*Approved
for Files*

CONTINENTAL INFLUENCES ON THE

ENGLISH PRAYER BOOK

1549 - 1552

Edna Emilie Bothe, A.B.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

in the

GRADUATE SCHOOL

of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

1926

378.7M71
XB658

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
COLUMBIA

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

January 27, 1926.

Dean R. J. Kerner,
Dean of the Graduate School,
University of Missouri.

Dear Dean Kerner:-

I return herewith the Master's dissertation of Miss Edna Emilie Bothe on "Continental Influences on the English Prayer Book 1549 - 1552. I have read the thesis and I find it a very careful piece of work. I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master's degree.

Very truly yours,

Charles A. Ellwood

CONTENTS

Chapter I	Continental Influences on the English Reformation Before the Reign of Edward VI	1
Chapter II	Continental Influences on the First Book of Common Prayer	16
Chapter III	Continental Influences on the Second Book of Common Prayer	58
Conclusion		85
Bibliography		92

CHAPTER I

CONTINENTAL INFLUENCES ON THE ENGLISH REFORMATION BEFORE THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

The importance of continental influence as a factor of the English Reformation is variously estimated by historians. There are those who consider foreign influence to be of no little importance, while others apparently believe that continental movements for religious reform exerted but slight influence on the English Reformation. The latter, although they do not deny the existence of continental influence, believe the movement for religious reform in England to have been English in origin, and therefore give more credit to Wycliffe than to

-
1. Smith, Preserved, Age of the Reformation, p. 281.

"More in England than in most countries the Reformation was an imported product. Its 'dawn came up like thunder' from across the North Sea."

Robinson, J.H., Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 23, p.17.

"It is impossible to estimate the influence which these teachers (from the Continent) exerted on the general trend of religious opinion in England, in any case, however, it was not unimportant, and the articles of the Church of England show unmistakably the influence of Calvin's doctrine."

Gairdner, James, Lollardy and the Reformation, p. 287, and History of England, p. 313, gives some credit to foreign influence and does not regard the Reformation itself as a development of Lollardy.

2

foreign reformers. Even though considerable importance be attached to Wycliffe as the "Morning Star of the Anglican Reformation," yet it does not seem as though this would necessarily diminish the power of continental influence. There is no doubt much in the Anglican Reformation which differentiates it from the reform movements of the Continent, but there is also much in it which is directly or indirectly related to continental influence. It has been said that four influences, Lollardism, Humanism, the Greek Testament, and the English Testament, made a reformation in England inevitable utterly irrespective of any revival movement on the Continent.³ However, if we consider the influences coming from the Continent before the revolt of Henry VIII from the Church, we find that all these influences, except Lollardism, owe something to continental reform.

The first trace of continental influence on religious reform in England is found in the work and

2. Pollard, A.F., Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, p.478

"The clamour raised by the advent of this foreign legion has somewhat obscured the comparative insignificance of its influence on the English Church."

Pollard, A.F., England Under Somerset, p. 106.

"There is little in the English reformation that was not anticipated by Wycliffe."

Hulbert, E.B., English Reformation, p. 81, also attributes the origin of the English reformation to Wycliffe but says that the English movement was assisted and accelerated by influences from across the Channel.

3. Hulbert, op. cit., p. 81

teachings of the Humanists. As early as the middle of the fifteenth century English students journeyed to Italy, there imbibed the new learning, and returned to Oxford and Cambridge where they taught that which they had acquired abroad. Among the more influential of these early English Humanists were Grocyn, Linacre, and Lyly.

These scholars, having gained their knowledge and inspiration from the Continent, paved the way for religious reform in England by fostering the study of those languages in which the Bible was originally written and by calling attention to the study of the original source from which the pure and simple teachings of Christianity are derived. These men received their inspiration from Savonarola and other Italian religious reformers. During their sojourn in Italy they came in contact with the corruption of the Papacy and the reckless extravagance and immorality of the clergy, and thus, came to recognize the need for reform in the Church. "The program demanding a wider cultivation of letters, a return to the Bible and early sources, the suppression of abuses and of the mediaeval accretions on the primitive Church, the reform of the Church and the substitution of an inner, individual piety for a mechanical, external scheme of salvation was first advanced by the Humanists and was afterwards largely realized by the reformers."⁴

4. Smith, Erasmus, p. 210.

The influence of Erasmus on the Reformation is considered so important that the expression, "Erasmus laid the egg and Luther hatched it," has come into general usage. Even though Erasmus chose to disagree with Luther and finally alienated himself from his cause, yet the importance of his influence on the English Reformation is generally recognized.⁵ The achievements of the Humanists⁶ were due more to Erasmus than to any other man.

Erasmus was a foreigner to England, having received his education at Deventer and other continental schools where Humanism was taught. After studying the works of the Humanist, Lorenzo Valla, he became one of his foremost disciples. He made at least six visits to England and lectured at both Oxford and Cambridge. There he made friends with the English Humanists, Grocyn, Linacre, and Colet. At repeated intervals he returned to the Continent and on one of these journeys went to Italy where he came in direct contact with Italian Humanists. His Greek Testament exerted great influence on the English Reformation, as it was used as the basis for later translation into the vernacular.

John Colet was one of the first of the Humanists

5. Hulbert, op. cit., p. 72. Emerton, E., Erasmus, p. 460. Clark, W., Anglican Reformation, p. 58.

6. Smith, Erasmus, p. 3.

to urge religious reform, and may well be called the leader of the religious Renaissance in England. He was a disciple of Pico della Mirandola and in his visit to Italy also probably came in contact with Savonarola and his reforming work. He lectured at Oxford and his chief contribution to the work of reform was that he led his students back to the original sources, the Scriptures themselves, to find the truths of religion. He also saw the need for reform among the clergy in both Italy and England. It is thought that Colet favoured Luther's ideas but his death prevented him from taking any part in the succeeding struggle. He is believed to have exerted considerable influence on Erasmus and More.

The third great figure of the early Reformation in England, who was influenced by ideas which had their origin on the Continent, was Sir Thomas More. He was educated at Oxford where Humanism was then being taught by scholars who had returned from Italy. He was also greatly influenced by Erasmus and Colet. He made a visit to the Continent as a representative of a commission appointed by Wolsey. While there he spent some time in Antwerp, Bruges, and Brussels, which were at that time strongholds of the art and literature of the Renaissance. More, like Erasmus, opposed Luther and Protestant reform, and allied

7. Smith, Erasmus, p. 216.

himself with the more moderate reformers.

It would seem almost impossible to conceive of either a Renaissance or a Reformation taking place without the aid of the printing press. The English press was in itself an imported product. William Caxton, after about thirty-five years sojourn on the Continent, where he learned the art of printing, brought it with him to England in 1476. It was printing which enabled the ideas and doctrines of the continental reformers to be carried over to England and promulgated among the people.

During the reign of Henry VIII, numerous heretical books were printed abroad and from thence transported to England where they were sold in ever increasing numbers. Many volumes of Tyndale's New Testament, which was printed at Cologne and Worms, were sent to England. Numerous other English treatises were printed abroad and together with the works of foreign reformers were smuggled into England in spite of the restrictions placed upon them and the attempt of the government to suppress them. Had it not been for the printing press, heresy, and consequently also the Reformation, might have been stamped out.⁸

Soon after Luther's revolt against the Papacy

8. The power of the press increased during the reign of Edward VI when it came under the influence of a government which favored continental reform.

we find more definite evidence of continental influence. A copy of Luther's Theses on Indulgences was sent by Erasmus to More and Colet about four months after their promulgation in Germany.⁹ In February, 1519, Froben sent a number of Luther's works to England and in 1520 many of Luther's works were found in the stock of a bookseller at Oxford. By 1521 the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were found to be infected with Lutheranism. The White Horse Tavern was nicknamed Germany because many of those who held reforming views met there to discuss their ideas. Luther's books were examined by a committee of the University of Cambridge, were condemned and on May 12, were¹⁰ burned in public at St. Paul's in London.

Tyndale's New Testament has already been mentioned as having been printed abroad and smuggled into England. As early as November 3, 1526, Archbishop Warham ordered a search for copies of this book. Tyndale had imbibed the ideas of foreign reformers, first those of Luther and later those of Zwingli. The translation was executed directly under foreign influence and therefore was condemned as heresy in England. An attempt was made to buy all copies of the book and all that could be

9. Smith, Age of the Reformation, p. 286.

10. Ibid, p. 282.

Lindsay, T.M., History of the Reformation, p. 320.

secured were burned. This, however, only gave Tyndale more money to print other editions, copies of which likewise found their way to England. Other books containing Lutheran ideas were also published and promulgated. Of these, John Heywood's "The Four P's," Simon Fisk's "Supplication of Beggars", and John Skelton's "Colyn Clout" ¹¹ were the most popular among the people.

It is somewhat difficult to determine the extent to which Lutheran ideas and doctrines had been adopted by the people. In earlier years (1517-1520) Lutheran ideas were confined largely to the universities and had been accepted by only a few. ¹² The majority of the common people

naturally still clung to their old beliefs. There are indications, however, that only a few years later the people were beginning to respond to the teachings of the Lutherans. ¹³

During the last two decades of Henry's reign, the reform party numbered such prominent men as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Cromwell. The adherence of the latter to the reforming group indicates the trend of public opinion, as Cromwell is generally believed to have

11. Smith, Age of the Reformation, p. 283.

12. Ibid, p. 281.

13. Ibid, p. 283 says, referring to the years 1521-1522, "While the chief priests and rulers were not slow to reject the new gospel the common people heard it gladly."

had little religious feeling and to have been governed by expediency rather than by any strong convictions on his own part.¹⁴

As early as 1527, "heresy, as it was then called, that is, the gospel, had already spread considerably in this diocese of London, and especially about Colchester and other parts of Essex, as well as in the city. The New Testament in English, translated by Tyndale, was in many hands and read with great application and joy; the doctrines of the corporal presence, of worshipping images¹⁵ and going on pilgrimages would not down." Even though some give less credit to the strength of reforming ideas among the people,¹⁶ it seems quite probable that the reforming party was gaining ground during the later years of Henry's reign. This growth in the number of adherents to the reforming party is very likely due in a large measure to the promulgation of Lutheran works and of works of Lutheran origin.

Besides the fact that continental reforming books were continually being sent to England, Henry VIII

14. Smith, Age of the Reformation, p. 299.

15. Strype, J., Ecclesiastical Memorial, p. 113.

16. Gairdner, Lollardy and the Reformation, p. 311, and History of the Church of England, p. 195.
On the whole, Gairdner believes that Lutheranism never gained a strong hold on the English people.

was also carrying on negotiations with the Lutherans. While the government was openly doing all in its power to exterminate heresy, Henry VIII seems to have secretly encouraged it.¹⁷ His dealings with the Lutherans were due purely to political considerations; for in so far as he cared about religion at all he apparently believed in the doctrines of the Catholic Church. However, he carried on a series of negotiations with the Lutherans because he felt that they might at some time be useful to him. Whether or not any concessions were to be made to the Lutherans was determined by Henry's need of a friend on the Continent at the time. When the Catholic forces on the Continent seemed to be combining against him, he would make further overtures to the Lutherans.¹⁸ Dr. Robert Barnes was first sent abroad to pave the way for an agreement with the Lutherans. Other representatives were sent in 1535, and, in 1538, the German Protestants sent a group of divines to England. Henry refused to agree to certain demands of the Lutherans so the attempt at an agreement was a failure, except in so far as it may have exerted an influence on certain doctrinal changes in England.¹⁹

17. Gairdner, Lollardy and the Reformation, p. 307.

18. Ibid, pp. 175, 177, 181.

19. Massingberd, F.C., English Reformation, p. 364, says that the English and foreign divines had agreed upon a statement of doctrine founded upon the Confession of Augsburg, but since Henry refused to agree to it, it was never published.

The first of these changes was The Ten Articles. These Articles set forth the authority of the three Creeds and included the three Sacraments of Baptism, Penance and the Lord's Supper. They explained the doctrine of Justification and the right use of images and practically abandoned the doctrine of Purgatory. The existence of Lutheran influence on these Articles is generally recognized, although some give less credit to it than others.²⁰ A considerable part of the language of these Articles at least is recognized as being of Lutheran origin. Fox, who had just returned from a conference with the Lutheran divines, presented the Articles, which indicates that they were probably of Lutheran origin. It has even been suggested that Fox himself may have prepared them.²¹ The Principal Articles Concerning Our Faith show a similarity to Melancthon's work. Other parts of these Articles show similarities to the Apology, the Adversus Anabaptists of Melancthon, and to the Augsburg Confession.²² Sufficient

20. Gairdner, Lollardy and the Reformation, p. 312,

"In spite, however, of an apparently Lutheran origin and Lutheran terms of expression in this remarkable document, we may fairly consider it orthodox, in so far as it went."

Lingard, John, History of England, Vol.V, p.103.

"Throughout the work, Henry's attachment to the ancient faith is most manifest and the only concessions which he makes to the men of the new learning is the order for the removal of abuses, with perhaps the omission of a few controverted subjects."

21. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 89.

22. Ibid, p. 90.

evidence of Lutheran influence on these Articles has been found to justify the conclusion that they were Lutheran in origin even though they were modified so as to conciliate the Catholics.²³

In the Institution of a Christian Man the four Sacraments which had been omitted in the Ten Articles were restored and Purgatory acknowledged. The doctrine of Justification by Faith, however, was also admitted. Evidence for Lutheran influence on the Institution has also been found, although it is sometimes considered as being more Catholic than the Ten Articles because the other four Sacraments which were omitted in the Articles are found here. However, the theologians who favoured Lutheran doctrines had conceded that the name of sacrament might be allowed the other four Sacraments with limitations. The Institution recognizes a difference between three of the Sacraments and the other four.²⁴

Cranmer was probably the most influential divine on the commission which formulated the Bishops' Book, as the Institution was called. He was probably familiar

23. Dixon, R. W., History of the Church of England, Vol. I, p. 418, quoted from Jacobs, op. cit., p. 90.

"It seems impossible to explain away the plain evidence which Laurence has brought to prove that the reformed doctrine refused into the Confession came from Germany."

24. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 112.

with Luther's Small Catechism from which parts of the Institution seem to have been taken.²⁵ Passages of the Bishops' Book show similarities not only to Luther's Catechism but to other Lutheran Confessions. Although this Book contains Catholic elements, it was to a certain extent a victory for the Lutherans as it silenced all opposition for a time.²⁶

The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of Any Christian Man, which followed, supplied the doctrines of the Church omitted in the Institution and declared the doctrine of transubstantiation to be infallible. The Six Article Law went still further in this direction by repudiating Lutheran doctrines and by reaffirming the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

Since the remaining chapters of this work are confined to liturgical changes, a brief review of such changes during the reign of Henry VIII, although they may not show direct evidence of continental influence, does not seem inappropriate. The Church services during the reign of Henry VIII underwent little changes and, in general, they remained the same as had always been used in England. However, there are a few changes which are of

25. Jabobs, op. cit., p. 106.

26. Ibid, p. 104.

interest because they prepared the way for the more drastic liturgical changes of the succeeding reign.

The first of these changes was in regard to the use of the Bible in English. Coverdale's translation from the Latin and German, was too avowedly of German origin; so a translation which was probably a combination of Tyndale's and Coverdale's translations, known as Matthew's Bible, became the authorized version. In 1538, Cromwell issued injunctions requiring that a copy of the Bible be placed in every church and commanding that the people be taught the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments in English. In the Convocation of 1543 a committee was appointed for the purpose of reforming the service books and it was ordered that on every Sunday and holy day one chapter of the Bible be read to the people. A committee of divines to whom the work of revising the services was intrusted brought forth a treatise entitled, "Ceremonies to be Used in the Church of England Together with an Explanation of Them." This book, however, was never authorized and therefore is of little importance.²⁷

Cranmer, however, was making plans for further reforms of the church services. In 1544, his translation of the Litany into English was adopted. Since this Litany was much the same as that incorporated in the first

27. Gairdner, History of the English Church, p. 226.

Book of Common Prayer, it will be considered in connection with this book. However, it might be mentioned here that Cranmer had before him not only the Latin liturgies but also Luther's Litany of 1529 and probably also certain Eastern liturgies, and enriched his translation from these.²⁸

Several new Primers also were published and used during the reign of Henry VIII. In 1535, Marshall published a Primer containing a Litany based on a Litany written or edited by Luther.²⁹ About 1541 the king began to exercise an influence on the Primer which led to the publication of King Henry's Primer of 1545. This contained the new form of the Litany with revised forms of prayers.³⁰

Cranmer also tried to get the king's consent to the abolition of certain ceremonies such as creeping to the cross on Good Friday, etc. The king, however, having been warned by Gardiner, did not consent to these changes. Thus, although few changes were introduced during this reign, Cranmer was preparing the way for more radical changes in ritual which he was ready to introduce as soon as an opportunity presented itself.

28. Procter, F., and Frere, W.H., History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 414.

29. Pullan, L., The Book of Common Prayer, p. 74.

30. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 33.

CHAPTER II

CONTINENTAL INFLUENCES ON THE FIRST BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

With the accession of Edward VI, January 28, 1547, the reform party which favoured the ideas and doctrines of the continental reformers came into power, and the way for further reform in church services was open. Cranmer, who had been making plans for liturgical reform for some time before the death of Henry VIII, was now free to introduce them. Somerset, who favoured further reform, allowed Cranmer to pursue his own course in regard to ecclesiastical affairs.¹ From the press, which was now controlled by a government favourable to foreign influence, poured forth books of continental origin, to which were added many others coming directly from the Continent.² Prominent leaders of the Reformation on the Continent, such

1. Jacobs, H.E., Lutheran Movement in England, p. 198.

2. Smith, Age of the Reformation, p. 312.

as, Bucer, Eguis, Martyr, Ochino, and Lasco came to England, were warmly welcomed by Cranmer, and given positions in the universities and in the Church. These foreign reformers are generally believed to have exerted considerable influence on the English Reformation during Somerset's protectorate.³

Changes in ritual were first introduced in the royal chapel where Compline was sung in English at Easter, April 11, 1547.⁴ At the service of thanksgiving for the victory over the Scots at Pinkie, the Te Deum and the Litany were sung in English.⁵ Gloria in Excelsis, the Creed, and the Agnus were sung in English instead of in Latin, at the opening of Parliament.⁶ In July, 1547,

3. Gairdner, History of the English Church, p. 261, says that great deference was paid to foreign opinion at this time.

Hulbert, op. cit., p. 130, says:

"The chief actors of the Reformation throughout Edward's reign proposed to take lessons from the continental divines, and to make the English Church as truly reformed as the German."

Pollard, Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, p. 478, on the other hand, says: "The continental reformers came too late to affect the moderate changes introduced during Somerset's protectorate."

4. Gasquet and Bishop, Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer, p. 64.

Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 35.

5. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 64.

6. Ibid, p. 64.

the first royal injunctions of Edward, providing for radical changes in ritual, were issued. They commanded that the Epistle and Gospel at High Mass be read in English. One chapter of the New Testament at Matins and one chapter of the Old Testament at Evensong were to be read in English on every Sunday and holiday. They also ordered that a copy of the Bible and of the Paraphrases of Erasmus be set up in every church. The clergy were ordered to study these and were to be examined in them by the bishops. One of Cranmer's homilies was to be read every Sunday. No lights were to be burned before images and no bells rung during the service, except one before the sermon. The Litany which had been set forth in English was to be used and the old form of processions were forbidden.⁷ These injunctions indicate the tendency of the time and prepared the way for a more uniform order of service. They were decidedly Protestant in their tenor and spirit and the continental reformers could scarcely have asked for more.⁸

The homilies authorized by these injunctions were written by Cranmer and published in July, 1547. They did not prove to be very popular and were severely criticized by Gardiner, although highly commended by Bucer.⁹

7. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., pp. 53, 54, 55.
Procter and Frere, op. cit., pp. 35, 36.

8. Hulbert, op. cit., p. 131.

9. Pollard, Political History of England, p. 14.

This would seem to indicate that they were, in general, favourable to foreign ideas. Cranmer especially emphasizes the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone without works. There is no evidence that any of the homilies were translations, but the thought as well as the language in some instances indicates that they owe something to Lutheranism.¹⁰ Although there are no Lutheran elements in many of the homilies, they have been found in the homilies on, "Salvation of Mankind by Only Christ Our Saviour," "Of Our Salvation", and "Of Faith." The two last mentioned homilies seem to be almost mosaics of passages from approved Lutheran authorities.¹¹ In the former, the opening sentence is taken directly or indirectly from the Schwabach Articles of Luther and Melanchthon, and the close of the paragraph introduces the very language of the Augsburg Confession, supplemented by a clause referring to the Active Obedience of Christ, which doctrine was derived from the Reformation of Cologne.¹²

Similarities to Lutheran ideas and works have also been found in the homilies, "Of Good Works", and "Of Christian Love and Charity." It does not seem, however,

10. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 335.

11. Ibid, p. 338.

12. Ibid, p. 336.

that in any of these instances Cranmer translated or even directly took his ideas or language from Lutheran sources, but that through his sojourn with Osiander on the Continent he had become so familiar with Lutheran ideas and services that they naturally occurred to him as he wrote.¹³

Although most historians scarcely mention Lutheran influence on these homilies, it is evident that Cranmer was quite familiar with Lutheran ideas and doctrines. That these should have had an indirect influence on this work seems probable.

In December, 1547, Communion in both kinds was approved by Convocation and afterwards was sanctioned by Parliament. In accordance with this act a commission was appointed to draw up a form of service for the administration of Communion in both kinds. The Communion Office of 1548 was a temporary measure supplementing the Latin Mass. This form of service was taken largely from the Consultation of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, which was drawn up by Bucer and Melancthon who borrowed extensively from Luther's Nurnberg services.¹⁴

The service begins with an Exhortation to be given the Sunday preceding or the day preceding the Communion Service. This Exhortation is modeled after the

13. Jacobs, op. cit., pp. 335, 336.

14. Gairdner, History of the English Church, p. 255.

first Exhortation of the Reformation of Cologne, which in turn was taken from the Cassel Order of 1539. The second Exhortation was constructed after the second one of the Reformation of Cologne, which was taken from the Nurnberg Exhortation of Volprecht.¹⁵ The warning which follows is similar in ideas to the Cassel Exhortation, the Prayer of Confession is similar to that of Cologne, and the Absolution is a free rendering from the same source. The Comfortable Words are also taken from this source.¹⁶ The words of distribution of the English Office of 1548 are as follows: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body unto everlasting life." "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life."¹⁷ The clauses, "which was shed for thee" and "which was given for thee", are taken from the Nurnberg formula which is also in accordance with Luther's ideas as expressed in his Small Catechism. In other respects the words of administration are similar to that of Schwabach Hall of 1543.¹⁸

The new Office seemed to have made a favourable impression on the foreign reformers. A letter from

15. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 241.

16. Ibid, pp. 241, 242.

17. Liturgies of Edward VI, p. 8.

18. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 243.

Hilles to Bullinger, written June, 1549, reads, "We have a uniform communion of the Eucharist throughout the entire realm, yet after the manner of the Nurnberg churches and some of the Saxons. The bishops and magistrates present no obstruction to Lutherans."¹⁹ Hilles probably refers to the Order of Communion as he wrote four days before the first Book of Common Prayer was published.²⁰

Auricular confession is no longer required by this Office. This also shows a reforming tendency. The elements are to be consecrated as was customary and the words of administration may be taken to indicate either the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation or the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. However, the words: "spiritually to feed and drink upon", used in the first Exhortation, seem to suggest the idea of the Spiritual Presence. Parts of this Office were incorporated in the first Book of Common Prayer and the entire Office left its impression on the services later provided.

In July, 1548, Cranmer's Catechism was published. Although this Catechism is sometimes spoken of as if it were an original production of Cranmer's, Cranmer, himself, speaks of it as a translation. It seems to be nothing more than a translation of the sermons appended to the

19. Original Letters, CXXI, quoted from Jacobs, op. cit., p. 243.

20. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 94.

Brandenburg Nurnberg Kirchenordnung of 1533.²¹ Cranmer may have been an inmate of Osiander's house when this order was in preparation and, therefore, would naturally have been familiar with it. Cranmer seems to have made some slight changes in his translation. He has added about fourteen pages on the Second Commandment and one page on the introduction to the Lord's Prayer, and omitted nineteen lines on the Second, three lines on the Fourth, and a page on the Seventh Commandment, and six lines and a repetition on the Third Article of the Creed. He also omitted a paragraph of fifteen lines on Baptism and left out much of the explanation of the Brandenburg Nurnberg order. In the latter the sermons are summarized at the close of each by words from Luther's Small Catechism. Cranmer brought these summaries together, thereby constructing an English Catechism similar to Luther's.²²

During the months preceding the compilation of the first Book of Common Prayer, preparation was being made for the introduction of a uniform order of service. On April 24, 1548, all preaching was forbidden until such an order should have been established. In January, the

21. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 315.

22. Ibid, p. 316.

ceremonies of using candles on Candlemas, ashes on Ash Wednesday, and palms on Palm Sunday were abolished. The use of holy bread, holy water, and the service of creeping to the cross on Good Friday, and the use of all images remaining in any church or chapel, were abolished in February. Other experiments were made in various places. St. Paul's choir and other parishes in London sang all the service in English. At the anniversary of Henry VIII at Westminster, May 12, the entire Mass was conducted in English.²³ In September, 1548, Somerset commanded that the services used in the colleges at Cambridge be the same as those then in use in the royal chapel. It appears that the services of the royal chapel had also undergone further changes. The services in use there corresponded somewhat to those later adopted by the first Book of Common Prayer.²⁴

The history of the compilation of the first Book of Common Prayer is wrapped in considerable obscurity. There is no evidence of any formal commission being appointed for the purpose of compiling it, although a commission of divines were assembled at Chertsey and at Windsor, for the settlement of liturgical questions.²⁵

23. Procter and Frere, op. cit., pp. 39, 40.

24. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 147.

25. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p.45.

The members of the commission are not known exactly and historians differ concerning them. The following men were probably among the members: Cranmer, Ridley, Holbeach of Lincoln, Thribly of Westminster, Goodrich of Ely, May, Dean of St. Paul's, Hayes, Dean of Exeter, Robertson, afterward Dean of Durham, and Redman, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.²⁶ The time at which the commission began its work is also indefinite, although it has been placed at September 22 or 23, 1548.²⁷

Cranmer had drawn up two drafts or schemes of service. A final draft of the Prayer Book was probably submitted to this commission for their approval. The Book as approved by them, however, seems to have been modified so as to gain the votes of the majority of the bishops.

On December 15, a disputation on the Eucharist took place in the House of Lords²⁸ and on the following day at the close of the debate the Prayer Book was read in the Commons. On January 21, 1549, the Act of Uniformity authorizing its use was carried through both houses. Ten bishops voted for the bill and eight against it, while

26. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 46.

27. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 145.

28. Perry, George, The Reformation in England, p. 72. This disputation is said to have been held in the Parliament House, but probably was not a part of the regular proceedings of Parliament.

two proxies were for it and one against it.²⁹ Whether or not the Book was submitted to Convocation for its approval is uncertain, as the records of the Convocation were later destroyed by fire. It seems probable, however, although there is no direct evidence to prove it, that the Book had the approval of Convocation.³⁰

The first Edwardine Act of Uniformity authorized the use of the first Book of Common Prayer and provided for the punishment of those who refused to use it and of those who used any other form of service. The first offense occasioned the loss of one spiritual benefice and imprisonment for six months, the second offense, imprisonment for a year and loss of all spiritual promotions, and the third offense, imprisonment for life.³¹ Thus, a uniform order of service was for the first time established in England.

The Book of Common Prayer was probably more the work of Cranmer than of any other one person.³² "It must

29. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 49.

30. Ibid., p. 52. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 181.

31. Gee, H., and Hardy, W.J., Documents Illustrative of English Church History, p. 361.

32. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 180. "The only positive statement that can be made is that Cranmer had the chief part in the inspiration and composition." Pollard, Political History of England, p. 23, "The draft Book of Common Prayer which was laid before Parliament in the ensuing session was to all intents and purposes the work of Cranmer."

be allowed that at this period the opinion of the Archbishop in matters of religion even apart from his position as the chief ecclesiastic of the realm, was a real determining factor in events.³³ Cranmer's contemporaries found it quite difficult to determine his policies, chiefly because he so often changed his mind, shifting from one position to another until at times it seemed impossible to determine to which side he belonged, and also because he seemed to be easily influenced, both by circumstances and by other people. At one time he assisted in punishing those who favoured Lutheran views, at another he had adopted that view and helped to condemn those who favoured Zwinglian ideas, and finally, himself adopted this view. He always held the greatest respect for royal authority and therefore strove to reconcile his conscience with the demands of his sovereign. When he was forced to make a decision on what policy to pursue he usually tried to take a middle course and probably based his choice on the exigency of the circumstances.³⁴ This very characteristic of Cranmer's, however, helps to explain the amount of foreign influence on the Prayer Book. "Cranmer was the chief maker of the Prayer Books and Articles and the theologians from abroad were the chief makers of

33. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 129.

34. Pollard, Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, p. 481.

³⁵
Cranmer." That he was greatly influenced by foreigners is evident.

In 1530, he was sent to France, Italy, and Germany to argue Henry's divorce case. Two years later he was again sent to Germany as an ambassador to secure an alliance with the Protestants. While abroad Cranmer became well acquainted with foreign reformers. He soon became intimate with Osiander whose niece he married. While at Nurnberg he probably became acquainted with the order of service then in use there. He may also have become familiar with the Brandenburg Nurnberg Kirchenordnung, then in preparation by Osiander and Brentz, and which later replaced the order then in use. After his return to England, he remained in correspondence with Osiander. "Cranmer's presence in Nurnberg therefore was destined to bear rich fruit in England in years to come."³⁶ He may also have learned to know other foreign reformers while abroad.

After his return to England Cranmer adopted Lutheran views and was generally considered a Lutheran by the reformers of the Swiss school.³⁷ Cranmer, himself,

35. Hulbert, op. cit., p. 135.

36. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 48.

37. Original Letters, Vol. II, p. 381, quoted from Jacobs, op. cit., p. 16. John ab Ulmis writing to Bullinger says, "He (Cranmer) has lately published a Catechism in which he not only approved that foul and sacriligious transubstantiation of the papists in the holy Supper of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous and bold."

admits that before he wrote his Catechism he was in the error of the Real Presence. However, it is evident that at the time of the debate on the Eucharist in the House of Lords, Cranmer had accepted the ideas of the Swiss reformers, as he and Ridley argued in favour of the Zwinglian view. The views that Cranmer had adopted represented that of the more moderate Zwinglians; that of the Spiritual Presence in the Eucharist. In his works on the Lord's Supper he explains his view by saying, "And as Christ saith not so, nor Paul saith not so, even so likewise I say not so, and my book in divers places saith clean contrary, that Christ is with us spiritually present, is eaten and drunken of us, and dwelleth within us, although corporally he be departed out of this world, and is ascended up into heaven. And yet as he giveth the bread to be eaten with our mouths, so giveth he his very body to be eaten with our faith. And, therefore, I say, the Christ giveth himself truly to be eaten, chewed and digested; but all is spiritually with faith, not with mouth."³⁸

This doctrine seems to have been much the same as that held by Bucer and Martyr.³⁹

It is somewhat difficult to determine who was responsible for Cranmer's change of mind and exactly when

38. Cranmer's Works on the Lord's Supper, pp. 12, 15.

39. Perry, op. cit., p. 81.

it took place, although it is generally believed that his change of attitude was caused by the influence of continental reformers and their doctrines.⁴⁰ Cranmer, himself, ascribes the change to Ridley, while other contemporaries attribute it to John a Lasco.⁴¹ Both may have been partly responsible for the change.

The foreign reformers of the Zwinglian school kept in close touch with Cranmer through correspondence and seemed to have been anticipating that Cranmer would eventually adopt their views. They were anxiously watching for any signs which might indicate a change of mind on the part of Cranmer, and the foreign reformers in England constantly reported his attitude to those on the Continent. Bullinger seems to have realized fully that the religious situation in England was controlled by Cranmer and that his conversion to the Zwinglian school was of the utmost importance to his cause.⁴² Bullinger also seems to have placed confidence in Lasco's ability to influence Cranmer. In writing to Hilles he asks about Lasco's whereabouts and whether Cranmer had received a book which he had sent to him.⁴³

40. Hulbert, op. cit., p. 136.

41. Pollard, Political History of England, p. 23.

42. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 230.

43. Ibid.

Lasco arrived in England at the end of September, 1548, and for the next six months lived with Cranmer. The change in the Archbishop's views seems to have taken place soon after Lasco's arrival. Although he may have been partly responsible for the change, it can hardly exclusively be attributed to him. On November 27, John ab Ulmis wrote to Bullinger, "Even Cranmer, by the goodness of God, and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, Master John a Lasco, is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy."⁴⁴ Considering Cranmer's temperament and disposition it is not surprising that these foreign reformers were able to persuade him to adopt their ideas and doctrines.⁴⁵

Although Cranmer was probably most responsible for the character of the changes in the English liturgy, there were other English churchmen whose influence on him and on the Prayer Book ought not to be overlooked. "It is probable that these foreign divines exercised less influence than the Englishmen who had fled from the persecutions of Henry VIII, imbibed foreign ideas and returned under Edward VI. Hooper was more potent than Bucer, and Coverdale, who had lived abroad fifteen years, may be compared with Martyr."⁴⁶

44. Original Letters, II, p.383, quoted from Jacobs, p. 217.

45. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 215.

46. Pollard, Thomas Cranmer, p. 269.

Hooper had imbibed Lutheran ideas from German books during the reign of Henry VIII and was forced to flee to the Continent to avoid punishment under the Act of Six Articles. While on the Continent he became acquainted with Bullinger and the Swiss reformers and adopted their ideas. After the death of Henry VIII he returned to England where he represented the more extreme school of reformers. He did all in his power to bring about a complete Swiss reformation in England and was bitterly opposed to Lutheranism. His attitude is shown in his refusal to take the required oath and wear the vestments authorized by the new Ordinal at his consecration to the See of Gloucester. He was supported by Lasco but Bucer and Martyr sided with Cranmer, who insisted on the enforcement of the requirements of the Ordinal. Hooper was committed to the fleet and finally agreed to conform.⁴⁷

Bishop Ridley's influence on Cranmer has already been mentioned, and as Cranmer himself recognized it, his influence must have been considerable. Together with Cranmer he had defended the doctrine of the Spiritual Presence, in the debate in the House of Lords. He was one of the most learned divines of the English Church at this time. He had been influenced by one of Zwingli's treatises against Luther and by the study of Ratramnus to

47. Procter, F., History of the Book of Common Prayer, p.33.

reject both the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran doctrines.⁴⁸ He was associated with Cranmer in the compilation of the first Book of Common Prayer.

Other English bishops who may have exerted some slight influence were Latimer and Cox. During Edward's reign the bishops who favoured reform were given positions of influence while those who were conservative, as Gardiner and Bonner, were deprived of their sees.⁴⁹ Thus, with a man like Cranmer, who was influenced by continental reformers and thoroughly in favour of their views, in control of ecclesiastical affairs, and a majority of the bishops favouring reforming ideas and most of them more or less influenced by the opinions of continental reformers; it would seem strange should a liturgy compiled under such circumstances show no signs of continental influence.

There is some difference of opinion as to the amount of continental influence on the first Book of Common Prayer. Some measure of foreign influence, and especially that of the Consultation of Cologne, is generally recognized. Some historians emphasize the conservative character of the Book rather than its reforming tendencies. Pollard considers it a compromise between the Catholic and reform parties and thinks that its resemblances to

48. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 207.

49. Hulbert, op. cit., p. 129.

Lutheranism arises from the common conservatism of the Anglican and Lutheran compared with the reformed churches.⁵⁰ Perry believes that the English Book is almost entirely an adaptation of the ancient Breviary and sacramental offices of the Sarum Custom Book and that its character reflects the triumph of the moderate and Catholic party over the more drastic reformers.⁵¹ Procter and Frere also belong to this group of historians who believe the Book to be Catholic in spirit and that the greater part of its content is derived from the old Catholic services.⁵²

On the other hand, are a group of historians who give more credit to foreign influence. Gasquet and Bishop, after an analysis and comparison of the texts of the English Book and the Lutheran service books, have arrived at the conclusion that the Book of 1549 was drawn up after the Lutheran pattern. This, they have found also to be confirmed by the historical circumstances.⁵³ Jacobs is another of this group who emphasize foreign influence on this Book and especially Lutheran influence.⁵⁴ Cardwell

50. Pollard, Political History of England, p. 49.

51. Perry, op. cit., p. 70.

52. Procter, F., History of the Book of Common Prayer, p. 54.

53. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., pp. 228-229.

54. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 298. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 90, however, say: "Jacobs from the Lutheran standpoint has multiplied references to many of the countless German Kirchenordnungen published between 1523 and 1522; but most of the similarities are slight and such as naturally occur in documents as are similar as these are in purpose and origin."

says that wherever the first Prayer Book deviated from the ancient breviaries, it was dependent on the progress on the Continent in religious worship.⁵⁵

Hulbert also places much emphasis on foreign influence on the English Prayer Book. He says: "Cranmer and the leaders in the English Church welcomed the reformers from the Continent as equals and teachers, put them into the divinity chairs in great universities, made them superintendents of the foreign congregations which were joyfully received and protected, invited them to assist in making the Church of England a true reformed church, and actually borrowed from the creeds and liturgies of their Lutheran and Calvinistic churches probably two-thirds in all of the form and language of the Book of Common Prayer. Page after page of that Book is free translation out of the Catechism and sermons of Martin Luther, out of the writings of Osiander and Melanchthon, out of the Cologne Archbishop Hermann's Consultations, out of the Strasburg Liturgy and the Litany of John Brentz, and out of the books of Lasco, Bucer, and John Calvin."⁵⁶

Although it may be surmised from the above opinions that continental reform movements may have exerted considerable influence on the first English Book of Common

55. Cardwell, Two Liturgies of Edward VI Contrasted, Pref. XII, sq., quoted from Jacobs, op. cit., p. 274.

56. Hulbert, op. cit., p. 137.

Prayer, it will be necessary to examine the sources from which the compilers drew and compare them with the English Book before arriving at any definite conclusions as to the amount of foreign influence.

