

2014

# Flesh, Blood, and Puffed-Up Livers: The Theological, Political, and Social Contexts behind the 1550-1551 Written Eucharistic Debate between Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner

Amanda Wrenn Allen

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations)



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Allen, Amanda Wrenn, "Flesh, Blood, and Puffed-Up Livers: The Theological, Political, and Social Contexts behind the 1550-1551 Written Eucharistic Debate between Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner" (2014). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 401.  
[https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations/401](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/401)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

FLESH, BLOOD, AND PUFFED-UP LIVERS:  
THE THEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL, AND SOCIAL CONTEXTS  
BEHIND THE 1550-1551 WRITTEN EUCHARISTIC DEBATE  
BETWEEN THOMAS CRANMER AND STEPHEN GARDINER

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of History

by  
Amanda Wrenn Allen  
B.A., Randolph-Macon Woman's College, 2007  
M.T.S., Vanderbilt University, 2010  
December 2014

Dedicated to  
Mom, Dad, Christopher  
here on Earth  
and  
Edward, Cranmer, Gardiner  
in the Great Beyond.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My years at LSU and my dissertation are very much products of a great support system. I never would have accomplished all I have without the encouragement I have experienced through the whole process. My first thank you doubtless goes to my advisor, Dr. Victor Stater. Thank you for encouraging all of my different research interests for papers and conferences, even though they all involve theology. Your help throughout the dissertation-writing process is greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank my other committee members: Drs. Maribel Dietz, Christine Kooi, and Meredith Veldman. Not only have you all helped me develop into the scholar I am today, but you have also shown me the professor I hope to become.

My LSU friends truly deserve loads of thanks. Thank you to my Brit girls Caroline Armbruster, Sabrina Cervantez, Erin Halloran, Clara Howell, and Kat Sawyer-Robinson. Not only have you all been great colleagues, but you have been amazing friends. I thank you all for enabling my Anglophilia. I must also thank Adelaide Hair and Emily Meyer who, despite being American historians, are two reasons I survived generals and my years at LSU. To my "neo-pagan environmentalist" mates David Brokaw, Jeffery Crawford, and Garrett McKinnon I am eternally indebted. You greatly enhanced my theological prowess and kept me emotionally balanced as I finished the dissertation. Of all of my friends at LSU my greatest thanks go to my dear friend and wonderful officemate Meghann Landry. Thank you for not only helping me get through the program, but helping me get through life; I will always value your friendship.

To my best friends Amanda McWilliams, Kristen Moore, and Jovonne Vrechek thank you for dealing with my crazy schedule and crazy mind these past years. You all

keep me grounded. Most important, though, I must thank my family. Mom, Dad, and Christopher I cannot express how thankful I am to call you my family. My father has helped me in so many ways, including serving as my academic sounding board for many years now. Thank you for your patience with all of my different research topics throughout graduate school. Without my mom's advice and strength I know I would not be as successful as I am today. Thank you for serving as my therapist and friend. Christopher, I am thankful for your encouragement my entire life despite your often wondering what it is I actually study. I could not ask for a better older brother. Thank you for being my family; I love you all.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iii
NOTES ON QUOTATIONS .....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	vii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER	
1 THE TWO-EDGED SWORD: THE POLITICS OF THE EUCHARISTIC DEBATE .....	16
2 FROM THE CONTINENT TO ENGLAND: THE IMPACT OF CONTINENTAL REFORM ON CRANMER AND THE EUCHARISTIC DEBATE .....	78
3 CHALLENGING THE ARCHBISHOP: THE ROLE OF CRANMER'S EARLIER EUCHARISTIC LEGISLATION IN THE DEBATE.....	115
4 "THIS IS MY BODY:" CRANMER AND GARDINER'S SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION .....	142
5 ANCIENT AUTHORITIES: USES OF EARLY CHURCH FATHERS IN THE DEBATE .....	166
CONCLUSION.....	249
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	243
VITA.....	267

## NOTES ON QUOTATIONS

All original spellings and letter usage have been retained in quotations. Shorthand abbreviations used in the original publications have been written out and included in brackets in the text. All dating is on the modern system with the year beginning January 1. Biblical quotes are from the 1541 English Great Bible unless otherwise noted.

## ABSTRACT

In 1550 Thomas Cranmer wrote *A Defence of the True and Catholike Doctrine of the body and bloud of our saviour Christ*. This theological work sparked a written debate between him and leading English traditionalist Stephen Gardiner in 1551. This dissertation outlines the differences between Cranmer's newly asserted Reformed understanding of a Spiritual Presence in the Eucharist and Gardiner's traditional doctrine of Real Presence, more commonly termed transubstantiation. The dissertation analyzes the three-book exchange between these bishops and explains how each uses the same Scripture, writings of the early Church Fathers, and contemporary Continental Reformers to establish their very different ideas. In addition to this theological context, the dissertation argues that both Cranmer and Gardiner are also writing with a personal, not solely spiritual, goal.

As the Reformation continued throughout Edward VI's reign, religious practice and doctrine in England were still quite uncertain and unstable. Thomas Cranmer was attempting to institute more reforms, taking England further from its traditional religious roots and relying on his authority as Archbishop to legislate and enforce the religious changes. Gardiner's consistent challenge to these changes presented Cranmer a potential discrediting of his authority and the Protestant cause in England. In turn, Gardiner was imprisoned during this debate and challenged Cranmer in order to demonstrate that Cranmer was, in fact, the man who was at fault and Gardiner should not be tried and held for his 'right' religious views. Thus, both men were trying to prove he was the credible authority, not his opponent.

This personal animosity, rife with insults, between the two theologians in 1551 was the culmination of over a decade's worth of opposition that marked this theological debate with a complicated underlying social context. The dissertation will also show that it was because of this debate that Cranmer created a clearly defined Reformed Eucharistic position that would later be adapted in the Protestant Elizabethan settlement. Thus, this debate directly impacted the trajectory of England's Protestant Eucharistic position well beyond 1551.

## INTRODUCTION

"This is my body" seems a simple-enough phrase but in sixteenth-century England it was one of the most hotly debated phrases between church reformers and traditionalists. Understanding just what Jesus meant at the Last Supper, the crucial doctrinal point of the debate, would determine the entire trajectory of the English Church established in 1534, not to mention England itself. Would England support traditionalism, matching the theology of Rome, albeit without papal supremacy, or a new Protestant version following the Zwinglian model? By the dawn of the Reformation the Eucharist had become the center of the entire religious structure. As historian Miri Rubin writes "at the centre of the whole religious system of the later Middle Ages lay a ritual which turned bread into flesh- a fragile, small, wheaten disc into God. This was the Eucharist: host, ritual, God among mortals."<sup>1</sup>

This was certainly true. By 1500 the Eucharist had become the primary area of religious life. The Corpus Christi festival was a main religious festival alongside Christmas and Easter celebrations. In this festival the consecrated wafer, paraded throughout European towns, allowed the entire village to see Jesus in the flesh. Also, ordinary lay members could actively participate in celebrating the miracle of transubstantiation because most lay members rarely partook in the actual Eucharistic portion of the Mass.<sup>2</sup> The Mass itself became entirely centered on the Eucharist as the highlight of the service. Homilies, songs, and prayers took a backseat to the consecration and eating of the host. The holiness of the service also limited who could partake in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (New York: Cambridge

<sup>2</sup> For more on the festival see Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, chapters 3-4.

eating; usually it was only the officiating priests. The sanctity of Jesus's corporeal flesh in the bread meant that most felt too unworthy to participate.

The Eucharistic portion of the service was also designed to ensure those present understood exactly what was occurring. The highlight of the liturgy was the priest elevating the consecrated host to heaven with a bell ringing to indicate the change had occurred. For a largely illiterate congregation this showed everyone present the bread was no longer bread but had been blessed and became the actual body of Christ.

The Eucharist also became a symbol for hope and miracles. For example, Rubin mentions a tale regarding a miracle during a Mass overseen by Gregory of Tours. Before partaking of the host a woman chuckled and said, having baked the bread, she did not know how Christ could suddenly be there. Gregory asked God to give the woman a sign to squash her doubt and God responded by putting a bloody finger in her particular host.<sup>3</sup> Thus, for Reformers the Eucharist became the central doctrine that had to be discussed. If change in the church were to occur it had to start with the heart of the religious system: the Eucharist.

This doctrinal debate in England would reach its climax in 1550 and 1551. In 1550 Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer published one of his most famous works, *A Defence of the True and Catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ*.<sup>4</sup> In this work Cranmer presented a Reformed Eucharistic

---

<sup>3</sup> Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 121. For another interesting look at the role of late-medieval eucharistic miracles in the lives of religious women see Caroline Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the religious significance of food to medieval women* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987).

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *A Defence of the True and Catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ, with a confutation of sundry errors concernyng the same, grounded and stablished vpon Goddes holy woorde, & approued by [the] consent of the moste*

theology. Rather than supporting the traditional view of transubstantiation--Christ's body and blood are fully in the bread and wine at the Eucharist with no bread or wine remaining--Cranmer asserted a Spiritual Presence theology. This understanding asserts Christ's Divinity is present in the bread and wine but not His corporeal flesh as in transubstantiation. The Eucharist is a memorial of Christ's one-time sacrifice on the cross. Yet it is not a mere figuration of the Last Supper; through Christ's spirit the bread and wine do give benefit to a worthy communicant. The bread and wine remain but, because of the Spiritual Presence, serve more than just acting as mere memorials. Cranmer's book signaled that the English Church under King Edward VI would be moving toward a more Reformed stance than had been seen before.

Although *Defence* presented a Reformed Eucharistic doctrine, there were areas in which Cranmer did not fully articulate his view or seemed to contradict his earlier works and the works of other established theologians. In response to these areas of confusion Stephen Gardiner, the Bishop of Winchester, released in 1551 *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same.*<sup>5</sup> In this work he directly challenged Cranmer's *Defence*. He criticized Cranmer's position by arguing that it contradicted Scripture, Church Fathers, Continental Reformers, and even Cranmer's previous works. In critiquing Cranmer Gardiner reaffirmed a Real Presence theology that

---

*ancient doctors of the Churche. Made by the moste Reuerende father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1550), 71, EEBO STC 6001 Reel 33:10, British Library.

<sup>5</sup> Stephen Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same. Made by Steuen Byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth* (Rouen: R. Caly, 1551), 2, EEBO STC 11592 Reel 343:11, Henry E. Huntington Library.

Christ's corporeal flesh is indeed in the bread and wine. By challenging Cranmer's doctrine Gardiner also challenged Cranmer's authority as England's leading divine. How could a man who misinterpreted the Eucharist retain his religious power? In response to this direct attack Cranmer published in 1551 *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebysshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe*.<sup>6</sup> Cranmer addressed all of Gardiner's criticisms and in so doing created a much stronger Reformed Eucharist understanding than originally presented in *Defence*. This left little room for confusion on England's religious trajectory under Cranmer and Edward VI. Despite the importance of this written Eucharistic debate, these books have been largely ignored in English Reformation historiography.

Dating back to the Reformation itself with Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* the English Reformation has been a widely scrutinized topic. Whig historians of the 1960s and 1970s argued the Reformation was a popular movement that gained strength among the masses, which would guarantee Protestantism would take root in England. In the 1980s and 1990s Revisionist historians challenged such popular support and the inevitability that England was destined to be a great Protestant nation. These historians argued the Reformation was a top-down political movement based on the whims of the individual

---

<sup>6</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebysshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1551), 394, EEBO STC 5991 Reel 211:05, Henry E. Huntington Library.

Tudor monarchs. They also argued that England was a very traditionally minded religious country and it was only with Elizabeth's long reign that the English Church was certain to remain Protestant. Since the mid-1990s the extremes of the Whigs and Revisionists have been challenged by a new generation of historians trying to find some sort of balance between the political and religious motivations behind the Reformation, as well as striking a balance between the movement being driven only by the people or only by the monarch. In this new group of historians there is a wide range of arguments that makes categorizing this new trend of scholarship somewhat difficult.

Despite this wide scope of English Reformation historical debate there are certain areas that remain greatly neglected. The reign of Edward VI is one such area. Most scholars focus on Henry VIII's initial actions leading to the break with Rome or on Elizabeth's long reign that solidified the Protestantism of the English Church. In comparison with these two long, action-packed reigns, Edward's short six-year minority seems inconsequential. This is especially so because his reign and the religious policies during it were followed by Mary I's extremely opposite Catholic reign. She overturned all of his policies, seemingly wiping away any influence his reign might have held. His reign, however, was very important in establishing the foundation of what would become the Anglican Church under Queen Elizabeth.

The Eucharist is the crucial point of contention between Protestants during the early decades of the Reformation. Most Protestants could easily agree on justification by faith alone and the importance of Scripture over church tradition. Yet, regarding the Eucharist, Reformers could not find common ground. For example, it was the October 1529 Marburg Colloquy that officially split Lutheran supporters from Zwinglians. The

one point Luther and Zwingli could not agree on that forced the split was Christ's presence in the Eucharist. Luther maintained a Real Presence theology, while Zwingli asserted only Christ's spirit, not His corporeal flesh, could be present at the Eucharist. Thus, it was the Eucharist that led to the multitude of various Protestant groups.

Consequently, in order to understand the English Church, unique from those on the continent, we must then understand the English Eucharist doctrine. This does not mean that the Eucharist is not considered in English Reformation scholarship, but the problem is that much of the discussion focuses on what is established during Elizabeth's reign. Historians acknowledge Henry's early break did not feature a divergence from traditional theology regarding the Eucharist; he clearly reaffirmed transubstantiation. While there is a general understanding that Edward's reign was pushing for greater reform, the short duration of the reign means many scholars jump to Elizabeth's reign to find doctrinal importance about the Eucharist. In doing so historians also attribute the Eucharistic understanding of the Spiritual Presence to Calvin's emphasis on the Elizabethan settlement and fail to acknowledge the impact of other continental reformers, most notably Zwingli, on the English Spiritual Presence doctrine.

A.G. Dickens begins the Whig scholarship trend in his classic 1964 *The English Reformation*, which he later slightly revised in 1989 in response to the growing Revisionist historiographical movement. Although he admires Edward's reign because of its push for further Protestant reform and its impact on Elizabeth's reign, Dickens still fails to give the reign proper due regarding the Eucharist. Rather, he connects English Eucharistic theology to Calvin, which automatically places the theology in Elizabeth's reign. In chapter ten, titled "The Reformation Under Somerset," Dickens begins with a

section on Calvin. He states that "[a]mid the Protestant refugees from Mary's persecution, and subsequently among the more religious of Elizabeth's subjects, Calvinism became the weightiest of the many foreign influences brought to bear upon the English Reformation."<sup>7</sup> In this chapter about the early years of Edward's reign, Dickens is already placing emphasis years later under a different monarch. Although Dickens argues Calvin was known in England during Edward's reign, Dickens continues to place the emphasis on Elizabethan Calvinism. As chapter two of this dissertation will show, Calvin had little impact on Cranmer's theological development and, thus, had little influence on Edwardian Eucharistic doctrine. It was not until the Marian Exiles lived in Geneva and returned to England at Elizabeth's ascension in 1558 that Calvin's impact was truly visible in English theology. Thus, Dickens' stress on Calvinism in the English Church disregards Eucharistic development before the Elizabethan settlement.

In response to Dickens' Whig interpretation, Christopher Haigh published *English Reformations* in 1993. In his attempt to show the Reformation was not a popular movement, but a top-down, politically driven endeavor, Haigh fails to discuss much of the theological change and its impact on the larger English population. This is especially so with his scant chapter on Edward's reign. Focusing more on the political aspects of Edward's Reformation, such as the legislation instituting the two *Book of Common Prayers* and the 1549 Prayer Book Rebellions, he barely touches on the Eucharistic changes found in both *Book of Common Prayers* and the 1552 *Forty-Two Articles of Religion*. His brief discussion on the new Communion theology in the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* states "its Eucharistic doctrine seems to be Calvinist, implying a

---

<sup>7</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* 2nd ed. (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989), 222.

spiritual but not corporal presence of Christ at the sacrament."<sup>8</sup> Yet, he does not explain why the Calvinist doctrine was adapted, nor does he discuss the possible impact of any other foreign influence, specifically Zwingli, on the Eucharistic doctrine. Most importantly, Haigh fails to discuss Cranmer in relation to these changes. He briefly mentions that it is Cranmer in connection with some other divines who is working on these new religious liturgies, but he does not discuss any motivation Cranmer might have had in altering the new theology. Haigh spends the majority of his chapter on Edward addressing the problems the short reign faced, and the rebellions and overall failures to carry out the new legislation at the local level, concluding that the Edwardian Reformation had little actual impact. As he finishes his Edward chapter: "[i]t was poetic justice: the second Reformation was made possible by the accidental timing of Henry's death, and halted by the accidental timing of Edward's."<sup>9</sup> Thus, Haigh fails to discuss the importance of the Eucharistic changes in Edward's reign or the impact these changes had on the evolving English Protestant Church.

Eamon Duffy carries much of Haigh's argument in *The Stripping of the Altars* published first in 1992 with a revised version in 2005.<sup>10</sup> Although he focuses more on the theological aspects of the Reformation, Duffy too asserts Edward's reign did not hold much influence on the later Elizabethan Church. Yes, Elizabeth used the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*, but Duffy emphatically points out it passed Parliament by only three votes and only after changes were made. Elizabeth used Edward's theology and

---

<sup>8</sup> Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1993), 180.

<sup>9</sup> Haigh, *English Reformations*, 183.

<sup>10</sup> Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c. 1580* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2005).

legislation, but was also more than willing to alter aspects to appease conservatives, thereby hoping to avoid religious rebellion. Thus, Edward's theology was important, but not so much that it was not easily changed and manipulated to suit Elizabeth's political and religious desires. If Edward's reign had been more important, then Elizabeth would have faced more resistance to changing his religious settlement. Duffy also fails to focus on the specific theological development of the English Eucharist because he is more concerned with showing what aspects of traditional religion and practice were abolished and the popular response to such destruction; he is not as concerned with showing what the English Church was building as with what it was destroying.

As Dickens, Haigh, and Duffy neglect the Eucharistic changes present in Edward's reign they, in turn, fail to address the influence Cranmer and Gardiner had in shaping this important doctrine and its contribution to the development of the English Church. This neglect is not limited to these more general Reformation books, but is also found in the scholarship specific to Cranmer and Gardiner. In the 1950s G.W. Bromiley and C.W. Dugmore both wrote on Cranmer's theological development from his time at Oxford to his death in 1556. Yet, regarding his Eucharistic development during Edward's reign, they both shy away from declaring him a total Zwinglian. When they acknowledge the Zwinglian aspects of the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*, they still fail to grant that this is a result of Cranmer's developed Zwinglian understanding. In fact, Bromiley asserts Cranmer never actually fully realizes his own theology. Rather, Cranmer spends too much time having to strike down what the Eucharist is not—transubstantiation-- that he has little time to define fully what the replacement theology actually is: Cranmer "becomes so enmeshed in the detailed refutation of a false teaching that he cannot work

out the implications of all his positive statements. He is also hampered continually by the fear that what he says will be snatched on by his opponents as concessions of admissions which finally prove their view."<sup>11</sup> Dugmore asserts that the stronger Zwinglian ideals found in Edward's reign and legislation are not because of Cranmer, but rather the more radical English divines around Cranmer. In the end Dugmore asserts it is better to put Cranmer closer to the Reformed Catholics because of his disregard for the extremely radical English Protestants.<sup>12</sup> Even though both of these scholars were discussing Cranmer's theology, they failed fully to understand his Eucharistic development and impact. Nor do they connect Cranmer's development with Gardiner's opposition to Edwardian changes. If Cranmer did have any outside influence, it was only from other Reformers, not from having to defend his Protestant theology against England's leading traditionalist. Thus, these biographers fail to show the importance of the Cranmer-Gardiner relationship and mid-century Eucharistic debate.

Peter Brooks followed Bromiley and Dugmore in 1965 with *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* in which he sought to show exactly what was Cranmer's Eucharistic theology. Yet, he agreed with Bromiley's argument that Cranmer's refutations against transubstantiation were never followed by a fully realized, redefined theology. Brooks does note that there is some Zwinglianism present by the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*, but refrains from calling Cranmer a Zwinglian. Brooks's reasoning for this is the ambiguity he finds in Cranmer's stress on the Eucharist as the "true presence." Brooks argues Cranmer does not explain what he means by 'true', yet it is clear it is more

---

<sup>11</sup> G. W. Bromiley, *Thomas Cranmer Theologian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), 81.

<sup>12</sup> C.W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958), 173-174.

than a mere memorial understanding, which is what Brooks asserts as the Zwinglian view. Brooks, however, fails to understand Zwingli's actual Eucharistic theology. As will be shown in chapter two Zwingli did not support a mere memorial understanding but he held a Spiritual Presence theology. This point also connects with Brooks's assertion that Cranmer's 'true presence' is ambiguous because, as we shall see, Cranmer clearly discusses that 'true' indicates a Spiritual Presence. Hence, in properly understanding Zwingli's theology and Cranmer's terminology, chapter two will show that Cranmer did assert a clear Zwinglian Eucharistic doctrine and "true presence" is not difficult to interpret. Brooks also fails to highlight any impact Gardiner's obstinacy may have had on Cranmer's theology. Once again Brooks, as with Bromiley and Dugmore, is too focused on Cranmer alone to acknowledge the role Gardiner may have played in shaping Cranmer's thought.

Diarmaid MacCulloch's 1996 *Thomas Cranmer* is quite the impressive biography of the Archbishop.<sup>13</sup> MacCulloch covers all aspects of Cranmer's life. Yet, there are still shortcomings regarding the connection between Cranmer and Gardiner and the impact thereof on England's Eucharistic doctrine. MacCulloch does chart Cranmer's theological development to a Zwinglian understanding, although he fails to detail in much depth just how Cranmer's Eucharistic theology reflects Zwinglianism. MacCulloch also discusses Cranmer's *Defence* and *Answer* but not in great detail and with little connection to Gardiner's *Explication*. MacCulloch is correct in connecting Gardiner's criticism of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, found in his *Explication*, with Cranmer's 1552 revision of *The Book of Common Prayer*. MacCulloch, however, fails to connect the *Explication's*

---

<sup>13</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998).

criticisms with Cranmer's *Answer*. Therefore, MacCulloch fails to show how the *Answer* became Cranmer's foolproof explanation of his new theology as the means to fully explain the new theology that would be found in the revised liturgy of the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*. MacCulloch, therefore, touches on many of the connections this dissertation will be proposing, but he fails to make all the necessary connections because he does not address the 1550-51 debate between Cranmer and Gardiner as a crucial event in the English Reformation.

This failure is also found in Glyn Redworth's great biography on Stephen Gardiner, *In Defence of the Church Catholic* from 1990.<sup>14</sup> Redworth mentions that Gardiner decided to assume the role of leading traditionalist in order to challenge Cranmer during the Edwardian Reformation; yet, Redworth largely considers how Gardiner made such attempts politically rather than religiously. Redworth illustrates Gardiner's attempts to work with the king via Lord Protectors Somerset (1547-1549/50) and Northumberland (1550/51-1553) and always swore allegiance to Edward's Supremacy. Redworth does not, however, devote much space to focus on Gardiner's religious debate with Cranmer. Redworth only briefly mentions *Explication* and its relationship with Cranmer's *Defence* and *Answer*. Nor does Redworth make the connection that it was Gardiner's criticisms in *Explication* that led to Cranmer's need to solidify his own Eucharistic theology in order to provide a stronger Protestant liturgy to counter Gardiner's incessant traditionalism.

These scholars do not, at least, fall into the pattern of Dickens, Haigh, and Duffy who argue the English Eucharistic doctrine owes more to Elizabethan Calvinism. Rather,

---

<sup>14</sup> Glyn Redworth, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: the life of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1990).

these scholars show that Cranmer was developing a unique theology. The problem, of course, is the assertion that it was never clearly realized before the Marian reversal beginning in 1553 and thus did not have a huge impact on the 1558 Elizabethan return to Protestantism.

MacCulloch and Redworth focus too much on their biographies' heroes and fail to acknowledge the importance of the opposing religious figure, specifically in the debate of 1550-51. MacCulloch and Redworth also join the ranks of the other scholars mentioned above in that they all fail to look at the *Defence*, *Explication*, and *Answer* exchange as an important debate. Dickens, Haigh, and Duffy do not discuss all the books if they mention any of the books at all. Bromiley and Dugmore reference *Defence* but fail to connect it to *Explication* and do not compare it with Cranmer's later *Answer*. Brooks, MacCulloch, and Redworth do reference the books in relation to each other, but only briefly and do not touch on everything Cranmer's and Gardiner's books cover. In so doing none of the authors demonstrate that this debate is in fact a crucial moment in the English Reformation.

Yet, upon a close reading of the debate it is clear it must be studied in depth and regain its place in Reformation historiography. Within this debate we see the importance of the Eucharist for both Cranmer and Gardiner, which points out how this doctrine was indeed the crucial tenet in defining the English Church. The debate indeed led Cranmer to a decisive Zwinglian Eucharistic theology. *Defence* began to reflect this but left some areas open to varying interpretation. Gardiner's *Explication* was crucial, therefore, in pushing Cranmer to remedy such deficiencies if he wanted to ensure England would have its own, clear theology. That is exactly what happens when Cranmer writes *Answer*. He

is correcting everything Gardiner critiqued, consequently providing a clear, decisive Eucharistic doctrine for England. Had Gardiner not written *Explication*, Cranmer would not necessarily have had to rework his theology or *The Book of Common Prayer*. Rather, *Explication* ensured a more reformed trajectory for England post-1551. Although he was England's leading traditionalist, this debate exhibits how ironically Gardiner was quite influential in making England a Reformed country. It was this greater Reformed, purely Zwinglian theology and liturgy in *Answer* and the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* that was adopted and adapted in Elizabeth's reign, rather than the more moderate, Lutheran-Zwinglian 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. Thus, the 1550-1551 debate and the connection between *Defence*, *Explication*, and *Answer* are imperative for understanding the development of the Anglican Church.

This dissertation will focus on the theological, political, and social contexts found in this debate to show why it is a crucial event in understanding the English Reformation. The first chapter will examine the political and social contexts surrounding both men in order to demonstrate that the debate was not solely a theological exchange. The English Reformation was always a mixture of theology and politics; religious change could not occur without political support, and vice versa. Both Cranmer and Gardiner had to discredit the other's political and personal credibility. Gardiner needed to challenge Cranmer's authority as Archbishop in his attempts to stop Cranmer from releasing further changes. Cranmer needed to ensure he continued to discredit Gardiner, and keep Gardiner safely in prison, to keep him from gaining support and staging a possible religious rebellion. The four following chapters will explore the theological contexts analyzing how Cranmer and Gardiner use Scripture, Church Fathers, Reformers, and

English Reformation documents to support their Eucharistic positions. Often, as we shall see, both authors rely on very similar Scriptural or early Christian texts, yet come to quite different interpretations. It is important to analyze these differences in order to understand exactly what theology Cranmer finally realized and put forth in the official late-Edwardian religious legislation. We can therefore conclude that this debate is important to study because it shows how great a part politics and individuals' authority played in shaping the theology of the English Reformation.

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **THE TWO-EDGED SWORD: THE POLITICS OF THE EUCHARISTIC DEBATE**

The heart of the Eucharistic debate between Cranmer and Gardiner was theological. The Eucharist is a central Christian religious doctrine after all. Yet, there is much more to this debate than theology alone. Cranmer and Gardiner had long been religious and political foes, dating back to the 1530s during Henry VIII's reign. The political and personal connection between these men for almost two decades before 1550-51 means that there is much more to their Edwardian Eucharistic debate than a theological discussion on the sacrament. As will be shown in the following chapters Cranmer and Gardiner often used their theological stances to discredit their rival's views. This was not only to discredit the opposing religious power but also the political authority each man wielded, or wished to wield, in Edward's reign. This chapter will detail the circumstances that created such opposition between Cranmer and Gardiner in 1550-51. It will then go on to discuss how this opposition manifested itself in the debate, while exploring the significance of understanding the political and personal undertones of what otherwise appears to be a strictly theological issue.

At this juncture it would be well to consider the educational paths that led Cranmer and Gardiner to their theological positions in 1550-1551. Beginning around 1527, both Cranmer and Gardiner were valuable assets for Henry VIII during his break with Rome and would remain two of Henry's most trusted allies until his death in 1547. Not much is known about Cranmer's upbringing before being sent to pursue a clerical education at Cambridge in 1503 when he was seven. He took a BA in 1511 and began an MA course of study, finishing in 1515. During this period Cambridge was beginning to

alter its course of study, mixing the classic medieval scholastic structure with the new humanist movement. Erasmus, the leading continental humanist took up residence at Cambridge in 1511, for example.<sup>1</sup> Cranmer eventually earned a Doctor of Divinity in 1526. While at Cambridge Cranmer became acquainted with many important people who would remain valuable friends throughout his life. These connections included Ralph Morice who eventually served as Cranmer's personal secretary and biographer. It was Morice's biography that John Foxe largely used in writing Cranmer's martyrdom in the Elizabethan *Book of Martyrs*.

Diarmaid MacCulloch, Cranmer's great modern biographer, is quick to point out that little is known about the personal views of Cranmer in the 1520s. He had been exposed to new humanist views as well as growing Protestant sympathies from friends, but there is little evidence Cranmer was drastically shaped by either of these new teachings at this juncture. In fact in the early 1520s Cranmer wrote annotations on a book against a Lutheran supporter, John Fisher. In these annotations Cranmer challenged Luther specifically about the Pope; Cranmer at this point was still a proponent of papal supremacy. This would begin to change in the late 1520s and early 1530s, however, once Cranmer became a faithful servant to King Henry VIII.

Henry's leading advisor in the 1520s was Thomas Wolsey. Wolsey, who kept a keen eye on thinkers from both Cambridge and Oxford, was the figure who brought Cranmer to Henry's attention. Cranmer's rise to power began when he joined Wolsey's Roman diplomatic group seeking the papal dispensation for Henry's annulment with Catherine of Aragon. When Henry wanted to break with the Pope, the loyal government

---

<sup>1</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998), 20-21.

servant was willing to comply and provide the necessary theological validation, even when Cranmer's original benefactor, Wolsey, could not. As Wolsey fell, Cranmer rose. When the Archbishopric of Canterbury opened up in 1533 it was an easy choice for Henry to make: Thomas Cranmer.<sup>2</sup>

Stephen Gardiner's path to his 1550-1551 stance was both similar and different to Cranmer's. In 1507 Gardiner's father died; his father's will included a demand that Gardiner, just a boy, be taken to Paris for several years of education. During this Parisian span from 1507 to 1511 Gardiner met Erasmus and was exposed to the new humanist thinking. In 1511 Gardiner returned to England and entered Cambridge, the same university his eventual political and religious rival was also attending. This was also the same year Erasmus came to Cambridge. Unlike Cranmer, however, Gardiner began to study Canon and Civil Law and by 1522 was a Doctor in both areas. Redworth, Gardiner's most recent biographer, claims Gardiner was an illustrious student. He was well known for his strong arguments and high thinking. While Cranmer took more time than necessary to complete his BA and MA, Gardiner was completing his double fields of study in record time. It is also clear that Gardiner was far more responsive to the new humanistic trends than Cranmer. Gardiner was a huge proponent not of medieval law but classical law systems. As Redworth argues, Gardiner as "the student of Roman law had drummed into his head the notion of the authority of the law-giver, namely the emperor, whose rights and prerogatives had in many ways simply been assumed by the pope of Rome."<sup>3</sup> Thus, we see Gardiner is already against papal supremacy in the early 1520s,

---

<sup>2</sup> For a more detailed account of Cranmer's education and life prior to 1533 see MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, chapters 1-3.

while in these years Cranmer was still supporting the Pope with his attacks against Luther and Fisher. Gardiner's great legal mind and belief in the rights of the emperor over the Pope make it unsurprising he would rise to political power in Henry's reign as the King desired the break with Rome. This view of papal supremacy does not of course mean Gardiner was open to the emerging Protestant theological views. Like Erasmus, Gardiner was a Humanist but not a Reformer. While Cranmer would continue on a theological journey after the 1534 *Act of Supremacy*, Gardiner would not. For Gardiner, Henry had achieved his legal right to oversee the English Church; nothing doctrinally needed to be done further.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, in comparing the early education of both men we see something very interesting. They both attended the same university, yet pursued different fields and had differencing degrees of humanist influence in their education. In the early 1520s it would seem more likely that Gardiner would be the voice of Reformation, not Cranmer. It was, after all, Gardiner who was a stronger proponent of humanism and anti-papal supremacy. It was not until the late 1520s and the early 1530s that we see the switch beginning to occur, as Cranmer began to emerge as a strong governmental leader and changed his early 1520s views on the Pope and later on his position on religion. Gardiner's desire for change ended in 1534 while for Cranmer this was the starting point.

By the 1534 *Act of Supremacy* Gardiner was theologically a traditionalist but supported the break with Rome. Cranmer supported the break with Rome but also wanted to see further religious change in the newly established English Church. This fact

---

<sup>3</sup> Glyn Redworth, *In Defence of the Church Catholic: the life of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1990), 10.

<sup>4</sup> For more on Gardiner's childhood, education, and rise to power in Henry's reign prior to 1533 see Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, introduction and chapter one.

led to years of hostility between both men and their continued attempts to diminish the other's political and religious authority across the realm. After 1534 Cranmer, along with Vicegerent Thomas Cromwell, was working on more religious changes: specifically the dissolution of the monasteries and an official English translation of the Bible. At this point, as will be discussed in chapter two regarding his theological progression, Cranmer was not fully reformed but was moving in that direction. Gardiner was well aware of this and wanted to preserve traditional theology in England.<sup>5</sup>

In 1535 Cranmer wrote to Cromwell concerning Gardiner. Under *The Act of Supremacy* Henry and Cranmer had issued religious injunctions across the bishoprics to uncover abuses. Gardiner, as Bishop of Winchester, challenged Cranmer's authority to oversee the Visitations in Winchester. In his letter to Cromwell, Cranmer discusses Gardiner's complaint that Cranmer is wrong to take the title "Totius Angliae Primas," or "Primate of All England."<sup>6</sup> According to Gardiner, such a title challenges Henry's authority as Supreme Head of the English Church, while also sounding much like the Roman hierarchical model that England had recently rejected. Cranmer defends the title by stating it has Scriptural authority and in no way challenges Henry's religious authority.

---

<sup>5</sup> For more on the general religious and political contexts in Henry VIII's and Edward VI's reign (beyond the specific Cranmer-Gardiner connection) see: Margaret Aston, *England's Iconoclasts Volume I: Laws Against Images* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1988); Barrett Beer, *Northumberland: The Political Career of John Dudley, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1973); G.W. Bernard, *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2005); M.L. Bush, *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975); G.R. Elton, *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1972); John Forman, "Tudor Diplomacy and Primitive Discipline," *Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies* 2 (1971): 108-118, accessed on March 26, 2014, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3003695>; and James McConica, *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 1965).

<sup>6</sup> This English translation is from the title page of Cranmer's 1550 *Defence*.

After defending himself, Cranmer criticizes Gardiner and provides what he believes is Gardiner's true motivation. It is Gardiner who is defying Henry because Gardiner is challenging the *Injunctions*. As Cranmer writes, "[b]ut to be plain what I think of the Bishop of Winchester, I cannot persuade with my self that he so much tendereth the King's cause as he doth his own, that I should not visit him."<sup>7</sup> Cranmer asserts Gardiner is doing nothing more than deflecting his anger over being subjected to the new Visitation *Injunctions*. By criticizing Cranmer Gardiner avoids a direct challenge to Henry who was very much behind issuing and enforcing the *Injunctions*.

This did not mean that Gardiner did not submit to the *Injunctions*; indeed, it was really Henry's order, not Cranmer's. In a letter to Cromwell June 10, 1535 Gardiner assures Cromwell he will tell the preachers in his diocese to uphold the changes. Although he does admit he will perhaps change some of the wording when he writes his own orders to his preachers, he insists he is still enforcing what Henry wants. "I have, of myn owne hed, made oute commaundementes thorowe out al my diocesse, of such tenour as my servaunte, this berer, shal shewe youe; in which I thinke I have satisfied the effecte of the Kinges Highnes letters to me directed for somoch."<sup>8</sup> Gardiner is not against upholding Henry's laws for he was indeed a staunch supporter of the King's Supremacy, yet Gardiner is avowing that in religious matters he is willing to challenge Cranmer's phrasing. Hence, he is not questioning Henry's authority but perhaps rather the religious authority of the Archbishop who had a hand in writing the religious *Injunctions*. Already there is a sense that Gardiner will not easily submit on religious issues unless it is what he

---

<sup>7</sup> Thomas Cranmer to Thomas Cromwell, 1535, in *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*, edited by G.E. Duffield (Appleford, United Kingdom: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1964), 253.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Thomas Cromwell, June 10, 1535, in *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, edited by James Muller (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1933), 66.

believes Henry really wants. This mindset will continue for the rest of Henry's reign and, as we shall see in the 1540s, Gardiner's opinions will diverge greatly from Cranmer's. This account from 1535 is not a major scuffle, yet we can already see growing hostility between the two bishops fifteen years before their Eucharistic debate.

Henry VIII wanted an official English translation of the Bible released in England. Although there had already been English translations from Wycliffites, William Tyndale, and Miles Coverdale, Henry found that these versions were inaccurate, given their reformed, heretical slants. He wanted a new version approved by him and the English bishops. Cromwell, as Vicegerent, was in charge of setting up the commission to oversee the official Bible. Not surprisingly Cromwell turned to Cranmer, as Archbishop, to aid in the process. Other divines, however, were also called on, including Gardiner. Although animosity had begun to build between Cranmer and Gardiner over the Reformation visitations, it would be the Great Bible that would be the first major area of contention between the two. The Great Bible revealed their growing opposition against each other and each man's struggle to retain greater power than his rival in Henry's government.

In Gardiner's 1535 letter to Cromwell, noted above, Gardiner mentions already working on translations for the new Bible. He tells Cromwell he plans to take a break from scholarly work after "having finished the translation of Saynt Luke and Saynt John, wherin I have spent a gret labour."<sup>9</sup> In 1537 Cromwell asked Cranmer's opinion on the newly completed English translation. In his response, Cranmer writes "as for the translation, so far as I have read thereof, I like it better than any other translation

---

<sup>9</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Thomas Cromwell, June 10, 1535, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 66.

heretofore made."<sup>10</sup> He then goes on to implore Cromwell to seek Henry's approval for the translation before the Bible is licensed and printed. Therefore, both Cranmer and Gardiner were influential in the eventual release of the Bible that was to be read throughout the realm. The 1537 version Cranmer was discussing with Cromwell did go through a few more revisions before the 1539 Great Bible was released. Cranmer, once again, had charge over the final release; he was to find the publishers and set the cost for the final product, as indicated in a letter to Cromwell November 14, 1539.<sup>11</sup> When it was released in 1539 the Great Bible contained portions of Tyndale's and Coverdale's translations but also featured amended areas.

1539 also saw the release of one of Henry's VIII's most infamous post-Reformation acts: *The Act of the Six Articles*. While an English translation of the Bible for use in every Church appeared to be a Reformed view, *The Act of the Six Articles* reaffirmed a very traditional theological stance for the English Church. For the purposes of our debate, the most important were articles one and two. Article one reaffirmed the Real Presence of Christ's body in the bread and wine and article two stated that only partaking in one kind, either the bread or the wine, was sufficient.<sup>12</sup> Both of these directly countered any Reformed vision of the Eucharist. For known traditionalists, such as Gardiner, *The Act of the Six Articles* was a theological triumph, while reformers, such as

---

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Cranmer to Thomas Cromwell, August 14, 1537, *Work of Thomas Cranmer*, 258.

<sup>11</sup> In this letter Cranmer writes, "Bartelett and Edward Whitechurche hath been with me, and have by their accounts declared the expenses and charges of the printing of the Great Bibles; and by the advice of Bartelett I have appointed them to be sold for 13s. 4d. a piece, and not above." The letter goes on to say the price was set as low as possible in order to encourage its purchase by any faithful person who so desires it to read. Thomas Cranmer to Thomas Cromwell, November 14, 1539, *Work of Thomas Cranmer*, 265-266.

<sup>12</sup> Henry VIII, *The Act of the Six Articles*, in *A Reformation Reader: Primary Texts with Introductions* 2nd ed., edited by David Janz (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2008), 334.

Cranmer, saw the Great Bible as a theological triumph for their views. So, 1539 with its two seemingly contradictory religious legislations really began to pit reformer against traditionalist, especially Cranmer against Gardiner. For example, Martin Bucer wrote to Philip Landgrave of Hesse lamenting Gardiner's influence over Henry regarding transubstantiation. The English translation of this German letter reads,

The crafty Bp. of Winchester bears rule, who has warned the King that if he proceed with the Reformation it will lead to commotion and the principal lords of England will be against him. Henry yields to his suggestions the more readily because the Bp., who has been some time his ambassador in France, holds out to him a hope that Francis will also depose the Pope and ally himself with him on the understanding that the Reformation go no further.<sup>13</sup>

We can begin to see Protestant animosity growing against Henry's slow reformation and, in this case, Bucer cites Gardiner as the reason. This negative view of Gardiner's influence on Henry is reiterated in a letter, a month after Bucer's, to the Elector of Saxony from four leading Reformers: Martin Luther, Justus Jonas, Philipp Melanchthon, and Johannes Bugenhagen. These reformers remark "[t]hat Henry VIII is acting against his conscience is clear" and the man leading Henry astray is Gardiner.

The bp. of Winchester, who is so powerful now, leads about with him two bad women in men's clothing, yet declares that marriage is against God's law and says he will maintain against the whole world the untruth of justification by faith. He has got two burnt before this year, only about transubstantiation, and the proverb is true that like master like man.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII* XIV (II), no. 186 September 16, 1539, edited by James Gairdner and R.H. Brodie (London: Majesty's Stationary Office, 1895), 54.

<sup>14</sup> *Letters and Papers* XIV (II), no. 379 October 23, 1539. Luther also had no qualms pointing out Henry's own folly; Gardiner was also manipulating the king. For example, in a letter to Albert Duke of Prussia Luther writes, "England stands by itself, takes away the Pope's name and property, but strengthens his doctrine and abominations." See no. 327 October 13, 1539.

It is clear Reformers were coming to realize that Henry and those around him, in particular Gardiner, were not interested in the same theological reformation found on the continent.

Yet, this is not as clear for Gardiner and the traditionalist faction. For many traditionalists publishing the Great Bible was seen as quite the reformed development. For example, on October 9, 1539 a case in Hastings was heard against Richard Busshe who claimed the Great Bible should be burned. Busshe believed the Great Bible featured doctrine contrary to *The Act of the Six Articles*. He also claimed the new Bible contained inaccurate English translations, arguing there were passages that directly challenged Jerome's Latin Bible, the standard pre-Reformation Bible.<sup>15</sup> The English Bible should be burned, therefore, because it held such heresies. It was also clear that, even though Henry was allowing an English translation, not just anyone could translate his own copy. On November 14, 1539 Cromwell ordered that no new Bible translation would be allowed for five years unless first approved by him (no doubt with approval from Henry and Cranmer as well).<sup>16</sup> Henry was not opening England up to numerous viewpoints. If nothing else, 1539 was a year of confusion. Both sides, traditional and reformed, could argue to their own benefit or opposition.

Within this setting, Cranmer and Gardiner both retained authority but they also faced the reality of Henry's confusing nature. As Archbishop of Canterbury Cranmer led the religious changes but remained subject to Henry's desires. As will be shown in chapter two Cranmer was already beginning to move towards a Lutheran viewpoint in the 1530s. His 1538 letter to Cromwell discussed Adam Damplip's rejection of

---

<sup>15</sup> *Letters and Papers XIV* (II), no. 301 October 9, 1539.

<sup>16</sup> *Letters and Papers XIV* (II), no. 516 November 14, 1539.

transubstantiation-- an argument which Cranmer suggested might contain some truth.<sup>17</sup> Yet, in 1539 *The Act of the Six Articles* affirmed transubstantiation. As Diarmaid MacCulloch has shown, it is clear Cranmer was present throughout the May-June 1539 Parliament and Convocation discussions that lead to the Act's formation.<sup>18</sup> Thus, Cranmer tolerated the traditionalism despite moving away from it. He knew challenging Henry would threaten his authority and position in England. Gardiner too faced the daunting task of maintaining Henry's privilege while holding his own views.

Gardiner, although Bishop of Winchester, held greater political than religious power in the late 1530s; he was the ambassador to France from 1535-38.<sup>19</sup> However, he too was not free from Henry's irascibility. On Gardiner's 1538 return Henry was not pleased with Anglo-French relations and laid blame at Gardiner's feet, rather than his own. Despite Gardiner's losing favor upon his return, by 1539 it appeared Henry accepted Gardiner's influence once again, although now in a religious capacity. Gardiner was present alongside Cranmer in the May-June discussions about the Great Bible and *The Act of the Six Articles*. Although the Act appealed more to Gardiner's theological views than Cranmer's currently evolving opinions, he too faced some setbacks with his too traditional theology, specifically regarding the value of auricular confession. Although the Act declares: "that auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained and continued, used and frequented in the church of God,"<sup>20</sup> it does not explicitly

---

<sup>17</sup> See chapter two.

<sup>18</sup> See MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 240-252.

<sup>19</sup> For more about this period in Gardiner's life see Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, chapter 4.

<sup>20</sup> Henry VIII, *The Act of the Six Articles*, 333.

state that confession is an efficacious sacrament necessary for salvation, something Gardiner wanted more clearly affirmed but Henry did not. While Gardiner stood firm in the beginning it was not long before he relented.<sup>21</sup> Both Cranmer and Gardiner were learning to modify their outward religious beliefs in order to retain power in Henry's reign. However, it is at this point that we can truly see the growing religious factionalism between Cranmer and Gardiner, which leads to growing personal animosity and the drive to weaken each other's political clout. Throughout the rest of Henry's reign, 1540-1547, Cranmer and Gardiner were subject to continual highs and lows in religious and political authority.

The confusion of 1539 carried over to 1540 when Gardiner was asked to serve as a regular court preacher during Lent; nor was he the only well known traditionalist asked to preach during this important religious period.<sup>22</sup> It therefore appeared Henry was reaffirming the traditionalism of *The Act of the Six Articles*. Gardiner used his Lenten platform to challenge one of his leading religious adversaries, Robert Barnes, who Redworth writes was Gardiner's "old sparring partner."<sup>23</sup> Gardiner wanted to see Barnes, a well-known Protestant closely linked to Thomas Cromwell, removed from his clerical duties. Gardiner's incriminating sermon did indeed result in Barnes' arrest, trial, and execution for heresy alongside two other Protestants: William Jerome and Thomas Garret.<sup>24</sup> This would all seem to indicate that Gardiner was leading the traditional faction

---

<sup>21</sup> Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 96-102.

<sup>22</sup> Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 107-109.

<sup>23</sup> Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 107.

to a triumph, especially as Henry did not stand in Gardiner's way. Yet, it was not to be such a clear victory. The three Protestants were burned while three traditionalists were hanged as papists for treason for pledging loyalty to the Pope instead of the king. Henry was not only challenging extreme Protestants, but also those traditionalists who were too extreme in maintaining papal authority. It is true the papists were not treated as heretics, demonstrating that theologically they were not considered wrong, but we still see Henry's attempt to decrease the growing factionalism stemming from his confusing 1539 policies.<sup>25</sup>

Gardiner's treatment of Barnes coincides with the 1540 fall of Vicegerent Cromwell, leading many historians to see Gardiner's Lenten actions, not as signs of deep-seated religious conviction or a reflection on Gardiner's relationship with Barnes, but as a desire to overthrow Cromwell and thereby elevate himself as Henry's leading political advisor. J.J. Scarisbrick contends that one of the reasons Cromwell fell was because he "had long had enemies- rivals like Stephen Gardiner, whom he had worsted in the competition for power in 1534 and continually struggled to keep away from Court ever since."<sup>26</sup> He further argues that Gardiner was part of the "conspiracy" to make Catherine Howard the next queen and assure Henry's divorce of Anne of Cleves, who had been

---

<sup>24</sup> For a full account of Gardiner's treatment of Barnes see Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 109-116. For the recantation and confession of the three men see *Letters and Papers XV*, no. 411, 158.

<sup>25</sup> For a good discussion of the burnings and hangings of these six men as a sign of Henry's 'via media' approach to religion and government see Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), chapter 2.

<sup>26</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968), 377.

Cromwell's choice.<sup>27</sup> G. R. Elton also argues Gardiner was directly responsible for Cromwell's fall. He explicitly states, "[n]o one has doubted that the machinations of Cromwell's enemies, with [the duke of] Norfolk and Gardiner at their head, were decisive in turning the king against his minister."<sup>28</sup> He later goes on to declare Cromwell's relations with Gardiner were "frankly hostile," going back to the fall of Wolsey and Cromwell's rise instead of his own. "From the first, therefore, [Gardiner] and Cromwell clashed on matters of policy and principle. From the first, also, they were personal enemies, for Cromwell signaled his victory by depriving Gardiner of his office of secretary. Hostility based on two such pillars was likely to endure."<sup>29</sup> Thus, according to Scarisbrick and Elton, Gardiner had a strong personal and political intention to bring down Cromwell.

Redworth challenges this classic view of a manipulative Gardiner managing Cromwell's demise on his own accord. Rather, Redworth contends Gardiner was only acting as he saw fit, according to Henry's desires. As he writes, "[f]ar from being a victim of Gardiner's manipulation of faction, Henry VIII had his own reasons for removing the best servant he ever had."<sup>30</sup> This is certainly true. Henry was not an easily manipulated king and in the religious-political tumult after 1539, Cromwell's demise served as a great teaching tool: even the highest officials are still subject to the King's

---

<sup>27</sup> Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, 378.

<sup>28</sup> G.R. Elton, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government Vol I* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 189.

<sup>29</sup> G.R. Elton, *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics*, 197.

<sup>30</sup> Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 106, 115-129.

will.<sup>31</sup> Cromwell had failed to provide a good match with Anne of Cleves, and thereby a good political-religious alliance with the Protestant duchy. He was also failing to maintain domestic order in areas of religion.<sup>32</sup> Yet Redworth is too apologetic in his treatment of Gardiner in this matter. Even if Henry were the primary mover in Cromwell's fall, it does not downplay the importance of looking at Gardiner's role in the events. Gardiner doubtless did want to help rid the court of Cromwell and achieve greater political standing as well; he had been aiming for this throughout his tenure in Henry's government. Nor was Gardiner acting completely politically. His dispute with Barnes had a political connection with Cromwell's downfall, but it was also a religious dispute on key doctrines, including justification by faith versus the need of good works. Gardiner, perhaps always a politician first in Henry's reign, still held deep religious convictions for which he was often willing to act.

The whole Cromwell affair did lift Gardiner's standing with Henry; he was key in announcing and securing the annulment with Anne of Cleves in early July 1540 and the resultant marriage to Catherine Howard. He was reappointed to the Privy Council of which he had not been a part since his return from France, and by the end of the year was named Henry's ambassador to the Imperial Council of Regensburg, which was called to reconcile Protestants and Rome. Yet this elevation was not as high as it could have been. Without Cromwell a new Vicegerent was needed, to which Gardiner was not named. Therefore, we see once again that what appears to be a traditionalist triumph--the fall of

---

<sup>31</sup> G.W. Bernard argues that Henry was not easily manipulated but rather was the key manipulator in his reign. For more see Bernard, *The King's Reformation*.

<sup>32</sup> See Susan Brigden, "Popular Disturbance and the Fall of Thomas Cromwell and the Reformers, 1539-1540," *The Historical Journal*, 24 (1981): 257-278, accessed on May 31, 2014, stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638786>.

Cromwell and Henry's annulment with the Protestant princess--still did not lead to a traditionalist being placed in the highest political position under the king.<sup>33</sup>

To outsiders 1540 signaled the end of the Protestant cause in England. In a May 1540 letter from Protestant Englishman John Butler to Heinrich Bullinger, Zwingli's successor in Zurich, Butler writes about the arrest of Barnes, Jerome, and Garret: "England is now in a very disturbed state...Three of our best ministers are in the Tower."<sup>34</sup> Lutheran Reformer Philipp Melanchthon had no kind words for Henry VIII regarding his treatment of both Cromwell and Anne of Cleves. To his friend J. Weinlaub, Melanchthon relates "[i]n England, Cromwell, who had the highest influence with the King, has been hanged, quartered, and burnt. The English tyrant is contemplating other outrages."<sup>35</sup> The following day Melanchthon sent a similar letter to another acquaintance, John Stigelius, declaring, "Let us cease to sing the praises of the English Nero. I know not whether you have heard of his cruelty to the Queen...I shall alter the preface in the Commonplaces and add a recantation of the praises, although they are not very extravagant. Cromwell has been hanged, quartered, and burnt."<sup>36</sup> He continues to refer to Henry as Nero in another August letter to fellow Reformer Myconius, emphatically declaring "[m]ust write nothing about the English Nero. May God destroy this

---

<sup>33</sup> Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 128-132.

<sup>34</sup> *Letters and Papers XV*, no. 734 May 1540.

<sup>35</sup> *Letters and Papers XV*, no. 982 August 16, 1540.

<sup>36</sup> *Letters and Papers XV*, no. 985 August 17 1540. It should be noted Cromwell was in fact beheaded rather than executed as Melanchthon reports. Melanchthon's exaggeration, though, shows how Cromwell's story was already being exaggerated as a means to build up Cromwell as a sort of Protestant martyr (emphasized in his being burnt which was the traditional means of religious persecution) against the increasingly tyrannical traditionalist Henry VIII.

monster!"<sup>37</sup> Even into 1541 we can see Protestants lamenting all of the setbacks from the previous year. Richard Hilles recounts the burning of Barnes, Jerome, and Garret; Cromwell's demise and execution; the ill treatment of Anne of Cleves; and even refers back to the unjust execution of Anne Boleyn. Hilles directly blames Gardiner as the source of Henry's about-face. It was Gardiner who made sure Henry fell in love with Catherine Howard, ending his marriage to Anne. As for Cromwell's fall, Hilles writes: "I know nothing for certain of the cause of Cromwell's execution, but probably it was for not supporting the divorce [with Anne of Cleves] as Winchester and others did."<sup>38</sup> God was currently punishing the English because they had failed to establish the Reformation in England. All the godly were being removed until the country's sins ended.

Thus far this discussion has considered Gardiner's religious and political role in 1540 largely in connection with Cromwell and not the other important Protestant in England: Cranmer. We must therefore ask what was Cranmer's authority throughout all of this? Cromwell and Cranmer had worked together to promote Henry's new Church and shared similar Protestant views. Throughout Cromwell's downfall Cranmer remained the Vicegerent's best ally. We must, therefore, ask how Cranmer's political and religious connection with Cromwell did not result in Cranmer's own fall. In the Parliamentary Rolls from the Summer of 1540 Cromwell's Bill of Attainder speaks of heresy. Cromwell was not only "the most detestable traitor that has been seen during the King's reign" but

also, being a detestable heretic, has dispersed into all shires false and erroneous books, many of which were printed beyond seas, tending to the discredit of the blessed sacrament of the altar and other article of religion declared by the King by

---

<sup>37</sup> *Letters and Papers XV*, no. 1015 August 28, 1540.

