

The Reformed
Primers.

much doctrinal improvement as the King's Vicegerent in ecclesiastical matters could venture upon. It has 'the form of bidding of the beads, by the King's commandment,'¹ and 'the Abrogation of the Holy-days.' Many of the psalms, anthems, lessons, and hymns are changed for others of more plain sentence: also a great number of the saints invoked in the Litany are omitted, according to the Injunctions of 1536. Prayer for the dead is retained in the bidding the beads and in the *Dirige*; but the Lessons of this service are changed for others, declaring the miserable state of man's life, the condition of the dead, and the general resurrection. It contains 'an instruction of the manner of hearing of the mass,' opposing the doctrine of the sacramentaries. The book follows three main divisions—Faith, Prayer (the *Hours*, with the xv. Oes,² the vii. and xv. Psalms, and the Litany, &c.), and Works, concluding after passages of Scripture upon the relative duties, with an extract from 2 Pet ii., headed 'The bishop of Rome with his adherences, destroyers of all estates.' This with all preceding Primers was superseded in 1545 by 'The King's Primer'³ and its Latin counterpart, the *Orarium*, of 1546.

This was much less pronounced, and contained, besides the Hours, the Penitential Psalms, the Litany, the *Dirge* and Comendations, and the Psalms and devotions of the Passion, only a short collection of Private Prayers.

and therein shall see briefly the order of the whole Book. Set forth by John, late Bishop of Rochester, at the commandment of the right honourable lord Thomas Crumwell, lord Privy Seal, Vicegerent to the King's Highness.' Burton, *Three Primers*, pp. 305—436. There was also an edition published in the same year in English and Latin. (Hoskins, *Primers*, No. 142 and p. 233.)

¹ This was carefully ordered by Henry, to omit all mention of the Pope, and to teach the people that the king was the supreme head immediately under God of the spirituality and temporality of the Church of England.

² These fifteen meditations on Christ's Passion, each beginning with 'O Jesu,' 'O blessed Jesu,' &c., composed and said daily by St. Bridget before the crucifix in St. Paul's church at Rome were a common feature in the older Pri-

mers (p. 19). Marshall rejected them as superstitious, and they were not placed in K. Henry's Primer (1545). Bishop Hilsley retained them in their usual place, before the vii. Psalms and the Litany, with an admonition prefixed: 'The xv. prayers following, called commonly the xv. Oes, are set forth in divers Latin primers, with goodly prynted prefaces, promising to the sayers thereof many things both foolish and false, as the deliverance of xv. souls out of purgatory, with other like vanities; yet are the prayers self right, good and virtuous, if they be said without any such superstitious trust or blind confidence.' Burton, *Three Primers*, p. 371. We find them again in the time of Q. Elizabeth: see *Private Prayers put forth in that Reign* (Parker Soc.), and Mr. Clay's note, p. 507.

³ Burton, *Three Primers*, pp. 437—526, and see above, p. 33.

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST PRAYER BOOK.

THE definite history of the compilation of the First Prayer Book is wrapped in considerable obscurity. In the previous chapter an account has been given of various steps which led up to it, but when the attempt is made to ascertain accurately the names of those who compiled it and the history of their work, little evidence is forthcoming. The authors of the Order of Communion lie hidden behind the vague phrases of the Proclamation of March 8, 1547—8, under which it was issued. Other phrases similarly vague occur in connexion with the First Prayer Book in the Act of Uniformity which authorized it. There is no direct evidence of any formal commission issued for the purpose, and indirectly all the details that can be ascertained are the following. In September, 1548, a number of bishops and divines were assembled at Chertsey and also (probably during the King's stay on September 22 and 23) at Windsor, for the settlement of liturgical questions and 'a uniform order of prayer.'¹

The names of these can only be ascertained by conjecture,² but since it is known that five bishops and four

¹ *Greyfriars Chronicle*, 56. *Jour- nal of Edward VI.* in Burnet, v. 7 (Pt. II. i. p. 6.)

² No names are given by Cranmer in his letter to Queen Mary of September, 1555, (*Remains*, p. 450), nor

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

Its authors.

divines took part at Chertsey in Ferrar's consecration to the see of S. David's on September 9, it is natural to suppose that they were of the number. They were the following: Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley of Rochester, Holbeach of Lincoln, Thirlby of Westminster, and Goodrich of Ely: Drs. May, Dean of St Paul's, Haynes, Dean of Exeter, Robertson, afterwards Dean of Durham, and Redman, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is noticeable as a piece of confirmatory evidence that at the service the consecration of the Eucharist, as well as the administration, was then performed in English.¹ Further signs of the work that was going on are traceable in the Protector's letter to the Vice-Chancellor &c. of Cambridge University dated September 4, wherein he orders the Colleges to follow the example of the royal chapel in divine worship 'until such time as an order be taken and prescribed by his Highness to be universally kept throughout the whole realm'²: and also in the 'Proclamation for the inhibition of all preachers,' issued on September 23, which speaks of his Highness' wish 'to see very shortly one uniform order throughout this his realm,' and of 'certain bishops and notable learned men' gathered together at this time for that very purpose by his Highness' commandment.³ It is quite possible that others beside the above nine persons were concerned in the work. Fuller, in his Church History, adds the names

by Ridley in his demonstrative letter as to Hooper's attitude towards vestments. Bradford's *Works*, II. 387.

¹ The Acts of Consecration have been printed from Cranmer's Register, f. 327^v, by Courayer, *Défense*, II. ii. Appendix, p. xxxvii.; and by Estcourt, *Anglican Ordinations*, Appendix, VIII.

² See above, p. 40.

³ See the proclamation, *Doc. Ann.*

XIII. and compare Wriothesley's *Chronicle*, II. p. 6, and *Greyfriars Chronicle*, p. 56: both of these ascribe the proclamation to September 28, but the earlier date coincides with Edward's visit to Windsor, and his interview with the Divines there. This proclamation is more explicit than the earlier one of April 24, *Doc. Ann.* no. x.*

of Bishops Skip of Hereford and Day of Chichester with Drs. Cox and Taylor, but evidence for these is not forthcoming.¹ It is clear however, that this body of divines, sometimes called the Windsor Commission, was a representative body drawn from both the conservative and the reforming side, and that, whatever other points of difference there may have been between them, they were at any rate all agreed in desiring a form of service in English which all could understand.²

No further light is cast upon the obscure workings of the divines till the meeting of Parliament, when the experimental stage was over and definite proposals were brought forward. It is clear that, in the meantime, the compilers of the Prayer Book had finished their work. The ecclesiastical business began on Saturday, December 15,

¹ Later writers, such as Burnet, give other lists which are less well attested. See for the whole question Gasquet and Bishop, chapter ix.

² Cranmer's letter to Queen Mary, September, 1555 (*Remains*, p. 450). 'But when a good number of the best learned men reputed within this realm some favouring the old, some the new learning as they term—where indeed that which they call the old is the new, and that which they call the new is indeed the old—but when a great number of such learned men of both sorts were gathered together at Windsor for the reformation of the service of the church, it was agreed by both, without controversy (not one saying contrary), that the service of the church ought to be in the mother tongue.' Compare Somerset's letter to Pole, enclosing a copy of the Book of Common Prayer, June 4, 1549. 'The conclusion, and that that ye make the extreme peril and danger, may peradventure be known to you at Rome, of a dissension amongst our bishops upon the chiefest points of religion. We here do know no such thing: but on

the contrary, by a common agreement of all the chief learned men in the realm the thing of long time and maturely debated among them which had most opinion of learning in the Scriptures of God and were likeliest to give least to affection, as well bishops as other, equally and indifferently chosen of judgment, not co-acted with superior authority, nor otherwise invited but of a common agreement among themselves—there was first agreement on points, and then the same coming to the judgment of the parliament, finally concluded and approved; and so a form and rite of service, a creed and doctrine of religion by that authority and after that sort allowed, set forth and established by act and statute, and so published and divulged to so great a quiet as ever was in England and as gladly received of all partes.' See *Troubles connected with B. C. P.* p. x. The Protector's opinion as to the unanimous acceptance of the First Prayer Book is, to say the least, an optimistic one. See below on this point, p. 54.

with a public three-days' debate in the House of Lords concerning the Eucharist,¹ founded upon a 'boke whiche was redde touching the doctrine of the Supper.' The Protector claimed this as representing the 'agreements' of the bishops except in so far as Day, Bishop of Chichester, had dissented upon three points. But Bishop Thirlby, of Westminster, tried to minimize the agreement of the bishops, and when challenged, began to explain away his own subscription to the book. There can be little doubt that the Protector was right, and that there had been a consultation of the bishops with a definite acceptance and subscription of a formal document.

It is evident from the Debate that the 'book' contained a summary of the doctrinal points involved,² not only with regard to the Eucharist, but also to Confirmation and perhaps other things, and that it contained the new 'Prayer of the Communion' in English, no doubt that which had been prepared for the First Prayer Book. It seems to have undergone some modification between the time, when the consultation of the bishops and its subscription by them took place, and the day when it was read in the House of Lords; at least Thirlby seems to suggest this;³ but in any case it was confessedly incomplete and left other things 'to be treated on afterwarde.'

After this short sparring as to the nature of the agreement and subscription of the bishops, *i.e.* as to the amount of authority to be justly ascribed to the 'boke,'

¹ A full account of this from a contemporary MS. is printed as an appendix by Gasquet and Bishop, p. 395 ff. but not well handled by them in chap. xi. Mr. Tomlinson in his edition (*The Great Parliamentary Debate*) corrects some of their mistakes, but errs on the other side.

² It is called 'this book of the doctrine,' fol. 7a, (cp. 5a), quoted above: in both cases Gasquet and Bishop obscure this by inserting a comma.

³ fo. 6b. 'Also there was in the booke: Oblation, whiche is lefte oute nowe.'

the debate plunged into the general subject, and it was clear that some of the bishops, though they may have been willing, like Thirlby, to subscribe to 'the boke' when presented to them for the sake of 'unitie at home in this Realme,' yet were not at all satisfied by it, and in particular found its omissions hard to reconcile with the doctrine which they held. Further experience of it somewhat modified their attitude, and Gardiner, for example, afterwards admitted with regard to the First Prayer Book, that 'there was never more spoken for the Sacrament than in that book,' though 'he would not have made it after that form.'¹

On the day following the close of the Debate, 'the book for the Service in the Church' was read in the Commons, and from that time the first Act of Uniformity began to make its way through Parliament, and was finally carried through both Houses by January 21, 1549, a week before the end of the second year of Edward's reign.²

The Debate had revealed the cleavage of opinion among the bishops,³ and the same is evident from the

¹ See the negotiations with him in 1551, printed in full by Foxe, vi. 114: cp. 169.

