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PREFACE

My purpose in this thesis is to study the English Books of Common Prayer of 1549, 1552, and 1559 in their historical setting, in an effort to see the reasons for their creation, to determine the extent of their Catholic validity, and to probe the question of their legality. Such an inquiry is historically significant in view of the very large part played in English history by the Church and her standards. It is almost a truism, but one worth repeating, that in order to understand English history it is essential to understand also the formation of England's ecclesiastical establishment.

In addition to the authors of the several books which I have used, I wish to express my sincere thanks to my advisers and teachers both at Rice Institute and Ohio State University, especially to Dr. Hardin Craig, Jr. for his invaluable criticisms and suggestions. Also I wish to acknowledge my debt to the Reverend James Dyar Moffett for suggesting this thesis to me, and to thank my family and friends for their inspiration and encouragement.

Houston, Texas.
June, 1948.
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CHAPTER I

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND

The basic economic changes in England which vitally affected the people's support of the Reformation, are to be sought in the reigns of Henry VIII and his father. The "new nobility," which was created after the Wars of the Roses, found it more profitable to pasture sheep on their land than to raise crops. This situation was accounted for in large part by the wool market in Flanders. Large numbers of tenant farmers were evicted by this conversion, for only a few men were needed to tend sheep. The landlords also enclosed much common pasture for their own purposes. Still more farmers were thereby dispossessed, and flocked to the cities, where they formed a loose, lawless, discontented mob, which had nothing to lose and everything to gain by any kind of change.

The dissolution of the monasteries by Henry VIII, although supported by one section of the population on moral grounds, and by another on economic grounds, removed usually kindly landlords, and replaced them, ordinarily, by less sympathetic ones. At the same time all classes were affected by a sharp rise of prices, which occurred because of (1) the influx of American gold and silver into Spain, which deranged the economic system of Europe; (2) the scarcity of agricultural produce occasioned by sheep culture; and (3) the debasement of the coinage engaged in by the Government in order to meet its rapidly expanding obligations.
The literature of the time reflects the discontent of the lower classes. About the year 1529 Simon Fish published a pamphlet entitled *A Supplicacyon for the Beggara*, which was directed against the clergy, whose magnificence ill-accorded with the poverty of the people. Its sale was forbidden by the Government, but it was surreptitiously hawked about.

Among other pamphlets of a similar purport, which were anonymously published, may be included the following: *A Supplycation to our most Sovereign Lorde Kynge Henry the Eight; A Supplication of the Poore Commons;* and *Certayne causes gathered together, wherein is shewed the decaye of England, only by the great multitude of shepe*. Probably the best known, and one of the most influential authors was Henry Brinkelow, who wrote two books, *Complaynt of Roderyck Mors* (1542), and *The Lamentacyone of a Christen Agaynst the Cytwe of London made by Roderigo Mora* (1545). Although it was not widely read by the people, for it was originally published in Latin, Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* reflected the general situation very well.

The early luxury of Henry VIII's Court was largely deceptive. His father, Henry VII, had left him a full treasury, a most unusual thing at this time in Europe. Young Henry was not exactly of a frugal turn, and by the time of his divorce from Catherine in 1532 he was rather hard pressed for funds. Direct taxation was out of the question, and the chief problem of the remaining years of his reign became that of money. Whatever policy was likely to produce the most cash was the one usually pursued by the Government.
Henry turned for money to the Church, which was immensely wealthy, eagerly followed by his courtiers. The indictment of the whole Clergy of the realm in 1531 on the charge of Praemunire elicited a qualified submission and a money grant of £100,000 sterling, which sum was worth many times more in real purchasing power in Henry's day than now. The subsequent appropriation of the wealth of the dissolved monasteries and chantries, together with the confiscation of the property of heretics, paid the Government's bills for many years. These facts give point to Cox's charge that "there would have been no Reformation had there been no property."

During Edward's reign the Government even invaded the domain of the cleric's personal property, as when the petit-canons' silver service at St. George's, Windsor, was inventoried and confiscated on the ground that the king could use it, and, moreover, it might tend to "superstitious uses."

The "new nobility," Henry's chief courtiers, were probably even more rapacious than the Government, and they caused many excesses. Henry himself was under no illusions about this condition. When, late in the reign, a cabal at Court attempted to encompass the downfall of Archbishop Cranmer, the king saved him and reproached the plotters in words of certain meaning:

I knowe your purposes well enough; you have hadd emonge you the commodities of the abbeis, which you have consumed some with superfluous apparell, some at dice and cardes and other ungratious rule, and now you wolde have the bishopp lands and revenewes to abuse likewise."

Such governmental restraint on the courtiers, however, was not long continued, for after Henry's death in January, 1547 those
of them composing the Council administered the Government.

In March, 1548 the Lord Protector asked Bishop Gardiner to relinquish the mastership of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, so that it could be converted with its neighbor, Clare Hall, into a new foundation for the study of Civil Law. Gardiner refused, for he knew that the endowments of Trinity Hall, to which he had devoted much time, would, in all likelihood, fall into the Protector's pockets.

Later, at the time of Gardiner's trial, Daniele Barbaro, the Venetian envoy, wrote that Gardiner's bishopric "was perhaps his greatest sin, as it yielded him a rental of 12000 crowns." That Barbaro was right was born out by the fact that when Bishop Ponet of Rochester was translated to Gardiner's see of Winchester he gave up the income in exchange for a yearly salary of 2000 marks. The relinquished income was immediately afterward granted to members of the Government.

These events support Innes' assertion that the chief oppressors of England were the members of Edward's Government, and that since the governors were the oppressors the people had no redress.

Somerset's fall in the autumn of 1549 can, to a great extent, be attributed to economic as well as religious conditions. Somerset had attempted to secure the passage of a bill during the previous session of Parliament designed to alleviate the lot of the peasants. This had not passed, but had aroused
towards him the enmity of the gentry and nobles, most of whom had formerly supported him.

The revolt in Devon and Cornwall and that in East Anglia, both of which occurred during the summer of 1549, were suppressed by the Duke of Warwick, who thereby became the idol of the upper classes. The causes of the Western Rising were probably mainly of a religious origin. The rebels demanded the restoration of (1) the Act of the Six Articles, (2) the Mass, (3) the reserved Sacrament, (4) Communion in one kind, (5) the opportunity for Baptism at any time, and (6) of the Latin for church services. This last demand was occasioned by the fact that the men of Cornwall knew no English and were at least accustomed to the Latin. They stated unequivocally their belief in the Real Presence in the Sacrament; and demanded that at least one half the monastery and chantry lands be restored unconditionally to the Church. Government mercenary troops from abroad put down the rising when the rebels laid siege to Exeter.

The Eastern Rising, under Robert Ket, was primarily social and economic; although it had a religious side too. The eastern rebels, however, approved the Settlement of 1549, as was illustrated by the fact that the new Prayer Book was used for Morning and Evening Prayer in their camp. In the East it was the inflated prices, the debased coinage, the continued acts of enclosure, the inflated rents, the eviction of tenants occasioned by the conversion of arable land into pasture, and the loss of hope after the failure of Somerset's proposed program that precipitated the open revolt.
Somerset's domestic policy was thus discredited in governing circles; his foreign policy was proved to be injudicious by the reversals in the war with France, which began in August. Warwick was therefore able to seize power in October and send the Protector to the Tower. As a result of his political adroitness, Warwick drew support from both the Catholics and Protestants in his palace revolutions; but he inclined to the latter after he was firmly in control. He realized that a return to Rome, or even to the Henrican Settlement, would spell his speedy downfall.

One of the chief attractions of the Protestants for Warwick, or Northumberland as he was later called, lay in the fact that, although a minority group, they had energy, zeal, and a program suited to his ends. "... the religious simplicity preached by the reformers gave colour and excuse for the confiscation of Church lands and the appropriation of Church treasuries. Many wealthy Catholic families also supported Warwick because they possessed by purchase, gift, or inheritance large parcels of former monastic and Church lands, and they feared the loss of them in a Catholic reaction. A letter written in the autumn of 1554 by Renard, the Imperial ambassador, to Charles V discloses the extent of this possession of Church property by Catholics.

It is my duty to inform your Majesty that the Catholics hold more Church property than do the heretics and that unless they obtain a general dispensation, they will not allow the Cardinal [Pole] to execute his commission."15

Throughout Edward's reign the Protestant preachers were busy. They attempted to lead public opinion, and to express
it to a certain degree, for they considered themselves to be the successors of the prophets of Israel. One of the most striking points of the English Reformation in general, and of the preachers in particular, is this Hebraic tone. In the preceding reign, Thomas Cromwell had unsuccessfully tried to restrict preaching to only those holding Government licenses. The preachers often feared no man, as Father Peto's frankness before Henry VII illustrates. Latimer, even while one of Henry's chaplains, seriously believed that "it was the preacher's duty to reprove the mighty." In January, 1548 Latimer began a course of sermons at St. Paul's Cross, in which he condemned the "unpreaching prelate" and also, in the same breath the greedy landlord. This latter condemnation was in support of Somerset's agrarian program. He also denounced the erastianism of certain Italianated Englishmen: "They make Christ and his Gospel only serve Civil policy . . ." Latimer spoke out against corruption and graft at other times too. In a course of sermons delivered at Court he said that bribery and robbery were common, and that if the officials who engaged in such practices did not desist and make amends they would most surely be damned. Northumberland must have supported the reformers with grave misgivings, for the anger of the Protestant preachers could so easily be turned against his Government.

At the end of the reign Cranmer's last speech before he was burned at Oxford illustrated conditions. He said:

Let them which be ryche ponder well theise sentences, for yff ever they hadd occasion to shewe theyr charytye they have yt now at thyss present, the poore people beyng so many and victuals so dear; for although I have longe been in pryson, yet have I hearde of the great penurye of the poor. 20
In Oxford, want was so prevalent that the records tell of migration to the country from the city in search of relief.

In Mary's reign the popular opposition against her marriage to Philip was mollified somewhat by the arrival in London of wagon-loads of Spanish gold, which seemed to indicate the prospect of a lightened taxation and a restored currency. Moreover, the marriage treaty promised England protection against France, and a union of England with her Flemish woolen markets in case an heir were born. These were great incentives to the poverty stricken populace to acquiesce peacefully to the restoration of Catholicism, which the majority probably desired anyway, and the acceptance of a foreign king.

Even so, the social and economic unrest was as difficult for Mary to quiet as for Northumberland, it being the result of two generations of social, moral, and economic upheaval. The attendant disintegration posed an almost insurmountable problem, and the religious agitation merely intensified it.

The maladjustments and heresies which affect a society reveal its character clearly. The transformation of English society during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII vastly increased the power of the crown, whose supremacy was only once challenged seriously until 1549. This was in 1536 with the "Pilgrimage of Grace" or Northern Rising. Even then, however, the rebels protested that they were rising not against the king, but rather against his religious policy.

For all the much-talked-of Tudor absolutism, the period
saw much free discussion among the people of England. It is true that thought and expression were fettered by our standards; for there were bounds, chiefly political, beyond which men might not go; but the variety of thought prevalent during the Middle Ages merged into the time of the Reformation without break.

"Scholasticism was a method rather than a single system of doctrine, and in different hands might and did lead to different conclusions."

In northern Europe and England the Reformation rested ultimately upon national grounds. After 1500 there was a growing feeling that the Pope was a foreigner and that Italian ecclesiastics were interlopers. Hatred of anything foreign, whether in dress, manner, language, or custom was common and rapidly intensified. Thus after the national awakening in England, it was easy for the Tudors and the reformers to turn scholasticism, as well as the New Learning, which struck its roots in the Moderno devotio of Italy and in the Christian humanism of Erasmus and the Germans, to schismatical and even heretical ends.

Even Catholics felt that some change was necessary and Starkey ([in his Dialogue] makes Cardinal Pole declare that just as the common law should no longer be written in French but in the common tongue, so all public and private prayers ought to be said in the vulgar tongue. This same feeling is illustrated by the popular support given Henry in his persecution of Wolsey, the rebellious mood of the populace toward Mary's Spanish marriage, and the support Elizabeth received from her Catholic subjects later in the century.

In spite of these stirrings and the tempest which was
to follow, the early years of the reign of Henry VIII were strikingly marked by a spirit of religious indifference.* Men were coming more and more to the conclusion that the Church was failing in her administration of her accumulated capital, and began to believe that it could be more wisely employed by the Government and private individuals. As Henry Adams has pointed out in his *Mont Saint-Michel and Chartres*, the great investment of the Middle Ages in the Church was not paying dividends to the investors. When this belief was aggravated by severe economic depression in the sixteenth century it began to take the form of active opposition to the Clergy and even to the Church as an institution. Men were not so much interested in doctrine in the first quarter of the century as they were in economics. The question of doctrine as a popular issue came later, after 1547.

This indifference to doctrine arose largely from the fact that most Englishmen believed in the spiritual supremacy of the sovereign. The stability of the religious establishment rested on the general consent of the populace in the last analysis, and was expressed by popular doctrinal acquiescence and even more by "a keen popular interest" which centered on the prince. The growing lack of sympathy between the Church and

*How low idealistic and religious enthusiasm had fallen may be gauged by the fact that only eleven guineas were netted by a collection taken at Court during the reign of Henry VII for a crusade against the Infidel. (From Lewis Einstein, *Tudor Ideals* (New York, 1921), p. 76.*
laity is illustrated by a book entitled *A Treatise concerning the division between the Spirituality and the Temporality*, which was published in 1532. The crying need for reform in the Church's discipline is illustrated by Bishop Fisher's speech before the Synod held by Wolsey shortly after the latter received his appointment as papal legate; and also by Colet's sermon in 1512 to the Canterbury Convocation, when he said, "Consider the miserable state and condition of the Church and bend your whole minds to its reformation." In both cases, however, doctrine was not in question, but merely discipline.

The destruction or enfeeblement of one order of Tudor society logically disturbed the equilibrium of all other orders. This was not particularly noticeable during the reign of a strong and able monarch like Henry; but with the accession of a minor, in the person of Edward VI, this disturbance became manifested. The avaricious individuality of the "new nobility" reached heights upon which the nation staggered.

The condition of the whole body politic can usually be determined by examining one of its basic social services, such as its educational system. Education decayed throughout Henry's reign, particularly after his break with Rome. The suppression of the monasteries resulted in the closing of many schools and the withdrawal of the support of many scholars at the universities. Most of the confiscated monastery incomes were not devoted to educational purposes.

The decay of schools and Universities became a byword. At Oxford priceless manuscripts and books were burned at the instigation of the Earl of Warwick. At Cambridge
Somerset himself superintended unparalleled vandalism. Ascham and Latimer both bewailed the state of the Universities, which may be judged from the fact that no one took a degree at Oxford in 1547 and in 1548 Gardiner feared the closing of Cambridge University. Probably the relative poverty of the Universities, and the better ability of the Government to control them, saved them from the fate of the monasteries.

The condition of clerical education, and, consequently, the probable ability of the Clergy to understand the intricate theological arguments of the age, such as the Westminster Colloquy, is illustrated by an examination of the clergy of Gloucester and Winchester, held in May, 1551. The results were as follows: Three hundred eleven clerics presented themselves; sixty-two who should have been present, and all of whom were pluralists, were absent. Among those present seventy-one were unable to repeat the Ten Commandments; thirty-three could not tell the chapter of the Bible in which they were found. Ten were unable to repeat the Lord's Prayer; twenty-seven couldn't tell who wrote it; and thirty did not know where it was found.

One of the few bright spots in this otherwise dismal picture, was the first bill introduced in Edward's first Parliament. It was a bill "for the bringing up of poor men's children," and reflected the influence of Brinkelow's ideas, and the interest in social reform of such men as Lupset, Crowley, Hales, and Lever. The bill, however, did not pass even the Commons, much less the Lords.

In contrast to the level of education at the end of the
reign of Edward VI, the great vigor of it at the beginning of the sixteenth century is unusual. At the time of Henry's accession in 1509, the New Learning was already studied in England, and had made itself felt in a select circle at both Universities; Henry himself was well-educated in Aquinas, scholastic philosophy, and the New Learning. During the first thirty years of the century the Benedictines supported several students at Oxford; and several colleges at Cambridge contained students supported by priests and monks. The monasteries often became rivals in the munificence of their educational endeavors. By the time of Edward VI, however, these conditions had radically changed, and, as the Catholic faith was driven out of England, the revival of learning died slowly. The Elizabethan literary renaissance owed its inception to other reasons.

Private reading, particularly of the Bible, was encouraged by the Edwardine Government. The various authorized translations, however, were filled with marginal notes of a Protestant nature. The Government of Edward also informally encouraged a pamphlet literature of a strongly Protestant character, which was part of the campaign conducted to prepare the laity for the 1549 Prayer Book. It failed to accomplish its purpose, however, for the most part, and, as a matter of fact, worked against it in the event.

There was little really good writing done in English during the first half of the sixteenth century; most writers, both Catholic and Protestant, devoted themselves to polemical religious pamphlets. Bishop Fisher's *Spiritual Consolation*,
which he wrote for his sister while he was in the Tower, is a notable exception, as was Cranmer's Prayer Book. The latter was partially a translation from the Latin, but it contains much original work of a high quality.

Whatever real advance the new doctrines made among the laity was accomplished primarily in the closing years of Henry's reign and the early years of Edward's, mainly through the agency of the several translations of the Bible and preaching. The latter was probably the more effective, because the great poverty of the people and their inability to read in many cases removed the possibility of reaching the lower classes by means of books.

The rapidity of change under Edward, which resulted in revolt and widespread discontent, frightened even the reformers, who came to believe that a slower pace was necessary for success. Bucer personally wrote to Edward, and warned him of the consequences of the precipitate policy which the Government was following. Many of the reformers felt that the morals of England had been better under the Pope than under the then current religious settlement.

Despite Bucer's warnings, the program of religious change was hastened on its perilous course. The social fabric in many places broke down; and disturbances in church, unseemly behavior among the clerics, factionalism, rioting, and loose morality became common. In order to keep some semblance of order, the Government deprived and unfrocked many of the clergy
to serve as a general warning to the others. Name-calling rather than charitable sermons was frequent in the pulpit. Ridley complained that his clergy were "common brawlers." The example of such behavior to the laity was hardly edifying; the situation was not of the sort that made for domestic and public concord or for any sort of piety. There was a popular movement against any form of reservation of the Sacrament, a tendency which Ridley and the Government approved. Blasphemy against the Sacrament became so customary that Parliament passed the Act Against Revilers in 1547 in order to correct such abuse, but it had little effect.

Already in every shop and hostelry, alehouse or other place of public resort nothing was to be heard but religious disputation. Not a gossiping old wife, not a dotard, not a sophist full of talk—but taught Holy Scripture having never learned it.

Moreover the Sacrament was made the butt of ridicule in stories, songs, and jokes. It was variously called "round robin," "jack-in-the-box," and, the worst, the "sacrament of the halter."

Barbaro, the Venetian envoy, reported that the reception of communion by proxy was widely practiced, and that it was most prevalent in the sees of Ridley and Latimer. Latimer came to the point of crying out that the English people utterly neglected the Sacrament: that "we care not for it."

The eating habits of the people changed after 1547, when the devotion of fasting during Lent met opposition. Dr. Glasier preached against fasting, as not being ordained by God, in April of that year; and this sermon was followed by much
preaching in the same vein. Fulsome praise was given to "belly cheer" by the preachers, who insisted that fasting at any time was injurious to the health. The 1549 Prayer Book omitted all mention of vigils and fasts; but Parliament prohibited them by statute, although fish days were retained for economic considerations.

Henry's last speech to Parliament in 1544 summarized this period, economically, socially, and religiously, in that he made a pathetic confession of failure, which Edward and Mary, and even Elizabeth to a certain extent, could well have repeated. He said:

I am sure that charity was never so faint among you; and virtuous and godly living was never less used; and God Himself among Christians was never less reverenced, honored, and served.54
CHAPTER II
POLITICAL BACKGROUND

There was no place for any sort of weakness in Tudor England; yet the spiritual estate of the realm was exceptionally feeble in spite of, and in many ways because of, its great wealth. The Clergy seemed to have outlived its raison d'être. The people at large, when not hostile, were usually indifferent to the Clergy, which had become synonymous with the Church in lay minds. The clerical courts, with their costly delays and gross, transparent injustices, were the people's most important grievance. Not that the king's courts were particularly superior, but at least they were English; and, with growing nationalism, men disliked the Church courts as being representative of foreign interference. This feeling was strongest when cases were appealed out of the realm. Long before Henry's divorce was even contemplated, stormy debates had arisen in Parliament over petitions which had been presented in 1515 against clerical fees. A party which favored the petitions was in favor at Court, and the clerics, consequently, began to take alarm.

Even so, the age was not dominated by religion, although it was influenced by it profoundly. Had religion been the supreme issue Protestant and Catholic parties would have been created throughout Europe, rather than Protestant and Catholic nations. At least on the governmental level, the age was fundamentally secular. The possibility that Henry VIII might use the Church of England for his own purposes had become apparent
as early as 1527, when Charles V was warned by an agent that Henry might convert England into a separate patriarchate if the Pope were long imprisoned by Spain. As the storm over Henry's divorce gathered strength, Du Bellay wrote, just before Wolsey's fall, that an attack upon the Church was openly proclaimed at Court. He said that the Government planned to confiscate the clerical wealth as soon as the Cardinal was gone.