<sup>38</sup> *Letters and Papers XVI*, no. 578 February 1541.

the authority of Parliament, and has caused parts of the said books to be translated into English, and although the report made by the translator thereof has been that the matter was expressly against the sacrament of the altar, [Cromwell] has, after reading the translation, affirmed the heresy so translated to be good; and also has obstinately maintained that every Christian may be a minister of the said sacrament as well as a priest.<sup>39</sup>

Cromwell is cited as a heretic over the most crucial doctrinal matter: the Eucharist. For Cranmer to be closely connected to Cromwell could have been extremely problematic. At Court it was well known the two men shared similar theological leanings and sympathies; hence, if Cromwell were being associated with such heresies, it would not be such a far leap to connect Cranmer with the same crime. Yet, Cranmer did not immediately disassociate himself from his political friend. According to French Ambassador Charles de Marillac in a June 11, 1540 letter, "Cromwell's party seemed the strongest lately by the taking of the dean of the Chapel, bp. of Chichester, but it seems quite overthrown by the taking of the said lord Cromwell, who was chief of his band, and there remain only on his side the abp. of Canterbury, who dare not open his mouth."<sup>40</sup> Cranmer did eventually open his mouth, or at least his hand, and penned a letter to Henry about the entire affair. In this letter Cranmer mentions his love for his friend Cromwell because Cromwell had always seemed to be such a faithful servant to the King. However, Cranmer reassures Henry if this treason is indeed true, then it proves Cromwell is no friend of Cranmer's after all.<sup>41</sup> Cranmer's direct appeal to Henry in this letter distanced

---

<sup>39</sup> *Letters and Papers XV*, no. 498 article 60 1540. The books Cromwell was accused of importing and translating are not listed.

<sup>40</sup> *Letters and Papers XV*, no. 767 June 11, 1540.

<sup>41</sup> MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 269-270.

him from Cromwell before Gardiner and the traditionalist faction could turn to Cranmer's demise.

Cranmer was also aided by a smart political move the previous year in 1539, which most likely saved him added embarrassment at the time of Cromwell's fall. Before Anne of Cleves' arrival in England, Cranmer could already detect Henry's decreasing desire for the marriage when a young, beautiful Catherine of Howard arrived at court. Knowing Henry's wandering eye and changeable heart, Cranmer suggested to Henry that perhaps the Cleves marriage was not the best idea. Cromwell, of course, continued to herald the marriage. As MacCulloch writes, "[i]n the event it was the kindly and politically clumsy Cranmer who got the King's psychology right; if only Cromwell had listened to him that day, and not placed his faith in over-ingenious portrait-painters and the arts of the Tudor advertising industry."<sup>42</sup> The marriage's complete failure was a major aspect of Henry's approval of Cromwell's fall. Cranmer's 1539 cautionary stance meant it would be harder to use the marriage against him, if the traditionalist faction wished to follow the 1540 Cromwell model in bringing down Cranmer.

Although this moment could have proven detrimental for the Archbishop, he emerged in better standing than when Cromwell was alive. When Henry did not appoint an immediate replacement for his Vicegerent, most likely to Gardiner's great dissatisfaction, the Privy Council emerged as Henry's prime advisory group. The officer with the highest precedence on the Council was the Archbishop of Canterbury. Not only had Gardiner, the leading traditionalist, failed to replace Cromwell, the leading political Protestant, he also remained less important than Cranmer, the other leading political Protestant sympathizer. Even though 1540 appeared as a triumphal year for the

---

<sup>42</sup> MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 258.

traditionalists with the fall of Cromwell and burning of three well-known Protestants, it was not a true triumph. Cranmer, and the Protestant cause, remained a real threat. This surely fanned the flames of Gardiner's animosity towards Cranmer. Surely too the traditionalist maneuvering against Cromwell, and indirectly against himself, fueled Cranmer's own aversion towards Gardiner.

It should be noted that, although Cranmer remained in the highest position of authority, thereby sheltering Protestant hopes, many Protestants saw the Archbishop's political complacency in a negative light. For example, in Hilles' letter to Bullinger, mentioned above regarding Gardiner, Hilles reports Cranmer's direct role in securing the divorce from Protestant Anne of Cleves in favor of traditionalist Catherine Howard and later decries Cranmer's help in securing additional clerical tithes originally to the Pope to be now offered to Henry. For Hilles this transfer of funds from Pope to King is little better; the extensive wealth should be for the benefit of those in the churches and not the already wealthy king. He sees Cranmer acting more as a politician rather than a spiritual leader. Hilles does not mind explicitly insulting Cranmer in this matter: "[t]he business, too, has been so artfully managed that the abp. of Canterbury and other lords spiritual (as these carnal persons are called) offered the King of their own accord the payment of this money in the name of the clergy because the King had delivered them from the yoke of the Roman pontiff."<sup>43</sup> All of this, therefore, further accentuates the extreme level of confusion in Henry's church and government. There is no clear-cut winning side. Both Gardiner and Cranmer, traditionalist and Protestant, seem to make gains while also facing setbacks. Such a roller coaster only further contributes to the growing political-religious loathing between Cranmer and Gardiner.

---

<sup>43</sup> *Letters and Papers XVI*, no. 578 February 1541.

1541 and 1542 saw a reemerging discussion about the Great Bible. In 1541 a new edition was published, without revisions but featuring a preface by Cranmer. The *Injunctions* released with the new edition reiterated those of 1539: the Bible was to be available in every church for all of England's subjects, yet was not to be read aloud during services or debated over by laymen.<sup>44</sup> In 1542, however, tensions escalated over the official Bible, beginning in Convocation. On January 27 Cranmer told the attending bishops and clergy that it was Henry's opinion "that in the English Bible many things needed reformation."<sup>45</sup> The account does not mention what these things are, although it is not hard to assume Henry desired the Bible reflect fully *The Act of the Six Articles* in order to reconcile the confusion of 1539. Although Cranmer put forth this need for change, only a few days later on March 17 he asked the bishops vote to retain the 1541 edition until a new revised version could be released.<sup>46</sup> This was voted down, however, as "the majority thought it might not [be released], unless first corrected."<sup>47</sup> This denial was followed in the February 13 session when commissions were established to review the Bible and make any necessary changes. Cranmer, overseeing the entire process, was not specifically called to review a particular portion, but Gardiner was chosen as one of the bishops to oversee the revision of the New Testament. During this same session Gardiner stood before Convocation and "read aloud the Latin words in the Bible which he wished either to be retained as they were or else fittingly turned into English."<sup>48</sup> Thus, we can see

---

<sup>44</sup> *Letters and Papers XVI*, no. 803 May 6, 1541.

<sup>45</sup> *Letters and Papers XVII*, no. 176 March 17, 1542.

<sup>46</sup> *Letters and Papers XVII*, no. 176 March 17, 1542.

<sup>47</sup> *Letters and Papers XVII*, no. 176 March 17, 1542.

Gardiner's religious authority now coming through in Convocation. In addition, we can see his traditionalist perspective with his desire to retain Latin words or fix improper English translations. He did not completely reject the idea of a vernacular Bible, yet he demonstrated his belief that Latin is still sometimes the superior choice.<sup>49</sup> We further note the growing conservative faction and power in convocation at this juncture. "The majority" voted against Cranmer's desire to retain the current edition. Also, in the March 10 session Cranmer put forth Henry's desires that the newly revised Bible "should be examined by both Universities" but, apart from Cranmer and two others, "all dissented and asserted that it was more suitable for the Synod than for the Universities."<sup>50</sup> Not only was Cranmer once again being challenged, but the desire to keep the Bible revisions out of the universities shows similar conservative conviction: the universities were indeed often hotbeds of reformed thinking.<sup>51</sup> We should also note this directly challenged one of Cromwell's last pieces of religious legislation from 1539: the decree that there were to be no new Bible translations for at least five years.<sup>52</sup>

After Convocation concluded a proclamation against the Bible in English was released March 17, 1542. Too many books, including the Bible, were being written in

---

<sup>48</sup> *Letters and Papers* XVII, no. 176 March 17, 1542.

<sup>49</sup> This argument is also visible in the 1550-51 Eucharistic debate with Cranmer as will be seen in chapter five with the discussion of the word/translation *Eucharistia* in Irenaeus's works.

<sup>50</sup> *Letters and Papers* XVII, no. 176 March 17, 1542.

<sup>51</sup> Gardiner was not always fond of the universities' new teachings and methods. This is evident in his frustrations with Cambridge during the same year. After Cromwell's downfall, Gardiner replaced him as Cambridge's Chancellor. Throughout 1542 Gardiner was in a written debate with John Cheke, Prince Edward's tutor and Cambridge Greek professor. Cheke, a well-known Protestant, was introducing new Greek pronunciations in his courses, but Gardiner did not like such changes. See *Letters and Papers* XVII nos. 327, 482, 483, 611, 742, 803, 891, 892.

<sup>52</sup> See above page 20.

English that featured "sundry detestable heresies" in order to "impugn the truth."<sup>53</sup> It was illegal for anyone to have a copy of Tyndale's or Coverdale's Bibles. This proclamation was not new; others stating the very same prohibitions had been released throughout the 1530s.<sup>54</sup> For example, in the November 16, 1538 Royal Proclamation Henry declared that no one

From henceforth shall print or bring into this his realm any books of divine Scripture in the English tongue with any annotations in the margin, or any prologue or additions in the calendar or table, except the same be first viewed, examined, and allowed by the King's highness or such of his majesty's council, or other, as it shall please his grace to assign thereto...no person or persons using the occupation of printing of books in this realm shall print, utter, sell, or cause to be published any books of Scripture in the English tongue until such time as the same books be first viewed, examined, and admitted by the King's highness, or one of his Privy Council, or one bishop of this realm.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Letters and Papers XVII, no. 177 March 17, 1542. For more on Gardiner's role in the 1542 Convocation see Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 156-165. The account is thorough although Redworth, as is the case with his entire book, is a bit too apologetic where Gardiner is concerned. Redworth continues to assert that, although Gardiner is pushing what he believes, his own desires are always secondary to Henry's desires and what Henry expects of his leading bishops.

<sup>54</sup> Other Examples: May 1538 Cranmer sent *Injunctions* to the Bishop of Hereford, one of which stated that, although the English Bible was to be accessible to all, the ministers were to admonish parishioners "not to be presumptuous in judging matters without perfect knowledge." *Letters and Papers XIII* (I), no. 1112 May 1538. A month later Cromwell sent a circular to bishops reminding them to put forth the new English Bible and encourage all to read it, yet reminded the congregants "they are not to reason about doubtful passages of the book in taverns and alehouses, but to resort to such learned men as are authorised to preach and declare the same." *Letters and Papers XIII* (I), no. 1304 June 1538. The April 1539 Parliament, in preparation for the release of the Great Bible, drafted a proclamation regarding the new English Bible. It was Henry's intention to release an official version in order "to correct abuses which have sprung from diversity of opinion and disputes over the Scripture." This new version would be the one correct understanding but it too, although accessible to all, was understood "that no one except curates or graduates of Oxford or Cambridge shall be admitted to preach or expound the Bible." *Letters and Papers XIV* (I), no. 868.

<sup>55</sup> *Tudor Royal Proclamations* Vol I, no. 186 Nov. 16 1538, edited by Paul Hughes and James Larkin (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1964), 271.

The March 17 proclamation reissued a year after the 1541 edition and right after Convocation's decision to provide a revised, better version shows the traditionalist concern that English Bibles can easily spread Protestant views, as well as the growing authority of the conservative faction to impede further reform. This all culminated with the May 1543 Parliamentary *Act for the Advancement of True Religion* that restricted English Bible reading to members of the nobility, clergy, gentry, and well-educated wealthy merchants.<sup>56</sup> Thus, the value of an official English Bible was greatly limited, indicating that the Reformers had very little success in affecting Protestant advancement in England.

This growing power shift toward the conservative faction from 1540 forward would reach its climax in 1543. Perhaps Gardiner and other traditionalists had not been able to rid Henry of Cranmer at the moment they secured Cromwell's demise, but by 1543 the traditionalist position, headed by Gardiner, seemed far stronger than Cranmer's and the Protestant position. In 1543 therefore we see the most important Henrician event that prevented any good relationship between Cranmer and Gardiner: the Prebendaries' Plot.

In order to understand how the Prebendaries' Plot came about we must first look at other religious activity in 1543. Leading up to the infamous plot we find one additional triumph for the conservative faction beyond *The Act for the Advancement of the True Religion*, giving Gardiner and his friends the confidence finally to bring Cranmer down. *The Act of the Six Articles* in 1539 had already secured traditional theology as official legislation, but the Act itself did not explain the theology. In 1543 the views in the Act were thoroughly expounded upon in *A Necessary Doctrine and*

---

<sup>56</sup> *Letters and Papers* XVIII (I), no. 66 item 6.

*Erudition for Any Christian Man*, more commonly referenced as *The King's Book*.

Gardiner's religious influence certainly shone forth in 1543. In the April Convocation he, alongside Cranmer, was in charge of checking the English translations of the Lord's Prayer, the Decalogue, and the seven sacraments.<sup>57</sup> Certainly his traditionalist theology was key in Henry's church at this juncture. This was displayed in full force with *The King's Book* first reading in the Privy Council and among the peers before being released late May 1543.<sup>58</sup>

Gardiner did not assist in the creation of *The King's Book*; he was on diplomatic missions in France when *The King's Book* was being written and annotated. However, this does not mean Gardiner had no effect on the book. Indirectly it was known Gardiner would implicitly agree with the material presented. He supported *The Act of the Six Articles* and had proven himself against reformed thinking in his dealings with Robert Barnes. Thus, when Gardiner returned to England in 1543 and received a copy of *The King's Book* he would not have disapproved. In fact he became Henry's greatest promoter for the book among the other bishops at Convocation and the nobility at Court. Along with Cranmer Gardiner was charged with promoting the book and securing its parliamentary passage. It should not be surprising that he was asked to do so alongside Cranmer. Cranmer supported *The King's Book*, because he was Henry's faithful Archbishop, yet everyone knew Cranmer's sympathies were not as traditional as those presented in the book. Gardiner, then, was responsible for holding the line against reformist language. Gardiner was, therefore, very important in promoting Henry's will in this case and seemed to be gaining even greater authority than the Archbishop.

---

<sup>57</sup> *Letters and Papers XVIII* (I), no. 365 April 1543.

<sup>58</sup> *Letters and Papers XVIII* (I), no. 507 May 1543.

This view was only enhanced in July 1543 when Henry was ready to marry Catherine Parr. As Archbishop it was Cranmer's right to oversee the royal marriage. On July 10 all signs indicated Cranmer would be officiating. He granted, with parliamentary consent, a license "to Henry VIII (who has deigned to marry the lady Katherine, late wife of lord Latymer, dec.) to have the marriage solemnised in any church, chapel or oratory without the issue of banns."<sup>59</sup> Cranmer was performing his duties already with such a license. Yet, only two days later when Henry and Catherine wed, Cranmer was not the officiate. Nor did this fall to the second highest position in the English Church, the Archbishop of York. Rather, it was Cranmer's conservative foe, Stephen Gardiner, who performed the marriage.<sup>60</sup> To both Cranmer and Gardiner this appeared a clear sign Cranmer was losing favor with the king while Gardiner as leader of the conservative faction was gaining power. By this point in 1543 it would have seemed to both parties that any further reform was impossible and the conservatives were in charge. With this dominance assured Gardiner and his friends decided it was time to remove Cranmer completely from power and Henry's favor.

Beginning in the summer of 1543 Cranmer's safety became more and more questionable. By the end of the year he had come very close to losing his power, title, and life. Fortunately, Cranmer had served his king well and, unlike with Cromwell, Henry saw no need for Cranmer's fall. Hence, the Prebendaries' Plot was a crucial event in the relationship between Cranmer and Gardiner. Cranmer would never be able to forget Gardiner's attempt to destroy him; Gardiner would never forget how his attempt failed and secured his foe's power for years to come.

---

<sup>59</sup> *Letters and Papers XVIII* (I), no. 854 July 10, 1543.

<sup>60</sup> *Letters and Papers XVIII* (I), no. 873 July 12, 1543.

The Prebendaries' Plot was a politically motivated response to the years of religious tensions and jealousies reaching back to the beginning of the English Reformation in 1533. In order to assure no more reform could occur Cranmer had to be removed from any political authority he held with Henry. The Plot had its beginnings in 1541 with angry conservative clerics in Canterbury. Robert Serles, who would be a leading figure against Cranmer, had already appealed to Henry in 1541 about inappropriate Protestant preachers in Cranmer's diocese; Gardiner took note of these complaints. As discussed above, however, 1541 was not the juncture to pursue the complaints. By 1543, though, it seemed everything was in place to use these complaints against the Archbishop.

March saw the arrest of several of the Protestant preachers about whom Serles had originally complained. Nevertheless, Cranmer was in charge of many of these examinations; it was after all his diocese and he remained a faithful Henrician archbishop, regardless of his own views. Cranmer did not know that, while all of these arrests were taking place, the conservative faction was also secretly building up a case against him. On April 22 the Council, at which Cranmer was not present but Gardiner was, drew up articles against many of Cranmer's Protestant associates in Canterbury and London; these articles were shown to Henry later in the evening.<sup>61</sup> Although Cranmer was not being directly charged with any outward heresy, those around him were, which was meant indirectly to implicate the Archbishop. Cranmer was completely unaware of the growing case against him and continued to be active in Convocation's revision of the Great Bible.

---

<sup>61</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol I, April 22, 1543, edited by John Dasent (London: Majesty's Stationary Office, 1890), 116-118.

It was not until July that Cranmer became aware of the conspiracy against him; it was through Henry's disclosure that the Archbishop discovered this first phase of the plot. At that point it is clear Henry did not wish to contribute to his Archbishop's destruction; rather, he charged Cranmer with the responsibility of figuring out who was behind the plot. Gardiner was one of the men Cranmer questioned.<sup>62</sup> In the collected account of Cranmer's interrogations regarding this matter, there is a deposition against John Parkhurst that features a note on the back written by Protestant sympathizer Matthew Parker, who was serving as a prebend at Ely Cathedral and would later serve as Archbishop of Canterbury under Elizabeth I. Parker's note directly calls out Gardiner as the person who campaigned against Cranmer: "Memorandum that King Henry, being divers times by Bishop Gardiner informed against Bishop Cranmer." Yet, Henry "who, perceiving the malice, trusted the said Cranmer with th'examination of these matters."<sup>63</sup> The interrogations are then listed, including that of Gardiner's nephew Germain Gardiner. It should be noted that Gardiner was of course not working alone, yet this should not decrease Gardiner's overall role in the plot. Gardiner doubtless wanted to see Cranmer lose favor and the Protestant cause falter completely. Gardiner was also present at the April 22 Council meeting that drafted the official articles against Cranmer's men, articles that were never shown to Cranmer. We of course cannot know with certainty how Gardiner felt about the whole affair, although it is safe to assume he was more than

---

<sup>62</sup> See Ralph Morice's notes on Cranmer in *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation Series 1*, Vol. 77, edited by John Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1859), 252. Morice was Cranmer's secretary and recounts Henry's meeting with Cranmer at Lambeth Bridge where he supposedly filled Cranmer in about the plot and told the Archbishop "I have suche affiaunce and confidence in your fidelitie, that I will committ th'examination herof wholie unto you, and suche as you will appoynt."

<sup>63</sup> *Letters and Papers XVIII* (II), no. 546.

willing to participate against his political and religious foe. What we do know, though, is that to outsiders it was seen as Gardiner's actions, as evidenced by Parker's note above. Bishop Gardiner was not specifically interrogated but his nephew Germain, who had been serving as the bishop's secretary, was.

Germain's examinations would not bode well for Gardiner if connections could be made between Germain's plotting and that of his master, especially if incriminating letters were found.<sup>64</sup> There was therefore a renewed attempt to take Cranmer down following the start of the July/August interrogations. The conservatives hoped they could convince Henry to remove Cranmer from the examinations before incriminating material could be discovered. Consequently in the fall of 1543 there was a second phase to the plot.

Cranmer remained unaware the Council was still working against him, but once again Henry was well aware of the situation and aided his Archbishop. In November when Cranmer was summoned to the Council, to hear of his transgressions and subsequent arrest, Henry intervened. Cranmer's secretary, Ralph Morice, provides the detailed account of the private exchange between Henry and Cranmer the night before the Council was set to arrest Cranmer. In this account the Council asked Henry to send Cranmer "to prison, for that they bare hym in hande that he and his lernyd men hadd sowne suche doctrine in the realme that all men almoste were infectid with heresie."<sup>65</sup> However, after Cranmer's submission to Henry to do what Henry thought best, Henry decided not to allow Cranmer's downfall. Rather, Henry told Cranmer once the allegations were opened to

---

<sup>64</sup> The full account of all the depositions and interrogations can be found in *Letters and Papers XVIII (II)*, no 546.

<sup>65</sup> Morice, *Narratives of the Reformation*, 255.

'give them this ryng, (which he delievered unto my L. Cranmer than,) by the whiche (saied the kyng,) thei shall well understande that I have taken your cause into my hande frome theym, which ryng their well know that I use it to none other purpose butt to call matters frome the counsaile into myn awne handes to be orderid and determy[ni]d.'<sup>66</sup>

Though Morice wrote this account later during Elizabeth I's reign to aid Foxe with *The Book of Martyrs*,<sup>67</sup> Cranmer did have Henry's ring to show the Council the following morning and once and for all ended the campaigns against him. Both phases of the plot failed because of Henry's intervention, but Cranmer himself also helped foil the plot. He had managed to prove himself a worthy subject for over ten years, worthy enough for Henry to save him twice.<sup>68</sup>

The Prebendaries' Plot is crucial in understanding the relationship between Cranmer and Gardiner. It could no longer be uncertain in Cranmer's mind that Gardiner wanted him out of power: political and religious alike. It was also now clear to Gardiner that, while the conservatives had been gaining authority, it was always at the discretion of the king. Henry wanted traditional policies in place, so he allowed Gardiner and the conservatives to make strides. However, when the conservatives attempted their own maneuvering, it proved unsuccessful. At the end of the day the conservatives were still just as subject to Henry as were the Protestants. It was also at this point that Gardiner

---

<sup>66</sup> Morice, *Narratives of the Reformation*, 256.

<sup>67</sup> See the introduction to chapter nine in *Narratives of the Reformation*, 236.

<sup>68</sup> For fuller accounts of the Prebendaries' Plot see MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 297-324 and Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, chapter 8. Michael Zell argues the Plot was motivated by social dissension in the countryside. While he shows there is a social-political aspect to the Plot his total disregard for the larger religious motivation greatly limits the validity of his argument in presenting a true account of the event. See Michael Zell, "The Prebendaries' Plot of 1543: a Reconsideration," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976): 241-253.

lost some favor with Henry. He retained political power serving diplomatic missions with France and the Holy Roman Empire, but lost the religious authority he had gained in 1542 and 1543. Surely this plot's memory still lingered in each man's mind when debating in 1551.

1544-45 saw little action regarding the relationship between Cranmer and Gardiner. Cranmer was once again the leading religious authority and Gardiner was often in France acting as Henry's ambassador. Thus, there was little direct conflict between the two men. While the preceding two years saw Gardiner overseeing much of the domestic religious legislation, after the Prebendaries' Plot we see this oversight switch back to Cranmer. For example, in June 1544 Henry told Cranmer to force Bishop Bonner of London to follow the *Injunctions*, which he does.<sup>69</sup> Just three days after being told, Bonner sent out instructions to his diocese, demonstrating Cranmer's continued grip on power.<sup>70</sup> This is especially so considering Bonner was a well-known traditionalist and was now willing to submit to the Protestant sympathizer for whom he had little love.

In 1545, Cranmer continued to make slow, yet steady reform regarding further use of English in religion. On August 10, Henry via the Council instructed Cranmer to ensure processions were held throughout the realm asking God for a naval victory against the French. Although processions were a traditionalist action, these processions were to be "sung or said...in the English tongue."<sup>71</sup> The following day Cranmer commanded Bishop Bonner to have public prayers, in English, given every Wednesday and Friday regarding the English campaigns in France, Scotland, and Boulogne. Cranmer also

---

<sup>69</sup> *Letters and Papers XIX* (I), no 732 June 18, 1544.

<sup>70</sup> *Letters and Papers XIV* (I), no 737 June 19, 1544.

<sup>71</sup> *Letters and Papers XX* (II), no. 89 August 10, 1545.

charged Bonner with spreading this command to bishops throughout the realm.<sup>72</sup> In October Cranmer prepared the English translations of processional songs to be used on holy festival days. Although holding festival days was a traditionalist practice the English translations indicate progress. Also, Cranmer admitted to the king that he took liberties in altering, or even omitting, some of the wording when he did not think the original Latin was fitting. "In which translation, forasmuch as many of the processions, in the Latin, were but barren, as meseemed, and little fruitful, I was constrained to use more than the liberty of a translator."<sup>73</sup> Hence, we see Cranmer back performing his appropriate duties as Archbishop and, although greatly limited by Henry's traditionalism, still furthering reform.

Gardiner's life as an ambassador did not mean he lost power in Henry's kingdom; it meant only that he did not have power in the religious life of England, which he wanted in addition to political authority. He remained a crucial part of Henry's war and subsequent negotiations with France and the Holy Roman Empire in 1544 and 1545. Throughout this time he was in constant correspondence with the King, his secretary Paget, and the Privy Council.<sup>74</sup> This power culminated with the Treaty of Utrecht in January 1546, which Gardiner played a crucial role in negotiating.<sup>75</sup> Not only had Gardiner kept England from facing further problems with France and the Empire, but he

---

<sup>72</sup> *Letters and Papers XX (II)*, no. 95 August 11, 1545.

<sup>73</sup> *Letters and Papers XX (II)*, no. 539 October 7, 1545.

<sup>74</sup> There are too many of these letters to record here. See *Letters and Papers XIX-XXI* for examples.

<sup>75</sup> A full account of the treaty can be found in *Letters and Papers XXI (I)*, no. 71 January 16, 1546.

also boosted Henry's ego. Overall Gardiner's diplomatic missions were successful and kept him in high standing, despite the events of 1543.<sup>76</sup>

Notwithstanding Gardiner's retention of political power through the beginning of 1546, as Henry VIII faced death and needed to establish a Regency Council for his son Edward, Gardiner would suddenly lose all political authority. Gardiner's political work leading up to the autumn of 1546 gave every indication he would be named as one of the Regency Council in Henry's succession plan. Yet, at the very end of 1546 just before Henry wrote his will, Gardiner made a miscalculation with the king. As in 1543, Gardiner misread Henry and was too confident in his position with him. Henry 'requested' Gardiner return some of his lands to the crown, no doubt to help Henry pay for the previous war with France. This was not an uncommon practice for Henry. For example, in 1546 on November 25 Cranmer surrendered four rectories to the king.<sup>77</sup> Gardiner refused, however, to forfeit the requested holdings. Redworth argues Gardiner believed if he could first talk about the transaction with Henry, everything would work out best for Henry and himself. Unfortunately Gardiner overestimated Henry's magnanimity and friendship and was rebuked for his refusal. Gardiner tried to placate Henry, and seems genuinely shocked by Henry's disfavor. In his letter to Henry December 2 he writes,

[p]leasith it your Most Excellent Majestie to pardonne me that, having noo such oppertinite to make humble sute to your Highnes presence as the trouble of my mynde enforcyth me, I am soo bold to moleste your Majestie with thiese my letters, which be oonly to desyre your Highnes, of your accustomed goodnesse and clemencie, to be my good and gracious lorde, and to continue such opinion of me as I have ever trusted and, by manyfold benefites, certaynly knowen your

---

<sup>76</sup> For a full account of Gardiner's diplomatic missions during England's war with France see Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, chapter 9.

<sup>77</sup> *Letters and Papers XXI* (II), no. 442 November 25, 1546.

Majestie to have had of me, and not to empayre it, as I veryly trust your Majestie wyl not, tyl your Highnes knowith, by myself, my dedes and bihaviour to deserve the same...I wold not wyllingly offende your Majestie for noo wordly [sic] thing...my doinges or saynges be otherwise taken in this matier of land[es], wherin I was spoken with, I must and wyl lamente myn infelici[te], and most humbly on my knees desire your Majestie to pardon it.<sup>78</sup>

The same day Gardiner penned a letter to Henry's secretary, Paget, appealing to him to make sure Henry received the letter and to encourage Henry to see Gardiner. In this letter Gardiner reiterates he meant no ill will against the king; everything was just misunderstood.

I here noo specialte of the Kinges Majesties myscontentement in this matier of landes, but, confusely, that my doinges shuld not be well taken; wherof I am sorry if it soo be, and, al other cares set aparte, care oonly for this, that it shuld be thought I wanted discretion, to neglecte the Kinges Majesties goodnes towardes me, which, as ye know, I have ever estemed oonly, and therupon made my wordly [sic] foundation.<sup>79</sup>

Despite these pleas Gardiner was excluded from Henry's will written at the end of December. It is unclear why Henry made such a decision; there are no letters or explanations to be found; yet it is plausible it was a political maneuver. Henry was, after all, the master politician. His greatest concern for Edward's Regency Council was Edward's authority and stability; *The Act of Supremacy* must be retained.<sup>80</sup> Gardiner's refusal to give the king his lands showed a certain level of disloyalty; perhaps Henry also

---

<sup>78</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Henry VIII, December 2, 1546, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 246-47.

<sup>79</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Paget, December 2, 1546, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 248.

<sup>80</sup> R. A. Houlbrooke and E. W. Ives both present this idea, although Houlbrooke places more emphasis on the Protestant vs. Conservative view in Henry's mind: Protestants had always shown devout loyalty to the Act of Supremacy because it countered papal authority. See R. A. Houlbrooke, "Henry VIII's Will: A comment," *The Historical Journal* 37 (1994): 891-899, accessed on April 25, 2104, stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639845> and E. W. Ives, "Henry VIII's Will: The Protectorate Provisions of 1546-7," *The Historical Journal* 37 (1994): 901-914, accessed on July 29, 2013, stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639846>.

remembered Gardiner's antics in 1543 that were not to Henry's liking. Of course, on the contrary Cranmer could be trusted. He willingly submitted his lands whenever asked and, while reformed-minded, always submitted to Henry's religious views. Gardiner's land refusal also coincided with the Duke of Norfolk's political disgrace.

The Duke's son had been arrested, and would later be executed for treason and it was discovered the Duke knew of his son's antics but did not report them to Henry. The Howard family was the leading conservative family at court and closely linked to Gardiner in religious issues. For example, it had been the Duke of Norfolk with Gardiner who pushed for Henry's marriage to Catherine Howard. Although there is no direct link between the Howard family's troubles and Gardiner, both of these men's downfalls happening at the same time likely made Henry question the political loyalty of the conservative faction.<sup>81</sup> The Protestants at court, specifically Cranmer and Edward Seymour, had shown nothing but loyalty. Consequently, in the King's will it was Cranmer, Seymour, and Protestant sympathizers who gained control in the Council. Gardiner was excluded and had lost every political hope he had been working for since the early 1530s. What was worse is that he lost out to Protestant sympathizers, including his long-time religious and political foe Cranmer.

With Gardiner completely out of political favor at Edward's ascension January 28, 1547, he became absolutely committed to his role as Bishop of Winchester. Gardiner would prove to be, or at least attempt to be, the conservative hero-bishop in Cranmer's new, fully-realized Protestant reign under Edward VI. If he could not challenge Cranmer politically from inside the government, then he would challenge Cranmer religiously

---

<sup>81</sup> See also Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 238-247 and MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 358-359.

from outside. We must consider, therefore, the actions Gardiner took against Cranmer's new religious regime under Edward. Gardiner's actions in 1547 and 1548 landed him in prison, eventually resulting in the loss of his bishopric and absolutely all of his authority, political and religious, in Edward's reign. The problems Gardiner presented continually challenged Cranmer, further angering the archbishop, while Gardiner in turn gets angrier as his predicament worsened. Thus, the years 1547-1550 see the culmination of all the growing tensions between both men, which result in the personal context of the Eucharistic debate. As soon as Edward ascended to the throne Protestants readily declared their hopes for further reform. For example, in his Coronation Sermon, Cranmer told the young king:

[y]our majesty is God's vice-regent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed, the tyranny of the bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed. These acts be signs of a second Josiah, who reformed the church of God in his days. You are to reward virtue, to revenge sin, to justify the innocent, to relieve the poor, to procure peace, to repress violence, and to execute justice throughout your realms. For precedents, on those kings who performed not these things, the old law shews how the Lord revenged his quarrel; and on those kings who fulfilled these things, he poured forth his blessings in abundance.<sup>82</sup>

Protestants around England began destroying images and challenging *The Act of the Six Articles* and *The King's Book*; they were all hopeful for the reforms Henry did not carry out.

Yet, the new regime could not immediately overturn the old order. For the first several months of Edward's reign traditional religious doctrine remained the legal rule.

Gardiner was well aware of this fact. In a letter to Bishop Nicholas Ridley of Rochester

---

<sup>82</sup> Thomas Cranmer, "Speech at the Coronation of Edward VI," in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556* Vol II, edited by John Cox for the Parker Society (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1846).

regarding one of Ridley's court sermons on images, Gardiner declared that images are not idols if people do not worship them. Their destruction is unnecessary. To justify his position he not only turned to Scripture and Church Fathers, but also cited Henry via *The King's Book*: "But to the matter of images, wherin I have discoursed at large: I thinke and ye consider (as I doubt not but ye will) the doctrine set forth by our late souveraine lord, ye shall in that matter see the truthe emonges whom I was not, nor was not privie unto it till it was don."<sup>83</sup> Gardiner continued to rail against the destruction of images to Paget in March, to a certain Captain Vaughan in Portsmouth in May, and Lord Protector Somerset in May and June.<sup>84</sup> In the June letter to Somerset Gardiner discussed how Henry had a private conversation with him and Cranmer about the usefulness of images when they were not used falsely and then reiterated to the Lord Protector "I wold wish images used as the boke, by his Highnes set forth, doth prescribe, and no otherwise."<sup>85</sup> He continued this thought a few paragraphs later admonishing Cranmer directly: "here it should be noted that my Lord of Caunterbury, being the high bishop of the realme, highly in favour with his late sovereigne lord...should so sone forget there olde knowledge in Scripture, set fourth by the Kinges Majestys booke, and advise to envey such matter of alteracion."<sup>86</sup>

Gardiner followed these letters with direct correspondence to Cranmer. In it Gardiner chastises the Archbishop for challenging *The King's Book*, and Cranmer's assertion that Henry was manipulated into passing it. Gardiner asks how Cranmer can

---

<sup>83</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Nicholas Ridley, February 23, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 259.

<sup>84</sup> See Gardiner's Letters nos. 118, 119, 121, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 268-295.

<sup>85</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, June 6, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 290.

<sup>86</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, June 6, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 292.

say such a thing after he, as Archbishop, approved it along with the entire Parliament? If Cranmer had thought Henry manipulated, why not put up a fight in 1543? As Gardiner writes:

in the truth canne be no seducyng to it as the Kinges books conteynith, but from it, which, if it had been soo, I ought to thinke your Grace wold not, for al the princes christened, being soo high a bishop as ye be, have yielded unto...And therfor, after your Grace hath foure yere continually lyved in agrement of that doctrine under our late souverain lord, nowe soo sodenly after his death to wryte to me that his Hignes was seduced, it is, I assure youe, a very straunge spech...In the truth is no seducing; the King my late sovereign lord, in his book, taught a true doctrine; ergo, he was not seduced.<sup>87</sup>

Gardiner reminded Somerset and Cranmer of what Henry legislated and what still remained in effect. Although Gardiner preemptively challenged the establishment in the hopes of keeping Somerset and, especially, Cranmer from instituting religious change, we also see him acknowledge that he is not at the same level of power he once was. He is calling the two men out but he knows he must also be cautious and deferential. This is best evidenced in another letter to Cranmer written only a few days after the one above criticizing the Archbishop for claiming Henry was seduced. Gardiner reiterated that Henry was not seduced when writing *The King's Book*, but what is more interesting about the letter is his reference to the 1543 Prebendaries' Plot. Gardiner assured Cranmer "nor can there be anything more unfounded than what is charged against me concerning plots and denunciations of your fellows."<sup>88</sup> Gardiner acknowledged he had been in the perfect position to take down Cranmer in 1543, but discussed how fellow Council member Wriothesley feared Gardiner sought revenge on Cranmer and thus "pleaded with many arguments to deter me from revenge, and he desired you to be held sacred...He easily

---

<sup>87</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Thomas Cranmer, June 12, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 300-301.

<sup>88</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Thomas Cranmer, July 1, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 325.

persuaded me, already so inclined, and brought me to his opinion not at all resisting."<sup>89</sup>

Gardiner asserted that he did "not say this to clear myself in your eyes by any testimony, nor do I take pains to convince you. I merely relate, since the opportunity offers, what is fact."<sup>90</sup> He felt secure enough to challenge the possible reform coming, but realizes he must also show deference. We see him reminding Cranmer, or trying to convince him, that Gardiner has never meant ill toward him. Apparently Gardiner hoped there were no lingering negative thoughts stemming from 1543; he realized such memories could be detrimental for him as Edward's reign moved forward.

July 1547 saw the first major Edwardian Reformation legislation: the Visitation *Injunctions*. Although these borrowed greatly from Henry's 1530s *Injunctions*, there were additions clearly pointing toward further change. For example, article two specifically declared all images were not only to be removed from churches but also destroyed. This automatically countered the strides Gardiner had been making in the early months of the reign to retain images as discussed above. Article six reaffirmed the need for English Bibles in every church, but unlike Henry's, Edward's *Injunctions* placed no restriction on who could read the vernacular Bible. The most Protestant articles, however, deal with the restructuring of the part of the service around the "High Mass."

The terminology "High Mass" still rings traditional regarding the Eucharist, yet we see changes being made in this part of the service. For example, right before the Mass the Last Supper scriptural passages must be read in English; there are no longer to be processions before the Mass, although songs are still allowed as long as they are in English. Further, a service should not focus solely around the Mass but each week must

---

<sup>89</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Thomas Cranmer, July 1, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 326.

<sup>90</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Thomas Cranmer, July 1, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 326.

feature a homily in English. This does not mean all traditional language has been removed from the *Injunctions*, though. They still refer to the Eucharist as the "High Mass" and item twenty-two declares no work is allowed on Sundays so that everyone may receive "the Communion of the very body and blood of Christ." Indeed, there is the new Protestant term "communion," but it is connected with a very traditional Real Presence phrase.<sup>91</sup> Despite these lingering traditional aspects we do see a shift away from ceremony and Latin concerning the Mass service, foreshadowing changes yet to come.

The most important aspect of the *Injunctions* regarding Bishop Gardiner's future comes in the last paragraph outlining the punishments for those who do not follow the King's orders. If one does not observe the articles he or she will face "pain of deprivation, sequestration of fruits of benefices, suspension, excommunication, and such other coercion as to ordinaries or other having ecclesiastical jurisdiction, whom his majesty hath appointed for the due execution of the same."<sup>92</sup> We have seen that Gardiner was not always cheerful about being subject to Visitations. In 1535 Gardiner asked Cromwell if it were really necessary for him to be subject to Henry's new Visitations.<sup>93</sup> Now in 1547 he was again subject to a Cranmer-designed Visitation even more reformed than those of 1535. The article to which Gardiner immediately objected concerned the new homilies.

---

<sup>91</sup> *Royal Tudor Proclamations*, no. 287 July 31, 1547, 393-403. On the Mass see items 19, 21, and 29.

<sup>92</sup> *Royal Tudor Proclamations*, no. 287 July 31, 1547, 403.

<sup>93</sup> See above pgs. 15-16.

Cranmer had been working on a series of fifteen homilies and they were released in conjunction with the *Injunctions*. Although there is no article demanding the use of these homilies, one item discusses them:

because through lack of preachers in many places of the King's realms and dominions the people continue in ignorance and blindness, all parsons, vicars, and curates shall read in their churches, every Sunday, one of the *Homilies* which are and shall be set forth for the same purpose by the King's authority, in such sort as they shall be appointed to do in the preface of the same.<sup>94</sup>

At this point the homilies were meant as a resource for those who were not yet versed enough in the true, reformed teaching. It was imperative the parishioners heard the truth and the homilies assured this was happening throughout the realm. Gardiner, however, challenged the theology in several of the new homilies and this would be the beginning of what led him to prison. In a letter to the Privy Council just shy of a month after the *Injunctions'* release, Gardiner declared

I have red a boke of homelies, set forth in the Kings Majesties name, to be redde through the realme by all curates and parsons (as the title purportheth), wher in I fynd suche matter as mesemeth very unmete to be strengthened with thauthoritie of the Kings Majestie. And knowing the boldnes of the printers in like cases heretofore, can not persuade myselfe of the Lord Protector and you [the Council], being enformed what yt conteyneth, will suffre yt to passe in that sorte.<sup>95</sup>

He specifically challenged the homilies on justification by faith alone and on good works. He claimed, following the same logic of his earlier 1547 letters, that these homilies directly contradicted what had already been established as truth in Henry's *King's Book*.<sup>96</sup> After pointing out how these homilies were incorrect he then directly challenged the

---

<sup>94</sup> *Royal Tudor Proclamations*, no. 287 item 29 July 31, 1547, 402.

<sup>95</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Privy Council, around August 30, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 362.

<sup>96</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Privy Council, around August 30, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 362-365.

*Injunctions*: "I harteie require you, at the reverence of Christes passion, to give remedie herein. The proclamation was by you most prudentlie devised to forbid rumors of innovations. And this boke of homelies, with certain injunctions, floweth abrode without authoritie, with a visitacion to follow, to put them in execution."<sup>97</sup>

Gardiner followed this specific attack on the homilies featured in the *Injunctions* with a second letter to the Privy Council August 30, 1547 challenging the authority of the new visitation articles. They directly challenge what Henry, and Henry's Parliament, declared as the truth and consequently should not be followed. He wrote that he had "red over suche injunctions as the printers have sent abrode; which conteyne matter against our late soveraigne lordes instructions and determinations in his most Catholique boke." He then cited the 1543 Parliamentary Act supporting the *King's Book*, which, in his opinion, demonstrated

our late soveragn lordes honour, wisdom, judgement, and trew knowlege in Christen doctrine by as stronge a knot conserved to continew among us as mans lawe can knyght. I entend to use the benefite of that acte for the defence of the simple clergie of my dioces, and make most humble request unto your good Lordships, first by these my letters, that ye will take in good parte my allegacion of the said acte of Parliament for conservacion in religion of the state yt is in.<sup>98</sup>

Here, Gardiner explicitly told the Privy Council he would not follow the *Injunctions* but would adhere to the religious legislation already on the books and, thus far, unchanged in Parliament.

On the same day he wrote to John Mason who was set to oversee Gardiner's Visitation. Gardiner informed Mason he did not agree with the *Injunctions* because they

---

<sup>97</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Privy Council, around August 30, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 366.

<sup>98</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Privy Council, August 30, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 369.

hold no authority over the already settled 1543 Parliamentary Act.<sup>99</sup> At this point it was impossible for the Council to allow Gardiner to do so, not only in his own church, but across his entire diocese as well. This is especially so because at this juncture Cranmer is already working on the English *Order for Communion* and Catechism,<sup>100</sup> which would usher in further reform that no doubt would fuel Gardiner's ire and pen. Gardiner's obstinacy led to his being sent to Fleet Prison September 25, 1547.

Gardiner continued to reject the *Injunctions* during questioning with Cranmer in October. Gardiner did concede, though, that if Cranmer or the Council could show Scriptural and/or Church Father support of justification by faith alone, he would then be willing to adhere to the new *Injunctions*. However, if they could not, then the Council should stop insisting on these religious innovations.<sup>101</sup> Although Gardiner appealed to Somerset in the Spring and Summer of 1547 about the *Injunctions* and Edwardian religious changes, it is Cranmer who directly met and spoke with Gardiner on the subject, thereby contributing to their already complex relationship. Cranmer questioned Gardiner in prison; this is quite the turn from 1543.

We can further see the development of their relationship in some of Gardiner's 1547 letters to Somerset. It should be noted we do not have a similar look at the relationship from Cranmer's letters. From 1547 onward Cranmer was busy working on Edward's religious settlement and we therefore do not have the same amount of his

---

<sup>99</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Sir John Mason, August 30, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 373-374. There is also a letter from mid-September to Sir John Godslave in which Gardiner once again reiterates he is unable to conform to the *Injunctions*. See Stephen Gardiner to John Godslave, September 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 375-377.

<sup>100</sup> See chapter three.

<sup>101</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, October 14, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 379-400.

writings specific to Gardiner as we see from Gardiner regarding Cranmer. It is not until *Answer* that we see Cranmer's personal animosity toward Gardiner shine forth.

Regarding Gardiner's writings, although he did not denounce Cranmer's character, Gardiner clearly denounced Cranmer's religious authority. In a letter of October 27 Gardiner told Somerset "my Lord of Caunterbury, when he sent for me last out the Fleet, handled me with fayre wordes, declaring me a man mete in his opinion to be called to the Counsell againe...they were worldly comfortable wordes."<sup>102</sup> Cranmer was in fact treating Gardiner with some level of respect during the interrogation, but it was not enough to persuade Gardiner to alter his religious convictions: "But I have not, I thanke God, that disceate whiche my Lord of Caunterbury thought to be in me, or would seme to thinke so, wherby to enduce other to thinke the same."<sup>103</sup> While the letter began with some level of respect for Cranmer, we do see the animosity coming through as Gardiner continues to write. As Gardiner tells Somerset,

Men be mortal, and dedes remaine, and me think my Lord of Caunterbury doth not wel to entaungle this your Grace with this matter of religion, and to borow of your autoryty the Fleet, the Marshalsea, and the Kinges Bench, with prisonment in his house, wherwith to cause men to agre to that it pleaseth him to call truth in religion, leaving that he setteth furth, not stablished by any lawe in the realme, but contrary to a law in the realme.<sup>104</sup>

No matter how respectful Cranmer might be at this moment, Gardiner and Cranmer have too much hostility between them as a result of their religious and political differences.

The outward appearance of politeness does not necessarily indicate what each man really thinks of the other.

---

<sup>102</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, October 27, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 403.

<sup>103</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, October 27, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 403.

<sup>104</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, October 27, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 405.

As Gardiner spent more weeks in prison without an audience from Somerset, despite his numerous pleas, and with no official arrest (in Gardiner's opinion), his civility towards the Council and Cranmer began to waver. His letters reveal agitation with both Somerset and Cranmer and the neglect he felt his religious views were facing. In a letter from December 4 Gardiner asked Somerset

[s]hall I be taken for an oratour that can turne and tosse the trewith as I lust, and can not persuade to youer Grace that I should be herde? I cannot have a better matter then I have, wherein, if I can do no good, why should my Lorde of Canterburie so feare me, as he doth, that he may not suffer me to come abrode, as one that should hinder his enterprices, when he saith my eloquence (if I have any) standeth me in no stede.<sup>105</sup>

Gardiner was certain he was being held because of his refusal to submit to the religious reforms Cranmer, via Somerset and the Council, was trying to push. This was indeed the reason. It is because of his religious obstinacy that Gardiner posed a threat. He threatened to hinder the Protestant Reformation in England and by standing up in this matter he became a political and social threat. His conviction might inspire other like-minded traditionalists to challenge Cranmer and the Council. As a result, we see the epitome of what will be the Cranmer-Gardiner relationship through their 1551 debate. The relationship became a power struggle based entirely on the progress of the English Reformation. Gardiner continually challenged Cranmer's authority to make religious changes and Cranmer attempted to keep Gardiner from any political or religious position from which he could discredit Cranmer.

On January 7, 1548 Gardiner was pardoned and released from prison. This came after Parliament's official repeal of 1539's *The Act of the Six Articles* and 1543's *The King's Book* which Gardiner had used so faithfully in his campaign to stop the Edwardian

---

<sup>105</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, December 4, 1547, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 427.

*Injunctions* and homilies. He was asked to submit to the new Parliamentary Acts and accept the *Injunctions* and homilies. Although at first he still refused to accept anything regarding justification by faith alone, Gardiner did eventually submit to an amended wording on the topic and was allowed to go back to his duties as Bishop of Winchester.<sup>106</sup> His freedom was not complete, however. The Council did not permit him simply to return to Winchester and preach as he wanted; rather, he was kept under observation. In April 1548 two royal chaplains, Giles Ayre and Robert Tonge, visited Winchester and reported grievances against Gardiner back to the Council. Redworth argues that the grievances against Winchester that he openly ridiculed the government and religious changes were likely false; other bishops present did not report complaints. Regardless, the claims went public and the Council required action. Winchester wrote extensively to Somerset declaring the accusations false, but something had to be done. The council, thus, required Gardiner to preach a sermon covering certain topics on June 29, 1548. Not only was he to assert his acceptance of Edward's *The Act of Supremacy*, but he was also to subscribe willingly to the religious innovations in both Henry's and Edward's reigns. Although Gardiner believed he satisfied the Council's demands during his sermon he was arrested the following day. He had failed to declare auricular confession unnecessary, a specific point to be declared, and mentioned the Eucharist, although that was not a point laid out by the Council, and it countered the December 27, 1547 Statute prohibiting anyone from publicly speaking on the Eucharist unless

---

<sup>106</sup> James Muller, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, introductory notes to nos. 140-144, 429.

specifically appointed to the task.<sup>107</sup> Gardiner was sent to the Tower and would remain there until Mary's ascension.<sup>108</sup>

Gardiner, as he did during his Fleet Imprisonment, penned letters to defend himself. In November 1548 he wrote to Somerset declaring his imprisonment unlawful because he had yet to be charged with any crime. He further said that his June 29 sermon was preached on commandment and satisfied

Gods lawe and the lawes of the realme, the Kings proclamacions, the Kyngs commandement, my Lord Protectors open letters, and not agaynst his privy leters, the suerte of the Kings estate, the quietnes of this realm, the discharge of his duety to the Kinges Majesty, the remembraunce of the kindnes of the Kinges Majesty that dead is.<sup>109</sup>

Almost a year later in October 1549 Gardiner wrote to John Dudley, the earl of Warwick, who had recently ousted Somerset on the Regency Council. In this letter Gardiner praises Warwick for his success and reiterates how he has been wrongly imprisoned by the tyrannous Somerset.<sup>110</sup> He told Warwick he has "remayned here miserably in prysonne above oon yere and a quarter, without cause or colour of cause to be in this prysonne."<sup>111</sup> Neither Warwick nor the Council listened to Gardiner's pleas. He remained

---

<sup>107</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol. II, June 30, 1548, 208-210. *Royal Tudor Proclamations*, no. 296, December 27, 1547, 410-412.

<sup>108</sup> Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 270-281.

<sup>109</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Somerset, November 3, 1548, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 440.

<sup>110</sup> Regarding Somerset, Gardiner writes he is happy Warwick has saved "this realme from the tyrannouse government of the Duke of Somerset, the delyveraunce of the Kinges Majesties noble personne from gret daunger (which God longe preserve)." Stephen Gardiner to Warwick, October 18, 1549, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 440.

<sup>111</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Warwick, October 18, 1549, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 440-441. Gardiner talks about his wrongful imprisonment for over a year in two other October letters and one from late November to the Privy Council. See *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, nos. 147, 148, 149, 441-445.

in prison as further religious changes were implemented throughout the realm, most notably the publication and propagation of the first *Book of Common Prayer*.<sup>112</sup> It is also during this period that Cranmer began to define his Eucharistic thought with his *Defence*, the first of our Eucharistic debate tracts. Thus, Gardiner is locked away with no political or religious authority as his foe, Cranmer, was undertaking the greatest theological steps in the English Reformation to that point.

As it became clearer that Gardiner's case would not be heard we see him take his final step towards a comprehensive challenge of the advancing Reformation. To this point, even while in prison, his letters show a politician willing to submit to the crown and acknowledge his mistakes. There were times when Gardiner spoke too far on various subjects, for example the June 29, 1548 sermon resulting in his Tower imprisonment. Yet, in his mind he did not think he was challenging the system in such a manner. His letters during imprisonment demonstrate that he wished to defend himself, but he always does so in a deferential manner. In his letters he also stays away from hot-button issues; specifically he does not openly declare transubstantiation. By late 1549 and early 1550 Gardiner began to realize, however, that he was not winning his case. Thus, he reasoned why not actually begin to challenge the system. What better way to do so was there than focus on the most contentious theological question of the time: the Eucharist?

He began his attack in a letter to Peter Martyr Vermigli. At first this might not seem important. Vermigli was after all a Continental Reformer of the Zwinglian bent rather than a council member in charge of the government. Yet, attacking Vermigli was also an indirect attack on Cranmer. As shown in chapter two Vermigli was invited by

---

<sup>112</sup> For a discussion on the theological understanding of *The Book of Common Prayer* and Cranmer and Gardiner's position on it see chapter three.

none other than Cranmer himself to be a religious professor at Oxford in 1548.<sup>113</sup> Vermigli and Cranmer doubtless shared theological positions on the Eucharist that Gardiner could not be wholly ignorant of. Gardiner asserted that Vermigli discusses "the Eucharist in a wicked and shameful way."<sup>114</sup> We know what Gardiner is avowing: Vermigli's view that the Eucharist is a Spiritual memorial rather than Real Presence. Yet, Gardiner is still not explicitly declaring the wickedness Vermigli represents, nor did Gardiner explicitly present his own correct view. Cranmer, however, was about to publish *Defence*, presenting his reformed Eucharistic position and Gardiner was no longer going to sit idly in prison and refrain from being very clear on his Eucharistic view: transubstantiation. Gardiner realized he had nothing more to lose so he went full force against Cranmer's Reformation. Therefore, it is clear there is more than just theology in this debate. There is a deep political and personal undertone in Gardiner's *Explication* and Cranmer's *Answer*.

This already existing animosity by 1550 is only further heightened when Gardiner's more open attacks against Reformation policy, particularly on the Eucharist, result in his losing his bishopric and finally coming to trial-- a trial that was overseen by none other than his enemy, Cranmer. On June 8, 1550 the Privy Council decided

it was nowe thought tyme he [Gardiner] shulde be spoken withall, and agreed that if he repented his former obstinancie, and wolde hensforthe applie himself to advaunce the Kinges Majesties proceedinges, his Highnes in this cace wolde be his goode Lorde to remitt all his errours passed, otherwise his Majestie was resolved to proceade against him as his obstinancie and contempt required.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> See chapter two.

<sup>114</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Peter Martyr Vermigli, late 1549 or early 1550, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 445.

<sup>115</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol. III, June 8, 1550, 43.

