THE LITTLE PRAYER BOOK THAT COULD: THE 1549 AND 1552 PRAYER BOOKS AS THE ENGINE OF REFORMED LITURGY AND DOCTRINE IN ENGLAND

Karen Steward
History 194H
Professor J. Sears McGee, Mentor
Professor Carol Lansing, Senior Honors Thesis Class Adviser
13 April 2005

NOTES

Dates: New style dates are used, that is, the year is taken to start on January 1, not March 25.

Spelling: Spelling is cited as found in the sources used. Certain typographical conventions have been modernized where appropriate: i is changed to j, u is changed to v, v v is changed to w, vowel macrons are changed to vowel + m or n.

INTRODUCTION

Every child knows the story of the Little Engine That Could. Pulling a heavy load, the tiny locomotive struggled uphill to deliver its precious cargo. It completed its seemingly impossible task and became a beloved character in children's literature. The Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer* is like that determined engine. Introduced in 1549 and revised in 1552, the Prayer Book had the difficult task of reforming liturgy and doctrine that had endured for centuries. It faced an uphill battle for acceptance, was completely derailed from 1553 to 1558, lost its engineer in 1556, regained its track in 1559, faced new perils during the following century, and, finally, became a beloved standard for worship in the Church of England.

The Protestant Reformation began slowly in England during the reign of Henry VIII, then gained momentum under his son, Edward VI. Edward's 1549 Prayer Book and its 1552 successor, in combination with related religious legislation, forced dramatic changes on the priests and parishioners for a short period before being outlawed by Mary I—who burned Prayer Book author Thomas Cranmer at the stake—after Edward died in 1553. However, Mary's brief Catholic rule ended with her death in 1558, and Elizabeth I's settlement of religion restored the Prayer Book. The 1559 Prayer Book was essentially the 1552 book; a few minor changes were made to maximize acceptability among people of diverse religious opinions. During Elizabeth's forty-five reign the book took firm root as people practiced its patterns of worship week after week, decade after decade. Her reign was never free of religious strife, yet the established Church of England, which universally used the Prayer Book, maintained the loyalty of the majority.

The reformed services of the Prayer Book, which had been strongly resisted in Edward's time, became accepted and even beloved through the long years of use under Elizabeth and

beyond. Judith Maltby used court records to show that early-seventeenth-century parishioners prosecuted their priests for not performing baptisms, communion, visitation of the sick, funerals, and other services according to the Prayer Book.[1] She also listed twenty-two pro-Prayer Book petitions presented during 1640-1642, when the government threatened to withdraw the book; the petitions had a combined total of well over 71,000 subscribers.[2] Such popular approbation revealed the popularity of the Prayer Book. A petition from Herefordshire expressed great satisfaction with the book: "The present publique forme of Gods Worship, and the Administration of the Blessed Sacrament, with other Rites agreeable to Gods holy Word, and purest Antiquitie . . . be to God's glory, and [the] Churches Peace."[3] Henry Townshend echoed this satisfaction in his diary: "And having been likewise blessed with an uniform liturgy ratified by law and with general consent received and continued amongst us, Unto which doctrine and government our petitioners have hitherto with much satisfied consciences lived comfortable."[4] These statements praised the services of the Prayer Book as godly and in accordance with practices of the ancient church, appreciated its lawfully imposed uniform liturgy, and confessed agreement with its doctrine. Although the government did outlaw the Prayer Book and replace it with the *Directory for the Public Worship of God* in 1645, most parishes ignored the Directory and there was "unobtrusive continuing use" of the illegal Prayer Book until it was restored in 1662.[5] These opinions and actions stand in stark contrast to the reactions of many people to the initial 1549 Prayer Book, including thousands who staged a two-month rebellion in southwestern

---

[1] Judith Maltby, "'By this Book': Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church," in *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, ed. Kenneth Fincham (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), 118-128.
[2] Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 238-247.
[3] Ibid., 115.
[4] Ibid., 113.
[5] Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 627. See also David Cressy, *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1997), 175, and Maltby, *Prayer Book*, 60.

England because they considered the new services distinctly unholy and several Church of England bishops who suffered imprisonment when they refused to conform to new doctrine and liturgical practices.

I argue that this book, despised at its inception in the mid-sixteenth century, stoutly defended in the mid-seventeenth century, and still used in the twenty-first century, was crucial to the development of the Church of England's liturgy and doctrine. It is important to understand its origins, intent, inauguration, and revision under Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer during Edward's reign. My emphasis is primarily religious, not political or economic. I examine reform measures that paved the way for the Prayer Book, Cranmer's rationale for instituting a new liturgy, traditional and evangelical elements in the services of the 1549 Prayer Book, reactions to the book and other liturgical innovations promulgated by parliament and the Privy Council, and the changes that made the 1552 book more radically evangelical than its predecessor. The heart of this examination is the section-by-section and service-by-service discussion of each prayer book. While Elizabeth's restoration of the prayer book and her long reign were responsible for the book's second chance, it was Cranmer's reformed liturgy itself that shaped worship and doctrine in the Church of England and eventually won the hearts of the people.

Cranmer's Prayer Book fit into a much larger arena of reform than only the Church of England. Religious upheaval characterized sixteenth-century Europe. What became known as the Protestant Reformation began when German priest Martin Luther invited debate about indulgences by posting his *Ninety-Five Theses* on the Wittenberg castle church door on 31 October 1517. Supported by Christian humanists, who sought a return to the teachings and practices of the apostolic church, various reform movements swept through Continental Europe

in the following decades, usually provoking popular and political opposition. Reformist literature crossed the channel to England, followed by reformers themselves. Even as reformist, or evangelical, ideas interested some English clerics—including Cranmer, who was appointed to the preeminent episcopal see of Canterbury in 1533—and theologically minded laypersons, Pope Leo X gave King Henry VIII the title Defender of the Faith after Henry wrote *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* [Declaration of the Seven Sacraments] (1521) to argue against Luther's teachings. Although spiritual and intellectual support for the Reformation existed at all levels of English society, Henry had no desire to break with the Roman Catholic Church. This desire changed with the emergence of the king's "Great Matter" in the early 1530s.

Dynastic, not theological, concerns jump-started the English Reformation. Henry wanted a son. He considered his wife, Catherine of Aragon, unlikely to bear one. Pope Clement VIII could not grant an annulment because he was being held prisoner by Catherine's cousin, Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. The Great Matter that concerned Henry's court was how to end the king's marriage to Catherine. A series of parliamentary acts, culminating with the November 1534 Act of Supremacy (26 Henry VIII, c.1), which abolished papal authority in England and gave Henry the title Supreme Head of the Church of England, enabled the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant the annulment. Henry's second wife, Anne Boleyn, bore a daughter, Elizabeth, and his third wife, Jane Seymour, gave birth to the longed-for son, Edward, on 12 October 1537.

Other than separating the Church of England from papal control through the Act of Supremacy, Henry was uninterested in reforming Catholic doctrine or liturgy. The June 1539 Act Abolishing Diversity in Opinions (31 Henry VIII, c.14), known as the Act of Six Articles, summarized the doctrinal position of the Church of England at the time of Henry's death. This

"exuberantly traditional" statement affirmed Catholic doctrine, thereby refuting evangelical tenets regarding the eucharist, clerical celibacy, private masses, and confession.[6] It read, first, "after the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance, but the substance of Christ, God and man" (i.e., transubstantiation was a true doctrine); second, "communion in both kinds [bread and wine] is not necessary"; third, "priests . . . may not marry"; fourth, "vows of chastity or widowhood, by man or woman made to God advisedly, ought to be observed"; fifth, "it is meet and necessary that private masses be continued"; and sixth, "auricular confession is expedient and necessary."[7] Each of these tenets was later undone by Edwardian reforms. Liturgically, the traditional Latin services changed very little after the Church of England broke with the Roman church—prayers for the king were added and Henry allowed limited use of English. The king sponsored an English translation of the Bible in 1539, a copy of which was placed in every church by order of a 6 May 1541 royal proclamation.[8] On 21 February 1543 Convocation ordered parish curates to read publicly one chapter from the English Bible at the morning and evening services of Matins and Vespers on Sundays and holy days. Also, Cranmer introduced an English litany for use "in time of processions" in 1544.[9] These minor innovations—reading a single biblical chapter in English at weekly services and occasional use of a vernacular litany—did little to prepare the populace for exclusive use of English in all services that began with use of the 1549 Prayer Book.

---

[6] Diarmaid MacCulloch, The *Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), 63.
[7] Gerald Bray, ed., *Documents of the English Reformation* (Cambridge, UK: James Clark & Co., 1994), 224.
[8] Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations. Volume 1: The Early Tudors (1485-1553)* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964), 286, 296. (hereafter TRP)
[9] Church of England, *The First and Second Prayer-Books of King Edward the Sixth*, Gibson, Edgar Charles Sumner, introd., Everyman's Library, no. 448, ed. Ernest Rhys (New York, NY: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1910), ix. See also Roger Bowers, "The Chapel Royal, the First Edwardian Prayer Book, and Elizabeth's Settlement of Religion, 1559," *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 2 (2000): 323-324, and Carl S. Meyer, *Cranmer's Selected Writings* (London, UK: S.P.C.K., 1961), 99-104.

Historiographers referred to early, mid-, and late Tudor periods of the English Reformation. The early period covered the last fifteen or so years of Henry's reign, during which papal supremacy was abolished and the Church *in* England became the Church *of* England. Edward's and Mary's reigns and the early Elizabethan years comprised the mid-Tudor period, when major reform and counter reform convulsed the kingdom. Elizabeth's later years, the late Tudor, period, saw the mature, established Church of England survive schismatic threats. Historians' vocabulary relating to reformers included Protestant, evangelical, conservative, and radical. The term Protestant had not yet been coined during Edward's reign, although it was used by some historians to describe the movement and its adherents from the time of Luther. A more proper term for Edward's period, evangelical, gained a foothold in the later twentieth century. Evangelicals, however, were not a single-minded group. They exhibited a spectrum of religious beliefs; conservatives among them preferred minor changes to liturgy and doctrine, radicals pushed for greater reform. The terms traditional and Catholic referred to those who resisted any degree of reform.

Three historiographical schools rose in the second half of the twentieth century. The earliest, or standard, school was exemplified by A. G. Dickens and Geoffrey R. Elton. They proposed a "bottom up" movement in which reform was inevitable and spread rapidly because it had widespread support from the populace. Elton believed that England was more Protestant than not by 1553; Dickens felt that reform had a solid foundation in populous areas of political importance before Elizabeth's reign. The revisionist school, represented by Eamon Duffy and Christopher Haigh, countered the standard school by asserting a "top down" reformation in which change imposed through governmental action was resisted by the populace. Duffy's studies revealed deep loyalty to Catholic ritual. Haigh wrote of multiple English reformations, or

distinct stages in the overall movement. Diarmaid MacCulloch and Ethan Shagan belonged to the postrevisionist school, whose proponents subscribed to a "top down" reformation that encountered both popular acceptance and resistance. Shagan believed that although change was imposed from on high, local parishes engaged in a kind of negotiation process as change was implemented. MacCulloch considered Cranmer the driving force of English religious reform, a leader whose careful agenda maintained necessary government support. Clearly, the English Reformation was imposed from above; the Prayer Book and other innovations were mandated by law. The ultimate success of the reformed Church of England required more than legal backing, however; acceptance of reform, whether gradual or rapid, depended on changing people's hearts and minds.

LEAD-UP TO THE 1549 PRAYER BOOK

The key members of Edward's government who influenced religious legislation were the young king (nine years old at his accession), Edward Seymour, John Dudley, and Thomas Cranmer. Henry's will stipulated that his executors could "devyse and ordeyn" a plan for governing the kingdom during the Edward's minority.[10] Accordingly, three days after Henry's death, on 31 January 1547, they elected the king's maternal uncle, Edward Seymour, the Earl of Hertford, as Lord Protector; he was made Duke of Somerset in February. Edward reported in his *Chronicle* that the council "thought best that the erle of Hartford shuld be made Duc of Somerset . . . Also thei thought best to chose the duke of Somerset to be Protectour of the realm and Governour of the Kinges person during his minorite, to which al the gentlemen and lordes did

[10] Henry's will quoted in Jennifer Loach, *Edward VI*, ed. George Bernard and Penry Williams (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), 26.

agre becaus he was the Kinges oncle on his mother's side."[11] Somerset headed Edward's government until October 1549. Important reforms instituted during his tenure included the royal injunctions of 1547, the repeal of Henry's heresy laws, the Chantries Act, Cranmer's *Homilies*, the Sacrament Act and Order of the Communion, state-sponsored and spontaneous iconoclasm, the Act of Uniformity authorizing use of the Book of Common Prayer, and the legalization of clerical marriage. John Dudley led the government after Somerset's downfall. He was elected Lord President of the Privy Council on 2 February 1550 and created Duke of Northumberland on 11 October 1551. A new Ordinal, the replacement of altars with communion tables, the 1552 Prayer Book, and the Forty-Two Articles of Religion were promulgated under Northumberland. These two men were leaders of Edward's "evangelical establishment"; despite his youth, the king took an active interest in matters of government and religion.[12]

The king's tutors, Richard Cox and Sir John Cheke, were well-regarded humanists at Cambridge University. Under their tutelage from July 1544 to early 1550, Edward was given a thorough humanist education in the Greek and Latin classics, French, writing and penmanship, music, sport, and patristics. The boy described his education as "learning of toungues, of the scriptures, of philosophie, and all liberal sciences."[13] Cox and Cheke, as well as the French tutor, John Belmaine, were also convinced evangelicals. Some of Edward's extant written assignments reflected his evangelical education, for example, a treatise on the pope as Antichrist and collections of scriptural passages on faith and idolatry, all written in French.[14] As a boy, Edward had limited influence, yet he was trained for and took his roles as king and supreme head of the Church of England seriously.

---

[11] John Gough Nichols, ed., *Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth*, Burt Franklin Research & Source Works Series, no. 51, 2 vols. (New York, NY: Burt Franklin, 1964), 2:211. See also W. K. Jordan, ed., *The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966), 3.
[12] MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 83.
[13] Nichols, 2:210. See also Jordan, 4.
[14] See Nichols, 1:144-205, for the texts of these assignments.

Edward and his evangelical establishment played necessary parts in the religious revolution that took place during his reign, but the leading character was undoubtedly the Archbishop of Canterbury. While Cranmer served in that position under Henry, he had to rein in a reforming impulse that was nurtured by Dutch Christian humanist Desiderius Erasmus, who had been a lecturer at Cambridge during the years Cranmer studied for his master's degree; a study of Lutheranism; and correspondence with Continental reformers, particularly Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer. With Edward as king, Cranmer was free to move forward with a program of reform. He began immediately, revealing his agenda in a short speech he gave at Edward's 20 February coronation: "Your Majesty is God's viceregent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see, with your predecessor Josiah, God truly worshipped, and idolatry destroyed, the tyranny of the Bishops of Rome banished from your subjects, and images removed."[15] His outlined his reforming project in more detail a 4 July 1548 letter to Polish reformer Jan Łaski.

> We are desirous of setting forth in our churches the true doctrine of God, and have no wish to adapt it to all tastes, or to deal in ambiguities; but, laying aside all carnal considerations, to transmit to posterity a true and explicit form of doctrine agreeable to the rule of the sacred writings; so that there may not only be set forth among all nations an illustrious testimony respecting our doctrine, delivered by the grave authority of learned and godly men, but that all posterity may have a pattern to imitate.[16]

Religious change began shortly after Edward ascended the throne. The parliamentary repeal of Henry's treason laws and Act of Six Articles (1 Edward VI, c.12) allowed open discussion of religious topics and publication of religious material and gave evangelicals relative freedom to promote their ideas. Three aspects of worship affected by Edwardian changes

---

[15] Henry Jenkyns, ed., *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1833), 2:119. See also Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c. 1580* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 448.

[16] Meyer, 73. See Jenkyns, 329-331 for the original Latin text.

matched the major areas of later dissatisfaction regarding the Prayer Books: dramatic or sensory components of worship, theological understanding of the eucharist, and the use of the vernacular.

Royal injunctions issued on 31 July 1547 limited liturgical drama by restricting certain traditional practices, forbidding ritual procession, banning visual elements, and regulating preaching. Edward made a brief entry in his *Chronicle:* "Certein injunctions wer set forth, wich toke away divers ceremonies; and commission sent to take down images: and certain homilies wer set forth to be read in the church."[17] The injunctions outlawed "works devised by man's phantasies," including pilgrimages, money or candles laid before relics or images, praying on beads, and kissing images.[18] Processions in the church or churchyard were prohibited. Curates were instructed to "take away, utterly extinct, and destroy all shrines, covering of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindles or rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glasses, windows, or elsewhere within their churches or houses."[19] Installation of parish poor boxes aimed at redirecting contributions to the church; instead of spending money on "pardons, pilgrimages, trentals, decking of images, offering of candles, giving to friars, and upon other like blind devotions, they ought at this time to be much more ready to help the poor and needy; knowing that to relieve the poor is a true worshipping of God."[20] Only ministers licensed by the king, Somerset, or Cranmer could preach freely; all others were obliged to read every Sunday one of the official homilies published in conjunction with the injunctions.[21]

---

[17] Nichols, 2:214. See also Jordan, 6.
[18] TRP, 394. See also Bray, 248.
[19] TRP, 401. See also Bray, 255.
[20] TRP, 401. See also Bray, 255.
[21] The injunction against unlicensed preachers was reinforced by a 24 April 1548 royal proclamation. See TRP, 421-423.

