

## 目 次

Thomas Cranmer, Continental Divines and the Edwardian Reformation Politics ..... Hirofumi Horie .....	1
I. Zurich antistes, Anglo-Zurichers and the Edwardian Reformation .....	1
II. Thomas Cranmer from his Lutheran phase to his adoption of the true presence doctrine .....	5
III. The Lambeth Talks and the House of Lords' Debate of 1548 .....	13
IV. The House of Lords' Debate of 1548 and the First Book of Common Prayer .....	18
V. Martin Bucer's arrival in England and its meaning .....	23
【研究ノート】山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』第二編「旋回基軸」の基本性格 一同書「統計索引」の「労働」統計年次検討を通じてー .....	28
I  課題と検討方法 .....	28
II 『分析』研究上の第二編位置づけの概観 .....	28
III 『分析』における「統計索引」の地位 .....	30
IV 『分析』の「労働」統計年次の検討 .....	32
V  結語 .....	37
編集後記 .....	44



# Thomas Cranmer, Continental Divines and the Edwardian Reformation Politics

Hirofumi Horie

Since the resurgence of the interest in the continental reformers during the last centuries, the influences these divines had upon the Reformation in England have long been discussed in the varied context. In the course of discussion, however, the question was raised whether the theological framework of the English Reformation was the result of an indigenous attempt — whether, that is, without totally denying foreign influence, the building of the fully reformed church reflected predominantly the English reformers' own studies of biblical and patristic sources, or whether it drew its major theological impetus and imagination from various continental examples, most notably from the Swiss Reformed traditions.

On the government level, as is often claimed, the Reformation in England was simply an endeavour to establish a national church with a uniform order of liturgy and other practices, ruling out foreign intervention supposedly on the ground of religion, both Catholic and Protestant, in English affairs. In this view the English religious settlement was almost identified with the pronouncement of English sovereignty. There appears to be an amount of truth in each of these analyses. Today no conscientious student of history doubts that some significant contributions were made by continental divines, especially by those belonging to the Reformed circle. Heinrich Bullinger's name should be included among those heavyweight reformers, such as Martin Bucer and Peter Martyr Vermigli whose sojourns in England helped to shape the course of reform one way or the other.

## I. Zurich antistes, Anglo-Zurichers and the Edwardian Reformation

While some historians placed minimal significance on Bullinger's possible contributions in England, others went to the extreme of claiming in some cases that the Zurich antistes provided the theological norm for the established church there. Walter Phillips briefly referred to this possible overemphasis upon the role played by Bullinger on the part of some Anglo-American historians who, according to Phillips, had protested against a tendency in the English Reformation historiography to overlook Bullinger and Zurich and to ascribe greater influence to Jean Calvin's Geneva.<sup>1)</sup>

A few questions need to be raised concerning some of the conclusions so far reached by the studies of Bullinger's relationship with England. First of all, some of the conventional research on this subject made an uncritical use of the reports given by Anglo-Zurichers

---

<sup>1)</sup> Walter Phillips, 'Henry Bullinger and the Elizabethan Vestiarian Controversy: An Analysis of Influence', *The Journal of Religious History*, 11 (1981), pp. 364-5.

during the reign of Edward VI and from the nonconformist platform in the Elizabethan period, many of which are printed in the Parker Society's edition of *Original Letters* and *Zurich Letters*.<sup>2)</sup> One needs to decipher to what extent Bullinger accepted the views presented by Zurich sympathizers in England.

On the other hand, other scholars stress Bullinger's contributions to the Elizabethan religious settlement by identifying Bullinger's alleged 'erastian' thought with the position of the established church in England. This view is especially popular among those who studied Bullinger's involvement in the Elizabethan vestiarian controversy, the publications of his *Refutatio* of the papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth and his *Decades* in English.<sup>3)</sup> The latter work was specifically mentioned in Archbishop Whitgift's 'Orders' to be used as a textbook for inferior ministers.<sup>4)</sup> Helmut Kressner, for example, indicates that the so-called *Staatskirchentum*, with which Richard Hooker's name is often associated, was claimed even earlier by John Whitgift who reached this conclusion under the influence of Zurich. In doing this Kressner tries to bring to our attention the difference of views on the issue between Zurich and Geneva, and asserts the affinity of Whitgift's understanding of the state church with that of the Zurichers:

Es war Zürich, das behauptete, die Kirche sei "je nach der Staatsform verschieden zu gestalten und habe sich Zeit, Ort und Umständen anzupassen", und Zürich verdankt es letztlich Whitgift, dass er die geistigen Fesseln zerreißen konnte, die Calvin und seine Jünger den Kirchen anlegten, indem sie auch die Kirchenverfassung ... zu den Glaubensartikeln und Glaubenswahrheiten rechneten. Den Calvinisten gegenüber haben die Zürcher Prädikanten stets die Überzeugung vertreten, dass das Kirchenrecht kein Glaubensgegenstand ist, dass es überhaupt keine göttlich sanktionierte kirchliche Verfassungsform gibt.<sup>5)</sup>

Whitgift's *Defence of the Answer to the Admonition*, according to Kressner, is evidence of the connecting link between Zurich and the English on the issue.<sup>6)</sup> However, to conclude on the Zurich origin of the English *Staatskirchentum*, Kressner offered too little evidence. A nation's ecclesiastical tradition can rarely be formulated along such a narrow line of influence. In order to examine what caused the English religious settlement to have taken

---

<sup>2)</sup> Hastings Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 1846-7), Parker Society edition, 2 vols; idem, ed., *Zurich Letters* (Cambridge, 1842-5), Parker Society edition, 2 vols.

<sup>3)</sup> David J. Keep, 'Henry Bullinger and the Elizabethan Church. A Study of the Publication of his "Decades", his Letter on the Use of Vestments, and his Reply to the Bull which Excommunicated Elizabeth', Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sheffield, 1970; Helmut Kressner, *Schweizer Ursprünge des anglikanischen Staatskirchentums* (Gutersloh, 1953).

<sup>4)</sup> Hirofumi Horie, 'The Origin and the Historical Context of Archbishop Whitgift's "Orders" of 1586', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 83 (1992), 240-57.

<sup>5)</sup> Kressner, *Schweizer Ursprünge des anglikanischen Staatskirchentums*, pp. 74-5.

<sup>6)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 75.

the road it did, a close look at the governments' current ecclesiastical policies is essential. Moreover, Kressner's claim for the affinity of Zurich and England on the issue of the state-church relationships will require further attention. We have to ask whether or not Bullinger taught the erastian view of church-state relationships in a modern sense of the word and whether he sided with the English authorities on various issues which took place during the decade immediately preceding his death in 1575. Did he support the bishops, and therefore the principle of the Religious Settlement, or the more nonconforming elements within the English Church?

The question may not be that simple. There are strong indications that Bullinger did not hold such a dichotomous understanding of the current situations in England. For Bullinger the choice was not either-or. He, as was the case for most other divines on the European continent, appears to have avoided direct involvement in the disputes in England. In this regard, a traditional picture of Bullinger (as in the case of the vestiarian disputes) taking the part of the radical group led by John Hooper, John Knox, Laski (John a Lasco) during the reign of Edward VI, while defending the view of the authorities in the 1560s and 70s, should also be reexamined. Did Bullinger fundamentally alter his position between these two periods of English Protestantism? Or did he remain consistent in his dealings with English affairs? It appears that, behind Bullinger's attitude toward the English developments, the shadow of Catholic 'machination' recently made visible by the calling of the general council under papal leadership loomed as the major influential factor.

Having said this, Bullinger's consideration of a wider confessional context is not sufficient to label him 'réformateur et conseiller oecumenique', as the renowned Bullinger biographer André Bouvier did.<sup>7)</sup> As can be evinced by his posture toward the Lutherans and his sentiment against the general council, the picture needs redressing. Since England played a major part in ecumenical politics, a proper depiction of Bullinger's conviction on this issue is essential in order to assess his overall effect on English ecclesiastical diplomacy.

The degree of the continental influence upon the Edwardian Reformation has been the subject of active discussion, and there is now little doubt that significant contributions were made by continental divines such as Bucer, Martyr, Laski, Bullinger and the Lutherans, in spite of the arguments to the contrary.<sup>8)</sup> Admitting the great amount of influence exerted by these divines, there still remains a question as to whose influence was crucial in deciding the course of ecclesiastical events during the young King's short reign. It still appears that historians fail to agree with each other and to provide a conclusive picture of the issue. Almost everyone agrees that Archbishop Thomas Cranmer played a central role in the process of the Edwardian Reformation, but as to the question who had influenced the Archbishop the most, we receive different interpretations depending on

---

<sup>7)</sup> André Bouvier, *Henri Bullinger, réformateur et conseiller oecuménique, le successeur de Zwingli* (Neuchâtel, 1940).

<sup>8)</sup> See, for example, C.W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London, 1958).

which sources historians were prone to trust. Touching the influence exerted by the Reformed theologians, C.H. Smyth's and more recently Constantin Hopf's works put Martin Bucer in the forefront, while Joseph C. McLelland and M.W. Anderson reevaluated Peter Martyr's positive contribution to the Edwardian reform.<sup>9)</sup> A much-cited old book by F.A. Gasquet and E. Bishop hinted at the Bullinger-Laski 'axis' in their attempt to convert Cranmer:

The conversion of the archbishop to the advanced doctrines of the Helvetian school of reformers had long been prepared for in the mind of Bullinger. He rightly felt that the key to the religious position in England was Cranmer's mind, and that to establish an influence over it would be to transfer the weight of his paramount authority in the ecclesiastical government from the Lutheran to themselves.... As early as June 1548 Bullinger was anxiously looking for news. He enquires eagerly from Richard Hilles the whereabouts of a Lasco .... He understood the influence which a Lasco would be likely to exercise over a mind so ductile as that of the archbishop,...<sup>10)</sup>

Some of the blame for this difficulty in interpretation could be placed upon Cranmer himself whose indecisive and malleable character has often been pointed out by recent scholarship. Historians have had a major problem in understanding what was in fact in Cranmer's mind. Compared with Matthew Parker during the Elizabethan period, the Edwardian Archbishop was unquestionably in the innermost circle of policy makers. Moreover, Cranmer did not have to face someone like Elizabeth I over him and therefore did not need to experience the sense of frustration to which Archbishop Parker and other Elizabethan bishops had to become accustomed. It is, however, important to recognise that Cranmer was not a man without principle. In fact, at least after 1548 it was his ecumenical mind which lay at the centre of his ostensibly indecisive policy making. This does not mean his approach was all-embracing, for example, on the issue of the Eucharist. His endorsement of the true presence of Christ's body in the Lord's Supper could actually incorporate a wider range of Eucharistic views than had so far been allowed. The Archbishop's position on the Eucharist was in total accord with his ecumenical stance. In this respect, it is disappointing that few scholars have given even a summary attention to the possible implication of the doctrine of Christ's true presence in the Supper for the wider ecumenical politics.

---

<sup>9)</sup> C.H. Smyth, *Thomas Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (Cambridge, 1926); C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford, 1946); J.C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli A.D. 1500-1562* (Grand Rapids, 1957); M.W. Anderson, *Peter Martyr: A Reformer in Exile* (Nieuwkoop, 1975). For a brief history of interpretation on Cranmer's Eucharistic position see Peter Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London, 1965).

<sup>10)</sup> F.A. Gasquet and E. Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1928 3rd revised edn.), p. 197.

The focus of our attention will be on Cranmer and his relationships to the continental divines, both resident in England and on the continent. It was quite naturally those who were invited to England that produced the utmost impact upon the Edwardian reform. The contribution made by the Zurich divines should be scaled on this balance of rival influences. Bullinger's close contact with 'Anglo-Zurichers' like John Hooper, Richard Hilles and John Burcher should not be taken to mean an exertion of his influence in English religious affairs. Even though the part played by theologians during the Edwardian Reformation was markedly greater than that under Elizabeth's reign, it was still the King's councilors, Cranmer being an important member of them, that ruled the business of the Church of England. These privy councilors, serving under the direct eyes of the monarch, used the parliament to legislate even on matters of doctrine, although relatively few councilors were in reality commissioned to deal with issues on religion.<sup>11)</sup> Cranmer without doubt sat at the centre of the stage. Therefore our research can justifiably centre around Cranmer and his association with various streams of influence from the continent.

Among these, their influence on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was by far the most important due to its international as well as domestic significance. One should be reminded of the fact that on the issue of the Eucharist the doctrine of Christ's true presence in the Lord's Supper played a key role throughout the Eucharistic debate in this period. Those who opposed the doctrine of real presence, which was held by the Catholics and the Lutherans, but were reluctant to endorse the Zwinglian memorialism searched for a middle ground. Although the advocates of the true presence doctrine maintained Christ's spiritual presence in the Supper, many of them managed to avoid endorsing the doctrine of 'real absence' by emphasizing the work of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist, namely the idea of *sursum corda*.

According to this view, the Holy Spirit worked as an agent in response to communicants' faith drawing their minds into heaven where they enjoyed a true communion of the body and blood of Christ. Thus man's faith played the central role in the Supper. Those who held this view included the major continental theologians like Calvin, Martyr and Laski. Bucer, who does not seem to have elaborated upon the idea of *sursum corda*, affirmed the spiritual presence, even though he tried to make sure that Christ, not merely the spirit of Him, was present in the Eucharist. In England, Cranmer was one of the chief promoters of the true presence doctrine.

## **II. Thomas Cranmer from his Lutheran phase to his adoption of the true presence doctrine**

The question whether there was a definite Lutheran phase in the development of Thomas Cranmer's theological thinking has occupied the interest of scholars for a prolonged period

---

<sup>11)</sup> D.E. Hoak, *The King's Council in the Reign of Edward VI* (Cambridge, 1976), p. 216.

of time. The question, however, is rather inadequate unless what it meant by being a Lutheran is clearly defined. On the Eucharist, did he believe in consubstantiation or did he at one stage simply try to uphold the real presence of Christ's body in the Supper? It may not be possible to state exactly with which particular Lutheran tenets the Archbishop concurred since Lutheranism itself was rather an uncertain community encompassing a different range of views especially on the Supper issue. But judging from the evidence we now possess, it is safe to say that he did go through a moderate Lutheran stage.

Cranmer's 'conversion' to Lutheranism was often attributed to his trip to Nuremberg which he made during the diplomatic mission to the Emperor in 1532. On this occasion the influence of a Nuremberg reformer, Andreas Osiander, became crucial when Cranmer married the niece of Osiander and thus took sides with the Lutherans on the issue of clerical marriage.<sup>12)</sup> Cranmer's visit to Nuremberg probably had no diplomatic importance since the city by then had withdrawn from the Protestant alliance politics. In fact, the leadership of the Protestant cities passed from Nuremberg to Strasbourg, the city which together with Landgrave Philip of Hesse took the initiative in forming a Protestant League in 1531.<sup>13)</sup> The Nuremberg council rejected the idea of forming a religious alliance with the southwest German cities which imbibed Zwinglian doctrines. Nuremberg instead relied on the idea of a strong *imperium*. These delicate situations will explain why Cranmer's book on the divorce was suppressed in this city in spite of Osiander's support for the English King. Nuremberg remained strictly Lutheran. It was with this rather conservative Lutheran city that Cranmer maintained his faithful contact.