The Council issued nineteen articles against Gardiner, to which he was asked to reply, following this announcement.<sup>116</sup> A commission was sent to Gardiner in prison, allowing him to peruse the nineteen articles and *The Book of Common Prayer* and provide a written response. These articles ranged from questions about the Supremacy, on which Gardiner heartily submitted, to theological points, such as the use of *The Book of Common Prayer*, and, of course, the Eucharist.<sup>117</sup> Article ten accused Gardiner of delivering contrary opinions on the Eucharist to one of the commissioners. Gardiner responded

I told him he wist not what transubstantiation meant, I will preach, quoth I, the very presence of Christ's most precious body and blood in the sacrament, which is the Catholic faith, and no doubtful matter, ne yet in controversy, saving that certain unlearned speak of it they wot not what...I must by special words speak of the sacrament and of the mass also. And when I shall so speak of them, I will not forbear to utter my faith and true belief therein, which I think necessary for the king's majesty to know...Which plain zeal of my conscience, grounded upon God's commandment to do his message truly, I would not hide, but utter so.<sup>118</sup>

This rejection led to a direct appeal from King and Council July 8 letting Gardiner know that if he did not submit, the King would no longer offer leniency. The letter opens:

It is not (We thinke) unknowne unto you with what clemencie and favour We, by thadvise of our Councail, caused you to be hearde and used upon those sundrie

---

<sup>116</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol. III, July 8, 10, 13, 15, 1550, 65-69, 72-78.

<sup>117</sup> On Supremacy see articles 1-5; on *The Book of Common Prayer* see articles 8 and 11: "Proceedings against Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, for opposing the Reformation of Religion, and disobeying the King's Orders and Injunctions respecting the same," in *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason and other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783* Vol. I: 1163-1600, edited by T.B. Howell (London: T.C. Hansard, 1809).

<sup>118</sup> "Proceedings against Stephen Gardiner," article 10, 611. It should be noted all of this is happening right around the *Defence's* release in Summer 1550. There is no clear publication date other than the year for *Defence*. Diarmaid MacCulloch argues it was likely released mid-Summer because the Imperial ambassador spoke of a copy on July 26. See MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 462.

complaintes and informacions that were made to us and our said Counsaile of your disordered doinges and wordes, both at the time of our late Visitacion and otherwise; which notwithstanding, considering that the favour both then and many other times ministred unto you wrought rather an insolent wilfulnesse in yourself than any obedient conformotie such as wolde have beseemed a man of your vocacion.<sup>119</sup>

The letter included a series of articles Gardiner was now required to submit to absolutely "upon paine of incurring such punishmentes and penalties as by our lawes may be put upon you for not doing the same."<sup>120</sup> These articles were not as numerous as those presented in June and touched mainly on Edward's Supremacy. Gardiner rejected these articles. A second round, far more detailed featuring twenty items versus six, were sent out July 15. These articles not only touched on Edward's Supremacy but addressed numerous theological issues including, for example, the rejection of images; the affirmation of justification by faith alone; communion in both kinds; that *The Book of Common Prayer* is godly; and the acceptability of clerical marriage.<sup>121</sup> Gardiner simply stated he would not make an answer until he had just council before the King and Council to present his case. On July 19, 1550 he appeared before the court after Edward allowed the meeting with the command "that if he woulde this daie also stande to his wonted obstinacie, the Counsaill shulde than proceade to the immediatte sequestracion of his Bushopricke."<sup>122</sup> He was given a three-month period in which to submit to everything.

---

<sup>119</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol. III, July 8, 1550, 65.

<sup>120</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol. III, July 8, 1550, 66.

<sup>121</sup> In "Proceedings against Stephen Gardiner" see the subsection "The Copy of the last Articles sent to the Bishop of Winchester," 624-626.

<sup>122</sup> *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol. III, July 19, 1550, 85.

He refused and he was officially deprived of his title and bishopric.<sup>123</sup> After all of the possibilities of clemency offered, this was Gardiner's final chance, but he stood firm to his religious convictions.

Gardiner's trial was not completely finished, though. He lost his bishopric largely for failing to submit to Edward's political and religious Supremacy over the Church in England, not for the specific theological discrepancies he held with King, Archbishop, and Council. Now it was time to face the religious side of the trial. For this he was placed under Cranmer's jurisdiction and the Lambeth Commission after the three-month period ended. At this point Cranmer had already published *Defence* and Gardiner had clearly read, and disliked, it. In a 1550 letter, no indication of month, Gardiner noted Cranmer's apparent about-face in the *Defence*. This letter would later be attached in the prefatory matter of Gardiner's *Explication*. In this letter Gardiner denounced Cranmer's Eucharistic theology as clear error and wonders how Cranmer could ever have switched to such a position. He wants Cranmer to ask himself the following questions:

'Howe vehemently did I reason openly in such a presence, as never was seen in Englande a more solemne, against oon Lambarde, thenne taken by me for an heretique, for defendinge the same doctrine which I nowe miself defende as Catholique! Was I not also the chief bishop in the place I am nowe in, whenne I and al the rest of the bishoppes, noon except, agreed that doctrine to be Catholique, which I nowe calle erroneus and fayned by the Papistes? Have I not said to many, secretly and openly, that I thought them madde that denyed the very presence of Christes body in the Sacrament?'...If my Lorde of Cauntourburye did but oons accoumpte these matiers with himself and compare therwith what he hath nowe doon in wryting this booke after this sorte, he must nedes with theise though[ts], fetching a syth from the botom of his brest, saye, 'What meane I? Who hath led me hereunto?' and soo yet with the grace of God recover himself.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> See *Acts of the Privy Council* Vol. III, July 19, 1550, 86-87.

<sup>124</sup> Stephen Gardiner to the Reader, 1550, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 447. The opening question is about John Lambert, tried and executed for denouncing transubstantiation in 1537. As

Gardiner then went on to tell the reader that he must, out of duty to God, write against the *Defence* in order to show the truth against Cranmer's errors. It is better he challenge Cranmer and the government and remain in prison suffering temporary physical pain than deny God's truth and gain eternal suffering and damnation.<sup>125</sup> So, while enduring the questioning process and the upcoming Lambeth Commission with Cranmer, Gardiner decided to write *Explication*. Yes, he will provide his explicit stance against the Edwardian Eucharistic theology in general, but this letter shows his answer will directly challenge Cranmer. He was not writing so much his own theology, but wrote instead about how Cranmer is wrong. Thus, the debate was not just about Eucharistic theology, but was largely based on the personal and political relationship between these two men.

Gardiner was writing *Explication* during the Lambeth Commission. The commission convened to discuss Gardiner's religious issues and make the ultimate decision about his fate as a divine and possible heretic. The charges laid against him were the same nineteen articles originally delivered to him in the Tower in June 1550. He was allowed to defend himself and, if he so desired, submit a defense in writing. Unfortunately, the account of this is found in John Foxe's record of the trial, clearly biased against Gardiner.<sup>126</sup> Despite this bias it is clear Gardiner defended himself as best

---

discussed in chapter two Cranmer does discuss Lambert's position before 1550 and wondered if Lambert in fact was not truthful.

<sup>125</sup> Stephen Gardiner to the Reader, 1550, *Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 448-449.

<sup>126</sup> *The Book of Martyrs* is a clear work of Protestant propaganda, however most scholars agree Foxe does provide accurate letters and witness accounts to be trusted for modern scholarship. For more on Foxe and his book see: Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas Freeman, *Religions and the Book*

he could, but took so much time writing up his defense and producing numerous witnesses that the commissioners took this as an attempt to delay the inevitable outcome. He also did not help his cause on January 26, 1551 when he presented an *Explication* manuscript to the commissioners who, of course, were headed by Cranmer.<sup>127</sup> Hence, he was defiantly challenging his arrest and trial. After such an explicit confutation of the English religious position there could be no expectation of freedom. His letter above shows he was ready for such a fate. The final verdict was not surprising:

we do evidently find and perceive that you Stephen bishop of Winchester have not only transgressed the commandments mentioned in the same, but also have of long time, notwithstanding many admonitions and commandments given unto you to the contrary, remained a person much grudging, speaking, and repugning against the godly reformations of abuses in religion, set forth by the king's highness authority within this realm...[we] do judge and determine you Stephen bishop of Winchester, to be deprived and removed from the bishopric of Winchester, and from all the rites, authority, emoluments, commodities, and other appurtenances to the said bishoprick in any wise belonging.<sup>128</sup>

As a consequence, the initial deprivation of his state trial was upheld on being found guilty of religious offenses at Lambeth. Despite this announcement Gardiner's friends managed to have *Explication* published abroad and smuggled into England. Cranmer, having received the January copy, was already working on his response, *Answer*. Now

---

*in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs'* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); David Loades, *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective* (Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate, 1999); and Evelyn Tribble, "The Peopled Page: Polemic, Confutation, and Foxe's Book of Martyrs," in *The Iconic Page in Manuscript, Print, and Digital Culture*, edited by George Bornstein and Theresa Tinkle (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1998).

<sup>127</sup> Redworth, *Defence of the Church Catholic*, 289.

<sup>128</sup> In "Proceedings against Stephen Gardiner" see subsection "The sentence definitive against Stephen Gardiner Bishop of Winchester," 629-630.

that Gardiner was officially deprived of any religious title Cranmer could not let Gardiner's views spread and challenge his, and his King's, views.

This entire chapter thus far has shown what caused the complex relationship between Cranmer and Gardiner to the point when our Eucharistic debate occurs. We have seen how both men faced highs and lows in their political and religious power. Often the lows were caused by each man's foe. By 1550 we have two enemies who must now defend their religious positions against each other in order to defend their political standing as well. Gardiner had lost everything to his rival and wanted it back; he had nothing to lose at this point by attacking Cranmer. If he were to fail his fate would remain the same, but if he succeeded, then Cranmer would fall and Gardiner would reclaim his authority. Conversely, Cranmer had everything to lose to his foe; he had to defend himself against Gardiner's constant attacks. It was not good for Cranmer's political position or his desire to spread reform to be constantly discredited, especially by someone who was imprisoned for opposing views. It is because of this that the Eucharistic debate of this study is more than a collection of theological writings to a general audience. It is also a highly political and personal debate between two long-time adversaries. The evidence is nowhere clearer than in the sources themselves. The insults are indicative of much more than religious conviction; they demonstrate the personal animosity quite vividly.

Cranmer's *Defence*, the first of the books in our 1550-51 debate, was not written as a direct attack on Gardiner. Rather, it was Cranmer's attempt to explain his theology in a grand tract, much in the style of the continental Reformers. Up to now Cranmer's writings were official, governmentally-legislated religious tools: the Catechism, *The*

*Order of the Communion*, and *The Book of Common Prayer*. These varied greatly from continental Reformers who were constantly writing theological expositions, such as Luther's *The Freedom of a Christian*; Zwingli's *On True and False Religion*; and Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. These works did not provide liturgies or teaching tools, as Cranmer's works thus far had, but rather dissected Scripture and the writings of early theologians to explain their own theological positions. Given this dichotomy, it was time for Cranmer finally to present a similar work to explain his views and account for the new religious tools he had already written. *Defence* was this work. *Defence* was therefore a general attack on false religion, rather than a direct attack on Gardiner. There are a few references to Gardiner, but they are infrequent. For example, he references "the byshop of Wynchester" when he discusses how even papists seem confused when trying to expound upon what "This is my body" really means.<sup>129</sup> This reference, though, is not focusing on Gardiner in particular, but Cranmer is counting him among other papists, whom he was calling out in general for false religion. Of course Cranmer knew full well, as would those readers who knew both Cranmer and Gardiner, that Gardiner was part of the insulted papist group in Cranmer's work, even if he were not directly referenced. Therefore, the majority of Cranmer's colorful insults in *Defence* are not direct attacks on Gardiner. There is an underlying personal animosity with Gardiner that sometimes comes through, but not nearly as much as it will in Gardiner's *Explication* and Cranmer's *Answer*. *Defence* remained, in large part, a general attack on papists, not Gardiner.

---

<sup>129</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *A Defence of the True and Catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ, with a confutation of sandry errors concernyng thesame, grounded and stablished vpon Goddes holy woorde, & approued by [the] consent of the moste auncient doctors of the Churche. Made by the moste Reuerende father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1550), 59, EEBO STC 6001 Reel 33:10, British Library.

Cranmer began *Defence* by addressing his reader. He apologized to those who are already aware of the true Eucharistic position for having to read his long sacramental explanation, but he must write this account because no single explanation is enough for "contencious Papistes & ydolaters."<sup>130</sup> He thus beseeched "the readers of pacience, to suffre me a littell whyle, to spend some tyme in vayne, to confute theyr most vayn vanitees."<sup>131</sup> Cranmer argued that the papists have invented transubstantiation, although he does not fully understand why, but he can assert "[t]he Grosse error of the Papistes, is of the carnall eatyng and drynkyng of Christes fleshe and bloud, with our mouthes. For they say, that who so euer eate and drynke the sacramentes of bread & wyne doo eate & drynke also with their mouthes Christes verye fleshe and bloud, bee they neuer so vngoldly and wycked persons."<sup>132</sup> Form the outset of *Defence* we have a general attack against the papists as a whole and not solely a personal attack on Gardiner. This is further exemplified with comments such as: "the fynal end of all this Antichristes doctrine is none other, but by Subtiltee and crafte, to bryng chrisitan people frome the true honouryng of Christ, vnto the greatest ydolatry, that euer was in this worlde devised"<sup>133</sup> and "it is a wouderous thyng, to see what shiftes and cautels the Popishe Antichristes deuise, to colour and cloke their wycked errors."<sup>134</sup> Once again Cranmer was not saying Gardiner in particular is leading people astray; rather, it is all the papists and antichrists who are doing so. As we shall see, this will change when Gardiner

---

<sup>130</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 15.

<sup>131</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 15.

<sup>132</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 91.

<sup>133</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 45.

<sup>134</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 109.

responds in *Explication*. He makes the debate a personal affair because of the personal and political background discussed in this chapter.

Gardiner immediately begins insulting Cranmer in *Explication's* Preface declaring he will not even use Cranmer's name; rather, he will simply refer to him as "the auctor." Gardiner does claim, though, that he will do so because sometimes what he says might seem abusive to Cranmer; using "the auctor" will decrease the direct insult.<sup>135</sup> This of course does not decrease the level of abuse toward Cranmer because the reader knows whom he is attacking when he says "the auctor." Cranmer does not miss this insult in his *Answer*, responding: "by suppressing of my name, you may the more vnreuerently and vnsemely vse your scoffyng, tauntyng, railyng, and defamyng of the author in generall, and yet shall euery man vnderstande, that your speche is directed to me in especill, as well as yf you had appoynted me with your finger."<sup>136</sup>

Throughout *Explication*, Gardiner challenged Cranmer's ability to prove his theology (which of course Gardiner does not think Cranmer does) as well as Cranmer's motive for presenting this new view. Referencing *Defence*, Gardiner writes, "the auctor occupyeth a great numbere of leaues...to proue Christes wordes (This is my body) to be a figuratiue speche. Sleight & shifte is vsed in the matter without any effectuall

---

<sup>135</sup> Stephen Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same. Made by Steuen Byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth* (Rouen: R. Caly, 1551), Preface, EEBO STC 11592 Reel 343:11, Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>136</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1551), 3, EEBO STC 5991 Reel 211:05, Henry E. Huntington Library.

consecution, to him that is lerned."<sup>137</sup> Not only does Cranmer use "shiftes" to challenge transubstantiation but he also attempted, and failed, to manipulate Church Fathers and Church tradition for his own use. Gardiner hopes,

I haue noted to the reader, with howe small substaunce of matter this auctor impugneth transubstanciation, and howe slenderly he goeth about to answeere suche auctors, as by their seuerall writynges conferme the same, besides the consent of Christe[n]dom vniuersally receyuyng the same. And howe in the meane waye, this auctor hath by his owne handes pulled downe the same vntrue doctrine of the figuratiue speache, that himselfe so lately hath diuised.<sup>138</sup>

Gardiner's ultimate purpose was to point out that Cranmer wrote to confuse the common people and subsequently retain his political authority without challenge. Cranmer's confusion is presented "to the comen peoples eares in which it might sounde euill they not beinge able to make answeere thereu[n]to, wherby they might be snarled, and inta[n]gled with vayne fanses against that truth, which before without curiosite of questions, they truely and co[n]stantly beleued."<sup>139</sup> To Gardiner, it is not some general figure subverting the truth and leading the common people astray; it is Cranmer alone. Gardiner wonders "what forehede, I pray you, is so heardened, that can vtter this among them, that know any thing of the learnyng of Christes churche?"<sup>140</sup> This is not just a theological discussion, but also a direct challenge to Cranmer's Eucharistic viewpoint and, therefore, his authority as Archbishop.

---

<sup>137</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 39.

<sup>138</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 133. He includes a similar statement on page 93: "cume to the mattier as I haue shewed this auctor to erre partelye by willfulnes, partelye by ignoraunce in thunderstandyng of the olde auctors."

<sup>139</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 135.

<sup>140</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 25.

Because he cannot allow Gardiner to insult him and his theological work in England, Cranmer responded directly to the former Bishop of Winchester in *Answer*. While the *Defence* remained a general attack on the papists, *Answer* was directed exclusively toward Gardiner. In chapter three we will consider Gardiner's attacks on Cranmer's earlier works: the Catechism and *The Book of Common Prayer*. The chapter examines these accusations in connection with Cranmer's theological progression and consistencies. Yet, these charges also challenged Cranmer's authority making it an important discussion for our present chapter as well. In essence, Gardiner was asking whether someone who seemingly changes doctrine on a whim actually should be allowed to write religious legislation. Cranmer had to defend himself against Gardiner's challenges, not only for theological reasons, but also for his own personal political reasons. On the opening page of *Answer*, Cranmer immediately attacks his foe by questioning Gardiner's title:

Here before the beginnyng of your boke, you haue prefyred a goodly title, but it agreeth with the argumente and matter thereof, as water agreeth with the fyer. For your booke is so farre from an explication and assertion of the true catholyke faythe in the mattier of the sacrament, that it is but a crafty cauillation & subtile sophisticatio[n], to obscure the truthe thereof, and to hyde the same, that it should not appeare. And in your whole booke, the reader (if he marke it wel) shal easely perceauē, howe little learnyng is shewed therein.<sup>141</sup>

Cranmer later tells Gardiner one of his chief purposes in writing *Answer* is to try to bring Gardiner to the truth. If Gardiner does not come to the truth even after reading this response, at least Cranmer knows he has done everything in his power to try to help Gardiner. "I shall doo as muche as lyeth in me, to teach and instructe you, as occasion shalle serue, so that the fault shall be eyther in your euell brynginge vppe all togyther in

---

<sup>141</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 1.

Poperye, or in your dulnesse or frowardenes, if you attayne not the true vnderstandyng of this matter."<sup>142</sup> Cranmer ends *Answer* with the following conclusion: "your doctryn hath suche ambiguities, suche perplexities, such absurdities, and such impieties in it, and is so vncertaine, so vncomfortable, so contrary to goddes worde and the olde catholike church, so contrarye to it selfe, that is declareth from whose spirite it commeth, whiche can bee none other but Antechrist himselfe."<sup>143</sup>

Cranmer also realized the political motivation behind Gardiner's attack; he realized this is not solely about Gardiner protecting transubstantiation. Just as Gardiner accused Cranmer of attempting to manipulate the common man in order to retain control over the populace, Cranmer makes a similar accusation. He writes that Gardiner is "giuen altogether to fynde faultes rather in other, the[n] to amend your owne, and to reprehend that in me, which you allowe in your selfe and other, and purposely will not vnderstand my meaninge, because ye wolde seeke occasion to carpe and controll."<sup>144</sup>

Cranmer understands Gardiner's attack is a personally motivated endeavor to bring down Cranmer in the hopes of regaining the power he held before his imprisonment. Cranmer also calls out Gardiner's *Explication* as a direct result of the Lambeth Commission and the deprivation of his bishopric. Gardiner used the *Explication* to make it seem as if he were deprived because of his sacramental theology alone, but Cranmer asserts the commission and subsequent deprivation were politically based. Gardiner's inflexibility over the sacrament was a direct political challenge to Edward's authority. Cranmer tells Gardiner he was

---

<sup>142</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 32.

<sup>143</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 443.

<sup>144</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 56-57.

called to iustice for your manifest contempt & continual disobediencies fro[m] tyme to tyme, or rather rebellio[n] agaynst the kynges Maiestie, and were iustly depriued of your estate for the same, you wold turne it not to a matter of the sacrament, whiche was no matter nor occasion therof, nor no suche matter was obiected against you, wherfore you nede to make any such defence.<sup>145</sup>

This chapter has demonstrated how political and personal the 1550-51 Eucharistic debate truly was. Theology was the central point but it was not the sole motivation for each author. From the 1530s Cranmer and Gardiner had been vying for political and religious power and their setbacks were often because of the other's opposition. Consequently, the two were never friends. The theological debate became the avenue through which they could challenge each other's religious and political authority in the realm. This motivation is crucial because Gardiner's discrediting attempt meant Cranmer had to respond with a clear, concise theology in *Answer*. What Gardiner criticized in *Defence* had to be remedied in order for Cranmer to provide the best understanding of the changes he was pushing. Thus, this personal, political background was the reason Cranmer wrote his clearer *Answer* in 1551 and laid out the clearest Reformed Eucharistic understanding in England. This chapter, therefore, has shown that a key part in understanding this debate is grasping its non-theological contexts: the personal and political.

---

<sup>145</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 2-3

## **CHAPTER TWO FROM THE CONTINENT TO ENGLAND: THE IMPACT OF CONTINENTAL REFORM ON CRANMER AND THE EUCHARISTIC DEBATE**

Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner were not debating in a vacuum. Rather, they were joining a three-decades-long fight over the correct Eucharistic interpretation. Thus, it is imperative to dissect their 1551 debate in the context of contemporary continental reform. Both authors reference leading Reformation theologians for their own purposes. Gardiner, who as a traditionalist is theologically opposed to all of the continental Reformers, references these men in his effort to discredit Cranmer. Gardiner demonstrates, in his opinion, how Cranmer stands alone in his Eucharistic theology. If Cranmer does not even agree with other Reformers, then surely this must point to the heresy Cranmer is spreading. Cranmer, in turn, uses the Reformers to discredit Gardiner while defending his own Reformed perspective. For Cranmer, Gardiner's need to rely on theologians whom Gardiner normally vehemently opposes, demonstrates the weakness of Gardiner's position. The major Reformers we must consider in our discussion are Martin Luther, Huldrych Zwingli, Martin Bucer, and Peter Martyr Vermigli.<sup>1</sup> Not only are they important because of their religious views, but also because of their direct connection with England at this juncture of the English Reformation. In 1547 upon Edward's ascension, Cranmer looked to the continent to help further the English Protestant cause. As we shall see, Cranmer invited Bucer and Vermigli to England, as well as other

---

<sup>1</sup> There are other reformers mentioned in the debate: Melanchthon, Oecolampadius, Justin Jonas, Osiander, and Hoen. They receive, however, little mention and do not have the same impact on Cranmer, Gardiner, or the English Reformation as the four explored in this chapter.

Protestant theologians not mentioned in the debate with Gardiner, all of whom affected Cranmer's own theological positions, especially regarding the Eucharist.

This chapter will focus in depth on Cranmer's Eucharistic development. His changing theology was directly dependent on the Reformers to be discussed. Although Cranmer relied on his own study of Scripture and the Church Fathers, it was through access to the Reformers that he read them with a different mindset. This chapter will conclude that, of all the Reformers, Zwingli was the most influential doctrinally, while Bucer greatly shaped Cranmer's desire for a united Protestant vision. Peter Brooks argues, "to dub Cranmer a 'Zwinglian' simply because he believed in the 'True' Presence is as unhistorical as the application of similar tags to Bucer, or Melanchthon."<sup>2</sup> Yet, Brooks oversimplifies the connection between the two theologians. There are more similarities than just the broad concept of a Spiritual Presence. Cranmer argues for a figurative understanding with a Spiritual Presence that mirrors Zwingli in numerous points. Both men argue for the communal role of the Eucharist in the Church; the Eucharist serving as a memorial of Christ's one-time sacrifice on the Cross; the importance of faith in making the sacrament effectual for the partaker; and, although the bread and wine are figures, they are not without value. Thus, in considering these numerous similarities we can call Cranmer a Zwinglian.<sup>3</sup> We shall see that Cranmer fails

---

<sup>2</sup> Peter Newman Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist: An Essay in Historical Development* 2nd ed. (New York: Seabury Press, 1992), 70.

<sup>3</sup> Alan Jacobs also denies Cranmer was a full Zwinglian because of a failure to understand the nuances in Zwingli's Eucharistic theology. Zwingli is often remembered as the Reformer who asserted the Eucharist was a memorial alone. This, however, is a gross oversimplification of his theology. He asserts the Eucharist is indeed a memorial but not without benefit. Nor does he deny a presence; rather he denies the corporeal presence but does argue Christ's divine spirit can be present for those who worthily partake in the sacrament. Once this nuance in Zwingli's theology is realized the connection between Zwingli and Cranmer's Eucharistic views can be

to define himself as a Zwinglian, and explore the possible reasons for this dissociation, yet the Zurich theology shines through. Perhaps 'Zwinglian' was not a term used among the Reformers in 1551, but the connection between Canterbury and Zurich would not have been mistaken then and therefore should not be mistaken now.

This chapter is not the place to offer a lengthy discussion about Luther and the beginnings of the continental Reformation.<sup>4</sup> However, it is important to consider his impact on English Protestantism, specifically on Cranmer's Eucharistic theology and his current debate with Gardiner. In addition to shaping Cranmer's early Eucharistic thought, as the father of the Reformation Luther became an important weapon for both Cranmer and Gardiner. Cranmer turned to him to support anti-transubstantiation while Gardiner used him to support a Real Presence against Cranmer's Spiritual Presence belief. Both authors acknowledge faults in Luther's theology of the altar, yet both rely on Luther to discredit their opponent.

In *Defence*, Cranmer does not explicitly discuss Luther or other Reformers. It is Gardiner who begins the use of Protestants in his *Explication* response to Cranmer. Despite the lack of inclusion of these thinkers in *Defence*, there are still areas that reflect Cranmer's reliance on and development from Luther. Immediately in the preface to

---

recognized. See Jacobs' footnote four in chapter two: Alan Jacobs, *The Book of Common Prayer: A Biography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 209-210.

<sup>4</sup> For general information on Luther and the German Reformation see: Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, translated by Robert Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966); Thomas Brady, *German Histories in The Age of Reformations, 1400-1650* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009); E.P. Meijering, *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought: The doctrines of Christ and Grace, the Trinity and the Creation* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1983); Heiko Oberman, *Luther: Man between God and the Devil*, translated by Eileen Walliser-Schwarzbart (New York: Doubleday, 1992); Robert Stupperich, *Melanchthon*, translated by Robert H. Fischer (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965); and Olli-Pekka Vainia, ed., *Engaging Luther: A (New) Theological Assessment* (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2010).

*Defence*, Cranmer places emphasis on grace through God alone, the importance of faith, and the priesthood of all believers. All three of these views were key Protestant beliefs rooted in Luther's theology. Cranmer begins by telling his reader that Christ prevails in those with faith. As long as we have faith Christ will preserve us against all evil and temptation. We need not take any other action, specifically the traditional concept of good works, beyond faith to receive such grace. As Cranmer writes, Christ has "suche a preservation vnto vs, that nether the deuils of hell, nor eternall deth, nor syn, can be able to preuaile against vs, so long as by true and constant faith, we be fed and nourished with that meate and drynke."<sup>5</sup> Cranmer also stresses all who are moved to God are made to do so by God. "[E]uery soule inspired by God, is desyrus to be delyuered from synne and hell, and to obteyne *at Goddes handes*, mercy, fauour, ryghtousnes, and euerlastyng saluation."<sup>6</sup> God alone offers our salvation; once again there are no good works humans can perform to achieve salvation. We can only offer faith in order to open our spirit to God's grace.

As he delves into his main discussion on the Eucharist, Cranmer also stresses the importance of the priesthood of all believers. Cranmer does not deny clergy should administer the Eucharist, but he denies that this means the minister is above the congregation. As Cranmer argues, "Christe made no suche difference betwene the preest and the lay man, that the prieste shoulde make oblation and sacrifice of Christ for the lay

---

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *A Defence of the Trve and Catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ, with a confutation of sandry errors concernyng thesame, grounded and stablished vpon Goddes holy woorde, & approued by [the] consent of the moste auncient doctors of the Churche. Made by the moste Reuerende father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1550), 10, EEBO STC 6001 Reel 33:10, British Library.

<sup>6</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 7, my emphasis.

man, and eate the Lordes Supper fro[m] him all alone, and distribute & apply it as him liketh."<sup>7</sup> The Roman church had developed the theory of clerical supremacy out of its false doctrine of transubstantiation. If Christ were bodily offered at the altar, it then followed that only ordained priests were spiritual enough to handle the holy elements. Yet, Cranmer argues this is not the case. Christ is not physically offered and thus there is no need for a heightened sense of clerical authority at the altar. Rather, Christ said clergy and lay are equal. The minister oversees the sacrament, not because he is higher, but because there must be someone to administer the Supper. This task goes to the minister who is most suited for it because of his religious training. He has been educated for this job but does not have some special Christ-offered power giving him the sole authority to perform the duty.

These examples demonstrate that at some level Lutheran ideas had infiltrated Cranmer's theology by 1550. It is necessary, though, to discern if possible just how much Luther influenced Cranmer's Eucharistic understanding. In the 1950s G. W. Bromiley and C. W. Dugmore both asserted Cranmer was never a Lutheran in his Eucharistic understanding. Dugmore cites Cranmer's 1538 prosecution of John Lambert. Lambert was accused of denying Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. Henry VIII charged Cranmer with providing a theological refutation to such heresy; Cranmer in turn argued that the belief of Christ's presence, which for Dugmore means transubstantiation, is agreeable with Scripture.<sup>8</sup> Bromiley focuses on Cranmer's Marian trial during which he

---

<sup>7</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 112.

<sup>8</sup> See C. W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformation* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958), chapter 8.

claims he never held a Lutheran belief.<sup>9</sup> Both of these authors conclude it was around 1547 when Cranmer changes his Eucharistic theology and it was nearer to a Zwinglian understanding; to them Cranmer was never a Lutheran. Peter Brooks, however, beginning in the 1960s and through the 1980s challenges this conclusion.<sup>10</sup> He asserts Cranmer experienced a two-fold Eucharistic development. The first phase was indeed Lutheran, followed by the second phase to a more Zwinglian position.

Brooks' interpretation is more accurate in understanding Cranmer's Eucharistic theological development to 1550. Bromiley and Dugmore fail to acknowledge the political motivations that necessitated Cranmer's denying his own changing views in 1538 and his 1555 trial. In 1538 he needed to avoid challenging Henry VIII's traditional transubstantiation theology, while in 1555 aligning with Luther in the Marian settlement would also prove unsafe. His silence on or denial of Lutheran beliefs therefore does not necessarily speak truth.

In 1538 there is a Lutheran view emerging in Cranmer's works. He stresses the doctrine of justification of faith alone in *The Thirteen Articles* and in notes on *The Bishop's Book*. In *The Thirteen Articles* Cranmer writes people "are not justified in virtue of the worth or merit of their repentance, or of any of their works or merits; but they are justified freely for Christ's sake through faith...This faith truly justifies; it is truly saving."<sup>11</sup> From his notes on the *Bishop's Book* we see him utterly denounce the efficacy

---

<sup>9</sup> See G. W. Bromiley, *Thomas Cranmer Theologian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), chapter 6.

<sup>10</sup> See Peter Newman Brooks, *Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* and Peter Newman Brooks, *Cranmer in Context* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Lutterworth Press, 1989).

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*, edited by G.E. Duffield (Appleford, United Kingdom: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1964), 3-4.

of good works for grace. "Now they that think they may come to justification by performance of the law, by their own deeds and merits, or by any other mean than is above rehearsed, they go from Christ, they renounce his grace."<sup>12</sup> Thus, in 1538 when he was questioning Lambert's Eucharistic views, it is clear Cranmer is in fact showing some Lutheran tendencies. Justification by faith does not speak to a Lutheran Eucharistic view, but we can see Cranmer is clearly influenced by Luther already by that point.

Brooks also references a letter between Cranmer and Cromwell dated 15 August 1538 about the superstitious nature of late medieval transubstantiation. In this letter, Cranmer discusses a Calais prior, Adam Damply, who was tried for denying the Real Presence. Damply, however, assured Cranmer he did not deny Christ's presence in the sacrament; instead he "confuted the opinion of transubstantiation" which Cranmer writes to Cromwell "therein I think he taught but the truth."<sup>13</sup> Brooks sees this as an example of some Lutheran influence in Cranmer's Eucharistic development. Cranmer is questioning the validity of the late medieval structure, the superstitious and mystical elements, of transubstantiation.<sup>14</sup> Yet Cranmer is not denying a Real Presence: not the Real Presence of transubstantiation but of the Lutheran understanding. Christ is corporeally present but not in a superstitious, magical transformation performed through the priest. For Brooks the confusion in asserting Cranmer's Lutheran theology, though, is that while Cranmer is questioning transubstantiation without denying a Real Presence, he does not say he is following Lutheran doctrine. Nor does he seem to accept each point of Luther's Real

---

<sup>12</sup> Cranmer, *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*, 11.

<sup>13</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556* Vol II, edited by John Cox for the Parker Society (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1846), 375.

<sup>14</sup> Brooks, *Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 8.

Presence view. Cranmer does not, for example, discuss the idea of Christ's Presence because of Christ's ubiquity: Christ is always present everywhere including in the bread and wine at the altar. This contributes to the confusion of Cranmer's actual Eucharistic theology in the 1530s and early 1540s. He never explicitly connects himself to Luther but it is evident Lutheran ideas did impact Cranmer's thinking.

In more recent scholarship Basil Hall sees Lutheran tendencies in Cranmer's Eucharistic thinking from the early 1530s to 1547. As Hall argues, Cranmer stresses a Real Presence while explicitly denying transubstantiation. Hall also challenges Brooks stating, "it is pointless to assert that Cranmer could not have held the Lutheran Eucharistic doctrine because he did not state the doctrine of Ubiquity."<sup>15</sup> Luther, himself, does not always discuss the view of ubiquity in the sacrament. Therefore, Cranmer's lack of consideration of that one aspect of the Lutheran Eucharistic theology does not automatically disavow his Lutheran leanings.

Diarmaid MacCulloch following Hall's argument also asserts Cranmer's Lutheran theology in the 1530s and early 1540s. His rejection of transubstantiation obviously means Cranmer is moving toward some sort of reformed theology, but, in order to illustrate that Cranmer was following a Lutheran understanding, MacCulloch points out how Cranmer was decidedly not Zwinglian at this juncture. He was far too moderate. MacCulloch expands on a letter included in Hall's argument, in which Cranmer writes, "I have seen almost everything that has been written and published either by Oecolampadius or Zwingli, and I have come to the conclusion that everything of everyone's writings must

---

<sup>15</sup> Basil Hall, "Cranmer's Relations with Erasmianism and Lutheranism," in *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*, edited by Paul Ayriss and David Selwyn (New York: Boydell & Brewer, 1993), 25.

be read with discrimination."<sup>16</sup> Rejecting the traditionalist and Zwinglian theologies puts Cranmer in the Lutheran model at this moment. As MacCulloch writes,

The Eucharistic views of the two Swiss reformers are dismissed, but also that Cranmer despises 'papistical and sophistical errors', in other words the theology of the medieval scholastic theologians, transubstantiation included. What survives is the teaching of the Church in its first five centuries, and also, by silent implication, the Lutheran theologians of north Germany.<sup>17</sup>

Through rejection of transubstantiation on one hand and Zwinglian thought on the other, the only position left for Cranmer in the 1530s and early 1540s is the middle ground, Lutheran Eucharistic position.

Although Cranmer does move beyond a Lutheran Eucharistic understanding around 1547, the Lutheran emphasis on faith remains a vital part of Cranmer's Eucharistic theology. As he writes in his *Defence*, Christ is not corporeally present in the bread and wine "but he is in dede spiritually in the faythfull christian people, whyche accordyng to christes ordinaunce be baptised, or receyue the communion, or vnfaynedly beleue in hym."<sup>18</sup> Later Cranmer declares, "our faith teacheth vs to beleue thynges that we see not."<sup>19</sup> This focus on faith as the means through which God's grace enters us in the sacrament follows Luther's emphasis on justification through faith alone. Therefore, Luther has given Cranmer a lasting legacy, even as he moves beyond Luther's own Eucharistic doctrine.

---

<sup>16</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998), 180.

<sup>17</sup> MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 181.

<sup>18</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 17.

<sup>19</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 22.

In his *Explication*, Gardiner does not focus on the similar emphasis on faith found in Cranmer's and Luther's theological foundations. Rather, Gardiner decides to focus on how different Cranmer's Eucharistic understanding is from the leading continental Reformer. As Gardiner explains, "Luther that professed openly to abhorre al that might be noted Papish, defe[n]ded stoutly the presence of Christes bodie in the Sacrament, and to be present really and substancially, euen with the same wordes and termes."<sup>20</sup> Gardiner is thus separating Cranmer's Spiritual Presence theology from the leading Protestant's own theology. In doing so Gardiner is questioning Cranmer's theological understanding. If the man who challenged the Pope and led the Reformation still asserts Real Presence then from what starting point is Cranmer's Eucharistic formula developing? Surely, Cranmer is inventing his own doctrine, unsupported by any other theologian, including those of non-Roman sentiment. In this passage, Gardiner not only separates Cranmer from Luther, but also appears to connect himself with Luther. What Luther and the Reformation challenged were the Pope and corruption of the Roman Church, which Gardiner as a Henrician Supremacy supporter would accept, but not the important doctrine of the Eucharist. Hence, Gardiner is following what has always been taught and is still being taught, even among Reformers. It is not Gardiner who is following a false doctrine, but Cranmer who follows his own imaginings.

In explaining how it is possible for Christ to be corporeally in the elements while also being corporeally in heaven, Gardiner uses the comparison of how Christ and God the Father are joined together in unity despite also being separate entities. In this

---

<sup>20</sup> Stephen Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same. Made by Steuen Byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth* (Rouen: R. Caly, 1551), 6, EEBO STC 11592 Reel 343:11, Henry E. Huntington Library.

explanation he uses a very Lutheran term: "of Christ we saye, he is consubstantiall to his father, by the substaunce of his godhead, and consubstantiall to man, by the substance of his manhod."<sup>21</sup> Gardiner is using this analogy to defend transubstantiation while using language indicative of Luther's Eucharistic theology. Once again Gardiner is connecting himself with Luther to disconnect Cranmer from the leading continental Protestant.

In his *Answer* response to Gardiner, Cranmer does not offer the Reformers much discussion because he cannot believe Gardiner would use them for support. In the past Gardiner had no love for Luther, but in his effort to discredit Cranmer Gardiner is more than willing to side with former foes. This is not lost on Cranmer. As he writes to Gardiner,

it semeth you be sore pressed, that be fayn to pray ayde of hym, whom you haue hytherto euer detested. The foxe is sore hunted that is fayne to take his borow, and the wolfe that is fayn to take the lyons denne for a shyft or to run for succour vnto a beast whiche he moste hateth. And no man condementh your doctrine of Transubstantiation and of the propiciatory sacrifice of the masse more seuerely and earnestly, then dooth Martyn Luther.<sup>22</sup>

Cranmer does not need to expand on Luther's doctrine because it is clean contrary to what Gardiner argues; no one other than Gardiner would attempt to make Luther a supporter of transubstantiation.

In 1531, Cranmer began a series of correspondences with other continental Reformers, notably Peter Martyr Vermigli and Martin Bucer. Through these growing

---

<sup>21</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 124-125.

<sup>22</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1551), 7, EEBO STC 5991 Reel 211:05, Henry E. Huntington Library.

friendships Cranmer was also being exposed to the views of Johannes Oecolampadius, Henry Bullinger, Philipp Melanchthon, and, most importantly, Huldrych Zwingli.<sup>23</sup> Even though the 1530s and early 1540s were Cranmer's Lutheran period, it is clear he was exposed to the more radical thoughts emerging from Zurich. We should note, though, that Cranmer's conversion from Lutheran consubstantiation to a more radical Eucharistic theology is hard to pinpoint. Peter Brooks marks the change circa 1546 or 1547 after Cranmer had a conversation with fellow English theologian Nicholas Ridley. Brooks's analysis stems from Cranmer's 1555 trial during which Cranmer declares the Ridley conversation as the moment of his theological change.<sup>24</sup> This is too easy an answer, however. Cranmer's 1555 reflection is years after the fact and during his trial for heresy, the stress of which makes any sort of confession questionable. It is more likely Cranmer had already been developing more radical theology leading up to 1546; he had, after all, been in contact with Zurich thinkers for about fifteen years. Cranmer was also well aware that voicing radical theology in the last years of Henry VIII's reign would have been dangerous. Cranmer saw the need for caution and, despite more radicalized views, would likely have remained quiet, until the coming of a more Protestant king.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> For more on Zwingli and the early Swiss Reformation see: Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Boston: Brill, 2007); Diane Poythress, *Reformer of Basel: the Life, Thought, and Influence of Johannes Oecolampadius* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011); W.P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1986); and W.P. Stephens, *Zwingli: An Introduction to his Thought* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1992).

<sup>24</sup> Brooks, *Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 38-39.

<sup>25</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch also argues that there are issues in simply accepting the 1555 trial statement. He explores the more likely gradual development and presents probable reasons why Cranmer chose to declare the 1546 conversation as the moment of conversion. See MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer*, 351-360. Basil Hall also briefly charts the development and 1546 change in his article, "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI," in

Regardless of when the actual conversion occurred, it is clear by 1548 that Cranmer had moved beyond the Lutheran Eucharistic understanding to something closer to the Zurich position: Christ's body and blood are not corporeally present in the bread and wine. For example, the 1548 *Order of Communion* was already showing an attack on Real Presence theology and would be used as the blue print for the communion liturgy in the upcoming 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*.<sup>26</sup>

As was the case with Luther, Cranmer does not thoroughly discuss any of the more radical theologians in his *Defence*. We do, however, see Zwinglian views shining through. Cranmer repeatedly stresses the communal aspect of the Eucharist. When people gather at the communion table they not only commune with God but also with each other and all faithful Christians who make up Christ's Church. It is this faithful community that is the true body of Christ here on Earth. Cranmer asserts Christ used bread and wine at the Last Supper

for lyke as bread is made of a great numbere of graynes of corne, grounde, baken, & so ioyned together, that therof is made one lofe: And an infinite numbere of grapes be pressed togyther in one vessell, and therof is made wyne, likewise is the whole multitude of true Christia[n] people spirytually ioyned, fyrste to Christe, and than among themselues togyther, in one faith, one baptisme, one holye spiryte, one knotte and bonde of loue.<sup>27</sup>

The bread and wine in the Eucharist are not only about Christ but the Christian Church joining together. Zwingli consistently stressed the Eucharist as the vow faithful Christians take to love and uplift their brethren and strengthen the Church. The bread

---

*Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*, edited by Paul Ayris and David Selwyn (New York: Boydell & Brewer, 1993), 217-220.

<sup>26</sup> The theology of both the 1548 *Order of Communion* and 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* will be discussed in greater length in chapter three.

<sup>27</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 11.

with its many grains baked together is a symbol of the Church and its many members connected through Christ and Christian love.<sup>28</sup>

Cranmer also stresses that the Eucharist is a remembrance of Christ's one-time sacrifice on the Cross, not a repeated sacrifice at each Mass as he argues the papists believe. "We make no sacrifice of hym, but only a co[m]memoration & remembrance of that sacrifice, whiche he alone made, & neuer none but he."<sup>29</sup> Although Cranmer does not use Zwingli's term "memorial," Cranmer's "commemoration" and "remembrance" hold the same meaning. According to leading Zwinglian scholar W. P. Stephens, it was one of Zwingli's major points that the Eucharist was seen as a remembrance of Christ's one-time sacrifice instead of a repeated event. This emphasis on the Cross is stressed in Zwingli's *The Canon of the Mass* in which Stephens analyzes, "the fundamental reality in Zwingli's thinking about the Eucharist and his concern is that people should meditate on the cross rather than make the sign of the cross."<sup>30</sup> Importance should be placed on what the Last Supper stood for--the coming death--and not the disciples' earlier eating of the bread and wine. If the eating were the important part, then why did Christ need to follow it with his death? Cranmer too shows that the death, which came after the supper, is what is important.

And by those sacrifices all christen people offer them selfs to god, but they offer not Christ again for syn, for that did neuer creature but Christ hym self alone, nor he neuer but vpo[n] good Friday. For altho he did institute the night before a sacrame[n]t of his deth, vnder [the] sacrame[n]ts of bread & wine, yet he made

---

<sup>28</sup> Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*, 253.

<sup>29</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 114.

<sup>30</sup> Stephens, *Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*, 224. He also stresses this idea in *Zwingli: An Introduction to his Thought*, 100-101.

not at that time the sacrifice of our redemption & satisfaction for our sinnes, but [the] next day following.<sup>31</sup>

As good Protestants, faithful to the Bible as the most important source for knowing God, both Cranmer and Zwingli turn to Scripture, which clearly states Christ was offered only once. Using Paul's letter to the Hebrews Cranmer emphatically argues with Gardiner,

Christe offered himselfe neuer but ones, because the scripture so precysely and so many tymes saith so, and hauinge the same for my warrant, it maketh me the bolder to stande againste you, that denie that thing to whiche is so often tymes repeated in scripture...the scripture saith plainly, that as it is ordeyned for euery man to die but ones, so Christe was offered but ones.<sup>32</sup>

Zwingli also stresses that the Eucharist is powerful, not because of a change within the bread and wine but because of the faith of the partaker.<sup>33</sup> If the partaker is faithful then the Holy Spirit is present and the believer spiritually eats Christ's body and blood. This is the central tenet of Cranmer's Eucharistic theology as well. Cranmer continuously stresses, in both *Defence* and the later *Answer*, that the efficacy of the sacrament derives not from the elements but from the believer's faith. Countering the papists in *Defence* Cranmer writes,

they teache, that Christe is in the breade and wyne: But we say (accordyng to the truth) that he is in them, that woorthely eat and drink the bread and wyne...They

---

<sup>31</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 98.

<sup>32</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 97. The Bible verse referenced is Hebrews 9: 27-28: "And as it is appoynted vnto all men, [that] they shall ones dye, and then commeth the iudgement euen so Chryste was ones offred, to take awaye the synnes of many."

<sup>33</sup> This theme is repeated throughout the "Eucharist" chapter in Stephens, *Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*. On page 224 Stephens quotes from Zwingli's *The Canon of the Mass*: "for in vain we eat the flesh of your Son and drink the blood, unless through faith in your word we firmly believe before all things that this same Son of yours, our Lord Jesus Christ, nailed to the cross for us, atoned for the transgressions of the whole world. For he himself said the flesh is of no avail, it is the Spirit who gives life."

saye, that Christ is receyued in the mouth, and entreth in with the bread and wyne. Wee saye that hee is receaued in the harte, and entreth in by faythe.<sup>34</sup>

Here we see Cranmer stressing the believer's worthiness because of faith. The partaker must believe that Christ's one-time sacrifice does offer Salvation. If the partaker reflects on Christ's offering and power, this faith will connect the partaker spiritually with Christ. In *Answer*, Cranmer states this simply: "Christes body can not be eaten but spiritually, by beleuinge and remembering Christes benefits, and reuoluing them in our mind, beleuing that as the bread and wine feed and nourish our bodies, so Christ feedeth and nourisheth our soules."<sup>35</sup> The figurative bread and wine are valuable if they lift our minds and hearts to Christ.

He continues this thought later in the *Defence* by reiterating that Christ is figuratively "in the bread and wyne, and spritually he is in them that worthely eate & drinke the bread and wine, but really, carnally, and corporally he is only in heauen, from whence he shall come to iudge the quicke and dead."<sup>36</sup> He concludes this declaration stating "this briefe answeere wyll suffice for all that the Papystes can bryng for their purpose, if it bee aptely applyed."<sup>37</sup> Cranmer has not only reaffirmed the Spiritual Presence for those who are faithful but has connected this idea with the clear designation of Christ's corporeal body being in heaven only, which Zwingli also argued. Both theologians use "at the right hand of God the Father" to insist it is impossible to have Christ corporeally present in the bread and wine; Christ's humanity can only be in one

---

<sup>34</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 46-47.

<sup>35</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 240.

<sup>36</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 75.

<sup>37</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 75.

place at a time. Thus, only Christ's divinity through the Spirit can be present.<sup>38</sup> Not only does Cranmer join Zwingli in this anti-transubstantiation viewpoint, but he also joins Zwingli in challenging Luther's ubiquity viewpoint based on the same understanding of the nature of the human body. Christ in his humanity cannot be everywhere as Luther argues in order to support a Real Presence. Only Christ's divinity is able to be everywhere at all times; therefore, only a Spiritual Presence can be in the Eucharist because Christ's humanity is securely in heaven.<sup>39</sup> The papists and Luther make Christ's "body to bee God, and so confounde the two natures of Christ, attributyng to his humayne nature, that thyng, whiche belongeth onely to his diuinitee, whiche is a moste heynous and detestable heresy."<sup>40</sup>

The last major area in which it is clear Cranmer is following Zwinglian theology is the purpose of the bread and wine if they are not turned into Christ's corporeal flesh and blood. Both Reformers assert the elements are symbols but they are not to be mistaken as *mere* symbols. The bread and wine are significant because of what they symbolize; Christ's body and blood offered on the Cross. They are also significant symbols because they lead the believer to spiritual reflection that enhances faith. In *Answer*, Cranmer states the bread "sheweth and preacheth to the godly receauer, what

---

<sup>38</sup> See Stephens, *Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*, chapter 11 and 245-247. Stephens is using Zwingli's *A Friendly Exegesis*, *Zwingli's Christian Reply*, and *Two Replies to Luther's Book* to reach these conclusions.

<sup>39</sup> Zwingli relies on Christ's words in John 6: 63 for Scriptural justification: "It is the sprete that quyckeneth, the fleshe proffeteth nothyng. The wordes [that] I speake vnto you are sprete and lyfe." Cranmer too uses this passage to support Spiritual Presence over Real Presence. The debate over Christ's natures is one of the central themes that permanently divided Zwingli and Luther; they were unable to come to a consensus regarding this view and neither man was willing to back down.

<sup>40</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 52-53.

God worketh in him by his almightie power secretlie and inuisible."<sup>41</sup> Christ ordained bread and wine for the sacrament so that people could understand the inward effect God has on the soul. As Cranmer discusses in *Defence*,

Christe ordeined this sacrament in bread & wine (whiche we eate and drynke, and be chief nutrimentes of our body) to the intent, that as surely as we see the breade and wyne with our eies, smell them with oure noses, touche theym with our handes, and taste them with our mouthes, so assuredly ought we to beleue, that Christ is our spirituall lyfe and sustinance of our soules, lyke as the sayd bread and wyne is the foode and sustinance of our bodies.<sup>42</sup>

God nourishes our soul as the bread and wine nourish our physical bodies. God's mysteries are beyond human reason, and we need the elements to help us understand.

In *Defence* Cranmer upholds

that in the sacramentall bread and wyne, is not really and corporally the very natural substance of the flesh and bloud of Christ, but that the bread and wyne be similitudes, mysteries and representacions, significacions, sacramentes, figures and signes of his body and bloud: and therefore bee called, and haue the name of his very fleshe and bloud.<sup>43</sup>

In *Answer*, Cranmer continues to argue for the symbolic nature of the elements while insisting on their value, regardless of the remaining bread and wine. From the very beginning of his response to Gardiner Cranmer wishes to make the figurative theology clear for his foe. On page four of the *Answer* he states that the bread and wine

---

<sup>41</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 11. Cranmer writes similarly on page 279: "And although all christen men ought of duetie continually to worshyp Christ beyng in heaue[n], yet bicause we be neglig[e]nt to do our duties therin, his word & sacrame[n]ts be ordeined to prouoke vs thervnto. So [that] altho otherwise we forgat our duties, yet whe[n] we com to any of his sacrame[n]ts, we shuld be put in reme[m]brance therof."

<sup>42</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 10.

<sup>43</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 64. He also expresses this idea on page 60: "To eate Christes body and drynk his bloud, be speches not taken in the proper signification of euery worde, but by translation of these wordes (eatyng and drynkyng) from the signification of a corporal thyng, to signifie a spiritual thyng: and by callyng a thyng that signifieth, by the name of the thyng whiche is signified therby."

haue no holynesse in theym, yet they be signes and tokens of the meruailous woorkes and holy effectes, which God woorketh in vs by his omnipotent power. And they be no vayne nor bare tokens, as you wolde perswade (for a bare token is that, whiche betokeneth onely, and gyueth nothyng, as a paynted fyre, whiche gyueth nother light nor heate.) but in the due ministration of the sacramentes, god is present, workyng with his woorde and sacramentes.<sup>44</sup>

The bread and wine are tokens but not without merit. The bread and wine direct the believer to thinking about God. The division between Cranmer's own theology and that of Zwingli is indistinguishable. This becomes a major area of contention between Cranmer and Gardiner.

Gardiner challenges Cranmer's theology but does not associate Cranmer with Zwingli. Rather, he glosses over the connection in an effort to establish Zwingli's Spiritual Presence as just a misunderstood Real Presence. As with Gardiner's take on Luther, dissociating another leading Reformer from Cranmer is meant to discredit Cranmer and the theology he is hoping to secure in the English Church. For Gardiner, Cranmer's view is figurative only with no Spiritual Presence. Gardiner asserts that the idea that Spiritual Presence is different from Real Presence is absurd. Cranmer remains adamantly against Real Presence; hence, it is impossible that Cranmer actually believes in a Spiritual Presence. The idea of a separate Spiritual Presence for believers only in the sacrament is also irrational in Gardiner's estimation. He easily admits, "Christ is spiritually in the man that dothe receyue worthely the Sacrament" because "so is he in him spiritually before he receyue, or els he can not receiue worthely."<sup>45</sup> Christ's presence

---

<sup>44</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 4. He declares the same on page 338: "For in the breade and wine Christ is but figuratiuely (as I saide before) and in the godly receauours spiritually, in whome also he taryeth and remaineth so longe as they remayne the membres of hys bodye."

<sup>45</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 48.

is always with believers and it makes no sense that partakers would need the sacrament to receive such presence.