The injunctions claimed that "through lack of preachers . . . the people continue in ignorance and blindness."[22] Therefore, *Certayne Sermons or Homelies, Appoynted by the Kynges Majestie to Be Declared and Redde by All Persones, Vicars, or Curates, Every Sondaye in their Churches Where They Have Cure* were written by a Cranmer-led team.[23] The Preface explained that they "conteined certain wholsome and godly exhortacions to move the people to honor and worshippe almighty God and diligently to serve hym."[24] Although the *Homilies* did not cover such critical subjects as purgatory or the eucharist, they disseminated evangelical doctrine throughout the church. This teaching (or propaganda) program began with the injunction for unlicensed preachers to read the *Homilies* and increased in momentum on 23 September 1548 when a royal proclamation prohibited sermons altogether and ordered that only *Homilies* be read until "one uniform order throughout this . . . realm," the Prayer Book, was published.[25]

The July injunctions also promoted use of English during worship, reiterating some of Henry's instructions and adding others. A chapter from the English New Testament was to be "plainly and distinctly read" at Matins each Sunday and holy day, and an Old Testament chapter read at Evensong.[26] The epistle and gospel were to be read in English at High Mass. On holy days with no sermon, the Our Father, Apostle's Creed, and Ten Commandments were to be read in English "to the intent the people may learn the same by heart."[27] And, finally, all churches

---

[22] TRP, 402. See also Bray, 256.
[23] The homilies were "A Fruitefull Exhortacion to the Readyng of Holye Scripture" possibly written by Cranmer, "Of the Misery of All Mankynde" by John Harpesfield, "Of the Salvacion of All Mankynde" by Cranmer, "Of the True and Lively Faithe" by Cranmer, "Of Good Woorkes" by Cranmer, "Of Christian Love and Charitie" by Edmund Bonner, "Against Swearying and Perjurie" influenced by Thomas Becon's tract *Invective against Swearing*, "Of the Declinyng from God," "An Exhortacion against the Feare of Deathe" possibly by Cranmer, "An Exhortacion to Obedience," "Against Whoredom, and Adultery" by Becon, and "Against Strife and Contencion" possibly by Hugh Latimer. Ronald B. Bond, *Certain Sermons or Homilies (1547) and A Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion (1570): A Critical Edition* (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 1987): 26-28.
[24] Bond, 56.
[25] TRP, 432-433.
[26] TRP, 398-399. See also Bray, 253.
[27] TRP, 394. See also Bray, 249.

were to purchase an English Bible and English-language copy of Desiderius Erasmus's *Paraphrases* on the gospels.

Reactions to these injunctions varied. Zealous reformers instigated a wave of iconoclasm. The Privy Council reacted to this spontaneous destruction by ordering the restoration of torn-down images. This action and reaction made everyone unhappy, some because images were removed and others because they were restored. In the end, the Council banned images in London and then in the entire kingdom in February 1548. Some parishes obeyed reluctantly, others without much protest; many images were sold to private individuals or hidden away—and replaced in churches during Mary's reign. Eamon Duffy asserted that "all over England churchwardens cooperated in the removal and destruction of images and the suppression of traditional service, but this cooperation should not be read as approval."[28]

Conservative Yorkshire priest Robert Parkyn did not approve of any of it. He observed that "in the first yeare of [Edward's] reigne was straitte injunctions gyven to all the spiritualltie of Englande, wherin specially was deposside all processions and thatt noyne sholde be usied, butt only to knealle in the mydde alee of the churche unto certayn suffragies in Englishe were songe or saide on holly days."[29] He went on to lament other losses: no ashes at the beginning of Lent (Ash Wednesday), "ymages, pictures, tables, crucifixes, tabernacles" removed from churches, no palms or processions on Palm Sunday, the passion story read in English instead of Latin, customary rituals of Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Easter not allowed, parishioners given

---

[28] Duffy, 462.

[29] Robert Parkyn, "Robert Parkyn's Narrative of the Reformation," ed. A. G. Dickens, *English Historical Review* 62, no. 242 (1947): 66. See also David Cressy and Lori Anne Ferrell, eds., *Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1996), 25.

the eucharist in both kinds on Easter, no fasting on Saint Mark's day, and no processions on rogation days.[30] He was most incensed at the treatment of reserved eucharistic bread.

> The pixes hangynge over thallters (wherin was remanynge Christ blisside bodie under forme of breade) was dispittfully cast away as thinges most abominable, and dyd nott passe of the blisside oystes therin conteanyd, butt vilanusly dispisside tham, utterynge such wordes therby as it dyd abhorre trew christian eares for to heare; butt only thatt Christ mercy is so myche, it was marvell that the earth did nott oppen & swalow upp suche vilanus persons.[31]

Other early reforming legislation dealt with the mass, which included the nature of the eucharistic elements of bread and wine as well as the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, which was tied to prayers for the dead and the cult of the saints. Veneration of the saints through pilgrimage and the worship of relics had been addressed in the injunctions. The practice of praying for the dead was attacked through the December 1547 Chantries Act (1 Edward VI, c.14). Edward mentioned this act in his *Chronicle:* "There was also a parliement called, wherin al chauntries were graunted to the King."[32] Chantries existed to offer prayers for the dead; dissolving them would end that practice and put some money in the royal treasury. This act was the only piece of Edwardian reform legislation that got stuck in Commons—apparently for economic, not religious, reasons; members of the Commons did not want to lose community assets without gaining something in return.[33] They forced revisions that provided pensions for laid-off chantry priests and endowments for schools and charities.[34] The act was a fiscal victory for the government because it raised money to fund the Scots war and a doctrinal victory for evangelicals because it abolished endowed prayers for the dead.

---

[30] Parkyn, 66-67. See also Cressy and Ferrell, 26.
[31] Parkyn, 68. See also Cressy and Ferrell, 26-27.
[32] Nichols, 2:220. See also Jordan, 8.
[33] MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 77.
[34] Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1993), 171.

Parliament broached the issue of the eucharist with the Sacrament Act (1 Edward VI c.1) in November 1547. Officially titled An Act against Revilers, and for Receiving in Both Kinds, the act provided that the "sacrament be hereafter commonly delivered and ministered unto the people within the Church of England . . . under both the kinds, that is to say, of bread and wine."[35] In Catholic practice, the laity received only the bread. The act used a humanist argument to justify the change: "it is more agreeable both to the first institution of the said sacrament . . . and also more conformable to the common use and practice both of the apostles and of the primitive Church . . . that the said blessed sacrament should be ministered to all Christian people under both kinds."[36] Cranmer presented a new liturgy on which he had been working for several years, the Order of the Communion, to be used for administering communion in both kinds. A royal proclamation dated 8 March 1548 stated that communion "be ministered unto our people only after such form and manner as hereafter, by our authority with the advice before mentioned, is set forth and declared."[37] The new order was to be in general use starting 1 April, Easter Sunday, the one day of the year when the laity expected to received communion. Through the order, Cranmer introduced several evangelical changes.

First, mandatory annual confession to a priest as a condition of communicating was abolished. Only those with heavy consciences needed to talk to a priest, who would listen to a confession and provide counsel but would not absolve sin. This instruction fit with the Reformation principle of *sola fide*, that a person was saved by individual faith and not through sacramental action, which was the reason reformers did not accept confession as a sacrament. A general confession and absolution was part of the new order; Ramie Targoff saw this as part of a

---

[35] Bray, 262.
[36] Bray, 261.
[37] TRP, 418.

general shift from individual to corporate worship provided in Cranmer's liturgy.[38] Second, more English was inserted into the Latin mass. After the priest took communion, he turned to face the congregation and—in English—delivered the new exhortation, confession, absolution, comfortable words, prayer of humble access, words of distribution, and benediction.[39] Third, as mandated by the Sacrament Act, the laity received both the bread and wine.

A fourth change related to the nature of the eucharist, one of the most hotly debated topics of the Reformation—"the vexed question of God's real, corporal or spiritual presence in or absence from the elements of bread and wine."[40] Reformers in general rejected the "corporal" presence of transubstantiation, the Catholic doctrine that at the moment of consecration, the substance of the bread and wine transformed into the body and blood of Christ. Martin Luther developed a theology of "real presence," or consubstantiation, wherein Christ's presence was in, with, and under the elements although the bread and wine themselves were not changed as during transubstantiation. Ulrich Zwingli taught that the eucharist was a memorial meal only; there was no presence of Christ in the elements. Cranmer initially leaned toward Luther's doctrine, but by end of Henry's reign he had revised his position in favor of "spiritual presence." After the repeal of the Act of Six Articles, it was no longer heresy to deny transubstantiation. In a December 1548 Parliamentary debate, therefore, Cranmer argued that "the change is inward not in the bread, but in the receiver."[41] He believed that a spiritual presence was given through grace to believers as they received communion. Further, communion was a memorial thanksgiving, not a reenactment of Christ's sacrifice. He did not, however, clearly state this belief in the Order of

---

[38] Ramie Targoff, *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 31-32.
[39] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 385, and *Prayer Books*, x.
[40] MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 34.
[41] J. T. Tomlinson, *The Great Parliamentary Debate in 1548 on the Lord's Supper* (n.p., n.d.), 12, cited in Basil Hall, "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI," in *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*, ed. Paul Ayris and David Selwyn (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1993), 217.

the Communion. The words of distribution, "the body/blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given/shed for thee, preserve thy body/soul unto everlasting life," neither confirmed nor denied transubstantiation.[42] These words said to each communicant as he or she received the elements could be interpreted as either a description of transformed bread and wine or a blessing accompanied by elements of remembrance. Cranmer's 1548 order helped pave the way for the 1549 Prayer Book, as it was incorporated into the new communion service.

The third aspect of worship affected by both early changes and the Prayer Book was the use of the vernacular, which was one of the hallmarks of the Reformation in general. Cranmer argued for the use of English as early as his Preface to the 1540 edition of Henry's Great Bible. He pointed out that shortly after Saint Augustine of Canterbury converted the Saxons in England, the Bible was translated into their language, "and when this language waxed old and out of common usage, by cause folk should not lack the fruit of reading, it was again translated into the newer language."[43] The fruits of reading included being "the readier unto all goodness, the slower of all evil," having God "vouchsafe with his Holy Spirit to illuminate thee," and knowing that "he that is ignorant shall find there what he should learn."[44] However, part of the appeal of Latin liturgy for early modern worshippers was its mystery. Yet, according to Timothy Rosendale, the use of Latin also created the necessity for Roman-controlled priests to be mediators between humanity and God. Therefore, using English helped break the bond with Catholicism.[45] Another outcome of using English in worship was that English came to be seen as "worthy of communicating formal petitions to God."[46]

---

[42] *Prayer Books*, x.
[43] Jenkyns, 105-106. See also Bray 235, and Meyer, 2.
[44] Jenkyns, 108, 109, 111. See also, Bray 237, 238, and Meyer, 4, 5, 6.
[45] See Timothy Rosendale, "'Fiery Tongues:' Language, Liturgy, and the Paradox of the English Reformation," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, no. 4.1 (2001): 1142-1164.
[46] Targoff, 5.

In relation to converting worship from Latin to English, Rosendale pointed out the aptness of Pentecost as the day the Prayer Book was to be in general use. In the biblical story of Pentecost, the apostles were endowed with the Holy Spirit and given the gift of tongues. People who heard them were able to understand the gospel in their own languages. The assigned Prayer Book epistle lesson for the day was from Acts 2: "They were al filled with the holy gost, and began to speake with other tonges, even as the same spirite gave them utteraunce . . . the multitude came together and were astonied, because that every man heard them speake with his owne language . . . we have heard them speake in our owne tongues the great weorkes of God."[47] Just as those early converts were edified by hearing God's word in their own tongues, Cranmer wanted to edify his English flock.

Everyone did not receive such edification favorably. Radical evangelical clergyman John Hooper complained in a letter to Swiss reformer Heinrich Bullinger, "And that popery may not be lost, the mass-priests, although they are compelled to discontinue the use of the Latin language, yet most carefully observe the same tone and manner of chanting to which they were heretofore accustomed in the papacy."[48] This desire to return to traditional ways—including liturgical drama, presentation and understanding of communion, and use of Latin—was not an uncommon response to Edwardian evangelical reforms. The reactions of the "mass-priests" and Hooper and everyone else to the injunctions and Order of the Communion created the context into which the Prayer Book was introduced.

---

[47] *Prayer Books*, 131.
[48] Hooper letter quoted in Rosendale, 1161.

THE 1549 PRAYER BOOK

David N. Griffiths traced the beginning of the Prayer Book to drafts of English-language morning and evening prayer services and a church calendar that Cranmer produced during Henry's reign.[49] Thus, when a mid-1548 debate in Convocation led to a call for a new service book, the archbishop had a head start. The committee formed to prepare the book comprised some dozen men that Cranmer knew well, as all of them were from his ecclesiastical province of Canterbury and most had attended Cambridge.[50] Evangelical reformers had a solid majority on the committee, which met at Chertsey Abbey near Windsor for several sessions during September-December 1548. Apparently, Cranmer presented a complete draft of the Prayer Book for approval.[51] The committee agreed that services would be held in English.[52] Full agreement on the service of communion may not have been reached. Nevertheless, a Bill for Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm, which mandated use of the Prayer Book throughout the realm, was introduced in the House of Lords on 13 December. The eucharist was the subject of the ensuing 14-19 December debate. The evangelical faction benefited from the absence of the conservative Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner, who was imprisoned in the Tower for not supporting the regime's religious policy. The act was passed to the Commons and then back to the Lords, which passed it on 15 Jan 1549.[53] It was

---

[49] David N. Griffiths, *The Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer 1549-1999* (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 53.

[50] The earliest extant lists of committee members date from the seventeenth century. A 1632 handbill listed the "Compilers of the English Common Prayer Book." This list included Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer, Bishop of Ely Thomas Goodrich (Goodrick), Bishop of Hereford John Skip, Bishop of Westminster Thomas Thirlby, Bishop of Chichester George Day, Bishop of Lincoln Henry Holbeach (Holbeck), Bishop of Rochester Nicholas Ridley, king's almoner Richard Cox, Dean of Lincoln John Taylor, Dean of Exeter Simon Haynes (Heynes), Dean of Westminster John Redman, and Archdeacon of Leicester Thomas Robertson (Robinson). Griffiths, viii. Other lists also included Dean of St. Paul's William May. Griffiths, 6.

[51] Griffiths called knowledge of committee proceedings "curiously patchy." Griffiths, 6.

[52] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 397.

[53] Griffiths, 7. See also Haigh, 173.

passed by Commons on 21 January.[54] Edward mentioned passage of the act in his *Chronicle:* "A parliement was called, wher an uniform order of prayer was institut, before made by a number of bishoppes and lerned men gathered together in Windsore."[55] Known as the first Act of Uniformity (2 and 3 Edward VI, c.1), it mandated that the Prayer Book was to be put into general use by Whitsunday (Pentecost), 9 June 1549.

Cranmer's preface to the Prayer Book outlined his reasons for creating a standard liturgy. He described what he considered problems or errors in existing liturgy and set out the solutions presented in the Prayer Book. Liturgical problems fell into three general categories: corruption of the liturgy over time, reduction of Bible reading in the liturgy, and lack of understanding caused by the use of Latin for worship. Extra worship elements introduced over the centuries and an overly complicated church calendar had corrupted the liturgy. The trade-off for adding "extras" had been a reduction of Bible reading. Cranmer complained that books of the Bible were no longer read in their entirety and that the number of Psalms included in the daily schedule had been drastically reduced.

A strong humanist strain permeated the preface. The opening sentence alluded to a common humanist refrain: original sources were more pure than subsequent iterations. "There was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so surely established, which (in continuance of time) hath not been corrupted: as (emong other thinges) it may plainly appere by the common prayers in the Churche."[56] Pure Christian worship, as practiced in ancient times, had become corrupt over the course of fifteen centuries. The preface continued with another tenet of Christian humanism, that the works of the ancient Church Fathers were of great importance. "The firste originall and grounde whereof [referring to worship] if a manne woulde searche out

---

[54] Haigh, 173.
[55] Nichols, 2:223. See also Jordan, 10.
[56] *Prayer Books*, 3. Parallel quote from 1552 Preface on 321.

by the auncient fathers, he shall finde that the same was not ordeyned, but of a good purpose, and for great advauncement of godlines."[57] In other words, the liturgy created by the early Church Fathers helped one attain greater holiness.