It is difficult to pinpoint exactly how far the Archbishop was persuaded to agree with Lutheran tenets. Those who deny a Lutheran stage in the mind of Cranmer cite his reply to the question of Dr. Martin at the examination before Bishop Brokes at Oxford in September 1555.<sup>14)</sup> To Martin's accusation that Cranmer had taught on the high sacrament of the altar three contrary doctrines, Cranmer answered that he had taught but two contrary doctrines. Judging from the context of these exchanges, it appears that Cranmer did not draw a strict line between Lutheran teaching and Zwinglian understanding on the Supper. While his Catholic opponent attempted tenaciously to draw the Archbishop to admit his successive adherence to these two Protestant doctrines on the Eucharist after relinquishing the Catholic teaching, Cranmer simply maintained that in his entire life he had taught only two opinions, namely the papists' doctrine and the teaching he held at this examination. In other words, the distinction Cranmer made here was only between the real presence and

---

<sup>12)</sup> Jasper Ridley, *Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1962), pp. 42-6. On the other hand, Osiander reported to Cranmer that his book *De Incestis Nuptiis* was banned by the Nuremberg high council in order not to incur the Emperor's displeasure. Nicholas Pocock, ed., *Records of Reformation* (Oxford, 1870), II, 483.

<sup>13)</sup> Hans Baron, 'Religion and Politics in the German Imperial Cities during the Reformation' *English Historical Review*, 52 (1937), pp. 405-27.

<sup>14)</sup> John Edmund Cox, ed., *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer* (Cambridge, 1846), Parker Society edition, pp. 217-8.



his new understanding which Nicholas Ridley and others helped him to understand. Cranmer replied to Martin, 'I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did, until my lord of London, doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors drew me quite from my opinion.'<sup>15)</sup>

This new position of Cranmer was conventionally termed as the true presence but it appears historians have so far failed to recognise the fact that by this new position Cranmer tried to bring together a wide range of positions which affirmed the spiritual presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. This view could allow the positions ranging from Martin Bucer's on the right to Laski and even Johannes Oecolampadius of Basel on the left. This broader understanding on the part of Cranmer is most clearly expressed in his *Answer to Stephen Gardiner Concerning the Sacraments*:

As concerning M. Bucer, what mean you to use his authority, whose authority you never esteemed heretofore? And yet Bucer varieth much from your error: for he denieth utterly that Christ is really and substantially present in the bread, either by conversion or inclusion, but in the ministration he affirmeth Christ to be present: and so do I also, but not to be eaten and drunken of them that be wicked and members of the devil, whom Christ neither feedeth nor hath any communion with them. And to conclude in few words the doctrine of M. Bucer in the place by you alleged, he dissenteth in nothing from Oecolampadius and Zuinglius.<sup>16)</sup>

What lay behind Cranmer's Eucharistic understanding is his enduring desire for Protestant unity. Even though there was in Cranmer's theological development a so-called transitional stage between the periods of his adherence to transubstantiation and the true presence, it is difficult to identify this stage as a Lutheran phase. As far as the Eucharist is concerned, we can at most assert that he held to Lutheran sentiment, but it is a quite different thing to claim that he held Lutheran tenets which included the doctrine of consubstantiation. As was the case with Luther himself, Cranmer did not embrace that doctrine. As in the case of transubstantiation, Luther regarded the theory as an unnecessary way of explaining the miracle of the real presence in philosophical terms, when a miracle *ipso facto* defies any such explanations. The faithful need only to believe that 'bread and wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ'.<sup>17)</sup> In Cranmer's translation of Justus Jonas's Latin *Catechismus* published in 1548, a similar point was made. It claimed, '... beleue the wordes of our lord Jesus, that you eate and drynke his

---

<sup>15)</sup> Ibid., p. 218. See also Sir John Cheke's preface to the 1557 Emden edition of *Defensio Verae Catholicae Doctrinae de Sacramento...* in John Edmund Cox, ed., *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, ..., relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (Cambridge, 1844), Parker Society edition, appendix p. 6 in which the year 1546 was given as the date of Cranmer's 'conversion'.

<sup>16)</sup> Ibid., p. 225.

<sup>17)</sup> Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, pp. 19-20.

veray body and blode although mans reason can not comprehend how and after what maner the same is ther present.<sup>18)</sup>

That Cranmer was not a blind follower of the Lutherans could be witnessed in his emotional reaction to the news of Philip of Hesse's bigamous marriage in 1540 to which Lutheran divines had granted theological approval. The letter Cranmer wrote to Osiander on 27 December 1540 revealed the Archbishop's irritation over the Lutheran introduction of novelties. He questioned not only their peculiar exegesis but also the 'intimate' relationship he had cherished with the Lutherans:

With the rest of your doctors my intimacy is of a lighter character and less close; and even of this I should not a little repent, if I knew that such were the fruits of the new gospel so greatly vaunted by them, and approved by us up to this time, in some measure, as we thought, not without reason.<sup>19)</sup>

Cranmer's Lutheran phase was not evident during the last years of Henrician conservatism expressly delineated in the Act of Six Articles and the King's Book which was written in order to instruct laymen on doctrine. The dawning of a more distinct Protestant reign in January 1547 did not bring about an immediate expression of Cranmer's inclination to Lutheran teachings. The first year of Edward VI's reign saw a commandment to use two books, i.e. the *Homilies* (authorized sermons for use in the Church of England) and Erasmus's *Paraphrase*. In July, the *Homilies* containing provision for a scriptural instruction were issued. The royal injunctions, which were issued in the following month and were based upon the Cromwellian Injunctions of 1536, demanded that the clergy use Erasmus's *Paraphrase*.<sup>20)</sup> There was nothing radical about the contents of these works, but they contained a strong Protestant argument, which was enough to excite Stephen Gardiner to challenge it. <sup>21)</sup> The shrewd Bishop of Winchester in his letter to Duke of Somerset written from the Fleet in October pointed out the contradictions not only between these two books but also between the act of parliament (i.e. the King's Book) and the book of *Homilies*:

These Bokes stryve one against another directly. The Book of the Homilies teacheth Faith to exclude charity in the office of Justification. Erasmus Paraphrases teacheth Faith to have charitie joined with him in Justification.... The Booke of Homilies in the

---

<sup>18)</sup> *Cathechismvs, That Is to Say, a Shorte Instruction into Christian Religion for the Synguler Commodity and Profyte of Children and Yong People* (London, 1548), fos. Ii, 5vff.

<sup>19)</sup> Cox, ed., *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, p. 408.

<sup>20)</sup> Francis Procter and W.H. Frere, *A New history of the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1902), p. 35.

<sup>21)</sup> Gardiner and Cranmer were rival keepers of Henry VIII's conscience, Gardiner as a legal expert reflecting the King's hold on the past, and Cranmer reflecting his efforts to reshape the future. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer A Life* (New Haven & London, 1996), pp. 77-8.

sermon of Salvation teacheth the clere contrary to the doctrine established by the Act of Parliament:... The Boke of Homyles hath in the Homilie of Salvation, how remission of synne is taken, accepted and allowed of God for your perfect Justification. The Doctrine of the Parliament teacheth justification, for the fulness and perfection therof, to have more parts than Remission of sinne, as in the same appereth. And althowght Remission of sinne be a justification, yet it is not a full and perfite.<sup>22)</sup>

One of Gardiner's arguments was on legal ground; the act of parliament of 1543 stipulated that any departure, without parliamentary sanction, from the doctrine established by Parliament was unlawful. If justification by faith is the cornerstone of Protestant theology, the book of *Homilies* was a clear inauguration of Protestant reform in the new reign. We do not have to speculate about the influence of the Lutherans on Cranmer's doctrinal conviction, since justification *sola fide* was not Luther's monopoly. Manuscripts preserved in Lambeth Place Library in London written in Cranmer's hand show the Archbishop's conviction on this doctrine. These notes on justification trace his long study in the Bible and the patristic sources.<sup>23)</sup> When we read a statement like 'although all that he justified must of necessity have charity as well as faith, yet neither faith nor charity be the worthiness and merits of our justification, but that is to be ascribed only to our Saviour Christ...', we cannot help but be impressed by the maturity of Cranmer's Protestantism.<sup>24)</sup> The *Homilies* certainly received a continental approval from Bucer who had also been engaged in the controversy with Gardiner. The further implication of this avowed adoption of justification *sola fide* was clearly envisaged by Gardiner. In his letter to Cranmer written around June 1547, Gardiner expressed his fear that this vile doctrine would lead to the denial of the real presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist:

...Bale is a sacramentary, and Joseph preached *sola fides*, and Zuinglius in his book against Luther sayth that this doctrine, *Sola fides iustificat*, is a foundation and principle to deny the presence of Christ's natural body really in the Sacrament. And although I have not heard so much of Joseph to be a sacramentary, yet because Zuinglius lynketh them together as afore, and I had heard that Joseph preached *sola fides*, in that number three there was for all degrees of untrew doctrine one.<sup>25)</sup>

---

<sup>22)</sup> John Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer...* (Oxford, 1840), II, 785-6. Also printed in J.A. Muller, ed., *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 381-2. See a series of Gardiner's indictments against these two books and the Injunction itself in his other letters to the Duke of Somerset and others. *Ibid.*, pp. 368-424.

<sup>23)</sup> These notes are printed in Cox, ed., *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, pp. 203-11.

<sup>24)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 209.

<sup>25)</sup> Muller, ed., *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, p. 305. John Bale was later Edwardian Bishop of Ossory in Ireland. Dr. John Joseph was Cranmer's chaplain.

Gardiner's fear was not unfounded since the Order of the Communion, which was published in March 1548 and was a direct result of the parliamentary enactment to establish the communion under both kinds, plainly supported the spiritual feeding of Christ's body.<sup>26)</sup>

The doctrine of spiritual presence could encompass a wide range of opinions. The Eucharistic position Cranmer adopted during the early Edwardian period is rather difficult to decipher. But the Archbishop, in spite of his apparent adherence to the true presence doctrine, indicated his proximity to the Lutherans, as exemplified in his translation of *Catechismvs*. This work was intended to give a brief instruction on Christian religion to children and young people in Nuremberg. Its German original *Catechismus oder Kinder · predig* was translated into Latin by Justus Jonas before the English translation.<sup>27)</sup> What is interesting and often unnoticed is the fact that *Catechismus* constituted a part of the *Kirchenordnung* of 1533 for Brandenburg-Nuremberg in the preparation of which Johann Brenz and Osiander played major roles.<sup>28)</sup>

*Catechismvs* appeared to have put forward the true presence doctrine in Cranmer's English translation, but the emphasis in the original German and Jonas's Latin was definitely on the fact of Christ's actual presence over against the absence. Cranmer's translation reads:

Wherefore we ought to beleue, that in the sacrament we receyue trewly the bodye and bloud of Christ. For God is almyghtye (as ye hearde in the Crede). He is able therefore, to do all thynges what he wil....Wherefore when Christe taketh breade, and saieth. Take, eate, this is my body we wought not to doute but we eat his veray bodye. And when he taketh the cuppe, and sayeth. Take, drynke, this is my blod, we ought to thynke assuredly, that we drynke his veray blode.<sup>29)</sup>

It then exhorts the readers to be watchful of those who deny Christ's presence 'for none other cause, but that they cannot compasse by mans blynde reason, howe this thinge shoulde be broughte to passe'.<sup>30)</sup> Peter Brooks called our attention to the skilful moderation Cranmer brought to his English translation. For example, he noted a difference between

---

<sup>26)</sup> See Joseph Ketley, ed., *Liturgies of Edward VI* (Cambridge, 1844), p. 3. '...he (God) hath not only given his body to death, and shed his blood, but also doth vouchsafe in a Sacrament and mystery to give us his said body and blood spiritually.' Another parliamentary action, the repeal of the Six Articles, probably contributed more to the psychological advancement of the reform on the part of the clerics, since expressing their opinions against 'popish trash' was still regarded by some clergy as unsafe as long as the Six Articles remained intact. Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, I, 224.

<sup>27)</sup> Jonas's Latin work published in 1543 was entitled *Catechismus pro pueris et iuuentute, in Ecclesijs et ditione Marchionum Brandeborgensium, latine redditus, per I. Ionam*.

<sup>28)</sup> *Kirchen Ordnung/In meiner gnedigen herrn der Marggraauen zu Brandenburg und eins Erbern Rats der Stat Nürnberg Oberkeyt vnd gepieten/Wie man sich bayde mit der Leer und Ceremonien halten solle* (Nuremberg, 1533). (hereafter abbreviated *Kirchenordnung*)

<sup>29)</sup> *Catechismvs*, fos. li. 5.

<sup>30)</sup> *Ibid.*

‘Ideo credere debemus, quod vere corpus et sanguis ejus *sit ...*’ and ‘Wherefore we ought to beleue, that in the sacrament *we receyue trewly* the bodye and bloud of Christ’.<sup>31)</sup> In spite of all the alleged modulations, even in Cranmer’s translation some sections could be interpreted to support the real presence position or at best the most conservative wing of the true presence advocates like Bucer or Melanchthon after 1541 who could have worked out the doctrinal rapprochement between the Lutherans and the Reformed.<sup>32)</sup> Certainly John ab Ulmis understood the publication of this *Catechismvs* as regression to Romist doctrine:

For he has lately published a Catechism, in which he has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the papists in the holy supper of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous, and lucid.<sup>33)</sup>

We do not know whether Cranmer was familiar with the fact that *Catechismus oder Kinder · Predig* was attached to the Brandenburg Church Order of 1533. If Cranmer was a devoted convert to the spiritual presence view, he would have noticed many defects in this Lutheran work. The thrust of the Eucharistic teaching in *Catechismus* can best be understood if one also looks at the section ‘von dem Abentmal’ in the *Kirchenordnung*. It professed:

Dieweyl dann Christus spricht/Es sey sein leyb/so sollen wir jme die eer thun vnd seinen wortten glauben/dann sie sein allmechtig/vnd er rufft dem das nicht ist/das es sey/Roma. am iiiij. Darumb yrren auch die so da sagen/Es sey den vnglaubigen nicht der leyb Christi/sunder allein den glaubigen/ ...<sup>34)</sup>

Cranmer’s choice of this Lutheran literature clearly illustrates his cautious approach to the Reformation at this early stage of the young King’s reign. Peter Brooks believes that the reader was subject to ‘the kind of gradual presentation of the Reformed viewpoint’.<sup>35)</sup> Admitting that Cranmer at this stage already held on to some sort of true presence position,

---

<sup>31)</sup> Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer’s Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 44 note (Italic Brooks’s). Original German reads: ‘Darumb sollen wir glauben/das es warlich sein leyb und sein blut sey.’ Brooks observed that any direct translation of the Latin would have supported transubstantiation. On the other hand, *Catechismus*, trusting the miraculous work of the Almighty, seems to have decided not to pry too deeply into the mode of Christ’s presence.

