesthode excedeth all other thynge

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

With .v. wordes he may consecrate
Goddes body in flessehe and blode to make
And handeleth his maker byt wene his hande
The preest byndeth and vnbyndeth all bandes
Bothe in erthe and in heuen.

Good Deeds introduces to Everyman another set of characters from the treatises: Discretion, Strength, Beauty, and Five Wits or Five Senses. These four will accompany him to his death, but will stop short of the grave. They represent the "goodes of kynde" found in The Book of Vices and Virtues. Already Everyman has been rejected by his goods of Fortune; now he turns to the
goods of Nature or "Kynde" for solace. These goods are divided in the treatises into the goods in the body and those in the soul. Note the similarity to Everyman's friends--Strength, Beauty, and Discretion:

In his body, as helpe, fairenesse, strenghe, dougtenesse, nobeleye, good tonge, and good voys.
Pe goodes hat a man hap in his soule is cler witt to vnderstonde well, sotil vnderstondynge for to fynde wel, goodes phynges of long mynde for to whholde wel, pe bodily vertues, wherfore hat on is more worpe hant a-noþer, as more large or more worshipful han a-noþer, or more gracios, or more atemple, or bettre y-ordeyned.
(p. 19)

These goods of Nature are helpful to Everyman, but they are not the "verrey goodes." They can go with him as far as the grave, but cannot help him at the day of doom. In Everyman as in the treatises, only the "goodes of grace" are able to go with the hero beyond the grave.

The character Five Wits in Everyman, being presented as a counselor who lectures on the power and virtues of the priesthood and the seven sacraments, may be puzzling. Why should these openings through which the waters of the great curse enter man's body (Jacob's Well, p. 1) be recommended by Knowledge and Good Deeds to Everyman to help him in his journey to a sure reckoning before God? These senses most often are described as leading man into sin (V. and Y., p. 180). Though this function of the five senses is the most widely known, it represents a cor-
ruption of their true mission in man's nature. The nature of man is dual, consisting of a rational and a sensual part. Through the rational (mind, will, and understanding) man's soul receives knowledge of God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

Through the sensual (the five wits or senses) man's soul is in contact with the material world and receives knowledge of visible nature. Thus the duty of the Five Wits is to counsel man's soul aright in his relationships with the everyday world. They are given this same function in the moralities Wisdom and Mundus et Infans. Hugo of St. Victor describes the proper use of the five senses:

There are five senses of the body, sight, hearing, smell, taste and touch, through which the soul just as within through reason and contemplation it proceeds in its own way to the invisible, so without to the visible, and performs those things of the body which are pleasing, suitable, useful, and necessary. For just as man is endowed with two natures, the spiritual and the corporeal, so his mind is fortified and adorned with a double power, i.e. within for contemplating the invisible through reason, without for contemplating the visible through the senses.

The function of Everyman's Five Wits is to show him those things of the body which are "pleasing, suitable, useful, and necessary": the ceremonies of the Church performed by the priesthood. Herein he seems to encroach on the duties of the character Knowledge, who has also led Everyman to the saving sacraments of the Church as a part of the knowledge necessary
for salvation, but he is intended to operate in the sensual sphere
while Knowledge works at the spiritual level. Thus, in the mor-
ality Wisdom, man's soul or Anima asks of Wysdam:

In A soule, what thynges be,
By whiche he hath his very knowyng? (ll. 133-34)

Wysdam answers:

tweyn parties: the on is the sensualite,
wich is clepyd the flesshly felyng;
The .v. outward wittys to hym be seruyng;
Whan thei be not rulyd ordynatyly,
the sensualite than with-out lesyng
is made the ymage of synne, then of his foly.
That other parte, that is clepyd reson,
And that is the ymage of god propyrly,
ffor by that the soule of god hath cognycion,
and be that hym seruyth and louyth duly;
Be the nether parte of reason he knoweth discretly,
All erthely thynges how thei shalbe usyd,
What Suffysith to his myghtys bodily,
And what nedith not to be refusyd. (ll. 135-48)

These "tweyn parties" in Everyman are the two characters Five
Wits and Knowledge.

In a later chapter we shall examine the new learning in the dia-
logues of the sixteenth century, which were semidramatic in form
and intent. Dialogues were also popular in the middle ages and
were also used to expound knowledge helpful for man's salvation.
There is one in particular which is interesting in connection with
the morality Everyman as presenting the same situation: man
suddenly faced by "thymage" of Death. Thomas Hoccleve's trans-
lation of a Latin dialogue-treatise, in grateful thanks to God for
curing him of his insanity, is entitled *How to Learn to Die* (c. 1423). The dialogue begins between the Disciple and Sapientia with the Disciple asking to be taught the "tresor of wisdam / & the konnynge of seintes." Of these things he wants a "knowl-echyng," but Sapientia promises only to teach him the things which will his "soule fructifie":

A chosen yifte shalt thow haue of me;  
My lore / eternal lyf shal to thee be,  
The dreede of god / which the begynnynge is  
Of wisdam / shalt thow lerne . . . (ll. 18-21)

Sapientia or Wisdom then outlines the knowledge necessary for gaining of eternal life: learn to die, learn to live, learn how to receive Wisdom "sacramentally," and learn to love Wisdom with a clean and pure heart. He explains how important it is to learn how to die; his "lore" on this subject is more profitable than gold or books on philosophy. The "misterie" of his lore he will show by summoning up "thymage" of Death in the person of a fair young man who has been called by Death. This young man and the Disciple then continue the dialogue, and the Disciple sees what the audience was shown in the production of *Everyman*. That is, he witnesses a young man, "thymage," who has not spent much time in doing good deeds or preparing his soul for death, lamenting the summons of Death. Thymage begs Death for more time, like Everyman, to get his account ready. Death answers only
"Thow dye shalt / reson noon / ne kynrede,
ffrendshipe / gold / ne noon othir richesse
May the deliure / out of dethes duresse. . . ."
(II. 131-133)

He laments because his eyes grow dim, and his beauty and
strength, which he had once with him, are leaving him. Lacking
good works of his own, he begs his friends for some of theirs.
He bids farewell to his friends and fellows, and as he dies he sees
the souls in purgatory blaming their friends for not helping them:

"fful euele we rewarded been of yow,
We brenne / and yee fyr nat qwenche a deel.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Worldly trust is / as slipir as an eel;
Alis nat trewe / pat the world promettith;
fful wys is he / pat ther-by litil settith. . . ."
(II. 722-728)

Disciple, trembling at the death of the young man, calls on
Sapientia, who tells him to repent, scourge his body with pen-
ance, and lead a virtuous life, thinking often on death. He has
been taught the "dreede of god," which is the beginning of wisdom.

The character Wisdom, or Sapientia, has used a dramatic
episode to teach the way of salvation to the Disciple. The young
man summoned by Death finds that the goods of this world are of
no help at such a time. There is no help in friendship, kindred,
fellows, gold, "richesse," beauty, or strength. Good deeds or
holy works would help but he has none. These are the charac-
ters to which Everyman turns first for help. The young man in
the dialogue dies and goes to purgatory describing the agony of the souls there. *Everyman* ends happily since Knowledge shows the hero the Church's path to salvation. The dialogue ends happily also since the dramatic episode turns out to be a kind of warning dream for the Disciple, who with the help of Sapientia will repent, do good deeds, scourge his body in penance, and prepare his soul for death--just what the author of *Everyman* would hope for his audience. Sapientia, like the character Knowledge in *Everyman*, teaches the "lore" of salvation. Both Disciple and Everyman have learned to distinguish the "verrey goodes" of life from the small or middle goods.

All the early morality plays took their subject matter from the "truth" of the time, which found systematic and organized expression in the religious treatises and sermons. Some of the plays used a very limited number of characters from the treatises, and emphasized one aspect of the salvation of man, as in the play *Mankind* where the role of Mercy in man's salvation is the main theme, with the wiles of the devil and his helpers added for comic element. Other (non-extant) plays such as the *Pater Noster Play* and the *Creed Play* evidently took just one section of the vast treatises for dramatization. Others, like *Everyman*, *The Castle of Perseverance*, and *Wisdom*, took a greater number of characters from the Vices and Virtues and their various branches and
twigs and covered more fully the path to salvation. Much of the instruction in _Everyman_ is of no value to the dramatic progress of the play, but it was of value to the audience for their soul's need.

In the interlude _The World and the Child_, or _Mundus et Infans_, the course of instruction for man's salvation is worked into the ages of man. The World controls the hero in his childhood, youth, and manhood, giving him a new name to suit each age of sin: Wanton for childhood, Love-Lust for youth, Shame for manhood. Conscience and Perseverance seek to reform the hero in manhood, but do not succeed until he has reached Age, when he repents and is given the name Repentance. Into this framework are worked the ten commandments, the seven deadly sins, the twelve articles of the faith, the sacraments of the church, the five wits of the body and of the soul, the trinity, the efficacy of the Virgin Mary, and the doctrine of repentance. The five wits "bodily" are said to be essential to the knowledge man must have to win heaven—a role close to that given them in _Everyman_. Also essential are the five wits of the soul: clear in mind, imagination, reason, understanding, and compassion.

Just as the medieval system of salvation is subject matter for these early morality plays, so the system of salvation contained in the so-called "new learning" forms material for the early sixteenth century interludes and plays. The medieval
morality plays are a part of the "salvation literature" of the time. The sixteenth century interludes and plays may be called a type of the new "salvation literature." As we have seen in the case of Everyman that a knowledge of the salvation treatises is essential to a correct interpretation of the play, so we shall find that the new salvation treatises help in interpreting the early sixteenth century plays. From the medieval system, we shall turn in the next chapter to the "new learning," expounded in the treatises of the time, as a basis for understanding the drama.
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34 Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England (Cambridge, Eng., 1933), Ch. VIII.

35 "Imprynted at London in Poules chyrche yarde by me John Skot," n. d.

36 The Book of Vices and Virtues, hereafter called V. and V. in this chapter.
37 XXXII, No. 4 (Oct., 1957), 728.

38 Ryan gives the relevant scholarship on the Elckerlijc-Everyman controversy in fn. 9, p. 728: "For example, Henry de Vocht, Everyman: A Comparative Study of Texts and Sources, Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama, New Series, XX (Louvain, 1947), pp. 57-60, gives extensive evidence from the OED to demonstrate that knowledge is used in the play in the now obsolete sense of acknowledgement, while he denies that the Flemish kennisse can be taken in the same sense. In an answer to De Vocht, J. van Mierlo, Die Prioriteit van Elckerlijc tegenover Everyman Gewandhaald (Turnhout, 1948), shows that kennisse also can be taken to mean 'acknowledgement or awareness of one's inner state of sin.' Early in the controversy, Francis A. Wood, 'Elckerlike-Everyman: The Question of Priority,' Modern Philology, VIII (1910), 283, asserted that kennisse means contrition and was wrongly translated in Everyman as knowledge! The important fact here is not the argument over which of the terms, the English or the Flemish one, is appropriate, but the agreement of these scholars that the character is intended to represent acknowledgement of sin."

39 In The Prymer, or Lay Folks' Prayer-Book, ed. Henry Littlehales, EETS, OS, No. 105 (London, 1895), may be found these examples of knowledge used as acknowledge to translate the Latin verb confiteor:

- p. 11, "His knowleching be on heuene and erpe."
- p. 17, "Knouleche ye to be lord, for he is good."
- p. 38, "For ye knowleche my wickednes."

These examples are from John Bale's plays, Farmer ed.

King Johan, p. 178, "By the gift of God, do knowledge my allegiance."

Temptation . . . , p. 165, Satan says: "Knowledge me for head of this world universal."

John the Baptist, p. 132, "Knowledge your trespass, and cease from doing ill."

40 OED examples:

1300, Cursor Mundi, 1593l, "knoalage of him, had i never nan."
1350, Cursor Mundi, 5051, "Mi fadir faris wele, sir, I wat, Knaulage of joures have I nan."

1375, Barbour's Bruce, I, 337, "Knaulage of mony statis, May quhile awailge ful many gatis."

1484, Caxton, Fables of Alfonse, i, "they had knowleche eche of the other by theyr lettres."

From Mundus et Infans, ca. 1500, Farmer ed., p. 183, Folly says to Manhood, "For Knowl-
edge have thou no care."


"... I wyll declare after a symple & playne maner ... what ye knowledge of sinne is, and how we ought trulye to pray folowyng the rehearsal of the commandementes and of the Pater noster."

From John Bale's John the Baptist, Farmer ed., p. 137, "A knowledge of sin the baptism of me to teach."


42 Ibid., pp. 2-3.

43 The similarities between Everyman and a 1507 edition of the Royal Book, printed by Wynkyn de Worde, are striking, es-
pecially in the illustrations and in the order of the material. There is a large illustration showing man in his sick bed surround-
ed on one side by six devils in the forms of various animals and on the other by the crucifix, the holy saints, Mary and the baby, and various angels. This illustration is before the Ars Moriendi section, which has its own picture with the following caption:

Remembre frendes grete and small, For to be redye whan dethe dothe call.
The illustration shows Death on a horse wading through the flames of Hell issuing from Hell's mouth, with his spear or arrow poised and aimed at a young knight. In his other hand Death carries a pick and a spade. It is in the following Ars Moriendi
section that the different goods are discussed. Man must have a special gift to be truly wise and to know the "lytel" and the "myddle" goods from the "grete" goods. This is, of course, the theme of Everyman. Next comes a discussion of the "veray sapyence" (lxviii) which we have seen means "knowynge without mysprysynge what euer thyng is worthe." Riches are vile; love of God and the virtues are the true good.


CHAPTER II

LUTHER'S NEW PLAN OF SALVATION FOR MAN,
OR THE NEW LEARNING, AS POPULARIZED IN ENGLAND
BY WILLIAM TYNDALE

The plays and interludes written and produced in England in the first half of the sixteenth century reflect the "new learning" in religion, which is directly traceable to the teachings of Martin Luther and his followers. Indeed, many of the plays were written for the express purpose of propagating the new heresy which was attacking the power and authority of the clergy and the Church of Rome. The new doctrine was not heretical in attacking the abuses of the Church--and much of the attack found in the plays was in the tradition of medieval criticism of the evils of the clergy and the abuses of papal power--but it was heretical in denying certain basic doctrines held by the Church to be essential to the attaining of salvation and in putting forth its own unorthodox new system of salvation. An understanding of the doctrinal shifts of the Reformation is essential to a correct interpretation of the plays of the period. This chapter will analyze the teachings of Martin Luther and show their spread in early sixteenth century England, partly through circulation of Luther's works, but chiefly by means of the treatises of William Tyndale, translator and paraphraser of Luther.
Martin Luther was the original force behind the doctrinal reformation which took place in England from 1520 to the end of the century. Other reformers (Melanchthon, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Calvin, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Bullinger), following his lead and deviating somewhat in doctrinal matters from him, influenced the course of English doctrinal reform throughout the century, but he was the prime mover, the first cause of the religious revolution. His new conception of Christianity came to him as a result of several factors: following Erasmus and the humanists, he read the Scriptures in the original languages and interpreted them without being bound by the centuries of Church tradition; he read St. Augustine in the same spirit, not depending on the earlier commentaries of philosopher-theologians; everything he read was colored by his own experiences and needs--his early training as an Occamist and his despair at not being able to achieve certainty of the love of God through ascetic practices. 1 His teachings came early to England in his own writings, published abroad and brought into England, at first openly and later secretly after the papal condemnation of 1520, and in the writings and influence of William Tyndale, and later of Thomas Cranmer. At Cambridge University as early as 1521 many students were reading the works of Luther, and a group, including such reformers as Cranmer, Robert Barnes, Thomas Bilney, and possibly John Bale, met at a tavern
nicknamed "Germany" to discuss the "new learning." Some of these Cambridge reformers found their way to Oxford when Cardinal Wolsey imported scholars for his new college. On May 12, 1521, Wolsey and the bishops went to St. Paul's to burn publicly Luther's books:

they were received by the dean, Mr. Richard Pace, and the Cardinal was censed. "Which ceremonies done, there were four doctors that bare a canopy of gold over him going to the high altar, where he made his oblation." He then mounted a scaffold erected at Paul's Cross, and took his seat under a cloth of estate; the Pope's ambassador and the archbishop of Canterbury at his feet on the right side, the Imperial ambassador and the bishop of Durham on the left, the rest of the bishops on two forms "outerright forth." Fisher bishop of Rochester preached the sermon in condemnation of the errors of Luther; "and there were many burned in the said churchyard of the said Luther's books during the sermon."^{3}

On May 14 of the same year, Wolsey commanded the Bishop of Hereford to search for all books, pamphlets, and papers composed or edited by Martin Luther, and to transmit them to him within fifteen days after the date of this admonition; to this mandate is appended a list of the errors of Martin Luther, to the number of forty-two. On May 21, Henry VIII wrote to Pope Leo X dedicating his *Assertio septem sacramentorum adversus Mart. Lutherum* to him. The following is a summary of his letter:

As nothing is more the duty of a Christian prince than to preserve the Christian religion against its enemies, ever since he knew of Luther's heresy in Germany, has made it his study how to extirpate it. The poison has now spread so far that it will not readily yield to one attack. Thought it best to call the learned of his kingdom to consider these errors and denounce them, and exhort others to do the same.
Has urged the Emperor and electors, since this pestilent fellow will not return to God, to extirpate him and his heretical books. Has thought it right still further to testify to his zeal for the faith by his writings, that all might see he was ready to defend the Church, not only with his arms, but with the resources of his mind. Dedicates, therefore, to the Pope, the first offsprings of his intellect and his little erudition. 5

Henry had certainly defended the Church with his arms, since every war in his reign in which the English had participated before the fall of Wolsey was fought to preserve the independence of the Papacy from the French or the Emperor.

Edward Lee, later Archbishop of York, in 1525 wrote to the King,

Hitherto, blessed be God, your realm is safe from the infection of Luther's sect, as for so much that although any, peradventure, be secretly blotted within, yet for fear of your royal Majesty, which hath drawn the sword in God's cause, they dare not openly avow. 6

There were many as early as 1521 "secretly blotted within," of both high and low estate. One Adrian Dolevyn was examined in 1521 for holding and publishing heretical opinions. He confessed to having said that the shepherds who preach the word of God should have meat and drink, but no money; that it was better to pray privately than in church; that pilgrimage was not profitable; etc. His penance was to bear a faggot bareheaded, barelegged, and barefooted, from Black Friars to Saint Paul's, then, service done, to stand before the preacher at the Cross all sermon time, and thereafter to return to Westminster, whence he came, and
receive the rest of his penance, at command of the Cardinal. It is true that there were heretics and heretical opinions in England as a kind of residue from the Lollard movement before Luther became the arch heretic of the age. Foxe's Actes and Monuments gives case histories of heretics before 1520 who condemned pilgrimages and the worship of saints; advocated the Scriptures, Creed, and Pater Noster in English; repudiated some of the Catholic sacraments; denied the power of the Pope and his Purgatory; and refused to believe in transubstantiation and indeed in the corporal presence. In fact, as early as 1519, John Colet had been cited by Fitzjames Bishop of London for holding heretical opinions. Luther's influence in England dates from as early as 1520 when he published the attack on the sacraments in The Babylonic Captivity, which was answered by the English King in 1521. In June of that year the Archbishop of Canterbury sent to Wolsey a priest named Adam Bradshawe, who had been put in prison at Maidstone for his presumption in pulling down writings and seals "set up at the abbey of Boxley against the ill opinions of Martin Luther." The trend to the new way of thinking was widespread, but few dared to be openly Lutherans in the face of official Church and State opposition. Erasmus sympathized with the views of Luther that the Church system of salvation was works-ridden and needed reform. He wrote to Colet in 1518 that the "court of Rome is shameless;
what can be more gross than these continued indulgences?" He felt that the princes and the Pope treated the people as cattle, not as human beings. The excessive reverence for Aristotle and for human traditions he condemned in a letter to Martin Dorpius, 1516:

There is no end of trifling questions. Decree follows on decree; and matters have come to this pass, that Christendom depends, not on the plain words of Christ, but on the definitions of schoolmen and the authority of the Bishops, such as they are. The recovery of the world to true Christianity is hopeless. Many holy men deplore this state of things.

He felt that the reform of religion depended on the careful study of the New Testament, and to this end he published his Greek New Testament, with an accompanying Latin version, as being closer to the Apostles' original. He further sympathized with Luther's attempt to give all the credit for man's salvation to God, and to emphasize the personal and spiritual aspect of the relationship between man and God rather than the reward-for-merit system into which he felt that the Church's teachings had degenerated. However, he could not follow Luther into open revolt against the Church nor into the abyss of predestination or determinism.

With the publication in 1525 of Tyndale's New Testament with its prologues and glosses, the problem of suppressing those "blotted" with the new learning became serious, and the Bishop of London, Tunstall, engaged the services of Sir Thomas More to defend the Catholic system, as a layman above reproach from the enemies of
the clergy and as a literary man well read in the Fathers of the Church. There resulted the well-known controversy between More and Tyndale, which began with More's Dialogue Concerning Heresies and Matters of Religion, written in 1528, but not published until 1529. In the Dialogue More attacks, point by point, the teachings of Tyndale, "whose books be nothing else in effect, but the worst heresies picked out of Luther's works, and Luther's worst words translated by Tyndale and put forth in Tyndale's own name."\textsuperscript{15} The followers of Tyndale and Luther, says More, "make a visage as though they came straight from heaven to teach them a new better way, and more true than the church teacheth, or hath taught this many hundred year."\textsuperscript{16} They set up "a new sect setting forth clean the contrary" of the teachings of the Church. More's basic position is: "And so believe you the church, not because it is truth that the church telleth you; but ye believe the truth of the thing, because the church telleth it."\textsuperscript{17} In 1530, Tyndale published An answere vnto Sir T. Mores dialogue.

Tyndale had indeed followed Luther in his doctrines of the "new learning," and had translated much of Luther's Preface to Paul's Epistle to the Romans and incorporated it into his own Prologue to the Romans in his New Testament.\textsuperscript{18} Also his True Obedience of a Christian Man, 1528, echoes Luther's accusations against the usurped powers of the Pope and the clergy and defends
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the divine right of kings. It found an eager reader in Henry VIII, who was chafing under the yoke of the Pope in his desire for a divorce from Catherine. Such statements as:

He that judgeth the king judgeth God; and he that layeth hands on the king layeth hands on God; and he that resistenth the king resisteth God, and damneth God's law and ordinance. . . .

and

If the king sin, he must be reserved unto the judgment, wrath, and vengeance of God. . . .

would tickle the vanity of any king and nourish his belief in his divine right. This particular aspect of the new heresy appealed to Henry and resulted in his using the reformers for his political purposes while winking for a time at the other heresies they taught.

Sir Thomas More continued to defend the Church against the heresies of Tyndale, Luther, and Frith in his Supplication of Souls, 1529, his Confutation of Tyndale's Answer, 1532, and his Apologye, 1533. However, he resigned the Chancellorship and was imprisoned and executed, 1535, for his resistance to the Oath of Succession acknowledging Anne as rightful Queen of England.

Luther's doctrines were allowed a great measure of freedom and even protection in the years during which Henry was breaking with the Pope, suppressing the monasteries, and limiting the power of the bishops in England. Anne Boleyn and her family and friends were Lutheran; the new Archbishop of Canterbury was Lutheran.
Thomas Cromwell, though he was not really religious nor concerned with doctrine, favored the reformers because they were anti-clergy and served his purposes of enhancing the power of the King at the expense of the clergy.²¹ He saved John Bale from the bishops when his plays or sermons were questioned because of their many heresies. These plays emphasized the usurped power of the Pope and the authority of the king over the national church, an acceptable heresy under whose sacred aegis many another heresy crept in.

Hugh Latimer preached the new heresies in mild form and received the protection and favor of the King. In 1533, Richard Browne, Priest, wrote to Dr. Bagarde, Chancellor of Worcester, that

one Lattemore preached at Brystowe on the second Sunday in Lent, and it is reported that he has done much harm among the people by sowing errors. It is reported that he said that Our Lady was a sinner, and that neither she nor any other saint ought to be worshipped; that he claimed upon pilgrimages; and that he said that the woman of Canene mentioned in the Gospel for the day, fared worse rather than better, for the prayers of the disciples for her, with other opinions fully against the determination of the Church. He has very sore infected the town. . . . The good Catholic people abhor his preaching.²²

Henry's toleration of Lutheran reform for political purposes led to the publication in 1536 of the ten Articles of faith which are somewhat Lutheran in character: the Bible and the three ancient creeds are declared to be the sum of Christian faith; forgiveness of sin in the sacrament of penance is ascribed, not to any work
or merit on the part of man, but solely to the merits of Christ; the sacraments are implicitly reduced to three—baptism, penance, and the Lord's Supper (explained in the Lutheran sense of the real presence); justification, obtained through contrition and faith, joined with "charity," is due entirely to the mercy and grace of God in Christ, though stress is laid on good works as the necessary adjunct of faith.  

Tyndale was strangled and burned as a heretic in 1536 by agents of the Emperor, but before the year was out his version of the New Testament with its prologues and with Tyndale's name on the title page was printed by the King's own printer. Coverdale's Bible was published by the eminent English publishers, Grafton and Whitchurch, in 1536 by order of the Vicar General Cromwell. It represented Tyndale's translation completed by Coverdale. In 1538, again by decree of Cromwell, the Great Bible was published and ordered to be placed in every church. Along with this decree to the bishops went the renewed order to force the people to learn the Creed, the Pater Noster, and the Ten Commandments in English before they be allowed to participate in the Sacrament of the Altar.

Luther's doctrines were advancing in England because of political exigencies. In 1538 a German embassy visited England to discuss a doctrinal agreement as preliminary to a defensive
alliance against the Emperor. Henry appointed a commission to discuss the Augsburg Confession, but though an agreement was reached on doctrine, there was disagreement on usages, such as communion in two kinds, and celibacy of the clergy. After the fear of an invasion by the Emperor and King of France had subsided in 1539, Henry's hatred of the Lutheran heresies flared again and resulted in the publication of the Act of the Six Articles of faith, which reverted to the Catholic position on many issues. It declared the denial of transubstantiation a heresy punishable by the stake and made hanging the penalty for such offenses as broken vows of chastity, denial of the necessity of auricular confession, and advocating the distribution to the laity of both elements in the mass. From 1540 to Henry VIII's death in 1547, Henry Gardiner directed the policy of English religion along these lines of the old religion and ceremonies of the Roman church: transubstantiation, mass in one kind to the laity, auricular confession, unmarried clergy, Latin services, honor to images, and the traditional ecclesiastical costumes. Luther's influence was retarded until the accession of Edward VI, when through Cranmer and the Protector, the English Church was led further into reform doctrines. Luther and other men of the new learning Melanchthon, Calvin, Bucer, and Peter Martyr--essentially Lutherans--were influential in the first and second Book of Common Prayer, 1549 and 1552.
in the practice of reading of the Litany, Gospels, and Epistles in English during services, and in the Forty-two Articles of faith.

With the return of the exiles from Germany after Henry's death, the attack on the ceremonies of the Church was begun in earnest. Robert Barnes's *Vitae Romanorum pontificatorum* (1535) had shown which popes had introduced different parts of the accepted Catholic ceremonies and had contrasted these innovations with the early church practices, thus laying the groundwork for the anti-ceremonialism of the last half of the century. The early sixteenth century attacks on the Church in England had been essentially doctrinal, but the reform of ceremonies and vestures, and the attack on the episcopal organization of the Church, occupied the second half of the century.

What were the heresies of the "new learning" which were the basis of the doctrinal reform in the English Church? Luther felt that his new interpretation represented a simplification of the system of religion offered by the Church, a reduction to the essential elements of religion: the revelation of the God of grace in the gospel, i.e., in the incarnated, crucified, and risen Christ. Adolph Harnack sees in Luther a going beyond Augustine in grasping the essential matter and truth of the gospel:

For Augustine there is ultimately in the salvation which grace bestows something dark, indescribable, mysteriously communicated; Luther sees in it the forgiveness of sins—that is, the God of grace Himself; and he substitutes therefore for a mysterious and
transforming communication the revelation of the living
God and 'fides.' . . . The linking together of surrender
to God with surrender to Christ is for the first time
clearly apparent in them [the medieval mystics (from 34
Bernard onwards)]; for Augustine it was more vague.
Luther too links the surrender to God with the surrender to Christ;
his whole theology is Christology: objectively, the person and
works of Christ, and subjectively, faith in the forgiveness of sins
effected by belief in Christ. 35 Through faith, which is a gift of
God, man is enabled to lay hold of the God of grace through the
work of Christ. Man is justified by faith alone in a movement of
communication with God through Christ. 36 Faith justifies man and
good works automatically follow, so that the Christian's active
busy life is like a good tree in bringing forth good fruits inevitably.

To Luther, the liberty of a Christian was a right, under the
promises of the gospel of Christ, not a privilege to be controlled
by the Church. However, a free Christian conscience was inward-
ly bound by its experience of Christ to honor God and to help
one's neighbors. Love and service follow faith but are not the
part of it which justifies man in the sight of God. The Church is
the congregation of those having faith. The basis of the Church
is in the Word of God, which to him meant the "pure gospel" or
the promises of God, and faith is sent to man through the preach-
ing of this Word.

Since religion is only faith, there is no special province of
public worship, nor selected mode of life, nor obedience to
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ecclesiastical injunctions by which a Christian may prove his faith, but he must prove it by his service within his natural mode of life, within his calling whether he be lawyer or bootmaker. Luther changed the ideal of religious perfection from doing good works for God to receiving faith from God and then as a consequence loving one's neighbor. The effort to propitiate God by works he rejected in favor of trusting God to do what is best for man. Trusting in God's promises is raised to the highest virtue, the sole ideal of the Christian. To attempt or to desire to change God's mind by offerings or gifts is in itself sinful as showing mistrust in God's providence. Man must be content to be damned if that is the will of God for him, and if that will in any way add to the glory of God (see Chapter V.).

The medieval system had thought that knowledge of God as the Father and faith in His guardianship were the beginning of salvation; Luther conceived of these as the main part, not just a beginning, of practical Christianity, thus bypassing the great system of works, penance, and satisfactions at which man labored under the supervision of the Church. The essential knowledge of God, for Luther, could be achieved only through viewing Him through the mirror of Christ's incarnation. Speculation about God apart from His revelation in Christ was foolish speculation, worthy of the heathen. Sin consists in not knowing God through Christ;
unbelief and mistrust of God's promises are the essence of all sin.

God creates penitence and bestows faith; man's role is receptive since his will is enslaved, and he is subject to eternal predestination. In this view Luther differed from the orthodox medieval position, which made God an aid in the process of salvation, not the absolute mover. Harnack writes that Luther's significance lies in this:

that he completely broke with the idea that the religious experience is composed of historic and sacramental acts, which God performs and holds in readiness, and subjective acts, which somehow are an affair of man's.  

He wished to vindicate the independence of the knowledge obtained through faith by making the production of faith by God in man's heart a nolite tangere of religion.

Luther's distinction between the law and the gospel is of great importance to his doctrine. He follows St. Paul closely in stating that the law was given to be violated since it was impossible to be fulfilled by man in his sinful state. It serves to show man his sin (Romans 3:20 and Galatians 3:24-25). The gospel is not just an announcement of a way of salvation--as such it would be a new law--but it is rather redemption itself. Here he also echoes St. Augustine, who thought of the law as doctrine, the gospel as power; the law produces enlightenment; the gospel peace.

Man's nature has been so far debased by the sin of Adam that he
is not capable of good works: "A righteous man sins in all his
good works." His will is enslaved by his sinful nature, and both
his intellect and emotion are in a state of darkness and bondage
because of original sin so that he works only evil even when he
does what is good. For this reason man cannot fulfill the law
for his salvation, but must depend on the gospel as a power
capable of saving him. He is justified only by faith in the gospel
as Paul writes to the Romans:

For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from
faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by
faith. (1: 17)

This faith is a gift of God by which man attains Christian Liberty
or the freedom to perform works which are imputed good by God.
Like Augustine, Luther felt that man is freed from the necessity
to do evil imposed on him by his sinful nature by God's gift of
faith or grace. In addition, Luther believed that man is also freed
from many traditions of the Catholic Church concerning things
indifferent to salvation, or adiaphora.

Justification is the forgiveness of sins, the imputation of
righteousness to man by God. It is not a long process of co-
operation between God's grace and man's efforts as in the medieval
system, but rather it is a momentary reception of a gift from God
which marks the receiver as among the elect. Sin still remains,
but it is not imputed to the sinner; God in His mercy has for-
given him and has called him righteous.

Luther substituted the authority of the Scriptures interpreted in the light of faith for the authority of the Church in doctrinal matters. Every doctrine necessary for man's salvation must have scriptural foundation to be an article of belief in the new system.

We define Luther's doctrinal teachings as a "new system of salvation," but Luther's own position was that his system represented a going back to the old Church; the papists were the apostates who had strayed from the primitive church. His system was a re-interpretation of St. Paul in what he considered the true Augustinian sense, i.e., the sense of the later writings of Augustinian on sin, grace, and predestination. Augustine was writing against the Pelagians with their free will and natural goodness of man; Luther was attacking what he considered the Pelagian position of the Catholic Church in allowing man some part in meriting his salvation. Both, following St. Paul, would give sole credit for man's salvation to the grace of God and faith. Luther, as well as Calvin, took much from Augustine, but they declined even more doctrines than they took--doctrines written in defense of the authority of the Catholic Church and the power of her sacraments.

For our purposes Luther's system was new in that it broke with the existing medieval system of salvation for man. The layman may feel that the actual doctrinal changes were not great,
perhaps just a shift in emphasis, a change in ceremonial forms,
but it should be remembered that an ultra-microscopic change in
a theological gene may result in a very great visible change in the
body of practical religion and in the literature reflecting it.

The English plays of the first half of the sixteenth century
represent, besides a violent attack on the abuses of the papal
system, an exposition of the new doctrinal changes, and an intro-
duction to a new terminology in man's quest for salvation. These
plays may take their place alongside the medieval "salvation litera-
ture," discussed in Chapter I, with the difference that they advocate
the "new learning" in religion rather than the "old."

This new learning, as we have seen, reached England early
in the century through the Universities. There were few actual
English translations of Luther's works in this period, but Tyndale's
doctrinal treatises, printed abroad and circulated in England, were
close renderings of Luther's system of salvation. An analysis of
the content of these treatises will show how the English public
could become familiar with Luther's doctrines without being able to
read Latin or German, and why the Church considered possession
of these treatises a matter of heresy. The plays and dialogues of
this period bear a close relationship to these new salvation treatises,
as was the case with the early morality plays and the medieval sal-
vation literature.
Sir Thomas More believed Tyndale's books to be nothing else "but the worst heresies picked out of Luther's works, and Luther's worst words translated by Tyndale and put forth in Tyndale's own name." Indeed, a comparison of Luther's and Tyndale's works shows that Tyndale followed Luther's teachings very closely, point by point, as he guided his readers through the new scheme of salvation. In _A Pathway Into The Holy Scriptures_ (printed sometime after 1525 and before 1532), which is essentially his Prologue to the New Testament, he argued for the Scriptures in the vernacular so that the common men might read for themselves what the clergy refused to teach them. He defines the Old Testament as the book of the law, and the New Testament as the book of the "evangelion" or "Joyful tidings," which tell man that he has been ransomed by Christ's death from sin and the devil. Like Luther he defines the "evangelion" or the "gospel" as the testament of Christ to be compared with the last will and testament of a man who, when he is about to die, "appointeth his goods to be dealt and distributed after his death among them which he nameth to be his heirs" (p. 9). In the same way, "Christ before his death commanded and appointed that such Evangelion, gospel, or tidings should be declared throughout all the world, and therewith to give unto all that believe, all his goods: that is to say, his life, wherewith he swallowed and devoured up death; his righteousness,
wherewith he banished sin; his salvation, wherewith he overcame eternal damnation" (p. 9). Like Luther, Tyndale follows Paul in defining the law of the Old Testament as "the ministration of death" which asks of man what is impossible for his sinful nature to perform (p. 10), and the gospel of the New Testament as the means of salvation. Christ is God's "mercy-stool" and through him only can man approach God or escape eternal death. In the new learning view of atonement, Christ's one sacrifice in his death is deemed all-sufficing for salvation.

Man is justified by faith alone, says Tyndale. This faith is a gift of God, "given to sinners, after the law hath passed upon them, and hath brought their consciences unto the brim of desperation and sorrows of hell" (p. 13). By this gift, sinners are enabled to justify God in requiring of man the fulfillment of the law and to believe in the promises of God that He will show mercy to those who are chosen or elected (pp. 13, 14). Though faith is never without love and good works, "yet is our saving imputed neither to love nor unto good works, but unto faith only" (p. 15).

Preaching is important in the new scheme of salvation, for when the promises of God through the sacrifice of Christ are preached "the hearts of them which are elect and chosen, begin to wax soft and melt at the bounteous mercy of God" and the "Spirit of God entereth into them which God hath ordained and
appointed unto eternal life; and openeth their inward eyes, and
worketh such belief in them" (p. 19). One of Luther's chief com-
plaints against the clergy was that they did not preach the promises
of God to the people but substituted ceremonies without signification
for effective preaching.

In another treatise called The Parable of the Wicked Mammon
(1527) Tyndale gives the English public more of Luther on the sub-
ject of justification by faith without the works of the law. 47 Like
Luther he deplores the tendency of the scholastic doctors to "rend
and tear the scriptures with their distinctions," corrupting the pure
word of God "to confirm their Aristotle" (p. 46). He accuses
them of teaching that man can save himself by his own merits as
a result of deference to the philosopher. The "shield of faith"
will enable man to resist all evil, especially that at the hour of
death (p. 48). Evidently referring to the Ars Moriendi tradition
he calls remembrance of the efficacy of Christ's blood "that holy
candle" without which "perishest thou, though thou hast a thousand
holy candles about thee, a hundred ton of holy water, a shipfull of
pardons, a cloth-sack full of friars' coats, and all the ceremonies
in the world, and all the good works deservings, and merits of
all the men in the world, be they, or were they, never so holy"
(p. 48).

Confession is essential, but it is confession to God and repen-
tance to Him for one's sins that is sufficient. The clergy need not be involved. Man may approach God personally without any other mediator than Christ. Again like Luther's, Tyndale's religion is Christ centered. Christ is "our Redeemer, Deliverer, Reconciler, Mediator, Intercessor, Advocate, Attorney, Solicitor, our Hope, Comfort, Shield, Protection, Defender, Strength, Health, Satisfaction, and Salvation" (p. 19, A Pathway Into The Holy Scripture). There is no need for other intercessors or for other sacrifices; Christ's one act of atonement is absolutely sufficient. There is still the belief that God had to be paid for man's sin, but Christ's "purchasing" was final and complete payment of the debt to an angry God (p. 19).

Man's good works automatically follow when God's gift of faith takes roots in the heart of the elect, but the works have no part in the presentation of this gift of faith (p. 55). The works declare a man to be good; they do not make him good. So the fruit of a tree does not make the tree good, but declares and testifies that the tree is good (p. 56). However, if no works follow "it is a sure and an evident sign, that there is no faith in the heart; but a dead imagination and dream, which they falsely call faith" (p. 61). At the day of judgment man's good works will be testified to by the poor whom he has helped: "And by the works is the faith known, that it was right and perfect" (p. 62). The heart,
however, must be righteous and good before any good works can proceed from it. Moreover, all good works must be done freely without any consideration for reward or profit; they must proceed from true faith in the heart of man or they are worthless. Both Luther and Tyndale saw the necessity of making good works of charity desirable in a society, but they wished to rid religion of the "divine commerce"-between-God-and-man doctrine of so much reward for so much work performed. In a kind of legal transaction with God, Christ has purchased the salvation of the elect with his death; there is nothing left for man to do for his own justification; Christ has paid all; nothing else is due. But good works follow man's justification and serve him well at the day of judgment as an indication of his true faith.

Like Luther, Tyndale believed that because of original sin men are evil, by "inheritance heirs of damnation," vessels of wrath even before they are born so that they cannot help sinning (p. 64). Some, God has chosen for salvation, and to these He sends His Spirit, "which openeth their eyes, sheweth them their misery, and bringeth them unto the knowledge of themselves," and comforts them, certifying in their hearts that "for Christ's sake, they are received into mercy" (p. 89). As to the cause of the election of some and the damnation or reprobation of others, Tyndale writes:

Now may not we ask why God chooseth one and not another; either think that God is unjust to damn us
afore we do any actual deed; seeing that God hath power over all his creatures of right, to do with them what he list, or to make of every one of them as he listeth. Our darkness cannot perceive his light. God will be feared, and not have his secret judgments known. . . . Let us therefore give diligence rather to do the will of God, than to search his secrets, which are not profitable for us to know. (p. 89)

In his "Prologue Upon the Epistle to the Romans," which he translates almost wholly from Luther's preface to Romans in his Bible, 48 Tyndale states the doctrine of predestination. It comes from St. Paul's account in the ninth chapter of Romans. He writes:

By which predestination our justifying and salvation are clean taken out of our hands, and put in the hands of God only; which thing is most necessary of all. For we are so weak and so uncertain, that if it stood in us, there would of a truth be no man saved; the devil, no doubt, would deceive us. But now God is sure, that his predestination cannot deceive him, neither can any man withstand or let him; and therefore have we hope and trust against sin. (p. 505)

But predestination is not to be rashly disputed. If man will follow the order of the Epistle to the Romans and "noose" himself "with Christ, and learn to understand what the law and the gospel mean, and the office of both the two," the necessity of predestination "will wax sweet," and he will feel "how precious a thing it is" (p. 505). Thus Tyndale, paraphrasing or translating Luther, sets forth the deterministic doctrine of salvation which alienated Erasmus and other humanists from the reform movement. It remained for John Calvin to analyze the doctrine and explore its every consequence, but it was present in the earliest reform writings.
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It follows from such determinism that man's will is not free to seek his own salvation. It is bound by sin and can do only sin (The Wicked Mammon, p. 113), except when, by faith, God works good through man's will. The servitude of the human will was of paramount importance in defining the exact relation of God and man, which Luther felt to be absolutely necessary to his conception of the Christian religion. Man must know what is his work, or duty, and what is God's before he can hope to live piously. Tyndale accepts this necessity and writes that man can in no way merit his salvation (The Wicked Mammon, p. 56).

Tyndale, in his Answer to Sir Thomas More's Dialogue (1530) defines the Church as the "congregation" of the elect as opposed to the customary meaning of the clergy: the pope, cardinals, bishops, priests, etc. 49 The church buildings should be used for preaching the word of God, not "for the use wherein they now are" (The Wicked Mammon, p. 106) for processions of priests and chanting Latin litanies. The heart of man is the actual temple in which God must be worshipped, not in temples made with hands. This church of the elect of God cannot err, but that of the "multitude of shaven, shorn, and oiled" can err. Of this Tyndale writes in his Answer to More:

There is another question, whether the church may err. Which if ye understand of the pope and his generation, it is verily as hard a question as to ask whether he
which had both his eyes out be blind or no; or whether it be possible for him that hath one leg shorter than another to halt. But I said that Christ's elect church is the whole multitude of all repenting sinners that believe in Christ, and put all their trust and confidence in the mercy of God; feeling in their hearts that God for Christ's sake loveth them, and will be, or rather is, merciful unto them, and forgiveth them their sins of which they repent; and that he forgiveth them also all the motions unto sin, of which they fear lest they should thereby be drawn into sin again. And this faith they have without all respect of their own deservings, yea, and for none other cause than that the merciful truth of God the Father, which cannot lie, hath so promised and so sworn. (p. 30)

The doctrine of election leads to absolute certainty about salvation, says Tyndale in agreement with Luther. The elect have a longing in their heart for the law of God which is a "seal and mark, which God putteth on all men that he chooseth unto everlasting life" (p. 79, The Wicked Mammon). The elect will be saved by their good deeds, not which they have done for themselves, but which Christ has done for them, "for Christ is thine, and all his deeds are thy deeds" (p. 79). The elect may fall into sin and be tried by God, but they will never be abandoned to damnation; thus the certainty of salvation in which the reformers gloried in contrast to the doubt which they felt the Catholic system of penance left in men (pp. 36-37, Answer).

