

Zeitschrift: Theologische Zeitschrift
Band: 30 (1974)
Heft: 2

Artikel: Pietro Martire Vermigli on the Scope and Clarity of Scripture
Autor: Anderson, Marvin W.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-878575>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 19.11.2024

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Pietro Martire Vermigli on the Scope and Clarity of Scripture

On 21 July 1542 Pope Paul III issued “*Licet ab initio*” which established the Inquisition in Italy¹. This papal bull led to several crises of conscience for the devotees of Catholic Evangelism, among whom were Reginald Pole, the Cardinal of England², and Gasparo Cardinal Contarini³. When the Emperor Charles V met at Lucca with Pope Paul III during September of 1541, Contarini renewed acquaintance with the Prior of S. Frediano, Pietro Martire Vermigli (1499–1562)⁴. This native of Florence had given lectures on I Corinthians at Naples in 1540⁵ and was one of several prominent Italians for whom the Papal bull would be decisive. Though precipitated by clandestine Protestantism at Modena and Lucca, the Inquisition reached into every corner of Italy. The Inquisitors moved swiftly against the Anabaptists when suddenly on 4 October 1551 Peter Manelfi defected at Bologna⁶. Pietro Carnesecchi, for circulating the tract “On the Benefits of Jesus Christ Crucified”, confessed his heresy to the Inquisition on 21 August 1566 and was burned at the stake for this and other revelations about his associations with the circle of Valdés⁷. It was dangerous to confess Pauline theology in Petrine territory. Either one became a Nicodemite⁸, making a cloister of his heart; or he selected the narrow way of the stake; or he could flee into exile.

¹ Text in B. J. Kidd, *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation* (1967), pp. 347–350.

² W. Schenk, *Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England* (1950). Pole changed his mind, rejecting “*sola fide*” between September 1546 at Trent and his response to the Cardinal of Augsburg in 1554: D. B. Fenlon, *Reginald Pole and the Evangelical Religion. Some Problems of Italian Christian Humanism in the Early Counter-Reformation* (unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation Cambridge, 1970), p. 271. See also M. Anderson, *Trent and Justification (1546). A Protestant Reflection: Scott. Journ. of Theol.* 21 (1968), pp. 401–402.

³ E. Gleason, *Cardinal Gasparo Contarini (1483–1542) and the Beginning of Catholic Reform* (unpubl. Ph.D. thesis Stanford University, 1963). See also J. B. Ross, *The Emergence of Gasparo Contarini. A Bibliographical Essay: Church History* 41 (1972), pp. 22–45.

⁴ Ph. McNair, *Peter Martyr in Italy. An Anatomy of Apostasy* (1967), pp. 231–235.

⁵ McNair (n. 4), pp. 150–179.

⁶ G. H. Williams, *The Two Social Strands in Italian Anabaptism, ca. 1526–ca. 1565: The Social History of the Reformation*, ed. by L. P. Buck and J. W. Zophy (1972), p. 183.

⁷ See O. Ortolani, *Pietro Carnesecchi. Con estratti dagli atti del processo del Santo Officio* (1963).

⁸ C. Ginsburg, *Il Nicodemismo. Simulazione e dissimulazione religiosa nell’ Europa del 500* (1970), shows that Calvin’s famous treatise of 1544 was directed against Otto Brunfels of Strasbourg. Martyr’s comments of 1545 were published with those of Melancthon, Bucer and Calvin in *De vitandis superstitionibus* (Genevae, Ioannes Girardus, 1549). An Italian version of 1553 exists in the Gucciardini collection, Firenze. For Italy one must now consult A. Rotondò, *Atteggiamenti della vita morale italiana del cinquecento. La pratica Nicodemitica: Riv. stor. ital.* 79 (1967), pp. 991–1030. See Corp. ref. XXXIV, cols. 627–628, for Martyr’s treatise of 1545.

1.