<sup>32)</sup> We have to wait until the latter half of the 1550s when Calvin’s Geneva attempted to seek a concord between the two camps. See my ‘Consensus Tigurinus or Dissensus Tigurinus? International Ecclesiastical Politics in Switzerland in the mid-16th Century’, *Senshu University Institute of Social Sciences Monthly Bulletin*, no. 532 (Oct. 2007).

<sup>33)</sup> Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, II, 381.

<sup>34)</sup> *Kirchenordnung*, fo. XLv.

<sup>35)</sup> Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer’s Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 45.

his view was, in fact, much closer to the Lutheran teaching than Brooks seems to allow. Cranmer probably could identify himself with the most conservative wing of true presence advocates. Thus, although the Archbishop had crossed the great divide, he still carried with him some old traits of Lutheranism.

The famous commonplace books of Cranmer, which were believed to be a result of his studious work conducted presumably in the mid-1530s and the early 1540s, testify to only gradual progress in the Archbishop's Eucharistic thinking. These commonplaces eloquently indicate his theological persuasion on the Eucharist during the Henrician period, which slanted toward the Lutherans. What was propounded in these commonplace books in the section *de Eucharistia* does not differ much from the Eucharistic teaching of the original *Catechismus*. The method used in the commonplace books was that the reasoning of the Reformed theologians like Zwingli and Oecolampadius was opposed by the arguments of Luther and Brenz.<sup>36)</sup> Zwingli, for example, argued that 'verum corporis Christi non esse in Coena domini' because he believed 'hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis traditur, necessario sequeretur, illud idem corpus, debere visibiliter adesse in coena domini...'. To this it was responded using Luther's argument:

Hoc argumentum, absurdum esse omnino, Lutherus aliis consimilibus argumentis ostendit, videlicet. Corpus Christi quod pro nobis visibiliter traditum est, sedet ad dexteram patris, ergo visibiliter illic sedet, si non visibiliter illic sedet, sequitur quod non sedet,...<sup>37)</sup>

The Brenzian contribution is also noteworthy. Although the actual folios are missing, the section entitled 'Osiander', which must appear before the section *de Eucharistia*, could prove to be a good testimony to Cranmer's familiarity with the Brandenburg-Nuremberg tradition to which *Cathechismvs* owed its origin.<sup>38)</sup>

Although Cranmer's 'conversion' to the true presence position is often attributed to the work of Nicholas Ridley in the year 1546 following John Cheke's dating, his full conversion to the doctrine of spiritual presence, shaking off the Lutheran garments, had to wait until his explicit denial of *manducatio impiorum* (eating by the unworthy in the Supper), which was witnessed in the famous debate in the House of Lords at the end of 1548.<sup>39)</sup> The period between 1546 and 1548 is crucially important since it is during this period that the apparent continental Reformed impact upon Cranmer's mind was first felt. Those who believed in Cranmer's thorough conversion to the Zwinglian view of the sacrament at the

---

<sup>36)</sup> British Library MS. Royal, 7B XI, fos. 111r-119v.

<sup>37)</sup> Ibid., fo. 111r. For the summary of the content of *de Eucharistia* see Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, pp.21-37.

<sup>38)</sup> See *Tabula Repartoria* in British Library MS. Royal, 7B. XI, fo. 4r. This table is printed in Cox, ed., *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>39)</sup> For Cheke's dating see footnote 15.

time of the House of Lords' debate face an arduous task in providing a plausible explanation for the conservative nature of the first Edwardian Prayer Book. In view of this difficulty along with Cranmer's ecumenical concern for the Protestant unity, an observation allowing Cranmer's true presence position to include a wide range of theological persuasions carries much weight. In fact, Cranmer's strong interest in the general synod to sort out the doctrinal differences, his sending of invitations to the continental reformers including immensely varied camps within Protestantism from Melancthon to Laski, and the very nature of the Prayer Book of 1549 affirm Cranmer's understanding of the true presence at this period which was broad enough to obtain a kind of unity encompassing different theological tenets.

### III. The Lambeth Talks and the House of Lords' Debate of 1548

Peter Martyr Vermigli was the first among the major continental mentors who arrived in England to assist the Reformation. His arrival in November 1547 before that of Laski and Bucer and his subsequent prolonged stay at Lambeth Palace are significant indications of his possible influence upon Cranmer's flexible mind. The Archbishop himself in his *Answer to Richard Smith's Preface* confirmed this and his confession seems to signify the importance of the first direct communication with the Italian reformer upon Cranmer's theological thinking.<sup>40)</sup> It is interesting to see how Cranmer himself profited from these conversations and became an observant witness to Martyr's consistent teaching. Before Martyr travelled to England, he had experienced a dispute over the Eucharist between the cities of Strasbourg and Zurich. The letter which Strasbourg divines, including Martyr and Bucer, sent to Zurich on 6 December 1546 indicates their willingness not to pry into the mode of communication in the Supper. It reads: 'Id ergo fecit admonuitque eos ut fide simplici institute et verborum Domini communicarent, nec se constituerent iudices controversiae quae hac de re agitator, aut etiam de modo scrupulosius inquirerent quo Christo communicamus.'<sup>41)</sup> Martyr tried to avoid stirring up the controversy between the two Reformed cities since it only worked to the enemy's advantage.

So when Martyr and Cranmer sat talking at Lambeth, both must have agreed on most of the pending issues including the Eucharist and the need for the general council or theological colloquy among the Protestant divines. Cranmer himself long cherished the

---

<sup>40)</sup> Cox, ed., *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer*, p. 374. Martyr stayed at Lambeth Palace throughout the winter. François van der Delft, imperial ambassador to England, certainly sensed the close relationship of Martyr and Bernardino Ochino, another Italian reformer, with Cranmer calling these two foreigners 'the pet children of the Archbishop'. Martin A.S. Hume and Royall Tyler, eds., *Calendar of Letters and State Papers Relating to English Affairs, Preserved Principally in the Archives of Simancas* (London, 1862-1954), p. 266 (Van der Delft to the Emperor, 16 May 1548). (以後 CSP Span. と略記)

<sup>41)</sup> Karl Gottlieb Bretschneider and H.E. Bindseil, eds., *Corpus Reformatorum*, XL, 438. See also Anderson, *Peter Martyr*, p. 84.

idea of a general council. There is a treatise on general councils, supposedly written by Cranmer probably around the mid-1530s. The headings in this treatise such as ‘whether it be necessary that one be head in general council’ or ‘whether the Bishop of Rome may be ruler in the council’ foreshadow the similar concern felt by the Elizabethan councillors.<sup>42)</sup> In what Gilbert Burnet called a ‘resolution of Cranmer and bishops’, Cranmer claimed: ‘In all the ancient councils of the church, in matters of the faith and interpretation of the Scripture, no man made definite subscription, but bishops and priests, for so much as the declaration of the word of God pertaineth unto them.’<sup>43)</sup>

As Cranmer himself observed, Martyr’s teaching on the Eucharist during the Lambeth conferences with the Archbishop was the same as one he adhered to throughout his Oxford lectureship on I Corinthians and during the subsequent Eucharistic disputation started in May 1549. During the disputation Martyr was in close touch with Cranmer as well as with Martin Bucer. What Martyr defended is shown in his famous letter to Bucer of 15 June 1549. Martyr in this debate powerfully upheld the true presence doctrine against Catholic charges. He expected Bucer to concur in opinion when he said:

...on weighing the whole thoroughly, you will easily understand that, — when I maintain that the Body of Christ becomes present to us by faith, and, by communicating, we are incorporated with Him, and are transformed into that [Body], — I do wander far from what you yourself teach.<sup>44)</sup>

He emphasised that the partaking of the body and blood of Christ was done by the mind and by faith, and the Holy Spirit effected this partaking.<sup>45)</sup> These must have been the central contentions of Martyr during the Lambeth talks. Martyr and Cranmer must have mutually confirmed their positions by sharing their biblical and patristic learnings. Martyr confessed a little later that he was much impressed by Cranmer’s knowledge of the patristic sources.<sup>46)</sup> There is no doubt that Martyr’s insight enriched Cranmer’s understanding of the true presence, as Laski’s and Bucer’s thoughts did for Cranmer a little later. From Cranmer’s standpoint, these continental reformers, though different in points of emphasis, agreed with each other in principle.

Bucer’s response to Martyr’s above-mentioned letter made on 20 June is indicative of this agreement. Unfortunately, excessive stress has thus been laid upon the issues Bucer raised in his letter which was meant only to ‘improve’ Martyr’s argument. The term ‘spiritual

---

<sup>42)</sup> Historical Manuscripts Commission (HMC) Hatfield, I, 10.

<sup>43)</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (Oxford, 1845), I, 284-5.

<sup>44)</sup> George Cornelius Gorham, ed., *Gleanings of a Few Scattered Ears, during the Period of the Reformation in England and of the Times Immediately Succeeding AD 1533 to 1588* (Cambridge, 1857), p. 81. (Hereafter abbreviated *Gleanings*)

<sup>45)</sup> *Ibid.* Martyr states: ‘I grant that the Holy Spirit is efficacious in the Sacraments by force of the Spirit and institute of the Lord.’

<sup>46)</sup> See Martyr’s epistle to *Tractatio* of 1549 which was prefixed to *Disputatio de Eucharistiae*.



presence' was often used interchangeably with the term 'true presence' since they both represented the position against the doctrine of the real presence which taught that Christ's body was really present irrespective of the communicant's faith. Bucer's theological sensitivity now forces us to distinguish the two, since in this letter he worried that Martyr might be understood to have maintained the presence, not of Christ, but only of the Spirit of Christ and of His influence.<sup>47)</sup> It was mainly a question of wordings and emphasis. Bucer wished that Martyr had expressed the exhibition of Christ in the Supper more distinctly lest he should fall under suspicion of propounding Christ's absence or mere signification in the Supper.<sup>48)</sup> That Martyr did not simply teach the presence of Spirit of Christ is evident when we look at the role Martyr attributed to the Holy Spirit, i.e. the idea of *sursum corda*.<sup>49)</sup> Bucer agreed that only by faith do we partake the body of Christ but contended that, if we avoided the use of terms like 'really' and 'substantially', we might not be able to express the true partaking of Christ's body. For Bucer the use of these terms did not necessarily conflict with the doctrine of the true presence.

That Bucer shared some Lutheran tenets, a criticism often raised against him, is not true as he evidently negates *manducatio impiorum* ('eating by the impious', also called *manducatio indignorum* meaning 'eating by the unworthy'). Bucer's rejection of the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity can be witnessed in the following statement of his:

One thing, however, has very much astonished me; that you seem to fear I shall be offended at your denying, That Christ is at the same moment in many places; and that it has escaped you that I, with Master Philip [Melanchthon], abominate from my whole heart that Ubiquity (as Philip calls it,) of Christ as man which some have laid down [as a dogma]. I have never felt disposed, nor am I up to this moment disposed, to come forward in that controversy, Whether Christ is circumscribed by any Physical place in the heavens.<sup>50)</sup>

---

<sup>47)</sup> Gorham, ed., *Gleanings*, P. 88.

<sup>48)</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49)</sup> Laski also expressed the same view in his letter to Bullinger and Konrad Pellican in 1546: 'Here I assent, and I confess that, our minds being drawn up into heaven by faith through the Holy Spirit, we there receive a true communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, ...' Gorham, ed., *Gleanings*, p. 32. Martyr's concurring view is expressed, for example, in the preface to *Disputatio de Eucharistia Sacramento Habita in Celeberr. Vniuersitate Oxonien. in Anglia...* (Tiguri, 1552), in which Martyr in effect said that those who criticised him for not accepting Transubstantiation and thus leaning toward Anabaptists did not understand the role of the Holy Spirit in the Sacrament: 'efficaciā spiritus Sancti nihil morantur, quam nos in hoc sacramento statuimus.' pp. 8-9. See Martyr's confession on the Supper exhibited to the Senate of Strasbourg in 1556 when he was called to Zurich. Peter Martyr Vermigli, *Loci Communes* (London, 1583), pp. 1068-70. (Hereafter abbreviated *L.C.*) See also his opinion touching the presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist introduced at Poissy. Also see his 'Confessio sev sententia D. Petri Martyris Vermilii de coena Domini, exhibita amplissimo Senatui Argentinensi, cum vocaretur Tigurum, Anno M.D. LXI.' *L.C.*, p. 1069. I have used Martin's English translation of *Loci Communes* published in 1583, but unless otherwise stated, I followed the page numbers of the 1583 Latin edition.

<sup>50)</sup> Gorham, ed., *Gleanings*, p. 91.

What Bucer disliked was Martyr's use of the term 'signification', even though it was modified by the adjective 'efficacious'.<sup>51)</sup> Although Bucer suspected the influence of Zurich followers in Martyr's temporary 'lapse', there is no evidence for this; it is more likely that Martyr's eagerness in the peculiar atmosphere of the debate made him assert a little more than he really wanted to go. Therefore after Bucer's counsel, the differences were settled to Bucer's satisfaction.<sup>52)</sup>

As Joseph C. McLelland points out, this disputation removed the false antithesis of Romanist/Zwinglian polarization which Bullinger's Swiss party had not helped to overcome.<sup>53)</sup> In fact, one of the contributions made by Bucer and Martyr was that their positive sacramental theology displaced the Lutheran/Zwinglian antithesis which was sharpened by the Anglo-Zurichers' incessant attack upon Lutheranism in England. This widened range of the theological centre of Protestantism in England, over against a polarisation into two extremes, benefited Cranmer more than anyone else. Certainly Martyr, before the arrival of Bucer from Strasbourg in 1549 as the result of the city's acceptance of the Interim, was the key figure to represent the true presence advocates.

Laski was another important figure whose arrival in England in September 1548, well before the Lord's debate, might have influenced the Archbishop's mind. Some scholars thought that Laski's visit to Lambeth actually caused Cranmer's adoption of the Zwinglian view on the Eucharist, thus providing a plausible answer to the alleged endorsement of the Zurich view by Cranmer during the Lords' debate in December, which was reported by Bartholomew Traheron to Bullinger.<sup>54)</sup> The same change of Eucharistic views on the part of Cranmer and Laski's influence on this were also reported to Bullinger by John ab Ulmis shortly before Traheron had written his letter: 'Even that Thomas himself, ..., by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, master John a Lasco, is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy.'<sup>55)</sup> However, the influence of Laski's first visit should not be overrated. Although Traheron would be justified in saying that 'I perceive that it is all over with Lutheranism', he was not accurate in claiming that Cranmer came over to their side, if by 'their side' he meant the Zurich sympathisers rather than a broader circle of true presence upholders. This has to be examined in the light of the record of the proceedings of the Lords' debates entitled 'Certeyne notes touching the disputacions of the Bisshoppes in this last parliament assembled of the Lordes Supper', which is preserved among the Royal manuscripts in the British Library.<sup>56)</sup>

---

<sup>51)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 142 (Bucer to Theobald Niger, 15 April 1550).

<sup>52)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 143.

<sup>53)</sup> Joseph C. McLelland, *The Visible Words of God* (Edinburgh, 1957), p. 278.

<sup>54)</sup> See for example, C.W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers* (London, 1958), p. 129; Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, I, 322-3.

<sup>55)</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 383.

<sup>56)</sup> British Library MS. Royal, 17B XXXIX. These proceedings of the Lord's debate are given in Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 127-40.

