

A. E. SCHIRMER

Concordia Theological Monthly



A P R I L

• 1 9 5 6

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXVII

APRIL 1956

No. 4

Cranmer's Legacy

By CARL S. MEYER

*The xxj day of Marche {1556} was bornyd
at Oxford doctur Cranmer, late archebysshope
of Canturbere.¹*

AT Oxford in the nineteenth century at the height of the Tractarian Movement, the Evangelicals believed that the Tractarians had shown themselves opposed to the principles of the Reformation. Partially to counteract this movement a proposal was made to erect a memorial to the Reformation martyrs. Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley—the three men who had been burnt opposite Balliol College—were to be honored especially. Latimer and Ridley had died together there on October 16, 1555. Five months later, on the 21st of March, 1556, “in the same place where Ridley and Latimer had suffered,” Thomas Cranmer was burnt.² The proposed memorial to these men was oversubscribed. Designed by Sir Gilbert Scot, it still stands today near St. Mary Magdalene's Church as a testimony of the faith of these martyrs. Thus, in the minds of some, Oxford University reaffirmed the historic Protestantism of the Church of England and of the University.³

The story of the martyrdom of these men has been told by John Foxe. Latimer and Ridley “played the man” in their deaths,

¹ *The Diary of Henry Machen, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*, ed. John Gough Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1848), p. 103.

² Richard Grafton, *Chronicle II* (London, 1809), 554. The original title was: *A Chronicle at large and meere history of the affayres of England . . . to the first yeere . . . of Queen Elizabeth* (London: 1568, 1569).

³ J. S. Reynolds, *The Evangelicals at Oxford: 1735—1871* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953), pp.110—112. The wording of the inscription is found on p. 111.

but the death of Cranmer was more glorious than the last months of his life. During his imprisonment "of all the Marian martyrs . . . archbishop Cranmer, of the mildest and meekest temper . . ." ⁴ had weakened. His recantations (there were six of them altogether) do him little credit, although it seems that he received a thorough sixteenth-century "brainwashing" before he wrote them. At the stake, however, he repudiated his retractions and renounced the pope "with all his false doctrine." ⁵

Whatever his faults may have been, he repented of them and pleaded for God's mercy, relying wholly on the merits of Christ. In words of great literary beauty with intense sincerity, words which every sinner might make his own, a poignant penitential plea for pity, Cranmer prayed there at Oxford on that "foul and rainy" March morning:

O Father of heaven, O Son of God, Redeemer of the world, O Holy Ghost, three persons and one God, have mercy upon me most wretched caitiff and miserable sinner. I have offended both against heaven and earth, more than my tongue can express. Whither then may I go, or whither shall I flee? To heaven I may be ashamed to lift up mine eyes, and in earth I find no place of refuge or succour. To thee therefore, O Lord, do I run; to thee do I humble myself, saying, O Lord my God, my sins be great, but yet have mercy upon me for thy great mercy. The great mystery that God became man, was not wrought for little or few offences. Thou didst not give thy Son, O heavenly Father, unto death for small sins only, but for all the greatest sins of the world, so that the sinner return to thee with his whole heart, as I do here at this present. Wherefore have mercy on me, O God, whose property is always to have mercy; have mercy upon

⁴ Thomas Fuller, *The Church History of Britain* . . . a new edition (London: Thomas Tegg & Son, 1837), II, Book VIII, Cent. XVI, Sect. II, 3 Mary, 25, 26, p. 399.

Cranmer's weakness had been recognized even before any persecution came his way. "We desire nothing more for him than a firm and manly spirit." John Hooper to Henry Bullinger, London, December 27, 1549, *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation* . . . ed. Hastings Robinson for the Parker Society (Cambridge: University Press, 1846), Letter XXXVI, I, 71. [Hereafter cited as *Original Letters*, PS.]

⁵ John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed., Stephen Cattley (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1839) VIII, 88. [Hereafter cited as Foxe, ed. Cattley.] Cf. pp. 80—85 for the recantation. Foxe speaks of it only in general terms as one recantation. He gives the full text of Cranmer's final confession.

John Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials, Relating Chiefly to Religion, and the Reformation of It and the Emergencies of the Church of England, under King Henry VIII, King Edward VI, and Queen Mary I* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1822), III, i, 388—400. Strype gives the text of each of the six recantations.

me, O Lord, for thy great mercy. I crave nothing for mine own merits, but for thy name's sake, that it may be hallowed thereby, and for thy dear Son Jesus Christ's sake. And now therefore, "Our Father of heaven, hallowed be thy name," &c.⁶

The man who spoke this prayer had been consecrated as Archbishop of Canterbury on March 30, 1533. During 1534 Henry VIII and his Parliament made the break with Rome; Cranmer, however, was retained as archbishop. The Submission of the Clergy and Restraint of Appeals statute,⁷ the Ecclesiastical Appointments Act—the Absolute Restraints of Annates, Election of Bishops, and Letters Missive Act,⁸ the Act Forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence,⁹ and the First Act of Succession,¹⁰ all passed in the spring of that year, paved the way for the Supremacy Act passed in November, in which it was enacted "that the king, our sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*; . . ." ¹¹

In spite of the gyrations of Henry's policies during the next thirteen years Cranmer remained the friend and devoted subject of his monarch. His influence was more evident during the reign of the boy king, Edward VI (1547—53); it was subjected to a temporary setback during the reign of Mary I (1553—58), under whom he suffered martyrdom.

Cranmer's influence has not yet died. It is present in the Book of Common Prayer and in the *Thirty-nine Articles*; it was exercised through the *Book of Homilies*, the Catechism issued as

⁶ Foxe, ed., Cattle, VIII, 87.

The manuscript from which Foxe copied this prayer has been reprinted; the critical notes there given leave little doubt of its authenticity. See *Narratives of the Days of the Reformation*, chiefly from the manuscripts of John Foxe the Martyrologist; with two contemporary biographies of Archbishop Cranmer, ed. John Gough Nichols (Westminster: Printed for the Camden Society, 1859), pp. 229, 230.

⁷ 25 Henry VIII, cap. 19; *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, eds. Henry Gee and William Hardy (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896), LI, 195—200.

⁸ 25 Henry VIII, cap. 20; *ibid.*, LII, 201—209.

⁹ 25 Henry VIII, cap. 21; *ibid.*, LIII, 209—232.

¹⁰ 25 Henry VIII, cap. 22; *ibid.*, LIV, 232—243.

¹¹ 26 Henry VIII, cap. 1; *ibid.*, LV, 243, 244.

"Cranmer's Catechism," and the Bible translation known as "Cranmer's Bible." There were other avenues of influence, but none probably more important than these. A brief survey of this legacy may perhaps serve as a modest literary memorial to Cranmer.

I

CRANMER'S BIBLE

Thomas Cranmer did not translate the Scriptures. The Bible editions of 1540 and 1541, known as "Cranmer's Bible," were called that because of the preface which he wrote for them, "A prologue or preface made by the / most reverend father in God, Thomas Archbyshop of Canturbury / Metropolytan and Prymate of England."¹²

Of Cranmer's interest in the Bible and his readiness to promote the reading of Scriptures there can be little doubt. How influential his preface was cannot be measured. His message, nevertheless, is still timely.

Cranmer addressed "two sondrye sortes of people," those who need a spur and those who need a bridle. The first class comprises those who do not want to read the Bible nor hear it read; the second class, those who read the Bible so that they can dispute the more. He gives three reasons for reading Scripture: (a) God's

¹² Facsimile reprinted in Harold R. Willoughby, *The First Authorized English Bible and the Cranmer Preface* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), p. 22.

A modernized version, in addition to the facsimile, of this preface is given by Willoughby; the modernization is the work of Herndon Wagers.

The preface can be found also in John Strype, *Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1812), II, Appendix CIV, 1020—34.

See also *The Fathers of the English Church*; or, A Selection from the Writings of the Reformers and Early Protestant Divines, of the Church of England. Vol. III, "Various Tracts and Extracts from the Works of Thomas Cranmer, with a Memorial of His Life" (London: John Hatchard, 1809), pp. 54—70.

Cranmer, however, should not be credited directly with the promulgation of the 1539 edition. See, e. g., Hugh Pope, *English Versions of the Bible*, revised and amplified by Sebastian Bullough (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1952), p. 73 n.