Martyr, like Ochino and later Vergerio⁹, fled into Northern Europe in 1542. In the famous *De fuga in persecutione*¹⁰ Martyr justified that flight. His title reminds one of Tertullian's treatise of A.D. 207–208. In fact, Martyr took great care to refute Tertullian's exegesis of Matthew 10:23: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee into the next: For verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Tertullian observed that Christ urged flight from one Palestinian city to another, not exile from the entire country¹¹. Since Mark 6:7–11 and Luke 9:1–5, 12:1–12 mention the Gentile mission, Martyr clearly saw the eschatological framework of Matthew's account – when the end is near one ought to abandon all things. Montanism was not one of Martyr's options when he wrote:

"Wherefore, since I am delivered from so great a danger, being not ignorant of these kinds of troubles, since I was certified from Rome, from the society, from the monastery, and from your city, of the persecution even at hand, since I did harm unto none, but by lectures and sermons did manifest the truth, all dignities, riches, and commodities set aside, being rid out of the bonds of superstitions, and delivered from so many hypocrasies: if I delivered my life from imminent oppression, there is no cause why any man should take occasion of offence. And doth not the Lord grant that we should avoid persecutions¹²?"

Martyr quoted from the Psalms as well as the Greek verse, "ho phygôn kai pálin machésetai". His purpose was to serve God "more commodiously"¹³.

Delio Cantimori in an essay on the problem of heresy in sixteenth century Italy observed that: "The religious struggles of the age were carried on *religionis causa* – for the sake of religion, for the sake of salvation, for the sake of conscience. . . . Since we are dealing with struggles that were primarily religious, we cannot subordinate the religious, and hence the theological, elements to the non-religious elements within them¹⁴."

Ochino's flight ended in anti-trinitarian radicalism, Vergerio's in anti-catholic invective. By contrast the sober and profound patristic scholar Peter Martyr created an impressive series of Biblical commentaries which clarified the "furor theologicus". He accused the Papacy of errors "in materia fidei", of schism, heresy and idolatry.

⁹ A. Cole Jacobson Schutte, Pier Paolo Vergerio. The Making of an Italian Reformer (unpubl. thesis Stanford University, 1969). See R. Bainton, Bernardino Ochino, esule e riformatori senese del cinquecento, 1487–1573 (1939).

¹⁰ Latin text by Taddeo Duno in all versions of P. M. Vermigli, *Loci communes* (London 1576 – Frankfurt 1656). There were several medical treatises of the period which discussed flight from pestilence, i.e. Gabriel Biel, *De pestis* (1500).

¹¹ Tertullian, *De fuga in persecutione*, rec. J. Marra, *Corpus scriptorum latinorum paravianum* (1957), pp. 69–72. T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study* (1971), pp. 178–183.

¹² G. C. Gorham, *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Immediately Succeeding, A.D. 1533 to A.D. 1588* (1857), p. 26. In the *Genesis Commentary* (1569), Martyr saw the continuing command of God at Matthew 10:9,16,28 and Luke 10:16. Flight therefore is God's will.

¹³ P. M. Vermigli, *In Primum librum Mosis qui vulgo Genesis dicitur commentarii* (Tiguri, Christophorus Froshoverus, 1569), fol. 130^v.

¹⁴ D. Cantimori, *The Problem of Heresy. The History of the Reformation and of the Italian Heresies and the History of Religious Life in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century – the Relation Between Two Kinds of Research: The Late Italian Renaissance, 1525–1630*, ed. by E. Cochrane (1970), p. 225.

Who was this peripatetic Protestant theologian, confidant of Bucer and Bullinger, Calvin and Cranmer, Beza and the Marian exiles? From 1499 to 1542 Martyr had lived in Italy. Educated at Padua and serving at Spoleto, Naples and Lucca, Martyr had not only come to the attention of the Inquisitors, but knew many of the leaders in Catholic evangelism such as Juan de Valdés, Cardinals Cortese, Pole and especially Contarini. It was the latter who requested Martyr's presence at the ill-fated 1541 Ratisbon Colloquy where Protestants and Catholics agreed on Justification¹⁵.