Furthermore, at least as to the first visit of Laski to England, it is probably wrong to assume that Laski was totally in tune with Zurich divines and their faithful followers in England almost to the point of making a concerted effort to introduce the reform patterned after the Swiss church. First of all, Laski did uphold the true presence doctrine as is evinced from Laski's letter to Bullinger and Pellican of March 1546, in which he revealed to them the nature of his correspondence with Bucer.<sup>57)</sup> What was presented in this letter was the doctrine of the true presence of the Vermiglian type which, as Laski understood, was concurrent with Bucer's view of the Eucharist. More significantly, it was in this letter that Laski suggested to the Zurichers that they should have a talk with the Lutherans and expressed his willingness to be an agent in order to bring the sacramentarian controversy to an end by mutual conciliation.<sup>58)</sup> Cranmer was confident that Laski could come to terms even with Melancthon if they both accepted his invitation. What Cranmer intended was not just a theological discussion but a certain agreement on a true and explicit form of doctrine which could be passed down to the posterity.<sup>59)</sup> The Archbishop must have envisaged the possibility of reaching an agreement. So he urged Laski to 'bring Melancthon along with you'.<sup>60)</sup> In his 1548-9 visit Laski was more in tune with the wide range of the true presence position rather than identifying himself solely with the Anglo-Zurichers.<sup>61)</sup> The later incidents during Laski's second visit from May 1550, such as his sympathy for Hooper's predicament during the vestiarian controversy and his disagreement with Bucer on the Supper reported by Martin Micronius to Bullinger, should not be read back to assume Laski's alleged 'radical' theology during his 1548 Lambeth talk with Cranmer.<sup>62)</sup>

It should also be noted that Laski on this first visit was mainly occupied with negotiations on behalf of a group of German princes for a Protestant League against the Emperor, and when his diplomatic activities bore no immediate fruit he returned to the continent with 50 pound of gifts given to him by the privy council and a letter from Cranmer to Melancthon.<sup>63)</sup> Considering the fact that the reformer was conducting very delicate negotiations on behalf of the German princes, it is unlikely that he had presented a view gravely offensive to the Lutherans. Thus it is more natural to believe that these continental divines helped Cranmer to stand firm on his belief which he initially adopted two years

---

<sup>57)</sup> Gorham, ed., *Gleanings*, pp. 32-3.

<sup>58)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 34.

<sup>59)</sup> Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, I, 17.

<sup>60)</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>61)</sup> Hooper was not back in England from Zurich till March 1549, and the effect of *Consensus Tigurinus* did not appear in England before 1550.

<sup>62)</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 572. This letter is dated 13 October 1550. According to Micronius, the issue they failed to reach an agreement upon was the corporeal presence in the Supper. But when we look at the fact that Bucer clearly denied Lutheran tenets, their disagreement does not seem to have been upon the principal matter. Even though Laski's position seems to have been hardened in the early 1550s, he maintained the true presence position throughout the 1550s.

<sup>63)</sup> Andrew Pettegree, *Foreign Protestant Communities in Sixteenth-Century London* (Oxford, 1986), p. 48.

earlier, rather than that they tried to change the Archbishop's view.

When we look at the international situation during this period, we can easily understand the cause of the unfruitful result of Laski's diplomacy. It came at a time when the English government became growingly sensitive and chose not to offend the Emperor. Forming the Protestant league was obviously not a good idea for maintaining a needed peach with Charles V whose help or at least neutrality England desperately needed in the face of a further deterioration in Anglo-French relationships. Moreover, the league with the German Protestants was no longer an attractive proposal at least for a while, especially since their defeat by the Emperor in April 1547 and the imposition of the Interim of Augsburg from May 1548.

The religion was another issue for this consideration. The first Prayer Book of 1549, which was imposed by the Act of Uniformity, is often believed to have retained its conservative character because the government did not want to cause any offence to the Emperor. The correspondence between Van der Delft and the Emperor revealed Duke of Somerset's somewhat cautious approach on religion in an attempt not to incur any sudden displeasure on the part of the Emperor. If Van der Delft's reports were to be believed, Somerset tried hard not to give him an impression that the government was rushing to the Protestant Reformation.<sup>64</sup> However, by early 1549, even his reports to the Emperor clearly indicated that the English 'had done away with the Holy Sacrament' hinting that they had made a final move to the radical doctrine.<sup>65</sup> Whatever was said about the conservative nature of the first Prayer Book, the imperial ambassador saw it as a radical departure from the true Catholic doctrine. Admitting that the Prayer Book was the result of a compromise, thus containing ambiguity, the Lords' debate and the subsequent adoption of this Prayer Book were still significant steps toward the reform of the English Church.

#### **IV. The House of Lords' Debate of 1548 and the First Book of Common Prayer**

In spite of its ambiguous theological position, the Prayer Book of 1549 removed two points of doctrine, i.e. the mass as a sacrifice and the change of substance of the bread and wine at consecration. No matter how significantly Gardiner's famous endorsement of this Prayer Book spoiled Cranmer's intent, the fact remains that it was an important step in the process of making the Church of England purer in doctrine and practice. Scholars often hastily look at it from the position of the second Prayer Book and call the reader's attention

---

<sup>64</sup> Hume and Tyler, eds., *CSP Span. 1547-1549* (London, 1912), p.219. (5 December 1547).

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 340. In mid- 1548, the imperial ambassador still saw some hopeful signs. He reported that the council had issued an order that neither the preachers nor anyone else were to presume to say anything on religious affairs beyond what had been approved by the King and his council, the consequence of which was that mass was again celebrated in all the churches. *Ibid.*, p. 273. The *Order of Communion*, which came out around this time, failed to repudiate Catholic Eucharistic doctrine, while accepting communion in both kinds.

to its unreformed character in comparison with its 'superior' successor. Having said this, it is simultaneously vital to note that the first Prayer Book anticipated the second Prayer Book from the outset. Judging from the speed with which the revision was made, there must have been a general understanding that the first Book served only a temporary purpose. Therefore there is little need to harmonise Cranmer's stance during the Lords' debate in which he rejected the real presence and his initiative in making the first Prayer Book that, as Gardiner suggested, could imply the doctrine of transubstantiation. Moreover, Cranmer was not given a free hand. Along with the influence of the current international situations, it was the opposition from the Catholic bishops that partly explains the compromised nature of the first Prayer Book.

Another cause of this difficulty in drawing a coherent picture of Cranmer's stance during this period is a tendency of some historians to make the Archbishop's 'conversion' more radical than our sources actually allow. This propensity is particularly evident among those, like C.W. Dugmore and Cardinal Gasquet, who speak highly of Laski's 'radical' influence on Cranmer at Lambeth. It is not accurate to claim that Cranmer was infused with a dose of Zwinglian teachings by the Polish reformer, which would create a wider hiatus between Cranmer's thinking and the nature of the first Prayer Book. In spite of strong oppositions from Catholic bishops, Cranmer, and of course Protector Somerset, controlled the debates fairly well, which is an impression given by the record of proceedings in the Lords' debate. To sum up, Cranmer held a moderate view of the true presence doctrine embracing different tenets within this particular expression of the mode of the presence and, at least in the eyes of the Archbishop, was totally in tune with the views presented by continental reformers like Martyr and Laski whose positions have been regarded by some as more radical (i.e. Zwinglian) than they actually were.<sup>66</sup> These divines seem to have known that the changes should yet be made but what they got was the best they could hope for under the present circumstances.

As Calvin wrote in his letter of 22 October 1548 to Somerset, there were two kinds of rebels the magistrates had to cope with:

The one ar fantasticall people who under coulour of the gospel wolde sette all to confusion. The other ar stoubbourne people yn the supersticions of the anti-christ of Roome. They all to guyther do deserve to be well punysshed by the sword, which is comytted unto yow.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Referring to Martyr's Eucharistic teachings, John Strype went further to the opposite extreme when he erroneously said that Cranmer was a cause in bringing Martyr to the true doctrine for, at his first coming to Oxford, he was a Papist or a Lutheran as to the doctrine of the presence. John Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford, 1840), I, 370.

<sup>67</sup> Public Record Office SP 10, 5, fo. 25r. This contemporary translation covers fos. 23-9. Another translation is printed in Jules Bonnet, ed., *Letters of John Calvin* (New York, 1972), II, 182-98.

Late in 1548, the major opposition to the authority came from the Romanists. When a number of bishops and divines drawn from both the conservative and the reforming sides assembled at Chertsey and at Windsor in September in order to settle a uniform order of prayer, they were evidently confronted with a draft of Cranmer's first Prayer Book and eventually gave their general assent to it.<sup>68)</sup> It is difficult to tell how much of Cranmer's new realisation in his sacramental theology was incorporated into this Prayer Book. One difficulty Cranmer faced was the fact that he had to satisfy two somewhat contradictory demands, i.e. the liturgical book which reflected the Protestant understanding and the maintenance of unity in the realm. The entire proceedings on this issue seem to suggest that Somerset and Cranmer sought for a speedy recognition of the Prayer Book and tried to avoid some procedures from which severe disturbances were expected. Their failure to recognise the need for convocational approval of the Book is one indication of it.<sup>69)</sup> They might have thought that the general consent given by the bishops at the aforementioned meetings was sufficient. But as the remarks made by the bishop of Westminster, Thomas Thirlby, hint, these meetings served the purpose designed by the Lord Protector Somerset and the Archbishop.<sup>70)</sup>

On the first day of the Lords' debate, Thirlby 'advised the audience to vnderstand that the boke whiche was redde touching the doctrine of the supper was not agreed on among the Busshoppes but onely in disputacion...'.<sup>71)</sup> Although it may be too much to say that Thirlby was playing to a gallery from the House of Commons, he did plead the bishops' 'innocence'.<sup>72)</sup> Earl of Warwick's response echoed the government's concern: 'That it was a perilous worde spoken in that audience and thought hym worthie of displeasure that in suche a tyme when concorde is sought for wolde caste suche occasions of discorde among men.'<sup>73)</sup> In the beginning of the second day's debate, Somerset, referring to the previous debate, disclosed his own understanding of the bishops' meeting: 'The bisshoppes consultacion was apoynted for unities. The boke of theyre agreements was redde. In Councelles though some consente not unto the thing yet by the most parte it is concluded. Onely the busshopp of Chechester refused to agree.'<sup>74)</sup> Thirlby's exposure a little after gives

---

<sup>68)</sup> A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation* (London, 1964), p. 218.

<sup>69)</sup> I am aware of the opposing argument. For a brief discussion of this issue, see Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 115-24.

<sup>70)</sup> Gasquet and Bishop believe that this meeting was held in October (thus not the so-called Winsor Commission) and refer to John Burcher's letter to Bullinger of October 1548. *Ibid.*, p. 144. See also Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, II, 643. But Burcher in this letter simply reported that a synod of the bishops had been convoked by the government to cope with the contention roused by the recently-published Cranmer's Catechism.

<sup>71)</sup> British Library MS. Royal, 17B XXXIX, fo. 5r.

<sup>72)</sup> Martyr reported to Bucer on 26 December: 'Whence those who are in the lower house,.... go up every day into the higher court of parliament, not indeed for the purpose of voting, (for that they do in the lower house,) but only that they may be able to hear these sharp and fervent disputations.' Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, II, 469.

<sup>73)</sup> British Library MS. Royal, 17B XXXIX, fo. 5r.

<sup>74)</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 5v.

us an idea as to what sort of agreement was reached among the bishops. It revealed the bishops' understanding that the draft of the Prayer Book was not the final form since many things were wanting in the Book and it was agreed that they should be treated of afterwards. Thirlby also claimed that he had been strongly moved to agree by a desire to secure concord and unity at home.<sup>75)</sup>

Thirlby's complaint seemed to be legitimate. Somerset and Cranmer appear to have made certain that the proposed Book would go through a smooth passage before its presentation at the parliament for debates. The current international situation called for the need to demonstrate the national consensus on the issue of the Eucharist. The account given by John ab Ulmis to Bullinger is not too far from the truth. He wrote: "The emperor's ambassadors arrived here the day before yesterday, with great pomp and display, as they thought. I do not affirm it for certain, (for it is only what I hear,) that they are desirous of presenting to the king of England their Interim, ..."<sup>76)</sup> The shadow of the Interim was felt by the Catholic bishops, especially by Thirlby who along with Stephen Gardiner had been on an embassy to the Emperor and had just come back to England in mid-1548. A dialogue between Edward VI and Protector Somerset reported by John Burcher to Bullinger is an indication of this, although the Catholic response to the Interim must have been different from what Somerset and Cranmer intended under the guise of the national unity. The fact remains that the Interim cast a long shadow on the English scene. According to Burcher's report, when the disputation (no doubt the reference to the Lords' debate mentioned above) was ended, the Protector accosted the young King with an expression of his surprise: 'How very much the bishop of Westminster has deceived my expectation.' To this replied the King: 'Your expectation he might deceive, but not mine.' When the Protector inquired the reason, the King said, 'I expected nothing else but that he, who has been so long time with the emperor as ambassador, should smell of the Interim.'<sup>77)</sup>

In spite of all the influences exerted by foreign divines like Martyr and Laski upon the Archbishop's thinking, they were not directly involved in the making of the Prayer Book. Peter Martyr certainly bears witness to the Archbishop's singular labour: 'The labour of the most reverend the archbishop of Canterbury is not to be expressed. For whatever has hitherto been wrested from them [the Catholic bishops], we have acquired solely by the industry, and activity, and importunity of this prelate.'<sup>78)</sup> However, there is one clue which hints at a possible contribution to the proceedings of the debate in the 1548-9 parliament by Martyr. There exists a tract among the Royal manuscripts entitled 'Of the Sacrament of thankesgeuing. A short treatise of Peter Martirs making' which was translated and glossed

---

<sup>75)</sup> Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 132.

<sup>76)</sup> Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, II, 383 (dated 27 November 1548).

<sup>77)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 646. This letter is dated 22 January 1549.

<sup>78)</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 479-80 (Martyr to Bullinger, 27 January 1550).

with a ten-point outline for Somerset's perusal.<sup>79)</sup> In the dedicatory letter to Somerset, written on 1 December (most likely in 1548), the translator entreated the Protector to defend the truths expounded in the treatise. In this tract, it was proclaimed that Christ 'doth verily fede the faithfull with his body and blude' and transubstantiation was denied. Also repudiated were such Lutheran tenets as *manducatio impiorum*. We do not know how Somerset utilised this ten-point summary. As the main issue in the Lords' debate was, as Somerset proclaimed on the first day's opening, to 'dispute whether breade be in the sacrament after the consecracion or not', there is no reason to doubt the probability that the summary treatment of Martyr's Eucharistic teaching had aided the Protector in his preparation before the debate.<sup>80)</sup> The Eucharistic view Cranmer and Somerset maintained during the debate corresponded to Martyr's teaching. Along with Cranmer's affirmation during the debate of the true presence position and his denial of *manducatio impiorum*, Martyr's belief that there is no confusion of the substances of bread and wine with Christ's body and blood was supported by Somerset with simple biblical citations.<sup>81)</sup>

On the other hand, the actual wordings of the Prayer Book were much more conservative, possibly reflecting Cranmer's wide understanding of the true presence doctrine and the government's sensitivity to the current international situations. The Book's use of the *Consultatio* of Hermann von Wied, archbishop of Cologne, along with its heavy dependence upon the old Sarum rite, is well-known. The possible influence of the Lutheran Church Order, most likely that of Nuremberg, either directly or through the *Consultatio*, has been pointed out by some.<sup>82)</sup> The Prayer Book certainly gave such an impression to one of the Anglo-Zurichers, Richard Hilles. Writing to Bullinger, he said: 'we have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg churches and some of those in Saxony; for they do not yet feel inclined to adopt your rites respecting the administration of the sacraments.'<sup>83)</sup> Hilles also added his own assessment of the current situation in relation to the conservative nature of the Prayer Book:

Thus our bishops and governors seem, for the present at least, to be acting rightly; while, for the preservation of the public peace, they afford no cause of offence to the Lutherans, pay attention to your very learned German divines, submit their

---

<sup>79)</sup> British Library MS. Royal 17C. V. The outline is fos. 2r-9r.