This attack planned by Henry, which matured only with the passage of years, did not envisage any doctrinal change. No one was more orthodox than Henry, as his later actions, particularly the Act of the Six Articles, amply proved. He was an absolutist and did not relish the idea of any appeal to private judgment other than his own. His changes were not religious, except in that doctrine was affected, to some extent, by the disavowal of the Pope and the papal system.

The Reformation under Henry was constitutional, structural, and financial; also by the suppression of the monasteries, with their charitable or educational concomitants it was rendered social. In a highly integrated institution, such as the Church is, it is almost impossible to make changes of the nature just mentioned without affecting the whole system, including doctrine. Henry discovered this as the years passed in his endless struggle with the reformers. After his death the balance which he had laboriously effected broke almost within a matter of days. The Henrican Settlement was a precarious equilibrium, maintained only by the constant vigilance of a strong king, and one never again achieved once it was broken in 1547.
Although Henry's general policy in politics, as in religion, was the balance of forces, his method, if any, was expediency. In 1545 Parliament passed an act by which most chantries were abolished. The chantry endowments reverted to the Government and were used to pay the expenses of the French War (1544-46). Yet this act was passed at a time when both the doctrine of Purgatory and the celebration of private Masses were part of the civil and ecclesiastical law of England. The doctrine and the act seem logically irreconcilable.

In the same year Henry intimated to Thomas Cranmer that he favored certain minor changes, such as demolition of roods, and the abolition of veiling images during Lent and the All-Hallows Night bell-ringing. Bishop Gardiner, then ambassador to France, informed Henry that such changes might prejudice the French, with whom England was carrying on negotiations. The plan for any change was instantly dropped.

Although it is generally admitted that throughout most of his reign the combined policies of balance and expediency was usually followed, many historians, who follow Strype, insist that Henry intended to make great religious changes toward the close of his reign. That such changes were imminent probably cannot be proved. Strype says that Henry, not long before his last illness, told Cranmer that he intended many changes. This story is the sheerest hearsay and cannot be taken for a factual account without other evidence, which is lacking. Chapuys, the Imperial ambassador, said that at the close of the reign the
reformers were apparently slightly in the ascendant. Henry himself did make two changes that might indicate a shift of emphasis: he appointed Protestant-minded men as Prince Edward's tutors, and he removed Gardiner's name from the Regency list. Henry told one of his courtiers that the latter was done because Gardiner was too strongly Catholic for a balanced Regency Council. Henry wished the factions to be evenly balanced so that one would cancel the other, and thus preserve the delicate balance of the Henrican Settlement.

Had Henry's Royal Will been followed the result would have been as Henry intended. Immediately after the king's death, however, it was disregarded in that a Lord Protector, in the person of the Duke of Somerset, was appointed. Of the two parts of Henry's general policy only that of expediency was followed in the new reign.

Cranmer's name headed the list of men composing the Regency Council, but this was because the Archbishop of Canterbury always followed the Royal Family in precedence, rather than that any leadership was implied. Cranmer was a good governmental figurehead, for as Archbishop his prestige was great and as a person he had no political or economic ambitions. He was already Primate of England and it was well-known that he had no desire for money. Paget, Henry's Secretary was probably the wiliest man in the Council; Rich was probably the most depraved; but Somerset was the leader of them all, at least at first.

The chief concern of the members of the Council was to
maintain their power in order to retain their wealth which they had obtained through Henry out of the Church spoliation; further to despoil the Church for their own benefit; and to provide for a perpetuation of their power by ensuring against a Catholic reaction. The rearing of Edward VI as a Protestant was part of their plan for ensuring their wealth and power, and their aim to Protestantize the Church would make possible their desire for further spoliation. Both would help prevent a Catholic reaction. The only major miscalculation of the Council was its failure to take into account the poor health of Edward and the grave possibility of his early death, which would place his older and strongly Catholic half-sister, Mary, on the throne.

Henry VIII died on January 20, 1547 and was buried at Windsor a few days later with all the ancient Catholic ritual. Bishop Gardiner officiated at these ceremonies. Four weeks later he assisted at Edward's coronation, which was his last official appearance during the new reign, probably because he was favorable to the religious status quo, and therefore was in disfavor with the new Government.

Edward was crowned by Cranmer, who also preached the coronation sermon.* The sermon was important because a new policy was enunciated in it which has been followed in Church-State relations ever since in one way or another. Cranmer said that the king, as head of the English Church and vicar of Christ in the Church of England, was above the law and that none could constrain him, least of all the Church. It was in reality the

* See Appendix III.
modern doctrine of the divine right of kings, which later became what might be called the divine right of the old Parliament and the divine right of the democratically elected representatives of the people at a still later date. Edward was hailed as a new Josiah come to power to effect the reformation of religion. In substance it was a declaration that the temporality was superior to the spirituality; and this has been a cornerstone of English policy ever since.

A new departure was made in the English Constitution with Edward's accession. Prior to this time the king had always ascended the throne solely by right of birth. Edward, however, and his two half-sisters after him, ruled both because of birth and Act of Parliament. In 1543 Henry had regulated the succession in accordance with the power to do so conferred upon him by Parliament a few years earlier. This precedent later took on grave significance and has become so important that no person can now become sovereign of England in opposition to Parliament.

By the time Edward was crowned the Council had arranged affairs to suit itself. Its general policy, beyond dropping the balance of Henry and retaining expediency, was enunciated by Cranmer's coronation sermon. The fall of the leading Catholic in the Council, Lord Chancellor Wriothesley, was encompassed. The way was now prepared for the change and further spoliation of the Church by Act of Parliament and order of Council.

The first part of the plan of the Council worked extremely well. Little King Edward was carefully trained by
his Protestant tutors and became a prodigy of anti-Catholic erudition. At the age of eleven he would sit for hours listening with rapt attention to polemical sermons. His classical training and skill in Latin genuinely surprised his elders. In order to fit him for affairs of state, his tutors propounded to him questions such as the relative merits of Aristotelian democracy and aristocracy, and always received the desired responses. His studies in Protestant doctrine were close, and his views may be found in his papers on the papacy, faith, and a gem in French on idolatry as excerpted from the Scriptures.

Protestant theology became almost an obsession with him, as may be seen from the fact that the most important argument that Northumberland used to persuade him in 1553 of the advisability of altering the succession in favor of Lady Jane Grey was that Mary was a Catholic and would probably undo his Government's religious changes if she came to the throne, and that Elizabeth was by law an illegitimate child.

An unusual legal situation developed during the first month of the reign. According to both law and custom the bishop's commissions of spiritual jurisdiction had to be renewed by the Government at the beginning of each new reign. Most of the commissions were issued; but Paget, a former protege of Gardiner, held up his patron's commission which was to have been issued on February 6, 1547 and without which Gardiner was powerless even in his own diocese. The commission was finally issued, but only after a visit by Gardiner to Court and considerable delay.
This seemingly minor incident was very important for two reasons: it indicated that the Government was not sympathetic to the Catholics, of whom Gardiner was the leader, and it brought to light the weakness of the contention of the Catholics that no religious changes ought to be made during the minority. The Henrican Settlement was defended by Gardiner and the Catholics on this ground. They insisted that the function of the Council was purely administrative. But if such was the case the Council had no power to renew the ecclesiastical commissions. It was obvious that they had to be renewed. On this point the chief legal obstacle to religious change came to disaster. The Catholic position of no change during Edward's nonage simply became untenable. The Catholic faction, as a whole, were, however, as much interested in maintaining the Henrican settlement in order to preserve the integrity of the State as in maintaining it for religious reasons. Gardiner believed that changes in the traditional religion during a minority would tend to loosen the cement of the social and political structure. That he was correct was born out by the tumults of 1549.

Throughout 1547 the Council went ahead with whatever measures it deemed necessary and advisable, relying for its authority upon the act of Henry's reign which gave royal proclamations the force of law. The Government moved very cautiously during these first few months, making only those changes which, if considered in the light of the events of a couple of years later, were very minor indeed. The Government let it be known
unofficially that it would not be displeased by the destruction of "abused" images. This policy in effect negated the Henrican Act of the Six Articles which had upheld images as well as the Sacramentals. When Bishop Gardiner protested the activities of the image-breakers in his diocese to Somerset, the latter intimated that the Catholic bishops showed too much concern for images and not enough for the Bible. The bishops soon after were ordered by the Council not to preach in any place except in their own cathedrals. When the bishops protested the Government, through Paget, said that in view of the coming changes it would be well for them if they were either pliable or else were not bishops.

Parliament in 1547 repealed most of Henry's repressive legislation, including that concerning the publication of books and pamphlets. This indirectly established a considerable freedom of the press for the first time in English history. Licenses were still required for printers, however, and by this means the Government discouraged pro-Catholic publications while encouraging the Protestant. On May 21, 1547 Gardiner wrote to Somerset protesting the Government approved spread of heretical books and the heretical sermons of Government licensed preachers. Particularly disturbing to him were John Bale's publications on Luther and on Anne Askew. Gardiner wrote: "It was a slander on the late King to extol as a martyr a woman like Anne Askew who had suffered death justly under the laws."

In the same month Gardiner complained to Somerset that the observance of Lent was falling into disuse; the Protector commended the bishop for his vigilance, remarked that non-observance of law could occur in even the best regulated
kingdom and concluded: "Lent remaineth still, and shall, God willing, till the King's Highness, with our advice and the residue of his Grace's Council, take another course." The Catholic faction associated with Gardiner feared the worst for themselves and their faith after such a reply, which showed how dependent even the most ancient practices of the Church were upon the Government.

The policy of change was furthered by the publication on July 31, 1547 of Cranmer's Book of Homilies along with royal injunctions which ordered its use in the Church, as well as that of an English translation of Erasmus' Paraphrase of the New Testament. Both works were of a thoroughly Protestant character. The continuance of the policy of expediency is well illustrated at this time. Although the Government permitted the enforced use of such Protestant works, it would not allow a papal representative to come to England, at the suggestion of the French ambassador, on the ground that no religious changes ought to be made during Edward's minority. The Government was not averse to self-contradiction if that served its purpose. This is further illustrated by the fact that the Homilies were actually against the law when they first were issued by royal authority, for they were contrary in doctrine to the King's Book of 1543. This illegality had been the main Catholic argument against them. In the interest of consistency and of quietness the King's Book was repealed at the next session of Parliament.

In order to enforce the royal injunctions a royal visitation was ordered. Its object, which soon became apparent,
was to turn the nation's pulpits into Protestant organs. It was one of the first parts of an unannounced governmental program of preparation leading up to the 1549 Prayer Book. The bishop's visitorial powers were temporarily suspended and the visitors, both lay and clerical, were appointed. The kingdom was divided into sections and each had its group of visitors. The program included a set of seventy-two inquiries, and the visitors were given power to enforce thirty-six injunctions of a Protestant nature. The visitation continued throughout the fall and winter of 1547-48.

At this same time bells and holy water also met opposition. The Angelus Bell, which had first been used about 1300 had been silenced by order of Henry VIII in 1538. The old ruling of Henry was enforced by the Edwardine Visitors, who extended the prohibition to cover all bells save one in each parish which was to be used only in order to call people to worship. This automatically silenced the Sacring Bell which was rung at the most solemn moments of the Mass. "Hallowing of bells" was covered also in this prohibition. The Ten Articles of 1536 had permitted the use of holy water and in 1539 the clergy had been ordered to preach against any abuse of it. Cranmer's Homilies condemned the use of it without comment. In February, 1548 the Council abolished the use of it,* and holy water stocks and containers were widely destroyed.

*This order was not completely enforced, because it was not until 1550 that Essex and Middlesex conformed; not until 1552 that Worcester and Glouster did so; thereafter most of the rest of the realm followed suit.
The process of controlling the pulpits and so preparing the people for further change was furthered in February, 1548, when, contrary to custom, local clergy were allowed to preach only in their own parishes, and there only by license of their Ordinary, the king, or the visitors. In April parish clergy were forbidden entirely to preach, only bishops and certain preachers licensed by the Government being allowed the privilege. The latter, who were usually Protestants, had to be permitted to preach whenever they appeared in a parish. This policy had been originally outlined in a letter from Council to the Clergy in February. In September, however, even the licensed preachers were suspended for they did the Protestant cause more harm than good as a rule.

With the publication of the 1549 Prayer Book, royal licenses were required for any clergyman (including bishops) or layman who wished to preach; licenses were also necessary for Bible reading of any sort. Extracts from the Homilies were required to be read whether there was a sermon or not. Parishioners were to be regularly examined by the clergy in the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, but not in the Ave Maria. Invocations of the saints were removed from the Primer of Henry VIII by Act of Parliament in 1549.

The suspension of all preaching in 1548 was ordered in an attempt to remove the possibility of religious civil war in England, which became more and more acute as the reign progressed. Most rulers, whether Catholic or Protestant, at this time believed that national unity in religion underlay political
unity, and were consequently willing to go to almost any lengths to achieve it. This, according to most authorities, was the fundamental reason for such events as the Spanish Inquisition, the St. Bartholemew's Massacre, and the various persecutions by both Catholics and Protestants in England.

The much-discussed tolerance of Somerset was extended as a rule only to those men that inclined to Protestantism. This was not primarily because Somerset himself entertained Protestant beliefs, although he did, but rather because it was politically and economically expedient that England become and remain part of the Protestant Movement. The Government also at first hoped to draw to itself by a show of liberality whatever groups of lukewarm Catholics it could and thereby strengthen its position. The Council also realized that it would be foolish to have disavowed Rome only to allow itself to be dominated by Canterbury. The Government believed that it must at all costs subordinate the Church to the State in order both to achieve its aims and to integrate the nation.

One important step which the Council decided to take late in 1547 in order to hasten and secure religious change without opposition was to make Gardiner either a docile part of the Government or else to silence him. He was the center of the Catholic opposition and the Council could not afford to allow him to occupy that position in view of the drastic changes which were contemplated. It was very likely that there would be active opposition even without Gardiner. On various legal pretexts designed to frighten him he was alternately committed to
the Fleet and confined to his Southwark residence. The difficulty was that the Council could not make a case of heresy against him. Finally in June, 1548 he was required to preach before the Court on certain controversial points. Gardiner thought that he had preached a satisfactory sermon, but whether he did or not was really beside the point. The Government used the sermon as its legal pretext of a charge of disobedience to the king, and on June 30th Gardiner was committed to the Tower. There he remained until he was released by Mary in 1553. The cupidity of the Government prompted his deprivation in the latter part of Edward's reign, but had little to do with his imprisonment.

The main supporters of Somerset's Government were the reformers, ranging from the mild Cranmer to the energetic Ridley; the politicians and courtiers (the "new nobility") who stood to profit, like Somerset himself, from religious change; and the very poor, to whom Somerset appealed by his proposed agricultural reform. The two chief problems of the Somerset Government, as of that of Warwick, were how to settle the agrarian discontent and how to carry the essentially conservative nation with it in its religious changes. Somerset fell in the autumn of 1549 for several reasons: (1) he had failed, in spite of his efforts, to educate the people to receive the mildly Protestant Prayer Book issued in the summer of that year; (2) he had aroused the ire of the gentry and many of the "new nobility" by his proposed agricultural reforms; (3) the failure of his French War lost him the respect of the people generally.
Somerset's fall was really a palace revolution, which involved only the inner governmental circle. The personnel of the new Warwick Government was similar to that of Somerset's. The same problems remained before Warwick as had faced the Protector, but were differently handled in most cases. Agrarian reform was utterly halted, and repressive legislation against the lower classes was passed by Parliament. Religious opposition had already been broken when the Eastern and Western Risings had been put down during the summer. The tempo of religious change was therefore quickened, and the Government's economic gain and its security was increased. Edward's education was continued much as before, except that Warwick cultivated the boy far more astutely than had Somerset, and consequently gained his almost unbounded confidence. The Church, as the capping of Warwick's policy, was made almost entirely erastian.

It can hardly be doubted that the spirit which dictated this revision of the Prayer Book in 1552 was rather political than spiritual. Dudley Warwick, who desperately feared a Catholic reaction when Edward should die and his Catholic sister Mary should succeed, wished to consolidate into one band the Protestants of all complexions, and particularly to gather into the fold of the establishment the "hot gospelers" like Hooper and Ridley and John Knox, who were the fighting strength of the Protestant cause.

At first there was great doubt whether Warwick, that is Northumberland,* would favor the Catholic or the Protestant cause. There ought to have been none, considering the source of the new master's wealth; but, since Catholics, hoping for a

---

*John Dudley, created Earl of Warwick on Feb. 18, 1547, Duke of Northumberland on October 11, 1551.
change in their favor, had supported him, there was a moment of questioning. Even Gardiner hoped for release and wrote to both Northumberland and the Council concerning it. No move was made to release him, however; and it soon became clear that Northumberland had turned to the Protestants. By the beginning of 1550 it was clear not only that the conservatives had nothing to hope from the new government, but even that the moderate reformers were to be hustled into further change by the extremists.

Somerset was shortly released from the Tower because his fall was generally regarded as part of a Catholic plot, although he was not immediately readmitted to the Council. There was a marked reaction against the Catholics. The two Arundells were sent to the Tower, Sir Richard Southwell to the Fleet, and the Earl of Arundel was confined to his house. Wrothesley, who had been restored to the Council after his initial fall, but who had again ceased to attend because of illness in October, 1549, was excluded from the Government entirely on February 2, 1550; and Bishop Tunstall, a Catholic also, was barred on the same day. A new Ordinal was drawn up and on February 6th and 7th the Catholic bishops, Heath and Bonner, were deprived for denying its validity. Thus the last remains of Henry's plan for a balanced Regency Council were wiped out, and all that was left was the policy of expediency according to the dictates of the personal interests of Northumberland and his associates. Their path was completely cleared in March, 1550, when peace was concluded with France by which Boulogne was surrendered. The peace
was humiliating, but necessary to the domestic policy of the
Government.

Northumberland had defeated the agrarian and religious rebels in the summer of 1549 so when the usual session of Parliament occurred in November, 1549 he passed a series of laws against them. There was little difficulty in doing this, for most of the men who sat in this Parliament were gentry and nobility who had been soundly frightened by the popular uprisings. They therefore passed acts which permitted them to enclose as much land as they liked; and others which imposed stringent penalties on anyone who might oppose them. The treason laws were strengthened and extended to include offenses against Privy Councillors.

The Government was still harassed by Gardiner's opposition which continued even from the Tower, yet it dared not execute him. An attempt, another act of governmental expediency, was made to win him after Somerset's readmission to the Council in April, 1550. Gardiner refused the conditions of the reconciliation, which would have required him to give up his Catholic principles. In desperation the Government, which also desired his property, deprived him on February 14, 1551. Jehan Scheyfve, the Imperial ambassador, reported that the trial

*It is rather amusing to note that an act was passed extending the treason laws to cover all "assemblies for altering of the laws." Had this been completely carried into effect it would have made treasonable the very Parliament which passed it.
was merely a formality, the deprivation having already been
determined upon and the arrangement of the spoils of the Diocese
of Winchester already in progress. In pursuance of its policy
of Protestantizing the Church of England the Government filled
the places of Catholics with Protestants. Ridley was consecrated
Bishop of London and Westminster; Ponet was given the See of
Rochester and was later translated to Winchester; Hooper, after
a long controversy about vestments, was consecrated Bishop of
Glocester.

By 1550 the Government and its religious changes were
both exceedingly unpopular among the people. The unpopularity
of each increased the unpopularity of the other. The nation_
began to waken from its lethargy to a realization that its gov-
ernors were not intent on the welfare of England but rather on
their own personal aggrandisement. All sorts of rumors circu-
lated. It was believed that Northumberland was going to issue
a new coinage of his own; some said that he aimed to seize the
crown. A few may have realized that the reforming zeal that
drove him on arose from his fear of a Catholic reaction under
Mary should Edward die without issue.

During 1552 a revision of the Prayer Book was in
preparation by Cranmer and his associates. They were prompted
by fear of a Catholic interpretation of the 1549 Prayer Book
and by the advice of foreign protestants, while the Government
was again prompted by expediency. The new book fitted well
the needs of the Government, for the bare ritual would allow
for the confiscation of Church property thus rendered superflous,
and the Government stood in grave need of money. Therefore, in April a commission was appointed to make an inventory of Church goods, and to confiscate whatever was not necessary under the new Prayer Book. The yield of this confiscation was so great that the work of the commission was scarcely completed when Edward died a year later. The commission was very thorough and even Cranmer objected, but he could do nothing to hinder its actions. The commission's seizures were augmented by intimidating the bishops into surrendering their incomes and estates for relatively meager salaries.

The radical element among the reformers opposed the 1552 Prayer Book on the ground that it was not sufficiently and unambiguously Protestant. Cranmer had carefully pruned out all the passages that Gardiner had believed the 1549 Prayer Book left open to Catholic interpretation, but even this was not satisfactory to the radicals.

As regards the Mass, the Reformer's principal object was to destroy its sacrificial character, so vehemently attacked by Luther, and as far as possible make it a simple communion service. Cranmer already [in 1548] thought what he would later say openly; that the Mass as such must be abolished "for as much as in such Masses is manifest wickedness and idolatry . . . all such popish Masses are to be clearly taken away out of Christian churches." 52

John Knox preached before the king at Windsor in October, and attacked the practice of kneeling for reception of Communion. He believed that it opened the way for adoration of the bread and wine. The king, profoundly influenced, insisted that the printing of the new Prayer Book, which was then in progress, be suspended until the question was settled. John a Lasco's
attack on kneeling reception in March and in early October had foreshadowed this controversy.