Martyr lived in Strasbourg from 1542 to 1547 where he lectured on the Old Testament¹⁶. At Cranmer's invitation Martyr joined the Archbishop of Canterbury at Lambeth in 1547 and became Regius Professor at Oxford. From the famous 1549 debate on the Eucharist to work on the Prayer Book of 1552, the Forty Two Articles and the "Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum", one can see Martyr's imprint on English reform during Edward VI's reign. When the Catholic Mary Tudor ascended the English throne in 1553, Martyr fled to Strasbourg. In 1556 he left a host of Marian exiles and Lutheran opponents at Strasbourg to join Bullinger at Zurich. While at Zurich Martyr attended the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561 and lectured on the Old Testament. His correspondence with Bullinger and Calvin marks Vermigli as an important reformed theologian¹⁷.

2.

In his Theses of 1543 Martyr proposed that the *Law/Gospel* motif permeated the canonical scriptures¹⁸. The use of scripture to sustain a godly life occurs in his Proposition XII from Exodus:

"God's law requires of our perfect actions three things: first, that we be honest in outward affairs; next, that we avoid violence of our own accord; and finally, that we refer every good and spiritual impulse totally to God¹⁹."

The Romans commentary (1558) was given as lectures during 1550 at Oxford. In these pages one reads a clear Christological basis for the new quality of life. After noting that the sorrow of death no longer held Christ, Martyr went on to assert with St. Paul that sin's tyranny no longer binds the Christian man:

"Righteousness and pureness of lyfe shall daily be renewed in us: which thing is brought to passe, when we depart from sinne: for as long as we live in sinne, we lead not a new life, but the olde life. There is no entraunce open unto the lyfe of the resurrection, but by death²⁰."

The same theme occurs in sermons, especially on Philippians 2. God has tempered a medicine out of the death and resurrection of Christ. Of this wholesome medicine we drink healthfully, argued Martyr, whenever by reading or preaching mention is made of

¹⁵ McNair (n. 4), p. 197.

¹⁶ K. Sturm, *Die Theologie Peter Martyr Vermigli während seines ersten Aufenthalts in Strassburg, 1542–1547* (1971).

¹⁷ M. Anderson, *Peter Martyr, Reformed Theologian (1542–1562). His Letters to Bullinger and Calvin: Sixteenth Century Journal* 4 (1973), pp. 41–64.

¹⁸ Thesis IV on Genesis: P. M. Vermigli, *Proposita disputata publice in Schola Argentinensi ab anno MDXLIII usque ad annum XLIX*, 3 (Basel, Petrus Perna, 1582), p. 431.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 471.

²⁰ P. M. Vermigli, *Most Learned and Fruitfull Commentaries . . . upon the Epistles of S. Paul to the Romanes*, transl. by H. B. (London, Iohn Daye, 1568), p. 149^r.

Christ's death and resurrection, "and we with a lively faith embrace the same"²¹. So must the biblical scholar orient his exegesis about the twin foci of scripture's *scope* and its *clarity*.

The *scope* of scripture includes theology, philosophy, and grammatical analysis. Those who recall Luther's dictum that at Wittenberg Aristotle is everywhere heading for a fall, may be surprised to learn that in Martyr's view, scholastic method aids the scholar to set forth his views in a plain way.

While in Strasbourg Martyr lectured on the Nichomachean Ethics. In Zurich, because the polymath Conrad Gesner lectured on the Ethics at the Carolinum, Martyr could prepare his commentary for publication. Here in this commentary on the Ethics the scope of a text first rested upon its explanation through theological loci. An example would be Martyr's Romans (1558) after chapter 11²². Together with the theological definition of justification, Martyr added a catena of patristic citations on "sola fide" and lamented that Albert Pighius taught that love justified rather than faith. Martyr held that all a man's deeds prior to justification are "occupied in evil works and wandreth in the hatred of God"²³. Secondly, grammatical and textual matters must be analyzed prior to a final exposition of the text. Not only does Martyr set forth a speculative theology, but also moral instruction, "ad uitam componendam"²⁴. Both are controlled by the biblical text as revealed knowledge. Such a moral dimension noted in St. Paul marks Vermigli as a biblical commentator unabashed to speak about the text which teaches him to amend his life intellectually and morally – to admit both his ignorance and his sin. This triple method of loci, text and exposition served as Martyr's exegetical model. Arabic commentators on Aristotle were aware of such an approach to philosophical texts²⁵.