<sup>80)</sup> British Library MS. Royal 17B. XXXIX, fo. 1r.

<sup>81)</sup> *Ibid.*, fo. 7v.

<sup>82)</sup> Parts of the *Consultatio* which influenced the first Prayer Book were drafted by Bucer. For a brief survey, see C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 94-8. Gasquet and Bishop made a much more valiant attempt to relate the words of institution in the communion service of the Prayer Book with the 1533 *Kirchenordnungen* of Brandenburg-Nuremberg. Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 179-83. The suggestion is highly probable if we take into consideration the publication in the previous year of *Catechismus*, which originally was attached to the *Kirchenordnungen*.

<sup>83)</sup> Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, I, 266 (dated 4 June 1549).



judgment to them, and also retain some popish ceremonies.<sup>84)</sup>

Hilles's interpretation of the situation failed to recognise the most crucial consideration given by the government during this period, namely its imperial rather than Lutheran policy. However, this letter did indicate that the Lutheran liturgical influence upon the Prayer Book was widely understood. Considering the fact that many Lutherans subscribed to the Interim, it could have been regarded by Cranmer as a 'safer choice'.

## V. Martin Bucer's arrival in England and its meaning

Bucer's arrival in England in April 1549 could imply the gradual end to the government's cautious imperial policy. This Strasbourg theologian not only refused the subscription to the Interim but was also one of the planners of a Protestant league involving England earlier in the decade. Therefore, the invitation of Bucer to England in fact carried much more risky implications than that of Martyr.<sup>85)</sup>

Thomas Cromwell's fall and death had created a vacuum in England's alliance diplomacy with German Protestant princes. To this vacuum Gardiner stepped in to promote an imperial alliance policy. The reason for his opposition to the Protestant alliance is described in his opinion given to Cromwell on the articles proposed at Schmalkalden as the basis for a league with England: 'howe shal they, without the consent of the hed of ther Church, which is thEmperour, establish with us the agreement upon ther religion?'<sup>86)</sup> Gardiner's mission of 1540-1 brought an agreement between Henry VIII and the Emperor, and the treaty was signed in February 1543 stipulating that, if either realm was invaded, they would stand against their common enemy. However, in late 1544 there was a move in England and Germany to promote a Protestant league, and Bucer seems to have played a key role in this endeavour. It was the time when Henry VIII became overconfident after the surrender of Boulogne, though the capture of the city turned out not so much of a triumph. Instead Henry VIII now had to cope with a new situation created by the peace treaty between Charles V and Francis I at Crépy.<sup>87)</sup>

This new scheme to align England with German Protestantism was not attempted by Henry VIII nor the Landgrave (Phillip of Hesse) but in what Max Lenz called 'Kreise der Strassburger Reformfreunde'.<sup>88)</sup> In the process, the English ambassador, Christopher

---

<sup>84)</sup> Ibid.

<sup>85)</sup> It was Thirlby who on his embassy to the Continent in April 1548 reported to William Petre and Somerset Bucer's refusal to sign the Interim. William B. Turnbull, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Edward VI, 1547-53* (London, 1861), pp. 19, 22.

<sup>86)</sup> J.A. Muller, ed., *The letters of Stephen Gardiner* (Cambridge, 1933), p. 72 (dated middle of February 1536).

<sup>87)</sup> For details, see G. R. Elton, *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558* (London, 1977), pp. 304-10.

<sup>88)</sup> Max Lenz, ed., *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer* (Leipzig,

Mundt, was deeply involved from the beginning. Then it was William Paget who showed sympathy with the scheme. Replying from Calais to Mundt's report that German princes would be interested in entering a league with Henry VIII, Paget told Mundt, 'Youe knowe myn affection that wayes', adding that German princes would no doubt receive such an answer as should content them if they sent an ambassador to the King.<sup>89)</sup> Receiving Paget's letter, Mundt, writing to Henry VIII, informed him that some leading men, hearing of the peace between the Emperor and the French king, had written to the Landgrave that they had feared some danger to the Protestants from this unexpected alliance. Mundt then added that the day after receiving Paget's letter (i.e. on 12 December) he visited a person of authority whom he found in favour of an alliance between Henry and the Protestants, and who agreed to write to the Landgrave exhorting him to reconcile the minds of the other orders of the Schmalkaldic League to it.<sup>90)</sup>

This person of authority was none other than Bucer himself. So, immediately after the meeting with Mundt, Bucer wrote to the Landgrave and promoted the Protestant alliance with England, referring at the same time to the vain efforts of Gardiner and the Duke of Norfolk in their attempts to formulate an imperial alliance policy:

Solte aber nachmals etwas freundschaftt und beforderung diesem könig von unsseren stenden begegnen, were zu verhoffen, das solichs solte das ubrige vom papstumb in Engeland gar aussfegen, dann allein der Vintoniensis und Hertzog von Nortford den König nach uffhalten, so die anderen herren alle und des von nortfords son selb (der Graf Surrey) nicks liebers dann furgang des Evangeli sehen. So haben auch diese zwen, die allein, den furgang des Evangeli zu verbieten, den könig in bundtnuss mit dem keiser pracht haben, nunmeer, weil diese bundtnuss nit so wol gerathen, das ansehen nit meer bei dem könig, das sie vor hatten.<sup>91)</sup>

Thus the invitation of Bucer could imply in the eyes of the imperial observers not just a bold step toward the reform, which Edwardian England had already taken, but also the siding with the Protestant alliance in Germany. Bucer, who had refused to sign the Interim, was regarded by the Emperor as an anathema to this imperial policy which was allegedly intended to encompass England in the form of an 'English Interim'. The letter from Simon Renard, the new imperial ambassador, to the Emperor indicates the fear that the English had entertained. They were afraid, so reported by Renard, that the Emperor might declare

---

1887), II, 275 note.

<sup>89)</sup> James Gairdner and R.H. Brodie, eds., *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII* (London, 1862-1929), XIX, ii, 357 (dated 11 November 1544). Mundt's letter was written on 20 October.

<sup>90)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 448 (dated 14 December 1544).

<sup>91)</sup> Lenz, ed., *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer*, II, 273 (dated 13 December 1544).

war against them. One of the reasons for this fear expressed by the English was that they might have incurred the Emperor's displeasure by their reception of Bucer and Bernardino Ochino whom the Emperor had ousted.<sup>92)</sup> So it is not too much to say that the policy of alliance with German Protestant princes during the waning period of Cromwellian influence after his fall and death was taken up by Bucer and other 'Strassburger Reformfreunde' including Mundt in a way to counter Gardiner's imperial alliance policy. Already in 1539 Bucer realised that Gardiner was the chief obstacle to England's bid to receive Protestantism in England.<sup>93)</sup>

However, in 1549, the English government was extremely cautious not to offend the Emperor as their relationship with France and Scotland deteriorated. This attitude is clearly expressed in the embassy William Paget and Philip Hoby took to the Emperor in June in an attempt to form an amicable relationship with him. Paget met with Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, Chancellor and chief adviser of Charles V, and received a favourable answer.<sup>94)</sup> In comparison with the situation in the late 1550s, the late 1540s after the Emperor's victory at Muhlberg were a period of weakening German protestant influence. The English probably well understood that the league with defeated princes would not help their cause against France. But the invitation of Bucer to England seems to have carried at least a symbolic significance for the Protestant alliance.

It was not just the imperial ambassador who was alarmed by the arrival of Bucer. Anxiety felt by Zurich sympathisers has already been mentioned. In John Hooper's words, Bucer was a third of such reformers, after Martyr and Ochino, who would 'leave no stone unturned to obtain a footing'.<sup>95)</sup> While Hooper's return to England in May 1549 might have extended the possibility of the range of reform to the left, thus to the reform patterned after Zurich's example, Bullinger's influence was hardly visible before 1549 except in the publication of a few of his works. One such work entitled *Two Epystles One of Henry Bullynger,...: Another of Jhon Caluyn,...: Whether It Be Lawfull for a Chrysten Man to Communycate or Be Pertaker of the Masse of the Papystes,...*, printed in London in 1548, was actually Bullinger's letter written in February 1541 to counter the teaching gradually permeating among the 'congregacions of lowe dowchlande' which claimed it as lawful for Christians to go to high mass. Against this Bullinger retorted that the Pope's mass, be it high or low, could not be reckoned among indifferent things, adding that 'yf the onlye

---

<sup>92)</sup> *CSP Span. 1550-52*, p. 170 (1 September 1550).

<sup>93)</sup> Gairdner and Brodie, ed., *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, XIV, ii, 54 (Bucer to the Landgrave, 16 September 1539).

<sup>94)</sup> John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials* (Oxford, 1822), II, i, 239-54. Paget and Hoby reported to Somerset on the success of the negotiation with the Emperor but refused to be overjoyed saying that words cannot please except some deeds follow. Turnbull, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Edward VI, 1547-53*, p. 43 (dated 12 July 1549). Hoby was said to be a zealous Protestant. Philip Hoby's brother, Thomas, translated Bucer's *Gratulatio ad Ecclesiam Anglicanam* and *Answer to Stephen Gardiner*. On Granvelle see M.Ch. Weiss, ed., *Papiers d'État du Cardinal de Granvelle* (Paris, 1846).

<sup>95)</sup> Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, I, 61.

sacrifice of Christ once offryde for the synnes of the worlde/maketh the beleuers perfecte, what nede they in ther high masses/daylye to offer the bodye and blude of Christe for the synnes of the quycke and deade.<sup>96)</sup> There is no clear evidence, however, to support the view that Bullinger's writing, in spite of its timely publication, exerted any influence upon the compilation of the Prayer Book. In fact, the Prayer Book retained many features connected with the old mass including particular vestments, a prayer for the dead, etc. Bullinger's influence could be described at best as atmospheric. If we are ready to admit any continental contributions to the Edwardian religious scene, they were made chiefly by those present at the scene in England rather than absent, a trend which basically continued to be true after 1549.

Prospects for advancement of the continental divines in England looked much better during Edward VI's reign. Among them Peter Martyr tops the list. His close association with Archbishop Cranmer helped to solidify the latter's conviction touching the doctrine of the true presence which he had lately adopted. Cranmer's theological position on the Eucharist, which was in harmony with those held by visiting continental reformers, could actually cover a wide range of perception within the framework endorsing a spiritual presence, and thus denying *manducatio impiorum*, which extended from Bucer to Laski. Also clear is the fact that there existed considerably more agreement than so far recognised among these visiting theologians on the issue of the Lord's Supper. Although the Archbishop's relationships with the foreigners failed to enjoy its full effect because of, for example, the nation's current imperial policies, the traces of influence by these divines are evident, most notably during the review period of the first Prayer Book. The *Consensus Tigurinus* (the Consensus of Zurich), recently agreed between Calvin and Bullinger to unify the Protestant churches on the doctrines of the Eucharist, had certainly given Cranmer a backbone for his work on the Prayer Book revision and for a very short period it seems to have served as the converging centre for the English Reformation.

However, political considerations still dominated the minds of policy-makers though still less obviously when compared to the Elizabethan period. Even the favoured position of Laski could be a result of the role he played during the negotiations with the German Lutherans. Heinrich Bullinger, in spite of his personal relationship with Anglo-Zurichers, failed to capitalise on the opportunity to influence the Edwardian reform. In fact, this special relationship ruined whatever little possibility was left to Zurich for an effective instillation of the Reformed doctrines and practices in the English soil. Nevertheless, the Edwardian period was a real chance for Reformed theologians residing in England. Although they basically remained as consultants and were largely not included among the rank of policy-makers, a good number of their opinions were nonetheless taken notice of.

---

<sup>96)</sup> *Two Epystles*, fo. Aiiiv. There is a famous story that Edmund Grindal, one of Elizabethan Archbishops of Canterbury, later attributed his conversion to a 'true opinion' to Bullinger's *De Origine Erroris*. See, for example, Patrick Collinson, *Archbishop Grindal* (London, 1979), p. 44.

With the premature death of Edward VI in July 1553 followed by the accession to the throne of Mary I, the continental reformers left England for the continent.