² Dixon, III. I. The Act of Uniformity is in Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, No. LXIX. Some qualifications were appended to the Act for the benefit of scholars: that persons understanding Greek, Latin, Hebrew, or other strange tongue, might say privately the prayers of Mattins and Evensong in such tongue as they understood: and, for the further encouraging of learning in the tongues in the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, that those Universities might use and exercise in their common and open prayer in their chapels, being no parish-churches, the Mattins,

Evensong, Litany, and all other prayers (the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass, excepted) prescribed in the said book in Greek, Latin, or Hebrew. For such versions of the Prayer-Book see below, p. 116.

³ Cp. *Traheron's Letter to Bullinger*, Dec. 31: 'Habita est Londini decimo nono Calendas Januarii, ni fallor, disputatio *περι εὐχαριστίας* in consensu omnium pene procerum totius Angliæ. Decertatum est acriter inter episcopos. Cantuariensis præter omnium expectationem sententiam vestram de hoc negotio apertissime, constantissime doctissimeque defendit. . . Nunquam splendidiorem victoriam veritas apud nos reportavit.'

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

Action of
Convocation
doubtful.

No official
record
extant.

Other
evidence.

voting. Ten voted for the Bill and eight against it, while of the four proxies two must be reckoned in its favour, one against it, and one as neutral.¹

It is a disputed and doubtful question whether the Prayer Book was submitted to Convocation or not; the records of that body were burnt in the Great Fire of London, 1666, so the question cannot easily be settled; but it seems clear that no record bearing witness to such a course was known to those living at that date, such as Heylyn, the historian, who had every opportunity of knowing and every inducement to call attention to such a record if he knew of it.²

On the other hand, it is also clear that the Convocation records of this reign were incomplete. Heylyn, the keeper of the archives, did not know of the records of the earlier Convocation of 1547, but they have now been found among the Parker papers.³ It is therefore quite possible that the same was true of the records of the Convocation of 1548-49.

For want of official records, recourse must be had to other sources. Certainly it seems very unlikely in view of the Debate in the House of Lords, and of the full discussion and vote of the bishops there, that the question came before them again in the Upper House of the two Convocations.

On the other hand, there is clear and distinct evidence that the Book had the approval of Convocation.

The King wrote to Bonner on July 23, 1549, asserting

Video plane actum de Lutheranismo, cum, qui prius habiti sunt summi ac pene soli illius fautores, nostri toti facti sunt.' *Orig. Lett.* CLII. (Parker Soc.) King Edward calls it in his journal, 'a notable disputation of the Sacrament in the Parliament-house.' Burnet, v. 7 (Pt. II. i. 6.)

¹ Gasquet and Bishop, pp. 170-172.

² Gasquet and Bishop, pp. 150, 151.

³ At Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. See Gasquet and Bishop, Appendix VII.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

It's value.

that the Book is 'set forth not only by the common agreement and full assent of the nobility and commons of the late session of the late Parliament but also by the like assent of the bishops in the same Parliament and of all other the learned men of this realm in their synods and convocations provincial.'¹

In a further letter to the Lady Mary he speaks of 'one full and whole consent both of our clergy in their several synods and convocations, and also of the noblemen and commons in the late session of our parliament.'²

It is hardly possible to have better evidence than two such letters as these written by the King, and to persons who had every opportunity of denying the accuracy of the statement if it could be denied.³ Such further evidence as is forthcoming adds nothing to the strength of these.⁴ It is true that the Edwardian Government was not scrupulous of the rights of the Church, and further was not over scrupulous of truth in defending its own policy; but the former objection cannot be raised as against a definite statement that the Convocations were consulted, nor the latter against letters written, not to bodies of disaffected subjects or others who could be deceived, but to the Princess Mary, who was very closely concerned, and to Bishop Bonner, who was a leading actor in the whole

¹ Foxe v. 726. Compare the Draft of the King's Memorial to the Sheriffs, which speaks of it as 'th' act of all our hole realm, and the common agreement of both our spiritualie and temporalie there gathered together.' *Troubles*, &c. p. 5. Compare p. 127. Compare also the King's Message to the Devonshire Rebels. Foxe, v. 734.

² *State Papers, Dom. Edw. VI.* vol. VIII. p. 51, quoted in full in Dixon, III. 148.

³ The Princess was inclined to raise objections to the book, as having merely parliamentary authority, but was told in reply that the law was 'by long study, free disputation and uniform determination of the whole clergy consulted, debated and concluded.' Foxe, vi. 8.

⁴ For example, Udall's *Answer to the Commoners of Devonshire and Cornwall, in Troubles*, &c. pp. 169, 171, or Cheke's reply to them, quoted in Gasquet and Bishop, p. 155.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.
Conclusion.

concern. The most natural conclusion is that the letter to Bonner was strictly accurate in its phrases, that is, that the Prayer Book was held to have the assent of the bishops by their votes in the House of Lords, and was further submitted to the Lower Houses of Convocation, and won the assent of the clergy generally through their representatives there. Such a course of proceeding was not without precedent, for it was that adopted in the Convocation of 1547 in the parallel matter of Communion in both kinds,¹ and possibly also with regard to clerical marriage.

Objects of
the reform.

The objects of the compilers of this first English Book of Common Prayer are stated in 'the Preface':—that 'all the whole realm should have but one Use in Divine Service; that the rubrical directions, "the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie² and the manifold changings of the service," should be simplified; that the Psalms should be all repeated in their order, instead of a few being 'daily said, and the rest utterly omitted'; that the Lessons should include "the whole Bible, or the greatest part thereof," in a continuous course, and the reading of the chapters should not be interrupted by "Anthems, Responds, and Invitatories"; that nothing should be read but "the very pure Word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is evidently grounded upon the same"; and that all should be "in the English tongue."

Wherein
differing
from the
present
Prayer
Book.

The principal differences between the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. and that now in use are as follows:—*Mattins* and *Evensong* began with the Lord's Prayer, and ended with the third Collect: the *Litany* was placed after the Communion Office; in some early editions it was added as a separate sheet at the end of the volume; and the rubric after the Communion Office which directs

¹ Gasquet and Bishop, 73 ff.

² See p. 257.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

its use was quite general, and referred both for the form and use of the Litany to Royal Injunctions; the address to the Blessed Virgin Mary, which had been retained in Henry's Litany, was omitted, together with the similar invocations of the angels and patriarchs. The *Communion Service* began with an Introit, not in the old form, but in the form of a Psalm sung as the celebrant was proceeding to the altar; the Commandments were not read, but the nine Kyries were sung unbroken; the prayers differed from our present form, but chiefly in their arrangement; the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary was especially mentioned in the praise offered for the saints; explicit prayer for the dead was retained; the long Canon or central prayer comprised all that subsequently was divided to form three prayers—the Church Militant prayer, the Consecration prayer, and the prayer of oblation: and in it the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, with the sign of the cross twice made over the elements, preceded the recital of the Institution of the Sacrament: at the Offertory water was mixed with the wine; the words used in communicating the people were those, adapted from the ancient words, which form the first clause of those now used. The sign of the cross was retained, not only twice, in the consecration prayer and (not in its present position) in Baptism, but also in Confirmation, in the Blessings at Matrimony, and in the Visitation of the Sick if the sick person desired to be anointed: a form of exorcism, and anointing, and the trine immersion were still used in *Baptism*; the water in the font was ordered to be changed, and consecrated, once a month at least: in the *Burial Service* explicit prayer was offered for the deceased person; and an Introit, Collect, Epistle and Gospel were appointed for a Communion at a Burial. The Ordinal was not yet annexed to the book.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.
General
principles.

The First reformed Prayer Book, though bearing some traces of foreign influence, was, in fact, a revision of the old Service-books of the English Church. Simplicity was gained by the omission of numberless ancient features of the mediæval offices; the doctrinal reform necessitated the removal, not simply of objectionable features in the old services which were few, but still more of innocent things,¹ which were misunderstood and perverted to support the false conceptions which were current, such as the theory of transubstantiation, and other still more gross popular misconceptions of Eucharistic doctrine. In this process many a rite, such as the Communion Office or the Office of Baptism, was very much changed, and many a beautiful and valuable feature was sacrificed. But the First English Book of Common Prayer was formed, not by a composition of new materials, but by a reverent, and on the whole conservative, handling of the earlier services, of which large portions were simply translated and retained.²

Acceptance
of the Book.

A book which thus combined old and new might hope to meet with general acceptance, both from the Conservatives and Reformers, both from the Old and New Learning, though without satisfying the more pronounced section of either party: but, at the same time, it could hardly expect to be so fortunate as not to meet with some violent opposition. The Act of Uniformity itself contemplated this; and, indeed, the whole expedient

¹ The Canon of the Mass is a case in point: nothing was more bitterly attacked by the Reformers, and a new Canon was written to take its place in the Prayer Book: but in fact, though the old Canon is obscure and unsatisfactory as compared with Greek liturgies, it cannot be said to encourage false doctrine, but rather to be an argument against transubstantiation. See the Archbishops' letter *Sæpius officio* (1897), p. 17, and below, pp. 446 and ff.

² So the Message to the Devonshire rebels states:—'It seemeth to you a new service, and indeed is none other but the old; the self-same words in English, which were in Latin, saving a few things taken out . . . ' Foxe, v. p. 734.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

now for the first time adopted, of enforcing a Service-book by a penal statute speaks eloquently in the same sense.

The party who welcomed the change were anxious to make it at the earliest opportunity. The date fixed by the Act was June 9, Whitsunday, or, if the book might be had earlier, then three weeks after a copy had been procured. But as early as the beginning of Lent 'Poules choir, with divers parishes in London and other places in England begane the use after the said booke.'¹ This example must have been widely followed, for at least four editions were published before Whitsunday, two of them early in March and two of them in May, and in several cases there must have been more than one impression of the same edition.²

Nor were the Conservative party slow in making their disapproval felt; and under the miserable government of the Protector and Council, there was a fire of discontent smouldering up and down the country, which hardly needed such a cause as this to cause it to break out into flame.

The month of June saw the Government set in great danger from insurrections all around, and forced to secure its safety by foreign mercenaries. But in most of these risings the question of religion played little or no part: they were agrarian and social in their origin, and generally did not even annex to themselves the *odium theologicum*.³ It was far otherwise, however, with the most conspicuous of them all, the rising in the West, which began with the religious grievances, and, though not uninfluenced by other considerations, remained in

¹ Wriothesley's *Chronicle*, II. 9. *duction to the Revision*, xxiii. Ash-Wednesday was March 6, but the earliest dated copies extant are those of March 7. Parker, *Intro-*

² *Ibid.*, pp. xxiv.-xxvii.

³ The Rebellion in Norfolk was however full of reformation zeal.

Eagerness of
one party.

Opposition
of the other.