This holiness was fostered by "readyng and meditacion of Gods worde."[58] The ancients designed the lectionary so that most of the Bible would be read each year. As a result of this extensive hearing of scripture, clergy would "be stirred up to godlines themselfes, and be more able also to exhorte other by wholsome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the trueth."[59] The principle that "wholsome doctrine" was found in scripture (not in the Scholastic teachings of medieval churchmen, whose theology of the mass encompassed transubstantiation, purgatory, and the continuing reenactment of Christ's sacrifice, all anathema to reformers) was one of the hallmarks of the Reformation, beginning with Luther's self-defense at the Diet of Worms in 1521, when he stated that he would not change his mind unless he was convinced he was wrong by "scripture and right reason." The preface was therefore both a humanist and a Reformation document; it looked to scripture as a pure original source that could be used to confound "adversaries to the trueth." Because it was important to be familiar with scripture, it was important to reestablish a lectionary that provided for a nearly complete reading of the Bible annually. Hearing the Word of God through sermons and scripture reading was a defining characteristic of reformed worship.

The preface listed specific complaints. First, the "Godly and decent ordre" set up by the ancients had been distorted by "uncertein stories, Legendes, Respondes, Verses, vaine repeticions, Commemoracions, and Synodalles"; this was an evangelical criticism of medieval

---

[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid.

Catholic liturgical traditions.[60] Second, these additions to the worship service had usurped the place of Bible readings, so that many books of scripture "were onely begon, and never read thorow."[61] Replacing the simplicity and unassailable authority of scripture with theatrical ritual was not approved by evangelical reformers. Third, reading the service in Latin instead of English meant that the people could not understand, that they "heard with theyr eares onely; and their hartes, spirite, and minde, have not been edified thereby."[62] Cranmer cited Saint Paul—an apostle, therefore considered a better authority than later theologians—on this subject. He alluded to 1 Corinthians 14:9 (King James Version): "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?" Worship and Bible translations in the vernacular were characteristic of all the sixteenth-century Reformation movements in Europe. Fourth, whereas all 150 psalms had previously been read weekly, "of late tyme a fewe of them have been dailye sayed (and ofte repeated) and the rest utterly omitted."[63] Again, Cranmer expressed disapproval over a reduction in scripture reading. Finally, the rules pertaining to the liturgical calendar in relation to Easter were too complex. Because the date of Easter was tied to the phases of the moon, it was not celebrated on the same day each year. Holy days related to Easter (Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Ascension, rogation week, Pentecost, and Corpus Christi) also changed each year. Therefore, feast days celebrated on fixed dates during February, March, April, May, and June might be eclipsed by one of the Easter-related holy days. The pye was a set of rules that enabled calculation of substitute dates for the fixed feast days. For example, if Good Friday fell on a particular feast day, the Good Friday readings would be read on that Friday, and the pye would be used to determine when the

---

[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid., 4. Parallel, 322.

readings for and celebration of the feast day would occur. The Preface claimed that the pye was so complicated that "there was more busines to fynd out what should be read, then to read it when it was founde out."[64]

The Prayer Book was the antidote to these "inconveniences." It included an easy-to-understand calendar. Scripture reading would be done in order and completeness. The extra elements of worship that had broken the "continuall course of the readyng of the scripture"[65] were omitted from the services contained in the book. There were a few necessary rules, which were "plain and easy to be understanded."[66] The raison d'être of the Prayer Book was given with this typical Reformation statement:

> Here you have an ordre for praier (as touchyng the readyng of holy scripture) muche agreable to the mynde and purpose of the olde fathers, and a greate deale more profitable and commodious, than that whiche of late was used. It is more profitable, because here are left out many thynges, whereof some be untrue, some uncertein, some vain and supersticious: and is ordeyned nothyng to be read, but the very pure worde of God, the holy scriptures, or that whiche is evidently grounded upon the same; and that in suche a language and ordre, as is moste easy and plain for the understandyng, bothe of the readers and hearers.[67]

This statement asserted that ancient authority trumped later innovation; that Catholic tradition was untrue, uncertain, vain, and superstitious; that pure liturgy focused on the Word of God; and that the vernacular should be used for worship. The interpretative nature of any religious doctrine or practice was exposed with the phrase "or that whiche is evidently grounded upon the same." Each Christian movement, long-established or newfound, believed in its own definition of what was grounded on God's Word as given in the Bible.

The preface ended with four more brief points. First, the liturgy of the Prayer Book was to be used by everyone throughout the kingdom. It replaced several other uses, or patterns of

---

[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.

worship, that were being followed in different geographical areas—"some folowyng Salsbury use, some Herford use, some the use of Bangor, some of Yorke, and some of Lincolne."[68] A unity of religious observance was important in the development of a national church. Second, questions or disputes about how to "understande, do, and execute the thynges conteyned in this booke were to be referred to diocesan bishops."[69] Giving bishops the authority to settle matters of interpretation confirmed that the Church of England would maintain its episcopal form of government. Third, although public worship must be in English, private devotions could be said in any language that the individual understood. This was an extension of the belief that people spiritually profited most when they understood what was being presented. Fourth, cathedral and college clergy were not required to say morning and evening prayer daily.

Cranmer pointed out in the preface the benefits of reformed liturgy for the Church of England: a simplified ceremony and lectionary, increased Bible reading, a uniform set of services for the entire kingdom, and worship conducted in English. The preface—written in English, the language of the people, instead of Latin, the language of scholars—was meant to be read by clergy and laypeople, as was the entire Prayer Book. Cranmer recommended that the book be used for both public worship and private devotions. Thus, he introduced something new: a manual intended for use by all, truly a book of *common* prayer. A June 1549 royal proclamation backed up this intention by setting price limits on the Prayer Book to ensure affordable editions.[70]

Cranmer was clear about the purposes of the Prayer Book, but the liturgy contained within it was neither clearly traditional nor clearly evangelical. Historians agreed that the book, which was modeled after both the traditional Use of Sarum and reformed German rites,

---

[68] Ibid., 4. Parallel, 322-323.
[69] Ibid., 5. Parallel, 323.
[70] TRP, 464.

introduced new theology yet retained many traditional ceremonial elements in an attempt to make both evangelicals and conservatives comfortable. It became clear after publication of the Prayer Book, however, that many people from all areas of the religious spectrum did not appreciate this blend of old and new.

Liturgy of the 1549 Prayer Book

Cranmer provided services for the occasions of life celebrated in traditional Catholic liturgy: daily worship and communion, childbirth, baptism, confirmation, marriage, sickness, and death. His ceremonies were grounded in the older traditions, yet he reshaped liturgy into a reformed pattern that reflected evangelical theology. Two aspects of Prayer Book services grabbed the immediate attention of clergy and worshippers—the use of English and the absence of some familiar dramatic and sensory elements. Worship in the vernacular was not only a tenet of the Reformation, it also enabled instruction within each service; this instruction helped the slow shift of people's beliefs. Omission of dramatic components simplified worship and, in some cases (not elevating the host, for example), also aided a doctrinal shift.

Table and Kalendar

The Table and Kalendar addressed Cranmer's concern—as noted in the Preface to the Prayer Book—regarding the consistency of scripture reading. It comprised two tables of scripture-reading cycles (one for the psalms and one for the rest of the Bible) and instructions for implementing the cycles. There were psalms and scripture lessons assigned for matins and evensong services each morning and evening of the year. When followed, all 150 psalms would be read twelve times a year, the New Testament would be read through three times a year, and the Old Testament once a year. Very few biblical chapters were left out of this lectionary, or

annual cycle of reading. For the most part, books were read as units, except that "whensoever there bee any proper Psalmes or Lessons appoynted for any feast, moveable or unmoveable; then the Psalmes and Lessons appoynted in the Kalendar shalbe omitted for that tyme."[71] A note about the numbering of Psalms emphasized that the Great [English] Bible was to be used, not the "common Latyn translacion."[72]

Matins

The daily service of matins, or morning prayer, illustrated the traditional-reformed blend of all Prayer Book services. Completely traditional elements modified by Cranmer made a new service. The chief innovation was, of course, that the service was read and sung entirely in English. To ensure that parishioners benefited from hearing the service in their native tongue, rubrics (procedural instructions) instructed the minister to read with "a loude voice," turn "so as he maye beste be hearde of all suche as be present," and "in such places where they doe syng, there shall the lessons be songe in a playne tune after the maner of distincte readyng."[73]

The service began with the Lord's Prayer, followed by versicles and responses, the *Gloria* (followed by an alleluia from Easter to Trinity Sunday), Psalm 95, and another *Gloria.* Next came the assigned readings for the day: the Psalms with *Gloria,* the Old Testament lesson followed by the canticle *Te Deum* (or *Benedicte Omnia* during Lent) and *Gloria,* and the New Testament lesson followed by the *Benedictus* (Zechariah's song from Luke 1), *Gloria,* and *Kyrie.* After the readings the priest recited the Apostles' Creed and Lord's Prayer, followed by versicles and responses. Morning prayer closed with the priest reading three short prayers called collects:

---

[71] *Prayer Books,* 8. Parallel, 329.
[72] Ibid., 6. Parallel, 327.
[73] Ibid., 22. Parallel, 350.

the first was "the same that is appointed at the Communion" for the day, the second was for peace, and the third for grace.[74]

In addition to the use of the vernacular, there were several other reforms. Responses from the congregation were not part of Latin services; lay participation in worship was a Prayer Book innovation. The lessons were a central focus of the service; strict adherence to the Kalendar provided thorough annual reading of the Bible. Printing the Lord's Prayer and Apostle's Creed (as well as the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds used in other services) established a "single authoritative version" of each of these Christian staples, which existed in various translations and formats.[75] Though they were daily services, most people attended matins and evensong only on Sundays; they became, in fact, the norm for Sunday worship.[76]

Evensong

Evening prayer, like morning prayer, began with the Lord's Prayer. This was followed by versicles and responses, *Gloria,* and alleluia. The assigned readings were next: the Psalms, the Old Testament lesson followed by the *Magnificat* (Mary's hymn of praise from Luke 1) and *Gloria,* and the New Testament lesson followed by the *Nunc Dimittis* (a benediction from Luke 2) and *Gloria.* Three collects were then offered: the collect assigned for the day, one for peace, and one for "ayde agaynste all perils."[77] Usually the service ended with the *Benedictus.* The Athanasian Creed was recited on specified holy days.[78] As in matins, hearing English, congregational participation in the versicles and responses, scripture lessons, and a standardized creed reformed the evensong service.

---

[74] Ibid., 26. Parallel, 355.
[75] Targoff, 65.
[76] Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Myth of the English Reformation," *Journal of British Studies* 30, no. 1 (1999), 9.
[77] *Prayer Books,* 29. Parallel quote from 1552 version on 358.
[78] The holy days were Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and Trinity Sunday. *Prayer Books,* 29.

Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels

The bulk of the Prayer Book was a section containing assigned Psalmic introits, collects, and readings from the New Testament epistles and gospels "to be used at the celebration of the Lordes Supper and holye communion," that is, for each Sunday and feast day of the year.[79] These psalms and lessons were not the same as those listed in the lectionary tables for matins and evensong. The inclusion of these prayers and Biblical texts in the Prayer Book not only facilitated the priest leading the service but also made it easy to use the book for individual study or devotion.

Communion

This section of the Prayer Book was titled "The Supper of the Lorde and the Holy Communion, Commonly Called the Masse."[80] This title combined both reformed (Supper of the Lord, Holy Communion) and traditional (Mass) elements, as did the entire service. Reactions later demonstrated that no one was pleased with such a compromise; it was too conservative for progressive evangelicals and too radical for traditionalists of either Catholic or evangelical persuasion. Nevertheless, it was a compromise that garnered Parliamentary approval after the December 1548 debate on the eucharist in the House of Lords.

When use of the Prayer Book began on 9 June 1549, a significant portion of the communion service had been in general use since 1 April 1548, when the Order of the Communion, which Cranmer incorporated into the Prayer Book "virtually unaltered," had been put into general use.[81] The complete service retained a traditional format in tandem with evangelical use of the vernacular and evangelical tenets. The service began with a Psalmic introit, followed by various prayers (including Our Father, *Kyrie,* and collect for the king), the

---

[79] *Prayer Books,* 32. Parallel quote from 1552 version on 368.
[80] Ibid., 212.
[81] MacCulloch, *Cranmer,* 485.

epistle and gospel lessons, the Nicene Creed, and a sermon or homily. "If the people bee not exhorted to the worthy receivyng of the holy Sacrament" by the sermon, such an exhortation was provided, followed by the offertory (scriptural sentences), proper preface, *Sanctus*, prayer for the church with words of institution, and more prayers, including the Our Father again. The somewhat familiar exhortation, confession, absolution, comfortable words, prayer of humble access, words of distribution, and benediction from the Order of the Communion completed the service. A noteworthy rubric allowed the confession to be read by a communicant or a minister "in the name of al those that are minded to receive the holy Communion."[82]

The changes related to confession instituted by the Order of the Communion remained in the Prayer Book. The pre-Communion exhortation addressed confession, incorporating the priest's instructions to the people from the earlier order: those with troubled consciences could confess to a priest and receive comfort and advice, those intending to communicate should "be truly repentant of your former evill life, and . . . confesse with an unfained hearte to almightie God," and each communicant should "be satisfied with his owne conscience, not judgying other mennes myndes or consciences."[83] The opening rubrics of the communion service added new instructions: those who lived "open and notorious evill lives" or were infected with malice or hatred must openly repent, reconcile, and make amends before communicating.[84]

Cranmer used the service to teach evangelical doctrine. The long exhortation following the sermon stated that in communion "we spiritually eate the fleshe of Christ and drinke his bloude," which argued against transubstantiation, in which the flesh and blood were literally eaten.[85] The petition in the prayer for the church asked that the bread and wine "maie be unto us

---

[82] *Prayer Books*, 224. Parallel, 386.
[83] Ibid., 216, 217.
[84] Ibid., 212. Parallel, 377.
[85] Ibid., 215.

the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe."[86] Cranmer had altered a phrase from the traditional Sarum rite, "may be made unto us," to say "maie be unto us," another affirmation that the bread and wine were not transformed.[87] Communion was to be taken "in the remembraunce of his moste fruitfull and glorious Passyon"; Christ's passion, or death, was "fruitfull" because it fulfilled its purpose with a one-time sacrifice that was gratefully remembered (reformed view), not symbolically reenacted (Catholic view), at every communion service.[88] The prayer for the church reiterated that Christ on the cross "made there (by his one oblacion once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifyce."[89] Support for traditional doctrine could also be found. The priest intoned "Graunt us therefore (gracious lorde) so to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christ, and to drynke his bloud in these holy Misteries" in the Prayer of Humble Access.[90] Also, Cranmer retained the ambiguous words of distribution from the Order of the Communion. And, significantly, a precise moment of consecration existed; the priest said, "blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes" while making the sign of the cross over the bread and wine.[91]

Instructional rubrics also introduced evangelical elements and ideas into the service. Clerical vestments were reduced to a plain white alb with cope. Parishioners contributed to a poor box, instituted to make the point that almsgiving to the church should benefit the living, not the dead through masses said to earn early release from purgatory.[92] Congregants were invited to receive communion often, not just once a year per traditional Catholic practice; those who desired to stay gathered in the quire. The priest took only as much bread and wine as necessary

---

[86] Ibid., 222.
[87] Hall, 218.
[88] *Prayer Books*, 216.
[89] Ibid., 222.
[90] Ibid., 225.
[91] Ibid., 222. The phrase is printed in the Prayer Book with crosses: "bl+esse and sanc+tifie."
[92] MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 163.

for the gathered group; there was to be no reservation of extra consecrated elements. In Catholic practice, reserved elements were honored and adored as the actual body and blood of Christ, which reformers considered idolatrous. Elevation of the elements at the moment of consecration, which had been the literal and figurative high point of the Catholic mass, was also forbidden as idolatrous. Round, unleavened, easily divisible bread with no printing replaced traditional holy bread, another innovation to differentiate communion from the mass. Private masses were abolished with the requirement that someone must communicate with the priest. An assigned parish rotation was suggested to ensure that this requirement was met. The communion rubrics indicated Cranmer's evangelical agenda more clearly than the words of the service, although the changes they instituted may have been harder to understand or accept because they were made without explanation.

Litany

The litany had been in use since Cranmer introduced it under Henry in 1544 and was, therefore, the oldest new innovation.[93] According to a rubric at the end of the communion section, the litany and suffrages were to be used in the midst of the communion service on Wednesdays and Fridays or as "otherwyse appoynted by his highnes."[94] The litany was a long responsive reading with themes of mercy, deliverance, and supplication. It was followed by the Lord's Prayer, a prayer of supplication, and various collects.