The Government, influenced by Cranmer, believed that it was not wise to alter the new book, which had already passed Parliament. To attempt to push it through Parliament again was thought to be courting trouble. The king, now come to an age when he had to be noticed, insisted that the book be altered; therefore on October 27th the Council ordered the "Black Rubric" inserted. This rubric declared that kneeling was required at reception not as an act of adoration, but only as "a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ." The bread and wine were specifically declared to remain unchanged and therefore not subject to adoration. This alteration was illegally made, but it satisfied the radical reformers and the king.

The revised Prayer Book became law on April 14, 1552 by Act of Parliament, and was to come into use on November 1st. The revision had been authorized by Parliament at the beginning of the session. The book had been completed some time between March 9th and April 11th. It was legal, save for the "Black Rubric," but had no synodical authority because it was never submitted to nor passed by Convocation.

That the Act of Uniformity of 1552 did not provide that the revised Prayer Book be enforced until so late in the year can probably be accounted for by the fact that time had to be allowed for the compilation and publication of the new
Articles of Religion; and also it was necessary to allow time for the assembling and work of a Protestant General Council which Cranmer urged. It was felt that if the revised book were published prematurely it might contravene doctrinal decisions reached by the Council, and so spoil the success of the meeting. Actually, however, the delay on this account was unnecessary, for this Council, which was to have served as a counterbalance to the Council of Trent, never convened.

The major religio-political differences between the 1549 and 1552 Prayer Books lay in the differences in the compromise arranged among the factions responsible for the revision. It was no longer a compromise between the Old Learning and the New, but rather one between two groups of Protestants; on the one hand the more conservative Protestants, which included such men as Cranmer, Ridley, and Ponet, and on the other the radical Protestants, such as Hooper, Traheron, Turner, Vernon, and Knox. The 1552 Prayer Book was the result of their compromise which was completed by the Forty-Two Articles and Ponet's Catechism.

The basis for the compromise of 1552, as for that of 1549, lay in the conception of the power of the crown entertained by most Catholics and Protestants alike. To most of these men the Crown was the king, or those agents appointed to act for him, and was supreme in all matters secular and spiritual. The responsibility for all acts of government, of whatever nature, rested upon the Crown; and this circumstance was believed to discharge the consciences of the subjects who obeyed it.
Therefore, if the king approved the revised Prayer Book, as he did, most Englishmen would accept it even though they might disagree with it. Upon such a basis any compromise approved by the Crown was acceptable in practice to the people, and to entertain and attempt to propagate a private judgment was the equivalent of being a traitor.

Edward's own ideas of Crown function are clear from the record which he kept in his Journals, and probably reflect those of the men about him. Edward's ideal was a centralized monarch under "one head, one governor, one law." His dream, strangely incongruent with the practices of his Government, was what later became known as benevolent despotism. Edward had no practical suggestions of any merit, however, on how such a condition could best be obtained. It is significant that the Church had, as a rule, no place as an institution in his theorizings save to serve as an instrument for quieting the people. Edward's ideas seem to reflect in part those of Latimer, who said in one of his sermons that the function of the king was "... to see that there be no unpreaching prelates in his realm, nor bribing judges, to see all estates, to provide for the poor, and to see victuals good cheap."

Probably one of the most striking features of Edward's reign lies in the absence of any influence of foreign policy on domestic. The Government was guided by motives that were essentially private and domestic, which was not at all the case under Henry VIII, Mary, and Elizabeth. The subordination of foreign to domestic affairs resulted in humiliation abroad and a free hand to impose religious changes at home. This freedom was
almost essential, because England was not a generally Protestant country at this time, as may be seen by the Northern "Pilgrimage of Grace," which occurred under Henry, and the Western and Eastern Risings, which occurred under Edward. Most of the reformers were found in London, Essex, Kent, and the two Universities.

The Edwardine religious changes were retarded mainly by the lower clergy and the laity. Many parish priests, particularly in the North and West, made the changes grudgingly if at all, and their passive resistance had great influence among their parishioners. This dearth of reforming clergy was a source of weakness to the Government's plans. Not only were there few reformed clergy, but even those few tended to disagree among themselves. The House of Bishops in Convocation was the only clerical organization in which the reformers dominated, and even this would not have been the case without governmental intervention. The lower house of Convocation was predominantly Catholic, and was sullen and often disloyal, although it outwardly conformed. This is probably why the 1552 Prayer Book was never submitted to Convocation; it would almost certainly have failed of passage.

During the last months of Edward's reign, Northumberland intrigued to secure the succession of his daughter-in-law, Lady Jane Grey, to the throne. At the time of Edward's death, July 6, 1553, Northumberland had apparently secured his aims. The plot failed, however, owing to treachery within the Council and to the fact that the people rallied to Mary, the legitimate heir. After Mary's accession a seemingly almost complete Catholic
reaction occurred, including submission to the papacy. This continued until Mary's death in November, 1558.

Elizabeth succeeded her half-sister in accordance with the Will of Henry VIII. The composition of Elizabeth's Council foreshadowed events to come; for the principal secretary was Sir William Cecil, and it included Sir Nicholas Bacon, the Earl of Bedford, Knollys, Parry, and Cave, all of whom were sympathetic to the Edwardine Settlement of 1552. Twenty-three members of Mary's Council were removed, including Archbishop Thirlby of York and the Bishop of Ely, both of whom were Catholics. Bishop Gardiner and Cardinal Pole were dead.

The proceedings of the Council were strictly secret because of the tenseness of the domestic situation and also because of the fact that any religious changes would result in a clash with the Pope and with most of the powerful nations of Europe, events for which England was not prepared. A memorandum of the Council has been preserved, entitled The Device For Alteration of Religion, In the First Year of Queen Elizabeth, which goes far to prove that religious change in a Protestant direction was contemplated from the very first. The first article of the Device reads:

When the alteration shall be first attempted? At the next Parliament: so that the dangers be foreseen, and remedies therefor provided. For the sooner that religion is restored, God is the more glorified, and as we trust will be more merciful unto us, and better save and defend Her Highness from all dangers.63

In spite of these definite plans, Elizabeth had to move carefully, for she wished to present Europe with a fait accompli.
The home situation seemed impossible. All the bishops and most of the lower clergy were solidly Catholic at the time of Elizabeth's accession. The Government feared that the clergy might lead a rebellion, thinking that they were doing a service to religion and country, although it entailed treason and bloodshed. At the outset of the reign it seems likely that even the Government did not know exactly what changes it would attempt to make; but, in any case, it was apparent that they would be in the nature of a compromise, considering the queen's temperament and the domestic and foreign situations.

After long political maneuvering, Parliament passed two Acts in 1559: the Supremacy Act and the Uniformity Act, which, together with the Prayer Book of 1559 and the Articles of Religion, constituted the Elizabethan Settlement. The Supremacy Act repealed the Heresy Act of Philip and Mary together with their Repealing Act. Ten Acts of Henry were thus restored, as well as the Supremacy Act of 1534, with one significant change: Elizabeth was to be known as "supreme governor" of the Church of England rather than "supreme head" as Henry and Edward had been styled. The implication was that the Crown was the administrative rather than the spiritual and legislative head of the Church. The Act of Uniformity made the 1552 Prayer Book lawful, and none other, although several features dealing primarily with the Eucharistic Canon were changed. Both these acts were passed without even so much as a bow to Convocation, which had declared itself to be opposed to change. In Parliament the clerical attitude was well expressed by the fact that every
spiritual peer voted against the Uniformity Act.

What this Settlement, the details of which are discussed in Chapter III, meant to the English clergy and people can be seen from the writings of the time. Jewel wrote: "For this is our doctrine, that every soul of what calling soever he be—be he monk, be he preacher, be he prophet, be he apostle [bishop]—ought to be subject to Kings and magistrates." Or again, Bishop Aylmer of London wrote to Christopher Hatton: "I preach without spirit. I trust not of God but of my sovereign which is God's lieutenant and so another God unto me." The fullest exposition of the relations between Church and State was probably best presented by Richard Hooker (Eccles. Polit., Bk. VIII). Hooker merely elaborated logically the policy implied by the acts of Henry VIII and enunciated formally by Cranmer in the Coronation Sermon. Hooker said:

There is not any man of the Church of England but that same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any man a member of the commonwealth which is not also of the Church of England.

To Hooker, as to Cranmer and to Cecil, religion and government were unable to exist apart, and in upholding the spiritual function of the State he had, perforce, to uphold the spiritual function of the Crown, which was supreme in all matters. This almost Byzantine conception of the relations of temporal and spiritual affairs fitted in well with Elizabeth's policy and with the temper of the people which was best exemplified by England's new national spirit.
Cardinal Allen wrote of England in his *Apologie* as follows:

It is the turpitude of our nation through the whole World, whereat we blush before strangers that sometimes fall into discourse of such things, that in one man's memory and since this strange mutation began, we have had to our Prince a man who abolished the Pope's authority by his own laws, and yet in other points kept the faith of his fathers; we have had a child who by like laws abolished together with the Papacy the whole ancient religion; we had a woman who restored both again and sharply punished Protestants; and lastly her Majesty that now is [Elizabeth] who by like laws hath long since abolished both again, and now severely punished Catholics as the other did Protestants; and all these strange differences within the compass of thirty years.
CHAPTER III
RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

As the years of Henry VIII's reign passed the idea of what public and private worship really was underwent a subtle modification in the minds of some of the clergy and laity, who came to believe that the primary purpose of church services and private religious practices was the edification of the congregation and the individual. During and before the Middle Ages a very different idea had prevailed. Clergy and laity had believed that public worship was an elaborate drama, a propitiatory sacrifice, celebrated for all the living and the dead in God's honor and for his appeasement. The chief function of the laity had been adoration of and homage to God under the accidents of bread and wine on the altar.

The daily and nightly offices of the Church were in like manner acts of praise and prayer to God, and it did not matter much if those present failed to catch the telling force of psalm and hymn and lection in their significant justaposition, so long as the office was duly sung to the glory of God.¹

A corresponding development of doctrine had occurred as the ceremonies of the Church, particularly the Mass, had become more and more elaborate and perfect in their imposing symbolism. The two developments proceeded concurrently, although the doctrine set the ceremony and not vice versa. Not that any new doctrine had been introduced, but simply that the ancient doctrine had been restated with greater clarity and ceremonial detail. In the course of these developments the emphasis had been shifted from the Communion of the laity to
the propitiatory sacrifice, although both were definitely present at the end as they had been at the beginning of the Middle Ages.

Henry VIII did not follow the new ideas of edification in spite of his break with Rome. His ideas on Catholicism were well expounded in what was popularly called the King's Book, issued in 1543, and probably written by Cranmer. It was completely orthodox save in one matter, that of Church unity. The book said that Christianity was not limited to any particular time or place and that Christ, through the Sacraments, sustained the Churches in all nations. It went on to say that these several Churches were not, however, united by any earthly institution, but only by a spiritual bond in Christ, who, at his discretion, dispensed his gifts and graces to each national Church. This rather left the Pope out. The fallacy of such a view of the Church, if there is one, would lie in two things: first, the misinterpretation of certain scriptural texts related to the foundation of the Church by Christ; and second, the fact that by the same token that Christ or the Holy Ghost inspired each national Church separately so might each diocese, parish, or individual Christian be differently inspired. Theologically such a position is untenable, for it implies a lack of unity and consistency in God's mind. Politically it was equally impossible. Henry could not afford to tolerate private judgment, for a united national Church seemed necessary to him for a united national state. In order to establish some authority the reformers accepted the infallibility of the Bible. The reformers failed to establish any workable authority, because an infallible book privately interpreted is
worse than useless to Church unity, it is positively vicious. Henry saw the progressive deterioration of the moral and spiritual unity of Christendom wherever the reformers gained control. He realized that the spiritual unity of England would disintegrate if private judgment were permitted so he stopped such a trend with himself, and his judgments were rigorously enforced as the Act of the Six Articles so well illustrated. Only after his death was this oppression relaxed.

That Henry allowed no liturgical and consequent doctrinal changes is pointed out by the fact that when Cranmer in 1542 proposed to Convocation that the breviaries, missals, and other service books be corrected and amended, although no translation was contemplated, it was rejected with the king's approval. In 1543 Cranmer again took up the matter, suggesting that the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments be said in English; and that all "apocryphas, feigned legends, superstitious orations, collects, versicles, and responses" be deleted from the liturgy. This proposal was also flatly refused, and with the Catholic reaction the movement for change temporarily collapsed. These proposals show the trend of Cranmer's mind, however.

The Bible itself, the "Gospel" of the reformers in which they placed such trust as being the only authority necessary for salvation beyond the state, came in for its share of criticism during and after Henry's reign. New translations were made into English, usually with Protestant glosses. The
reformers used these for propaganda purposes. In their hands the
Bible became a well stocked arsenal for their struggle against
Rome, the very Church which had given the scriptures to Europe, 6
and also against Henry's establishment. In it they could find
a text to use as a weapon for every occasion, and, by the use of
private judgment, interpreted many texts, that had formerly
supported the Church, in ways detrimental to her. It was, indeed,
upon these very texts that the reformers concentrated their atten-
tion. Most of the sincere Catholic scholars of England, such as
Fisher, More, Colet, and Tunstall were on the side of the reformers
in their desire to make an accurate English translation of the
Bible, but they had small use for the purposes to which the
reformers wished to put it.

Henry's position after his repudiation of the Pope was
anomalous. He was by law made the supreme head of the Church of
England, yet he was not a priest. His only remotely legitimate
source of authority over the English Church was scripture, yet
he refused, save very grudgingly, to allow any publication of
the Bible among the people. Henry asserted himself in spiritual
affairs, both through Convocation, where his vicar, Thomas
Cromwell, presided and directed action, and through Parliament,
where his will in the affairs of the Church was enacted into the
law of the land. His ultimate source of authority, the Bible, he
hardly dared to invoke among the people, however.

In 1540, when the Great Bible was issued with many
restrictions by authority of the king, its Psalter immediately
became popular. This Psalter, with variations, has been used
until the present time, although the Great Bible has long since been displaced. In the 1549 Prayer Book this Psalter was used, and the 1552 and 1559 Prayer Books followed suit, although Parliament did not officially sanction its use until the Act of Uniformity of 1662.

The best conclusions that careful research has yielded up till now is that the Psalters of 1548 and 1549 seem to have been based on the text of the Tunstall and Heath Great Bible of November, 1541, and the Psalter of 1552 seems in turn to have been derived from them. Further variations kept appearing until 1578, but after this date the text of the Prayer Book Psalter remained substantially the same until its official adoption in 1662.

Throughout the Middle Ages "Primers" or devotional books for laymen had been in use, such as the Book of the Hours. They were, of course, in Latin. As early, however, as the fourteenth century there were a few translations of these made into English. It was not until the reign of Henry VIII that a printed English translation was published.

The incorporation of the English Litany in the Primer of Henry VIII, which was later used by Cranmer in the Prayer Book, had a devious history. In 1543, due to a bad harvest and a generally gloomy political outlook, Henry ordered that the ancient custom of open-air processions accompanied by the Latin Litany be revived. The order was a failure because the people didn't know the Latin prayers, so Henry ordered Cranmer to prepare an English Litany. This was used for the first time during the course of the preparations of Henry in 1544 for the 12 French war. It was inserted in the Primer and contained petitions to the Virgin, the angels, and patriarchs. A prayer
to deliver the people "from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities" was included, but was omitted from the Prayer Book Litany of 1559 and was never restored.

The functions of the Primer were, after Henry's death, gradually usurped by the Prayer Book. The Primer's prayers were usually translated from the Sarum Use. All the Prayer Books used the rendering of the Magnificat from the Primer, and it was also used in the translation of the Bible under James I.

The Primer of Henry VIII was issued by the king's authority, and was intended to be "a determinate form of prayer that men might both know what they prayed, and also in what words, and neither to offer to God things standing against true religion, nor yet words far out of their intelligence and understanding." Included in it were the Canonical Hours, the Penance Psalms, the Dirge, the Commendations, the Psalms and Devotions of the Passion, the new English Litany, and certain private prayers. This was about the only liturgical reform of the reign.

There was one event shortly after the question of Henry's divorce became acute that was of significance to the legality of later events. This was the consecration of Cranmer as Archbishop of Canterbury. The question arises as to how Cranmer could legally renounce his allegiance to the Pope after having sworn at his consecration before the high altar at Canterbury Cathedral to be the Pope's liege and to protect England from schism. It was a matter of perjury.
On March 26, 1533, three days before his elevation, Cranmer took a private oath in the presence of witnesses sworn to secrecy at St. Stephen's Chapter House at Westminster that he would not let his forthcoming public oath to the Pope be binding upon him to prevent any changes in the ecclesiastical arrangement that Henry might find it expedient to effect.

After Cromwell's fall and the Catholic reaction in the latter years of Henry's reign Cranmer turned his attention privately to liturgical research looking to the possible revision of the Church's services. He drafted two schemes of church service, both of which were later used as the partial basis of the First Book of Common Prayer. He also drew up a revised code of canon law, the reform of which Parliament had authorized in 1534, 1536, and 1544. Actually the commission to carry this reform into effect was not appointed until near the end of Edward's reign. Cranmer also began work on the Homilies in 1539, although they were not submitted to Convocation until 1543, and were not passed then.

There were some intimations of change in the air at the time of Henry's death. The central thing in the minds of both the Henrican Catholics and the reformers was the Mass, which was the core of Catholic doctrine. If the reformers expected to accomplish anything the Mass would of necessity have to be destroyed. The attack was circuitous, initially, but as Edward's reign progressed, it gained in directness. The reformer's high point of power was with Knox's sermon on kneeling in 1552. The controversy between the two parties
revolved around the question of what the Sacrament was, whether it was a sacrifice propitiatory, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a memorial communion. The several doctrines on the subject which were current in Europe at this time, and eventually in England too, were the following: (1) the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation, (2) the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation, (3) the Zwinglian doctrine of Sacramentarianism, and (4) the Suvermerian or Bucerian doctrine of the Strassburg School. The last named, together with the third, is approximately the position reached by the Church of England with the promulgation of the Prayer Book of 1552.

No immediate changes in religion of any consequence occurred during the first ten months of Edward's reign, although portents of changes to come were on every hand. Reformers were appointed to preach before the Court, and Barlow, Bishop of St. David's, even went so far as to lay down a platform of change in February, 1547. At this Gardiner and the Henricans took alarm. The composition of the new Government boded ill for Catholicism. Somerset, the Protector, even before Henry's death, was well-known for his sympathy toward what the reformers were pleased to call "pious doctrine." Gardiner and Thirlby were excluded from power, and Wriothesley soon was, too. Norfolk and Surrey were not only excluded but were in disgrace. Bishop Tunstall and Sir Anthony Browne were in the Government, but they lacked the character and ability to carry on an effective opposition to the reformers.
Although in high places there was uncertainty about the policy of the Government toward religion, the local parish life of England continued in its accustomed channels, continuing the services and practices of Mother Church in most cases. This quiet was soon to be rudely broken, and the false security of parochial life did not long outlast the old king. The revolution soon to be inaugurated in parish life was perhaps unparalleled in such a brief period in the history of the Church. There were certain parishes, however, particularly in London and the east of England, where Wycliffe's ideas lingered on, and which provided fertile seed-beds for the work of the reformers.

There was, indeed, a striking parallelism between Lollardy and the new doctrines. Wycliffe had called for a thorough reform of ecclesiastical discipline, had denounced the monastic system, urged clerical marriage, advocated a "spiritual" religion with the Bible in the vernacular uppermost to the neglect of tradition, and had finally ended by denying the Real Presence in the Sacrament, insisting on only a spiritual presence. The reformers followed Wycliffe as far as he went, and only parted company with him in order to go further.

As was said above, Gardiner hoped to check the advance of the reformers by questioning the Government's power to effect doctrinal change during the minority. At best it would have been only a stop-gap, for Edward was being reared as a Protestant, and in any event would probably
have ushered in doctrinal changes upon attainment of his majority. Gardiner's opposition was constitutionally weak, for it had no precedent. Never had the royal authority been diminished during a minority or even a period of royal insanity. The argument of this opposition broke down in practice too.

Gardiner, Bonner, Tunstall, Thirlby, and all the Catholic bishops had, albeit reluctantly, taken out new licences for the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction at the commencement of the reign; and if the royal supremacy was in abeyance these licences were all invalid. It was impossible to set up a distinction between the Supreme Head's power to effect ecclesiastical jurisdiction and his power to effect ecclesiastical changes: if one could be exercised in his minority, so could the other. 23

By the same token, of course, what could be accomplished during a minority could be also done during a majority. The Church of England was Erastian without disguise; and under an absolute monarch was subject, almost without restraint, to his whims and vagaries.