The sources from which Crammer drew in compiling the Book of Common Prayer are: The pre-Reformation service books such as the uses of Sarum and York, the Reformed Latin Breviary of Cardinal Quignon, the Mozarabic Missal, Eastern Liturgies, and Lutheran service books.⁵⁷ Of these sources the first and the last mentioned probably furnished most of the material for the Prayer Book. The pre-Reformation service books were those in use in England before the time of the Reformation, and as they do not represent continental influences, they do not concern us here.

Quignon, a Spanish Cardinal, a member of the Franciscan order, and a friend of Pope Clement VII, was one of a small group of ecclesiastics of the Church who desired reform. He drew up a reformed breviary which was published in February, 1535, and dedicated to Paul III. This first edition provided for somewhat drastic reform of the services. The Psalter was rearranged, the lessons were reduced to three, one from the New Testament and another from the Epistles or Acts of the Apostles or a saint's life or homily. His first edition met with such

57. Warren, F.E., Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 259.

drastic criticism that a revision was necessary, and even the second edition met with so much opposition that it was suppressed by the Pope in 1558.⁵⁸ Cranmer's drafts show that it was the first edition which he used.

Sir William Palmer first pointed out that the Breviary of Quignon had probably exerted an influence on the Book of Common Prayer. He noticed that whole passages of the preface seem to have been taken from the preface of Quignon's first edition. However, it seemed impossible to trace the origin of any part of the Book of Common Prayer directly to Quignon's work. A comparison of these drafts of Cranmer's with Quignon's Roman Breviary shows how Cranmer's scheme of office, both in its general order and in detail, was inspired by Quignon's Breviary.⁵⁹ The preface of the first Book of Common Prayer shows most unmistakably the influence of Quignon's work and its influence on the Prayer Book is generally recognized.⁶⁰ Cranmer's drafts also show that he was influenced by Quignon

58. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 27.

59. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 16.

60. Gloucester, E.C.S., Introduction to the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI, p. VIII.

"The preface to the first Prayer Book is a literal translation from the preface of the first edition of Quignon's."

Pollard, Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, p. 484.

"The reformed Breviary of Cardinal Quignon, dedicated in 1535 to Paul III, anticipated many of the changes which Cranmer made in the ancient use."

in the arrangement of the Kalendar and the hour services. In Cranmer's first draft he adopted Quignon's scheme of the year but provided for three lessons at Matins, one at Lauds and one at Evensong. In the second scheme he omitted the lesson at Lauds and in the third fixed the number at Evensong at two. The Prayer Book provided for two lessons alike at Morning and Evening Prayer. Quignon had reduced the lessons to a uniform three at Matins.

Other changes made in accordance with Quignon's work were: the making of the Sunday and holy-day services identical in structure with the week day services, the removal of all antiphons and responds, the increased amount of Holy Scripture read, the idea of prefixing to every service a form of confession and absolution, the substitution of the Athanasian Creed for the Apostles' Creed on certain days instead of the former being an addition to the latter. "The uniform assignment of three Psalms to each hour suggests the average number and arrangement of

60. Continued.

Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 187.

"As to the Roman Breviary of Quignon, in the Book of 1549, no part remained but what had been incorporated in the preface, and such general influence as it may be supposed to have exercised in regard to the continuous reading of the Scripture."

Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 29.

"The reformed Breviary, at any rate, in its earlier shape, was before Cranmer, and left its mark upon the Prayer Book."

the Psalms in the Prayer Book at Matins and Evensong.⁶¹"

Another source, from which Cranmer probably drew in the compilation of the Prayer Book, is the Mozarabic Missal, the ancient rite of Spain.⁶² The portion of the Prayer Book which seems to have been derived from the Mozarabic use is the prayer for the blessing of the font in the Baptismal Office.⁶³ Even though this portion seems to have been taken from this use, its influence at most can only be estimated as having been slight, for out of a volume of nearly nineteen hundred folio columns of print Cranmer apparently used only one column and possibly a line or two more. Besides these prayers, the Prayer of Consecration in the Communion Office, commencing, "Who in the same night," seems to be somewhat similar to the Mozarabic Missal, although much the same thing is found in a Lutheran

61. Warren, Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 259.

62. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 571.

63. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 186.

"Some portion of the blessing of the font survives in the present Prayer Book but the means whereby it found its way into the Book of 1549 is a problem yet to be solved."

Procter and Frere, op. cit., Note, p. 571.

"This series of eight short prayers (for the consecration of the font) is one of the most easily identified portions of the form, they are all found in a similar series of sixteen short prayers in the Mozarabic *Benedicti Fontis*."

source.⁶⁴ Other changes which may have been made in accordance with this source are: the use of the plural instead of the singular in the form of opening versicles of Morning and Evening Prayer and many of the new collects introduced into the Prayer Book. Although these were not transferred bodily from any Mozarabic service book, yet they preserve some Mozarabic ideas and phrases. Many addresses beginning with "Dearly beloved brethern" are also probably taken from this source.⁶⁵

The Greek liturgies, although probably known to Cranmer, exerted but slight influence on the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer. The most evident similarity is in the Prayer of St. Chrysostom.⁶⁶ The Epiklesis or invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, must have been copied from an Eastern liturgy. It runs thus, "Hear us, O Merciful Father we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ."⁶⁷

64. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 185.

Warren, Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 259, suggests that the Lutheran and Anglican derived the prayer independently for the same source.

65. Warren, Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 259.

66. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 400.

67. Warren, Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 209.

Several petitions in the Litany seem also to have been modeled after similar petitions in the Deacons' Litany and in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. They resemble these more closely than they do any of the petitions in the Latin uses. These petitions are: "That it may please Thee to give to all nations unity, peace and concord," etc.; "That it may please Thee to illuminate all Bishops, Priests, Deacons," etc.; "That it may please Thee to succor, help and comfort all that are in danger," etc.;⁶⁸ and, "That it may please Thee to preserve all that hear," etc. Of all the continental service books which furnished material for the first Book of Common Prayer, the Lutheran service books exerted the greatest influence. There are two types of reformation service books, the Lutheran and the reformed. The latter exerted but a slight influence on the first Prayer Book. The compilers of the reformed liturgies wished to abolish every sign of the old Roman Mass, while the Lutheran liturgies were based on the Roman Mass and abolished only that which made the Mass a sacrifice.⁶⁹ Both the Lutheran and the Anglican service books are more conservative than the reformed. Most of the Lutheran liturgies are based either on Luther's Latin Mass of 1523 or on his German Mass of 1526. The

68. Warren, Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 209.

69. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., pp. 217-218.

Brandenburg Nurnberg Agende was published in 1533, having been compiled by Osiander assisted by Brentz.

The Lutheran liturgy which exerted more influence on the English Book than any other was the Liturgy for the Reformation of Cologne. Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, adopted Lutheranism, caused a liturgy to be drawn up, and submitted it to the leading Lutheran divines of Germany. The greater part of this book was doctrinal but it also contained an order of service. It was the work of Bucer and Melancthon who drew largely from the Brandenburg Nurnberg Order of 1533, from the orders of Herzog Heinrich of Saxony drawn up by Justus Jonas in 1536, and from the Hesse Cassel Order of 1539.⁷⁰ It was published in 1543. A Latin translation was published in 1545 and an English translation of the Latin work in 1547. The influence of this service on the Communion Office of 1548 has already been considered.

In the order of services for Matins and Evensong of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, several similarities to various Lutheran services are found. A comparison of the Matin services of the Prayer Book with those of the old Lutheran Matin service given in Lohe Agende, shows the two to be apparently much the same. The order of services for Evensong, 1549, is found to be similar to

70. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 224.

the Vesper services of Luther. In 1523 Luther advised the use of entire Psalms for the introits. This idea was adopted in the English Book of 1549.⁷¹ The compilers of the English Liturgy substituted a number of collects, which they may have borrowed in part from Lutheran sources, in place of the old collects. The Gospels and Epistles of the English and those of the Lutheran orders are similar in most cases. In instances where they differ, as for the Gospel and Epistle on the twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity, the English followed one of Luther's services, in this case the Register of Epistles and Gospels, while the Lutherans followed another, those adopted by Luther in his Postils.⁷³

The Communion Office in the first Book of Common Prayer is somewhat similar to the Order of 1548. The Lutheran influences on it have already been considered. "Looking, therefore, at the characteristics of the new Anglican service and contrasting it on the one hand with the Ancient Missal and on the other with the Lutheran liturgies, there can be no hesitation whatever in classing

71. Jacobs, op. cit., pp. 246, 247.

72. Ibid, p. 251.

73. Ibid, p. 252.

Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 228. "The reduction of the daily services to Matins and Evensong and the general order of the services themselves afford other evidence." (Of Lutheran influence.)

it with the latter, not with the former."⁷⁴ In this Office the Confiteor, which in the old services was at the beginning of the Mass was omitted by Luther and also by Cranmer. Simple directions for the preparation of the altar were given in its place. The old salutation, "Dominus Vobiscum" and the "Gloria tibi Domine" before the Gospel were omitted in most of the Lutheran services and also in the Book of Common Prayer.⁷⁵

The Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words are modeled after the corresponding parts of the service in the Reformation of Cologne.⁷⁶ The words of distribution are the same as those used in the Office of 1548. The Exhortation following the Creed is based on Volprecht's service and the Prayer of Consecration including the Words of Institution, although modeled after the Sarum Use, also in part follows that of the Cassel and Cologne Orders. A comparison of the Prayer of Thanksgiving at the close of the service, with that of the Brandenburg Nurnberg Order of 1533, shows them to be much the same.

74. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 224.

75. Ibid., pp. 220-221.

76. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 243.

Brandenburg Nurnberg 1533

O Almightiger ewiger Gott
Wir sagen deiner Gottlichen
miltigkeit lob und dank das
du uns mit dem haylsamen
Flaysche und Blut, deines
aynigen Sons Jesu Christi,
unsers Hern gespyst und
getrencht hat ... etc.

77

Prayer Book 1549

Almighty and everlasting God
we most heartily thank Thee,
for that Thou hast vouch-
safed to feed us in these
holy mysteries with the
spiritual food of the most
precious Body and Blood of
Thy Son Jesus Christ ...etc.

The Litany drawn up by Cranmer in 1544 was not incorporated in the Prayer Book when it was first issued. A rubric, however, provided that it should be sung on Wednesdays and Fridays. Later it was incorporated in the Prayer Book, and although there were a few changes made, it remained much the same as that first translated by Cranmer.⁷⁸ Luther had revised the Litany before March 13, 1529, in both German and Latin and had introduced it into the service at Wittenberg. There seems to be sufficient evidence that Cranmer had Luther's Litany before him and that, at least in parts of it, he followed Luther rather closely.⁷⁹ Marshall's Primer published in 1535 corre-

77. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 243.

78. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 420.

79. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 231. "Cranmer follows Luther closely, either immediately or through the Litany in the Reformation of Cologne, which is Luther's." Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 413. "It is clear that he (Cranmer) had before him not merely the current Litany as used through Lent or on the Rogation Days with the different form prescribed for the dying, but also the form of Litany put out by Luther in 1529. Thus he did not merely translate the old Latin form but enriched it from foreign sources."

sponds closely to Luther's Latin Litany except that it retains the intercession of saints. Hilsey's Primer of 1539 also contained a reformed English Litany which also follows Luther but not so closely as Marshall's. Cranmer probably used these together with Luther's Litany, at times supplying his own translation of Luther rather than following Marshall.⁸⁰

The invocation of saints was omitted by Luther, greatly curtailed by Cranmer in 1544 and finally left out entirely in 1549. In the Deprecations the clause, "In all time of our tribulations", etc., was formed by combining four separate clauses of Luther's Litany.⁸¹ In the translation Luther's Latin Litany furnished "from sin" and his German Litany suggested the translation of "Insidus" as "crafts and assaults", and "perpetua" as "everlasting". In the intercessions the similarity to Luther's Litany becomes more evident. The clergy, named as "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons", is similar to Luther's "Bishoffe, Pfarrherr, und Kirchendiener." The Osecrations, with a few changes made by Cranmer, are very much like Luther's Latin Litany. The clause, "That it may please Thee to have mercy upon all men", is practically a literal translation of Luther while others, such as, "That it may please Thee to

80. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 243.

81. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 416.

strengthen such as do stand" etc., "To beat down Satan under our feet", and "To succour help and comfort", are translated more accurately from Luther by Cranmer than by Marshall. The versicles and collects which follow are also from Luther.⁸²

A considerable part of the Public Baptismal Office seems to have been derived from Lutheran sources. "Out of about two hundred and fifty lines, between seventy and eighty at most are taken from the elaborate and lengthy office of the old English rituals. This includes one whole prayer, also to be found in Luther's service; in the Book of 1549 it has a position similar to that in Luther's book, but in the Sarum ritual it is found in quite another place and connection. The bulk of the new Office is apparently original or derived from the books of Luther and Hermann."⁸³ Most historians agree that much of the material for this Office is derived from Lutheran sources.