Risings,
especially in
the West.

the clearest way a revolt against the new changes in religion. It began upon Whit-Monday, June 10, and in spite of the strenuous efforts of the Government, spurred by fears of a French invasion, it was not subdued until after two months had passed.¹ The insurgents formulated their complaints in several sets of Articles: ² they demanded the observance of the General Councils, the revival of Henry's Law of the Six Articles, the restoration of the Mass in Latin without any to communicate, and of the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament: Communion in one kind, and only at Easter: greater facilities for Baptism: the restoration of the old ceremonies—Holy-bread and Holy-water, Images, Palms, and Ashes. 'We will not receive the new service, because it is but like a Christmas game; but we will have our old service of Mattins, Mass, Evensong and procession in Latin, not in English.' They demanded the restoration of the custom of praying by name for the souls in purgatory, and the recall of the English Bible as tending to encourage heresy; they proposed that impropiators should have to give up half the abbey lands and chantry lands in their possession for the foundation of new religious houses.

These demands were certainly thorough, and they were backed by a sturdy force of arms: it was easy to send a reply to the Articles in gentle tones, as was the King's answer,³ or contemptuous and menacing, as was that of the Archbishop,⁴ but not so easy to quell the

¹ For the history, see Dixon, III. 43 and ff.

² See Fifteen articles in Strype's *Cranmer*, Appendix XL. or *Troubles*, &c., p. 145 and ff. Also a set of Nine articles printed from *Holmshed*, p. 1009, in Dixon III. 57ⁿ, and in Foxe, v. 731. The latter differ from those

summarised in the text above, *e.g.* in dealing with Confirmation, The Celibacy of the Clergy, and Eucharistic doctrine.

³ Foxe, v. 732.

⁴ *Works*, *Miscellaneous* (Parker Soc.) pp. 163 and ff. or in Strype's *Cranmer*, Appendix, XL.

rebellion, or reduce the West country to quietness. Yet the character of the Articles shows how the whole movement was due to the stiffest conservatism of men who did not wish even their least justifiable usages to be disturbed.

Before the suppression of the revolt, an answer was given to the King's reply which suggests that as the movement proceeded it came into the hands of wiser men, for the questions were handled with far greater power and skill. Some of their points scarcely admitted of denial or refutation, as, for example, when they speak of the King's reply as not being his own, but written for him by those who had long abused his name for the ruin of the country and the oppression of the poor. Again, when they assert that their governors had passed all limits, performing duties reserved to bishops, they accurately describe the course of ecclesiastical affairs as regulated by a despotic Privy Council, from which for the time all bishops but Cranmer had disappeared. Again, in urging the doctrine of the Real Presence, and claiming that great doctrinal matters can only be settled by the consent of the whole of Christendom, they were taking up very solid ground.¹

By the end of August the rising was suppressed, and it only remained for Lord Russell and his foreign mercenaries to stamp out all the traces of it, to distribute rewards, pardons, punishments, and, by the special direction of the Council, to pull down the bells out of the steeples in Devonshire and Cornwall, leaving only one, 'the least of the ryng that now is in the same,' to prevent their being used again in the cause of sedition.²

¹ See the analysis which Pocock gives of their answer (known only through a French translation) in *Troubles*, &c., p. xviii. ² *Troubles*, &c., p. 73.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

This incident, marred though it was by the touch of sordid meanness which everywhere disfigured the Council's tyrannical rule, acted, no doubt, as a clear object-lesson to the rest of England. But, nevertheless, it was necessary to take elaborate steps to enforce the adoption of the new book.

Enforce-
ment of the
Act of Uni-
formity.

Public disputations were held both at Oxford and Cambridge, where the Universities were already undergoing the troubles and indignities of a Royal Visitation, with a view to popularising the doctrines of the New Learning. The Princess Mary was attacked, and long negotiations followed in a futile attempt to force her to accept the Prayer Book and give up her Latin Mass. Ultimately she was allowed a dispensation for herself and her chaplains to keep to the Latin Mass in private.¹

The Lady
Mary.

The divided sympathies of the country were graphically mirrored at S. Paul's, where the Dean (May) was eager in favour of the reforms, and the Bishop (Bonner) was steadfast against them; and, consequently, innovations were rapidly made, but old customs lingered on longer than the reform-party approved. The Bishop seldom or never performed the new service in the Cathedral, and countenanced the retention of the old Votive Masses — *e.g.* the Apostles' Mass and Our Lady's Mass — in the chapels, and not in the quire, under the form of the Apostles' Communion and Our Lady's Communion.² To counteract this bad example, the Archbishop made a point of going to the Cathedral to officiate, and the Council ordered the suppression of the several Masses in the chapels, and confined the Communion to the high

St. Paul's
Cathedral.

¹ Dixon, *History*, III. 148.

² Votive Masses were additional masses said not in connexion with the ordinary liturgical course, but in commemoration of some particular saint

or mystery as here, or in view of some special intention, *e.g.* against plague or on behalf of the dead. *Sarum Missal* (Burntisland) p. 735* and ff.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

altar. These were only the beginnings of Bonner's troubles, for, after a further rebuke from the Council, he was required first to celebrate in the Cathedral and then later to preach; and after his sermon he was formally denounced, tried by a special Commission, imprisoned in the Marshalsea, and finally deprived on October 1.¹

Meanwhile other events, designed to enforce the new book, were, in fact, showing how unstable it was as a basis for a new and lasting régime. A new Royal Visitation was projected, with a draft series of Articles, which went far beyond the earlier Visitation of 1547. It appears to have been designed to enforce the Prayer Book, to suppress sundry ceremonies which had escaped the ravages of previous Visitations, and to prevent the perpetuation of others in connexion with the new English Mass; but, in fact, the Visitation Articles went beyond, and were in some cases contrary to, the provisions of the Service-book. They expressly forbade some things which the book had only omitted, such as the altar lights, and the shifting of the book from one place to another;² but they also attacked 'oil, chrism and altars,' which the book had retained; and, with an echo of the Council's letter to Bonner, but with greater stringency than was there shown, forbade more than one Communion upon any day except Christmas Day and

Royal
Visitation.

¹ Dixon, III. 128. Gasquet and Bishop, 240 and ff.

² Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* xv. § 2. 'Item, For an uniformity, that no minister do counterfeit the popish mass, as to kiss the Lord's table; washing his fingers at every time in the Communion; blessing his eyes with the paten, or sudary; or crossing his head with the paten; shifting of the book from one place to another; laying down and licking the chalice of the Communion; holding up his fingers, hands, or thumbs, joined towards his temples; breathing upon the bread or chalice; showing the sacrament openly before the distribution of the Communion; ringing of sacring bells; or setting any light upon the Lord's board at any time; and finally to use no other ceremonies than are appointed in the king's book of common prayers, or kneeling, otherwise than is in the said book.'

Easter Day, when provision was made for two in the book.

It is uncertain how far the Visitation ever took place; the Articles are now only known from a draft copy, and that is not now extant; but they must have been known at the time, since Ridley and Hooper based upon them their Visitation Articles of 1550.¹

It might naturally be expected that some who clung to the old forms would watch for some turn of affairs in the political world which should restore the old books of service to their place in the churches. The fall of the Duke of Somerset was thought to be such an event;² and upon his being sent to the Tower in the autumn of this year (1549), it was rumored that the Latin service and the old ceremonies would be restored, 'as though the setting forth of the Book of Common Prayer had been the only act of the said Duke.' Therefore, to prevent the possibility of a return to the old service, a King's Letter³ was issued (December 25), to call in, and burn, or deface and destroy, all the old church-books,⁴ 'the keeping wherof shold be a let to the usage of the said Boke of Commene Prayers.' This Order of Council was afterwards confirmed and extended by an Act of Parliament,⁵ to call in the books, and to take away images out of the churches.

By another Act of this Parliament⁶ (January 31, 1550), the King was empowered to appoint six prelates and six other men of this realm, learned in God's law, to

¹ Ridley's Articles and Injunctions are in *Doc. Ann.* XXI. or his *Works*, p. 319. Hooper's in his *Later Writings*, p. 118 and ff.

² Hooper's *Letter to Bullinger*, Dec. 27, 1549: 'Magnus ceperat nos timor, magnus metus mentes piorum invaserat, qualem successum Christi re-

ligio adhuc herbescens in Anglia esset acceptura post lapsum ducis Somersetiae. . . .'³ *Original Letters*, xxxvi.

³ *Doc. Annals*, xx.

⁴ See the list quoted above, p. 23.

⁵ Statute 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 10. See Dixon, III. 160.

⁶ Statute 3 and 4 Edw. VI. c. 12.

complete the liturgical reform by the preparation of a new Ordinal; and whatever should be 'devised for that purpose by the most number of them, and set forth under the Great Seal of England before the 1st day of April, should be lawfully exercised and used, and none other.'

The Bill was carried only after some opposition, nine bishops voting in its favour and five against it. On February 2 an order of the Council was made appointing the commissioners, but there is no list of names recorded in the Council Book.¹ It seems probable that the work of preparation was already done: it is even possible that the new form had been experimentally used at an ordination held by Cranmer and Ridley at S. Paul's before the end of 1549.² In any case, within a week of the appointment complaint was made at the Council Board (February 8) that Heath, Bishop of Worcester, 'wolde not assent to the boke made by the reste of the bishops and clergy.' At the end of the month he was still obdurate, and on March 4 he was sent to prison by the Council. He persisted in his refusal for eighteen months, and was finally deprived of his see on October 10, 1551.³ At the beginning of March the book appeared,⁴ and, in spite of some criticisms, was generally accepted.⁵

¹ *Acts of the Privy Council*, II. 379; or *Troubles*, &c. p. 137.

² Strype's *Cranmer*, 191 [Bk. II. cap. xi.].

³ Dixon, III. 322; *Acts*, u. s., II. 388, 403, 405.

⁴ *The form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons*, 1549, (= 1550); reprinted in *Liturgies and Documents of the Reign of Edward VI.* (Parker Soc.).

⁵ As early as March 5 Hooper, in a

sermon in London, complained of the form of the Oath of Supremacy as especially objectionable: 'So help me God, all Saints, and the holy Evangelist.' (Hooper's *Early Works*, p. 479; cp. *Orig. Letters*, p. 81.) This was altered upon his arguments, and all mention of swearing by the saints was struck out by the King's own hand, July 20, when Hooper accepted the bishopric of Gloucester, and took the oath as amended. *Orig. Lett.* CCLXIII. (Aug. 28). *Micronius*

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

Its
character.

It represented a great change from the old services of the Pontifical. The Act provided for a 'form and manner of making and consecrating of archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, and other ministers of the Church'; but the book made no provision for the 'other ministers,' and thus at one blow the English Church gave up the subdiaconate as well as the minor orders, and restricted itself to the three orders which have survived of those mentioned in the Bible.