Luther and Tyndale rejected five of the Catholic sacraments as not true Scriptural sacraments. Tyndale's emphasis in the Answer is not on the number of sacraments but on the lack of signification
of the Catholic sacraments. He calls them "dumb ceremonies" in whose "work" men are supposed to believe; the real meaning of them lies hidden in the Scriptures and is not taught (pp. 29, 44). The sprinkling of holy water originally signified the sprinkling of Christ's blood for man's redemption, says Tyndale, and though it seems superfluous since the sacrament of the altar signifies the same thing, he would allow it as harmless as long as the signification was taught. When it became a "dumb ceremony" with only superstitious meaning for the people, it became evil (pp. 70-71, Answer). Similarly the meaning of the kissing of the pax, which originally signified that the peace of Christ should be ever among men, has been lost. When its significance was no longer remembered, it became only a deed whose efficacy was believed in as a kind of magic. The sacraments of confirmation and of the mass have likewise lost their signification through ignorance on the part of the people. The vestments, candles, gestures, salt, and the elaborate altar accouterments once had their significations, but now only the ceremony remains (pp. 74-75, Answer). His objection to these ceremonies is that though they originally preached to the people through their significations, they at present "dumb ceremonies" used as a substitute for preaching.

Tyndale opposes what he considers the worship of the saints, images, relics, and sacred places (pp. 82-83, Answer). Pil-
grimages to shrines are of no value in the worship of God, and the miracles performed at such places prove nothing, even if they are genuine, as they may be of the devil rather than of God (p. 91

Answer).

The mass, Tyndale would call the Lord's Supper (p. 97, Answer). He wrote a separate treatise on The Supper of The Lord, an exposition of John vi, in which he condemns the papists for sacrificing Christ's body again and again at mass and not recognizing that the one sacrifice of the crucifixion is enough. He denies the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Christ (p. 228). Christ's words are spiritual, not carnal; his meaning is "whoso believeth my flesh to be crucified and broken, and my blood to be shed for his sins, he eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, and hath life everlasting" (p. 230). The body of Christ's manhood cannot be everywhere at once; the body of his Godhead being spiritual may be everywhere at once; therefore the presence of Christ in the Supper is spiritual and not "real" or actual. As the many faces in several mirrors are not real faces,

no more is it Christ's very body, as they would make thee believe, in the bread, so many places at once. But the bread, broken and eaten in the supper, monisheth and putteth us in remembrance of his death, and so exciteth us to thanksgiving, to laud and praise, for the benefit of our redemption; and thus we there have Christ present, in the inward eye and sight of our
faith. We eat his body and drink his blood; that is, we believe surely that his body was crucified for our sins, and his blood shed for our salvation. (pp. 235-236)

Luther had also denied transubstantiation, but he maintained that Christ's words, "Hoc est corpus meum," must be taken literally and therefore the real presence affirmed. How the actual body of Christ was present in the elements of the sacrament, Luther explained by the doctrine of consubstantiation. According to it, the substance of Christ's body exists together with the substance of the bread, and in like manner the substance of His blood together with the substance of the wine. As the Son of God took on a human body without in any way destroying its substance, so Christ in the sacrament assumes the nature of bread and wine without changing them. In his doctrine of the spiritual presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, Tyndale agreed with Zwingli and Oecolampadius rather than with Luther. He also represents the position taken later in the century by the English church on the issue (see below Chapter VI). Luther lumped together under the name Sacramentarians all reformers who disagreed with him on this point, from those who affirmed the real presence but called it spiritual, to those who denied any presence and considered the elements of the sacrament empty signs.

The medieval emphasis on love and hope gives place in the new learning to a constant repetition of "faith." Tyndale states
the new orthodoxy on the relationship of faith, love, and grace:

By faith are we saved only, in believing the promises. And though faith be never without love and good works, yet is our saving imputed neither to love nor unto good works, but unto faith only. For love and works are under the law, which requireth perfection and the ground and fountain of the heart, and damneth all imperfectness. Now is faith under the promises, which damn not; but give pardon, grace, mercy, favour, and whatsoever is contained in the promises. (p. 15, A Pathway Into The Holy Scripture)

We have seen that in the medieval system of salvation for those who have sinned after baptism the order of procedure was knowledge of one's sins in detail with all the circumstances, contrition for one's sins, confession to a priest of each and every sin with all its circumstances, penance or satisfaction for each sin, and absolution. This formula is retained by the reformers with some alterations to make it fit the new doctrine. Tyndale writes:

So now, by the natural order, first I see my sin: then I repent, and sorrow: then believe I God's promises; that he is merciful unto me, and forgiveth me, and will heal me at the last: then love I; and then I prepare myself to the commandment. (pp. 84-85, The Wicked Mammon)

God sends his Spirit to the elect under the new system, and the Spirit "openeth their eyes, sheweth them their misery, and bringeth them unto the knowledge of themselves; so that they hate and abhor themselves, are astonied and amazed, and at their wit's ends, neither wot what to do, or where to seek health" (p. 89). God then comforts the elect with His promises lest they despair and
certifies that they are made sons of God by election. In a later chapter we shall find this formula dramatized in the play *Lusty Juventus*. Knowledge of oneself and of one's sinful nature, which comes through hearing the law preached, is essential to salvation: "It is not possible that the Lord Christ should come to a man, except he know himself and his sin, and truly repent" (p. 104).

Also essential is knowledge of God's will as revealed in His testament or gospel (p. 105). Knowledge is as important to the reformers as it was to the author of the *Somme le Roi* and its translators, who made the teachings of this book available to English readers in *The Book of Vices and Virtues*, the *Ayenbit of Inwit*, and the *Royal Book*. The reform preacher, Hugh Latimer, calls Knowledge the gentleman-usher to Lady Faith. 51 This knowledge of God's will and of sin, however, is to come from the Scriptures, either read or preached, not from the traditions of the Catholic Church. And the knowledge of one's sin is to be a kind of general awareness of one's sinful nature granted by faith to those chosen by God for eternal life. Repentance for this sinful nature is also general and does not necessitate the rehearsal of individual sins and their circumstances to a member of the clergy. Secret confession to God is sufficient:

though I cannot do the will of God so purely as the law requireth it of me, yet if I see my fault and meekly knowledge my sin, weeping in mine heart, because I cannot do the will of God, and thirst after strength;
I am sure that the Spirit of God is in me, and his favour upon me. (p. 76, Ibid.)

Tyndale writes further on the efficacy of secret confession to God:

"He is not a sinner in the sight of God, that would be no sinner."

He that would be delivered, hath his heart loose already. His heart sinneth not, but mourneth, repenteth, and consenteth unto the law and will of God, and justifieth God; that is, beareth record that God which made the law is righteous and just. And such an heart, trusting in Christ's blood, is accepted for full righteous. (p. 94, Ibid.)

The relationship of repentance is a close one between God and man, with Christ as the only mediator. "Ear-confession" or auricular confession is condemned as a torment to men's consciences (p. 245, Obedience of A Christian Man) and as unscriptural (p. 22, Answer). Following Luther, Tyndale prefers the word repentance to penance as a translation of the Greek word metanoia (p. 23). Repent, he says, is the meaning of the Scriptures rather than do penance. Repentance in the heart is sufficient without the penances prescribed by the priests.

But whether it is do penance or repent, man must know his sins or his sinful nature before he can do penance or repent. We have seen in Chapter I that knowledge, in the medieval system, included, besides a knowledge of God, his nature and his will, a detailed working knowledge of the seven deadly sins and their numerous branches and twigs with all the accompanying circumstances, and a knowledge of all the articles of the great curse. To
the reformers, a personal knowledge of God through Christ, which in the medieval system was confined to the contemplative way of life, was possible for each Christian who was given faith as one of the elect. The knowledge of sin was still necessary in the new system, but was revealed to the elect as a general realization of their sinful nature when they heard the law and the gospel preached. Knowledge of God's promises in the New and Old Testament was a gift of God to His chosen people that they might not despair at the revealing of their sinfulness.

Before turning to an analysis of the sixteenth century plays and dialogues, it may be well to take a summary look at the old system against which the new was pitted. In the medieval system, original sin has dulled man's ability to will the good but has not destroyed it. He still has some part in his salvation and his justification becomes a lifelong process of cooperation between God and man. Only through the Church can a man be saved. The Church alone has the power of the seven sacraments for his salvation:

1. Baptism removes the guilt of original sin, leaving only concupiscence. 2. Confirmation seals the baptism. 3. Ordination empowers the clergy with the authority of the Church and leaves on them an indelible mark. 4. Marriage is also considered a sacrament of the Church.
5. The sacrament of penance in the old system assumes paramount importance in the process of salvation as the means by which man obtains God's forgiveness for sins committed since baptism. The Church, through its clergy, has the sole power on earth to declare this forgiveness. Every sin must be paid for with good works and satisfactions before absolution is final. Men must shrive themselves often: they must know their sins, confess them to a priest with attrition and if possible with contrition, and do penance for them.

6. The sacrament of the altar, in which is present through transubstantiation, the actual or real body and blood of Christ, represents both a communion (once a year) and a sacrifice or good work (performed thousands of times a year). The layman received communion in one kind only. Masses, as supreme good works, are effective satisfactions for sins on earth and in purgatory.

7. The sacrament of extreme unction is considered necessary for the completion of the soul's journey through life.

Good works are necessary for man's salvation in the medieval plan. They include, besides masses sung or said, alms to the poor, gifts to the Church or the clergy, pilgrimages, prayers to the saints, and repetition of Our Lady's Psalter, the Pater Noster, or the Ave Maria in Latin.

Besides having the power of the sacraments, the Catholic Church
also has final authority in all matters of doctrine and interpretation of Scriptures. The Pope is spiritual head of all Christendom. He controls the power of the keys by which all are loosed or bound on earth and in heaven. His power is derived directly from St. Peter; he is Christ's vicar on earth, having control of the Church's great treasury of merits.

Essentially this is the medieval religious system attacked by Luther and his followers. With St. Paul and St. Augustine as inspiration, Luther shows man's ability to will the good as essentially destroyed by original sin. Justification is by faith alone, and faith is a free gift of God with no regard to man's merits. Man is under God's immutable predestination and may in no way effect any part of his own salvation. Good works follow the gift of faith, but do not cause justification. Christian liberty is the freedom from the necessity of doing evil obtained by justification. The law shows man his sin, but man cannot fulfil it because of his fallen nature. God's promises of mercy keep him from despair, and he is justified and imputed righteous by God's will. The preaching of these promises along with the law turns the hearts of the elect toward God.

Luther reduces the number of sacraments to two: baptism and the Lord's Supper. Sin, not just concupiscence, remains after baptism. The Lord's Supper should be a true communion
of Christians with Christ and with each other, not a sacrifice or
a good work. The laity should have the privilege of communion
in both kinds. The service should be in the vernacular so that
the people may understand.

The sacrament of penance, with its extensive system of con-
fessions and satisfactions, is wiped away. The functions of the
clergy are further reduced by this action as well as by the con-
demnation of the mass as a sacrifice and the denial of the neces-
sity of extreme unction.

These are the doctrinal changes which we shall examine in the
plays, dialogues, and treatises of the early sixteenth century.
They constitute the doctrines of the "new learning" in religion.
This new learning was also propagated by means of hymns, ballads,
sermons, and last wills and testaments. The number of these
writings is vast, and much has survived to give a picture of the
very busy reformers, who, though only a small proportion of the
population, were widely heard and known. Fewer plays or inter-
ludes have survived than the other kinds of propaganda literature.
From contemporary references to plays and from the bibliographi-
cal lists of John Bale, however, it is evident that the number of
lost protestant propaganda plays in English is great. Many of the
titles of Bale's own lost plays show them to be of controversial
nature, and it may be guessed that the others exhibited the same
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Lutheran or "new learning" bias which is to be found in his extant plays. 52

Some of the early sixteenth century moralities and interludes either expounded the old system of salvation or reflected its acceptance in their plots, characters, and message. But others turned to the new learning. We shall also see in these new learning plays some which expounded the new system fully and others which merely reflected its acceptance.
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CHAPTER III

THE NEW LEARNING IN THE PLAYS OF JOHN BALE

In the tradition of the early morality plays, which we have seen were didactic in purpose, John Bale wrote his plays to present a doctrine for the salvation of man, the new-learning way to salvation. An analysis of the new learning in his plays will lead to a better understanding of their nature and purpose. Bale's plays also retain some of the teachings found in the early morality plays: for example, the ten commandments and the seven vices in The Three Laws. In addition, Bale wrote two separate plays, now lost, on medieval material from the treatises: the Pater Noster Play (Super Oratone Dominica) and On The Seven Sins (De Septem Peccatis). But his extant plays are all clearly written in the spirit of the new learning. Besides being doctrinal plays—a good name for the medieval morality plays, too—Bale's plays are often satirical and scathing attacks on the papal power and the papists. At times the doctrine comes out of the attack on the abuses of the papal system, as when in The Three Laws Bale attacks the priestly vows of celibacy and advocates the marriage of the clergy by showing the terrible conditions which result from the ban on marriage. At other times the doctrine is presented in dramatized sermons undiluted by satire or comic
elements as in God's Promises, The Preaching of John the Baptist, and The Temptation of Our Lord. In King Johan Bale uses an actual historical situation on which to hang his new doctrine.

John Bale, a Carmelite friar, was converted to the new learning probably about 1531. He was influenced in this decision by the teachings of Martin Luther, which were topics of discussion at Cambridge while he was a student at Jesus College. Just how deep and far-reaching his conversion was may be seen from a detailed examination of his extant plays: The Three Laws, God's Promises, The Preaching of John the Baptist, The Temptation of Our Lord, and King Johan. On the negative side he was violently anti-papist and anti-Catholic, condemning such doctrines as the supremacy of the Pope over all Christendom, the celibacy of the clergy, the power of the keys, the effectiveness of the mass, the existence of purgatory, the worship of saints, pilgrimages to various images, and the abuses and ignorance of the clergy. Having thus demolished much of the old system of salvation, he offers on the positive side as an alternative plan of salvation to man the doctrines of the new learning. As we shall see in a later chapter, he cites Luther and Tyndale as authorities for his new teachings. He was also an admirer of John Wycliffe, preserving his books and listing his works in his own catalogues. In the First Examination of Mistresse Anne Askew, he calls Wycliffe
"the very organ of God, and vessel of the Holy Ghost" because he wrote against the Pope and certain papal abuses "like as Martin Luther hath done also in our time."  

Jesse W. Harris calls Bale a "dramatic innovator, an adaptor who aroused a school of controversial drama into being." Even though Bale's plays may date from the early thirties as Harris maintains, they were preceded by at least one other religious propaganda play, directed against the heretic Luther. There is record of a lost Catholic religious play being produced at revels before the King in November of 1527:

The Kyngis plesyer was that at the sayd revells by clarks in the Latyn tonge shold be playd in hys hy presence a play, wherof insuythe the namys.—First, an oratur in aperell of gold; a poyed in aperell of cloth of gold. Relygeun, Ecclesia, Veritas, like iiij. novessis in garments of sylke, and vayells of lawne and sypers. Erressy, Fallse Interpretacion, Corrupcio Scriptoris, lyke laydys of Beeme inpereld in garments of sylke of dyvers collors. The herrytyke Lewtar lyke a party frer, in rosset damaske and blake taftata. Lewtars wife lyke a frowe of Spyers in Almayn, in red sylke. Petar, Poull, and Jamys, in iiij. abetts of whyghte sarsenet, and iiij. red mantylls and heris of sylvor of damaske and pelleuns of skarlet; and a cardenall in hys apparell; ij. sargents in ryche apparell. The Dolfyn and his brother, in cottes of velvet inbraudrid with gold, and capis of satyn bownd withe velvett; a messyngar in tynsell satyn; vij. men in gownys of gren sarsenet; vij. wemen in gownys of cremsyn sarsenet war in ryche cloth of gold and fethers and armyn; iiij. Almayns in apparell all cut and sclyt of sylke. Lady Fees, in ladys apparell all whyght and ryche; and lady Quyetnes and dame Tranquylyte, rychely beseyn in ladis apparell . . .

There is evidence, as Harris points out, that two other plays of
one Thomas Arthur, a fellow student of Bale's and a rabid Protestant convert, were acted at Cambridge between 1520 and 1532. Most probably these were new-learning plays, and if they were Bale may well have known them. It would seem that Bale, instead of being the originator of the school of controversial drama, was an imitator of earlier writers of this kind of play and a developer and user of the technique.

A comedy concernynge thre lawes, of Nature, Moses, and Christ, corrupted by the Sodomytes, Pharisees & papystes most wycked

In the prologue to the Three Laws Bale is concerned with the popular question of his day—the nature of law and its necessity in the world at large and in the commonwealth in particular. This question is also discussed by St. German in 1530 in a dialogue entitled Hereafter foloweth a Dyaloge in Englyssh / bytwyxt a Doctoure of Dyuynte / and a Student in the Lawes of Englande: of the groundes of the sayd Lawes and of Conscyence / in which the "lawe eternall" is said to have three expressions: 1. in the law of nature, 2. in the lawe of God, and 3. in the law of man. These three divisions anticipate those of Richard Hooker in his Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, first published near the end of the century. Bale's three laws are all included in the law of nature and of God, the latter being divided into the law of Moses or of
Bondage, and the law of Christ or of Grace. He does not treat the positive laws of man except to say that they should be based on these laws of God exclusively. His purpose in the play is to show how these laws of God have been corrupted by unbelief or Infidelity in all the ages of man, and to warn man not to make any laws which do not agree with the laws of God. The agents of unbelief, or Infidelity, he makes the papists, whom he labels "fowle Idolaters, and sodomytes," "couetouse prestes," and "ambycyouse prelates / Hypocryticall fryres, false doctours, & false curates." These laws have been restored by God through the "late Josias," the "valeant kynge Henrye," who has banished the Pope from England, along with covetousness, ambition, false doctrine, and hypocrisy. Christian Faith has been appointed to govern the congregation (church), and all the "olde popyshnesse is past whycch was dapnacyon."

Bale uses a kind of theological present in the play as the papists are made to corrupt laws in an age before the historical existence of the papacy. The chief vice, the father of all vices, Infidelitas, uses Idolatria and Sodomismus, two papists, to corrupt the character Naturae Lex before the entrance of Moseh Lex in Act III, and in a similar fashion Ambitio and Avaritia, two other papists, corrupt Moseh Lex long before the coming of Christ. It is true that these three laws were introduced in the first act
by Deus Pater, but Act I is a kind of explanatory prologue having little to do with the action of the play. Bale's reasoning in using this theological reckoning, perhaps, was that the vices which have corrupted God's laws in all ages are exemplified vividly in the papists of his own time. This device would allow for satire of the papists as well as for an explanation of the laws of God in the new-learning interpretation.

Infidelitas, the chief motivator of the play, represents unbelief, the basis of all sin in the new doctrine. The six auxiliary vices Idolatria, Ambitio, Sodomismus, Pseudodoctrina, Avaritia, and Hypocrisy are described as the "frutes of Infydelyte" or of unbelief. In the new system of salvation, all sin comes from lack of faith or unbelief in the promises of God. These vice characters, the fruits of unbelief, were connected in the stage production of the play with the papists by their "apparellynge":

Let Idolatry be decked lyke an olde wytche, Sodomy lyke a monke of all sectes, Ambencyon lyke a byshop, Courousnesse lyke a pharyse or spyrityall lawer, false doctryne, lyke a popysh doctour, and hypocresy lyke a graye fryre.

Besides their apparel there is their constant chatter about popish or Catholic ceremonies, saints, and beliefs, to identify them with the papists. Bale thus further achieves his satire on the papists by making the vices speak as followers of the old system and by mixing extreme vulgarity and evil thoughts with this reli-
gious expression. On the other hand, the virtuous characters speak in the language of the new learning and are entirely decorous, wishing only the good for mankind. Much of the humor of the play comes from the mock-religious antics of the vices. For example, the evil Infidelitas and Sodomus sing a merry song to celebrate the completion of their plans to corrupt Naturae Lex, and Infidelitas says, *alta voce*, "Oremus," and prays a mocking prayer asking God to comfort them by the wives, sisters, and daughters of their parishioners:

*Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram formasti laicos, da quaesumus, ut sicut eorum sudoribus vivimus, ita eorum uxoribus, filiabus et domicellis perpetuo frui mereamur. Per dominum nostrum Papam.*

There is actually little new or distinctive about Bale's description of the law of nature. It is still the medieval law of the natural universe given by God at the creation and followed by all elements of nature except man and the angels who have broken it. Naturae Lex was given the task of residing in the heart of man to keep him pure in love of God, but unbelief in man's heart has crippled this law. His corruption results from the action of the busy vices Idolatria and Sodomismus, who by their very nature cause man not to love God and to resort to things beastly. The identification of these two vices with the papists strikes a blow against the foes of the new learning. In describing the evils
which result from the vows of chastity made by the nuns, priests, and monks, Bale argues, as Luther and Tyndale do, for allowing the priests the remedy of nature, i.e., marriage.

Moseh Lex, sent by God to govern man after natural law has failed, describes himself as a law of "rygour and of hardenes," following the doctrine of the new learning derived from St. Paul (Romans 3:20) in saying, "in effect / I shewe what synne is."

We shall meet with this character again in other reform plays: e.g., in The Life and Repentaunce of Marie Magdalene he is called Lawe and given the function of showing Mary her sins. Moseh Lex shows man how impossible it is for him to fulfill the law perfectly because of his sinful nature, and thus brings on despair, but he also directs man to Christ where he shall have forgiveness and salvation.

Infidelitas, ever vigilant, is on the scene lamenting to this new law the good old days before the fellows of the new learning preached the Scriptures, Christ, and Paul:

Whan the Monkes were fatte,
And ranke as a ratte,
With bellyes lyke a Bore,
Then all thynges were dere,
Both bese, breade and bere,
Now grudge the iourers sore.

Whan Byshoppes myght burn,
And from the truth turne,
The syllye symple sowle.
Than durst no man creake,
Open mouth nor speake,
Of Christ nor yet of Powle.

Now are the knaues bold,
With Scriptures to holde,
And teache them euerie where.

... ... ... ...

We are now lyke to fall.
If we do not fyght,
For the churches ryght
By the Messe we shall lose all. (Actus Tertius)

The actual corruption of Moseh Lex is carried out by Avaritia
Jurisconsultus, who is dressed like a spiritual lawyer, and
Ambitio, dressed like a bishop, both sons of Infidelitas or un-
belief. Ambition will start the corruption of the law of Moses
thus:

With fylthy gloses, and dyrty exposycyons,
Of Gods lawe wyll I hyde, the pure dysposycyons.
The keye of knowledge, I wyll also take awaye,
By wrastyng the text, to the scriptures sore decaye.

(Actus Tertius)

Avaritia, the lawyer, plans to make the law of Moses "not worth
two straws" through cautels and delays, and by the sophistry of
philosophy and logic. He will place a veil before the face of
Moses so that none may know the true meaning of the law.
Ambitio will poison the law with good works and good intents,
pilgrimages, worshipping of images, "lyppe labour," and "ydle
ceremonye." They will keep the priests in ignorance by occupying
them with busy work in the form of long Latin hours, long
matins, long evensongs, and long masses. This conception of
the ignorance of the priests is later made into a separate char-
acter in the play New Custom where Ignorance appears as an
elderly popish priest, friend of Perverse Doctrine, another priest.
All Bible readers are to be condemned by the bishop Ambitio lest
they discover the true meaning of the law of Moses. Infidelitas
makes an attempt at witty word-play commenting on the civil and
canon laws by which men are condemned by the one and punished
by the other:

. . . whan thu doest slee, soch as thy lawes contepne
Thou mayst saye, Not I, but the powers ded them contempne
These Labels betoken the lawes of se non & can non.

(Actus Tertius)

The civil and canon law of the time became a target of attack
for the reformers because the extensive glosses and commentaries
obscured its meaning as they did in the case of the Scriptures.

Bale attacks the use of Latin in the Catholic services accusing
the papists of using English only when it will be of monetary
advantage as in pardons, dirges, offerings, and pilgrimages.
Avaritia plans to use English in a creed which will further his
control over the people. Bale parodies in this creed the twelve
articles of faith:

First they shall beleue in our holy father Pope,
Next, in hyis decrees, and holy decretals.
First in holy church, with sencer, crosse and cope,
In Ceremonyes, and blessed Sacrametals.
In purgatory then, in pardons and in trentals,
In praynge to sayntes, and in saynt Frâces whoode,
In our lady of Grace, and in the blessed roode.
They shall beleue also, in rellyckes and relygyon,
In our ladyes psalter, in fre wyll and good wurkes.
In ember dayes, and the popes remyssyon,
In bedes and in belles, not used of the turkes,
In the golden Masses, agaynst sech spretes as lurkes
With charmes and blessynges. Thys crede wyll brynge
in moneye.

In Englysh therfor, we wyl it clarkely cõweye.

(Actus Tertius)

By such a parody, Bale denies by implication all the articles expressed therein, thus preaching the tenets of the new learning indirectly.

The actual corrupting of the law is done off-stage while
Infidelitas speaks at length about the evils of the Pope and his followers who have drawn a veil over the face of Moses to hide the light of the law. As Infidelitas exits, Moseh Lex comes in blinded, lamed, and sorely decayed calling on the princes for religious reform as Luther had done in his own land:

Ye christen prynces, God hath geuen you the poure,
With scepture and swerde, all vyces to correct.
Let not Ambycyon, nor Coustousnesse demoure,
Your faythfull subiectes, nor your offycers infect.
Haue to your clergy, a dylygent respect
And se they do not corrupt the lawes of God,
For that doth requyre, a terryble heauye rod.

(Actus Tertius)

Bale always conceived religious reform as taking place under the protection and direction of a Christian prince. He was unhappy with the extreme form of protestantism which he found in Germany
and Switzerland during his last period of exile from England during the reign of Mary.

The last law sent by God, Christi Lex, takes the name Evangelium and describes himself as the gospel, a full forgiveness in the blood of Christ, tidings of gladness, spirit of life, necessary science, and grace. His wife is the church or Christian congregation, but not the church of the papists. His church is a "lyuysh buylidyng, grounded on fayth alone," whose membership is small and secret. It is ruled only by God's word, and does not consist in outward ceremony. Infidelitas impudently accuses Evangelium of being one of the fellows of the new learning who forsake Holy Church and "fall fast to wyuyng," and Evangelium asserts the new learning doctrine that marriage is better than the whoredom of the Pope's "oyled swarme."

To corrupt the third law given by God to man, Infidelitas calls on Pseudodoctrina, who is dressed like a Popish "doctour," and Hypocrisy, who is decked out like a grey friar. He raises their anger against Evangelium by repeating what the people say of the Pope and his followers, having learned from the Gospel the truth of religion. The people say that the friars' orders have arisen out of Hell and that Pseudodoctrina teaches "nothyng but lousy tradyciôs." Since the people's knowledge springs from the gospel or Evangelium, the two vices are determined to slay him. Four
knights—representing ambitious prelates, covetous lawyers, igno-
norant lords, and unjust justices—are secured to keep Evangelium
down in his grave. Hypocrisy plans to raise up the "seuen
slepers" (Dorbel, Duns, Durande, Thomas of Aquinas, Bacon, and
Henricus de Gandavo) in the universities to help in the fight
against Evangelium. These seven (he names only six) will read
Aristotle to the clerks with the commentaries of "Avicen and
Averoyes" to help destroy the Gospel. The Pope will command
all kings to attack Evangelium.

Evangelium enters and demands audience to preach, but is re-
fused permission since he does not have the authority of the Pope
or of a bishop. There is no time for preaching that day as they
have a holy feast coming and must go in procession with the
"blessed Rood of Rest" besides the long matins, lauds, hours,
prime, Mass, evensong, and compline, and the censing of altars,
casting of holy water, and holy bread making. Evangelium, truly
a man of the new learning, demands whether God has commanded
such ceremonies of them. He thinks they are fruits of their
imagination, and condemns these Latin services which replace the
preaching of the gospel. This whole scene of the quarreling over
who is to preach is in the Chaucer–Heywood tradition of the dis-
play of false and ridiculous relics to accompany or take the place
of the sermon. Infidelitas turns pardoner and displays relics
which include a wing of the Holy Ghost and a bell to keep the dogs from biting their hogs. Evangelium is outraged that the preaching of the gospel, the promises of God, should be interrupted for such a display. Pseudoctrina accuses him of being a heretic of the new learning, and he is arrested and sent off-stage to be burned with green fagots.

In the last act of the play, Vindicta Dei, the vengeance of God, punishes Infidelitas as the source of all sin with water, sword, and fire. He exits, afire, screaming "Credo, credo, credo, I saye, Credo, credo, credo." Deus Pater promises to restore the three laws to their original purity, thus restoring the Christian liberty and freeing the Christian from the accretion of man-made laws resulting from superstition and infidelity. He will restore Christianity to its primitive purity—a goal cherished by Luther:

Now haue we destroyed, the kyngedom of Babylon,  
And throwne the great whore, into the bottellesse pyt,  
Restorynge agayne, the true fayth and relygyon,  
In the christen churche, as we haue thought it fyt,

............................................................

The olde popysnesse, is past whych was daphnacyon,  
We haue now renued, our christen congregacyon.  
(Actus Quintus)

Christian Faith is appointed to govern this Christian congregation and is advised by Deus Pater not to make any laws that are not called for by the three laws He has given to govern man. Deus
Pater continues to sum up the position of the new learning in His directions to Fides Christiana:

Enprent their declaracyon  
Of my swete promyse, and than make thu relacyon,  
To my folke agayne, that they may walke to me,  
Without popysh dreames, in a perfect lyberty.  

(Actus Quintus)

This is Luther's dream of a closer and more personal relationship between man and God with Christ as the only mediator, omitting such mediators as the clergy, the saints, and the virgin Mary. Deus Pater defines the gospel in the manner of Luther and Tyndale as the sum of all the promises made by Him to man:

The promyse we made, in all these thre ar Gospell,  
We wolde thu shuldest so, to our congregacyon tell.  

(Actus Quintus)

We shall meet with this conception of the gospel again and again in the plays and dialogues of the new learning: in Bale's own play God's Promises; as God's Merciful Promises, a character in Lusty Juventus; and in Bale's Dialogue between two children.

The valiant King Henry, as the representative of the Lord, has restored these three laws, and it is to be hoped that his son Edward, "soch a kynges of god elect," will continue to free the country from the "danable darkenesse" into which the papists have plunged it.

We have seen in Chapter I of this dissertation that there is a close relationship between the medieval morality plays and the
doctrinal treatises of the time; so with Bale's plays there can be demonstrated similarities to Tyndale's treatises in doctrine and diction or terminology. Those treatises of Tyndale were popular paraphrases of Luther's doctrine, expressed in a language different from the usual religious terminology of the day, but understood well by the common Englishman. For instance, Tyndale calls the church the "Christian congregation," for which he is denounced by Sir Thomas More, and Bale accepts and uses this designation. Tyndale writes that the church of God is not the "multitude of shaven, shorn, and oiled; which we now call the spirituality and clergy." not the "shaven flock of them that shore the whole world." Bale writes that the church is not the church of "disguised hypocrites, Of apish shavelings, or papistical sodomites" nor the "popes oyled swarme." There are similar echoes of Tyndale in doctrine and diction throughout The Three Laws, and, indeed, throughout Bale's writing. A few more illustrations will show the nature of the similarity between these two early reformers. Bale lists the evils to be found as a result of the forbidding of marriage to the clergy:

Shall I tell ye farther newes:
At Rome, for prelates, are stewe
Of both kyndes.

Similarly, Tyndale accuses the Pope of setting up in Rome "a stews of twenty or thirty thousand whores, taking of every piece tribute
yearly," and the Pope, not content, set up "thereto a stews of young boys, against nature, the committers of which sin be burnt at a stake among the Turks" (Answer, p. 52). Both Tyndale and Bale use this evidence of the corruption of the clergy to preach their doctrine of the desirability of marriage for the religious. Reflecting Tyndale's terminology further, Bale calls the ceremonies of the papists "ceremonyes dome"; Tyndale calls them "dumb superstitious ceremonies" (Answer, p. 76). The character Infidelitas represents unbelief from which, writes Bale in Act Five, spring all the vices who have corrupted the laws of God; Tyndale writes that "no sin damneth, save there where there is no belief" (Answer, p. 174). Also like Tyndale, Bale defines the gospel as the sum of the promises of God made to man in the Old and New Testaments (The Three Laws, Actus Quintus).

 The primary function of The Three Laws is to show the nature of laws, their origin in the laws of God, and the corrupting process which has come about through the papists. A secondary function of the play is to show the other elements of the new learning, a new faith under a Christian Prince. Since, as a play, it is limited in scope, The Three Laws omits some of the tenets of the new system and treats others scantily. For instance, Bale does not deal exhaustively or even adequately with the subject of predestination. Nor is he quite clear in this play as to the rela-
tionship of faith to love and hope in the new learning, as may be seen from the speech of Evangelium:

I requyre but loue for man's iustifycatyon,
With a fayth in Christ, for hys heith and saluacyon.

(Actus Quartus)

The orthodox new doctrine would place faith first in man's justification; love and hope follow faith but do not justify man in the sight of God. Nor does Bale follow Luther in distinguishing clearly between the law and the gospel. He does make Moseh Lex bring a knowledge of sin, and he calls the gospel "hygh tydynges of gladnesse," "infallyble veryte," and "a full forgeuenesse," but he also makes Christi Lex a parallel law with the law of nature and the law of Moses as one of the three laws given by God to govern man. Bale does not emphasize the antithesis between Christ and Moses which is important in Luther's system of thought. For Bale, each is the head of a beneficial divine law, but one is not essentially different from the other. Luther would not make a second Moses of Christ, nor present Christ as other than a gentle intercessor with honey on his lips instead of gall. Bale does not seem to be troubled by placing the two in similar positions, each with a law of his own to be corrupted by Infidelitas and restored by Deus Pater.

Nor does Bale treat fully the feeling of complete confidence in salvation under the new learning which was of great comfort to
Luther. In the Catholic doctrine of justification by faith and works, Luther and the reformers saw the continual threat of damnation hanging over man. In the free gift of salvation to man with no regard to his own merit, they saw complete assurance. Bale touches on this confidence but he does not elaborate. As a result of this assurance there is no question about whether his Good Deeds will be able to recover their strength sufficiently to accompany man and help him before the final judgment seat as they must do in Everyman. If one is among the elect, one will be saved finally. Bale does not concern himself with who is elected and who is not; he is directing his word to the "christen congregacyon" and there is no longer any "carefull doubt of conscyeece" for the elect. He accepts the doctrine of predestination, but he does not trouble to try to fathom the secrets of God. He writes that the elect are of all nations "though their nombre be but small." However, he does not face or try to explain away the implication of the doctrine of election that if a man is among the elect, he will be saved eventually no matter what he does in this life. Like Luther, he would condemn those who "put saluacyon in shauen crowne, mytar, or whode," and he offers the word of God as a substitute for these things, but he also writes that man must still work at his salvation. Man must listen to the Gospel preached and follow the laws prescribed therein. Bale is not clearly dis-
tistinguishing, as Luther would have done, between "justification" and "glorification." In saying that man must work at his salvation he must mean at his "glorification" since for him justification comes about through faith alone. Without the free gift of faith, man is damned. Luther and the reformers felt that their justification by faith alone was a joyous doctrine, a great comfort to the soul. They did not abandon the ethical and moral side of religion, though they were accused by their enemies of doing so; rather they made that part of Christianity follow justification by faith as fruit follows the tree in coming forth. But in this play Bale does not make the distinction clear between Luther's doctrine of "being" saved or justified and of "becoming" glorified as a result of justification.

Bale's Doctrinal Cycle of Plays

A Tragedye or enterlude / manyfestyng the chefe promyses of God / vnto man by all ages in the olde lawe, from the fall of / Adam to the incarnacyon of the lorde Jesus / Christ.

In The Chief Promises of God, the first of a trilogy which includes also John the Baptist's Preaching and The Temptation of Our Lord, Bale sets forth more clearly and at greater length his plan of salvation. In The Three Laws his purpose had been a biting satirical attack on the papists as well as presentation of doctrine. In his cycle he presents as a dramatized sermon a more
systematic account of his beliefs with only incidental attacks on
the papists. The first play of the cycle is little more than a
series of seven dialogues between God, as Pater Coelestis, and
seven prophets, six from the Old Testament and one from the New.
In each dialogue God promises some method of saving man from
damnation until the final promise in the sending of Christ.

The text of The Chief Promises of God is taken from the
first chapter of the gospel of John, which says that in the word
(which is now called the eternal son of God) was life from the
beginning, and that life was the light of men. Pater Coelestis
defines the Son as coequal with Him, one God essential with Him,
and attributes to the Son, as John does, the creation of heaven
and earth. The new learning was Cristocentric and Christ was
made the creating force of God, coeternal and coequal with Him.
There is no trace of the anti-trinitarian heresy in Luther, Tyn-
dale, or Bale.

Early in the first act Adam states the doctrine of justification
by faith alone with no regard for man's deserving. Pater
Coelestis makes it clear that man is not saved by his own works
when he says to Isaias:

In vaine you offer your sacrifice to mee,
Discontent I am: with you beasts of Gomora,
And haue no pleasure when I your offrings see,
I abhorre your feastes, and your solemnity.
For your tradicions: my wayes ye set a part.
Your, workes are in vaine, I hate them from the hart.
(Actus Sextus)
Baleus Prolocutor rejects the doctrine of the freedom of the will of man to help attain his salvation: "Where is now freewill, whome the ypocrites comment." Man's will is of "smale treasure" as the will of God does all. In discussing the doctrine of predestination, Bale treats the positive aspect of election chiefly as he calls Abraham God's true elect and Moses His chosen servant. The lot of the chosen people is enviable since, though God may punish them, He never abandons them utterly. Bale reiterates the doctrine of absolute certainty of salvation for those who are among God's elect.

Here again in the first play of this cycle of doctrinal plays, as in The Three Laws, we find echoes of Tyndale. The very title, The Chief Promises of God, is a central theme in Tyndale's doctrinal treatises. We have seen that he defined the gospel, along with Luther, as the sum of the promises of God made throughout the ages. Faith is the believing of these promises. To believe them is to honor God; not to believe them is the essence of all sin. Thus Infidelitas or unbelief was made the root of all the vices in The Three Laws.

The Chief Promises of God has been called a prophet play in the tradition of the fifteenth century cycles, and it is undoubtedly similar to them. Bale, however, uses it to expound the new definition of the gospel put forth by Luther and later by Tyndale
in *A Pathway into the Holy Scripture*, which served as a prologue to the quarto version of his translation of the New Testament:

The righteousness that before God is of value, is to believe the promises of God, after the law hath confounded the conscience: as when the temporal law oftentimes condemneth the thief or murderer, and bringeth him to execution, so that he seeth nothing before him but present death; and then cometh good tidings, a charter from the king, and delivereth him. Likewise, when God's law hath brought the sinner into knowledge of himself, and hath confounded his conscience and opened unto him the wrath and vengeance of God; then cometh good tidings. The Evangelion sheweth unto him the promises of God in Christ, and how that Christ hath purchased pardon for him, hath satisfied the law for him, and appeased the wrath of God. (pp. 16-17)

It would be well to reread this statement by Tyndale of the new teaching before reading any plays of the new learning in the sixteenth century. The characterization, the plot, and the action would become clearer. It represents a theme upon which the various plays are variations and elaborations. In the same prologue, Tyndale adds another part of the new doctrine which is met with often in the plays:

and the promises rehearsed, which are contained in the prophets, in the psalms, and in divers places of the five books of Moses, *which preaching is called the Gospel or glad tidings;* then the hearts of them which are elect and chosen, begin to wax soft and melt at the bounteous mercy of God, and kindness shewed of Christ. For when the evangelion is preached, the Spirit of God entereth into them which God hath ordained and appointed unto eternal life; and openeth their inward eyes, and worketh such belief in them. (p. 19)
Bale's play rehearses these promises of God as contained in the prophets, psalms, and the books of Moses in order to serve as a sermon, the preaching of which would be a means whereby God moves the hearts of the elect, opens their "inward eyes," and works "belief in them." It almost seems that Bale is attempting to put Tyndale into another medium so that his message will reach more people. This closeness will appear throughout our examination of Bale's plays, which echo various of the Tyndale treatises.

Unlike The Three Laws, which may be classed as a morality play with its struggles of vices against the abstractions of the three laws, Bale's trilogy of plays beginning with The Chief Promises of God is modeled on the great medieval cycle plays. It is a short cycle intended to be played in a short time, but it is comprehensive enough to present most of the story of the fall and redemption of man. As in the longer cycles, the method of condensation is a summary narration of events not presented. The great mass of material and the great span of time covered in the long cycles made it imperative for these cycles, too, to condense. Also some condensed more than others, depending on the number of guilds needing a play for presentation and on other factors.

As in the great cycle plays, much information and action is narrated in the speech by God, who in Bale's play is called Pater Coelestis. Also like the cycle plays, Bale's cycle begins with a
speech by God in which he introduces himself and defines his
nature and attributes, as well as those of his Son and the Trinity.
In the medieval cycles, following the Genesis account, God calls
himself the sole creator of heaven and earth, angels and man,
but, as we have seen, in Bale's play great care is taken by Pater
Coelestis to point out that his Son is coequal with Him and actual-
ly the executor of creation. Thus Bale follows the account of
creation which emphasizes the divinity and power of Christ as did
Luther and the later Protestants. It will be remembered that
Milton made Christ the creator in Paradise Lost.

The Chief Promises of God, though it has some elements of
the cycle prophet plays, is more than a prophet play. It serves
the same function as the prophet play in preparing the audience
for the coming of Christ, but it has in addition the function of pre-
senting a summary of the history of man and his relation with God
down to the time of Christ. In the cycles this history is related
by a series of plays beginning sometimes with the fall of Lucifer
and sometimes with the creation and fall of man. Bale presents
it in summary form in a series of dialogues between Pater
Coelestis and seven prophets. The dialogue method enables Bale
to allow God to make His promises in the first person—a more
dramatic method of presentation than the narration of the older
cycles. Also Bale's play, as has been pointed out, serves to de-
fine the gospel of Christ in terms of the new learning as the sum of the promises of God to man throughout the ages. This gospel will be the good news preached by John the Baptist in the second play of Bale's cycle. In fact, John the Baptist appears in the last dialogue and is given the mission of preaching the New Testament and gospel of Christ. Thus is formed a link between the first two plays of the cycle.

John the Baptist's Preaching in the Wilderness

Bale leaves no doubt about the function of this second play which is to show the way to salvation by presenting the "heavenly verities"--

Which are, for our sin, most sovereign remedy;  
And for our souls' health so highly necessary,  
That without knowledge of them, we cannot have  
A true faith in him which died our souls to save.  
(pp. 129-130)

John preaches the effectiveness of the gospel of the one who is to come after him. Faith in this gospel will enable man to conquer all the seven deadly sins and help the unlearned sinner to understand the word of God.

The wise and learned the idiot will deface;  
Sinners shall exceed the outward saints in grace;  
Abjects of the world in knowledge will excel  
The consecrate rabbis by virtue of the Gospel.  
The poor man, by faith, shall very clearly deem  
The clause that will hard unto the lawyer seem;  
All that, aforetime, untoward did remain,  
The rule of God's word will now make straight and plain.  
(p. 132)
Here Bale repeats Luther's contention that knowledge gained by faith is valid and even superior to that derived from reason or philosophy. The simple sinner will be enlightened by the light of faith so that he will be able to know the meaning of the Scriptures and not be dependent on the Church for its interpretation. This teaching frees the individual conscience from Church authority and enables it to deal directly through Christ with God by reason of the gift of faith. Luther, however, later resorted to the authority of his own church in the interpretation of Scriptures to avoid a complete chaos of individual "inner light" interpretations.