The Bible itself, in several editions, had the inscription: "The Byble in / Englyshe, that is to saye the con- / tēt of all the holy scrypture, both / of ye olde, and newe testamēt, with / a prologe therinto, made by / the reverende father in God, Thomas / archbyssshop of Cantor / bury. / This is the Byble apoynted / to the use of the churches." Willoughby, p. 21.

Word is light; (b) custom has sanctioned the reading of Scripture in the vernacular; (c) it avails much to read God's Word. He quotes Chrysostom at some length to show the benefits of Bible reading. All manner of men are encouraged to read this book, for it contains "fruitful instruction and erudition for every man." Cranmer also points out that the King, Henry VIII, as the Supreme Head of the Church, had approved the reading of Scripture.¹³ Cranmer, it may be remarked incidentally, set great store by the king's authority.

To the second class of readers, those who abuse the Scriptures and come to them as "idle babblers and talkers of the Scripture out of season and all good order," he wrote:

Wherefore I would advise you all, that come to the reading or hearing of this book, which is the word of God, the most precious jewel, and most holy relic that remaineth upon earth, that you bring with you the fear of God, and that you do it with all due reverence, and use your knowledge thereof, not to vainglory of frivolous disputation, but to the honour of God, increase of virtue, and edification both of yourselves and other.¹⁴

He cites Gregory of Nazianzus, as he had cited Chrysostom in the first part, to support his argument by an appeal to authority.

In his official capacity as Archbishop of Canterbury Cranmer also promoted the reading and study of Scripture in other ways. "A Declaration to be read by al Curates upon the publishing of the Bible in English," emphasizing the king's role in promoting the reading of Scripture, is extant.¹⁵ Cranmer had been influential in getting Convocation to pass a resolution on December 9, 1534, asking for the translation of Scripture "into the vulgar tongue, by some honest and learned men, to be nominated by the King."¹⁶

¹³ "A Prologue or Preface Made by the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, Metropolitan and Primate of England," *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, edited for the Parker Society by Edmund Cox (Cambridge: University Press, 1846), pp. 121, 122. [Hereafter cited as Cranmer, Works, ed. Cox, PS, II.] Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, II, Appendix CIV, 1027 f; facsimile in Willoughby, loc. cit.

¹⁴ Cranmer, Works, ed. Cox, PS, II, 122; Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, II, Appendix CIV, 1029; facsimile in Willoughby, loc. cit.

¹⁵ Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, II, Appendix, XXIII, 735, 736. Undated.

¹⁶ Ibid., I, 34; Albert F. Pollard, *Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation*, 1489—1556 (New York and London: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1906), pp. 109—111. G. Constant, *The Reformation in England*, trans. E. I. Watkin (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1942), II, 19.

Cranmer took "an old English translation" of the New Testament—and sent portions of it to nine or ten of "the best learned Bishops" for their correction and revision. He would serve as editor. He did the same with the Old Testament.¹⁷ However, his plan did not work out. When the Great Bible was published by Richard Grafton in 1537, Cranmer was instrumental in obtaining the regal endorsement of that edition.¹⁸ During Lent in 1538 Cranmer lectured on the Epistle to the Hebrews in the chapter house of the monastery of the Holy Trinity in Canterbury.¹⁹ In the articles of visitation which he set up for the Canterbury diocese in 1548 Cranmer wished the visitors to inquire: "Whether they have discouraged any person from reading any part of the Bible, either in Latin or in English, but rather comforted and exhorted every person to read the same, as the very lively word of God, and the special food of man's soul."²⁰

The Cathedral Chapter at Canterbury was to have Scriptures read at mealtime.²¹ In various ways Cranmer showed his active

¹⁷ Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, I, 48, 49.

¹⁸ Ibid., I, 81—86. See ibid., I, 115—122 regarding other editions and ibid., II, 637—642. Pope, *English Versions of the Bible*, pp. 178—180. Pope was disturbed because "the Great Bible was substantially Tyndale's."

Brooke Foss Westcott, *A General View of the History of the Bible*, 3d ed., revised by William Aldis Wright (New York: Macmillan Co., 1905), p. 77.

The documents regarding the licensing of Matthew's Bible are printed in *Records of the English Bible: The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525—1611*, ed. Alfred W. Pollard (London: Oxford University Press, 1911), pp. 214—222.

T. Harwood Pattison, *The History of the English Bible*, 5th ed., revised (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1938), pp. 64—69.

J. S. Mombert, *English Versions of the Bible*, new and enlarged edition (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., n. d.), pp. 201—239.

Pollard, *Cranmer*, pp. 111—114.

J. F. Mozley, *Coverdale and His Bibles* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 307, refers to "the secular powers, aided by Cranmer," as "promoting the cause of the English Bible."

¹⁹ Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, I, 90.

²⁰ *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, eds. Walter H. Frere and William Kennedy (Alcuin Club Collections, XV) (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1910), II (1536—58), 179.

Ibid., II, 117—119, paragraph 7 of the "Royal Injunctions of Edward VI, 1547" which may have been written by Cranmer. The injunction adds "... that all Christian persons are bound to embrace, believe and follow, if they look to be saved: whereby they may know their duties to God, to their sovereign lord, the king, and their neighbor. . . ."

²¹ Ibid., II, 249: "Whether you have every day some part of Holy Scripture read in English at your table, in the time of your meals."

interest in promoting Bible reading. Writing in answer to the demand that the English Bible be recalled (1549), he expressed his grief and defended the dissemination of Scriptures in the vernacular. It would serve, he said, for comfort, for edification, and for the refutation of heresy for laymen and for priests.²² "The Bible was Cranmer's Ark of the Covenant. . . ." ²³

Strype calls Cranmer "a great scripturist" and says that he was "the chief repairer of the reputation of the holy Scriptures."²⁴ His concern for Scripture may be seen from a letter addressed to Matthew Parker when Parker was invited to preach at London on July 22, 1548. He does not doubt that Parker "will purely and sincerely set out the holy scriptures, so as God's glory may be advanced, and the people with wholesome doctrine edified."²⁵ His Catechism, too, contains a panegyric of Scripture in the "Epistle" addressed to Edward VI that is worth quoting:

And what can be more apte to be grauen or paynted in the tender hertes of youthe, then Goddes holy worde? what can lead them a ryghter way to god, to thobedience of theyr Prince and to al vertue and honestie of lyfe, then the syncere vnderstandyng of Gods worde? whyche alone sheweth the waye howe to knowe hym, to loue hym and to serue hym. What can better kepe and staye them, that they do not sodenly and lyghtly fall agayne from theyr fayth? What can cause them more constantly to wythstande thassaultes of the Deuyll, the worlde and the fleshe, and manfullye to beare the crosse of Christ, then to lerne in their youth to practise the same? And verely it semeth no new thing that the children of them that be godly, should be thus instructed in the faythe and commandementes of God, euen from their infancye. For doeth not God commaunde hys people to teache hys lawe, vnto theyr chyldren and chylders chyldern? Hath not thys knowledge continued from tyme to tyme, amongst them to whome God promysed to be theyr God, and they hys people? Doeth it not appeare by playne expressed wordes of

²² Thomas Cranmer, "Answers to the Fifteen Articles of the Rebels, Devon, Anno 1549," *Works*, II, PS, p. 183.

It might be noted that the confutation of heresy is also a cogent argument in "Udall's Answer to the Commoners of Devonshire and Cornwall," *Troubles Connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*, ed. Nicholas Pocock (Westminster: printed for the Camden Society, 1884), pp. 141—145.

²³ Pollard, *Cranmer*, p. 229.

²⁴ Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, II, 637.

²⁵ Archbishop Cranmer to Dr. Matthew Parker, May 5, 1548, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, edited for the Parker Society by John Bruce (Cambridge: University Press, 1853), XXVII, 39.

In another letter Cranmer commends Parker for his "godly zeal in the advancement of God's Word." Archbishop Cranmer to Dr. Matthew Parker, February 17, 1548—49, *ibid.*, XXIX, 40.