The simplification of the old rite was somewhat ruthlessly carried out, and little of the old was retained. Considerable use was made of a scheme of Bucer,¹ but his doctrinal innovations were rejected. The Ordinal² was not annexed to the Prayer Book for the present, but continued a separate book until, after a further reduction of its ceremonial, it was annexed to the Second Prayer Book.

The Church of Ireland, which as yet had no Convocation, followed in ecclesiastical reforms the orders which were sent across from England. Edward's Act of Parliament,³ which commanded the Communion to be given 'under both the kinds,' applied to 'the people within the Church of England and Ireland'; and the Proclamation prefixed to 'The Order of the Communion' (1548) made no distinction between the two countries. Only one attempt was made to urge the

to Bullinger. Hooper's own account of the matter is given in a *Letter to Bullinger* (June 29), *Orig. Lett.* XXXIX.

¹ *De ordinatione legitima* in his *Scripta Angl.* pp. 238—259. This must have been written in 1549, though not published till 1577.

² It was accepted by such a shrewd contemporary observer as Daniele Barbaro, the Venetian Envoy, as being the equivalent of the old. In

his full and interesting description of the First Prayer Book and of the Ordinal he speaks of the latter as 'containing the form of conferring Holy Orders; nor do they differ (he adds) from those of the Roman Catholic religion, save that in England they take an oath to renounce the doctrine and authority of the Pope.' *State Papers, Venetian*, V. 347—353.

³ See above p. 37.

The Prayer
Book in
Ireland.

The First
Prayer Book
of
Edward VI.

Order upon the people, and this caused such an outburst of feeling against the perpetrator of it—Staples, Bishop of Meath—that both he and others thereafter took refuge in silence.¹

It was not until February 6, 1551, that a Royal letter was sent to the Viceroy to recount how the King has 'caused the Liturgy and prayers of the Church to be translated into our mother tongue of this realm of England,'² and to express the Royal pleasure that Ireland should have the same benefit. On receipt of it, Sir Anthony St. Leger summoned an ecclesiastical assembly of the bishops and clergy of the various provinces, to whom he submitted the order. It was violently resisted by the Primate Dowdal, Archbishop of Armagh, and, after an altercation, he left the assembly, followed by the greater part of the bishops. Only Browne, Archbishop of Dublin, remained with Staples and three others, who made a most servile submission to the Royal command, and the Prayer Book was first used in Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin, on Easter Sunday (March 29, 1551).³ Its progress was very slow. In the greater part of the country English was a tongue less understood than Latin. The larger body of bishops—with the exception of Dowdal, who fled the country—though they made no resistance, were both unwilling and incapable. A year later the Lord Deputy found great negligence, and the old ceremonies yet remaining in many places; and this experience of his probably refers only to the small anglicised portion of Ireland.⁴ The

¹ Dixon, III. 404.

² The letter is quoted in full in Dixon, III. 413, from *Harl. Misc.* V. 563.

³ Stephens, *MS. Book of Common Prayer for Ireland* (Ecl. Hist. Soc.), Introd. pp. iii. and ff. The title of the

Book, which was printed at Dublin, 1551, is, '*The Boke of the common praier and administracion of the Sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche: after the use of the Churche of England.*' Ibid. p. v.

⁴ Dixon, III. 422.

book was published for Ireland in the same year, and remained in use till the end of the reign, for no authorisation was ever given to the Second Prayer Book in Ireland, though no doubt it was used in English circles there.¹ The Book was unpopular everywhere; and though the conservative priests, as in England, made the best of it for the moment by retaining the old ceremonial, they made no delay to restore the Latin Mass on the first news of the death of Edward.²

¹ Bp. Bale insisted on its use when he was consecrated by Abp. Browne, but was unable to secure its use in his diocese. Dixon, III. 498.

² 'The Communion was altogether like a popish Mass, with the old apish tricks of Antichrist, bowings and

beckings, kneelings and knockings.' This is Bp. Bale's account from his scurrilous description of his brief experiences in Ireland, *The Vocation of John Bale to the Bishopric of Ossory*: quoted in Dixon, III. 497 and ff.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER NOTED.

THE old Latin Services were each provided with their music, and the musical Service-books were just as much authoritative as the rest. When the First Prayer Book was published, the want of a similar musical counterpart soon would be felt.¹ This was never officially satisfied: strong official opinions were expressed condemnatory of all music but the plainsong,² and Cranmer, at least, desired a great simplification of the traditional melodies so that there should be one note only to a syllable. The tentative efforts made previously to the Prayer Book proceeded as we have seen³ upon that principle, but a more public and permanent result was achieved by the publication in 1550 of *The Booke of Common Praier Noted*, containing a full, though simple, musical directory for the Prayer Book upon the lines of the old Church music which had for a thousand years been in use⁴—that is to say, for Mattins, Evensong, Communion Service, and Burial of the Dead, with a special Mass for the funeral.⁵

At the end appeared the name 'John Merbecke,' which recalled how, in 1543, in the Royal Chapel of Windsor itself, four singing men had been condemned for heresy under the Act of the Six Articles, and three had actually been burnt in front of the castle; while the fourth, whose worst offence seems to have been the construction of a concordance to the Bible in English, was pardoned, and survived to carry out this musical reform.⁶

¹ As in the case of the Litany of 1544. See above, p. 32.

² 'Itaque vibratam illam et operosam musicam quæ figurata dicitur auferrî placet, quæ sic in multitudinis auribus tumultuatur ut sæpe linguam non possit ipsam loquentium intelligere.' *Reformatio Legum. De div. off. cap. v.*

³ See above, p. 35.

⁴ Preface. 'In this booke is conteyned so muche of the Order of Common Prayer as is to be song in Churches.' See Grafton's original issue, or Whittingham's reprint for

Pickering (1844). It did not contain the Litany, nor any direction for reading the lessons, although even to the end of the reign it was said that 'In Cathedrall Churches they utter their lessons in plaine song.' *Brief discourse of the Troubles begun at Frankfurt* (Reprint of 1846), p. xxix.

⁵ As this does not include *Gloria in excelsis*, it is evident that it was not contemplated that this would be included in a Funeral Celebration; the rubric allowed such omission on weekdays.

⁶ Foxe, v. 464. Dixon, II. 328.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK.

Revision.

The failure
of Uniformity.

No sooner had the First Prayer Book appeared, backed by the first attempt to enforce Uniformity by Act of Parliament, than it became a bone of contention. The conservatives disliked it for its innovations and its abrogation of the old services, the reformers because it retained too much of the old and did not go far enough in innovation. For the moment, both parties were content to use it, but in doing so they put very different constructions on it. The Catholic-minded, with the Bishops of the Old Learning at their head and the precedent of the Order of Communion at their back, maintained with the new Rite as much as was compatible of the old doctrine and ceremonial.¹ There was nothing to prevent their doing so,² and in the absence of rubrics directing otherwise they were perfectly within their rights. The party of reform led by the reforming

¹ In October, 1550, it was reported to the Council of the service in S. Paul's, 'that it was used as the very Mass.' Council Book, Strype, *Memoirs*, II. i. 237. Bucer made similar complaints; Gorham, *Ref. Glean*, p. 201. Strype, *Mem.* II. ii. NN.

² Indeed, the book could not be used except by applying to it a knowledge of the method of performing

the Latin Service. It was assumed that the Priest would know, for example, (i) the old rules for the endings of the Collects, (ii) the old preface for Trinity Sunday and its variations from other prefaces (see below, p. 490), (iii) the rules for the saying or not saying of *Gloria in excelsis* (see above, p. 65 n.).

bishops, according to the shade of the colour of their opinions, either welcomed the simplicity of ceremonial, resigning with relief the old elaborateness, or else outran the new movement itself, by declaiming against such decency and order as was still prescribed, or even by refusing conformity to it.

Thus it is one of the grim sarcasms of history that the first Act of Uniformity should have divided the Church of England into the two parties, which have ever since contended within her on ceremonial and doctrinal matters. From the first, little is heard of the former body: the blind though dogged conservatives had little chance of making any pause in such a whirl of change, and the voices even of the central body of Catholic-minded bishops and clergy, who were willing enough for reform but did not want a revolution,¹ were soon drowned in the clamour of extreme men goaded on by the extravagance of foreign divines and the shamelessness of rapacious politicians. Iconoclasm had only whetted its thirst by a

¹ The sense in which they were willing to accept the Prayer Book may be gathered from Gardiner's allusions to it in his controversy with Cranmer. For example: It teaches 'the most true and catholic doctrine of the substance of the Sacrament' that 'we receive in the Sacrament the Body of Christ with our mouth' (Cranmer's *Works* on the Lord's Supper, I. 55). He willingly argues that 'When the Church by the minister and with the minister prayeth that the creatures of bread and wine set on the altar (as the Book of Common Prayer in this realm hath ordered), may be unto us the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, we require then the celebration of the same supper which Christ made to His Apostles for to be the continual memory of His death with all fruit and effect, such as the same had in the first institution' (*Ibid.* 83, cp. 79). He approves the book on the point 'that it is very profitable at that time when the memory of Christ's death is solemnized to remember with prayer all estates of the Church' (*Ibid.* 84). In conclusion, he declares that 'the effect of all celestial or worldly gifts to be obtained of God in the celebration of Christ's Holy Supper when we call it the Communion, is now prayed for to be present, and with God's favour shall be obtained if we devoutly, reverently, and charitably and quietly use and frequent the same without other innovations than the order of the book prescribeth' (*Ibid.*), and that 'the true faith of the holy mystery . . . in the Book of Common Prayer is well termed, not distant from the Catholic faith in my judgment' (*Ibid.* 92).

Revision.
Destruction
of altars.

breaking down of images, and proceeded to the destruction of the altars in defiance of the Prayer Book, but under the direction of such men as Ridley, the new Bishop of London who, by a miserable alienation of the Church's property, had acquired the place of the deposed Bonner (April, 1550).¹

The extreme men attempted in every way to prevent the moderates from interpreting the doctrine and arranging the ceremonial of the Prayer Book in accordance with Catholic precedent, and even the ceremonies expressly retained were openly denounced, both by English and foreign Reformers.² Their attempt might have been tolerable from men who themselves were loyal to the existing order, even though they viewed it with a sour and narrow prejudice; but their further proceedings disqualified them from being in any sense fair exponents of the new order; and the whole course of events showed

Dissatisfac-
tion of the
Reform
party.

¹ Dixon, III. 197.

² See Hooper's letter to Bullinger, Dec. 27, 1549, rejoicing over the destruction of the altars, but complaining that 'the public celebration of the Lord's Supper is very far from the Order and Institution of our Lord': complaining also of the repeated celebrations, the vestments and candles, and that 'the mass priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the papacy.' *Orig. Letters*, p. 72.

Three months later, Hooper spoke of the Prayer Book as 'very defective and of doubtful construction, and, in some respects, indeed, manifestly impious.' *Ibid.* p. 79.