Gardiner then goes on to insist that Cranmer greatly misuses such words as *spiritually* for his own benefit. Although Gardiner does not specify what benefit Cranmer is seeking, it is clear Gardiner means that Cranmer confounds readers. Gardiner adamantly believes Cranmer is asserting a purely figurative understanding; in Gardiner's opinion this means the elements have no significance, making this theology absolutely incorrect. By using terms and phrases such as *spiritually* and the *true presence*, Cranmer can make it appear he is speaking of something other than mere figuration to cover the extreme heresy of his views, leading people astray. As Gardiner exclaims,

I will declare thus of the thyng it selfe, that is Christes very body, beyng present in dede, it maye be sayd (adore it) worshippe it there, which may not be sayd of the figure. It may be sayd, of the very thyng beyng present there, that it is a highe myracle to be there, it is aboue nature to be there, it is an highe secret mysterie to be there. But none of these speaches can be conuenie[n]tly sayd of thonly figure, that it is such a miracle, so aboue nature, so highe a mysterie, to be a figure. And therefore, it is no true doctrine to teache, that we may say the same of the figure, that may be sayde of the theyng it selfe.<sup>46</sup>

A figure does not deserve reverence; therefore, if the elements are praised, they cannot be figures but Christ's corporeal flesh and blood.

Yet, Gardiner does not decide to call out Zwingli for this gross heresy. Zwingli also uses Spiritual Presence in his theology, but Gardiner does not dismiss it as a means of hiding his real belief in figuration only, as Gardiner accuses Cranmer's use of the phrase. Rather, he seizes on Zwingli's understanding of a Spiritual Presence and interprets it as, in fact, the Real Presence. Thus, in Gardiner's argument Zwingli agrees with transubstantiation, Gardiner, Luther, and all other Christians. Such identification

---

<sup>46</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 64.

denotes that Cranmer is isolated with his imagined figurative doctrine. On Zwingli, Gardiner writes,

zinglius himselfe, who was no Papist as is well knowe[n], nor god christe[n] ma[n] as some sayd neyther, sayth playnly writing to luther in the matter of the sacrament it must nedes be true that if the body of Christ be really in the sacrament, there is of necessite transubstantiacion also. Wherefore seing by luthers trauayle who fauored not the bishoppe of Rome neither, and also by euidence of the truth most certaine and manifest it apperith that according to the treue catholique faith Christe is reallye present in the sacrament, it is now by Suinglius iudgeme[n]t a necessary conseqe[n]ce of that trueth to saye there is transubstantiation also.<sup>47</sup>

Later, Gardiner also writes, "howbeit as for transubstantiacion Suinglius taketh it truely for a necessary conseqe[n]ce of the truth if there be in the Sacrament the real presence of Christes bodye as there is in dede."<sup>48</sup>

Connecting Zwingli with transubstantiation is ludicrous. No other learned theologians, reformed or traditional, would make such a claim. Gardiner was an educated theologian and surely knew this was not true. Thus, Gardiner's motives in discussing Zwingli are clearly directed toward discrediting Cranmer. As indicated by the explanations above, Cranmer was absolutely following Zwinglian Eucharistic theology. Of all the Reformers, Zwingli offers Cranmer his greatest support. If Cranmer is following Zwingli, who has a multitude of followers including an entire city, Zurich, dedicated to his theology, then this would add weight to Cranmer's assertion he is promoting the truth. Why else would Zwingli have such influence if he had not brought back the truth to the true catholic church? Consequently, for Gardiner it is imperative to disconnect Cranmer from his closest theological ally. As with Gardiner's treatment of

---

<sup>47</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 93.

<sup>48</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 141.

Luther, it is not enough to simply show Cranmer is different from Zwingli, but Gardiner also connects himself with Zwingli. Once again Gardiner is putting all the weight on transubstantiation. All those who appear to refute Real Presence do in fact uphold this viewpoint. Gardiner, who believes what all other faithful Christians believe, is indisputably correct; Cranmer, who alone follows his theology, is irrefutably wrong.

Although it is fascinating that Gardiner treats Zwingli in such a manner, it is perhaps more confusing to wonder why Cranmer does not respond to Gardiner's claims. Cranmer barely references Zwingli in *Defence* or *Answer*, even though he discusses other Reformers, including Zwinglian followers. Thus, it is important to consider why Cranmer does not directly reference the Reformer his own Eucharistic theology follows. Indeed, there are several reasons why Cranmer would have avoided a direct connection with Zwingli.

Cranmer's association with Zwingli goes back to the early 1530s when Cranmer was just beginning to move from transubstantiation to a Lutheran Eucharistic position. Throughout the 1530s Cranmer's letters and notes highlight his objection to a Zwinglian position. In a 1537 letter to Swiss reformer Joachim Vadian who argues against Real Presence, Cranmer calls out Vadian for following Zwingli's (and Zwingli's follower Oecolampadius's) Eucharistic errors. Cranmer writes,

I have seen almost every thing that has been written and published either by Oecolampadius or Zuinglius, and I have come to the conclusion that the writings of every man must be read with discrimination...As far indeed as they have endeavoured to point out, confute, and correct papistical and sophistical errors and abuses, I commend and approve them. And I wish that they had confined themselves within those limits, and not trodden down the wheat together with the tares...For how much soever you may exercise your ingenuity, you will certainly never convince me, nor, I think, any unprejudiced reader, that those ancient authors are on your side in this controversy...Wherefore, since this catholic faith which we hold respecting the real presence has been declared to the church from

the beginning by such evident and manifest passages of scripture, and the same has also been subsequently commended to the ears of the faithful with so much clearness and diligence by the first ecclesiastical writers; do not, I pray, persist in wishing any longer to carp at or subvert a doctrine so well grounded and supported.<sup>49</sup>

It is clear even in 1537 that Cranmer was adamantly opposed to Zwingli's Eucharistic theology.<sup>50</sup> This early negative perspective surely shaped Cranmer's lasting view of Zwingli even as he moved closer to the Zurich Reformer in the mid-1540s.

Zwingli died in 1531 while Cranmer was still staunchly against the Zurich position. As a result, as Cranmer moved closer to Zwingli, it was through Zwingli's followers, not the man himself. Zwingli the man was therefore never able to combat the negative legacy Cranmer associated with him before his death. This is difficult to prove, but it is likely that the early negative association Cranmer felt about Zwingli remained because Zwingli himself was unable to counter it. Perhaps, then, Cranmer was unwilling to accept he was following the man he had for so long seen as an incorrect radical. Nor would Cranmer see himself as following the man who died before Cranmer had fully rejected the traditional model. Rather, Cranmer credited his theological developments to other men who followed a Zurich model, for example, Ridley, as declared in Cranmer's 1555 trial and by Peter Martyr Vermigli. Consequently, in Cranmer's mind he was not a Zwinglian because Zwingli, the man, had not directly affected him.

---

<sup>49</sup> Thomas Cranmer to Joachim Vadian, 1537, in *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556* Vol II, edited and translated by John Cox for The Parker Society (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1846), 344.

<sup>50</sup> Peter Brooks also analyzes Cranmer's *Commonplace Books*, begun in 1538 and completed 1544. Brooks shows how many of the passages on the Eucharist are directly taken from parts of Luther's 1527 *Das diese wort Christi* in which Luther argues Real Presence against Zwingli and his figurative theology. Thus, we see Cranmer is still supporting a Lutheran Eucharistic theology defined, in part, in opposition to Zwingli. See Brooks, *Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 22-35.

Another possible explanation for why Cranmer did not associate himself with Zwingli was Cranmer's belief in promoting a unified Protestant church. The Marburg Colloquy in 1529 demonstrated the problem of extremism in creating a unified Protestant front. At this colloquy Luther and Zwingli were unable to agree fully on a Eucharistic position. They did agree on some areas but not the most important aspect of the sacrament: the nature of Christ's presence in the bread and wine.<sup>51</sup> This fundamental difference made it impossible for these men and their followers to unite, which created lasting animosities between both extremes. Cranmer was against such separation and doubtless disliked the negative impact Zwingli's extremism in 1529 had on creating a unified Reformed Church. Once Edward VI was crowned king in 1547, Cranmer in his capacity as Archbishop of Canterbury hoped to connect the English Church with the continental Reformed theologians. He knew that extremism could alienate potential allies. Therefore, it is probable Cranmer was unwilling to side openly with the extreme Zwinglian position in order to avoid said alienation. The Zwinglian position caused trouble at Marburg; it could still cause problems at Canterbury twenty years later.

As we have discussed Cranmer's strong connection to Zwingli, let us consider Cranmer's connection with two other Reformers, Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli. Cranmer never had a personal relationship with Zwingli, and, as a result, Cranmer never acknowledged the impact Zwingli's theology had on his own. Cranmer was quite close with both Bucer and Vermigli, however. He valued their opinions and influence on his own theology and the theology of the English Church. Cranmer failed to associate himself with Zwingli but had no issue praising Bucer and Vermigli.

---

<sup>51</sup> For the full transcript of the colloquy see: Donald Ziegler, ed., "Marburg Colloquy, 1529," in *Great Debates of the Reformation* (New York: Random House, 1969).

After the 1529 failure at Marburg and Zwingli's death in 1531, Martin Bucer took it upon himself to unite the various Protestant viewpoints on the Eucharist. This commitment to a unified Reformed Church became one of his unique qualities among the continental Reformers and greatly resembles Cranmer's own views in Edward VI's reign. Bucer arrived in England in 1549 to serve as a professor of Divinity at Cambridge at Cranmer's invitation. In the few years Bucer was in England until his death in 1551, Cranmer continued to value his personal and professional friendship. This friendship is evident in their correspondence. For example, Cranmer uses friendly language, calling Bucer "my Bucer" when inviting Bucer to England in 1549:

To you, therefore, my Bucer, our kingdom will be a most safe harbour, in which, by the blessing of God, the seeds of true doctrine have happily begun to be sown. Come over therefore to us, and become a labourer with us in the harvest of the Lord...Laying aside therefore all delay, come over to us as soon as possible. We will make it manifest that nothing can be more gratifying or agreeable to us than the presence of Bucer. But take care that you suffer no inconvenience from the journey.<sup>52</sup>

There is present in Cranmer's language a genuine concern for Bucer's well being and safety, as well as Cranmer's sincere desire to work on religious issues with the man.

Cranmer's affection for Bucer is also evident in his 1551 letter to Bucer's widow:

The especial favour with which I regard your husband during his lifetime, is by no means diminished now that he is no more. His remarkable piety indeed, and profound learning, has produced not a transient but an everlasting benefit to the church; whereby he has not only bound all godly persons, but myself more than all of them, under perpetual obligations to him. You must not therefore on any account allow yourself to be deterred from writing to me, should there be any thing in which I can be of use to you or to your affairs. For, stirred up by your

---

<sup>52</sup> Thomas Cranmer to Bucer, October 2, 1549, *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, 424.

letters, I shall not only recall to myself, and not without satisfaction, the agreeable remembrance of a very dear friend.<sup>53</sup>

As with Luther and Zwingli, Cranmer does not directly reference Bucer in his 1550 *Defence*. It is not until Gardiner mentions the Strasbourg theologian that Bucer enters the debate. Unlike with Luther and Zwingli, however, it is hard to discern any of Bucer's Eucharistic theology coming through in *Defence*, despite not being mentioned.<sup>54</sup> This is not surprising, though, because Bucer's Eucharistic theology was never as clear as Luther's or Zwingli's because of Bucer's desire to bridge both extreme positions in order to create a unified doctrine. Ian Hazlett and Nicholas Thompson both describe Bucer's 'mediation' theology.<sup>55</sup> Bucer's main goal when discussing the Eucharist was to bridge the Zwinglian and Lutheran positions.<sup>56</sup> While Bucer was closer to Zwinglian theology,

---

<sup>53</sup> Thomas Cranmer to Bucer's Widow, April 20, 1551, *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, 434.

<sup>54</sup> For more reading on Martin Bucer see: Amy Nelson Burnett, "Church Discipline and Moral Reformation in the Thought of Martin Bucer," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 434-456, accessed on July 29, 2013, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2541469>; Nicholas Thompson, "Martin Bucer," in *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*, edited by Lee Palmer Wandel (Boston: Brill, 2014); and David Wright, ed., *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

<sup>55</sup> Ian Hazlett, "Eucharistic communion: impulses and directions in Martin Bucer's thought," in *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*, edited by David Wright (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1994) and Nicholas Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534-1546* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2005).

<sup>56</sup> Basil Hall illustrates how this middle-ground approach on the Eucharist caused problems once he was in England. Many of the extreme Zwinglian followers including Bishop Hooper disliked the ambiguous language in the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer's* Last Supper liturgy and Bucer's acceptance of it. This only further highlights Bucer's concern with bridging varying groups rather than submitting to an extreme position. This did, however, cloud some of his influence regarding the Last Supper doctrine. While Cranmer did not question Bucer's views, it is clear many of the other leading English theologians were beginning to dismiss Bucer's authority in light of more radical advancements. This did not diminish Bucer's overall influence in England, however. In other theological matters, for example rejecting anointing of the sick, his views were accepted and are evident in the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*. See Basil Hall, "Martin Bucer in England,"

stressing that Christ was once offered on the Cross and his human body now sits in heaven, he continued to stress the Eucharist is beneficial because Christ makes it so. Bucer does not emphasize the importance of the worthiness of the believer; it is not about the human action at the table but Christ's power in the ministration of the elements. This connected to the Lutheran emphasis of Christ's presence in the sacrament, even though he never submits to the corporeal presence. Bucer was also willing to allow more traditional language in the Eucharist to appeal to Lutheran sensibilities. For example, he continues to call the sacrament a sacrifice<sup>57</sup> and does not rail against the term *transubstantiation* as long as it is used in its proper sense: the plain bread and wine are changed into sacramental figures and not Christ's corporeal body and blood.<sup>58</sup> The use of traditional Eucharistic language to appeal to more conservative Reformers is mirrored in Cranmer's own language in the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, in which Cranmer still refers to the Eucharist as the Mass, while stripping the liturgy of its more papist ritual aspects.<sup>59</sup> Both men therefore share a common aspiration to connect varying Eucharistic theologies of the time to achieve a unified church.

Gardiner, however, presents his reader with an interpretation of Bucer's Eucharistic theology in his *Explication*. Without citing the book he is using for his claims, Gardiner declares Bucer "professeth the same fayth of the real and substa[n]ciall

---

in *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*, edited by David Wright (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

<sup>57</sup> For more on Bucer's sacrificial Eucharistic theology see Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition*.

<sup>58</sup> Thompson, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition*, 180.

<sup>59</sup> This will be considered in greater length in chapter three on Cranmer's works, including the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*.

presence of Christes bodie in the Sacrament, whiche he affermeth to haue been beleued of all the church of Christ from the beginnyng hitherto."<sup>60</sup> Gardiner later includes a discussion on Bucer "to shewe how in his iugement we haue not only in earth, the operation & vertue of the sonne, but also the substaunce of the sonne...& can not be deuyded in substaunce from it, & therefore we haue in yerth the substa[n]cial presence of the sonne, not onely the operation & vertue."<sup>61</sup> As we have noted previously, this is not a wholly incorrect interpretation of Bucer's theology; Bucer does submit to Christ's presence in the sacrament prior to the communicant's partaking. The difference, of course, is that Bucer does not consider this the same corporeal presence Gardiner believes. Although Bucer was somewhat ambiguous in his position, Gardiner would have known, just as with Zwingli, Bucer did not follow the traditional transubstantiation model.

It, therefore, must again be asked why Gardiner wishes to present Bucer in such a manner. The answer is as it was with Zwingli: to discredit Cranmer's position. Claiming Bucer for himself would greatly enhance Gardiner's attack on Cranmer because of Bucer's close connection with Cranmer. When introducing Bucer, Gardiner often notes that Bucer was currently in England. For example, he writes, "Bucer that is here in Engla[n]d,"<sup>62</sup> and "Martine Bucer now reside[n]t at Cambridge."<sup>63</sup> These simple identifications remind the reader Bucer is presently in England in one of the most prestigious academic posts under Cranmer's invitation. Thus, showing that Bucer does

---

<sup>60</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 5.

<sup>61</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 36.

<sup>62</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 5.

<sup>63</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 36.

not agree with his close friend and professional benefactor continues to separate Cranmer and his theology from all possible support. Referencing Bucer's being in England also allows Gardiner to show that there is still support in England, even in its academic centers, for transubstantiation and traditional doctrines.

Cranmer defends his friend in *Answer*. He questions Gardiner's use of Bucer despite it being well known that Gardiner held great disdain for Bucer before this debate. For example, in a 1545 letter addressed to "The Reader," Gardiner implores the reader not to follow the Reformers who insult everyone, despite claiming to return true virtue to the world. He continues this train of thought specifically referencing Bucer:

their ringleader, Bucer, insulted me, the 'mannikin' to use his term, who was 'muttering' against him, it can readily be seen in what light he held me, with what arrogance and disdain he thrust me from him, with what contempt he brushed me aside...I kick back and assail him the more vigorously, for this reason: that he may cease to slander...Moreover, their pride of empty knowledge, and their boasting of learning falsely so called, have made altogether impossible a courteous and temperate controversy with them.<sup>64</sup>

In this one letter it is evident Gardiner liked Bucer neither as a man nor a theologian, but in less than six years he cites Bucer for support against Cranmer. Cranmer, thus, asks Gardiner, "What meane you to vse his auctoritie, whose auctoritie you neuer esteemed heretofore? And yet Bucer varieth muche from your errour, for he denyeth vterly, that Christ is really and substa[n]cially present in the bread."<sup>65</sup> Cranmer even implores Bucer to question Gardiner, "But nowe maister Bucer help this man at nede: For he that hath euer hitherto cried out agaynst you, now beyng at a pynche driuen to his shiftes, crieth for help vpon you. And although he was neuer your friende, yet extende your charitee to

---

<sup>64</sup> Stephen Gardiner to the Reader, December 12, 1545, in *The letters of Stephen Gardiner*, edited and translated by James Arthur Muller (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1933), 206-208.

<sup>65</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 266.

helpe hym in his necessitte."<sup>66</sup> Here we see Cranmer discredit Gardiner's argument. Gardiner is only now siding with Bucer in an effort to win his argument. It is imperative for Cranmer to prove Gardiner has never before connected with Bucer, or any other Reformer. Thus, Gardiner's theology is separate from all these other theologians. It is not Cranmer, but Gardiner, who is in isolation.

Cranmer also reflects that Gardiner only resorts to this support as a "shifte" showing the overall weakness of Gardiner's entire argument. He is attempting to make anything work for him because he has no actual truth on which to stand. Cranmer asks, "What neede you to bryng Martyn Bucer to make me answee, if you coulde answee your selfe? but bycause you be ashamed of the matter, you would thruste Martyn Bucer in your place, to receaue the rebuke for you."<sup>67</sup> Cranmer knows full well Gardiner does not actually believe he and Bucer share the same Eucharistic theology. Rather, Cranmer sees this as all part of Gardiner's attempt to win this debate while discrediting Cranmer.

The last of the important continental Reformers to include in this chapter is Peter Martyr Vermigli. Cranmer invited the Italian reformer to England in 1547 and by 1548 Vermigli was Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. After being forced out of Italy in 1542 for his Protestant tendencies, Vermigli spent the five years before moving to England in Strasbourg where he established a close relationship with Martin Bucer and was exposed to Zwinglian theology. Unlike Bucer, Vermigli was willing to acknowledge his radical position rather than attempt to find a middle ground to bridge all sides.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 103.

<sup>67</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 144.

<sup>68</sup> For more reading on Vermigli see Marvin Walter Anderson, *Peter Martyr A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A chronology of biblical writings in England & Europe* (Nieuwkoop, Netherlands:

Thus, in relation to Cranmer's Eucharistic theology Vermigli was more important than Bucer because he had a clear Zwinglian viewpoint that matched Cranmer's. In reading *Defence* it is hard to identify specific areas in which we see Vermigli's theology because he was such a strong Zwinglian. His theology would match what we have already discussed concerning Zwingli.<sup>69</sup>

When Gardiner introduces his reader to "Peter Martyr of Oxforde taken for no Papist,"<sup>70</sup> the reader gets a very different interpretation of Vermigli's Eucharistic theology. Although Vermigli has tried to associate transubstantiation with the papists, it is only Gardiner who asserts Vermigli fails to do so. Rather, Vermigli shows he and all other theologians uphold the same theology as the papists. Vermigli "sheweth how as touchyng the real presence of Christes bodie, it is not onely the sentence of the Papistes, but of other also."<sup>71</sup> No matter how hard Vermigli tries he is unable to separate transubstantiation from the truth and in the end supports Real Presence, in spite of his best efforts. Further in *Explication*, Gardiner expands on what Vermigli actually argues, quoting from Vermigli's explanation of Augustine's sermon "De verbis Domini:"

---

B. De Graaf, 1975); Frank James III, "Peter Martyr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism and Resurgent Augustinianism," in *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*, edited by Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark (Carlisle, California: Paternoster Press, 1999); and Joseph McLelland, ed., *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform* (Ontario: Wilfried Laurier Press, 1980).

<sup>69</sup> For more reading on the influence of Vermigli on the Edwardian English Church beyond Eucharistic matters see, in addition to Anderson, N. Scott Amos, "Strangers in a Strange Land;" Donald Fuller, "Sacrifice and Sacrament;" John Jackson, "Law and Order: Vermigli and the Reform of Ecclesiastical Laws in England;" and Douglas Shantz, "Vermigli on Tradition and the Fathers: Patristic Perspectives from his Commentary on I Corinthians," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*, edited by Frank James III (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004).

<sup>70</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 7.

<sup>71</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 7.

"vndoubtedly there is a certayne maner of eatyng that fleshe, and drynkyng that bloud, after whiche maner, whoso euer eateth and drynketh, dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him."<sup>72</sup> The fact that Vermigli uses the language "eatyng that fleshe, and drynkyng that bloud" rather than eating the bread and wine must indicate that the body and blood are corporeally present. Yet, there is a key phrase that disrupts this interpretation: "a certayne maner." As a Zwinglian, Vermigli surely believed Christ was present but spiritually, not corporeally; a Spiritual Presence is the "certayne maner" in which believers receive Christ.

It should not be thought that Gardiner truly believed Vermigli supported transubstantiation. Unlike Bucer, Vermigli's Eucharistic theology did not include confusing language; he, like Zwingli, clearly articulated a figurative understanding in which Christ's spirit connects with the faithful believer. This is certain as seen in the preface to the 1549 *Tractatio* which served as his argument for an Oxford Eucharistic debate held the summer of that year. In the preface he writes,

I admit that we verily partake of the Thing of the Sacrament, that is, the Body and Blood of Christ; but so that I hold, that this is done by the mind and by faith; and in the meantime I grant that the Holy Spirit is efficacious in the Sacraments by force of the Spirit and institute of the Lord. This, however, I endeavour to maintain, in opposition to superstitious notions; chiefly with the view that people should not confuse either the Body of Christ, carnally and through a corporeal Presence, with the Bread and Wine.<sup>73</sup>

This obviously is anti-transubstantiation with no room for a different interpretation. It is also known that Gardiner knew about the 1549 debate and Vermigli's position. In a letter

---

<sup>72</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 83-84.

<sup>73</sup> As quoted in Anderson, *Peter Martyr*, 105. Anderson details Vermigli's Oxford Eucharistic debate and Gardiner's disapproval in greater detail pages 101-107.

to Vermigli from either 1549 or 1550, written from prison, Gardiner chastises the Oxford professor for his Eucharistic position:

You discuss the Eucharist in a wicked and shameful way; with subtlety and shrewdness you cunningly twist certain considerations to your purpose, and openly and forcibly distort certain others; you treat nothing with honesty and integrity. These are the things, Peter, of which, in the name of the Eucharist, I complain.<sup>74</sup>

Therefore it is evident Gardiner knows, comprehends, and does not approve of Vermigli's Eucharistic position just a few years before he uses him for support in *Explication*.

As is his habit Gardiner is manipulating this Reformer for the purpose of discrediting Cranmer and not really for establishing a similar Eucharistic doctrine with Vermigli. It was very important for Gardiner to decouple Vermigli and Cranmer. As discussed above, Gardiner sought to disconnect Zwingli and Cranmer on the basis of showing Cranmer in fact does not follow the theology of the man on whom his theology is supposedly based. Separating Cranmer and Bucer was imperative because of the close personal and professional relationship of the two men. Vermigli's connection must be broken for both of these reasons. Vermigli was a staunch Zwinglian and close friend and professional ally to Cranmer. As we have seen it is unclear when Cranmer crossed over to a Zurich Eucharistic position, but it was some time around 1546 or 1547, at about the time Vermigli was invited to England. Thus, as Cranmer is developing a more radical position, a radical Zwinglian surrounds him. All of this is happening under the connection of the two men as close friends. The influence Vermigli could have on Cranmer, and thus the English Church, could prove detrimental for the traditionalist cause. Gardiner, therefore, must sever the tie between these two men. Demonstrating

---

<sup>74</sup> Stephen Gardiner to Peter Martyr Vermigli, 1549 or 1550, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, 445-446.

that Cranmer does not even follow his close friend and theological influencer would greatly enhance Gardiner's purpose of discrediting and alienating Cranmer's theology in hopes of halting further reforms.

In response to Gardiner, Cranmer does not include a lengthy discussion in *Answer* about Vermigli. Vermigli receives a few references in connection with other Reformers. For example Cranmer offers the following chastisement of Gardiner: "Ys not your doing rather a calling for ayde, when you be fayne to flye for succour to Martin Luther, Bucer, Melancthon, Epinus, Ionas, Peter Martyr, and suche other, whom all the world knoweth you neuer fauored, but euer abhorred their names?"<sup>75</sup> Cranmer explains why he need not discuss Vermigli in length, writing "As for doctour Peter Martyr, he is of age to answere for hym selfe."<sup>76</sup> In another section, Cranmer makes it clear Vermigli is quite capable of explaining his Eucharistic theology, eliminating Cranmer's need to defend him in *Answer*. This passage is about Vermigli's use of Irenaeus to argue against transubstantiation. All Cranmer writes on the matter: "Peter Martyr maketh the matter so playne, that he concludeth Ireneus wordes to make directlye agaynst the doctrine of the Papistes."<sup>77</sup> Cranmer was well aware of Vermigli's Eucharistic understanding; Vermigli's 1549 *Tractatio* was written specifically for Cranmer. Although we have no letter or other documentation indicating Cranmer knew of Gardiner's responding letter, there is plenty of evidence that others knew about the debate and Gardiner's disapproval of Vermigli's stance. There are letters on the topic between Vermigli and Bucer. Edward VI's tutor Cox intimately connected with Cranmer and Protector Somerset endorsed Vermigli's

---

<sup>75</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 177.

<sup>76</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 232.

<sup>77</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 175.

position in the debate. Nicholas Udall under royal commission translated the whole of the debate into English.<sup>78</sup> Certainly Cranmer was aware of the debate and the traditionalists' responses to it. Cranmer knew Vermigli was capable of defending himself as he had already done before this current debate between Cranmer and Gardiner. Consequently, there is no need for Cranmer to defend Vermigli's already clear and well-disseminated doctrine.

Before concluding this chapter a short discussion of John Calvin is necessary. Calvin is considered one of the most important of the Protestant Reformers and did influence the Anglican Church. He was not, however, a vital part of this debate between Cranmer and Gardiner or a strong influence on English theology at this point. Calvin began his Protestant transformation around the same time as Cranmer;<sup>79</sup> hence, because both were developing their own theologies simultaneously, Calvin did not exert much influence on Cranmer's own progressing views. Rather, Cranmer turned to Reformers who already had a clear theological standpoint. It should be noted, however, that it is clear in examining both men they did follow a similar progression. Calvin's early Eucharistic doctrine was closely linked to Luther's views, but as the 1540s progressed Calvin turned more toward Zurich, most likely because he was now working in another Swiss town, Geneva. In Calvin's final Eucharistic theology, represented fully in the last edition of *The Institutes* in 1559, he holds a figurative understanding with a Spiritual Presence, quite similar to that of Cranmer.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Anderson, *Peter Martyr*, 104-107.

<sup>79</sup> Kurt Aland, *Four Reformers: Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Zwingli*, translated by James Schaaf (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979), 116-117.

By 1550, Calvin had already released three Latin editions of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, each edition growing in volume and explanation. Although it is likely Cranmer and Gardiner were familiar with these editions, they play little role in the debate. It was not until 1561, after Calvin finished his final edition, that an English edition was printed. At this point it is clear Calvin's theology is further shaping the English Church, but not specifically on the Eucharist. After Edward's death in 1553 many English Reformers fled to Geneva to escape Mary's religious settlement returning England to the Roman Church. These years in Geneva meant English Reformers were now looking to Geneva, not Zurich, and on their return to England in 1558 under Protestant Elizabeth they brought back Genevan theology.<sup>81</sup> The Eucharistic view, however, was not altered in Geneva. Rather, because Cranmer held such a similar Eucharistic theology to Calvin, the Genevan exiles would have been well acclimated to the Eucharist in that city. Calvin's articulate and thoroughly explained Eucharistic doctrine only enhanced what the English Reformers had already begun to follow under Cranmer's Eucharistic theology and legislation.

The continental Reformers are important in understanding Cranmer's and Gardiner's 1551 Eucharistic debate. Cranmer developed his Reformed theology largely influenced first by Luther then by Zwingli and his followers. For Gardiner, the

---

<sup>80</sup> For more on Calvin's Eucharistic theology see: Thomas H.L. Parker, *Calvin: An Introduction to His Thought* (London: Continuum, 2002) and Nicholas Wolterstorff, "John Calvin," in *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*, edited by Lee Palmer Wandel (Boston: Brill, 2014).

<sup>81</sup> For more on Calvin's influence in the early Elizabethan religious settlement see: Brett Armstrong, "Popular Polity?: The Imposition of Elizabethan Church Discipline in the Deanery of Stottesden" and Dale Walden Johnson, "Marginal at Best: John Knox's Contribution to the Geneva Bible, 1560," in *Adaptations of Calvinism in Reformation Europe: Essays in Honour of Brian G. Armstrong*, edited by Mack Holt (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2007).

Reformers do not influence his own theology, yet he strives to connect himself with Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, and Vermigli in an effort to discredit Cranmer's theology and ongoing religious changes in England. Cranmer used these men as a religious tool to uphold his own Eucharistic understanding, while Gardiner worked these men as political tools to bring down Cranmer's political authority in the English Church. Thus, in the debate between Cranmer and Gardiner we do not see accurate explanations of what the continental Reformers believed or spread among their followers. Rather, we see the specific English interpretation necessary for the political context in which Cranmer and Gardiner are writing. Both authors are guilty of rejecting the subtle differences among the continental thinkers that separated all their movements, often leading to confusing interpretations, for example Gardiner's view that Zwingli supported transubstantiation. Accuracy, however, was not why Gardiner and Cranmer turn to the Reformers. Rather each author looked for general themes to which he could connect to bolster his own argument while alienating his opponent's theology.

### CHAPTER THREE

## CHALLENGING THE ARCHBISHOP: THE ROLE OF CRANMER'S EARLIER EUCHARISTIC LEGISLATION IN THE DEBATE

Before his *Defence* of 1550 Cranmer had been writing official religious documents for almost two decades. The majority of these important documents were written between 1547 and 1549 in the early years of Edward's regime and the Protestant thrust in England. Cranmer's position in these works was not always as clearly Reformed as the *Defence* and *Answer* would be. This is not surprising given Cranmer's own gradual Eucharistic evolution. Such lack of clarity does, however, elicit criticism from Gardiner in his *Explication*. Gardiner uses Cranmer's earlier works to prove Cranmer's new Eucharistic position set forth in 1550 is just that, new. Gardiner contends that Cranmer is pushing something that nobody, not even the Archbishop himself, had before preached. Thus, such a newly imagined theology is heresy and should not be promoted in England. It becomes imperative for Gardiner to use Cranmer's own earlier works against him to help bring the Archbishop down. Gardiner had always been consistent with his transubstantiation theology while the Archbishop seemingly altered his from work to work. Gardiner, therefore, was and always had been promoting the truth while Cranmer is spreading new heresies.

For his part, Cranmer refuses to let Gardiner make such claims. In his *Answer*, Cranmer is not only reasserting a Protestant Eucharistic theology, the Spiritual Presence, but also defending himself. Cranmer demonstrates how his previous views are not as contradictory as Gardiner claims. Instead, even within his seemingly ambiguous views, Cranmer always denies transubstantiation. This chapter will explore Cranmer's three crucial Eucharistic works prior to the 1550 *Defence*: the 1548 *Catechismus*, the 1548

*The Order of the Communion*, and the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. In analyzing these three works we will see that there is in fact a consistency in Cranmer's Eucharistic theology. There are indeed areas that seem traditional which Gardiner and other conservatives could use against Cranmer, yet with a close reading of each work it is apparent that Cranmer's Zwinglian Spiritual Presence is already developing. Therefore in 1550 when he pens *Defence*, Cranmer is not presenting something new. The *Defence* is simply the clearest culmination of his theology.<sup>1</sup>

In 1548 Cranmer published two official religious works that featured a discussion on the Eucharist. First, in November 1547 Parliament passed *The Bill for the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*. This bill authorized the release of the English-language *The Order of the Communion*, which was first circulated in the early months of 1548. The 1548 *Order of the Communion* marked the first instance of an all-English liturgy written for the Eucharist. The mix of the English vernacular and the use of "Communion" in the title, rather than Mass, indicated the trajectory Cranmer and the Edwardian Reformation were beginning to take. Much of this Protestant language would then be directly copied in the upcoming 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. We should note, though, that this *Order*, although indicative of a Protestant thrust, was still not fully Zwinglian. In the summer of 1548, a few months after the release of *The Order of the*

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted Gardiner was not writing about his Eucharistic theological views for the first time in *Explication*. Gardiner's theology, however, did not seem inconsistent, as did Cranmer's. Rather, Gardiner clearly asserts transubstantiation theology throughout his major works. The two most noteworthy are his help with the 1543 *King's Book* and the 1546 *A detection of The Devils Sophistrie, wherewith he robbeth the vnlearned people, of the true byleaf, in the most blessed Sacrament of the aulter*. Both of these works, written during Henry VIII's reign, firmly assert the same Scriptural and Church Father support for the Real Presence seen in his 1551 *Explication* as discussed in chapters four and five.

*Communion*, Cranmer released *Catechismus*, an English catechism for children.<sup>2</sup> Whereas the *Order of the Communion* showed some indication of Reformed theology, the catechism would prove problematic for Cranmer as he began to assert a Zwinglian understanding because Gardiner could easily show language reflective of a Real Presence in the communion portion of the catechism. It is important for us to consider what Eucharistic theology is present in both of these works and how influential each work was in shaping Cranmer's later understanding, in the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* as well as his *Defence and Answer*. Both works, even the seemingly traditional catechism, demonstrate a clear progression in Cranmer's Eucharistic theology and can point towards a fully realized Zwinglian theology in the 1550-51 debate we are presently studying. This will help us better understand Cranmer's theology and Gardiner's true motivations behind his critiques in his *Explication*.

Cranmer's 1548 *Catechismus* does not come across as Zwinglian at first reading. Further, even during a first read through, *Catechismus* would be difficult to discern a clearly Lutheran Eucharistic theology. Rather, transubstantiation seems to be at the forefront of the catechism's teaching. Diarmaid MacCulloch argues that such language in the catechism was an embarrassment for Cranmer.<sup>3</sup> Yet, it was not wholly traditional. It does clearly put forth transubstantiation but also features Protestant views much like his *Order* from the same year. The most damning phrases Cranmer includes are: "Christ

---

<sup>2</sup> The *Catechismus* was not released with a corresponding legislative Act demanding its use- as with the *Order* and the later *Book of Common Prayer*. However, because Cranmer put his name and official Archbishopric title to the work, it did carry some weight. Cranmer also sent a letter to King Edward VI asking the young king to approve and push the catechism once again showing a certain level of official authority. As Diarmaid MacCulloch categorized it, the *Catechismus* was semi-official.

<sup>3</sup> See Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998), 386-391.

saieth of the breade, this is my bodye, and of [the] cuppe he sayeth this is my bloud. Wherefore we ought to beleue, [that] in the sacrament we receyue trewly the bodye and bloude of Christ"<sup>4</sup> and "Wherefore when Christe taketh breade, and saieth. Take, eate, this is my body we ought not to doute but we eat his veray bodye."<sup>5</sup> This certainly sounds like transubstantiation: the body is corporeally present in the bread and we eat this actual flesh in the sacrament. This is further stressed, and perhaps is even more anti-Protestant in its force, in the following phrase: "Wherefore seyng Christ saieth, do this as often as ye do it, in reme[m]braunce of me, it is euident herby, that Christe causeth, euen at thys tyme, his bodye and bloude to be in the sacrament."<sup>6</sup> Not only is it again reiterated that the body and blood are present, but the important Protestant emphasis on the role of remembrance in the sacrament has also been struck down. Yes, we are to remember but that is secondary to Christ's corporeality in the sacrament.

Such phrasing offers plenty of criticisms for Gardiner to direct at Cranmer's seemingly contradictory theology only two years later in *Defence*. In his *Explication*, Gardiner criticizes the catechism as a method of discrediting Cranmer's 1550 *Defence*, because Gardiner sees only transubstantiation being taught in the catechism. He simply states, "as a booke set forth in the archbisshoppe of Cantorburies name called a Catechisme, willeth children to be taught that they receaue with their bodely mouth the

---

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *Catechismus* (London: Nycolas Hyll, 1548), Fol. ccxxxv, EEBO STC 5993 Reel 33:07, British Library.

<sup>5</sup> Cranmer, *Catechismus*, Fol. ccxxxv- Fol. ccxxxvi. On the same page Cranmer says the same in regard to the blood: "And when he [Christ] taketh the cupe, and sayeth. Take, drynke, this is my blod, we ought to thynke assuredly, [that] we drynke his veray blode. And this we must beleue, yf we wil ne counted Christe[n] me[n]."

<sup>6</sup> Cranmer, *Catechismus*, Fol. ccxxxviii.

body and bloud of Christ."<sup>7</sup> Gardiner also concludes that Cranmer's emphasis on reverently approaching the sacrament is indicative of transubstantiation. There is no need to offer reverence to bread or wine; only Christ's corporeal being would require such attention. Thus, the catechism fully teaches a Real Presence to England's youth. Describing one of the many pictures featured in the catechism, Gardiner described what is clearly the traditional, reverent model of receiving the host. If it all looks as it did before, then the catechism must be teaching what the church has always upheld; not the new theology Cranmer is attempting to spread a few years after this work. Gardiner's description and explanation follow:

setforth in pictur the maner of the ministring of this sacrame[n]t, where is the altare with ca[n]del light set forth the priest apparelled after the old sort and the man to receiue kneeling barehed & holdyng vp his handes, whiles the priest mynistreth the host to his mouth, a matter as clere contrarye to the matter of this booke as is light and darknesse, which noew this auctor would colour with speaches of auctors, in a booke wryten to instructe rude childre[n].<sup>8</sup>

If Cranmer had no issue preaching Real Presence to England's youth in 1548, then what Cranmer is attempting to assert in 1550 must be questioned. In Gardiner's opinion, all of Cranmer's previous works, including this important teaching tool, support Gardiner and the traditionalists. Such a change in *Defence* can only indicate that Cranmer has fallen victim to a false teaching and is not to be followed. Gardiner enhances this view by saying that, of all the works in England, it is the catechism and the *Book of Common*

---

<sup>7</sup> Stephen Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same. Made by Steuen Byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth* (Rouen: R. Caly, 1551), 17, EEBO STC 11592 Reel 343:11, Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>8</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 86.

*Prayer* that are the most important and promote the "moost true Catholique doctrine."<sup>9</sup> Gardiner is declaring that the catechism and *Book of Common Prayer* should be read as the official religious doctrines in England. The *Defence* is a lesser document and, therefore, its religious views should not be followed because they contradict the two most important (and official) Edwardian books.

However, there are still Protestant views that do come forth upon closer reading. They might not be as clearly obvious as the above traditional statements, but they are still present. Gardiner's interpretation of the catechism to use against Cranmer in 1551 is not therefore a fully accurate understanding. The catechism denounces the view that priests offer a sacrifice at the altar with the sacrament. Rather, Christ offered a one-and-only sacrifice on the Cross. This is a very Protestant attack against the traditional Mass theology. "[O]nely the death and bloude of our sauoure Christ, was a sufficient and worthy sacrifice, to take away our synnes, and to obteyne for vs forgyuenes of oure offenses...Christ is that sacryfice that pacifyeth Gods dyspleasure, & obteyneth pardon for oure synnes, and not for our synnes onely, but also for the synnes of all the worlde."<sup>10</sup> We must remember Christ's death and what it meant. Thus, the catechism does put forth a Zwinglian sense of the Eucharist as a memorial.

So we ought to receaue this blessed sacrament, in the remembraunce of Christ, as saint Paule saieth, that is to saye, we ought to preache his death, vntil he come a gaine...In the meane season, we ought to remembre and preach his death, that he hath redemed vs, with his death and sheding of his most precious bloude, & purchased for vs forgyuenes of oure synnes. And this we ought euer to haue in oure remembraunce, that in no wyse we forget this his exceding great benefyte, and that we seke not for remyssion of synnes, by any other wayes or meanes, then by fayth in Christe.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 18.

<sup>10</sup> Cranmer, *Cathechismus*, Fol. ccxxxvii.

Not only is Cranmer here stressing justification by faith alone, but also the Eucharist as a memorial. Neither of these points can be connected to traditional Eucharistic theology.

The catechism further challenges the traditional doctrine in its discussion of the role of the priest at the table. When the priest prays over the elements it is not he who is providing power to the sacrament. It is Christ who adds power to the bread and wine.

"Howe can the pryest or minister make the bodie and bloude of Christ? To the whiche I answer, that the minister doth not this of himself. But Christ himselfe doth gyue vnto vs his fleshe & blode, as his wordes dothe euyde[n]tly declare."<sup>12</sup> This passage still emphasizes the elements as the body and blood, yet Cranmer is removing any power from the priest and turning all focus to Christ's power through His one-time sacrifice.

This is further enhanced by the denial that humans can do any sort of act or good work to help achieve salvation. "Wherefore they be in a great erre, whiche wyll make satisfaction for their synnes, with fastyng, prayer, almes bedes, and suche lyke good workes."<sup>13</sup> Christians should still do good works, but this comes only after one has started to follow Christ, not before. Once again all the power comes from Christ. Consequently, the catechism is promoting Protestant justification through faith alone rather than a theology of good works.

The catechism also upholds the practice of communion in both kinds. The catechism discredits not only the traditional practice but also Henry VIII's 1539 *The Act of the Six Articles*. In this Act the second point stated "that communion in both kinds is

---

<sup>11</sup> Cranmer, *Catechismus*, Fol. ccxxxviii.

<sup>12</sup> Cranmer, *Catechismus*, Fol. ccxxxviii.

<sup>13</sup> Cranmer, *Catechismus*, Fol. ccxxxvii.

not necessary ad salutem, by the law of God, to all persons; and that it is to be believed, and not doubted of, but that in the flesh, under the form of bread, is the very blood; and with the blood, under the form of wine, is the very flesh; as well apart, as though they were both together."<sup>14</sup> The catechism challenges this theology by teaching that Christ offered both bread and wine to his disciples and we should therefore conduct the Last Supper in the same manner. "For Christ gaue to his disciples both kindes and hath bydde vs, that we also shoulde do the same...Now we ought therefore to receaue the sacrament vnder both kyndes, as Christe commaunded vs."<sup>15</sup>

Most important the catechism stresses the worthiness of the partaker with a sense of spiritual eating. These are key Zwinglian Eucharistic views. The catechism teaches us that we must examine ourselves to determine whether we are worthy of partaking in the sacrament. Are we truly faithful to Christ and also able to forgive and love our neighbors? Only then do "ye worthely receaue the body and bloud of Christ. And he that so receaueth it, receaueth euerlastyng lyfe."<sup>16</sup> In so doing the partaker is also showing his or her faith in Christ and belief of Christ's power in us. "And he [that] this beleueth, eateth and drynketh the bodye and bloude of Christ spiritually. Of this Christ speaketh, when he sayeth. He that eateth my fleshe and drynketh my bloud, abydeth in me and I in

---

<sup>14</sup> Henry VIII, *The Act of the Six Articles*, in *A Reformation Reader: Primary Texts with Introductions*, 2nd ed., edited by David Janz (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2008), 334. This view is also reiterated four years later in Henry VIII, *A Necessary Doctrine and erudicion for any chrysten man, set furth by the kynges maiestye of Englande* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1543), F.v (five pages after), EEBO STC 5176 Reel 32:01, British Museum: "For he that receiueth this sacrament worthily, vnder the one kinde, as vnder the fourme of breade onely, receyueth the hole body and bloud of Christ, and as manie and greatte benefittes of Christe, as he that receiueth it in bothe kindes." (This book is more commonly referred to as the *King's Book*.)

<sup>15</sup> Cranmer, *Catechismus*, Fol. ccxxxviii.

<sup>16</sup> Cranmer, *Catechismus*, Fol. ccxi.

him."<sup>17</sup> Here, Cranmer is highlighting how through worthiness we spiritually eat Christ. There is no understanding of a corporeal eating for all at the table. Hence, even though the catechism reflects a transubstantiation view, it also stresses Cranmer's all-important Spiritual Presence theology.

Cranmer devotes little effort in *Answer* responding to Gardiner's criticisms of the catechism. In beginning his response to the *Explication*, Cranmer provides a quick reference to Gardiner's attack on the catechism: "As concernyng the Catechisme by me set foorth. I haue answered...that ignorant men for lacke of iudgement and exercise in olde authors, mystake my sayd Catechisme."<sup>18</sup> Cranmer is asserting Gardiner has failed thoroughly to read the catechism and understand its true, reformed theology. Gardiner will only find transubstantiation because he is too blind in his old way of thinking. Cranmer does provide a clearer explanation of what Gardiner has failed to understand toward to the end of *Answer*. Cranmer cheekily writes,

[a]nd in that Cathechisme I teache not (as you do) that the body and bloude of Chryst is contened in the sacrament beyng reserued, but that in the mynystration therof we receyue that body and blud of Christ, whervnto if it may please you to adde or vnderstand this woord (spiritually) then is the doctrine of my Catechisme sounde and good in all mennes eares, whyche knowe the trewe doctrine of the sacramentes.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Cranmer, *Cathechismus*, Fol. ccxi.

<sup>18</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebysshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1551), 7, EEBO STC 5991 Reel 211:05, Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>19</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 269.

Cranmer asserts, as we argued above, there is indeed a Spiritual Presence theology in the catechism, which does not contradict Cranmer's later *Defence* theology. It was just too subtle for Gardiner to grasp because Gardiner is not open to understanding the truth.

Gardiner is right in finding transubstantiation in the 1548 catechism, yet this theology is also contradicted by numerous Protestant views, including denouncing the sacrament as a sacrifice and the addition of a concept of Spiritual Presence. Both of those points, being key elements of Cranmer's Eucharistic theology coming in the 1550 *Defence*, therefore make Cranmer correct in asserting the catechism is actually reformed. We must ask, therefore, why the catechism has such contradictions, that both of these men can be considered right in their interpretations of this work? First of all, Cranmer was not the original author of the catechism, nor was he overseeing the entirety of the English translation. Nonetheless, we must credit Cranmer for this source because he does offer his name as the authority publishing this edition. He had to have read and approved the catechism if he willingly ascribed his name and Archbishop title to it. Regarding the English translation, D. G. Selwyn has provided an in-depth study of the 1548 catechism's origins and Cranmer's involvement with its English translation. The Nuremberg Lutheran Reformer, Andreas Osiander, authored the original catechism in 1533. Osiander and Cranmer had a close relationship before Edward's ascension to the throne; Cranmer's first wife happened to be Osiander's own niece. We can conclude, therefore, that Cranmer was certainly familiar with the German version. Further, in 1539 Justus Jonas published a Latin translation of the catechism, which made it more accessible throughout learned Europe. Once he began to think about publishing an English catechism Cranmer turned to Jonas' Latin translation as the starting point. Cranmer arranged a group to oversee the

translation; hence, Cranmer was not directly writing the 1548 catechism but remained an active part of the English translation and release. Because the 1548 edition was a translation overseen by several different men, it is not surprising that inconsistencies would have remained in the English version. Yet, Cranmer was aware of what was being presented and changes were sometimes made. As Selwyn argues,

It is clear that the English version is very much more than translation...the translator felt at liberty to adapt the Latin of Justus Jonas to what he believed were the needs and capabilities of his English users without any sense of obligation to the Lutheran original. Editorial discretion was extended also to some detailed modifications of doctrine.<sup>20</sup>

These doctrinal modifications included Zwinglian theology, which as shown above is apparent in the catechism when read critically. There were some traditional and Lutheran views because the catechism started as a Lutheran work, but this 1548 English version was not as traditional as Gardiner wanted to prove.

Secondly, 1548 is only a year or two after Cranmer made his final theological progression to the Zwinglian Spiritual Presence theology. *The Order of the Communion* and the catechism are the first theological works he undertook with his new theology. It is probable therefore he is still working through language and phrasing. He had many more years of writing for a very traditionally minded king in his background; it is unlikely he could so easily switch in just a year to presenting full-fledged Zwinglian views. This also combines with the last probable reason the catechism holds mixed views: Cranmer's desire to promote a universal Protestant church. As noted in chapter two Cranmer wanted to avoid extremism in order to reach out to as many varying

---

<sup>20</sup> D.G. Selwyn, *A Catechism set forth by Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, United Kingdom: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978), 38. For more on the original German and Latin Lutheran versions see Selwyn chapter 2. For more on the process of turning the original into the 1548 English version (and Cranmer's particular role) see Selwyn chapter 3.

Protestants as possible. We have argued that was one reason why Cranmer never identified himself as a Zwinglian, in order to avoid placing himself at one extreme. The catechism and the *Order* both reflect this desire for avoiding extremism. For those who prefer a more traditional Real Presence theology, for example a Lutheran, it can be found. Those who want to emphasize the Eucharist as a memorial can also find their view.

This, however, was not how his contemporaries saw the catechism. Rather, traditionalists and Protestants alike read only Real Presence. Traditionalists saw transubstantiation while Protestants read either transubstantiation or Luther's Real Presence consubstantiation. For many Edwardian Protestants both Real Presence theologies were equally wrong; thus, Protestants saw the catechism as a failure. For traditionalists, specifically Gardiner, the catechism became a calling card to show they were not out of line with what the Archbishop was indeed promoting in the Edwardian church. Then after Cranmer's 1550 *Defence*, Gardiner would turn to the catechism to use it against the Archbishop, claiming the Archbishop was denying his own earlier theology.

The 1548 *Order of the Communion* is not quite as confusing as the catechism on first reading. Although it too seems at first to promote transubstantiation, its more reformed views are far more apparent than those in the catechism. This is important to note because it will be this *Order*, rather than the catechism, that directly influences the language, structure, and theology of the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*. The *Order* begins with a very clear Protestant view: communion in both kinds. In the *Order's* opening Proclamation Cranmer declares that with consent of Edward VI and Parliament "the most blessed Sacrament of the body & bloud of our savior Christ, should from thensfurth be commo[n]ly deliuered and ministerd vnto al persones with in our realme of

England and Irelande, and other our dominions vnder bothe kyndes, that is to say, of bread and wyne."<sup>21</sup> This signaled a clear end to the Henrician settlement, by reversing *The Act of Six Articles*, and the real push for a more Protestant Reformation. Although Cranmer does not criticize Henry VIII, he does acknowledge that changes must be made in order "further to trauell for the reformation & setting furth of suche godly orders, as maye bee moste to godes glory, the edifyng of our subiectes, and for thaduancemente, of true religion."<sup>22</sup> The Eucharist had been the major area of contention between Henry and English Protestants during the 1540s, so it is not surprising Cranmer's first piece of official Edwardian legislation deals with this critical practice.

The key Protestant changes in the *Order* which show up in the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* are: the importance of the sacrament as a remembrance of Christ's death; the sacrament as a means of thanksgiving; the role of spiritual eating at the table; and the worthiness of the partaker. Gardiner never specifically references the *Order* in *Explication* but, because of its use in the *Book of Common Prayer*, which is called out by Gardiner, it is important to see those Protestant ideas were already imbedded in Cranmer's thoughts even before the *Book of Common Prayer* and *Defence*.

The most important difference between Gardiner's traditional Eucharistic theology and Cranmer's Reformed understanding deals with the purpose of the Lord's Supper, as was the case between all traditionalists and Protestants. For Gardiner the sacrament was Christ's corporeal body and blood, each offering thereby connecting the partaker with the flesh actually given on the Cross. Cranmer, however, as noted in the

---

<sup>21</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *The Order of the Communion* (London: Rychard Graffon, 1548), A.ii, EEBO STC 16458.3 Reel 55:00, British Museum.

<sup>22</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, A.ii following page.

last chapter, was moving away from any sort of Real Presence theology at the time the *Order* was released. In the *Order* we see the Zwinglian emphasis on the Supper as a remembrance of the body offered at the Cross. After the opening proclamation, the *Order* opens with this first piece of Eucharistic theology: "the most co[m]fortable Sacrame[n]t of the body and bloud of Christ, to be taken of them in the remembraunce of his most fructful and glorious passion."<sup>23</sup> Later Cranmer writes Christ instituted the Last Supper "as a pledge of hys loue, and a contynuall remembraunce of thesame."<sup>24</sup>

This focus on the Supper as a remembrance connects with another of Cranmer's Zwinglian Eucharistic views: the sacrament as our thanksgiving for Christ's death. The emphasis shifts from the power inherent in the elements to the importance of understanding Christ's death and acknowledging what it provides--salvation. As Cranmer states "our dutie is, to come to these holy misteries with most hartly tha[n]kes to be geuen to almighty God, for his infinite mercy and benefites, geuen & bestowed vpon vs."<sup>25</sup> Partakers offer thanksgiving as each remembers what Christ did for humanity. This also connects with the role of the individual at the table. Cranmer is already stressing his important emphasis on the worthiness of the partaker in order to receive any benefit from the sacrament. Cranmer beseeches everyone to "consyder the greatnes of the thyng, and so searche & examyne your awne consciences" so that each will "be found worthi to come to such a table."<sup>26</sup> We can see that Cranmer is switching focus from a mystical power in the elements to the worthiness of the individual person receiving the elements.

---

<sup>23</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, A.ii 3 pages after.

<sup>24</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, B. iij.

<sup>25</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, A. ii four pages after.

<sup>26</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, A. ii four and five pages after.

This does not mean, however, that Cranmer is saying we make the sacrament efficacious. Rather, it is when we are worthy that Christ's power, already offered at the Cross, is received. As Cranmer writes in the prayer to be recited before the partakers come to the table, "[w]e do not presume to come to this thy table (O mercyfull Lord) trusting in our awne ryghteousnes, but in they manyfold and greate mercyes."<sup>27</sup> Not only does this highlight that God is still the one working in the sacrament, but it also counters any notion of us making the sacrament a good work. This counters the traditional view of a person's meritorious works and emphasizes the Protestant ideal that it is God alone who offers salvation.