## 【研究ノート】

# 山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』第二編「旋回基軸」の基本性格 —同書「統計索引」の「労働」統計年次検討を通じて—

中根 康裕

## I 課題と検討方法

本稿は、日本社会科学の古典である、山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』（1934年岩波書店、1977年岩波文庫版、本稿での引用は全て岩波文庫版により、引用は頁数のみ記す。尚、引用文中〈 〉内は筆者による注）の第二編「旋回基軸」の基本性格について考察する。

本稿はこの課題を、管見した限り、『分析』に関する先行研究において試みられた形跡の無い、『分析』における掲出統計の年次検討という方法で果たそうとする。とくに『分析』が自らの「主たる課題」（7頁）とした日本資本主義の「基本構造＝対抗・展望」（7頁）の提示との関係において掲出統計群の中で最も核心的位置を占める「労働」（索引14－15頁）統計に絞り、そこでの個別統計の根拠年次に着目して編別・章別・項別に検討する。

この検討を通じて、『分析』先行研究の基調をなして来た、『分析』における叙述を基準とした検討の次元から一步を進め、叙述の根拠をなす掲出統計を基準とした次元で『分析』第二編「旋回基軸」の基本性格に評価を加えることが本稿の目的である。

次節では、『分析』の先行研究において第二編「旋回基軸」がいかに位置づけられて来たかを顧みる。

## II 『分析』研究上の第二編位置づけの概観

本節では、第二編「旋回基軸」の位置づけを軸に『分析』先行研究の類型的な整理を試みる。

まず一方の極には、『分析』を日本資本主義研究史上「不滅の功績」（大内〔2000〕7頁）をもつと評価しつつも「土地制度」が「資本主義全体の型を規定」する「土地制度史観」（同前32頁）に立つために「歴史的変化が無視」される「論理構造」（同前34頁）をもつとして、第三編「基核 半封建的土地所有制＝半農奴制的零細農耕」を主軸とみる所論がある。そこでは『分析』が主「課題」として示した「基本構造＝対抗・展望」に即した検討は措かれ、資本と土地所有なる純経済過程の観点から評価が加えられる。また、「旋回基軸」の論理は「再生産構造把握」から「必然的に形成」されたのではなく山田氏の「革命願望の所産」（長岡〔1980〕44頁）

であるとする所論においても第一編「生産旋回＝編成替え」と第三篇の関係が経済分析上の主軸とされる。同様に戦後初期、『分析』では「資本制」と「封建制」が「並んで」（豊田〔1949〕8頁）発展するとされているとした所論でも、第一編と第三編の相互関係が主軸とされる。さらに、『分析』の「軍事的半農奴制的」規定は諸々の搾取「型」の「編制」と「分解」の「把握」（山崎〔1989〕235頁）を意味するとされているとする所論においても第一編が主軸とされ、第二編には副次的地位が与えられている。

これに対し他の一極には、『分析』の「軍事的半農奴制的型制」規定は何より変革主体としての「プロレタリアート」の析出という「絶対不可欠の課題」（南〔1977〕315頁）に迫られたものとする所論がある。そこでは『分析』が主「課題」として示した「基本構造＝対抗・展望」に即した検討がなされ、第二編「旋回基軸」が、第一編との連繋下に主軸とされ、第三編はその下へ統合される地位を与えられる。また端的に、『分析』は「一般的危機」の「合理的理解」への「扉」を開く「鍵」として「産業資本確立の過程の規定」（大島〔1982〕15頁）を位置づけているとし、一般的危機把握のための産業資本確立期の規定という「とらえ返し」の「方法的連関」の「理解」が「決定的」（同前15頁）とする所論においても第二編が主軸的とされ、第二編と第一編で「相対的完結性」（同前14頁）をもつとされる。同様に早く、『分析』刊行直後に「労働問題研究」への「一大寄与」をその功績の「随一」（山田勝次郎〔1934〕初出〔1966〕206－207頁）に挙げた所論、また、戦後初期に「永く正当に受け取られぬまま」（N.N.N〔1949〕初出〔1989〕143頁）打ち棄てられていた「一般的危機の段階」の「基本構造＝対抗・展望」（同前156頁）の提示という『分析』の主「課題」を復権した所論においても、共に、「一般的危機」なる「現段階用」へ「改訂」されるべき産業資本確立期の「労働組合の組織＝労働争議＝労働運動」の「全土的な地図」が「作成」（山田勝次郎同前〔1966〕208頁）され、「産業資本確立期での総対抗表示」（N.N.N同前〔1989〕162頁）が行われたとして第二編に重きが置かれている。さらに、『分析』は「経済的分析における経済主義の峻拒の姿勢」に立ち「生産力」と「生産関係」の「主体的把握」（毛利〔1971〕153頁）が「貫徹」する「理論構成」（同前154頁）が採られているとする所論においても、第二編に重きが置かれている。

他に、『分析』の産業資本確立期分析は一般的危機期の階級対抗・展望を示すために「直接的に不可欠な基礎分析」（大石〔1975〕5頁）の視角から、しかも「階級構造の分析」を「中心」（同前11頁）に限定して行われたとする所論があり、第一・二編が並置されている。

尚、『分析』は基本構造が内包する「特有な基本矛盾」（後藤〔2002〕126頁）と階級対抗上の「キイ労働力」（同前130頁）析出の双方を通じて、その原初稿が発表された『日本資本主義発達史講座』（1932－33）の「第三部 帝国主義日本の現状」の「基礎的な分析」に「相当する」（同前133頁）という最近の所論では、直接に一般的危機期の基礎分析と明瞭に位置づけられ

つつ第二編が主軸とされている。

以上、『分析』研究上における第二編「旋回基軸」の位置づけについては、大別して相対抗する二つの見地がある。一つは、第三篇「基柢」または第一編「生産旋回＝編成替え」、あるいは両者の相互関係を主軸として、第二編「旋回基軸」に付加的な位置づけを与える見地であり、『分析』を純経済過程研究の視点から把握する立脚点に立つ。

今一つは、第二編「旋回基軸」に主軸の位置づけを与える見地であり、『分析』を「基礎的経済過程」と「労働力集成＜＝労働者農民闘争＞」の総体的研究の視点から把握する立脚点に立つ。この見地内部ではさらに、「基本構造＝対抗」分析が産業資本確立期のものという見地と、直接に一般的危機期の基礎的な現状分析であるという見地に分岐する。

そして、これら対抗する諸見地自身が『分析』研究における第二編「旋回基軸」の性格規定の未決性を明示する。その何れが、より有効性をもつ見地なのかという問題には、本稿の限定を超えるため、今は立ち入らない。

筆者自身は既発表の諸論稿において、一般的危機期当代の変革主体析出という畢竟の課題を主題とした第二編「旋回基軸」を『分析』全体の「背骨」（中根〔1999〕50頁）と位置づけ、一般的危機期からの「とらえ返し」視点は「政治的軍事的『他律的要因』への着眼」と「結び合わされ」て「十全」（中根〔2000〕133頁）になるという見地から『分析』の構成を検討し、『講座』を企画・主導した野呂栄太郎の「手になる実践的諸論稿との連繋的把握」の「決定的重要」（中根〔2002〕49頁）性を強調して来たが、それらは尚、『分析』の叙述を基準とした検討に留まった。本稿は叙述の根拠をなす掲出統計の次元に降りて第二編「旋回基軸」の性格規定を試みる。

次節では、『分析』において「統計索引」へ排列された統計群の地位を、『分析』の「課題」と「視角」そして分析「力点」からその成果へ至る連関において吟味する。

### Ⅲ 『分析』における「統計索引」の地位

山田氏は『分析』について、「問題把握」の「鍵」を示した「序言」（11頁）と、「世界史的連繋における日本資本主義の構成と転変」の「史的概括」を示した「年表（前過程。画期、基礎的経済過程、労働力集成）」と、同じく「構成と転変」の「範疇的概括」を示した「索引（事項索引、統計索引）」（11頁）とを「対照」（12頁）しつつ、第一編末に収録した「付注『半農奴制的零細耕作と資本主義との相互規定』（90－91頁）と第二編末に収録した「後輯『日本資本主義考察の一視角』（214－221頁）を「概覧」することが同書の理解を簡「便」（12頁）にすると指示した。



この指示を、上述した一般的危機期の階級対抗・変革展望の全機構的提示という『分析』の「課題」から「とらえ返し」で「産業資本確立過程」の「規定」という具体的分析方法が採用されて来るという視点から把握すると、「統計索引」として範疇的に概括された『分析』掲出統計群の地位が鮮明になる。

すなわち、第二編執筆「進行中」の「一着想」（11 頁）である「後輯」における、一般的危機期なる「現実的なるもの」が「押し付け」（221 頁）る「構造揚棄の『必然性』と『条件』」（214 頁）を提起するという立場と、同じく、第一編執筆「準備的要綱の一節」（11 頁）である「付注」における、「階級分化」の「急速な進行」（90 頁）を「基礎」とする一般的危機期の「急速広汎」な「階級対抗」の「展開」を「分析」（91 頁）するという立場は、山田氏という分析主体の立脚点そのものを明示している。そしてこの立脚点に立つがゆえに自らに課した分析対象の「全機構的な把握」の視点を、「範疇的」かつ「段階的」な「基本視角」から「要約」（214－215 頁）する。このように「後輯」と「付注」は相まって、山田氏の立脚点および分析視角を端的に示している。

この立脚点と分析視角ゆえに、「序言」に示される「産業資本確立の過程」の「規定」が問題把握の鍵＝「力点」（7 頁）に、つまり具体的分析方法に選び採られて来る。

そして、この「鍵」によってこじ開けられた日本資本主義の『軍事的半農奴制的性質』の『秘密く＝『日本資本主義発達史講座』発表の『分析』第一編原初稿「工業における資本主義の端初的諸形態、マニュファクチュア・家内工業」11 頁＞』の全貌を、「年表」の形で「史的」に、同時に「事項」ならびに「統計」の「索引」の形で「範疇的」に「概括」し、その「全生涯」を「一眸」に「収むる」（11 頁）ものとしたのである。

以上の連繋の下、『分析』における範疇的概括の一極をなす「統計索引」へ排列された統計群は、「事項索引」へ整序されて行く諸範疇・諸規定を範疇化・規定化へと導く素材＝根拠を歴大な参考史誌群と共に形成し、他方、史的概括をなす「年表」へ整序されて行く「画期」・「基礎的経済過程」・「労働力集成く＝労働者農民闘争＞」の歴史的諸事実の史的意味の確定へと導く素材＝根拠を同じく歴大な参考史誌群と共に形成する地位にある。つまり、事項概括の基礎であると共に史的概括の基礎でもある地位に立つ。

ここに、本稿が、『分析』において範疇的概括の一極という地位を与えられた「統計索引」へ排列される掲出統計群の検討に降りて行く所以がある。

次節では、『分析』が課題とした日本資本主義の「基本構造＝対抗・展望」の提示との関係上、「統計索引」で最も中心的位置を占める「労働」統計に絞り、個別統計の根拠年次に焦点を当て、編別・章別・項別に検討する。従って検討は、（一）第二編第二章「分析。産業資本確立期頃に視点を置ける、半農奴制的零細耕作を隷役く＝搾取＞土壌とする所の、また衣料生産に於

ける生産旋回＝編成替えの基軸たる所の、軍事機構＝キイ産業の構成。基本構造」の「A 分析」節「第二分析 労働力」項、(二) 同じく第二編第二章の「A 分析」節「第一分析 機構」項、(三) 最後に第一編第二章「分析。産業資本確立期に視点を置ける、軍事機構＝キイ産業の強靱な統一性を基軸とする所の、また半隷農的零細耕作農民及び半隷奴＜＝奴隷＞的賃銀労働者を労役＜＝搾取＞土壌とする所の、問屋制度的家内工業＝マニュファクチュアの諸形態」の順で行われる。

#### IV 『分析』の「労働」統計年次の検討

##### (一) 第二編第二章「A 分析」節「第二分析 労働力」項の「労働」統計年次の検討

この「第二分析 労働力」項に掲出された「労働」統計群は、その全部が、「労働力」の質について「陶冶＜＝訓練＞」と「集成＜＝闘争＞」(175 頁)の両面から叙述する際の根拠をなす、労働力「編制」統計に属するものである。さらに言えば、労働力「編制」統計は全て「第二分析 労働力」項に集中している。しかも、その統計群の根拠年次はほとんど全てが「一般的危機＜＝『分析』「年表」では日本資本主義において 1918 年以降＞」期に属している。この点には止目すべきである。

すなわち、「キイ」労働力の「第一範疇」(171 頁)をなす「陸軍工廠〔軍器工廠・火薬工廠〕労働力の型」(173 頁)の根拠統計年次は、「軍器工廠」・「火薬工廠」共に 1923 年のもの。ついで、陸軍工廠との連繫下に同じく「第一範疇」の地位を与えられる「鉄道関係〔ダイヤグラム・鉄道工場〕労働力の型」(176-177 頁)の根拠統計年次は、「ダイヤグラム」に示される「鉄道従業員」のそれが 1925 年、「鉄道工場」のそれが 1928 年のもの。以上、労働力群の「最も規定的」(171-172 頁)な「軍事工廠第一範疇」の労働力「編制」分析の根拠統計年次は、その全てが 1923-28 年という一般的危機期に密集している。

同様に、「キイ」労働力の「第二範疇」(179 頁)をなす「海軍工廠〔同＜＝海軍工廠＞・製機工場〕労働力の型」(180 頁)の根拠統計年次も、「海軍工廠」のそれが例外として 1870 年でありつつも、「船渠」の中枢をなす「製機工場」のそれは 1930 年最新のもの。ついで、海軍工廠との連繫下に同じく「第二範疇」の地位を与えられる「港湾海洋労働力〔港湾沖仕・下級船員〕の型」(183-184 頁)の根拠統計年次もまた、「港湾沖仕」のそれが 1929 年、「下級船員」のそれが 1927 年のもの。以上、労働力群の「最も規定的」な「軍事工廠第二範疇」の労働力「編制」分析の根拠統計年次も、例外的一表を除き、全てが 1927-30 年という一般的危機期、とくにその「第三期＜＝『分析』「年表」では日本資本主義において 1927 年以降＞」に密集している。

ここに、山田氏が『分析』の課題とした「基本構造＝対抗・展望」の提示に当たり、「最も質

量的<=戦闘的>」な労働力群として依拠し、自らの立脚点とした「キイ」労働力群が、1923-30年という一般的危機期当代の主体であることを確定し得る。

つぎに、軍事工廠での「迫進」(122頁)が「促迫」する「原基機構」(123頁)、すなわち「基本原料(鉄・石炭)確保」(143頁)部門と「基本技術(工作機械=旋盤製作)」(159頁)部門の「推転」(143頁)下にある労働力の「編制」分析の根拠統計年次について。

一方の、「基本原料(鉄・石炭)確保」部門の労働力をなす「製鉄機構〔同<=製鉄機構>・製鋼工場〕労働力の型」(187-188頁)の根拠統計年次は、「製鉄機構」のそれが例外として1902年でありつつも、製鉄機構の中枢をなす「製鋼工場」のそれは1928年のもの。また、製鉄機構との連繋下にある「採鉱機構〔炭鉱・金属鉱山〕労働力の型」(191頁)の根拠統計年次も、「炭鉱」・「金属鉱山」共に1925年のもの。以上、軍事工廠以外のキイ産業の一極をなす基本原料確保部門の労働力「編制」分析の根拠統計年次も、例外的一表を除き、全てが1925-28年という一般的危機期に密集している。

他方の、「機械制生産の基礎的問題」を「解決」する「機械をつくる機械」である「旋盤」を「根幹」とした「工作機械」それ「自体」の「製作技術」部門、すなわち、「基本技術」として「産業資本確立過程の規定」に「決定的意義」をもつ「工作機械」の「製作技術」(194頁)部門の労働力については、これら「金属加工の部面」がある産業全体を通じて労働力「編制」の「枢軸」に立つ「旋盤工」の「地位」(159頁)を明示する点に焦点が絞られ、その「旋盤工およびミーリング工の地位〔受心台部分品の工作作業工程および工費〕」(195頁)の根拠統計年次は1923年のもの。

また、この「旋盤工」を「根幹」とする「金属工業=機械器具工業」の「脆弱性」(166頁)の下で、その「紡績機械の圧倒的部分」を「輸入」(105頁)に「委ね」る紡績業部門の労働力と、明治以来「今日」まで「手工」(105頁)に「委ね」る製糸業部門の労働力については、これら両部門の「肉体消磨的」な「労役の強度」と「手工」技術的低位に置かれた「女工」(197頁)中心の「半隷奴的」労働力と「キイ」労働力との「連関」の「特殊性」(196頁)を明示することに焦点が絞られ、その「繊維工業〔紡績工場・製糸工場〕労働力の型」(196-197頁)の根拠統計年次は、「紡績工場」のそれが1926年のもの。「製糸工場」のそれは明治以来「製糸技術」に今日まで「根本的变化なく」(196-197頁)という理由から1872年のもの。