The Reformation of Cologne is usually considered as the source of a large part of the Baptismal Office, however, the general order of the parts differs somewhat from Hermann's Consultation.⁸⁴ In the latter the service

82. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 226.

83. Perry, op. cit., p. 70; Jacobs, op. cit., p. 253.

84. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 520.

is divided into two parts, one part of the service taking place the day before Baptism. In the English Book the entire service takes place on the same day, although one part of it is performed at the church door. This part corresponds somewhat to the part in Hermann's Consultation which took place before Baptism. In general, however, the service probably more nearly resembles that of Luther's⁸⁵ of 1524.

The rubrics at the beginning of the service in the English Office require that information of the desire to have the child baptized be given to the curate over night or in the morning. The Reformation of Cologne merely prescribes that it be given "in good time." The question, "whether the children be baptized or no," is similar to the Brandenburg Nurnberg Order of 1533 which states, "The priest shall first ask whose the child is, what it shall be named, and whether it have received Jachtaufe," and to that of the Reformation of Cologne which reads, "The pastors should ask whether in haste they have before received Baptism, or, as it is called genothtauft⁸⁶ sein." In the Exhortation which follows, only one sim-

ilarity to the Reformation of Cologne, the phrase, "are conceived and born in sin," has been found. The Exhorta-

85. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 225.

86. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 255.

tion of Cologne is also much longer than that of the Prayer Book.⁸⁷ Comparing this Exhortation of the Prayer Book with that of Luther's Order of 1523, it will be seen that there is more similarity between these than between the Exhortation of the English order and that of the Consultation of Cologne, in which but one phrase shows a slight similarity.

Luther, 1523

Dear friends in Christ:
we hear daily out of the
Word of God, and learn
by our own experience,
that we all from the fall
of Adam, are conceived and
born in sin, wherein, being
under the wrath of God,
we must have been con-
demned and lost eternally,
except, we be delivered by
the only begotten Son of God
our Lord Jesus Christ.

I beseech you, therefore,
that, from Christian love
ye earnestly intercede
for this child with our
Lord God, that ye bring
it to the Lord Jesus Christ
and unite in imploring for
it the forgiveness of sins
and entrance into the King-
dom of Grace and Salvation.

88

Prayer Book of 1549

Dearly beloved: Forasmuch as
.....
.....
.....all men
.....
be conceived and born in sin,
can enter into the Kingdom of
God except he be regenerate
.....
and born anew of water and
the Holy Ghost.

I beseech you to call upon
God the Father, through our
Lord Jesus Christ, that of
His bounteous mercy he will
grant to these children that
thing which by nature they
cannot have, that is to say,
may be baptized with the Holy
Ghost, and received into
Christ's Holy Church, and be
made lively members of the
same.

87. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 576.

88. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 253.

The first prayer following the Exhortation seems to be taken either from the Cologne order or directly from Luther's original of 1523, from whence it came indirectly into the Consultation of Cologne. Some believe it to be nearer Luther's form than to the Consultation, at least in some phrases,⁸⁹ but a comparison with the Cologne order also shows that they are quite similar in words as well as in thought. The making of the sign of the cross and the words used follow Cologne.⁹⁰ The collect which follows was transferred by Luther from an ancient prayer used in adult baptism to infant baptism. The Exorcism follows Luther's formula of 1524.⁹¹ In the old English services the Gospel was taken from St. Matthew but in the Book of 1549, Cranmer followed the Lutheran services in substituting the Gospel from Mark.⁹²

The Address or Exhortation of the Consultation, although there is very little similarity in words to that of the English Address, may have furnished part of the idea and matter for the Exhortation of the Prayer Book.⁹³

89. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 577.

90. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 258.

91. Ibid., p. 259.

92. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 578.

93. Ibid., p. 278.

The similarity between the collect of Cologne and that of 1549 seems to justify the conclusion that it is a literal translation of Cologne, only a qualifying clause of the
94
Lutheran Order being suppressed.

Cologne

Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give Thee eternal thanks, that Thou hast vouchsafed to call us to this knowledge of Thy grace and faith towards Thee.

Increase and confirm this faith in us evermore. Give Thy Holy Spirit to this infant that he may be born again, and be made heir of everlasting salvation, which of Thy grace and mercy Thou hast promised to Thy Holy Church to old men, and to children through our Lord Jesus Christ, which liveth and reigneth with Thee now and forever. Amen

95

Prayer Book of 1549

Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give Thee humble thanks that Thou hast vouchsafed to call us to knowledge of Thy grace and faith in Thee:

Increase and confirm this faith in us evermore.

Give Thy Holy Spirit to these infants, that they may be born again, and be made heirs of everlasting salvation

.....
.....
.....
through our Lord Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and Thy Holy Spirit, now and forever. Amen

The address to the sponsors before Baptism is somewhat similar to the corresponding address of Hermann's Consultation in the service for the day of Baptism. In the English Order, however, the purpose of the address is to lead up to the baptismal promises which, in the German
96
Order, had been made on the day before Baptism.

94. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 259.

95. Consultation, fol. CLXIV, taken from Procter and Frere, op. cit., Note, p. 579.

96. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 579.

The closing address to the sponsors is partially derived from the Sarum and York uses but seems to be derived somewhat also from a formula originally introduced by Osiander in 1524 and adopted by the Brandenburg Nurnberg Order.

The corresponding address of the Cassel Order also shows⁹⁷ some points of resemblance to that of the English address.

The closing words from "Remembering", etc., seem to be derived⁹⁸ from Luther's Catechism.

In the Order of Private Baptism the dependence on the Consultation of Hermann is also manifest. The rubrics, inquiries and certificates, before the Gospel are derived from the Cologne Order "which there can be no⁹⁹ doubt is its immediate source." The mention of the Lord's Prayer in the rubric at the beginning of the service, "First let them that be present call upon God for His Grace, and say the Lord's Prayer if time will suffer," may have been due to the Consultation which reads, "And when they have said the Lord's Prayer let them baptize him in¹⁰⁰ the name of the Father," etc. The similarity between the questions asked in the two Orders is quite pronounced.

97. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 260.

98. Ibid, p. 261.

99. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 226.

100. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 580.

Cologne 1543

Through whom was this done?

And who were present?

Whether they who baptized the child called properly upon the name of the Lord? And baptized the child with water?

In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost?

Whether they know that these words were used according to Christ's command?

101

Prayer Book of 1549

By whom the child was baptized?

Who was present when the child was baptized?

Whether they called upon God for grace and succor in that necessity?

With what thing or what matter did they baptize this child?

With what words the child was baptized?

Whether they think the child be lawfully and perfectly baptized?

The service of Confirmation of the first Book of Common Prayer also seems to have been borrowed in some parts from Lutheran sources. The idea of a public profession of faith by children on coming to years of discretion was not contained in the old English services and seems to be Lutheran in origin.¹⁰² The Lutheran Confirmation service required a knowledge of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments, just as the first English Prayer Book. The introductory rubrics are similar to those of the Consultation of Cologne. The Cologne Order assigns the examination to a visitator, although it states that the work would be appropriate for the bishop. The first Book of Edward assigns the work to the bishop.

101. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 263.

102. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 228.

In the questions that follow, the Cologne Order is followed both as regards place and subject matter.¹⁰³ The making of the sign of the cross seems to be according to the old form of service, although the laying on of hands was customary among the Lutherans.¹⁰⁴ The collect beginning, "Almighty and everlasting God, which makest us," is generally conceded to have been composed from the collect which preceded the laying on of hands in the Consultation.¹⁰⁵

The Order of Matrimony follows that of the old English services and is in general similar to them, although a few additions were introduced from Lutheran sources. The introduction is similar to that of the Sarum Use but also in some respects resembles that of the Reformation of Cologne. Other similarities may be found to other Lutheran sources such as, Schwabach Hall of 1543 and Brandenburg Nurnberg.¹⁰⁶ In the Exhortation the words, "if any man show just cause", and "or else forever after hold his peace", are found in Osiander's service of 1526 and are similar in other Lutheran sources. The Cologne Order says, "If any one hath aught to say thereon, let him speak in time or afterward be silent and refrain from

103. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 268.

104. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 228.

105. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 268; Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 605.

106. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 270.

107

interposing any hindrance." The joining of hands and the pronouncement of union were old customs but are not found in any of the English services before the Prayer

108

Book of 1549. This part of the service is usually as-

109

cribed to the Consultation of Cologne, although a similarity to Luther's Traubuchleyn of 1529 is also apparent. Both services are given in comparison with the English Order.

Luther 1529	Cologne	Prayer Book 1549
Weil dann Hans N. und Greta N. einander zur Ehe begehre, auch die Ehe Einander ver- sprochen und solches sie offent- lich fur Gott und seiner gemein be- kennet, darauf die Hande und Trau- ringe einander gegeben haben, so spreche ich sie ehelich zu- sammen, in Namen Gottes des Vaters, und des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes. Amen 110	Forasmuch as this John N. desireth this Anne to be his wife in the Lord, and this Anne desireth this John to be her hus- band in the Lord and each hath made the promise of Holy matrimony and have now both professed the same openly and have confirmed it with giving of rings each to the other and joining of hands, I, minister of Christ and the Congregation pronounce that they be joined together with lawful and Chris- tian matrimony and I confirm their marri- age in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Amen 111	Forasmuch as N. and N. have con- sented together in holy wedlock, and have witnessed the same here be- fore God and this company; and there- to have pledged their troth either to other, and have declared the same by giv- ing and receiv- ing gold and sil- ver, and by joining of hands I pronounce that they be man and wife together. In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen

107. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 272.

108. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 616.

109. Ibid., p. 616.

110. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 272.

111. Consultation, fol. CCXXXI, taken from Procter & Frere, op. cit., note, p. 616.

The sentence, "Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," is found in almost every Lutheran Order. The Psalm 128 which follows is the same in Osiander's Order and in the Lutheran orders in general. The Address at the close of the service resembles that of Luther's service.¹¹²

In the Order of the Visitation of the Sick some similarities to the corresponding offices of Lutheran sources have been found. The idea for the Exhortation seems to have been adopted from the Reformation of Cologne¹¹³ and was originally found in the Saxon Order of 1537. The idea seems to be somewhat the same although there is practically no similarity of words. The Order of the Burial of the Dead in the Book of 1549 retains many features of the old orders which are the same in Lutheran sources. The first collect, "Almighty God we give Thee hearty thanks,"¹¹⁴ is found in the Reformation of Cologne.

Thus, the similarities that have been found between the continental sources of the first Book of Common Prayer and the Prayer Book, itself, and the extent to which the compilers of the Prayer Book seem to have borrowed from continental sources, have been shown. It has also been pointed out that the historical circumstances at the

112. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 272.

113. Ibid, p. 273.

114. Ibid, p. 273.

time of the compilation of the first Book of Edward VI were favourable to continental influence. It is impossible to give an exact estimate as to the amount of continental influence on the first Book of Common Prayer, but from what has been given above, the conclusion that the English Prayer Book owes a considerable part of its ideas, form, and in some cases even its language, to continental services and to the ideas of continental reformers, may be drawn. However, the first Prayer Book satisfied neither the more extreme English reformers nor the conservatives who desired the reestablishment of the old services, and since Cranmer, himself, had accepted a view beyond that represented by the Book of 1549, a revision seemed probable even before the first Book came into use.

CHAPTER III

CONTINENTAL INFLUENCES ON THE SECOND BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

After the first Book of Common Prayer had come into use it was found that there were two groups who were dissatisfied with it. The more extreme reformers, who had adopted Zwinglian or Calvinistic ideas, believed the Book contained too much Lutheranism and that it did not go far enough in the direction of Protestant reform. The conservative group, composed of Catholics and those who favoured the old forms of worship, objected to it because it differed too much from the old services to which they were accustomed. They did all in their power to make the new service conform to the old service of the Mass. Therefore, a royal visitation was ordered to enforce the proper use of the first Prayer Book.

The instructions given to the visitors show how the new service was being used. They ordered "that no minister do counterfeit the popish mass, as to kiss the Lord's table; washing his fingers at every time in the Communion, blessing his eyes with the paten, or sudary; or

crossing his head with the paten; shifting of the book from one place to another; laying down and licking the chalice of the Communion; holding up his fingers, hands, or thumbs, joined toward his temples; breathing upon the bread or chalice; showing the sacrament openly before the distribution of the Communion; ringing of sacring bells; or setting any light upon the Lord's board at any time; and finally to use no other ceremonies than are appointed in the King's book of common prayers, or kneeling, otherwise than is in the said book.¹"

To prevent such use of the service book a revision of it was considered necessary. After Somerset's downfall the danger of a return to the old form of service caused an order for the destruction of the old service books to be issued. The increased influence of continental reformers in England and the pressure brought to bear on Cranmer by them, as well as the general dissatisfaction with the first Book and the way in which it was used, made a revision of the service almost inevitable.

However, before the work of revision was begun, the king was empowered by an act of Parliament to appoint six prelates and six other men of the realm to prepare a

1. Cardwell, E., Documentary Annals, Vol. XV, sec. 2, quoted from Procter, F., History of the Book of Common Prayer, Note 29.