There were many indications of the future course of the Government's religious policy, beyond the composition of the Council, in spite of the initial apparent quiet. One was the publication of the Udall edition of Erasmus' Paraphrase of the New Testament and, at the same time, Cranmer's Book of Homilies. If there were any doubts left the injunctions of the Council and the royal visitation ought to have dispelled them. 24

Parliament sat in the late fall of 1547, as did Convocation. For once, almost the first time since 1529,
the Clergy was practically unanimous on theological questions. The Convocation passed a measure which required Communion in both kinds and this was included in the 1547 Act of Parliament against irreverence. The Clergy also granted permission to clerics to marry, but, although it passed the Commons, the Lords rejected it. After Parliament rose "just before New Year's" Cranmer submitted a series of questions to his colleagues designed to ascertain their opinions on the Mass. The general consensus seemed to be to retain the Mass, but to add an English communion service for the laity. In the course of this examination Cranmer objected to the term "oblation and sacrifice" in the Mass. He said that it was only a "memory and representation of the Sacrifice on the Cross." He went even further to declare that the Mass had no efficacy save for those who made their communions and that private Masses for the living and the dead were, therefore, vain superstitions. Cranmer's supporters in these ideas on the Mass included Ridley, Holbeach, Barlow, Cox, and Taylor. The majority of the bishops took the Catholic view, and the Protector, typically cautious, wanted no hasty measures just then.

After the prorogation of Parliament in January, 1548, questions were again addressed to the bishops, this time to determine the consensus as to the best form for the Communion Service. Of course, the replies varied, some wanting no change, others desiring a completely English service. The new Order for Communion of March, 1548 came the closest to Bishop Tunstall's recommendations. He suggested a compromise whereby the Latin Mass would be retained for all essentials,
with the addition of an English Communion Service for the laity.

Other events occurred which intimately affected the life of the parish. The chief question which agitated the reformers during 1547 was the use of images. The churches in England were full of them, and the laity, for the most part, held them in high esteem. The general policy of the Government at first was to destroy only those images which were "abused." The determination of whether or not an image was "abused" usually rested with the local authorities. Usually in those troubled times a single complaint against an image was sufficient to insure its destruction. It was not difficult to find a complaint, particularly in the towns, and a period of unrestrained destruction ensued in many places. "Images" also included not only statuary, but also pictures, murals, and stained glass windows. Most of these furnishings were gifts of pious persons, many of whom were long since dead, and were articles of great value, in some instances art treasures. Some parishes saved their stained glass because they could not afford to reglaze their windows. Foreigners purchased large quantities of such Church property for a fraction of its actual value. Often private home were looted by the irresponsible persons sometimes entrusted with parts of the royal visitation.

*Cranmer had all the images in his diocese destroyed in 1548. In the spring of 1549 the Oxford Colleges were purged of images and even the niches were destroyed. In 1550 Ridley purged the diocese of London, and in 1551 Bulkeley purged Northern Wales, and Hooper removed all images in the dioceses of Gloucester and Worcester the same year. The latter destroyed even the effigies on tombs, which the Council had exempted.
On February 11, 1548 the Council abolished the distinction which had hitherto been made between "abused" and "non-abused" images, and ordered their wholesale destruction. The same order prohibited the blessing of the candles for the coming year on the Feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the crossing with ashes on Ash Wednesday, the use of palms on Palm Sunday, the creeping to the Cross on Good Friday, the blessing and use of the Pascal Candle, and the use of holy bread and holy water.

Gardiner endeavored to stop in part these prohibitions by arguments which he sent to Somerset on February 28, 1548. He said:

We are assured by Scripture that in the name of God the Church is able and strong to cast out devils, and holy water, not supposed by the intelligent to have any virtue in itself, is used to convey the effect of this invocation of God's name, just as water in Baptism is a vehicle of God's grace.

On images he said:

All the matter to be feared is excess of worshipping. The function of images is to work in us a holy remembrance of Christ and his saints. We kneel and bow and cense not at that the images be, but at that the images signify.

That such arguments had little effect upon the Government was amply proved by subsequent events.

Later there was a general removal or destruction of altars and organs throughout the realm. In the summer of 1549 the organs were removed from All Soul's College, Oxford, and soon thereafter from the entire University. Ridley encouraged their removal in London. In 1550 the organ was taken
from St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and Holgate removed those in York Minster in 1552. The altars were pulled down in Jesus' College, Cambridge, in 1549; in June, 1550 Ridley dismantled the High Altar in St. Paul's Cathedral, London. This sort of pillage continued throughout the land until on November 24, 1550 the Council legalized it by an order for a general destruction of all altars. The stones in many cases were used for water troughs and for repairs on floors and walls of churches and secular buildings. At the same time rood screens were dismantled and the wood used to build secular furniture. Throughout England Reservation of the Sacrament was discontinued: in 1548 at Winchester, in 1548 at Worcester, and in 1549 at London. This may have been occasioned by foreign influence, which was now strong in England. Towards the end of 1548 Peter Martyr had presented Somerset a tract which said, "The residue of this Sacrament, after Communion is done, ought not to be kept as we see it now in Popish churches."

The Edwardine Visitors attacked the use of rosaries, but did not categorically forbid them. The Homilies condemned their use in general terms. In 1549 those who used them in public were ejected from churches in many places, and in 1550 Ridley forbade the use of them in his London diocese. Hooper even went so far as to order the houses of the laity in his see to be searched for them in 1552. In all action of this kind the churchwarden was very instrumental and became in reality a minor government official.
Cranmer, early in June, 1547, revived the idea of a Book of Homilies, which he had first suggested in 1542, to take the place of sermons. Initially Gardiner had promised to assist him; but he refused to do so in 1547 because of his principle that no innovations should be made during the king's nonage. Gardiner also believed that the King's Book adequately met whatever real need there might have been for them. When the Book of Homilies was finally issued it said nothing about the Mass. The omission was extremely important, for since the Clergy was limited by law to reading the Homilies rather than preaching sermons, it effectively stopped instruction in favor of the Mass.

The publication and enforced use of Erasmus' Paraphrase was far more destructive of Catholic belief among the laity, however, than the Homilies. The whole book was slanted to the Protestant view of doctrine. It "suggested endless parallelisms between the Jewish priesthood and the clergy, the antagonism of Christ's teaching to ecclesiastical injunctions, the opposition between the spirit and the letter." To have such doctrine read day after day in the churches of England was bound to produce some effect, either of revulsion or approval. The whole thing was really part of the attempt to prepare the minds of the laity to accept the new Prayer Book of 1549. As was seen above this attempt was not very successful.

On May 12, 1548 the whole Communion Service was said in English at Westminster by a royal chaplain; and in
the Royal Chapel a service similar to that enforced later by
the first Act of Uniformity was in use by August, 1548. Various
churches throughout the realm concurrently saw the cessation of
the Latin Mass, including St. Paul's, London. Aside from
the fact that in form and basic doctrine the Order of Communion
of 1548 is a forerunner of the Prayer Book of 1549, it is in¬
teresting in that its Preface states the religious policy of
the Government officially. In it "the king is made to say that
he was able to discern in what directions the further reform
which the document [the Preface] promised was necessary."

One of the dominant ideas, of course, of this 1548
Order of Communion was the encouragement of the laity to make
their communions and that frequently. Private communions were,
however, not urged by the new service and as a result the sick
almost never made them. Thus the Visitation of the Sick and
Extreme Unction rapidly fell into disuse. Luther's attitude
on the Epistle of St. James may have had something to do with
this. Many reformers utterly condemned private communions.
Ceverdale stated expressly in his translation of Calvin's The
Treatise on Death his beliefs: "... the sick man must satisfy
himself with the general breaking of bread whereof he was par¬
taker with the whole congregation."

The need for liturgical, although not doctrinal,
reform was undoubtedly in order in England as elsewhere at
this time. The Roman Catholics freely admitted this, and,
indeed, they began their reform before it was begun in England.
Cardinal Quignon had reformed the Breviary in 1535, dedicating it to Pope Paul III. Many of these reforms anticipated those of Cranmer by over a decade. That Cranmer made use of the reformed Breviary of Cardinal Quignon seems very likely. The similarities of the reforms were first pointed out by the Rev. William Palmer in his *Origines Liturgicae* in 1832.

The next publication of interest, after the Order of Communion of March, 1548, occurred in July, and is called *The Psalter, or Book of Psalms*, whereunto is added the Litany and certain other devout prayers. It was issued under the king's license and is important because the Communion Service was explicitly said to be a service in remembrance of Christ's death and not a propitiatory oblation and sacrifice offered to God for the quick and the dead. The Real Presence was thus in effect denied. Following this book there issued from the press a regular flood of anti-Catholic literature. Among the most important works that were thus published are the following: Marcourt's *Declaration of the Mass*; Luther's *Disclosures of the Canon of the Popish Mass*; a reprint of 1545 original of *The Lamentation of a Christian Against the City of London*; a reprint of Tracy's *Zwinglian A Brief and Short Declaration*; a reprint of Tracy's *A Most Godly Instruction*; a reprint of Turner's *New Dialogue*, wherein is contained the Examination of the Mass; Turner's translation of the Calvinistic tract of Regius entitled *A Comparison between the Old Learning and the New*. The following works by Gilby: *The True Judgment and*
Declaration of a Faithful Christian; Answer to the Devilish Detection of Stephen Gardiner; The Old Faith of Great Britain and the New Learning of England; News From Rome; The Treatise against the Privy Mass; The New Dialogue; and A Christian Sentence and True Judgment of the Most Honorable Sacrament; the anonymous A Compendious Treatise of Slander; Martyr's Of the Sacrament of Thanksgiving; and the book attributed to Cranmer entitled Unwritten Verities, which emphasized the authority of kings in matters spiritual.

The Unwritten Verities, was particularly important because the 1549 Prayer Book, although moderate in doctrinal change, contained several things laid down in principle therein. First, as was said, the authority of the king over the Clergy was emphasized. Second, the Church was bound to condemn those things not found explicitly in the Scriptures. Third, certain practices could be tolerated until such time as the civil authorities saw fit to forbid them. This book was really written to prepare the country for change at the expense of the Clergy and the Church, and it adopted a moderate conciliatory tone throughout.

From a consideration of the books printed prior to the publication of the 1549 Prayer Book, it seems most unlikely that the 1549 Book was meant to be permanent. This literature was unofficially fostered by the Government, which could easily have forbidden it but did not, while great restraint was laid upon the Roman Catholic press. The stream of books and pamphlets continued almost unabated until the end of the reign. If the
1549 Book had been meant to be permanent why did the Government foster printed attacks upon it? It seems highly doubtful that the 1552 Prayer Book was entirely due to the presence of foreign Protestant divines in England. "Only one theory seems to satisfy the situation, and that is that the First Prayer Book was either issued as a mere effort to beat time, or that it was meant to test public opinion." It seems possible that both reasons entered into its publication, as well as the fact that some sincere men who voted for it in Parliament actually thought that it was final, and approved of it as far as it went in change, which, compared with the innovations of the Continental reformers, was not very far.

In support of the theory that the 1549 Prayer Book was not meant to be final it is interesting to note that in August, 1549, the Council ordered that no books could be published except those licensed by the Government. The publications after this order, however frequently attacked the 1549 Book. Why did the Government license such books if the first Prayer Book was intended to be final? Bucer and Fagius both wrote to Strasburg from Lambeth, where they were staying, and where they would undoubtedly have access to inside information, that the Catholic concessions in the 1549 Prayer Book were merely temporary; and they wrote thus before the day had even arrived for its compulsory use.

In 1547 Convocation asked Cranmer to lay before it the results of his labors since 1543 on service book revision.
He refused to do so, however, until he was prepared to offer a relatively finished draft. Finally, in 1548, after the publication of the Order of Communion, he formally brought before the Clergy the idea of an English Book of Common Prayer. Somerset supported the idea, hoping for an ensuing uniformity of "worship, of doctrine, of discipline, which all would learn to understand and appreciate." The Protector was fearful of the effects of religious dissension on the unstable political situation.

One can find in the British Museum two trial drafts of the order of services which were drawn up by Cranmer. The first was based primarily upon the Sarum Use and showed the strong influence of the reformed Breviary of Cardinal Quignon. The second had striking parallels to the Orders of Morning and Evening Prayer in the 1549 Prayer Book. In the final result the spirit of the Sarum Use permeated the Collects, Epistles, Gospels, and the Orders of Morning and Evening Prayer. The Consultation of Archbishop Hermann vitally influenced both the Order of Baptism and the Communion Service. Quignon's Breviary made a large contribution to the Preface, the Calendar, and the Plan of Scripture readings for successive days. The Communion Service was also indebted to the liturgies of the Greek Church, especially that of St. John Chrysostom, and also to those of the Gallican and Mozarabic Rites.

All the various services were collected into one book and, with radical changes, were put into English. There is a marked compression of the old offices, of which the new
daily services were the shortened and expurgated counterparts. Martins, Lauds, and Prime formed the basis of Morning Prayer, and Vespers and Compline that of Evening Prayer. In both of these new services can be observed "Cranmer's order more profitable, for there is no Ave, no apocryphal or doubtful legends, no perplexing search to find out what should be read." The Communion Service is certainly a compromise of the first order, not Zwinglian, not Roman, not Lutheran, but all of these and still none of these. If it inclined in any direction, however, it would be toward the Lutheran. The changes entailed a considerable aesthetic loss, for the Latin services, when well done, had great beauty and interest in spite of their intricate and elaborate nature. The loss of a number of excellent Latin hymns was tragic and really unnecessary, even for the purposes of the reformers. On the whole, however, Cranmer did exceptionally well; his style is masterful, and the Prayer Book of 1549 ranks as probably the greatest English prose masterpiece of the reign.

It is well-known that Cranmer was the chief person involved in the composition and compilation of the 1549 Prayer Book. There are indications that other bishops were also consulted. The whole process is vague, however, for the records are practically non-existent. In September and October, 1548 a group of clerics met at Windsor and later at Chertsey Abbey, one of Cranmer's estates, to discuss the theological controversies then rending the land. From the clerics own assertions it is known that draft of the 1549 Prayer Book was put before
them for their approval. Most of them assented to it, although some complained later that it was subsequently altered. In the event, however, the Prayer Book in the form in which it was presented to Parliament was, to all intents and purposes, the work of Cranmer.

The Prayer Book came before Parliament, which opened on November 24, 1548, for approval. Here the salient point of contention was the Communion Service. The doctrines involved in the Mass were debated in the House of Lords on December 14th to 17th, 1548, on three points: (1) Whether or not there was a Real Presence after the consecration; (2) Whether or not such a Real Presence, or any benefits for that matter, could be received by evil men, and (3) whether or not transubstantiation occurred by consecration. Lay lords as well as prelates debated these questions with heat, although it is doubtful whether the debate influenced the contents of the Prayer Book as it was passed. The chief point of interest about this strange Parliamentary debate was that Cranmer there stated his beliefs. He said:

Our faith is not to believe Him [Christ] to be in bread and wine, but that he is in heaven; this proved by Scripture and Doctors till the Bishop of Rome's usurped power came in. Later on in the debate he said 'I believe that Christ is eaten with the heart. The eating with our mouth cannot give us life, for then should a sinner have life. Only good men can eat Christ's body; and when the evil eateth the Sacrament, bread and wine, he neither hath Christ's body nor eateth it'.

Thus Cranmer insisted upon a spiritual presence, the reception of which was made by the faith alone of the communicant. In
this same debate Ridley was of the same mind as Cranmer, but rather more circumspect. He said that only bread and wine in all respects remained after consecration, but "still the bread of communion is not mere bread, but bread united to the divinity."

The Act of Uniformity was passed by Parliament on January 20, 1549 and included the requirement to use the new Prayer Book. Cranmer had to modify the book slightly in order to obtain a majority of the bishops in the House of Lords. The clerical vote was 13 for, 10 against, and 4 unaccounted. The most important change was the substitution of the phrases "sacrament of the body" and "sacrament of the blood" for the words "bread" and "wine" in the last rubric of the Communion Service in order to please Bishop Bonner.

The question of whether the 1549 Prayer Book was passed by Convocation has aroused wide variation of opinion among historians. It is probably impossible to ever determine the answer definitively, for the records of the Convocation of Canterbury were burned in the Great Fire of London in 1666. Such historians as Heylyn and Fuller, who worked before the fire, do not mention that Convocation passed the Prayer Book of 1549. Burnet and Collier say nothing in the affirmative and W. Wake categorically says that the book was never passed. Strype, writing in 1723, said that the book was offered to Convocation, but not that it was passed. Henry Gee says that it probably was, Cirlot says definitely that it was, and Dixon and Gasquet have gone to great pains to prove that it was not, as has Constant. The question is very significant, because apologists
for the Anglican Church rest their case for Anglican catholicity upon the ground that only those acts passed by Convocation are ecclesiastically legal. If Convocation did not pass the Prayer Book of 1549, as it did not pass those of 1552 and 1559, the ecclesiastical settlement of Tudor England is of very doubtful validity in the eyes of the Church, if the initial assumption, that determination of Church law resides in the Church, is valid.

The Act of Uniformity gave a very good account of the purpose of the 1549 Prayer Book. As we have seen from the examination of the literature of the period, this was not its only purpose, however. Cranmer had his purposes too, which throw further light on the subject. They were given in the Preface of the Prayer Book. He said:

The godly and decent order of the ancient fathers hath been so altered, broken and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories and legends with multitudes of responses, verses, vain repetitions, commendations, and synodals . . . that they [the laity] have hearkened with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind have not been edified thereby.63

The implication is that the new Prayer Book would clear up these difficulties. Others have disagreed with Cranmer as to what was the true purpose of the 1549 Prayer Book. As one modern author says:

The Prayer Book of 1549 recast the old rites and ceremonies in accordance with the new ideas of the German reformation. Under the pretext of restoring public worship to its primitive purity, it superimposed upon the old English liturgy that of the Lutherans, whose spirit inspired the entire work.64
If the 1549 Prayer Book cleared away a certain lack of congregational edification, which may or may not be the case, it raised some difficulties as well. The radical reformers disliked it because it was not unambiguously Protestant. The Catholics disliked it because it was implicitly Protestant, although when its use became an accomplished fact Gardiner tried to explain away its Protestant implications as we shall see.

That Cranmer, its chief author, intended to depart from Catholic doctrine can be seen in his treatise On the Lord's Supper, in which he wrote, "... not long before I wrote the said catechism [he had translated the Catechism of Justus Jonas in 1548] I was in that error of the real presence as I was many years past in divers other errors as of transubstantiation." In his Remains he tells us that Ridley had influenced him. He thus must perforce have held Protestant doctrine when he composed the 1549 Prayer Book, for his views were relatively indigenous, and not much influenced by the foreign reformers whom he entertained at Lambeth Palace.

As H. O. Taylor so well pointed out, the new Communion Service discarded the Catholic conception of the Mass as a sacrifice satisfactory and an oblation to God for the sins of all men; and became rather a celebration with "these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine" of "the memorial which thy Son hath, willed us to make." "A 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' was offered, not (as Cranmer explained) to reconcile us to God, but to testify the duty of those who have been reconciled already by Christ."
In Edward's *Domestic Papers* is found the young king's stout defence of the Prayer Book after the revolts in the summer of 1549 had put the reformers on the defensive. He wrote after the fall of Somerset and said that although the Protector was gone the people would not have back the Mass, for it had been abolished by Parliament with royal approval. In his views on doctrine he agreed in all respects with Cranmer, illustrating the results of his Protestant training. Later, however, Edward began to outrun his teachers, having become so radical on the religious question that he "wished all ancient rules to be modified so as to be in conformity with the reformed religion, including the statutes of the Order of the Garter."  

As was said earlier, there were several influential books published with governmental sanction, which were of a vitriolic nature, after the 1549 Prayer Book was issued. Among them are the following: Lancaster's *The Right and True Understanding of the Supper of the Lord*; Ochino's *A Tragedy of the Unjust and Usurped Primacy of the Bishop of Rome*; Bale's *Examination of Mistress Anne Askewe*; Bale's *The Image of Both Churches*; Vernon's *Five Abominable Blasphemies contained in the Mass*; Vernon's *Godly Sayings of the Old Ancient Fathers upon the Sacrament*; the anonymous *The Battery of the Pope's High Altar*, which contained the first reference to sitting reception of the Sacrament; an official edition of Tyndale's *New Testament*; the anonymous and Calvinistic *The True Belief in Christ and His Sacraments*; Hooper's *Godly Confession*. 
This last work was especially significant because it came from the pen of so influential a person. Hooper denied herein the efficacy of baptismal regeneration. He said that it was merely a "sign, seal, and confirmation of redemption by faith." He had no belief in Apostolic Succession. He said:

I believe that the Church is bound to no sort of people, or any ordinary succession of Bishops, Cardinals, or such like... I am sorry with all my heart to see the Church of Christ degenerate into a civil polity... so that the Holy Ghost must be a captive and a bondman to the Bishop's sees and palaces.  

His teachings on the subject of the Communion was utterly Protestant. He said:

As for the Supper of the Lord... I believe it is a remembrance of Christ's death, a seal and confirmation of his precious body given unto death wherewith we are redeemed. It is a visible word that preacheth peace between man and man, teacheth to condemn the world for the hope of the life to come.  

Gardiner answered Hooper from the Tower; the latter was not very learned and his refutation was relatively easy to accomplish. The chief line of Gardiner's argument was that Hooper, by advocating direct spiritual communion with God had removed effectively the need for any corporate Church here on earth. This, although logical, Hooper was not prepared to admit, nor for that matter were any of the reformers. Hooper's position was thus shown to be self-contradictory. The chief appeal of Hooper's stand was to the man or government that chafed under clerical control, and particularly to the economically powerful classes of the day. "Men who understood little of the subtleties of the sacramentarian controversy
were ready to embrace a doctrine which, claiming to be apostolic, tended to free life from clerical control."