Theodore Beza contrasted Martyr's *clarity* to Bucer's prolixity. Bucer's attempt to explain the Eucharist only confused Beza. In a letter of 23 June 1565 Beza urged Cassiodora De Reina to use "the clearer and more certain writings of our Martyr"²⁶. In January of 1555 John Calvin sent Martyr a lengthy comment on the Eucharist. Martyr cautioned Calvin against such ambiguous terminology. Calvin in turn reminded Martyr that Bucer went far amiss in his attempt to resolve this issue. "For he, wishing to calm the violence of Luther and his partisans, stooped so severely that he was entangled in continual complexity by single words²⁷."

The clarity of Martyr's biblical writing was noted by his opponents. Cornelius Schulting, a Catholic writer, in 1602 contrasted Martyr to Calvin: "In Martyr's *Common Places* there is great perspicuity of diction. In Calvin's Institutes as well as in his biblical commentaries, though industrious and studious,

²¹ A. Marten (ed.), *The Common Places of the Most Famous and Renowned Diuine Doctor Peter Martyr*, 3 (London, H. Denham, Th. Chard, W. Broome & A. Mounsell, 1583), p. 355.

²² See M. Anderson, *Peter Martyr on Romans*: Scott. Journ. of Theol. 26 (1973), p. 401–420.

²³ Vermigli (n. 20), p. 397f.

²⁴ P. M. Vermigli, *In primum, secundum, et initium tertii Libri ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum . . . commentarius doctissimus* (Tiguri, Christophorus Froschouerus Iunior, 1563), pp. 7–8.

²⁵ R. Walzer, *Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Aristotelischen Poetik: Greek Into Arabic* (1962), p. 134.

²⁶ Théodore De Bèze, *Correspondance*, 6 (1565), publ. par F. Aubert, H. Meylan & A. de Henseler (1970), p. 115.

²⁷ John Calvin, *Letters Compiled from the Original Manuscripts and Edited with Historical Notes* by J. Bonnet, transl. by M. R. Gilchrist, 3 (1858), p. 121; Corp. ref. XLIII, 2089, 18 January 1555.

it seems that a tortuous serpent deceives and conceals from the reader the form which meanders so much that he sees only the tail which he can scarcely hold on to²⁸.”

The clarity of Martyr’s exegesis would seem to derive from his personal orientation in which to the question of hermeneutical scope he gave a clear christological answer. There can be no doubt but that Martyr defended Chalcedonian terminology against Francesco Stancaro. This Anti-trinitarian professor of Hebrew challenged Martyr’s exegesis of Romans. As Stancaro would have it, the true understanding of Christ was obscured by the theologians of Zurich and Geneva²⁹. Though Martyr defended the non-biblical terms of Chalcedon, he also pressed on Calvin and Beza the biblical model in Romans 5 and I Corinthians 15. His positive analysis of the Two-Adam Christology is as significant as his defense of a two-nature Christology. Martyr’s comments are refreshing on this subject.

3.

At the end of a series of letters in which Martyr commented on exegesis and theology, he raised a crucial matter with Calvin that takes one to the core of Martyr’s theological thought³⁰. The activity of the *spirit* of *Christ* constitutes true *communion* with Christ. The sacraments and the Word of God are “tokens and signs of the true communion with Christ”³¹. Martyr’s biblical reference is to Hebrews 2:15 that Christ by his death “set free all those who had been held in slavery all their lives by the fear of death”³². His letter to Calvin touched on the renewing power of the Holy Spirit in one’s daily life. A brief analysis of this theme in Bucer, Calvin and Martyr will show their agreement on this issue. Martyr wrote to Calvin on 8 March 1555:

“It is a thing of great importance that he which is of Christ, should understand by what means he is joined unto him. First, I see, that he by the benefit of his incarnation, (as it is said unto the Hebrews) would communicate with us in flesh and blood. For since that the children were partakers together of flesh and blood, he himself would also be a partaker thereof. But unless that another kind of communion had happened therewithall, this would be very common and weak. For so many as are comprehended unto mankind do now after this manner communicate with Christ: for they be men as he was. So as besides that communion this happeneth, to wit, that unto the elect, faith hath access at the time appointed, whereby they believe in Christ, and so they are not only forgiven their sins and are reconciled unto God, wherein consisteth any true and sound respect of justification, but also there is added a renewing power of the spirit, whereby our bodies also, flesh, blood and nature, are made capable of immortality, and become daily more and more as I may say fashioned unto Christ: not, that they cast away the substance of their own nature, and pass in very deed into the body and flesh of Christ, but that they no less draw near unto him in spiritual gifts and properties, than they did naturally even at very birth communicate with him in body, flesh and blood. Now therefore we have

²⁸ C. Schulting, *Bibliothecae catholicae et orthodoxae, contra summam totius theologiae Calvinianae in Institutionibus Ioannis Calvini, et Locis communibus Petri Martyris breuiter comprehensae*, 1 (Coloniae Agrippinae, Stephanus Hemmerdem, 1602), sig. A¹.

²⁹ Franciscus Stancarus Mantuanus, *De trinitate & mediatore Domino Nostro Iesu Christo, aduersus Henricum Bullingerum, Petrum Martyrem & Ioannem Caluinum, & reliquos Tigurinae ac Genuensis ecclesiae ministros, Ecclesiae Dei perturbatores* (Cracow, Marcus Scharfenbergus, 1562), sig. D. VI^r.

³⁰ As early as 1549 Martyr concluded the Oxford debate on the Eucharist with a reference to this joining with Christ.

³¹ Marten (n. 21), 5, p. 98.

³² Hebrews 2:15 in the Jerusalem Bible.

here two conjunctions with Christ: The one natural which by birth we draw even from our parents, but the other commeth unto us by the Spirit of Christ, by whom at the very time of regeneration we are made new according to the image of his glory³³.”

By August, Calvin responded that the subject was one of vast importance³⁴. Calvin’s purpose in answering so briefly was to demonstrate his entire agreement³⁵. There are, said Calvin, two communions to be understood: the one in which fellowship with Christ is created by His death, and the other in which there is “a second influence of His Spirit, enriching us by His gifts”³⁶. Calvin felt that St. Paul’s expression in I Corinthians 1:9 that the faithful are called into the *koinōnía* of His (Son) was a better term than either Consortium or Societas to describe the first communion. The second communion stems from the indwelling Christ and is received in the Sacred Supper:

“Hence, – that we are strong in hope and patience, – that we soberly and temperately keep ourselves from worldly snares, – that we strenuously bestir ourselves to the subjugation of carnal affections, – that the love of righteousness and piety flourishes in us, – that we are earnest in prayer, – that meditation on the life to come snatches us above (*sursum rapit*) – this, I maintain, flows from that second Communion . . .”³⁷

Martyr also discussed this subject in a letter to Theodore Beza of 1555:

“Now it remaineth that I should aunswere unto those thinges which you demaund as touching our communion with Christ . . . Wherefore it behooueth that there come an other likenesse whereby the nature of euerie Christian, as touching soule, bodie, and bloud, be ioyned unto Christ: and that is when by the helpe and indowment of Christes benefites we are renued unto all things and being adorned with diuine properties, are made holie and iust, and through the giftes of God, doe claime unto our selues the gift of immortalitie and of eternall glorie³⁸.”

Martyr went on to describe those benefits of Christ as gifts which restore the believer to Christ. Then Martyr concluded to Beza:

“Then doe wee beginne after some sort to be like unto him when we be borne men, and finallie when by the faith of Christ we are restored unto his merites, giftes, benefites, and properties³⁹.”