Calvin wrote a long letter to the Protector on October 22, 1549 (not 1548), urged a more drastic Reformation, and objected especially to the

prayer for the dead in the Communion Service, the chrysom and the unction. Next he exhorted Bucer, who was now in England to urge the Protector also 'that rites which savour at all of superstition be utterly abolished.' Gorham, *Ref. Glean.* pp. 66, 115.

Bucer, in his *Censura* (1551), complained, echoing the Injunctions (see them above, p. 59): 'Sunt qui quibuscunque possunt signis nunquam satis execratam missam suam representare student; et vestibus, luminaribus et inclinationibus, crucibus, abluendo calicem, aliisque missalibus gestibus, halitu supra panem et calicem Eucharistiæ, transferendo librum in mensa de dextra ad sinistram mensæ partem, mensam in eodem ponendo loco quo stabat altare, ostendendo panem et calicem Eucharistiæ, adorantibus illa vetulis aliisque superstitiosis hominibus, qui sacramentis tamen non communicant.' *Scripta Anglicana* (Basel, 1577) pp. 493, 494. Cp. pp. 465, 472.

Revision.

that they were embarked on a far more headlong career of innovation than at first was realized. The destruction of the altars was one clear indication that there was to be no finality in the position created by the Prayer Book. Ridley, who with Hooper¹ was prime mover in the destruction of the altars of Baal,² attempted to reconcile his action with the provisions of the Prayer Book, but in fact it was a high-handed and illegal proceeding, though accomplished under cover of an official Visitation of his Cathedral and Diocese, and backed by the civil power.³ Notwithstanding these efforts, many altars remained with their rich hangings and jewels, and gold and silver plate; and we can hardly think otherwise than that some courtiers desired their destruction because they hoped to enrich themselves by the plunder of such valuable furniture,⁴ which would not be wanted for 'an honest table.' Hence an order was issued (Nov. 4, 1550) for the entire removal of the altars, and arguments were prepared, and sent with the Council's letter,⁵ to the bishops, to reconcile the parishioners to the loss of the ornaments of their churches.⁶ The change, however, involved rubrical difficulties: the people had been accustomed to kneel before the altar at the time of Communion; but what should be their posture before or around a table? The

Their law-
less action.

¹ See his Sermon IV upon Jonas. *Early Writings*, p. 488.

² *Orig. Letters*, p. 79.

³ King Edward's Journal (in Burnet, *Hist.*). 'June 23, Sir John Gates, Sheriff of Essex, went down with letters to see the Bishop of London's injunctions performed, which touched plucking down of superaltaries, altars, and such like ceremonies and abuses.' See *Greyfriars Chron.* p. 67-69, Wriothlesley, *Chronicle*, ii. 47, for details of the changes at S.

Paul's in 1550 and 1551.

⁴ *Instructions for the Survey of Church-goods in Northamptonshire*, 1552. '... in many places great quantity of the said plate, jewels, bells, and ornaments be embezzled by certain private men.' Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* XXVII.

⁵ *Doc. Ann.* XXIV. cp. Gorham, p. 213.

⁶ For the course of the Altar war, see Dixon, III. 199 and ff.

Revision.

priest also had been directed to stand before the middle of the altar fixed at the east end of the choir; but where should he stand to minister at a movable table placed for the Communion in the middle or at the western entrance of the chancel, or even in the nave of the church? All this pointed to the need of further change.

Disputes
about
vestments

With the same tendency, a great discussion was going on about ecclesiastical vestments. Everything which had been used under the old *régime* was unclean in the eyes of the more ardent reformers, who had foreign ideals before them and communicated with Switzerland rather than with Germany. Great attacks had been made upon the vestments, which had been retained, as well as upon the ceremonies. This matter was brought to a head by the appointment of Hooper, against his will, to the bishopric of Gloucester. He had for some time been conspicuous as a leader in the attack on the Prayer Book, but the Council reckoned on forcing their nominee to accept, not only the bishopric, but also the vestments and ceremonies which he scrupled. For nearly a whole year he remained obdurate: he carried his point about the oath¹ but could gain no support from those in power in the other respects. After a long, hot, and fruitless debate with Ridley,² Hooper was committed to the Fleet, by order of the Privy Council (January 27, 1551). This curious mode of compelling a bishop-elect to be consecrated had the effect desired by those in authority. Hooper yielded so far as to submit to the reduced ceremonial of the Ordinal and be consecrated (March 8), and then to preach in rochet and chimere before the King,³ on the understanding that he would not be re-

Hooper,
Bishop of
Gloucester.

¹ See above p. 61.

² *Orig. Letters*, p. 573 (October 20, 1550).

³ *Orig. Letters*, CXXIV. Foxe gives a quaint description of this scene. *Acts and Mon.* VI. 641.

Revision.

quired to use the objectionable dress on all occasions in the retirement of his diocese.¹

A further disturbing element in the situation was the formal criticism which some of the foreign divines had been requested to pass upon the Prayer Book at its first appearance. Peter Martyr (Vermigli), the Italian Austin Canon whom the Inquisition had driven out of Italy, had come by way of Zürich and Strasburg, to join the body of Lutheran and other refugees² whom Cranmer collected round him as early as the beginning of the reign. At the end of May 1549, he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, where his lectures raised no small commotion.³

Influence of
foreigners.Peter
Martyr.

Martin Bucer, who as Pastor at Strasburg had watched with interest the course of events in England, was also drawn across the Channel, when in consequence of the celebrated religious compromise devised by the Emperor and known as the *Interim* (July 1548) his position in Strasburg became a difficult one.⁴ He arrived in England at Cranmer's invitation in April 1549 and at the end of the year became a friendly rival of Martyr⁵ in the Divinity Chair at Cambridge.

Bucer.

The opinion of each of these doctors was sought upon the Prayer Book, apparently in view of the raising of the question of further revision in the coming Convocation of December 1550. Hitherto there had been no such invitation, and though Bucer's influence might be trace-

¹ See Dixon, III. 213-220, 254-256. established at Glastonbury. These foreign congregations were allowed the exercise of their own forms of worship under Cranmer's protection, in spite of the protest of Ridley and other bishops. See *Orig. Letters* CCLXIII. and Additional Note, p. 86.

² Two others who deserve special mention as compilers of services at this date were John à Lasco, who became pastor of the foreign congregations in London, and Valerandus Pollanus, who fled to England from Strasburg with a number of his French and Flemish followers, and was

³ Dixon, III. 66.

⁴ Dixon, II. 522.

⁵ *Ibid.* III. 119.

Revision.

Bucer's first impressions.

able in the Ordinal the foreigners had had no direct part in the revision;¹ but this was now entirely altered. Bucer had already written down his first impressions in a letter sent to the Ministers at Strasburg on the day after he reached Lambeth; in this he expressed general approval with regard 'to the establishment of doctrines and the definition of rites,' but criticised with characteristic moderation the concessions made in the retention of vestments, candles, chrism, and the commemoration of the dead.² This was clearly a hasty review of the book, written as he made his first acquaintance with it through the medium of an interpreter.³ His mature judgment was elaborately given from an intimate acquaintance with the book in his *Censura*, a laborious criticism extending to 28

His Censura.

¹ Dixon, II. 281 n. and see above p. 62.

² 'The cause of religion as far as appertains to the establishment of doctrines and the definition of rites, is pretty near what could be wished. Efforts must now be made to obtain suitable ministers . . . for . . . the pastors of the Churches have hitherto confined their duties chiefly to ceremonies, and have very rarely preached and never catechised . . . As soon as the description of the ceremonies now in use shall have been translated into Latin we will send it to you. We hear that some concessions have been made, both to a respect for antiquity and to the infirmity of the present age: such for instance as the vestments commonly used in the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the use of candles: so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead and the use of chrism: for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred

by too extensive innovations from embracing His religion, but that rather they may be won over. This circumstance, however, greatly refreshed us, that all the Services are read and sung in the vernacular tongue, that the doctrine of justification is purely and soundly taught, and the Eucharist administered according to Christ's ordinance, private masses having been abolished.' *Orig. Letters*, CCXLVIII. p. 535. April 26, 1549.

³ 'Equidem cum primum in hoc regnum venissem, quæ publice dogmata quique ritus in ecclesia essent recepti: videremque eo, num meum possem ministerium his solido consensu adjungere, librum istum sacrorum per interpretem, quantum potui, cognovi diligenter; quo facto egi gratias Deo, qui dedisset vos has ceremonias eo puritatis reformare; nec enim quicquam in illis deprehendi, quod non sit ex verbo Dei desumptum, aut saltem ei non adversetur, commode acceptum. Nam non desunt pauca quædam, quæ si quis non candide interpretetur, videri queant non satis: cum verbo Dei congruere.' *Buceri Prologus in*

Revision.

chapters,¹ sometimes shrewd, sometimes merely perverse, always moderate and scholarly, and generally representing a middle position between the doctrine of the Church and the extravagances of extreme foreign Reformers.

While speaking with approval of the Daily Prayers and the Communion Service as entirely scriptural and primitive, and approving of the division of the sexes in church, he objects to the use of the choir for Divine Service, as being an antichristian separation of the clergy from the laity, and also inconvenient for hearing.

He speaks in terms of general approbation of the Communion Service,² the order that intending communicants should signify their names to the Curate, and the new directions about the form and substance of the bread, but he would 'like to add, that the usual leavened bread may be used as well as the wafer.' He objects to the use of the first part of the service without proceeding to an actual communion as 'half a Mass, yet with all the vesture of a whole Mass';³ to the receiving of oblations from persons absent, to the practice of non-communicants remaining in church, and to certain gestures, such as kneeling, crossing, knocking upon the breast, which were practised, by many people, and allowed, though not directed, by a rubric. He objects to the use of peculiar vestments⁴ at this service, because they had been abused

Communion Service.

Censuram (*Scripta Angl.*, p. 456.)

¹ '*Censura Martini Buceri super libro Sacrorum, seu ordinationis ecclesie atque ministerii ecclesiastici in Regno Angliæ, ad petitionem R. Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, Thomæ Cranmeri, conscripta.*' Inter Buceri *Scripta Anglicana*, fol. Basil. 1577.

² 'De hac quantas possum ago gratias Deo, qui dedit eam tam puram, tamque religiose ad verbum Dei exactam, maxime illo jam tempore quo hoc factum est, constitui.

Perpaucis enim verbis et signis exceptis nihil omnino in ea conspicio, quod non ex divinis depromptum Scripturis sit; si modo omnia populis Christi digna religione exhiberentur atque explicarentur.' *Ibid.* p. 465.

³ 'Dimidiatam missam dicere vestibus omnino missalibus.' *Ibid.* p. 459.

⁴ 'Non quod credam in ipsis quicquam esse impii per se, ut pii homines illis non possint pie uti.' *Ibid.* p. 458.