Particularly after the publication of the 1549 Prayer Book reformers of a new type came into prominence in England. They were not Lutheran in doctrine; they were not Calvinist, for Calvin's ideas were hardly yet known in England, not coming to be influential until after Mary's reign. These new reformers have loosely been called Calvinists, but such was simply not the case. They were generally disciples of the Swiss school and the imperious Bullinger was their oracle. They resembled the Donatists in doctrine; called any who disagreed with them often inaccurately "Papist;" and "described themselves as 'Christians,' or 'they that have received the Gospel.'" Cranmer, although he often sympathized with them, never was one of them. He was surrounded with a group of these new, radical Protestants. They never brought him to their various positions, but they probably influenced him to some extent to attempt a revision of the 1549 Prayer Book, which was contemplated, even at the time of its publication, by both the Government and him. Among these radicals were the following men, many of whom were foreigners: Pietro Martire Vermigli, Tremellius, Ochino, John á Lasco, John Utenhove, Martin Bucer, Paul Fagius, Dryander, Micronius, Poullain, Peter Alexander, Vérnon, Hooper, Coverdale, Bale, Rogers, and Traheron. Of these Martíre, Bucer, and Hooper were probably the most influential.
Bucer was asked in 1550 by his diocesan, Bishop Goodrich of Ely, to write a Censura on the 1549 Prayer Book. He did so and it was later printed in Bucer's Scripta Anglicana (Basel, 1577). Some of his critical comments may have influenced Cranmer. The man who influenced Cranmer most, however, was he who seemed least likely to do so, namely, Gardiner. Gardiner by his Catholic interpretation of the 1549 Prayer Book probably convinced Cranmer that it would have to be revised in a Protestant direction.

In 1550 the Défence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament had been written by Cranmer with the approval of the Government. It was written in order to clarify all ambiguous passages in the 1549 Prayer Book, and can be taken as the official interpretation of it. The Défence substantiates to a great degree the contention that Cranmer and his associates intended a Protestant Prayer Book in 1549. Cranmer said in this book concerning the doctrine involved in the Communion Service that "I take to be a plain untruth . . . that the body and blood of Christ be under the forms of bread and wine." He insisted that Christ was not present in any form whether spiritual or corporal, but rather "in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine; he is spiritually and corporally in heaven." According to Cranmer the phrase in the Canon of the 1549 Prayer Book that the bread and wine "may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ" meant that the recipients of Communion "in the godly using of them, they be unto the receivers Christ's Body and Blood." It was the use
of the Sacrament that was significant to Cranmer and not the Sacrament itself. He compared it to Baptism, on which he held similar ideas.

It seems rather obvious that the 1549 Prayer Book was made deliberately ambiguous by the Government and Cranmer in order to force it through Parliament. Later it would be easy to publish an official clarification under Government license. The Defence served this purpose. Cranmer at this time may not have been an avowed Zwinglian, but in any case his idea of a spiritual presence which is only present in a worthy reception of the bread and wine is so near to Zwinglianism as to make the difference between the two almost imperceptible.

From the Tower Gardiner answered this official interpretation. His sure, keen thrust is observed from his pointed remark that "for the first time in history a Primate of all England has called into question the central mystery of the Christian worship . . ." This must have hurt, for Cranmer was proud of his office, as was seen at his degradation a few years later under Mary, when he asked the men who tried to remove his pall, "Which of you has a Pall?"

Gardiner's book was entitled An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith, Touching the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar (1551). He stated his belief in transubstantiation, taking "This is my body" to be literally true. He pointed out that this has always been thus interpreted by the faithful so far as he can find out. He admitted that it
involved a miracle, but saw no reason to deny it. He said that this doctrine was not gross because when Christ's body and blood were present on the altar they were his spiritualized body and blood, and not his earthly form. Christ being a spiritual being could, by the idea of omnipresence, be in heaven and on earth too. "Flesh profiteth nothing in itself, but flesh in Christ is united to the divine nature, and is therefore spirit and life to the believing partaker." Gardiner continued as follows:

As Christ is naturally in his Father, and his Father in him, so he that eateth verily the flesh of Christ, he is by nature in Christ, and Christ is naturally in him, and the worthy receiver hath life increased, augmented, and confirmed by the participation of the flesh of Christ. We eat not the carnal flesh of a common man, as the letter teacheth, but the very spiritual flesh of Christ, God and man, as faith teacheth. We receive Christ's flesh glorified, incorruptible, very spiritual, and in a spiritual manner delivered unto us.  

Thus Gardiner said further that the presence of Christ in the Sacrament was what is known as substantial, not accidental, and also spiritual, and was really, not figuratively, nor in the heart of the recipient only, present. He said that it was received by all men but that Christ's presence instantly departed from the evil man who was a recipient. Gardiner continued by saying that the Church, in teaching that the Sacrament is a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead, did not derogate from "the complete and perfect sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross." The Mass was not a repetition of the Great Sacrifice, but rather a re-presentation, of it for the sin into which men daily fall. It was celebrated
actually by Christ working through the priest at the altar. He further pointed out that if the Real Presence was acknowledged transubstantiation was the logical corollary, and that to affirm the former and deny the latter was to introduce contradiction into the faith. Any such contradiction had been condemned at the Council of Constantinople in A. D. 553. The fact that Gardiner related these doctrines to the 1549 Prayer Book in opposition to Cranmer's official interpretation made them doubly important.

Gardiner's Explication used the 1549 Prayer Book as its tactical point because it was Cranmer's own work. If a Catholic interpretation could be given to it Gardiner believed that the reformers would be turned back upon themselves. He noted five passages in the 1549 Communion Service which, he said, upheld Catholic doctrine: (1) the words of administration; (2) the rubric providing for the fracture of each wafer into two parts; (3) the whole of the Prayer of Consecration; (4) the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church with its petitions for the dead as well as for the living; and (5) the Prayer of Humble Access, made before the Communion but after the Consecration, and in which adoration was shown the Sacrament.

The Explication was answered by Cranmer in An Answer ... unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation Devised by Stephen Gardiner. Gardiner answered in 1552 with a publication entitled Confutation Cavillationum. Cranmer began a reply to this during his imprisonment after Edward's death, but he never finished it. Peter Martyr finally published a Latin rejoinder
in 1559, although both Cranmer and Gardiner were dead by that time. In any case, the negative influence of the "crafty" Stephen Gardiner is seen in the 1552 revision. Every point that he had used as evidence of the Catholicity of the 1549 Prayer Book was carefully revised, rejected, or transposed so that its meaning was utterly changed.

A meeting of bishops was held at Lambeth Palace in January, 1551 to discuss possible Prayer Book revision. The bishops who attended, although we cannot be certain, were probably Cranmer, Ridley, Goodrich, and Holbeach, together with Cheke as Court observer, Cox, the King's Almoner, and possibly others. Hooper was certainly not there, for he was in disgrace after his part in the Vestiarian Controversy. Cranmer did not then favor revision, for he feared the influence of the radical reformers at Court and the effects of Hooper's conflict over vestments at the time of his elevation. Cranmer even started to write his reply to Gardiner's Explication, hoping to ease the situation without resorting to revision. Cheke, however, threatened Cranmer with Parliamentary intervention at the king's initiative if revision were not begun. Such intervention Cranmer wished to avoid if possible, so he yielded to Cheke. The sweating sickness which occurred in the summer of 1551 postponed action, however, and it was not until the winter of 1551-1552 that work was begun.

There is no exact record of just who drew up the revision of 1552 beyond Cranmer, who probably did most of it.
It may be that members of the Ordinal Commission of 1550 helped, or possibly members of the Commission for the Reform of the Ecclesiastical Law, who were consulted on the Forty-Two Articles. On October 6, 1551 a Commission of Thirty-Two was appointed to change the canon law. This commission included eight clerics, eight laity, eight lawyers, and other persons. It seems quite likely that this commission also had a part in the revision, and such a theory is explicitly suggested by the letters of Ulmis.

The revised Prayer Book passed Parliament in the spring of 1552. All the "Catholic" passages of the 1549 Prayer Book were deleted: the words of administration became "Take and eat (or drink) this in remembrance that Christ died for thee." Just what the "this" was was hardly clear, but in any case it was purely a matter of remembrance and had no Real Presence attached to it. The rubric concerning the body of Christ being whole in each piece of bread disappeared, as did the fraction. The Prayer of Humble Access was placed before the Consecration so that no adoration could be inferred. All prayers for the dead were omitted. Also rubrics about vestments disappeared for the most part, and the word "altar" was replaced by "table" throughout the book. The Kyrie Eleison became a part of the prayer to God to be given grace to keep the Ten Commandments, instead of being an invocation of the presence of the Lord. Likewise the Gloria in Excelsis, by being placed after the Communion, became a prayer of thanksgiving rather than a triumphal song sung to herald the presence of God. The
Benedicitus was truncated for the same reason. The Agnus Dei was omitted because it implied supplication to the Real Presence. Ordinary bread was used in order to remove "superstition" as one of the rubrics says; and the Mass vestments were forbidden as signifying a sacrificing priest. The communion table, which replaced the altar, was removed from the east wall of the church and placed in the nave to drive home the point that it was no longer a sacrificial altar, but rather a congregational supper table upon which a drama in memory of the Last Supper was occasionally reenacted.

The Act of Uniformity of 1552 indicated without equivocation the reasons for the revision. It said that there had been many doubts about the meaning of the 1549 Communion Service; and that therefore, in order to remove them and to bring the Prayer Book into accord with the intention of the Government, even in 1549, the revision had been undertaken. The Preface of the 1552 Prayer Book stated (as did that of 1559) that "... if the Bishop of the Diocese be in any doubt [about the interpretation of the Prayer Book], then may he send for the resolution thereof unto the Archbishop."

This precluded by law the possibility of any such controversy as had arisen between Cranmer and Gardiner. It had the effect of giving the Archbishop's interpretations the force of law, and thus his intentions and pronouncements determined the official meaning of any Prayer Book passage. Although the 1552 Prayer Book passed Parliament, it was definitely never
passed by Convocation, and was even illegally changed after Parliamentary passage by the addition of the "Black Rubric."

It is doubtful whether the 1552 Prayer Book would have been final had Edward lived. He was strongly Protestant and, towards the close of his reign, verged toward Calvinism. Upon attaining his majority he would have effected whatever changes he thought fitting and proper. Moreover, Cranmer seems not to have considered the 1552 Prayer Book final, as is seen from Bullinger's statement in 1555 that "Cranmer had drawn up a book of prayers an hundred times more perfect than that which was then in being, but the same could not take place, for he was matched with such a wicked clergy and convocation." The radical reformers, such as Knox, did not consider the 1552 Prayer Book as final, and they exercised a considerable and ever-growing influence under Edward.

Just at the end of the reign the commission to change the ecclesiastical law of England was appointed. The work of this commission, the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum, really was not a revision of canon law, but a new constitution for the Church of England constructed on abstract principles. It was never enacted into law nor submitted to Convocation because the reign ended too soon. The most noteworthy features were the proposed revival of diocesan synods, and the reduction of the provincial Convocations to meetings of the bishops to be convened with the assent of the king to consider momentous spiritual
affairs of common interest. The power of the ecclesiastical courts was not to have been reduced, however. It also included the provision that deniers of or blasphemers against Christianity, as understood by the reformers, were to be subject to forfeiture and death. The ecclesiastical courts were to have exclusive jurisdiction in such cases, the civil arm to be used only for the executions. Moreover, excommunications were held to consign the excommunicants to eternal hell. In this the English Church aspired to use a weapon designed for hands far stronger than her's. The rigor of these provisions may explain in part why the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum was never enacted into law, for it was contrary to the spirit of the times. Not that Tudor England objected to persecution, but it wanted it done, when done, by the State, not by the Church. In addition, the divorce laws would have been relaxed by the proposed code, but the private morality of both clergy and laity would have been strictly regulated. Such a law would almost certainly fail of passage in any age. It is chiefly interesting as a reflection of the minds of some of the reformers.

The case of the Forty-Two Articles was a very different matter. They were enacted into law, and went into effect on June 9, 1553, but not November 1, 1552 as originally planned. They were primarily the product of Cranmer; and concerned themselves with doctrine, as the Fifty-Four Articles, which are not utterly lost, concerned themselves with rites and ceremonies. Almost every one of the clauses on the
Communion were rebuttals to the decrees of the Council of Trent. Also certain errors of the Anabaptists and of the Millenarians were here condemned. The language and substance showed borrowings from the Augsburg Confession. The influence of the radical reformers can be seen in some of these pronouncements on the Communion, but not nearly so much as in the unpublished *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* which said, "The Eucharist is a sacrament in which they who sit as guests at the Lord's holy table receive food from the bread and drink from the wine." The Council published the Forty-Two Articles with a complete lack of honesty, for it added to the legal title that the Articles had been agreed upon by the "bishops and other learned men in the synod at London" in March, 1553. Such was not the case, since the Clergy in synod were definitely not consulted.

After Edward's death the Forty-Two Articles were not explicitly repealed and in Elizabeth's reign went unnoticed at first. Later, before Convocation met in 1562, Parker and other bishops worked on their revision. The Convocation finally adopted the Latin version of them as reduced to the Thirty-Nine Articles. In 1571 Convocation slightly revised this version, put it into English, and adopted it. Later in the same year Parliament passed it into law.

Edward died in July, 1553 and Mary died in November, 1558. The latter was succeeded by Elizabeth.
With Elizabeth's accession a period of doubt and confusion as to the Government's religious policy ensued. The Catholic Mass continued in most places without interruption, but little incidents showed the spirit of the new reign. On Christmas Day, 1558, for example, the priest saying Mass before Elizabeth elevated the Host against her instructions, and she, in anger, left the service before it was completed. Also it was said that her hand shrank from Bonner's lips as he kissed it. Bonner had been a great persecutor of Protestants in his London diocese under Mary.

Elizabeth was crowned on January 15, 1559, the same day that Calvin dedicated to her his book of comments on Isaiah. The actual coronation ceremony is obscure, but the bishops, so it would appear, swore fealty as always, the Epistle and Gospel were read in English, the celebrant of the Mass was one of her own chaplains, he did not elevate the Host, and she did not communicate. She was anointed by the Bishop of Carlisle, since there was no Archbishop of Canterbury living at the time.

Elizabeth's first Parliament opened on January 25, 1559. The religious policy of the new Government, which was headed by Cecil, was kept a profound secret, although plans were made by the inner circle as was noted above. Before the Parliament had opened the Government had ordered that no religious alterations of any sort were to be inaugurated privately on any pretext. In spite of this proclamation many of the reformers, who had been in exile under Mary,
began to return and break the religious peace on all sides. As a consequence, at Christmas, 1558 the Government had again forbidden any changes except that the Litany, Epistles, Gospels, and Commandments might be said in English. All preaching was forbidden by the same proclamation.

The new Parliament sat, with recesses, until May 8, 1559, and during that time the Elizabethan Settlement in its essentials was hammered out and made law.

It is often objected that the whole settlement was made by Parliament, and that the result was a parliamentary church, erected by authority of Parliament, not merely without reference to the clergy in Convocation, but in direct opposition to their wishes and despite their protest.

On the other hand it is argued that no other course could have been followed, considering the circumstances of the time. This argument is open to grave question, however.

By early 1559 it had become obvious that the incumbent clergy would not yield to changes. The Convocation of Canterbury sat the day after Parliament, according to custom, and its lower house declared its position in a set of five articles known as the Protest Against Religious Change. The Protest read as follows:

1. In the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of the words of Christ duly spoken by the priest, is present realiter, under the kinds of bread and wine, the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also his natural blood.
2. That after the consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance but the substance of God and Man.
3. That in the Mass is offered the true body of Christ, and his true blood, a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.\textsuperscript{117}

As a fourth point the Clergy gave full affirmation to papal supremacy, and in the fifth article declared:

\begin{quote}
That the authority of handling and defining concerning the things belonging to the faith, sacraments and discipline ecclesiastical hath hitherto ever belonged, and ought to belong, only to the pastors of the Church, whom the Holy Ghost, for this purpose, hath set in the Church, and not to laymen.\textsuperscript{118}
\end{quote}

Thus the Clergy declared for the Roman Mass and for Roman supremacy and told laymen to stay out of the regulation of faith, worship, and discipline. The bishops were as firm on these subjects as the lower clergy.

The bishops, of course, sat in the House of Lords, and, since they were united in their opposition to religious innovation, they had great conservative influence. Many of the lay lords, however, were Protestants, often for economic motives, and Norfolk, Bedford, and Clinton were their leaders. The House of Commons was the same house that had sat under Mary and was predominantly conservative, although it did contain some members who earnestly favored change.

The first act of Parliament was to repeal Mary's Act of Repeal and to restore ten of Henry's Acts concerned chiefly with papal power. Next it legalized again Communion in both kinds and repealed Mary's Heresy Act. Then it tried to return to the Crown all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to empower the queen to appoint commissions to exercise this
jurisdiction, and to appoint an oath to be taken by the
officers of the Church and State which acknowledged the
Crown's supremacy. This was the Supremacy Act, which,
although finally passed on April 29, 1559 did not pass
without a parliamentary struggle.

Parliament had been glad to get back the money
that had been paid to the Pope in the form of tenths and
first-fruits under Mary, and there had been no particular
difficulty about the rejection of papal supremacy. The
difficulty arose over the Government's desire to make the
Crown, represented in the person of a woman, Elizabeth, the
supreme head of the English Church. The Government managed
to force a bill through Commons which gave Elizabeth as
full supremacy as Henry had enjoyed; but it utterly broke
down in the Lords on February 27th. The prelates stood
together against it along with the Catholic lay peers, and
in a house that numbered, as a rule, scarcely more than
forty members all told this was a large bloc. After much
wrangling, a much milder bill passed the Lords on March
18th and was returned to the Commons, where it was passed
with amendments and returned to the upper chamber. Here
it stagnated until April 1st. It looked as if the Catholics
might win in the end. Finally the "Supreme Governor" compro-
mise was agreed upon with Elizabeth's consent, and the bill
passed both houses. The queen had the substance of the
power, and she knew it and was sensible enough not to quibble
over the title. She was made in reality the head of the
Church of England, for how can headship and governorship be separated in practice?

Before the passage of the Supremacy Act the Government began its campaign to pass a Uniformity Act. The conservative lay peers banded themselves with the prelates to prevent its passage, for it proposed to restore the Prayer Book of 1552 with three exceptions. Again the doctrine of the Mass was debated in Parliament, and the debate, so well reconstructed by Henry Gee, was tempestuous, to put it mildly.

The issue was clearly drawn by Bishop Scott. He said that the bill in question would destroy the religion in which most Englishmen had been reared; and substitute a new thing, which had existed only a year and then in opposition to the consensus of English Catholics, and which was not in conformity with the rest of Christendom. He pointed out that the proposed book allowed "no oblation, no real sacrifice, no consecration performed or intended . . . And yet, he says, 'the factors thereof contend that it is most perfect according to Christ's institution and the order of the primitive Church.'

In the speech itself, the last great Catholic oration in the British Parliament, Bishop Scott said:

For first, by this bill, Christian charity is taken away, in that the unity of Christ's Church is taken away . . . if Athanasius did think that no man ought to doubt of matters determined in the Council of Nice, where there was present three hundred and eighteen bishops, how much less ought we to doubt of matters determined and practiced in the Holy Catholic Church of Christ . . . And as for the certainty of our faith, whereof the story of the Church doth speak, it is a thing of all other most
necessary; and if it shall hang upon an Act of Parliament, we have but a weak staff to lean unto . . . this doctrine and form of religion, which this bill propoundeth to abolish . . . is that in which our forefathers were born . . . there is required . . . a full mind and intent to do what Christ did, that is, to consecrate His Body and Blood . . . as for this new book, there is no such thing mentioned in it . . . but rather the contrary . . .124

The opposition suddenly collapsed in the face of the power and persistence of the Government, and the Act of Uniformity by a queer trick of fate passed Parliament the day before the Act of Supremacy. The sudden passage of the two bills was also probably owing to the fact that the long drawn-out debate and the consequent social unsettlement had become a national danger. Civil war seemed imminent. This may also account for why the Prayer Book of 1552, with a few changes was used: there was not sufficient scholarly leisure to devise a new one. The foreign situation at this time, which was threatening, as well as the domestic turmoil, also helps in understanding this almost unseemly haste at the end. The Government had thus succeeded in forcing through its religious changes in opposition to the declared position of Convocation, the wishes of the individual prelates, the beliefs of a large minority in Parliament (the Act of Uniformity passed by only three votes in the Lords), and, as nearly as can be ascertained, the general will of the people at large.