Like the preachers of the medieval Catholic system, John calls on his audience to repent and turn to the Lord, but with the difference that the confession is public and general:

I know, blessed Lord! by plain experiment,
Most nigh unto health is he that showeth his sore.
Wherefore I confess, in place here evident,
The sinful living that I have used afore.
A wretched sinner I have been evermore--
Unthankful to thee; to man uncharitable;
And, in all my works, both false and deceivable.

(pp. 133-134)

Such a general confession found its place in the Book of Common Prayer as a replacement of the auricular confession once necessary as a preparation for receiving the Sacrament of the Altar. It is sufficient in the new doctrine for man's salvation. There is no need to rehearse the individual sins and their circumstances in the ear of the clergy. Man confesses openly here to the "blessed Lord,"
but secret confession to Him was just as acceptable. After the confession John the Baptist does not prescribe penance in the form of sacrifice of "calf nor goat," but he urges help to the poor as a means of pleasing God. Charity to the poor, which showed love of neighbor, was felt by Luther to be the only kind of good works worthy of the Christian's attention.

John's preaching of the word also causes remorse in another listener, Publicanus, whose "inward eyes" are opened. He is baptized "in token of repentance"; thus the author indicates a limitation of the magical power of the sacrament and confining it to a sign of an inner state of man's conscience.

Publicanus, who as a tax collector had been taking exorbitant sums from the people and keeping some of the money for himself, is not ordered to renounce his calling and give all his substance to the poor, but is told to conduct his lawful occupation according to law without taking extra money from the people. In other words, he may serve God as acceptably by doing his calling well as by turning to a religious order. To the reformers the various estates of the laymen were as worthy ways of life in the sight of God as the most religious of the orders. There was no special grace set aside for the ascetics or the virgins as was taught in the medieval treatises.

It will be remembered that Luther felt that Christ's sacrifice
was not the beginning of man's justification but the all-sufficing event which caused it. Man becomes righteous by imputation when Christ's merits are given to him in the gift of faith. His justification is not a long process of cooperation between God and man but an instantaneous gift from God. John the Baptist tries to get his audience to picture Christ in this way as an "all-sufficing light":

The baptism of me is the baptism of repentance;  
His baptism in faith bringeth full recoverance.  
My doctrine is hard, and full of threatenings;  
His words are demure, replete with wholesome blessings.  
I fear the conscience, with terror of the law;  
He, by the Gospel, man's soul will gently draw.  
A knowledge of sin the baptism of me to teach;  
Forgiveness by faith will be hereafter preach.  
I open the sore; he bringeth the remedy.  
I stir the conscience; he doth all pacify.  
As Essaye saith, I am the crier's voice;  
But he is the word and message of rejoice.  
The lantern I am; he is the very light;  
I prepare the way, but he maketh all things perfect.

(p. 137)

Here Bale seems to grasp Luther's distinction between the law and the gospel, between the harsh Moses and the sweet Christ, more clearly than in The Three Laws. This is Luther's picture of Christ as a gentle pacifier, and a gentle director of man's soul to God, as opposed to Christ the avenger of the Day of Judgment.

After John has preached thus to the people, Pharisaecus and Sadducaeus, who represent the papists, accuse him of preaching the new learning. They cannot bear to see this unlearned fellow
attempt to teach those who are learned in the law; they will have none of this "new fangled school." Besides being learned men they are the children of Abraham and cannot perish. John's reply comes from the ninth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which was a kind of reform manifesto dear to the heart of Luther, Tyndale, and Calvin. Paul says that they are not all Israel, which are of Israel; the children of Abraham's flesh are not the children of God, but rather, the children of the promise or the faith are the chosen seed. We shall examine a play written to illustrate this ninth chapter of Romans when we look into Jacob and Esau in a later chapter. Phariseus and Sadducaeus suspect John of heresy for preaching thus; he will bear looking into.

John is called on to baptize Jesus Christus, who describes his nature and mission as a savior rather than a judge. Pater Coeléstus speaks after the baptism owning this to be His Son and "only heart's delight" (p. 147). He continues saying that for the man of sin "Alone it is he that me doth pacify" (ibid.). The traditions of men are not to be followed, nor is Moses' law except as Christ interprets it, "For he alone knoweth my purpose towards you, And none else but he-- . . ." (ibid.). The significance of Bale's emphasis on the efficacy of Christ "alone," or "only," lies in the reformers' rebellion against the many mediators between Christ and man in the medieval system. Especially effective in
getting the ear of Christ for the sinful man was the Virgin Mary, Mother of Christ, who became more popular as a gentle mediator as Christ became more the avenger of the final judgment. Her powerful position may be seen in the art of the middle ages wherein she is depicted variously as queen of Heaven being crowned by God and Christ, as the mother and comforter of the baby Christ and the powerless wounded body of Christ, and as the great mother in ermine robe whose garment covered and protected all classes of society. 13

After the play closes, Baleus Prolocutor summarizes the significations of John's preaching. He preached not man's traditions but Jesus Christ to the people. His manner of preaching was not with "hard clothing" or "long prayers"; he did not wander in the desert and eat wild locusts to impress the people, but rather "His mind was that faith should purify the heart" (p. 149). The only penance which John urged was that man forsake his old life and follow the gospel of Christ. Bale admonishes man for his salvation's sake to follow Christ rather than the pope and the Catholic saints:

Give ear unto Christ; let man's vain fantasies go,
As the father bade by his most high commandment;
Hear neither Francis, Benedict, nor Bruno,
Albert, nor Dominic, for they new rulers invent;
Believe neither Pope, nor priest of his consent;
Follow Christ's Gospel, and therein fructify
To the praise of God, and his son Jesus glory.

(Ibid.)
The Biblical account of the preaching of John the Baptist and the baptism of Christ is followed faithfully by Bale in his cycle, as it was in the medieval cycle plays. The difference in the two treatments comes from the incidental or added doctrinal elements accompanying the main story. The Chester cycle has no Baptism play, but the other three great cycles place the story after Christ’s visit to the temple among the doctors. Actually there is very little doctrinal instruction in the cycles in proportion to the Biblical material, but there is some which would cause them to be objectionable to the reformers of the sixteenth century. It will be well to examine the doctrine in these cycles and compare it with that in Bale’s treatment of the same episodes. Such a comparison will serve to illustrate the change which took place in the drama as a result of a new theological system or a new interpretation and emphasis in the doctrines of Christianity. In the York plays Jesus is made to say that the baptismal water will have special virtue ever after his baptism:

> Anodir skill I schall þe tell,
> My wille is þis, þat fro þis day
> þe vertue of my baptyme dwelle
> In baptyme-watif euere and ay,
> Mankynde to taste,
> Throug my grace þerto to take alway
> þe haly gaste.

This belief in a kind of magical efficacy in the sign of the sacraments was one of the reformers’ objections to the old system.
Another example of these incidental doctrinal elements in the medieval cycles is the closing remark of John the Baptist to the audience in the York baptism play, "Now sirs, that barne that marie bare, be with you all." The reformers played down the role of Mary in salvation, returning the emphasis to Christ himself. In the Towneley Plays there are more Catholic doctrinal elements than in the York cycle, but they are still incidental to the main story. For example, Jesus commands John to baptize him "with oyle and creme that thou shalt make / vnto that worthi sacrament," and John follows his instructions saying: "here I the anoynt also / with oyle and creme, in this intent, / That men may wit, where so they go, / This is a worthy sacrament." He continues with more doctrine which would offend the reformers--the seven sacraments instead of the two allowed to be Scriptural:

Ther ar sex othere and no mo,
The which thi self to erthe has sent,
And in true tokyn, oone of tho,
The fyrst on the now is it spent.  

There is also mention of his mother by Jesus, and John goes out to preach the medieval lore of the seven deadly sins and the danger of dying suddenly without the proper sacramental preparation for death. It will be remembered that Bale makes John preach "not men's traditions, nor his own holy life, But to the people Christ Jesus did he preach, Willing his Gospel among them to be rise" (p. 148).
These doctrinal elements in the York and Towneley cycles are not as prominent or as numerous as those to be found in the *Ludus Coventriae* cycle. In the Baptism play in this cycle, John is made to preach the fear of "fyere brynnyng in hell" to persuade man to do penance for his trespasses:

Penitencial nunc agite
Appropinquabit regnum celorum
ffor your trespas penaunce do 3e
and 3e xall wyn hevyn dei deorum
In hevyn blysse ye xall wyn to be
Among þe blyssyd company omnium supernorum

. . . . . . . . . . .

Batyme I cowncell yow for to take
And do penaunce for your synnys sake
and for your offens amendy's 3e make
your synnys for to hyde.

The *Ludus Coventriae* John calls on man to do penance; Bale's John calls on man to repent. This is a basic point in Luther's teaching and one which is echoed in Tyndale. The exhortation to repent rests with the individual conscience entirely; the command to do penance, though it implies a contrite heart, is a matter between man and the clergy as representatives of God on earth. The command to do penance carries with it the necessity of knowing the vast lore on the sins and their circumstances, of distinguishing minutely the individual sins, and of obtaining from the confessor just the correct penance to fit the sin and its circumstances. Bale's John preaches that "Abjects of the world in knowledge will excel The consecrate
rabbis by virtue of the Gospel" (p. 132). By faith the poor man will understand what seems difficult to the lawyer; this is indeed "new learning." The John of the *Ludus Coventriae* cycle says that Jesus went into the wilderness to do penance to show man the necessity of doing penance for his sins. He preaches further the necessity of contrition, shrift, and penance:

Reconsyle jour-self and be to god plesaunt
With contryscion schryffte and penauns þe devyl may þe dryve

Shryfte of mowth loke þat þe make
And þan þe fende in helle so blake he xal þow nevyr more greve.

Shrift and penance are stressed again and again in this cycle of plays. John preaches that "God wyl be vengyd on man þat is both dum and mute þat wyl nevyr be shrevyn but evyr more doth delyre [act madly]," and that

Schryfte of mowthe may best þe saue
Penauns for synne what man wyl haue
whan þat his body is leyd in grave
His sowle xal go to blys.

If Everyman had taken the advice of this play there would have been no need for fear when Death summoned him. The character Knowledge was able to show him the way in time to save his soul so that all ended well. The *Ludus Coventriae* play ends with more exhortation to penance:

Good penauns þow to preche ful hertyly do I mene
Shryfft and satysfaccion evyr more to haue in thought
What man in good penauns and schryfte of mowth be sene
of god he is welbelovyd that all his worlde hath wrought
and all jinge of nowth deede make.
Now haue I tawght yow good penauns
god graunt yow grace at his plesauns
to haue of synne delyverauns
Ffor now my leve I take.\textsuperscript{24}

Denying to penance a place among the sacraments instituted by
Christ resulted in the most far-reaching changes in practical reli-
gion which came out of the Reformation. Its repercussions may be
seen in the drama which preached the new learning. Bale's plays
tell the same stories as the medieval cycle plays, but they tell
them with embellishments of the new doctrines, omitting the Catholic
doctrinal elements which were objectionable.

A brefe Comedy or enterlude concernyyge the temptacyon
of our lorde and sauer Jesus Christ by Sathan in the
desart.\textsuperscript{25}

The third play in Bale's doctrinal cycle is The Temptation of
Our Lord. In it the temptation-of-Christ episode is used to show
how Christ refutes the Devil with Scriptures. It will be remember-
ed that the Ludus Coventriae cycle interprets Jesus' going into the
wilderness as an attempt on his part to show man the necessity of
doing penance. But in Bale's play Jesus makes it plain that he
does not fast in order to teach men to fast:

But of my fastynge, thynke rather thys my cast,
Sathan to prouoke, to worke hys cursed intent,
And to teache yow wayes, hys myschifes to preuent,
By the worde of God, whych must be your defence,
Rather than fastynges to withstande hys vyolence.
Bale takes an indirect gibe at the papists when he presents Satan as a hermit who says that he knows nothing of Scriptures since he is given only to a life of contemplation. Satan, however, in spite of his denial of any knowledge of the Scriptures, quotes readily from them to tempt Jesus to throw himself off the pinnacle. Jesus accuses him of wrenching the Scriptures and quoting only that part which suits his purpose as the papist doctors do.

Like Bale's Temptation, three of the medieval cycle plays tell the story of the temptation of Jesus by the Devil as it appears in the Bible. The Towneley cycle alone has no temptation play. In these three cycles the play comes directly after that of John the Baptist as it does in Bale's cycle. However, the similarity between the medieval cycle versions and Bale's ends here. We have seen that Bale's message in the play is the importance of Scriptures in man's fight against Satan. The message of the great cycle plays is that though man is tempted by the three vices of Adam, i.e., gluttony, vainglory, and covetousness, he has been created capable of withstanding the temptations as Jesus does in the play. It is true that Jesus uses quotations from the Scriptures to resist Satan in the medieval cycle plays as he does in Bale's play and in the Biblical account, but the central theme of the cycle plays is not the emphasis on Scriptures as the chief means of resisting the devil and of patterning one's life. It is rather the ever-present threat
of the deadly sins to man and the manner in which Jesus over-
comes them through grace. At the end of the play in the Chester
cycle the Doctor is made to explain the significance of the tempta-
tion story:

Loe, lordinges, Godes righteousnes,  
As Gregorye maketh mynde expresse,  
Synce our forfather overcomen was,  
By three things to doe evill;  
Glotione, vaine glorye, their be towre,  
Covetouse of highnes also,  
By thes three poynites, boute moe, Christe hase overcomen  
the devill.\textsuperscript{26}

Also in the \textit{Ludus Coventriæ} cycle there is a conference of devils
including Belyall, Belsabub, and Sathan with a plan to tempt Jesus
in these same three sins:

The best wytt I holde it be  
hym to tempte in synyns thre  
the whiche mankende is frelte  
dothe ffare soneste Alway.\textsuperscript{27}

The moral is that though man will be tempted by Satan throughout
his life, he will be able to withstand the temptations:

Ffor god hath the ʒovyn myght and mayn  
hym for to with-sytt evyr at nede.\textsuperscript{28}

Bale's moral is that the Scriptures are a powerful weapon
against the temptations of the Devil. The people should have the
word of God in their own language so that they can use it in their
fight against the everpresent Satan. Although (in Bale's play) Satan
is defeated in his efforts to tempt Jesus, he takes comfort for the
future when Jesus is dead and the "vycar at Rome" will be his
friend. Bale's Jesus is confident that though man will suffer from these efforts of the vicar of Rome and Satan, he will not perish, since God has promised that his faithful shall tread the dragon underneath their feet. Baleus Prolocutor concludes the play and the cycle with a doctrinal speech of the new learning. "Where fayth take rotynge, the deuyll can neuer greue [man]," he says. Christ never taught fastings to withstand the devil, but rather a strong faith and the Scriptures are His remedy. The papists, he says, "brynge in fastynge, but they leue out Scriptum est." He wants it understood, however, that he does not condemn fasting as such since it is one of the fruits of faith, though it plays no part in man's justification.

In this short cycle of three plays, Bale preaches the doctrines of the new learning without aid of vices or other comic elements to relieve the instruction. Instruction in dramatic form, however, is always more interesting than outright preaching, and in the case of Bale's cycle the instruction must have proved sensational when the three plays were put on in Kilkenny, Ireland, at the Market Cross on the day Mary was crowned Queen of England and amid joyous Catholic celebrations elsewhere. The intrepid Bale defied the Catholics there until he barely escaped with his life to the continent.

The cycle or trilogy of plays rehearses the promises of God...
to man and defines the gospel as the sum of these promises. Faith is the believing of God's promises. John the Baptist's message is to "repent" and lead a renewed life showing the fruits of faith. Jesus' message in the third play is to depend on the Scriptures as a help against Satan. These doctrinal messages differ from the lessons drawn from the same Biblical episodes in the medieval cycle plays. The Catholic admonition of "do penance!" is changed to "repent and believe the promises of God."

As in the case of The Three Laws, echoes of Tyndale may be found in Bale's three cycle plays. Similarly in the fourth extant play of Bale, to be considered next, we shall see a direct debt to Tyndale.

**KING JOHAN**

Bale's King Johan was certainly written by 1536, revised in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, and finally rediscovered and published in the nineteenth century. It is probably the first historical play in English, but allegorical characters are worked into the historical setting producing a kind of historical morality play. Its theme is the divine right of kings to rule their nations absolutely and the usurpation of this power by the Pope and the bishops in England. Bale takes the quarrel between King John and the Pope over the appointment of Stephen Langton to the Archbishopric of
Canterbury; makes John into a martyr in the cause of the Widow England; portrays the Clergy as evil, seditious, and avaricious; and preaches the divine origin of kings and their right to rule without question. He also manages to assert some doctrines of the new learning.

Why the thirteenth century King John? What made Bale think of him for his play? The grave of King John at Worcester was opened in 1529, and there exists a poem written in Bale's handwriting in honor of the occasion. We shall also find that Tyndale had King John in mind in 1529 and used him in a treatise to illustrate the evils of the clergy. It would seem that Bale is again following Tyndale. Before going into Tyndale's treatise and Bale's play it may be well to review Henry VIII's struggle for power against the clergy and the Pope after the fall of Wolsey. In this struggle Henry was supported by advocates of the new learning, Tyndale and Bale. Tyndale's 1529 treatise, the Obedience of a Christian Man, gave Scriptural evidence of the rightness of Henry's position, and Bale's King Johan drew example from history to justify the strong measures taken against the English clergy and the Roman Pope. We have seen (above Chapter II) that Tyndale's treatise was brought to the attention of Henry in 1529 by Anne Boleyn and was favorably looked upon by the monarch who was eyeing the wealth, power, and corruption of the clergy and chafing under the
delaying tactics of the Pope in the divorce suit. Tyndale's words probably strengthened Henry over the next five years in the actions by which the spiritual jurisdiction of the clergy was destroyed: the Praemunire applied to all the clergy, 1531; the Supplication of the Commons against the Ordinaries, the following year; the limiting of the benefit of clergy; the act restraining citations; and the act for the Submission of the Clergy and Restraint of Appeals, 1534, by which the clergy were neither to execute their old canons or constitutions nor make new ones without the assent of the King, and a commission of thirty-two persons appointed by the King was to revise the canons. 32 In fact, Henry echoes Tyndale in an answer to the new Archbishop Cranmer, who had asked to be permitted to proceed in the final determination of the "King's Business." Although he grants the humble request, he reminds the Archbishop that he is nothing more than the principal minister of the spiritual jurisdiction belonging to the crown, and that the sovereign recognizes no superior but God, and is not subject to the laws of any earthly creature. 33 We shall find these words very close to Tyndale's in the Obedience of a Christian Man. Besides the struggle with the clergy, Henry waged a battle with the Pope which finally resulted in the complete expulsion of the Pope's jurisdiction in English church affairs--the only sphere where he had ever had any legal jurisdiction in England. These two struggles for power are reflected in Bale's King Johan,
where Clergy is a close friend of Sedition in the conspiracy against the king to turn the three estates against him and help usurp his power for the Pope. Probably Bale’s play is an actual part of these two battles with the purpose of helping make popular the steps taken by Henry against the clergy and the Pope. After the papal sentence against Henry in the divorce suit, in 1533, the complete severance from Rome began. First, in 1534, payment of annates to the Pope was completely forbidden, and the "Pope’s Holiness" in statutes became "The Bishop of Rome, otherwise called the Pope." 34 In the same year the act concerning Peter-pence and dispensations, earlier called "a Bill for the abrogation of the usurped authority of the Roman Pontiff," was passed. 35 Appeals to the Pope were prohibited in the already-mentioned act for the Submission of the Clergy, 1534. A new heresy act obviated many heresies against the Pope, and the convocation and the universities made a declaration that the Pope had no power in England since he was only the Bishop of Rome. Henry made official his title Supreme Head of the Church of England. The next year, 1535, it was ordered that every preacher in England should preach at least once against the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome. 36 The bishops’ oath was to be to the king only, while the clergy now swore obedience to their diocesans and further swore to renounce the Pope, his constitutions, and decrees
forever. There was an active campaign to turn the clergy and the people against the Pope and to make the legislative acts against him seem reasonable. In 1536 a law made it a Praemunire to extol the authority of the Bishop of Rome, and Henry refused a summons to a general council called by the Pope, denying his authority to call a council and repudiating the primacy of the Apostolic See. The Convocation under direction of Cromwell declared that Christendom had no head in Rome. 37

It seems most likely that Bale's King Johan was written sometime in 1534 or 1535 when preachers were ordered to preach against the usurped power of the Pope. It was not only not heretical to write or speak against the Pope; on the contrary it was patriotic, expedient, and indeed compulsory to do so. In this constitutional struggle, Henry VIII was attacking the power of the clergy and the Pope but not the religious beliefs they represented. Tyndale and Bale attacked ostensibly the power of the clergy and the Pope, but they also worked in an attack on the Catholic beliefs and inserted new-learning doctrines.

In 1528, Tyndale had urged the King that it was not sufficient to take the word of the clergy for the justice of an accusation. It is the King's duty to test their actions by Scriptures:

Let the temporal power, to whom God hath given the sword to take vengeance, look or ever that they leap, and see what they do. Let the causes be disputed before them, and
let him that is accused have room to answer for himself. The powers, to whom God hath committed the sword, shall give accounts for every drop of blood that is shed on earth. Then shall their ignorance not excuse them, nor the saying of the hypocrites help them, "My soul for yours, your grace shall do a meritorious deed"; "your grace ought not to hear them"; "it is an old heresy condemned by the church." The king ought to look in the scripture, and see whether it were truly condemned or no, if he will punish it. 38

Henry VIII assumed the function of interpreting the Scriptures when he declared himself Supreme Head of the Church of England.

Since he must make decisions on religious doctrines, he must have a guide; Tyndale had suggested the Scriptures for this guide. Imperial Majesty, representing Henry VIII in King Johan, uses the Scriptures as authority to exile the Pope.

As we examine Bale's King Johan, we shall see a closeness to Tyndale's Obedience of a Christian Man, which makes it seem that the playwright took certain parts of Tyndale's treatise and worked them into a play presenting King John as a good and wise monarch who sacrifices his crown and submits to Pope Innocent to save the Widow England from the ravages of war. The influence of the Pope is presented in the character Sedition, the vice of the play, who is also Stephen Langton, the unwelcome papal appointee to the Archbishorshipric of Canterbury. It is the function of the vice to see to it that no prince has his subjects' obedience "Except yt doth stand, w↑ the popes p'hemynece" (ll. 221-222).

He says that he hides in various members of the clergy and under
"ear confession" and "Benedicite." The Church is presented as infected with Sedition, Dissimulation, Usurped Power, and Private Wealth--characters who beset King John and resist his attempt to reform the clergy, to punish them for their crimes to the Widow England and to himself, and to limit their appeals to Rome. These are the same charges against the English Church and the clergy that were made by Henry VIII and the Commons, who took turns accusing the clergy and sending Submissions to Convocation for them to admit. We have seen that the whole clergy was accused under Praemunire. Bishop Fisher was accused of sedition and executed, as were the Holy Maid of Kent and her conspirators. The Pope was denounced for usurping power, and the private wealth of the monasteries was looked on as an evil within Henry's realm. Like John, Henry was attempting a reform of the clergy, punishment of their crime of Praemunire, and a limitation of their appeals to Rome. Private Wealth (Cardinal Pandulphus), in the play, puts John's kingdom under interdict, and finally excommunicates him. John submits and receives his crown again from the Pope as a symbol of his obedience to papal power. He is later murdered by Simon of Swinsett, a monk who believes firmly that he will go immediately to heaven for this act against John, the enemy of the Church.

Like Tyndale, Bale attacks the Church's use of the curse and
excommunication for gaining power and setting one king against another rather than for the salvation of souls. Besides these political aspects of the play, there is an exhortation to preach the Gospel and to depend on the Scriptures for guidance. The political theory of the divine right of kings is itself Scriptural, as Tyndale and Bale both maintain. God's Word has been exiled from England by the Papists, laments the Widow England, and with His Word her husband, who is God, has also been exiled, since He will not remain where His Word is not.

Sedition boasts that Nobility believes only what Holy Church tells him. John asks whether Nobility gives any credence to "criste holy gospell." Sedition answers:

no sq by the messe, but he callyth them heretycke
pt preche pe gospell, & sedicyows scymatycke
(ll. 281-282)

John accuses Clergy of holding England in disdain with his Latin hours, "serymonyes & popety playes," so that the Holy Word decays in the land (ll. 417-418). The gospel is not highly regarded in England and Usurped Power, the Pope, would refuse absolution to Dissimulation, the messenger of the Clergy, if he admitted to preaching it.

As in Tyndale's writings, the theme of know-the-Scriptures, depend-on-the-Scriptures, preach-the-Scriptures is ever present. When King John is cursed by the Cardinal, he challenges him to
prove the curse by Scripture as he will not accept any curse not directly from the Scriptures. The Cardinal, however, is satisfied with what the Holy Father approves. Even Civil Order thinks poorly of the security of the Scripture, and Commonalty is presented as blind and povertystricken because he has not had the Word of God preached to him.

But these are minor themes in the play, secondary to the main contention that the king, as a minister of God, is subject only to the judgment of God and should not be under the dominion of the Pope or the clergy. Tyndale had written thus of the king's relation to God in the Obedience of a Christian Man:

Hereby seest thou that the king is, in this world, without law; and may at his lust do right or wrong, and shall give accounts but to God only. (p. 178)

And in even stronger language he writes that only God may judge the king:

He that judgeth the king judgeth God; and he that layeth hands on the king layeth hand on God; and he that resisteth the king resisteth God, and damneth God's law and ordinance. If the subjects sin, they must be reserved unto the king's judgment. If the king sin, he must be reserved unto the judgment, wrath, and vengeance of God. (p. 177)

Bale makes England reply as follows to Sedition, when he boasts that he will subdue the king with the help of the Pope:

trwly of the devyll, they are þt do onythyng to the subdewyng, of ony christen kyng for be he good or bade, he is of gode apoytyng the good for the good, þe badde ys for yll doyng (11. 101-104)
Tyndale similarly had written that God gives the people a good or a bad king according to their deeds:

Heads and governors are ordained of God, and are even the gift of God, whether they be good or bad. And whatsoever is done to us by them, that doth God, be it good or bad. If they be evil, why are they evil? Verily, for our wickedness' sake are they evil; because that when they were good, we would not receive that goodness of the hand of God, and be thankful, submitting ourselves unto his laws and ordinances; but abused the goodness of God unto our sensual and beastly lusts. (p. 194)

In Bale's play, King John will not forsake the Widow England because "god hath sett me, by his apoyntment Ivst to further thy cavse, & to maytayne p¹ Ryght" (ll. 137-138).

In another scene Tyndale's words are echoed. Clergy, in King Johan, takes an oath to support the king, but nevertheless plots to subdue him for his opposition to Holy Church. At first Nobility defends the king, but Clergy persuades him that it is not his duty to support his prince since such action might bring Holy Church to thraldom. Nobility argues that Christ paid tribute to Caesar, but Clergy answers that then Christ was not above the temporal head whereas now his vicar, the Pope, is above princes. Clergy warns Nobility that he must listen to Holy Church and not reason about such high matters. Nobility is confused, but he submits since he knows that he is unlearned in such things. This scene illustrates Tyndale's discussion of the captivity of Kings who from birth are surrounded by flatterers or men already
"sworn true" to the Pope. If any of the nobles of the realm tends to remain true to the king, he writes, the papists will provide him with a "ghostly father" who will persuade him to abandon the king.

Tyndale writes that the followers of the Pope, or Antichrist, have reduced the kings to servitude:

Ye tread them under your feet, and lead them captive, and have made them your bond-servants to wait on your filthy lusts, and to avenge your malice on every man, contrary unto the right of God's word. (p. 247)

In Bale's play Sedition plots with the other vices and with Clergy and the Pope to subdue King John so thoroughly that England shall rue it for three hundred years.

Bale refers to the charge against the clergy of accumulating wealth through unjust means. Dissimulation boasts that the Clergy came into its Private Wealth through him, and Private Wealth in turn boasts that Usurped Power, the Pope, first came to power through him. Sedition, not to be left out of this bragging contest, makes the three--Dissimulation, Private Wealth, and Usurped Power--bear him on stage on their backs to show their part in his presence in every country. In like manner Tyndale writes that the clergy have robbed the realm of its riches as well as of the word of God:

they have robbed all realms, not of God's word only, but of all wealth and prosperity; and have driven peace out of all lands, and withdrawn themselves from all obedience to princes, and have separated themselves from the lay-men, counting them viler than dogs; and
have set up that great idol, the whore of Babylon, 
antichrist of Rome, whom they call pope; and have con-
spired against all commonwealths, and have made them 
a several kingdom, wherein it is lawful, unpunished, to 
work all abomination. In every parish have they spies, 
and in every great man's house, and in every tavern 
and alehouse. And through confessions know they all 
secrets, so that no man may open his mouth to rebuke 
whatsoever they do, but that he shall be shortly made 
a heretic. (p. 191)

In like manner, we have seen Sedition plan to hide under "ear-
confession" and "Benedicite" if he is driven out of the monasteries, 
which John threatens to destroy if necessary to get rid of him.
The Pope and his vices drive peace out of England and withdraw 
their obedience from King John. The vices, who represent the 
Catholic clergy, fear that if John is not subdued, he may succeed 
in his reform measurers and they will have to give up their benefit 
of clergy and answer for their crimes like the "rascal sorte, of 
prophane layete" (l. 919).

The craft of the Pope and the bishops, writes Tyndale, is to 
keep the princes' kingdoms small so that no one king can be a 
menace to the authority of Holy Church:

For as long as the kings be small, if God would open 
the eyes of any to set a reformation in his realm, 
then should the pope interdict his land, and send in 
other princes to conquer it. (p. 235)

Similarly in Bale's play Usurped Power, the Pope, places England 
under an interdict because of a proposed reform of the clergy and 
calls in the King of France and others to help defeat King John.
Tyndale also wrote against one king fighting another for the sake of the Pope:

Kings were ordained then, as I before said, and the sword put in their hands, to take vengeance of evil-doers, that other might fear: and were not ordained to fight one against another, or to rise against the emperor to defend the false authority of the pope, that very antichrist. (p. 185)

In Bale's play Private Wealth, the Cardinal, threatens John with the punishment of Holy Church and John rebukes him:

Christ wyll not his, the p'nces to correcte but to ther p'[s]cept're, rerther to be subiecte the office of yow, ys not to bere yp sword but to geve counself, acording to god's word

.......

yet are ye beců, soche myghty lordž this howr that ye are able, to subdewe all p'ncet powr
(ll. 1347-54)

Bale has ingeniously taken the pronouncements of Tyndale and applied them to a historical situation from the Chronicles, thus producing a play with apt contemporary political application. It will be remembered that Luther, too, saw the only hope for reform of the church in the Christian Princes.

So far we have pointed out various similarities between Bale's play King Johan and Tyndale's Obedience of a Christian Man. Tyndale, in 1529, was arguing for reform of the clergy and expulsion of the power of the Pope from England; Bale, probably several years later, seems to be justifying the various steps of reform already taken by Henry VIII against the clergy and the Pope.
In Tyndale's summary of the message of his treatise, written certainly before Bale made a Protestant hero out of this rebel king, he uses the case of King John as an example of the tyranny of the clergy over the kings:

Read the chronicles of England, (out of which yet they have put a great part of their wickedness,) and thou shalt find them always both rebellious and disobedient to the kings, and also churlish and unthankful; so that when all the realm gave the king somewhat to maintain him in his right, they would not give a mite. Consider the story of king John, where I doubt not but they have put the best and fairest for themselves, and the worst of king John: for I suppose they make the chronicles themselves. Compare the doings of their holy church (as they ever call it) unto the learning of Christ and of his apostles. Did not the legate of Rome assoil all the lords of the realm of their due obedience, which they ought to the king by the ordinance of God? Would he not have cursed the king with his solemn pomp, because he would have done that office which God commandeth every king to do, and wherefore God hath put the sword in every king's hand? that is to wit, because king John would have punished a wicked clerk that had coined false money. The laymen that had not done half so great faults must die, but the clerk must go escape free! Sent not the pope also unto the king of France remission of his sins, to go and conquer king John's realm? So now remission of sins cometh not by faith in the testament that God hath made in Christ's blood, but by fighting and murdering for the pope's pleasure. Last of all, was not king John fain to deliver his crown unto the legate, and to yield up his realm unto the pope wherefore we pay Peter-pence? They might be called the polling-pence of false prophets well enough. They care not by what mischief they come by their purpose. War and conquering of lands is their harvest. (pp. 338-339)

This passage could well be a résumé of Bale's play; here again Bale is clothing Tyndale in dramatic form. 

It is also easy to
see why this treatise against the clergy found favor with Anne Boleyn and Henry VIII but not with the bishops.

We have reviewed the progress of the struggle waged by Henry and the Commons against the spiritual jurisdiction of the clergy which had been granted them by various kings since the struggle with John in the early thirteenth century. Along with the fight against the clergy Henry also waged a legal battle against the Pope and finally against the monasteries, destroying them utterly and confiscating their wealth. As we have seen, this three-pronged struggle against hostile powers within the realm is the theme of Bale’s King Johan. Throughout the play there are references to the abuses of the clergy and the papal system against which Henry and his Parliament legislated in the long legal maneuvering which ended in the submission of the clergy, the denial of the primacy of the Pope in Christendom, and the destruction of the monasteries. The Widow England accuses the Clergy and the monks and friars of bringing her to ruin and robbing the realm of its wealth and the Word of God. The Clergy and the monks harbor Sedition in every land; they are agents of the Pope. So far the play has enumerated the three enemies against which Henry legislated in the early fifteen-thirties: the clergy, the monks, and the Pope. Clergy asks John for the same privileges as his predecessors have granted them, but John promises only what they deserve, i.e., the abate-
ment of their pride. The matter of the conflict in oaths of obedience to the King and to the Pope is discussed in relation to the Clergy and the Nobility. Henry VIII attacked the bishops' oaths to the Pope as dividing their loyalty; Cranmer qualified his oath to the Pope to make his supreme allegiance to Henry clear; finally they took only an oath to the king. Bale makes his Clergy submit as Henry forced his to do, but the submission is only a blind for seditious activities. They will fight for the liberties of Holy Church with the aid of the Pope in spite of their oaths.

The evils of the monasteries and their inhabitants are rehearsed by Dissimulation and Sedition. The "liberties" of the Church, which will be defended by the evil coalition of vices, include: benefit of clergy and sanctuary, which was limited in Henry's time; appeals to Rome, which were also limited and finally forbidden by Henry; the power of the Pope to excommunicate the king and his subjects, which disappeared with the declaration against the primacy of the Pope; the right of the monasteries to their wealth and power, which Henry destroyed; oaths of allegiance to the Pope, which were made illegal; payment of annates, tithes, and Peterpence to Rome, which were cut off in the acts against the power of the Pope by Henry and the Parliament. These "liberites" of the church are shown to be the seditious means by which the clergy and the Pope usurp the power and authority of the king. In the
case of King John the ending is unhappy since the Pope and the clergy completely subdue him and finally murder him. If the play had ended after John's death, the audience would have had to draw their own conclusion that this might happen to their present King Henry in his struggle with these same two--the clergy and the Pope. In the extant version of the play, however, a concluding act or scene explains fully the contemporary application of the first part of the play. Verity shames Nobility, Clergy, and Civil Order into repentance for the way they have treated their king. The time of action shifts to the reign of Henry VIII as Imperial Majesty admits that he had sent Verity to make his three estates repent. Verity lectures the three of them further on disobedience to the king and makes them promise to exile the Pope from the land. They will help take Private Wealth out of the monasteries, preach the Word of God in the land, and make Henry the supreme head of the Church. As we have seen, these were Henry's requirements of the clergy and the Parliament in his constitutional struggle for absolute authority within the commonwealth.

Still not certain that the audience grasped the import of the action, Bale brings in the vice Sedition and makes him confess his double-dealings in behalf of the Pope. He warns Henry that some of the bishops laugh at his injunctions to preach the gospel, or do not enforce them because they are busy hunting heretics. For this reason:
In your parlement, commaude yow what ye wyll
The popes ceremonyes, shall drowne the ye Gospell styl.

(ll. 2475-76)

Sedition admits that he returned to England to serve Henry "lyke as I ded kynge Iohn." Henry, or Imperial Majesty, orders him hanged and his head mounted on London Bridge. Could this be a reference to Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who was similarly treated for his refusal to take the oath of succession? He was executed in 1535 and his head was put atop the bridge. Because of the adverse criticism such an act brought forth on the continent, Henry's ambassadors were especially instructed how to answer the charges, and Cromwell wrote an elaborate defense of the action to the Court of Rome in which he accused Fisher, and also More, of seditious behavior. 40

This last act of the play also makes mention of the measures being taken against the despised sect of the Anabaptists, "a secte newe rysen of late." In 1535, fourteen of them who had come into the country from Holland were burned for their beliefs.

The play closes with the three estates who had rebelled against King John promising to do their function faithfully in the future. Another short section has been added later mentioning the Queen and commending her for also subduing the papists and the Anabaptists, an obvious compliment to Elizabeth for whom the play may have been produced.
The main purpose of Bale's *King Johan* seems to have been to give support to Henry and his constitutional struggle against the clergy and the Pope, but it also manages to include some doctrines of the new learning. Sometimes Bale achieves his ends by attacking, satirizing, or parodying the doctrines or ceremonies of the papists; sometimes he preaches outright the new learning. He condemns the use of the curse or excommunication to uphold the power of the Pope rather than for the salvation of men's souls. He attacks the "popish purgatory" which has impoverished the Commonalty. The Widow England is clean undone by the "false merchandyse yowʳ pardons, yowʳ bulle, yowʳ purgatory pyckepurse yowʳ lent haste, yowʳ schryfte" (ll. 1645-17). The use of relics is ridiculed, reminiscent of Heywood and Chaucer, with such relics as a bone of the blessed Trinity, a "dram of þe tord, of swete seynt barnabe," a feather from Saint Michael's wing, a piece of David's harp string, a "lowse of seynt ffræuc‡," and the "lachett, of swett seynt thom₂'s shewe." These relics help effect absolution for Clergy "a pena et culpa, wᵗ a thowsand dayes pdon."

Bale parodies confession and absolution, making Sedition hear the confession of Nobility, who has sinned against God, offended in the seven deadly sins, broken the ten commandments, done no works of charity, and kept his five bodily wits "on-godly." However, Sedition is only interested in whether Nobility believes in
what Holy Church teaches, and whether he flees from the "new lernýg." He asks whether he can say his creed and his Latin Ave Maria, and whether he believes in purgatory and in holy bread. Since Nobility satisfies Sedition in these matters, he is deemed ready for absolution, but before granting it, Sedition makes him promise to help subdue King John. Nobility is doubtful about treason to his king, but Sedition threatens him with damnation if he does not obey Holy Church. Nobility submits and is absolved of all obedience to the King, "In nomine Domini, Pape, amen."

Bale calls the church the "faithful congregation," Tyndale's term. He preaches the Word of God as a remedy for all evil, and the Scriptures as a test of all laws. He makes King John accuse Nobility of despairing in God and thinking Christ's death insufficient, since he wishes to establish perpetuities for his soul. These doctrines of the new-learning are incidental and unobtrusive in the play as a whole. The main theme—the absoluteness of the king's power and the usurped power of the clergy and the Pope—is also new learning, but it was sanctioned by Henry, who for political purposes went along with the new learning thus far. Bale does not present the complete system of new doctrine in King Johan; rather, he attacks the old and gives only that portion of the new learning which was politically expedient.

The great weapon the Church had in the curse and excommun-
ipation is presented in King Johan as evil when it is used to uphold the usurped power of the Pope and to cause kings to fight kings for the Pope's benefit. In 1535 after the execution of More and Fisher, a Bull of Excommunication against Henry VIII was prepared by the newly elected Pope, Paul the Third. Henry and Cromwell knew about it even before its issuance. In it the Defender of the Faith is accused of having fallen from the faith. The Bull enumerates his crimes:

He denies that the Roman Pontiff is the head of the Church and the Vicar of Christ: he calls himself Supreme Head of the Church of England. The hardness of his heart resembles Pharaoh. His adulteries, his murders, his sacrilegious outrages are innumerable. He burns and scatters the bones of saints: and, himself the fellest of wild beasts, he stables wild beasts in the desecrated homes of religion.

Henry is commanded to present himself before the Pope within ninety days to answer the charges or be subject to excommunica-
tion. The Bull further states the consequences of the excommunica-
tion to Henry and his people:

we deprive him of his kingdom, them of their goods: and if they depart from the number of the living in an impenitent state, we decree that they ought to lack Christian burial, we smite them with the sword of anathema, malediction, and eternal damnation. Their lands, their churches, their religious houses we place under an interdict, so that none of the office of religion may be performed, not even on the pretext of indulgence granted... we command all the subjects or dependents of the King and his followers to renounce their obedience, and take up arms against them:... Let not foreign nations hold commerce with them: but
rather capture their goods and persons; let princes pursue them with war, so long as they remain in error and rebellion. 43

The sentence was to be fixed to church doors and proclaimed in every church within three days "with bells and banners, with candles lit and then extinguished." It has been said by Froude that the bull was published in 1538, but Dixon thinks it may not have been officially published. 44 It was ordered to be set up on the church doors in Tournay, Bruges, and Dunkirk; but were the orders carried out? Would the monarchs of Europe dare publish such a sentence against the King of England? Published or not, however, it was well known--to Henry and Cromwell through spies at Rome, and to the heads of the other governments.

We have seen that Bale's King Johan, written by 1536 or at the latest by 1539, presented the curse and excommunication of the king as evil. After hearing the curse pronounced on him by Cardinal Pandulphus, King John says in horror, "ye cowde do nomor, & ye cam fro the devyll of hell . . . ys this the charyte of yt ye call the churche" (ll. 1379, 1381). King John is a pathetic figure as he is subdued by his enemies, cursed by the Church, forced to give up his crown, and murdered. Bale doubtless wished to imply that Henry, too, was pathetic in being cursed by the Pope and his land put under an interdict. The play would serve as powerful propaganda to show the people the real culprits in the
sentence of excommunication against Henry. King John, fighting
heroically against the clergy and the Pope, is defeated; King Henry,
waging an equally heroic battle against the same enemies, will be
victorious if he is supported by his three estates—Commonalty,
Nobility, and a reformed Clergy.

John Bale's plays are the earliest in date of the new-learning
plays which have survived. Harris gives evidence which points to
as early a year as 1531 for the original version of The Three Laws. 45
Certainly it and King Johan were in existence by 1536 when Bale
listed them in his Anglorum Heliades. The small cycle probably
dates around 1538 when it was said on the title page of the 1547
edition to have been compiled by the author. Bale was concerned
with the nature of laws and with the reform of ecclesiastical laws
promised by Henry and his commission of thirty-two. He supported
Henry in his divorce suit and in his struggle against the clergy,
the Pope, and the monasteries. He condemned without restraint
the Pope and his Catholic ceremonies and doctrines. He preached
the doctrines of Luther, many of which he seems to have found in
Tyndale, as indicated by the verbal and ideological similarities be-
tween the writings of these two reformers. Especially influential
were Tyndale's Parable of the Wicked Mammon (1528), A Pathway
into The Holy Scripture (153-), and the Obedience of a Christian
Man (1529).
To understand the characters and situations in Bale's plays it is necessary to be familiar with the doctrines of the new learning as well as with those of the old. To appreciate his humor at the expense of the old religion, it is necessary to realize the intense hatred and fear of the Pope which was felt in England from the fifteen-thirties to the end of the century. Such hatred and fear would allow ribald jokes at the expense of the papists, satire on their ceremonies, and parodies on their creeds. During Henry's struggle against the Pope and at his final expulsion, the papists were national enemies, political as well as religious. They were in the same category as the devils and the vices which plagued mankind. The modern reader cannot appreciate humor at the expense of a still revered sect, but Bale and his audience were not so confined by tolerance. They probably laughed heartily at the monks, friars, priests, bishops, and popes in compromising situations.