Baptism

Two ceremonies were provided for baptism, one for public baptism in church and one for private baptism in a house. The opening rubric explained that in ancient times baptism was performed only on Easter and Whitsunday and was "openly mynistred in the presence of all the

---

[93] Compare the 1544 litany in Meyer, 99-104, to *Prayer Books*, 231-235 and 361-367.
[94] *Prayer Books*, 229.

congregacion."[95] In an effort to approximate this custom, which had fallen out of use, public baptisms were to be held only on Sundays or holy days. In addition to (somewhat) restoring an ancient practice, other advantages of public baptism were that congregants served as witnesses and they were reminded of their own "profession made to God."[96] Understanding the baptismal profession was possible because the ritual was performed in English. Private baptisms were held only if "great nede shall compell them so to doe."[97] The Prayer Book also instructed that water in the font be changed at least once a month and provided simple prayers for sanctifying the water, which replaced an elaborate Catholic ritual.[98]

Candidates for public baptism and their godparents began the ceremony at the church door. After prayers, naming the child, signing the cross on the child's forehead and breast "in token that thou shalt not be ashamed to confesse thy fayth in Christe crucifyed," exorcism, a gospel lesson from Mark 10 with a brief explanation, and recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed, the baptismal party was escorted from the church door to the font.[99] This procession was followed by a brief statement to the godparents, questions regarding belief answered by the godparents on behalf of the child, baptism by triple immersion in water, bestowal of the chrisom (a white baptismal gown), anointing, and exhortation to learn "thinges which a christian man ought to know and beleve to his soules health."[100] This ceremony was closely based on the traditional Latin ritual, although dramatic elements utilizing salt and spittle were not included.[101] The critical moment came with the words "I baptize thee," which in this

---

[95] Ibid., 236. Parallel, 394.
[96] Ibid., 236. Parallel, 394.
[97] Ibid., 242. Parallel, 400.
[98] See Cressy, 141, for a description of hollowing the font and water from the Sarum missal.
[99] *Prayer Books*, 237.
[100] Ibid., 245. Parallel, 399.
[101] Cressy, 107.

reformed rite indicated the promise of redemption and reception into the church, not deliverance from original sin.[102]

Private baptism was a short ritual: a prayer, recitation of the Lord's Prayer "yf the tyme will suffre," naming the child, and baptism by water.[103] A child who was baptized privately and did "afterwarde lyve" was brought to church, where the parents were carefully questioned by the parish priest to ascertain "whether the childe be lawfully Baptized or no."[104] If the baptism was determined to have been lawful, then a public affirmation of the baptism took place. This ceremony included the gospel from Mark 10 with its explanation, the Lord's Prayer, the questions regarding belief, bestowal of the chrisom, prayers, and exhortation to learn Christian tenets. If lawful baptism was in doubt, the child was baptized with these words: "If thou be not Baptized already, [name] I Baptize thee in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holy gost. Amen."[105] This formulation prevented duplicate baptism and made the point that one baptism was doctrinally correct, which was directed not at Catholics, but at Anabaptists, who practiced rebaptism.

Confirmation

The confirmation section contained a short catechism as well as the liturgy for the rite of confirmation. The first rubric for confirmation asserted the importance of doctrinal education in English for members of the Church of England by requiring that confirmands "can say in theyr mother tong, tharticles of the faith [the Apostles' Creed] the lordes prayer, and the tenne commandementes; And can also aunswere to suche questions of this shorte Catechisme, as the

---

[102] Ibid., 114.
[103] *Prayer Books*, 242. Parallel, 400.
[104] Ibid.
[105] Ibid., 245. Parallel, 403.

Busshop (or suche as he shall appoynte) shall by his discrecion appose them in."[106] This requirement sought to assure that the rising generation was learning authorized doctrine and was comfortable with praying and reciting in English. Supplying the same basic teachings to everyone was also a key component of creating a unified national church.

The other introductory rubrics focused on age. Early reformers had grappled with the issue of baptizing infants. Many radical reformers cited New Testament evidence to support their teaching that only those capable of deciding for themselves to follow Christ should be baptized. The magisterial reformers (Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, and their followers) affirmed the efficacy of infant baptism. Many of them, however, decided that children needed to reach an age of accountability before confirmation, so that a child or youth could make his or her own informed decision to embrace Christianity. The rubrics echoed this concern. First, children should have reached "the yeres of discrecion," in other words, capable of confirming for themselves what their godparents promised for them at baptism.[107] Second, confirmation provided "strength and defence against all temptacions to sin, and the assautes of the worlde, and the devill" as children grew older and were "in daungier to fall into sinne."[108] Third, it was "agreeable with the usage of the churche in tymes past" to offer confirmation to those who had received instruction, professed faith, and agreed to obey God's will.[109] Fourth, if a child died before confirmation, baptism was enough for salvation.

The catechism was designed to make sure the confirmand had a basic understanding of baptismal promises, the creed, the ten commandments, duty to God and neighbor, and the Lord's Prayer. This concern with consistent, authorized doctrinal education reflected not only general

---

[106] Ibid., 247. Parallel, 404.
[107] Ibid.
[108] Ibid.
[109] Ibid.

evangelical concern with understanding the gospel but also Cranmer's project to create a unified church. The catechism was silent on the great unanswered doctrinal question of the Edwardian reformation—the nature of the eucharist. Diarmaid MacCulloch saw this silence as "proof of the stopgap nature of the 1549 Prayer Book."[110] Closing rubrics instructed parish curates to offer instruction, parents and masters to send children to church for this instruction, and curates to supply bishops with lists of candidates. The final rubric stated "there shal none be admitted to the holye communion: until suche time as he be confirmed."[111] The short confirmation ceremony comprised versicles and responses, a prayer, making the sign of the cross and laying hands on the confirmand, another prayer, and a blessing.

Matrimony

Introductory rubrics stated that banns must be published for three Sundays or holy days before the wedding, in both parishes if the bride and groom were not in the same parish, and that on the appointed day the couple and their friends and neighbors should gather in the church. The priest welcomed the congregation and explained the trifold purpose of matrimony—"procreacion of children . . . remedie agaynst sinne, and . . . mutual society."[112] He asked if those present knew of impediments to the marriage (age, consanguinity, previous marriage contract), ascertained the willingness of the bride and groom to marry one another, and asked who was giving the woman to be married. Then the couple exchanged vows and the groom gave the bride a ring. This was followed by another prayer, the pronouncement of matrimony, and a blessing (with the sign of the cross) on the couple. The couple approached the altar while Psalm 128 or Psalm 67 was sung. They knelt at the altar during three prayers of blessing (or two, if the woman was past childbearing age). This was followed by a gospel lesson and a sermon (or reading provided in the

[110] MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 91.
[111] *Prayer Books*, 251. Parallel, 409.
[112] Ibid., 252. Parallel, 410.

Prayer Book in lieu of the sermon). A final rubric ordered the couple to receive communion that same day.

This ceremony was a simplification of previous matrimonial ritual. As usual, dramatic elements were omitted, such as an elaborate ritual as the couple entered the church and the blessing and anointing of the ring. Retention of the ring, even without the blessing, caused dissention for years to come; radical evangelicals wanted the ring banned from the ceremony. This 1549 Prayer Book service was the first liturgy ever to approve of marriage "for the mutuall societie, helpe, and coumfort, that the one oughte to have of thother."[113] It was also the first marriage liturgy written by a married bishop. Many parts of this English marriage ceremony are familiar to twenty-first-century ears—a testimony to the longevity of the Book of Common Prayer.[114]

Visitation of the Sick

The minister entered the house of the sick person with a blessing of peace, sang Psalm 118, gave a short prayer for mercy followed by a *Kyrie,* the Lord's Prayer, and versicles with responses. More prayers were followed by an exhortation (a short version was provided for the very sick). The minister then elicited a confession of faith using the questions asked at baptism and talked to the sick person to determine "whether he be in charitie with all the worlde."[115] The sick person was urged to forgive others, make amends for his or her own faults, make a will, and declare debts. The sick person confessed "yf he fele his conscience troubled with any weightie manner" and the minister said a prayer of absolution, a collect, Psalm 71, and another prayer.[116]

---

[113] MacCulloch, *Boy King,* 132. *Prayer Books,* 252. Parallel, 410.
[114] Recognizable phrases include "dearly beloved friends, we are gathered together here in the sight of God . . . ," "wilt thou have this woman/man to thy wedded wife/husband?," "to have and to hold from this day forth, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, to love and to cherish till death us depart," "with this ring, I thee wed," and "I pronounce that they be man and wife."
[115] *Prayer Books,* 262. Parallel, 419.
[116] Ibid.

The voluntary confession stood in contrast to the Catholic sacrament of extreme unction, in which confession was necessary. If the sick person desired, he or she was anointed and the sign of the cross was made, followed by Psalm 13. Although this ceremony is quite traditional, Eamon Duffy pointed out that some traditional symbolism was omitted. For example, a rubric indicated that the priest should "annoynte him upon the forehead or breast only."[117] The Latin rite also included symbolic anointing of the eyes, ears, lips, limbs, and heart.[118]

The Prayer Book outlined the manner of offering communion to the sick. If it was done on a day when communion had been celebrated at church, the minister might have reserved (set aside) enough of the consecrated host (bread or wafers) to serve communion to the sick person and others in attendance. A short communion service is described in a rubric: general confession, communion, absolution, "coumfortable sentences of scripture," and collect.[119] If there was nothing reserved, communion would be prepared and offered in the house, using the ceremony outlined in the book: prayer, *Kyrie,* collect, epistle from Hebrews 12, gospel from John 5, preface, and the rest of the communion service "unto the ende of the Canon."[120] The consecrated host from such a service could be reserved for other sick people being visited the same day. A rubric assured any who "by reason of extremitie of sickenesse, or for lacke of warnyng geven in due tyme, to the curate, or by any other just impedimente" did not receive communion that if he or she was sincere and earnest in belief, he or she did "eate and drynke spiritually the bodye and bloud of our savioure Christe, profitably to his soules helth."[121]

Several considerations regarding communion were present in this service. Because reservation of the elements was discouraged to avoid idolatrous worship of the consecrated host,

---

[117] Ibid., 264.
[118] Duffy, 466.
[119] *Prayer Books,* 266.
[120] Ibid., 267.
[121] Ibid., 268. Parallel, 423.

provision was made to prepare communion in the house. If there was no one besides the priest and the sick one to communicate, it would be a "just impediemente" and communion could not be offered. Therefore, the priest consoled the sick one that he or she could communicate spiritually. The possibility of not receiving communion on one's deathbed was another aspect of the evangelical desacralization of extreme unction; communicating was no longer a necessity for dying in a sanctified state.

Burial

The burial service opened with the priest reading scriptures from John, Job, and 1 Timothy as he accompanied the body from the church to the grave. At the graveside, the priest intoned "I commend thy soule to God the father almighty, and thy body to the grounde."[122] A service to be held in the church was outlined, to be held either before or after interment. It opened with Psalms 116, 146, and 139 and a lesson on the resurrection from 1 Corinthians 15. A *Kyrie*, the Lord's Prayer, versicles and responses, and a prayer followed. Psalm 42, an epistle lesson from 1 Thessalonians 4, a gospel lesson from John 6, and a collect were provided for a communion service when there was a burial. While this service omitted the traditional holy water and incense, it retained prayers on behalf of the deceased and included the priest's direct address to the corpse. In this 1549 service, the dead person was still considered part of the gathered community of saints.

Purification of Women

After childbirth, a woman came to the church and knelt near the quire door for the minister's blessing. He offered thanks for her deliverance from the "greate daunger of childebirth" and sang Psalm 121.[123] Next followed the *Gloria, Kyrie,* Lord's Prayer, and

---

[122] Ibid., 269.
[123] Ibid., 278. Parallel, 428.

versicles and responses. A final prayer commended the woman to a faithful life. A rubric ordered "the woman that is purifyed" to present the chrisom used at the child's baptism and other accustomed offerings and gave permission for her to receive communion.[124] The title and rubric references to purification clung to the age-old idea that women required penitential cleansing after childbirth before they reentered society. Dramatic elements from the traditional ceremony were omitted, including the woman wearing a white veil and carrying a lighted candle, two married women escorting the postpartum woman, and the priest sprinkling the woman with holy water before she entered the church.[125]

Ash Wednesday

The Ash Wednesday service took place on the first day of Lent, the six-week penitential period preceding Easter. The service began with the litany. The minister then introduced the "general sentences of goddes cursyng agaynste impenitente sinners, gathered out of the xxvii Chapter of Deuteronomie, and other places of scripture" to move parishioners to repentance.[126] The long address from the minister that followed was also calculated to induce repentance. On their knees, congregants recited Psalm 51, followed by the *Gloria, Kyrie,* Lord's Prayer, and versicles and responses. Prayers and an anthem finished the service.

Of Ceremonies and Certain Notes

The penultimate section of the 1549 Prayer Book, entitled "Of ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retayned," presented Cranmer's reasoning behind the abolition or retention of ritual elements in Prayer Book ceremonies. Some were abolished because

> some at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanitie and supersticion: Some entred into the Churche by undiscrete devocion, and suche a zele as was without knowlage, and for because they were

[124] Ibid., 279.
[125] Cressy, 205-206.
[126] *Prayer Books,* 280. Parallel, 430.

> winked at in the beginning, they grewe dayly to more and more abuses . . . they have muche blynded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut awaye, and cleane rejected.[127]

Other ceremonies were retained because they provided "a decent ordre in the Churche" and "pertayne to edificacion."[128] Because Christ's law of the spirit was unlike the ritualistic Mosaic law, ceremonies that provided order or inspiration should be retained "in the freedome of spirite, beeyng contente onely wyth those ceremonyes whyche dooe serve to a decente ordre and godlye discipline, and suche as bee apte to stirre uppe the dulle mynde of manne to the remembraunce of his duetie to God."[129] Yet, a principle more important than the retention or rejection of any particular ceremony was obedience to ecclesiastical authority and order. "And although the keping or omytting of a ceremonie (in itselfe considered) is but a small thyng: Yet the wilfull and contemptuous transgression, and breakyng of a common ordre, and disciplyne, is no small offence before God."[130]

Some ceremonies were dropped because there were just too many; "the great excesse and multytude of them hathe so encreased in these latter dayes, that the burden of them was intollerable."[131] Others were deemed too "dark," that is, too obscure or difficult to understand. "This our excessive multitude of Ceremonies, was so great, and many of them so darke: that they dyd more confounde and darken, then declare and sette forth Christes benefites unto us."[132] A few were rejected because nothing would remain if they were purged of their corruption. "The abuses coulde not well bee taken awaye, the thyng remaynyng styll."[133]

---

[127] Ibid., 286. Parallel, 324.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Ibid., 287. Parallel, 325.
[130] Ibid., 286. Parallel, 324.
[131] Ibid., 287. Parallel, 325.
[132] Ibid.
[133] Ibid.

The new order for services was written to please neither conservatives who were loath to give up any of the old ritual nor reformers who rejected all former ritual, but to negotiate a middle way that was pleasing to God.

> Some thynke it a greate matter of conscience to departe from a peece of the leaste of theyr Ceremonies (they bee so addicted to their olde customes), and agayne on the other syde, some bee so newe fangle that they woulde innovate all thyng, and so doe despyse the olde that nothyng canne lyke them, but that is newe: It was thought expediente not so muche to have respecte how to please and satisfie eyther of these partyes, as how to please God, and profitte them bothe.[134]

Those who were offended because some of the old ceremonies were retained should understand that "wythoute some Ceremonies it is not possible to kepe anye ordre or quyete dyscyplyne in the churche."[135] Once they admitted that some ceremony was necessary, they should also see that creating a new ceremony when a useable one already existed was foolish. "Such menne (grauntyng some Ceremonyes conveniente to bee hadde), surelye where the olde maye bee well used: there they cannot reasonablye reprove the olde (onelye for theyr age) withoute bewraiying of theyr owne folye."[136] A concluding summary stated that abused ceremonies had been omitted, others were retained to maintain order, ceremonies did not have the force of God's law and could therefore be changed as necessary, and the ceremonies in the book were clearly understandable.

The section titled "Certayne notes for the more playne explicacion and decent ministracion of thinges, conteined in thys booke" made several brief points about liturgical practice. For celebrating matins, evensong, baptisms, and burials, ministers should wear simple white robes called surplices and "such hoodes as pertaineth to their [university] degrees."[137] At

---

[134] Ibid., 286. Parallel, 324.
[135] Ibid., 287. Parallel, 325.
[136] Ibid.
[137] Ibid., 288.

other times, ministers were "at libertie to use any Surples or no."[138] The more elaborate Catholic vestments, including stoles, tunicles, and chasubles, were abandoned in favor of evangelical simplicity. The wearing of university hoods underlined the scholastic accomplishments of ministers, making the point that theological education was an important requirement of a Church of England minister. Bishops celebrating communion were also to robe more simply than before, though they were still to carry the staff, or crosier, that was the symbol of their office. The acts of "kneeling, crossing, holding up of handes, knocking upon the brest" could be used or not, "as every mans devocion serveth."[139] Finally, on various holy days or "for other greate cause," specified alterations could be made in the prescribed liturgy.[140]

Ordinal

An Ordinal—instructions for the rituals of ordaining bishops, priests, and deacons—was not included in the 1549 Prayer Book. A 1549 act of Parliament (3 and 4 Edward VI c.12) empowered the king to appoint a committee to prepare an Ordinal, which was to come into use on 1 April 1550. A committee appointed in January 1550 approved a draft presented by Cranmer, for which he had drawn on both existing practice and Martin Bucer's *De ordinatione legitima*.[141] The Ordinal was published in early March.