²
 new ordinal. The commission was appointed February 2, and on February 28 the Ordinal, signed by eleven commissioners, was brought to the council. It seems probable, therefore, that the work had already been prepared before the meeting of the commission and it has been suggested that the new form of ordination might have been experimentally used at an ordination held by Cranmer and Ridley at St. Paul's in 1549.³ The services prescribed by the old Pontifical differed considerably from those provided for by the new Ordinal. It provided for a manner of consecrating of archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, and other ministers of the Church but no form of service was given for the consecration of the other ministers. Thus, the English Church gave up the minor orders and retained only those mentioned by the Bible.⁴ The Ordinal remained a separate book until 1552, when, with a few changes, it was incorporated in the second Book of Common Prayer. The oath "so help me God, all saints and holy evangelists," to which Hooper had objected, was left out in 1552.

In the preparation of this Ordinal it seems that considerable use was made of a scheme for ordination drawn up by Bucer in 1549. There is even a possibility of this

2. Preeter and Frere, op. cit., p. 60.

3. Ibid, p. 61.

4. Ibid, p. 62.

form having been written because of a request from Cran-
⁵mer. The inquiry of the priests closely follows Bucer's draft and some of the Epistles and Gospels and also the Psalms appointed for the introit in the order of the priests were suggested by it. The eight questions asked are quite similar to Bucer's although the phraseology is modified and Bucer's ninth question is not found in the English Order.⁶ Bucer used practically the same service for all three Orders but nevertheless his service exerted an influence on the examination in all three of the English Orders. In the Exhortation preceding the examination of candidates for the priesthood and in the prayer which follows there is also a similarity to Bucer's Ordinal. "But here the similarity ends, and when the more crucial parts of the service are reached there is no sign of Bucer's influence."⁷

In one respect, however, the reformers and even the council had gone beyond the changes provided by the first Book of Common Prayer. Ridley as Bishop of Rochester and later as Bishop of London, had begun a crusade for the removal of altars in his churches. Hooper had also preached a sermon at Lent urging the destruction of altars

5. Harvey, E.A., Martin Bucer in England, p. 53.

6. Procter and Frere, op. cit., Note, p. 664.

7. Ibid, p. 665.

and the substitution of the table instead of the altar in the Communion service. In accordance with this movement, the council, in November, 1550, ordered the removal of altars throughout the country.⁸ In the first Book of Common Prayer, however, the priest was directed to stand before the middle of the altar and the people were instructed to kneel before the altar. The Prayer Book, thus, implied that there should be an altar and the council had already gone beyond the orders prescribed by the first Book of Common Prayer. "The destruction of the altars was one clear indication that there was to be no finality⁹ in the position created by the Prayer Book."

Toward the close of the year 1550, some suggestions for changes in the Book of 1549 were mentioned in Convocation. The work of revision, however, was done by a commission appointed by the king. Cranmer mentions Ridley and Martyr as members of the commission and the views of Bucer and Martyr on the first book were also in¹⁰ the hands of the commission. Although quite a few changes were made in the book the first version was in no way condemned. The second Act of Uniformity authorizing the new form described the first Book as, "a very godly

8. Pollard, Political History of England, p. 53.

9. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 68.

10. Ibid, p. 78.

order, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm.¹¹ The same act stated that the first Act of Uniformity was to remain in full force while any one using any other form of service than the revised Book was to be punished by six months imprisonment for the first offense, one year's imprisonment for the second, and imprisonment for life for the third.¹²

The second Book of Common Prayer represents the furthest point reached by the English service in the direction of continental reform. "The Communion Office was radically altered until it approached very nearly the Zwinglian idea of a commemorative rite."¹³ The title of this Office, "commonly called the Mass," in the first Book, was now omitted. The introits were also omitted, the Ten Commandments introduced, and Gloria in Excelsis was transferred from near the beginning to near the end of the service. The long prayer which had been constructed from the old Roman Canon was now divided into three parts. The first part became the Prayer for the Church Militant, the second, the Prayer of Consecration and the third, the first prayer after the Communion. The invocation of the Holy Ghost

11. Gee and Hardy, op. cit., p. 53.

12. Ibid., p. 372.

13. Pollard, Cambridge Modern History, Vol. II, p. 508.

upon the elements, the mixing of water and wine, the use of the sign of the cross in the Prayer of Consecration, the name of the Virgin Mary and of the saints were all omitted. The Agnus Dei and the post Communion anthems¹⁴ were also left out. The words of administration were changed to, "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." These words indicate a transition to the Zwinglian view and could not in any way be interpreted in a Catholic or a Lutheran sense.

Changes were also made in the other offices of the Prayer Book. In the Order for Morning and Evening Prayer the introductory sentences, Exhortation, Confession, and Absolution were placed at the beginning of the service. In the Baptismal Office the exorcism, anointing, triple immersion and the use of the chrism were omitted. The anointing, the direction for private confessions, and the use of the reserved sacrament were removed from the Office of the Visitation of the Sick. In the service for the Burial of the Dead the provisions for the celebration of the Communion was omitted. A rubric ordered that "the minister at the time of the Communion and all other times

14. Warren, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 259.

in his ministration shall use neither albe, vestment, nor cope: but being archbishop, he shall have and wear a rocket; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only." The first Book had prescribed an albe and cope for the priests and albes with tunacles
 15
 for deacons.

The Act of Uniformity authorizing the use of the second Book of Common Prayer was passed April 6, 1552, and the revised Book was to come into use on All Saint's Day, November 1. There was considerable delay in the publication of the revised edition because of a controversy over the rubric requiring communicants to kneel at the reception of the elements. The more extreme reformers desired the elimination of this rubric. Cranmer, however, refused to be led further and strongly defended the rubric. Nevertheless, an explanation that "we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." This additional rubric made it clear that the revisers had determined to abandon the doctrines of transubstantiation and consubstantiation of the Catholics and Lutherans.

15. Warren, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 22, p. 259.

The chief source of continental influence on the revision of the Prayer Book in 1552, was the ideas of the continental reformers then in England. "The English divines may have saved their dignity by not making the alterations in the book in the way suggested by the foreign divines, but that they made them in the direction which they pointed out is evident."¹⁶

However, it is possible to over-estimate the influence which these foreign reformers had on the first revision of the Prayer Book and there are some historians who believe their influence to have been comparatively slight.¹⁷ Even though there may be some question as to the extent which the revisers followed the advice of the continental reformers, that they exercised an influence over Cranmer and probably over other English divines, is evident. Bucer, Martyr, and Lasco were all intimate friends of Cranmer and he seems at all times to have shown the utmost respect for their opinions.

One of these foreign reformers who exerted considerable influence on the first revision of the Prayer

16. Perry, op. cit., p. 92.

17. Massingberd, op. cit., p. 386.

"However willing the foreign divines may have been to give their assistance it does not appear that their suggestions were implicitly followed, and there is reason to believe, on the contrary, that what was done was, for the most part the work of the commissioners themselves."

18

Book was Martin Bucer. In the earlier stages of the Reformation on the Continent Bucer had attempted to bring about a compromise between the views of Zwingli and Luther.¹⁹ His ideas, therefore, represented a moderate view, midway between those of the Lutheran and Swiss schools and were similar in many respects to those of Cranmer. Bucer nowhere teaches the real bodily presence in the Eucharist, but that Christ is present in the elements and is given as spiritual food to those who believe. He maintains that the presence of Christ is conceivable only through faith, not through worldly understanding. This view corresponds closely to Cranmer's idea of a spiritual presence.²⁰

Cranmer had probably become acquainted with Bucer while he was on the Continent and before Bucer's arrival in England had ample opportunity to become acquainted with his doctrines. That he was familiar with Bucer's ideas is evident from his reply to Gardiner's argument that Bucer agreed with him on certain points. He says, "And yet Bucer varieth much from your error: for he denieth utterly that Christ is really and substantially present in the bread, either by conversion or inclusion, but in the ministration he affirmeth Christ to be present: and so do

18. Harvey, op. cit., p. 74.

19. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 210.

20. Harvey, op. cit., pp. 55-56.

I also, but not to be eaten and drunken of them that be wicked and members of the devil, whom Christ neither feedeth nor hath any communion with them, and to conclude in few words the doctrine of M. Bucer in the place by you alleged, he dissenteth in nothing from Oecolampadius and Zwinglius."²¹

There is also a possibility of Cranmer's having been influenced by Bucer in his ideas of the Eucharist.²²

The change in regard to vestments in the ordination service has also been ascribed to Bucer's influence over Cranmer. In the controversy over vestments Lasco sided with Hooper and Bucer favoured the abolition of the required vestments provided it could be done lawfully,²³ and later an act of Parliament abolishing them was passed. The fact that Cranmer invited Bucer to come to England,²⁴ made him divinity lecturer at Cambridge, and probably asked for his opinion of the first Book of Common Prayer with a view to its revision, would seem to indicate that he had an influence on Cranmer.

Bucer was a pastor at Strasburg but when his position became dangerous because of the Interim, he accepted Cranmer's invitation to come to England. He

21. Cranmer's Works on the Lord's Supper, p. 126.

22. Harvey, op. cit., p. 57.

23. Ibid, p. 62.

24. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 71.

arrived in April, 1549, and at the end of the year was placed in the divinity chair at Cambridge. Soon after his arrival in England, he wrote a letter to the ministers at Strasburg giving his first impression of the first Prayer Book which was then in use. He says, "The cause of religion as far as appertains to the establishment of doctrines and the definition of rites, is pretty near what could be wished. Efforts must now be made to obtain suitable ministers for the pastors of the churches have hitherto confined their duties chiefly to ceremonies, and have very rarely preached and never catechised As soon as the description of the ceremonies now in use shall have been translated into Latin we will send it to you. We hear that some concessions have been made, both to a respect for antiquity and to the infirmity of the present age: such for instance as the vestments commonly used in the Sacrament of the Eucharist and the use of candles, so also in regard to the commemoration of the dead and the use of chrism, for we know not to what extent or in what sort it prevails. They affirm that there is no superstition in these things, and that they are only to be retained for a time, lest the people, not having yet learned Christ, should be deterred by too extensive innovations from embracing His religion, but that rather they may be won over. This circumstance, however,

greatly refreshed us, that all the services are read and sung in the vernacular tongue, that the doctrines of justification is purely and soundly taught and the Eucharist administered according to Christ's ordinance, private

masses having been abolished.²⁵ This was Bucer's opinion of the Book before he was able to study it carefully, having become acquainted with it through an interpreter.

Somewhat later, probably at Cranmer's request,²⁶ he prepared a more careful and detailed criticism of it.

Bucer's "Censura" has been described as, "A laborious criticism extending to twenty-eight chapters, sometimes shrewd, sometimes merely perverse, always moderate and scholarly, and generally representing a middle position between the doctrine of the Church and the extravagances of extreme foreign reformers."²⁷ Bucer's criticism was indeed moderate and his recommendations were not in favour of radical change. As in his earlier letter, he again commends the first Prayer Book. "I cannot render

25. Original Letters, CCXLVIII, p. 535, quoted from Procter, F., History of the Book of Common Prayer, Note, p. 72

26. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., Note, p. 289, think that the words, "written at the request of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury," at the beginning of Bucer's "Censura" are an addition of the editor and that the original draft shows no such title. They believe that the "Censura" was addressed to the Bishop of Ely but that Cranmer knew it had been sent to him.

27. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 72.

thanks to God enough," he writes, "for giving a service so pure, and ordered so religiously according to the Word of God, especially considering the time when it was drawn up. I see nothing in it which is not altogether drawn from Holy Scripture." ²⁸ Bucer differed from the more extreme reformers of the Zwinglian school in that he believed in more conservative reform. For this reason some historians are of the opinion that the revisers actually went beyond Bucer's recommendations in some instances. ²⁹ Whether Bucer's criticism influenced the revisers in making the changes and the extent to which it did so, is a question ³⁰ on which there is some difference of opinion.

28. Censura, p. 465, quoted from Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 288.

29. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 288.

"It is certain that in this (Communion Office) the revisers whilst accepting Bucer's suggestions as to details did not follow his ideas. He did not suggest the revolutionizing order of 1549."

Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 81.

"Many of the suggestions of the former (Bucer) had been adopted, but his conservative views had clearly not found as much favor as his proposals for alteration, and, while some of his worst suggestions were set aside, in other respects the changes were more radical."

Pollard, Thomas Cranmer, p. 271.

"Bucer represented a compromise between Luther and Zwingli; the first book was more Lutheran, the second more Zwinglian than he liked."

30. Clark, William, The Anglican Reformation, p. 159.

"What influence he (Bucer) had upon its (Prayer Book) composition we do not know, and it has been said that he did not altogether approve of the proposed changes, but his Censura, published less than two

That at least some of the changes made in the Prayer Book in 1552 were in accordance with Bucer's wishes is evident after comparing his "Censura" with the changes made by the revisers. After having expressed his approval of the first Book of Common Prayer in general, he proceeds to suggest certain changes. He suggests that in the Communion Office the usual leavened bread may be used as well as the unleavened bread prescribed by the first Book.³¹ In the Book of 1552 the rubric reads, "And to take away the superstition which any person hath or might have in the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten with other meals."