Paule, that Timothe was broughte vp euen from a chylde in holy scriptures? Hath not the commaundementes of Almyghtye God, thartycles of the Christian faythe, and the Lordes Prayer, been euer necessarelye (since Christes tyme) requyred of all, both yonge and olde, that professed Christes name, yea though they were not learned to reade? For doubtless in these thre pointes is shortlye and playnlye included the necessarye knowledge, of the whole summe of Christes religion, and of all thynges appertynyng vnto euerlastyng lyfe.²⁶

These words of Cranmer demonstrated the truth of what an eminent historian, writing for popular study, has said: "If Cranmer's greatest contribution to the English Reformation was his continuous care for the introduction of the Bible to the people, his next most important service was the provision of a service book in English."²⁷ The latter has been recognized more readily than the former. It is entirely in keeping with Cranmer's theology to emphasize his zeal for Scriptures and the dissemination of Scriptures. Between 1533 and 1553, during the time Cranmer was the leading churchman of England, seventy editions of the Bible or the New Testament appeared in English. Not all, but also not a few, of these were due to Cranmer's concern.²⁸ "Cranmer is fairly entitled to the chief credit for introducing . . . the open Bible; . . ."²⁹

²⁶ *A Short Instruction into Christian Religion*, being a Catechism set forth by Archbishop Cranmer in MDXLVIII: together with the same in Latin, translated from the German by Justus Jonas in MDXXXIX, ed. Edward Burton (Oxford: University Press, 1829), pp. xxxiii—xxxiv [cited as Burton, ed., *Catechism*].

²⁷ F. E. Hutchinson, *Cranmer and the English Reformation*, Teach Yourself History Library, ed. A. L. Rowse (New York: Macmillan Co., 1951), p. 93.

²⁸ T. H. Darlow and H. F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society* (London: Bible House, 1903), I (English) 4—59. Each edition is described briefly.

Bibles, Testaments, Psalms, and other Books of the Holy Scriptures in English. In the collection of Lea Wilson (London: 1845), "Preface," p. 5. Seven editions of Cranmer's folio Bible appeared between 1539 and 1541. They are No. 7, pp. 18, 19, L. Folio, April 1540; No. 8, p. 20, L. Folio, July 1540; No. 9, pp. 21, 22, L. Folio, May, 1541; No. 10, pp. 22, 23, L. Folio, December 1541; No. 11, pp. 23, 24, L. Folio, November 1540; No. 12, pp. 24, 25, Folio, November 1541; No. 13, pp. 25, 26, Folio, 1540. *Berthelet*.

H. S. Bennett, *English Books and Readers, 1475 to 1557*. Being a Study in the History of the Book Trade from Caxton to the Incorporation of the Stationers' Company (Cambridge: University Press, 1952), p. 34.

²⁹ Arthur D. Innes, *Cranmer and the Reformation in England* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), pp. 88, 89.

Of extreme importance in promoting the reading and use of Scripture was "A Fruitful Exhortation to the Reading and Knowledge of Holy Scripture," the first of the homilies in the *Book of Homilies* of 1547. It was almost certainly written by Thomas Cranmer.³⁰ It begins: "Unto a Christian man there can be nothing either more necessary or profitable, than the knowledge of holy Scripture, forasmuch as in it is contained God's true word, setting forth his glory, and also man's duty. And there is no truth nor doctrine necessary for our justification and everlasting salvation, but that is, or may be, drawn out of that fountain and well of truth."³¹ His exhortation for reading the Scriptures is theocentric:

For in holy Scripture is fully contained what we ought to do, and what to eschew, what to believe, what to love, and what to look for at God's hands at length. In these books we shall find the Father from whom, the Son by whom, and the Holy Ghost in whom all things have their being and keeping up; and these three persons be but one God, and one substance. In these books we may learn to know ourselves, how vile and miserable we be; and also to know God, how good he is of himself, and how he maketh all creatures partakers of his goodness. We may learn also in these books to know God's will and pleasure, as much as, for this present time, is convenient for us to know.³²

Its benefits to mankind are such, Cranmer points out, that it ought to be read diligently. He cites both Chrysostom and Augustine to support his contentions. An interesting, almost incidental, remark indicates his Renaissance leanings: "Although other sciences be good, and to be learned, yet no man can deny but this is the chief, and passeth all other incomparably."³³ To him the Bible was meat, a "light lantern," a jewel, the best part.³⁴ Therefore the Scriptures ought to be read humbly, with a meek and lowly heart, with prayer. Even though some places be difficult to understand,

³⁰ *The Two Books of Homilies Appointed to Be Read in Churches*, ed. John Griffith (Oxford: At the University Press, 1859), photostatic copy of preface, p. xxvii.

³¹ "A Fruitful Exhortation to the Reading and Knowledge of Holy Scripture," Part I, Homily I, *Sermons or Homilies Appointed to Be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory*, in two parts, to which are added the Constitution and Canons Ecclesiastical and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, 4th ed. (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1816), p. 1.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 3.

they should be read diligently — a note that was necessary to the sixteenth-century reader. "If we read once, twice, or thrice, and understand not, let us not cease to, but still continue reading, praying, asking of others, and so by still knocking, at last, the door shall be opened; . . ." ³⁵ To Thomas Cranmer the Scriptures were "one of God's chief and principal benefits to mankind here on earth." ³⁶

Among those who valued Cranmer's position on the Scriptures was the German Lutheran Pietist August Hermann Francke. He issued a brochure on Cranmer to promote Bible reading. ³⁷ In that way Cranmer repaid part of the debt which he owed German Lutheranism.

II

CRANMER'S CATECHISM

The work popularly known as "Cranmer's Catechism" ³⁸ — acknowledging Cranmer's interest in the instruction of the youth — was only in part the product of Cranmer's direct industry; more so, however, than was "Cranmer's Bible." In the case of the Catechism, Cranmer directly promoted its translation, edited it, and supervised its publication; he also wrote the dedicatory preface for it.

There has been some question about the actual translator of this book, for it was not originally written in English. The nineteenth-century editor of this work pointed out that the title on the preface page said that it was "ouersene and corrected" by Cranmer. ³⁹ The

³⁵ Ibid., pp. 6, 7.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 7.

³⁷ See A. H. Francke, *The Judgment of Archbishop Cranmer*, concerning the people's right to, and discreet use of, Holy Scripture: together with a comprehensive manual of directions for a profitable reading of the same by the celebrated Professor Francke (never before published in English). London: Burton and Briggs, 1816.

³⁸ *Catechismus That is to say a shorte Instruction into Christian Religion for the syngular commoditie and profyete of childrē and yong people*. Set forth by the mooste reuerende father in God Thomas Archbyshop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitane. Gualterus Lynne excudebat 1548.

Walter Lynne, printer and bookseller, "was an ardent reformer who enjoyed the patronage of Cranmer." Bennett, p. 165. See fn. 28 above.

³⁹ Burton, ed., *Catechism*, p. iv; cf. p. 1. See fn. 26 above.

actual translator, he believed, may have been Rowland Taylor, John Ponet, or Thomas Becon;⁴⁰ it is very unlikely that Cranmer himself was the translator.⁴¹

Tite and Thomson count it as a work of "acknowledged religious excellence" and regard it as one of the real merits of Thomas Cranmer that "he published the First kind and familiar Manual of Religious Instruction for Children, which was ever placed in a Child's hands in England: . . ." ⁴² In examining the authorship of the English version they note the variations between the English and the Latin; these variations are, to them, "almost positive proofs of the hand of Cranmer being everywhere visible in the familiar and even maternal language of the English copy." They point out, also, that discretionary power is assumed in the variations "which none of the Archbishop's household either possessed or would have ventured on exerting." Then, too, two passages are added, not found in the Latin, "which are both expressed in the quaint, rural, and domestic English of Cranmer." ⁴³ For these reasons they are inclined to the truth of the words set forth in the title of the preface that the translation was overseen and corrected by Cran-

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. viii. The recent biography of Thomas Becon cites Jacobs, who believed that Thomas Becon was the most likely translator of the Catechism. Derrick S. Bailey, *Thomas Becon and the Reformation of the Church in England* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1952), "Detached Note F," p. 137. H. E. Jacobs, *Lutheran Movement in England*, p. 324. H. E. Jacobs, "The Lutheran Element in Early English Catechisms," *The Lutheran Church Review*, III (July, 1888), 173—177.

⁴¹ Johann M. Reu, *Quellen zur Geschichte des kirchlichen Unterrichts in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands zwischen 1530 und 1560*; Erster Teil: *Quellen zur Geschichte des Katechismusunterrichts*; Erster Band: *Süddeutscher Katechismus* (Guetersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1904), 422 [cited as Reu, *Quellen*, I, 1] says ". . . Cranmer veranlasste eine Übersetzung derselben ins Englische."

Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "Anglo-Lutheran Relations During the Reign of Edward VI," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VI (September 1935), 679, calls it "a translation from Cranmer's pen."

⁴² William Tite and Richard Thomson, *A Bibliographical and Literary Account of the Volume of Religious Instruction for Children, Usually Denominated Cranmer's Catechism Printed and Published in A. D. 1548*. Drawn up from two copies in possession of William Tite. (Printed as a Memorial Book for the friends of William Tite and Richard Thomson of the London institution; seventy-five copies only [a copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington, D. C.] London: Charles Skipper & East, 1862), p. viii.

Later on they remark, p. 23: ". . . this most tender and pious little volume speaks such quaint, beautiful, and infantile English. . . ."

⁴³ Ibid., p. 24.

mer.⁴⁴ Despite an incidental remark of Cranmer to Gardiner,⁴⁵ claiming direct responsibility for the translation, the evidence as presented above is almost conclusive for the claim that Cranmer was editor rather than translator of the Catechism.⁴⁶

The original authors of the work were Andreas Osiander and Dominicus Slepuner.⁴⁷ The English translation was made from a Latin translation of the original German Catechism. The title page of the Latin version stated that it was so translated (*e Germanico Latine redditus*).⁴⁸ The original German Catechism had been issued with the *Kirchenordnung* of 1533 promulgated by George of Brandenburg and the Council of Nuremberg. The second part contained Catechism sermons, each ending with the appropriate section of Luther's Small Catechism of 1529. This Nuremberg Catechism⁴⁹ by Osiander and Slepuner was translated

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ See Burton, ed., "Preface," *Catechism*, p. iv.

⁴⁶ In his doctoral dissertation Gerhard S. Kuhlmann has examined the question of the origin of the translation carefully. He comes to the conclusion: "The assumption that Cranmer delegated some or the most of the work of translating to another is permissible and even very probable, but at the least he must have reviewed, revised, and corrected the whole work very carefully himself. . . . And such changes and variations as were made in the English translation from its Latin original . . . were undoubtedly made by Cranmer himself." Gerhard S. Kuhlmann, "Luther's Small Catechism in England in the Sixteenth Century," *Kirchliche Zeitschrift, herausgegeben von der Amerikanisch Lutherischen Kirche*, LXII (September 1938), 528.

⁴⁷ Reu, *Quellen*, I, 1, 421; Piepkorn, loc. cit. English authorities do not seem to be aware of this fact.

Kuhlmann, *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, LXII (August 1938), 477—484. Kuhlmann is dependent almost entirely upon Reu.

⁴⁸ "Catechismus pro pueris et iuventute, in ecclesiis et ditione illustriss. principum, Marchionum Brandeburgensium, et inclyti Senatus Norimbergensis, breviter conscriptus, e Germanico Latine redditus, per Justum Jonam," Burton, ed., *Catechism* (second part), p. 1.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. viii, indicates that Burton knew of the Brandenburg-Nuremberg Catechism through Seckendorff, "which he thought to have contained the very Catechism now under consideration." He said that "of this German original no copy has as yet been discovered." He did not know the authors of the German Catechism.

Seckendorff was not a very informative guide. He knew of the 1591 edition, but did not describe the work too accurately.

Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff, *Ausführliche Historie des Luthertums, und der heilsamen Reformation* . . . translated from Latin into German (Leipzig: J. F. Gleditsch und Sohn, 1714), pp. 1356—57 (Bk III, xxxv): ". . . und der andere den Catechismum Lutheri, dessen Nahme zwar nicht genennet wird, und einige Catechismuspredigten."

into Latin by Justus Jonas, Sr.; that Latin translation was translated into English, to be known as "Cranmer's Catechism."⁵⁰ A 1564 edition of the German is on hand,⁵¹ which has been compared with a reprint of the first (1533) edition.⁵² There can be no doubt of the dependence of the English on the Latin or the Latin on the German, nor may it be doubted that the German was the original.⁵³

The order of the six chief parts in Luther's Small Catechism is followed, also in the numbering of the Ten Commandments. The preface, e. g., is the same in the three versions.

To illustrate the interdependence of the three versions and the fact that Luther's Small Catechism was used as a basis, the following excerpt is given from "Die ander Predig. Von der Erlosung,"⁵⁴ "Secunda Contio de Redemptione,"⁵⁵ "The Seconde Sermon of Oure Redemption."⁵⁶

Darumb solt jhr nun /
meine liebe Kindlein /
von hertzen glauben
vnd vertrauen / in
Jhesum Christum den
einigen Son Gottes /
vnsern lieben HERRen /
vnd gar nicht zweyffeln
/ er hat für vns gethan
/ was wir thun solten /
vnd kontens nicht / Er
hat auch für vns ge-

Ideo, filioli, ex toto
corde credetis in Jesum
Christum Filium Dei
unicum, Dominum nos-
trum; nec dubitate, quin
satisfecit pro nobis, et
passus sit etiam pro
nobis, pro reatu nostro.
Atque per ipsum
habemus remissionem
peccatorum, et recon-
ciliati sumus Deo, ut

Wherefore good chyl-
dren, beleue ye with al
your heart in thys Jesus
Christ the onely Sonne
of God oure Lord, and
doubte not but that he
hath suffered for our
synnes, and contented
the iustyce of his Father
for the same, and hath
brought vs agayne vnto
his fauour, and made vs

⁵⁰ Burton, ed., *Catechism* (first part), p. 1.

⁵¹ The title page of the second part of the volume is *Catechismus oder Kinderpredig. Auff's new yetzo / dem alten Exemplar nach / mit sonderm fleisz widerumb gedruckt. Zu Nürnberg / bey Christoff Heussler. 1564.*

Reu, *Quellen*, I, 1, 422, mentions 16th-century editions in 1534, 1536, 1539, 1556, 1564, 1591, 1592.

⁵² Ibid., I, 1, 462—564, reprints the original as published by Johann Petereium in 1533.

⁵³ Frederick J. Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation* (London: James Clarke & Co., Ltd., n. d. [1927]), p. 77.

Reu, *Quellen*, I, 1, 421, 422.

Tite and Thomson, p. 3, show that two printers (Walter Lynne and Nicholas Hyll) each issued an edition of the *Catechism* in 1548.

Constant, *Reformation in England*, II, 253, is not correct in stating that it was simply a translation of the Wittenberg Catechism of 1539.

⁵⁴ Brandenburg-Nürnberg *Kirchenordnung*, Part II, *Catechismus*, XLIII, h. Reu, *Quellen*, I, 1, 516.

⁵⁵ Burton, ed., *Catechism*, Part II, 99, 100.

⁵⁶ Burton, ed., *Catechism*, Part I, 117, 118.

litten / was wir ver-
schuldet hetten / vnd
hat vns also vergebung
der sünde erworben /
vnd mit Gott dem
Vater versönet / dasz
er vns für seine Kinder
helt / und wann wir
inn diesem Glauben
bleyben / mit Christo
das ewig leben wil
geben.

jam habeat nos pro
dilectis filiis, et quando
perseramus in hac fide
daturus est nobis vitam
aeternam.

his wel beloued chil-
dren and heyres of hys
kyngdome.

What did Cranmer teach in this Catechism, which was translated under his supervision, regarding the Lord's Supper? In the original German the doctrine of Martin Luther was correctly set forth.⁵⁷ The English translation gives the meaning of the original:

Secondarily Christ saith of the breade, this is my bodye, and of the cuppe he sayeth, this is my bloud. Wherefore we ought to beleue, that in the sacrament we receyue trewly the bodye and bloud of Christ. For God is almyghte (as ye hearde in the Crede). He is able therefore, to do all thynges what he wil. And as saint Paul writeth he calleth those thinges whiche be not, as yf they were. Wherefore when Christe taketh breade, and saith. Take, eate, this is my bodye we ought not to doute, but we eat his veray bodye. And when he taketh the cuppe, and sayeth. Take, drynke, this is my blod, we ought to thynke assuredly, that we drynke his veray blode. And this we must beleue, yf we wil be counted Christen men.⁵⁸

It also includes the definition of the Sacrament of the Altar according to Luther's Small Catechism: "Es ist der ware Leyb / vnd das Blut vnsers HErrn Jesu Christi / vnter dem Brot vnd Wein / vns Christen zu essen vnd zu trincken von Christo selbs einge-
setzt."⁵⁹

The English translation of this definition of the Sacrament of the Altar reads: "Yt is the trew body and true bloude of our Lorde

⁵⁷ Brandenburg-Nürnberg *Kirchen-Ordnung*, Part II, *Catechismus*, LXXVII, n. v. Cf. Reu, *Quellen*, I, 1, 560, 561. See also Burton, ed., *Catechism*, Part II, 176, 177.