A brief preface to the Ordinal described the origins of and qualifications for the offices of bishop, priest, and deacon. In true humanist style, it referred to the apostolic church as the authority for these offices. Furthermore, men of old had not decided themselves to take on these offices but had been "called, tried, examined, and knowen, to have such equalities, as were requisite for the same. And also by publique prayer, with imposicion of handes, approved, and

---

[138] Ibid.
[139] Ibid., 289.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Haigh, 176. See also Loach, 118.

admitted thereunto."[142] Age qualifications—deacons must be at least twenty-one years old, priests twenty-four, and bishops thirty—prevented children from holding these offices, which was considered by reformers a Catholic abuse of clerical positions. A deacon must be "a man of vertuous conversacion, and wythoute cryme, and . . . learned in the Latyne tongue, and sufficientlye instructed in holye Scripture." [143] Because holding the position of deacon was a prerequisite to becoming a priest or bishop, these qualifications applied to all three offices. Using "suche maner and fourme, as hereafter foloweth" was the proper way to reverently perpetuate these offices in the Church of England.[144]

The Ordinal outlined separate ordination services for deacons, priests, and bishops, with instructions for adapting a service when candidates for different offices were present. The three services contained similar elements: an opening exhortation, the litany and suffrages, epistle readings from Acts 6, Acts 20, or 1 Timothy 3 giving descriptions from apostolic times of clerical functions and attributes, gospel readings from Matthew 28 or John 10, 20, or 21 describing the duties of the offices, the Oath of the King's Supremacy, an examination of the candidates, ordination by laying on of hands, presentations of symbols of office (New Testament to deacons, Bible and chalice to priests, pastoral staff to bishops), and communion. Rubrics instructed a candidate for deacon or priest to wear a plain alb; a newly elected bishop was to wear a surplice and cope.

The ordination service began with an "exhortacion, declaring the duetie and office of suche as come to be admitted Ministers, howe necessarye such Orders are in the Churche of Christe, and also, howe the people oughte to esteme them in theyr vocacion."[145] This teaching

---

[142] *Prayer Books*, 292. Parallel, 438.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid., 439.

opportunity allowed candidates and congregations to hear reformed expectations regarding proper execution of the clerical offices. The chosen epistle and gospel lessons and the examination also provided instruction from an evangelical point of view about the qualifications and duties of deacons, priests, and bishops. The examination particularly revealed what reformers considered important. First, candidates should be inwardly convinced that they "truly bee called, according to the will of our Lorde Jesus Christe."[146] Second, candidates for deacon should "unfaynedlye beleve" in scripture and read it to the people; candidates for priest and bishop should believe that canonical scripture contained "all doctryne, required of necessitie for eternall salvacion" and commit to "teache nothing . . . but that you shalbe perswaded, maye be concluded, and proved by the scripture."[147] This condition of ordination reflected Luther's doctrine of *sola scriptura*, that scripture—not patristic or papal tenets—contained all teachings necessary for salvation. A short homily in the service for priests underlined this teaching by stating, "ye cannot by any other meanes compasse the doyng of so weightie a woorke perteining to the salvacion of man, but with doctryne and exhortacion, taken out of holy scripture."[148] The third part of the examination inquired whether candidates were willing to be diligent in their particular callings: deacons to assist priests in worship, instruct catechism and baptize, and discover and provide relief to "sicke, poor, and impotent" parishioners; priests to administer the sacraments, teach the people to observe the sacraments, "banishe and drive awaye al erronious and straunge doctrines," and diligently pray and study the scriptures while "laying asyde the study of the world, and the fleshe"; bishops to study scripture and pray for understanding in order to "teache and exhorte with wholesome doctryne, and to withstande and convince the

---

[146] Ibid., 446 (deacons), 455 (priests), 461 (bishops).
[147] Ibid.
[148] Ibid., 308-309.

gainsaiers" and encourage others to do the same.[149] Fourth, candidates promised to be "wholesome examples of the flocke of Christ" and exemplify "quietnesse, peace, and love."[150] The first, third, and fourth requirements aimed to provide clergymen who took their callings seriously rather than merely taking a profit from a benefice bestowed upon them, which was a common Reformation-era complaint about corrupt clergy. Fifth, candidates for deacon and priest promised to obey the "ordinary, and other chiefe Ministers of the Church" and new bishops took a formal Oath of Due Obedience to the archbishop.[151] Christopher Haigh rightly observed that that the Ordinal "provided Protestant pastors rather than Catholic priests."[152]

RESPONSES TO THE 1549 PRAYER BOOK

The first Act of Uniformity referred to "the honour of God and great quietness, which by the grace of God shall ensue upon the one and uniform rite and order in such common prayer and rites and external ceremonies to be used throughout England."[153] This expected "great quietness" did not follow promulgation of the Prayer Book. The general populace and most parish ministers were taken aback by the simplified, English-language service, and they reacted negatively to the drastic change. For example, the villagers of Sampford Courtenay in Devon sat through the new service on Whitsunday, but the next day they forced their priest, William Harper, to don his "olde popishe attyre" and celebrate mass in Latin.[154] The king complained that the new liturgy was being ignored in many places, and the Council noted that Londoners were avoiding church

---

[149] Ibid., 447 (deacons), 455-456 (priests), 461 (bishops).
[150] Ibid., 447 (deacons), 456 (priests), 461-462 (bishops).
[151] Ibid., 447 (deacons), 456 (priests), 460 (bishops).
[152] Haigh, 168.
[153] Bray, 267.
[154] Loach, 71. Anthony Fletcher and Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Tudor Rebellions*, 4th ed., Seminar Studies in History, ed. Clive Emsley and Gordon Martel (New York, NY: Longman, 1997), 52.

services.[155] Robert Parkyn was especially distraught over changes to eucharistic practice: "And so tholly masse was utterly deposside thrughe owtt all this realme of Englande & other the Kyng's dominions att the saide Penticoste, and in place therof a communion to be saide in Englishe withowtt any elevation of Christ bodie and bloode under forme of breade & wyne, or adoration, or reservation in the pixe."[156] These and other reactions most often responded to one or more of the three major aspects of change: loss of ceremonial elements, use of English, and treatment of the eucharist.

Edward's oldest half-sister, Mary, a devout Catholic, had a strong negative reaction focused on the eucharistic mass. The siblings engaged in a battle of wills. Mary continued to celebrate mass privately. Edward sent a letter to his sister in January 1551 telling her to obey the Act of Uniformity. The king's *Chronicle* reported a March meeting with Mary, "where was declared how long I had suffered her masse against my will . . . She answerid that her soul was God['s], and her faith she wold not chaung."[157] On 9 August Edward recorded that "24 lordes of the counsel met at Richemond, to commune of my sister Marie's matter: who at length agreed that it was not meet to be suffered any longer."[158] Mary's cousin Charles V campaigned for her; Edward wrote on 3 January 1552 that "the'emperour's embassadour moved me severally that my sister Mary might have masse, wich, with no litle reasoning with him, was denied him."[159] For Edward, this confrontation was about asserting his authority. As he stated in his *Chronicle* on 10

---

[155] Haigh, 175-176.
[156] Parkyn, 69-70. See also Cressy and Ferrell, 27-28, and Newton Key and Robert Bucholz, eds., *Sources and Debates in English History 1485-1714* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004), 67.
[157] Nichols, 2:308. See also Jordan, 55. The meeting took place on 17 March but was entered in the *Chronicle* on 18 March. The words "against my will" were crossed out by the king.
[158] Nichols, 2:336. See also Jordan, 76, and Loach, 133.
[159] Nichols, 2:387. See also Jordan, 104.

April 1551, "my sister was my subject, and should use my service apointed by act of parliement."[160] For Mary, it was about celebrating the mass according to her beliefs.

Bishop of Winchester Stephen Gardiner was arrested for opposing the new liturgy.[161] His opposition also centered on the eucharist. Seven entries in Edward's *Chronicle* during June and July 1550 demonstrated the king's interest in the Gardiner matter. The entry for 14 June stated, "the duke of Somerset, with 5 other of the counsel, went to the bishop of Winchester, to whom he made this answere: — 'I, having deliberatly seen the book of common praier, although I wold not have made it so my self, yet I find such thinges in it as satisfieth my conscience, and therefor both I wil execut it myself, and also see other my parishoners to doe it.'"[162] Gardiner was indeed able to satisfy his conscience. During his imprisonment, he wrote *Explication and Assertion of the Catholic Faith*, a "masterly subversion of the 1549 book" in which he used the Prayer Book to defend real presence in the eucharist.[163] Edward's 13 February 1551 *Chronicle* entry recorded the end of the matter, "the bishop of Winchester, after a longe triall, was deposed of his bishoprike."[164]

Other conservative bishops lost their sees during 1550-1551, including Edmund Bonner, George Day, Nicholas Heath, Thomas Thirlby, Cuthbert Tunstall, and John Veysey. New evangelical bishops included Miles Coverdale, John Hooper, John Ponet, Nicholas Ridley, John Scory, and John Taylor. Edward commented on these episcopal changes in an essay titled "Discourse on the Reformation of Abuses" he wrote during the parliamentary session of 23 January-15 April 1551, "for discipline, it were very good that it wentfurth, and that those that did notablye offend in swearing, rioting, neglecting of God's word, or such like vices, were duely

---

[160] Nichols, 2:313. See also Jordan, 58.
[161] MacCulloch, *Later Reformation*, 14.
[162] Nichols, 2:278. See also Jordan, 35-36.
[163] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 505.
[164] Nichols, 2:303. See also Jordan, 53.

punished, so that thos that shuld be th'executours of this discipline were men of tried honesty, wisdom, and judgment."[165]

It is not surprising that conservatives such as Parkyn and Gardiner objected to the Prayer Book. Yet radical evangelicals objected equally strenuously because elements of traditional ritual remained—vestments, the sign of the cross, wedding rings, the baptismal chrisom, and prayers for the dead—and because the communion service did not explicitly support a memorialist view of the eucharist. John Hooper wrote a letter on 27 March 1550, stating "I am so much offended with that book, and that not without abundant reason, that if it be not corrected, I neither can nor will communicate with the church in the administration of the [Lord's] supper."[166] He also denounced the new Ordinal in his Lenten sermons preached at court in 1550—not for its doctrine, but because it required ordinands to wear the traditional clerical vestments of surplice and cope and to swear by the saints when they took the Oath of the King's Supremacy (originally used under Henry VIII), which wearing and swearing he abhorred because of their association with the Catholic mass. When he was nominated as bishop of Gloucester in July 1550, he refused the position because he would not participate in the ceremony.

A year-long controversy ensued. Polish reformer Jan Łaski agreed with Hooper that such vestments offended God; Italian reformer Peter Martyr counseled Hooper to wear the vestments, which Martyr considered an "indifferent" liturgical matter. Bishop of London Nicholas Ridley and Cranmer led the charge against Hooper. Cranmer constructed the argument as one about authority, as evidenced in a 2 December 1550 letter he wrote to Martin Bucer. Cranmer asked

> whether, without the offence of God, it may be lawful to the ministers of the Church of England to use those vestures which of these days they wear, and so are prescribed of the magistrate? Whether he that shall affirm that it is unlawful, or

---

[165] Nichols, 2:478-479. See also Jordan, 159-160.

[166] H. Robinson, ed., *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation (Zurich Letters), 1537-1558*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1846-47), 1:79, cited in Loach, 122. See also Hall, 222.

> shall refuse to wear this apparel, offendeth against God, for that he sayeth that thing to be unclean that God hath sanctified; and offendeth against the magistrate, for that he disturbeth the politic order?[167]

Bucer replied, "I think that such ministers of the English Churches may with the grace of God use these vestments which are prescribed at this day."[168] The Council put Hooper under house arrest and enjoined him not to preach or publish. After publishing a defensive work, he was imprisoned at Lambeth Palace in mid-January 1551 and moved to the Fleet prison in early February. He wrote a capitulary letter to Cranmer on 15 February. He was at last confirmed by the king in Gloucester on 20 July, wearing a cope and surplice. He was not, however, required to swear by the saints because at the ceremony Edward crossed out the offending phrase from the oath.[169]

This so-called Vestments Controversy was important in relation to the Prayer Book because it highlighted the compromise nature that offended people on both ends of the religious spectrum and because it confirmed Cranmer's control of England's reform process. Diarmaid MacCulloch saw it as a decisive moment in the English Reformation, the "high watermark of Protestant advance," after which moderate reformers controlled the movement.[170] However, it is difficult to know the trajectory Cranmer would have followed if Edward had lived longer. The Vestments Controversy's position as "high watermark" might have been eclipsed.

The Hooper affair was not the only high-profile attack on the Prayer Book. On 10 June, the day after the Prayer Book was put into general use, people in Devon and Cornwall rose in protest. Writing in about 1555, Parkyn remembered that "after the saide Penticost in the moneth of Junii began a commotion or insurrection of people in the sowth partts as Cornewaylle &

---

[167] Jenkyns, 1:341.
[168] Bucer letter quoted in MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 481.
[169] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 472-473. See also MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 35-36, and Loach, 118-120.
[170] Diarmaid MacCulloch, "The Myth of the English Reformation," in *The Journal of British Studies* 30, no. 1 (1991): 18.

Deynschyre with othre therto annexide, butt in the moneth of July was many mo schyers rasside upp for maintennance of Christ churche."[171] Thousands of rebels gathered from a wide area, marched to Exeter, and laid siege to the city on 2 July. They issued articles of complaint, most of which concerned liturgical changes mandated by the Prayer Book and other official proclamations.[172] Cranmer formally responded to the rebels and their articles, writing "you were deceived by some crafty papists, which devised those Articles for you, to make you ask you wist not what" and offering to "open plainly and particularly your own Articles unto you, that you may understand them, and no longer be deceived."[173] The articles and Cranmer's responses revealed which changes disturbed the rebels and how the principal architect of those changes defended them.

The first article stated "we wyll have the general counsall and holy decrees of our forefathers observed."[174] Cranmer responded with a diatribe against the rebels' disobedient address to the king—"Is this the fashion of subjects to speak to their prince; 'we will have?' . . . and that saying with armour upon your backs and swords in your hands"—and statements that papal laws and ordinances were wicked, ungodly, tyrannical, and partial and that papists were heretics and traitors.[175] The second article demanded Henry's "syxe articles, to be in use again."[176] Cramer noted that the Six Articles had been in force only because of the "evil counsel of certain papists, against the truth, and common judgment both of divines and lawyers."[177] He also pointed out that since it was impossible to obey both papal decrees and the Six Articles, the rebels' first and second articles were contradictory. The third article said "we will have the masse

---

[171] Parkyn, 70.
[172] See Fletcher and MacCulloch, 58-59, for a discussion of the preliminary and final sets of articles.
[173] Jenkyns, 2:202-203. See also Key and Bucholz, 64.
[174] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 139. This and the following rebel articles are cited from a 1549 tract titled *A Copy of a Letter*. See also Jenkyns, 2:204, and Key and Bucholz, 64.
[175] Jenkyns, 2:204, 205, 206. See also Key and Bucholz, 64.
[176] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:212, and Key and Bucholz, 64.
[177] Jenkyns, 2:212. See also Key and Bucholz, 64.

in Latten . . . wythoute any man or woman communycatyng with hym [the priest]."[178] Regarding the mass in Latin, Cranmer asked, "Will you not understand what the priest prayeth for you, what thanks he giveth for you, what he asketh for you?"[179] As to no one communicating with the priest, he asserted that such a thing was contrary to "all the forms and manner of masses that ever were made, both new and old."[180] The fourth article desired that "the Sacrement hange over the hyeghe aulter, and there to be worshypped."[181] Cranmer said, "in the beginning of the church it was not only not used to be hanged up, but also it was utterly forbid to be kept."[182] The fifth article requested that "the Sacrament of the aulter but at Easter delyvered to the lay people, and then but in one kynde."[183] Cranmer chided,

> Methinks you be like a man, that were brought up in a dark dungeon, that never saw light, nor knew nothing that is abroad in the world: and if a friend of his, pitying his ignorance and state, would bring him out of his dungeon, that he might see the light and come to knowledge, he being from his youth used to darkness, could not abide the light, but would wilfully shut his eyes, and be offended both with the light, and with his friend also.[184]

The sixth article asked for baptism "at all tymes aswel in the weke daye as on the holy daye."[185] The archbishop pointed out that baptisms could be performed at any time for children close to death, yet otherwise baptisms should be performed with many people in attendance so that all "may rejoice together of the receiving of new members of Christ into the same church . . . [and] may remember and the better know, what they promised themselves by their godfathers and godmothers in their own baptism."[186] The seventh article demanded the restoration of holy bread

---

[178] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:213.
[179] Jenkyns, 2:214.
[180] Ibid., 2:218.
[181] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:218, and Key and Bucholz, 65.
[182] Jenkyns, 2:219. See also Key and Bucholz, 65.
[183] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:220, and Key and Bucholz, 65.
[184] Jenkyns, 2:220. See also Key and Bucholz, 65.
[185] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:222.
[186] Jenkyns, 2:223.

and holy water, palms and ashes, images, and "all other auncient olde Ceremonyes."[187] Cranmer's strongly worded reply condemned "holy bread, holy water, holy ashes, holy palms, and all other like ceremonies, ordained [by] the Bishops of Rome, adversaries to Christ, and therefore rightly called Antichrists."[188] The eighth article insisted on a return to the Latin mass, saying the English service was "lyke a Christmas game."[189] Cranmer retorted, "I would gladly know the reason, why you Cornish men refuse utterly the new English, as you call it, because certain of you understand it not: and yet you will have the Service in Latin, which almost none of you understand."[190] Furthermore, the new service was certainly not a game, "but in the English service appointed to be read, is there nothing else but the eternal word of God, the New and the Old Testament, the word that hath power to save your souls."[191] The ninth article requested that priests "praye specially by name for the soules in purgatory."[192] Cranmer asserted that "Scripture maketh mention of two places, where the dead be received after this life, of Heaven and of Hell; but of Purgatory is not one word spoken."[193] After denying the existence of purgatory, he also denied the need to suffer for sins in the next life: "if . . . the faithful that die in the Lord be pardoned of all their offences by Christ, and their sins be clearly sponged and washed away by his blood, shall they after be cast into another strong and grievous prison of Purgatory, there to be punished again for that which was pardoned before?"[194] The tenth article demanded "the whole Byble and al bokes of scripture in Englysh to be called in agayn."[195] Cranmer queried, "wherefore did the Holy Ghost come down among the apostles in fiery tongues and gave them

---

[187] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:224.
[188] Jenkyns, 2:224.
[189] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:230, and Key and Bucholz, 66.
[190] Jenkyns, 2:230. See also Key and Bucholz, 66.
[191] Jenkyns, 2: 231.
[192] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:233.
[193] Jenkyns, 2:231.
[194] Jenkyns, 2:234.
[195] Fletcher and MacCulloch, 140. See also Jenkyns, 2:236, and Key and Bucholz, 66.

knowledge of all languages, but that all nations might hear, speak, and learn God's word in their mother tongue?"[196] He further argued that "to confute English heretics we must needs have God's word in English."[197] The few remaining articles did not relate to changes wrought by the Prayer Book.