30. (Continued.)

months before his death, showed that he was in general sympathy with the innovations."

Harvey, op. cit., p. 66.

"Vergleicht man nur die zwei Liturgiebücher Edward VI mit dem Vorschlag Bucer's, so wird es klar, daß nicht wenige der bucherschen Vorschläge in das revidierte Gebetbuch aufgenommen wurden."

Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 46, on the other hand, say, "Although the points censured were for the most part altered in the revised book, yet these alterations do not seem to have resulted from Bucer's opinion, but rather to have been settled before the two foreign Professors were even asked to give their judgments."

Pollard, Thomas Cranmer, p. 272.

"Even Bucer's opinion prevailed only so far as it coincided with those of Cranmer and Ridley, to whom was due the chief share in the compilation of the second Book of Common Prayer."

Ward, A.W., Dictionary of National Biography, p. 176.

"But a small part of the improvements suggested by him were actually carried out."

31. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 73.

Bucer objected to the rubric which prescribed that "so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the Holy Communion," because he believed it a cause of superstition which induced people to believe that if any bread and wine remained it was holy and must not be used for ordinary purposes. The rubric³² was omitted in the revised Book. He also expressed his dislike for the rubric in the first Book which contained the clause "as touching, kneeling, crossing, holding up the hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left as every man's devotion serveth without blame." Accordingly this clause also was omitted³³ in the second Book.

He also criticized the way in which the words of the long prayer which corresponded to the old Roman Canon were recited. "They are by the law to say the words aloud," he says, "nevertheless they still use the former posture over the bread and wine so that they seem rather to wish to change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord by the words, than to excite those present to communicate. I should wish, therefore, that the little black crosses and the rubric about taking the bread and wine into the hands should be removed from the book as well as the prayer for the blessing and sanctifying the

32. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 295.

33. Harvey, op. cit., p. 69.

34

bread and wine." Accordingly, the words "and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word; vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that they may be made unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ," which was the prayer to which Bucer referred, were left out, as were also the little black crosses.

The rubric also provided that the elements be placed in the hands of the communicants rather than to be put in their mouths as was ordered in the first Book. This also was done in accordance with Bucer's wish. ³⁵ Another rubric, which stated that the whole body of Christ was to be believed present in every portion of the consecrated host, was objected to by Bucer and was also left out of ³⁶ the revised Book.

He also objected to the use of peculiar vestments at the Communion service, but here his advice was only partially followed, for the new Book ordered the minister to use neither albe, vestment, nor cope but an archbishop and bishop were to wear a rocket, a priest or deacon a surplice only. ³⁷ The Book of 1549 required that the

34. Censura, p. 472, quoted from Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., Note, p. 296.

35. Harvey, op. cit., p. 69.

36. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 290.

37. Harvey, op. cit., p. 66.

people communicate at least once a year. Bucer thought this was not often enough so the second Book declared that "every Parishoner shall communicate at least three times in the year."

In another respect, however, the revisers made a change quite contrary to Bucer's advice. In the Canon the words "that whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ," were left out of the second Book. In his "Censura" Bucer writes at great length for the retention of these words. However, notwithstanding his plea that these words be retained, those who favoured their omission succeeded in having them removed.³⁸ The threat against sinners, which according to the first Book was to be read only on the first day of Lent, might according to the second Book be read on other days also. This, too, was in accordance with a wish expressed by Bucer in his "Censura."³⁹

In the Office of Baptism, Bucer objected to the practice of beginning the service at the church door. In the second Book, therefore, the entire service was to take place at the font.⁴⁰ He also objected to the making of the

38. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 292.

39. Harvey, op. cit., p. 73.

40. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 298.

sign of the cross on the breast and forehead of the child. This was left out in 1552, but the words which Bucer suggested to be used at this place were not used by the re-
⁴¹visers. The exorcism was another part of the service which he disliked and here again this part of the service was omitted but was not replaced by the words which he suggested. The custom of addressing the questions to the child instead of to the sponsors was also changed by the
⁴²revisers in accordance with his wishes. Other parts of the first Book to which he objected and which were changed, apparently in accordance with his suggestions were: prayers for the dead, the prayer for the intercession of
⁴³angels, and extreme unction.

Although these changes seem to have been made in accordance with Bucer's wishes, the responsibility for them can hardly be attributed to him alone. Part of the changes seem to have been made through his influence alone, others, however, are probably due to the agreement of Bucer's recommendations with those of the reformers. The changes in regard to the form and quantity of bread in the Communion and the giving of it into the hands of the communicants and the procedure in Baptism may be attributed

41. Harvey, op. cit., p. 71.

42. Ibid, p. 72.

43. Ibid, p. 69.

to Bucer alone but the questions of vestments and cross making were debatable questions of the time and may be attributed to others as well as to Bucer.⁴⁴ It must be admitted also that in some instances his suggestions were not followed. In some cases changes which he wished made were not made and parts of the service which he desired to retain were omitted.⁴⁵

The revision of the Prayer Book began during the autumn of 1550. The criticisms of Bucer and Martyr were delivered to Cranmer in January, 1551, and the work of revision was finished in the summer of 1551. The Book was adopted by Parliament April 6, 1552. Thus, the work of revision was probably well under way and perhaps some of the changes already determined upon before the opinions of Bucer and Martyr were placed before the commission.⁴⁶ Since the "Censura" was before the revisers and the work of revision not completed, there would still seem to be a possibility of its influence. For why should Cranmer have secured the opinions of these foreigners and placed them in the hands of the commission, if he did not expect the revisers to follow their suggestions? It must also be remembered that Cranmer, whose opinion carried more weight

44. Harvey, op. cit., p. 73.

45. Ibid., p. 73.

46. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 46.

than any other member of the commission, was already familiar with Bucer's ideas and probably favoured changes which he knew would be in accordance with his wishes.

Peter Martyr Vermigli had been driven from Italy by the Inquisition, so he came to live with the other Protestant reformers at Zurich and Strasburg. He was invited to England by Cranmer in 1547 and soon after his arrival in 1549 was made divinity professor at Oxford. Although at first apparently a Lutheran he had imbibed the doctrines of the Swiss reformers and his ideas resembled more nearly those of the Geneva school than those of the English reformers. "A man of vehement spirit, without the subdued reverential temper of Bucer; he had not the same view of the dignity of the Sacraments, nor a like regard to ecclesiastical order."⁴⁷ Martyr was the spiritual father of Bishop Jewel, who later became one of the most influential divines of the English Church.⁴⁸

A translation of his "Of the Sacrament of Thanksgiving," which was dedicated to Somerset and probably used by him as a basis for the debate in 1548, shows his views of the Eucharist to be similar to those of the Zwinglians.⁴⁹

47. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 70.

48. Massingberd, op. cit., p. 367.

49. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 210.

50. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 159.

Cranmer's own words show that he was familiar with Martyr's ideas. He says, "Of M. Peter Martyr's opinion and judgment in this matter, no man can better testify than I, forasmuch as he lodged within my house long before he came to Oxford, and I had with him many conferences in that matter, (of the Eucharist) and know that he was then of the same mind as he is now, and as he defended after openly in Oxford, and both written in his book."⁵¹ Since Cranmer was so familiar with Martyr's views and held him in such high esteem, does it not seem possible that he may have been influenced by his ideas in the revision of the first Book of Common Prayer?

Martyr's criticism of the Prayer Book is not in existence, although Bucer gives an account of it in a letter written January 10, 1551. He probably was not very familiar with the Prayer Book as he seemed surprised to find what the Book contained after having read Bucer's criticism of it. So he merely added his approval to Bucer's suggestions.⁵² "Vermigli's share in the preparation of the Prayer Book of 1552 has been variously estimated, but seems to have been limited to advocacy of alterations proposed by Bucer before his death."⁵³ However,

51. Cranmer's Works on the Lord's Supper, p. 374.

52. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 77.

53. Alexander, Gordon, Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. LVIII, p. 255.

the Exhortation to be used when people seem negligent to come to the Communion is thought to have been composed by⁵⁴ him.

John a Lasco was a Polish noble who left his own country to become one of the extreme German reformers and served as pastor at Emden in East Frisca. He first visited England in 1548 and while there he resided with⁵⁵ Cranmer for six months. His influence over Cranmer at this time has already been discussed. In 1550 he again came to England, having obtained leave of absence from⁵⁶ his king. He was now made pastor of the congregation of German refugees in London. He represented the more extreme school of Swiss reformers and his views on the Eucharist were more extreme than those of Bucer. "His influence at the court of Edward VI was great, and can be traced in the second Prayer Book and in Cranmer's later views, but the production of his own liturgy seems to indicate that his influence was not as successful as he⁵⁷ wished."

He drew up his own form of service for the use

54. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 483; Massingberd, op. cit., p. 367.

55. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 89.

56. Jacobs, op. cit., p. 208.

57. Archbald, W.A., Dictionary of National Biography, Vol. 32, p. 159.

of his congregation in London and they were given permission by the government to use it. Cranmer would naturally want to be familiar with this form of service, not only because Lasco was his intimate friend but because it behooved him to know what the government was sanctioning. The influence of this service on the Prayer Book is probable. The recitation of the Commandments followed by a form of confession and absolution in Lasco's book somewhat resembles the corresponding portions of the second Book of Common Prayer.⁵⁸ Lasco was also a member of a commission of thirty-two members appointed to frame ecclesiastical laws.⁵⁹

Another form of service which probably had some influence on the first revision of the Prayer Book, was that used by another foreign congregation led by Pollanus. Pollanus had succeeded Calvin as pastor of the Church of Strangers at Strasburg but was forced to flee together with his congregation because of the Interim.⁶⁰ The people of this congregation were weavers and on their arrival in England were given a home in the abbey buildings at Glastonbury. They were allowed to carry on their own form of service which was published by Pullain in February, 1551.

58. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 89.

59. Ibid., p. 90.

60. Ibid., p. 86.

This book is generally supposed to have furnished suggestions for the revision of the Prayer Book in 1552.⁶¹ "It will be seen that this service of Pollanus which has a strong family likeness to others of the Geneva type, may have furnished the hint, that the decalogue should be repeated in the public service, and suggested some phrases in the English additions of 1552."⁶² However, there are practically no similarities of words and sentences in the two services and the book of Pollanus has no form of absolution. The idea for the form of daily prayer alone seems to have been suggested by the service used by this congregation of refugees.

It is natural that a man as influential as John Calvin should have been concerned about the changes in religion which were taking place in England. Calvin wrote to Somerset on October 22, 1549, urging that certain changes be made in the services of the English Church. He objected especially to the prayer for the dead in the Communion Office, the chrysom and unction. He also wrote to Bucer asking him to urge "that rites which savour of all superstition be utterly abolished."⁶³ However, aside from the indirect influence exerted by the service of Pollanus

61. Procter and Frere, op. cit., p. 86.

62. Ibid., p. 88.

63. Ibid., p. 68.

and his influence on the other foreign reformers in England, it is doubtful whether Calvin exerted much influence on the English Church service at this time. It was not until after the return of the Marian exiles that Calvin's doctrines gained any foothold in England.

The opinions of foreign reformers of the second Book of Common Prayer throws some light upon the extent to which continental reform movements influenced the English service. Peter Martyr, in a letter to Bullinger, June 14, 1552, assured him "that all things had been removed from the Book of Common Prayer which could nourish superstition."⁶⁴ Calvin, although he criticized the English Prayer Book, found no serious fault with its essential parts and Bullinger expressed his approval of the Book in general, although he objected to certain parts of it. "It may be presumed that if exception were taken by Bullinger or Calvin to points of more serious import, such as the⁶⁵ Communion Office, some indication would have been given." The second Book of Common Prayer in general, although it went too far in the direction of continental reform to satisfy the more conservative, still retained much which was essentially English and which distinguished it from the services of the reformed churches on the Continent.

64. Gasquet and Bishop, op. cit., p. 303.

65. Ibid, p. 306.

"How far the views expressed in the revision were indigenous in growth, and how far due to foreign influence it is impossible to say. But it is clear that whatever inspiration there may have been was Zwinglian rather than Calvinistic and that the point of view adopted was not exactly that of any foreign church or any foreign divine in England."

⁶⁶ On the other hand, however, it seems certain that the second Book of Common Prayer would have been entirely different in its form and character had it not been for the influence of continental reform and of continental reformers in England. The new service book, however, was destined to remain in use for only a short time for after the accession of Mary, July 6, 1553, all evidences of reform in the Church were destroyed and a Catholic reaction was ushered in.