The new Act of Uniformity required the use of the Prayer Book of 1552, as was said, with certain changes. The "Black Rubric" was dropped, the Litany omitted the phrase
about the Pope's "detestable enormities," the forms of administration of the Sacrament from the 1549 and 1552 Communion services were combined as one, and certain lessons were required for every Sunday in the year. These were the only changes authorized by Parliament, but when the printed copies of the 1559 Prayer Book appeared there were other changes made in the Ornaments Rubric, which stood until 1662 when more additions were made. There were no contemporary protests about these unauthorized changes in 1559, and it is therefore probable that they were made with the approval of the Privy Council. The text of the Uniformity Act of 1559 read as follows:

All ministers shall be bounden to say and use the matins, evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and administration of each of the Sacraments and all other common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book [that of 1552], so authorized by Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Edward VI, with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every Sunday of the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants, and none otherwise.126

The Ornaments Rubric of 1552 read as follows:

And here is to be noted that the ministers at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but being archbishop or bishop, he shall wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only.127

The Ornaments Rubric of 1559 read as follows:

And here is to be noted that the minister at the time of Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments
in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book. 128

Also the following Proviso is found in the Uniformity Act of 1559:

Such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use as was in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI, until other order shall be taken by the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her commissioners appointed and authorized under the great seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or of the metropolitan of this realm. 129

The last clause clears up the controversy over what were lawful vestments and turns the matter over to the discretion of the Crown and the Archbishop of Canterbury. The changes not specified in the Act of Uniformity were, therefore, legal.

In accordance with the laws, a Court of High Commission was established to deal with ecclesiastical jurisdiction in matters of discipline. Heresy was still a capital crime, but under the new laws of Elizabeth the bishops could scarcely bring heretics to trial and only the most incendiary radicals and ardent Roman Catholics stood in any real danger. Of course, any aberration from the lawful Prayer Book was a crime on the part of the clergy. For the first time in English history all men were by law required under penalties to attend the services of the established Church. All clergy were required to uphold the Settlement upon pain of loss of benefice, and office holders in the Government were required to subscribe to the oath in the Supremacy Act. The Settlement was admittedly a compromise, and one that satisfied neither
the Catholics nor the extreme Protestants; but it was clearly
more Protestant than Catholic, and England took her place
among the Protestant nations amid rejoicings from Germany and
Switzerland.

During the summer and autumn of 1559 the oath con-
tained in the Supremacy Act was submitted to the bishops of
England for their subscription, and save for Kitchen, Bishop
of Llandaff, they utterly refused to take it and were there¬
fore deprived. It was hoped by the Government that Heath and
Tunstall might help consecrate their Protestant successors,
but they declined to do so. The queen nominated successors
for the now vacant sees of England, her nominees were duly
elected, but there was no one to consecrate them. The pros-
pect looked black for Apostolic Succession in England.

As the first step to overcome the situation the
Government considered it necessary to have a successor
consecrated to the See of Canterbury, which had been vacant
since Cardinal Pole's death at the beginning of the reign.
After considerable delay Matthew Parker was finally conse-
crated Archbishop of Canterbury on December 17, 1559, he
having been nominated by Elizabeth who carried through the
matter with dignity. Four bishops, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale,
and Hodgkins, the first and last of whom had been consecrated
according to Catholic rites and the second and third of whom
according to the Edwardine Ordinal, consecrated Parker using
the Edwardine rite. The records of these proceedings are
adequate. All four of these bishops were under deprivation, that is, they lacked jurisdiction. They had been deprived by the ecclesiastical authorities under Mary. The question therefore arises as to how bishops lacking jurisdiction could consecrate Parker? No priest or bishop when deprived of jurisdiction can exercise the power of his priesthood, although he still remains a priest or bishop. The only power that could legally have lifted the deprivation of these four men was Convocation, or even more properly the Pope, and neither one did so as far as can be ascertained. Elizabeth supplied all these "defects" of the consecrators, but it is doubtful if she could legally do such a thing for she was both a woman and a member of the laity. Therefore, one cannot but deny the power of Barlow and his associates to legally and validly consecrate Parker. A question has also been raised by Rome concerning the intention of the consecrators to consecrate a Catholic bishop. It seems clear that the consecrators had no intention of consecrating a bishop in the Roman Catholic sense, and, as will later be shown in Chapter V, the Ordinal had no intention of creating a Catholic bishop. By "Catholic bishop" is meant a bishop with power to offer the sacrifice of the Mass. Thus the Roman Catholics claim that both the intention and the form were insufficient. This may or may not be true, but if it is no priest of the Anglican Clergy is in Apostolic Succession, for they all stem from Parker, and the sacraments which they administer, with the exception of Baptism, are invalid. This is a serious question, for it involves not only the health and destiny of the souls of the clergy involved, but also
those of the laity in their charge.

After Parker's consecration, reforming bishops were rapidly consecrated to fill the vacant sees of England, mostly from among men who had been in exile during Mary's reign. A royal visitation was then organized, during which all Episcopal jurisdiction was suspended. The visitors went throughout the realm administering the Oath of Supremacy and enforcing the new Prayer Book and other regulations. The visitors were very gentle, considering the times, and showed much forbearance to hesitant clergy. About two hundred deans and canons had followed the examples of their bishops, and it was necessary, in order to have a stable ecclesiastical establishment, not to drive out too many parish priests.

We have the record of the visitors proceedings in the Province of York and similar methods were probably followed elsewhere.

A summary form of the Oath was drawn up for subscription by the clergy . . . and in this they undertook to 'acknowledge the restoring again of the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual to the Crown of the realm, and the abolishing of all foreign power repugnant to the same . . .'

Most of the clergy took the oath, probably reluctantly in many cases. Other regulations were also enforced, which included the orders that in preaching the Clergy was to praise and uphold the queen's supremacy and to defame the Pope; that each parish was to have an open copy of the English Bible in sight, together with some copies of the works of the reformers;
that anyone who supported Catholicism was to be reported to the civil authorities who were to deal with him according to the law; that anyone absenting himself from church services without just cause was to be fined; that churchwardens were to destroy all shrines, images, stained glass windows, organs, rood screens, crucifixes, and altars; that tables were to be set up in place of the altars; that the homes of the laity were to be searched for forbidden ornaments; and that the marriages of all clergymen had to be approved by their bishops and two magistrates.

The new services were instituted with less disturbance than might have been expected. Altars and rood screens were demolished, as well as other ornaments, and tables for communion were installed.

. . . a coat of whitewash veiled the painted saints from view. Within a dozen years there had been four great changes in worship, and no good had come of it all. For some time afterwards there are many country gentlemen whom the bishops described as indiffered in religion. '137

The laity wanted to be left alone, both by the Catholics and Protestants, and above all desired stability and permanence. The lack of disturbance over the new services probably grew out of this desire for peace; and also the series of major changes had made many doubt the rightness of any religion and therefore they lacked religious interest.

In the midst of all this change a rather pitiful relic from former times remained: this was Elizabeth's
Royal Chapel. Here there was a handsome altar with cross and lights, and here the clergy wore chasubles. Moreover, there was rarely a sermon, for sermons bored the queen as a rule. The Catholics took encouragement from the queen's tastes, but the Protestants, who hated the ornaments which she had, and loved the sermons which she did not have, were horrified. The chapel was probably kept for two reasons: the queen's private religious tastes, and, above all, diplomatic considerations with foreign powers.

The visitors of 1559 understood the Ornaments Rubric of 1559 to mean that of 1552, not that of 1549, which would have forbidden the wholesale destruction in which they engaged. The Uniformity Act allowed the Government to exercise its discretion, and apparently the visitors went out with instructions to follow the 1552 Rubric. Some of the visitatorial regulations on ornaments are tragic, but some are wryly amusing. In any case they are significant, for the doctrine is shown forth by the ceremony.

Every form was an expression or symbol of some doctrinal acceptance. . . . to substitute communion tables for altars was to declare that the communion was not a sacrifice; the change was a Protestant demonstration, a renunciation of the Mass, and with it a renunciation of the sacerdotal primacy of Rome.139

Often vestments had been supplied by the great self-denial of pious Catholics during the poverty-stricken reign of Mary. Now they were destroyed on the ground that they tended to superstition; some were turned into cash which was usually appropriated by the Government, some were
made over and given to the poor, still others were made into actor's robes, while some were even made into covers for pew cushions. This desecration is a reflection of the ideas of the Marian exiles, one of whom had written on October 24, 1557 from Geneva to England as follows:

For put the case that the ministers were comanded to wear the pied coate off a foole or the garmente off a vice in a plaie, were it not manifeste skorninge off the ministrie so to do? And those that use theis other garments and apparrell . . . do seem verely to us to trespasse somewhat worse then so, because that the lorde hath not only reared and set us this priestlike apparell as a toie to be laughe at even off many off Papistes themselves: But it is also certeine, that the same is poluted and defiled with infinite superstition.

Rood screens were, according to the records, sold for lumber to make bridges, testers for beds, and use in ceiling ornamentation, and only occasionally parts were retained to build a communion table. Patens, chalices, crosses, and candlesticks were destroyed, as were the old Latin service books, rosaries, and crucifixes. Most of these articles were gifts of people still living, for the same sort of goods, and of a much better quality as a rule, had been destroyed under Edward.

In the course of the destruction of the altars the Government finally had to intervene in order to prevent the destruction of the chancels of many fine old churches. After the destruction of the altars the communion table was like a waif. "It was moved in and out of the choir at will: hats and dust lay on it more frequently than the Sacrament,
and when Holy Communion was administered some stood, some sat, some knelt." Decorous behavior in churches had become almost a thing of the past due to the rapid changes which had lost the Church the respect of the laity. From the letter from Geneva quoted above another passage reads as follows:

Furthermore knelinge at the receypt of the sacrament hathe in it a shewe off Godly and Christian reverence and might therefore in times paste be used with profit, yet for all that because owte of this fountaine the detestable use off bread worship did folowe, and dothe yet in theis daies stick in many mindes, it seemethe to us that it was justlie abolished owte from the congregations.\textsuperscript{142}

The sermon had become the center of the church service, and was preached only for the edification of the congregation. There was little left of the ancient Mass by this time in England.

By October, 1559 the royal visitation was completed, the royal supremacy had been generally acknowledged, and the realm had been purged, at least so it was hoped, of Catholic practices. The work of the visitors was taken over by the Court of High Commission which sat permanently in London. This court was an arbitrary tribunal and, however beneficial may have been its intention, it failed miserably to do justice at all times. "It was, to all intents and purposes, the English Inquisition; and if its summary jurisdiction was sometimes beneficial, it became, not infrequently, an instrument of great tyranny."\textsuperscript{143}

In the early years of Elizabeth's reign the
variations in ceremonial became the scandal of the realm. Later, with more settled conditions, uniformity became the rule. It is significant to examine some of these variations, however. The communion table probably suffered worse than anything else, although the baptismal ceremonies were not far behind, and also preparation for confirmation was almost non-existent. The book published in the early years of the reign entitled Varieties in the Service and Administration (London) tells the story very well:

Some say the service [Morning Prayer] in the chancel, others in the body of the church; some in the pulpit with their faces to the people, some keep precisely to the order of the book; others intermeddle psalms in metre. . . . The Table standeth in the body of the church in some places, in others it standeth in the chancel; in some places the table standeth altar-like, distant from the wall a yard; in some others in the midst of the chancel, north and south; in some places the Table is joined, in others it standeth upon trestles...

For baptism kitchen basins were often used, and ordinary cups replaced the chalices in the administration of the Sacrament. The variations in these and other matters brought the Church into disrepute and made it the butt of ridicule.

In spite of all the changes, however, the radical Protestants were still unsatisfied, believing that many unwarranted and wicked remains of Catholic practice still were in the English Church. They were supported by the Calvinists in Scotland. On December 28, 1566 an open letter was written from the Scotch Presbyterians to the Clergy of England. It reads in part:

. . . . what haith Christ Jesus to doe with beliall?
what feloshipp is thair betwixt darkness and licht?
yff surplese, corner capp, and tippet have byn badges off ydolatres in the verie acte off their ydolatrie, what have the preachers off Christian livertie and the open rebuker off all superstition to doe with the dregges off the romishe beast?145

Bishop Jewel of Salisbury, at the urging of Parker and Cecil, undertook to be the apologist of the Elizabethan Settlement. In 1559 he had challenged all comers to dispute with him on the Settlement by appeal to Scriptures, the Fathers, or the Primitive Councils. He was soon involved in a flood of controversy from which he never emerged. The Catholics, Cole, Harding, Dorman, Rastall, and others, took the field against him. Their chief sources of weapons being Louvain, Antwerp, Douai, Rheims, and Rome. He defended the changes made under Elizabeth on the ground that they were a return to the Primitive and Catholic Church of Apostolic days. His book on the subject was entitled The Apology of the Church of England, was written first in Latin, and later translated by the wife of Nicholas Bacon. It was endorsed as orthodox Anglican doctrine by the Canons of 1604.

The Parliament of 1563 strengthened the Supremacy Act, and the Convocation of the same year republished Cranmer's Homilies and added a second book of its own. Two catechisms by Dean Nowell were also sanctioned, one for the people and one for the Clergy. The Articles of Religion, as we saw, were revised by this Convocation. Thus the year saw the completion in detail of the Elizabethan Settlement. The English Church now had its authorized teaching for Clergy, school, and congregation. The doctrine as set forth in these formularies
was a long retreat from the Swiss position which the Church of England held at the end of Edward's reign. Again a balance had been struck, not like that of Henry between Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics, but one between the moderate and extreme Protestants; and Hooker, toward the end of the reign, defined it.
CHAPTER IV
THE COMMUNION SERVICES

Any discussion of the Communion Services in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559 must, to be complete, consider the services upon which they were, to a great extent, based. Beyond the accounts given in the New Testament, the earliest known description of the Eucharist or Mass is recorded by Ignatius (c.A.D.112) in his Epistle to the Smyrneans. He denounced schism, commanded that the laity be governed by the bishop and his subordinates, and insisted that a valid Eucharist was only one celebrated by the bishop or a representative appointed by him.

Avoid divisions as the beginning of evils. All of you follow the bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and follow the presbytery as the Apostles; and respect the deacons as the command-ment of God. Let no man perform anything pertaining to the church without the bishop. Let that be considered a valid Eucharist over which the bishop presides, or one to whom he commits it.¹

The main point here, however, is that the Eucharist was celebrated as early as A. D. 112, that it was apparently a well-established usage, and that it could be celebrated only by the proper clergy.

In The Didache, which was discovered at Constantinople in 1875, and variously dated from A. D. 90 to 130, there is some clarification of what the Apostolic Eucharist must have been like. It is really a Eucharist-Agape, and opens with a blessing of the bread and wine, and a command
that it be given only to the baptized. Thus the bread and wine after being blessed was considered something special, to be partaken of only by believers. The people then eat and drink, and afterwards make prayers of thanksgiving in which the phrase "spiritual food and drink" occurs. The service continued with prayers for the Church and the world. In what might be called a rubric at the close of the document it was expressly commanded that only those Christians who had previously confessed their sins might be partakers. Also the significant word "sacrifice" is used. Only a priest can offer a sacrifice in any generally understood meaning of the word, and therefore this is one of the first early bits of evidence for a sacrificing priesthood. The passage reads: "On the Lord's day assemble and break bread, and give thanks, having first confessed your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure."  

The first definite statement of transubstantiation without any equivocation was made by Justin Martyr in his Apology (c. A.D. 150). He wrote as follows, describing the practice of the time:

Then is brought to the president [bishop] of the brethren bread and a cup of water and wine. And he takes them and offers up praise and glory to the Father, through the name of his Son and of the Holy Ghost . . . those who are called deacons . . . give to those present a portion of the Eucharistic bread and wine and water, and carry it away to those that are absent.' This food is called with us the Eucharist . . . we do not receive them as ordinary drink; but as by the word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour took flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we are taught, the food blessed by the prayer of the word which we have received from him, by which, through its transformation, our blood and flesh is nourished, this food is the flesh and blood of Jesus who was made flesh.
Thus the mixed chalice is mentioned, acolytes seem to be used, the Minor Oblation is made, the communion is delivered to the laity by the clergy, reservation and private communions practiced, the Incarnation and Atonement mentioned, and transubstantiation set forth. Elsewhere in this same book the Kiss of Peace before the Minor Oblation is described; visitation of the sick, the poor, and prisoners is discussed; grace at meals is said to be practiced; the observance of Sunday and its reasons is pointed out; the reading of the Gospels and Epistles is mentioned; and alms for the poor are said to be collected.

The Canon of Hippolytus (c. A. D. 225) contains all the things mentioned by Justin only with a liturgical elaboration. The order of the Missa Fidelium until the Communion is as follows: The Kiss of Peace; the Offertory; the Sursum Corda; the Preface; the Thanksgiving; the Institution; and the Dominical Words, which read: "Take eat, this is my body which is broken for you; and likewise also the cup, saying, This is my blood which is shed for you. As often as ye perform this ye perform my memorial." Then follows the Anamnesis and Oblation, the Epiclesis (Invocation) of the Holy Spirit, and the Doxology.

St. Ignatius in the Epistle quoted above condemns the Docetics for a disbelief in transubstantiation, and in his Epistle to the Ephesians he calls the Eucharist "the medicine of immortality." Irenaeus (Adv. haer. IV.) said
that the Word in the Sacrifice of the Eucharist was offered
to God, or in other words that Christ was re-presented to
God by Christ in the person of the priest in the Mass.
Tertullian (De corona, 3) said that the Eucharist should be
administered to the laity only by the proper clergy and also
in Ad uxorem, II, 5 speaks with favor of reservation.
Cyprian (Bp. of Carthage, 248-58) says (Epistle 1 xviii.14):

If Jesus Christ our Lord and God is himself the
high priest of God the Father and first offered
himself as a sacrifice to the Father, and com-
manded this to be done in remembrance of himself,
then assuredly the priest acts truly in Christ's
room, when he imitates what Christ did, and he
offers then a true and complete sacrifice to God
the Father, if he so begin to offer as he sees
Christ himself has offered.

In the Byzantine Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, dating
from c. A. D. 375, which Cranmer knew because a copy of the
1547 edition is found in his library with his autograph,
the order of the Missa Fidelium is as follows: the Proskomide;
the Kiss of Peace; the Sursum Corda; the Eucharistic Thanks-
giving; the Sanctus and Benedictus; the Work of Redemption;
the Institution; the Anamnesis and Oblation; the Invocation
of the Holy Spirit; the Intercessions for the Faithful
Departed, for the Church, and for the Living; the Prologue
to the Lord's Prayer; the Lord's Prayer with the Doxology;
the Prayer of Blessing on the Communicants; the Elevation
of the Sacrament; the Fraction; the Commixture and Infusion;
the Communion of the Clergy and of the Laity, the Host being
dipped in the Wine; the Prayer of Thanksgiving; and finally
the Dismissal.
For the purposes of comparison, the following is the text of part of the Canon of the Mass. There can be little doubt that the Church in Constantinople fully believed in 375 that the Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice and that transubstantiation occurred.

... and gave it to his holy disciples and apostles saying: Take, eat; this is my Body which is broken for you, for the remission of sins. Amen. Likewise, after supper, he took the cup, saying, Drink ye all of this; this is my Blood of the new covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. Amen... And we offer to thee this reasonable service, without shedding of blood, and we beseech and implore thee, and offer our supplications unto thee, that thou wilt send thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts set forth before thee; and make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ; and that which is in this Cup the precious Blood of Christ; changing them by thy Holy Spirit... 12

In the West St. Ambrose of Milan wrote the book De Sacramentis shortly before his death (c. 397). He set down there the Pre-Gregorian Canon of the Mass as well as some commentary upon it. In his commentary he agrees in detail with Irenaeus about the function of the priesthood, and with Justin Martyr about transubstantiation. The Canon reads in part:

Render this our offering approved, ratified, and made reasonable and acceptable since it is the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ... and having broken it gave it to his apostles and disciples saying: Take and eat ye all of this, for this is my body which is broken in behalf of many... Receive and drink ye all of this for this is my blood. Howsoever many times thou doest this, so often thou doest this in remembrance of me, until I shall come again.*13

---

*This passage was translated from the Latin by the courtesy of Dr. Floyd S. Lear.
The order of the Gallican Use (before Charlemagne) in the *Missa Fidelium* was as follows: Prayers of the Faithful; the Kiss of Peace; the Prayer over the Corporal; the Offertory Procession, with the offering of the bread and wine, together with the Offertory Psalm; the Minor Oblation; the Secrets; the Preface; the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*; the Post-*Sanctus*; the Institution; the Post-Institution; the Major Oblation; the Doxology; the Fraction; the *Pater Noster*; the Episcopal Blessing; the Communion; the Post-Communion; and the Dismissal.

The order of the Gregorian *Missa Fidelium* of A. D. 600 is as follows: The Offertory Procession with the offering of the bread and wine, together with an anthem; the Minor Oblation; the *Dominus vobiscum* and *Sursum Corda*; the Preface; the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*; the *Te Igitur*; the *Memento* of the Living; the *Communicantes*; the *Hanc Igitur*; and the *Quam oblationem*. The Institution followed, beginning with the *Qui pridie*, and including the *Simili Modo* and the *Haec quotienscumque*. Then followed the Memorial and Major Oblation, including the *Unde et memorae*, the *Supra quae*, the *Supplices te rogamus*, and the *Memento* of the dead. The Doxology; the *Pater Noster*; the Fraction; the *Pax Domini* and Commixture; the Kiss of Peace; and the Communion Anthem led up to the Communion with devotions; which was followed by the Post-Communion Collect; the *Oratio Tertia*; the Prayer over the People on week-days in Lent; and finally the *Benedicamus Domino* or else the *Ite, missa est.*

*An offering of money was added in the tenth century; the censing of the oblations, a *Lavabo* Prayer, and some new
In England there were used, prior to the changes under Edward VI, several variations of the Roman Mass of Gregory I: the Sarum Use, the Lincoln Use, the Hereford Use, and the York Use. The Sarum or Salisbury Use, which had been introduced by St. Osmund about 1085, and which had certain "Gallican" features, was the most important; for it was the most widely celebrated, and had come into use at London and Canterbury, as well as in most of southern England.