⁵⁸ Burton, ed., *Catechism*, Part I, 207, 208.

Piepkorn follows Pullan, Gasquet and Bishop, and others, in pointing out the omission of one sentence ("When he calls and names a thing which was not before, then at once that very thing comes into being as He names it"). He says that the rest of the passage is rendered in "equivocal language." Piepkorn, *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VI (September 1935), 681.

⁵⁹ Brandenburg-Nürnberg *Kirchenordnung*, Part II, *Catechismus*, LXXIX, n. vj.

Reu, *Quellen*, I, 1, 563. Burton, ed., *Catechism*, Part I, 207, 208.

Jesus Christe, whiche was ordeyned by Christ him selfe, to be eaten and dronken of vs Christen people, vnder the forme of breade and wyne."⁶⁰

Later Cranmer maintained that the words "really" and "substantially" were not used in this Catechism, but the word "truly," because, he said, "we in the sacrament do receive the body and blood of Christ spiritually."⁶¹ Whatever Cranmer's explanation may be, it seems safe to say that in 1548 Cranmer held the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, by 1550 he had gone over to the Reformed interpretation.⁶²

Contemporary judgments about this Catechism are interesting. John ab Ulmis wrote to Henry Bullinger: "For he has lately published a Catechism, in which he has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the papists in the holy supper

⁶⁰ Burton, ed., *Catechism*, Part I, 213.

⁶¹ Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, I, 228.

⁶² Burton, "Preface of the Editor," *Catechism*, pp. xvii—xxv, discusses the question of Cranmer's position on the Lord's Supper.

See also the notes of the editors of Cranmer's writings in *The Fathers of the English Church*; III, 30, 31, 318, 319. This volume contains "A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ . . ." (usually called "The Book of the Sacrament"), written by Cranmer in 1550, pp. 327—520; also "The Answer . . . Dr. Richard Smith" by Cranmer, pp. 521—549.

The first volume of Cranmer's *Works*, edited by Cox and published by the Parker Society, contains his writings on the Sacrament of the Altar.

Cyril C. Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist (Cranmer Dixit et Contradixit)*, M. Dwight Johnson Memorial Lectureship in Church History (Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949 [57 pp.]), wrote in connection with the controversy carried on by Dom Gregory Dix and G. B. Timms. Richardson stressed that Cranmer emphasized the mystical union with Christ.

Piepkorn shows that Cranmer seems to have subscribed wholeheartedly to Luther's views until the middle of 1548 and by the middle of December he had gone over to the Helvetian position. Piepkorn, *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VI (September 1935), 681—686.

Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom, with a History and Critical Notes*: Vol. I: The History of the Creeds, 4th ed., revised and enlarged (New York and London: Harper & Bros., 1899), p. 601, says that Cranmer abandoned Luther's views on the Eucharist by December 4, 1548.

Pollard, *Cranmer*, pp. 234—245.

Even during his lifetime Cranmer's position was interpreted variously. *Original Letters*, PS, I, 13n, 71, 72, 323; II, 383, 388.

Wiese, in telling the story, warns against syncretism. M. Fr. Wiese, *Den lutherske Kirke i England i den første Halvdel af det 16. Aarhundrede* (Decorah, Iowa, 1898), pp. 20, 57—62.

of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous, and lucid.”⁶³ John Burcher reported:

The archbishop of Canterbury, moved, no doubt, by the advice of Peter Martyr and other Lutherans, has ordered a catechism of some Lutheran opinions to be translated and published in our language. This little book has occasioned no little discord; so that fightings have frequently taken place among the common people, on account of their diversity of opinion, even during the sermons. The government, roused by this contention have convoked a synod of the bishops to consult about religion. God grant they do not produce some prodigy!⁶⁴

The translation of the Catechism, however, is one more bit of evidence of the direct relations between the Lutheran Reformation, especially the reformation in Nürnberg, with the Reformation movement in England. It has also been used as the basis of American translations of Luther's Small Catechism⁶⁵ — one of the legacies of Cranmer to American Lutheranism.

III

“THE BOOK OF HOMILIES,” 1547

Of greater importance than the Catechism was the *Book of Homilies*⁶⁶ issued in the year 1547. The book was a sermon book to be taken into the pulpit and read to the people, one sermon or homily each Sunday. There were twelve such sermons in the volume. The first laid the basis for all spiritual knowledge, a homily on Holy Scriptures written by Thomas Cranmer. The second homily dealt with original sin. The next treated of salvation; the fourth, of faith; the fifth, of good works. These three were written by Cranmer.⁶⁷ Cranmer, perhaps with Nicholas Ridley, edited this

⁶³ John ab Ulmis to Henry Bullinger, London, August 18, 1548, Letter CLXXXV, *Original Letters*, PS, II, 381.

⁶⁴ John Burcher to Henry Bullinger, Strassburgh, October 29, 1548, Letter CCXCVIII, *ibid.*, II, 642, 643.

⁶⁵ Kuhlmann, *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, LXII (November 1938), 666.

⁶⁶ *Certaine sermons, or homilies, appoynted by the kynges maistie to be declared a. redde by all persones vicars, or curates, euery Sondaye in their churches where thei have cure* is the title as given under 13639 in the *Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475—1640*, compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (London: Bibliographical Society, 1926).

⁶⁷ The authorship of the various homilies is discussed by Hughes, *Reformation in England*, II, 95, n 4. He lists Homily I, III, IV, V, and IX as being by Cranmer. Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, p. 163, states that the 3d, 4th, and 5th homilies are usually attributed to Cran-

First Book of Homilies,⁶⁸ or, as the chronicler calls them, "certain Homelies, or Sermons, to be vsually read in the Church vnto the people."⁶⁹

The Homily of salvation, theocentric and Scriptural in its orientation, is divided into three parts. In the first part Cranmer sets forth that all men ought to seek their justification and righteousness alone in Christ's death and merits, for no one can be justified by his own good works. The second part is devoted to an exposition of the necessity of faith. The last part shows the futility of good works for earning salvation.

Let Cranmer himself speak. In the first section of his sermon, after quoting and expounding passages from St. Paul's letters, he says:

In these foresaid places, the Apostle toucheth specially three things, which must concur and go together in our justification. Upon God's part, his great mercy and grace: upon Christ's part, justice, that is, the satisfaction of God's justice, or the price of our redemption, by the offering of his body and shedding of his blood, with fulfilling of the law perfectly and thoroughly: and upon our part, true and lively faith in the merits of Jesus Christ, which yet is not ours, but by God's working in us.⁷⁰

Again, in the second part of this homily, he writes:

But this proposition, "that we be justified by faith only, freely and without works," is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being insufficient to deserve our justification at God's hands, and thereby most plainly to express the weakness of man and the goodness of God, the great infirmity of ourselves, and the might and power of God, the imperfectness of our own works, and the most abundant grace of our Saviour Christ; and thereby wholly for to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only and his most precious blood-shedding.

This faith the holy Scripture teacheth; this is the strong rock and foundation of Christian religion: this doctrine all old and ancient authors

mer. Griffith [supra, fn. 30], p. xxvii, believes that the first homily was "probably written by Cranmer" and that the third, fourth, and fifth are by him. Griffith believes Ridley to be the author of the ninth homily, whereas J. T. Tomlinson, *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies: Some Forgotten Facts in Their History Which May Decide Their Interpretation* (London: Elliot Stock, 1897), p. 233, assigns this ninth homily "probably" to Cranmer and seems to have no doubt that Cranmer was the author of the first homily. See also the discussion by Cox, Cranmer, *Works*, ed. Cox, PS, II, 128 nl. He is certain that Cranmer wrote at least the third, fourth, and fifth homilies.

⁶⁸ Griffith pp. vii—viii and p. xxviii, where he says: "It is highly probable that Ridley took part with Cranmer in preparing the First Book. . . ."