Revision.

to superstition, and would lead to disputes; also to the delivery of the Sacrament into the mouth and not into the hand of the communicant, and to the direction to place upon the holy table only so much bread and wine as may be sufficient for the communicants, as implying a 'superstitious' notion of the effect of consecration: ¹ he allows however, that at a very early period care was taken to avoid profanation of the remains of the consecrated elements. He objects to prayer for the dead, and to the phrase, 'sleep of peace,' as implying a sleep of the soul; to the ceremonies of making the sign of the cross, and taking the elements into the hand in the action of consecration; to the prayer of invocation of the Holy Spirit, that the elements 'may be unto us the Body and Blood of Christ'; and to the mention of the ministry of the holy angels in carrying our prayers before God. He objects to the crossing at consecration and wishes to have the Manual Acts abolished, as well as the words 'who in the same night, &c.' and all that signified consecration. He approves of homilies, and proposes several additional subjects for new ones. He allows that a second Communion was anciently administered on high festivals, when the churches were too small to hold the congregation; but he dislikes the practice, implying, as it did, that there would be a larger number of communicants at Christmas and Easter than at other times, whereas all ought to communicate every Lord's Day.

Baptismal Office.

He proposes that Baptism should be administered between the sermon and the communion, because more people were present then than at the morning or evening

¹ 'Nonnulli eam sibi fingunt superstitionem, ut existiment nephas esse, si quid ex pane et vino communicationis ea peracta supersit, pati id in usum venire vulgarem; quasi pani huic et vino insit per se aliquid numinis aut sancti etiam extra communicationis usum.' *Ibid.* p. 464. This view was propounded only to be emphatically rejected.

Revision.

prayers; ¹ and that the office should be begun at the font, where the congregation can hear, instead of at the church door. He observes that every scenic practice ought to be removed from divine service, and that whatever ancient ceremonies are retained should be few in number, and should be carefully explained to the people: such ceremonies in Baptism were, the putting on the white garment or chrysom, the anointing with chrism, and the signing with the cross: the exorcism also he considers to be objectionable, as implying that all unbaptized persons are demoniacs. The clause which asserts the sanctification of water to the mystical washing away of sin by the Baptism of Christ he wishes to be omitted, utterly disliking all benedictions, or consecrations of inanimate things. He wishes the phrase to be altered, that infants 'come,' whereas they are brought to Baptism: he dislikes the mode of addressing the infants, who cannot understand what is said, both at the time of signing with the cross, and in the examination which was addressed to the child, although the questions were answered by the sponsors. He approves of private Baptism in case of necessity.

He insists upon frequent catechizing, and that all young persons, whether confirmed or not, should be present, and that none should be confirmed before they had by their manners approved their faith, and their determination of living unto God. He desires that marriages should be solemnized only in open day, and before the congregation; he desires that the bishops should make a law of prohibited degrees; he approves of the ceremonies of

Catechism.

Confirmation.

Matrimony.

¹ 'Cumque nec ad matutinas nec ad vespertinas preces solet ecclesia incipiatur.' *Ibid.* p. 477. The substitution of Morning Prayer for the Lord's Service had clearly not yet frequentissima adhuc est ecclesia, begun.

Revision.

Visitation of the Sick.

Burial.

Communion.

Festivals.

the ring and marriage-gifts, and the manner of first laying them upon the book, and then receiving them from the Minister to give to the Bride. In the office of the Visitation of the Sick he objects only to the anointing; in the Churching office to the chrysom and the offering; and, in the Burial Service, to the form of commending the soul to God, or in any terms praying for the dead. He wishes the Communion Service to be used more frequently than on the first day of Lent, three or four times in the year; the denunciations he thinks should be arranged in the order of the Decalogue. Bell-ringing he greatly dislikes, and would have it entirely forbidden, except only before service. If any Festivals were retained, besides those of our Lord, and a very few others,¹ he thinks that they should be observed only in the afternoon. He speaks of many people walking about and talking in the churches, and therefore wishes them to be shut when no service was proceeding. As additions to the Prayer Book, he wishes a Confession of Faith to be composed, shortly and clearly declaring the points that were controverted in that age; and also a larger Catechism.² The examination in the Ordination Service he wishes to be extended to disputed points of theology, and he desires that Ministers should be kept to their duty by annual inspections and Synods.³

Bucer delivered this well-meaning but unsatisfactory criticism on January 5, 1551, to the Bishop of Ely, for whom it was originally written, though subsequently the

¹ 'Item quibus visitatio Mariæ Dominica, institutio Baptismatis, matris Domini, natalis Johannis, et divi Petri atque Pauli, Martyrum, Angelorumque peragitur memoria.' Bucer, *Censura*, p. 494.

² 'In quo singulæ Catechismi partes, Symbolum quod vocant Apostolorum, decem præcepta, Oratio

Dominica, institutio Baptismatis, Cœnæ, ministerii ecclesiastici, disciplinæ poenitentialis, sic explicentur, ut populus in horum explanatione locos omnes religionis . . . valeat perdiscere.' *Ibid.* p. 501.

³ Cf. Dixon, II. 281-293. Collier, *Ecl. Hist.* v. pp. 387 sqq.

Revision.

Martyr's view.

Preparations for a Revised Book.

preface was addressed to the archbishop: before the end of the next month he was dead.

In the case of Peter Martyr there is no extant document containing his criticisms of the Prayer Book, though he certainly drew up and submitted a censure of his own. We have only his own account of his criticism, in a letter to Bucer (January 10, 1551). It seems that he was not well acquainted with the contents of the Prayer Book, and that no complete Latin version was within his reach. A version, probably of the ordinary services, by Cheke, was put into his hands, and upon it he offered a set of annotations to the archbishop. Afterwards, on reading Bucer's larger treatise, he was surprised to find what the book contained, and added his approval of his friend's observations. He notices one point which he marvels that Bucer had overlooked, that if a sick person was to receive the Communion on the same day that it was publicly administered in the church, a portion of the Sacrament was to be reserved and carried to the sick person. To this Martyr objected, because he held falsely that 'the words belong rather to men than either to bread or wine.'¹

At the same time as these censures were prepared, some conference was held of bishops and others to prepare for future changes. The views of Bucer and Martyr were in the hands of those concerned: the latter was being assured by Cranmer that great changes were in prospect, was congratulating himself on having had such an excellent opportunity of admonishing the bishops,² and was

¹ Strype, *Cranmer*, App. LXI. mihi exposuit, neque ego de illo aut ad panem aut ad vinum pertinere.' quærere ausus sum. Verum hoc non me parum recreat, quod mihi D.

² 'Conclusum jam est in hoc eorum Checus indicavit: Si noluerint ipsi, colloquio, quemadmodum mihi retulit ait, efficere ut quæ mutanda sint reverendissimus, ut multa immutentur. Sed quænam illa sint, quæ consenserint emendanda, neque ipse ipse suæ majestatis auctoritatem in-

Revision.

being insolently assured by Cheke that if the bishops were reluctant they would be coerced by the King. Both Cranmer and Ridley were anxious at this time for the abolition of the vestments, but unwilling to bring it about except 'by the general consent of the whole kingdom.'¹ All was being prepared in view of the future meeting of Convocation and Parliament: the bishops 'agreed among themselves on many emendations and corrections in the published book,' and 'the alterations on which they decided were noted in their places,' and shewn to Peter Martyr: but he from his ignorance of English gained nothing from this but the general impression that they had not gone far in reform, and that Cranmer was held back by his colleagues. Cheke again appears at this stage as the extreme man of the body of revisers:² but no further light is thrown either on its procedure or on its composition until we reach a letter of Cranmer³ written after the passing of the second Act of Uniformity, which mentions by name Ridley and Martyr with 'a great many bishops and others of the best learned within this realm appointed for that purpose.'

Legislation.

The sweating sickness which prevailed in the autumn was probably the reason why Parliament, which should have met in November, was prorogued till the month of January; and with it the hopes of the reforming party were postponed.⁴ Meanwhile they had to content themselves with the hopes of the reform of Ecclesiastical Law—a project which was occupying the minds of a Commission throughout the autumn and during the

terponet.' Peter Martyr, *Letter to Bucer*; Strype, *Cranmer*, App. LXI. (Jan. 10, 1551). Gorham, p. 227.
¹ *Orig. Letters*, 426, John ab Ulmis to Bullinger (Dec. 31, 1550). This illustrates their rigid attitude towards Hooper. See p. 70.
² Martyr to Bucer (Feb. 1551). Gorham, p. 232.
³ See below, p. 84.
⁴ *Orig. Letters*, 500; Martyr to Bullinger (Oct. 26, 1551).

Revision.

opening months of 1552,¹—and with some disputations on the subject of the Eucharist.²

On January 24th, two days after the execution of Somerset, Parliament met, and Convocation on the following day. Of the acts of the latter, Heylyn professed that he could find little record: but a document which he assigns to a Convocation in 1550 and 1551 probably belongs to this date.³

The opportunity, for which Cranmer and the reforming bishops had been waiting, was now come, for obtaining public authorisation for their further projects; the moderate party had been everywhere repressed, and their leaders among the bishops, who had submitted, however unwillingly, to the First Prayer Book, were in prison—Gardiner, who had been committed to the Tower on the morrow of his sermon on the Eucharist delivered June 29, 1548;⁴ Bonner, who had used the new book, and then had also fallen victim to the tyrannical expedient of being forced to preach a test sermon;⁵ Heath, who had lost his liberty over the Ordinal, Day over the destruction of altars, and Tonsal on an obscure charge of treason.⁶ From the scanty and dubious records of Convocation, it seems likely that the proceedings there were abortive. There seems to have been

In Convocation.

¹ Several commissions were issued, and their meetings are alluded to in letters of the time in a misleading way as *convocatio*. See *Orig. Letters*, 444, and also 314, which must be of the same date, cp. 447, 503, 580, 889. See Dixon, III. 351, for the history of this project.
² Nov. 25. Sir John Cheke, Horne dean of Durham, Whitehead, and Grindal, with Feckenham and Young on the popish side, met at the house of Sir Wm. Cecyl, Secretary of State. Cheke propounded this question: 'Quis esset verus et germanus sensus verborum cœnæ, Hoc est corpus meum? Num quem verba sensu grammatico accepta præ se ferebant, an aliud quiddam?' A second disputation upon the same question was held on Dec. 3rd. Strype, *Cranmer*, II. 26.

³ See Gasquet and Bishop, 286. Their view seems far more probable than Dixon's (III. 249).

⁴ Dixon, II. 520; III. 163, 220.

⁵ Dixon, III. 132 and ff.

⁶ Dixon, III. 320.

Revision.

no discussion upon the new draft of the book as a whole, but only upon some 'doubts' concerning the feasts, retained or abrogated,¹ and the formula and method of administering the Holy Sacrament.² And this is only in the Upper House; while the Lower House debated, but came to no conclusion, and deferred the question.³

In Parliament.