Henry VIII wanted to be rid of any spiritual jurisdiction which entailed fees to the Pope, and he wanted to deprive the clergy of any appeal to a higher authority, but he fully intended to maintain Catholic doctrine and ceremony in England, without the help of Rome. In achieving these ends he made use of such new-learning men as Cranmer, Cromwell, Latimer, and even Tyndale, and tolerated others such as Bale and Simon Fish. These men desired not only
to be rid of the Pope's jurisdiction over the clergy; they desired also to further the reform of doctrine. The Pope had usurped power from the king, it was true, but the men of the new learning thought that he had also usurped power from Christ, God, and the Holy Ghost, and that this usurpation needed correction even more than the other. Thus Henry furthered the reform of doctrine in spite of himself by attacking the Pope, an enemy common to him and the reformers. Perceiving his error he tried to reverse the trend with the Act of the Six Articles, or the "Act for abolishing of diversity of opinions" (1539), but even the heavy penalties which these Articles of the old system carried did not stop the march of progress toward a reinterpretation of Christian doctrines. Bale and others went into exile in Germany, where they were further indoctrinated in the new learning. During the reign of Edward VI they returned with renewed vigor to carry on the reform.
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CHAPTER IV

THE NEW LEARNING IN OTHER SIXTEENTH CENTURY PLAYS:

THE RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD, LUSTY JUVENTUS,

NICE WANTON, MISOGONUS, THE LIFE AND REPENTANCE

OF MARIE MAGDALENE, AND NEW CUSTOM

These six plays:

Resurrection of Our Lord
Lusty Juventus
Nice Wanton
Misogonus
The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene
New Custom

date roughly from the reign of Edward VI to the early years of
Elizabeth's reign. They are plays of the new learning, but they
are less violently abusive of the old system than are Bale's plays.
They show the progress of the Reformation doctrine as it became
officially accepted in England. They preach its tenets and reflect
its presence, but they are not so belligerent in their attack on the
Pope and the Papists as were the plays written when the clergy
was ordered to preach at least once a year against the Pope. The
author of Lusty Juventus laments that the fruits of faith have not
come to the country even though the new doctrine has been with
them for some time; sin is still present. In New Custom the
later vestment controversy is touched upon.
RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD

The Resurrection of Our Lord, extant in manuscript in four fragments, is divided into "playes" for the first and second days. It tells the story of the rolling back of the stone from the sepulcher and the appearance of the risen Christ to Mary and the apostles. Although it is anonymous, W. T. Davies thinks that it was probably written by John Bale. He identifies it with Bale's De Christi Resurrectione and De Sepulta & resurrect. Doctrinally it is a new-learning play, and for that reason might have been written by Bale. But from other internal evidence, both doctrinal and metrical, it appears so different from Bale's extant plays that it would be unsound to name him the author.

Metrically the play does not read like Bale's work. Many of the lines are from fifteen to eighteen syllables in length. Bale's lines, in his extant plays, are usually twelve syllables or under, with many short Skeltonic lines in The Three Laws. The author of the Resurrection resorts to "identical" rimes extensively: twenty-one examples in forty-two pages. Bale seldom uses identical rime: twelve examples in three hundred pages. When Bale does use it, he usually has in mind some purpose of emphasis by repetition, as in these lines from The Three Laws:

See the lay people pray never but in Latin;
Let them have their creed and service in Latin,
That a Latin belief may make a Latin soul--
Or he rimes the penultimate word as in these examples: "burn them" and "turn them," "forsake me" and "take me," "forsake him" and "shake him," and "weigh it" and "obey it." He is never at a loss for rimes, sometimes piling up eight in a row. Either the author of the Resurrection was desperate for rimes or he admired the device of the identical rime, for he used it frequently without any extenuating circumstances. Another indication of his lack of ability in riming is his pairing "God" with such words as "likeneso," "good," and "cloude." In all of Bale's extant plays "God" is rime only with "rod," except on two occasions when it is rime with "hod" and "cod." It is hard to believe that in one play only he would rime "God" imperfectly as the author of the Resurrection has done.

If the Resurrection of Our Lord is Bale's De Christi Resurrectione, it was in existence by 1536, the date of the Anglorum Heliades in which it was listed by Bale along with The Three Laws and King Johan, or at least by 1539 when some additions were made to the Anglorum manuscript. The doctrine presented in the Resurrection, though it is reform doctrine, is mild, unobtrusive, inconspicuous, and entirely unlike the bitter, bold, bellicose attacks in The Three Laws and King Johan. It is true that Bale's little cycle of plays, 1538, is milder in its attack on the papists, yet it presents doctrines of the new learning systematically, as an inte-
gral part of the plot and action. The doctrine of the Resurrection appears chiefly in the commentary of Appendix, who advocates reading the Scriptures, apologizes for elaborating on the Scriptural account of the appearance of Jesus to Peter, and comments on the "promises most joyous" of the gospel. Also some doctrinal elements are worked into the speech of Jesus when he expounds the meaning of the Scriptures to Cleophas and Luke on the way to Emmaus: the church consists of the "faithfull elected"; the last supper is a spiritual sacrifice of the mystical body of Christ done with "thankfull remembrance" and a "thankfull memorye"; the promises of God to the prophets of the Old Testament show the "Doctryne Evangelicall." Some few hints of reform doctrine appear in the other parts of the play--Luke calls the preaching of the Scribes and Pharisees "faultie and coulde" in comparison with that of Jesus which "kindled and sett a fier our hartes with in vs," Cleophas says that their hearts were in despair before Jesus expounded the Scriptures to them, while Jude and Peter discuss the importance of preaching in man's salvation. These are tenets of the new learning, but they are not treated at length or strongly emphasized. Their presence seems to reflect an accepted doctrine which is no longer the subject of heated dispute, a doctrine which needs to be preached, but which does not need violent defense. All in all, the play seems very unlike the Bale of the fifteen-thirties.
An Enterlude called lusty Juventus. Lyuely describing the frailtie of youth: of natur, prone to vyce: by grace and good counsayll, traynable to vertue.

The author of the interlude Lusty Juventus, one R. Wever, might well have called his play, as the author of Everyman had done, a treatise in the manner of a moral play. But, written during the reign of Edward VI, Lusty Juventus is a treatise on the new way to salvation as preached by the reformers, whereas Everyman, as we have seen, presented the old plan of salvation. The new way is not called that of the "New Learning" as it was in Bale's plays, but its adherents are referred to as "New Gospellers." It is not the way of Holy Church found in Everyman and the moral treatises and sermons examined in Chapter I of this thesis; it is rather that of Luther, Melanchthon, and Tyndale found in Chapter II. The youth Juventus is saved by faith alone without his own deserving. He comes to salvation through a knowledge of God and His chief promises as related in the Word of God. Once he has returned to sin after his justification by faith, he is not saved by the Church's sacrament of penance administered by a confessor as in Everyman, but he is kept from despair by being reminded of God's Merciful Promises, which apply to those who repent in their hearts for their sins. He does good deeds not to help save himself; they are the fruits of his faith, not the means of his salvation. As in Everyman the hero has been led astray during his life by Friend-
ship and Fellowship, so in *Juventus* the hero forgets what he has learned of Good Counsel and turns to vice with these same two, accompanied by Abominable Living. He repents his sins and is instructed in the way of salvation by God’s Merciful Promises in the words of St. Augustine:

> Yf vnsto the Lordes word you do your eares encline,  
> And obsarue those thinges, which he hath commaunded  
> this sinfull state, in the whiche you haue lyen.  
> Shalbe forgotten, and neuer more remembred,  
> And Christ hym selfe in the gospel hath promysed,  
> that he which in hym vnfaynedly doth beleue,  
> Although he were dead, yet shall he lyue.

---

For me his mercy sake thou shalt optayne hys grace  
And not for thyne owne desertes, this must thou know  
For my sake alone he shall receyue solace,  
For my sake alone, he wyll thee marcy shew,  
therfore to hym as it is moste dew,  
Geue most harty thankes, with hart vnfayned  
Whose name for euer more be prayed.

The play is a prodigal son type, which advocates the early training of youth in the way of virtue and salvation. The way presented is that of the reformers, but the general pattern is that of innocence, sin, and repentance. *Juventus* comes on the scene a young man singing of his love and thinking of pleasure only. He meets Good Counsel, who informs him that he must learn God’s Commandments. *Juventus* answers in surprise:

> What? am I bound, as wel as the cleargy,  
> To learne and follow his preceptes and lawe?
He is sorry that he has not known this before and has wasted much
time:

I know my tyme I haue rudely spended,
Folowyng my owne lust, being led bi ignoraunce;
But nowe I hope of better knowledge through your
acquaytaunce.

Good Counsel laments Juenuous's ignorance and proposes to give
him the necessary knowledge for salvation:

I praye God guide you with hys graceyous assistans
Unto y^e^ knowledge of hys truth, your ignoraunce to undo,

The lambe Jesus Christ my meanynge is so,
By sure fayth and confidence in his bitter death and passion,
The onely price of oure health and saluacyon.

Here is the reformers' doctrine that the passion of Christ is the
only price of salvation, already paid for man. Notice the use of
the word knowledge for "aquantance with truths" necessary for
salvation. As in Everyman, there is a character Knowledge, who,
with Good Counsel, helps Juenuous in the necessary knowledge.

Good Counsel, reminiscent of the medieval moral treatises which
called good counsel and knowledge gifts of the holy ghost (see
Chapter I), lists as the first step to salvation continual prayer:

That it might please the Lorde omnipotente
To send vnto you his holi spirit and comforter:
Whiche wil leade you euery daye and houre
Unto the knowledge of hys worde and verytie
Where in you may learne to lyue most christianly.

Juenuous then prays for the "true knowledge of thy lawe and wil,"
and, as if in answer to his prayer, the character Knowledge
comes in. He does not speak at first but Good Counsel sees him
and says:

Beholde Youth, now reioyce we may
For I se knowledge of God, veritie stand here behinde
He is come now to satisfey your mynde
In those thynges which you will desire.

There is left no doubt for the reader of this play that the character
Knowledge means "knowledge," and represents a gift of God. He
says:

Now, good christian audience, I will expresse mi name
The true knowledge of gods veritie, thus my name doth highte
Whom God hath appointed, to geue ye blind their syght.

Good Counsel praises the Lord for sending Knowledge to instruct
youth aright so that he will be able to live according to God's
pleasure. The instruction given represents the new-learning way
to salvation. The emphasis is on the word of God, on faith, and
on the fruits of faith, as Knowledge tells Juvenus:

Blessed is he which heareth ye worde of god and kepeth it,
That is to belue his word, & lyue accordingly
Declaryng the fayth by the fruytes of spirit
Whose frutes are these, as s. Paul to ye Gal, doth wrighte,
Loue ioie, peace, long sufferung and faithfullnes
Mekenes, goodnes, temperaunce and gentilnes.

Good Counsel and Knowledge work together in explaining the essen-
tial knowledge necessary. Good Counsel adds further emphasis to
the words of Knowledge on the necessity of faith:

Where fayth is not, godly lyuing decaieth;
For whatsoeuer is not of fayth, sayth s. Paul, is synne,
But where a perfite faith is, there is good working.
Luther considered "good works" or deeds done without faith in Christ as sins, in opposition to the Catholic doctrine that good deeds are never evil even if done by a sinner. Knowledge continues his instruction with a statement that faith only makes man righteous in the sight of God. Juventus wants to know why he should do good works if this be true, and Good Counsel gives him the reformers' answer to the criticism that their doctrine of salvation by faith alone leads to a wicked and idle life:

Because they are required of al christian men,  
As the necessary fruities of true repentance.

Eternal life is given only "through faith, for Christes deseruinges." Since this is true, man should not work as "hierlinges," but as "good brauches, bearing frute in hym." Juventus is amazed at this information and answers, "My elders neuer taught me so befoere." Knowledge replies that his elders were themselves "wrapped in ignorance, Being deceuyed by false preachers." He tells Juventus:

to Gods word you must only encline;  
Al other doctrine cleane set aparte.

Juventus is convinced and asks for information how he must "live in chrystian religion." Knowledge summarizes for him saying that the first step is to fear God and the next to believe all His promises without exception. Good Counsel adds that he must learn the contents of Christ's testament which is as a clear fountain out
of which springs consolation to all who "thyrst after eternal saluacyon." Juventus vows to live according to these instructions and thanks Good Counsel for bringing him to "the knowledge of his heueuenly Gospel." Knowledge hopes that he will be able to live as he resolves:

That when ye shal make acountes or rekening
Of thyss talent, whych you haue receued,
You may be one of those, wt whom ye Lord shal be pleased.

The sudden coming of this time of reckoning is the theme of Everyman. Juventus is not really faced with the actual time of reckoning as is Everyman, but he is warned that it will come. Both these plays are in the tradition of the Ars Moriendi treatises; they teach man how to learn to die.

The next scene shows the Devil lamenting in a long soliloquy the spread of the Word of God and his inability to keep the youth of the land in the old traditions "made by men." The younger generation is bringing up its children in the knowledge of the Scriptures and so it is harder for him to turn them to sin when they are older. Nevertheless, with the help of Hypocrisy, who masks under the name of Friendship, and of Fellowship and Abominable Living, the Devil is able to lead Juventus into the lusts of the flesh. He is on the way to hear a preaching when, being promised merry company with Abominable Living, he decides to live a merry life. This life is represented in the play
by a lusty song asking "Why should not youth fulfyl hys owne mynde, 
As the course of nature doth hym bynde," and by the speech of 
lamentation by Good Counsel at the evil life of the hero.

In this lengthy speech of Good Counsel, Juventus is made to 
represent the young days of the reform movement when the new 
doctrine of justification by faith alone, with its admonition to read 
the Word of God, was readily accepted by people. Good Counsel 
laments that such knowledge as the reform brought has not resulted 
in the fruits of peace: meekness, long suffering, and temperance. 
The people still turn to vice and sin even though they have the 
proper knowledge of the way to salvation. They profess the word 
of God but do not follow it. So it is with Juventus, who, like 
Erasmus' Poliphemus, is a "great gospeller in the mouth," but 
whose life is full of sin. He has received "the knowledge of 
veritie," but he has not borne the fruits of such knowledge. 
Juventus sees the nature of his offense and despairs of ever being 
saved. Good Counsel introduces him to God's Merciful Promises 
who comforts him by reminding him of the promises of God made 
throughout the Scriptures. Juventus repents and thanks God for 
giving him respite to amend his sinful life. Unlike Everyman, 
who also is given a short time to make his reckoning sure, Juventus 
turns to the Word of God which he will follow in his living, testing 
every act by this "squire and rule most just." It will be remem-
bered that Everyman turned to the sacraments of Penance, of the
Eucharist, and of Extreme Unction for his preparation for the final
reckoning. Juventus tells the audience that kindred and fellowship
can not help at that final day:

Neyther kyndred nor felowshyp shal you excuse
When you shall appere before the judgement seat
But youre owne secret conscyence shal the geue an
audite.

Like Everyman he has learned that these two companions are
of no assistance on the dreadful judgment day. Unlike Everyman
he finds that confession within his own conscience is sufficient to
make his reckoning sure. He has no need for priesthood; it is a
personal matter between him and the deity. He further advises
the audience that they must not delay their secret confession:

Do not delaye the tyme, and saye my ende is not nere
For w't short warning, the lordes cog shal sodely apere.

It should be noted how much of the lore of the medieval treatises
remains in the new system, but with a difference: the final
reckoning of the use made of the talents lent to man by God, sud-
den death coming without warning, the need of confession to prepare
for the sudden summoning, the uselessness of the things of this
world at such a time, the value of Good Counsel and Knowledge,
and the usefulness of good deeds.

Just as Everyman echoes the teachings in The Book of Vices
and Virtues and The Royal Book, so Lusty Juventus follows the
plan of salvation given by William Tyndale in his treatises. The play places great emphasis on knowledge: "knowledge of his [God's] truth," "knowledge of his word and veritie," "knowledge of thy lawe and wil," "the knowledge To know his doctrine from the false and perverses," knowledge of the contents of Christ's Testament, and "knowledge of this heueuenly Gospel." Tyndale also stresses knowledge as an aid to salvation and to godly living:

Labour for knowledge; that thou mayest know God's will, and what he would have thee to do."

Like the author of Lusty Juventus, he shows where to find the knowledge advocated—in Christ's testament:

Our mind, intent, and affection or zeal, are blind; and all that we do of them, is damned of God: and for that cause hath God made a testament between him and us, wherein is contained both what he would have us to do, and what he would have us ask of him. (The Parable of the Wicked Mammon, p. 105)

Tyndale also advocates for man a knowledge of himself and of his sins:

whom God hath elect and chosen, and to whom he hath appointed mercy and grace in Christ, to them sendeth he his Spirit; which openeth their eyes, sheweth them their misery, and bringeth them unto the knowledge of themselves; so that they hate and abhor themselves, are astonished and amazed, and at their wit's ends, neither wot what to do, or where to seek health. (p. 89)

In Lusty Juventus, Good Counsel brings the hero to a knowledge of the sinful life he has led since he promised to follow the way of the gospel, and Juventus exclaims, "Alas, alas, what I haue wrought
and done." He is led to desperation by a realization of his sins but is brought back from the depths of despair by God's Merciful Promises. Compare Tyndale's words on God's promises in a continuation of the last quotation above. After men have been brought to the verge of despair by a knowledge of their sinful nature:

Then, lest they should flee from God by desperation, he comforteth them again with his sweet promises in Christ; and certifieth their hearts that, for Christ's sake, they are received to mercy, and their sins forgiven, and they elect and made the sons of God, and heirs with Christ of eternal life: and thus through faith are they set at peace with God. (p. 89)

Tyndale's and Bale's definition of the gospel as the sum of the promises made by God to man should be remembered when analyzing the character God's Promises in Lusty Juventas. He represents the glad tidings of the gospel or the promises of God made to man throughout the Old and New Testaments. Juventas repents his iniquity after having been brought to a knowledge of his sins. Tyndale writes further on knowing one's sins:

It is not possible that the Lord Christ should come to a man, except he know himself and his sin, and truly repent. (p. 104)

The repentance is of the same nature in the play and in Tyndale. Both call for man to repent, or to have repentance, but neither advocates doing penance. The repentance is private. It is a matter of Juventas' own "secret concyence."
The play is intended to present the lesson that, although man is justified only by faith, he still must do good deeds and live according to the law of God. Good works are the "necessary fruities of true repentance," "declaryng the fayth by the fruytes of the spirit." Tyndale writes that spiritual things cannot be known "save by their works; as a tree cannot be known but by her fruit" (p. 109). Both the play and Tyndale quote St. Paul (Galatians iii) on the fruits of faith. Knowledge lists them as:

Loue ioie, peace, long suffring and faithfulnes
Mekenes, goodnes, temperaunce, and gentilines.

Tyndale lists faith, hope, love, patience, long-suffering, and obedience" (p. 193). Although the quotations from Tyndale so far have been taken from The Parable of the Wicked Mammon, his treatise A Pathway Into the Holy Scripture, and his prologues to various books of the Bible, would furnish further exposition of the reform system of salvation found in the play Lusty Juventus.

We have seen that Juventus was tempted by the same characters as those who had led Everyman astray:

That, through wicked fellowship:
And false pretende frendship,
Youth shall lyue carnally.

Everyman had lived thus and was called to a reckoning just as Good Counsel warns Juventus he must some day make an account of the talents he has received. Juventus learns also that neither kindred nor friendship will help him when he shall appear before
the judgment seat. In being aware of the necessity of making his peace with God immediately, without delay, for the Lord gives short warning of His sudden appearance, he knows what Everyman finds out the hard way, by experience. These are evident echoes of the earlier Catholic play in the later reform one. Such similarities could come from a common source in the literature of the Ars Moriendi, or the author of the later play could have been familiar with the earlier and very popular morality play.

A knowledge of the religious terminology or jargon and the doctrines it represents is of invaluable aid in understanding the nature of the characters in the sixteenth century plays. Such a knowledge would have helped Sterling P. Kincaid understand the meaning of the characters in Lusty Juventus and would have prevented him from attributing to the author of the play a lack of understanding of what he was trying to do. Kincaid does not recognize Friendship, Fellowship, and Kindred as the three well-known characters of the Ars Moriendi treatises, who take man's mind away from divine things. The fourth, riches, is omitted in Lusty Juventus. These we have met before in Hoccleve's dialogue How to Learn to Die, in Caxton's Royal Book, and in Everyman. Good Counsel, whom the audience would know well, also puzzles Kincaid. This traditional conception, explained at length in The Book of Vices and Virtues, makes ability to choose
and follow good counsel a gift of the Holy Ghost. Of course, the
best counsel was "maister Ihesu Crist, þat is wisdom of God þe
fadre" (p. 190), whom we also meet as the counsellor in the
morality play Wisdom. But Good Counsel appears in other charac-
ters with the same function of guiding man to the right path of
salvation: Good Angyll in the Digby Mary Magdalenæ, Sapientia
in Hoccleve's How to Learn to Die, Knowledge in Everyman, and
Good Counsel and Knowledge in Lusty Juventus. The nature of the
character Knowledge in Lusty Juventus also perplexes Kincaid, who
says of him only that he "represents a virtue within the mind of
the hero" (p. 605). We have seen in Chapter I the confusion which
abounds in modern scholarship as to the meaning of the character
Knowledge in Everyman. This confusion is dispelled by a perusal
of the moral treatises which tell the same story in another medium.
An examination of sixteenth century reform pamphlets or treatises
likewise reveals a definite, distinct meaning for the important word
knowledge in the doctrine of the new learning (see Chapter II). It
was retained from the moral treatises of the old faith but new
meanings were added. It still meant acquaintance with the right
path to salvation, but it took on the added meaning of knowledge
of this path through the Scriptures. It still meant knowledge of
sin, but with a different emphasis from the old days when to know
sins was to know every branch and twig of every sin and the accom-
panying circumstances for the purpose of auricular confession. To Latimer, as we have seen, knowledge was the gentleman-usher to Lady Faith. To Luther and Tyndale it was a knowledge of man's hopelessly sinful nature with its enslaved will and complete inability to do good in the sight of God. It was the prerequisite for despair in one's own powers, which was an indispensable element in the formula of salvation. Its meaning was inextricably linked with Luther's conception of the purpose of the law, which was taken literally from Paul's statement in Romans (3:20): "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." The character Knowledge, following Paul's statement, first informs Juvenus that he will not be justified by his own merits or by doing the "deeds of the law." Good deeds do not justify man in the sight of God but they are the "necessary fruits of true repentance." Knowledge summarizes the necessary information for salvation from Scriptures for the benefit of Juvenus and the audience. Juvenus thanks him for "this godly knowledge" which ushers in a faith in the gospel, which he says will make him lead a better life. He thanks Good Counsel also for bringing him this knowledge which is personified by the character Knowledge. Later in the plot, after the life-in-sin-episodes, it is Good Counsel who brings to Juvenus a knowledge of his sinful life, not through a
separate character this time but by an excoriating speech on his vices. Herein he serves the function of the law in Paul's statement. In The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene it is the character Lawe who performs this service and brings on despair which results in repentance. Good Counsel, then, besides retaining something of the medieval gift of the Holy Ghost—the ability to choose good counsel—incorporates these two aspects of the doctrine of the new learning: first, the knowledge of God's verity or way to salvation, presented in the play in a separate character Knowledge; and second, the knowledge of sins which is necessary for despair in one's own strength. These characters would not be confusing to Kincaid if he had read, along with Aristotle's Poetics, the much-despised religious treatises and sermons which give the background necessary for interpreting these religious plays. His judgment is that these virtuous characters are "prolix and repetitiously boring." Rather, they do adequately what they must do in presenting thoroughly and completely man's way to salvation. The audience was being given in palatable form the inside information on a new and sure-fire method of salvation. The modern reader may be bored because he no longer credits the efficacy of this method, but he should not quarrel with an author for presenting the case fully and completely. For example, to assume, as Kincaid does, that the play should end shortly after
the "climax" when Juventus is converted or turned from sin, is to ask the author not to give the audience a complete account of what they must do to be saved. The denouement is not, as Kincald puts it, "unnecessarily delayed with superfluous whipping up of tedious moralising and sterile summaries of allegory and their significance." After the "climax" or conversion must come these two elements of the formula of salvation: 1. despair in one's own powers and 2. God's Merciful Promises of salvation. John Bale wrote a whole play on God's Promises; surely this important character deserves a couple of pages here to quiet the despair of those who are aware of their sin. Juventus's final summary of his life and how the system of salvation applies to it is helpful, taking the place of the explanatory epilogue customary and acceptable in the plays of the time. It is not "sterile" but quite beneficial for their souls' need.
A pretie Enterlude called Nice Wanton

It will not be necessary to analyze in detail the interlude Nice Wanton since it is not a doctrinal play like Everyman, Bale's plays, and Lusty Juvenus. However, since the way of repentance suggested to the wanton is that of the reformers rather than that of the Catholic Church, we shall look at it briefly. The plot is given in the verses printed on the title page:

Wherin ye may see,
Three braunches of an il tree,
The mother and her Children three,
Two naught and one godly.

Early sharp that wilbe thorne,
Soon il that wil be naught:
To be naught better vnborne,
Better vnfed then naughtily taught.

The moral of the play is, "He that spareth the rod, the child dooth hate." When the two children who have been "brought up wantonly in play" turn out evil and end their lives in "miserable wise," the mother despairs and tries to kill herself. She is prevented by her good son Barnabas, who comforts her "by the Scriptures." He is the spokesman for the correct way to salvation as he tells his sister to repent:

Confesse the trueth and I wil comfort thee,
By woord of God omnipotent,
Although your time ye haue mispent,
Repent and amend while ye haue space:
And God wil restore you to helth and grace.
He continues to comfort her, promising to play "a brotherly part" even though she had refused his counsel when they were children:

For the soul is more preciof moste deerly bought
With the blood of Christe dying therfore:
To saue it first a meane must be sought,
At Gods hand by Christe mans onely sauiour.

He tells her that God has plagued her for her sins because of His love for her so that she, once knowing herself, might call for grace. She must repent so truly that she will sin no more:

And then beleuee with stedfast faith:
That God wil forguie you for euermore,
For Christes sake as the Scripture saith.

The formula for salvation for the sinner is to know his sin, repent, amend, and avoid despair, but believe the promises of God that He will be merciful. Compare this with the formula in *Lusty Juvenus*: the hero has received a knowledge of the verity of God but has fallen into sin and not shown the fruits of faith; Good Counsel leads him to a knowledge of his sins and Juvenus repents, but despairs that he can be forgiven; Good Counsel then reproves him and God's Merciful Promises assures him that he will be forgiven. Compare this formula also with that in *Everyman* where the hero is steered through the sacraments of the Church by priesthood. He, too, must know his sins, confess, and repent, but he must confess to a priest, receive and do penance to fit his sin, obtain absolution, and go to the priesthood for the last two sacraments, "The holy sacrament and oynement togyder."
The role of the clergy has been reduced in the new formula for salvation, their chief function now being the preaching of the Word of God to the people.
A merry and p[lea] . . . . . . . . Misogonus\textsuperscript{13}

The play Misogonus, published in 1577, is a secular prodigal-son-type of play with little reference to religious doctrine. The gentry or the virtuous, well-to-do, intelligent characters are men of the new learning; the rustics, gossips, and servants still hold to the old system of saints, prayers for the dead, and other Catholic ceremonies. The wicked priest Sir John is also of the old faith. The rustic Codrus and his wife Alison, in discussing their dead mistress with their master Philogonus, say they have said prayers for her since her death twenty years before:

Alien. My swete mistrissse now oure swete Lady of Walsing\textsuperscript{a} be wth hir swetly swe[t] soule
I haue bid many a prayer for hir both early and late

Codrus. Faith and so haue I, thers near a day but I haue hir in my bede role
I say a deprofundus for hir erie night accordinge toth olde rate.
(Actus tertius, ll. 150-53)

Philogonus, man of the new learning, rebukes them for their superstitions:

Pray for hir no more, but rather giue god praise your praiers are but superstitions & she I hopes at rest yow loue hir it semes so did I, & shall doe all my daies but now to praye for our selves here while we liue I count it best.
(Actus tertius, ll. 154-57)

Codrus answers:

Low yow Alison wer Moster is oth new larninge did not I tell yow before.
(Actus tertius, l. 158)
The priest Sir John is better at dicing, drinking, and wenching than at fulfilling his duties in the chapel. Misogonus, the evil son, and his servant Orgalus are looking for a pair of dice to amuse Melissa with a game. There is none to be found, but they think of Sir John who always has dice:

Orgalus. He Sf I am sure heis not without a dosin pare of dice
I durst Jepert heis now at cardes or at tables
A bible may soft youe heile yet be more wise
I tell yow heis none of this new start vp rables.
(Actus secundus. Scena quarta, ll. 61-64)

He is presented as a thoroughly evil priest who curses by God's body and sides, chases after the pretty women parishoners, and neglects the services of his charge. His clerk, having rung the church bell for him in vain, comes seeking him in the tavern to conduct the services, but Sir John refuses to leave his game. He tells the clerk to take his place in the Church:

Fayth Jake its no matter an all thy lessons be lackinge
say a magnificat nunc dimittis an even end wth the crede
(Actus secundus. Scena quarta, ll. 242-43)

Orgalus asks:

What shall he leue out y^e saumes and his pater noster
what good will y^e crede doe without thos and his avy.
(Actus secundus. Scena quarta, ll. 244-45)

The clerk goes off saying, "Ile patert as well as I can . . ."
Juventus. The doctrines are incidental to the story of wayward youth. Nor are Misogonus and Nice Wanton doctrinal treatises of the new learning in the form of a moral play as are the next two interludes to be considered in this chapter: The Life and Repentaunce of Marie Magdalene and New Custom.
A new Enterlude, neuer before this tyrne imprinted, entREATING OF THE LIFE AND REPENTANCE OF MARIE Magdalene: not only godlie, learned and fruitefull, but also well furnished with pleasant myrth and pastime, very delectable for those which shall heare or leade the same.

The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene, by the learned clerk Lewis Wager, was first printed in 1566, but from the reference in it to the king and from the theology, it appears to have been written during the reign of Edward VI. In the Prologue of the play, the author outlines his intentions to use a Biblical example of a truly penitent sinner, whose penitence is shown to be true by "hir fruictes," i.e., love which springs from her faith, to illustrate "godly Sapience" so that the "ignorant may learne what is true beleue." Christ converted Mary Magdalene by his preaching and drove out of her seven "spirites vncleane." In spite of her former sins, Mary's love of Christ was so great that she did not give way to despair:

Hir sinne did not hir conscience so greuously freate,  
But that Faith erected hir heart again to beleue 
That God for Christ's sake wold all hir sins forgeue.  
(ll. 77-79)

This is the new-learning formula of salvation: faith, knowledge of sin, repentance which results in the fruits of faith, and love.

The knowledge of one's sinful nature, obtained from the law, brings on despair in one's own strength, but faith in God's Promises rescues the penitent, showing her that her sins can be forgiven.
Into this formula are woven the sins of Mary Magdalene, the 
casting out of the seven unclean spirits from her by Jesus, and 
the supper at the house of Simon the Pharisee where a woman 
(not named) washes the feet of Jesus with her tears, dries them 
with her hair, and anoints them with ointment. For mirth and 
merriment are added the vice Infidelitie, who like Bale’s Infidelitas 
in The Three Laws represents unbelief, which is, for the reformers, 
the father of all sins, and his friends Pride, Cupiditie, and Carnall 
Concupiscence, who represent the seven unclean spirits. Infidelitie 
introduces himself:

Infidelitie is my name, you know in dede; 
Proprely I am called the Serpents sede. 
Loke, in whose heart my father Sathan doth me sow, 
There must all iniquitie and vice nedes grow. 
The conscience where I dwell is a receptacle 
For all the diuels in hell to haue their habitacle. 
(ll. 235-40)

Mary chooses an evil counselor in Infidelitie and so brings 
about her fall. She has just inherited the castle of Magdalene and 
enough wealth to lead a worldly life of pleasure. Present to lead 
her astray are Pride, who flatters her for her beauty, Cupiditie, 
who makes her think only of her dress and not of charity for the 
poor, and Carnall Concupiscence, who has kindled such a carnal 
desire in her that she will not think of God. The vices have the 
usual boasting match, each praising himself for his ability to lead 
men into sin. Cupiditie, for example, claims to be called in
Scripture the "roote of all iniquitie," but remembering that
Infidelitie already has that role he says:

Infidelitie in dede is the seede of all syn,
But cupiditie openeth the gate and leteth hym in.
(ll. 319-320)

The vices take assumed names in the customary fashion: Infidelitie
is Legal Justice and Prudence, Cupiditie is Utility, Pride is
Nobility and Honor, and Carnall Concupiscence is Pleasure. They
dress Mary beautifully in the latest style and teach her how to use
her beauty to attract admirers:

Pride: By your eares somtimes with pretie tusks and toyes
You shall folde your haire, like Tomboyes.
It becommeth a yong gentlewoman, be ye sure,
And yong men vnto your loue it will allure.
(ll. 550-55)

The realistic temptation of Mary into a life of pride and lust takes
up almost half of the play and must have been convincing and enter-
taining on the stage. She and her evil counselors finally arrive at
Jerusalem, where Simon the "pharisie" is plotting with Malicious
jugement to trap the new Prophet into saying something contrary
to the law by inviting him to his house for dinner. Infidelitie and
Malicious jugement are old friends, and the "seede of all syn"
enthusiastically offers to help in the plot against the new "Messias,"
Christ.

Thus far in the plot the doctrinal elements have been very
slight, but now the new learning takes over and carries out the
salvation of the fallen Mary. The "Lawe of God" comes in and shows her her sin—the chief function of the law in the new learning:

I am a ministration of death workyng yre;
I shewe God's request, and man's vnabilitie;
I condemne hym for synne vnto eternall fyre;
I fynde not one iust of man's fragilitie.
(ll. 1059-62)

Infidelitie does not give up easily but argues with each of the characters who represent the successive steps in the way of the new learning to salvation. After the Lawe has shown Mary his power, Knowledge of Synne enters to "freate and byte the conscience within, causyng the same euermore to lament." Mary is made aware by these two that she is a sinner, unable to keep the law of God, and that as such she is damned. Properly, Mary despairs and even blames God for so harsh a judgment on sinners. Infidelitie agrees with her, attempting to turn her even more against a cruel God and vigorously chasing out Knowledge of Synne:

You bottel-nosed knaue, get you out of place;
Auoyde, stinkyng horeson; a poysun take thee.
(ll. 1215-16)

Christ the new Prophet enters. Infidelitie argues that if the law of Moses cannot save a sinner, neither can this wretched prophet. Mary professes to believe in the new Messias, and Christ knows that she has been turned to belief by God:

No man can come to me, that is, in me beleue,
Escept my father draw hym by his spirite.
(ll. 1327-28)
He presents her with Fayth and Repentance—gifts of God in the doctrine of the new learning. Repentance is a "true turnyng of the whole lyfe and state Vnto the will of the lord God omnipotent," not just repentance for particular sins committed. Fayth is also defined in the reform sense:

Wherfore I am a certaine and sure confidence,
That God is mercifull for Christ Jesus's sake
And where as is a turnyng or penitence,
To mercy he will the penitent take.

Faith therefore is the gyft of God most excellent;
For it is a sure knowledge and cognition
Of the good will of God omnipotent,
Grounded in the word of Christes erudition.

(II. 1391-98)

Faith is grounded in the promises found in the Scriptures and must not be separated from the Word of God. Faith's operation is not to inquire into the nature of God, but to believe the holy Scripture when it tells that He is good. Faith must believe the declared will of God as found in the Scriptures. According to Luther's doctrine of the hidden and the revealed will of God, man cannot fathom the hidden will of God; all he can do is to seek out the revealed will in the Scriptures.

Repentance instructs Mary that although Christ has promised her forgiveness, she has in no way merited this forgiveness—it is a gift of God. Mary, grateful and not tainted with the antitrinitarian heresy, praises God with an affirmation of belief in the Trinity:
Honor, praise, and glory to the father eternall;
Thankes to the sonne, very god and very man;
Blessed be the holy gost, with them both coequall,
One god, which hath saued me this day from Sathan.
(ll. 1451-54)

The last scene is in the house of Simon the Pharisee with
Infidelitie, disguised as another Pharisee, Malicious Jugement,
Simon, and Christ present at dinner. The host and his two guests
are questioning Christ for the purpose of tricking him into saying
he is the son of God so they can betray him. Mary Magdalene,
"sadly apparelled," enters lamenting her sins and praising the
mercy of Christ, who forgave them not from her "merites and
dedes" but from "vnspeakable mercy." He had told her to repent
and "[d]o the fruictes of Repentance." She creeps under the
table and does "as is specified in the Gospell." Malicious
Jugement and Infidelitie attack Jesus for allowing a sinner to touch
him. Jesus tells Simon the story of the two debtors, one with a
large debt, one with a small, who are forgiven their debts because
they have no money to repay their master. He asks, "Which of
these detters ought the lender most loue?" The answer shows
why he accepts Mary's ministrations; he has come into the world
to help the great debtors. To Mary he says once more, "Woman,
thy synnes are forgeuen," and adds the teaching of the new learning,
"God for my sake will not them to thee impute." She does not
deserve the forgiveness of God, which is a free gift; her sins are
not taken away, they are just not imputed to her through the mercy of God for the sake of Christ's passion. He says further, "thy faith hath saued thee." Mary is comforted, and exclaims, "O joyful tydynges, O message most comfortable!" Simon tells Jesus that he will not report him to the authorities for his words, but after Christ leaves he plots with the other two guests, Infidelitie and Malicious ingement, to have him examined by the bishops.

The last scene carries the new-learning formula of salvation to its conclusion. Mary enters with Justification and asks him to explain to her why Jesus said her sins were forgiven because she had loved much. Justification is glad she asked that question:

A question right necessary to be moued,
For therby many errors shall be reproued.
(I. 1971-72)

Her love did not deserve that Christ should forgive her sins, because only Christ was able to love God completely enough to deserve anything. Man, because of his sinful nature, is unable to fulfill the commandment to love God with all his heart, soul, and strength. Her love followed the forgiveness of her sins as a "fruit of faith." She was justified by her faith, not by her love. Love, the "speciall fruicte of Faith," enters and reiterates the doctrine just expressed:

When Christ of his mercy dyd hir sinonnes forgueue,
Loue deserued not forgeuennesse of sinonnes in dede,
But as a fruite therof truely it did succede.
(I. 2020-2021)
Lest the moral of the play still be not clear, Love summarizes the doctrine presented:

Such persons we introduce into presence,
To declare the conversion of hir offence.
Fyrst, the lawe made a playne declaration,
That she was a chylde of eternall damnation:
By hearyng of the law came knowledge of synne;
Then for to lament truely she dyd begynne.
Nothyng but desperation dyd in hir remayne,
Lokyng for none other comfort but for hell payne.
But Christ, whose nature is mercy to haue,
Came into this world synners to saue;
Which preached repentance, synnes to forgeue,
To as many as in hym faithfully dyd beleue.
By the word came faith; Faith brought penitence;
But bothe the gyft of God's magnificence.
Thus by Faith onely Marie was justyfied,
Like as before it is playnly verified:
From thens came loue, as a testification
Of God's mercy and her justyfication.
(ll. 2031-48)

Here is the whole Lutheran doctrine of man's relation to God through Christ. It was imported in Tyndale's treatises and in Luther's own books; it accompanied stinging attacks on the papists in Bale's plays; and it is now growing on the native soil as an established doctrine, presented in Marie Magdalene, as was the doctrine in Everyman, for itself, without attack on any other system.

In the fifteenth century the same story had been used in a play, the Digby Mary Magdalene, the first part of which told the Biblical story of Mary's fall and redemption and of Lazarus's resurrection, and the second related the adventures of the legendary Mary abroad performing miracles at Rome and in the Holy Land
and spending thirty years in the desert, fed miraculously by angels. This earlier play, though it was not essentially doctrinal like Everyman, is of course a Catholic play. The second part is specifically Catholic, the reformers having rejected the saints and all the legends about them as objects not worthy of worship. In the first part, the ruin of Mary is brought about by the World, the Flesh, and the Devil with the appropriate deadly sins as assisting devils: Pride and Covetysie, the sins of the World; Lechery, Glotony, and Sloth, the sins of the Flesh; and Wrath and Envy, the sins of the Devil. Lechery, aided by Bad Angyll, is sent by the World, the Flesh, and the Devil to do the actual tempting of Mary into a life of sin. In Wager's play, it will be remembered, Infidelitie or Unbelief is the master of the seven sins, and acts as chief tempter along with Pride, Cupititie, and Carnall Concupiscence. Pride and Cupititie represent the sins of the World; Carnall Concupiscence represents the sins of the Flesh; the sins of the Devil are not directly represented, but are contained in Infidelitie as "the seede of all syn." In the Digby play, Mary is shown the extent of her sins and warned of hell fire by Good Angyll. In the new-learning play the Lawe shows her her sin and introduces her to the character Knowledge of Sin, who brings on despair. In both plays Mary confesses her sins to the Prophet, Christ, but in the earlier play she specifies the sin
and promises to apply the appropriate virtue to combat it as was
taught in the doctrinal treatises:

And for that I haue synnyd in the synne of pryde,
I wol en-abyte me with humelyte;
A-gens wrath and envy, I wyl devyde
Thes fayer vertuys, pacyens and charyte.

(ll. 682-85)

Because of her "contrysson," her faith, and her charity, says the
Prophet in the sixteenth century play, her sins are forgiven her.
The author defines extensively the terms Repentance, Faith, and
Justification in the sense of the new learning. He also makes it
explicit that Love is a fruit of Faith and that by faith only is Mary
justified and her sins not imputed to her.
A new Enterlude No lesse wittie: then pleasant, entitled new Custome, devised of late, and for diverse causes nowe set forth, never before this tyme Imprinted. 1573.

That New Custome was written in the reign of Elizabeth is shown by the character Avarice relating a trick which "my selfe plaied in the daies of queene Marie" that resulted in the burning of one brother for heresy. The theme of the play is that things are not what they seem, for New Custom is not really what his name implies, but rather he is the most ancient doctrine of Christianity, the Primitive Constitution which Christ and the Apostles affirmed. The first scene is a dialogue between Perverse Doctrine and Ignorance who uphold Papal doctrine and ceremonies. They are outraged against the young fellows who, with Bible or New Testament in hand, rail against transubstantiation, purgatory, and the mass, and say that by scripture they cannot be proved. There is one young man in particular who must be discredited. Hypocrisy, Superstition, and Idolatry, sisters of Perverse Doctrine, call him New Custom. He has been preaching against their ceremonies and rites:

Hee disalloweth our ceremonies, and rites, and teacheth another way
to serve God, then that whiche wee do vs;
And goeth about the peoples myndes to seduce.
It is a pestilent knaue, he wyll haue priestes no corner cappes to weare.
Surplices, are superstition, beades, paxes, and suche other geare,
Crosses, belles, candells, oyle, bran, salt, spettle,  
and incense,  
With sensing, and singing, hee accomptes not worth  
iii halfpense.

The reform of the first half of the century had been chiefly one  
of doctrines, while that of the reign of Elizabeth centered around  
ceremonies, vestments, rites, and church organization. New  
Custom reflects this shift in emphasis. Perverse Doctrine, showing  
the audience he is a vice, takes on a false name, Sound Doctrine,  
and gives to Ignorance the title Simplicity so that they can go anywhere without suspicion.