⁶⁹ Grafton's *Chronicle*, II, 500.

⁷⁰ Cranmer, "Homily of Salvation," *Fathers of the English Church*, III, 555. Cranmer, *Works*, ed. Cox, PS, II, 129.

of Christ's church do approve; this doctrine advanceth and setteth forth the true glory of Christ, and suppresseth the vain glory of man. This whosoever denieth is not to be reputed for a true Christian man, nor for a setter forth of Christ's glory, but for an adversary of Christ and his Gospel, and for a setter forth of men's vain glory.⁷¹

Finally in the third part he presents the matter eloquently and again Scripturally:

Therefore to conclude, considering the infinite benefits of God, shewed and exhibited unto us, mercifully without our deserts, who hath not only created us out of nothing, and from a piece of vile clay, of his infinite goodness hath exalted us (as touching our soul) unto his own similitude and likeness; but also, whereas we were condemned to hell and death eternal, hath given his own natural Son, being God eternal, immortal, and equal unto himself in power and glory, to be incarnated, and to take our mortal nature upon him, with the infirmities of the same; and in the same nature to suffer most shameful and painful death, for our offences, to the intent to justify us, and to restore us to life everlasting; so making us also his dearly-beloved children, brethren unto his only Son our Saviour Christ, and inheritors for ever with him, of his eternal kingdom of heaven.⁷²

The "Homily of Faith" has the subtitle "A Short Declaration of the true, lively, and Christian Faith." In it Cranmer distinguishes, first of all, between a dead faith ("which bringeth forth no good works, but is idle, barren, and unfruitful") and a quick or lively faith. The first kind is unprofitable; the faith lively brings forth good works. In simple language he exhorts the people to lead lives which shew the fruits of faith. "If these fruits do not follow, we do but mock with God, deceive ourselves, and also other men . . . but be sure of your faith, try it by your living, look upon the fruits that come of it, mark the increase of love and charity by it towards God and your neighbor, and so shall you perceive it to be a true lively faith."⁷³

⁷¹ Cranmer, "Homily of Salvation," *Fathers of the English Church*, III, 559; Cranmer, *Works*, ed. Cox, PS, II, 131.

⁷² Ibid., p. 134; Cranmer, "Homily of Salvation," *Fathers of the English Church*, III, 565, 566.

Pollard, *Cranmer*, p. 231, points out that Cranmer's views in this sermon "are scarcely distinguishable from Luther's own."

Tomlinson, p. 238, citing Fitzgerald, *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, II, 215, says that Melancthon's *Commonplaces, De vocab. gratiae*, "furnished the quarry from which this Homily was dug."

Constant, *Reformation in England*, II, 251, 252, stresses the Lutheran character of the homilies written by Cranmer.

⁷³ Cranmer, "Homily on Faith," *Fathers of the English Church*, III, 580, 581. The entire homily is found *ibid.*, III, 567—581; Cranmer, *Works*, ed. Cox, PS, II, 140.

The "Homily, or Sermon, on Good Works annexed unto Faith" follows immediately the "Homily on Faith." The introductory sentence of the sermon refers to the preceding homily. It continues with the declaration that works which are acceptable or pleasing to God cannot be done without faith; in the Scriptures God described what kind of works His people should walk in, in His Commandments not in men's commandments. Cranmer speaks out against "papistical superstitions and abuses" and delineates the will of God.⁷⁴

How often these homilies were read from pulpits in England during the second half of the sixteenth century and the first part of the seventeenth is difficult to guess.⁷⁵ There were 8,000 parishes in the England of Elizabeth; supposing that each homily was read in each parish once each year for a period of at least eighty years, then at least two generations of Englishmen heard these homilies of Cranmer. Surely God's Word as expounded by Cranmer did not return to Him void and the message of salvation by grace through faith brought forth fruit. Their doctrinal and confessional importance may be gauged from the reference in the eleventh article of the *Thirty-nine Articles*.

IV

"THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER"

Cranmer's greatest contribution to his own and later generations was probably *The Book of Common Prayer*. The ordering of the public worship of the church was a momentous task for the reformers, for Luther in Saxony and Petri in Sweden, for Calvin in Geneva and Bucer in Strassburg, and for Cranmer in England. That Cranmer wrote the liturgy and transferred the forms into the English language with great beauty and dignity is generally recognized. He is regarded as one of the great masters of English prose,

⁷⁴ *Fathers of the English Church*, III, 582—598; Cranmer, *Works*, ed. Cox, PS, II, 141—149.

⁷⁵ In Griffith, pp. xlvii—lviii is a "Descriptive Catalogue of Editions of the Homilies to the End of the Seventeenth Century." In 1547, the first year, six editions appeared from Grafton's press; three, from Whitechurch's. *Ibid.*, p. ix, and see p. lxxvii.

for he wrote "with a deep sense of reverence, a concern for seemliness and a delicate ear for the harmonies of the English language."⁷⁶

That the *Prayer Book* of 1549 must be ascribed to Cranmer may be seen from the fact that no formal commission nor a formal body of any kind is known to have been engaged in this work. Cranmer had been busy in liturgical studies.⁷⁷

In his compilation Cranmer used the Sarum Breviary, the Reformed Breviary of the Spanish Cardinal Quignon, the *Simplex ac pia deliberatio* of Hermann von Wied, Archbishop of Cologne (in reality composed by Martin Bucer and revised extensively by Philip Melancthon, Erasmus Sarcerius, and perhaps others), and the *Brandenburg-Nürnberg Kirchenordnung* by Osiander and Brentz.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Hutchinson, *Cranmer and the English Reformation*, p. 104.

⁷⁷ Cf. e.g., Edgar L. Pennington, *The Church of England and the Reformation* (Eton: The Savile Press, 1952), p. 50.

Hughes, *Reformation in England*, II, 109, calls it "the work of Cranmer only and of those who thought like him."

Karl Ferdinand Mueller and Walter Blankenburg, *Leiturgia, Handbuch des Evangelischen Gottesdienstes*; erster Band: *Geschichte und Lehre des Evangelischen Gottesdienstes* (Kassel: Stauda-Verlag, 1954), p. 66, call it "das Werk von Cranmer." In a footnote, *ibid.*, n. 192, "Obschon wir keine Urkunden über die Entstehung der ersten Fassung besitzen, lässt die Einheitlichkeit der Sprache und der Struktur ebenso wie das ausserordentliche liturgische Feingefühl es als wahrscheinlich erscheinen, dass nicht eine Kommission, sondern ein Mann das *Book of Common Prayer* geschaffen hat."

⁷⁸ Francis A. Gasquet and Edmund Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer: An Examination into Its Origin and Early History with an Appendix of Unpublished Documents*, 2d ed. (London: John Hodges, 1891), *passim*.

Luther D. Reed, *The Lutheran Liturgy: A Study of the Common Service of the Lutheran Church in America* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1947), pp. 127 ff.

Francis Procter and Walter Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of Its Offices* (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1951), pp. 26—90.

Edgar C. S. Gloucester, "Introduction," *The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward Sixth*, Everyman's Library edition (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1913), pp. vii—xv.

Hughes, *Reformation in England*, II, 112, 113, with discussion of Quignon (Quinonez); lacking, however, a complete enumeration of all or even most of Cranmer's sources.

William Palmer, *Origines liturgicae, or Antiquities of the English Ritual*, 4th ed. (London: Francis and John Rivington, 1845), I, 228—234, has a dis-

The *Prayer Book* of 1552 contained decided modifications and changes due to the influence of Richard Hooper, John Knox, Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, John a Lasco, and perhaps others.⁷⁹

It may be added, incidentally, that the *Prayer Book* of 1559 is an adaptation of the 1552 version, that the revisions of 1604 and 1661—1662 did not greatly alter Cranmer's work, and that the forms used today owe much to Cranmer.⁸⁰

No attempt will be made here to trace further the origins of the *Book of Common Prayer* nor to show the changes made from the First to the Second *Book of Common Prayer*. How the *Book of Common Prayer* came to influence the Lutheran liturgies in America must likewise remain untold here.⁸¹ To demonstrate, however, a close connection in at least one respect between the *Book of Common Prayer* and the liturgy of The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod a careful comparison has been made between the col-

cussion of Quignon's Breviary and parallel columns showing the dependence of Cranmer on Quignon for preface to the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549. Jacobs, *Lutheran Movement in England*, pp. 218—229.

Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, pp. 215 to 235.

⁷⁹ Besides the references in the preceding footnote see the following: For the influence of Bucer's *De ordinatione legitima* on the Anglican ordination rite see E. C. Messenger, *The Lutheran Origin of the Anglican Ordinal* (London: Burns, Oates and Wachbourne, Ltd., 1934), pp. 1—56.

The influence of Peter Martyr, et al is discussed by Arthur Carl Piepkorn, *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* (September 1935), 672 f., 675, 677 to 679.

The judgment of Mueller and Blankenburg, *Leiturgia*, I, 67, can be repeated: "Im Gesamttypus steht das *Book of Common Prayer* den lutherischen Gottesdienstordnungen am nächsten."

Gasquet and Bishop, Appendix VI, p. 448, say: "The form of Institution in the Book of Common Prayer must consequently be referred for its origin to the Brandenburg-Nürnberg recension of the Lutheran recital and not to either the Roman or the Mozarabic."

Pollard, *Cranmer*, pp. 184—223 on First Edward and pp. 246—274 on Second Edward, has an excellent account.

⁸⁰ See the standard histories of the *Prayer Book*, especially Procter and Frere, *passim*.

⁸¹ For which see especially Reed, *Lutheran Liturgy*, *passim*. For an analysis of the influence of the *Book of Common Prayer* on the rite of the Lutheran Church in America, see Arthur Carl Piepkorn, "Anglo-Lutheran Relations," in *Pro Ecclesia Lutherana* (New York: The Liturgical Society of St. James, 1934) II, 64—69.

lects of Cranmer of 1549 and 1552 and the collects given in the *Lutheran Liturgy* for the Sundays and chief festivals of the church year.⁸²

Twelve collects are the same, identical except for changes in punctuation and modern spelling. They are: The collects for Epiphany, the first Sunday after Epiphany, the second Sunday after Epiphany, Sexagesima, Oculi, the collect for Matins on Good Friday, the collects for the tenth, fourteenth, twenty-first, twenty-second, and twenty-fifth Sundays after Trinity (used for the ninth, thirteenth, twentieth, and twenty-fourth Sundays after Trinity respectively in the Lutheran order of service). The collect for the third Sunday in Advent has a different word order in the Lutheran liturgy.

Twenty-three collects show only slight variations, a word or two, or a phrase. They are the collects for the following days or Sundays: St. John the Evangelist, third Sunday after Epiphany, fifth Sunday after Epiphany, Septuagesima, Ash Wednesday, Jubilate, Cantate, Rogate, Ascension (the Communion collect), Exaudi (as a collect for Ascension in the Missouri Synod liturgy), first Sunday after Trinity, the fourth, sixth, seventh, ninth, sixteenth, and twenty-third Sundays after Trinity (used on the third, fifth, sixth, eighth, fifteenth, and twenty-second Sundays after Trinity respectively in the Missouri Synod liturgy), the Purification of Mary (one), the Annunciation (one), St. Matthew, St. Michael, St. Simon and St. Jude (1549 only) (used on Evangelists', Apostles', and Martyrs' Days according to the Missouri Synod form), and All Saints.

In addition, nineteen other collects show greater variations in wording without, however, changing the thought. They are the collects for the following days or Sundays: Fourth Sunday in Advent, Innocents' Day, Circumcision, fourth Sunday after Epiphany, Reminiscere, Laetare, Palmarum, Easter (one of the collects at the first Communion — 1549), Trinity, the second Sunday after Trinity, the fifth, eighth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fifteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth Sundays after Trinity

⁸² *Two Liturgies, 1549 and 1552*, PS, pp. 1—75 for 1549 and pp. 239—264 for 1552. See also the Everyman's Library edition, *The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward the Sixth*.

The Lutheran Liturgy, Authorized by the Synods Constituting the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, n. d.), pp. 48—215.

(used in the Missouri Synod liturgy on the fourth, seventh, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, fourteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth Sundays after Trinity respectively).

Only six collects show serious deviations from those of 1549 and 1552. These are chiefly for saints' days. The collects that show alterations and/or omissions are those for the following Sundays or days: the twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity (used on the twenty-third as above for the Sundays after Trinity following the second Sunday), St. Andrew, St. Matthias, St. Mark, St. James the Elder, St. Luke.

In pointing out these similarities it is not the thought of the writer to suggest that these collects were original compositions by Cranmer. Almost all of them are of pre-Reformation origin.⁸³ The *English* dress, however, is due to Cranmer; he made the exquisite translations for which the Lutheran churches of America owe him a large debt of gratitude.

V

THE "FORTY-TWO ARTICLES"

The *Thirty-nine Articles* of the Established Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States set forth their doctrine. The candidate for ordination must declare that he believes "the doctrine of the Church of England therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God. . . ." ⁸⁴ That such a subscription provides for wide latitude in doctrine within a church body is evident. However, the fact that these articles exist much in the form that they do is attributable to the formulation of the *Forty-two Articles* by Thomas Cranmer.

The history of these articles, especially an intense analysis of their sources, cannot be set forth in detail. They have their Lutheran origins, but their Lutheranism was modified.

⁸³ Jacobs, too, pointed this out in his *Lutheran Movement in England*, pp. 297, 298.

Reed, *Lutheran Liturgy*, p. 269: "The framers of the *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549 provided a matchless series of English translations and adaptations. Two thirds of the Collects in First Edward are close translations of the terse Latin originals. Most of the remainder were original compositions (fourteen for saints' days alone), by Cranmer in 1549, or by Bishop Cosin in the revision of 1662."

⁸⁴ E. J. Bicknell, *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, 3d ed., revised by H. J. Carpenter (London, New York, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955), p. 21.

The *Forty-two Articles* go back to the *Ten Articles* of 1536. The first five of these articles are doctrinal in nature, dealing with the rule of faith, the three sacraments, and justification.⁸⁵ The second part deals with ceremonies, rites, and usages in the church.

Jacobs has demonstrated with citations and comparisons in parallel columns the truth of his contention: ". . . the evangelical statements of the articles were taken not only largely from the Apology, but also largely from the Augsburg Confession, and other writings of Melanchthon."⁸⁶ The *Ten Articles* were dependent on Melanchthon,⁸⁷ since they were based on the Wittenberg Articles of 1536. However, the direct process by which this influence was exercised cannot be stated positively.⁸⁸

Two years later the *Thirteen Articles* of 1538 were written. They are the result of the deliberations of a German commission and an English commission, meeting in London. Vice-Chancellor Franz Burkhardt of Saxony, Georg von Boyneburg of Hesse, and Frederic Myconius of Gotha made up the German delegation; Cranmer headed the English divines.⁸⁹ With him were associated the Bishops

⁸⁵ Charles Hardwick, *A History of the Articles of Religion*: to which is added a series of documents, from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615; together with illustrations from contemporary sources, 3d ed., revised by Francis Procter (London: George Bell & Sons, 1876), pp. 39—48; Appendix I, pp. 237—258, for the text of the *Ten Articles*.

See also Smithen, *Continentalism and the English Reformation*, pp. 154 to 156; Schaff, *Creeeds of Christendom*, I, 611, 612; Pollard, *Cranmer*, pp. 103, 104; Innes, *Cranmer*, p. 89.

⁸⁶ Jacobs, *Lutheran Movement in England*, p. 95.

Laurence, *Eight Sermons*, p. 14, said that the Articles of 1536 "breathed the spirit of Lutheranism."

⁸⁷ Hardwick, p. 247; Hughes, *Reformation in England*, II, 29, 30; Rupp, *English Protestant Tradition*, pp. 109—114; Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, pp. 154—156; Constant, *Reformation in England*, II, 295.

⁸⁸ Rupp, *English Protestant Tradition*, p. 112.

Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, pp. 160 to 162, 171; Hardwick, pp. 60, 61.

Rupp showed the confused character of these documents, saying that "the *Ten Articles* were more garbled even than the Wittenberg Articles." Later he added the remark: "It sometimes appears that in exalting the Middle Way the English Church has elevated confusion of thought to the level of a theological virtue." Rupp, *English Protestant Tradition*, p. 114.

⁸⁹ H. Maynard Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1948), pp. 140—144; Hardwick, pp. 52—65; Rupp, *English Protestant Tradition*, p. 115; Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, p. 102.