On this question of union with Christ, Kilian McDonnell has given an excellent account of Calvin’s eucharistic and ecclesiastical concerns in which Calvin is “in large part indebted to Martin Bucer”⁴⁰. This “Ecclesiology of Inwardness” had union with Christ as its norm. From Martyr’s letter cited above and Calvin’s response, one wonders if Martyr did not equally influence Calvin on this normative “ecclesial moment”. Since Martyr discussed the same question in his I Corinthian Commentary of 1551, there is a possibility that Martin Bucer’s “Praelectiones in Epistolam ad Ephesios” given in Cambridge during 1550/51 reflect what Martyr may have gained from Bucer then and even earlier⁴¹. Martyr had read Bucer on the Psalms and Gospels while in Naples. Even so,

³³ Marten (n. 21), 5, pp. 96–97. The same concern appears in a letter to Beza, *ibid.*, p. 105.

³⁴ Gorham (n. 12), p. 349, 8 August 1555.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 350–351.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 351.

³⁸ Marten (n. 21), 5, p. 105.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁴⁰ K. McDonnell, *John Calvin, The Church, and the Eucharist* (1967), p. 177. McDonnell nowhere documents this debt to Bucer.

⁴¹ M. Bucer, *Praelectiones doctiss. in Epistolam D.P. ad Ephesios . . . habitae Cantabrigiae in Anglia anno MD.L. & LI* (Basel, Petrus Perna, 1562). Neither C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (1946), nor H. Vogt, *Martin Bucer und die Kirche von England* (1968), mention Martyr with respect to this work.

on this question of union with Christ, Bucer's influence on Martyr is negligible. Bucer's *Praelectiones* were edited by Immanuel Tremellius, who points out in his preface that death prevented Bucer from proceeding beyond the fifth chapter. In chapter four one finds a treatise called "Quid sit Ecclesia"⁴². There Bucer represented thoughts similar to those of Martyr expressed in the 1549 *Tractatio*:

"Moreover, every Christian because he is a new creature must also live that life by new customs and duties. These he must do so that everything might naturally serve God's glory in accomplishing human salvation.

This true and efficacious power is life itself whose customs and actions minister Christ Himself, to one another, who is one living body directing all things. I live, yet not I, but Christ lives in me⁴³."

It is important to note that the section of Calvin's *Institutes* on the life of Christian men which ended all editions of the *Institutes* since its first inclusion in the 1539 edition shifted to Book III in 1559. In the 1559 edition it is found in Book III, chapter VI. There Calvin added an expression which he deduced from the Scriptural premise that the Christian is conformed to the image of Christ. The new emphasis is this chapter's manifestation of the work of the Spirit. On the subject of total conversion by the Spirit, Calvin said that what Paul called renewal of the mind is the means whereby Christ lives and reigns in us. This kind of Christian philosophy is foreign to all the philosophers⁴⁴. Certainly Calvin's 1548 *Commentary* on Ephesians was available to Martyr by 1549. Even so, it seems likely that Martyr's letter of 8 March 1555 was partially responsible for these insertions in the 1559 *Institutes*. Niesel has shown that Calvin's polemic against Osiander led him to define these issues in 1550 or 1551⁴⁵. In the *Commentary* on John 17:21, Calvin said in 1553:

"So that the unity of the Son with the Father be not vain and useless, it is necessary that the virtue of the same should spread throughout the body of the faithful. Whence we also gather that we are one with the Son of God, not to say that he transmutes his substance into us, but because by virtue of his Spirit, he communicates to us his life, and all the benefits he has received from the Father⁴⁶."