New Custom argues with Perverse Doctrine declaring himself  
to be Primitive Constitution and denouncing such "trumpery" as  
"Popes, and their pardones, their Purgatories for sowles," the  
mass, and the reading of Duns or a "Questionist" instead of the  
Scriptures. Perverse Doctrine intends to enlist the aid of his sister  
Hypocrisy to put down this "miscreant villain" who means to deface  
their ancient rites and religion. Hypocrisy recommends discrediting  
New Custom before the people whenever he preaches, in every  
possible way. Among other things she thinks they should, while  
pretending religion, put on a good show for the people:

Pleasing the multitude with suche kinde of grace [gear],  
As with them to the whiche most inclined they are.  
Square cappes, longe gownes, with tippettes of silke,  
Braue coopes in the churche, surplices as white as milke,  
Beades, and suche like, all these beare the price.
These things smell of antiquity and will recommend their cause
to the ignorat. Perverse Doctrine tells Avarice and Cruelty of
the conditions which exist since New Custom has come into the
country and begun to deface

All our olde doings, our service, our rites, that of yore
Haue bene of great price in the olde time before.

Later, Light of the Gospel and New Custom corner Perverse Doc-
trine and make him listen to the message of faith. He is converted
and his name is changed to Sincere Doctrine. Having reformed, he
wishes to make his apparel conform to the correct doctrine:

Now as touching my apparell what counsell do you give?
For I see well that in the Constitution Primitive:
They vsed no suche garment as I haue on heree,
But fashioned it after some other maner.

New Custom agrees and gives him the correct attitude toward
vestments:

... in suche things a man ought not to take so greate heed,
For the wearing of a gowne, cap, or any other garment,
Surely is a matter, as mee seemeth, indifferent,
Howbeit, wyse princes, for a difference to be had:
Hath commaunded the clergye in suche sorte to be clad.
But hee who puttes his religion in wearing the thing:
Or thinkes him selfe more holly for the contrarie doing:
Shall prowe but a foole, of what euer condition,
Hee bee, for sure that is but meere superstition:

......

Wherfore use your apparell, as is cornele, and decent,
And not against Scripture any where in my judgement.

Light of the Gospel brings in Edification and Assurance who, in
turn, assure Sincere Doctrine of God's Felicity, and the play ends
with a song and a wish for a heavenly grace for Queen Elizabeth
and all her council.

The theme of *New Custom*, that the new learning is really the
old primitive faith and the Catholic faith the new additions made
by man to the primitive Constitution, was voiced by Luther and
expounded by the reformers who were galled by the appellation
"new learning." Though many accepted the designation and used
it proudly, there were others who felt obliged to write an explana-
tion. In 1537 William Turner translated a treatise in dialogue form
from the Latin of Urbanus Regius in which the new is defined as
the old and the old the new. It was written to answer these
"braynles and madde fellowes" who say that the reformers preach
new learning "lately deuyed & fornyshed in the shoppes or work-
houses of heretikes." The author would have them know that "we
do teache and preache the olde and the trewe heauenly doctryne of
the sprete that is the gospell of God." Another treatise with the
same intent is Myles Coverdale's translation of a treatise by
William Bullinger on *The Old faith, an evident probacion out of the*
*holy scripture, that the christen fayth (which is the right, true,
old and undoubt ed fayth) hath endure d sens the beginnyng of the*
*worlde.* In the preface to the reader Coverdale vents his feelings
against those who call the reform the new learning. Man has been
wandering in the prison of Satan and false doctrine but will not
come out when the Word of God summons him. Those who follow
the Word and emerge from the prison are looked on with scorn
by "a number of dizzards and scornful mockers":

And like as when a poor wretch cometh out of prison,
he shall have more to stand gazing and gaping upon him,
than to do him good, or to help him to his fees; even
so now that God of his mercy hath called us out of Satan's
prison, and from the school of false doctrine, my
lord's fool with his companions standeth staring upon
us, and mocketh us, because we sit not still with
other prisoners. There goeth a fellow of the new learn-
ing, saith one; there is one of these new-fangled
gospellers, saith another; that is one of the new
brethren, saith the third; he followeth the new faith,
&c. . . . (p. 4)

In the treatise proper the origin of the Christian faith is pushed
back to the first man, and Adam and Eve are said to be the first
Christians because they had faith in the promise of God to redeem
them through His son. These Old Testament promises of God are
as much a part of the Gospel or good tidings as are the New Testa-
ment Gospels. New Custom is closer to Turner's translation of
the dialogue of Urbanus Regius than to Bullinger's treatise since
the play only pushes the age of Primitive Constitution back fifteen
hundred years to the time of Christ. The character Light of the
Gospel perhaps includes these Old Testament Promises of God,
but they are not specified as part of the Gospel. The intention of
the play is to discredit the Papists and label theirs the new faith,
while showing that the reformers are close to the primitive church
of the time of the Apostles. The conclusion of Coverdale's trans-
lation also has this same purpose of making the doctrines of the new learning seem to have issued out of the mouth of Christ or from the Apostles, while the Catholic doctrines represent the church in sore decay and corruption of the "old" faith.

In this chapter we have analyzed three purely doctrinal plays of the new learning, two others which merely reflect the new system of salvation, and one resurrection play which has some doctrinal elements added to the Biblical story. Of the three doctrinal plays two, *Lusty Juventus* and *The Life and Repentance of Marie Magdalene*, represent an attempt to present the full formula of salvation interwoven with a story, while the third, *New Custom*, seeks to defend the new learning against the charge of being new-fangled doctrines dreamed up in the workshops of heretics. *Nice Wanton* and *Misogonus* are both prodigal-son plays with incidental reference to the doctrine of the new learning. The references are favorable since the virtuous characters in *Misogonus* are adherents of the new, while the ignorant rustics and the evil priest are the followers of the old. In *Nice Wanton* the godly Barnabas is of the new persuasion, but the evil characters are not identified with the Papists and, indeed, lack any religious discipline.

All six of these plays date roughly between 1547 and 1577 and are thus later than the extant plays of Bale. They present a doctrine more secure in its hold on the people and less on the defensive.
Violent abusive attacks on the old system are not to be found in them; they preach the new way rather than attack the old.

We have also seen in this chapter how close in subject matter and diction are these new-learning plays to the moral and religious treatises of Tyndale, Coverdale, Bullinger, and other reformers. Because of this relationship between these two media for propagation of the new doctrines, a working knowledge of the fuller and more lengthy treatises gives a clearer understanding of the characters and doctrines, and even of the dramatic structure of the plays.
CHAPTER IV
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15 The author states in the prologue that he follows the accounts of Luke and Mark in his story, but here he is following only Luke in making the woman anoint the feet of Jesus. Mark's account, like Matthew's, states that she anoints his head.


17 Caxton printed the English translation of the Legenda Aurea of Jacobus de Voragine (c. 1275) in 1483 under the title of the Golden Legend. The legendary accounts of Mary's marvelous exploits may be found in this collection of legends.

18 A comparison betwene the Olde learnynge & the Newe, translated out of latin in Englysh by Wyliam Turner. Prynted in Southwarke by me James Nicolso. Anno 1537. Another edition was printed in 1548. For an analysis of this dialogue see Chapter VI of this dissertation.

19 Writings and Translations of Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter, ed. George Pearson for the Parker Society (London, 1844). The text printed in this collection is from the 1547 edition, but
there was also a 1541 edition as well as one printed in 1624 under the title "Look from Adam, and behold the Protestants' faith and religion, evidently proved out of the holy Scriptures against all Atheists, Papists, loose libertines, and carnal Gospellers: and that the faith, which they profess, hath continued from the beginning of the world, and so is the true and ancient faith. . . ."
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CHAPTER V

THE NEW-LEARNING DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION

IN THE HISTORY OF JACOB AND ESAU

The interlude called A newe mery and wittie Comedie or
Enterlude, newly imprinted, treating vpon the Historie of Iacob
and Esau, taken out of the xxvij. Chap. of the booke of Moses
entitled Genesis has survived in a blackletter edition printed in 1568
by Henry Bynneman, but it was registered to a Henry Sutton 1557-
1558\(^1\) as recorded in the Stationers' Register. The composition
date is not known though G. Schurwechs in a note in English
Studies\(^2\) contends that it was not written before 1539 since its pro-
logue and epilogue depend on Calvin's 1539 edition of the Institutio
Christianae Religionis. It will be shown in the course of this chap-
ter that the author of Jacob and Esau did not depend on Calvin's
work, and, indeed, that the doctrine of predestination presented in
the epilogue is opposed to Calvin's. Thus all that can be said
about the composition date is that the play was written sometime
before 1557-1558, the registration date.

Summary of the Plot

The author of Jacob and Esau uses the Biblical story of the
two brothers to illustrate one of the new-learning doctrines—pre-
Jacob and Esau

destination of some to eternal life and of others to damnation. The story is taken chiefly from the twenty-seventh chapter of Genesis as the title states, but the selling of the birthright and the prophecy concerning the servitude of Esau are from Genesis 25. The author adds much elaboration of detailed incident, motivation, and character analysis and development. Esau is portrayed as a hunter who cares for nothing but the hunt. He makes his servant rise early and thinks nothing of disturbing the sleep of his neighbors with his hunting horn. Except with Isaac, Esau is unpopular with everyone: his mother, his brother, the neighbors, and even the servants. After he has bought a mess of pottage with his birthright, he refuses to share with his servant Ragau even though he thinks him famished. Instead, he berates him for always thinking of his stomach. Luckily, Ragau, like the true Plautine servant that he is, has managed to eat his fill of the pottage secretly before reporting to his master. The Genesis account makes Esau a man of the fields, a hunter, but not an evil man. The play shows him defying all the rules of God and man.

Hanan and Zethar, two of Isaac's neighbors, are awakened by the horn of Esau. Zethar blames Isaac for not raising his son more strictly, but Hanan argues that both Jacob and Esau have had the best of home training and education as well as good example set by their parents. He continues:
Yong it pricketh (folkes do say) that wyll be a thorne,
Esau hath ben nought euer since he was borne.
(ll. 162-63)

Esau's trouble comes from his own "yll inclination." Zethar is for dismissing Esau as a wicked one not worthy of their concern, but Hanan replies:

Oh it is our parte to lamente them that doe yll.
Lyke as very Nature, a godly heart dothe moue
Others good proceedings to tender and to loue:
So suche as in no wise to goodnesse will be brought:
What good me but wil mourn, since god vs al hath wrought
(ll. 183-87)

Rebecca laments to Jacob that it was ever her chance to bear such a son as Esau; Jacob answers that they must be content with God's ordinance. Rebecca remembers that before the sons were born a voice from the Lord came to her saying that there were in her womb two unlike nations and the elder should be subjected to the younger. She feels that she is the one to carry out the will of God, so she advises Jacob to plot to get the birthright from Esau. In Genesis Rebecca has nothing to do with this transfer of the birthright; Jacob is the sole perpetrator. In the play Jacob hesitates, but consents when his mother tells him that it is the will of God.

Rebecca first tries to persuade Isaac to transfer the birthright to Jacob on the strength of the prophecy that the elder should be subjected to the younger. She is certain that God will "set vp Jacob, and Esau downe throw" (l. 416). Isaac refuses as the "title of birthright, that commeth by descent" he cannot change.
It is "natures lawe" that Esau shall have his heritage. But Jacob manages to obtain the birthright for his mess of pottage. Esau's servant Ragau pities "good blessed father Isaac" that he should have a son who would sell his inheritance so cheap, but he thinks that God "this thyng hath wrought, For Jacob is as good as Esau is nought" (ll. 629-30). Esau is presented as a heartless master to his servant and as a dishonest dealer as he plans to take back his birthright when his father dies. Rebecca praises God with a "hymn or psalm" when she hears of Jacob's success. She is sure now that Jacob is elected of God and Esau is rejected. She and Jacob plot to deceive Isaac and obtain his blessing also for the younger son.

The scenes of selecting the kids for the "venison," preparing them, and keeping the deception of Isaac a secret by the entire household are told with homely details and humor. Everyone except Isaac wants the plot to succeed. Abra, the maid, sings "Yong doth it pricke that will be a thorne" (l. 1122) of Esau while she sweeps the tent. Jacob doesn't like deception, but he will bow to the will of God. Rebecca gives thanks for the success of their plan.

Esau returns with his venison and discovers that Jacob has already received the blessing. Isaac, who has also discovered the deception, has little left to say to Esau. He blesses Esau saying that his dwelling-place shall have the fatness of the earth and the
dew of Heaven and that he shall live by the sword. Esau swears vengeance on all those who perpetrated the deed. Though he knows that God does not allow vengeance, he will have it anyway; "The Lord will not see all things, some thing may be hid" (I. 1546). He vows to kill Jacob when the occasion arises. The nurse reports the threat to Rebecca, who sends Jacob off to Laban her brother to choose a wife from among his people. Esau is violently angry, but because his mother asks him to forget his hatred of Jacob, he promises, with the private reservation that when he sees Jacob he will do as God moves his mind at the time. This repentance with a reservation is the best the reprobate is capable of. The play ends with Ragau calling all to sing a hymn of praise to God:

Thy almighty hand did create and frame,  
Both heaven and earth and all the elementes  
Man of the earth thou haste formed and create,  
Some do thee worship, and some stray awrye,  
Whome pleaseth thee, thou dost choote or reprobate,  
And no fleshe can ask wherefore or why?  
(II. 1778-1783)

Luther's Belief in Predestination and the Early Controversy over the Freedom of the Will

Upon first reading this interlude about Jacob and Esau, the modern reader, not familiar with Luther's, Melanchthon's, and Bucer's views on predestination, may be led to believe that the source of the play must be the Institutes of John Calvin, or at least the doctrine of election as expounded by Calvin. As we shall
see later in the chapter, one critic even goes so far as to say that
the author actually had the 1539 edition of Calvin's Institutes open
before him when he wrote the play, for he translated several lines
from that edition. However, although there is little in the play be-
fore the epilogue with which Calvin could quarrel, it is not necessary
to assume that any play on election and predestination is indebted to
Calvin. One of the tenets of the new learning was a firm belief in
double predestination and a determinism which followed from Luther's
rejection of works as merits for justification and from his emphasis
on the enslaved will of man, which, because of original sin, was
unable to do anything toward its salvation. As Henry Wace puts it,
"Protestant theology of the sixteenth century both began and ended
in strict theories of Predestination." Luther believed in double and
immutable predestination and approved the statement of the theory
which Melanchthon made in his Loci Communes Rerum Theologi-
carum (1521). Again Wace states that Melanchthon's early teaching
congering predestination was not less severe than Calvin's. He
quotes the Loci Communes passages on the doctrine of predestina-
tion and the freedom of the human will:

Since all things which happen, necessarily happen
according to Divine predestination, there can be no
liberty of our will.

If you regard the human will in reference to predestina-
tion, there is no liberty either in external or internal
works; but all things happen according to Divine deter-
mination.
It is true that in the later editions of the Loci (1535 and 1544), Melanchthon came to teach a kind of synergism, or a co-operation between man's will and God for his salvation, and rejected Luther's determinism, but the "Genuine" Lutherans continued to teach Lutheran predestination and enslavement of the will by sin. 8

Erasmus wrote against Luther's doctrine of the enslavement of the human will in De Libero Arbitrio (1524). He writes that Christian piety consists in "striving with all our might" toward salvation, but he also adds that "apart from the mercy of God our will is ineffective." Luther answered him in his treatise De Servo Arbitrio (1525) in which he argued that man's will is capable of nothing toward his salvation. He considered Erasmus' position as an attempt to side with neither party in the controversy, a stand which would allow him to "emerge from between Scylla and Charybdis unscathed--so that if the waves in the open sea upset and overwhelm you, you can then assert all that you now deny, and deny all that you now assert." 9 Luther felt that it was absolutely essential to Christianity that man know exactly what God's will performs and what man's will is capable of. Erasmus' stand on the issue, he considered protean in nature:

Here you plainly assert that the will is in some respect active in matters pertaining to eternal salvation, for you represent it as striving; and, again, you represent it as the object of Divine action when you say that without God's mercy it is ineffective. But you do not define the limits within which we should think of the will as acting and as
acted upon; you take pains to engender ignorance as to what
God's mercy and man's will can effect by your very teaching as to what man's will and God's mercy do effect! Thus
that caution of yours sends you round in circles . . . 10

Erasmus had asked, "What use or need is there, then, of
publishing such things [as man's enslaved will and God's predes-
tination], when so many harmful results seem likely to follow?" 11
Luther replied that it is enough that God willed their publication in
the Scriptures, but for those who want further explanation, he would
say that it is necessary to preach that man's will is enslaved in
order to humble man's pride and to show him the true nature of
Christian faith. He writes on humbling man's pride:

But a man cannot be thoroughly humbled till he realizes
that his salvation is utterly beyond his own powers,
counsels, efforts, will and works, and depends absolutely
on the will, counsel, pleasure and work of Another--God
alone. As long as he is persuaded that he can make even
the smallest contribution to his salvation, he remains
self-confident and does not utterly despair of himself, and
so is not humbled before God. (p. 100)

The true nature of Christian faith is to believe that God is merciful
even "though He saves so few and damns so many; to believe that
He is just, though of His own will He makes us perforce proper
subjects for damnation," writes Luther. There would be no need
for faith if man could understand "how this same God, who makes
such a show of wrath and unrighteousness, can yet be merciful and
just" (p. 101).

God is not to be judged by human standards of justice; rather
men must join Paul in exclaiming:
O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unspeakable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out. (Rom. 11:33)

This is one of the favorite texts in the play Jacob and Esau, as we shall see later. Luther continues to give advice to those who would find God unjust for damning some and saving others without regard to merits:

You may be worried that it is hard to defend the mercy and equity of God in damning the undeserving, that is, ungodly persons, who, being born in ungodliness, can by no means avoid being ungodly, and staying so, and being damned, but are compelled by natural necessity to sin and perish; as Paul says: "We were all the children of wrath, even as others" (Eph. 2.3), created such by God Himself from a seed that had been corrupted by the sin of the one man, Adam. But here God must be reverenced and held in awe, as being most merciful to those whom He justifies and saves in their own utter unworthiness; and we must show some measure of deference to His Divine wisdom by believing Him just when to us He seems unjust. (p. 314)

From these words of Luther (printed in 1525) it seems plain that the doctrine in the interlude Jacob and Esau could be Lutheran instead of Calvinistic, though on this point the two are essentially the same. That is to say that the influence behind the play could have been as well Luther's De Servo Arbitrio and the controversy involving it as Calvin's Institutes. Such an assumption would allow for a much earlier date of composition for the play than Scheurweghs argues.

The controversy over the freedom of the will to help in its own salvation was a burning issue throughout the twenties, thirties,
and forties, and indeed throughout the sixteenth century. On the enslaved will Luther based his doctrine of justification by faith alone without merit for works. Henry VIII requested Erasmus to answer Luther on the denial of the liberty of man's will to help effect its own salvation, and the De Libero Arbitrio resulted (1524). This treatise is referred to in William Roy's dialogue between two priests' servants, Rede Me and Be Nott Wrothe (1528). When Jeffraye asks whether Erasmus did nothing to prevent the death of the mass at Strasbourg, Watkyn answers:

He was busy to make will fre
A thynge not possible to be
After wyse clarkis estimacion.

Luther's answer to Erasmus' treatise must have been well known in England, as the merchants imported and circulated heretical books in considerable quantities. Bishop Fisher wrote against it in his Confutatio. In 1527 Tunstal gave Sir Thomas More permission to keep Lutheran books in order that he might answer the opinions therein, and A Dialogue Concerning Heresies and Matters of Religion (1528) was the first of his answers. His attack was on the heresies of Luther as expounded by Tyndale, whose translation of the New Testament, with its Lutheran prefaces, was having great influence on the people. Among other heresies, those of predestination and the enslaved will of man were refuted. In the examination of an English Lutheran heretic, More writes, it
had come out that he believed:

that all thing hangeth only upon destiny, and that
the liberty of man's will should serve of right nought,
nor men's deeds, good or bad, made no difference afore
God, but that in his chosen people nothing misliketh
him be it never so bad, and in the other sort nothing
pleaseth him be it never so good. (p. 197)

More denies that man's will is of no help in his salvation and that
his deeds are to no avail in his justification. Like Erasmus he
states the Church's position on predestination in attributing its
cause to God's foreknowledge or prescience that some would be
virtuous and others would not:

Now God from the beginning before the world was
created, forseeing in his divine prescience or rather
in the (e)ternitie of his Godhead, presently behold-
ing, that Peter would repent and Judas would despair,
and that the one would take hold of his grace [and]
the other would reject it, accepted and chose the one,
as he would have made the contrary choice, if he had
foreseen in them the contrary choice. (p. 298)

As to Luther's teaching on predestination or "destiny," as More puts
it, More writes: "this false opinion is, as the king's highness
[Henry VIII] most virtuously writeth in his epistle to Luther, the
most abominable heresy that ever was" (p. 299).

We see from these early testimonials that free will vs. enslaved
will was the question of the hour in the sixteenth century long before
Calvin formulated it in his Institutes. John Bale asks at the end
of his play God's Promises, compiled in 1538, but probably written
earlier, "Where is now freewill, whome the ypocrizes comment." 15
He continues with the attitude of the new learning towards the Church's belief in free will:

    Whereby they reporte they may at theyr owne pleasure
    Do good of them selues, though grace and fayth be absent
    And haue good intentes theyr madenes with to measure.

He concludes:

    The will of the flesh is prooued here smale treasure,
    And so is mans will, for the grace of God doth all.

Bale also mentions Luther's treatise De Servo Arbitrio in a defense of Luther and the other reformers attacked in A Genealogy of Heresy, a treatise by one Ponce Pantolabus. He thinks that Pantolabus must have had this treatise on the enslaved will in mind when he accused Luther of doing away with man's liberty. From this reference, though late, it may be further seen that Luther's treatise was well known in England.

Source of the Doctrine of the Play and of the Prologue and Epilogue

With the possibility in mind that Luther and the general controversy on the freedom of the will may have been the inspiration of the author of Jacob and Esau, it will be well to examine the claim of G. Scheurweghs that the author of the play, wishing to express the same ideas on predestination that Calvin formulated in his Institutes, actually translated "a few lines from Calvin, as will appear from the juxtaposition of the passages." He quotes the
passages from the prologue and the epilogue alongside passages in Latin from Calvin's *Institutio Christianae Religionis nunc vere demum suo titulo respondens* (1539) to prove his point. There is certainly a superficial and apparent correspondence between the two sets of passages, but on closer examination it is seen that in these very passages Calvin is arguing *against* the position taken by the author in the epilogue that the foreknowledge of man's merits is the cause of God's predestination. Such a cause for predestination would leave room for the works of man in his election. But Calvin, in the first of the passages quoted by Scheurweghs, states that the prophecy, "the elder should serve the younger," was made before the sons were born "in order that the design of God should endure, not from works, but from calling." He leaves here no place for the works of man as the cause of his predestination. In fact, in the next passage quoted by Scheurweghs, Calvin attacks those who would put forward God's foreknowledge of man's future merits as the cause of predestination:

> Why will they put forward a pretext toward obscuring these statements by assigning some place among the elect by means of works, either past or future?

Calvin goes on from here—in the third passage quoted by Scheurweghs—to say that to attribute election to the foreknowledge of man's merits is to misunderstand what Paul intends:

> Truly this is useful to evade what the apostle contends for—[viz.] to judge the distinction of the
brothers not from any reason of works, but from the mere calling of God, inasmuch as it shall have been fixed before they were born.  

If the author of Jacob and Esau translated part of his prologue and epilogue from Calvin's Institutes, as Scheurweghs maintains, he misunderstood what Calvin was driving at in the passages, as will be shown at greater length later in the chapter.

Actually the source for the passages which Scheurweghs quotes from Jacob and Esau, and, indeed, for the entire prologue and epilogue, is the ninth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, along with the chapters from Genesis which tell the same story.

Prologue (ll. 1-4)
In the Boke of Genesis it is expressed, That whē God to Abrahā made sure promis That in his seede al nations shold be blessed: To send him a son by Sara he did not misse.

Romans 9:9
For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son.

Prologue (ll. 5-7)
Then to Isaac (as there recorded it is) By Rebecca his wife, who had lōg time be barain Whē pleased him, at one birth he sent sons twaine.

Romans 9:10
And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac.

Prologue (ll. 8-12)
But before Jacob and Esau yet borne were, Or had eyther done good, or yll perpetrate: As the prophete Malachie and Paule witnesse beare,
Jacob and Esau

Jacob was chosen, and Esau reprobate:  
Jacob I loue (sayde God) and Esau I hate.

Romans 9:11, 13
(For the children being not yet born, neither having done  
any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to  
election, might stand, not of works, but of him that  
calleth;)  
As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I  
hated.

Prologue (ll. 13-14)  
For it is not (sayth Paule) in mans renuing [running] or will,  
But in Gods mercy who choiseth whome he will.

Romans 9:16, 15
So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that  
runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.  
For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will  
have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will  
have compassion.

Epilogue (ll. 1801-02)  
Yet not all fleshe did he then predestinate,  
But onely the adopted children of promise:

Romans 9:8
. . . They which are the children of the fleshe, these  
are not the children of God: but the children of the promise  
are counted for the seed.

Epilogue (ll. 1803-04)  
For he forknewe that many would degenerate,  
And wylfully giue cause to be put from that blisse:

Romans 8:29  
For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be  
conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the  
first-born among many brethren.
Epilogue (ll. 1805)
So on Gods behalfe no maner default there is.

Romans 9:14
What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid.

Epilogue (ll. 1811-14)
. . . . . . . . it is meete for vs,
With Paule the Apostle to confesse and say thus:
Oh the deepnesse of the riches of Gods wisedome,
How vnsearcheable are his wayes to mans reason?

Romans 11:33
O the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.

Songs
(ll. 872-875)
Blessed be thou, O the God of Abraham,
For thou art the Lord our God, and none but thou:
What thou workest to the glory of thy name,
Passeth mannes reason to searche what way or how.

(ll. 1776-77)
O Lorde the God of our father Abraham,
Howe deepe and vnsearcheable are thy judgementes?

Play
(ll. 1471-72)
O Lorde my God, how deepe and vnsercheable
Are all thy judgements, and how immutable.

Romans 11:33
O the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out.
This detailed comparison of the prologue and epilogue with the ninth chapter of Paul's Epistle shows a striking similarity of thought, arrangement, and wording. The first four lines of the prologue are a summary of events related in Genesis culminating in the birth of a son to Sarah and Abraham; Romans 9:9 is also a brief summary of these events from Genesis. Lines 5-7 of the prologue of the play then turn to Isaac and Rebecca and the sons sent them by the Lord; Romans 9:10 tells of the same event. Lines 8-12 of the prologue relate how, before birth and before either son had done good or evil, Jacob was loved and chosen and Esau was hated and reprobated; Romans 9:11 and 13 tell exactly the same events. These lines of the prologue also give Malachi and Paul as the authorities who bear witness to this choosing by God of Jacob over Esau; and in Romans 9:13: "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated," Paul quotes from Malachi just what the prologue has attributed to Malachi and to Paul. Lines 13-14 of the prologue:

For it is not (sayth Paul) in mans running,

or will,

But in Gods mercy who choseth whom he will.

repeat what is said in Romans 9:16: "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy," and Romans 9:15: "For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will
have compassion." The rest of the prologue tells what the play will show by means of the Jacob and Esau story:

But now for our comming we shal exhibite here
Of Jacob and Esau howe the story was,
Wherby Gods adoption may plainly appeare.

Compare this purpose with Paul's in the ninth chapter of Romans, verse 4, where he proposes to discuss "Who are Israelites: to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." The prologue continues:

And also, that what euer Gods ordinance was,
Nothing might defeate, but that it muste come to passe.

Paul also believes that nothing can defeat the word of God. In the beginning verses of the ninth chapter to the Romans, he is appalled at the wickedness of some of his kinsmen, the Israelites, and he seeks to reconcile the fact that these are the chosen people of God with their behavior. He says, "Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel" (verse 6). He then proceeds through Abraham's son to the sons of Isaac, where he finds a story to illustrate his theory of adoption in the twin sons of Isaac. This story of Jacob and Esau, Paul uses to illustrate God's method of adoption and to show that what God had decreed in his promises to Abraham really was taking place even though some of the "chosen" people were wicked. Paul's purpose also was to extend the adoption to the Gentiles, but
this purpose is not treated by the author of *Jacob and Esau*.

Thus the lines of the prologue (8-15) which Scheurweghs thinks were translated in part from Calvin are shown to fit into an arrangement which follows Romans 9 in thought and wording. Scheurweghs' examples from the epilogue will be found to fit into this arrangement also as they are compared with verses from the same chapter of Romans and from two other chapters. The first eight lines of the epilogue lay the blame for man's "sentence of death" at Adam's door and represent God, the Omnipotent, as decreeing to restore man by his mercy. Lines 1801 and 1802 add:

Yet not all fleshe did he then predestinate,
But onley the adopted children of promise.

Compare these with Romans 9:8: "... They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." Lines 1803 and 1804 show God's reason for choosing some to salvation and some to reprobation:

For he foreknewe that many would degenerate,
And wylfully guie cause to be put from that blisse.

These lines find no exact counterpart in chapter nine of Romans, but verse twenty-nine of chapter eight is similar: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren." Paul does not actually say that God's foreknowledge of man's future
merits was the cause of predestination, merely that He predestined those whom he foreknew. The author of the play states that since God foreknew that some men would "degenerate" and "wylfully giue cause to be put from that blisse," He destined some for salvation and some for reprobation on the basis of that foreknowledge. This basis for predestination was not admitted by Calvin as we shall see later in this chapter.

The epilogue continues in line 1805: "So on Gods behalfe no maner default there is." Compare this line with Romans 9:14, "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid." Lines 1806-1811 of the epilogue continue:

But where he chooseth, he sheweth his great mercy:
And where he refuseth, he doth none iniury,
But thus farre surmounteth mans intellecction,
To attaine or conceiue, and much more to discusse:
All must be referred to Gods election,
And to his secret judgement . . .

Romans 9, verses 14-18 emphasize the mercy of God in choosing some men for salvation. Paul in verses 20-23 asks of those who would complain of God's predestination, "O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" A passage close to the lines in the epilogue is to be found in Romans 11:33, "O the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out." In fact the author of the play now turns to this very passage and con-
times his epilogue in lines 1811-1814:

... it is meete for vs,
With Paule the Apostle to confesse and say thus:
Oh the deepnesse of the riches of Gods wisedome,
How vnsearcheable are his wayes to mans reason?

From this comparison of the prologue and epilogue of Jacob and Esau with the words of St. Paul in Romans, it is seen that the author in his new learning was following Paul rather than Calvin as Scheurweghs contends. The Epistles of Paul were very popular with the reformers, and in particular that to the Romans was revered. Luther lectured on the Epistle to the Romans in 1515-1516 at Wittenberg, and the commentaries which resulted became a kind of Reform manifesto. A Latin version of Luther's preface to Epistle to the Romans was published in England in 1523, and William Tyndale used it for the basis of his Prologue Upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, published in his New Testament (1525), as a separate pamphlet in 1526, and incorporated into the first edition, 1537, of Matthew's Bible. In fact, Tyndale's Prologue was a paraphrase and sometimes a literal translation of Luther's preface. It is listed by Foxe as a forbidden book, and it was attacked by Sir Thomas More and Dr. Robert Ridley as heretical. Among other heretical opinions this Prologue comments on Paul's discussion of God's predestination "whence it springeth altogether; whether we shall believe or not believe; be-loosed from sin, or not be loosed. By which predestination our justifying and salvation are clean taken
out of our hands, and put in the hands of God only; which thing is
most necessary of all. For we are so weak and so uncertain,
that if it stood in us, there would of a truth be no man saved; . . .
But now is God sure, that his predestination cannot deceive him,
neither can any man withstand or let him, and therefore have we
hope and trust against sin. 25 The following quotation from this
Prologue of Luther and Tyndale shows their feeling for the doctrine
of predestination before the publication of the De Servo Arbitrio:

But here must a mark be set to those unquiet, busy, and
highclimbing spirits, how far they shall go; which first
of all bring hither their high reasons and pregnant wits,
and begin first from on high to search the bottomless
secrets of God's predestination, whether they be predes-
tinate or not. These must needs either cast themselves
down headlong into desperation, or else commit themselves
to free chance, careless. But follow thou the order of
this epistle, and noose thyself with Christ, and learn to
understand what the law and the gospel mean, and the
office of both the two; that thou mayest in the one know
thyself, and how that thou hast of thyself no strength but
to sin, and in the other the grace of Christ; and then see
thou fight against sin and the flesh, as the seven first
chapters teach thee. After that, when thou art come to
the eighth chapter, and art under the cross and suffering
of tribulation, the necessity of predestination will wax
sweet, and thou shalt well feel how precious a thing it is.
For except thou have borne the cross of adversity and
temptation, and hast felt thyself brought unto the very brim
of desperation, yea, and unto hell-gates, thou canst never
meddle with the sentence of predestination without thine
own harm, and without secret wrath and grudging inwardly
against God; for otherwise it shall not be possible for thee
to think that God is righteous and just. Therefore must
Adam be well mortified, and the fleshly wit brought utterly
to nought, ere that thou mayest away with this thing, and
drink so strong wine. Take heed therefore unto thyself,
that thou drink not wine, while thou art yet but a suckling. 26
The importance of the Epistles of Paul to the Reformation cannot be too strongly stressed. In this same Prologue Luther and Tyndale write that the Epistle to the Romans is especially important in understanding the whole New Testament:

Forasmuch as this epistle is the principal and most excellent part of the New Testament and most pure evangelion, that is to say, glad tidings, and that we call gospel, and also is a light and a way unto the whole scripture; I think it meet that every christian man not only know it, by rote without the book, but also exercise himself therein evermore continually, as with the daily bread of the soul. No man verily can read it too oft, or study it too well; for the more it is chewed, the pleasanter it is; and the more groundly it is searched, the preciouseer things are found in it, so great treasure of spiritual things lieth hid therein. . . . it hath been hitherto evil darkened with glosses and wonderful dreams of sophisters, that no man could spy out the intent and meaning of it; which nevertheless of itself is a bright light, and sufficient to give light unto all the scripture.27

The Church frowned on the free and unrestrained reading of Paul's Epistles. In the investigation into the charge that the University of Oxford was infested with Lutheranism, on February 25, 1528, one Mr. Clerk was charged with reading "in his chamber Paul's Epistles to young men and those who were of two, three, or four years standing in the University."28 In answer to the articles of heresy against him one John Pykas in the same year admitted that his mother gave him Paul's Epistles in English and bade him live according to the Epistles and the Gospels and not after the way the Church taught. He later bought the New Testament in English, he testified, but on hearing that these books were forbidden he
gave them to his mother. He admitted, perhaps tongue in cheek, that he fell into his errors by reading these books. 29

This popularity of Paul's Epistles and the use of the Epistle to the Romans by Luther and Tyndale to affirm their doctrine of predestination make it quite probable that the source of the reform play Jacob and Esau is Paul rather than Calvin. The comparison of prologue and epilogue with the Epistle has shown that their main source was undoubtedly the ninth chapter of Romans. It is true that the inspiration for this interpretation of Paul might have come from Calvin, especially in the last years of Henry VIII's reign and in that of Edward VI when the influence of Calvin and his friends was increasingly prevalent in England. Though the author of The History of Jacob and Esau could have translated Calvin's Institutes as Scheurweghs contends, it is not essential to assume that he did. The case may well be like that of Erasmus and his connections with Luther. In writing to Richard Pace, he wished for some "Deus ex machina" that would bring a happy conclusion to the tragedy which Luther had so inauspiciously begun. He complained that his opponents are now showing that Luther has taken a great deal from his, Erasmus's, books, but he suggested that Luther has taken still more from Paul's Epistles. 30 In fact, Erasmus and Luther used Paul's Epistle to the Romans (the ninth chapter, on which the author of Jacob and Esau based his propogue and epilogue)
to both prove and disprove the existence of free will. Erasmus, as the proponent of free will in man, found it necessary to explain away Paul's apparent espousal in the Jacob and Esau incident of predestination by God with no regard for the merits of man. 31 Luther attacks, in De Servo Arbitrio, Erasmus's explanation of Malachi 1:2-3 as quoted by Paul in his ninth chapter of Romans:

"Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Erasmus, says Luther, explains away God's hatred and the fact that Esau was predestined before he was born to serve his younger brother Jacob, in three ways: first, Erasmus takes the servitude to mean temporal servitude and to have no reference to salvation; second, he assumes that Malachi means temporal affliction or hatred, not eternal; and third, God is said to hate Esau because by His foreknowledge He is able to know that Esau will merit hatred by his deeds (pp. 222-229). This last position is exactly that taken by the author of the interlude Jacob and Esau in the epilogue. There is no need to go forward to Calvin's Institutes (first edition 1536, expanded edition 1539) for the source or inspiration of the play and its doctrine, when the Biblical story on which the play is based forms part of the burning controversy (1524 and 1525) between Erasmus and Luther on the question of free will and eternal predestination with no regard to the merits of man. Calvin also uses the Jacob and Esau story and Paul's ninth chapter of Romans in his defense of predestination,
but Luther had used it years before.

To prove that the author of the play "depends" on Calvin's Institutes, as Scheurweghs contends, it would be necessary, in the absence of external proof of direct translation or paraphrase, to show that the ideas in the play are peculiarly Calvinistic. It is true that the author of Jacob and Esau and Calvin discuss predestination and related ideas, but there seems to be no evidence that these ideas could not have come from the Lutheran controversy with Erasmus or from the intellectual atmosphere of the time or more directly from Paul's Epistles interpreted in this atmosphere. In fact, there is internal evidence that if the author depended on Calvin for his ideas, he either did not understand Calvin's doctrine or he disagreed with him on some points. Their doctrines of the cause of God's predestination are not in accord. In the epilogue the Poet is made to say:

Yet not all fleshe did he then predestinate,  
But onely the adopted children of promise:  
For he forknewe that many would degenerate,  
And wyfullye giue cause to be put from that blisse:  
So on Gods behalfe no maner default there is.  
(II. 1801-1805)

Calvin admits that God is omniscient and has foreknowledge of all that is to be, but, as we have seen, he denies emphatically that this foreknowledge is the cause of God's electing some to life and leaving some to damnation. He attacks those who, like the author of Jacob and Esau, justify God in the matter by assuming that pre-
destination is based on foreknowledge of man's worth. He is discussing predestination in connection with Paul's ninth chapter to the Romans:

The question considered is the origin and cause of election. The advocates of foreknowledge insist that it is to be found in the virtues and vices of men. For they take the short and easy method of asserting, that God showed in the person of Jacob, that he elects those who are worthy of his grace; and in the person of Esau, that he rejects those whom he foresees to be unworthy. Such is their confident assertion; but what does Paul say? "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God's election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her [Rebecca], The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." (Rom. IX. 11-13). If foreknowledge had anything to do with this distinction of the brothers, the mention of time would have been out of place. Granting that Jacob was elected for a worth to be obtained by future virtues, to what end did Paul say that he was not yet born? Nor would it have been any occasion for adding, that as yet he had done no good, because the answer was always ready, that nothing is hid from God, and that therefore the piety of Jacob was present before him. If works procure a favour, a value ought to have been put upon them before Jacob was born, just as if he had been of full age. But in explaining the difficulty, the Apostle goes on to show, that the adoption of Jacob proceeded not on works but on the calling of God. In works he makes no mention of past or future, but distinctly opposes them to the calling of God, intimating, that when place is given to the one the other is overthrown; as if he had said, The only thing to be considered is what pleased God, not what men furnished of themselves. Lastly, it is certain that all the causes which men are wont to devise as external to the secret counsel of God, are excluded by the use of the terms purpose and election. 33

After this definite denial of foreknowledge as the cause of God's election---it will be remembered that the author of Jacob and Esau defended God on this very ground---Calvin writes two of the passages
used by Scheurweghs to prove that the play "depends" on the Institutes:

Why should men attempt to darken these statements by assigning some place in election to past or future works? This is altogether to evade what the Apostle contends for—viz. that the distinction between the brothers is not founded on any ground of works, but the mere calling of God, inasmuch as it was fixed before the children were born. Had there been any solidity in this subtlety, it would not have escaped the notice of the Apostle, but being perfectly aware that God foresaw no good in man, save that which he had already previously determined to bestow by means of his election, he does not employ a preposterous arrangement which would make good works antecedent to their cause.  

For Calvin, God elects whom He will of His own good pleasure; why He pleases to save some and not others is one of the mysteries of God, but God does not choose some because He foresees their virtues or reject others because He foresees their vices. Calvin quotes Paul (Eph. 1:4, 5) where he says that God "hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we might be holy and without blame before him in love." Some are elected that they might be holy, not in consequence of their holiness, past or future. Calvin's defense of God is not on the grounds of foreknowledge, but rather that God is a law unto Himself and man is not to question His decrees. The elect, Calvin thinks, along with Augustine, are saved by the mercy of God while the reprobate are left in sin by the justice of God since all have sinned in Adam and none deserve salvation. He states that the belief in God's
foreknowledge of man's future merits as the cause of election was held by such Church Fathers as Ambrose, Origen, and Jerome, but he rejects this position. We have seen earlier in the chapter that Sir Thomas More in his Dialogue (1528) takes this way out of the dilemma of double predestination and a just and loving God. He wrote that God foresaw before the world was created that Peter would repent and Judas would despair; therefore He chose the one and rejected the other. 

This is the position we find the author of Jacob and Esau taking in his epilogue. How can we reconcile this position of the epilogue, which agrees with that of the Church, with the reform nature, whether Calvinistic or Lutheran, of the rest of the play? This is the problem of which Scheurweghs and other modern critics are apparently not aware.

The consequences of the doctrine of double and immutable predestination were so devastating that many were unable to accept them, and various methods of softening them were resorted to in the sixteenth century. We have found the author of the play Jacob and Esau adopting the Church's explanation of the justice of God in electing some to life and some to death. This was also Erasmus's way out as has been seen from his De Libero Arbitrio. Bishop Hooper argues around the problem in his preface to a commentary on the ten commandments. He rejects the extreme positions saying:

It is not a christian man's part to attribute his salvation to his own free will, with the Pelagian, and extenuate
original sin; nor to make God the author of ill and our 
damnation, with the Manichee; nor yet to say, God hath 
written fatal laws, as the Stoic, and with necessity of 
destiny violently pulleth one by the hair into heaven, and 
thrusteth the other headlong into hell. But ascertain 
thyself by the scripture, what be the causes of reprobation. 39

He goes on to say that the cause of rejection or damnation in man 
is sin or failure to receive the gospel when he hears it, and the 
cause of man's election to life is "the mercy of God in Christ."
We judge election "by the event or success that happeneth in the 
life of man, those only to be elected that by faith apprehend the 
mercy promised in Christ." 40 Other than this, man cannot judge 
of election. This explanation solves nothing as to the cause of pre-
destination, but Bishop Hooper, martyr for the reform cause in 
1555, was satisfied with it. John Bradford, also martyr in 1555, 
writes that God shows mercy to the elect because it pleaseth Him, 
and "'hardeneth the heart of others whom he will,' as saith Paul." 41 
This "'will of God' were good for no creature to call to account."
Archbishop Cranmer accepts predestination according to the will of 
God without any merit on man's part:

But certain it is, that our election cometh only and wholly 
of the benefit and grace of God, for the merits of Christ's 
passion, and for no part of our merits and good works: 
as St. Paul disputeth and proveth at length in the epistle 
to the Romans and Galatians, and divers other places, 
saying, Si ex operibus, non ex gratia; si ex gratia, non 
ex operibus. 42

Bishop Hugh Latimer, martyr also in 1555, accepts predestination 
but believes that man is the cause of his own damnation:
For if the most part be damned, the fault is not in God, but in themselves: for it is written, Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri; "God would that all men should be saved:" but they themselves procure their own damnation, and despise the passion of Christ by their own wicked and inordinate living. Here we may learn to keep us from all curious and dangerous questions: when we hear that some be chosen and some be damned, let us have good hope that we shall be amongst the chosen, and live after this hope . . . Think that God hath chosen those that believe in Christ, and that Christ is the book of life. If thou believest in him, then thou art written in the book of life, and shalt be saved. So we need not go about to trouble ourselves with curious questions of the predestination of God. 43

If men would still inquire whether they be among the elect of God, Latimer would give them this formula, which is reminiscent of the know-thy-sins formula discussed in connection with *Everyman* (see Ch. I):

And when you find these three points to be in you; namely, first, when you know your sin and be sorry for the same; and afterward believe to be saved through the passion of Jesus Christ; and thirdly, have an earnest desire to leave sin, and to fly the same; when you find these three things in your hearts, then you may be sure that your names are written in the book: and you may be sure also, that you are elect and predestinate to everlasting life. 44

As we have seen, Luther also recognized the need for man to defend "the mercy and equity of God in damning the undeserving, that is, ungodly persons, who, being born in ungodliness, can by no means avoid being ungodly and staying so, and being damned, but are compelled by natural necessity to sin and perish." 45 His answer is that God is not to be adjudged by human reckoning, but rather revered and held in awe no matter what His actions. However,
he, with Calvin, would admit no merit on the part of man as the cause of God's predestination. Thus we have the author of Jacob and Esau deviating from Luther's doctrine as well as from Calvin's. In other words we have an obvious reform play with a joker which nullifies the intention of the play. What is the explanation?