The articles showed the rebels' concerns about the forms of worship, whereas Cranmer's responses focused on doctrinal issues. He corrected assumptions about the biblical or apostolic origins of specific practices and explained the theology inherent in Prayer Book ritual. Sermons and tracts taught evangelical tenets directly; liturgy provided more subtle instruction that was very effective in the long run, as evidenced by the unwillingness of the rebels to give up centuries-old understandings and practices. Cranmer planned to bring about a full English Reformation using both direct and indirect methods. His responses to the rebels elucidated the intentions of the new liturgy in an attempt to gain acceptance for it.

Lord John Russell led a victorious campaign against the rebels, lifting the siege of Exeter in early August and defeating the remaining rebel forces two weeks later at Sampford Courtenay and Oakhampton.[198] Rebel leaders were executed, as instructed by Somerset in a 27 July letter to Russell: "Ye shall hang two or three of them, and cause them to be executed lyke traytors."[199] Vicar of St. Thomas Robert Welsh was hung from his church tower with "a holy-water bucket, a sprinkle, a sacring bell, a pair of beads and such other popish trash hanged about him," a clear warning to those intent on keeping traditional worship practices alive.[200] In mid-July Lord Henry Grey of Wilton put down smaller anti-Prayer Book riots in Oxfordshire. Edward's *Chronicle* noted that when Grey and his men arrived on the scene, it "did so abash the rebels, that more

---

[196] Jenkyns, 2:237.
[197] Jenkyns, 2:238. See also Key and Bucholz, 66.
[198] For Edward's description of the campaign, see Nichols, 2:229-230, and Jordan, 13-15.
[199] The letter from Somerset and the Council to Russell is reprinted in Fletcher and MacCulloch, 144.
[200] Eyewitness Robert Hooker quoted in Fletcher and MacCulloch, 56.

then hauf of them rann ther wayes, and other that tarried were some slain, some taken, and some hanged."[201] Four conservative parish priests were hung from their church steeples.[202] Another rising in the summer of 1549, Kett's Rebellion, occurred in Norfolk and Essex. On 27 August the Earl of Warwick put down about 16,000 rebels camped at Mousehold Heath.[203] The grievances were mostly economic, not religious, but the large rebellion added to the "troubles of 1549."

The Privy Council blamed Somerset for these troubles. He was forced to resign in late October and was imprisoned in the Tower. In the *Chronicle*, Edward described this bloodless coup, in which "the lord Protectour, by his owne agreement and submission, lost his protectourship, treasourirshipe, marchalshipe, al his moveables, and niere 2,000 pound lande."[204] Somerset had been linked with the reform movement, and his downfall gave rise to the rumor that Henrician worship would be reinstated.[205] These rumors that were "noised and bruited abroad that they should have again their old Latin service, their conjured bread and water, with such like vain and superstitious ceremonies" were dispelled by a 25 December royal proclamation.[206] The proclamation ordered the destruction of "all antiphonaries, missals, grails, processionals, manuals, legends, pyes, porcastes, tournals, and ordinals after the use of Sarum, Lincoln, York, Bangor, Hereford, or any other private use."[207] Bonfires of books followed.[208]

During Somerset's imprisonment, Warwick took over leadership of the Privy Council, being elected Lord President of the Council on 2 February 1550 and later made Duke of Northumberland on 11 October 1551. Somerset was pardoned in February 1550, restored to the Council in April, arrested for plotting to kill Northumberland on 16 October 1551, and tried at

---

[201] Nichols, 2:228. See also Jordan, 13.
[202] Nichols, 2:229n, and MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 120.
[203] Parkyn, 70n. For Edward's military description of Kett's rebellion, see Nichols, 2:230-231, and Jordan, 15-16.
[204] Nichols, 2:244. See also Jordan, 19.
[205] Duffy, 469.
[206] TRP, 485.
[207] Ibid.
[208] MacCulloch, *Boy King*, 97.

Westminster on 1 December.[209] He was convicted of treason felonious and executed on 22 January 1552. Edward's *Chronicle* entry for that day coolly stated, "The duke of Somerset had his head cut of apon Towre hill betwene eight and nine a cloke in the morning."[210] The regime change from Somerset to Northumberland, an influx of evangelicals fleeing Charles V's July 1548 Augsburg Interim, and the episcopal replacement of conservatives with reformers increased evangelical strength throughout the kingdom and set the stage for revision of the Prayer Book.

THE 1552 PRAYER BOOK

As in the case of the first Prayer Book, little is known about the actual creation of the 1552 revision. As the revision was being drafted, Edward opined in his "Discourse on the Reformation of Abuses" that "prayers must first with good consideracion be setfurth, and fautes therin be amendid; next being setfurth the peple must continually be allured to heire them."[211] The new Prayer Book was authorized by Parliament in the second Act of Uniformity (5 and 6 Edward VI c.1), passed in April 1552. The act explained that the revised book was for the "perfection of the said order of common service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same prayers and fashion of service more earnest and fit to stir Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God."[212] It compelled weekly attendance at church and officially "annexed and joined" the Ordinal to the Prayer Book.[213] The book was to come into use on All Saints Day (Allhallow Day), 1 November 1552.

On 27 September the Privy Council ordered printing of the Prayer Book stopped. A sermon given by John Knox, who had been brought from Scotland by an admiring

---

[209] For Edward's account of the trial, see Nichols, 2:370-374, and Jordan, 97-100.
[210] Nichols, 2:390. See also Jordan, 107.
[211] Nichols, 2:478. See also Jordan, 159.
[212] Bray, 282.
[213] Ibid., 281, 282.

Northumberland, before Edward and the Privy Council in November 1551 had condemned the practice of kneeling at communion as idolatrous. Ensuing discussions eventually led to the Council's desire to add instructions forbidding kneeling at the reception of the elements. When Cranmer refused to add such a rubric, the Council decided on 22 October to add an explanation that kneeling implied humilty rather than worshipful adoration.[214] (Later dubbed the Black Rubric because it was printed in black rather than the usual rubric red, it did not appear in Elizabeth's 1559 Prayer Book but was restored in the 1662 edition.) Printing resumed, and the book was ready for its 1 November debut.

Liturgy of the 1552 Prayer Book

The new Prayer Book was decidedly more evangelical than the original. Many services were shortened, and additional traditional liturgical components were purged. The communion service more clearly advocated a spiritual presence in the eucharist. The burial service also changed significantly; emphasis was shifted from the dead to the living.

Preface

Until their last paragraphs the prefaces of the two Prayer Books are almost identical. There are minor spelling and punctuation differences, and a few words are different. The penultimate paragraph of the 1549 Prayer Book ordered that questions or disputes regarding the use or understanding of the Prayer Book be resolved by the diocesan bishops. The 1552 book adds this sentence to the end of the paragraph: "And yf the Byshoppe of the Diocesse be in anye

[214] MacCulloch, *Cranmer*, 526-527. This explanation was also issued as a royal proclamation dated 27 October 1552.

doubte, then maye he sende for the resolution thereof unto the Archebyshoppe."[215] This gave Cranmer license to bring into line bishops who were reluctant to institute liturgical reform.

The last paragraph in the 1549 book stipulated that priests need only say matins and evensong "from tyme to tyme."[216] The 1552 version obligated "all Priestes and Deacons"[217] to say these offices daily "either privatly or openly"[218] unless they were prevented by "preaching, studeing of divinityie, or by some other urgent cause."[219] Furthermore, parish clergy were to perform the offices in their churches daily, ringing a bell so that parishioners could attend. Making Morning and Evening Prayer mandatory for clergy and inviting laity to attend was a way to increase familiarity, and thus comfort, with evangelical worship in English.

Of Ceremonies

Though this section was identical to its 1549 counterpart (excluding minor spelling, punctuation, and word changes), its position within the book was drastically altered, moving from the penultimate place to immediately follow the preface. This justification for changing liturgical practice now had a place of prominence, rather than being an afterword as it was in 1549, most likely in response to the many complaints about such changes. The section titled "Certayne notes" was dropped completely in the 1552 version; its instructions about clerical vestments were instead included in a rubric at the beginning of the 1552 Morning Prayer section.

The Table, Kalendar, and Almanak

In the instructions for reading the tables, the traditional Catholic terms matins and evensong were replaced with morning prayer and evening prayer, a simple yet profound change asserting that these daily services were not borrowed from the Catholic Church, but were specific

---

[215] *Prayer Books*, 323.
[216] Ibid., 5.
[217] Ibid., 323.
[218] Ibid.
[219] Ibid.

to the Church of England. This change in terminology was applied consistently throughout the 1552 book. The month-by-month table for Old and New Testament Lessons indicated feast days in both versions. Feast days for St. Barnabas and St. Mary Magdalen were dropped and St. George was added in the 1552 version, which indicated that Cranmer was still tinkering with the liturgical calendar. There were two additions to this section. The first was a concise listing of Psalms and Lessons for morning and evening prayer on feast days. The second was an almanak, or table, that listed the dates for Easter for the years 1552-1570. These additions were handy references and did not reflect liturgical or doctrinal changes.

Morning Prayer

The 1552 morning prayer service began with a new introductory section: scripture sentences, exhortation to confession, confession read by both priest and congregation, and absolution. The versicles and responses following the Lord's Prayer used the plural our/us instead of the singular my/me used in 1549, providing a corporate feel to worship. The seasonal alleluia was dropped. Following the first lesson, the minister was free to use either canticle, *Te Deum* or *Benedicite Omnia,* in any liturgical season; the 1549 book had dictated that *Benedicite Omnia* be used during Lent. Following the second lesson, a choice was offered between the *Benedictus* mandated in the 1549 book and Psalm 100. The Apostles' Creed followed, recited by the priest and people together, not the priest alone, as in 1549. After a *Kyrie,* the people joined the priest in the Lord's Prayer. The same versicles and responses and three collects ended the service.

The new service introduced two major changes. First, the move toward corporate confession exhibited in the 1548 and 1549 communion services now extended to morning prayer. The exhortation to confession urged, "although we ought at al times humbly to knowledge our

synnes before God: yet ought we most chiefly so to doe, when we assemble and mete together."[220] Second, as Ramie Targoff observed, worship was becoming more participatory and communal.[221] People and priest said the confession, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer together. Versicles changed from first person to third person. Corporate confession was encouraged. The idea of worship as a spectacle was being overturned.

Evening Prayer

Rubrics appearing in the morning prayer service instructed the priest to open evening prayer with the new scripture sentences, exhortation to confession, confession, and absolution. As with morning prayer, the alleluia was omitted from evening prayer. Following the first lesson, a choice was offered between the Magnificat dictated in 1549 and Psalm 98. Likewise, a choice was offered following the second lesson between the original *Nunc Dimittis* and Psalm 67. As in the 1549 service, evening prayer ended with three collects, the *Benedictus,* and recitation of the Athanasian Creed. The rubric before the 1552 creed, however, added seven saints' days to the original six holy days on which the creed was to be said.[222] Doubling the number of annual recitations of this creed in English may have been meant to reinforce it in the minds or better imprint it in the hearts of parishioners. Diarmaid MacCulloch theorized that the extra recitations may have been meant to combat unitarian ideas with the Creed's "merciless trinitarian detail."[223]

Litany

The litany appeared following communion in the 1549 Prayer Book; in 1552 it appeared after evening prayer. In addition to Wednesdays, Fridays, and "otherwyse appoynted" days, it was now to be used on Sundays. The litany itself was the same as that of 1549. Four new collects

---

[220] Ibid., 348.
[221] Targoff, 28.
[222] The extra feast days were St. Mathias, St. John Baptist, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, Sts. Simon and Jude, and St. Andrew. *Prayer Books,* 358.
[223] MacCulloch, *Boy King,* 141.

were appended: two for times of dearth or famine, one for times of war, and one for times of plague or sickness. None of these changes were significant except, perhaps, the additional Sunday recitations, which promoted familiarity with English-language liturgy.

Collects, Epistles, and Gospels

There were three minor changes in this lengthy section of the prayer book. First, the 1552 book omitted psalmic introits, a simplification. Second, there was no collect for St. Mary Magdalene's feast day, as that celebration had been taken off the calendar. Third, the collect for St. Andrew's Day was different, changing the emphasis from adversity to obedience.

> 1549 version: Almyghtie God, which hast geven suche grace to thy Apostle saynct Andrew, that he counted the sharp and painful death of the crosse to be an high honour, and a great glory; Graunt us to take and esteme all troubles and adversities which shal come unto us for thy sake, as thinges proffytable for us toward the obtaining of everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lorde.[224]

> 1552 version: Almighty God, which didst give such grace unto thy holy apostle St. Andrew, that he readily obeyed the calling of thy Son, Jesus Christ, and followed him without delay: Grant unto us all, that we being called by thy holy word, may forthwith give over ourselves obediently to follow thy holy commandments: throught the same Jesus Christ our Lord.[225]

Communion

The 1552 communion service was significantly different—and more evangelical—than the 1549 service. Cranmer attacked more fervently any hint of transubstantiation or reference to the traditional Catholic mass. The title of the service changed to "The Order for the Administration of the Lordes Supper or Holye Communion," leaving out the word "mass" that had been in the 1549 title.[226] While many rubrics and words were retained, others were altered, dropped, or added. The entire service was reordered and shortened. A series of letters, each representing a prayer, response, exhortation, scripture lesson or sentence, and so forth, can

---

[224] *Prayer Books*, 177.
[225] Ibid., 375.
[226] Ibid., 377.

illustrate the realignment and reduction of service elements. The 1549 order was ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZabcdefghijklmnopqrs. The 1552 order, with * representing a new element, was A*DEFGILTUKJZabcMNOPQRSdVefWjCklmnopq.

A responsive recitation of the Ten Commandments replaced the introit and *Kyrie* at the beginning of the service. This completely new element announced immediately that the 1552 service was different. The people were participants, not spectators. They responded "Lord, have mercye upon us" after the priest read each commandment, which meant they not only participated, they co-opted the *Kyrie* from the priest.[227] The commandments also served a second purpose. They were enumerated in the evangelical pattern, which emphasized the sinfulness of idolatry. The traditional first commandment to have no other gods but God swallowed the following admonition not to make graven images. Evangelicals divided this text into two commandments: first, to have no other gods but God and, second, to make no graven images. (To maintain a total of ten commandments, evangelicals combined the last two traditional commandments related to covetousness.) This highlighted prohibition against idolatry in the context of the communion service aimed at the eucharistic elements, which Cranmer was determined to present as ordinary bread and wine and not the body and blood of Christ. Cranmer believed grace was conferred on the righteous during the act of communing and not through the elements themselves.