Again in a sermon on Ephesians 3:9–12 in 1558 Calvin insisted that union with Christ makes even the angels "wonder at the riches that God has displayed in uniting us with the body of his Son⁴⁷." Long before this Calvin had used the phrase "bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh" in his *Sermon to flie Idolatrie* (1537, translated 1551, fol. E V^r). In a comment on Ephesians 5:28–32 published in 1548 Calvin denied that the sharing in the substance of Christ meant the Lord's Supper. The reality of the experience is spiritual. At verse 31 Calvin concluded:

⁴² Bucer (n. 4), fol. 111–129.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, fol. 114F. Even so P. Stephens endorses the much argued weakness in Bucer's understanding of the person of Christ. "Bucer does not sufficiently do justice to that element in the New Testament which stresses the newness of the situation created by the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, and the gift of the Holy Spirit", W. P. Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (1970), p. 264.

⁴⁴ John Calvin, *Institutio christianae religionis* (Geneva, Oliva Roberti Stephani, 1569), fol. 245 and fol. 246.

⁴⁵ W. Niesel, *Calvin wider Osianders Rechtfertigungslehre: Zeits. f. Ki. gesch.* 46 (1928), pp. 410–430.

⁴⁶ F. Wendel, *Calvin. The Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, transl. by Ph. Mairet (1963), p. 238.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 238; Corp. ref. LXXIX, col. 470. Calvin began this series of sermons in May of 1558.

“We are ‘bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh’, not because like ourselves he is man, but because by the power of his spirit he ingrafts us into his body so that we derive from him our life⁴⁸.”

It is apparent that Calvin changed his mind about this issue between 1548 and 1558. Martyr shared in that change. At Galatians 2:20 the double union for Calvin in 1548 was regeneration by the Spirit and justification by Grace. In 1558 it is the Death of Christ and the Indwelling Spirit.

It would seem that Calvin and Martyr shared a common concern to avoid Osiander’s essential righteousness while at the same time they took care to assert that union with Christ which St. Paul clearly enunciated in his Epistles. Prior to Martyr’s 1555 letter to Calvin there is a hint in the I Corinthian Commentary of 1551 that Martyr arrived at his understanding of union with Christ by a reading of Patristic sources. In discussing union at chapter 10 Martyr cited, from Cyril on John 15, Hilary’s eighth book “On the Trinity” and Irenaeus’ book four “Against Valentinian”⁴⁹. The common source for this reformed doctrine of sanctification would seem to be two Pauline passages in Romans 5 and I Corinthians 15.

B. C. Milner argues that neither Krusche, *Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes nach Calvin* nor T. F. Torrance, *Kingdom and Church* relate the simultaneity of justification and sanctification in Calvin’s thought. Torrance would seem to dissolve sanctification in justification, while Krusche makes justification logically prior. Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin*, is aware that real progress in righteousness is spoken of in the Institutes but never perfection (Institutes III.3.14.). Milner does well to point out that, “Simultaneity means, then, that sanctification and justification begin together in faith and end together in salvation”⁵⁰.

Calvin and Martyr agreed with St. Paul’s view of the two Adams expressed in Romans 5. Salvation is accomplished by the work of Christ, experienced in the believer by faith and nourished by the Eucharist. St. Paul used the parallel between Adam and Christ at Romans 5:12–21 and I Corinthians 15:22, 34–49. The typology in Romans 5 clarifies redemption, and in I Corinthians 15 resurrection. Calvin’s comparison of Christ and Adam followed St. Paul and “contains in nuce Calvin’s anthropology, Christology and soteriology”⁵¹. There is an important qualification in Calvin’s I Corinthians (1546). There at 15:47 on Paul’s reminder that “the first Adam was from the earth”, Calvin comments:

“Let us observe in the first place that this is not an exhortation, but pure doctrine, and that he is not treating here of newness of life, but pursues, without any interruption, the thread of his discourse respecting resurrection of the flesh⁵².”

In the Institutes Calvin saw that relationship as one in which “Adam, implicating us in his ruin, destroyed us with himself; but Christ restores us to salvation by His grace” (Institutes II.1.6.). Martyr at Romans 5:12 comments on this antithesis. There, too, Martyr views the relationship of Adam to Christ as “an obscure and very difficult thing” (Romans 1558, p. 152). He goes on to assert the identity of Christ with Abraham and therefore as a true son of Adam the only one who can restore men to righteousness

⁴⁸ E. A. Dowey, Jr., *The Knowledge of God in Calvin’s Theology* (1952), p. 202.