ここに、山田氏が『分析』の課題とした「基本構造=対抗・展望」の提示に当たり、自らの立脚点とした「キイ」労働力群が、労働手段製作部門での労働力「編制」の「枢軸」をなす「旋盤工」を基準にして、その結合上の序列を確定され、他方、「厩大」な半奴隷的「特殊」労働力群との連繋の契機が与えられ、こうして、それら全体が、1923-30年という一般的危機期当代の主体であることを確定し得る。

以上の検討より、今や、『分析』第二編第二章「A 分析」節「第二分析 労働力」項における労働力「編制」統計群を根拠とする分析によって得られた「客観的<＝歴史的>」な「任務」を「遂展<＝遂行>」する「者」(<＝主体>)として提示された「プロレタリアート」は、それが「産業資本確立期頃<＝第一編第二章の場合と異なり「頃」が付加されている点に注意>」に「視点」を置いた章の裡に叙述・配置されているに関わらず、直接に、一般的危機期において「日本型ブルジョアジー」(200頁)に対峙している主体であることが明瞭となる。

## (二) 第二編第二章「A 分析」節「第一分析 機構」項の「労働」統計年次の検討

この「第一分析 機構」項に掲出された「労働」統計群は、その全てが「労働力」の量を通じ、日本資本主義の生産力展開を主導する「キイ産業」である「軍事機構」に内包される「矛盾」(127頁)と「制約」(168頁)について「迫進」速度と「推転」方向との両面から叙述する際の根拠をなす、「労働者数」統計に属するものである。すなわち、ここで「労働者数」統計は、資本に包摂された客体＝可変資本としての労働力群の集積度と集積方向を通じて、「キイ産業」が主導する生産力展開の速度と方向に内包される「矛盾」と「制約」を分析する根拠をなしている。それゆえ「労働者数」統計の主力は「第一分析 機構」項に集中している。この点には止目すべきである。

同時に、「軍事工廠」での「迫進」を起動点として「原基機構」での「推転」に至るこれら統計群の根拠年次が、まさしく、産業資本確立期を基点として「金融資本成立確立<＝『分析』「年表」では日本資本主義において1906-18年頃>」期から一般的危機期に至る年次を貫串している点にも止目すべきである。

すなわち、「キイ産業」の内でも「決定的」な「推進的起動力」(122頁)をなす「軍事工廠」での「迫進」速度を示す、「陸軍工廠〔東京工廠・大阪工廠〕職工数」(126頁)ならびに「海軍工廠〔工廠・造兵造火廠〕職工数」(137頁)の根拠統計年次は、いずれも等しく1893-1906年のもの。まさに産業資本確立期に当たる。

ついで、陸軍工廠との連繋下にある「輸送通伝」部門での「迫進」速度を示す、「鉄道工場職工数表」(131頁)の根拠統計年次は1909年のもの。同じく海軍工廠との連繋下にある「汽機汽罐」部門での「迫進」速度を示す、「製罐工〔原動機・艦船・車両製造工場のもの〕の構成＝数」(141頁)の根拠統計年次は1927年のもの。すなわち、陸海軍工廠での「迫進」と連動しながら金融資本成立期から一般的危機期へ繋がって来る。

さらに、「軍事工廠」での「迫進」によって発展を「促迫」される「爾余」(142頁)の「キイ産業」である「原基機構」での「推転」方向について。

その一方の極である、「基本原料(鉄・石炭)確保」部門での「推転」方向を示す「製鉄機構

〔国営・民営〕職工数〕(149頁)の根拠統計年次は1929年のもの。製鉄機構との連繫下にある「鉱山＝炭鉱労働者数、内地」(157頁)の根拠統計年次は1914-19年のもの。以上、軍事工廠以外のキイ産業の一極をなす基本原料確保部門の「推転」分析の根拠統計年次は1914-29年に至り、金融資本成立期から一般的危機期へ繋がって来る。

また他方の極である、「基本技術(工作機械＝旋盤製作)」部門の「推転」方向を示す「工作機械＝旋盤製作の職工数」(163-164頁)の根拠統計年次は1914-29年のもの。当該部門の拮据を「制約」する「顛倒的矛盾」にもとづく当該部門の「脆弱性」(166頁)を示す「金属工業＝機械器具工業職工数の比重」(166-167頁)の根拠統計年次は1914年のもの。当該部門の国際的な「絶対的相対的」(167頁)な「脆弱性」を示す「金属工業＝機械器具工業労働者数の比重、日本ならびに各国」(167頁)の根拠統計年次は1919-29年の一般的危機期のもの。以上、軍事工廠以外のキイ産業の一極をなす基本技術部門の「推転」分析の根拠統計年次も1914-29年に至り、基本原料確保部門の「推転」分析の根拠統計年次と相まって、金融資本成立期から一般的危機期へ繋がって来ると共に、とくに国際比較において「機構」の「脆弱性」を示す根拠統計年次は一般的危機期に焦点を絞って掲出されている。

ここに、一般的危機期の「キイ」労働力群を自らの立脚点とする山田氏が、『分析』の最終課題である当代の階級対抗と変革展望を示す前提をなす「基本構造」確定の「指標」(167頁)としての資格において、「軍事工廠」と「原基機構」の全体にわたってその集積度と集積方向を示した「労働者数」統計群の根拠年次は総じて1893-1929年を貫串しており、産業資本確立期を基点に金融資本成立期から一般的危機期にまで延び渡っているものであることを確定し得る。

しかもそれが、「迫進」部門である「軍事工廠」分析の根拠統計年次における1893-1927年へ延び渡る貫串と、「促迫」部門である「原基機構」分析の根拠統計年次における1914-29年へ延び渡る貫串と、「軍事機構＝キイ産業」を「基軸」とした「基本構造」全体に内包された「機構の脆弱性」分析の根拠統計年次における一般的危機期に焦点を絞った1919-29年へ延び渡る貫串という、連繫波及しながら1929年を終点とする三段の貫串で示されていることを確定し得る。

以上の検討より、今や、『分析』第二編第二章「A 分析」節「第一分析 機構」項における機構「労働者数」統計群を根拠とする分析によって得られた、その客体＝可変資本としての労働力群の集積度と集積方向を指標とする「機構の脆弱性」は、それが「産業資本確立期頃」に「視点」を置いた章の裡に叙述・配置されているに関わらず、産業資本確立期から金融資本確立期を経て一般的危機期を貫串するものであることが明瞭となる。

(三) 第一編第二章「分析。産業資本確立期に視点を置ける、軍事機構＝キイ産業の強靱な統一性を基軸とする所の、また半隷農的零細耕作農民及び半隷奴的賃銀労働者を労役土壌

とする所の、問屋制度的家内工業＝マニュファクチュアの諸形態」の「労働」統計年次の検討

この第一編第二章に掲出された「労働」統計群も、その全てが「労働力」の量を通じ、日本での資本主義的「生産」への「旋回」（30頁）においてその「一切の生産領域」を「貫徹」して「現出」（74頁）する「四つ」の搾取関係の「型」（77頁）を「衣料生産」部門を「基調」（30頁）にして叙述する際の根拠をなす、「労働者数」統計に属するものである。すなわち、ここでも「労働者数」統計は資本に包摂された客体＝可変資本としての労働力群の集積度と集積形態を通じて、「衣料生産」を「基調」とする搾取関係の成立の要件を日本資本主義「興隆」の「絶対要件」（89頁）として分析する根拠をなしている。それゆえ「労働者数」統計の残りは第一編第二章に集中している。この点には止目すべきである。

同時に、「衣料生産」を「基調」とする「生産旋回」を示す、これら統計群の根拠年次が全て「産業資本確立期＜＝『分析』「年表」では日本資本主義において1897－1907年頃＞」に密集する点にも止目すべきである。

すなわち、「衣料生産」部門中、「典型的」（74頁）な『『惨苦の茅屋ヤマヘーレン』』（54頁）の搾取関係を、問屋制度的家内工業の形態下に成立させる「織物業」での「展開」を示す「織物職工数表」（51頁）の根拠統計年次は1898－99年のもの。

ついで「衣料生産」部門中、「純粋日本型の特殊労役＜＝絞血＞制」（64頁）的搾取関係を、マニュファクチュアの形態下に成立させる「製糸業」での「興隆」を示す「製糸職工数表」（63頁）の根拠統計年次は1896－99年のもの。

さらには「衣料生産」部門中、「典型的」（74頁）な「植民地以下」的「労働賃銀」と「肉体消磨的な徹夜業」の「労働条件」（46－47頁）からなる搾取関係を、大工業の形態下に成立させる「紡績業」での「興隆」を示す「紡績職工数表」（45頁）の根拠統計年次は1882－99年のもの。

ここに、山田氏が『分析』の課題とした「基本構造＝対抗・展望」の提示の前提分析をなす、日本資本主義「興隆」の「絶対要件」である当該資本主義「一切の生産領域」を「貫徹」する搾取関係の四つの「型」の「指標」（45頁）としての資格において、従ってその「分解」が「一般的危機」の「前提条件」（121頁）と位置づけ返される資格において、「衣料生産」全体にわたってその集積度と集積形態を示した「労働者数」統計群の根拠統計年次は全て1882－99年という産業資本確立期只中のものであることを確定し得る。

以上の検討より、今や、『分析』第一編第二章における衣料生産部門「労働者数」統計群を根拠とする分析によって得られた、その客体＝可変資本としての労働力群の集積度と集積の形態を指標とする日本資本主義「興隆」のための搾取関係の諸「型」は、それが「産業資本確立期

<＝第二編第二章の場合と異なり「頃」が付加されていない>に「視点」を置いた章の裡に叙述されている通り、産業資本確立期に焦点を絞ったものであり、その「分解」が一般的危機の前提条件へと反転するものであることが明瞭となる。

尚、本稿の末尾に、本節における『分析』掲出「労働」統計の検討の総括として、【表1『分析』「労働統計」の根拠年次の構造】を掲げる。当該「労働」統計の圧倒的部分が第二編第二章に密集し、その「編制」統計は「第二分析 労働力」項に、「労働者数」統計は「第一分析 機構」項に集中する構成をもっていることが見て取れる。

## V 結語

本稿は、『分析』掲出の「労働統計」の根拠年次を編別・章別・項別に検討することを通じて、『分析』における叙述を基準とした検討の次元から一步進め、その叙述の根拠をなす掲出統計を基準とした検討の次元で『分析』第二編「旋回基軸」の基本性格について評価を加え得る段に到達した。検討を行ってきた当該「労働統計」の大部分が第二編の首章をなす第二章に密集している以上、その検討を経た今、第二編全体の基本性格に評価を加え得る。

一言にして、当該「労働統計」の根拠年次に照らす限り、『分析』第二編「旋回基軸」は、危機の前提条件を示した第一編「生産旋回＝編成替え」との「合体」（33頁）的な把握を必須としつつ、一般的危機期の日本資本主義を総体的に把握した現状分析という基本性格を有し、基本構造の制約性とその下での階級対抗・変革展望の提示という『分析』の「課題」に即する限り、主編に位置するとの評価を加え得る。

すなわち、一般的危機期に屹立する「プロレタリアート」が「日本型ブルジョアジー」との「対抗」の中で「展望」を見い出すため、当該「危機」把握の「基準」の「基礎」（200-201頁）としての位置づけにおいて日本資本主義の「基本構造」を分析・総括している。決定的なのは、一般的危機期当代の「プロレタリアート」の視角の一元的貫徹という把握である。

以上の結語の裡に本稿の独自性が存する。誠に当該「労働統計」の根拠年次の検討を通じる限り、『分析』第二編は、原初稿が日本資本主義の「根本的矛盾」の「解決」の「条件」を「一般的危機」の「契機」から「闡明」（『日本資本主義発達史講座』内容見本中『特色』）1932年初出、復刻版『講座』〔1982〕別冊1所収）することを企図した『日本資本主義発達史講座』なる「文字通り」の「協同労作」の「一部」（野呂栄太郎『日本資本主義発達史講座』趣意書）1932年初出、同前所収）として執筆されたという、その生成過程に照応する性格を鮮明に有している。（『日本資本主義発達史講座』刊行開始80周年 - 2012年8月31日脱稿）

【表1 『分析』「労働統計」の根拠年次の構造】

区分	産業資本確立期 (1897-1907)	金融資本成立期 (1906-18)	一般的危機期 (1918-)
第二編第二章「第二分析 労働力」項			陸軍工廠〔軍器工廠・火薬工廠〕労働力の型 =軍器工廠 (1923)・火薬工廠 (1923) 鉄道関係〔ダイヤグラム・鉄道工場〕労働力の型 =ダイヤグラム (1925)・鉄道工場 (1928) 海軍工廠〔同・製機工場〕労働力の型=海軍 工廠 (1870 〈例外〉)・製機工場 (1930) 港湾海洋労働力〔港湾沖仕・下級船員〕の型 =港湾沖仕 (1929)・下級船員 (1927) 製鉄機構〔同・製鋼工場〕労働力の型=製鉄 機構 (1902 〈例外〉)・製鋼工場 (1928) 採鉱機構〔炭鉱・金属鉱山〕労働力の型=炭 鉱 (1925)・金属鉱山 (1925) 旋盤工およびミーリング工の地位 (1923) 繊維工業〔紡績工場・製糸工場〕労働力の型 =紡績工場 (1926)・製糸工場 (1872 〈例外〉)
第二編第二章「第一分析 機構」項	陸軍工廠〔東京工廠・大阪 工廠〕職工数 (1893-1906) 海軍工廠〔工廠・造兵造火廠〕 職工数 (1893-1906)	鉄道工場職工数表 (1909) 鉱山=炭鉱労働者数、内地 (1914-19) 金属工業=機械器具工業職工 数の比重 (1914)	製罐工〔原動機・艦船・車両製造工場のも の〕の構成=数 (1927) 製鉄機構〔国営・民営〕職工数 (1929) 工作機械=旋盤製作の職工数 (1914-29) 金属工業=機械器具工業労働者数の比重、 日本ならびに各国 (1919-29)
第一編「生産旋回」第二章	紡績職工数表 (1882-99) 製糸職工数表 (1896-99) 織物職工数表 (1898-99)		

【典拠資料】山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』「統計索引」の「労働」項 (岩波文庫版、1977年、索引14-15頁)  
 (備考) 上記「労働」項の中で、資本と対抗する主体の資格において労働力群を示す「編制」表は波線で、資本に包  
 摂される客体の資格において労働力群を示す「労働者数」表は網掛け文字で表示している。