Although he is moving away from the idea of a Real Presence in the elements toward an emphasis on the partaker, Cranmer nevertheless is not resorting to a memorial theology altogether, as he never will. Rather, in the *Order* he is already beginning to discuss the Spiritual Presence theology that becomes the heart of his Eucharistic understanding in *Defence* and *Answer*. Cranmer explains that when we come to the table with a worthy heart, then "we receue this holi Sacrament (for then we spiritually eate the flesh of Christe an drinke his blood: Then we dwell in Christ and Christ in vs, we be made one with Christ & Christ with vs)."<sup>28</sup> Cranmer's parenthetical addition is very important in reading his true Eucharistic understanding. Yes, we eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, but we do so spiritually. This parenthetical aside is included to make sure one does not interpret his use of body and blood as Real Presence.

These viewpoints indicate that Cranmer is developing a Reformed Eucharistic liturgy for England. Admittedly there are also inconsistencies. These traditional views

---

<sup>27</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, C. j.

<sup>28</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, B. ij.

are later included in the first *Book of Common Prayer* which gives Gardiner much ammunition against Cranmer. The most important seemingly traditional language is that Cranmer still refers to the elements as Christ's body and blood. He does not explain that the bread and wine signify the body and blood and he is speaking metaphorically when he refers to the elements as Christ's corporeal being. For example, Cranmer implores us to come to the table and remember Christ's "awne blessed body and precious blood, for vs spiritually to fede vpon."<sup>29</sup> Cranmer does amend the statement with "spritually to fede vpon" but only after he has declared Christ's "awne blessed body" to be present in the sacrament. In the same prayer of invitation to the table mentioned above he writes, "Graunt vs therefore gracious Lord so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Iesus Christ, and to drynke his blood in these holy misteries."<sup>30</sup> This is a very traditional statement. Not only does Cranmer discuss our eating and drinking Christ's corporeal flesh and blood, but his appeal to God to enact this presence also reads like the traditional Mass moment of consecration when the priest would pray to God to transform the wafer into the body. Cranmer also here declares the sacrament a "holy misterie," which also sounds like the traditional description of the sacrament. Thus, this sentence reads quite contrary to Cranmer's Protestant language. This is further enhanced when the priest is instructed, while at the table presenting the elements to each partaker, to say "[t]he bodye of oure Lorde Iesus Christ, which was geuen for the, preserue thy body vnto euerlastyng life" and "The blud of oure Lorde Iesus Christ, which was shed for the, preserue they soule vnto euerlastyng life."<sup>31</sup> There is no amendment saying to eat in remembrance of Christ or to

---

<sup>29</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, B. iij.

<sup>30</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, C. j.

eat the body spiritually. Thus, these phrases have no Protestant undertones, but rather read very traditionally. Cranmer also highlights the traditional stance of reverence at the table. Partakers are meant to come to the table and kneel to show respect for what is occurring at the table. Cranmer does not explain why the partakers are meant to kneel before the elements, which could be construed as idolatry. Why kneel before mere elements? This confusing practice will be included in both the 1549 and 1552 *Books of Common Prayer* and will become an important point of contention not between Gardiner and Cranmer, but between Cranmer and fellow reformers.<sup>32</sup>

Gardiner does not directly challenge Cranmer on *The Order of the Communion*; however, he does challenge the first *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP).<sup>33</sup> Almost every part of the *Order* was used in the communion portion of the new English liturgy.<sup>34</sup> Thus,

---

<sup>31</sup> Cranmer, *Order*, C. j page after.

<sup>32</sup> In the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* the practice of kneeling remained a part of the Communion service. As the BCP passed among bishops and ministers it was clear many staunch Protestants were against this retention. In order to placate the contention and make sure the BCP would be accepted Cranmer included what became known as the Black Rubric. This last minute addition to the second BCP explained why kneeling at Communion was acceptable. It was not done for reverence of the elements, and thus idolatrous, but out of reverence for Christ's actions on the Cross now remembered at the table.

<sup>33</sup> For more on the *Book of Common Prayer* see: Raymond Chapman, "English Society, Religion and the Book of Common Prayer;" David Loades, "From Cranmer to Bancroft: The Origin of the Book of Common Prayer 1549-1604;" and Neil Patterson, "A Perusal of the History of the Book of Common Prayer," in *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present, and Future, A 350th Anniversary Celebration*, edited by Prudence Dailey (New York: Continuum, 2011); Michael Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order: The Destruction of Catholicism through Liturgical Change* (New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House, 1976); James Deverux, "Reformed Doctrine in the Collects of the First 'Book of Common Prayer,'" *The Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965): 49-68, accessed on July 29, 2013, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1508791>; Alan Jacobs, *The Book of Common Prayer: A Biography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013); and Leonel Mitchell, *Praying Shapes Believing: A Theological Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Winston Press, 1985).

<sup>34</sup> The few, small sections from the *Order* not included in the BCP include descriptions about Christ saving sinners. For example, "If any man here be an ope[n] blasphemor, an aduoueror, i[n] malice, or enuy or any other notable cryme, & be not truly sory therefre & earnestlye mynded

the *Order* is indirectly challenged through Gardiner's critiquing the *Book of Common Prayer*. In addition to the original *Order* passages, Cranmer includes a much more thorough communion liturgy in 1549. These passages enhance the Protestant views already present in the *Order*. Hence, even though the BCP does feature the traditional views from the *Order* (as discussed above), these new inclusions do help diminish the traditional theology in favor of a more Protestant, specifically Zwinglian, Eucharistic theology presented to the English people. Cranmer includes a prayer for the priest to use during the presentation of the bread and wine at the Last Supper and current table. In this prayer the priest says, "we co[m]mend vnto thy mercifull goodnes, this congregation whiche is here assembled in thy name, to celebrate the co[m]memoratio[n] of the most glorious death of thy sonne."<sup>35</sup> Commemoration is Cranmer's Zwinglianism bursting through. The Eucharist is meant as a memorial for Christ's death, which was the one-time only sacrifice that offers the communicant salvation. The prayer continues this theology with the priest saying,

O God heauenly father which of thy tender mercye, diddest geue thyne onely sonne Iesu Christe to suffer deathe vpon the crosse, for oure redemption, who made there (by his one oblation once offered) a full perfect and suffycient sacrifice, oblatio[n], and satisfaction for the sinnes of the whole world and did institute and in his holy Gospell commaund vs, too celebrate a perpetuall memorye, of that hys precyous deathe vntyll his commyng agayne.<sup>36</sup>

---

to leaue thesame vyces, or that doth not trust him self to be reco[n]cyled to almightie God, & in charytie with all the worlde, let him yet a whyle bewaile his sinnes & not come to thys holy table, lest after the taki[n]g of this moste blessed breade, the deuell enter into hym as he did into Iudas, to ful fill in hym all iniquitie, and to bryng hym to destruction, bothe of body and soule." B. iij. See also B. iij three and four pages after for the other small biblical verses about sin not included in the BCP.

<sup>35</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *The Boke of the common praier and administratio[n] of thee Sacramentes, and other Rytes and ceremonies of the Churche, after the vse of the churche of Englande* (London: Ioannis Oswaeni, 1549), Fol. C. lxi., EEBO STC 16271 Reel 482:04, Cambridge University Library.

<sup>36</sup> Cranmer, *BCP*, Fol. C. lxi.

Once again Cranmer is stressing that the sacrament is meant as a memorial for Christ's sacrifice at the Cross. The language of commemoration and memory cannot be taken as anything other than Zwinglian theology.

The prayer does still include the use of body and blood when referring to the bread and wine. Just before the priest presents the bread and wine and reads the Scriptural words of institution, the priest prays asking God "with thy holye spirite and worde, vouchesafe too bl+esse [sic] and saine+tify [sic] these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maye bee vntoo vs, the bodye and bloud of thy moste derely beloued sonne Iesus Christe."<sup>37</sup> Yet this use of body and blood should not be read as a declaration of transubstantiation or even a Lutheran Real Presence. The priest is not asking that the bread and wine be turned into the corporeal flesh, and is therefore not a call for transubstantiation. Nor is there an emphasis on the corporeal flesh joining alongside the elements, thereby denying Lutheran consubstantiation. Rather, Cranmer is switching the focus on what is happening in or with the elements at the table to a focus on what happens in the partaker. Cranmer is calling on God to work the elements in us and then give the body and blood of Christ. In addition to this different focus Cranmer also does not discuss what he means by body or blood. He does not explicitly call either the *very* flesh or *very* blood. Thus, Cranmer can easily be referring to his Spiritual Presence. Christ's divine, not corporeal, body and blood are offered to those who are worthy.

We should also point out that the priest is to say this prayer, with its Zwinglian notes, and offer the bread and wine "without any eleuacion, or shewyng the Sacrament to

---

<sup>37</sup> Cranmer, *BCP*, Fol. C. lxi.

the people."<sup>38</sup> This further abolishes the notion of any sort of change occurring in the elements because, in transubstantiation theology, the change occurs at the moment of elevation. The people are then supposed to be shown the wafer with the understanding they are now gazing at Christ's flesh. By eliminating these actions it is clear England's new Eucharistic celebration is not promoting a change of any sort to the elements. Rather the change is now in the worthy partaker.

After the words of institution and the blessing over the elements the priest continues to pray. This second part of the prayer reiterates many of the same sentiments found in the first section.

Wherefore O Lorde and heauenly father accordyng to the institution of thy derely beloued sonne our sauour Iesu christ we thy humble seruauntes do celebrate and make here before thy diuine Maiestie, [with] these thy holy gyftes, the memorial which thy sonne hath wylled vs to make, hauynge in remembrance, his blessed passion, myghtie resurrection and gloryous ascention.<sup>39</sup>

Here Cranmer is specifically using *remembrance* in connection with the Eucharist, signaling his Zwinglian sympathies. He is once again stressing that this memorial is for Christ's one-time sacrifice. The prayer continues with Cranmer stressing that Christ's body is only received through a worthy partaker, not because Christ is present in the elements. "[H]umbly beseching the, that who soeuer shall be partaker of this holye Communion, may worthely receiue the most precious bodye and bloude of thy sonne Iesus Christe."<sup>40</sup> Cranmer is in fact using the terms body and blood, but only in connection with the partaker being worthy. Therefore, the body and blood can only be

---

<sup>38</sup> Cranmer, *BCP*, Fol. C. lxiii.

<sup>39</sup> Cranmer, *BCP*, Fol. C. lxiii.

<sup>40</sup> Cranmer, *BCP*, Fol. C. lxiii.

received inwardly, depending on each individual person, and cannot already be present in the bread and wine offered to everyone, even those who are not worthy. As with the use of body and blood in the first part of the prayer, here too Cranmer does not specifically refer to Christ's body and blood as corporeal flesh. He is thinking of the body and blood in the spiritual sense: Christ's divine body, not the corporeal flesh which sits in Heaven, is that which is present.

After all have communed the priest offers a series of biblical verses (it is the individual priest's prerogative which verses to use from a given list) and another prayer. The priest thanks God "for that thou hast vouch safed to feade vs in these holy misteryes with the spirituall foode of the most precious body and bloud of thy sonne our sauior Iesus Christ."<sup>41</sup> Here Cranmer is now explicitly saying how we are to understand the body and blood: spiritual food. We see the epitome of his Zwinglian Eucharistic theology shining forth. It does not matter that Cranmer uses the words body and blood as long as one understands what they mean. Christ is not corporeally present but through his divinity is spiritually present in the believer. Thus, the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* might contain some confusing language at first glance, but when thoroughly read we can see Cranmer is admitting his Zwinglian theology. The theology that is present in 1549 is no different from that in the 1550 *Defence*, as Gardiner would argue.

Gardiner spends a great deal of time criticizing the *Book of Common Prayer*. This is not surprising considering the *Book of Common Prayer* was the most important of Cranmer's theological legislation. Although the Protestantism of the BCP was more easily discernable than that in the catechism, Gardiner still does not find it difficult to see transubstantiation supported in the communion liturgy. Gardiner cannot understand how

---

<sup>41</sup> Cranmer, *BCP*, Fol. C. lxvi.

Cranmer, in *Defence*, criticizes papists for believing Christ is corporeally present in every individual wafer broken and offered at the altar when, "in the booke of commen prayr (nowe at this tyme) set forthe in this realme: It is ordered to teache the people, that in eche parte of the bread consecrate, broken, is the hole body of our sauour Christ, which is agreable to the Catholique doctrine."<sup>42</sup> It is true that there is an amendment at the end of the communion service that says the bread "may be aptly deuyded in diuers pieces, and euery one shal be deuyded in two pieces at [the] least or more, by [the] descretion of the minister, and so distributed. And men must not thinke lesse to be receiued in parte, the[n] in the whole, but in eche of them [the] whole body of our sauour Iesu Christ."<sup>43</sup> It should be noted, however, that this is an aside meant for the minister and clerk overseeing the service and would not be read to the congregation during the Communion service. Nor does it refer to how the body is present: corporeally or spiritually. In addition, it should be remembered, as noted above, there is no longer the elevation at the moment of consecration, and this reference gives no indication that a change has occurred with the elements. We can conclude, then, that the *Book of Common Prayer* is not presenting the same idea of Christ's presence in all the parts, as Gardiner would argue. Yet, because Cranmer does not provide direct, explicit language about his view on the manner of Christ's presence, Gardiner uses this passage against the Archbishop.

Cranmer, however, counters this attack in *Answer*. Yes, the *Book of Common Prayer* talks about Christ being wholly present in each part of the distributed bread. It

---

<sup>42</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 21.

<sup>43</sup> Cranmer, *BCP*, Fol. C. lxxvii.

does not, however, mean what Gardiner and "the Papistes teache."<sup>44</sup> Rather, it is meant to evoke Christ's Spiritual Presence in the sacramental elements.

But as in baptisme wee receyue the holye ghoste, and put Christe vpon vs...so bee wee as trewely fedde, refreshed and comforted by Christe, receauyng a peece of the breadde at the Lordes holye table, as if we dydde eate an whole loafe...in euery parte...is whole Christe and the holye spirite, sacramentally, so bee they in euery parte of the bread broken, but not corporally and naturally, as the Papistes teache.<sup>45</sup>

Christ is present in every part because His divinity is present wholly and cannot be divided. Yet, Cranmer is clear to make it known it is Christ's divinity which is present. There is no corporeal presence being taught in this portion of the *Book of Common Prayer*. Instead, he is teaching the same Spiritual Presence theology found later in his *Defence*. Cranmer's theology is consistent from 1549 to 1550, despite Gardiner's assertions otherwise.

Gardiner continues his attack pointing out that the *Book of Common Prayer* still requires the priest to pray and consecrate the bread and wine. The priest beseeches God to offer Christ to us via the elements.

The body of Christ, is by goddes omnipotency, who so worketh in his worde, made present vnto vs at suche tyme, as the Churche prayeth, it may please him so to do, whiche prayour is ordered to be made in the booke of common prayour now set forth, Wherin we require of God, the creatures of bread and wyne to be sanctified, and to be to vs the body and bloud of Christ, whiche they can not be, onles God worketh it, & make them so to be.<sup>46</sup>

If the bread and wine were meant as mere memorial elements, then there would be no need for sanctification and no need to call upon God to enact His power in the elements.

---

<sup>44</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 71.

<sup>45</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 71.

<sup>46</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 29.

The *Book of Common Prayer* must be promoting transubstantiation because it is promoting a fundamental change to the elements. This all occurs in the same fashion of the traditional church, too, with the priest offering the elements in prayer. Therefore, despite Cranmer's best intentions of presenting a different, reformed communion, Gardiner finds the fundamental theology presented in the official English liturgy to be exactly the same as that through the centuries.

Of course Cranmer responds that this is not what is actually being presented in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Once again, Gardiner has failed to read the truth.

In the boke of the holy communion we do not praie absolutely, that the bread and wine may be made the body and bloude of Christ, but that vnto vs in that holy mystery they may be so, that is to say, that we may so woorthely receaue the same, that we may be partakers of Christes body and bloude, and that therwith in spirite and in truth we may be spiritually nourished.<sup>47</sup> Here, Cranmer is explicitly pointing out that the *Book of Common Prayer* is supporting a Spiritual Presence. We pray to God to help make us worthy in order to receive Christ's spirit. There is no call to God asking Him to turn the bread and wine into the body and blood. This once again, as with the catechism and *Order*, reiterates Cranmer's shifting emphasis from a power in the elements to an emphasis on the individual partaker being a worthy receiver. Importance is not what happens outwardly at the table with the bread and wine, but inwardly with the partaker.

As he did in his criticism of the catechism, Gardiner turns to the *Book of Common Prayer's* emphasis on adoration as a sign that the bread and wine are much more than

---

<sup>47</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 89. Cranmer reiterates this view on page 325: "in the boke of the holy communion, wee do not praye that the creatures of bread and wyne maye be the body and bloude of Christe, but that they may be to vs the body and bloude of Christe, that is to say, that we maye so eate them, and drynke them, that we may bee partakers of his bodye crucified, and of his bloude shedde for our redemption."

simple bread and wine; they must, in fact, be the corporeal body and blood. It is

Gardiner's judgment that

well setforth in the booke of co[m]mo[n] prayor, where the priest is ordred to knele, and make a prayor in his owne, and the name of all that shall communicate, confessyng therin that is prepared there, at whiche tyme neuerthesse, that is not adored that the bodelye eie seeth, but that whiche faythe knoweth to be there inuisibly prese[n]t, which and there be nothyng (as this auctor nowe teacheth) it were not well.<sup>48</sup>

To kneel and praise only bread and wine would be idolatry; surely Cranmer would not want to spread such blasphemy in the official BCP. It must be concluded that the elements are more. The elements are Christ's corporeal body and blood.

Cranmer counters Gardiner's continual argument that the *Book of Common Prayer* features transubstantiation. In no part of the liturgy does Cranmer write, and thus the priest says, that God turns the elements from bread and wine to the corporeal body and blood. Thus, Gardiner is creating all of these arguments in his own imagination. He asks Gardiner to show where Cranmer supposedly presents such a theology.

[a]s concernynge the forme of doctrine vsed in this church of Englande in the holy communion, that the bodye and blud of Christ be vnder the formes of breade and wyne, when you shall shew the place where this forme of wordes is expressed, then shal you purge yourselfe of that, which in the meane tyme I take to be a playne vntruth.<sup>49</sup>

After asking Gardiner to prove him wrong, Cranmer concludes it will never happen.

Cranmer has never written anything other than the Spiritual Presence. Nor does the *Book of Common Prayer* vary from *Defence* or any of Cranmer's Edwardian theology.

Cranmer then challenges Gardiner's love of the *Book of Common Prayer*. It does not

---

<sup>48</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 87.

<sup>49</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 57.

make sense that Gardiner is trying to use the *Book of Common Prayer* for his own traditional benefit against Cranmer. Thus, Cranmer sassily concludes this matter saying, "yet the booke of common prayer, neyther vseth any suche speach nor giueth any suche doctrine, nor I in no pointe improue that godly booke, nor varye from it. But yet glad I am to heare that the sayd book lyketh you so well, as no man can mislyke it, that hath anye godlynes in hym ioyned with knoweledge."<sup>50</sup> If Gardiner likes it so much, then perhaps Gardiner has true (Reformed) godliness in him yet.

Gardiner attempts to discredit Cranmer's 1550 *Defence* by citing Cranmer's earlier works, specifically the 1548 *Catechismus* and 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, which relied heavily on the 1548 *The Order of the Communion*. It is Gardiner's argument that these earlier works supported the traditional view of transubstantiation. Cranmer, after all, used the terms body and blood without any specification that they meant other than the corporeal reality. Yet, this chapter has shown that Gardiner's criticisms are not so clear-cut. There is traditional language in the catechism, *Order*, and *Book of Common Prayer*, but there is also Zwinglian language. In fact these earlier works are consistent with the main points Cranmer will argue in *Defence*. Cranmer qualifies the use of body and blood while simultaneously denouncing the traditional idea that the sacrament is also a sacrifice. Christ's death was the one and only sacrifice, so whatever occurs at the table is not a repeating sacrifice, which transubstantiation implies. Cranmer also puts a strong focus on the worthiness of the partaker at the table. Only someone who is faithful can actually receive the body and blood. This, therefore, counters the traditional notion that Christ is already present in the elements before people partake. Most importantly,

---

<sup>50</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 60.

Cranmer is already stressing in these earlier works the idea of spiritually eating the body and blood, and thereby already asserting his Spiritual Presence theology.

The difference between these earlier works and the 1550 *Defence* is that Cranmer's language and Zwinglian theology are not explicit. Rather, all of these above mentioned views must be read between the lines. It is for this reason Gardiner sees traditional theology. Surely Gardiner could detect Cranmer's true views but by focusing on what is outwardly stated--the traditional language--Gardiner can use these works against Cranmer. By doing so Gardiner can question Cranmer's authority to push suddenly a seemingly new theology on England. If before Cranmer had always promoted the traditional view, this apparently sudden change must prove Cranmer is creating a new theology that is not true to the faith. However, as Cranmer emphatically demonstrates in his *Answer*, his earlier works do not support Real Presence but the same truth he was advocating in England post-1550.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### "THIS IS MY BODY:" CRANMER AND GARDINER'S SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION

A theological discussion on the Eucharist must include a discussion on Scripture. It is in the Gospels that the narrative of the Last Supper is recounted, while the letters of Paul address how the church is to reenact the Eucharistic narrative. For Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner it is through Scripture that the truth of the Eucharist is found. The early sixteenth-century Humanists and Reformers stressed the importance of looking first to Scripture for church matters.<sup>1</sup> Martin Luther famously stressed *sola scriptura*. It was Scripture alone, not later church traditions, that provided the truth of God and Jesus, and the foundation of church practices. Cranmer certainly followed this reformist emphasis of *sola scriptura*. Yet, this does not mean that Scripture did not hold the same value for traditionalist Stephen Gardiner. He did not stress Scripture as the only source of truth, but it was still the most valuable evidence for church doctrine. After all, all later church tradition and theology derive from Scripture. This chapter will examine how Cranmer and Gardiner turn to Scripture to support their different Eucharistic views. We will see that often they rely on the same scriptural references yet arrive at very different

---

<sup>1</sup> For more reading on Reformation Scriptural interpretation see: Keith Elliot, "The Text of the New Testament" and Lee Gibbs, "Biblical Interpretation in Medieval England and the English Reformation," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation: Volume 2 The Medieval through the Reformation Periods*, edited by Alan Hauser and Duane Watson (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2009); G.R. Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Road to Reformation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Timothy George, *Reading Scripture with the Reformers* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2011); Gerald Hobbs, "Hebraica Veritas and Traditio Apostolica: Saint Paul and the Interpretation of the Psalms in the Sixteenth Century," in *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by David Steinmetz (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1990); Nicholas Keene "A Two-Edged Sword": Biblical Criticism and the New Testament Canon in Early Modern England," in *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, edited by Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2006); and Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Reformation of the Bible, the Bible of the Reformation* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1996).

conclusions. The most commonly referenced scriptural passages are Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, John 6 and 7, and Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. The three main areas of Cranmer's and Gardiner's Eucharistic debate from the scriptural evidence are: the Eucharistic elements as figures only or Jesus's actual body; the role of the believing partaker and whether evil men eat at the table; and the Eucharist as sacrifice and the role of the priest at the table.<sup>2</sup>

The most important difference between Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner regarding the Eucharist is whether the elements are turned into Jesus's corporeal flesh. For Cranmer the bread and wine remain in the Eucharist because they are not turned into Jesus's actual body or blood. The bread and wine become figures of Jesus's body and blood that were offered only once on the Cross. Gardiner takes the opposite view, arguing that a change does occur. Following the Church's doctrine of transubstantiation, the bread and wine are turned into Jesus's corporeal flesh and blood, despite the still outward visible forms of bread and wine. Regarding the bread becoming Jesus's body, the two points of scriptural contention are Jesus's statement "This is my body" found in Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, and Jesus's assertion "I am the bread of life" from John 6:35. Regarding the wine turning into Jesus's blood, the debated phrase is "This is my blood of the new testament" from Matthew 26: 28 and Mark 14: 24. The

---

<sup>2</sup> For more general reading on Eucharistic theology in the New Testament and early Christianity see: Bruce Chilton, *A Feast of Meanings: Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1994); Gillian Feely-Harnik, *The Lord's Table: Eucharist and Passover in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1981); Jerome Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991); Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1977); I. Howard Marshall, *Last supper and Lord's Supper* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1980); Francis Moloney, *A Body Broken for a Broken People: Eucharist in the New Testament* (Victoria, Australia: Collins Dove, 1990); and Daniel Sheerin, *The Eucharist* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1986).

phrasing about the blood and covenant is slightly different in Luke 22: 20: "Thys cup is the newe testament in my bloude, whyche is shed for you." As we shall see this slightly different phrasing that emphasizes the cup, not the blood, as the new covenant will play a major role in Cranmer's argument.

These passages raise a very important question: What does "is" mean? For Cranmer the verb can be substituted with *signifies*, while Gardiner argues it means the *actuality* of the object. For Cranmer the bread is a figure of Jesus's body, while for Gardiner the bread is the actual, corporeal flesh. These two different interpretations thus lead to very different understandings of the Eucharist.

Cranmer first presents his figurative reading of the Scripture in *Defence*. He assures his reader that he need not be wary of a figurative understanding because the entire Bible is full of similitudes. Thus, understanding the sacrament as a figure for Jesus's corporeal body and blood that sit in heaven only, is not out of the ordinary. Cranmer uses two examples to illustrate the use of similitudes throughout the Bible. First, he cites how God spoke of being carried in the Ark. Cranmer, however, explains we cannot read this as God literally being carried because God cannot be confined or carried by earthly men or vessels.<sup>3</sup> Cranmer also quotes from Matthew 3 as Jesus saying

---

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *A Defence of the True and Catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ, with a confutation of sundry errors concernyng the same, grounded and stablished vpon Goddes holy woorde, & approued by [the] consent of the moste auncient doctors of the Churche. Made by the moste Reuerende father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1550), 71, EEBO STC 6001 Reel 33:10, British Library. In the margins Cranmer marks this paraphrase as coming from 1 Kings 7. In this chapter, Solomon is building the Temple and the chapter concludes with the Ark being placed at the Temple's High Altar. Solomon prays to God that God, via the Ark, will dwell in this new house Solomon has built for God. Although Solomon is speaking of God as being in the Ark and now "living" in the new Temple, Cranmer insists this is all meant figuratively. Solomon and his fellow Jews did not understand that God was only in that one place. The Ark and Temple are representations of God's presence among His chosen people, from their time of Exodus to the now reached promised land.

"My father is an husband ma[n], and he hath his fan in his hand, and will make clean his flower, and gather the wheate into his barne."<sup>4</sup> Of course this cannot be taken in a literal understanding because God is not an actual husbandman with human hands for work. If believers have no problem interpreting these and other passages figuratively, then there should not be an issue with understanding the sacrament as a similitude for Jesus's death, resurrection, and offering of everlasting life.

Not only is the entire Bible full of figurative speeches, but also many of these speeches are from Jesus himself. Thus, when we read his words "This is my body" at the Last Supper, we are already attuned to his often-figurative style and therefore should read his instructions with a symbolic understanding. As Cranmer asserts, "with an infinite nombre of sentences, Christe spake in Parables, Metaphores, tropes and fygures. But chiefly when he spake of the sacramentes, he vsed fyguratiue speches."<sup>5</sup> Cranmer supports this argument with passages from Acts, Matthew, John, Romans, and Galatians as examples of numerous baptism figurative speeches. If everyone acknowledges that Jesus's speeches on baptism are to be read figuratively, then Jesus's speeches on the Eucharist must also be understood in the same manner. It does not make sense to read only certain sacramental passages figuratively and others not.

After assuring his reader that figurative interpretation is acceptable for the Last Supper, Cranmer speaks on the exact passages that he believes indicate a figurative and not literal understanding of the corporeal presence in the bread and wine. Cranmer begins by discussing the paschal lamb of the Old Testament. The paschal lamb signifies the future promise that Jesus will fulfill. The Hebrew practice of spilling the lamb's

---

<sup>4</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 72.

<sup>5</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 72.

blood prefigures Jesus's blood offered at the Cross. The lamb's blood symbolically connects to Jesus not at the Last Supper but at the Cross. The wine used at the Last Supper held no significance except in offering the same future promise as that of the lamb's blood. It was not until Jesus spilled blood at his death that the promise was fulfilled. The Eucharist, as practiced after Jesus's death, does not contain Jesus's real blood, just as it was not present at the Last Supper. In the Eucharist the wine now signifies the promise was indeed fulfilled. The paschal lamb, the Last Supper, and the Eucharist are all symbols of what happened at the Cross.

Jesus himself further stresses this symbolic nature at the Last Supper when he instructs his Apostles to practice the Last Supper in *remembrance* of what will occur at the Cross. Thus the Eucharist, as this remembrance, cannot hold the actual blood and gift of Salvation, but instead the acknowledgement of how Jesus's death gave us everlasting life. As Cranmer explains,

whensoever we do eate the bread in his holy supper, and drynke of that cuppe, we should remember howe muche Christ hath done for vs, and howe he dyed for our sakes...And as forasmuche as this holye bread broken, and the wine deuided, do represent vnto vs the death of Christe nowe passed, as the kylling of the Paschall lambe did represent the same yet to come: therefore our sauour Christe vsed the same maner of speache of the bread and wine as God before vsed of the Paschall lambe.<sup>6</sup>

Cranmer also turns to Luke 22: 20 to show that Jesus could not mean his actual blood replaces the wine. In this verse Jesus offers the cup to the disciples and says, "This cuppe is a new testament in my bloude."<sup>7</sup> This is an important verse in Cranmer's

---

<sup>6</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 73.

<sup>7</sup> Luke 22: 20 as quoted in Cranmer, *Defence*, 74.

argument because Jesus is not calling the wine blood; hence, transubstantiation cannot here be supported. This verse holds two figures:

One in this worde Cup, whych is not taken for the cuppe it selfe, but for the thing conteyned in the cup. An other is in this worde, Testament, for neither the cuppe, nor the wyne contayned in the cuppe, is Christes testament, but is a token, signe and figure, whereby is represented vnto vs his testamente, confirmed by his bloude.<sup>8</sup>

If Jesus meant to turn the wine into his own blood, he would not have spoken of offering the cup. Nor does Jesus say that the cup (or its contents) becomes the blood, but that the cup is the new *testament*. This testament is the gift of Salvation now fulfilled because of Jesus's death on the Cross. There is no mention of transubstantiation, or anything near it, in this passage. However, this phrasing occurs only in Luke. In Matthew and Mark the corresponding verses read "this is my bloude of the newe Testame[n]t."<sup>9</sup> These two versions are not as clearly against transubstantiation as is Luke's version. Matthew and Mark could easily be read as preaching transubstantiation because Jesus is directly connecting the contents of the cup with his blood. Yet, Cranmer does not address this crucial difference, leaving a hole in his argument against scriptural support for transubstantiation.

To further stress that Jesus spoke figuratively, Cranmer discusses John 6:35-63 in which Jesus calls the bread His body and explains what He means by such speech. In this Scripture, Jesus declares "I am that breed of lyfe...If eny ma[n] eate of thys bread: he shall lyue for euer. And the breed that I will geue, is my fleshe, whych I wyll geue for the

---

<sup>8</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 74.

<sup>9</sup> Matthew 26: 28 and Mark 14: 24.

lyfe of the worlde."<sup>10</sup> After Jesus spoke these words the Jews and disciples question how a man can give his very flesh to eat "because they knewe none other eatinge of his fleshe, but by chawing and swalowyng."<sup>11</sup> In response Jesus replies that his body is from heaven, not earth. Those who believe in Jesus eat the spiritual, not human, flesh for "it is the spirite that giueth lyfe, the flesh auayleth nothing."<sup>12</sup> After quoting this section, Cranmer provides his analysis of what Jesus actually meant in calling Himself bread. Jesus wanted his disciples not to dwell on earthly things, such as bread, as the maintainers of life. Rather, it is God, through Jesus and the Holy Spirit, who offers eternal life. Jesus uses the analogy of being the heavenly bread to explain how God offers everlasting life for those who believe, just as daily bread sustains our lives here on earth. Jesus is speaking figuratively in order to teach; he is not actually insisting his flesh is in the bread offered at the table. As Cranmer explains, these words are "not to be vnderstand, that we shall eate Christ with our teethe grossely and carnally, but that we shall spiritually & gostly with our fayth eate him, beyng carnally absent from vs in heauen."<sup>13</sup>

Cranmer further argues that the order of Jesus's words at the Last Supper supports a figurative interpretation.<sup>14</sup> Jesus' instructions for his disciples to take and eat the bread and take and drink the wine occur before Jesus tells them the bread and wine are his body and blood. In Cranmer's understanding, the disciples are told to eat and drink the bread

---

<sup>10</sup> John 6: 48 and 51.

<sup>11</sup> John 6: 61 as quoted in Cranmer, *Defence*, 60.

<sup>12</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 60.

<sup>13</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 61.

<sup>14</sup> Matthew 26: 26-27 and Mark 14: 22-23.

and wine before the elements are consecrated. Thus, the disciples never ate or drank anything other than bread or wine. He explains:

Christ tooke breadde, and brake it, and gaue it to his disciples, and sayd: Take, eate. All this was doone and spoken before the words of consecration. Wherefore they must nedes be vnderstand of the very bread, that Christ toke bread, brake bread, gaue bread to his disciples, commandyng them to take bread, and eate bread. But the same is more playne and eident of the wyne, that it remayneth, and is dronken at the Lordes supper.<sup>15</sup>

If a change had occurred, and had been necessary in the Eucharist, then Jesus would have consecrated the elements before their distribution. So too would Jesus have told them to take and eat his body, yet the Scripture is clear that Jesus told them to take and eat bread.

In the *Defence*, Cranmer concludes his discussion that Scripture explicitly denies a corporeal presence in the bread and wine by citing numerous other scriptural passages. John 16:10, Mark 16:19, Colossians 3:1, Hebrews 8:1 and 10:12-13 all clearly state Jesus is in heaven, not here on Earth.<sup>16</sup> There is no way he can carnally sit in heaven and simultaneously be corporeally in the Eucharist; only his divinity, not his humanity, is ubiquitous.

In *Explication*, Gardiner immediately responds to Cranmer's assertion that the Scripture supports a figurative Eucharistic theology. On page two, Gardiner criticizes Cranmer, charging "there is no scripture that in lettre mainteineth the doctrin of this

---

<sup>15</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 19.

<sup>16</sup> John 16: 10: Jesus tells his disciples, "After a whyle ye shall not se me, & agayne after a whyle ye shal se me: for I go to the father." Mark 16: 19: "So then, when [the] Lord had spoken vnto them he was receaued into heauen, and is on the ryght hande of God." Colossians 3: 1: "if ye be the[n] rysen agayne with Christ seke those thynges whych are aboue, where Christe sytteth on the ryghte hande of God." Hebrews 8: 1: "we haue soche an hye prest as sytteth on the right ha[n]de of the seate of maiestye in heaue[n]." Hebrews 10: 12-13: "But thys man after he hath offered one sacrifice for synnes, is set downe for euer on [the] ryght hande of God, & fro[m] hence forth taryeth tyll hys foes be made hys fote stole."

auctorsboke."<sup>17</sup> If Jesus had meant the bread to be taken as a figure of his body, then he would have explicitly stated so. Nor does Paul interpret and present a figurative understanding of Jesus's words at the Last Supper. "For Christ saith not that the bread doth only signify his bodie absent, nor saint Paul sayth not so in any place, ne any other canonical Scripture declareth Christes wordes so."<sup>18</sup> Gardiner continues this train of thought a few pages further stating, "[t]here is no scripture sayth, Christ did not geue his bodie, but the figure of his bodie, nor the geuyng of Christes bodie in his supper, verely and really so vndersta[n]ded, doth not necessariely impugne and contrarie any other speache or doying of Christ, expressed in scripture."<sup>19</sup> There is no reason why Cranmer, or other Reformers, should read anything more into Jesus's words than what he clearly puts forth.

Gardiner quotes the Last Supper passages from Matthew, Mark, and Luke alongside Paul's first letter to the Corinthians 10:16-17 and 11:23-30.<sup>20</sup> For Gardiner, the

---

<sup>17</sup> Stephen Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutation of a booke written agaynst the same. Made by Steuen Byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth* (Rouen: R. Caly, 1551), 2, EEBO STC 11592 Reel 343:11, Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>18</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 2.

<sup>19</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 3-4.

<sup>20</sup> 1 Corinthians 10: 16-17: "Is not the cup of blessynge whych we blesse, partakyng of [the] bloude of Christ? is not the bread which we breake, partakyng of the body of Christ? because [that] we (though we be many) yet are one bread & one bodye, in as much as we all are partakers of one bread." 1 Corinthians 11: 23-30: "That whych I delyuered vnto you, I receaued of the Lorde. For the Lorde Iesus the same nyght, in whych he was betrayed, toke breed: and whan he had geue[n] thanks, he brake it and sayde: Take ye, and eate: thys es my body, whiche is broken for you. This do ye in the remembraunce of me. After the same maner also he toke the cup, whe[n] supper was done, saying: Tys cuppe is the newe testament in my bloude. Thys do as oft as ye drincke it, in remembraunce of me. For as often as ye shall eate this breed, and drincke this cup: ye shal shewe the Lordes death tyll he come. Wherefore, whosoouer, shal eat of this bread, and drincke of the cup of the Lorde vnworthelye, shalbe gyltye of the body and bloude of

three synoptic passages and the two passages from Paul explicitly state that Jesus offered not bread but his actual body; not wine but his actual blood. Jesus called what he offered body and blood; there is no other meaning than the simple truth that the bread and wine are the body and blood. From the very beginning of the Church, this truth has been upheld and taught.

The Catholique church acknowlegyng Christ to be verie God and verie man, hath fro[m] the beginnyng of these textes of scripture co[n]fessed truely Christes intent, and effectual myraculous woorke, to make the bread his body, and the wyne his bloude, to be verely meate, & verely drinke, vsing therin his humanitie wherwith to fead vs, as he vsed the same, wherwith to redeame vs, & as he doth sanctify vs by his holy spirite, so to sanctify vs by his holy diuine fleshe and bloude...So he, that hauyng Christes spirite, receaueth also the Sacrament of Christes bodie and blood; doth really receaue in the same, and also effectually Christes bodie and blood.<sup>21</sup>

Jesus said the bread was his body; Jesus has the power to make it so. Thus, it is undoubtedly Jesus' corporeal flesh in the Eucharist.

Gardiner also directly challenges Cranmer's interpretation of John 6:35-63. In this passage Jesus says he is "the bread of life" before he proceeds to offer the bread to his disciples and calls it the body. Jesus has been sent from God as the bread offering everlasting life. Cranmer is correct in asserting this passage speaks of something heavenly: the focus is not on common bread but on Jesus as the spiritual bread. Yet, Gardiner maintains that, because Jesus declares himself "the bread of life," the bread he later offers at the Last Supper must be his actual flesh. The Eucharistic bread and wine become the promised body and blood that will bring salvation. Jesus declares his

---

the Lorde. But let a man exame[n] hym self, and so let hime eate of the breed, and dryncke of [the] cup. For he that eateth or drincketh vnworthely, eateth and dryncketh his owne damnacyon, because he maketh no differe[n]ce of [the] Lordes body. For this cause many are weake and syck amo[n]ge you, and many slepe."

<sup>21</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 10-12.

promise in naming himself the bread; the Eucharist is proof the promise was indeed fulfilled on the Cross. Jesus "for fulfillyng of his promise sayd: Take, eate, This is my bodie, which wordes haue been taught, & beleued to be of effecte and operatorie, and Christe vnder the forme of bread to haue been, his verie bodie."<sup>22</sup> For Gardiner there is no need to provide any more discussion on how Scripture disputes a figurative Eucharistic theology instead of the proper corporeal presence doctrine. The Scripture is simple and clear and needs no further elucidation.

Gardiner also challenges Cranmer's discussion of Jesus's word order during the Last Supper as proof of a figurative understanding. For Gardiner, Cranmer puts too much emphasis on this word order when it makes no difference to the actual understanding of the Eucharist. We are only told what Jesus said, but do not know exactly when the disciples ate, before or after. Therefore it is ludicrous to try to determine the exact events of that night; it would not change the fact that Jesus gave his body and blood.

Theuangeliste reherseth what Christ said, and did simplye and truely, in whiche story we must so place in vnderstandyng, as we tryfle not the mysterie, as staying and stoppyng of lettres and syllables. And therefore though the worde (take, eate) goo before the wordes (This is my bodye) we may not argue that they tooke it and eate it afore Christ had tolde them what he gaue them.<sup>23</sup>

As he criticizes Cranmer for making assumptions about the actual events at the Last Supper, Gardiner also interjects his own opinion of what likely happened. Certainly the disciples would have waited to hear the significance of the bread and wine offered to them; they therefore would not have eaten until after consecration and the change from bread and wine to body and blood. As he writes, Cranmer "fansieith that the Apostels

---

<sup>22</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 13.

<sup>23</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 96-97.

should be so hasty to drinke ere Christ had tolde them what he gaue, whiche & they had, I thinke he woulde haue stayed the cuppe with his hande, or byd them tary, whiles he had tolde them more."<sup>24</sup>

In his *Answer*, Cranmer is astonished that Gardiner challenges him and the figurative understanding. The Scripture is simple and clear, yes, but not in supporting Gardiner. Rather, it is clear that bread and wine remained after Jesus consecrated the elements at the Last Supper; thus, clearly the Eucharist offers bread and wine, not Christ's corporeal flesh and blood. As he writes,

where you [Gardiner] say that you haue probable matter for you, and I haue none for me, it is cleane contrarie. For you haue vtterly nothinge for you but all the whole world against you, if you saye that the substaunce of co[m]mon bread is not broken at all. And I haue for me the very playn wordes of Christe, of the Appostell, and the Euangelistes.<sup>25</sup>

Cranmer, as in the earlier *Defence*, stresses that Jesus often talks in parables or analogies. Sometimes these parables are explained in the Scripture, but mostly remain unexplained so that the faithful hearer can discern the truth for him or herself. "For Christe speaking so many things in parables, similies, allegories, metaphors and other tropes & figures, although somtyme Christe himselfe & somtyme the eua[n]gelistes open the meaning, yet for the moste parte, the meaning is lefte to the iudgement of the hearers, with out any declaration."<sup>26</sup> Thus, there is no reason why Jesus, the gospel writers, or

---

<sup>24</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicato[n]*, 97.

<sup>25</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1551), 394, EEBO STC 5991 Reel 211:05, Henry E. Huntington Library.

Paul needed to state explicitly that the bread and wine were figures of the body and blood. The believer would understand without explanation.

Gardiner has been so blinded by "Popishe errors, frowardnes and selfloue"<sup>27</sup> that he is now unable to read what is clear. Luke 22: 19 and 1 Corinthians 11: 24-25 clearly state "Do this in remembrance of me" when we are to take the bread and wine. We are meant to remember that Jesus gave his corporeal body and blood at the Cross; we are not meant to think we have it in the elements at the Eucharistic table. As Cranmer explains, "it is the lordes death, that shalbe signified, represented and preached in these holly misteries, vntil his comming again."<sup>28</sup>

Not only has Gardiner been blind in reading the above passages, but so too has he missed the truth in John 6. Cranmer remarks that Gardiner's "vnderstanding of the vi. chapter of Iohn is suche, as neuer was vttered of any man before youre tyme, and as declareth you to be vtterly ignorant of gods misteries."<sup>29</sup> In John when Jesus declares himself as the bread of life, it is not part of a Last Supper narrative and therefore cannot be used as evidence for a corporeal presence in the Eucharist. Rather, John, which does not include a direct Last Supper narrative, must be read with the other three gospels and Paul's letters as part of the larger context of the narrative. For Cranmer, reading John 6 in this larger context makes it clear that Jesus is speaking of a spiritual bread and body; there is no corporeal understanding. This is demonstrated by the fact all four Gospel writers continue to speak of bread and wine "both before and after the eatyng and

---

<sup>26</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 36.

<sup>27</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 11.

<sup>28</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 11.

<sup>29</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 22.

drinkinge."<sup>30</sup> They are asserting there is still bread and wine; the bread and wine were never changed into the corporeal body and blood.

The next scriptural point of contention concerns the role of the partaker during the Eucharist and the question of whether evil men eat Jesus's body and blood in the Sacrament. According to Cranmer it is the belief of the receiver that allows him or her to commune with God at the table. Emphasis is placed on the person's faith rather than a power in the elements. It is through faith that the believer eats Christ's spiritual body and blood. Thus, evil men cannot be a part of the Eucharist. Evil men eat only bread and wine, but never receive the spiritual body and blood.

Gardiner does not deny that the receiver must have faith in order to receive the promise of salvation in the sacrament, but the partaker's belief is not the only thing that unites the partaker to the spiritual food. Instead, because the bread and wine are already the body and blood, Jesus in his humanity and divinity is already fully present. Here more emphasis is placed on God's power in the elements rather than only in the faith of the partaker. This, therefore, leads Gardiner to conclude that evil men do eat Jesus's corporeal and spiritual body and blood. However, because they do not believe in God's glory, eating the body and blood offers only damnation, not salvation.

In *Defence*, Cranmer begins this discussion focusing on Paul's first letter to the Corinthians 10: 1-4. In this passage Paul assures the Corinthians that the ancestors before Jesus's birth "dyd all eate of one spirituall meate and dyd all dryncke of one maner of spirituall dryncke"<sup>31</sup> because they were faithful to God. When we are at the table, with proper faith, we partake in the same spiritual food of the pre-Jesus believers. The

---

<sup>30</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 37.

<sup>31</sup> 1 Corinthians 10: 1-4.

emphasis, therefore, is on the believer's faith and not the need for Jesus's corporeal flesh and blood to be in the Sacrament. The Eucharist is about a spiritual presence only.

Because the Eucharist has only a spiritual, not corporeal, presence, evil men do not eat anything except the common bread and wine. Nonbelievers do not have the faith to connect them to the spiritual food. For emphasis, Cranmer turns to John 6: 47-51, 53-58. Here Jesus declares he is the bread of life that comes from heaven to offer everlasting life. Only those who are faithful will eat this heavenly bread and live forever. Jesus compares himself to the manna offered in the Old Testament to the Hebrews during their exodus. Yes, the manna gave life here on earth but only on earth, for all those who ate it still died. Jesus as the bread from heaven, however, offers everlasting life. For Cranmer this illustrates that the emphasis is on believing Jesus was sent from heaven to offer salvation. Using the manna example, Cranmer insists common bread, even that at the sacramental table, cannot sustain life. It is only through belief that one can actually connect with Christ's life-giving body.

If only believers are able to eat Christ's spiritual food, it then follows that evil men are unable to participate wholly in the truth of the Eucharist. All that evil men receive is the common bread that offers no eternal life. "[I]t foloweth necessariye, that vngodly persones (beyng lymmes of the deuil) do not eate Christes fleshe nor drynke his bloud, except the Papistes would say, that such haue euerlastyng life."<sup>32</sup> As Cranmer explains, "the eating of his bloude was not lyke to the eatinge of Ma[n]na. For bothe good and badde dyd eate Manna, but none doo eate his fleshe and drynke his bloudde, but they haue euerlastinge lyfe."<sup>33</sup> Cranmer continues stressing that it is very clear what

---

<sup>32</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 91.

Christ intended in his words and nobody should find another interpretation. He ends his explanation asking, "What nede we any other witnes? whan Christ him selfe doth testifie the matter so plainly, that who so euer eateth his fleshe and drinketh hys bloude, hath euerlastyng lyfe? and that to eate his fleshe and to drinke his bloud, is to beleue in him?"<sup>34</sup>

In *Explication*, Gardiner does not provide a lengthy response on evil men partaking. For Gardiner, Paul provides a clear understanding that evil men do eat; therefore there is little to explain after analyzing Paul's clear words. Paul explicitly says those who believe receive Jesus's promise of salvation but those who do not believe suffer damnation. If Jesus's body and blood were not present in the elements, then the unworthy would not be subject to this judgment. In 1 Corinthians 11: 27-32, Paul says, "In him that receyuethe vnworthely remayneth the iudgement, and condempnation."<sup>35</sup> For Gardiner this explicitly demonstrates that everyone, good or evil, fully participates in taking Jesus's body and blood; it just has a different effect, depending on the individual partaker. "And yet Saint Pauls wordes playnelye importe that those did eate the verye bodye of Christe, whiche did eate vnworthely, and therefore were gyltie of the body and bloud of Christ."<sup>36</sup> The unworthy could not be "gyltie" of Jesus's body and blood unless they do indeed eat it at the table. If they do eat, it would follow that the body and blood must be in the bread and wine.

---

<sup>33</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 91.

<sup>34</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 91.

<sup>35</sup> As quoted in Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 81.

<sup>36</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 81.

Because Gardiner did not provide a lengthy response in *Explication*, Cranmer does not provide a lengthy rebuttal in *Answer*. Cranmer quickly quotes John 6: 56 "He that eateth my fleshe and drinketh my bloude, dwelleth in me, and I in hym."<sup>37</sup> For Cranmer this cannot mean evil men eat Jesus's actual body and blood because Jesus, in his perfect divinity, could never dwell in "yll menne."<sup>38</sup> Thus, evil men eat only the common bread but not the spiritual food, as Gardiner contends.

Cranmer also turns to 1 Corinthians 11 to refute directly Gardiner's use of Paul for support. "But you [Gardiner] alleadge for you Saynte Paule, who speaketh for you nothyng at all...I knowe that Saynct Paule in the eleuenth to the Corinthyans, speaketh expressely of the vnwoorthye eatyng of the breade, but in no place of the vnwoorthy eatyng of the bodye of Christe."<sup>39</sup> Cranmer later reiterates this same point, writing, "in that place he spake of the eating of the bread and drinkyng of the cuppe, and not of the corporal eatyng and drinkyng of Christes fleshe and bloudde."<sup>40</sup> At this point it becomes imperative for Cranmer to point out the exact terminology in use. Paul uses *bread* and *wine* when discussing a person's worthiness, not *body* and *blood*. Gardiner, he asserts, is misreading and misinterpreting Paul. This distinction makes it clear Gardiner's brief argument is groundless. Once it is evident Paul is speaking "of the materiall bread in the sacrament, whiche is all one, whether the good or euyll eate of it"<sup>41</sup> Cranmer goes on to state that this proves the discussion of worthiness is all about the individual partaker.

---

<sup>37</sup> As quoted in Cranmer, *An Answer*, 5.

<sup>38</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 5.

<sup>39</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 77.

<sup>40</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 260.

<sup>41</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 260.

There is no power in the material bread, which everyone receives; rather, the power is in those who believe in Jesus's divinity.

[A]ll the care is on our syde, to take heede that we eate not that breade vnworthely. For as the eatyng of the bread vnwoorthily, not of Christe him self (who can not be eaten vnworthily) hath theeffect of iudgement and damnation, so eatyng of the same bread worthely, hath theeffecte of Christs death and saluation.<sup>42</sup>

The third area of disagreement between Cranmer and Gardiner regards the Eucharist as a sacrifice.<sup>43</sup> According to Cranmer, Jesus's death on the cross was the last necessary sacrifice and the Eucharist is only a remembrance of it. Priests, therefore, do not offer oblation with each new Eucharist. Jesus alone offers us salvation through his final sacrifice. Gardiner agrees that Jesus offered the last necessary, perfect sacrifice. However, Jesus also instituted the Eucharist, giving the very body and blood that was sacrificed; hence, we may participate in the same sacrifice. Priests are not offering a new sacrifice, but Jesus's very sacrifice. Gardiner also makes sure to point out that priests themselves are not creating the sacrifice and its saving properties. They are instead agents for Jesus whose power connects the Eucharist to Jesus' propitiatory sacrifice at the cross.

In trying to show the Eucharist is not a sacrifice and that priests have no power to grant remission of sins through the sacrament, in *Defence* Cranmer turns to Paul for the scriptural evidence. Cranmer argues the papists use Paul's letter to the Hebrews 5: 1 as their evidence that priests do offer propitiatory sacrifices during the Eucharist. The verse

---

<sup>42</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 260.

<sup>43</sup> For more on early Christian interpretations of the Eucharist as sacrifice see: R.P.C. Hanson, *Eucharistic Offering in the Early Church* (Bramcote, United Kingdom: Grove Books, 1979) and Kenneth Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering* (New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1986).

reads: "euery hygh priest is ordayned to offre gyftes and sacrffices for sinnes."<sup>44</sup> Paul does not, however, mean priests who have come after Jesus's sacrifice on the cross. Cranmer argues that Paul is referencing the numerous Old Testament priests who were following the old law, not yet replaced by Jesus's sacrifice. Cranmer then goes on to argue that, even though these early priests did offer sacrifices, they themselves were not the ones who were offering the gift of redemption. If they held such power, it would have been unnecessary for them to offer repeated sacrifices. As Cranmer quotes from Hebrews 10: 18 "where remysson of synnes is, there is no more offryng for synne."<sup>45</sup> Thus, the old priests Paul references, "were not such priests that by their offrynges and sacrffices they could take away the peoples synnes, but they were shadowes and figures of Christe, oure euerlastynge prieste, whyche onely by one oblation of hymselfe taketh away the synnes of the worlde."<sup>46</sup> Jesus is the only priest who can offer the single propitiatory sacrifice and Cranmer asserts that the papists are wrong if they discern Paul's words otherwise. As Paul stresses in Hebrews 10: 14 "Christ with ones offeryng, hath made perfect for euer, theym that bee sanctifyed: puttyng theyr synnes cleane out of Gods remembraunce."<sup>47</sup> Cranmer sums up the papists' false interpretation thusly: "the Popyshe priestes, that apply this text vnto them selues, do directly contrary to the meanyng of saint Paul, to the great iniury and preiudice of Christe, by whom only saint Paule saithe, that

---

<sup>44</sup> Hebrews 5: 1 as quoted in Cranmer, *Defence*, 112.

<sup>45</sup> Hebrews 10: 18 as quoted in Cranmer, *Defence*, 105.

<sup>46</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 112.

<sup>47</sup> Hebrews 10: 14 as quoted in Cranmer, *Defence*, 105.

the sacrifice and oblation for the syn of the whole world was acco[m]plished & fulfilled."<sup>48</sup>

Cranmer also argues that the papists turn to the Old Testament prophet Malachi for support of the Mass and the power of the priests. In Malachi 1: 11, God through Malachi's mouth, says "euery where shoulde be offered vnto God a pure sacrifice and oblation."<sup>49</sup> The papists use this as evidence that the Eucharist is indeed a sacrifice performed by the priests and should be offered as much as possible. Cranmer, though, is quick to note that Malachi nowhere speaks of the Eucharist or priestly oblation. Rather, the prophet "spake of the oblation of all faythfull people (in what place so euer they bee) whyche offre vnto God, with pure hartes, and myndes, sacrifices of laude and prayse."<sup>50</sup> Malachi speaks only of the faith of each believer, not of the Eucharist. Through our faith and thanks for God's promises we are constantly offering ourselves to God. Once again, the papists have failed to read and interpret Scripture properly regarding the Eucharist.