Cranmer made other changes to forestall traditional interpretation of the eucharist. He edited a 1549 phrase in the precommunion exhortation, "continuall remembraunce of the same his owne blessed body, and precious bloud, for us to fede upon spiritually," to read "continual remembraunce of hys death," removing a reference to feeding—albeit spriritual feeding—on

---

[227] Targoff, 30.

Christ.[228] The Prayer of Humble Access retained the phrase "to eate the fleshe of thy dere sonne Jesus Christe, and to drinke his bloud" but omitted "in these holy misteries" immediately following, which severed the direct connection between the remembered body and blood and the elements of bread and wine.[229] The 1549 service contained a precise moment of consecration of the elements, signified by the priest making the sign of the cross while saying "blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe."[230] Such a moment was missing in the 1552 service. The priest did not make the sign of the cross over the elements and the words were changed to "graunt that wee, receyving these thy creatures of bread and wyne, accordinge to thy sonne our Savioure Jesus Christ's holy institucion, in remembraunce of his death and passion, maye be partakers of his most blessed body and blood."[231] While this formulation did mention the body and blood, it also retold the scriptural account in which Christ instituted the Lord's Supper as a remembrance. Distribution of the elements immediately followed this story, creating a memorialist association between Christ's admonition to "doe this in remembraunce of me" and communion.[232] The 1552 words of distribution reinforced this connection and clearly stated the nature of the bread and wine: "Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by faythe, with thankesgeving. Drinke this in remembraunce that Christ's bloude was shed for thee, and be thankefull."[233] These statements moved Church of England eucharist theology firmly into the evangelist camp.

The emphasis on communal confession and deemphasis of formal confession to a priest that began with the Order of the Communion and continued in the 1549 Prayer Book was also

---

[228] *Prayer Books*, 215, 386.
[229] Ibid., 389.
[230] Ibid., 222.
[231] Ibid., 389.
[232] Ibid.
[233] Ibid.

part of the 1552 service. The people were asked to "searche and examine your own consciences, as you should come holy and cleane to a most Godly and heavenly feaste."[234] A parishioner who "cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or counsel" was invited to see a priest.[235]

Rubrics in the 1552 revision of the Prayer Book aided Cranmer's quest to evangelize communion. A November 1550 Privy Council directive to all bishops had ordered that altars be replaced with wooden communion tables or, as Edward put it, "to pluke down th'aulters."[236] A rubric specified that the table was to be spread with a "fayre white lynnen clothe" and be placed "in the body of the Churche, or in the chauncell" with "the Priest standing at the north syde of the Table."[237] Replacing the altar with a table that stood in a different location and orientation dissociated Prayer Book communion from the traditional mass. The 1549 book specified that the priest could not celebrate communion unless someone communicated with him; the 1552 book required "a good noumbre" of parishioners to partake with the priest.[238] Requiring congregants to participate in communion reinforced the idea that grace was given to individuals only as they each partook; grace was not received on behalf of all by the priest as he alone communicated. The new dictate that parishioners communicate three times a year, instead of only once at Easter, fulfilled the same purpose. To "take away the supersticion" that the communion bread itself was special—either before or after the service—it was to be "as is usuall to bee eaten at the Table wyth other meates, but the best and purest wheate bread" and any bread left over after the service "the Curate shal have it to hys owne use."[239]

---

[234] Ibid., 384.
[235] Ibid., 385.
[236] Nichols, 2:296. See also Jordan, 49.
[237] *Prayer Books*, 377.
[238] Ibid., 392.
[239] Ibid.

The controversial Black Rubric added by the Council at the last minute also related to the eucharistic elements. It clarified that kneeling communicants displayed "humble and gratefull acknowledgyng of the benefites of Chryst."[240] Kneeling in no way implied "that any adoracion is doone, or oughte to bee doone, eyther unto the Sacramentall bread or wyne there bodily receyved, or unto any reall and essencial presence there beeying of Christ's naturall fleshe and bloude."[241] The bread and wine "remayne styll in theyr verye naturall substaunces, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatrye to be abhorred of all faythfull christians."[242] Cranmer may have refused to add this rubric, but it certainly reflected his eucharistic theology. Robert Parkyn shared his opinion of the new words of distribution and the rubric stating that kneeling did not imply adoration: "O how abhominable heresie and unsemynge ordre was this, lett every man pondre in his owne conscience."[243]

Baptism

The 1552 baptismal service was shorter than the 1549 service. Instructions for both public and private baptism were retained. The opening prayer was slightly shorter in 1552; signing the cross on the child's forehead, now a symbol of welcome into the congregation, and the Lord's Prayer were moved to follow baptism; exorcism, the creed, procession from the church door to the font, the chrisom, and anointing were omitted; the questions of belief were concatenated; triple immersion was replaced by single immersion; and some of the prayers that had been used for sanctifying newly changed font water were instead inserted into the service. Private baptism itself remained unchanged. In the public affirmation ceremony after private

---

[240] Ibid., 393.
[241] Ibid.
[242] Ibid.
[243] Parkyn, 75.

baptism, the questions about belief were concatenated and the chrisom was omitted. There were no instructions for changing the font water.

The omission of exorcism, procession, chrisom, and anointing were part of the reform trend to remove traditional Catholic elements of church ritual. Omitting the creed, concatenating the questions, and shortening the opening prayer were part of Cranmer's overall simplification project for the 1552 liturgy. These changes were not appreciated by everyone. Robert Parkyn complained, "From the sacramentt of baptissme was takyn bothe chrisom att uncttynge att breast & forheade, brynginge the childe att fyrst evin unto the foontt, and nothinge to be saide att churche doore as lawdablye was uside a foretyme."[244]

Confirmation

There were two changes of note in the 1552 version of catechism and confirmation. First, the ten commandments appeared in full (as taken from Exodus 20), rather than the partially abbreviated form used in the 1549 catechism. Second, crossing and laying on of hands was replaced by a simple prayer in the ceremony. These changes reflected Cranmer's concern with Christian education and his campaign against ceremonial liturgy. Surprisingly, Parkyn did not mention the second change in his list of complaints about the second Prayer Book, but he did criticize Cramner's policy of not confirming infants and small children: "No childe to be confirmyde att bischopps' handes unto itt cowde say by hertt tholle cathachisme, and so partt was nott able to be confirmyde skaresly att 7, 8 or 9 years of aige."[245]

Matrimony

There were several minor wording changes in the marriage ceremony. Specific mention of gold and silver was absent from the new version, though the groom still gave the bride a ring.

---

[244] Ibid., 75-76.
[245] Parkyn, 76.

The sign of the cross was left out. References to the altar were changed to Lord's table because all churches had been ordered to replace their stone altars with wooden communion tables. One of the 1549 prayers mentioned Tobit and Sara as examples; this was changed to Abraham and Sara in the 1552 version because the story of Tobit and Sara was in a book not considered part of the Protestant biblical canon. Naturally, Parkyn had a comment. "No golde or silver to be layde on the boyke att ministringe of holly matrimony, but a rynge only with preast & clerke dewttie, wiche rynge was putt uppon the woman's 4 fynger of her lefftt hande."[246]

Visitation of the Sick

The order for visitation of the sick was shortened by omitting Psalm 118, the anointing and sign of the cross, and Psalm 13. The anointing and sign of the cross were cut because they were reminiscent of extreme unction, which reformers did not recognize as a sacrament. Parkyn objected strenuously to this omission, citing scripture to back his opinion. "Extreme unction was utterly abolischide & none to be uside contraire tholly appostle S. James doctrine."[247] He referred to James 5:14 (King James Version), "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." Another significant change in the order for communion of the sick was that using reserved elements was banned. Formerly, they had been carried ceremoniously to the home of the sick one, encouraging worship—idolatrous worship, as reformers saw it—of the consecrated elements.

Burial

The burial service was significantly shortened in the 1552 Prayer Book. The entire service took place at graveside, and no communion was offered. The scripture readings for procession to the grave were the same. Several prayers for the dead and the three psalms were

---

[246] Ibid.
[247] Ibid.

omitted. The resurrection lesson from 1 Corinthians 15 and the *Kyrie* were retained. The final prayer was rewritten, replacing "hell and paynes of eternall derkenesse" with "the myseryes of this sinneful world."[248] The collect from the 1549 burial service communion was added after the last prayer to end the 1552 burial service.

In traditional Catholicism, the living and the dead maintained a close association through the veneration of relics, the cult of saints, and the practice of praying and offering masses for the release of souls from purgatory. Church of England doctrine, as stated in Article 23 of the Forty-Two Articles published in 1553, was that "the doctrine of School-authors concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."[249] Changes in the burial service were meant to discourage traditional thinking concerning the souls of the dead. The words of interment no longer directly addressed the body being laid in the grave with "I commende thy soule to God the father almighty, and thy body to the grounde."[250] The idea that one could talk *to* the dead was rejected. Instead the minister talked *about* the dead one: "it hathe pleased almightie God of his great mercy to take unto himselfe the soule of our dere brother here departed."[251] Deleting communion from the funeral service removed the association of "mass" with the souls of the dead. Parkyn caustically lamented the omission of the prayers for the dead: "No diriges or other devoutt prayers to be songe or saide for suche as was departtide this tranisitorie worlde, for thai nedyde none (saide the boyke). Why? By cawsse ther sowlles was immediattlye in blisse & joy after the departtynge

[248] *Prayer Books*, 275. Parallel, 427.
[249] Bray, 297.
[250] *Prayer Books*, 269.
[251] Ibid., 424-425.

from the bodies, and therfor thay nedyde no prayer."[252] Eamon Duffy summed up the intent of the 1552 burial service as "no longer a rite of intercession on behalf of the dead, but an exhortation to faith on the part of the living."[253]

Thanksgiving after Childbirth

This service gained a more positive connotation in the 1552 Prayer Book. The name of the ritual was changed from "the purification of women" to "the thanksgiving of women after childbirth" or, more commonly, "the churching of women."[254] This shift in emphasis was echoed in the rubrics referring to the woman: the 1549 "woman that is purifyed" was now the "woman that cometh to geve her thankes."[255] The woman no longer offered the child's chrisom because the chrisom was no longer used in the baptismal service.

Comminacion against Sinners

The comminacion (denunciation) against sinners was the 1549 Ash Wednesday service. Except for the title and subtitle, it remained unchanged. The subtitle indicated that the prayers of this service were no longer limited to Ash Wednesday but could be "used dyvers tymes in the yere."[256] Apparently Cranmer felt that congregations might need to be called to repentance more than once a year.

Ordinal

Changes were made in the Ordinal that was published after, but as companion to, the first Prayer Book. It was included at the end of the 1552 book, appearing in the table of contents as "The fourme and maner of makyng and consecrating of Bischoppes, Priestes, and Deacons."[257] Significantly, after Hooper's initial refusal to be ordained Bishop of Gloucester if he had to wear

---

[252] Parkyn, 76.
[253] Duffy, 475.
[254] *Prayer Books*, 428.
[255] Ibid.,, 279, 429.
[256] Ibid., 430.
[257] Ibid., 320.

a surplice and cope, the rubrics relating to vestments worn by candidates were omitted from all three services. Also related to the Hooper affair, the phrase in the Oath of the King's Supremacy requiring ordinands to swear by the saints that Edward had impulsively deleted at Hooper's ordination was changed from "so help me God, all Saints and the holy Evangelist" to "so help me God, through Jesus Christ."[258] Similarly, the closing words of the bishops' oath of obedience to the archbishop changed from "so helpe me God, and his holy gospell" to "so helpe me god throughe Jesus Chryste."[259] New priests had been presented with Bibles and chalices in the 1449 service; the omission of chalices in 1552 deemphasized the sacraments in favor of scriptural knowledge as the path to salvation. Also, there was no rubric indicating the bestowal of a pastoral staff on new bishops, although they were still admonished to "bee to the flocke of Christ a shepeherde."[260] The admonition without the presentation emphasized the ministering aspects of the office over ceremonial and adminstrative duties. Other changes to the 1552 Ordinal included minor wording changes and references to the introit in the service for priests (introits in general had been omitted in the 1552 book). Though somewhat subtle, revisions in the Ordinal made its services more evangelical than they had been in 1550.

THE LEGACY OF THE EDWARDIAN LITURGY

Edward got sick in February 1553 and soon developed a life-threatening illness.[261] Both the Succession Act of 1544 and Henry VIII's will stipulated that the staunchly Catholic Mary would assume the crown if Edward died childless, with Elizabeth next in line if Mary died without an heir. According to a document written in Secretary William Petre's hand, likely taken

---

[258] Ibid., 300, 446.
[259] Ibid., 314, 460.
[260] Ibid., 463.
[261] Loach, 159.

from notes Edward had written for a will, the king was concerned about religion in the realm. The second point of these so-called minutes was "our sayd executours shall not suffer any peece of relligion to be altred, And they shall diligently travayle to cause godly ecclesiasticall lawes to be made and sett forthe: suche as may bee agreable with the reformation of relligion now receyved within our realme."[262] Edward and Northumberland began to consider other options for the succession.

Edward produced "My devise for the succession," which disinherited his half-sisters in favor of the descendants of Henry's sister Mary.[263] The plan originally read that the crown would go "to the L'Janes heires masles." The first s was crossed out and two new words were inserted above the line so that it read "to the L'Jane and her heires masles."[264] Lady Jane Grey had married Northumberland's son, Lord Guildford Dudley, on 21 May 1553; perhaps Northumberland was the instigator of this "devise." On 15 June, the reluctant judges were convinced by the "sharp words and angry countenance" of the king to agree to the plan.[265] Legal papers were drawn up and signed by members of the government and leading citizens of London; many of these men later claimed they had been coerced by Northumberland.[266] Edward died on 6 July. His death was kept secret until seventeen-year-old Lady Jane was proclaimed queen in London on 10 July. Mary immediately rallied troops to her side and was proclaimed queen on 19 July. Support for Jane evaporated and Catholic Mary reigned.

As Edward's government had done six years earlier, Mary began to implement religious change almost immediately. Parkyn rejoiced that "in August ther was a proclamation sett furthe declaringe how the gratius Quene Marie dyd lycence preastes to say masse in Lattine after tholde

---

[262] Nichols, 2:574.
[263] For a Tudor family tree, see Nichols, 2:563. For the text of the "Devise" and its signatories, see Nichols, 2:571-573.
[264] Nichols, 2:564. See also Loach, 163.
[265] Nichols, 2:568.
[266] See Nichols, 2:569-570.

anncient custome."[267] The Statute of Repeal (1 Mary St. 2, c.2) repealed Edward's Acts of Uniformity and ordered a return to the liturgy used during the last year of Henry VIII's reign. The Marian Injunctions, issued 4 March 1554, listed specific instructions relating to liturgy and the conduct of clergy. In 1554 Mary also restored the authority of the pope over the English Church. She executed Cranmer on 21 March 1556. The return to Roman Catholicism was short-lived, however, as Mary died on 17 November 1558.

Elizabeth I ascended the throne upon Mary's death, and the religious pendulum swung back to the evangelical side. The 1559 Act of Supremacy (1 Elizabeth I, c.1) restored the monarch as Supreme Governor of the Church of England. The Act of Uniformity (1 Elizabeth I, c.2), which became effective 24 June 1559, repealed Mary's anti-Edwardian legislation and mandated use of a new Prayer Book. This 1559 Prayer Book was closely modeled on Cranmer's 1552 book.[268]

The Prayer Book that had introduced great change and inspired great passion for a small moment in time was given a second chance. The cumulative effects of Cranmer's two Prayer Books and related reform legislation had made an impression that survived the period of Marian exile. Sustained use of Cranmer's liturgies during Elizabeth's long reign and in the years beyond molded the character of worship in the Church of England, a distinct blend of centuries-old tradition and Reformation practice and theology. Cranmer's monumental reforming project, his desire to "set forth . . . a pattern to imitate," created a little Prayer Book That Could—and Did.

---

[267] Parkyn, 79. See also Cressy and Ferrell, 28, and Key and Bucholz, 68.
[268] See Bowers, 317-344, for discussion of Elizabeth's decision to use the 1552 Prayer Book.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bond, Ronald B. ed. *Certain Sermons or Homilies (1547) and A Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion (1570): A Critical Edition.* Toronto, Canada: Toronto University Press, 1987.

Bray, Gerald, ed. *Documents of the English Reformation.* Cambridge, UK: James Clark & Co., 1994.

Church of England. *The First and Second Prayer-Books of King Edward the Sixth.* Gibson, Edgar Charles Sumner, introd. Everyman's Library, no. 448, edited by Ernest Rhys. New York, NY: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1910. (A reproduction of the text is available at http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1549/BCP_1549.htm and http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/BCP_1552.htm).

Hughes, Paul L. and James F. Larkin, eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations. Volume 1: The Early Tudors (1485-1553).* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1964.

Jenkyns, Henry, ed. *The Remains of Thomas Cranmer.* 4 vols. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1833.

Jordan, W. K., ed. *The Chronicle and Political Papers of King Edward VI.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Meyer, Carl S., ed. *Cranmer's Selected Writings.* London, UK: S.P.C.K., 1961.

Nichols, John Gough, ed. *Literary Remains of King Edward the Sixth.* Burt Franklin Research & Source Works Series, no. 51. 2 vols. New York, NY: Burt Franklin, 1964.