Including both the Missa Catechumenorum and the Missa Fidelium the order of the Sarum Use reads as follows:
The Confession of the Priest and Ministers; the Preparation; the Kiss of Peace; the Blessing of the Incense and the censing of the Altar; the Introit; the Kyrie Eleison; the Gloria in Excelsis; the Salutation; the Collects of the Day; the Epistle; the Gospel; the Nicene Creed; the Minor Oblation; the Offertory; the Censing of the Oblations; the Ablutions; the Invocation of the Holy Ghost; the Orate Fratres; the Secrets; the Preface (including the Dominus vobiscum and the Sursum Corda); the Proper, Sanctus, and Benedictus; the Canon of the Mass which includes the Te Igitur, the Memento of the Living, the Communicantes, the Offeratory Prayers were added in the eleventh century; the Elevation of the Host was added in 1100, the Sacring Bell in 1200, Censing and Elevation of the Chalice in 1400, and genuflections in 1570; the Agnus Die was inserted in 700; the Placeat Tibi was added in the tenth century, as was the Last Gospel in 1570.
Hanc Igitur, the Quam oblationem, the Qui pridie, the Simil
Modo, the Haec quotienscumque, the Unde et memores, the
Supraquae, the Supplices te rogamus, the Memento of the Dead,
the Nobis quoque, and the Doxology; the Pater Noster and the
Libra Nos (Interpolation); the Fraction; the Benedictio Episcopi;
the Pax Domini; the Agnus Dei; the Commixture; the Prayers of
the Priest before Communion; the Communion of the Priest and
the Prayer of Thanksgiving; the Communion of the Laity; the
Ablutions; the Communion Anthem; the Post-Communion and Collect;
the Prayer over the People on week-days in Lent; the Benedicamus
domino; and finally the Ita, missa est.

The text of the Canon of the Mass of the Sarum Use
reads in part as follows:

Which oblation, we beseech thee, almighty God, do
thou vouchsafe, in all respects, to bless, approve, ratify, and make reasonable and
acceptable, that it may be made unto us the Body
and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son,
our Lord Jesus Christ... he blessed, brake,
and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, and
eat ye all of this; For this is my Body... Take, and drink ye all of this; for this is the
cup of my Blood of the new and everlasting cove¬
nant, a mystery of faith, and which shall be shed
for you and for many in remission of sins. As
oft as ye shall do these things, ye shall do them
in remembrance of me... We humbly beseech thee,
almighty God, command these gifts to be borne
by the hands of thy holy angel to thy altar on
high in the presence of thy divine majesty, that
as many of us shall by partaking at this altar
receive the most sacred Body and Blood of
thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly bene¬
diction and grace; through the same Jesus Christ
our Lord. Amen.

Cranmer and his associates did not directly use all
the sources referred to above, but all of them had gone into
the creation of the sources which they did use: the Sarum Use, the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the Consultation of Archbishop Herman, the Gallican Use, and possibly other sources.

The following things are particularly important in the documents just examined: First, save for the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, which was in Greek, they were all in Latin. Second, they all, as early as The Didache (c. A. D. 90), have a specific statement or implicit understanding of sacrifice which must have a priesthood to celebrate it. Third, they all, even as early as Ignatius (c. A. D. 112), have a specific or implied belief in the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. Fourth, the idea of a memorial following the Institution is in them all after A. D. 225. This memorial did not imply a ceremony in memory of Christ's passion, but rather it contains the idea of an offering or memorial of Christ by Christ through the priest before God for the sins of all men living and dead. It was, therefore, a propitiatory sacrifice; in other words a re-presentation, of the Great Sacrifice for the present sins of the whole world. The "do this in remembrance of me" clause seems, thus, to mean two things, an action in memory of Christ and an action as Christ did it with the same significance. Fifth, they are all not only propitiatory sacrifices but also Eucharists, or sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving. Sixth, they are all dramas or reënactments of the Last Supper. Seventh, they are all Communions. Eighth, they are offered for the living and the dead, and so a belief in Purgatory is implied and private and votive masses are in order. Ninth, they all,
by their nature, require auricular confession prior to Mass on the part of all communicants. Tenth, reservation of the Sacrament and private communions were practiced from earliest times. Eleventh, the Mass from earliest days could be celebrated only by bishops or their accredited representatives. Twelfth, the Sarum Use was, in all its essentials, the same Mass that was celebrated in A.D. 225, and, from what can be legitimately inferred in the absence of more complete records, the same essentially as that at the time of Ignatius, who recorded the general practices of the Church less than one hundred years after the Ascension of our Lord.

The fact that the reformers in Edward VI's time believed that they were returning to the usages of the Apostles and early Fathers probably lies in the paucity of early records at their disposal. The earliest document which one can be certain they possessed was, apparently, the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, which was late fourth century. Even on the basis of this their results are scarcely logical, for it is a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead and has a definite belief in transubstantiation, whereas the reformers denied the validity of both these things. Moreover, how they explained to themselves and their followers such passages, according to any generally recognized rules of Biblical exegesis, as the "Thou art Peter..." passage (Matt. XVI, 18, 19), the "anointing him with oil" passage (James V, 14), the "vine" passage (John XV, 4), the "high-priest" passage (Hebr. V, 1), the "Take and eat: this is my body" passage (Matt XXVI, 26), the "all generations
shall call me blessed" passage (Luke I, 48), and others is utterly beyond the understanding of many men.

Cranmer wished to replace the ancient ecclesiastical order and doctrine of Western Christendom with what he and other reformers called "The Gospel," the same Gospel that had recorded the foundation of the Church within which it had been written, compiled, and given to the world, including England. Although Cranmer did not agree with them, many of the reformers wished to set up the infallible Bible as the ultimate authority, allowing very fallible men to interpret it according to their own lights. In the light of the law of the Catholic Church the changes of the reformers appeared heretical as well as schismatic, for they wished not merely to reform ceremony and discipline, but to change doctrine as well. The reformers believed, and probably sincerely so in most cases, that they were returning by their changes to Apostolic practice, but any examination of early documents will illustrate how far in theory and practice they actually were from the ancient Catholic, that is Apostolic, Church.

The first step on this road of change was the publication of the English Order for Communion on March 8, 1548. This service was only ten pages long, and was used in addition to the Mass. Its use was ordered beginning April 1st. The

*This point will be discussed in Appendix II.
most important innovation which it made, not at all heretical, was the administration of the Sacrament sub utraque; it was affirmed that an administration sub una was not a mutilated communion. The only change that was of an unorthodox nature concerned the Sacrament of Penance. The laity were allowed to make their communions after only the General Confession and Absolution, rather than after auricular Confession and Absolution. The laity could, however, make auricular Confessions and receive Absolution if they wished.

The Order reads as follows: The Latin Mass was used until after the priest had communicated; then in English followed the Invitation; the Exhortations; the General Confession; the Absolution; the Comfortable Words; the Prayer of Humble Access; the Words of Administration; and the Peace. The Consultation of Archbishop Herman was the chief source of this service, and the contents of each part were essentially the same as those used in the 1549 Prayer Book. The words of the administration of the Sacrament which had already been consecrated according to the Sarum Use read as follows:

And when he [the Priest] doth deliver the sacrament of the body of Christ he shall say to every one these words following: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life.' And the Priest delivering the Sacrament of the blood, and giving every one to drink once and no more, shall say, 'The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul to everlasting life.' If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he follow with the Chalice, and as the Priest ministereth the bread, so shall he for more expedition minister the Wine, in form written before.
In the 1549 Prayer Book the "Holy Communion commonly 24 called the Mass" begins with vestments rubrics. The priest was required to wear an albe and vestment or cope, while the deacons, if any, wore albes and tunicles. The priest began the service "standing humbly afore the midst of the Altar." An Introit opened the service; followed by the Lord's Prayer recited by the priest alone; the Collect "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open . . . ;" the Office of the Day or Introit; the Kyrie Eleison; the Gloria in Excelsis; the Salutation; the Collect for the Day; the Collects for the King; the Epistle; the Gospel; the Nicene Creed; the Bidding of the Bedes; the Sermon or Homily; the Offertory Sentence; the Preface; the Proper; the Sanctus and Benedictus; the Canon, beginning with the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church, followed by the Commemoration of the Saints, the Prayer for the Faithful Departed, the Prayer of Consecration; the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, the Institution, the Oblation and Memorial, further intercessions, and the Doxology; the Lord's Prayer (by all); the Peace of the Lord; the Prayer of Christ the Pascal Lamb; the Invitation; the General Confession; the Absolution; the Comfortable Words; the Prayer of Humble Access; the Communion of the Priest and Laity while the Agnus Dei was sung; the Post-communion Sentences; the Thanksgiving; 26 and the Blessing

It is interesting to notice that, except for the Canon, the service, although somewhat changed, seems to be orthodox enough. Even the Canon, the real test of orthodoxy,
seems to be sufficient in its outline. In order to determine its orthodoxy a more careful examination of it is therefore necessary. The text of the 1549 Canon beginning with the Prayer of Consecration through the Oblation and Memorial reads as follows:

O God, heavenly father, which of thy tender mercy diddest give thine only sonne, Jesu Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblacion once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblacion, and satisfacion for the sinnes of the whole worlde, and did institute, and in his holy Gospell commaunde us, to celebrate a perpetual memory, of that his precious death, untill his comming again: Heare us (O merciful father) we besech thee: and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to blesse & and sanctifie these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of they moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe . . . Take, eate, this is my bodye which is geven for you, do this in remembraunce of me . . . Drink ye all of this, for this is my bloude of the newe Testament, whyche is shed for you and for many, for the remission of synnes: do this as oft as you shall drinke it in remembraunce of me . . . And here we offre and present unto thee (O Lord)oure selfe, oure soules, and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee: humbly besechyng thee, that whosoever shalbee partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive . . .27

It is plain, even upon the most superficial reading that, although all the parts of the Catholic Canon are here the substance of the old rite is utterly changed. Several things stand out which are particularly worthy of notice. First, the Great Sacrifice is said to be sufficient for all time and was only offered once, and, therefore, this is not a propitiatory sacrifice. Second, the Real Presence is seriously questioned in that "be" rather than "be made" is
used in the Invocation; and again in that the text indicates in the institution twice, the first time unnecessarily and therefore pointedly, that the Communion is celebrated in "remembrance" of Christ. Third, in the Oblation "ourselves, our souls, and bodies" are the sacrifice, not Christ in the bread and wine. Thus any possibility of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is ruled out. Moreover, at the beginning of the Offertory there occurs the rubric which reads:

Then so many as shall be partakers of the holy Communion, shall tarry still in the quire, or in some other convenient place... All other (that mind not to receive the said holy Communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and the clerks. 28

In substance this treated those who were not communicating as the unbaptised had been treated in the early Church. It implied that a person who did not communicate had no reason to hear the service, and so implied that the service was efficacious only for communicants. Thus the Mass was changed into a Communion Service only. The suppression of the liturgical parts of the Offertory, or "Minor Oblation" as it is called, 29 also implied the same thing. Finally, in the General Exhortation, which the Curate read just before the Offertory, the people are told in three different places that they "spiritually" eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. From this, which precedes the Consecration, it seems clear that the later occurrence of the words "body" and "blood" do not indicate a Real Presence or transubstantiation in any orthodox sense. 30

The titles of both the 1552 and 1559 Communion Services are devoid of the word "Mass," the service being called simply
"The Holy Communion or the Lord's Supper." In both Prayer Books there is no mention of vestments for the priest, and the services open with the Collect "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open . . .," and then follows the Collect for the Day; the Collects for the King or Queen; the Ten Commandments; the Epistle; the Gospel; the Nicene Creed; the Sermon or Homily; the Offertory Sentence; the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church; the Prayer for the Rulers of Men; the Prayer for all Bishops and Priests; the Prayer for the Congregation; the Prayer for the Tempted and Tried; the Exhortation to come to Communion frequently; an alternate Exhortation; the General Exhortation; the Exhortation before the General Confession; the General Confession; the Absolution; the Comfortable Words; the Preface; the Proper; the Sanctus; the Prayer of Humble Access; the Prayer of Consecration; the Invocation of the Holy Ghost; the Institution; the Communion of the Priest and Laity; the Lord's Prayer; the Memorial and Oblation, or, in place of them, the Thanksgiving; the Gloria in Excelsis; and the Blessing.

Several things can be observed from this outline alone. First, the Gloria in Excelsis is changed from a song of triumph heralding God's presence into a thanksgiving after communion. Second, the Kyrie Eleison has become part of a supplication to be aided in observing the Ten Commandments, rather than a supplication that the coming sacrifice may wipe out sins. Third, the Agnus Dei is dropped entirely, as is the Benedictus, because the first asks that the Real
Presence take away sins and the second heralds the coming of the Real Presence. Fourth, the Prayer of Humble Access is placed before the Consecration and the Memorial and Oblation after the Communion so that no adoration is implied by the first and no sacrifice of any sort or Real Presence by the second. The terminology is similar to the ancient Mass, but the service scarcely preserves a shred of the ancient meaning and action.

The Canon of the 1552 and 1559 services consists of the Consecration, Invocation, and Institution, and reads as follows:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thy only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again: Hear us, O merciful father, we beseech thee, and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood. Take eat, this is my body, which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for remission of sins: do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me.

The only line that might possibly give this Canon some slight Catholic validity is the "most blessed body and blood" clause, which ordinarily, taken alone, would imply a Real Presence. Cranmer did not intend it to be so interpreted; from the
context it would appear that the communicant will not receive a Real Presence, but rather a general spiritual presence, and even this is not present in the elements but only in the faith of the communicant. Therefore, on the basis of the Canon any attempt to interpret the 1552 and 1559 Canons and consequently the Communion Services in an orthodox sense utterly falls to the ground. They are so transparently Protestant that one can only marvel at the many endeavors to give them a Catholic validity.

There are three significant rubrics appended to the Prayer Books; these are the following: All three books order that there shall be no celebration of the Communion Service unless there be at least one person present to communicate with the priest. This implies that the efficacy of the Sacrament lies only in its reception. The Prayer Book of 1552 specifically states that there is no Real Presence in the Sacrament. This in itself would preclude any Catholic interpretation even if the text were very orthodox. The 1559 Prayer Book omits this so-called "Black Rubric." The 1549 Prayer Book requires the Sacrament to be received in the mouth directly for otherwise it might be saved and "tend to superstitious uses."

The Administration of the Sacrament in the 1549 Prayer Book reads as follows: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." and: "The blood of our Lord Jesus
Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." This seems to be perfectly orthodox, although taken in the context of the total service its Catholicity may well be doubted. The 1552 Prayer Book reads as follows: "Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." and: "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee and be thankful." This only intensifies what was said above, that the 1552 Prayer Book Communion Service was utterly Protestant. This applies to the 1549 Communion Service too, for it tried to reconcile the Catholic (possibly) 1549 Administration with the Protestant 1552 Administration. The result was that the two opposites cancel one another and nothing is the result. The 1559 Prayer Book Administration reads as follows:

The body of our Lord Jesu Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life, and take, eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, feed on him in thine heart by faith with thanksgiving."

and:

The blood of our Lord Jesu Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life. And drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

Whatever seeming Catholicity the 1559 Administration might have would be determined by the "eat this" and "drink this" phrases. The "body" and "blood" clauses are in the nature of salutations, and do not appear to determine the meaning of "this," which seems to refer to the actual bread and wine and nothing more.
CHAPTER V

THE ORDINAL AND OTHER SIGNIFICANT SERVICES

Probably the most significant services, other than the Communion, were contained in the Ordinal; that is, the forms for the ordering of deacons and priests and the form for the consecration of bishops. There was no Ordinal included in the 1549 Prayer Book, nor in the 1559 Prayer Book, the only one being that of the 1552 Prayer Book, which continued in use until the revision of the Ordinal in 1662. Previous to the 1552 Ordinal, changes had been made in the ancient Roman Pontifical. It is known that on September 9, 1548, a few months after the publication of the 1549 Order for Communion, Cranmer, Holbeach, and Ridley consecrated Farrar to be Bishop of St. David's. The rites followed on this occasion, which was at Cranmer's house at Chertsey, differed considerably from the hitherto established use. In 1549 Cranmer and Ridley held an ordination in St. Paul's, London according to the rites later established by law in 1550. Thus it is obvious that, although the Roman Pontifical was still legal until 1550, it fell into disuse even before the new Ordinal was completely formulated.

On January 25, 1550 a bill providing for a new Ordinal was passed by Parliament, it having been introduced by Cranmer during the November session, and a commission to carry this law into execution was appointed. It seems that a completely new Ordinal was not contemplated; but
rather a revision and improvement of one that Latimer and Ridley had already drafted, which in its turn was based upon one drawn up by Bucer.

Bucer's ideas on the ministry are worth noting, for aside from the actual words of ordination, the shortening of a few prayers, and the insertion of the Oath of Supremacy, the Ordinal drawn up in 1550 and used in the 1552 Prayer Book followed Bucer's *De Ordinatione Legitima* almost exactly.

Bucer recognized two, rather than three, distinct orders in the Church: one the ministry of the Word, Sacraments, and discipline, and the other the care of and ministry to the poor, the sick, prisoners, and other unfortunate souls. He sought to provide a single form of ordination that would be suitable for both orders. Bucer's form of actual ordination read as follows:

> The hand of Almighty God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be upon you, protect and govern you, that ye may go and bring forth much fruit by your ministry, and may it remain with you unto life eternal. Amen.

This sounds more like a blessing that the Sacrament of Holy Orders, and lacks the slightest Catholic validity, because according to Catholic doctrine the essence of ordination is the conferring by the bishops of the power to offer sacrifice in the traditional sense of the latter word.

The new Ordinal was published in March, 1550, although it is known as the Ordinal of 1552, because it was not until the latter year that it was incorporated into the Prayer Book.
Cranmer and Ridley were chiefly responsible for its final form. The Act of Parliament had provided for forms for ordering "other ministers," which would have included ostiaries, lectors, exorcists, acolytes, and subdeacons; but the new Ordinal took no notice of this provision. Most of the gorgeous and elaborate ritual of the Pontifical was swept away by the new forms, of which simplicity was the keynote. Pollard says that "all that was necessary to convey the clerical character was nevertheless preserved." This is open to question, and depends upon what is meant by "clerical character," which seems to mean something very different to Pollard than to Catholic law and tradition.

In spite of what the new Ordinal might or might not have conveyed as regards "clerical character," it excited the displeasure of the extremists of both sides at the time of its publication. This was not unusual, however, for this was the ordinary reaction to whatever Cranmer and his associates did. On the one hand the Catholic Bishop of Worcester, Heath, refused to subscribe to the Ordinal. The Government wished to confiscate his estates, and to present him with an Ordinal which he had to refuse to maintain the integrity of his faith was an easy way to get rid of him. He was deprived and committed to the Fleet where he remained until the accession of Mary. On the other hand, Hooper, the radical Protestant leader, condemned it too, but for entirely opposite reasons from those of Heath. Hooper objected to the form of the Oath of Supremacy included, and especially to the vestments required at ordination and consecration. His objections formed
the prelude to the famous Vestriarian Controversy. Due probably
to his influence, the Prayer Book of 1552 dropped the rubrics
preparing vestments.

The form for the ordering of Deacons was as follows:

Take thou authority to execute the Office of a Deacon
in the Church of God committed unto thee; in the Name
of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The form for the ordering of Priests was as follows at the laying
on of hands:

Receive the holy Ghost; whose sins thou dost forgive,
they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain,
they are retained. And be thou a faithful Dispenser
of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments; in
the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the
Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Bible was then delivered to the new minister and the following
words said:

Take thou authority to preach the Word of God and
to minister the holy Sacraments in this congrega-
tion, where thou shalt be so appointed.

The order of ordaining Priests thus included both a sacrament
and a commission. The form for the consecration of Bishops
was as follows:

Take the holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir
up the Grace of God, which is in thee, by imposi-
tion of hands: for God hath not given us the
spirit of fear, but of powers, and love, and of
soberness.

Here the Bible was delivered to the new Bishop.

Aside from the actual forms of ordination of deacons
and priests and the consecration of bishops, the intention of
the Ordinal is probably the most important element in it. In
other words, what sort of deacons, priests, and bishops did the
1552 Ordinal intend to ordain and consecrate? From the text it seems clear that the intention was to make priests who had the sacradotal power of jurisdiction to teach, preach, absolve, baptise, and conduct public worship of praise, thanksgiving, and petition, but not to offer sacrifice and adoration. The same thing was true of bishops, although they were given the additional powers of confirmation and ordination. All allusions to a sacrificing priesthood were removed. Now the essence of the priesthood, according to Catholic doctrine, is the power to consecrate bread and wine into the body and blood of our Lord and to offer them, Christ acting in them, as a protitiatory sacrifice, a re-presentation or continuing presentation of the Great Sacrifice, to God for the sins of the living and the dead. Since the Ordinal from 1550 to 1662, and probably even to the present, did not confer such power upon the priests and bishops of the Anglican Church, the priesthood of a legitimate nature died out in England and thus Apostolic Succession died with it. Pope Leo XIII in 1896 therefore issued the Bull Apostolicae Curae, in which he condemned Anglican Orders on the ground that the Anglican Church and its Ordinal did not intend to ordain priests and consecrate bishops in a full, true, Catholic sense. The principle of Lex orandi, lex credendi is followed here, as it must inevitably be for all theoretical and practical purposes throughout any examination of the several Prayer Books. A transformation of liturgy is but the outward manifestation of an inward transformation of spirit, belief, and doctrine.
The Order for the Visitation of the Sick is particularly noteworthy, for in it is found the only form in the Prayer Book for absolution after auricular confession. The form was identical in all three Prayer Books, save that in the Book of 1552 and 1559 the anointing with oil is omitted. The Absolution reads as follows:

Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners, which truly repent and believe in him: of his great mercy forgive thee thy sins, and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.¹³

The "Amen" here seems to have more than usual importance. Peter Martyr agreed with this 1549 form in all points except that he disapproved of any reservation of the Sacrament for the sick man, desiring that it be consecrated in the latter's presence. Martyr's ideas on the subject were followed in this case in the 1552 Prayer Book.