⁴⁹ P. M. Vermigli, In . . . priorem ad Corinthios epistulam (1551), p. 259r: “Et recte patres aduersus haereticos, qui uel naturam humanam, uel naturam diuinam, uel utriusque coniunctionem in una persona, quod Christum, negabant, argumenta sua ex eucharistia deduxerunt.”

⁵⁰ B. C. Milner, Jr., *Calvin’s Doctrine of the Church* (1970), p. 168.

⁵¹ G. Bates, *The Typology of Adam and Christ in John Calvin: The Hartford Quart.* 5 (1964), p. 47.

⁵² John Calvin, *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, transl. by J. Pringle, 2 (1948), pp. 55–56.

through the long-suffering of God. Martyr helped Calvin to see the Son of Man of the Gospels as the Second Adam of Paul, that the One who suffered to give His life a ransom for many undid by His saving act the ruinous act of the first Adam. His triumph is the surety of their faith. In I Corinthians (1546) Calvin denies newness of life, in John (1553) he allows that the Spirit communicates benefits of the Father. By 1558 Calvin speaks about union with Christ. Martyr left his mark on Calvin's theology.

When Zwingli wrote his 1522 treatise "On the Certainty and Clarity of the Word of God", he wished that one would compare scripture with scripture and test the whole by what it said about Christ. Martyr, who read Zwingli's "Commentarius de vera et falsa religione" while in Naples during 1537–1540, used scholastic methodology to analyze the scope of scripture. In so doing he found that to know Christ made the scripture clear. Small wonder that in the frontespiece of his Commentary on I Corinthians (1551) Martyr placed the verse from Galatians 6:14. This made him a *scholar of Christ* as well as a Christian scholar. As Sir Herbert Butterfield has well said: "Hold fast to Christ, and for the rest be totally uncommitted⁵³." Peter Martyr, in fleeing the Inquisitors of Italy, fled to fight again, not against flesh and blood, but against idolatry in the Eucharist and hypocrisy in theology⁵⁴. In the only extant letter from Martyr's Italian days is a postscript to the Canons at Lucca: "I am free from Hypocrisy through the grace of Christ⁵⁵." While the Defenders of the Faith lanced Italy with the stake and Index over their view of biblical interpretation, Peter Martyr laboured over his books and parchments in Northern Europe. In the end Orthodoxy silenced dissent and freedom to explore scripture, but the Word of God was not fettered.

Four centuries later it is still not time to congratulate ourselves for tolerance in matters of faith and exegesis. Though we no longer burn a Servetus, on occasion we may even malign a Trinitarian. At least in the sixteenth century theologians of all stripes were serious about the Gospel. Gordon Rupp sums up their ultimate concern when he wrote of early English protestants: "The case for the open Bible rests in the end not on an estimate of the intellectual capacities of common men. . . . But it rests in the main on the fact that the God who made all men and spent himself in their redemption wills by his Spirit to lead men home in a plain way to himself, and that in the end we are not as children to be protected from the adventure of truth, nor slaves who need not be told more than is good for them, but sons of God⁵⁶."

Peter Martyr, among many others, opened the Bible to show his confrere's in exile the truth of God's redemption — that the scope of scripture and its clarity is found in the "Benefits of Jesus Christ Crucified".

Marvin W. Anderson, St. Paul, Minnesota

⁵³ H. Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (1949), p. 146.

⁵⁴ L. Santini, 'Scisma' e 'eresia' nel pensiero di P. M. Vermigli: *Boll. della Soc. di studi Valdesi* 90 (1969), pp. 27–43.

⁵⁵ McNair (n. 4), p. 288.

⁵⁶ G. Rupp, *Six Makers of English Religion 1500–1700* (1964), pp. 30–31. — I am grateful to Professor Gordon Rupp of Cambridge University for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper, which was read at St. Paul Diocesan Seminary, Minnesota, on 14 December 1972.