66. Pollard, Thomas Cranmer, p. 69.

CONCLUSION

Continental influence on the English Reformation and on the Book of Common Prayer is often under-estimated. The facts which have been given indicate that it is a factor which ought not to be over-looked or passed over hurriedly in the study of the English Reformation. In its early stages the English Reformation was directed into certain channels of thought by the teachings of the English Humanists who had received their ideas and inspiration from the Humanistic teachers of the Continent. Erasmus, More, and Colet, by teaching an appreciation of freedom of thought in religion and of a search for the truth, prepared the way for religious reform. When the Reformation on the Continent began England was prepared to follow in the path of the religious reformers of the Continent.

Almost immediately after Luther's revolt against the Papacy his works were sent to England where they were eagerly read by those who were interested in reform. Other books, written by both continental and English reformers, were printed on the Continent and smuggled into England. These books aided the development of heresy,

which became more common in England during the reign of Henry VIII, and helped to prepare the way for further religious reforms.

The negotiations of Henry VIII with the Luther- and, although they were a failure so far as reaching any definite agreement was concerned, had an effect on the articles of faith of his reign. The Ten Articles and the Institution of a Christian Man show evidence of Lutheran influence. The other doctrinal changes of the reign were reactionary and the Lutherans failed to exert any lasting influence on the doctrines of the Church at this time.

Only a few liturgical changes were introduced during the reign of Henry VIII, although Cranmer was planning to introduce them, and would probably have done so, had it not been for the opposition of his sovereign. The Litany, however, was translated from the Latin by Cranmer and the English Litany was adopted in 1544. In his translation Cranmer borrowed from Luther's Litany as well as from the old Greek and Latin liturgies.

As soon as Edward VI came to the throne Cranmer was able to introduce further changes. A few changes in ritual were first introduced in the royal chapel. In 1547 Cranmer's homilies, several of which are similar to Lutheran works, were published. The first important

measure, however, was that providing for the administration of the Communion in both kinds. This demanded a new order of service for the administration of the Communion. The Communion Office of 1548 was an English form of service which was inserted in the Latin Mass. A considerable part of this new order is similar to the Consultation of Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, which was drawn up by Bucer and Melanchthon, who borrowed considerably from Luther's Nurnberg services. Cranmer also published a Catechism which was probably merely a translation of sermons contained in the Brandenburg Nurnberg Order of 1533.

Cranmer was undoubtedly the most influential divine in England during the reign of Edward and was chiefly responsible for the changes in ritual and for the compilation of the first Book of Common Prayer. Cranmer spent several years on the Continent during the reign of Henry VIII, and while there came in contact with the continental reformers. He was sensitive to foreign influence and at the time of the compilation of the first Prayer Book had adopted Lutheran doctrines. Thus, it seems natural that the first Book of Common Prayer should show signs of Lutheran influence.

Not long before the first Prayer Book was adopted Cranmer abandoned the Lutheran for the Zwinglian doctrine of the Eucharist. It is evident that this change

was due to the influence of foreign reformers. The second Book of Common Prayer, therefore, reflects Cranmer's new ideas and consequently those of the reformers of the Zwinglian school. With Cranmer at the head of the Church and the government in the hands of those who favoured reform, the circumstances were most favourable to foreign influence. Foreigners were welcomed in England and given positions of responsibility in the Church.

A considerable number of the similarities between the first Book of Common Prayer and various Lutheran services have been pointed out. Some parts seem to have been taken directly from Lutheran services while others show only a slight similarity to them. The Consultation of Hermann of Cologne exerted considerable influence, although in some cases the compilers seem to have borrowed from other Lutheran services such as the Cassel Order and the Brandenburg Nurnberg Kirchenordnungen.

Although some trace of Lutheran influence may be found in practically all the offices of the first Prayer Book, the Communion Office, the Baptismal Office, and the Litany seem to show more evidence of having been taken from or modeled after Lutheran services. However, because of these similarities it is easy to over-estimate the amount of continental influence on the first Book of Common Prayer. In so far as bulk is concerned, the

greater part of the Book was taken from the old English services. The spirit of the Book, in general, is conservative and it is quite capable of a Catholic interpretation. However, the Lutheran services were largely based on the older services of the Church, as were also the English services. Therefore, a part of the similarity may be due to the fact that they were both taken from a common source. Nevertheless, some parts of the first English Book are so similar to Lutheran services that there seems to be little doubt as to their origin. Since Cranmer favoured Lutheran doctrine at the time of the compilation of the Book of 1549, the Lutheran origin of parts of the service seems even more probable.

Other continental liturgies of a more conservative character, such as Quignon's Breviary and the Mozarabic Missal, also had an influence on parts of the new service, although their influence was slight compared to that of the Lutheran and old English services.

Although the second Book of Common Prayer was only a revision of the first, the changes made in it completely changed the character of the Book. A Catholic or even a Lutheran interpretation was no longer possible as the changes in the Communion service indicate that the English reformers had adopted the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist. Since the revised Book clearly adopted this

doctrine of the continental reformers, their influence is apparent.

Three influential foreign divines, Lasco, Martyr, and Bucer, had come to reside in England and were intimate friends and advisers of Cranmer. When a revision of the Prayer Book had been determined upon, Cranmer seems to have asked Martyr and Bucer for their criticisms of it with a view to its revision. A considerable number of the changes which Bucer suggested were made, although they may not all have been made because of his suggestions alone. Nevertheless, the fact that the changes which were made correspond to those he suggested seems to indicate that his ideas had some influence on the revision.

In addition to the influence of these foreign divines the services used by the French and German congregations led by Lasco and Pollanus also had an influence on the revision of the Prayer Book. Their influence, however, was slight compared to that exerted by the foreigners themselves. It seems that the greatest amount of continental influence on the second Book of Common Prayer was due to the influence which foreign divines exerted upon Cranmer, which in turn led him to make more radical changes in the Prayer Book.

Had it not been for the influence of continental Protestant reform the Book of Common Prayer would probably

have retained its conservative character. The reaction of Mary's reign, on the other hand, prevented further changes in the direction of continental reform. The subsequent changes made in the Prayer Book were in a Catholic direction, although the position which was abandoned in 1549 was never regained. It was the second and not the first Prayer Book which was adopted with modifications by Elizabeth. In spite of the Puritan agitation for further reform during the succeeding reigns the English Prayer Book has retained much the same character as the Elizabethan Book even though a few subsequent changes have been made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Contemporary Sources.

Everyman's Library

First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI. J. M. Dent and Son, London. E.P. Dutton and Company, New York, 1910.

Gee, Henry and
Hardy, W. J.

Documents Illustrative of English Church History. Macmillan and Company, London, New York, 1896.

Parker Society Publications.

Crammer's Works on the Lord's Supper, edited by J.E. Cox. The University Press, Cambridge, 1844.
The Two Liturgies of Edward VI, edited by J. Ketley. The University Press, Cambridge, 1844.
Original Letters Relative to the Reformation. The University Press, Cambridge, 1846.

Richter, Aemil Ldw.

Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen.
2 volumes. Landes Industrie-Comptoir, Weimar, 1846.

Secondary Sources.

(a) History of Prayer Book.

Benton, Josiah Henry	<u>Book of Common Prayer and Books Connected with Its Origin and Growth.</u> 2nd edition. Privately printed. J.H. Benton, Boston, 1914.
Burbridge, Edward	<u>Liturgies and Offices Illustrating the Common Prayer.</u> Bell and Son, London, 1885.
Campion, W.M. and Beaumont, W.J.	<u>The Prayer Book Interleaved.</u> 10th edition. Rigingtons, London, 1880.
Cardwell, Edward	<u>Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church from 1546-1716.</u>
J.H. and J. Parker, London, 1862.
<u>History of Conferences About the Book of Common Prayer, 1551-1690.</u>
J.H. and J. Parker, London, 1849.
<u>The Two Books of Common Prayer Compared.</u> J.H. and J. Parker, London, 1853.
Cornford, James	<u>Book of Common Prayer with Historical Notes.</u> Eyre and Son, London, 1897.

- Dix, Morgan Lectures on the First Book of King Edward. E. and J.B. Young, New York, 1881.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. Volume 22. Warren, Frederick Edward. The Book of Common Prayer. The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company. New York, 1911.
- Fallow, F.M. The Order of Baptism. Burns and Oates, London, 1838.
- Gasquet, Francis Aidan and Bishop, Edmund Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer. 3rd edition. John Hodges, London, 1891.
- Lathbury, Thomas History of the Book of Common Prayer. J.H. and J. Parker, London, 1858.
- Lawrence, Richard Sermons and Bampton Lectures, 1804 J.H. and J. Parker, London, 1838.
- Procter, Francis A History of the Book of Common Prayer. Macmillan and Company, London, 1878.
- Procter, Francis and Frere, Walter Howard A New History of the Book of Common Prayer. Revised edition. Macmillan Company, London, 1901.

- Pullan, Leighton History of the Book of Common Prayer. Longmans Green and Company, London, 1900.
- Warren, Frederick Edward Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church. Wareh, Oxford, 1881.

(b) History of the Reformation.

- Burnet, Gilbert History of the Reformation. 3 volumes. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1819.
- Cambridge Modern History Volume II. Gardiner, James. Henry VIII. Pollard, A.F. Reformation Under Edward VI. The University Press, Cambridge, 1907.
- Clark, William The Anglican Reformation. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1901.
- Cunningham, William The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation. F. and F. Clark, London, 1862.
- Dictionary of National Biography Edited by Stephen, Leslie and Lee, Sidney. Macmillan Company, New York, London, 1890.

Dixon, Richard Watson	<u>History of the Church of England from 1529 to 1570.</u> Clarendon Press, London, 1902.
Einstein, Lewis	<u>The Italian Renaissance in England.</u> Columbia University Press, New York, 1913.
Emerton, Ephraim	<u>Desiderus Erasmus of Rotterdam.</u> G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York.
Froude, James Anthony	<u>History of England.</u> 12 volumes. Longman's Green and Company, London, 1870.
Gairdner, James	<u>Lollardy and the Reformation in England.</u> 2 volumes. Macmillan and Company, London, 1908.

<u>The English Church in the Sixteenth Century.</u> Macmillan and Company, New York, London, 1903. |
| Gasquet, Francis Aidan | <u>The Eve of the Reformation.</u> Simpkin, London, 1900. |
| Hardwick, Charles | <u>A History of the Articles of Religion and a Series of Documents, 1536-1615.</u> George Bell and Son, New York, 1890. |

Harvey, A. Edward	<u>Martin Bucer in England.</u> Doctor's Dissertation. Buchdruckerei Heinrich Bauer, Marburg, 1906.
Hulbert, Eri B.	<u>The English Reformation and Puritanism.</u> The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1908.
Jacobs, Henry Eyster	<u>Lutheran Movement in England.</u> G.W. Frederick, Philadelphia, 1894.
Lindsay, Thomas M.	<u>A History of the Reformation.</u> 2 volumes. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907.
Lingard, John	<u>The History of England.</u> Vol. V. John Grant, Edinburgh, 1902.
Maitland, Samuel Raffey	<u>Essays Connected with the Reformation in England.</u> John Lane, London, New York, 1899.
Massingberd, Francis
Charles	<u>The English Reformation.</u> J.W. Parker, London, 1847.
Perry, George G.	<u>History of the Reformation in England.</u> Longman's Green and Company, London, New York, Bombay, 1898.

Pollard, Albert
Frederick

England Under Protector Somerset.

Kegan Paul, French Trubner and
Company, 1900.

Political History of England.

Longman's Green and Company.
London, New York, 1910.

Thomas Cranmer and the English
Reformation, 1489-1556. G.P.

Putnam's Sons, New York, 1904.

Seeböhm, Frederick

The Era of the Protestant Revolution. 2nd edition. Charles
Scribner's and Sons, New York,
1901.

The Oxford Reformers. 3rd edi-
tion. Longman's Green and Com-
pany, New York, 1896.

Smith, Preserved

The Age of the Reformation.
Henry Holt and Company, New York,
1920.

Erasmus, Harper Brothers, Pub-
lishers, New York, London, 1923.

Strype, John

Annals of the Reformation. 7
volumes. Clarendon Press, Oxford,
1824.

Ecclesiastical Memorials. 6

volumes. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1822.

Memorials of Cranmer. 3 volumes

Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1840.

History of the Life and Acts of

Grindal. 2 volumes. Clarendon

Press, Oxford, 1821.

Walker, Williston

The Reformation. Charles Scrib-

ner's Sons, New York, 1902.

378.7M71
XB658

University Libraries
University of Missouri

Digitization Information Page

Local identifier Bothe1926

Source information

Format	Book
Content type	Text
Source ID	010-100693297
Notes	Printed on single side.

Capture information

Date captured	November 2020
Scanner manufacturer	Plustek OpticBook
Scanner model	A300 Plus
Scanning system software	Book Pavilion
Optical resolution	600 dpi
Color settings	8 bit grayscale
File types	tiff
Notes	Blank pages not captured.

Derivatives - Access copy

Compression	Tiff: LZW compression
Editing software	Adobe Photoshop CC
Resolution	600 dpi
Color	grayscale
File types	pdf created from tiff
Notes	Images cropped, straightened, brightened