Some critics think this play may have been written by Nicholas Udall, and herein may lie the answer to a puzzling situation. Udall was involved with Thomas Garet, who was suspected of Lutheranism, while at Oxford; and he himself fell under suspicion. Later in his life, after 1545, he came out in bold defense of the Reformation and translated, at Queen Katherine's request, Erasmus's Paraphrase on Luke. In the preface he says he desires to translate into English the Latin works which will forward the new learning. He translated the tract on the Eucharist by Peter Martyr, the reformer, and John Bale praised him highly in 1548. Yet in the reign of Mary he was prominently connected with the production of plays for the court and in obvious favor with the Catholic queen. The Catholic Stephen Gardiner, Lord Chancellor in Mary's reign, bequeathed in 1555 forty marks to Udall though a few years earlier he had given evidence against him. Here is a pattern that might well fit the play Jacob and Esau, which starts out to be a play about predestination interpreted in the sense of the new learning and ends
with a statement of Catholic doctrine in attributing the cause of predestination to God's foreknowledge of man's future merits. If Udall wrote the play earlier than the reign of Mary, he might well have ended it originally in the Reformation doctrine on predestination. Then he could have made it acceptable for registration in Mary's reign by adding the lines on foreknowledge. Or he could have written it in the thirties with the express purpose of explaining Paul's ninth chapter of Romans against the reformers and in agreement with Erasmus. The first of these possibilities seems the more likely as there is no hint of anything but Lutheran doctrine until the epilogue. The reader is certainly deceived by the prologue and the play itself into thinking it a Lutheran (or Calvinistic) play on predestination. For example, in the prologue these lines could lead to no other conclusion:

But before Jacob and Esau yet borne were,
Or had eyther done good, or yll perpetrate:
As the prophete Malachie and Paule witnesse beare,
Jacob was chosen, and Esau reprobate:
Jacob I loue (sayde God) and Esau I hate,
For it is not (sayth Paule) in mans renuing \[\text{running}\]
or will,

But in Gods mercy who choseth whome he will.

But now for our comming we shal exhibite here
Of Jacob and Esau howe the story was,
Wherby Gods adoption may plainly appeare:
And also, that what euer Gods ordinance was,
Nothing might defeate, but that it muste come to passe.

(II. 8-21)

These lines deny any merit on the part of man in his being chosen;
all is according to God's mercy and will. The last two lines quoted seem to point to Luther's doctrine of necessity or necessitating foreknowledge by which God was bound to fulfill what he foresaw. His foreknowledge of man's merits was not the cause of his choosing, but once He had chosen and so foreseen the fate of men, His ordinance must of necessity come to pass. Since Esau is presented in the play proper as an evil man, the interpretation could be made that he was rejected and hated because God foresaw that he would be evil. This explanation, however, is not even hinted at in the play, and only in the epilogue does the author make this assertion. The reader feels throughout the play that Esau is evil because he is rejected and hated by God. But the only explanation given in the play is that God chooses whom he pleases and rejects whom he pleases, and man is not to ask why:

Some do thee worship, and some stray awrye,  
Whome pleaseth thee, thou doste choose or reprobate,  
And no fleshe can aske thee wherfore or why?  
(II. 1781-83)

There is no attempt to say on just what basis God chooses. It is only in the epilogue spoken by the Poet that we are told that God "forknewe that many would degenerate, And wylfully giue cause to be put from that blisse," so He rejected and hated those.

There is other evidence that Udall could have written Jacob and Esau. The plot structure and the characterization show the influence of Roman comedy as in Udall's Ralph Roister Doister. When com-
pared with Bale's lengthy, rambling, bitingly satirical propaganda pieces, *Jacob and Esau* is a sophisticated play unified in time, action, and place, obviously influenced by the Latin models found in the plays of Plautus and Terence popular at the time. The meter of *Ralph Roister Doister* and *Jacob and Esau* is similar in being rime couplets of doggerel with approximately five accents to the line.

In this chapter we have seen that as far as doctrine is concerned, Udall could have written the play. The shift in the doctrine seems to match the pattern of his life under the regimes of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary. When Udall wrote condemning the Pope and the Roman church in the Preface to the translation of Erasmus's Paraphrase of the New Testament (1548), he praised Erasmus as a man who had sifted out from the right doctrine "the trashe and bag-guage stuff that through papisticall tradicions had found a waie to crepe in." Erasmus in all his "moste clerkely wrytynges," writes Udall, brings in "the pith of all ye myndes & menynges of all the good Doctours of the churche, that ever wrote in iustification of feith, in honouring God onely, in reputaunce and puritie of a christen mannes lyfe, in detestyng of imagerie and corrupte honour-yng of Saintes, . . . in bewraiynng the iugleyng sleightes and fine practise of poperie." He finds Erasmus a man of "excellent witte, of much studie, of exquisite learnyng, of profound knowelage, of an
exact iudgemente, of notable diligence, ... and of vnestimable zele towards the settynge furth of Christes moste holy ghospell ... 51 We have seen that Erasmus explained God's election of some and not others by His foreknowledge of their future merits in his De Libero Arbitrio. Perhaps his great admiration for Erasmus made it easy for Ûdall to change the doctrine of Jacob and Esau so that it would be acceptable to the new Catholic censorship. Such a change would not represent a violent about-face in his thinking since, as we have seen, he and Erasmus had always been close in their attitude toward the abuses of the Roman Church and the need for reform.

However, whether Udall wrote the play or someone else did, it is an example of the new learning in the drama of the time. The scope of the doctrine is limited; there is no overall plan of salvation nor any struggle of vices and virtues for the soul of man. Rather, one point of reform doctrine, God's predestination, is expounded in the prologue and epilogue in a rough paraphrase of the ninth chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and the play itself is a Scriptural exemplum, taken from Genesis, illustrating the doctrine. The songs and the prayers in the play further emphasize the doctrine of God's election. The lines in the epilogue attributing God's predestination to His foreknowledge of man's merits are puzzling, but they may be explained by the existing religious and
political situation when the play was registered during the reign of
the Catholic Queen. Predestination was a good Catholic doctrine
when explained in this sense. Certainly, the play cannot be called
"rigidly Calvinistic" with these lines present which are directly
opposed to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination.
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CHAPTER VI
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It has been shown in this dissertation that the new learning was put forth extensively in the early sixteenth century plays. It may also be demonstrated that the semi-dramatic dialogue was used as a form for the new religious propaganda. Consideration of the new learning in the dialogues is relevant in this study of the drama because many of the dialogues of the early sixteenth century were dramatic in form, often being produced as plays or interludes (see below). Even those "closet" dialogues, which were not meant to be produced, were nevertheless closely akin to the drama in their dramatic structure. In fact, the role of the dialogue form in the development of the early Tudor interlude has been neglected and deserves further study. With a closer look into the drama of the early sixteenth century we find that the secular interlude may have sprung directly from the dialogue. This parental relationship would be hard to prove, but, certainly, a close relationship may be shown between the dialogue and the earliest interludes. E. K. Chambers finds the term interlude used in the fifteenth century for all types of plays, religious as well as secular, and suggests that the term interludium may have been misunderstood by modern critics to be a ludus in the intervals of something else (a banquet, or mystery
and morality plays), while it really meant a lūdus carried on be-
tween (inter) two or more performers or a lūdus in dialogue form.¹
Many of the interludes were performed in the intervals at the ban-
quets in the houses of the great. They retained the essential
nature of a dialogue until elaborated in the sixteenth century by
various devices for mirth and merriment.

There was a long tradition of the dialogue in the medieval
literature. Herford analyses the medieval dialogues and classifies
them into three groups.² The first group contained the purely
didactic treatises in which the dialogue form was simply a pedago-
gic device for presenting necessary knowledge. The second and
largest group were the debates between antagonists such as Summer
and Winter or the Owl and the Nightingale in which the dramatic
form was more important than the subject matter. The third group
Herford calls the polemic dialogue in which the serious thought
of the didactic treatise and the genuine discussion of the debates
were combined. The dialogue form had been used by the Christian
doctors in every age to teach their message more dramatically.
We find John Foxe defending the dialogue as a method of instruction
in religious matters in the preface to a sixteenth century dialogue³
in which he gives precedents in the writings of Hilarius, Ambrose,
Jerome, and Augustine. Also the Dialogues of Pope Gregory were
popular with sermon writers.
In addition to these native debates and religious polemic dialogues, the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries had access to the classical dialogues of Plato (in Latin and Greek), and of Cicero and Lucian (in English). The influence of these dialogues on early interludes may be seen in their form and subject matter. In fact the very earliest extant secular interlude, *Fulgens and Lucres* by Henry Medwall, produced at Lambeth Palace at Christmas 1497 to entertain the Flemish and Spanish ambassadors, is a translation and adaptation of an Italian Ciceronian dialogue, *De Nobilitate Controversia*, or *De Vera Nobilitate*, 1428, by Buonaccorso of Pistoja. This dialogue was printed in an English version of John Tiptoft by Caxton in 1481 along with Tiptoft's translation of *De Amicitia* and an anonymous rendering of *De Senectute*. It is the story of Lucretia, daughter of Fulgentius, a noble Senator of Rome, and her two suitors, Publius Cornelius, a descendant of the Scipios who is a rich and idle aristocrat, and Gaius Flaminius, of humble birth but studious and virtuous. Lucretia asks her father's advice and he, in turn, submits the problem to the Senate before which the two suitors plead their case. There is no announcement of the Senate's decision. Medwall selected the most dramatic elements from this dialogue and made them into a play with a definite climax and a comic subplot paralleling the main action of Lucres and her two suitors. The decision is left up to Lucretia, who chooses the
low-born but virtuous suitor. The genius of Medwall converts the long dialogue into an excellent drama with suspense, love interest, and humor. Here may be seen the birth of a secular interlude out of a Ciceronian dialogue. In the only extant copy of the play, printed by John Rastell between 1513 and 1519, the title shows that the debate nature of the play was recognised as it is called a "godely interlude . . . of the disputationon of noblenes." The "disputacyon" is for the purpose of showing to a courtly audience that nobleness is not just a matter of noble birth but is also the practice of virtuous living. Lucres' choice of the poor-born but virtuous Gaius Flaminius over the noble-born but dissolute Publius Cornelius, though it has a democratic ring to the modern reader, was not meant to bear a moral to the low-born, but was rather a warning to the noble that a virtuous life was necessary to true nobility— even more so in a noble-born person because he must live up to the responsibility of his degree in society. The play was presented

... that suche as be gentilmen of name
May be somwhat mouyed
By this example for to eschew
The wey of vyce and fauour vertue,
For syn is to be reprouyd
More in them, for the degre,
Than in other persons such as be
Of pour kyn and birth. 11

The servants A and B cannot understand why Lucres chose Gaius:

B. By my fayth she saide, I tell the true,
That she wolde nedis haue hym for his vertue
And for none other thynge.
A. Uertue, what the deuyll is that?  
   And I can tell, I shrew my catt,  
   To myne vnderstondynge.  
B. By my fayth no more can I  
   But this she said here opynly,  
   All these folke can tell.  

Fulgens and Lucres is a dialogue with low comedy added to make it more full of "myrth" for the company assembled at the palace. The characters furnishing the comedy are closely akin in nature to the servants in the Latin comedy of Plautus and Terence. Did Medwall know the Latin drama?

This formula of dialogue-plus-low-comedy may be found in many other early Tudor interludes. Usually the comic characters are the Vices as we have seen in Bale's plays, but sometimes they are the Latin servant type as in the Play of the Wether. In other plays the dialogue form is uppermost, with the humor arising from the discussion as in Of Gentylnes and Noblyyte, an anonymous interlude attributed both to Rastell and to Heywood. The full title of this interlude is illustrative of the close connection of the dialogue and the play:

Of Gentylnes and Noblyyte

A dyaloge betwen the marchaunt, the knyght, and the plowman, dysputyng who is verye gentylman, and who is a nobleman, and how men shuld come to auctoryte, compilid in maner of an enterlude with divers toys and gestis addyd therto to make mery pastyme and disport.

Like Fulgens and Lucres it is a dialogue on the true nature of nobility, but it differs in being also a well-rounded debate on the
subject. Here the formula is dialogue-plus-"divers toys and gestis."
It may be compared in form and subject matter with other less
dramatic dialogues of the time: Heywood's The Spider and the Flie
and "A Proper Dyalege betwene a Gentillman and a Husbandman,
Eche complaynynge to Other their miserable calamite through the
ambicion of the clergye." It has its source, like these, in the
courtesy-book tradition exemplified by Elyot's The Boke Named the
Gouernour (1531). It, along with these, is a part of the popular
medieval discussion of the duties of the various estates of society.
The dialogue and the dialogue-interlude were used to set forth this
teaching long before they were turned into propaganda pieces for
the teachings of the new learning of the reformers.

Besides in those two plays already mentioned, the debate or
dialogue form may be detected in many other early sixteenth cen-
tury plays or interludes. In the undisputed Heywood canon this
form is a favorite. His play usually known as Witty and Witless
is titled A Dialogue concerning Witty and Witless. It is a debate
between the two title characters on whether it is better to be a wise
man or a fool. Cameron sees the influence of Erasmus's Colloquia
as well as his Encomium Moriae on this dialogue and its humanistic
Christianity. In form it is simply a dialogue or debate. There
are no vices added for comedy; the humor arises from the debate
itself. Another play by Heywood called The Play of the Wether is
essentially a dialogue. Jupiter is the judge who, after hearing re-
quests for different types of weather from the Gentleman, the
Merchant, the Ranger, the Water-miller, the Wind-miller, the
Gentlewoman, the Launderer, and the Boy, decides that since he
cannot please all, he will let the weather remain as it has always
been. Merry Report (Mercury), the vice, resembles the servant-
type of the Latin comedy as he acts as go-between and messenger
for Jupiter and furnishes the humor of the play. Cameron cites
two dialogues of Lucian, well known in the early sixteenth century,
as sources for the subject matter and form of this play. 17 Heywood's
interlude is a play, but it is close to its sources and so to the dia-
logue form.

Looking further into the Heywood canon we find another dialogue
or debate with a judge to decide the issue in the Play of Love. 18
The character Lover-not-Loved states that the greatest sorrow is
to be in his situation:

Of all pains the most incomparable pain
Is to be a lover not loved again. 19

Loved-not-Loving disagrees with him, saying:

Wherefore I say that the most pain doth move
To those beloved of whom they cannot love. 20

They present arguments at length, but failing to convince each other
they agree to call in an impartial judge. Meanwhile, Lover-Loved
vows that to be in his condition is the highest pleasure obtainable
but is contradicted by Neither-Lover-nor-Loved. They, too, will submit the question to an unbiased hearer. Each couple presents long subtle arguments to the other couple, who act as judges. The final judgment is that the pain of the one is equal to that of the other, and the pleasure of the one is equal to that of the other.

The moral of the play or disputation is:

Be we content, wealth or woe, and each for other
Rejoice in the one and pity the other.\[^21\]

Since man cannot find contentment in human love, he should seek the love of the "Lord of Lords." There are no vices added for comedy; the humor arises from the subtle arguments and the abundance of alliteration in the debate itself. There is no action in the play except the going on and off stage. All is intellectual debate.

Heywood's *The Pardoner and the Friar* is a stichomythic preaching debate between two rascals who are separated and dispatched by neighbor Pratt and the Parson. His *Playe called the foure PP* is a lying contest with a judge for the tallest tale, but *A Merry Play Between John John, the husband, Tyb, his wife, and Sir John, the priest* shows no relation to the dialogue form.

Another interlude, *Wealth and Health*, entered in the Stationers' Register in 1557, is a later example of the debate as an interlude. Wealth, Health, and Liberty each claim the greatest importance to the realm in the manner of Lydgate's *Horse, Sheep, and Goose* in the dialogue of that name. *Good Remedy* shows up as judge, de-
claring that all three are absolutely essential to the commonwealth and all must be protected. The vices, added to extend the dialogue and create interest by corrupting the three essentials to the country, are Ill-Will and Shrewd Wit. Another danger to the wealth of the realm is introduced in the comic character of the drunken "whorson Fleming," who represents all aliens who were depriving Englishmen of the rewards of trade.

The influence of the dialogue form for instruction may be seen in John Bale's plays. His God's Promises is a series of seven dialogues between Pater Coelastis and seven prophets including John the Baptist looking forward to the coming of Christ. It is called by the author a tragedy and as such has no comic relief. It is not a debate but an instructional treatise in dialogue-interlude form. As part of a small cycle play it leads to the second play, John Baptist's Preaching in the Wilderness, which is likewise an informative dialogue in the form of an interlude looking forward to Christ's coming and preaching the message of justification by faith. The third member of the cycle, the Temptation of Our Lord, is a dialogue between Christ and Satan showing how Christ refuted and defeated Satan by means of the Scriptures. There are no comic characters in this cycle; all is serious intent. These plays are dialogues with very little dramatic action, and except that they are known to have been performed, they might well be called closet dia-
logues or sermon-dialogues instead of tragedies, comedies, or interludes.

In the mid-century John Bon and Mast Person by Luke Shepherd we have a short dramatic dialogue or interlude or both, which is a debate between the parson and a rustic, John Bon, on the subject of transubstantiation and the corporeal presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar. Whether it was actually produced or not, it could be excellent drama. It is a dramatic dialogue whose humor comes not from the addition of vices but from the cunning reasoning and dissimulation of the plowman. This formula of debate-plus-humor arising out of the debate we have seen in such plays as Witty and Witless, Of Gentleness and Nobility, and The Play of Love.

Also closely allied to the short interlude and the dramatic dialogue was the dialogue-ballad popular in the early century, for example A Ballad of Luther, The Pope, A Cardinal, and The Husbandman. The Husbandman complains that the Friars have stolen all his ancestors' money and "with our soules played the merchants," but now they are overthrown by the "swete word" of God. Luther accuses the Pope, Antichrist, of having usurped the king's powers and of trying to do the same with God's word. He has threatened all those who follow God's word and burned their books, damning them with "boke, bell, and candell." But Luther will fight and bring down the Pope's powers with his pen and the word of God.
The Pope says he has acted within the church law, and even though he has brought many to damnation, he, not Luther, is within the law. Luther has striven against his purgatory because it is not scriptural, but whatever the Pope does is well. He is above the Scriptures since he is God's vicar on earth. The Cardinal, sent from Rome to oppose Luther as a heretic, offers pardon to any who will resist Luther and assures salvation in case of sudden death in the struggle, saying, "God can make you no resistaunce." The heretics shall go to hell because they have not the Pope's blessing; they think the blood of Christ is sufficient to be saved, fearing not the Church's excommunication; therefore they shall go to hell. The ballad is essentially a dialogue without plot or resolution.

A cursory examination of the literature will show the tremendous popularity of the dialogue form in the medieval period and in the early sixteenth century. Besides the well-known debates and dialogues there are many treatises which are not called dialogues but which have that form, for example Hoccleve's Complaint and his How to Learn to Die and a 1507 dialogue reminiscent of Everyman called Here begyneth a lytell treatyse of the dyenge creature en-fected with sykenes vncurable with many sorrowfull complayntes. Also dialogues were used in the sermons as exempla: the author of Jacob's Well uses a dialogue of Cesarius showing four fiends
fighting with four angels for the soul of a deceased man. In addition, the mummmings often were in essentially dialogue form; the following description of a "balade . . . for a momyng" by Lydgate shows it to be the spoken accompaniment of a mimed debate:

Now folowe here pe maner of a bille by wey of supplicacou putte to pe kyng holding his noble feest of Christmasse in pe Castel of Hertford as in a disguysing of pe Rude upplandsishe people compleyning on hir wyves with pe boystous aunswere of hir wyves devisyd by lydgate at pe Request of pe Countre Roullour.

Mummings or "mommyres" were popular at the court of Henry VIII as after-banquet entertainment. John Trevisa's preface to his Translation of Higden's Polychronicon is in dialogue form: "Dialogue between a Lord and a Clerk upon Translation." Also the examinations of various heretics took dialogue form: The Examination of Master William Thorpe, priest, of heresy, before Thomas Arundell, Archbishop of Canterbury, the year of our Lord, M.CCCC. and seven, and The Examination of the honourable Knight, Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, burnt by the said Archbishop, in the first year of King Henry Fifth. These two dialogues are Lollard tracts.

In the early sixteenth century the form was a popular as ever; a complete list of dialogues would be exceedingly long. A list of the well known ones would include: Heywood's Spider and the Fly, More's Utopia, Dialogue Concerning Tyndale, and Dialogue of Comfort, Starkey's Dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset,
Elyot’s Of the Knowledge which maketh a Wise Man and Pasquil the Playne, Ascham’s Towophilus, Erasmus’s Colloquia, and Lyndesay’s Monarchie. In the last half of this chapter some of the less well-known dialogues will be examined in their relation to the new learning.

There is evidence that dialogues or disputations were performed at court and elsewhere. It is well known that the dialogue-like interludes which have been discussed so far, with the possible exception of John Bon, were acted as plays. There are records showing that other dialogues were also acted. Cameron quotes from the Calendar of State Papers the record of Jupiter and his messenger Mercury introducing a debate in the Court revels at Greenwich in 1527. In the nineteenth year of the reign of Henry VIII, there was a great celebration in the banquet house of the King for the French Ambassadors rejoicing that France and England were at peace. There was an oration in Latin by a person clothed in cloth of gold, with a mantle of blue silk "full of eyes of golde" with a cap of gold and a garland of laurel set with berries of fine gold, after which eight of the "kynges Chappel" richly appareled came in and sang a song. From the other side eight others from the Chapel entered bringing with them another person:

these two persones plaied a dialog theffect wherof was whether riches were better the loue, and when they could not agre vpon a conclusion, eche called in thre knightes,
all armed, thre of them woulde haue entred the gate of
the Arche in the middel of the chambre, & the other iii.
resisted, & sodaily betwene the six knyghtes, out of the
Arche fell doune a bar all gilte, at the whiche barre
the six knyghtes fought a faire battail, and then were
departed, and so went out of the place: then came in an
olde man with a siluer berd, and he concluded, that
loue & riches, both be necessarie for princes (that is
to saie) by loue to be obedied and servued, and with
riches to rewarde his louers and frendes, and with this
conclusion the dialogue ended. 31

In 1543 a "dialogus" by R. Textor was acted at Queens' College,
Cambridge. 32 Another record shows Queen Mary authorizing pay-
ment to Nicholas Udall in 1554 for putting on "dialogues and Entre-
ludes" before the court. 33 The dialogues, like the masks, mum-
mings, interludes, and disguisings, formed a part of the varied
dramatic activity of the court. In being produced, they became
Drama of a sort. And we have seen that many of the interludes
were essentially dialogues or disputations with comic devices added
for mirth and merriment.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

In the earlier chapters of this dissertation we have seen the
close relationship between the moral or religious treatises and the
interludes in the subject matter which they treat. Their form or
structure differs, but the instruction given in both is the same.
Thus Tyndale's treatises in prose are echoed in Bale's interludes
in dramatic verse, Caxton's Royal Book in Everyman. The relation-
ship proposed here between the dialogue and the interlude is similar but even closer, since the structural form as well as the subject matter of the two is akin.

The new learning was set forth in all possible media: treatises, interludes, last wills and testaments, hymns, ballads, sermons, and dialogues both dramatic and non-dramatic. By dramatic dialogue it is meant those dialogues which are capable of being produced with dramatic effect. Non-dramatic dialogues are those earlier referred to as "closet" dialogues which because of their length do not lend themselves to dramatic production. In the first category are John Bon and Mast Parson, a short dramatic debate on transubstantiation, and The Booke in Meeter of Robin Conscience. The former will be analyzed in a later section dealing with dialogues on the Sacrament of the Altar. Robin Conscience is really three dialogues by a man of the new learning with his father, mother, and sister, who are all of the old faith. He begs his father to repent and have "respect vnto Christ's Testament." The father's sin is covetousness, which he defends as permissible:

By the Masse, it is all my delight and pleasvre
To haue heere abovvdance of worldly treasvre.

He is shown to belong to the old faith by his favorite oath "By the Masse." Men swear only by that which they consider sacred; a man of the new learning would never swear by the Mass. Robin is shown to be of the new doctrines by his refrain:
Wherfore, good father, amend and repent
And haue a respect vnto Christ's Testament.

The father shows no signs of repentance as the son accuses him,
"your goodes is your God." The next dialogue shows Robin coun-
selling his mother to repent. Her chief sin is pride in her dress:

To liue and goe gentle-like, gallant and gay,
Seeing it is my cheefe desire alway.

She too is of the old beliefs as is shown by her swearing by the
saints, by the Mass, and by "sweet Mary milde." Robin's refrain
throughout this dialogue labels him as a new-learning man:

Wherfor, good mother, marke this thing well,
To liue and goe Christian like after the gospell.

Meeting no greater success with his mother than he had with his
covetous father, Robin approaches his sister Proud Beautye with
this advice:

Wherfore, measure yoovr pleasvre by God's woord and will,
And you shall finde that yoovr minde is whorish and ill.

She is not convinced, as her refrain shows:

To be faire and feate, nice and neate, is a gay thing:
To colly and kis, my pleasvre it is, for all yoovr new
learning.

The conclusion is thus:

To talke well with some women dooth as much good,
As a sicke man to eate vp a loade of green wood.

In the many dialogues which would probably not be produced
because of their length, the points of the new teaching were discussed.

It may be well to consider first the dialogues dealing with those doc-
trines already found extensively in the interludes, and second those
dialogues on the Sacrament of the Altar and related subjects found
only incidentally in the extant interludes. The 1537 dialogue A co-
parison betwene the Olde learnynge & the Newe, a translation
by William Turner of the Latin of Urbanus Regius, gives a summary
of all the chief new-learning doctrines. In a verse dedicated to
the reader the author recommends the book to those who believe
that the new is false and the old is better:

Let them this boke reade and beholde
For it preferreth ye learnynge most olde.

He continues in the preface that his adversaries accuse his doctrine
of being "lately deuysed & fornyshed in the shoppes or workhouses
of heretickes." He would answer that the reformers' doctrine is
the old and true "heauenly doctryne of the sprete that is the gospell
of God." Is it new that God predestined man to be the sons of
Christ not according to man's works but according to God's purpose
and grace? he asks. The dialogue which follows is a comparison
between the old and the new beliefs for the purpose of showing that
those who call the reformers preachers of the new learning are
"braynles and madde fellowes" since what they teach is not the new
but the ancient faith of the early church. In the dialogue the Catho-
lic doctrines are the new learning and the reformers' teachings are
the old learning. For example, New Learning says:
Who so ever cometh to the yeares of discrecyon, at the least once in the yeare, he is bounde to confesse all his synnes, both open and secrete: with all theyr circum-
staunces to his curate, or els he is not a christen man.

Old Learning answers:

In the xxxi. Psalme: I have sayde I wyll confess agaynst me myne vnryghteousnesse to J Lorde, & thou haste forguen me J vngodlynesse of my synne. Beholde, J Prophete doth confesse hym to y Lorde: & he getteth forguenesse of al his sinnes . . . Where is here ony rehearsyng, of circu-
stauces, & of hydde synnes, in the prestes eare . . .

The author is taking offense at a name given the reformers at first in derision but later taken over and used by them in their sermons, treatises, and plays. It was Luther's contention that his doctrines represented a going back to the simple Christianity of the early church before it became weighted down with what he called men's traditions. The dialogue continues to take up point by point the issues between the old and the new: the new champions free will, the old denies it in matters of faith; the new defines the mass as a sacrifice and a merit or good work, the old says that the Supper of the Lord is a memorial to the death of Christ and not a sacrifice, a remembrance of a sacrifice but not a sacrifice. Other doctrines reversed in this fashion are the number of sacraments, penance, confession, satisfaction, faith and works, merits, worshipping of saints, choice of meats, fasting, vows, matrimony, ceremonies, man's traditions, and canon law. In other words the new faith be-
comes the old in this definition. The dialogue closes with a
quotation from Romans viii and ii Timothy i and a statement to the Christian Reader on predestination:

Therefore when God wolde shewe wrath, and to make his power known, he brought forth with great pacyence the vessels of wrath, which are ordayne to damnacyon, that he myght declare ryches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he hath prepared vnto glory, whom he hath called. . . . Accordyng as he hath chosen vs by hym, or euer foudacyon of wold was layed, that we shulde be holy and without blame before him in loue . . . God hath saued vs, and called vs wyth an holy callyng, not accordyng to oure dedes, but accordyng to his owne purpose and grace.

Similarly John Bale gives a summary of the doctrines of the new learning in his A dialoge or Communycacyon to be had at a table betwene two chyldren gathered out of the holy scriptures, by Johan Bale, for his ii yonge sonnes Johan and Paule. 43 The two young sons are precocious, showing a marked tendency to speak like the characters in their father's interludes. Johan is especially his father's son as he replies to Paule's question "What shal I esteeme the traditions of men besides that gospel?"

The leuen of Pharisées, chaffe, cockle, tares, stubble, swylle, swines draffe ydylnesse, ydolaty, whordome of the spretre, fylthynesse, false worshypynge, the call of straunders, in the fearefull curse of God and abhominacion standing in the holy place.

Paule asks further about the passage in John which says that the word was in the beginning with God and was God. He is pussed because he has heard the "popyshe churche" teach that Matthew was the first writer of the gospel. Johan's answer echoes the doc-
trine in Bale's interlude the Three Laws (see Chapter III):

No, God wrote it fyrst in the naturall hart of man, & so yt remained here styll till Moyses and the prophetes ded leave it in outward wrytinge to the peoples farder erudicyon. Ffor as S. Paule doeth wytnesse, all they ded eate fro the first beginninge of one spiritual meate & dranke of one spiritual drynke, ½ harde rocke folowinge the which was Jesus Christ. And this is a toke that one gospel hath reigned in ½ people of god sence ½ worldes begininge.

The dialogue upholds infant baptism against the Anabaptists. Johan tells Paul the new-learning function of the law--to show him his sin and his condemnation. Paul thinks then that he will not look at the law because it will cause him to despair, but Johan says he must know his sinful nature before he will seek Christ. Paul concludes in a manner which makes the children of Isaac Watts's time seem gay. He says:

I am ordayne of God to his ende. First to acknowledge myselfe a wycked synner, then to arys from it through true repentaunce, and so to leade a newe lyfe after the gospell, tyll suche tyme as my eternall father shall ... call me from this corruptible mansyon, thys foren lande, this vale of mysterye, this castell of synne, and thyshabytacle of deathye, into the eternall heritage of hys sonne Jesus Christ.

The Dyalogue bytwene Jullius the seconde / Genius / and saynt Peter (1535) attacks the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope.

The reader is advised to "refrayne from laughynge" as Pope Julius is shown at the gates of paradise trying to get in. His key won't fit as he has inadvertently brought the key to his "treasoury."

He beats on the gates in irritation, threatening to break them down
and thinking that the porter must be drunk. Petrus comes at last, but, thinking there is a monster at the gate from the smell, he does not immediately open up. He asks the identity of the guest, and Julius is amazed that he does not recognize the key he holds, the golden oak, the triple crown, and his cape shining with precious jewels. Petrus thinks the key unlike the one Christ originally gave him; the crown he does not recognize as no one entering those gates would wear the like—only tyrants; the rich vestments he despises as he did when he was on earth. Julius introduces himself as Julius the Lombard, but Petrus will not let him enter unless he be holy, no matter how great he was on earth. Julius replies that he has "vi. M. bulles" in which he is called not only holy but "moost holy." His very name on earth was "holynesse"; men used to say the "holynesse of moost holy julius" had done thus and so. Petrus says he does not look holy, nor do any of the 20,000 followers look like good Christians; rather they resemble drunkards and robbers. Julius himself, continues Petrus, is "defyled and vicyate with tokens of prodigious & abhomynable lust." Genius, the spirit of Julius, agrees that Petrus has now rightly "pawnted hym in his colours." No amount of threats from Julius will move Petrus. He denies the efficacy of Julius' thunderbolts of excommunication and his bulls since Christ never mentioned any such. The entrance to the gates of paradise is obtained through "good werkes" and
"deseryung merites." Julius has been too busy fighting battles on earth to have any good works to his credit. He plans to encamp outside the gates until reinforcements arrive and then he will storm them and gain entrance. Petrus asks Genius whether all bishops are like this one. Genius replies, "Of trouthe a great parte of them / but this was the captayne of all mischief." Petrus sees why so few people enter his gates, with such "pestylent caytyfes" as governors of the church.

This dialogue is dramatic in nature, containing some action and a definite scene or place. Although it is extensive in length, it could have been produced with entertaining effect. The doctrine of the dialogue is typical of the time of its composition---1535. Attacking the power and infallibility of the pope was not only an acceptable heresy in England when Henry VIII was declaring himself head of the Church in England, but also, as we have seen in Chapter III, a command performance. The translator of this dialogue writes to the reader that the life of Julius causes "me often to marueyle at them that says, the Pope of Rome (as they call hym) cannot erre." But it should be noted that in requiring good works for entry into the gates of paradise the dialogue remains orthodox Catholic doctrine and not new learning. This also was Henry's position.

The infallibility and power of the pope was attacked in another dramatic dialogue translated by John Ponet, Bishop of Winchester,
from the Latin of Bernardino Ochino of Siena in 1549. The scene for *A tragoedie or dialoge of the uniuste vsurped primacie of the bishop of Rome* is laid in Hell before a gathering of the fallen angels with Lucifer and his chief agent Beelzebub presiding. The intent of the dialogue is to show the origin of the papacy. Lucifer laments that the fallen angels or devils are not succeeding well enough on earth; so he plans to establish a new kingdom there "replenished with idolatry, superstition, extorsion, treason, contencion, discorde, tirany, and crueltie, with spoylinge, murder, ambicion, filthines, injuries, factions, sectes, wickedness, and mischiefe," in which all kinds of abominations shall be committed. Yet shall Christian men think it a kingdom spiritual and most holy and godly. The Pope will be the head, sent into the world by Lucifer as his son just as God had sent his son for man's salvation. The scheme is carried out in nine colloquies with the scene shifting from Hell to Heaven to earth. After it has succeeded the devils gather again in Hell to rejoice at the birth of Antichrist even as the angels rejoiced at Christ's nativity. Lucifer plans to help spread the doctrine that Peter passed along the keys to Heaven and Hell to his successor at Rome. This kingdom of Antichrist will be destroyed by Henry VIII and his son Edward VI with the weapon the word of God, which is sufficient to lead man to faith. Henry VIII indulges in a little dramatic irony when, not knowing the true origin of the
Pope's kingdom as related in the earlier colloquies, he says that if man could know all the wickedness of the Pope, he would rather deem him of the realm of the Devil in Hell than the Vicar of Christ. The Papists warn Henry that if he opposes the Pope he will lose his title of Defender of the Faith. Henry answers, "Nay we will be called the destroyer of the false faythe of Antichriste." Throughout, Lucifer and Beelsebub speak in character with topsy-turvy values appropriate for the rulers of Hell and haters of God, who had thrown them out of Heaven. The account of the dialogue in the DNB is amusing: "It does not lack dramatic power, but the view of the origin of the papacy which it presents is unhistorical."

The confutation of .xiii. Articles, wherunto Nicolas Shaxton, late byshop of Salisbury subscribed and caused to be set forthe in print the yere of our Lorde. M.D.xlvi. whè he recanted at Smithfields at London at the burning of mestres Anne Askue, which is liuely set forth in the folowyng.

Refutes besides the Catholic doctrine of the Mass, the articles on marriage of priests, nonpreaching prelates, auricular confession, and free will. Shaxton's side is presented through the articles which he accepted, and one Crowley refutes each in its turn. Crowley also condemns the six articles of faith passed in 1539 under Henry's renewed efforts to stamp out the new-learning heresy:

Whych thing though it be established with as much assurance as my brother my Lorde of Winchesters [Stephen Gardiner's]
wyt coulda deuise, yet must it be destroyed, because it is of man not of God.

It is not a dramatic dialogue and is much too long for possible stage production.

In a dialogue between Alutarius and Curio, Lutheran innovations in the church service are upheld. Alutarius dislikes the Lutheran influence on the church which causes the preachers to preach Christ, to preach against sin and in favor of faith, and to sing songs in the mother tongue. He thinks hymns in the mother tongue are evil. But Curio defends the new practice of singing in the vernacular saying that Paul was the first to propose it. Alutarius prefers the old church where the "walles be excellently paynted, the altares be excellently trymmed, the rofe of y churche is gallantly furnysched w gyftes offred to sayntes," and the vestments are many-colored. These are things, says he, that "can mollyfie euen a stonie harte and drawe him to the contemplacion of heuenly thynges." Curio replies that the fathers were against ornamentation of the churches as vanity. God is worshipped truly only by the Gospel by faith. Alutarius asks whether the Lutherans condemn all ceremonies and Curio answers not as long as the ceremonies are used as introduction and do not fight with the gospel. Fear, faith, love, knowledge of scriptures, innocence of life are more important than ceremonies which are not to be trusted for salvation. Alutarius is not convinced; so the two part, Curio re-
gretting he has not been able to change his friend's mind. Another
dialogue in the same collection, between Sanderus and Glandorpius,
condemns the worshipping of saints. Sanderus has just returned
from a visit to the city of Gottinga, where he heard in a tavern that
the chapel of St. Nicholas close by had been broken into and looted
of all its gold and silver. An unlearned cobbler present said he
would never pray to St. Nicholas again since the saint could not
even protect his own things. Another man replied "euyll goten,
euyll loste." Glandorpius thinks that the worship of saints detracts
from the merits of Christ. He finds it intolerable that to every
saint "they haue attributed a severall office / as Roche to heale the
pestilence, Barbara to mitigate the tothache / George to defende
a man in the warres / Erasmus to gyue ryches / and this our
Nicholas to delyuer men out of prison." This is like the Gentiles
[Greeks], who had a god for every office. The saints have been
given the role of mediator between God and man and Christ's priest-
hood and office are destroyed. The last dialogue in this same col-
lection is between Philostatius and Gegetius on the subject of
Christian liberty in the Lutheran sense. A Christian man, though
outwardly free, is controlled by a Christian conscience and made to
do right. He has been freed from the old law by the sacrifice of
Christ. He is freed by Luther's doctrines from many restrictions
in things "indifferent" to salvation, but he still must observe some
of these restrictions for the sake of the common order.

The dialogue The metynge of Doctor Barons and doctor Powell at Paradise gate . . . 47 is a debate between a new-learning martyr and a Catholic martyr both burned on the same day at Smithfield. Neither convinces the other, but Powell (the Catholic) vows he will do everything he can to make sure Robert Barnes is the devil's guest.

A dialogue or Familiar talk betweene two neighbours, concerninge the chyefest ceremonyes that were, by the mighti power of God's most holie pure worde, suppressed in Englands, and nowe for our unworthines, set up agayne by the bishoppes, the impes of Antichrist . . . (1554) laments the return of Catholic ceremonies under Mary. 48 (See below.)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

In the extant plays of the early sixteenth century the Mass as sacrifice and the subject of transubstantiation are mentioned, but the bitter supper-strife is not fully treated. Harbage lists a lost play by Richard Spencer called Sacrament of the Altar as an anti-Catholic play. 49 There certainly were plays dealing with this burning issue, as there was little reticence in the period to deal openly with the most sacred and spiritual topics in every available
medium. In fact there is evidence of such plays from a Catholic poem *A pore helpe*:

The bukler and defence  
Of mother holy kyrke,  
And weaspê to drive hence  
All that against her wircke.  

The author writes that these "felowes newe" deny the real presence in the sacrament of the altar. His poem in Skeltonic verse is written to oppose them:

Blessed sacrament, for thy passion  
Here and se our exclamation  
Agaynst these men of newe facion,  
That stryue agaynst the holy nacion  
And Jest of them in playes,  
In taurerns and hye wayes,  
And theyr good actes dysprayse

Though none of these plays has survived, many of the dialogues treating the subject are extant. It will be well before going into these dialogues to review the doctrines involved in the dispute.

Like Wicliffe, Luther had rebelled against the Catholic teaching of transubstantiation in the mass, and he had denied that the mass was a sacrifice, but he was a conservative in retaining the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the sacramental elements. The Catholics stressed the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist, saying that He is present with His Flesh and Blood, Body and Soul, Humanity and Divinity. Luther, attempting to hold the Real Presence without admitting transubstantiation: viz., Christ is present in the Eucharist by the change of the entire substance of bread and
wine into the Body and Blood, believed in consubstantiation: vis., the substance of Christ's Body exists together with the substance of bread, and in like manner the substance of His Blood together with the substance of the wine. The heresy here is that of Berengarius of Tours and of Wicliffe, who denied, not the real presence, but the change of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood, maintaining that the consecrated Bread, retaining its substance, is the Body of Christ, that is, not losing anything which it was but assuming something which it was not. For Luther the text "Hoc est corpus meum" meant literally what it said, but he pictured a kind of co-existence of the substance of the elements of the sacrament with the body of Christ instead of a change of the substance into the body of Christ. He was the only one of the reformers who held out for the Catholic doctrine of the real, corporeal presence. Calvin admitted the dynamic spiritual presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, while Zwingli and Oecolampadius interpreted the text "Hoc est corpus meum" figuratively as "This signifies my Body," and "This is a sign (symbol, image, type) of my Body." There were all shades of difference between the orthodox Catholics and the extreme "Sacramentarians" who denied any presence in the sacrament. Though many strove for compromise and harmony among the reformers, none was possible and there was bitter strife between the Lutherans
and the various degrees of what Luther termed Sacramentarians.

This dispute was especially evident in the German dialogues of the time and in those in England, both the translations and the original works.

In 1539 the officially orthodox position of England was made clear in the question of transubstantiation by the "Act for abolishing of diversity of opinions" commonly known as the Statute of the Six Articles. The first Article deals with the Sacrament of the Altar:

First, 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: and that after the Consecration there remaineth no substance of bread or wine, nor any other substance but the substance of Christ, God and man.

The penalty for being convicted of speaking against this Article was loss of goods and death by burning with no chance of abjuration.

These Articles were repealed the first year of the reign of Edward VI, 1547. In The Order of the Communion, 1548, the spiritual eating of the body and blood is emphasised. The sacrament is taken "in remembrance of his most fruitful and glorious passion," and is offered in both kinds to the laity. In the two editions of the Edwardian Book of Common Prayer, the position taken on the presence of Christ in the Sacrament is close to that of Peter Martyr, visiting professor at Oxford, who influenced the direction of the supper-strife or controversy in England. Thus the doctrine of the
real presence is more Zwinglian than Lutheran in placing Christ's body in heaven and making the "eating" spiritual. In the first Prayer Book (1549), the wording is the same as in the Order of Communion (1548) concerning the spiritual eating of the body and blood of Christ: Christ has left to man in the holy mysteries of the sacrament "a pledge of his love, and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body, and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation." The sacrament is not a sacrifice but a "remembrance of his most fruitful and glorious Passion," nor does it obtain remission of sins, this remission being the achievement of the original Passion.