Meanwhile, the time was coming for the whole book to be put forward in Parliament with the second Act of Uniformity. About a month was occupied in the passing of the measure (March 9–April 14). The two bishops, who remained of the former opponents of the First Prayer Book, again appeared to vote against the new Bill—viz., Aldrich, of Carlisle, and Thirlby, of Norwich.⁴ It was finally passed at the close of the Session on April 14, but its operation was not to begin till the All Saints' Day (November 1) following.⁵

The Second Prayer Book.

When the proposals were scrutinised, it was clear that the opinions of Bucer and Martyr had not been without their effect: many of the suggestions of the former had

¹ This was probably connected with the Act about fasts and Holy days passed by this parliament. Dixon, III. 436.

² The first debate among the prelates was of such doubts as had arisen about some things contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and more particularly touching such feasts as were retained and such as had been abrogated by the rules thereof: the form of words used at the giving of the bread, and the different manner of administering the Holy Sacrament; which being signified unto the Prolocutor and the rest of the clergy who had received somewhat in charge about it the day before, answer was made that they had not yet sufficiently considered of the points proposed; but that they would give their lord-

ships some account thereof in the following Session.' Heylyn, *Hist.*, 5 Edw. § 15, but ascribed to 1550–1551. Cp. p. 79 for this Convocation.

³ In the Convocation of October, 1553, Weston, the Prolocutor, expressly congratulated the Convocation that the Prayer Book had not had its sanction. Dixon, IV. 73.

⁴ At its opening session, parliament was occupied with a Bill designed simply to enforce more rigidly the frequenting of the services of the first Prayer Book: this subsequently coalesced with the new Bill for the revised Prayer Book, and became the second Act of Uniformity. Dixon, III. 431 and ff.

⁵ The Act is in Gee and Hardy's *Documents*, no. LXXI.

been adopted, but his conservative views had clearly not found so much favour as his proposals for alteration, and, while some of his worst suggestions were set aside, in other respects the changes made were more radical. These seem to have been dictated by the desire to be rid of such passages in the First Prayer Book as the moderate party—and especially Gardiner¹—had fastened upon for their comfort. At the same time, for the sake of appearances, and to bridge over the gulf between the old order and the new, the alterations, important as they are, were said to be adopted only for the sake of rendering the new book 'fully perfect in all such places in which it was necessary to be made more earnest and fit for the stirring up of all Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God,' and with no intention of condemning the doctrines of the former book. And the second Act of Uniformity declared that the First Prayer Book was a very godly order in the mother tongue, 'agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church'; and that such doubts as had been raised in the use and exercise thereof proceeded rather from 'the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause.'

The chief alterations now made were:—

In the *Daily Prayer*, the introductory Sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution, were placed at the beginning of the service.

In the *Communion Office*, the Decalogue was added, and the Kyries adapted to it; the Introit was omitted; and the mixture of water with the wine at the Offertory; the new Canon or long prayer of consecration, beginning with the Prayer for the Universal Church, and ending with the Lord's Prayer, which had been composed as an

¹ In his controversy with Cranmer. See above, p. 67, note.

The Second Prayer Book

The nature of the changes.

No condemnation intended of the First Prayer Book.

Changes made in 1552.

amendment upon the ancient Canon in the Roman Liturgy, was divided into three parts, and became the Prayer for the Church Militant, the Prayer of Consecration, and the first alternative Prayer after Communion; at the same time the commemoration of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the thanksgiving for the Patriarchs and Prophets, the sign of the cross and the invocation of the Word and the Holy Ghost at the consecration were struck out from it. The order of parts was altered so that communion should immediately follow consecration. At the delivery of the Blessed Sacrament to the communicants, the second clause in each case of our present forms was substituted for the first clause, whereby direct mention was avoided of taking the Body and Blood of Christ.

In *Baptism*, the exorcism, the anointing, the putting on the chrysom, and the triple repetition of the immersion were omitted; the font was to be filled, and the water to be consecrated, whenever the service was used.

In the *Visitation of the Sick* the anointing was omitted: the curate was no longer directed to celebrate or to reserve but only vaguely to 'minister' the Communion; in the *Burial Service*, the prayers for the dead, and the special office for the Eucharist at funerals.

The rubric concerning *Vestments* ordered that neither alb, vestment, nor cope should be used; a bishop should wear a rochet, a priest or deacon only a surplice.

The chief doctrinal alteration was in reference to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. In the book of 1549 the Communion Service had been so constructed as to be consistent with the Catholic belief in the real presence. But the alterations in 1552 were designed to facilitate and foster the view that the prayer of consecration had reference rather to the persons than to the elements, and that the presence of Christ was not in

Doctrinal
change re-
specting
Christ's pre-
sence in the
Eucharist.

the Sacrament but only in the heart of the believer. The pale of Church communion was thus enlarged for the more ultra reformers, and narrowed by the attempt to exclude those who were determined to retain the primitive doctrine apart from mediæval accretions.

The interval between the close of Parliament and the date fixed for the use of the new book (November 1) was by no means uneventful. While still in embryo the book was the subject of controversy, and just before it came to the birth, a storm burst which left an ill-starred mark upon it. The extreme party among the reformers had for some time been making a dead set at the practice of kneeling at communion. The crotchety Hooper had shown his non-conforming zeal in this as in other respects, and others had followed his example. The immediate cause of the storm seems to have been the profane recklessness of John Knox, who, though a licensed preacher, had openly set aside the Prayer Book, and, taking advantage of the absence of any direction on the subject, had substituted sitting for kneeling, and common bread for wafer bread in the Communion; he was now not content with infecting the north of England with his irreverence, but, when he came up to London as Royal Chaplain, he preached a violent sermon against the kneeling.¹ The Council awoke to the fact that in the forthcoming Prayer Book this practice, which was calling forth so much opposition, was for the first time specifically ordered; and, thereupon beginning to repent, suspended the issue of the book,² already in print (September 27, 1552), under the pretext that there were

Publication
delayed.

¹ *Orig. Letters*, 591. Utenhovius if he have distributed any of them to Bullinger, Oct. 12, 1552. among his company (of stationers),

² 'A letter to Grafton the printer that then to give strait commandment to every of them not to put any of the books of the new service. And of them abroad until certain faults

printer's errors which needed alteration, and also wrote to Cranmer, ordering him to reconsider the question. The Archbishop had apparently at last reached the end of his tether. He had been pushed on and on by foreign influence, by Bucer first, and after Bucer's death by more extreme men from abroad: but he would go no further: in reply, he made a spirited but despairing protest¹ against altering what Parliament had settled in deference to 'glorious and unquiet spirits, which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy;' and he showed up both the crudity of the Scriptural argument which was being alleged against the custom, and also the indecency of sitting to receive, but kneeling both immediately before and after reception.

While Cranmer was conferring, Knox had a new opportunity of prosecuting his victory. The draft of the Articles of Religion applauded the ceremonies of the new Book, and when the draft was (on October 21) referred to certain censors for their opinion, Knox renewed his attack. On the 27th following—whether in consequence of this or not is not clear—a letter went forth from the Council to the Lord Chancellor 'to cause to be joined unto the Book of Common Prayer lately set forth a

corrected.' *Council Book*, Sept. 26. Dixon, III. 476.

¹ After promising to see to the correction of printer's errors, he continued: 'And where I understand further by your Lordship's letters that some be offended with kneeling at the time of the receiving of the Sacrament, and would that I (calling to me the Bishop of London and some other learned men, as Mr. Peter Martyr or such like) should with them expend and weigh the said prescription of kneeling, whether it be fit to remain as a commandment or to be left out of the book: I shall accomplish the King's Majesty's commandment here-

in, albeit I trust that we with just balance weighed this at the making of the book, and not only we, but a great many Bishops and others of the best learned within this realm appointed for that purpose. And now the book being read and approved by the whole State of the realm in the High Court of Parliament with the King's Majesty his royal assent—that this should now be altered again without parliament, of what importance this matter is I refer to your Lordship's wisdom to consider.'

The whole letter is in Blunt. *Annotated B.C.P.* (London, 1888), p. 21, and Tomlinson, p. 256.

certain declaration, signed by the King's Majesty and sent unto his Lordship, touching the kneeling at the receiving of the Communion.'¹

Thus the Council compromised the matter by the insertion, on the eve of publication,² of the celebrated Black rubric,' which declared, in explanation of the rubric requiring communicants to kneel at receiving the Holy Sacrament, 'that it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or to any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood.'

Thus against the Archbishop's will and without the consent of the Church, English religion reached its low water mark and the ill-starred book of 1552 began its brief career. Ridley officiated at its first use in S. Paul's on All Saints' Day; the choir of S. Paul's was finally devastated,³ the organ silenced, the bishop in bare rochet, and his clergy in bare surplices filled in the details of the picture; and thereafter all communion ceased except on Sundays.⁴

¹ *Council Book*, Oct. 27, in Dixon, xxxvi. III. 483.

² This had already been almost completely done by anticipation a week previously, and the organ had been silenced a month since. *Greyfriars Chronicle*, 75.

³ While in others it was never inserted at all. Parker, *Introduction*, xxxii—*Wriothesley's Chronicle*, II. 78, 79; ⁴ *Greyfriars Chronicle*, 76. (Cp.

ADDITIONAL NOTE.

INFLUENCE OF FOREIGNERS.

MENTION has been made of Calvin, and of Bucer and Martyr, the distinguished foreigners who, having taken refuge in England, had some influence on the course of events here. Two others deserve further notice.

V. PULLAIN. The first of these is Valerand Pullain (Valerandus Pollanus) a Fleming by birth. He had succeeded Calvin in the pastorship of the Church of Strangers at Strasburg, but by reason of the publication of the *Interim* (1548), he was obliged to flee from that city with his congregation. These people were chiefly weavers of worsted; and on their arrival in England the Duke of Somerset gave them a home in the abbey buildings at Glastonbury, and provided them with the means of carrying on their manufacture.¹ In February 1551, Pullain published their Order of Service in Latin,² with a dedication to King Edward, to defend his people from those who slandered them for their change of religion and for licentiousness.³ This book has been supposed to have furnished hints to the revisers of the Book of Common Prayer in some additions which were made in 1552 to the ancient services. The introductory Sentences, with the Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution, which were then placed at the beginning of the Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Ten Commandments with the Responses, especially the last, subjoined to them, which were at the same time introduced at the beginning of the Communion Service, are supposed to be due in some degree to this publication of Pollanus. The following is the passage referred to, being the commencement of the Sunday Service:—

‘Die dominico mane hora octava, cum jam adest populus Pastore accedente Choraules incipit clara voce, *Leve le cueur*, ac

¹ Strype, *Cranmer*, II. 23. *brevis Apologia pro hac Liturgia, per*

² ‘*Liturgia Sacra, seu Ritus Ministerii in ecclesia peregrinorum profugorum propter Evangelium Christi* Lond. 23 Februar. Ann. 1551.’