In his *Explication*, Gardiner argues that the priests do offer a sacrifice in every Eucharist, but not in the manner Cranmer explains it of the papists. Jesus does offer the only necessary sacrifice on the cross. This one-time event grants the remission of sins and everlasting life. Yet, Jesus did ordain his disciples, and thereby the priests who followed, with a duty to offer sacrifices at the altar in the future. This sacrifice, however, is not the same as the one Jesus offered on the cross. Rather, priests are offering the remembrance of the one sacrifice. Anytime a believer turns to God with "good thoughtes & good meditacions" a sacrifice occurs. The sacrament of the Eucharist directs us to

---

<sup>48</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 112.

<sup>49</sup> Malachi 1: 11 as quoted in Cranmer, *Defence*, 112.

<sup>50</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 112.

think good thoughts and meditations on God, making it a sacrifice. In so offering ourselves, God's favor towards us increases, which is the point of any sacrifice. Gardiner turns to Paul from Hebrews 13: 15, "By hym therefore do we offre sacrifice of laude alwayes to God: [that] is to saye, the frute of those lypes, whych co[n]fesse his name." Here Paul reminds the Hebrews that our thanks for God's gifts and mercy, which is taught in the Eucharist, is itself a sacrifice.

For Gardiner it follows that, if the Eucharist is truly a sacrifice, then the priest who administers the Eucharist in fact offers a propitiatory sacrifice. As he writes,

it foloweth because the Prieste in the daylye Sacrifice doth as Christ hath ordered to be done for shewynge forthe and remembraunce of Christes death, that acte of the Priest done accordynge to goddes commaundement must nedes be propitiatorye and prouoke goddes fauour, and ought to be trusted one, to haue a propitiatorye effecte with God to the membres of Christes bodye.<sup>51</sup>

This does not mean Gardiner is asserting that it is the priest who has the power to extend salvation, though. Rather, the priest acts as the visible servant for the everlasting, invisible priest, Jesus, who offers redemption. It is through the visible, earthly priest that the believers receive Jesus's body at the table, but it is Jesus's power and everlasting sacrifice that bring the body to the sacrament to be so given.<sup>52</sup> Gardiner cites 1 Timothy 4 and Titus 1: 7 for examples of how Paul instructed Timothy and Titus to be good servants of Christ. Although Gardiner does not provide direct quotes, the language in these sections points to priests as Christ's servants,<sup>53</sup> which supports Gardiner's

---

<sup>51</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 150.

<sup>52</sup> In the margins Gardiner cites Hebrews 7 for this discussion of Christ's perpetual priesthood.

<sup>53</sup> 1 Timothy 4: 6: "thou shalte be a good mynster of Iesu Chryste" and Titus 1: 7: "For a byshope muste be blamesse, as the stewarde of God."

contention that the priests have power, but only the power granted from their Master, Jesus.

In his *Answer* response, Cranmer asserts Gardiner does not properly understand what the New Testament authors meant by propitiatory sacrifices. Cranmer argues there are two sorts of sacrifices: "sacrifice propitiatorye" and "sacrifice gratificatory."<sup>54</sup> Jesus's death is the only propitiatory sacrifice.<sup>55</sup> What occurs at the table, and what Paul's letter to the Hebrews and Malachi's prophecy speak to, can be considered a sacrifice gratificatory. This latter sacrifice "dothe not reconcyte vs to god, but is made of them that be reconciled to testify their duties, and to shewe them selues thankfull vnto him. And these sacrifices in Scripture be not called propiciatory, but sacrifices of Iustice, of laude, praise and thankes giuing."<sup>56</sup> Gardiner has mixed up these two distinctions and presents the Eucharist, wrongly as a propitiatory sacrifice when it is clearly gratificatory. Cranmer then claims Gardiner has so confounded the Scriptures' meaning "to defende

---

<sup>54</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 437.

<sup>55</sup> In the margins, Cranmer cites Romans 3 and John 3 as the evidence that Jesus is the sole propitiatory sacrifice we need. He is most likely referencing Romans 3: 21-26: "But now is the ryghteousnes of God declared wythout the lawe for asmuch as it is alowed by the testimonie of the lawe and of the Prophetes. The ryghteousnes of God commeth by the fayth of Iesus Christ, vnto all and vpon all them that beleue. Ther is no difference for al haue synned, and are destytute of the glorye of God: but are iustified frely by his grace, through the redempcion that is in Christe Iesu, whome God hath set forth to be [the] obtayner of mercy thorowe fayth, by [the] meanes of his blood, to declare his ryghteousnes, in that he forgeueth the synnes that are passed, whych God dyd suffre, to shewe at thys tyme hys ryghteousness, [that] he might be counted iust, & the iustifyer of him which beleueth in Iesus." And John 3: 16-18: "For God so loued [the] worlde, that he gaue is only begotte[n] sonne, that whosoouer beleueth in him, shuld not peryshe, but haue euerlasting lyf. For God sent not his so[n]ne into the worlde through hym myght be saued. He [that] beleueth on hym, is not conde[m]pned But he that beleueth not, is conde[m]pned all ready, because he hath not beleued i[n] [the] name of [the] onely begotte[n] sonne of God."

<sup>56</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 437-438.

your propiciatory sacrifice of the prestes in their masses, wherby they may remitte synne, and redeeme soules out of Purgatory."<sup>57</sup>

In analyzing the Scriptural references on the Last Supper, Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner are limited to a handful of passages. Thus, they are often referring to the same passages throughout their debate. Yet, they arrive at very different conclusions regarding the Eucharist. Cranmer argues that Scripture clearly points to a figurative Eucharistic theology. Jesus used bread and wine to serve as signs for his body and blood sacrificed once on the cross. Gardiner, however, argues Jesus turned the bread and wine into his very body and blood when he said, "this is my body" and "this is my blood." With this different starting point, the two English theologians arrive at different conclusions on other Eucharistic issues as well. They disagree on whether it can be said evil men eat Christ's body; whether the daily Eucharist is a sacrifice; and whether the priest holds any special power at the table. Scripture is the starting point for any theological discussion and for each of these authors the Scripture clearly supports his own side while disproving his opponent's. As this chapter has shown, Cranmer and Gardiner therefore diverge from the outset at the very heart of this Eucharistic debate.

---

<sup>57</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 438.

## **CHAPTER FIVE ANCIENT AUTHORITIES: USES OF EARLY CHURCH FATHERS IN THE DEBATE**

While Scripture was both Cranmer's and Gardiner's primary source for understanding all church practices, especially the Eucharist, the early Church Fathers could also prove helpful. Connecting with the Church Fathers meant Cranmer and Gardiner could demonstrate that their current views were a continuation of the earliest church thought on the topic of Eucharistic theology, which was a substantive argument as England moved toward strong Protestant practices. Therefore it was imperative for each bishop to include as many of these early theologians in his position as possible, to boost his own argument while discrediting his opponent's. In developing their personal views as they read the early theologians, both Cranmer and Gardiner were exposed to the larger continental humanistic environment and the devotion to the early Church that humanist education reflected. Many of the great humanist thinkers, including Erasmus, visited England and brought with them the importance of reading original sources.<sup>1</sup> As humanism spread to England, many scholars embraced the humanist approach, promoting classical scholarship and emphasizing early church thinkers. Not only did these humanist thinkers continue the classical scholarship tradition, but they also began translating many of the older Greek authors into Latin and English, which would prove useful for Cranmer's and Gardiner's writings. Turning back to original sources also reinvigorated interest in many of the early theologians Cranmer and Gardiner would use in their 1551 written debate. William Haaugaard found that by 1536 ten English editions of early

---

<sup>1</sup> William Haaugaard, "Renaissance Patristic Scholarship and Theology in Sixteenth-Century England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 10 (1979): 40, accessed August 29, 2013, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539542>.

fathers, including Augustine, Jerome, and John Chrysostom were already circulating.<sup>2</sup>

All three of these authors, we shall see, were substantial contributors in Cranmer and Gardiner's debate. The humanist stress on original sources forced Cranmer, especially, to look backwards at the 'primitive church,' just as continental Reformers were doing. As Euan Cameron argues, "[t]he primitive Church... represented the touchstone by which later developments were to be evaluated and (mostly) found wanting. The oldest and purest form of Christianity was the best. In this sense the Reformation embodied humanist historical sensibilities from its very inception."<sup>3</sup> This was true for Cranmer. Satan and his priests had not yet infiltrated the primitive church; thus, it held the true understanding of Christianity. It was important to look to the early church, not the corrupted institution of the later middle ages, to find the path for England's Eucharistic theology.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Haaugaard, "Patristic Scholarship," 43-44. For more information on the particular tracts published as well as 60 more published by the end of the century see his footnotes 20-26.

<sup>3</sup> Euan Cameron, "Primitivism, Patristics, and Polemic in Protestant Visions of Early Christianity," in *Sacred History: Uses of the Christian Past in the Renaissance World*, edited by Katherine Van Liere, Simon Ditchfield, and Howard Louthan (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2012), 28.

<sup>4</sup> For more reading on English Medieval and Reformation scholarship see: Maria Dowling, *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII* (London: Croom Helm, 1986); Josef Eskhult, "Latin Bible Translations in the Protestant Reformation: Historical Contexts, Philological Justification, and the Impact of Classical Rhetoric on the Conception of Translation Methods," in *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Matthew McLean (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2012); Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians c. 1080-1220* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); Timothy Rosendale, "Fiery tongues: Language, Liturgy, and the Paradox of the English Reformation," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001): 1142-1164, accessed on July 29, 2014, URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/121969>; Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christ: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); G.J.C. Snoek, *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist: A Process of Mutual Interaction* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1995); and Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

Gardiner too relies heavily on the Church Fathers to defend his doctrine of transubstantiation. He was not, however, as focused on the idea of the primitive church as was Cranmer. For Gardiner, any church theologian, even those of the later Middle Ages, could be used as support; Gardiner did not find fault in the medieval church as did Cranmer and his fellow continental Reformers. In this debate, however, the majority of his theologians are those of the primitive church. This is not surprising, though, considering that the *Explication* is a direct response to Cranmer's *Defence*. Gardiner, therefore, focuses more on refuting Cranmer's use of early Church Fathers than providing his own separate list of patristic evidence. With Cranmer's focus on only those Church Fathers he believed were uncorrupt, Gardiner's refutation is, thus, limited. This does not mean, however, that there is little weight to using these early fathers alone. As with Cranmer, Gardiner asserts these early theologians are quite valuable to his doctrinal view. It is these men, after all, who set the church on its historical trajectory through the middle ages to Gardiner and Cranmer's era. Showing early support for transubstantiation thus demonstrates that Gardiner and his fellow conservatives are not presenting a later false invention, but rather are upholding the proper Eucharistic doctrine present from the beginning of the Church.

According to Cranmer, the Church Fathers never mentioned a Eucharistic notion resembling transubstantiation. The only presence in the bread and wine was spiritual, not corporeal. As Cranmer states in his *Defence*, "What subtiltee thynkest thou (good reader) can the Papistes now ymagine, to defend their pernicious errour, that Christe in his humayne nature is bodylye here in yearthe, in the consecrated bread and wyne: seeing that all the old Churche of Christe beleued the contrary, and al the olde authors wrote the

contrary?"<sup>5</sup> In addition, without a Real Presence, the view that a sacrifice was performed at the altar could not stand. No author ever supported the perpetual sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist, as the papists uphold in their false teaching. Christ offered the only necessary sacrifice on the cross, once and for all; nothing more was needed. When the old authors use sacrifice they "called it not a sacrifice for synne, bycause that it taketh away oure synne but bicause it was ordeined of Christ to put vs in remembrance of the sacrifice made by him vpon the crosse."<sup>6</sup> What is performed at the altar, or table to use Cranmer's reformed terminology, is our own sacrifice. We remember Christ's death and offer ourselves to be worthy to receive this gift.

Responding to Cranmer's *Defence*, however, Gardiner in his *Explication*, continually challenges this claim, asserting that the earliest fathers did in fact support Real Presence and a repeated sacrifice at the altar. The later medieval theologians simply put a name, transubstantiation, to the already existent doctrine. Gardiner, too, had been exposed to humanism and he used original sources, in the original Greek and Latin, to prove his arguments.<sup>7</sup> He cites four marks in the Church Fathers "which be certaine testimonies to the truth of there fayth of real presence of Christes most precious body in the sacrament."<sup>8</sup> First, all of these authors argue against heretics who do not support the

---

<sup>5</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *A Defence of the True and Catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ, with a confutation of sandry errors concernyng thesame, grounded and stablished vpon Goddes holy woorde, & approued by [the] consent of the moste auncient doctors of the Churche. Made by the moste Reuerende father in God Thomas Archebysshop of Canterbury, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1550), 52, EEBO STC 6001 Reel 33:10, British Library.

<sup>6</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 113.

<sup>7</sup> Haaugaard, "Patristic Scholarship," 52-53.

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same.*

Real Presence. Second, every early theologian marveled at the great miracle wrought through God's omnipotence. If no miracle is present, then what is to be marveled over? Third, when figure is used in connection with Christ's body it is not meant as signification but as *form*; hence, Christ's corporeal body. Last, these authors discussed adoration of the sacrament.<sup>9</sup> Christians can only adore godly, not figurative, things; therefore, these authors must be supporting Christ's body actually in the bread. Therefore in Gardiner's argument, these four marks directly support Real Presence against Cranmer's figurative understanding.

In his *Answer* to Gardiner, Cranmer does not let these challenges go unanswered. He once again asserts that the early authors did not assert a Real Presence. The

fathers neyther said nor beleued as you here report, but they taught that bothe the sacrament and the thing thereby represented (whiche is Christes bodye) remaine in their proper substaunce and nature, the sygne beyng here, and the thing signified beyng in heauen, and yet of these twoo consisteth the sacrifice of the church.<sup>10</sup>

Regarding Gardiner's third point claiming figure to mean the actual body, Cranmer explicitly denies any early theologian thought as Gardiner argues. Christ's words were figurative and the Church Fathers acknowledged this. "[T]o the faythfull and spirituall eares, the woordes of Christe bee figuratiue, and to theym the truthe of the figures bee

---

*Made by Steuen Byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth* (Rouen: R. Caly, 1551), 141, EEBO STC 11592 Reel 343:11, Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>9</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 141.

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Cranmer, *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe* (London: Reynold Wolfe, 1551), 343, EEBO STC 5991 Reel 211:05, Henry E. Huntington Library.

playnely opened and declared by the Fathers, wherein the Fathers bee worthye muche commendation, bycause they trauayled to open playnely vnto vs, the obscure and figuratiue speaches of Christe."

In sum, for both Cranmer and Gardiner the Church Fathers are important. Throughout each of their books, numerous authors are quoted and thoroughly dissected. In turn, Cranmer and Gardiner also point out how his opponent wrongly interprets the authors. Thus, each book features the same authors and the same passages; yet from very different viewpoints. This chapter will explore the individual Church Fathers used by both men, in expressing their own views while discrediting the opposition. We should note that the adjective *early* is important in this discussion. For Cranmer only the early Church Fathers, those before the eleventh century, were valid because it was in the eleventh and twelfth centuries that corruption entered the church. Cranmer does on occasion quote later medieval theologians, but only to further discredit papist thinking. Because Cranmer does not bring these theologians into his *Defence* discussion, Gardiner does not turn to them in his *Explication*, even though they fall in line with his own views.

### Justin the Martyr

The first Church Father Cranmer references in his *Defence* is Justin, who Cranmer mentions, "is the oldest author that this daye is knowen to write any treatie vpon the sacramentes" and was martyred in 165.<sup>11</sup> According to Cranmer, Justin asserts the bread and wine are to be offered as tokens of thanksgiving, "and be called also the body and bloude of Christ...And yet the same meate and drynke (saith he) is chaunged, into our

---

<sup>11</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 23.

flesh and bloud, and nourisheth our bodies."<sup>12</sup> Although Justin does refer to the bread and wine as the body and blood, Cranmer points out Justin also asserts the bread and wine remain. The "same meate and drynke" cannot turn "into our flesh and bloud" if they are no longer present when we eat and drink at the table. Had transubstantiation occurred, no bread and wine would have remained for us to take. This interpretation also falls in line with Cranmer's stress on the inward working of the believer during the Eucharist. The emphasis is put on the bread and wine nourishing the bodies of those who "professe Christe, and lyue accordynge to the same."<sup>13</sup> Thus, the act of nourishment which the Eucharist provides is dependent on the partaker, not an outward miracle performed by a priest.

In looking at this same passage in *Explication*, Gardiner claims Cranmer misreads Justin and adds a section that is not found in the original work. Gardiner asserts that Cranmer fails to read or understand Justin's Real Presence theology because he places too much focus on the bread and wine as food that nourishes the believer. Gardiner concedes this is what Justin writes, but he does not explicitly state the bread and wine remain.

Rather, Gardiner argues the original text reads:

For we do not take these for commen breade or dryncke, but like as Iesus Christe our Sauyour incarnate by the worde of God, had fleshe and bloud for our saluacion, euen so we be taught the fode, (wherwith our fleshe and bloud be nourished by alteracion) when *it is consecrate by the prayour of his worde, to be the flesh and bloude of the same Iesus incarnate.*<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 23.

<sup>13</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 23.

<sup>14</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 105, my italics.

Gardiner's translation follows that of Cranmer's until the last phrase in which he asserts after the consecration the bread and wine are indeed the flesh and blood.

In his *Answer* Cranmer directly challenges this reading. He states that in his *Second Apology* Justin writes how, after the consecration prayer, "the Deacons giue to euery one present a part of the bread, wine and water consecrated."<sup>15</sup> Here Justin is still referring to the elements as bread and wine although consecration has occurred. Justin also mentions each person receiving a part of the bread and wine. For Cranmer this must directly be linked to offering simply bread and wine because a person, even a Deacon, cannot break the body of Christ to be distributed in parts. Thus, to conclude that he is correct, Cranmer asks Gardiner a rhetorical question, "doo not then the bread, wine and water remaine after consecation? seing that they be distributed to diuers men in partes? For I think you wil not say, that the body of Christ is deuided into partes."<sup>16</sup>

It is apparent in Cranmer's view, if anyone is at fault for false translation, it is Gardiner who purposely places the bread and wine's act of nourishment before the consecration. He thereby concludes that after consecration the bread and wine are physically gone. However, Cranmer argues the proper translation places consecration first, with Justin still calling the elements bread and wine after the consecration prayer

---

<sup>15</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 317. The *Second Apology* was probably written around 155 (although the date is never clearly indicated in the text) in response to Christian persecutions under Lollius Urbicus (who is mentioned). It is most likely Cranmer is quoting from the *First Apology* rather than the *Second Apology*. The *First Apology*, written between 152 and 154, features Justin's theology, including his Eucharistic views, while the *Second Apology* is a brief account focused on the role of Christians facing persecution. See Cullen Story, *The Nature of Truth in "The Gospel of Truth" and in the Writings of Justin Martyr: A Study of the Pattern of Orthodoxy in the Middle of the Second Christian Century* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1970), xv and LW Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 14-20, 142-150.

<sup>16</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 317.

has taken place. Cranmer then ends his reply to Gardiner about citing Justin, saying "you vntruly put it before the consecration, and so wilfully and craftely alter the order of Iustinus wordes, to deceaue the reader, and in this point wyll I ioyne an yssue with you. Ys such craft and vntruth to be vsed of byshoppes?"<sup>17</sup> Cranmer is calling out Gardiner on the same charge of misinterpretation Gardiner levied against Cranmer.

Richard Hanson argues that Justin does not discuss a Real Presence, which supports Cranmer's interpretation. The bread and wine are significant in the rite, but as an offering of thanksgiving to God, not because they are Christ's actual flesh and blood. He also notes that the proper translation has Justin calling the bread and wine by those terms, not body and blood, after the consecration prayer.<sup>18</sup>

However, it would be a mistake to mark Cranmer as the correct theologian outright. There is ambiguity in Justin that can also justify Gardiner's interpretation. In the larger *Apology*, Hanson illustrates Justin sometimes uses the term *sacrifice* to discuss the Eucharist, without providing an adequate definition of the sacrifice.<sup>19</sup> It is not surprising, therefore, that Gardiner would interpret sacrifice with Christ's action on the cross and thus, the actual body and blood in the bread and wine.

Gardiner also challenges Cranmer's treatment of Justin's *Apology* in the *Defence*. Recalling the humanist education of both men, exact translation was very important. Gardiner, therefore, called out Cranmer who, in discussing Justin, did not wholly quote but largely paraphrased the *Apology* into a few sentences. In doing so, Cranmer made

---

<sup>17</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 317.

<sup>18</sup> R.P.C. Hanson, *Eucharistic Offering in the Early Church* (Bramcote, United Kingdom: Grove Books, 1979), 7-8.

<sup>19</sup> Hanson, *Eucharistic Offering*, 8.

Justin say what Cranmer needed in order to support his Reformed views. The two examples of Cranmer's mishandling which Gardiner cites are: "the bread, water, and wyne in this sacrament, ar meates ordeyned purposely to geue thanks to God"<sup>20</sup> and "they be called the body and bloud of Christ."<sup>21</sup> "Ordeyned purposely" and "be called" implies the elements as mere significations, with no belief in Real Presence, but Gardiner argued these few words are not found in Justin's original text or meaning.<sup>22</sup> They altered Justin's meaning to fit Cranmer's needs.

Cranmer, however, responds that his paraphrasing is not inaccurate. He paraphrased simply for the reader's benefit. As long as he retains Justin's true sense and meaning, there is then no harm in summarizing. "I knit vp together in as few words as I can, rendring the sense truly, & not varyng far from the words. And this haue I done, not willi[n]gly to corrupt Iustine but I doo it to recite to the reader Iustines mynd shortly and plainly."<sup>23</sup> Cranmer further adds that Justin's Greek is hard to translate properly into English; thus, sometimes it is better to paraphrase than to try to provide a direct translation.<sup>24</sup> In the end, Cranmer argues, it does Gardiner no good to bring up this issue because even Gardiner's translation supports what Cranmer originally discussed in *Defence*: the Real Presence cannot exist because Justin speaks of breaking the bread into parts which cannot be done with Christ's body. "And what need I willyngly to corrupt Iustine, when his wordes after your allegation, seruing more for my purpose against your

---

<sup>20</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 105.

<sup>21</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 106.

<sup>22</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 105-107.

<sup>23</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 316.

<sup>24</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 317.

fayned transubstantiation, then as I alleadg them my selfe."<sup>25</sup> For Cranmer, this entire paraphrasing discussion and Gardiner's improper translation serve as examples of Gardiner's continued means to "caste a miste before the readers eyes."<sup>26</sup>

### Irenaeus

Irenaeus does not figure largely in Cranmer and Gardiner's debate. This is likely because of the fragmentary nature of most of Irenaeus's writings; there are few Latin examples and fewer still in the original Greek text.<sup>27</sup> In his brief mention of Irenaeus in *Defence*, Cranmer begins by justifying Irenaeus's authority. He wrote only 150 years after Christ<sup>28</sup> and was Polycarp's disciple, who in turn was John the Evangelist's disciple. Thus, Irenaeus is closely linked with Christ and the early church.<sup>29</sup> Cranmer's translation from Irenaeus's "Contra Valentinus" (one of five books in Irenaeus's *Adversus Haereses*)<sup>30</sup> reads: "Whan the name of God is called vppon it, it is not than common bread, but the bread of thankesgeuing, hauing two thinges in it, one earthly, and the other heauenly."<sup>31</sup> Cranmer claims this quote resembles Justin's idea that the offering is one of

---

<sup>25</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 317.

<sup>26</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 317.

<sup>27</sup> Hanson, *Eucharistic Offering*, footnotes 24, 28, 30, 31.

<sup>28</sup> He lived c. 130-202.

<sup>29</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 24.

<sup>30</sup> Written around 180, this work was meant to counter current Gnostic heresies, including the book against the Valentinians quoted in Cranmer. For more see Gerard Vallee, "Irenaeus's Refutation of the Gnostics," in *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius* (Ontario: Wilfried Laurier University Press, 1981).

thanksgiving. Cranmer then explains what the earthly and heavenly things in the offering indicate. "What ment he by the heauenly thyng, but the sanctificacion whyche cometh by the inuocacion of the name of God? And what by the earthly thyng? but the verye bread, which (as he sayd before) doeth nourishe our bodies, as other bread dothe which we doo vse?"<sup>32</sup> It is Cranmer's understanding, then, that Irenaeus, like Justin, believes the bread and wine remain after the consecration.

Gardiner, however, believes Cranmer improperly translates Irenaeus's original Greek term *Eucharistia*. Cranmer translates this word as "the bread of thankesgeuing." Gardiner, though, argues that this misrepresents the true meaning of the word when read in context with its following phrase, "hauing two thinges in it, one earthly, and the other heauenly." If Irenaeus had mentioned only an earthly aspect, then bread alone would suffice; however, the heavenly aspect implies there is more in this process than just bread as an offering of thanksgiving. Gardiner, therefore, analyzes Irenaeus saying

Irene doth not call the bread receyuinge the callyng of God, the bread of thankesgeuyng, but (Eucharistia) and in this (Eucharistia) he sheweth how that, that he calleth the heauey thing, is the body and bloud of Christ...what he ment by the heauenly thing in (Eucharistia,) whiche is the very presence of Christes body & bloud.<sup>33</sup>

Consequently Irenaeus's use of *Eucharistia* holds more meaning than Cranmer asserts, thus overthrowing "this author [Cranmer] in the impugnation of Christes reall presence in the Sacramente, and therefore can nothyng helpe this auctors purpose agaynst

---

<sup>31</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 24.

<sup>32</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 24.

<sup>33</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 106-107.

transubstantiation."<sup>34</sup> Although he tries to provide the best explanation of what *Eucharistia* means, Gardiner continues to use the word itself in his discussion because, as evidenced with Cranmer, its heavenly character is often lost in translation.

Cranmer agrees in his *Answer* that *Eucharistia* does imply more than mere bread in the offering, which Gardiner failed to understand in Cranmer's original interpretation. Cranmer argues that "bread of thanksgiving" holds this heavenly understanding and encapsulates fully the meaning of *Eucharistia*. The bread and wine, as Irenaeus states, "ought not to be taken as commone breade, or as bakers breade, and wyne drunken in the tauerne."<sup>35</sup> This does not mean, however, that the bread and wine no longer exist by becoming Christ's body and blood. Rather, *Eucharistia* means the bread and wine are no longer used solely for feeding our bodies. After the consecration they become our gifts to thank God; hence, they hold more meaning than a regular loaf of bread at dinner. They connect us with God, but have not become Christ. "[T]hey ought to be taken for bread and wyne, wherin we geue thanks to God, and therefore bee called Eucharistia corporis & sanguinis Domini, the thankynge of Christes bodye and bloude."<sup>36</sup> Cranmer goes on to argue that Irenaeus speaks of the bread and wine after consecration nourishing our bodies. Yet, if Gardiner's interpretation is to be believed, "how can those thinges staye and encrease oure bodyes, whiche be transubstantiated and gone before wee receaue them?"<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 107.

<sup>35</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 174.

<sup>36</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 174.

<sup>37</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 319.

Cranmer also challenges Gardiner's belief that *Eucharistia* cannot be accurately put into English and therefore should always be referred to as *Eucharistia*. This failure to translate keeps English readers in the dark, countering the whole purpose of translating the early theologians in the first place. As Cranmer asks, "[d]o not I write to englishe men, which vnderstand not what this greke word Eucharistia, meaneth? what great offence is it the[n] in me to put it into english, [that] english men may vnderstand what is said? Shuld I do as you do, put greke for english & write so obscurely, that english me[n] shulde not know the authors meanyng?"<sup>38</sup>

As with Justin there is ambiguity at the heart of Irenaeus's words, which could support both Cranmer and Gardiner. Irenaeus indeed stresses the Eucharist as an offering of thanksgiving, but he also emphasizes that through consecration we are connected with Christ in the elements. This connection is not explicitly discussed, however. Irenaeus does not say the bread and wine are fully transformed into Christ; rather, he only mentions that we are brought into communion with Christ when we offer this consecrated bread.<sup>39</sup> It is not surprising then that Cranmer would read Irenaeus as anti-transubstantiation while Gardiner would find his an account of Real Presence.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 318.

<sup>39</sup> Hanson, *Eucharistic Offering*, 9-10.

<sup>40</sup> For further reading on Irenaeus see: Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A history of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, translated by John Steely (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970) and Gerard Vallee, *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius* (Ontario: Wilfried Laurier University Press, 1981).

## Tertullian

While Tertullian, writing in late second- and early third-century Carthage and Rome, wrote numerous works, Cranmer and Gardiner focus on small passages from *Adversus Iudaeos* and *Adversus Marcionem*.<sup>41</sup> Cranmer argues Tertullian unequivocally denies Christ's corporeal presence in the bread and wine. While Cranmer does not dwell much on quoting or analyzing Tertullian in *Defence*, he does note,

this Tertulian speaketh nothyng against the trueth of oure catholike doctrin, but he speaketh many thynges most plainly for vs, and against the Papistes, and specially in thre pointes. Fyrst in that he sayth that Christ called bread his body. The second that Christ called it so, because it representeth his body. The thyrde, in that he sayth, that by these woordes of Christ, This is my bodye. is mente, This is a fygure of my body.<sup>42</sup>

Cranmer here presents several important conclusions regarding Tertullian. First, Cranmer connects Tertullian with all of those who are part of the catholic church, including the other Church Fathers and Cranmer himself. As we see throughout Cranmer's works, Cranmer continually stresses that he and his views are part of the true catholic church, meaning the universal church, which has existed from the time of Christ. This of course directly challenges Gardiner and those who follow Roman doctrines who claim to be the catholic church. Cranmer is pushing Gardiner, and those who assert a Real Presence, out of Christ's established church. The Roman church is far from the primitive church.

---

<sup>41</sup> Timothy Barnes, *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 1. *Adversus Iudaeos* was written around 197 with some revised passages appearing in the 208 *Adversus Marcionem*. For more, see Barnes, *Tertullian*, 55.

<sup>42</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 77.

Next, Cranmer argues that Tertullian points out Christ called the bread and wine his body and blood. But *called* is not the same as *made*. This connects with Cranmer's second and third points that the bread and wine were so called to make them representations of Christ, but not the actual body and blood. Cranmer reiterates these simple points in the following lines: Tertullian "saith that Christe called bread his body."<sup>43</sup> And, he

sayeth these wordes. Christ did not reprove bread wherby he did represent hys very body. And in the same booke he saieth, that Iesus taking bread, & distributing it amonges his disciples, made it his body, saying, This is my body, that is to saye, (saith Tertulian) a figure of my body. And therefore saithe Tertuliane, that Christe called breade his body. and wyne his bloode, bycause that in the Olde Testament breade and wyne were figures of his body and bloode.<sup>44</sup>

Once again, *called* not *made* is stressed, as is *figure*. Therefore, Cranmer can conclude that Tertullian in no way supports a transubstantiation understanding of the Eucharist.

Gardiner in *Explication* charges Cranmer with a bad interpretation. He explicitly denies Cranmer's discussion of *called* not *made*: Christ in fact "made the bread his bodye, not onely called it so" and "Christ called it his body, & made it his body."<sup>45</sup> Because Christ's calling the bread the body made it so, there is no distinction between the two words as Cranmer claims. Bread was once a figure in the Old Testament (as Cranmer stated above) but with Christ figure became reality. "Christ made the bred his body, which bread was in the mouth of the p[ro]phet [Jeremiah] a figure of his body. Wherefore it foloweth by Tertullians co[n]fession when Christ made the bread his body, that Christ

---

<sup>43</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 58.

<sup>44</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 62.

<sup>45</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 54.

ended the figure, and made it the truth, making now his body that was before the figure of his body."<sup>46</sup>

Gardiner does agree with Cranmer that Tertullian "doth evidently proue, & at the lest dothe not improuue the Catholique doctrine of Christes church vniuersally receiued."<sup>47</sup> Of course Gardiner's idea of the catholic church includes Roman doctrine, particularly transubstantiation. What we see developing is a major area of contention between Cranmer and Gardiner: *called* versus *made*. In Cranmer's theology Christ's calling does not equate to a change, while Gardiner believes the two terms are interchangeable when Christ speaks.

Although Cranmer did not often cite Tertullian in *Defence*, and Gardiner also did not speak at length on the author in *Explication*, Cranmer does provide a lengthier discussion in his *Answer*. Cranmer expands on Tertullian in order to counter the gross misinterpretation Gardiner sets forth in linking *called* and *made* and confusing *figure* with *actuality*. Cranmer explains that Tertullian "saith, that bread and wine were figures in the old testament, and so taken in the prophetes, and now be figures agayne in the new testament, & so vsed of Christ himself in his last supper."<sup>48</sup> Gardiner also fails to provide a full translation of Tertullian's passage regarding Christ's making the bread and wine the body and blood: "where Tertullian sayth, that Christe made bread his body, he expoundeth him selfe how Christ made bread his body, addynge by and by these words, That is to say, a figure of his body."<sup>49</sup> Cranmer is asserting that, by deliberately cutting

---

<sup>46</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 42.

<sup>47</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 54.

<sup>48</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 137.

short this passage, Gardiner is fitting Tertullian to his own views; continuing the passage clearly would have supported Cranmer's interpretation. Cranmer concludes, regarding Gardiner's treatment: "but if thou canst forbear good reader (when thou readest the fond handlyng of Tertullian by this ignorant and subtil lawyer) I pray the laugh not, for it is no matter to be laughed at, but to be sorowed, that the most auncient authors of Christs churche shulde thus be eluded in so weighty causes."<sup>50</sup>

### Clement of Alexandria

Clement was a second- and early third-century Alexandrian. Cranmer mentions Clement in only one section of *Defence*; yet his claims are important to consider and spark further debate in Gardiner's *Explication* and Cranmer's *Answer*. Cranmer brings to the reader's attention a supposed letter written by the early theologian.<sup>51</sup> In this letter the writer is discussing what is to be done with the bread and wine after the sacrament has been carried out. Cranmer remarks that the papists use this letter as proof of an early transubstantiation doctrine. In the letter the author lays out restrictions on what is to be done with the consecrated bread. For example, if any bread remains it is to be eaten by the clerks so it is not left out over night and those who have taken the bread should "not

---

<sup>49</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 137.

<sup>50</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 137.

<sup>51</sup> Denise Buell asserts there is only one known surviving letter from Clement containing a portion of the Gospel of Mark. Cranmer and Gardiner do not discuss the origins or larger context of the letter they are quoting, but it is most likely this letter. For more on Clement see Denise Buell, *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999) and Eric Osborn, *Clement of Alexandria* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

by and by take other common meates, leaste they should myxte that holye portion, with the meate whiche is degysted by the bealy" until an adequate period of time has passed.<sup>52</sup> Papists use these rules, according to Cranmer, to prove that the consecrated bread is not common bread but Christ's holy body.

Cranmer however makes two claims: first, Clement is not the author and second, whoever the author, he does not in fact support the Real Presence. Cranmer writes,

yf the Epistle, which they [papists] allege, were Clementes (as in ded it is not, but they haue fayned many thynges in other mennes names, thereby to stablyshe their fained purposes) neuertheles whose soeuer [the] Epistle was, if it be throughlye co[n]sydered, it maketh mucche more against Papistes, than for their purpose.<sup>53</sup>

He then goes on to spell out three ways the letter counters the papists and transubstantiation.

First, the author uses "peeces" to describe the offering and leftover Lord's body. As we have noted elsewhere, Christ's body cannot be broken into many pieces; thus, the author was writing figuratively when he called the pieces the actual body. Only the bread can be broken into pieces. Secondly, the author instructs communicants not to keep any remaining pieces; yet, papists retain the elements long after completing a Mass. Despite using this letter to support their views and practices, the papists do not even follow what the author directs. Lastly, the author teaches that many elements are needed in order to suffice for everyone partaking in the sacrament. For papists, however, only the priests

---

<sup>52</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 75.

<sup>53</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 76.

are generally allowed to participate in the Eucharist. Once again the papist practices do not match what this author, who they claim is on their side, asserts.<sup>54</sup>

Unfortunately in *Defence*, Cranmer fails to provide an argument on why he believes Clement is not this letter's true author, thereby weakening his analysis on the letter against the papists. Gardiner, not surprisingly, responds that it is not forged; yet he too fails to provide evidence to support his contention. In his *Explication*, Gardiner responds to Cranmer point by point. First, he argues "those many hostes, after consecracion, be not many bodyes of Christe, but of many breades one body of Christ...the catholique faith teacheth that the fractio[n] is in the outwarde signe, & not in the body of Christ."<sup>55</sup> So, it is the outward sign in the form of bread that is broken, but all of these pieces contain the whole body of Christ. Regarding not leaving any bread overnight, Gardiner argues Clement means not leaving any consecrated bread available to those who might use it for common bread and not with reverence. Clement does support the continuing efficacy of the holy bread long after the day of consecration because it can be taken to those unable to take Mass (sick, invalids). Thus, this instruction still fits with the Roman practice of keeping the elements, as long as they are kept away from those who might seek to use them for irreligious purposes. With Cranmer's last point, Gardiner agrees that the sacrament should be offered to everyone, not just priests. However, there is no law that restricts a priest from taking the sacrament on his own when such an opportunity might arise, for instance, when no one attends a Mass or people are not spiritually ready to come to the altar.<sup>56</sup> Gardiner concludes his rebuttal, writing

---

<sup>54</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 76.

<sup>55</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 49.

But what soeuever we may gather, that note of this auctour [Cranmer] remayneth vnproued...and here I dare therefore ioyne an issue with this auctor, that none of his thre fayned notes is grounded of any wordes of this, that he noteth a fayned Epistel, takyng the only wordes that he allegeth here.<sup>57</sup>

In answering Gardiner's charges, Cranmer offers proof that the letter was forged in his *Answer*. First, none of Clement's contemporaries, for example Eusebius and Jerome, mention this letter at all while they refer to many other writers' works, including some of Clement's writings. Also, in other parts of the letter there are obvious remarks that show it is false. For example, at one point the author claims James asked him to write an account of Peter's death. This cannot be true, however, because the real Clement lived well after both Peter and James's deaths.<sup>58</sup> When answering Gardiner's three-point account, Cranmer reiterates the same views present in *Defence*. He repeats "The body of Christe hath no fragmentes nor broken peeces, and therefore the calling here is so material, that it proueth fully [the] matter, that to call bread Christes body, is a fyguratiue speache."<sup>59</sup> In the end Cranmer offers one of his numerous insults about Gardiner's manipulation over the sources and how such manipulation leads Gardiner to failure: "But you wrangly so mucche in this matter to auoide absurdytes, that you snarle youre selfe into so many and heynouse absurdites, as you shall neuer be able to wynde youre selfe oute."<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 49-50.

<sup>57</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 51.

<sup>58</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 167.

<sup>59</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 168.

<sup>60</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 168.

## Origen

Writing in the first-half of the third century, first from Alexandria and then from Caesarea,<sup>61</sup> Origen receives more mention than the authors previously discussed.

Cranmer introduces Origen in a short, succinct paragraph in *Defence*:

Shortely after Ireneus, was Origen about 200 yeares after Christes ascension. Who also affirmeth, that the materiall bread remaineth, saying, that the mattier of the breade auayleth nothing, but goeth donne into the bealy, and is auoyded dounewarde, but the woorde of God spoken vpon the breade, is it that auailleth.<sup>62</sup>

We clearly see why Cranmer would use this statement to support his Eucharistic theology. Origen is affirming that, post-consecration, bread and wine are still present. The elements are not efficacious, but it is God's word that strengthens the partaker. This connects with Cranmer's Spiritual Presence theology: the bread and wine are only signs, but the believer still profits from God's word present in the sacrament.

Elsewhere in *Defence*, Cranmer cites Origen to discuss Christ's two natures, human and divine, to indicate that it is not Christ's actual body but his spirit that is present in the sacrament. Christ's body, as asserted in Scripture and as Origen explains, is in heaven and cannot be in two places. As such, in Cranmer's interpretation "Origene hath plainly declared his mynd, that Christes body is not both present here with vs, & also gone hence & estranged frome vs. For that were to make two natures of one body, & to

---

<sup>61</sup> Henri Crouzel, *Origen*, translated by A.S. Worrall (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), 2-3. See also: Rebecca Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology: models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

<sup>62</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 23.

diuide the bodye of Iesus."<sup>63</sup> It is Christ's divinity, or spirit, that is ever-present in heaven, earth, and the sacrament.

Cranmer argues that the papists continually misuse Origen and misinterpret him as an early proponent of what would later be termed transubstantiation. Cranmer follows this criticism with his own interpretation stating that, because Origen asserts Christ's body is in heaven, and cannot be on Earth either, Origen is speaking figuratively that bread is the body.

Origen thus mente, that Christes fleshe is a spirituall meate, and his bloude a spirituall drynke, and that the eatyng and drynkyng of his fleshe and bloude may not be vnderstande lytterally, but spiritually, it is manifested by Origenes owne woordes...whosoever vndersta[n]deth them (the figuratiue words) otherwyse, they be deceiued, and take harme by their owne grosse vnderstandyng.<sup>64</sup>

Cranmer charges that in the papist doctrine of transubstantiation, both worthy and unworthy people would be eating Christ's body. This, however, cannot be because the unworthy cannot partake of Christ's perfect, holy body. To do so would be to defile Christ. Therefore Cranmer relies on Origen to support this theology that evil men cannot partake in the sacrament and that only those of spiritual worthiness will receive Christ's body through Christ's Spiritual Presence. "The worde was made fleshe and very meat, whiche who so eateth, shal suerly lyue for euer, which no euel man can eate."<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 50. Cranmer's interpretation comes from reading a section of Origen's *Commentary on Matthew*. This is the only place where Cranmer mentions the source from Origen he is citing. Gardiner makes no mention of which source he is using. It is likely both are quoting from the *Commentary on Matthew*. It was in the *Commentary* that Origen gave his most-detailed Eucharistic theology. See Crouzel, *Origen*, 226-229.

<sup>64</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 78. Cranmer also reiterates this same message in another section on pg. 61: "Considre (saith Origen) that these thinges written in gods bokes, are figures, and therefore examine and vnderstande them as spirituall, and not as carnall men. For if you vnderstand them as carnall menne, they hurte you and feede you not."

Gardiner does not devote as much attention to Origen as Cranmer does, but he does react in *Explication* to Cranmer's figurative interpretation of Origen's writings. Yes, Origen uses the term *figure* but not singularly: "whe[n] he speaketh of a figure, sayth not there is a only figure, whiche exclusive (only) beyng away."<sup>66</sup> Just because Origen does not include *only*, Gardiner argues we cannot take Origen to support a figurative understanding. Of course what Gardiner does not touch upon, or what Cranmer does not respond to, is that Origen does not explicitly say there is anything *in addition to* the figure either. Thus, Origen is not frankly saying the body is now fully present. Gardiner goes on to say that by Origen's teachings "the sacreme[n]t of bread & wyne, should not onely signifie Christ (that is to say) preach him, but also exhibite him se[n]sible (as Origenes words be reaported) here to be."<sup>67</sup> Once again, Origen's writing means much more than to take the bread and wine solely as figurative elements.

This understanding does pose a dilemma, however. If Gardiner is agreeing there is some figure remaining, in addition to Christ's body, how does this then connect with transubstantiation? What exactly is remaining if the bread and wine are no longer present? Gardiner uses an analogy of Adam's creation to discuss the difference between the *matter* and *material* of the bread and wine. "Whenne God formed Adam of claye, the mattier of the clay remayned in Adam, and yet the materiall claye remayned not, for it was altred into another substance."<sup>68</sup> The matter, or appearance, of the bread and wine remains but the material, or essence, does not. It is the material aspect of the bread and

---

<sup>65</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 93.

<sup>66</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 41.

<sup>67</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 54.

<sup>68</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 107.

wine that are changed into Christ's corporeal body and blood. Thus, the partaker might think he sees bread but he only sees material bread, because the essence of bread is gone and has become Christ. Gardiner does not address Origen's discussion of evil men, but as we shall see he does answer this argument elsewhere.

In *Answer*, Cranmer does not give Gardiner's refutation much thought. Rather, he simply restates that which he did in *Defence*. He simply concludes that in the attack Gardiner has

nothyng aunswered directly to Origen although he directly writeth agaynst your doctrine. For you say that the eatyng of Christes fleshe is taken in the propre signification without a fygure. Origene sayth there is a figure. And Origen sayth further, that is is onely a figuratiue speeche, although not addyng this woorde (onely) yet addyng other woordes of the same effect.<sup>69</sup>

Once again Cranmer argues Origen supports a figurative interpretation of Christ's body in the bread, and clearly no other interpretation can be made.

It is odd that Cranmer spends such little time refuting Gardiner. As mentioned above, Cranmer fails to discuss Gardiner's emphasis that Origen does not explicitly write *only* in his Eucharistic doctrine; thus, in Gardiner's opinion, countering Cranmer's earlier argument that Origen speaks only of the Eucharist as figurative. It is curious Cranmer fails to discuss this because throughout both *Defence* and *Answer*, Cranmer has no issue criticizing Gardiner's manipulation of language for his own purpose. Origen does not use *only* in his Eucharistic discussion, but neither does he use *in addition to*. Without *in addition to*, Cranmer could have easily replied Origen does not speak of Christ's body in the bread, adding strength to Cranmer's anti-transubstantiation argument against Gardiner. Yet, he fails to do so.

---

<sup>69</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 130.

## Cyprian

Cyprian was one of Tertullian's students in the early third century.<sup>70</sup> Most of Cyprian's theological writing came during his tenure as Bishop of Carthage from 248 until his martyrdom in 258. When Cranmer introduces his reader to Cyprian in *Defence*, we are given a quick paraphrase, rather than direct quotation, of Cyprian saying we offer and drink wine, yet if we are worthy we drink the very blood of Christ spiritually.<sup>71</sup> Later, Cranmer quotes a short passage from Cyprian's *Commentary on the Lord's Supper* in which Cyprian says the bread is "chaunged in Nature, but not in outewarde fourme, is by the omnipotency of goddes word, made flesh."<sup>72</sup> While the quote may be short, Cranmer's analysis of it is lengthy. First, Cranmer argues that papists cite this passage because of the phrase "chaunged in Nature" to support transubstantiation. This, however, is a gross misreading because it completely ignores the next clause "but not in outward fourme." This phrase automatically contradicts transubstantiation. Rather, this sentence in its entirety speaks of something of greater value being *added to* common bread.<sup>73</sup> The change is an enhancement, not a replacement. Once Christ's spirit is in the bread, the worthy truly eats Christ: "wee be partakers of the spiryte of God, and moste purely ioyned vnto Christe, and spiritually feade with his fleshe and bloud, so that nowe the sayd mysticall breade is bothe a corporall foode for the body, *and* a spirituall foode for the

---

<sup>70</sup> For more on Cyprian's background see Hans von Campenhausen, *Men Who Shaped The Western Church*, translated by Manfred Hoffman (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 36-60 and Michael Sage, *Cyprian* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975).

<sup>71</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 24.

<sup>72</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 35.

<sup>73</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 35.

soule."<sup>74</sup> Cranmer also exploits Cyprian to challenge the papist view that we eat Christ with our mouths. As Cranmer writes, "we whette not our teeth to byte but with pure faith we breake the holy breade."<sup>75</sup> Once again Cranmer is stressing that it is through faith that anything holy is "eaten." Christ cannot be chewed.

Gardiner questions Cranmer's interpretation of Cyprian's view that wine remains, arguing that in the original quotation, not Cranmer's paraphrase, Cyprian calls the wine "new wine" after consecration.

Is not here mention of newe wyne of the creature of the vyne...what newe wyne can be, but the bloud of Christ, the very wyne consecrate by gods omnipotencye of the creature of the vyne offred?...[Cyprian] vseth the worde wyne to signifie the heauenly drinke of the bloud of Christ, made by consecration of the creature of wine.<sup>76</sup>

Cranmer's paraphrase glosses over the key term *new* so that he can fit Cyprian to his own beliefs, rather than giving the reader Cyprian's true theological view. Gardiner later states that everything Cyprian discusses on the Eucharist irrevocably promotes transubstantiation: "Cyprian can make nothyng by those wordes againste transubstantiacion, who wryteth playnely of the chaunge of the bread by gods omnipotencye into the fleshe of Christ."<sup>77</sup> Thus, Cranmer's interpretation is nothing more than from "his ymaginatio[n] diuiseth, who vseth the worde spirituall, as a stop, and opposition to the catholique teaching, whiche is not so."<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 35, my emphasis.

<sup>75</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 92.

<sup>76</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 108.

<sup>77</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 108.

<sup>78</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 129.

At this point it would appear Gardiner's use of Cyprian in *Explication* wins the round. He is, after all, providing direct quotations that apparently challenge Cranmer's quick paraphrase. However, Gardiner opens his words to criticism with the following analysis of Cyprian: "This breade whiche our lorde gaue to his disciples chaunged in nature, but not in outwarde forme, is by the omnipotencye of gods worde made fleshe."<sup>79</sup> The clause "but not in outwarde forme" is problematic as Gardiner asserts Cyprian supports transubstantiation. If transubstantiation occurs at the moment of consecration, then how can the outward forms of bread and wine remain? Cranmer picks up on this confusion in his *Answer* response. The bread and wine remain; Christ's body cannot be corporeally present.<sup>80</sup> Beyond this rebuttal, Cranmer does not include much more on Cyprian against Gardiner. Cranmer does not believe he needs to because Gardiner so poorly used Cyprian for his purposes that a response is not necessary. Because Gardiner failed to consider Cyprian's own words ("but not in outwarde forme"), Gardiner's critique is invalid and needs no response.<sup>81</sup>

### Eusebius Emissenus

Eusebius began his career as one of Origen's students, ending as bishop of Caesarea 314-339/340.<sup>82</sup> In *Defence*, Cranmer cites Eusebius to argue that there is a

---

<sup>79</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 127.

<sup>80</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 321.

<sup>81</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 186.

change that occurs, but it is an inward, spiritual change in the believer. Eusebius's explanation of the believer's experience in baptism is analogous to that of the Eucharist:

Thou visibly dydest remaine in the same measure, that thou haddest before, but inuisibly thou wast made greater, without any increace of thy body. Thou was the self same person, and yet by the increace of faith, thou wast made an other man. Outwardly nothyng was added, but all the chaunge was inwardly. And so was man made the son of Christe, and Christ fourmed in the mynd of man.<sup>83</sup>

After consecration, the bread and wine have the spirit of Christ and those who are faithful eat the true body through this Spiritual Presence. As in baptism no change occurs unless the believer is inwardly worthy.<sup>84</sup>

As direct evidence, rather than using just an analogy, Cranmer quotes from Eusebius's "Sermon on the Eucharist:"

whan thou comest to the reuerend altare to be fylled with spiritual meates, with thy faith looke vpon the body & bloud of him that is thy god, honor hym, touche hym with thy mynde, take hym with the draught of thyne inwarde man. And these spirituall thinges require no corporall presence of Christ hymselfe, who sytteth contynually in heauen at the right hande of his father.<sup>85</sup>

Here we see key phrases Cranmer uses in his own theology: "with thy faith looke vpon the body & bloud," "touche hym with thy mynde," and "these spiritually thinges require no corporall presence." The emphasis is on the believer's inward faith. There is no need for Christ's corporeal flesh and blood, because our mind and faith connect us to Christ.

---

<sup>82</sup> Lyman, *Christology and Cosmology*, 82-123. For more on Eusebius see: Glenn Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* 2nd ed. (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1986).

<sup>83</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 25.

<sup>84</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 25.

<sup>85</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 100.

Gardiner directly responds to Cranmer's use of the above passages. First, Gardiner counters Cranmer's interpretation of Eusebius's baptism analogy. Cranmer edits Eusebius's speech on baptism to fit his needs; Cranmer is manipulating the sources. "[T]his auctor thought it would sounde gaylye well, to the confusion of that trewe doctryne of tournynge, to speake in Baptisme of the turnyng of a man in to the body of the Church...he bryngeth forthe the same in suche forme of wordes, as he would haue them, and not as they be."<sup>86</sup> Gardiner then asserts that when Eusebius does talk about Baptism as a comparison with the Eucharist, he is actually supporting transubstantiation. A man's soul is truly, not figuratively, changed in baptism; so, the bread and wine are similarly actually changed.<sup>87</sup> Even when trying to manipulate Eusebius's words, Cranmer still fails to support his view; Eusebius clearly pronounces the elements change into Christ.

It should be noted that Eusebius talks of the believer's inward faith as an important aspect of properly receiving the sacrament, but it is not Eusebius's Eucharistic theology in total. Eusebius also goes on to declare "howe the inuisible priest [Christ] with his secrete power by his worde doth conuert the visible cratures in to the substance of his body and blood."<sup>88</sup> Christ, through his divinity, does in deed "turneth the visible creatures into the substaunce of his bodye and blood."<sup>89</sup> This should not be surprising because God's power is great; just as He commanded "the heightes of heuens, the depnes of the flouds, and largenes of landes, were founded of nothyng, by like powre in spirituall

---

<sup>86</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 108.

<sup>87</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 109.

<sup>88</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 86.

<sup>89</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 64.

Sacramentes, where vertue commandeth, theeffect of the truth serueth."<sup>90</sup> In his own theology, Gardiner continually asks why Cranmer and other Reformers cannot believe God can turn bread and wine into Christ's body and blood when Cranmer believes in God's power at Creation. Here, Eusebius is presenting the same argument: God is powerful enough to create the world and thus is able to change simple bread and wine into Christ.

Cranmer forcefully responds to Gardiner on these issues, with a barrage of quotations from and explanations on Eusebius in *Answer*. Cranmer argues that Gardiner himself has manipulated Eusebius's words regarding the invisible priest's turning the bread into the body. Cranmer cannot find such a passage in reading Eusebius. Eusebius speaks of a turning, but it is not what papists claim happens in transubstantiation. Once again, Cranmer turns to Eusebius's baptism analogy to illustrate that change occurs but not as the papists would have it. Why would Eusebius compare baptism and the Eucharist if he supports transubstantiation because he would never suggest transubstantiation occurs during baptism? Thus, Cranmer says he understands Eusebius's "own playn wordes, & you [Gardiner] gather his meanyng of your owne imagination, deuisynge such phantastical things, as neither Emissen sayth, nor yet be catholyke."<sup>91</sup>

Even when not comparing the Eucharist with baptism, Eusebius plainly states that the bread and wine remain but when a believer is inwardly faithful, then the body and

---

<sup>90</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 64.