Hughes, *Reformation in England*, I, 357, is inaccurate here.

of Stokesly and Sampson, and four doctors, among them Barnes and Heath.⁹⁰ From the end of May into August they discussed doctrine and on through September. The result, as noted, were the *Thirteen Articles*, without public authority, unknown until the nineteenth century.⁹¹

That Cranmer used them when he continued his efforts to draw up a statement of faith during the reign of Edward VI is certain. The first draft of the *Forty-two Articles* was made in 1549 largely by Cranmer himself. After they had been submitted to the bishops, to the Council, to Cecil and Cheke, to the boy king, and then to his chaplains, they were revised once more by Cranmer. Not until June 1553, a few weeks before his death, were they formally authorized by Edward VI.⁹²

The Lutheran antecedents of the *Forty-two Articles* (and through them, together with the Württemberg Confession, of the *Thirty-nine Articles*) are not disputed. Three of the doctrines set forth in them, however, should be examined briefly, viz., justification, the Lord's Supper, and election.

Regarding justification the *Forty-two Articles* say: "Justification by only faith in Jesus Christ, in that sense as it is declared in the homily of Justification, is a most certain and wholesome doctrine for Christian man."⁹³ The "Homily on Justification" is the "Homily

⁹⁰ So Rupp, loc. cit.

⁹¹ Rupp, *English Protestant Tradition*, pp. 117, 118, for their headings and derivations. They are printed in full in Hardwick, pp. 259—276; Cranmer, *Works*, ed. Cox, PS, II, Appendix XIII, 472—480.

Jacobs, *Lutheran Movement in England*, pp. 136—139, emphasized their dependence on the Augsburg Confession. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I, 612 to 613. Pollard in his *Cranmer* did not discuss them.

⁹² Hardwick, pp. 66—114; Bicknell, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 10, 11; Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, pp. 171—176; Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, I, 614, 615; Hughes, *Reformation in England*, II, 137; Jacobs, *Lutheran Movement in England*, p. 340; Pollard, *Cranmer*, pp. 284—286. Constant, *Reformation in England*, II, 282—298.

⁹³ *Two Liturgies*, 1549 and 1552, PS, p. 528.

Article XI of the *Thirty-nine Articles* reads: "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." Bicknell, *Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 199; Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, III, 494.

of Salvation" written by Cranmer himself. It teaches the fundamental truth of Scripture, emphasized by Martin Luther, enshrined in the watchword *Sola fide*.⁹⁴

Regarding the Lord's Supper the *Forty-two Articles* confess:

The supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another; but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a communion of the body of Christ; likewise the Cup of blessing is a communion of the blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood, cannot be proved by holy writ: but it is repugnant to the plain words of scripture, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one, and the selfsame man, cannot be at one time in divers places, but must needs be in some one certain place; therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and divers places. And because (as holy scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world; a faithful man ought not, either to believe, or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not commanded, by Christ's ordinance, to be kept, carried about, lifted up, nor worshiped.⁹⁵

Cranmer erred here. His modification in the first paragraph "rightly, worthily, and with faith" goes beyond Scripture. His syllogism in the second paragraph against the "ubiquitists" is a *non sequitur*. He fails in his understanding of the Scriptural teaching

⁹⁴ Bicknell, *Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 199—207, cannot be followed in his insistence on the "avoidance of Lutheran exaggerations" in this article. Rupp is a much better guide. Rupp, "'Justification by Faith' and the English Reformers," ch. viii in *English Protestant Tradition*, pp. 156—194. See also his *The Righteousness of God: Luther Studies* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953), *passim*, for an exposition of justification.

E. Harold Brown, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal*, 3d ed. (London: Parker & Son, 1856), pp. 274—315. Brown, p. 293: "That, which the English reformers meant by justification by faith, is, that we can never deserve anything at God's hands by our own works . . . that, though therefore we ascribe justification to faith only, it is not meant, that justifying faith either is or can be without fruits, but that it is ever pregnant and adorned with love, and hope, and holiness."

Gilbert Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, revised and corrected by James Page (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1852 [originally published in 1699]), p. 160: "*By faith only* is not to be meant faith as it is separated from the other evangelical graces and virtues; . . ."

⁹⁵ *Two Liturgies, 1549 and 1552*, PS, p. 534.

of the two natures in Christ. Only in the last paragraph, against the Roman Catholics, does he come close to the Lutheran teachings.⁹⁶

However, on the doctrine of election in the *Forty-two Articles* Cranmer is much closer to Luther than to Calvin. Hughes points out: "The article on Predestination (17, 17) is largely taken from Luther's prolog to his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans."⁹⁷

Article XVII reads:

Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed, by his own judgment, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen out of mankind; and bring them to everlasting salvation by Christ, as vessels made to honour. Whereupon such as have so excellent a benefit of God given unto them, be called, according to God's purpose, by his Spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling: they be made like the image of God's only begotten son, Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works: and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things; as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So for curious, and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall: whereby the Devil may thrust them either into desperation, or into a recklessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

⁹⁶ Much of the original article was embodied in Article XXVIII of the *Thirty-nine Articles*. The last two sentences of the second paragraph were dropped. For them was substituted: "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." Bicknell, *Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 382.

The secondary literature on the interpretation of this article is extensive. Among others see: Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, pp. 198—207; Brown, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 677 to 725; Burnet, *Exposition of the Articles*, p. 415: "By real we understand true, in opposition to both fiction and imagination: . . ."

⁹⁷ Hughes, *Reformation in England*, II, 137, without, however, any reference to Luther. See also Rupp, *Righteousness of God*, pp. 38, 39, for a discussion of this preface used by Tyndale, without, however, any reference to its relation to Article XVII.

Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, p. 187, recognizes the dependence on Luther; see pp. 183—191.

Smithen's reference is to Hardwick, *Articles of Religion*, p. 405. *Ibid.*, pp. 403—406, is the reference given by Hughes.

Furthermore, although the decrees of predestination are unknown unto us; yet we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture: and in our doings that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.⁹⁸

It is difficult to understand why anyone has confused the statement of Article XVII with Calvin's doctrine.⁹⁹ When compared with the Lambeth Articles of 1595, there can be no question of their Scriptural, Lutheran teaching.¹⁰⁰

Cranmer did not remain with the Scriptural teachings in all doctrines. His beliefs regarding the Lord's Supper, both in his early years and his last years, were erroneous. Cranmer wanted to remain true to the Scriptures, but he (was he influenced too much by his early humanism?) did not quite take his reason captive. His total reliance on his Savior remains as one of his noteworthy qualities, a reliance which he shows at his death on that twenty-first day of March, Anno Domini 1556, four hundred years ago.

St. Louis, Mo.

Jacobs, *Lutheran Movement in England*, said nothing about the dependence of Article XVII on Luther.

⁹⁸ *Two Liturgies, 1549 and 1552*, PS, p. 530.

⁹⁹ Brown, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, pp. 413—416 makes a strong case for Lutheran influence, but stresses the "strictly Scriptural language." He seems to think Cranmer purposely avoided declaring himself decidedly.

Burnet, *Exposition*, p. 227, said that the explanation of the article could be made with "a latitude of different opinions," adding "and I leave the choice as free to my reader as the church has done."

Laurence, *Eight Sermons*, discussed the doctrine of predestination in Sermon VII, pp. 143—163 (and notes pp. 389—429); article XVII he examined in Sermon VIII, pp. 165—187 (and notes pp. 431—462). He found it impossible to reconcile article XVII, the doctrine of the Liturgy, or the Homilies with Calvinistic predestination.

Smithen, *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation*, p. 188, agreed with Schaff that this Article XVII is "reformed or moderately Calvinistic." For Schaff's opinion see *Creeds of Christendom*, I, 616. Smithen had said on the previous page, p. 187: "Yet the fact remains that, though predestinarian, Article XVII is not strictly Calvinistic."

Constant, *Reformation in England*, II, 286: "In Article XVII 'of Predestination and Election' there is not a word which even suggests Calvin's doctrine."

¹⁰⁰ Article I of the Lambeth Articles states: "Deus ab aeterno praedestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam reprobavit ad mortem." The Lambeth Articles may be found in the *Works of John Whitgift*, edited for the Parker Society by John Ayne (Cambridge: University Press, 1853), III, 612, 613; Brown, *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 417 n. Schaff, *Creeds of Christendom*, III, 523—525.