³ Strype, *Eccles. Mem.* II., ch. Argentine. Adjecta est ad finem xxix. p. 242.

Influence of foreigners.

The Strasburg Liturgy

* Est decalogus rituum redditus.

populus accinit cum modestia et gravitate summa, ut ne quid voluptati aurium, sed serviant omnia reverentiæ Dei, et ædificationi tam canentium, quam audientium, si qui fortasse adsint non canentes.

Cum absolverint primam tabulam, tum pastor mensæ astans versus ad populum sic incipit: Adjutorium nostrum in nomine Domini, qui fecit cælum et terram. Amen. Deinde clara et distincta voce populum admonet de confessione peccatorum, hisque verbis præit:

Fratres, cogitet nunc vestrum unusquisque se coram Deo sisti, ut peccata et delicta sua omnia simplici animo confiteatur et agnoscat, atque apud vosmetipsos me præeuntem sequimini his verbis.

CONFESSIO PECCATI.

Domine Deus, Pater æterne et omnipotens, agnoscimus et fateamur ingenue apud sanctissimam Majestatem tuam, peccatores esse nos miseros, adeoque a prima origine, qua concepti et nati sumus, tam ad omne malum esse pronos, quam ab omni bono alienos; quo vitio tuas leges sanctissimas assidue transgredimur, eoque nobis exitium justissimo tuo judicio conquirimus. Attamen, Domine Deus, pœnitet sic offendisse bonitatem tuam, proindeque nos et facta nostra omnia nimium scelerata damnamus, orantes ut tu pro tua clementia huic nostræ calamitati succurras. Miserere igitur nostri omnium, O Deus et Pater clementissime ac misericors, per nomen filii tui Jesu Christi Domini nostri te obtestamur; ac deletis vitiis, ablutisque sordibus cunctis, largire atque adauge indes Spiritus tui sancti vim et dona in nobis, quo vere et serio nostram miseriam intelligentes, nostramque injustitiam agnoscentes, veram pœnitentiam agamus: qua mortui peccato deinceps abundemus fructibus justitiæ ac innocentie, quibus tibi placeamus per Jesum Christum filium tuum unicum redemptorem ac mediatorem nostrum. Amen.

ABSOLUTIO.

Hic pastor ex scriptura sacra sententiam aliquam remissionis peccatorum populo recitat, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Ac toto hoc tempore populus magna cum reverentia vel astat, vel procumbit in genua, utut animus cujusque tulerit.

Demum pronuntiato Evangelio hoc remissionis peccatorum a pastore, rursus populus præeunte Choraule totum decalogum

Influence of foreigners.

* Confessio Peccatorum:*

repeated after the Minister.

* Absolutio.*

Influence of
foreigners.

'Oratio.'
The Prayer
after the
Command-
ments.

absolvit, tum pastor ad orandum hortatus Ecclesiam his verbis ipse præit.

ORATIO.

Dominus adsit nobis, ut Deum oremus unanimes :

Domine Deus, Pater misericors, qui hoc decalogo per servum tuum Mosen nos Legis tuæ justitiam docuisti; dignare cordibus nostris eam ita tuo spiritu inscribere, ut nequicquam deinceps in vita magis optemus, aut velimus, quam tibi obedientia consummatissima placere in omnibus, per Jesum Christum filium tuum. Amen.

Hic Ecclesia eandem orationem verbis prope iisdem Choraule præeunte succinit.

Interea pastor suggestum conscendit ad concionandum. . .'

There follow the reading of Scripture, exposition and an hour's sermon, a collection, a long prayer for various needs and persons, and the service ends with creed, psalm, and blessing.

It will be seen from this extract that this service of Pollanus, which has a strong family likeness to others of the Genevan type,¹ may have furnished the hint, that the decalogue should be repeated in the public service, and suggested some phrases in the English additions of 1552.² But in the English book the Commandments were to be plainly recited in the hearing of the people, instead of being sung by them in metre; and they were appointed to be said not in the Morning Prayer, but at the commencement of the Communion, or principal service. The words, '*dignare cordibus nostris eam ita tuo spiritu inscribere;*' contain the subject of the petition which was placed as the concluding response after the Commandments, '*write all these thy laws in our hearts.*' Comparing this extract with the commencement of our Daily Prayer, we must observe that there is not one strictly parallel sentence, and Pollanus gives no form of Absolution at all. All that can be alleged respecting the opening portion of our service is, that the hint may have been taken from two books of service used by congregations of refugees in England, which were published about this time: the one being the version of Calvin's form, by Pollanus;

¹ Cp. *The forme of Common Prayer* 1547 had ordered that they should be taught to the people in English printed by Whitchurche, June 7, after the reading of the Gospel with the Lord's Prayer and Creed. *Doc.* 1550.

² The Edwardine Injunctions of *Ann.* II. p. 7.

and the other, that used by the Walloons under John Laski, or à-Lasco.

This truly influential person was a Polish ecclesiastic of noble birth, who left his country and his honours (1538) and became one of the extremest German reformers and Pastor at Emden in East Frisia. His first visit to England was in the autumn of 1548, when he resided six months with Cranmer. The introduction of the *Interim* into Friesland compelled him to seek a shelter in England in 1550.¹ He was soon after appointed superintendent of the congregations of foreign Protestants, German and French, in London, who were incorporated by a royal charter² and installed in the church of the Austin Friars,³ with permission to use their own ceremonies.⁴ He published in Latin the service used by his Church.⁵ His friendly intercourse with Cranmer would naturally lead to an inquiry as to the form of his worship; and that, not only with a reference to the English Service-book then under review, but that the English Government might know to what they were giving shelter and sanction. In this book there is a recitation of the commandments followed by a form of Confession and of Absolution, in which some phrases resemble the corresponding portions which were added to the second Book of Edward VI. The following are from the Confession:—

' . . . Neque amplius velis mortem peccatoris, sed potius ut convertatur et vivat . . . opem tuam divinam per meritum Filii tui dilecti supplices imploramus . . . nobisque dones Spiritum Sanctum tuum . . . ut lex tua sancta illi [cordi] insculpi ac per nos demum . . . tota vita nostra exprimi ejus beneficio possit.'⁶

The Absolution follows thus:—

'Habemus certam et indubitatam promissionem . . . quod omni-

¹ *Orig. Letters*, p. 560, Micronius to Bullinger (May 20, 1550), p. 483; Martyr to Bullinger (June 1, 1550). He was appointed superintendent by King Edward, on the 24th of July; *ibid.* note. Dixon, III. 231, 424.

² Collier, *Record*, LXV. Burnet, v. 305 (Pt. II. i. 202). *Orig. Letters*, 567, Micronius to Bullinger (Aug. 28, 1550).

³ Now the Dutch church in Austin Friars, E.C.

⁴ This was for some time limited: for an account of the services see *Orig. Letters*, 575, Micronius to Bul-

linger, Aug. 14, 1551. cp. 568, 570, 577. The Italians were also under Laski as superintendent. Dixon, III. 425.

⁵ '*Forma ac ratio tota ecclesiastici ministerii, in peregrinorum, potissimum vero Germanorum, ecclesia; instituta Londini in Anglia per Edwardum Sextum.*' *Sine loco et anno.* Other editions appeared in German, French, Dutch and Italian. *Brit. Mus. Catalogue*, II. 983.

⁶ *Forma ac ratio*, pp. 69—71. Cardwell, *Two Prayer Books of Ed. VI. compared.* Pref. p. xxxii. note.

Influence of
foreigners.

JOHN A-
LASCO.

Superinten-
dent of the
foreign Pro-
testant con-
gregations in
London.

His form of
Service

contains a
form of Con-
fession and
Absolution.

Influence of
foreigners.

bus vere pœnitentibus (qui videlicet agnitis peccatis suis cum sui accusatione gratiam ipsius per nomen Christi Domini implorant) omnia ipsorum peccata prorsus condonet atque aboleat . . . omnibus, inquam, vobis qui ita affecti estis denuncio, fiducia promissionum Christi, vestra peccata omnia in cœlo a Deo Patre nostro modis plane omnibus remissa esse.

Hooper mentions à-Lasco as alone standing on his side of all the foreigners who had any influence.¹ He was named among the thirty-two commissioners to frame ecclesiastical laws.² When the change came and England was no longer a congenial sphere, he returned to work on the Continent and left England, September 15, 1553.³

Lutheran
Kirchen-
Ordnungen.

It has proved very easy to over-estimate influence of foreign reformed services upon the English Rites. Apart from the *Consultation* and the Lutheran Litany, where the indebtedness is evident, and in the former case traceable to a widely current English version of that document, the parallelisms are vague. The above extracts show this to be so even in the case of documents which must have been well-known in England. Jacobs⁴ from the Lutheran standpoint and Gasquet from the Roman Catholic standpoint have multiplied references to many of the countless host of German Kirchen-Ordnungen published between 1523 and 1552: but most of the similarities are slight and such as naturally occur in documents as similar as these are in purpose and origin. The family likeness, such as it is, is collateral, not lineal.

¹ *Orig. Letters*, p. 95. Hooper to Bullinger (Aug. 1, 1551).

² *Orig. Letters*, p. 503, Martyr to Bullinger (March 8, 1552).

³ *Ibid.* p. 512. See further Hard-

wick, *Reformation*, (London, 1886) pp 70, 82 and ff. *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, and

for his early life, Dalton, *John a-Lasco*.

⁴ *The Lutheran Movement in Eng-*

land, p. 218 & ff.

CHAPTER V.

THE ELIZABETHAN PRAYER BOOK.

THE death of Edward VI (July 6, 1553), the collapse of the attempt of Lady Jane Grey to mount the throne, and the accession of Mary left no room for doubt as to the immediate fate of the English Prayer Book. It was practically buried with Edward when a month later, by way of compromise, while Gardiner performed a Requiem Mass before the Queen and Council in the Tower, Cranmer performed his funeral in Westminster Abbey on August 8 with the Burial Service and Communion from the Prayer Book.¹ For some time longer the English book remained in possession as the only Service-book in legal use, and for a moment there was some possibility that the compromise adopted over Edward's lifeless body might be continued for the peace of the Church:² but soon controversy broke out with too raging a flame to stop short of the destruction of the adversary. The Government moved slowly, while unauthorized zeal, as once before, anticipated the law, in introducing the Latin services into the churches in imitation of the Royal

* In Mary's
Reign.* A moment of
compromise.* Zeal out-
runs law.

¹ Dixon, iv. p. 10. 'First Proclamation about Religion'

² No prohibition of the English of Aug. 18. See Gee and Hardy, service was suggested by the Queen's LXXII. *Doc. Ann.* XXVIII.