Parkyn, Robert. "Robert Parkyn's Narrative of the Reformation." Edited by A. G. Dickens. *English Historical Review* 62, no. 242 (1947): 58-83.

Sourcebooks

Cressy, David, and Lori Anne Ferrell, eds. *Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook.* New York, NY: Routledge, 1996.

Fletcher, Anthony and Diarmaid MacCulloch. *Tudor Rebellions,* 4th ed. Seminar Studies in History, edited by Clive Emsley and Gordon Martel. New York, NY: Longman, 1997.

Key, Newton and Robert Bucholz, eds. *Sources and Debates in English History 1485-1714.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Secondary Sources

Bowers, Roger. "The Chapel Royal, the First Edwardian Prayer Book, and Elizabeth's Settlement of Religion, 1559." *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 2 (2000): 317-344.

Cressy, David. *Birth, Marriage, and Death: Ritual, Religion, and the Life-Cycle in Tudor and Stuart England.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Dickens, A. G. *The English Reformation,* 2d ed. London, UK: B. T. Batsford, 1989.

—. "The Early Expansion of Protestantism in England 1520-58." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 78 (1987): 187-222.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c. 1580.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Elton, G. R. *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558.* London, UK: Edward Arnold, 1977.

Griffiths, David N. *The Bibliography of the Book of Common Prayer 1549-1999.* New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors.* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Hall, Basil. "Cranmer, the Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI." In *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar,* edited by Paul Ayris and David Selwyn. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1993.

Loach, Jennifer. *Edward VI.* Edited by George Bernard and Penry Williams. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999.

—. *The Later Reformation in England, 1547-1603,* 2nd ed. British History in Perspective, edited by Jeremy Black. New York, NY: Palgrave, 2001.

—. "The Myth of the English Reformation." *The Journal of British Studies* 30, no. 1 (1991): 1-19.

—. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.

Maltby, Judith. "'By this Book': Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church." In *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642*, edited by Kenneth Fincham. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993.

—. *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England.* Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History, edited by Anthony Fletcher, John Guy, and John Morrill. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Rosendale, Timothy. "'Fiery Tongues:' Language, Liturgy, and the Paradox of the English Reformation." *Renaissance Quarterly* 54, no. 4.1 (2001): 1142-1164.

Shagan, Ethan. *Popular Politics and the English Reformation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Targoff, Ramie. *Common Prayer: The Language of Public Devotion in Early Modern England.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001.

CHRONOLOGY

Henry VIII

1533
Thomas Cranmer made Archbishop of Canterbury

February 1533
Act of Restraint in Appeals (24 Henry VIII, c.12)

1534
Treason Act

November 1534
Act of Supremacy (26 Henry VIII, c.1) abolishes papal supremacy in England

1535
Miles Coverdale's English Bible published in Zurich

1536
Act of Ten Articles

1536
Dissolution of small monasteries

1536
Cranmer begins correspondence with Heinrich Bullinger

1536-37
Pilgrimage of Grace led by Robert Aske in northern England

1537
Bishops' Book explains Ten Articles

1537
Thomas Matthew's English Bible

12 October 1537
Future King Edward VI born to Henry VIII and 3rd wife Jane Seymour

24 October 1537
Edward's mother Jane Seymour dies

By 1538
Cranmer produces private draft of morning and evening prayer

1538-39
Dissolution of large monasteries

June 1539
Act for the Abolishing of Diversity in Opinion (31 Henry VIII, c.14), aka Act of Six Articles

14 November 1539
Henry VIII sponsors Great Bible through royal proclamation

1539
English Protestants take refuge in Switzerland as government swings anti-Protestant

6 March 1541
Royal proclamation orders English Bible to be placed in every church

1542
Committee of Convocation appointed to consider reformation of service books

1543
King's Book

21 February 1543
Order of Convocation for parish curates to read publicly one chapter from English Bible at matins and at vespers on Sundays and Holy Days

1544
Cranmer writes English litany for use "in times of processions"

1544
Cranmer instructed to write a prayer book in English based on service at Salisbury Cathedral

July 1544
Richard Cox starts as Edward's first tutor

Edward VI

28 January 1547
Henry VIII dies; Edward VI is king

31 January 1547
Executors elect Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, as Lord Protector of the Realm and Governor of the King's Person

February 1547
Edward Seymour named Duke of Somerset; Thomas Seymour made Lord Sudeley and Lord Admiral of England; John Dudley, Lord Lisle, made Earl of Warwick and Lord Great Chamberlain

20 February 1547
King Edward's coronation

23 February 1547
Nicholas Ridley denounces images and holy water in Ash Wednesday sermon at court; iconoclasm in London and Southampton results

Late April 1547
Holy Roman Emperor Charles V victorious over Schmalkaldic League at Muhlberg; first wave of Protestant refugees to England

May 1547
Royal visitation of churches announced

31 July 1547
Royal proclamation proclaims injunctions for religious reform and publishing of *Certain Sermons or Homilies*

Late August 1547
Invasion of Scotland

Early September 1547
Royal visitation of churches begins; Edmund Bonner and Stephen Gardiner imprisoned for protesting visitation articles and imposition of *Homilies*

Late Summer-Autumn 1547
Stained-glass windows removed in London and other areas; images pulled down in St. Paul's and elsewhere

10 September 1547
Duke of Somerset victorious over Scots at Pinkie

November 1547
Italian reformers Pietro Martire Vermigli (Peter Martyr) and Bernardino Ochino arrive in England

4 November 1547-15 April 1552
Edward's first parliament

4 November-24 December 1547
1st session of Edward's 1st parliament

November 1547
Sacrament Act (1 Edward VI, c.1) orders communion in both kinds for laity; put into effect through Order of the Communion

December 1547
Chantries Act (1 Edward VI, c.14) allows crown seizure of thousands of chantries and guilds

December 1547
Convocation and Commons pass Act to Take Away All Positive Laws against the Marriage of Priests (2 and 3 Edward VI, c.21) that legalized clerical marriage (passes Lords in February 1549)

December 1547
Inventory of church plate by diocese ordered

1548
Government orders visitations of Oxford and Cambridge

January 1548
Council order forbids traditional ceremonies for Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday

6 February 1548
Royal proclamation prohibits private innovations in ceremonies

21 February 1548
Council orders destruction of all images in all churches

February 1548
Spanish reformer Francisco Enzinas (Francis Dryander) arrives in England

March 1548
Peter Martyr appointed professor of divinity at Oxford

8 March 1548
Royal proclamation announces Order of the Communion, to be in use on 1 April 1548, Easter Sunday

24 April 1548
Royal proclamation forbids preaching without a license granted by king, Somerset, or Cranmer; those without licenses to read *Homilies* instead of preaching

1 July 1548
Bishop Stephen Gardiner imprisoned in the Tower after a St. Peter's Day (June 29) sermon; writes *Explication and Assertion of the Catholic Faith* defending transubstantiation

July 1548
Augsburg Interim proclaimed by Holy Roman Emperor Charles V; evangelicals flee to England

Summer 1548
Polish reformer Jan Łaski arrives in England

23 September 1548
Royal proclamation forbids all preaching; *Homilies* must be read until Prayer Book is published

September-December 1548
Prayer Book committee meets under Cranmer's leadership at Chertsey Abbey

24 November 1548-14 March 1549
2nd session of Edward's first parliament; 2 and 3 Edward VI, c.19 reduces number of holy days

December 1548
Prayer Book presented to Parliament

13 December 1548
Bill for Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments introduced in House of Lords

14-19 December 1548
Parliamentary debate in House of Lords focuses on eucharist

15 January 1549
House of Lords passes Act of Uniformity (2 and 3 Edward VI, c.1)

17 January 1549
Thomas Seymour imprisoned in the Tower for high treason

21 January 1549
Commons passes Act of Uniformity that requires use of Prayer Book by 9 June 1549

February 1549
House of Lords passes Act to Take Away All Positive Laws against the Marriage of Priests

15 February 1549
Inventory of church plate by county ordered

7 March 1549
Earliest dated extant copies of Prayer Book, printed by Edward Whitchurche

8 March 1549
First printing of Prayer Book by Richard Grafton

14 March 1549
Act of Uniformity receives royal assent

19 March 1549
Thomas Seymour executed

25 April 1549
German reformers Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius arrive in England; Bucer later appointed Regius Chair of Divinity and Fagius professor of Hebrew at Cambridge

May 1549
John Hoooper returns to England after exile in Zurich

June 1549
Royal proclamation sets price limits for Prayer Book

1 June 1549
Oxford disputation re eucharist begins; evangelicals led by Peter Martyr, conservatives by William Chedzey, William Tresham, and Morgan Phillips

9 June 1549
Whitsunday (Pentecost); Prayer Book ordered into exclusive use

June-July 1549
Oxfordshire Riots; put down in mid-July by Lord Henry Grey of Wilton; leaders (including four priests) hanged

10 June-mid-August 1549
Western Rising in Devon and Cornwall against the Prayer Book led by vicar Robert Welsh; rebels lay siege to Exeter; put down by John Russell, Lord Privy Seal; leaders (clerics) executed

20 June 1549
Cambridge Disputation re eucharist begins

9 July-27 August 1549
[Robert] Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk, East Anglia; no major religious component; rebels completely put down on 27 August by Earl of Warwick at Mousehold Heath

September 1549
Bishop Edmund Bonner imprisoned for preaching in defense of transubstantiation

October 1549
Duke of Somerset overthrown by Privy Council; he "confesses" on 24 Oct; imprisoned in Tower; John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, moves into power as King Edward's leading adviser

4 November 1549-1 February 1550
Parliament session; 3 and 4 Edward VI, c.10 enacted against images and ancient service books

Late 1549
3 and 4 Edward VI, c.12 empowers King Edward to appoint committee to prepare Ordinal

25 December 1549
Royal proclamation orders bishops to destroy old service books

1550
Stranger Churches organized in London; total membership ca 3000-4000

1550
War against France and Scotland ends; treaty negotiated by Earl of Warwick

1550
Book of Common Prayer Noted, a musical directory for Prayer Book by John Merbecke, published

January 1550
Committee appointed to prepare Ordinal

2 February 1550
Earl of Warwick made Lord President of Council

6 February 1550
Duke of Somerset released from Tower

18 February 1550
Duke of Somerset pardoned by King Edward

March 1550
Earl of Warwick negotiates treaty ending war with France

March 1550
Ordinal published

March 1550
Bishop Nicholas Heath imprisoned in the Fleet for "failure to subscribe to the new Ordinal"; deposed as Bishop of Worcester

1 April 1550
Ordinal ordered into use by this date

3 April 1550
Retiring Bishop William Rugge (Repps) of Norwich replaced by Thomas Thirlby of Westminster; Bishop Edmund Bonner of London replaced by Nicholas Ridley of Rochester

10 April 1550
Duke of Somerset restored to Council

2 May 1550
Execution at stake of unitarian activist Joan Bocher (Joan of Kent); the first of two executions for heresy in Edward's reign

14 May 1550
Duke of Somerset restored to Privy Chamber

June 1550
Earl of Warwick's son Lord Lisle marries Duke of Somerset's daughter Lady Anne at Sheen

June 1550
Nicholas Ridley issues visitation articles for London; orders replacement of altars with communion tables in London diocese; others follow his lead throughout spring and summer

30 June 1550
John Ponet made Bishop of Rochester

July 1550
John Hooper nominated as Bishop of Gloucester; refuses nomination because he will not wear the vestments required by the Ordinal

Summer 1550
Cranmer's *Defence of the true and Catholic doctrine of the sacrament of the body and blood of our saviour Christ* published

Summer 1550
Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall under house arrest

November 1550
Council orders bishops to replace remaining altars with communion tables

December 1550
Bishop George Day imprisoned in the Fleet for refusing to enforce order against altars

15 December 1550
Stephen Gardiner's trial opens

Early 1551
John Hooper imprisoned in the Fleet prison for refusing to be consecrated as Bishop of Gloucester

1551
Cranmer publishes an *Answer* to Stephen Gardiner's attack on Cranmer's *Defence*

January 1551
Martin Bucer publishes *Cesura*, a criticism of Prayer Book

Mid-January 1551
John Hooper imprisoned in Lambeth Palace

23 January-15 April 1551
Parliament session

28 January 1551
King Edward writes angry letter to Mary telling her to obey his laws re use of Prayer Book

14 February 1551
Stephen Gardiner trial ends; deprived as Bishop of Winchester and imprisoned in Tower

15 February 1551
John Hooper capitulates re vestments

28 February 1551
Martin Bucer dies

March 1551
John Ponet made Bishop of Winchester; replaces deprived Stephen Gardiner; John Scory replaces John Ponet as Bishop of Rochester

17 March 1551
King Edward and Mary meet over Mary's refusal to follow Prayer Book

25 April 1551
Execution of unitarian activist George van Parris at Smithfield; second of two executions for heresy in Edward's reign

Summer 1551
King Edward and Council require Cranmer to frame Articles of Religion

20 July 1551
John Hooper consecrated as Bishop of Gloucester; replaces late John Wakeman

August 1551
Privy Council forbids Mary's household to hear mass

August 1551
John Veysey forced to retire as Bishop of Exeter; succeeded by Miles Coverdale

October 1551
George Day deprived of Bishopric of Chichester; succeeded by John Scory, Bishop of Rochester, in May 1552

October 1551
Nicholas Heath deprived of Bishopric of Worcester

11 October 1551
John Dudley, Earl of Warwick, made Duke of Northumberland

16 October 1551
Duke of Somerset imprisoned in the Tower for treason

November 1551
John Knox preaches before King Edward and the Privy Council against kneeling at communion

December 1551
Commission appointed to revise canon law

1 December 1551
Duke of Somerset's trial for treason for plotting to kill Duke of Northumberland begins

22 January 1552
Duke of Somerset beheaded

29 January 1552
Council appoints commission to inventory church plate in each county

23 January-15 April 1552
Parliamentary session; 5 and 6 Edward VI, c.3 omits Conversion of St. Paul, St. Barnaby, Mary Magdalen as holy days

20 February 1552
Royal proclamation orders punishment for irreverence in churches

April 1552
Second Act of Uniformity (5 and 6 Edward VI, c.1) authorizes 1552 Prayer Book; Prayer Book to be in use 1 November 1552

May 1552
John Hooper consecrated as Bishop of Worcester (still serving as Bishop of Gloucester); John Scory, Bishop of Rochester, made Bishop of Chichester; John Taylor, Dean of Lincoln, made Bishop of Lincoln

September 1552
Cranmer submits draft Articles of Religion

27 September 1552
Printing of Prayer Book stopped per order of Council; controversy over kneeling at communion

October 1552
Cuthbert Tunstall deprived as Bishop of Durham

22 October 1522
Council decides to add "Black Rubric" to Prayer Book

27 October 1552
Royal proclamation declares meaning of kneeling at communion, aka Black Rubric

1 November 1552
Allhallow Day/All Saints Day; revised Prayer Book comes into use

Late 1552
First edition of Prayer Book that includes psalter

1553
Protestant Short Catechism written by Bishop John Ponet

Early 1553
Draft of canon law revision, *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum,* ready to present to Parliament

February 1553
King Edward becomes ill

March 1553
King Edward's 2nd parliament dissolved

April 1553
Confiscation of church plate and valuables ordered

21 May 1553
Lady Jane Grey marries Lord Guildford Dudley (Northumberland's son)

19 June 1553
Forty-Two Articles of Religion published

Summer 1553
Duke of Northumberland blocks passage of *Reformatio* in House of Lords

6 July 1553
King Edward dies

Lady Jane Grey

10 July 1553
Lady Jane Grey proclaimed queen in London

19 July 1553
Lady Jane Grey deposed

Mary I

19 July 1553
Ascension of Mary I

21 July 1553
Duke of Northumberland arrested

25 July 1553
Duke of Northumberland imprisoned in the Tower

August (?) 1553
Duke of Northumberland executed

5-6 August 1663
Bishops Stephen Gardiner, George Day, and Cuthbert Tunstall released from prison

8 August 1553
King Edward's funeral

18 August 1553
Mary I allows but does not require priests to say mass in Latin

14 September 1553
Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer imprisoned in the Tower

4 October 1553
Archbishop of York Robert Holgate imprisoned in the Tower

5-21 October 1553
Parliament session; first Act of Repeal (1 Mary St. 2, c.2)

4 March 1554
Marian Injunctions

November 1554
Cardinal Reginald Pole back to England as papal legate

12 November 1554-16 January 1555
Parliament session; second Act of Repeal (1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c.8)

16 October 1555
Nicholas Ridley and Hugh Latimer burned at stake

21 March 1556
Cranmer burned at stake

Elizabeth I

17 November 1558
Mary I dies; ascension of Elizabeth I

1559
Act of Supremacy (1 Elizabeth I, c.1)

8 May 1559
Act of Uniformity (1 Elizabeth I, c.2)

24 June 1559
1559 Prayer Book to be in general use

1559
Elizabethan Injunctions

1563
Thirty-Nine Articles