In the second Prayer Book (1552), the above passage is changed to read that Christ by his death has "instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort." The Prayer Books show the attempt to walk the tight rope between the Lutheran and the Zwinglian doctrine of the real presence, after the Catholic doctrine has been abandoned. At times these books especially the Second, lean definitely towards the Zwinglian interpretation. For example the prayer of consecration in the First Prayer Book states that the priest should say:

with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.
In the Second Prayer Book he is made to say:

grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesu Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood. 62

On the question of kneeling while receiving the sacrament, the Second Prayer Book permits it but warns against considering it adoration of the host:

Lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ's true natural body, to be in more places than in one at one time. 63

The Forty-two Articles of 1552 make it even clearer that transubstantiation and the bodily presence are not to be believed:

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. Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one, and the self same 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 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. 64
The sacrament is not to be "kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshipped." Also Christ's death has satisfied once and for all, for man's sins and there is no need for additional sacrifices:

Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which, it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or sin, were forged fables, and dangerous deceits. 65

The first Convocation under Queen Mary reaffirmed belief in transubstantiation and repudiated the Prayer Book. The Mass was reinstated and the service was to be as it had been before the Edwardian reforms. The Prayer Book was again accepted in Elizabeth's reign and the Mass outlawed.

One of the earliest English blasts at the Catholic Mass was by William Roy in dialogue form published in 1528: *Rede Me and Be Nott Wrothe*. It is a dramatic dialogue in verse between two priests' servants, Jeffraye and Watkyn, lamenting the decease of the Mass, slain at Strasbourg by a "sharpe two edged sworde" which was "goddis worde" drawn out of the holy gospel. It was killed by "Hedius / Butzer, and Capito / Celarius, Symphorian / and wother mo." Faber, Emser, Eck, and Morner did the best they could to succor the dying Mass but to no avail. Jeffraye asks about the role of Erasmus in the death:

Medled nott Erasmus / in this matter
Which so craftely can flatter
With cloked dissimulacion?

Watkyn answers:
He was busy to make will fre
A thynge notte possible to be
After wyse clarkis estimacion.

He feareth greatly some men saye /
Yf masse shulde utterly decaye /
Least he shulde lose his pension.
Notwithstandyng he hath in his hedde /
Soche an opinion of the god of bredde /
That he wolde lever dye a marter.
Than ever he wolde be of this consent /
That christ is not theare corporally present /
In bredde wyne and water.

The Universities of "louayne" and "Colayne" fought for the mass
by bringing out Thomas and Scotus, but were defeated because

Goddis worde is so efficacious /
And of strengthe so mervelous /
That agaynst it is no resistyng.

The dead Mass must be buried, but where? Jeffraye suggests the
shrine of St. Thomas, whose riches he says, "Myght an Emperours
raunsome paye." Or the Cardinal's palace might be the place since
he has treated the gospel so beastly by burning it openly in London.
The clergy and friars will all oppose the burying of the mass be-
cause they have their living by it. The temporal powers will
oppose it also because they have been taught that the Mass saves
sinners, chases away fiends, solemnifies marriage, makes fair
weather, makes women conceive, cures sickness, and remedies all
distress.

The preface to the dialogue proper in Rede Me is also a dia-
logue, This Time, between the author and Treatous. The author
wants Treatous to go forth into the world to show God's truth, but
Treatous is afraid because of the recent burning of the holy testa-
ment. His refrain at the end of each stanza is

Wherefore my deare author: it cannot be.

Inserted is a long lamentation in rime royal rime scheme by the
clergy with this variable refrain at the end of each stanza:

Seynge that gone is the masse
Nowe deceased alas alas.

They lament the loss of riches and power—both spiritual and
temporal:

The masse made vs lord Æd kynge over all /
Fame and nere euer y wheare havyng power
With honorable tytles they dyd vs call /
Dredynge to offende vs at any houre.
The Æ were we as fressh as the gardâ floure.
Vnder favoure of the masse /
Nowe deceased / alas alas.

The masse made vs so stronge and stordy /
That agaynst hell gates we did prevayle.
Delyveringe soules utes of purgatory /
And sendynge theym to heven with out fayle.

Fare wele 0 holy consecracion /
With blyssed sanctus and agnus dei.
No lenger nowe with you we can praye.
Seynge that gone is the masse /
Nowe deceased / alas alas.

Adue / gentle dominus vobiscum /
With comfortable / ite missa est.
Requiem eternam / is nowe vndon /
By whom we had many a fest.
Requiescat in pace and good rest.
Seynge that gone is the masse /
Nowe deceased alas alas.
According to the edition printed at Wesell in 1546, most of the first edition of 1528 was destroyed by Cardinal Wolsey to whom the dialogue was dedicated and against whom it was directed.

We have seen earlier in the chapter that The confutation of .xiii. Articles ... (1548) is essentially a dialogue between one Crowley and Bishop Shaxton, in which Crowley refutes the Catholic articles sworn to by Shaxton in his recantation. Crowley denies the "fayned miracles" of transubstantiation and declares that the substance of bread and wine remain even after consecration. The elements of the sacrament are a "sygne or token of the blessed body of our Sauoure Christ." He takes the text "Hoc est corpus meum" to mean "Thys singifieth my bodye." The Jewish passover was the eating of the lamb in remembrance of the original passover in Egypt and "So lykewise the breede is called the bodye of Christe. Not bycause it is the natural bodye in deede whyche was offered on the crosse for oure synnes once for al, ... but bycause it signified that blessed bodye, and was commaundde to be eaten in the remembraunce there of. ..." Shaxton states the Catholic doctrines and Crowley refutes them. Shaxton: the bread and wine are turned into the very natural body and blood of Christ so that no substance of bread and wine remain after the words of consecration. Crowley: where are the Scriptural proofs of this position? He is prepared to "Labour to drawe you by force of argumets,
none otherwyse, then Hercules drewe the froward Cerberus out of hell." To convince Shaxton he will propose an experiment. First he defines bread as a "confection made of manye graynes, vnited or made into one bodye, by the myxture of water, and force of fyre, hauynge in it the vertue to nourishe the sensible bodyes."

His experiment is that he be locked up with no other nourishment than consecrated (and non-poisoned) bread to see whether the bread nourish his body and keep him alive; he thinks it will, proving the presence of the substance of the bread. Shaxton maintains that once the elements of the sacrament are consecrated they no longer contain the substance of bread and wine but remain always the "very body and blood of our sauioure Christ, althoughe it be re-serued, & not prestely distributed." Crowley asks whether the body and blood of Christ be corruptible and may putrify or not. He anticipates a negative answer and says, but there is a rule of "your holy father" (the Pope) that the pyx must be changed every month and the wine drunk by the priests before it sours. If there is no substance of bread and wine remaining, what is it which putrifies?

By this he thinks the Papists must admit that the substance of bread and wine remain after consecration.

Shaxton would worship the elements or signs in the Sacrament since they are the body and blood of Christ. Crowley calls this "detestable Idolatrye." Mac makes the bread one day and the bread
becomes his creator the next; this is idolatry. Shaxton says that
the priest offers the body of Christ up daily under the form of
bread and wine as a sacrifice as well as a remembrance of the
original passion. Crowley thinks that it is contradictory to call
the sacrament both a sacrifice and a remembrance, as it is to
make the sacrifice a propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of
the world and a praising and thanksgiving for the original passion
which has already achieved this satisfaction.

Shaxton takes the orthodox position that the sacrifice in the
Mass is available and profitable both for the quick and the dead.
This Article Crowley says is false—only faith is necessary to apply
Christ's merits to the sins of man, not a sacrifice by a priest.
He calls on the preachers to preach the pure word of God without
the "dregges of Dunsse learning and mans traditioes." The Sacra-
ment of the Altar should be administered to the people in both kinds,
and the service should be in the language of the people, says
Crowley. He declares Shaxton's sacrament "to be no communion,
but a Romyshe merchandise." This very lengthy dialogue was
obviously meant to be read, not produced.

Another dialogue meant for reading is Thomas Becon's The
Catechism, set forth Dialogue-wise in Familiar Talk between the
Father and the Son. Like Bale's dialogue between two children,
this dialogue is amazing because of the lengthy and extensive knowl-
edge the son relates to his father--the son is not yet six years old. He asks his father to consider his tender years when he answers the questions, and his father agrees that he will not expect anything beyond his age, just "such matters as be meet for children to know."
The dialogue covers the whole sum of Christ's doctrine--repentance, faith, law, prayer, sacraments, and the offices of all degrees--and is 410 pages in length. The six-year-old son does most of the talking with only prompting questions from the father. In the fifth part of the dialogue the two discuss the second of the two Protestant sacraments--the Lord's Supper. Their line is orthodox Anglicanism as found in the Prayer Books and the forty-two Articles. At the heavenly banquet the faithful spiritually, through faith, eat the body and blood of Christ in commemoration and perpetual remembrance of His passion. The Lord's Supper should be a communion of the faithful and not a private repast as it is made in the private Masses of the Papists. Christ meant for the people to have the communion in both kinds. The Lord's Supper is no sacrifice, nor should the consecrated bread be reserved and kept in boxes and pyxes as the Papists do. In the primitive church the communicants ate all the bread and wine at the supper or gave the leftovers to the poor. Further the ceremony at the Supper should be in the mother tongue.

The six-year-old son proves to be an expert on Biblical history,
the Church Fathers, Church history, and Catholic and Anglican doctrine. On the subject of transubstantiation he, like Bale's son, shows himself to be the true son of his father. Asked what pope brought in this doctrine of transubstantiation and where, the youngster answers: Pope Innocent at Rome "in a certain council called Concilium Latronense, in the which were gathered together wonderful swarms of smeared, spiritual, shorling sorcerers, to the number of twelve hundred and odd" who hatched transubstantiation, "this cockatrice's egg." He calls the doctrine a "wicked error" and quotes St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, Panormitanus, Origen, and St. Cyprian at length on the subject. It is a late-invented doctrine, a monstrous and misshapen child, which the Latin fathers did not allow; he quotes Ireneus, Gelasius, and St. Augustine.

Christ's body is in heaven, not corporeally in the bread and wine; He is present spiritually. As He is a man, His body is in heaven; as He is a God His body is spiritually everywhere. In this manner He is present only to the faithful in the sacrament. The wicked do not partake of the body of Christ, for Christ said, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." This the wicked cannot do. This part of the reform doctrine, had it been in force earlier, would have prevented the writing of such a play as the medieval Play of the Sacrament in which the host is stolen by the Jews and mistreated, with astonishing results because
of the indwelling body, blood, and power of Christ which remained in the reserved eucharist after consecration.

The boy continues to please his father with his knowledge. He thinks that a table is more suitable for the Supper than is an altar. The primitive church used a table, and since there is no sacrifice, the altar is not necessary. He knows just what simple vestments should be worn by the priest at the sacrament. His father asks what he thinks of wearing the surplice which is allowed in many reformed churches. The son, knowing his Luther, answers, "In things indifferent we may use our liberty, which we have gotten by Christ." Again he reflects Luther in answer to his father's question about the Papists' habit of not allowing the layman to touch the sacramental bread. This is a sign of how far above the laity the clergy have elevated themselves. He thinks the layman may touch the bread with his hands for Christ did not say to his disciples sitting at the table: "Gape, hold, eat, etc." and so thrust the bread into their mouths. Rather He said "Take ye, and eat."

The father is complimentary to his son as they finish this part of the dialogue. He says, "Well, my dear son, thou hast not only satisfied, but also overcome mine expectation in all things wherein I have hitherto talked with thee." Though the length of this dialogue would certainly prohibit its dramatic production, it is a more pleasant instructional treatise because it is in dialogue form. Thomas
Becon used the dialogue form again in the *Jewel of Joy*, a treatise on reformed doctrine, addressed to the then Princess Elizabeth, in *The Fortress of the Faithful*, and in *The Dialogue between The Christian Knight and Satan*, wherein Satan moveth unto desperation, the Knight comforteth himself with the sweet promises of the Holy Scriptures. 67

*A Dyalogue or Disputacio bytwene a Gentlyman and a Prest* Concernynge the Supper of *e Lorde*, written during the reign of Edward VI, presents a priest from the north of England being rather easily convinced by the arguments of the Gentleman that the mass is not Biblical, that it is a token or memory of Christ's death, that Christ's body is in heaven, and that it must be replaced by the "lordes Supper." The two plan to meet again the next day at Westminister hall.

Another dialogue of this type in which one man meets a second from another part of the country or from a foreign land, is the *Newes from Rome concerning the blasphemous sacrifice of the papisticall Masse*. 68 by Randoll Hurleston. It is a dialogue between Mithobius and Philogus, who has just returned from Italy where he learned nothing new in religion. What he had learned previously in Germany is still what he believes. Although the Italians are well learned in the humanities, "yet they so abhorre true religion that amonge the there is nothing more despised." He tells of witnessing
a mass said by the "highest byshoppe which fearith all heauen with his lokes," presumably the pope. He never saw anything "more folysh or superstitious, for sauyng the proud vestimētes asses bray-enges, the noyse of musicians, a fewe childishe ceremonies, nothyng appeared in all that sacrifice worthie to be loked vpon the wich be no parte of religion." Mithobius concludes that Luther was right in calling the Papists the destroyers of true godliness. Philogus would use even harsher words for them than Luther's. During the mass he left to have dinner, where he heard men praising this pom- pous service and condemning Luther for opposing it. These people would like to see the sword used to make Luther, this worst of all heretics, return to the authority of the Pope. Philogus, heated by wine and anger, answered these scoffers that the Pope is Antichrist and all the sacrificers who follow him are unworthy of Christ be- cause they "crucifie Christ every daye, whom the Jewes were contente once only for to crucifie. ..." These men were so "madde" that they would have turned him over to the officers, but his friends helped him escape on a boat down the Tiber.

Mithobius thinks men are wrong to look on the mass as a satisfying work which "both satisfieth for other mens sinnes, and pacifieth goddes wrath." He says that Chrisostom called it a re- membrance of a sacrifice. Philogus, the argumentative divinity student, is impressed with this information. He says:
I wyll remeber this place of Chrisostome well and truely, that I maye haue somewhat, to laye agaynste them whiche in euery place bragge of the doctours auctoritie.

Philogus asks Mithobius to act the schoolmaster and define the word sacrifice for him. Philogus calls it a propitiatory act which pacifies God's wrath, purges man's sins, reconciles man with God; Christ's sacrifice is an example. Philogus thinks that the "sacrificers" or papists show "haynous reproche of Christes merites" by repetition of this sacrifice. Luther, says Mithobius, defended the dignity of "the mercifull sacrifice agaynst these asses, and the sacrifice of thanks gyuynge is admitted onely in to the supper of the lorde. . . ." Philogus admiringly says to Mithobius, the physician:

You playe the phisician nowe in dede, not for the body but for the woüdes of the soule for who wold euuer haue loked for such exactues [sic] in diviuitie [sic] of a phisittane.

They part, with Mithobius advising his friend to begin preaching after he has given his mind sufficiently to divinity.

Another type of dialogue, the examination or trial scene, was also used in the supper controversy. The fifteenth century Examination of Master William Thorpe . . . 69 is a Lollard dialogue in which Thorpe is accused of preaching that the Sacrament of the Altar, after consecration, is still material bread in substance. The same belief is attributed to Sir John Oldcastle in the fifteenth century dialogue account of his examination. Both men deny transubstantiation, but do not deny the corporeal presence of Christ in the
Sacrament; as Lord Cobham states it to the Archbishop: "the worshipful Sacrament of the Altar is very Christ's body in form of bread." In The first examinacyon of A. Askewe and The lattre Examinacyon of A. Askewe John Bale uses the dialogue form to show how unjustly this young woman was treated. It touches the supper controversy, but is not mainly concerned with it. Directly related to the supper controversy is William Turner's Examination of the Mass or A newe Dialogue wherein is conteyned the examinatio of the Messe and of that kind of priesthode, whiche is ordeyned to saye messe: and to offer up for remission of synne, the body & bloud of Christe againe. It is a trial scene with defendant, accusers, defenders, and judge. Fremouth, on the advice of Knowledge, accuses Messe of heresy and blasphemy for claiming that she can take away man's sins and make God with five words. The penalty, if she be found guilty, will be banishment from the land to Rome. She is defended by Doctor Porphiry and Sir Philip Philargiry, doctors of Canon Law and Divinity respectively. Messe attempts to prove she is as worthy as the Lord's Supper since she has more power than it. She can deliver souls from purgatory, make fair or rainy weather, heal all sickness, effect remission of sins, and with five words make both God and man. Master Justice condemns Fremouth for speaking against the Six Articles and the Sacrament of the Altar. Knowledge states the intention of the king (evidently
Edward VI at the beginning of his reign) to purge the church of all abuses and use the word of God as a touchstone for all ceremonies and sacrifices. The strategy of the defense is to prove that the Mass and the Lord's Supper are the same essentially, and therefore that Messe should be allowed to remain in England. Knowledge defeats this argument by showing that the two are different and have different aims. He quotes several prayers from the Mass to show that her purpose is to propitiate God, to obtain the remission of sins, to obtain rain, or to honor certain saints. These are not the ends of the Lord's Supper, which is done only in remembrance of Christ's Passion. Palemon, the judge, demands more Scriptural evidence for the Mass, but none may be found. He decides against her, but will not burn her. She is "to packe out of this realme, wal thi bagge and bagage in these .viii. daies, & go to thy father the pope, & all the spede, thou canst, & say here is in Englađe no more place for him or any of his generatio." This dialogue is dramatic in form and would lend itself well to production. Herford sees it as an imitation of the dialogues of the German Georg Wirsel; Turner was in exile when Wirsel's dialogues were fresh and popular in Germany. Herford's phrase for this type of dramatic dialogue is "drama of debate," which he thinks had its home in Germany and was imported into England. From the early examples of the debate in drama given at the first of this chapter, however, it
would appear that England had her own drama of debate. One such
debate dating around the end of the fourteenth century was printed
in the sixteenth century in the *Canterbury Tales* as "The Plough-
man's Tale." It is a debate between the Griffon, or bird of prey,
representing the Pope's cause, and the Pelican, representing the
Lollard beliefs. There is a physical battle at the end of the de-
bate between the Griffon and his helpers the ravens, rooks, crows,
and buzzards, and the Pelican with only the Phoenix on her side.
The Phoenix, or Christ, routs the other birds, and the Pelican wins
the day. The debate and the struggle are recorded by an ostensibly
impartial observer who disclaims any responsibility for the ideas
presented therein.

Another examination or trial dialogue, *A New Dialogue called*
the *enlightment agaynste mother Messe* (1548), parallels Turner's
*Examination of the Mass* in structure, characters, and subject matter.
Here Godes Word is the judge, Veryte and Knoleg are the accusers,
Wisdom is the sergeant who arrests her, the twelve apostles act
as jury, Master Couetus and Master Stifneck are her defenders, and
Vedicta Dei and Final Desperacion are her final overseers on her
journey back to her father the pope. As in the *Examination of the*
Mass Mother Messe is arrested for claiming powers beyond human
power. Here she is accused of being a sorceress guilty of treason,
theft, and murder. The jury finds her guilty, and the judge sen-
tences her first to death and then to banishment at the pleading of her friends for mercy. *Vendicta Dei* and "fynall desperacion" are appointed to take her and her two brothers Superstition and Idolatry back to their father in Rome. The judge, Godes Word, speaks to the audience after the sentencing, warning them of the evil nature of this monster Mother Messe. She is the "abhominacion of desolacion and the greate babilon the mother of whoordome," and the "rosse coloread whore that Sainct John spake of In hys reuylaciōs." Even more than Turner's dialogue, this drama of debate is capable of stage production. It could as aptly have been called an interlude, a play, or a comedy as many of the works so named.

With the return of Catholicism under Mary, the reinstatement of the Mass followed. Herford gives an account (see earlier this chapter) of a dialogue on this return called *A dialogue or Familiar talkes betweene two neighbours, concerninge the chyefest ceremonyes that were, by the mighti power of God's most holy pure worde*, suppressed in Engelande, and nowe for our unworthines, set up agayne by the bishoppes, the impes of Antichrist...

The speakers are Olyver "a professour of Gospell," and Nicholas, a Catholic. Olyver meets Nicholas on his way to early mass. They exchange greetings. Olyver hints that his neighbour was not formerly found turning out so early to church. "No, when there was nothing to do but to hear a priest babble. But I thank God I may see my maker again," etc.

The Catholic refers to the preaching of "God's most holy pure worde"
as the hearing "a priest babble." He prefers the dramatic ceremony in which the body of Christ is created in the Sacrament by the words of consecration.

Also attacking the return of the Mass to England is the dramatic monologue, which contains much dialogue, by Hughe Hilarie entitled The resurreccion of the masse / with the wonderful verses of thesame / newly setforth unto the greate hartes ease / loye and confort of all the catholykes (Strasburg, 1554).

Ridley and Latimer were burned as heretics in 1555 along with many other professors of the new learning. In 1556 a dialogue appeared purporting to be conversations between these two martyrs:

Certé godly / learned / and comfortable conferences / betwene the two Reuerende Fathers / and Holye Martyrs of Christe / D. Nicolas Rydley late Bysshoppe of London / and M. Hughe Latymer Sometyme Bysshoppe of Worcester / during the time of theyr emprysonmentes. Wherunto is added a Treatise agaynst the error of Transubstantiation / made by the sayd Reuerende Father D. Nicolas Rydley. The dialogue proper consists of conferences on the Mass and related doctrines. Ridley objects to the Mass being said in a foreign tongue and Latimer agrees. Ridley continues: the Mass is a private table instead of a communion table, communion in only one kind is robbing the people of half what Christ meant for them, Catholics serve the sign of the sacrament rather than the thing signified, transub-
stantiation is a false doctrine, the corporeal presence is to be de-
nied, adoration of the bread is to be resisted as it is not the body
of Christ, the Mass is not a sacrifice, the Mass does not purge
man's sins, and the lifting of the eucharist is unnecessary. Ridley
brings forth the arguments; Latimer agrees with him and expands
them. Latimer recommends Turner's Mystresse Missa in which
the Mass "was iustely condemned / and banished vnder payne off
burning. But the deuel hath brought her in agayne / to bringe vs
to burnynge." They discuss the matter with each other but will not
argue with their accusers as it would be fruitless.

In a treatise (not a dialogue) printed in 1555, Ridley analyzes
the supper-controversy and shows the Anglican position in an apt
analogy. He disagrees not only with the Catholics but also with the
Anabaptists, who "put no difference betwene the Lordes table and
the lorde meate, & their owne," and those Sacramentarians who
make the Sacrament "nothing elles, but a bare signe or a figure, to
represent Christ non otherwise, than the Iuye bushe dothe represent
the wyne in a tauerne or as a vile persone gorgiouslye apparailed
may represent a kyng or a prince in a playe." His is the orthodox
Anglican doctrine that the natural substance of the body of Christ is
in heaven, but by its divine nature it is actually present in the
sacrament. He uses the popular figure of the sun to illustrate his
his point. The sun is in heaven in its substance, yet it is present
here on earth, too, "For Goddes worde and his Sacramentes be
(as it were) the beames of Christ, which is Sol iusticiae, the Sune
of ryghteousnes."

So far we have examined some of the vast number of dialogues
favoring the new learning. There were also dialogues written
against the new learning, but not nearly so many. A very early
one was by Wylyam Barlow, 1531, A dyaloge describyng the orygyn-
all grond of these Lutheran faccyons, and many of theyr abusys. 79
The preface calls Lutherans "new techers of auncyent heresyes."
These Lutherans say "ye haue no fre will, your good deedys shall
not saue you, nor your yll deedys shall not dangue you, e sacramentys
of y church be nothing of necessite, ye nede not to be confessyd to
a preest, ye are not bownde to obey the lawes of e churche etc.
. . ." The author translates Mark 1:15 as "Do ye penaunce sayth
Christ. . . ." Man should do penaunce,

For it is the fulnes of scyence / whereby we cœe downe
fyrst to know oure self / & so ascœd to ye knowledge of
god by hys word whereout through heryng sayth taketh her
effect.

It is interesting to compare this bit of teaching with the situation
in Everyman, where the character Knowledge leads the hero to a
knowledge of himself and of God's way to salvation through the
sacrament of penaunce; however, there is no mention of God's word
producing Faith in Everyman. The dialogue itself is between
Wyllyam, who argues the Lutheran case, and Nycholas, just home
from Germany, who demolishes Wyllyam's arguments by relating his own personal experiences with the Lutherans in their own land. He dwells particularly on the bitter strife over the Lord's Supper between Luther, Carlstadt, Zwingli, and their followers, and the executions by drowning of the Anabaptists for their beliefs.

The well-known Dialogue concerning Tyndale by Sir Thomas More, attacking point by point the Lutheran heresies as put forth by Tyndale, and Tyndale's Answer, also in dialogue form, are too long for treatment here. More's friend asks at length about certain reform doctrines which are troubling him and More analyses them showing wherein they are erroneous. The dialogue form makes the long treatise more readable.

Another dialogue arising out of the dispute between the old and the new learning and defending the old is A new boke of purgatory whiche is a dyaloge & dysputatyon betwene one Comynge an Al-mayne a Christen man / & one Gynaemyyn a turke of Machomests [sic] law / dysputynge by natural reason and good philosophye / whether there be a purgatorye or no purgatorye which boke is deuyded into thre dyalogys. The fyrrst dyaloge sheweth and treateth of the merueyous exstens of god. The seconde dyaloge treateth of the immortalyte of manyns soule. The thyrde dyaloge treateth of purgatory, by John Rastall. 80

One of Erasmus's Colloquia satirizes the gospeller who carries
his New Testament but does not live its precepts, indeed does not know what is in it. Polyphemus or the Gospeller was published in Latin in 1529 and in English translation in 1549. 81 Henry de Vocht writes that Erasmus had Felix Konings in mind when he wrote the dialogue as an example of some of the licentious reformers and their lack of intellectual and moral refinement. 82 He also sees Oecolampadius in the other speaker's role. The dialogue sparkles with the humor of the skilled and able satirist, who avoids the crudity and viciousness of a John Bale, whether from consideration for his victims or from lack of religious zeal. Cannius meets Poliphemus carrying in his hand an elaborate book "paynted and garnysshed" with saffrom and "lymmed" with "Simople, asaphetida, redleed, vermilō, and byse." It has "knottes, tassils plates, claspes, and brasen bullyoms." Cannius thinks that it should also have Poliphemus's "armes" on it: "the heed of Silenus, an olde iolthede drunkard totynge out of a hoggeshed or a tun." Poliphemus is outraged that Cannius should talk so of his book and warns him that it is a holy book, the gospel. Cannius is surprised, exclaiming, "God for thy grace what hath Poliphemus to do with the gospell?" He hopes it has some effect in making him an honest man, but just carrying it will not make him holy since an ass can carry three hundred such books on his back and still not be holy. Poliphemus is inclined to think that the ass that bore Christ is holy
since he touched Christ's body. He asks of Cannius whether it is not a sign of holiness to carry around the gospel. Cannius explains that a man must carry the gospel in his hands, his mouth, his mind, and his heart before he is holy. Poliphemus, a dense "great lubber," can understand only when Cannius uses the analogy of a man carrying a tankard of good wine on his back; it would be a burden. If he drank as much as he could hold in his mouth and spit it out again, it still would be no good to him. Only if he drank himself completely full would it have any effect on him. Poliphemus is touched by the thought of good wine and Cannius drives his point home:

The gospel is suche a lyke thynge of all this worlde, for after that it hathe ones persed & entered in the veynes of the mynd it altereth, transposeth, and cleane changeth vpsodowne the whole state of mæ, and chaungeth hym cleane as it were into a nother man. (p. 17)

Poliphemus exclaims:

Ah ha, nowe I wolde wheresabout ye be, belyke ye thinke that I lyue not accordynge to the gospell or as a good gospeller shulde do. (p. 17)

Cannius then by examination proceeds to see whether Poliphemus lives as the gospel recommends. His first question is what Poliphemus would do if a man told him he lied falsely or called him a knave. Poliphemus answers:

What wolde I do quod he, that is a question in dade, mary he shulde feele the wayghte of a payre of churlysh fystes I warrant the. (p. 18)
Cannius gives him the Christian way of turning the other cheek; Poliphemus does remember having read some such thing in his book but he has quite forgotten it. The two go down the list of religious activities commanded by the gospel: prayer, fasting, giving to the poor, keeping the commandments. Poliphemus does none of them, but he says Christ died for his sins so he does not have to worry. Cannius wants to know how Poliphemus can prove he is a true gospel lover. Poliphemus says that the proof is in his defense of Erasmus's New Testament when a certain friar babbled and railed against it. He waited until he was alone with this friar and "I caught my frere by the polled pate with my left hande and with my right hâde I drew out my daggar and I pommelled the knaue frere welfauardly aboute his skonce that I made his face as swollen and as puffed as a puddynge." He thinks this is proof that he favors the gospel. Before he let the friar go, he continues:

I gaue hym absolucion afore he departed out of my handes wî this newe testament thryse layde vpon his pate as harde as I myght dryue yî I made thre bunches in his heed as bygge as thre egges in the name of the father, the sone, & the holy goost. (p. 24)

Cannius thinks this was done like a "ryght gospeller of these dayes."
The dialogue continues in this vein until Poliphemus excuses himself for not being sharp in his answers; he has been drinking hard with friends and will dispute further about the gospel when he is sober.

Cannius: Whê wyll that be?
Poliphemus: When thou shalt see me, in the meane season
god be with you gentle Cannius... (p. 30)

Cannius wishes that he may become as "valiant or puisant" a fellow
as his name Gospeller sounds. Poliphemus, not to be outdone,
answers:

And bycause ye shall lose nothyng at my hande with wyshynge
I pray god that Cannius maye neuer lacks a good can or a
stoope of wyne or bere, wherof he had his name. (p. 31)

This dialogue, because it is dramatic, humorous, and short, would
make a more intertaining interlude than many which were actually
produced. It was not Englished until 1549, but many learned Eng-
lishmen would have known the Latin version of 1529.

In another dialogue called Ye Pylgremage of Pure Deuotyon
Erasmus tells how the "new learnynge, whiche runnyythe all the
worlde ouer now a dayes" has decreased the business of St. James'
shrine. As a result of the teachings of the new learning, people
do not give the much money any more, saying that it is better to
give it to the poor, with which sentiment Erasmus would agree.

Another dialogue, which like Erasmus's Polyphemus pokes mild
fun at the new gospellers, is Elyot's Pasquil the Playne (1533), a
dramatic discourse on the advantages of speech vs. silence. Gnotho the Greek servant is dressed in a fashion which looks as if
he "pulled hit from somme worshipfull doctour," and carries in his
hand the "Novum testaméntum" and in his bosom a copy of "Troylus &
Chreiseid." He expounds to Pasquil a sentence from Aeschylus and
is told that he does not understand the Greek dramatist any better
than he does the New Testament which he carries. Gnatho becomes
angry and Pasquil explains that anger is against the principles of
the book he carries. Pasquil advises Gnatho to be silent on the
holy scriptures and especially the epistles of Paul. Gnatho is
unimpressed and in turn advises Pasquil to learn to quote from the
New Testament. While the unlearned Gnatho preaches, Harpocrates
standing by holding his finger to his lips "speketh littell or nothyng
/ but formynge his visage in to a grauitie with silence / loketh as
if he affirmed all thyne that is spoken." Gnatho preaches that it
is a strange world and among other things now some men say
"faythe is tourned to herisye." Pasquil, still of the opinion that
Gnatho is too ignorant a fellow to be delving into theology, answers
that "some woulde be in the bowels of diuinite, or they know what
belongeth to good humanite." Pasquil, a statue in the city of Rome,
has as his function hearing the complaint of all who come once a
year. He speaks lightly and disrespectfully of monks and popes,
but he explains sympathetically the use of images in the Catholic
system to call to mind the wisdom, goodness, and virtue of the
person represented. The dialogue is a mild reproach to the new
gospelers who preach what they do not know when silence on such
sacred matters would be more appropriate.
The new religious learning of Luther, which sought to reintroduce the doctrines of St. Paul and St. Augustine as they had existed in the early church, was exciting news in the early sixteenth century, discussed in every possible medium of human communication. The hymns, the ballads, the Prayer Books, state proclamations, prose treatises, verse treatises, sermons, Biblical commentaries, private conversations, letters, plays, interludes, and, as we have seen in this chapter, disputations, debates, and dialogues are full of the controversies involved in the struggle of the new against the old. The number of dialogues written on the new learning was great, but the figure is not immediately apparent because many dialogues were printed under other genre names: treatises, catechisms, ballads, interludes, books. Many works published without designation of their form in the title are dialogues. For example A Myrrour or glasse for them that be syke & in payne is a dialogue between Timotheus and Tobias about a vicar who refuses to visit a dying man until he be at liberty from saying his matins and masses. This chapter represents a sampling of the dialogue literature of the time. Because of its nature and form the dialogue is considered here as a member of the drama family. Whether the relationship between early sixteenth century dialogues and plays is that of parent and child may be disputed, but that there was a very
close family relationship can hardly be denied. We have seen that in many cases the interludes could have as well been called dialogues, and the dialogues interludes or plays. Is Of Gentleness and Nobility a dialogue or an interlude? Its title calls it a "Dyaloge ... compild in maner of an enterlude." Is the Endightment agaynste Mother Messe a dialogue or an interlude? Its title is A New Dialogue ..., but it is essentially a play with a list of characters, real and allegorical, definite scenes, dramatic action and interest. It is not too long for production. Perhaps the distinction between these two genres was thought to be the use of verse in the interludes but not necessarily in the dialogues. Some dialogues were written in verse, but no interludes, so far as I have observed, were in prose. Many dialogues were produced as dramatic offerings and probably served the function of interludes at court whether they were so named or not. The purpose of this chapter has been to show the closeness of these two types of drama and to give a summary look at those dialogues written for and against the new learning.
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APPENDIX

QUOTATIONS FROM MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF
LUTHER'S WRITINGS ON THE MAIN POINTS
OF HIS DOCTRINE

At the University of Erfurt, Luther received a scholastic edu-
cation, with emphasis on the teachings of William of Occam, who
opposed the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. Even
at Erfurt, Aristotle was the authority on dialectics and philosophy,
and Luther knew his works on logic, ethics, natural philosophy,
and metaphysics.¹ Scholasticism, of the Occam variety, not
humanism, formed the basis of his education though he did find
some time to read Cicero, Virgil, Livy, and Plautus.² In July, 1505,
after an intense emotional experience, he suddenly gave up the in-
tention to study law, renounced the world, and entered the
Augustinian monastery at Erfurt.³ Later in his life he writes of
this decision:

I was always thinking, when will you do enough that God
may be gracious? Such thoughts drove me to the monastery
... I went into the cloister that I might not be lost but
might have eternal life. I wanted to help myself through
the cowl ... In the cloister we had enough to eat and
drink but we had suffering and torment in heart and con-
science ... I was often terrified at the name of Jesus.
The sight of a crucifix was like lightning to me and when
his name was spoken I would rather have heard that of
the devil, because I thought I must do good works until
Christ because of them became friendly and gracious to me.
I was not troubled about women, gold, and goods but I had lost faith and could not suppose that God was other than angry, and that I must placate him with my good deeds. 4

He was a conscientious monk, who worked hard at salvation of his soul. He writes in 1532:

For almost fifteen years I wore myself out in self-sacrifice, tormenting myself with fastings, vigils, prayers, and other very burdensome tasks, with the idea of attaining to righteousness by my works. Certain it is, I was a pious monk and observed the rule of my Order so strictly that I venture to say that if ever a monk could have gained heaven through monkery, I should certainly have got there. 5

The word "poenitentia" troubled him, and he received comfort from the words of his superior John Staupitz, Professor of Sacred Theology and Vicar of the Augustinian Order, who once had said to him "that there is no true penitence which does not begin with love of righteousness and of God, and that this love, which others think to be the end and the completion of penitence, is rather its beginning." 6 These words "stuck in me like a sharp arrow" and he reread the Scriptures in light of this suggestion:

Lo, there began a joyous game! The words frolicked with me everywhere! They laughed and gambled around this saying. Before that there was scarcely a word in all the Scriptures more bitter to me than "penitence," though I was busy making pretences to God and trying to produce a forced, feigned love; but now there is no word which has for me a sweeter or more pleasing sound than "penitence." For God's commands are sweet, when we find that they are to be read not in books alone, but in the wounds of our sweet Saviour.

He learned later in studying Greek that "penitence" is in that lan-
guage *metanoia* which means a "coming to one's senses," and is a "knowledge of one's own evil, gained after punishment has been accepted and error acknowledged; and this cannot possibly happen without a change of heart and our love." He continues:

All this answers so aptly to the theology of Paul, that nothing, at least in my judgment, can so aptly illustrate St. Paul. . . . Depending on these things, I ventured to think those men false teachers who ascribed so much to works of penitence that they left us scarcely anything of penitence itself except trivial satisfactions and laborious confession, because, forsooth, they had derived their idea from the Latin words *poenitentiam agere*, which indicate an action, rather than a change of heart . . .

**To do penance** can be quite different from **to repent**. Luther came to the conclusion that he could not achieve salvation by doing penance but only by repenting and becoming a "new man."

**Justification by Faith Alone**

He writes that he desperately tried to understand Paul's Epistles but that one expression, "the justice of God," stood in his way. He took it to mean the "justice whereby God is just and deals justly in punishing the unjust." He analyzes his experience with this conception of justice:

My situation was that, although an impeccable monk, I stood before God as a sinner troubled in conscience, and I had no confidence that my merit would assuage him. Therefore I did not love a just and angry God, but rather hated and murmured against Him. Yet I clung to the dear Paul and had a great yearning to know what he meant.

Night and day I pondered until I saw the connection be-
between the justice of God and the statement that "the just shall live by his faith." Then I grasped that the justice of God is that righteousness by which through grace and sheer mercy God justifies us through faith. Thereupon I felt myself to be reborn and to have gone through open doors into paradise. The whole of Scripture took on a new meaning, and whereas before the "justice of God" had filled me with hate, now it became to be inexpressibly sweet in greater love. This passage of Paul became to me a gate to heaven.

If you have a true faith that Christ is your Saviour, then at once you have a gracious God, for faith leads you in and opens up God's heart and will, that you who should see pure grace and overflowing love. This it is to behold God in faith that you should look upon His fatherly, friendly heart, in which there is no anger nor ungraciousness. He who sees God as angry does not see Him rightly but looks only on a curtain, as if a dark cloud had been drawn across his face.9

In teaching that man is justified by faith alone, he had laid himself open to the charge that he rejected "good works." He rejects only those works which do not flow from faith and which are not commanded by God but are "self-selected" works such as:

running to the convent, singing, reading, playing the organ, ornamenting churches, altars, convents, gathering chimes, jewels, vestments, gems and treasures, going to Rome and to the saints, curtsaying and bowing the knees, praying the rosary and the psalter, etc.10

These, he thought, were overemphasized by the Church while the faithful performance of one's duty in one's calling was minimized and considered a lower kind of morality. In remembering his monastic days he says that the life was a "soft kind of life," free from the annoyances of civil and domestic affairs. Yet it was a "prison to good men who did not think simply of their bellies but
longed for salvation." He writes:

Each one of us bears in his breast a great monk. That is, each would like to have such a work in which he could glory: "Behold, I have done this. Today I have satisfied God by my prayers, by my good works, so I can enjoy greater peace of mind." . . . Because the conscience is a most delicate thing, it cannot be guarded sufficiently against this vice of presumption. For that reason let no one be secure. We who confess Christ should walk in fear and grow in faith, and acknowledge that we each bear in our breast a monstrous and disgusting monk, that is a foolish and carnal delusion of works, the ruin of faith. . . . So we have to struggle as long as we live against this monk and the devil who rules and assists him.  

Man cannot do good works unless he has faith in Christ. He is unable to effect his salvation by means of his own efforts. In 1521 Luther writes in defense of his article, condemned by the papal Bull, that "A righteous man sins in all his good works." This article, he says, vexes the great work-saints, who place their reliance not on God's mercy, but on their own righteousness, that is, on the sand; . . . He quotes from St. Gregory: "The holy man Job saw that all our good works are nothing but sin, if God judges them; therefore, he says, 'If anyone will contend with God, he cannot answer Him one of a thousand.'"  

Original Sin and the Enslaved Will of Man  

At the root of this doctrine of man's inability to do good works in God's sight is Luther's belief, taken from St. Augustine, that man
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has inherited original sin from Adam, original sin so great that even grace can only blot out the guilt or culpa but not the con-
cupiscence which remains even in the elect. 17 This disposition to sin is always with man and only begins to be removed by grace, and this removal is not completed unless there is perseverance to the end. 18 As an Occamist, Luther held that original sin consists not in concupiscence, but in the loss of original righteousness, involving guilt (culpa) which is taken away in baptism, while concupiscence remains in the struggle of the flesh and the spirit, as the punishment (poena) of original sin. 19 Luther writes in clarifi-
cation of this position:

Both intellect and emotion in virtue of original sin are in a state of darkness and bondage, and until faith dawns on the soul and love (in the selfless sense) frees them, man is impotent to will or possess or work the good. Nay he can only work evil, even when he does what is good. 20

This definition of original sin leads Luther to deny absolutely the freedom of the will of man in his fallen state.

In answer to the Pope's Bull condemning the articles of belief expressed by him, Luther (1521) defends the article on the will of man: "Since the fall of Adam, or after actual sin, free will exists only in name, and when it does what it can, it commits mortal sin." He quotes Augustine in reply: "'The free will, without God's grace, has no power except to sin.'" He continues his answer:
Paul says, in II Timothy ii, "Instruct those that oppose the truth; peradventure God will give them repentance, that they acknowledge the truth, and return from the snares of the devil, by whom they are taken captive at his will." Where is the free will here when the captive is of the devil, not indeed unable to do anything, but able to do only what the devil wills? Is that freedom, to be captive at the devil's will, so that there is no help unless God grant repentance and improvement? So also says John viii, When the Jews said they were free, Christ said, "Verily I say unto you, all they who sin are servants or possessions of sin; if the son make you free, ye shall be free indeed." So St. Augustine changes the term "free will," in his work Against Julian, book ii, and calls it servum arbitrium, "a will in bondage."

Again Moses says in Genesis vi and viii, "Everything that the heart of man thinks and desires is only evil at all times." Hearken to that, dear papists. . . . If there is a good thought or will in men at any time, then we must accuse Moses of lying, for he calls all the times, all the thoughts, all the desires of the human heart evil. What kind of freedom is it that is inclined only to evil?21

He wishes the term free will had never been invented:

It is not in the Scriptures, and it were better to call it "self-will," which profiteth not. Or, if anyone wishes to retain it, he ought to apply it to the new-created man so as to understand it the man who is without sin. He is assuredly free, as was Adam in Paradise, and it is of him that the Scriptures speak when they touch upon our freedom; but they who lie in sins are unfree and prisoners of the devil; yet because they can become free through grace, you can call them men of free will, just as you might call a man rich, although he is a beggar, because he can become rich. But it is neither right nor good thus to juggle with words in matters of such great seriousness; . . . The error about the free will is a peculiar teaching of Antichrist; therefore it is no wonder that it is spread so far throughout the world, for Antichrist is to seduce the whole world. . . . 22
Erasmus published the *De Libero Arbitrio* in 1524 attacking Luther's assumption of the servitude of the human will. Luther recognized that Erasmus had pointed to a cardinal point in his theology and had seized him by the throat. 23 To Erasmus the dogma of the impotence of the human will was merely a curious and superfluous speculation, but to Luther it was the very essence of the Christian faith: "without it neither God, nor Christ, nor the Gospel, nor faith, nor anything is left us." 24 It is absolutely necessary to know in what relation man stands to God:

Hence the necessity of being able to distinguish definitely between the power of God and our own, between His work and ours, if we wish to live piously. 25

God foresees, determines, and effects all events; He does not foresee anything contingently; what He wills is immutable though it may seem contingent and mutable to man. 26 Luther thinks that the distinction between absolute and conditional necessity is a mere play on words. Without the belief in absolute necessity, faith, worship, and service of God would be impossible, since man could not trust God's promises or be certain of his salvation, and the Gospel would cease to offer consolation to him. 27

Luther faced the awkward consequences to the doctrine of the impotence of the will in *De Servo Arbitrio* published in 1525 in answer to Erasmus's *De Libero Arbitrio*. Erasmus had objected that no one would tend to amend his life if this doctrine were
taught to the people. Luther answered that this is so, but only the elect can amend their lives anyway and the fact that impiety might be increased as a result of the teaching is one of the evils to be borne. As a compensation there is, he writes, "opened for the elect a door to righteousness, an entrance into heaven, a way to God." Election is God's will and as such must be accepted with the never-failing or doubting belief that God is just and what He does is right. God's eternal predestination takes man's salvation out of his hands, as Luther explains in the Preface to The Epistle to the Romans, 1522. This is as it should be since if man had to save himself, the devil would prove too strong for most men. But "since God is certain, and His predestination cannot fail, and no one can withstand Him, we still have hope against sin." Those who begin "at the top to search the abyss of divine predestination, and worry in vain about whether they are predestinate" will despair. Speaking of Paul's Epistle to the Romans he continues:

But do you follow the order of this epistle. Worry first about Christ and the Gospel, that you may recognize your sin and His grace; then, when you have reached the eighth chapter, and are under the cross and suffering, that will teach you the right doctrine of predestination, in the ninth, tenth and eleventh chapters, and how comforting it is. For in the absence of suffering and the cross and the danger of death, one cannot deal with predestination without harm and without secret wrath against God. The old Adam must die before he can endure this subject and drink the strong wine of it.
Therefore beware not to drink the strong wine while you are still a suckling. There is a limit, a time, an age for every doctrine.