### 主要参考文献一覧（執筆者 50 音順）

- アンドリュー・E・パーシェイ（2004）『近代日本の社会科学』（山田鋭夫訳、NTT出版、2007年）
- 井上晴丸・宇佐美誠次郎（1951）『危機における日本資本主義の構造』岩波書店
- 内田芳明（1972）『ヴェーバーとマルクスー日本社会科学の思想構造ー』岩波書店
- 内田義彦・田添京二（N.N.Nの筆名で発表）（1949）「市場の理論」と「地代範疇」の危機ー日本資本主義分析における再生産論適用の問題によせてー（『内田義彦著作集 第10巻』岩波書店、1989所収）
- 内田義彦（1967）『日本資本主義の思想像』岩波書店
- 宇野弘蔵（1962）『経済学大系1 経済学方法論』東京大学出版会
- 大石嘉一郎（1975）「序章 課題と方法」同編『日本産業革命の研究（上）ー確立期日本資本主義の再生産構造ー』東京大学出版会
- 大島雄一（1982）『日本資本主義分析』の軌跡ー「再生産論の具体化」と構造論＝危機論ー 土地制度史学会『土地制度史学』94号
- 大内力（2000）『大内力経済学大系第7巻 日本経済論（上）』東京大学出版会
- 神山茂夫（1947）『日本資本主義分析の基本問題』岩崎書店
- 北村貞夫（1982）『経済学の基本問題ーマルクス＝山田経済学研究序説ー』ミネルヴァ書房
- 久保新一（2012）「山田理論と南理論の継承と発展への一視角ー「文明」危機の視点からー」神奈川大学経済学会『商経論叢』47巻3・4合併号
- 後藤康夫（2002）「軍需品表式と生産力展開ー再生産論の具体化における媒介項をめぐる(2)ー」福島大学経済学会『商学論集』70巻4号
- 小林賢齊（2001）『資本主義構造論ー山田盛太郎東大最終講義ー』日本経済評論社
- 向坂逸郎（1947）『日本資本主義の諸問題ー資本主義と農村の階級分化ー』黄土社
- 寺出道雄（2008）『評伝日本の経済思想 山田盛太郎 マルクス主義者の知られざる世界』日本経済評論社
- 豊田四郎（1949）『日本資本主義構造の理論』岩崎書店
- 長岡新吉（1980）『日本資本主義分析』の歴史と論理ー一つの「講座派」批判ー『経済学批判8号』社会評論社
- 中西洋（1982）『増補 日本における「社会政策」・「労働問題」研究』東京大学出版会
- 中根康裕（1999）「山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』の原像」基礎経済科学研究所『経済科学通信』90号
- 中根康裕（2000）「山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』の起点」政治経済研究所『政経研究』75号
- 中根康裕（2002）「山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』の「段階的」媒介環」福島大学経済学会『商学論集』71巻1号
- 二瓶敏（1985）「山田盛太郎著『日本資本主義分析』『経済』1985年4月号 新日本出版社
- 野呂栄太郎他編（1932-33）『日本資本主義発達史講座 全7巻』岩波書店（同復刻版、1982）
- 南克巳（1977）『「分析」文庫版への解説』山田盛太郎『日本資本主義分析』岩波文庫版
- 毛利健三（1971）「ファシズム下における日本資本主義論争」長幸男・住谷一彦編『近代日本経済思想史 II』有斐閣
- 守屋典郎（1967）『日本マルクス主義理論の形成と発展』青木書店
- 山崎隆三（1989）『近代日本経済史の基本問題』ミネルヴァ書房
- 山田勝次郎（1934）「日本資本主義の合理的把握の一典型ー山田盛太郎著『日本資本主義分析』の紹介ー」（内田義彦・大塚久雄・松島栄一編『現代日本思想大系第20巻 マルクシズム I』筑摩書房、1966所収）
- 山田盛太郎著作集編集委員会編（1983-85）『山田盛太郎著作集 本巻5巻 別巻1巻』岩波書店
- 吉原泰助他編（1976）『資本論入門』有斐閣
- 涌井秀行（2010）『戦後日本資本主義の根本問題』大月書店

# 研究会報告

2012年11月16日（金） 定例研究会報告（社会知性開発研究センター共催）

テーマ： Interrogating Sustainable Development: From Theory to Practice.

報告者： Dr. Teresa Sobieszczyk（University of Montana）

場所： 生田校舎図書館本館視聴覚室

報告内容概略：

開発社会学の視点から持続可能な開発の研究に携わる米国の研究者をお招きし、持続可能な開発の理論的整理、実践例の紹介と評価についてお話を伺った。

まずアジェンダ 21 の定義に基き持続可能な開発を定義し、さらに持続可能な開発は環境・社会・経済の三分野にまたがるとし、それぞれの分野で緊張関係がある点が指摘された。

次に持続可能な開発についての三つの理論的背景を紹介し、実例を挙げて比較検討を行った。第一に自由市場原理に基づく環境主義が挙げられる。それは、企業や個人が自発的行動をとるべきであるとするもので、フェアトレードなど、グリーン消費主義と言われるものが主な例である。第二の理論は政策修正派の持続可能な開発である。持続可能性の視点を政策に導入するもので、一般の経済指標に加えてエコロジカルフットプリントといった環境指標を取り入れるなど、より真実に近いとされる進歩指標を提示したり、USAID が援助政策や事業に公害防止といった要素を取り入れたりする例がある。ただしこの立場は、経済成長と同時に持続可能性の問題を改善できるとしており、根源的な変化をもたらすわけではないため、このような持続可能な開発はより効果的な環境保護や格差是正を作り出す機会を阻んでいるかもしれないとの見解もある。最後に構造批判アプローチによる持続可能な開発が挙げられた。従来の自由市場原理による持続可能性の取り上げ方は環境問題・貧困問題を生み出してきたが、市場の要求に応えようとするよりも、人々や地域の環境の必要性に応える仕組みをつくることにより持続可能な開発を実現するという立場である。

以上を踏まえて、ベリーズとベトナムの複数のエコツーリズムの事例からどの理論基盤がどんな性質のエコツーリズム事業につながり、それはどの様に評価をするべきかについて検証がなされた。エコツーリズム事業に民間企業・政府がどう関わってきたか、貧困削減に影響を与えたか、エコツーリズムは今後有力な開発事業として位置づけられるか、より広い社会変容につなげられるような社会運動との関係性などの視点から議論がなされた。

記：専修大学経済学部・飯沼健子

2012年11月21日(水) 定例研究会報告

テーマ： ベトナムの教育事情について

報告者： ゴ・フォン・ラン

(ベトナム社会科学院東北アジア研究所・日本研究センター副センター長)

コメンテーター： ファム・ティ・スアン・マイ

(ベトナム社会科学院東北アジア研究所環境および持続的発展研究室室長)

時間： 16:45 ～ 18:30

場所： 生田校舎 社研会議室

共催： 社研特別研究助成「ベトナム社会主義共和国の経済及び産業、社会、文化の変容と諸課題」(代表 佐藤 康一郎)

参加者数： 20人

報告内容概略：

ベトナムの現代教育は1945年に始まり、現在まで数度の教育改革を経ている。特に1986年には「ドイモイ(刷新)政策」とともに教育システムも大きく変化し、学校教育は12年制度に改革された。

小学校は居住地近くの学校に振り分けられる。小学校の必修科目は国語、数学、自然、社会、英語、科学、歴史、地理であり、選択科目は音楽、美術、道徳、体育、情報通信がある。

基礎中学は、自宅近辺の学校に割り振られ、学習年数は4年間。履修科目は数学、物理、化学、生物、工芸、文学、歴史、地理、公民教育(道徳)、外国語(英語、フランス語、ロシア語、中国語、日本語)、体育、音楽、美術、情報通信(コンピュータ)。進学のためには入学試験を受けなければならない。

普通中学校は3年制である。卒業試験は6つの科目で、基本科目の数学、文学、外国語など。2010年現在、大学、短大への進学率は40%である。普通中学と類似の役割を果たすものとして、職業訓練を重視する専門中学が存在する。卒業後すぐに生産工場などで工員として働くことができる。

高等教育では、現在409の大学、短大が存在するが、この10年間に307が新たに設立された。全国64省・都市の中、62の省・都市に大学か短大があり、学生数は1,700,000人、毎年の新入生は500,000人とされる。大学は専攻によっていくつかのブロックに分類される。自然科学、技術、経済・財政など主に数学に関連している『Aブロック』、医学、農林など主に生物学に関連している『Bブロック』、人文・社会科学に関連しているのは『Cブロック』、外国語に関連している大学は『Dブロック』、その他の大学は細分化され、入学試験も別々に行われる。しかし現在大学卒業者の37%は就職できていない。

研究会では日本であまり知られていないベトナムの教育制度の実情が報告され、熱心な質問が相次いだ。今後の交流推進のためには、両国制度の異同についての研究を深めていかねばならない。

記：専修大学人間科学部・嶋根克己

2012年12月4日(火) 定例研究会報告

テーマ： 危機に瀕する世界経済-アメリカとEUを中心に

報告者： 平井俊顕氏(一橋大学経済研究所客員教授、上智大学名誉教授)

討論者： 宮本光晴所員(本学経済学部)

鈴木直次所員(本学経済学部)

司会： 野口旭所員(本学経済学部)

時間： 16:30~18:30

場所： 生田校舎8号館832会議室

参加者数：15名

報告内容概略：

本研究会では、昨年発足したケインズ学会の初代会長を務める平井俊顕氏を招き、氏の近著『ケインズは資本主義を救えるか-危機に瀕する世界経済』(昭和堂、2012年)の内容を踏まえて、特にリーマン・ショック以降のアメリカとEUが直面する経済問題について、平井氏による報告、鈴木、宮本両氏による討論、そして全体討論が行われた。

平井氏によれば、2008年9月のリーマン・ショック後の世界経済は、2010年5月頃を境として、旧ケインズ主義的なマクロ財政政策の復活期と、超緊縮財政路線の蔓延期という二つの対照的局面に分けることができる。

2009年に成立したアメリカのオバマ政権は当初、ケインズ的な拡張的財政政策を経済政策の柱として据えていた。さらに、医療保険制度改革(通称オバマケア)と金融規制改革(ドッド=フランク法)という、それまでの規制緩和の流れを逆転させるような二つの大きな制度改革に着手した。しかしながら、拡張的財政政策は2010年6月には挫折し、二つの制度改革もさまざまな妨害に遭遇することになった。それは、海外における欧州財政危機と国内におけるティー・パーティー運動を背景として、反ケインズ的な均衡予算イデオロギーが急速に強まったからである。

他方のユーロ危機は、発足当初より明らかであったドイツとPIIGS諸国との間の経済的不均衡が、リーマン・ショック後の世界的不況の中で一挙に顕在化したものである。PIIGS諸国はドイツの圧迫によって財政緊縮を迫られてきたが、それは欧州財政危機をむしろ深刻化させる結果になっている。

以上のような平井氏の報告に対して、鈴木氏は、オバマ政権の財政政策を「ケインズ政策の復興」とするのはやや過大評価ではないか、オバマ以前の「金融自由化政策」の位置付けが過大に否定的ではないか等のコメントを行った。また宮本氏は、平井氏の立場はウォール街占拠派とも相通じるような「ケインズ原理主義=財政主義による市場原理主義批判」であるが、欲望の徹底的追求を是とする実験国家としてのアメリカに対して、そのような立場からの批判は必ずしも有効ではない、とするコメントを行った。

その後、平井氏が二人の討論者へのリジョインダーを行い、さらには、ケインズの財政政策と財政危機との矛盾をどう考えるか等を含めたさまざまな議論が、フロアーも含めて展開された。

なお、本研究会は、社会科学研究所グループ研究助成「グローバル化時代の国際経済の諸問題」との共催として行われた。

記：専修大学経済学部・野口旭

2012年 12月8日(土) シンポジウム報告

シンポジウム：“2012年米大統領選挙”

報告者： 砂田 一郎 (学習院大学) 「オバマの再選と二極化するアメリカ」

大島 寛 (広島修道大学) 「オバマはなぜ怒らなかったのか」

時 間： 14:00-17:00

場 所： 専修大学神田校舎 13A 会議室

参加者数：17名

報告内容概略：

今回のシンポジウムでは、“2012年米大統領選挙”と題し、2012年11月に実施された米大統領選挙について、砂田は今年の大統領選挙過程の全体を総括した報告を行った。大島は、選挙戦終盤に行われた第一回テレビ討論会におけるオバマ大統領の敗北をとりあげ、討論会で見られたオバマの「人種性」に焦点を当てた報告を行った。

砂田の報告では、オバマの再選によって連邦政治の極端な右傾化が避けられ、これに加えてオバマ民主党による「多数派連合」形成の可能性が高まったことをその意義として挙げる一方で、一般得票率において共和党候補ロムニーが48%を獲得したことは、有権者がオバマに与えたのは「不確かなマンデイト」であり、これとともに連邦議会議員選挙での共和党下院支配の維持、2011年からの「分割政府」の継続により、二期目でのオバマの新たな改革を困難にさせることが論じられた。

大島の報告では、第一回テレビ討論会でのオバマの敗北の要因の一つとして、討論の中でのあいまいで矛盾する政策や「数字の誤り」を述べた共和党候補ロムニーへの反論、すなわち「怒り」をオバマが発しなかったことに注目した報告を行った。各メディアの解説では、選挙戦終盤になってオバマが「失点をしなければ勝てる」ような有利な状況となったので、オバマが「慎重、抑制」的な態度をとったことが挙げられているが、大島は、オバマが「怒らなかった」のは「怒れる黒人」に対する白人たちの中での恐怖感を生じさせることなどを含めて、「怒りは何も生まない」という信念があるからだと論じた。また、大統領選挙でのオバマの再選は、白人たちが黒人を含めた「マイノリティー」大統領を受け入れたわけでは決していないことを強調した。

フロアからは、経済的業績を誇るオバマ陣営が、そのツケともいえる「財政の崖」問題に選挙期間中にどのような見解を示していたのか、分極化する米国の統合を第一の課題としたオバマの課題達成の程度、オバマ再選と連邦下院議員選挙における共和党勝利の関係、選挙過程における外交争点、オバマの怒りと彼の家庭環境の関係など、多くの議論がなされた。

記：専修大学法学部・藤本一美

## 執筆者紹介

堀江 洋文 ほりえ ひろふみ 本学経済学部教授

中根 康裕 なかね やすひろ 本研究所客員研究員（法政大学大原社会問題研究所嘱託研究員）

## 〈編集後記〉

『社会科学研究所月報』第 594（2012 年 12 月）号をお届けします。福島利夫所員が本年 9 月、経済学部長に就任されたことに伴い、急遽、編集委員に補充され編集後記を書くこととなりました。これとって具体的な仕事はしていないのに恐縮です。本号にご寄稿頂いた堀江洋文先生、中根康宏先生、ありがとうございます。堀江先生の英語論文で取り上げられている時代は、おそらくマーク・トウェインの有名な『乞食王子』のモデルとなったエドワード六世の時代だと思われます。このお話は幼稚園ぐらいの時代（1960 年代後半）に聞いたきり、その後、タイトルに差し障りがあったのかあまり聞くことがなかったような気がしますが、近年は岩波文庫から『王子と乞食』というタイトルで完訳版が出ているようです。また、中根先生の研究ノートは、故・山田盛太郎氏の『日本資本主義分析』第二編「旋回基軸」の基本性格を検討したものです。故・山田盛太郎氏といえば、専修大学社会科学研究所の創設者的な位置にある、とてもゆかりの深い方だと伺っております。社会科学研究所にとって温故知新ともいうべき意義を有するものではないでしょうか。

N. S.

---

2012 年 12 月 20 日発行

神奈川県川崎市多摩区東三田 2 丁目 1 番 1 号 電話 (044)911-1089

専修大学社会科学研究所

(発行者) 町田俊彦

製作 佐藤印刷株式会社

東京都渋谷区神宮前 2-10-2 電話 (03)3404-2561

---