<sup>91</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 206. Following this line of argument on page 304 in his *Answer*, Cranmer also reiterates this: "And where you alleage Emissen for the conuersion of the substance of bread and wyne, this conuersion (as Eimissen saith, and as I haue declared before) is lyke to our conuersion in baptisme, where outwardly is no alteration of substance but the meruailous and secrete alteration is inwardely in our soules."

blood can be seen. Cranmer's analysis on this aspect of Eusebius appears much like the analysis he provided in his earlier *Defence*. For example, he writes

Emissenes mynde is this, [that] although oure sauour Christe hath taken his body hence from oure bodely sight, yet we see him by faith, and by grace he is here present with vs, so that by him wee be made new creatures, regenerated by him, and fedde and nourished by him, whiche generation and nutrition in vs, be spirituall, without any mutation appearing outwardly, but wrought within vs inuisible by the omnipotent power of God.<sup>92</sup>

Yet, in *Explication* Gardiner had already shown how this passage, originally from *Defence* and now reiterated in Cranmer's *Answer*, is wrongly interpreted. Once again Cranmer's ignorance, in Gardiner's opinion, has led him astray even though Eusebius speaks plainly for Real Presence. The passage Cranmer uses does not, in fact, support Cranmer but raises questions about Cranmer's own interpretation. As Gardiner asks Cranmer,

But to speake of Emissene if by his fythe, the verye bodye and bloud of Christe were not present vpon the altare, why dothe he calle it a reuerend altare?...and why should fayth be required to lake vpon the bodye and bloud of Christ, that is not there on thaltare, but as this auctor [Cranmer] teacheth onely in heauen.<sup>93</sup>

This train of thought, however, rests on Gardiner's continued assumption that Cranmer argues for no presence in the sacrament at all. However, Cranmer does not assert this theology. For Cranmer, there can be reverence at the altar because Christ is spiritually present and in the sacrament for those who worthily partake. Thus, in *Answer* Cranmer retaliates, on

---

<sup>92</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 324. Further on this page Cranmer repeats this idea: Emissen "dooth vs to vnderstande, that [Christ] is not present in the fourmes of bread and wyne out of the ministracion but when the bread and wyne bee eten and drunken accordyng to Christes institution, then to them that so eate and drinke, the bread and wyne is the body and bloude of Christ."

<sup>93</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 86-87.

callyng the aultar A reuerend aultar, those wordes proue no more the reall presence of Christe in the aultare, then the callyng of the font of Baptisme A reuerend font, or callyng of mariage Reuerend matrimony, shuld conclude that Christ were corporally present in the water of Baptisme, or in the celebration of matrimony.<sup>94</sup>

Reverence is due because it is one of God's holy institutions, not because Christ's body is corporeally present.

### Hilary

After his Christian conversion in 345, Hilary became bishop of his hometown Poitiers around 353 and began his theological writing career at that time. Only a few years later, in 356, he was forced into exile in Phrygia, where he wrote his most important theological work, *The Holy Trinity*. He returned to Poitiers around 360 where he remained and continued his religious career until he died in 367.<sup>95</sup> Hilary receives very little attention from Cranmer, but Gardiner relies on him enough to warrant addressing. In his *Defence*, Cranmer provides only one substantial paragraph about Hilary, and even then it is not one of Cranmer's lengthier passages. Cranmer states,

Hilarius also in fewe wordes saieth the same. There is a figure (saieth he) for breade and wyne be outwardly seene. And there is also a truthe of that fygure, for the body and bloude of Christe bee a truthe inwady beleued. And this Hilarius was within lesse than. 350. yeares after Christe.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 270.

<sup>95</sup> Benedict XVI, "St. Hilary of Poitiers," in *Great Christian Thinkers: From the Early Church through the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2011) and John Gibson Cazenove, *St. Hilary of Poitiers and St. Martin of Tours* (New York: E. & J. B. Young, 1883), 13-15.

<sup>96</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 26.

It might be a short reference, but it clearly supports Cranmer's views: bread remains, it signifies the inward change effected on the faithful. In addition, for credibility Cranmer shows Hilary as an early, and therefore, uncorrupted theologian to be believed. The one other time Cranmer addresses Hilary is in connection with Cyril. Both Hilary and later theologian Cyril use baptism to explain the work in the Eucharist. Rather than speak directly on Hilary, Cranmer instead only quotes and expands on Cyril, whom Cranmer asserts will also answer for Hilary.<sup>97</sup>

Gardiner responds in uncharacteristic fashion. With most of the theologians, as we can see from the preceding discussions, Gardiner generally addresses only the passages or claims first presented in Cranmer's *Defence*. With Hilary, however, Gardiner references Hilary more than Cranmer does. Gardiner first points out that Cranmer makes use of an incorrect translation of Hilary's passage on baptism and the Eucharist. Indeed, Gardiner knows Cranmer was using a bad translation because it was Gardiner's own translation, which he had realized contained some errors that he is now to correct in his *Explication*.

This criticism against Cranmer's translation is interesting for two reasons. First, it is confusing why Cranmer would turn to a translation by Gardiner, when in Cranmer's works we already know he does not always trust Gardiner's translations. Secondly, Gardiner provides no proof to illustrate that Cranmer is, in fact, using the supposedly wrong translation. In the *Defence*, Cranmer makes no mention of what Hilary translation he is using in his commentary. Irrespective of these problems, Gardiner does point out where the area of contention in interpretation exists between Cranmer and himself: the word *vero*, which translates as *truly* in English. In Gardiner's original translation, which

---

<sup>97</sup> See Cyril section below.

he believes is the cause of Cranmer's misinterpretation, *truly* is used as an adjective for *mystery* in the following phrase: "the true mystery, the flesh of Christ's body." This placement is incorrect because a mystery is always true and therefore requires no adjective describing it as such.<sup>98</sup> The proper translation, now put forth in the *Explication*, reads "the mysterie, truely, the fleshe of Christes body." Truly now stands on its own, which in Gardiner's estimation, asserts Christ's actual, true body is present. "[T]hat word (truely) so placed, sitteth furthe liuely the reall presence, and substantiall presence, of that is receyued, & repeteth againe the same that was before sayd, to the more veheme[n]cie of it."<sup>99</sup> Thus, with the proper translation, it is clear that Christ's body is indeed present in the mystery of the sacrament in bread and wine.

As we have seen elsewhere, a major point of Gardiner's emphasis is that we join with Christ because we partake of his corporeal body and blood. It is not a spiritual body, but the actual body from the Incarnation. All of this is accomplished not through our faithful mind alone, but through eating the true elements at the sacrament. To support his contention Gardiner turns to Hilary, explaining,

se we be naturally in Christ by our natural fleshe, which he toke in the virgyns wombe, and he naturally, in vs, by the same fleshe in him glorified, and geuen to vs, and receyued of vs in the sacrement. For Hilarie sayth in plaine wordes, howe Christes very bloud receyued and dronken (Accepta & hausta) bryng this to passe.<sup>100</sup>

Gardiner's view is that Christ must dwell in us corporeally, contrasted to Cranmer's view that it is Christ's divinity that dwells within us. According to Gardiner

---

<sup>98</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 58.

<sup>99</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 58.

<sup>100</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 59.

this belief would mean we are not receiving Christ's humanity but his Godhead alone which "were then to make vs all gods by nature, whiche is ouer great an absurditie, and Christe in his diuine nature dwelleth onely in his father naturally."<sup>101</sup> Gardiner does not deny we receive Christ's divinity, but we so do through grace and this divine nature never mixes with our nature. Rather, Christ's human body can mix with our nature and perfect it so we are ready to receive the divine grace. The bread and wine may appear outwardly to remain, but inwardly we believe they have been changed into Christ's real body and blood. Through our belief comes the truth that they no longer remain despite the appearance thereof.<sup>102</sup>

Gardiner concludes, "here vop[n] wil I wynne the Issue, that in Hilarie, the matter is so plaine otherwise then this auctour reherseth, as it hath no colour of defence to the contrarye."<sup>103</sup> In plain words, then, Gardiner's Real Presence theology is correct and Cranmer's figurative speech is wrong.

As he did in referencing Hilary in *Defence*, Cranmer does not devote much effort in responding to Gardiner on Hilary in his later *Answer*. First, Cranmer challenges Gardiner's translation issues. Cranmer admits he has never seen this improperly translated work Gardiner accused him of using. Cranmer then states he has never seen a Hilary translation that holds Gardiner's new, fixed translation. Cranmer concludes, "therefore it seameth that you neuer redde any prynted booke of Hylarius."<sup>104</sup> Cranmer repeats that Hilary is not concerned with Real Presence, but instead stresses that Christ

---

<sup>101</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 59.

<sup>102</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 96 and 110.

<sup>103</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 59.

<sup>104</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 190.

dwells within those believers who are faithful.<sup>105</sup> Cranmer also asks Gardiner why Hilary would use the term *figure* in his speech if, under transubstantiation, there is nothing left to serve as a figure? With these very brief replies, Cranmer concludes that Gardiner is wrong and can find no proof in Hilary to contradict Cranmer's theology. Cranmer tells Gardiner he will willingly admit guilt to Gardiner if Gardiner can prove himself correct regarding Hilary. If not "then must you [Gardiner] holde vp you hande, and saie giltie."<sup>106</sup> So ends the quick discussion on Hilary.

### Ambrose

In 374, Ambrose became Archbishop of Milan, a position he held for over two decades until his death in 397.<sup>107</sup> When Cranmer first introduces his readers to Ambrose in *Defence*, he emphatically declares that Ambrose asserts the bread and wine remain; there is a change but it is spiritually in the believer. Ambrose then explains, "if the word of God be of that force that it can make thynges of noughte, and those thynges to bee, whiche neuer were before, muche more it canne make thynges that were before, still to bee, and also to be chaunged into other thynges."<sup>108</sup> It should not be questioned that God can keep the bread and wine present while imparting them with a Spiritual Presence for those who worthily receive the elements. This is a curious argument, because, as noted above, Gardiner often comments that transubstantiation should not be questioned because

---

<sup>105</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 178.

<sup>106</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 192.

<sup>107</sup> Von Campenhausen, *Men Who Shaped*, 87-128.

<sup>108</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 26.

God's power can accomplish anything, including changing bread and wine into Christ's real body and blood. Here, Cranmer turns the argument around; the figures can exist simultaneously with Christ's Spiritual Presence.

Later in the *Defence*, Cranmer notes how the papists latch onto this idea that God can accomplish anything, which thereby upholds transubstantiation. For proof of this argument, the papists turn to Ambrose's work titled, *De iis qui initiantur mysteriis*.<sup>109</sup> Cranmer, however, states that, although Ambrose does have a book on the mysteries, the source the papists use is not by Ambrose. Despite its forgery, Cranmer still dissects the passage to demonstrate that even the unknown author is not in fact heralding transubstantiation. Ambrose acknowledges God's power to change, but does not say that in this change the bread and wine are physically gone. Rather, we now receive the bread and wine not just

as other common meates and drynkes, but as thynges cleane changed into a hygher estate, nature and condition, to be taken as holy meates and drynkes, wherby we receaue spirituall feedyng...Whiche so well agreeth with the substance of bread and wyne styl remainyng, that yf they were gone awaye, and not there, this our spirituall feedyng, coulede not be taught vnto vs by them.<sup>110</sup>

Cranmer stresses that the authentic Ambrose could never be taken to support Real Presence; in numerous passages Ambrose repeatedly calls the bread and wine figures of Christ's body and blood. Ambrose "sayth, that before the consecration, an other kynd is named, but after the consecation, the body of Christe is signified."<sup>111</sup> He also implores

---

<sup>109</sup> *De iis qui initiantur mysteriis* is the Latin title given in Cranmer's *Defence*. The Latin title more commonly seen today is simply, *De mysteriis*. *De mysteriis* includes significant sections on initiation rites, such as baptism and confirmation, for the Church, which is most likely why Cranmer includes "qui initiantur" in his given title.

<sup>110</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 41-42.

"that we must not seeke Christ vpon yearth, nor in yerth, but in heauen, where he sytteth at the ryght hande of his father."<sup>112</sup> Christ corporeally is in heaven; his body is only figuratively represented in the forms of bread and wine.

Yet, this does not mean that Ambrose is suggesting the bread and wine are mere symbols. Ambrose, in Cranmer's opinion, asserts the Spiritual Presence. Through the sacrament the believer indeed connects with Christ and receives grace.<sup>113</sup> It is Christ's spirit that does this, not the bread and wine. "[A]s the bread is a corporal meat, and corporally eaten, so saith S. Ambrose, is the bodye of Christe a spirituall meate, and spirituallly eaten, and that requireth no corporall presence."<sup>114</sup>

Further, Cranmer believes another reason the papists are confused by Ambrose is one short sentence, in which Ambrose writes: "Before the consecration, saith he (as they allege) it is bread, but after the woordes of consecration it is the body of Christe."<sup>115</sup> The problem, according to Cranmer, is the papists do not understand the meaning of the word *consecration*. The papists take it to be a complete transformation into something else. This, however, is not wholly accurate. Simply defined, in Cranmer's words, "consecration is the separation of anye thing from a prophane and wordely vse, vnto a spirituall and godly vse."<sup>116</sup> In the Eucharist the moment of consecration marks the point

---

<sup>111</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 63.

<sup>112</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 52.

<sup>113</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 63.

<sup>114</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 83.

<sup>115</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 82.

<sup>116</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 82.

at which the bread and wine transform from plain bread and wine into the figures of Christ's holy body. However, no physical change has actually occurred.

Not that the bread and wine haue or can haue any holynes in them, but that they be vsed to an holy worke, and represent holy & godly thinges...before the woordes of Christ, is called Bread, but when the woordes of Christ be pronounced, than it is not called bread, but it is called by the name of Christes body.<sup>117</sup>

In addition, *called* is repeatedly used, once again stressing that *called* is not the same as *made*, as Gardiner and his fellow papists try to argue. The elements are called Christ's body because they represent the holy flesh, not because they have been made so.

In *Explication*, Gardiner again returns to the debate between *called* and *made*, in response to *Defence*. Gardiner does not understand how Cranmer can separate these two words. To call is to make, especially when it is Christ's powerful words.

[O]ut of Christes mouth, callynge the bodye of Christe, is makynge the bodye of Christe, whiche woordes callyng, signifynge, namynge vsed in saint Ambrose wrytynges, do not limite Christes woordes, and restrayne them to an onely callyng, and only signifyng, or an only naming, but geue an vndersta[n]dyng agreable to other of Saint Ambrose woordes, that shewe the breade after consecration to be the bodye of Christ, the callyng to be vnderstanded a real callynge of the thyng that so is made, and likewise a reall signifynge of the thyng in dede present, and a reall namynge, as the thyng is in dede.<sup>118</sup>

Just as Cranmer believed Ambrose's words were plain enough to counter Real Presence, Gardiner asserts Ambrose clearly supports that theology. In his first reference to Ambrose in *Explication*, Gardiner asks "What ca[n] be more plainly spoken, then S. Ambrose speketh, when he sayth these words. It is the bread before the co[n]secration but after it is the bodye of Christe."<sup>119</sup> Even though Ambrose might not forthrightly say

---

<sup>117</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 82.

<sup>118</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 133.

the bread and wine are gone, it is evident that is exactly what he means. "Sainte Ambrose saith not that the substaunce of the breade, and wyne is gone, and that is true, he sayth not so in syllables, but he sayth so in sence: because he speaketh of a chaunge so playnelye in the breade into that it was not."<sup>120</sup> Gardiner admits Cranmer is exactly correct in asserting that the bread and wine are turned into something of a higher estate. Cranmer is wrong, however, to believe that this higher estate is only a spiritual manifestation with the bread and wine remaining.<sup>121</sup> For Gardiner this higher estate is the transformation into Christ's corporeal flesh and blood.

Gardiner also charges that Cranmer has misinterpreted Ambrose's sense of where proper adoration is due in the sacrament. For Cranmer, we are to marvel at the inward effect the sacrament has on the believer. Gardiner counters that when speaking of marveling, Ambrose tells us to marvel at the change occurring in the bread. We are to wonder at how, even though the bread appears to remain, God has completely transformed it into Christ's body.<sup>122</sup> Such power is surely to be marveled at.

Gardiner also questions Cranmer's criticism that the papists use a forged work by Ambrose. According to Gardiner there is no question that *De iis qui initiantur mysteriis* is authentic, as many others have proven. Of course, just as Cranmer fails to prove it is a forgery, Gardiner fails to prove it is authentic.<sup>123</sup> He does not cite those who have actually proven the authenticity, nor does he provide any analysis himself from within the

---

<sup>119</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 66.

<sup>120</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 131.

<sup>121</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 131.

<sup>122</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 132.

<sup>123</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 131.

source to show unequivocally Ambrose's authorship. Both Cranmer and Gardiner are attempting to challenge authorship credibility to serve their own purposes, but in the case of Ambrose this argument does not benefit either bishop. In fact, Cranmer does not even address Gardiner's rebuttal on this issue in his *Answer*.

As detailed above, Cranmer provided a lengthy discussion on Ambrose in his *Defence*, and therefore does not dwell overmuch on responding to Gardiner's claims in *Answer* because, in his judgment Gardiner has failed to offer adequate criticisms.

Turning to their Ambrose debate, Cranmer answers,

[i]t is not I that wrastle with S. Ambrose, but you, who take greate payne to wraсте his woordes cleane contrary to his entent and meanyng. But where you aske this question, what can be more playne then these wordes of Sainct Ambrose, It is breade before consecration, and after it is Christes body? These wordes of S. Ambrose be not fully so playne as you pretende, but cleane contrarye...the bread is called Christes bodye after consecration (as S. Ambrose saythe) and yet it is not so really but sacramentally.<sup>124</sup>

Of course Ambrose's words are meant figuratively and this meaning is quite plain.

Gardiner is the writer who confuses Ambrose and changes meaning for his own benefit.

Cranmer concludes by noting that not only does Ambrose deny transubstantiation, but he explicitly denies it. As Cranmer clarifies, "against Transubstantiation he teacheth plainly, that after consecration not only thynges reamyn, but also that the thyngs cha[n]ged, stil remayn. And what is this, but a flatte condemnation of your ymaged transubstantiation?"<sup>125</sup> This passage both reflects anti-transubstantiation theology and upholds Cranmer's Spiritual Presence view. Cranmer explains although the bread and wine remain, they are no longer mere elements but have been changed by Christ's spirit

---

<sup>124</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 210.

<sup>125</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 331.

being added to them. With these few references on Ambrose, Cranmer concludes his counter to Gardiner. Cranmer presented enough solid support from Ambrose in the *Defence* and, therefore, need not repeat those proofs here in his *Answer*.

### Chrysostom

Chrysostom was born around 349 in Antioch where he began his religious career and became Archbishop of Constantinople in 397 remaining so until his death in 407.<sup>126</sup> John Chrysostom figures largely in the Cranmer-Gardiner debate; he provides numerous sources that both Cranmer and Gardiner seize upon for their own support. Our first encounter with Chrysostom in Cranmer's *Defence* is short and to the point: "[t]he nature of bread (saith he) doeth styll remayn, to the vtter and manyfest confutation of the Papistes."<sup>127</sup> Cranmer then elaborates on Chrysostom's view, arguing that Chrysostom asserts the bread does remain after consecration; yet, the consecrated bread now has a "hygher name, and bee called the body of Christ: to signifie vnto the godly eaters of that bread, that they spiritually eat the supernaturall bread of the body of Christ, who spiritually is there present, and dwelleth in them, and they in hym, although corporally he sytteth in heauen at the right hande of his father."<sup>128</sup>

Cranmer uses numerous examples from Chrysostom's many works to illustrate Chrysostom's undoubted support for Cranmer's own argument. For example, in a homily

---

<sup>126</sup> For more on Chrysostom see J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom-Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1995).

<sup>127</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 26.

<sup>128</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 28.

from his *Adversus Iudaeos*, Chrysostom writes, "[t]hat whiche we do, is doon for a remembrance of that whiche was done by Christ."<sup>129</sup> Chrysostom goes on to say that it is wrong to think that we make daily sacrifices of Christ in the Mass; rather, we daily offer a memorial of Christ's sacrifice, which wiped away the need for any following sacrifices from us.<sup>130</sup> In his "Homily on John," Chrysostom reiterates the idea that Christ is not corporeally present, stating Christ "ment not of his fleshe (god forbid) but he ment of the them that fleshley and carnally vnderstand those thynges that Christe spake. But what is carnall vnderstanding? To vnderstand the woordes simply as they be spoken, and nothing els."<sup>131</sup> Here, Cranmer is able to draw out support for his view that Christ is not corporeally present in the elements, but is present in the faithful believer. The faithful Christian meets, and communes with, Christ in heaven; where Christ is both corporeally and spiritually present.<sup>132</sup>

In using Chrysostom, Cranmer also challenges the belief that the priest wields power in overseeing the Eucharist. The papists argue for priestly power because, as God's ordained ministers, they are the only people holy enough to impart the power of consecration to the bread and wine, and then administer the changed elements. Cranmer argues, however, that the priests have no special power; priests do not impart a change to the bread and wine. As Chrysostom writes, "whan you comme to these mysteries (speakyng of the Lordes boorde and holy Communion) do not thynke that you receyue by

---

<sup>129</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 113.

<sup>130</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 113-114.

<sup>131</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 61.

<sup>132</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 84: Christ "is in heauen only, and in our myndes by fayth we ascend vp into heauen, to eat hime there, although sacramentally as in a signe and figure, he be in the bread and wyne & in them that ryghtly receiue the bread & wyne."

a man the body of God."<sup>133</sup> The sacrament is not given power through a priest, but directly from God. Cranmer also uses this statement to strike down transubstantiation further: "if we receiue not the body of Christ at the handes of a man, Ergo, the body of Christ is note really, corporally and naturally in the sacrament, and so geuen to vs by the priest. And than it foloweth, that all the Papistes bee lyars, because they fayne and teache the contrary."<sup>134</sup> The priest cannot distribute Christ, because Christ is not corporeally present in the bread or wine. The power in the sacrament, from Christ, is a spiritual power in worthy receivers.

Cranmer also argues that the papists wrongly think Chrysostom supports transubstantiation because they do not understand his writing style. For an uninformed reader, it would seem Chrysostom's "sounde of wordes maketh moste for the aduersaries of the truthe: but they that bee familiar and acquainted with Chrysostomes maner of speaking how in all writinges hee is full of allusions, schemes, tropes and figures, shall soone perceyue, that he helpeth nothyng there purposes."<sup>135</sup> In another section, Cranmer points out that Chrysostom commonly uses "negatives by comparison" in his Eucharistic expositions. Thus, when Chrysostom writes that the Lord's Supper does not include bread he did not actually mean there was no more bread or wine. Rather, "his inte[n]t was, to drawe our myndes vp wardes to heauen, that we shuld not consider to mucche the bread, wine, priest, and body of Christ we shuld consider his diuinitee and holy spirite [g]iuen vnto vs to our eternall saluation."<sup>136</sup> Once again this supports Cranmer's theology

---

<sup>133</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 84.

<sup>134</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 84.

<sup>135</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 83.

that it is the mind of the faithful Christian, not the bread, that is important; it is when one looks to heaven, not the actual bread, that he or she shall see and commune with Christ.

While most of the evidence Cranmer supplies from Chrysostom does seem to support his own theology, Cranmer also includes one passage that seemingly contradicts his view. "So dothe saint Iohn Chrysostome saye, that we see Christe with oure eies, touche hym, feel hym, and grope hym with our handes, fixe our teeth in his fleshe, taste it, breake it, eate it, and digest it, make redde our tongues and die them with his bloude, and swalowe it, and drynke it."<sup>137</sup> Cranmer's explanation on this passage is simple; it is not meant to be taken literally but figuratively. Figuratively the passage indicates that, just as we physically see, taste, eat, and drink common bread and wine, so too do the mind and spirit see, taste, eat, and drink Christ's Spiritual Presence when we worthily partake in the sacrament. Yet this passage says nothing about speaking figuratively.

Gardiner, not surprisingly then, does not consider Chrysostom a proponent of a figurative Eucharistic theology. In *Explication*, Gardiner denigrates Cranmer's association that a Spiritual Presence means the elements themselves must be figures and not Christ's corporeal body. "[T]hauctor of the boke vseth a sleight to ioyn figuratiuely to spiritually, as though they were alwayes all one, whiche is not so."<sup>138</sup> Chrysostom stresses that the faithful turn to heaven and receive the full benefit of salvation because of their worthiness. Yet this does not in turn mean that Christ is not corporeally absent from the bread. Spiritual and corporeal presences are not mutually exclusive. Gardiner

---

<sup>136</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 39-40.

<sup>137</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 100.

<sup>138</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 41.

exhibits Chrysostom's true understanding, that Christ is both spiritually and corporeally present in the sacrament, with the following passage:

O greate benevolence of God towardes vs, he that sitteth aboue with the father, at the same houre, is holde[n] here with the ha[n]des of all men, and geueth himselfe to them that will clapse and embrace hime, thus sayth Chrisostome co[n]fessyng to be aboue, and here the same thynges at ones, not onely in mens brestes, but ha[n]des also.<sup>139</sup>

Chrysostom is also insistent that wine must be used in the sacrament because there cannot be Christ's blood if there is no wine. Thus, Gardiner concludes that if the wine is a mere sign, why would Chrysostom care what drink was used if it were only a memorial?

Clearly, something higher happens that specifically requires wine.<sup>140</sup>

Gardiner also accuses Cranmer of falsely understanding the Roman view on priestly function. Gardiner has never asserted that the priest, alone, holds power to effect the change at consecration; only God can exert such power. However, this does not deny that the visible priest at the altar is exercising some power through Christ, the invisible priest.

Christe is the Inuisible Prieste, and ministreth in the visible church by his visible minister, the visible Prieste, whereof Chrisostome woulde by his wordes put vs in reme[m]brance, not denyng therby the visible menistrye no more then he doth in his other wordes deny the visible forme of bread...touchyng the Priest Sainct Chrisostomes do by no meane teach vs that there is no visible Prieste, but to thinke the bodye of Christe is delyuered of Christes hande, whiche excludeth not in like sorte the ministre visible.<sup>141</sup>

In typical fashion, Gardiner once again challenges the credibility of Cranmer's source. It is not the papists who invent or edit sources for their own benefit; Gardiner

---

<sup>139</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 53.

<sup>140</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 111.

<sup>141</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 129.

asserts that Cranmer uses this dishonorable method. As Gardiner discusses, "Chrisostome in this place (of an epistell not published by credite) saith that the nature of breade remayneth, so Cyprian that was older then he, saith the nature of bread is chaunged, which Chrisostome in his other workes, by publique credite set a brode, semeth not to denye."<sup>142</sup> Here, Gardiner is convicting Cranmer of finding an unknown letter; this suggestion is put in as an aside, leaving the reader to, perhaps, jump to the conclusion it is most likely a forged document. It should be noted, however, that it not only contradicts all of the known, credible Chrysostom works, but also contradicts other important church theologians. Consequently, Cranmer's use of Chrysostom should be read critically, if not fully discredited. Nonetheless, Gardiner does not specifically address which passage in Cranmer features the unknown letter. For his part Cranmer does not miss this gloss and simply responds in *Answer* that Gardiner has no proper words to offer against Cranmer's interpretations. This is not surprising though; it is just "a sleight and comon practise of you [Gardiner], whan you cannot aunswer the matter, to sek faultes in the translation, where none is."<sup>143</sup>

In *Answer*, Cranmer also returns to the argument over the difference between *calling* and *making*. The bread, in its figurative form, can be called the body of Christ but that does not mean it is the body. "But (say you) a figure can neuer be cou[n]ted worthy the name of [the] thyng onlesse [the] thyng were there in dede. Wrangle then with S. Iohn Chrysost. hymself, and not with me, who sayth that the bread is exalted to the name of the Lordes body."<sup>144</sup> Elsewhere, Cranmer repeats this view that, just because it is now

---

<sup>142</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 110 marked 97.

<sup>143</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 344.

referred to by a higher name, it does not mean it is no longer bread. Chrysostom says, after all, "as plainly as can be spoke, that the breade remayneth after consecration, although we call it by a more excellent name of dignitie, that is to say, by the name of Christes body."<sup>145</sup>

Cranmer also returns to the discussion on what Chrysostom means when he writes of holding Christ in the partaker's hands. He justifies his earlier position from the *Defence*, in responding to Gardiner. We do in fact hold, see, taste, and chew Christ but only figuratively. Unlike his discussion on this topic in the *Defence*, in this later *Answer* Cranmer provides some elaboration, although not in much greater detail, on what he means by *figuratively* regarding Chrysostom's passages. All of these carnal actions "declareth not the inwarde worke of God in the substaunce of the visible Sacrament, but signifieth what God worketh inwardely in trew beleeuers."<sup>146</sup> We do not physically eat Christ, but those who are faithful and worthy do spiritually eat, or commune, with Christ in heaven. Chrysostom, or others, using this figurative language offers an earthly comparison to which a person can relate in that we understand physical eating and the figurative language helps explain the more confusing internal mystery that actually happens in the sacrament.

Cranmer is also baffled by Gardiner's discussion on the visible priest. Referencing his earlier *Defence*, Cranmer insists he was not denying that the visible priest has any power. Rather, he denies that the priest is imparting Christ into the bread, because the bread is not corporeally changed at all. This also strikes down Gardiner's

---

<sup>144</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 344.

<sup>145</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 298.

<sup>146</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 178.

explanation that it is Christ, as the invisible priest, who creates the change through his visible priest. Here again Cranmer denies there is any change to be made; therefore this discussion avoids the initial point Cranmer was making in referencing the priest.

Cranmer said one should not think he or she receives Christ from a priest, because Christ is not in the bread to be offered by a priest to begin with. Cranmer reminds Gardiner that Chrysostom

teacheth them that come to that holy mysteries, with what thynges their myndes should be chiefly occupied, not about earthely and visible thynges, but about thynges celestiall and inuisyble...when you comme to the mysteries, doo not thynke that you receaue by a man the body of God...the thyng that we receaue (sayth he) is not the bodye of God, and the personne of whome wee receaue is not a manne, lyke as before immediately he sayde, that the thyng whyche we see is not breade.<sup>147</sup>

It is quite clear, in Cranmer's opinion, that Chrysostom does not support transubstantiation; therefore, Chrysostom does not support Gardiner's arguments.

### Jerome

Jerome was born in northern Italy around 347. He traveled throughout Western and Eastern Christendom in the fourth and fifth centuries until his death at Bethlehem in 420. Jerome wrote extensively, but is best known for his Latin translation of the Bible, the Vulgate.<sup>148</sup> Jerome receives very little attention from Cranmer in *Defence*. This is a bit surprising, as William Haaugaard has pointed out that Jerome was one of the more

---

<sup>147</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 382.

<sup>148</sup> Von Campenhausen, *Men Who Shaped*, 129-182.

commonly translated and read Church Fathers in sixteenth-century England.<sup>149</sup> In the *Defence*, Jerome is not often quoted; rather, he is referenced as in agreement with other authors whose views are quoted, for example Ambrose and Augustine.<sup>150</sup> Cranmer pays Jerome even less attention in the later *Answer*. Contrast this with Gardiner's use of Jerome at several points throughout his *Explication*. As we shall see Gardiner is not blind to Cranmer's underuse of Jerome, and uses that to his own advantage.

The one reference in *Defence* that does serve Cranmer is from Jerome's *Commentary on Titus*. In this work Jerome explains the difference between sacrificial *panes propositionis* and Christ's body present at the sacrament. In Cranmer's analysis, Jerome

ment that the Shew bread of the lawe [*panes propositionis*], was but a darke shadow of Christ to come, but the sacrament of Christes bodye is a cleare testimony, that Christ is already come, & that he hath performed that whiche was promysed, and doth presently comforte and feede vs spiritually with his precious body and bloud, not withstandyng that corporally he is ascended into heave[n].<sup>151</sup>

The Israelites had to offer repeated bread sacrifices because Christ had not yet come and fulfilled their promises from God. Christians, however, are no longer required to offer these sacrifices because Christ has offered the only needed sacrifice. Thus, the Eucharist is not a repeated sacrifice, but the memorial of that which Christ has already offered.

In his *Explication*, Gardiner responds to Cranmer's analysis on the *panes propositionis*. Cranmer's discussion is nonsensical, he asserts, because it cannot fit with his Eucharistic figurative theology. Jerome speaks of the Jewish bread sacrifices as a

---

<sup>149</sup> Haaugaard, "Patristic Scholarship," 43.

<sup>150</sup> For these examples see Cranmer, *Defence*, 58 and 94.

<sup>151</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 87 marked 79.

prefiguring of the truth to come in Christ's body. These sacrifices also prefigured what was to occur in the sacrament at the altar. Yet, if Cranmer's figurative theology is to be supported, then these early sacrifices prefigured the figurative bread. "So as if Christes body in the Sacrament should bethere but figuratiuely (as this auctor [Cranmer] teacheth) then were the bread of proposition, figure of a figure, and shadowe of a shadowe, whiche is ouer great an ansurditie in our religion."<sup>152</sup> Gardiner maintains that the sacrifices could not prefigure a symbol but Christ's actual body; Christ must corporeally exist in the bread and wine to make those early sacrifices true.

After correcting, in Gardiner's estimation, Cranmer's false interpretation of Jerome regarding *panes propositionis*, Gardiner continues to reference Jerome in support of the Real Presence. Cranmer has left out Jerome or so arranged Jerome's passages for his own benefit in order not to reveal Jerome's truth.<sup>153</sup> Gardiner, however, is willing to do so.

First, Gardiner proves Jerome's belief that those who unworthily take the bread defile Christ's body.<sup>154</sup> "We defile the bread, that is to say, the bodye of christ whe[n] we cume vnworthely to thaltare...Can any wordes be more manifest & euide[n]t to declare S. Hieromes mynde howe in the visible sacrame[n]t men receyue vnworthely, whiche be euil men the bodye and bloud of Christ."<sup>155</sup> These clear words indicate that Christ's body

---

<sup>152</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 73 marked 62.

<sup>153</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 73.

<sup>154</sup> This counters Cranmer's arguments that evil men cannot defile Christ's perfect body; thus, the body cannot actually be present in the bread.

<sup>155</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 85-86.

is truly present and eaten, even for and by evil men. These words are plain and Cranmer has passed over them either "of purpose, or by ignorance."<sup>156</sup>

Gardiner also explains that, while Jerome sometimes uses *represent* in discussing what occurs at the sacrament, *represent* does not mean mere *signification* as Cranmer would like. *Represent* means providing the truth of the thing being signified. Therefore, writing that the bread represents Christ's body means the bread in truth is the body.

Sainct Hierome speaketh of the representacion of the truth of Christes body, which truth excludeth an only figure. For howsoever the visible matter of the sacrament be a figure, the inuisible parte is a truth: whiche saincte Hierome sayth is here represented (that is to say) made prese[n]t, which only signification doth not.<sup>157</sup>

With other authors, Gardiner continually criticizes Cranmer's over-explanation of what authors mean when using words such as *figure*, *signification*, and *called*. Yet, in this instance Gardiner is doing just what he criticizes Cranmer for doing. *Represent* could be argued to support plainly Cranmer's figurative theology, yet Gardiner does not allow the words to speak so plainly as he wishes Cranmer to do with other authors. Despite this change in rhetorical approach and the apparent support it could offer Cranmer, Cranmer does not challenge Gardiner's handling of this matter in *Answer*. While Cranmer usually has the last word in this debate because of his *Answer*, concerning Jerome it is in fact Gardiner who speaks loudest, most, and last.

---

<sup>156</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 86.

<sup>157</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 44.

## Cyril

At the age of 34, Cyril became Bishop of Alexandria, serving from 412 to 444.<sup>158</sup> Cranmer asserts Cyril in no way claims Christ is corporeally present in the bread and wine. There is a presence, but it is the Spiritual Presence Cranmer is continuously declaring. In Cyril's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, as quoted in Cranmer's *Defence*, Cyril writes, "Although Christ toke awaye fro[m] hence the presence of his body, yet in his Maiestye of his Godhead he is euer here, as hee promised to his disciples at this departyng, saying: I am with you euer vnto the worldes ende."<sup>159</sup> Christ is present in his divinity, but not humanly. His flesh is in heaven.

In Cranmer's opinion, the papists have falsely used Cyril for their own benefit because of one section in his *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, which reads, "we know not the strengthe and vertue of the mystical benediction, whiche when it is made in vs, doth it not make Christ by co[m]munication of his flesh to dwel corporally in vs."<sup>160</sup> The papists take "his flesh to dwel corporally in vs" as proof for transubstantiation; Christ corporeally enters us through the bread and wine. Cranmer clarifies what he believes Cyril meant,

although in these words Cyril doth say, that Christ doth dwell corporally in vs, when wee receiue [the] mystical benediction: yet he neither sayth that Christ dwelleth corporally in the bread, nor that he dwelleth in vs corporally onely at suche tymes as wee receiue the sacrament, nor that he dwelleth in vs, & not we in him, but he sayth aswel, [that] we dwel in him, as that he dwelleth in vs. whiche dwellyng is neither corporall nor local, but as heauenly, spiritual & supernatural

---

<sup>158</sup> Susan Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 15.

<sup>159</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 51.

<sup>160</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 80.

dwellyng, whereby so long as we dwell in him & he in vs, we haue by him euerlasting life.<sup>161</sup>

Once again the key word in the interpretation is *spiritual*. Christ is indeed present but not in our carnal understanding of body and blood. It is through his divinity that he is made corporeally present in those who are worthy.

Cranmer also uses Cyril to counter Gardiner and transubstantiation because Cyril is opposed to persons believing they are eating Christ with their physical mouths. Cyril strictly forbids such thinking on the sacrament.

But as for the corporall eatinge and drinkinge with our mouths, and digesting with our bodies...our sacrament (saith he [Cyril]) doth not affirme the eatinge of a manne, drawinge wickedly christen people to haue grosse imaginacions and carnal fantasies of suche thinges as be fine and pure, & receiued onely with a sinsere faithe.<sup>162</sup>

If transubstantiation did occur, it must then follow that people are eating Christ's human form, with which Cranmer shows Cyril adamantly disagrees.

Cranmer also demonstrates Cyril's opposition to transubstantiation by the fact that, if the bread and wine were corporeally Christ's body and blood, then evil men would be able to eat Christ. For Cranmer, this is reprehensible. We saw this same argument in Cranmer's discussion on Origen. Christ's body provides healing power for a sick soul seeking redemption, but such remedy can only be offered to those who seek it and are worthy to commune with Christ. Evil men, however, because they do not seek such remedy, cannot receive it. "Christes aduersaries the Papistes, depriue and robbe hym when they affirme, that suche men do eate his flesh & receiue this plaister [medicine], as

---

<sup>161</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 80.

<sup>162</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 81.

remayne still sicke and sore, and be not holpen therby."<sup>163</sup> Christ's body only heals; hence, in denying Him this action in the bodies of corrupt men, the papists are denying Christ's power. Christ cannot be corporeally present in the bread and wine because evil men cannot eat him, even though they do take the sacramental elements.

In his *Explication*, though, Gardiner challenges Cranmer's interpretation of *corporeally*, a word which is quite plain in its meaning. In order to evade the clear definition of the word, Cranmer had to provide a lofty explanation that obscures Cyril's true theological understanding. "[F]or Cyrill telleth hymselfe plainely, what he meaneth by the word (corporally) whiche place and this auctour [Cranmer] had founde, he might haue spared a greate many of wordes vttered by diuination, but then the truthe of that place hindreth and qualeth in maner al the booke."<sup>164</sup> Gardiner then goes on to provide his own exposition of Cyril's meaning. Christ gives his body in the sacrament so that when we partake, we receive Christ corporeally because he is already spiritually within the faithful.<sup>165</sup> We must receive Christ corporeally in order for our bodies to join with Christ and his physical death and resurrection.<sup>166</sup> Gardiner does concede, though, that Cranmer cannot be too much at fault because he was using a bad translation from the Reformer Oecolampadius. Of course, this would challenge Cranmer's skill as a humanist and theologian because he relied on a contemporary translation rather than reading the original Greek for himself. To help Cranmer remedy his mistake, Gardiner prints the

---

<sup>163</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 97.

<sup>164</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 60.

<sup>165</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 60.

<sup>166</sup> This theological view is derived from the idea that all humanity is corrupted because of Adam's sin. Thus, to receive salvation we must unite our corporeal bodies with the perfect body of Christ whose human form died to remit our sins.

original Greek and its Latin and (Gardiner's) English translations from Cyril's *Commentary on the Gospel of John*.<sup>167</sup>

Cranmer, obviously, cannot let Gardiner get away with such claims. So in *Answer*, Cranmer repeats that when Cyril is speaking on Christ's body and our eating it, Cyril is speaking figuratively. We do not carnally eat Christ's corporeal body; rather, we eat "only by a pure faith, and not that he is eaten corporally with our mowthes, as other meates be."<sup>168</sup> As always with Cranmer, *faith* is stressed as the means of communicating with Christ. We are indeed united with Christ in the sacrament, but Cyril "speaketh not one woord of the coporall presence of Christ in the fourmes of bread and wyne."<sup>169</sup>

Cranmer yields to Gardiner that our salvation is dependent on connecting our corporeal bodies with Christ's, but this unity is not through the sacrament. Rather "Cyrill and other olde authours" assert Christ connected with our corrupt humanity at his incarnation. Thus, we are already corporeally connected with Christ.<sup>170</sup> The sacrament provides the spiritual connection by which we confirm our faith in Christ and our worthiness for salvation. Cranmer does not dwell much more on Cyril and ends his response to Gardiner with a strong insult for his opposing bishop: "For although you lyke a Gra[m]marien, ruffle in your cases, Gendres, nombres, and personnes, corruptyng the

---

<sup>167</sup> For the Greek, Latin, and Gardiner's own English translations see Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 61-63.

<sup>168</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 21.

<sup>169</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 199.

<sup>170</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 199.

Greeke, Latyn and Englishe, to draw them to your purpose, yet shall you neuer proue that Cyril speaketh of an any other eatyng of Christe, but by faith."<sup>171</sup>

### Theodoret

Born in Antioch around 393, Theodoret became bishop of Cyrrhus in 423, afterwards completing most of his theological writings until his death in 457.<sup>172</sup> In turning to Theodoret for support, Cranmer quotes from Theodoret's two *Dialogues* in his *Defence*, citing four points through a reading and proper understanding of Theodoret. First, Jesus *called* the bread and wine by the names they came to *signify*: body and blood. Second, there is a change after consecration but the bread and wine also remain the same. Third, even though we know the bread and wine remain, after consecration we should use the terms body and blood out of respect for Christ's power and grace in the sacrament. Fourth, the bread and wine remain not in some minor form, but in their entirety: "nature, substance, bygness, forme, and fashion."<sup>173</sup> The papists contradict all four points with transubstantiation; thus, they cannot rely on Theodoret for support.

In the *First Dialogue*,<sup>174</sup> Theodoret compares Christ calling his body the bread with Christ calling himself the vine. Even though Christ called himself the vine, he was not physically changed into the vine; just as the bread does not become Christ's corporeal

---

<sup>171</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 200.

<sup>172</sup> Glenn Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* 2nd ed. (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1986), 208-214.

<sup>173</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 70-71.

<sup>174</sup> The First and Second *Dialogues* are two of three books making up Theodoret's *Eranistes*. This work, written around 447, was largely a refutation of the Monophysites.

flesh.<sup>175</sup> Using the *Second Dialogue*, Cranmer quotes Theodoret as saying "the bread and wyne after the consecration lose not their propre nature, but kepe their former substaunce, forme, and figure, whyche they had before, even so the body of Christe, after his ascention, was changed into the godly substaunce."<sup>176</sup> This clearly denounces transubstantiation.

Yet, Theodoret is not proclaiming a mere figurative Eucharistic theology. After the consecration there is a change that takes place; Christ's power is *added to* the bread and wine, which remain.

[B]y the chaungynge of the names, should beleue the thynges whyche bee wrought in them by grace. For he that called that, which is his naturall body, corne and bread, and also called hym selfe a vyne, he dyd honour the visible tokens and signes, with the names of his bodye and bloud, not chaungynge the nature, but addynge grace to nature.<sup>177</sup>

This is reminiscent of the previously addressed debate between *changed* or *added to* in Cranmer and Gardiner's discussion of Cyprian. Despite the remaining bread and wine, we know that grace, via Christ's spirit, has been added when we worthily come to the table and, using our minds, consider what Christ has accomplished.<sup>178</sup> Cranmer again is

---

<sup>175</sup>Cranmer, *Defence*, 29. Cranmer repeats this line of justification using another quote from Theodoret's *First Dialogue* on page 66: "wher he [Theodoret] dysputeth & sheweth at length, how the names of things be changed in scripture, and yet thinges remayne styll. And for exaample he proueth that the fleshe of Christ is in [the] scripture sometyme called a vayle or couerynge, sometyme a clothe, sometime a vestiment, and sometime a stole."

<sup>176</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 29.

<sup>177</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 67.

<sup>178</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 69. Cranmer's exact quote on this interpretation: "for the sacramentall signes goe not from their owne nature after the sanctification, but continue in theyr former substance, forme and figure, and may be sene and touched as well as before, yet in our myndes we doo consyder, what they be made, and do repute and esteme them, and haue them in reuerence, accordynge to the same thynges that they be taken for."

stressing, through his interpretation of Theodoret, that the sacrament's efficacy is wrought in the faithful believer, not the bread and wine.

Gardiner's response to Cranmer is simple: Cranmer has mistranslated the original Greek, thereby altering Theodoret's actual Eucharistic theology. Cranmer asserts Theodoret calls the faithful Christian to believe that a change has occurred even though the elements are still present. Gardiner, however, argues that in the original Greek the word *believe* was understood in connection with the actual thing, in this case Christ's body.<sup>179</sup> Believing equates to truth, not signification. It is "an absurditie, to beleue thynges otherwise the[n] they be, as though they wer, & very Idolatrie to worship that is not, as though it were in dede."<sup>180</sup>

Gardiner's assertion is that Cranmer's problem is his failure to understand what Theodoret means when he says bread remains. All that remains is the visible form. The substance, nature, and essence of the bread and wine are fully changed into Christ's body and blood. As Gardiner clarifies, Theodoret explains "what he meaneth by it [that the bread remains], addynge it maye be seen and felt as before, whiche is not the nature of substaunce properlye, but like comen speache that remayneth maye be called matter."<sup>181</sup> In transubstantiation it is true the entire substance of bread is changed, but form is not the same as substance, which is the reason it appears to remain. Cranmer fails to understand this differentiation, which leads him to misinterpret Theodoret and numerous other early church theologians.

---

<sup>179</sup> The word here debated is *taquam*, see Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 45.

<sup>180</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 45.

<sup>181</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 104.

Cranmer does not dwell on addressing Gardiner's use of Theodoret in *Answer*. He repeats his earlier claims from *Defence* that Theodoret clearly states the bread and wine remain after consecration, even though they are now called the body and blood.<sup>182</sup> As for Gardiner's translation issue, it is Gardiner who has falsely read and understood Theodoret. The "wordes of Theodorete after your interpretation contayn bothe a playn vntruth, and also manifest idolatrye: for the signes and tokens whiche he speaketh of, be the verye fourmes and substances of bread and wyne."<sup>183</sup> Cranmer does not just point out that the form remains, but so too does the substance thereby countering Gardiner's claim that Theodoret means only the form remains while the substance is transformed into the body. In concluding this matter regarding Gardiner's translation criticism Cranmer provides one of his juiciest insults insisting Gardiner is "so puffed vp with wynde, that it is a maruail it brasteth noth. But be pacient a while good reader, and suffre vntill the blast of wynde be past, and thou shalt see a great calme...and nothing in it but all vanitie."<sup>184</sup>

### Gelasius

Born in Rome, Gelasius was elected Pope in 492 and served until his death four years later.<sup>185</sup> Most of his few theological works focused on the Monophysite

---

<sup>182</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 298.

<sup>183</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 152.

<sup>184</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 152.

<sup>185</sup> For more on Gelasius's papal tenure see: A.W.J. Holleman, *Pope Gelasius I and the Lupercalia* (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1974).

controversy in Constantinople in the late fifth century.<sup>186</sup> In *Defence*, Cranmer gives Gelasius little mention. However, in one key passage, Cranmer explicitly highlights Gelasius's views on Spiritual versus Real Presence: "Note well these wordes agaynste all the Papistes of our tyme, that Gelasius (which was byshop of Rome more tha[n] a thousand yeres passed) writeth of this sacrament, that the breadde and wyne cease not to be there styll." What words could better denounce transubstantiation?

Gardiner, of course, challenges Cranmer's interpretation.

As bread and wyne go into the diuine substaunce the holy gooste bringyng it to passe, and yet remayne in the proprietie of there nature, so that principall mysterye, those natures remayninge, whereof it is declared vnto vs true and hole Christ to continue. In these wordes of Gelasius where he saith the breade and wyne go into the diuine substaunce, is playnly declared the presence of the diuine substaunce, and this diuine substaunce, can signifie none other substaunce, but of the body and bloode of Christe.<sup>187</sup>

Cranmer, as he did with Theodoret, misunderstands Gelasius who declares the bread and wine's forms remain but not the substances. The substance has been changed fully into Christ's corporeal body, matching Gardiner's, not Cranmer's, view. This passage illustrates Gelasius's true theology, as does the following Gardiner interpretation:

"Gelasius in opening the mystery of the Sacrament, speaketh of tra[n]siti[o]n of the

---

<sup>186</sup> Festus Balogun, *Three African Popes: A Short Analytical History of their Lives and Pontificates* (Nigeria: Catholic Bishop of Osogbo Diocese, 2004), 17-26. Monophysites argued that Christ had only one nature, a divine nature. This is primarily a Christological debate but there are Eucharistic problems that result from this controversy. Specifically, if Christ were only divine, then what purpose is the Eucharist, which celebrates Christ's human death along with his divine resurrection? Although Cranmer and Gardiner do not reference what Gelasian works they are using, it is likely the references come from Gelasius's anti-Monophysite writings. It is also important to note Gelasius was defending the orthodox Nicean position against Monophysitism because the one versus two natures issue is discussed between Cranmer and Gardiner in the sixteenth-century (as discussed elsewhere). This illustrates the importance of the Christological debate on Christ's natures in Eucharistic development, not only in the early church but in the Reformation as well.

<sup>187</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 122.

bread, & wyne into the godly substa[n]ce, whiche worde transition, is mete to expresse transubstantiatio[n]."<sup>188</sup>

Cranmer cannot allow such misinterpretations to go unanswered. As he states in *Answer* when he begins his rebuttal, "I Pitie you, to see howe ye swynke and sweate, to confounde this author Gelasius. And yet his woordes bee so playne agaynst your Papisticall Transubstantiation, that you haue clearely lost all your paynes, labours, and costes."<sup>189</sup> Cranmer does not understand how Gardiner can possibly confuse Gelasius's statement that "the substaunce or nature of bread and wyne ceaseth not to bee" with a Real Presence theology that states the substance of bread and wine cease to be.<sup>190</sup> In Gelasius's discussion on the sacraments having a divine substance, it is the worthy believer who is altered, not simply the elements of bread and wine becoming Christ's holy body. "[T]o them that woorthily receaue the sacramentes, to them they be tourned into the diuine substaunce, through the workyng of the holy ghost, who maketh the godly receauers to be the partakers of the diuine nature and substance."<sup>191</sup>

### John Damascene

John Damascene was born in Damascus in the second half of the seventh century. His religious career began in 706 when he became a monk, and later preacher, in

---

<sup>188</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 123.

<sup>189</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 351.

<sup>190</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 351.

<sup>191</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 356.

Palestine where he remained until his death.<sup>192</sup> Neither Cranmer nor Gardiner devotes much to elaborating on John Damascene's true theology.<sup>193</sup> However, it is important for us to examine what brief discussion he does receive. For Cranmer's part, in the *Defence*, Cranmer tells his reader "Iohn Damascene maye in no wyse be passed ouer, whom for his auctoritie the aduersaries of Christes true naturall body doo reken as a stout champion sufficient to defende all the whole matter alone."<sup>194</sup> However, Damascene in fact only marginally supports Cranmer's opinion. Damascene is a 'young' theologian in comparison with the early authorities. He is writing two to three centuries later than the previously discussed theologians and hence is farther removed from Christ's early Church. Damascene also contradicts many of the early authorities in doctrinal matters, which discredits his theology and authority. For example, Cranmer notes that Damascene "varieth fro[m] the most ancient authors (if he meane as thei [the papists] expound him) as when he saith, that the bread and wine be not figures, whiche all the old authors call figures, and that the bread and wine consume not, nor be auoyded downwarde, whiche Origen and S. Augustine affirme."<sup>195</sup>

Having said that, even though Damascene does provide the papists with idolatrous support, one of his key passages the papists use against the true Eucharistic figurative

---

<sup>192</sup> Andrew Louth, *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 3-14.

<sup>193</sup> Damascene is probably not given extensive attention primarily because his writings are not greatly concerned with Eucharistic theology. Andrew Louth shows that most of his writings center on Christology and the nature of the Trinity because he is largely defending Christian orthodoxy (based on Nicaea and Chalcedon) against the Monophysites, Monotheitists, and the emerging Muslim population of his period. See Louth, *St. John Damscene*, 8-14 and chapters 5-6.

<sup>194</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 87 marked 79.

<sup>195</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 87 marked 79.

doctrine does not justify transubstantiation. Cranmer points out that the papists have failed to use the false gold Damascene can provide and only bury themselves further. The papists continually refer to Damascene's assertion that we eat Christ spiritually.<sup>196</sup> What Damascene really means, which the papists get wrong, is that Christ has two natures, God and man, just as man has two natures, spiritual and carnal. When we partake in the sacrament our spiritual nature connects with Christ's godly nature. Neither our corrupt carnal nature nor Christ's humanity is involved. We are just too ignorant to see the spiritual effect in the sacrament, so God ordained the use of bread and wine to serve as explanatory tokens for the invisible mystery. "[T]o healpe our infirmities, and to make vs the better to see the same with a pure fayth, our saviour Christ hath set forth the same, as it were before our eyes, by sensible signes and tokens, whiche we dayly vsed and accustomed vnto."<sup>197</sup>

Cranmer also believes Damascene contradicts the papists's claims to worship and adore the sacrament, which is pure idolatry. It is Christ who is to be worshipped, who is "sittyng in heaue[n] with his father, and beyng spiritually within our selues."<sup>198</sup> He also denies that the bread and wine are totally removed after consecration. Rather, Christ's divinity is joined with the bread and wine.<sup>199</sup> We see Cranmer stressing that after consecration there is an *addition* to the bread and wine, not an entire transformation. Though the papists could easily use Damascene to support their errors, when they do reference this non-authority they fail to use passages that call for transubstantiation.

---

<sup>196</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 87 marked 79.

<sup>197</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 88.

<sup>198</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 89.

<sup>199</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 90.

Surely such a failure to find support, even among discreditable theologians, must reflect the false doctrine of transubstantiation and the Roman church.