In the Order of Baptism it is significant to observe that the form was sufficient according to Catholic doctrine. It was made lawful to baptise either by immersion or by infusion. Moral regeneration was strongly implied in the Order of Public Baptism and was explicitly upheld in the Orders for Private and Adult Baptism. That there was little change made in the Baptismal Services was probably because of the presence in England of numerous Anabaptists from the Continent, against whom the Government was bending every effort. Any change of consequence was out of the question because the Government feared that it would thereby give these troublesome
people an opening. The Government even went so far as to license a book written by John Vernon in 1551 entitled *A Most Sure and Strong Defence of the Baptism of Children.*

In the Order for Confirmation the 1549 Prayer Book required the confirming bishop to say:

\[\text{Sign them (O Lord) and mark them to be thine for ever, by virtue of thy holy cross and passion. Confirm and strengthen them with the inwardunction of thy holy Ghost, mercifully unto everlasting life. N. I [the bishop] sign thee with the sign of the cross, and lay my hand upon thee. In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost. Amen.}\]

In place of this form the 1552 and 1559 Prayer Books required the bishop to say:

\[\text{Defend, O Lord, this child with thy heavenly grace, that he may continue thine for ever, and daily increase in thy holy Spirit more and more until he come into thy everlasting kingdom. Amen.}\]

The 1549 Order for Confirmation was primarily, however, a ratification of the baptismal vows, which had no place in the Roman Order. The anointing with chrism was abolished, therefore, leaving only the laying on of hands as the outward sign. The Order was thus modeled on the Lutheran form. It lost its true validity in the eyes of Catholics for the use of chrism had been the distinguishing symbol of this sacrament, it being called *Sacramentum Chrismatis.* The 1552 and 1559 Books, of course, continued this omission. In addition their form quoted above seems to be a prayer of petition, rather than a sacramental prayer which, together with its proper outward sign, would carry efficacious grace.
In the Order for the Burial of the Dead the Communion was not celebrated because it implied a Mass for the dead. Also there is at no point in the service any specific prayer for the dead, which is an implicit denial of Purgatory. The prayers are all for the living. As a matter of fact, in the closing Collect the minister implies that the soul of the dead about to be interred is in heaven already.

Aside from the services themselves there were several other things contained in the Prayer Books which are important. The title pages of all three books were identical except for the concluding line. In the 1549 Book it read "... rites and ceremonies of the Church after the use of the Church of England." In the 1552 and 1559 Books it read "... rites and ceremonies in the Church of England." This variation is significant because the former recognizes by implication that other Churches and uses legitimately existed, whereas the latter two seem to imply by their silence that no other use or Church was legitimate.

The Prefaces of the three books directed that the services be conducted in a language understood by the laity. This did not preclude the use of Latin in a collegiate church, for example, where everyone understood it. It was not customary, however, to use Latin even in such cases. The Prefaces also said that the new services were simpler than the Roman and so much easier to follow; and that because all of them were bound together in one book the parish expenses of supplying
many books would be reduced.

The section following the Preface in all the books is entitled "Of Ceremonies, Why some Be Abolished and Some Retained." Two passages here are significant. The first one reads as follows:

... the most weighty cause of the abolishment of certain ceremonies was, That they were so far abused; partly by the supersitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the unsatiable avarice of such as sought more their own lucre than the glory of God, that the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still.23

The second one reads as follows: "For we think it convenient that every Country should use such Ceremonies as they think best to the setting forth of God's honor and glory. . . ." 24

The first quotation is a good commentary on the diseased condition of the discipline of the Church in England just prior to the changes. Also it admits in effect that in order to stop the disease Cranmer considered it necessary to kill the patient. The passage says not that the ancient services were in error but rather that the men who used them were. There was certainly no guarantee that the abuses mentioned would be cured by a change in service forms. The men of England seem to have been as avaricious and superstitious after the changes as before, as was pointed out in Chapter I. It may be argued that the Roman ecclesiastical institutions in England tended by their very nature to abuse. In answer it can be said that the same argument may be voiced about any institution of whatever sort. Many abuses of a serious type have and do exist, for example, in the United States Government,
but would it not be better to educate the people than destroy
the Government? The answer is obvious. In the second quota-
tion it is undoubtedly true that ceremonies can and should vary
somewhat in different parts of the world, but not in ways that
will entail doctrinal change. The variations must, therefore,
of necessity be very slight, for how can ceremonies vary appre-
ciably without doctrinal variation? The principle of lex
orandi, lex credendi applies here with vigor.
The Church of England has always claimed to be a Catholic Church, that is an integral part of Universal Christianity. Henry VIII and his successors do not appear to have had any intention of starting a new Church, but had rather the laudable end of purifying the existing one, which the reformers believed had departed from the teachings and commands of Christ, the Apostles, and the Fathers. Most of the reformers were sincere, disinterested men. The Government of England followed a policy of expedient compromise, but still as a matter of formal policy did not aim at a new Church. There was certainly nothing wrong with the aim of purification of Church discipline, but the question arises as to whether that is what actually occurred. The problem can be stated in the form of two questions: Did the reformers or even the whole body of the Church in England have a legal right to attempt this purification apart from the main body of Christendom; and if they did possess such a right was it wisely exercised? That is, did the reformers actually return to primitive Christian doctrine and practice, or did they and the English Church, in the effort at purification, depart from the true doctrine which Rome claimed to express?

In order to see the full implications of these questions, it is necessary to restate them concretely and precisely. Thus restated: (1) Could Convocation legally transfer its power spiritual to the Government? (2) Did it do so by its
passage of the Submission of the Clergy on May 15, 1532 and its tacit approval of the Supremacy Act of 1534? (3) If such power were transferred, would not England automatically become schismatical? (4) If such power were transferred, would not the determination of the meaning of all subsequent acts, both of Parliament and Convocation, be ultimately controlled by the intention of the Government rather than the Church of England? (5) Would not, therefore, the Catholicity of the English Church's doctrine and practice be determined by the intention of the Government? (6) Would not, therefore, heretical intention on the part of the Government determine all ambiguous acts heretically?

The crux of the whole matter, from the legal viewpoint, lies in the first two questions. If they are answered in the negative the remainder logically must be also, and the case of Anglican Catholicity falls to the earth, and vice versa if answered in the affirmative. F. L. Cirlot has made an excellent case in his book Apostolic Succession and Anglicanism (Lexington, Ky., 1946) for the argument that the determination of the meaning of all doctrinal acts of the Tudor Governments, or any other English Governments, would rest with Convocation, that is the Church. He says that, since Convocation did not repudiate Catholic doctrine per se, the meaning of all ambiguous passages in the Prayer Books, in fact all passages not defined in meaning by Convocation, would be determined by Pre-Reformation doctrine. This seems logical enough on the surface, but if Convocation gave its power spiritual to the Government Cirlot's argument loses its validity. It may be argued, however, that Convocation could
not give its powers to anyone or to any institution, although it might think that it could and even did; and that it could not pass on basic doctrinal matters even with its full powers, although it might try and seem to do so, for it was not an ecumenical council. By this argument all doctrine of the English Church was really Catholic even at the height of the changes under Edward. The only flaw here is that, if such is the case, the Church of England in Tudor days and what is known as the Anglican Communion at the present time, would perforce have to return to Rome in order to have practice coincide with doctrine, legally speaking.

The Church of England in 1532 was under contract by the oaths of its individual bishops, clergy, and monks to obey the authority of the Pope, although such an action might involve praemunire. It could be argued that the oaths of the Clergy were invalid for they contravened the Statute of Praemunire. But was the statute itself legal, even though passed by Parliament? From a legal point of view the only answer is "no," for it contravened King John's Concession of the Kingdom to the Pope in 1213, whereby the king made a contract with the Pope by which he agreed to hold his kingdom as a fief from the Holy See. Such a concession was legal if the principle of the supremacy of the king, invoked by both Catholics and Protestants were legal, as it was acknowledged to be, in spite of the Settlement of Bec in 1107 and the Clarendon Constitutions of 1164, which the act of the supreme monarch in 1213 superseded. No contract can be

*See Appendix I.
legally broken save by the free consent of both the contracting parties. The Pope did not agree to the breaking of the contract of 1213 nor to the breaking of the contracts between the individual clergy of England and himself in 1532-34. The Magna Carta, to which appeals are frequently made as being the basic document of English-speaking liberties, specifically states as its first provision that the Church shall be free of secular control. Yet under the Tudors and ever since their time, the Church of England has been Erastian. It would seem that the Magna Carta is only invoked when it is expedient. It is interesting to note that the people who put the greatest emphasis on the Magna Carta are usually the same people who depreciate the most the Concession of the Kingdom to the Pope. How they can do this is very strange, because the two documents emanated from the same source. If the Magna Carta is legal, so is the Concession of the Kingdom to the Pope. Moreover, the meaning of the first clause on Church freedom in the Magna Carta would legally be determined by the Concession of the Kingdom to the Pope because the latter was issued two years before the former.

From what has been said in this brief survey it cannot be conclusively stated that the two initial questions must be answered negatively, but it can be said that, from the evidence at hand, it is strongly probable that such must be the answers. So far as the question as to whether the reformers used the control over the Church of England wisely is another matter, but can be answered in a general way from evidence of the results of their activities. As was noted, Henry VIII did not believe that

*See Appendix I.
the results of the changes in his reign were good, nor did other competent critics think so in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. Such evidence speaks for itself.

Many of the Catholics and reformers alike in sixteenth century England would have thought the questions discussed above to be beside the point. They considered themselves absolutely subject to the king, and that he, not they, was morally responsible to God for the consequences of the nation's religious settlement. This view was very ancient in origin. A. J. Carlyle, in his Medieval Political Theory in the West (1903, i, 210), points out that some of the Fathers themselves had first voiced the idea in Christian literature.

... the person and the authority of the ruler is so sacred that disobedience to him or resistance of his commands is equivalent to disobedience to God Himself. By some of the Fathers the divine authority of State is transferred whole and entire to the particular ruler.7

Dunning says that the theory was first urged in the West by Marsiglio of Padua just prior to the Reformation, and that Cranmer got his ideas on the relations between Church and State chiefly from this source (Dunning, Ancient and Medieval Political Theory, 242-43). It is known that Defensor Pacis by Marsiglio was printed in England in 1536 with the approval of Thomas Cromwell.

The Catholic view was stated when Gardiner said that, in connection with the break from Rome, an Act of Parliament, approved by the king, discharged the consciences of himself and all other loyal Englishmen, although he and they might strongly disapprove of the Act. The Catholic would follow the law of
the king, even though he might disapprove of it, for he believed that he himself was not breaking God's Law in such a case, but rather only the king. Barlow and Cranmer held the same position as the Catholics, but went beyond in that they believed that potestas ordinis, as well as potestas jurisdictionis, was conferred by order from the king, and that consecration was therefore unnecessary. The king, they believed, at his coronation anointment became the vicar of Christ on earth in his own kingdom; that he was not ordained as an ordinary priest, for he was ordained by birth and coronation to be sumus episcopus; and that, consequently, the whole Clergy was spiritually subject to him, as was the laity. "All Christian princes, he [Cranmer] said, have committed to them immediately of God the whole cure of their subjects."

The great flaw in the Protestant view on the power of the king lay in two things. First, there was no adequate warrant in Christian tradition, Scripture, or practice for it. Second, it did not work well in practical affairs. Under such a system the Church came to be subject to the expediency of the Government and the whims of the king. As events proved it seemed that in order to keep a vigorous, independent national ecclesiastical organization, the final authority would have to be a Church Universal under "God's Law," that is, Catholic tradition. As one historian says, Catholic tradition was "constant, known, and ratified by the age-long acceptance of Christendom." As the reign of Edward progressed, and the Elizabethan Settlement was made, with the many doctrinal changes involved, the great body of Catholics in England came to believe that the anti-papal
Catholic experiment was a failure, and had become anti-Catholic as well as anti-papal. The belief grew that "Rome" and "Catholic" were by nature synonymous. Gardiner himself seems to have come to the belief that Sir Thomas More was right when he had told the court at his trial on June 28, 1535 that England could not depart from the Catholic Church for the English Church was but one member of the Body of Christ. As More said: "... this realm, being but a member and a small part of the Church, might not make a particular law disagreeable with the general law of Christ's universal Catholic Church." This principle, for which More, Fisher, the monks of Charterhouse, and countless other men and women gave their lives and fortunes, seems to have had more validity than the reformers and their descendants would like to admit. As Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 248-58, said in his book De catholicae ecclesiae unitate:

He builds his Church upon one man; and though he gives to all the Apostles an equal power... yet he has ordained by his authority the source of unity beginning from one man. Certainly the other Apostles were what Peter was, but primacy is given to Peter that it may be shown that the Church is one and the chair one. And all are pastors, but one flock is indicated which is fed by all the Apostles with unanimous consent... He that holds not this unity of the Church, does he think that he holds the faith? He that strives against and resists the Church, he that deserts the chair of Peter upon whom that Church was founded, is he confident that he is in the Church?...

This unity we ought to hold and preserve...
APPENDIX I

A. John's Concession of the Kingdom to the Pope, 1213.

John, by the grace of God king of England, lord of Ireland, duke of Normany and Aquitaine, earl of Anjou, to all the faithful in Christ who shall inspect this present charter, greeting. We will it to be known by all of you by this our charter, confirmed by our seal, that we, having offended God and our mother the holy Church in many things, and being on this account known to need the Divine mercy, and unable to make worthy offering for the performance of due satisfaction to God and the Church, unless we humble ourselves and our realms--we, willing to humble ourselves for Him who humbled Himself for us even to death, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit's grace, under no compulsion of force or of fear, but of our good and free will, and by the unanimous advice of our barons, offer and freely grant to God and His holy apostles Peter and Paul, and the holy Roman Church, our mother, and to our lord the Pope Innocent and his catholic successors, the whole realm of England and the whole realm of Ireland with all their rights and appurtenances, for the remission of our sins and those of all our race, as well quick as dead; and from now receiving back and holding these, as a feudal dependant, from God and the Roman Church, in the presence of the prudent man Pandulf, subdeacon and one of the household of the lord the Pope, do and swear fealty for them to the aforesaid our lord the Pope Innocent and his catholic successors and the Roman Church, according to the form written below, and will do liege homage to the same lord the Pope in his presence if we shall be able to be present before him; binding our successors and heirs by our wife, forever, that in like manner to the supreme pontiff for the time being, and to the Roman Church, they should pay fealty and acknowledge homage without contradiction. . . All which, as aforesaid, we willing them to be ratified and confirmed in perpetuity bind ourselves and our successors not to contravene. And if we or any of our successors shall presume to attempt this, whoever he be, unless he shall come to his senses after due admonition, let him forfeit right to the kingdom, and let this charter of obligation and concession on our part remain in force forever.


The Oath of Fealty, administered at London in the spring of 1213, was witnessed by the Archbishop of Dublin;
the Bishop of Norwich; the Earl of Essex; the Earl of Salisbury; the Earl of Pembroke; the Count of Boulogne; the Earl of Warenne; the Earl of Winchester; the Earl of Arundel; the Earl of Ferrers; and three lay commoners.

B. The Church Clauses of Magna Carta, 1215.

1. We have in the first place granted to God, and confirmed by this our present charter, for us and for our heirs forever, that the Church of England be free, and have her rights intact, and her liberties unimpaired; and so we will it to be observed, which appears from the fact that freedom of elections which is considered to be most important and necessary for the Church of England, we have by our uninfluenced and spontaneous will, before discord had arisen between us and our barons, granted and confirmed by our charter, and have secured its confirmation by the lord Pope Innocent III, which we shall observe and also will that it be observed in good faith by our heirs forever. We have also granted to all free men of our realm for us and our heirs for ever, all the liberties mentioned below, to have and to hold for them and their heirs of us and our heirs.

63. Wherefore we will and firmly command that the English Church be free, and that the men in our realm have and hold all the aforesaid liberties, rights, and grants . . .


APPENDIX II

THE SCRIPTURES AND THE CHURCH

Matthew published his gospel among the Hebrews in their own tongue, when Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome and founding the Church there. After their departure Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself handed down to us in writing the substance of Peter's preaching. Luke, the follower of Paul, set down in a book the Gospel preached by his teacher. Then
John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned on his beast, himself produced his gospel, while he was living at Ephesus in Asia.

From Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons (c. 300) *Adversus haereses*, III. 1. i.; text in Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church* (New York, 1947), 37-40

Thus it can be said that the men who wrote the Scriptures of the New Testament were Christians, leaders of the Holy Catholic Church, writing within the Church, under the inspiration, perhaps unconsciously, of God the Holy Ghost. The Church came first and the Scriptures second, they being for the glory of God and the edification of the faithful. The tradition of the Church, which cannot err doctrinally, is of equal importance. The Scriptures themselves say that much of the teaching of the Apostles was by word of mouth. Moreover, at no place in the Scriptures do the Apostles say that they committed all their teaching to writing. The Church is the living body and the Scriptures her records. They were written within her bosom, they were compiled by her, and they were propagated by her throughout the world. A record cannot determine its own meaning, the only agency that can determine it is the source of the record. The source in this case was God, and the Church is the Mystical Body of God. Therefore, what source of determination of Scriptural meaning is possible save the Holy Catholic Church? The pronouncement of this Church in the Council of Trent, Session IV, April 8, 1546 defines what she believes on the relationship of the Scriptures to herself.

The Holy, Oecumenical and General Synod of Trent . . . having this aim always before its eyes, that errors may be removed and the purity of the Gospel be preserved in the
Church, which was before promised through the prophets in the Holy Scriptures and which our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God first published by his own mouth and then commanded to be preached through his Apostles to every creature as a source of all saving truth and of discipline of conduct; and perceiving that this truth and this discipline are contained in written books and in unwritten traditions, which were received by the Apostles from the lips of Christ himself, or, by the same Apostles, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, and were handed on and have come down to us; following the example of the orthodox Fathers, this Synod receives and venerates, with equal pious affection and reverence, all the books both of the Old and New Testaments, since one God is the author of both, together with the said Traditions, as well those pertaining to faith as those pertaining to morals, as having been given either from the lips of Christ or by the dictation of the Holy Spirit and preserved by unbroken succession in the Catholic Church . . .

From Concilium Tridentinum, Diarium, etc. Nova Collectio; text in Henry Bettenson, Documents of the Church (New York, 1947), 367.

APPENDIX III

SPEECH OF ARCHBISHOP CRANMER AT THE CORONATION OF EDWARD VI.

Most Dread and Royal Sovereign: The Promises your Highness hath made here, at your Coronation, to forsake the Devil and all his Works are not to be taken in the Bishop of Rome's Sense, when you commit anything distasteful to that See, to hit your Majesty in the Teeth, as Pope Paul the Third, late Bishop of Rome, sent to your Royal Father, saying, "Didst thou not promise, at our permission of thy Coronation, to forsake the Devil and all his Works, and dost thou run to Heresy? For the Breech of thy Promise, knowest thou not, that 'tis in our Power to dispose of thy Sword and Scepter to whom we please?" . . .

The Bishops of Canterbury for the most part have crowned your Predecessors, and anointed them Kings of this Land: Yet it was not in their Power to receive or reject them, neither did it give them Authority to prescribe them Conditions to take or to leave their Crowns, although the Bishops of Rome would encroach upon your Predecessors by their Act and Oil, that in
the end they might possess those Bishops with an Interest to dispose of their Crowns at their Pleasure. But the wiser sort will look to their Claws and Clip them...

To condition with Monarchs upon Ceremonies, the Bishop of Rome (or other Bishops owning his Supremacy) hath no authority: but he may faithfully declare what God requires at the Hands of Kings and Rulers, that is Religion and Vertue. Therefore not from the Bishop of Rome, but as a Messenger from my Saviour Jesus Christ I shall most humbly admonish your Royal Majesty what Things your Highness is to perform.

Your Majesty is God's Viceregent, and Christ's Vicar within your own Dominions, and to see, with your Predecessor Josias, God truely worshipped and Idolatry destroyed; the Tyrany of the Bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and Images removed. These Acts be signs of a second Josias, who reformed the Church of God in his Days. You are to reward Vertue, to revenge Sin, to justify the Innocent, to relieve the Poor, to procure Peace, to repress Violence, and to execute Justice throughout your Realms...

From Strype, Memorials of Cranmer, Bk. II, Ch. I, 144-45.
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