Why God elected some to receive grace and eternal life and others not to receive such benefits is a mystery which man has no right to question. What God wills is right and man's complaints will not change His immutable will. To distinguish between fore-knowing and fore-ordaining in order to get over the difficulty of attributing evil to God is to Luther a mere quibble. He admits that this is a hard doctrine, and one leading to despair at first before man learns to trust all to God.

**Christian Liberty**

In his *Treatise on Christian Liberty*, 1520, Luther emphasizes that the Christian man needs freedom in all but the essentials of salvation, which are the Word of God or the Gospel of Christ and a firm faith in this Word. All else is non-essential:

The soul receives no benefit if the body is adorned with the sacred robes of the priesthood, or dwells in sacred places, or is occupied with sacred duties, or prays, fasts, abstains from certain kinds of food or does any work whatsoever that can be done by the body and in the body. . . . On the other hand, it will not hurt the soul if the body is clothed in secular dress, dwells in unconsecrated places, eats and drinks as others do, does not pray aloud, and neglects to do all the things mentioned above, which hypocrites can do.

Another aspect of Luther's Christian Liberty was the leveling of all classes of Christians into a fellowship or communion of souls.
each equal to the other no matter what his occupation or status in
society. The clergy were no longer to be considered spiritually
higher than the layman. They were merely ministers chosen by
the congregations to administer God's sacraments.

[The] "spiritual"--priests, bishops or popes--are neither
different from other Christians nor superior to them,
except that they are charged with the administration of
the Word of God and the sacraments which is their work
and office, so it is with the temporal authorities,
--they bear sword and rod with which to punish evil
and to protect the good. A cobbler, a smith, a farmer,
each has the work and office of his trade, and yet they
are all alike consecrated priests and bishops, and every
one by means of his own work or office must benefit
and serve every other that in this way many kinds of
work may be done for the bodily and spiritual welfare of
the community, even as all the members of the body
serve one another. 35

Through baptism all of us are consecrated to the priest-
hood. . . . Therefore when a bishop consecrates it
is the same thing as if he, in the place and stead of
the whole congregation, all of whom have like power,
were to take one out of their number and charge him
to use this power for the others. 36

Luther's complaint against the Church of Rome is that through their
canon law and the sacrament of ordination of the clergy, they have
almost destroyed this "great grace and power of baptism and of the
Christian Estate." 37 All true Christians are members of a spiritual
community, and all Christians are given the power of the keys to
bind or loose their fellow Christians. The power is not exclusively
the possession of the successor of St. Peter.
The Law and the Gospel

If faith alone justifies, why does the law of the Old Testament prescribe so many works, ceremonies, and laws to be followed and kept to the last "jot" and "tittle"? This law represents, says Luther, the commands of God given for the purpose of making man despair of his ability to save himself and of teaching man to know himself in his utter weakness and dependence on God. The second part of the Word of God is the gospel, which is not to be considered a "law of Christ" but which consists of the promises of God. When a man has become sufficiently humble and aware of his inability to save himself and to fulfill the law, the second part of the Word comes in and comforts him:

If you wish to fulfill the law, and not to covet, as the law demands, come, believe in Christ, in Whom grace, righteousness, peace, liberty and all things are promised you; if you believe, you shall have all, if you believe not you shall lack all. 38

He continues:

Thus the promises of God give what the commands of God ask, and fulfill what the law prescribes, that all things may be of God alone, both the commands and the fulfilling of the commands. Therefore the promises of God belong to the New Testament, nay, they are the New Testament. . . . As the word is, so it makes the soul, as heated iron glows like fire because of the union of fire with it. . . . And this is that Christian liberty, even our faith, which does not indeed cause us to live in idleness or in wickedness, but makes the law and works unnecessary for any man's righteousness and salvation. 39

This law, or the justitia Dei, in the Pauline sense, that must be
perfectly fulfilled to please the justice of God was to Luther a source of anxious care:

To speak of myself, the term justitia became so loathsome to me that it would not have caused me so much suffering if some one had laid violent hands on me. . . . For I have found in myself and many others that when we esteem ourselves righteous, God laughs at our righteousness. 40

The thought of the law as the expression of the divine righteousness and of its non-fulfillment would at times overwhelm him with the sense of guilt before God: "The law was the most terrible misery, the thing as Paul says, that kills. The law is no joke. As a young man it meant to me sheer death." 41 He writes in the Preface to the New Testament, 1522:

See to it, therefore, that you do not make of Christ a second Moses or of the Gospel a book of laws and doctrines, as has been done heretofore; and certain prefaces, even those of St. Jerome, speak for this. For the Gospel does not really demand works of ours by which we become righteous and are saved, nay, it condemns such works; but it does demand faith in Christ, that He has overcome for us sin, death and hell, and thus makes us righteous, and gives us life and salvation, not through our works, but through His own works, death, and suffering, in order that we may avail ourselves of His death and victory, as though they were our own. 42

Luther considered Moses the very antithesis of Christ. He was determined to recast Christ in the role of a sweet and gentle intercessor who would replace the numerous saints and the Virgin Mary as man's personal savior. In his commentary on Psalm 45:2, "Grace is overflowing upon his lips," Luther takes David's
words as referring to Christ:

So Christ should not be depicted with gall or a sword in His mouth, as they always portray Him, unless it is to be understood spiritually. He should be depicted in such a way that His lips seem to be pure sugar or honey. Whoever depicts His mouth otherwise errs, and we should rather listen to this poet than to the papists and Satan, the authors of this horrible picture. For this poet will not deceive us when he ascribes to Christ the loveliest mouth. This must be noted carefully. For Christ should not make hearts sad with His words, He ought not to terrify. Whoever terrifies and vexes consciences in Christ's name is not a messenger of Christ but of the devil, for Christ's name is: "A bruised reed He will not break, and a dimly burning wick He will not quench." He is gentle: "He will not cry or lift up His voice or make it heard in the street" (Is. 42:3, 2). He is not rough, severe, biting like Moses, who looks like the very devil and speaks in a way that our heart almost vanishes before him. For he has lips overflowing with gall and wrath, that have been embittered with laurel and gall, in fact, with hellish fire. So away forever with Moses! But our King has pleasant lips; that is, His Word is the Word of remission of sins and of comfort for the lowly, the Word of life and salvation to recall the damned and dying. 43

The Authority of the Scriptures

Luther translated the Bible into German for the use of those who could not read Latin or Greek. He advocated the reading of the Scriptures in preference to reading the numerous commentaries of the Fathers on them:

In this I follow the example of St. Augustine, who is one of the first, and almost the only one of them to subject himself to the Holy Scriptures alone, uninfluenced by the books of all the Fathers and the Saints. This brought him into a hard fray with St. Jerome, who cast up to him the writings of his predecessors; but he did not care for that. If this example of St. Augustine had been fol-
lowed, the pope would not have become Antichrist, the countless vermin, the swarming, parasitic mass of books would not have come into the Church, and the Bible would have kept its place in the pulpit.  

He thinks it is useful to have some of the books of the Fathers and some of the decrees of the Councils preserved, but "est modus in rebus, and it is no pity that the books of many of the Fathers and Councils have, by God's grace, been lost. If they had all remained, one could scarce go in or out for books, and we should still have nothing better than we find in the Holy Scriptures."

"Then, too, it was our intention and our hope, when we began to put the Bible into German, that there would be less writing, and more studying and reading of the Scriptures." He hopes that the reading of his own books will not keep any man from reading and studying the Scriptures. His books are to be read as he "read the orders and the ordures of the pope and the books of the sophists," i.e., as an aid to the Scriptures not as a substitute.

Luther's early view of the authority of the Scriptures is given in a treatise called "That we are to reject the Doctrines of Men."

In it he writes:

But some one will say that Moses speaks only of his word; but to the books of Moses there have also been added many books of the prophets and the entire New Testament. I answer: True, but nothing new has been added: the same things that are found in the books of Moses are found in the others. For the other books do no more than show how in the course of history the word of Moses was kept or not kept. It is indeed stated in different words and the histories are different, but throughout there is one and the same
teaching. And here we can challenge them to point out anywhere in all the books added to the books of Moses a single word that is not found earlier in the books of Moses. For it is beyond question that all the Scriptures point to Christ alone. Now Christ says, in John v, 46, "Moses wrote of me." Therefore everything that is in the other books is also in the book of Moses, and these are the original documents. 48

Later (1527) Luther warned that in reading the Scriptures, man must not only ask himself whether it is God's Word, but must also ask to whom the words are spoken and whether they apply to the particular situation. 49 He was not an advocate of literal inspiration of the words of the Bible. Man must use his best judgment obtained in the light of faith to interpret the words of Scripture. In his opposition to the authority of the Pope and the Church, Luther emphasized the authority of the Scriptures and the right of each of the members of the spiritual Church or the communion of saints to interpret the meaning under the light given him by the Holy Spirit. The essentials and the non-essentials of religion he subjected to the test of being ordered by the Word of God. If a ceremony was commanded by the Scriptures, it was to be considered an essential; if not it was a non-essential, and a Christian was at liberty to keep it or to discard it without danger to his salvation. But Luther did not go so far as Zwingli and Carlstadt in discarding all ceremonies and practices that were not expressly ordered by the Scriptures. For him these things were _adiaphora_ and to be left to the free choice of the individual or the particular congregation of church.
In interpreting the Scriptures he says that he avoids "allegorical meanings, because they do not yield sound interpretations but mostly detract from the truth and simplicity of faith." He does not accept all the books of the Bible as equally worthy, however, and sets himself up as the judge of the authenticity of the different books of the New Testament, though he invites the readers to judge for themselves whether he is right after reading his "Prefaces to the New Testament":

From all this you can now judge all the books and decide among them which are the best. John's Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles, especially that to the Romans, and St. Peter's first Epistle are the true kernel and marrow of all the books. They ought rightly be the first books and it would be advisable for every Christian to read them first and most, and by daily reading, make them as familiar as his daily bread. . . . the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter far surpass the other three Gospels, -- Matthew, Mark and Luke.

Luther doubted the authenticity of the Epistle of St. James because it advocates works as a means to righteousness and contradicts St. Paul by trying to show that Abraham was justified by works (in offering to sacrifice his son Isaac) and not by faith alone:

Flatly against St. Paul and all the rest of Scripture, it ascribes righteousness to works, and says that Abraham was justified by his works, in that he offered his son Isaac, though St. Paul, on the contrary, teaches, in Romans iv, that Abraham was justified without works, by faith alone, before he offered his son, and proves it by Moses in Genesis xv. Now although this Epistle might be helped and a gloss be found for this work-righteousness, it cannot be defended against applying to works the saying of Moses in Genesis xv, which speaks only
of Abraham’s faith, and not of his works, as St. Paul shows in Romans iv. This fault, therefore, leads to the conclusion that it is not the work of any apostle.

He thinks it is not apostolic as it does not teach the passion, the resurrection, or the spirit of Christ:

Its purpose is to teach Christians, and in all this long teaching it does not once mention the Passion, the Resurrection, or the Spirit of Christ. He names Christ several times, but he teaches nothing about Him, and only speaks of common faith in God. For it is the duty of a true apostle to preach of the Passion and Resurrection and work of Christ, and thus lay the foundation of faith, as He Himself says, in John xv, "Ye shall bear witness of me." All the genuine sacred books agree in this, that all of them preach Christ and deal with Him. That is the true test, by which to judge all books, when we see whether they deal with Christ or not, since all the Scriptures show us Christ (Romans iii), and St. Paul will know nothing but Christ (I Corinthians xv). What does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even though St. Peter or Paul taught it; again, what preaches Christ would be apostolic, even though Judas, Annas, Pilate and Herod did it.

He continues:

But this James does nothing more than drive to the law and its works; and he mixes the two up in such disorderly fashion that it seems to me he must have been some good, pious man, who took some sayings of the apostles’ disciples and threw them thus on paper; or perhaps they were written down by someone else from his preaching. He calls the law a "law of liberty," though St. Paul calls it a law of slavery, of wrath, of death and of sin (Galatians iii; Romans vii). . . .

In a word, he wants to guard against those who relied on faith without works, and is unequal to the task and would accomplish by insisting on the Law what the apostles accomplish by inciting men to love. Therefore, I cannot put him among the chief books, though I would not thereby prevent anyone from putting him where he pleases and estimating him as he pleases; for there are many good sayings in him.
Luther deplored the condition in the universities where he says "the blind heathen master Aristotle rules alone, even more than Christ."\textsuperscript{54} It grieves him "to the heart that this damned, conceited, rascally heathen has with his false words deluded and made fools of so many of the best Christians. God has sent him as a plague upon us for our sins."\textsuperscript{55}

Why, this wretched man, in his best book, On the Soul, teaches that the soul dies with the body, although many have tried with vain words to save his reputation. As though we had not the Holy Scriptures, in which we are abundantly instructed about all things, and of them Aristotle had not the faintest inkling! And yet this dead heathen has conquered and obstructed and almost suppressed the books of the living God, so that when I think of this miserable business I can believe nothing else than that the evil spirit has introduced the study of Aristotle.

Again, his book on Ethics is the worst of all books. It flatly opposes divine grace and all Christian virtues, and yet it is considered one of his best works. Away with such books! Keep them away from all Christians.\textsuperscript{56}

The Word of God in the Scriptures is the one essential for salvation. Luther feels that the people have been robbed of it by the Pope and the Church. He prays, "Blessed are they, be they scattered among the Turks or under the pope, who are robbed of the Word but would sincerely like to have it."\textsuperscript{57} In describing the third wall that the Romanists have erected against any reform of themselves, i. e., the sole authority of the Pope to interpret the Scriptures, Luther writes that since all Christians are priests in one baptism and in one faith and Gospel, all Christians have the
power to test and judge what is correct or incorrect in matters of faith. If the Pope acts against the Scriptures, the laymen or secular authorities must reprove and correct him. 58

In De Libero Arbitrio Erasmus had said that the whole Word of God should not be preached to the people. This suggestion applied chiefly to the difficult problem of the freedom of the will and immutable predestination. Luther disagrees with holding back any portion of the Word or the Gospel from the people as Christ has commanded that the Gospel be preached to all the world. 59 Luther sums up the position of the reformers thus:

What is happening in our time? The pope has no shortage of learned, wise, and intelligent people, but is far ahead of us in skill, brains, and intelligence. Yet he does not get anywhere against us. We do nothing but open our mouths and speak the Word boldly. We wage a battle with the pope in which we wield no sword and shoot no guns. Yet with the Word, the Our Father, the children's Creed, and the Gospel we erect a power which is so strong and mighty that it mows down the system of priests, monks, and nuns as well as the whole papacy. He regards our Gospel as the preaching of fools, even as heresy, yet he must be afraid of it and go down before it. 60

It was of primary importance to the reformers that the people be allowed to read the Scriptures and that the Gospel be preached to them constantly. The peasant Karsthans, in a popular German dialogue, addressed Luther:

Dear Luther, write the divine truth in our language, in German, that we simple laymen also may read it. Only let it be true and well-grounded in Holy Scripture, as, in fact, nearly all of your writings are. 61
The Sacraments

The number of sacraments had been officially seven since 1439, when a definite ecclesiastical declaration was made at Florence. In 1520 Luther reduced the number to three in his treatise On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church: Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Penance, with the last one being doubtful and later to be rejected as a true sacrament.

The Sacrament of Baptism has suffered from the "Captivity" by the Church of Rome. Few remember their baptism, which for most people was infant baptism, and many new ways have been devised by the Church of ridding man of his sins and helping him on to heaven. These new ways are false and their source Luther sees in the "dangerous saying of St. Jerome's either unhappily phrased or wrongly interpreted—in which he terms penance 'the second plank' after the shipwreck; as if baptism were not penance."

He continues:

Accordingly, when men fall into sin, they despair of "the first plank," which is the ship, as though it had gone under, and fasten all their faith on the second plank, that is penance. This has produced those endless burdens of vows, religious works, satisfactions, pilgrimages, indulgences, and sects, whence has arisen that flood of books, questions, opinions and human traditions, which the world cannot contain; so that this tyranny plays worse havoc with the Church of God than any tyrant ever did with the Jewish people or with any other nation under heaven.

Baptism is sufficient if it is received in faith for man's salvation.
even if he fall into sin afterwards. This faith is the most im-
portant of all works for it is "a work of God, not of man, as Paul 
teaches." Other works God works through us with our help, but 
faith "He works in us and without our help."  

The signs are added to the promises in the sacraments to 
represent that which the words signify. Many have been driven 
to attribute such great power to the sacraments of the New Law 
that "in their opinion they benefit even such men as are in mortal 
sins," and "they do not require faith or grace; it is sufficient not 
to oppose a 'bar,' that is, an actual intention to sin again." These 
views are "godless and infidel," says Luther. The signs of the 
Bible, both Old and New Law, have attached to them promises 
which require faith. "Their whole efficacy, therefore, consists in 
faith itself, not in the doing of a work; for whoever believes them 
fulfills them, even if he should not do a single work. . . . The 
sacraments are not fulfilled . . . when they are observed, but 
when they are believed." He holds that it cannot be true that the 
sacraments are "effective signs of grace." He writes:

All such assertions tend to destroy faith, and arise 
from ignorance of the divine promise. Unless you 
should call them effective in the sense that they cer- 
tainly and efficaciously impart grace, where faith 
is unmistakably present. But it is not in this sense 
that efficacy is now ascribed to them; as witness the 
fact that they are said to benefit all men, even the 
godless and unbelieving, provided they do not oppose 
a "bar"--as if such unbelief were not in itself the 
most obstinate and hostile of all bars to grace.
Baptism signifies death and resurrection of the Christian in a new relationship to God. It does not become useless if the Christian lapses into sin; it never loses its power unless he despairs and never returns to its salvation.

We are, therefore, never without the sign of baptism nor yet without the thing it signifies; nay, we must be baptised ever more and more completely, until we perfectly fulfil the sign, at the last day. . . . For all our life should be baptism, and the fulfilling of the sign, or sacrament, of baptism; we have been set free from all else and wholly given over to baptism alone, that is, to death and resurrection. 73

This understanding of baptism has been taken captive by the Roman pontiff, he writes, and works and ceremonies substituted for faith and baptism. 74

Luther deviated from the official doctrine of the Church in believing that sin remains in man after baptism. 75 The Church preferred to call what remained of the devil in man after baptism a defect or a weakness. Luther uses St. Paul's statements, "I serve after the flesh the law of sin" and "The sin that dwelleth in me doeth the evil," to show that sin actually remains in man after baptism and not just a defect. 76 He explains his position thus:

After baptism and repentance all sins are forgiven, but sin is still present until death, although because of the forgiveness it does not prevent salvation, provided we strive against it and do not obey it. . . . For this is the rich grace of the New Testament and the surpassing mercy of the heavenly Father, that through baptism and repentance we begin to become righteous and pure, and whatever of sin is still to be driven out He does not hold against us, because of
the beginning we have made in righteousness and because of our continual striving against and driving out of sin. 77

He quotes from St. Augustine: "Sin is forgiven in baptism; not that it is no longer present, but it is not imputed." 78 Man is justified by faith in the promises of God, but he is sanctified by a life-long process of fighting against the flesh and sin, a process which is successfully concluded only at death.

In connection with his discussion of the true meaning of baptism, Luther writes that he would abolish all vows to enter religious orders as detracting from the significance of baptism. 79 The religious men making such vows consider them a type of new baptism and so have "appropriated to themselves all righteousness, salvation and glory, and left to those who are merely baptised nothing to compare with them." 80 The Pope, writes Luther, "that fountain and source of all superstitions, confirms, approves and adorns this mode of life with high-sounding bulls and dispensations, while no one deems baptism worthy of even a thought." 81 Thus those who take religious vows presume to achieve greater things by their works than others achieve by their faith. 82 Baptism makes all Christians priests and bishops and popes, though all do not exercise the office for the sake of good order. To Luther a priest is nothing else than an officeholder. 83 He proceeds to deny the theory of characteres indelebiles or the "indelible mark" which is supposed to be left on the priests by the Church's Sacrament of
Priests are only ministers of the people who cease to be priests unless they preach the Word and offer the sacraments to the people.

In the early part of *The Babylonian Captivity* Luther includes penance as a sacrament even though there is no visible or outward sign of the promises of God made in the sacrament. (Later in the Treatise he reduces the number of sacraments to two: Baptism and the Lord's Supper.) Luther feels that the Roman Church has emphasized the power of the keys, which it assumes to apply to the Pope and the clergy only, to such an extent as to rule out the necessity of faith in the receiving of the sacrament. The Church, he writes, teaches that contrition precedes faith in the promise of the sacrament; it also teaches that contrition is a merit and a work and does not emphasize that faith produces contrition in man. The Papists cite only those instances of Scripture which show that many obtained grace by reason of their contrition and humility of heart. Luther sees this humility as a result of faith which is a gift of God and not a merit of man. Other Papists, he writes, "again more bold and wicked, have invented a so-called 'attrition,' which is converted into contrition by virtue of the power of the keys, of which they know nothing. This attrition they grant to the wicked and unbelieving and thus abolish contrition altogether." Luther admits some truth in the Papists' teaching that con-
trition is to be attained by the recollection and contemplation of sins, but he sees peril in the doctrine if the beginning and cause of contrition in faith are not stressed; "the immutable truth of God's threatening and promise, to the awakening of faith" is the beginning of contrition. If faith and love are not present, it is not true contrition, for "even the devil and all the damned have this sort of contrition, which we Germans call 'the contrition of Judas' or 'gallows-contrition.'" 89

As a result of this doubt concerning the method of arousing contrition in men's hearts advocated by the Church, Luther condemns the popular practice of elaborate enumeration of sins and the attempt to "frame a contrition for every sin." He writes:

That is impossible; we can know only the smaller part of our sins, and even our good works are found to be sins, according to Psalm cxliii, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." It is enough to lament the sins which we can readily call to mind. Whoever is in this frame of mind is without doubt ready to grieve and fear for all his sins, and will do so whenever they are brought to his knowledge in the future. 90

The following article of Luther was condemned by the Papal Bull of 1520:

When we undertake to make a full and complete confession of all our sins, we do nothing else than show that we are not willing to leave the forgiveness of them to God's mercy. 91

Man's secret sins are known to God alone. Private confession to a Christian brother is a great comfort and is as effective as con-
fession to a priest of the Church. The manuals analysing and
categorising sins are useless and even harmful. Luther writes
further:

To these evils they have added the "circumstances," and
also the mothers, daughters, sisters, brothers—and
sisters-in-law, branches and fruits of sins; since, for-
sooth, astute and idle men have worked out a kind
family tree of relationships and affinities even among
sins—. . . My advice would be to ignore all circum-
stances utterly. With Christians there is only one cir-
cumstance,—that a brother has sinned. For there is
no person to be compared with a Christian brother. And
the observance of places, times, days, persons, and all
other superstitious moonshine, only magnifies the things
that are nothing to the injury of those which are every-
thing; as if aught could be greater or of more importance
than the glory of Christian brotherhood! Thus they bind
us to places, days and persons, that the name of brother
may be lightly esteemed, and we may serve in bondage
instead of being free—-we to whom all days, places,
persons, and all external things are one and the same.

In his discussion of the captivity of the Sacrament of Penance
by the Church, he found grave faults with the system of satisfactions
demanded for the sins of the people. He felt that the emphasis on
the external acts of satisfaction had served to make men trust in
their works for salvation to the exclusion of true penitence:

With these scruples they torture poor consciences to
death, and one runs to Rome, one to this place, another
to that, this one to Chartreuse, that one to some other
place, one scourges himself with rods, another ruins
his body with fasts and vigils, and all cry with the same
mad zeal, "Lo here is Christ! Lo there!" believing that
the kingdom of heaven, which is within us, will come
with observation. . . . Some have gone even farther
and have constructed those instruments for driving souls
to despair,—their decrees that the penitent must re-
hearse all sins anew for which he neglected to make
the imposed satisfaction. . . . Moreover, how many
are possessed with the notion that they are in a saved
state and are making satisfaction for their sins, if
they but mumble over, word for word, the prayers the
priest has imposed, even though they give never a
thought meanwhile to amending their life! They believe
that their life is changed in the one moment of con-
trition and confession, and it remains only to make
satisfaction for their past sins. 94

This error, he thinks, is greatly encouraged by the practice of
absolving of the sinner before the satisfactions have been completed,
contrary to the practice of the ancient Church. The sinner is more
concerned with completing his satisfactions than with contrition,
which he supposes to be over when he had made confession. 95

The Sacrament of Ordination Luther rejects as a true sacra-
ment in The Babylonian Captivity. Of ordination, he writes, the
Church of Christ knows nothing:

it is an invention of the church of the pope. Not only
is there nowhere any promise of grace attached to it,
but there is not the least mention of it in the whole
New Testament. 96

He feels strongly that in this sacrament lie the roots of what he
considers the tyranny of the clergy over the laity; he writes:

trusting in the external anointing by which their hands
are consecrated, in the tonsure and in vestments, they
not only exalt themselves above the lay Christians, who
are only anointed with the Holy Spirit, but regard them
almost as dogs and unworthy to be included with them
in the Church. Hence they are bold to demand, to exact,
to threaten, to urge, to oppress, as much as they please.
In short the sacrament of ordination has been and is a
most approved device for the establishing of all the hor-
rible things that have been wrought hitherto and will yet be wrought in the Church. Here Christian brotherhood has perished, here shepherds have been turned into wolves, servants into tyrants, churchmen into worse than worldlings. 97

The Sacrament of Ordination is only a rite of the Church for choosing men to preach the Gospel.

In exalting the Christian Brotherhood of laymen, Luther even went so far as to say that it was all right if the layman touched the sacramental elements with his hands since every Christian is anointed and sanctified with the oil of the Holy Spirit and in ancient times this privilege was granted the laity. 98 Though the laity had the same power as the clergy, they were not to exercise it without the common consent of all the brotherhood.

The Sacrament of Extreme Unction lacks Scriptural authority for being called a sacrament, says Luther, and the words of the Apostle James enjoining Christians to pray over their sick brothers have been perverted to a sacrament for the dying only. 99 Nor is marriage a true sacrament, writes Luther. He concludes that, in fact, there are only two sacraments in the Church of God—the bread and baptism—the others, even penance, lack some essential; only these two have both the divine promise and a visible sign. 100 He considers these two sacraments sufficient for the Christian life: baptism belongs to the beginning and the entire course of life, the bread belongs to the end and to death. And the Christian should use them both as long as he is in this poor body, until, fully baptised and strengthened,
he passes out of this world and is born unto the new life of eternity, to eat with Christ in the Kingdom of His Father, as He promised in the Last Supper,—"Amen I say to you, I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God." Thus He seems clearly to have instituted the sacrament of the bread with a view to our entrance into the life to come. 101

Luther would have the Lord's Supper rather than the Mass as it existed at the time. He attacked the belief that the Mass was in itself a good work an opus operatum, and a sacrifice. In his treatise The Babylonian Captivity, he writes that there is to-day no more generally accepted and firmly believed opinion in the Church than this,—that the mass is a good work and a sacrifice. And this abuse has brought an endless host of others in its train, so that the faith of this sacrament has become utterly extinct and the holy sacrament has been turned into a veritable fair, tavern, and place of merchandise. Hence participation, brotherhoods, intercessions, merits, anniversaries, memorial days, and the like wares are bought and sold, traded and bartered in the Church, and from this priests and monks derive their whole living. 102

Anything that has been added to the Scriptural account of the Lord's Supper (Matt. 26:26 ff.) is to be considered non-essential: "vestments, ornaments, chants, prayers, organs, candles, and the whole pageantry of outward things." He defines the Sacrament as Christ's testament just before His death in which He promises remission of sins to those who will believe and have faith in the promise. This promise comes from free and unmerited mercy. The sign of this promise is the body and blood of Christ which is to be taken by men into their bodies as a constant reassurance of this promise.
If man believes and accepts this gift from Christ, he has done all that is expected of him; he is not to give on his part, but to receive in faith the promise of God for the remission of his sins. Man does not offer a sacrifice to God; he accepts in faith a gift from God. The "empty hands of faith" receive a blessing from God. Not many, says Luther, know that the Mass is a promise of Christ, for the priests keep the words of consecration secret only for themselves to understand; yet even the priests do not reverence the words of the Mass as a promise:

for we too fail to regard them as promises or as a testament, for the strengthening of faith. Instead of believing them, we reverence them with I know not what superstitious and godless fancies. . . . For what worse idolatry can there be than to abuse God's promises with perverse opinions and to neglect or extinguish faith in them? . . . we cannot deal with God otherwise than through faith in the word of His promise. He does not desire works, nor has He need of them; we deal with men and with ourselves on the basis of works. But He has need of this,--that we deem Him true to His promises, wait patiently for Him, and thus worship Him with faith, hope and love. Thus He obtains His glory among us, since it is not of ourselves who run, but of Him who showeth mercy, promiseth and giveth, that we have and hold every blessing.103

Luther considered it a "wicked error to offer or apply masses for sins for satisfactions, for the dead, or for any necessity whatsoever of one's own or of others."104 He favored the abolition of all Masses said for money for the benefit of others. Of endowed Masses he writes:

It is also to be feared that the many masses which are endowed in the foundations and monasteries are not only
of little use, but greatly arouse the wrath of God. It would therefore be profitable not to endow any more, but rather to abolish many that are already endowed, since we see that they are regarded only as sacrifices and good works, though they are really sacraments, just like baptism and penance, which profit only those who receive them, and no others. But now the custom has crept in, that masses are said for the living and the dead, and all hopes are built upon them; for this reason so many of them have been founded and the present state of affairs has come about. 105

He would abolish anniversary, mortuary, and soul masses as they are only a

miserable gabbling of wretched vigils and masses, which is neither reading nor praying; and even when prayed, they are performed not for God's sake and out of willing love, but for money's sake and because they are a bounden duty. 106

The prayers offered up at the Masses, Luther admits, may do good for those prayed for, but he thinks that the priests do not believe themselves to be offering up only prayers but think themselves to be "offering up Christ Himself, as all-sufficient sacrifice, to God the Father, and to be performing a good work for all they have the intention to benefit." 107 This is the greatest "stumbling-block," and even the words of the canon or that part of the Mass included between the Sanctus and the Lord's Prayer tend in this direction, "when they speak of 'these gifts,' 'these offerings,' 'this holy sacrifice,' and farther on, of 'this oblation.'" 108 They also pray "'that the sacrifice may be accepted even as the sacrifice of Abel,' etc., and hence Christ is termed the 'Sacrifice of the altar.'" 109
Luther denied that there was a transubstantiation in the substance of the bread and wine of the Sacrament of the Altar:

the Church had the true faith for more than twelve hundred years, during which time the holy Fathers never once mentioned this transubstantiation—forsooth, a monstrous word for a monstrous idea:—until the pseudo-philosophy of Aristotle became rampant in the Church, these last three hundred years, during which many other things have been wrongly defined.\footnote{110}

He believed that the real body of Christ is present in the Sacrament, but that it exists with the substance of the bread in a kind of consubstantiation. This term consubstantiation was not Luther's, nor do the Lutherans admit that it describes their position, but it has been used as a handy one-word description of what they believe. Richard Hooker, in the \textit{Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity} (1597), uses the term and describes the Lutheran doctrine thus:

\begin{quote}
/ they / lay the union of Christ's deity with his handsome as their foundation and ground; from thence they infer a power which the body of Christ hath thereby to present itself in all places; out of which ubiquity of his body and blood they gather the presence thereof with that sanctified bread and wine of our Lord's table; the conjunction of his body and blood with those elements they use as an argument to shew how the bread may as well in that respect be termed his body because his body is therewith joined, as the Son of God may be named man by reason that God and man in the person of Christ are united; to this they add how the words of Christ commanding us to eat must needs import that as he hath coupled the substance of his flesh and the substance of bread together, so we together should receive both; . . . \footnote{111}
\end{quote}

He adds that the followers of consubstantiation plead God's omnipotency in the sacrament by the "kneading up of both substances
as it were into one lump."

Luther gave the following description of his doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament in a sermon preached in 1526:

Although he is present in all creatures, and I might find him in stone, in fire, in water, or even in a rope, for he certainly is there, yet he does not wish that I seek him there apart from the Word, and cast myself into the fire or the water, or hang myself on the rope. He is present everywhere, but he does not wish that you grope for him everywhere. Grope rather where the Word is, and there you will lay hold of him in the right way. Otherwise you are tempting God and committing idolatry. For this reason he has set down for us a definite way to show us how and where to find him, namely the Word. Those people, who say that it is unreasonable for Christ to be present in the bread and wine, do not know or see this at all, because they also do not understand what Christ's kingdom is, and the sitting at the right hand of God. If Christ were not with me in dungeon, torture, and death, where would I be? He is present there through the Word, although not in the same way as here in the sacrament, where through the Word he binds his body and blood so that they are also received corporeally in the bread and wine. If we believe the one, it is easy also to grasp and believe the other. Heaven and earth are his sack; as wheat fills the sack, so he fills all things. And as a seed bears a stalk, an ear, and brings forth many kernels; or again, as a single cherrystone cast into the ground brings forth a tree which bears many blossoms, leaves, inner and outer bark, and cherries; or again, as my voice reaches so many ears; much more is Christ able to distribute himself whole and undivided into so many particles.

Contrary to the belief of the Catholic Church, Luther believed that the layman should be given communion in two kinds, or both the bread and the wine, because that is the way the Supper is recorded in the Scriptures. He thought, however, that the effectiveness of the Sacrament depends on the desire of the recipient,
so that he receives the benefits even if he is denied both kinds so
long as he has faith and desires the Communion. He concludes that
it is "wicked and despotic" to deny both kinds to the laity and this
is the "first captivity" of the Sacrament, concerning its substance
and completeness. 115 Man is free under his Christian liberty to
take it in one or in two kinds since Christ did not expressly command
either. Those who refuse to give it to men desiring both kinds sin
in withholding it. 116

Marriage of the Clergy

Though Luther denied that marriage is a sacrament of the Church,
he set about to raise the opinion of the married state in society.
He writes to the Knights of the Teutonic Order that they should all
marry: "God says in Genesis II, 'It is not good that the man be
alone; I will make him an help who shall be about him,' etc." 117
Many people, including the Pope, cannot understand these words and
say that a wife is a hindrance to the service of God. However,
Luther feels that

in God's sight it is a precious and noble good work to
train and educate children, to rule wife and servants
in a godly manner, to earn one's living in the sweat of
one's face, and to endure much misfortune and many
difficulties in the person of a wife, children, servants
and others. 118

The life of a monk or priest who has vowed chastity is of no more
value in attaining eternal life than that of the layman, for
We are all created to do as our parents did, to beget and raise up children. This is implanted in us, as is proved by the members of our bodies, by our daily emotions, and by the example of all men. Now if God Himself does not perform a miracle, and you remain unmarried and vow chastity, you do exactly the same as he who vows adultery or something else that God has forbidden. And we see and understand how it remains unfulfilled of itself, because it is an impossible and foolish vow, and why unchastity grows only the more rampant and shameful, until it has become unmentionable. Yet these obdurate men wish to compel a man not to feel that he has a man's body and a woman not to feel that she has a woman's body.119

The Catholic position on the marriage of priests was given by Sir Thomas More when he attacked Tyndale's statement that the sacraments of the papists "defile one another: for wedlock defileth priesthood more than whoredom, theft, murder, or any sin against nature."120 More wrote that "Syth the marriage is no marriage, it is but whoredom itself. And I am sure also that it defileth the priest more than double and treble whoredom; syth that his marriage being, as it is, unlawful, and thereby none other but whoredom, doth openly rebuke and shame two sacraments there at once, that is, both priesthood and matrimony."121 More's objection was obviated by Luther's and Tyndale's belief that marriage and ordination were not Scriptural Sacraments, and that vows of chastity were not binding since they were against what God had made possible for most men to observe.
Excommunication

On the subject of excommunication Luther differed from the Church in his opinion of the correct meaning and use of the ban. He has described the fellowship which Christians share when they take part worthily in the communion or Sacrament of the bread and wine. He continues:

This fellowship can neither be given nor taken away by any one, be he bishop, pope, or angel or any creature. God alone through His Holy Spirit must pour it into the heart of the one who believes in the sacrament. . . . This fellowship no ban can touch or affect, but only the unbelief or sin of the person himself; by these he can excommunicate himself, and thus separate himself from the grace, life and salvation of the fellowship. 122

The ban can exclude men from the external fellowship of the Church: the lesser ban excluding the sinner from external participation in communion and the greater ban going farther and forbidding burial, selling, trading, all association and fellowship with men, and finally even fire and water, the necessities of life. 123 Luther believed that both these bans were instituted by Christ for the correction and help of Christians who were straying from the proper path. 124 The Church, however, uses them for the purpose of money or temporal power, which use Luther believes to be a perversion of their intended function of correction of wayward souls. He quotes 2 Thess. III: "Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother," and continues saying, "But now ruthless tyrants deal with men as though they would cast them down to hell, and do not in any wise
seek their correction."¹²⁵ So far he has been attacking the abuses of the ban by the Church, but he differs doctrinally from them in holding that even if a man is under the ban of the Church "where the true faith and love of God remain in the heart, there remains a real participation in all the possessions and intercessions of the Church, together with all the benefits of the sacrament, since the ban is and can be nothing else than exclusion from the external sacrament or from association with men."¹²⁶ He would teach the people to love the ban as a means of guiding their souls back on the true way to heaven; the Papal Bull (1520) condemned this opinion.

The Papists, writes Luther,

devised a saying, to wit "Our ban must be feared, right or wrong." With this saying they insolently comfort themselves, swell their chests and puff themselves up like adders, and almost dare to defy heaven and to threaten the whole world; with this bugaboo they have made a deep impression, imagining that there is more in these words than there really is. Therefore we would explain them more fully and prick this bladder, which with its three peas makes such a frightful noise.¹²⁷

It is true that man must bear the ban whether right or wrong as he does other tribulations, but Luther continues:

For if it is true that pope, bishop and the whole spiritual estate may without fear resist injustice, injury and contempt in their own interest, then it is also true that the ban may be resisted and repelled as vigorously as they seek their interest. . . . It behooves me to say, [to the Pope and Clergy] Thy injustice makes me tremble; it behooves thee much more to take heed and be in fear lest
thou do me wrong and threaten me besides, saying that I must endure it in fear; for thy injustice can harm me only in time, but thee it harms to all eternity.\textsuperscript{128} 

The ban of the Church does not send the soul of man to the devil as some believe, he writes; a man under the ban should nevertheless not neglect the Sacrament but spiritually come to it: that is, "he should heartily desire it and believe that he can spiritually receive it."\textsuperscript{129} 

\textbf{The Church} 

Luther justified his rebellion against Mother Holy Church, the Roman Church, by redefining the Church. He writes:

I believe that there is on earth, through the whole wide world, no more than one holy, common, Christian Church, which is nothing else than the congregation, or assembly of the saints, i.e., the pious, believing men on earth, which is gathered, preserved, and ruled by the Holy Ghost, and daily increased by means of the sacraments and the Word of God. . . . To this congregation Christ gives the keys, and says, in Matthew xviii, \textsuperscript{18:18} "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.\textsuperscript{130}"

This statement is also made to Peter, as the Catholics claim, in Matthew xvi \textsuperscript{16:19}, but it is made to him as a representative of the one and only church. This church is invisible and is not the church of the papists at Rome; he writes:

the Christian Church is not bound to any place, person or time, and although that ignorant multitude, the pope with his cardinals, bishops, priests and monks, do not want to understand it or admit it to be the truth, yet firmly on my side are Sir Omnes \textsuperscript{[the common people]}
... and they stand with me against the painted and pretended church of the pope and his papists. 131

The church is the bride of Christ; she is "mistress and queen of mercy, life, salvation, and all things." 132 He thinks that the things that "they used to sing about the Virgin Mary in the churches might more correctly be sung about the Church, and should be." 133 She may be compared to humans who are beset by sin; her sin is taken away and put upon the shoulders of her bridegroom Christ—as in the case of man. 134

Luther advocated the separation of the "kingdom of this world" and "the kingdom of Christ." 135 The Church and the State should be separate, each ruling its own sphere. 136 The secular authorities should not persecute men for heresy or constrain any man to believe one thing or another, for faith is a divine work to which no one can be forced. 137 Heretics should not be burned for their beliefs. 138 Belief is a matter of every one's conscience, and is no lessening of secular power, so that the secular authorities should leave men to their own beliefs. 139 He later changed his mind and joined in the persecution of the Anabaptists for their beliefs. Like Sir Thomas More, he was in favor of religious tolerances as long as men believed what he thought proper.
Supremacy of the Pope

In the tradition of John Wycliffe and John Huss, Luther denied that belief in the supremacy of the Pope was necessary for salvation. He denied the authority of the Pope over the secular branch of the government; rather he would advocate the reform of the Church by the secular government as the only agency able to break through the Babylonian Captivity and bring about a reform. He denied that the Pope had control over purgatory and the souls therein, and in fact he found no Scriptural authority for the existence of a purgatory. He denied the existence of the Church's "treasury of merits" over which the Pope was supposed to have control, and the right of the Pope to issue indulgences and dispensations in matters essential to man's salvation. He felt that the Pope was "a special tool of Satan" who had rejected Christ and had taken up the sword. The Pope was Antichrist, ruler of the kingdom of the devil.

The Virgin Mary

Luther's attitude toward the Virgin Mary was part way between the medieval adoration of the Virgin and the extreme Protestant depreciation of her. In The Magnificat he explains her position as the mother of God:

As the wood had no other merit or worthiness than that it was suited to be made into a cross and was appointed by God for that purpose, even so her sole
worthiness to become the Mother of God lay in her being fit for it; so that it might be pure grace and not a reward, that we might not take away from God's grace, worship and honor by ascribing too great things to her. For it is better to take away too much from her than from the grace of God. Indeed, we cannot take too much from her, since she was created out of nothing, like all other creatures. But we can easily take away too much from God's grace, which is a perilous thing to do and not well pleasing to her. It is necessary also to keep within bounds and not make too much of calling her "Queen of Heaven," which is a true enough name and yet does not make her a goddess, who could grant gifts or render aid, as some suppose, that pray and flee to her rather than to God. She gives nothing, God gives all . . . 143

Christ is the only mediator between God and man, and there is no need for man to go through the Virgin to reach Christ or God.
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