For his part, Gardiner in *Explication*, concerning John Damascene, only challenges Cranmer's discussion. He points out that Cranmer never once directly quoted Damascene, specifically the passage the papists supposedly use incorrectly. Rather, Cranmer only provides his own summary of Damascene's writing. Cranmer "abuseth himselfe with Damascene, and goth about to answere him by makyng of a summe, which summe, is so wrong accompted, that euery man that readeth Damascene, may be auditour to co[n]trole it."<sup>200</sup> Gardiner then writes that he would willingly provide the Latin original, with its proper English translation, to show just how wrong Cranmer's interpretation was. Even so, Gardiner further tells the reader he decided he need not go to such great lengths when the original Latin, with numerous correct translations, was readily available throughout Europe. Thus, Gardiner ends up doing just what he has criticized Cranmer for: he provides a summary of Damascene's views. Not surprisingly his summary asserts that Damascene does say the substance of bread and wine is fully changed into Christ's corporeal flesh and blood. This feeble rebuttal by Gardiner does not provoke Cranmer to make a response in his *Answer*. Rather, he simply writes, "As for Damascene needeth no further aunswer, then I haue made in my former booke. But I praye the reader, that he wyll diligently examyne that place, and so to bee an indifferente auditour beetwixte vs two."<sup>201</sup>

---

<sup>200</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 75.

<sup>201</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 237.

## Theophylact

Neither Cranmer nor Gardiner is entirely clear on Theophylact's identity. We are given no information about the century or location of his writings. However, we can reasonably discern which theologian named Theophylact is being debated in turning to Cranmer's discussion about him in the *Defence*. As it turns out, there are a few pieces of evidence in our debated books to help determine which Theophylact Cranmer and Gardiner are using. First, we know he is a later theologian, living many years after Theophilus (d. 412). We also know Cranmer references a *Commentary on Mark* while Gardiner references a *Commentary on John*. With these clues, it is likely the Theophylact in question was the eleventh-century archbishop of Ochrid who is best remembered for his biblical scholarship.<sup>202</sup> In opening the *Defence* exposition on Theophylact Cranmer starts by discussing the papists's use of a certain Theophilus of Alexandria. In a *Commentary on Mark*, the papists allege this Theophilus states "the bread is not a fygure onely of Christes body, but is chaunged into the very body of Christe."<sup>203</sup> This is obvious support of transubstantiation. Cranmer challenges the papists, however, that this commentary is not by Theophilus but Theophylact, "who was many yeres after Theophylus."<sup>204</sup> The papists have ascribed the later Theophylact's words to Theophilus only in order to derive support from an early theologian. As Cranmer

---

<sup>202</sup> Margaret Mullett, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* (Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, 1997), 43-54. Theophylact's date of birth is unknown. In the 1070s he moved to Constantinople for his education, where he remained twenty years. Around 1090 he left for Bulgaria after his appointment as Archbishop of Ochrid.

<sup>203</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 85.

<sup>204</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 85.

explains, "suche hath euer been the Papistical subtiltees, to set furth their owne inuencions, dreames and lyes, vnder the name of antiquitie and auncient authors."<sup>205</sup>

The papists have falsified the authorship, as well as the actual words and meanings therein. In this writing, Theophylact declares that God reserves the "kynde of bread & wyne, and yet turneth them into the vertue of Christes fleshe and bloud."<sup>206</sup> The papists interpret this as meaning that *virtue* equates *verity*. Thus, the forms remain but the true substance of the bread and wine are fully altered. This, though, in Cranmer's view, is not the proper interpretation and discredits Theophylact's meaning. Theophylact clearly talks of the remaining bread and wine. The alteration that occurs is an addition to the remaining elements. The "sacramental bread & wyne remayne still in their propre kyndes, and yet to them that worthely eate and drynke them, they bee turned not into the corporal prese[n]ce, but into the vertue of Christes fleshe and bloud...[giving] the celestial and spiritual eatyng of Christ."<sup>207</sup> For the faithful Christian, Christ is present but only spiritually, never corporeally.

Gardiner expresses his confusion on why Cranmer believes the papists have willingly changed Theophylact's authorship to Theophilus of Alexandria. Cranmer offers no proof that this is indeed the case. Rather, Theophylact is acknowledged as the author of all his known works.<sup>208</sup> In addition, Cranmer has completely confused Theophylact's meanings. From his *Commentary on John*, Theophylact writes,

---

<sup>205</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 85.

<sup>206</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 85.

<sup>207</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 86-87.

<sup>208</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 72.

Take hede that the bread whiche is eaten of vs in the mysteryes is not only a certaine figuration of the fleshe of our Lorde, but the fleshe itself of our Lorde, for he sayde not, The bread which I shall geue is the figure of my flesh, but it is my flesh. For that bread by the mysticall benediction, is transformed by mystical wordes and presence of the holy ghost into the flesh of our Lord.<sup>209</sup>

In analyzing Theophylact's words in his commentaries on both Mark and John, Gardiner asserts the bread's change into the *virtue* of Christ means Christ's very body. Had Theophylact meant there was no real flesh, he would have specifically said so.<sup>210</sup>

In *Answer*, Cranmer does not accept Gardiner's discussion on the meaning of *virtue*. Virtue does not equate to corporeal presence. All Theophylact says is the bread and wine are turned into the virtue, not the body itself. If Theophylact had meant the very body he would have used that term.<sup>211</sup> Nor is Gardiner correct in asserting that Theophylact uses *spiritual* to describe the sacrament in connection with the Real Presence. Cranmer states that Theophylact uses *spiritual* because that is the only means through which Christ is in the bread and wine. If Christ were also present corporeally, Theophylact would have also discussed that aspect of the sacrament. All this alludes to Cranmer's view that the bread and wine remain while Christ's spirit has been added to the sacrament. In discussing the spiritual eating of Christ, Cranmer asserts Theophylact means, "wee doo not onely eate corporallye the bread (whiche is a sacrament and figure of Christes body) but spiritually we eate also his very body, and drincke his very blood. And this doctryne of Theophilactus is both trew, godly and comfortable."<sup>212</sup> Theophylact

---

<sup>209</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 71.

<sup>210</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 71.

<sup>211</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 226.

<sup>212</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 224.

is clearly in line with the early theologians. In Cranmer's opinion, Gardiner is once again quite wrong.

### Augustine

The most commonly cited Church Father for both Cranmer and Gardiner is Augustine. This is not surprising because of Augustine's predominance in theology throughout the early and medieval Church. Augustine's religious career in late fourth- and early fifth-century Northern Africa culminated in his elevation to the bishopric of Hippo.<sup>213</sup> His works were the largest collection of available early church theologian works throughout Europe, including England, in both Latin and English.<sup>214</sup> Thus, he holds the largest place in both Cranmer and Gardiner's works and requires a lengthy discussion here.

Augustine's first reference in Cranmer's *Defence* is a brief quotation: "That whiche you see in the altare, is the bread and the cup, whiche also your eies do shew you. But faith sheweth further, that bread is the body of Christe, and the cuppe his bloude."<sup>215</sup> Although it is brief, this quotation exhibits two important points of interest. First, Cranmer explains it is clear that Augustine believes there are four items present in the sacrament: bread, wine, body, blood. This counters transubstantiation, which asserts after

---

<sup>213</sup> Arnoud Visser, *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3.

<sup>214</sup> Haaugaard, "Patristic Scholarship," 43.

<sup>215</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 26-27.

the consecration only the body and blood are present.<sup>216</sup> Second, the quotation clearly supports Cranmer's view that it is through inward faith, not through a miraculous altered bread and wine, that the worthy partaker will receive the body and blood.

Gardiner counters this general viewpoint, arguing that Augustine fully complies with transubstantiation. His words are simple and for the educated man cannot be confused. Gardiner exclaims,

The wordes of S. Augustine for the reall presence of Christes body be suche as no mane ca[n] wreste, or writh to an other se[n]se, & with their force haue made this auctor [Cranmer] ouerthrowe him selfe in his owne wordes. But that S. Augustine saith towching the nature of bread and the visible eleme[n]te of the sacrament with out wresting or writhing may be agreed in co[n]uenie[n]t vndersta[n]ding with the doctrine of tra[n]substantiation, & therefore is an authoritie.<sup>217</sup>

So we understand that Gardiner fully believes Augustine supports transubstantiation, just as Cranmer fully believes Augustine does not.

In order to prove which side Augustine really supports, Cranmer and Gardiner break down his views on the following topics: the sacrament as figure; spiritual eating; sacramental adoration; what is meant by calling; and what evil men eat when taking the sacrament. For Cranmer, as we have noted elsewhere, the sacrament of Eucharist is a figure of Christ's Last supper; the bread and wine are figures of Christ's corporeal body and blood. In *Defence*, he references Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*, which posits a figurative Eucharistic theology:

Nowe this saying of Christ (Excepte you eate the fleshe of the sonne of manne and drinke his bloode, you shall haue no lyfe in yo[u]) seemeth to commaunde an

---

<sup>216</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 26-27. Cranmer's exact words: "What can be deuised to be spoken more plainly against the error of the Papistes, which say that no bread nor wyne remayneth in the sacrament?"

<sup>217</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 116.

haynous and a wicked thyng, therefore it is a figure commaundyng vs to be partakers of Christes passion, keeping in our mindes to our great comforte and profite, that his fleshe was crucified and wou[n]ded for vs.<sup>218</sup>

It would be a "haynous" act to corporeally eat and drink Christ's actual body and blood; Augustine would never support such a view, so the eating Augustine discusses must be figurative. Referencing the same quotation, Cranmer further explains,

S. Austin in [that] place declareth [the] eting of Christs flesh to be only a figuratiue spech. And he openeth [the] figure so, as [the] eting must be me[n]t [with] the mi[n]d, not [with] the mouth, [that] is to say, by chawi[n]g & digesting in our minds, to our great co[n]solatio[n] & profyt, [that] Christ was crucified & died for vs.<sup>219</sup>

Gardiner does not deny Augustine uses figure; however, it is not to be interpreted as Cranmer has. As Gardiner explains in *Explication*, Augustine means "by the word figure, to signifie a secrete depe mistery hidde[n] fro[m] carnal vndersta[n]dyng."<sup>220</sup> This divine mystery is transubstantiation; therefore the term *figure* does not contradict a Real Presence. He does not talk about Christ's body and blood absent from the sacrament.

From the above-mentioned *De Doctrina Christiana*:

Saincte Augustine writeth, the sacrament of the body of Christ is after a certaine maner, the body of Christ, the Sacrame[n]t of the bloud of Christ, the bloud of Christ, But after what maner? that it sould signifie onely the body & bloud abse[n]t? In no wise: For the same S. Augustin writeth in many places, the body and bloud of Christ to be honored, & to be receiued in those visible tokens.<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>218</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 62.

<sup>219</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 25.

<sup>220</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 42.

<sup>221</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 44.

Augustine could mean nothing but Christ's corporeal presence in the bread and wine when he says the body and blood are "receiued in those visible tokens."

In *Answer*, Cranmer directly challenges Gardiner's treatment of this specific Augustinian speech. There is no way a person could understand figure as indicating the Real Presence unless that person is entirely ignorant and obstinate. Cranmer uses this opportunity to provide one of his numerous digs at Gardiner:

the eating & dryncking of Christes flesh & bloud is a figuratiue speache: whiche place you expound so farre from S. Augustines meaning, that who so euer loketh vpon his wordes, may by and by discerne, that you do not or wil not vnderstande him. But it is moste like (the wordes of him being so plaine and easy) that purposely you will not vnderstande him, nor nothing elles that is against your will, rather then you will go from any part of youre will and receaued opinion.<sup>222</sup>

Cranmer further goes on to explain that Christ is, and always will be, both God and man combined. Yet, his humanity is in heaven only. According to Cranmer it is a gross misunderstanding to assume Augustine, or any other Church Father, advocates eating Christ's human form because eating any man's flesh, even Christ's, "is horrible and abhominable."<sup>223</sup> Thus, it is plain Augustine's use of figure means figure, not Real Presence.

Cranmer uses two examples to denote the sacrament is a figure. First, from Augustine's letter to Boniface, Cranmer paraphrases Augustine's saying that each year we celebrate Good Friday. Yet, we know the real Good Friday only happened once; it does not happen anew each year. Thus, our Good Friday is a representation of the actual event. Similarly, the sacrament is a representation of the Last Supper and Christ's death,

---

<sup>222</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 22.

<sup>223</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 22.

which occurred but once, even though we refer to our celebrations by the same names.<sup>224</sup>

Second, Cranmer also discusses Augustine's analysis of the Old Testament patriarchs.

The faithful in the Old Testament made sacrifices to reflect their belief in the promise of

Christ's coming. Christ was not yet corporeally present in those sacrifices, but the

sacrifices were figures of what would come. Our Eucharist is the figure of what has

already passed and the promise fulfilled in Christ's death. "S. Augustin speketh of the

gyuyng of Christ to death, (whiche the sacramentes of the old testament, testified to

come, and ours testifie to be done) and not of the giuyng of hym in the sacramentes."<sup>225</sup>

Just as Christ was not corporeally present in the patriarchs' sacrifices, he is not

corporeally present in the current sacrament.

Cranmer continues his rebuttal of Gardiner by contending that Augustine never

mentions corporeality. Had he meant a corporeal presence rather than a figurative

understanding, it would have clearly been written. But Augustine

neuer wrote in all his long workes as you [Gardiner] doo, that Christe is in the sacramente corporally, carnally, or naturally, or that hee is so eaten, nor I dare boldly saye he neuer thought it. For yf he hadde, he woulde not haue written so playnely (as he dooth in the places by me alleadged) that wee muste beware, that we take not litterally, any thyng that is spoken figyuratiuely.<sup>226</sup>

---

<sup>224</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 64.

<sup>225</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 86-87.

<sup>226</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 134. He repeats this adamant sentiment in two more passages: On pages 64-66, Cranmer asserts Augustine argues, "that in sacraments we must not conside what they be, but what they signify. For thei be signes of thinges, beyng one thyng and signyfing an other...And that offering of the flesh whyche is doone by the priestes handes, is called Christes passion, deathe and crucifyng, not in very deede, but in a mysticall significacion." On page 336, Cranmer quotes Augustine "sayth not that the body and bloude of Christe bee really in the sacrament, but that in the sacrifice of the church, that is to say, in the holy administration of the Lordes supper, is bothe a sacrament, and the thyng signified by the sacrame[n]t."

Although Augustine and Cranmer promote the figurative understanding of the sacrament, Cranmer does not mean he or Augustine assert that the sacrament is a mere figuration without any sort of spiritual benefit.

Rather, the sacrament includes Christ's Spiritual Presence for those who worthily receive, bringing us to the next point of dissension between Cranmer and Gardiner on Augustine: spiritual eating. As Cranmer explains in *Defence*, Augustine implored that

we shoulde not tarry and fixe our myndes vpon his fleshe (whiche of itself auayleth nothyng) but wee shoulde lyfte vp our myndes from the flesh to the spirite, whiche geueth lyfe...[Christ] commended vnto [us] a sacrament, vnderstande it spiritually, and it shall geue you lyfe. And although it muste bee visibly ministred, yet it must be inuisibly vnderstande.<sup>227</sup>

The outward signs are the figuration of the inward spiritual change God effects on the faithful Christian. It is wrong to believe the outward signs exert any power.

Gardiner, however, does not believe that Augustine's insistence on the spiritual, inward presence of Christ automatically dismisses the Real Presence in the outward elements. As he shows in his *Explication*, Augustine explains the spiritual aspect of the sacrament to counter anyone who would only focus on the outward elements. Bread and wine alone cannot offer benefit, but do so in connection with the inward change and the Spiritual Presence. The efficacy of the sacrament is dependent on the corporeal and Spiritual Presences in both the outward and inward signs.<sup>228</sup>

Cranmer responds that this is simply untrue. The outward signs remain signs to explain what happens through the inward, spiritual mystery. The only purpose of the bread and wine is to provide an understanding of the sacramental eating. We know bread

---

<sup>227</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 102-103.

<sup>228</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 88.

and wine nourish our bodies, which helps us understand that the spiritual food in the sacrament nourishes our soul and everlasting lives. The sacramental power is inward only; it is this inward presence that connects us with Christ. As Cranmer expounds on Augustine in *Answer*, as we

corporally feede of breade and wyne (whyche comforteth theyr heartes, and contynueth this corruptible lyfe for a season) so spirytually they feede of Christes very fleshe, and drynke his very bloudde. And we bee in suche sorte vnited vnto hym, that his fleshe is made our fleshe, hys holy spirite vnytnge hym and vs so togyther.<sup>229</sup>

Here we clearly see Cranmer's emphasis. The bread and wine can only feed our earthly bodies, but they help us direct our minds to the true efficacy of the sacrament, the inward change. Cranmer also remarks it is the Holy Spirit which joins our bodies to Christ; it is not Christ's body and blood in the outward signs that do so.

The next area of disagreement about Augustine's view is the meaning of Christ's calling the bread and wine the body and blood. As seen in our discussions with some of the other Church Fathers, Cranmer asserts *calling* means *signifying*, while Gardiner believes it means *making*. In *Defence*, Cranmer turns once again to Augustine's letter to Boniface to discuss what *calling* means: the elements are called the body and blood "because they be figures, sacraments, and representacions of the thinges theymselve whiche they signifye, and wherof they beare the names...a thing which signifieth (saith he) is wont to be called by the name of the thing whiche it signifieth."<sup>230</sup> This is true throughout the Scripture when Jesus calls himself the shepherd or vine. In those cases

---

<sup>229</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 174.

<sup>230</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 65.

the figurative understanding of calling is never questioned and it should not be questioned in the sacrament.

Gardiner answers that *calling* is indeed the same as *making*. By calling the bread the body, a person is declaring that the original bread is now truly the body. There cannot be truth of the body without the actual body. Therefore, in calling the bread the body, Christ clearly made it so. As he writes in *Explication*, the speech "breade is the body of Christ is as much to say, as it is made the body of Christ, and made not as of a matter, but...by conuersion of the visible creature in to the substaunce of the body of Christ."<sup>231</sup> Nobody would call something by a new name if it were not actually the new thing.

In *Answer*, Cranmer responds that Gardiner has misread Augustine in this area for Augustine clearly points out, with his Good Friday comparison, that *called* is a figurative term commonly used throughout Scripture. He bids Gardiner "reade the place of sayncte Augustine who wyll, and he shall fynd, that he speaketh of the maner of speache, as calleth one thyng by the name of an other, where it is not the very thyng in dede."<sup>232</sup> Gardiner need only read Augustine to discover Augustine's true meaning, which is of course that *called* is meant figuratively. Further, in analyzing Augustine's *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, Cranmer reiterates this view regarding Augustine's theology: although the sacrament is called the body and blood "yet is the sacrament no more but the sacrament there of, and yet is it called the body and blud of Christ, as sacraments haue the names of the thinges whereof they be sacramentes."<sup>233</sup> Nowhere does Augustine

---

<sup>231</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 112 marked 94.

<sup>232</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 144.

explicitly write that Christ's calling meant actual making; thus, it is only a figurative manner of speech.

Cranmer and Gardiner also disagree that Augustine's insistence on adoration in the sacrament means Christ must be corporeally present. In his *Defence*, Cranmer begins this exposition by stating the papists falsely use Augustine to support worshipping the bread and wine as the actual body and blood. From Augustine's *Commentary on Psalm 98*, Cranmer quotes Augustine, writing "no man doeth eate the flesh of Christe, excepte he first woorshyp it."<sup>234</sup> The papists twist this to mean we must worship the bread and wine. Cranmer, however, points out that Augustine is not saying we must worship Christ's flesh, which is now present in the bread; there is no mention of the bread or wine. Rather, Augustine is calling us to worship Christ who sits in heaven, at which point we then will be spiritually fed in the sacrament. "For who is hee, that professeth Christe, and is spiritually fedde and nourished with his fleshe and bloude, but he wyll honoure and worship hym, syttyng at the right hande of his father, and rendre vnto him from the bottom of his hert, all laude, prayse, and thankes, for his mercyfull redemption?"<sup>235</sup> There is due adoration in the sacrament, but not for the elements. The adoration applies to Christ's spiritual power in the sacrament for those who are worthy.

In Gardiner's understanding, however, Augustine would not stress the adoration of the visible bread and wine if he meant Christ's divinity and spiritual power only. As quoted in *Explication*, "S. Augustine speaketh of the geuyng of Christes flesh to vs to

---

<sup>233</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 264.

<sup>234</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 102.

<sup>235</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 102.

eat, and declareth after, that he meaneth in the visible Sacrament."<sup>236</sup> According to Gardiner, Augustine clearly argues the visible elements are to be worshipped. These visible elements, though, cannot be simply bread and wine because only holy things can be venerated; therefore, we must conclude that Augustine understands Christ is corporeally present in the visible bread and wine. Without a corporeal understanding, adoration of the visible sacrament is pure idolatry.<sup>237</sup>

Cranmer's response in *Answer* is that Gardiner does not read Augustine in a larger context in order to ascertain Augustine's true understanding on Eucharistic adoration. For Augustine does not just call us to adore the Eucharist, but also the sacrament of baptism; we are also called to hear reverently what Scripture says. Yet, nobody asserts Christ's body is in baptism or the hearing of the Word. Rather it is Christ's spirit that we adore when we partake or listen. It is the same with the Eucharist. "Euery goode Christian manne oughte to come to CHRISTES sacramentes, with greate feare, humilitee, faythe, loue, and charitee."<sup>238</sup> There is adoration but only for Christ's divine power in the inward believer.

The final point over which Cranmer and Gardiner debate regarding Augustine's Eucharistic theology is whether evil men eat Christ's body. Cranmer argues in *Defence* the papists must submit that evil men eat Christ's body if transubstantiation is true. This is a gross misunderstanding because an evil man cannot defile Christ's body; therefore,

---

<sup>236</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 87.

<sup>237</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 89: "if the very flesh of Christe were not in the Sacrament truly present, whiche is as moche to saye as in substanunce present...if it wer not corporally prese[n]t that is to saye, the very body of Christe there present god and man? If these truthes consentinge in one were not there Saincte Augustine would neuer haue spoken of adoracion there..."

<sup>238</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 169.

Augustine would never support such heinous blasphemy. Cranmer therefore explains that Augustine argues that evil men only eat the sacramental bread and wine. Quoting from Augustine's *City of God*, Cranmer writes

heretiques and scismatikes myghte eat the sacrament of Christes body, but not his verye body, bycause they bee no membres of his body...For Christe spake those wordes, as if he should say: He that dwelth not in me, and in whom I dwel not, lette hym not say or thynke, that he eateth my body, or drinketh my bloude.<sup>239</sup>

Only those who are worthy will actually receive Christ's body through Christ's spirit. "So in the Lordes Supper bothe eate and drynke the sacramental bread & wyne, but bothe eate not Christ hymselfe, and bee fedde with his flesh and blood, but those only whyche worthely receiue the Sacrament."<sup>240</sup> Thus, Augustine does not support a Real Presence theology because Christ cannot be corporeally present in the bread and wine if evil men cannot receive the body and blood.

Gardiner challenges Cranmer that good and evil men do receive the same sacrament. He agrees that the efficacy of the sacrament depends on the partaker's inward worthiness, but the actual sacramental elements are the same for both. These elements are the body and blood. "[B]e the receyuer worthy or vnworthy, good or euil, the substaunce of Christes Sacrament is all one as beyng goddes worke, who worketh vniformely, and yet is not in all that receyue of like effecte, not for any alteracion or diminution in it, but for the diuerstie of him that receyueth."<sup>241</sup> It is because evil men do eat the body and blood that Augustine focuses on Christ's words, saying those who do not worthily eat Christ do so at their own damnation. Gardiner explains Augustine, "noteth

---

<sup>239</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 94.

<sup>240</sup> Cranmer, *Defence*, 99.

<sup>241</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 25.

the difference in the receauer, not in the Sacrament receaued, whiche beyng receaued with the mouth onely, and Christ entryng, in mysterie only, doth not sanctify vs, but is the stone of stumblng and our iudgement and condempnacion."<sup>242</sup> There would be no emphasis on damnation if evil men were not actually eating Christ's corporeal flesh. There is also no need to worry about Christ's perfect body being defiled by the evil man's corrupt nature.

In his *Answer*, Cranmer responds using Augustine's discussion on Judas to prove evil men eat only bread and not the actual body. Augustine asserts Judas, unlike the faithful Apostles, did not eat Christ's flesh at the Lord's Supper. Judas ate "the bread of the lorde, not the bread being the Lorde signifiyng thereby that the euell eate the breade, but not the lorde himselve."<sup>243</sup> Here we see several distinctions. First, the bread is "of the Lorde" rather than "being the Lorde," countering a corporeal understanding. Secondly, Cranmer uses *signifying* to further a figurative Eucharistic understanding instead of Real Presence. Thus, his discussion that evil men cannot eat the body is directly related to his figurative theology.

In this discussion on whether evil men eat the body, both Cranmer and Gardiner focus on the worthiness of the receiver in order for the sacrament to grant salvation. Yet, they differ at the point in which the body is actually received. For Cranmer it is only received after it has been eaten and is only received by those worthy. Gardiner, however, asserts that the body is present before it is eaten by anyone. They both agree that evil men do not receive benefit from the sacrament yet we see that this area of agreement is minute in the larger disagreement over when the body is present and the role of the

---

<sup>242</sup> Gardiner, *An Explicatio[n]*, 19.

<sup>243</sup> Cranmer, *An Answer*, 264.

visible sacramental elements. This agreement reverts back to the larger figurative-Real Presence debate.

These five points of discussion regarding Augustine are all smaller proofs within the larger debate on whether the Eucharist is a figurative understanding or the doctrine of actual transubstantiation. As with all of the other Church Fathers, Cranmer and Gardiner believe Augustine fully supports his own view and not that of his rival. Cranmer believes he clearly demonstrates that Augustine spoke of the visible sacrament as a sign of the inward Spiritual change in faithful Christians. Gardiner, on the other hand, clearly sees transubstantiation upheld in Augustinian theology. Christ is undeniably present corporeally and spiritually in the bread and wine.

### Conclusion

All of the Church Fathers here are used for Cranmer's and Gardiner's own benefit. We do not see the entirety of these early theologians' works on the Eucharist; rather, they are selected portions that support one side while denying the other.<sup>244</sup> It is important to study these early theologians in the Cranmer-Gardiner debate, not to understand the actual thought of these men, but to understand how Cranmer and Gardiner *interpreted* these authors. From our investigation we see two very different understandings, Real

---

<sup>244</sup> For further general knowledge on many of the Fathers discussed above see: Charles Biggs, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1913); Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2003); Gerald McDermott, *The Great Theologians: A Brief Guide* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2010); and Hans Von Campenhausen, *Men Who Shaped the Western Church*, translated by Manfred Hoffman (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).

Presence and a figurative Spiritual Presence, emerge from the same theologians and books.

In their debate Cranmer and Gardiner look to different proofs and explanations within the larger transubstantiation/figurative debate. Origen, Cyril, Jerome, and Augustine are all used in the debate on whether evil men eat just bread or Christ's true body. The role of adoration in the sacrament is visible in Cranmer and Gardiner's discussions on Clement, Eusebius, Ambrose, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Augustine. Cranmer and Gardiner have two views on the method of eating in the sacrament: corporeal or spiritual. Here, they rely on Cyprian, Cyril, Hilary, John Damascene, and Augustine for support. The discussion on the definition of *calling* versus *making* uses Tertullian, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Theodoret, and Augustine. While the related debate over consecration fully *changing* the bread to the body or simply *adding* Christ's spirit to the remaining bread turns to Theodoret, Cyprian, and Theophylact for proof. In the lengthy debates on the nature and substance of the bread and wine after consecration Cranmer and Gardiner reference Justin, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Theodoret, Gelasius, John Damascene, Theophylact, and Augustine. The two bishops rely on Clement, Origen, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Jerome to support the discussion on Christ's humanity and Godhead in the sacrament.

In addition to these areas, which prove either Cranmer's figurative, Spiritual Presence theology or Gardiner's transubstantiation doctrine, both authors use their humanist background in scholarship to challenge further each other's use of the Church Fathers. As a result, Justin, Irenaeus, Clement, Chrysostom, Hilary, Ambrose, John Damascene, and Theophylact all come under humanist scrutiny. Cranmer argues that

Gardiner misinterprets these men and Gardiner argues it is Cranmer who misinterprets. Clement and Theophylact also face authorship criticism. In Cranmer's view, Clement has been falsely ascribed as the writer of a letter used by papists supporting transubstantiation. Gardiner counters that the letter is definitely by Clement. Cranmer also alleges the papists have cunningly said Theophylact's writings were written by the earlier theologian Theophilus so that transubstantiation would appear to be an early doctrine. Once again, Gardiner challenges this as Cranmer's own cunning way to strike down the true doctrine of transubstantiation. In all of these cases we see the importance that humanist scholarship played in this debate. The Church Fathers provided valuable support and it was therefore imperative that Cranmer and Gardiner critically analyze the authors to boost their own views while devaluing their opponent.

## CONCLUSION

The 1550-51 debate between Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner gave the English Church its most important theological doctrine: a Spiritual Presence understanding of the Eucharist. Cranmer had already begun devising this new theology before 1550, as seen in *The Order of Communion* and the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, yet, at that point, he had not offered the clearest understanding of this doctrine. His 1550 *Defence*, however, removed any doubt that he would eventually give England a strong Reformed liturgy. In response Stephen Gardiner wrote *Explication* in 1551 to attempt to diminish *Defence* as an important theological work and keep Cranmer from advancing the ideas found in it. Such a direct attack against him meant Cranmer had to respond, which he did with his 1551 *Answer*. Through extensive theological analysis of Scripture, early Church Fathers, and Continental Reformers, each man strove to provide a solid argument for his own theology: the Real Presence for Gardiner and the Spiritual Presence for Cranmer. Not only did each man argue for his own position, but also used Scripture, Church Fathers, and Reformers to critique and often criticize the other man's view.

Although this was first and foremost a theological debate, there was also a unique political and personal context that greatly shaped the motivation each man had for defending his own position while challenging that of his rival. Cranmer and Gardiner had long been vying for religious and political power in the post-Reformation years of Henry VIII's reign. When one man seemed to gain greater authority, it was often in response to the other man's slipping from Henry's favor. This constant back and forth of power built up a personal animosity between the two men that culminated during Edward's reign when Gardiner lost all religious and political power to Cranmer. This

political and personal context meant the Eucharistic debate was not only about denouncing each other's theology but also their government power and influence. Gardiner had lost everything to Cranmer and needed to fight back to return to favor. Cranmer had to protect his position from Gardiner's attacks. Gardiner had nothing left to lose; Cranmer had everything to lose. They chose theology and the pen as their battleground.

We should note that, had it not been for Gardiner's criticisms, Cranmer would not have quickly needed to revise his theology. Consequently, we must also give due credit to Gardiner for the shaping of the English Church. Cranmer is often seen as the hero of the early English Reformation against the evil Gardiner, but as this dissertation has shown Gardiner was really the impetus that forced Cranmer to become England's Zwinglian Reformed hero. Although we can rest assured that Gardiner would not like to be associated as an aid to the Reformation, his *Explication* was just as important as *Defence* and *Answer* in creating a Reformed English Church. This debate makes it quite clear that without Cranmer and Gardiner working together, or should we say, by working against each other, England's Spiritual Presence might never have become so clear and established.

The mixture of the theological, political, and personal contexts in the debate ended with Cranmer's *Answer*. Cranmer expanded on the ideas presented in *Defence* and made sure to leave no areas open to further misinterpretation, as Gardiner had found in *Explication's* critique of *Defence*. Thus, *Answer* provided a strong, clear Spiritual Presence Eucharistic theology with no room for Gardiner or other traditionalists to find a Real Presence doctrine. As Cranmer wrote this stronger proof for his doctrine he was

also revising the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer*, releasing the second edition in 1552.

The holes and areas of confusion from the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* were now gone in the 1552 edition, just as the holes in *Defence* were now gone in *Answer*. Gardiner used *Explication* to critique the 1549 edition and Cranmer responded with *Answer* and a new prayer book. As a result the debate must be seen as a crucial event in shaping Cranmer's theological development and the life of the developing Anglican Church. It was the revised, fully Reformed 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* which would be adopted in Elizabeth's reign and be used for decades as the English Church became what we now know as the Anglican Church. It is not in Elizabeth's reign that the English Church developed its crucial Eucharistic doctrine. The timeline needs to be pushed back from 1563 to 1551 in showing just when the Anglican Church established its most important theological foundation: the 1550-1551 Cranmer/Gardiner debate.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

- Anderson, William P., ed. *A Journey Through Christian Theology: With Texts from the First to the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Cranmer, Thomas. *A Defence of the True and Catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Christ, with a confutation of sandry errors concernyng thesame, grounded and stablished vpon Goddes holy woorde, & approued by [the] consent of the moste auncient doctors of the Churche. Made by the moste Reuerende father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane*. London: Reynold Wolfe, 1550. EEBO STC 6001 Reel 33:10, British Library.
- . *An Answer of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Archebyshop of Canterburye, Primate of all Englande and Metropolitane vnto a crafty and sophisticall cauillation deuised by Stephen Gardiner doctour of law, late byshop of Winchester, agaynst the trewe and godly doctrine of the moste holy sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauour Iesu Christe*. London: Reynold Wolfe, with the kyng his moste gracious priuilege, 1551. EEBO STC 5991 Reel 211:05, Henry E. Huntington Library.
- . *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556* Vol. II, edited by John Cox for The Parker Society. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1846.
- . *The Boke of the common praier and administratio[n] of thee Sacramentes, and other Rytes and ceremonies of the Churche, after the vse of the churche of Englande*. London: Ioannis Oswaeni, 1549. EEBO STC 16271 Reel 482:04. Cambridge University Library.
- . *The Work of Thomas Cranmer*. Edited by G.E. Duffield. Appleford, United Kingdom: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1964.
- Dasent, John, ed. *Acts of the Privy Council of England: 1542-1552*. Vols. I-III. London: Majesty's Stationary Office, 1890-1891.
- Edward VI. *The Chronicle of Edward VI*. In *The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI*. Edited by W.K. Jordan. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1966.
- Foxe, John. *The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe: A New and Complete Edition*. Edited by Stephen Cattley. London: R.B. Seeley, 1837.

Gairdner, James, ed. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*. Vols. VIII-XXI. London: Majesty's Stationary Office, 1895-1910.

Gardiner, Stephen. *An Explicatio[n] and assertion of the true Catholique fayth, touchyng the moost blessed sacrament of the aulter with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same. Made by Steuen Byshop of Wynchester, and exhibited by his owne hande for his defence to the kynges maiesties commissioners at Lambeth*. Rouen: R. Caly, 1551. EEBO STC 11592 Reel 343:11, Henry E. Huntington Library.

----- . *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*. Edited by James Arthur Muller. New York: Cambridge, University Press, 2013.

Henry VIII. *The Act of the Six Articles*. In *A Reformation Reader: Primary Texts with Introductions* 2nd ed. Edited by Denis Janz. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2008.

----- . *A Necessary Doctrine and erudicion for any chrysten man, set furth by the kynges maiestye of Englande. &c*. London: Thomas Berthelet, 1543. EEBO STC 5176 Reel 32:01, British Museum.

Howell, T.B., ed. *Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials And Proceedings for High Treason and other Crimes and Misdemeanors from the Earliest Period to the Year 1783, Vol I: 1163-1600*. London: T.C. Hansard, 1809.

Hughes, Paul and James Larkin, ed. *Tudor Royal Proclamations Vol I: The Early Tudors (1485-1553)*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1964.

Kidd, B.J., ed. *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1911.

Nichols, John, ed. *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation, Chiefly from the Manuscripts of John Foxe the Martyrologist; with two Contemporary Biographies of Archbishop Cranmer*. Series 1 no. 77. London: Camden Society, 1859.

Ziegler, Donald, ed. *Great Debates of the Reformation*. New York: Random House, 1969.

### Secondary Sources

Ahnert, Ruth. "Writing in the Tower of London during the Reformation, ca. 1530-1558." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 72 (2009): 168-192. Accessed on October 29, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/hlq.2009.72.2.168>.

- Aland, Kurt. *Four Reformers: Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Zwingli*. Translated by James Schaaf. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979.
- Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Translated by Robert Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Amos, N. Scott. "Strangers in a Strange Land: The English Correspondence of Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*. Edited by Frank James III. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.
- Anderson, Judith. "Language and History in the Reformation: Cranmer, Gardiner, and the Words of Institution." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (Spring 2001): 20-51. Accessed on March 4, 2012. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1262219>.
- Anderson, Marvin. *Peter Martyr A Reformer in Exile (1542-1562): A chronology of biblical writings in England & Europe*. Nieuwkoop, Netherlands: B. De Graaf, 1975.
- , "Peter Martyr Vermigli: Protestant Humanist." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*, edited by Joseph McLelland. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980.
- Anderson, William P., ed. *A Journey Through Christian Theology: With Texts from the First to the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Armstrong, Brett. "Popular Piety?: The Imposition of Elizabethan Church Discipline in the Deanery of Stottesden." In *Adaptations of Calvinism in Reformation Europe: Essays in Honour of Brian G. Armstrong*. Edited by Mack Holt. Burlington, Vermont: Shagate, 2007.
- Aston, Margaret. *England's Iconoclasts Volume I: Laws Against Images*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Ayris, Paul. "Continuity and Change in Diocese and Province: The Role of a Tudor Bishop." *The Historical Journal* 39 (1996): 291-313. Accessed on March 26, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640182>.
- Balogun, Festus. *Three African Popes: A Short Analytical History of their Lives and Pontificates*. Nigeria: Catholic Bishop of Osogbo Diocese, 2004.
- Barnard, L.W. *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Barnes, Timothy David. *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

- Beer, Barrett. *Northumberland: The Political Career of John Dudley, Earl of Warwick and Duke of Northumberland*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1973.
- Benedict XVI. *Great Christian Thinkers: From the Early Church through the Middle Ages*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2011.
- Bernard, G.W. *The King's Reformation: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2005.
- . "The Making of Religious Policy, 1533-1546: Henry VIII and the Search for the Middle Way." *The Historical Journal* 41 (1998): 321-349. Accessed on April 25, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640109>.
- Bigg, Charles. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1913.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John Steely. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Brady, Thomas, Jr. *German Histories in The Age of Reformations, 1400-1650*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Brigden, Susan. "Popular Disturbance and the Fall of Thomas Cromwell and the Reformers, 1539-1540." *The Historical Journal* 24 (1981): 257-278. Accessed on May 31, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2638786>.
- Bromiley, G. W. *Thomas Cranmer Theologian*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Brooks, Peter Newman. *Cranmer in Context*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Lutterworth Press, 1989.
- . *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist: An Essay in Historical Development*. New York: Seabury Press, 1965.
- Brown, Peter. *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2003.
- Buell, Denise Kimber. *Making Christians: Clement of Alexandria and the Rhetoric of Legitimacy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Burnett, Amy Nelson. "Church Discipline and Moral Reformation in the Thought of Martin Bucer." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 438-456. Accessed on July 29, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2541469>.

- . "Hermeneutics and Exegesis in the Early Eucharistic Controversy." In *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by Bruce Gordon and Matthew McLean. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2012.
- Bush, M.L. *The Government Policy of Protector Somerset*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975.
- Bynum, Caroline. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the religious significance of food to medieval women*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1987.
- Cameron, Euan. "Primitivism, Patristics, and Polemic in Protestant Visions of Early Christianity." In *Sacred History: Uses of the Christian Past in the Renaissance World*. Edited by Katherine Van Liere, Simon Ditchfield, and Howard Louthan. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Cazenove, John Gibson. *St. Hilary of Poitiers and St. Martin of Tours*. New York: E. & J. B. Young, 1883.
- Chesnut, Glenn. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*, 2nd ed. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1986.
- Chapman, Raymond. "English Society, Religion and the Book of Common Prayer." In *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present, and Future, A 350th Anniversary Celebration*. Edited by Prudence Dailey. New York: Continuum, 2011.
- Chilton, Bruce. *A Feast of Meanings: Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1994.
- Collinson, Patrick. "The Coherence of the Text: How it Hangeth Together: The Bible in Reformation England." In *The Bible, the Reformation and the Church: Essays in Honour of James Atkinson*. Edited by W.P. Stephens. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Crouzel, Henri. *Origen*. Translated by A.S. Worrall. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989.
- Davies, Michael. *Cranmer's Godly Order: The Destruction of Catholicism through Liturgical Change*. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House, 1976.
- Devereux, James. "Reformed Doctrine in the Collects of the First 'Book of Common Prayer.'" *The Harvard Theological Review* 58 (1965): 49-68. Accessed on July 29, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1508791>.
- Dickens, A.G. *The English Reformation* 2nd ed. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989.

- Donaldson, Peter. "Bishop Gardiner, Machiavellian." *The Historical Journal* 23 (1980): 1-16. Accessed on April 25, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable2638705>.
- Dowling, Maria. *Humanism in the Age of Henry VIII*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c.1400-c.1580*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Dugmore, C. W. *The Mass and the English Reformation*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958.
- Elliott, J. Keith. "The Text of the New Testament." In *A History of Biblical Interpretation: Volume 2 The Medieval through the Reformation Periods*. Edited by Alan Hauser and Duane Watson. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.
- Elton, G. R. *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- . *Reform and Reformation: England, 1509-1558*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1977.
- . *Studies in Tudor and Stuart Politics and Government: Papers and Reviews 1946-1972* Vol. I. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Emerson, Everett. *English Puritanism from John Hooper to John Milton*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1968.
- Eskhult, Josef. "Latin Bible Translations in the Protestant Reformation: Historical Contexts, Philological Justification, and the Impact of Classical Rhetoric on the Conception of Translation Methods." In *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*. Edited by Bruce Gordon and Matthew McLean. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2012.
- Evans, G.R. *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Road to Reformation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Evenden, Elizabeth and Thomas Freeman. *Religions and the Book in Early Modern England: The Making of Foxe's 'Book of Martyrs.'* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Feeley-Harnik, Gillian. *The Lord's Table: Eucharist and Passover in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1981.

- Forman, John. "Tudor Diplomacy and Primitive Discipline." *Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies* 2 (1971): 108-118. Accessed on March 26, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3003695>.
- Fraenkel, Peter. "Ten Questions Concerning Melanchthon, the Fathers and the Eucharist." In *Luther and Melanchthon: In the History and theology of the Reformation*. Edited by Vilmos Vajta. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.
- Fuller, Donald. "Sacrifice and Sacrament: Another Eucharistic Contribution from Peter Martyr Vermigli." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*. Edited by Frank James III. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.
- George, Timothy. *Reading Scripture with the Reformers*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2011.
- Gibbs, Lee. "Biblical Interpretation in Medieval England and the English Reformation." In *A History of Biblical Interpretation Volume 2: The Medieval through the Reformation Periods*, edited by Alan Hauser and Duane Watson. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2009.
- Green, Lowell. "Melanchthon's Relation to Scholasticism." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*. Edited by Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark. Carlisle, California: Paternoster Press, 1999.
- Haaugaard, William. "Renaissance Patristic Scholarship and Theology in Sixteenth Century England." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 10 (1979): 37-60. Accessed August 29, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539542>.
- Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Hall, Basil. "Cranmer's Relations with Erasmianism and Lutheranism." In *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*. Edited by Paul Ayris and David Selwyn. New York: Boydell & Brewer, 1993.
- . "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI." In *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*. Edited by Paul Ayris and David Selwyn. New York: Boydell & Brewer, 1993.
- . "Martin Bucer in England." In *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*. Edited by David Wright. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Haller, William. *The Elect Nation: The Meaning and Relevance of Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

- Hanson, R.P.C. *Eucharistic Offering in the Early Church*. Bramcote, United Kingdom: Grove Books, 1979.
- Harrison, D.E.W and Michael Sansom. *Worship in the Church of England*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Hazlett, Ian. "Eucharistic communion: impulses and directions in Martin Bucer's thought." In *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*. Edited by David Wright. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge, University Press, 1994.
- Hendrix, Scott. "The Use of Scripture in Establishing Protestantism: the case of Urbanus Rhegius." In *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*. Edited by David Steinmetz. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1990.
- Hobbs, R. Gerald. "*Hebraica Veritas and Traditio Apostolica*: Saint Paul and the Interpretation of the Psalms in the Sixteenth Century." In *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*. Edited by David Steinmetz. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1990.
- , "Martin Bucer and the Englishing of the Psalms: pseudonymity in the service of early English Protestant piety." In *Martin Bucer: Reforming church and community*. Edited by David Wright. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Holleman, A.W.J. *Pope Gelasius I and the Lupercalia*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1974.
- Houlbrooke, R. A. "Henry VIII's Wills: A Comment." *The Historical Journal* 37 (1994): 891-899. Accessed on April 25, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2639845>.
- Howard, Leon. *Essays on Puritans and Puritanism*. Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 1986.
- Ives, Eric. "Henry VIII's Will: The Protectorate Provision of 1546-7." *The Historical Journal* 3 (1994): 901-914. Accessed on July 29, 2013. URL: <http://jstor.org/stable/2639846>.
- Jackson, John. "Law and Order: Vermigli and the Reform of Ecclesiastical Laws in England." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*. Edited by Frank James III. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.
- Jacobs, Alan. *The Book of Common Prayer: A Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- James, Frank, III, ed. *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper*

- Reformanda*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.
- , "Peter Martyr Vermigli: At the Crossroads of Late Medieval Scholasticism, Christian Humanism and Resurgent Augustinianism." In *Protestant Scholasticism: Essays in Reassessment*. Edited by Carl Trueman and R. Scott Clark. Carlisle, California: Paternoster Press, 1999.
- Johnson, Dale. "Marginal at Best: John Knox's Contribution to the Geneva Bible, 1560." In *Adaptations of Calvinism in Reformation Europe: Essays in Honour of Brian G. Armstrong*. Edited by Mack Holt. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2007.
- Jolkkonen, Jari. "Eucharist." In *Engaging Luther: A (New) Theological Assessment*. Edited by Olli-Pekka Vainio. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2010.
- Keene, Nicholas. "'A Two-Edged Sword': Biblical Criticism and the New Testament Canon in Early Modern England." In *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*. Edited by Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2006.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom- Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- King, John and Mark Rankin. "Print, Patronage, and the Reception of Continental Reform: 1521-1603." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 38 (2008): 49-67. Accessed on March 26, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20479321>.
- Kirby, Torrance. *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology*. Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Kodell, Jerome. *The Eucharist in the New Testament*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Kreider, Alan. *English Chantries: The Road to Dissolution*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- LaVerdiere, Eugene. *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Lehmberg, Stanford. *The Later Parliaments of Henry VIII: 1536-1547*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Lillback, Peter. "The Early Reformed Covenant Paradigm: Vermigli in the Context of Bullinger, Luther and Calvin." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*. Edited by Frank James III. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.

- Loades, David. "From Cranmer to Bancroft: The Origin of the Book of Common Prayer 1549-1604." In *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present, and Future, A 350th Anniversary Celebration*. Edited by Prudence Dailey. New York: Continuum, 2011.
- . *John Foxe: An Historical Perspective*. Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate, 1999.
- . *The Oxford Martyrs*. London: B.T. Batsford, 1970.
- Louth, Andrew. *St. John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Lyman, Rebecca. *Christology and Cosmology: Models of Divine Activity in Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- MacCulloch, Diarmaid. "Putting the English Reformation on the Map: The Prothero Lecture." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 15 (2005): 75-95. Accessed March 17, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3679363>.
- . *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*. New York: Palgrave, 1999.
- . *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998.
- . "Two Dons in Politics: Thomas Cranmer and Stephen Gardiner, 1503-1533." *The Historical Journal* 37 (1994): 1-22. Accessed July 29, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640049>.
- Macek, Ellen. "Richard Smith: Tudor Cleric in Defense of Traditional Belief and Practice." *The Catholic Historical Review* 23 (1986): 383-402. Accessed on April 25, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25022336>.
- MacDonald, A.J. *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine*. Merrick, New York: Richwood Publishing, 1977.
- Macy, Gary. *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians c. 1080-1220*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1980.
- McClain, Lisa. "'They Have Taken Away My Lord': Mary Magdalene, Christ's Missing

- Body, and the Mass in Reformation England.” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 38 (2007): 77-96. Accessed on August 29, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20478246>.
- McConica, James. *English Humanists and Reformation Politics under Henry VIII and Edward VI*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- McDermott, Gerald. *The Great Theologians: A Brief Guide*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2010.
- McNair, Philip. "Peter Martyr in England." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and Italian Reform*. Edited by Joseph McLelland. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1980.
- McNeill, John. "Cranmer's Project for a Reformed Consensus." *The Journal of Religion* 8 (1928): 539-565. Accessed March 17, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1196213>.
- Meijering, E.P. *Melanchthon and Patristic Thought: The doctrines of Christ and Grace, the Trinity and the Creation*. Leiden, Netherlands: EJ Brill, 1983.
- Mitchell, Leonel. *Praying Shapes Believing: A Theological Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Winston Press, 1985.
- Moloney, Francis. *A Body Broken for a Broken People: Eucharist in the New Testament*. Victoria, Australia: Collins Dove, 1990.
- Mozley, J.F. *John Foxe and His Book*. New York: Octagon Books, 1970.
- Muller, James. *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*. New York: MacMillan, 1926.
- Mullett, Margaret. *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop*. Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing, 1997.
- Muss-Arnolt, William. "Puritan Efforts and Struggles, 1550-1603: A Bio Bibliographical Study." *The American Journal of Theology* 23 (1919): 345-366. Accessed on March 26, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3155299>.
- Oberman, Heiko. *Luther: Man between God and the Devil*. Translated by Eileen Walliser-Schwarzbart. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Osborn, Eric. *Clement of Alexandria*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Parker, Thomas. *Calvin: An Introduction to His Thought*. London: Continuum, 2002.

- Patterson, Neil. "A Perusal of the History of the Book of Common Prayer." In *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present, and Future, A 350th Anniversary Celebration*. Edited by Prudence Dailey. New York: Continuum, 2011.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Reformation of the Bible, the Bible of the Reformation*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Pocock, Nicholas. "The Condition of Morals and Religious Belief in the Reign of Edward VI." *The English Historical Review* 10 (1895): 417-444. Accessed on March 26, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/547828>.
- Poythress, Diane. *Reformer of Basel: the Life, Thought, and Influence of Johannes Oecolampadius*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- Prins, A.A. *The Booke of The Common Prayer, 1549: An Enquiry into its Language (Phonology and Accidence), with an Introductory Note about its Composition and Origin*. Amsterdam: M.J. Portielje, 1933.
- Redworth, Glyn. *In Defence of the Church Catholic: the life of Stephen Gardiner*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1990.
- Riordan, Michael and Alec Ryrie. "Stephen Gardiner and the Making of a Protestant Villain." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 34 (2003): 1039-1063. Accessed on August 29, 2013. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20061644>.
- Rosendale, Timothy. "'Fiery tongues:' Language, Liturgy, and the Paradox of the English Reformation." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001): 1142-1164. Accessed on July 29, 2014. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1261969>.
- Rubin, Miri. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Rupp, Gordon. *Patterns of Reformation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.
- Ryrie, Alec. *Being Protestant in Reformation Britain*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Sage, Michael. *Cyprian*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975.
- Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Scarisbrick, J.J. *Henry VIII*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.
- Selwyn, D.G. *A Catechism set forth by Thomas Cranmer*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1978.

- Shagan, Ethan. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Shantz, Douglas. "Vermigli on Tradition and the Fathers: Patristic Perspectives from his Commentary on I Corinthians." In *Peter Martyr Vermigli and the European Reformations: Semper Reformanda*. Edited by Frank James III. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.
- Sheerin, Daniel. *The Eucharist*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1986.
- Smith, H. Maynard. *Henry VIII and the Reformation*. London: MacMillan, 1948.
- Snoek, G.J.C. *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist: A Process of Mutual Interaction*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1995.
- Sowards, J. Kelley. *Desiderius Erasmus*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975.
- Spitz, Lewis. *The Protestant Reformation 1517-1559*. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Steinmetz, David. "Calvin and the Patristic Exegesis of Paul." In *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*. Edited by David Steinmetz. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1990.
- Stephens, W.P. *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- . *Zwingli: An Introduction to his Thought*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Stevenson, Kenneth. *Eucharist and Offering*. New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1986.
- Story, Cullen. *The Nature of Truth in "The Gospel of Truth" and in the Writings of Justin Martyr: A Study of the Pattern of Orthodoxy in the Middle of the Second Christian Century*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1970.
- Stupperich, Robert. *Melanchthon*. Translated by Robert H. Fischer. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.
- Thompson, Nicholas. *Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534-1546*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2005.

- . "Martin Bucer." In *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*. Edited by Lee Palmer Wandel. Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Tracy, James. *Erasmus of the Low Countries*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.
- . *Erasmus: the Growth of a Mind*. Geneva, Switzerland: Librairie Droz, 1972.
- Tribble, Evelyn. "The Peopled Page: Polemic, Confutation, and Foxe's Book of Martyrs." In *The Iconic Page in Manuscript, Print, and Digital Culture*. Edited by George Bornstein and Theresa Tinkle. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Trueman, Carl. "'The Saxons be Sore on the Affirmative': Robert Barnes on the Lord's Supper." In *The Bible, the Reformation and the Church: Essays in Honour of James Atkinson*. Edited by W.P. Stephens. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Tyacke, Nicholas. "The Ambiguities of Early-Modern English Protestantism." *The Historical Journal* 34 (1991): 743-754. Accessed on March 24, 2014. URL: [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0018246X00017593](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0018246X00017593).
- Vallée, Gérard. *A Study in Anti-Gnostic Polemics: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius*. Ontario: Wilfried Laurier University Press, 1981.
- Visser, Arnoud. *Reading Augustine in the Reformation: The Flexibility of Intellectual Authority in Europe, 1500-1620*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Von Campenhausen, Hans. *Men Who Shaped the Western Church*. Translated by Manfred Hoffman. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Walsham, Alexandra. *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Wandel, Lee Palmer. *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Wendel, Susan. *Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-Definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2011.
- Wessel, Susan. *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Williams, George Huntston. *The Radical Reformation* 3rd ed. Kirksville, Missouri: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992.

Witt, William. "Anglican Reflections of Justification by Faith." *Anglican Theological Review* 95 (2013): 57-80. Accessed on March 26, 2014. URL: <http://www.ebscohost.com>

Wolterstorff, Nicholas. "John Calvin." In *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*. Edited by Lee Palmer Wandel. Boston: Brill, 2014.

Wooden, Warren. *John Foxe*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1983.

Yamamoto-Wilson, John. *Catholic Literature and the Rise of Anglicanism*. Tokyo: The Renaissance Institute, 2002.

Zell, Michael. "The Prebendaries' Plot of 1543: a Reconsideration." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27 (1976): 241-253.

## VITA

Amanda Wrenn Allen was raised in Virginia Beach, Virginia and graduated from Ocean Lakes Magnet High School in 2003. While enrolled at Randolph-Macon Woman's College in Lynchburg, VA, she spent her junior year studying in England at Oxford University and the University of Reading. It was during this year she realized her love for the Theological History of the English Reformation and decided to make its study her life's work. In 2007 she received a Bachelor of Arts in Religion from Randolph-Macon Woman's College. In 2010 she earned her Master of Theological Studies with a concentration in the History of Christianity from Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee. She will receive her Doctor of Philosophy in British History from Louisiana State University December 2014.