CHAPTER XVI

THE REFORMATION AND THE ANGLICAN LITURGY

It was after prolonged hesitation that the addition of this chapter to the book was decided on, and then only in deference to the advice of others. I am still sensible of two objections to doing so. One is that to place this chapter at this point in the book is inevitably to give the impression that the work of Archbishop Cranmer is in some sense the climax of all christian liturgical development, whereas in the whole story it is no more than an incident, and that of no central interest to the subject of liturgy as a whole. A Coptic christian, if one were to read this book, might feel that the process (which I have barely mentioned) by which the Antiochene liturgies of the *Egyptian S. Basil* and *S. Gregory* replaced the old Alexandrian liturgy of *S. Mark* at Alexandria was more worthy of study; and it could not be denied that the extinction of a genuinely ancient tradition going back continuously to apostolic times is of much more interest to the scientific study of liturgy than the replacement of the late derived rites of Sarum and Hereford and the rest. In the one case a tap-root of all liturgical history which has contributed to all other rites in their origins and in their present structure (*e.g.* the preface and sanctus) is severed; in the other a top branch with some rather luxuriant flowers is cut off, while the tree remains unaffected.

The appending of this chapter, viewed from the strictly scientific standpoint, is therefore a disproportion. But I think it is a sufficient answer to this to say that the book seems less unlikely to be read by Anglicans than by Copts. An author and his readers are quite entitled to pursue their special interests, though they will be wise to remind themselves of their relative proportions in the subject as a whole. The Anglican rites, in their various forms, to-day serve perhaps 20,000,000 people, of whom perhaps 5,000,000 are practising communicants. The Latin rites serve (nominally) some 250,000,000; the Eastern rites perhaps 45,000,000 in all (excluding Russia); there are probably between 100,000,000 and 150,000,000 members of the various protestant bodies. No doubt in each case we must make very large deductions from these nominal totals, as in the case of the Anglicans, to come at the real number of worshippers. But they remain impressively larger than ourselves. If we are candid we shall remember this.

The second objection is less easily disposed of. Ever since the sixteenth century we Anglicans have been so divided over eucharistic doctrine, and we are to-day so conscious of our divisions, that there is scarcely any statement that could be made about either the eucharist or our own rite which would not seem to some of one's fellow churchmen to call for immediate

contradiction on conscientious grounds. It is quite understandable. These things go deep behind us. Two archbishops of Canterbury have lost their lives and a third his see, in these quarrels. One king has been beheaded and another dethroned; many lesser men have suffered all manner of penalties from martyrdom downwards on one side and another. These things have left their traces, tangling and confusing our own approach to the matter in all sorts of irrelevant ways. Besides the conscious inheritance of different intellectual and doctrinal positions from the past, and inextricably mingled with it, is another inherited world of unconscious misunderstandings, prejudices, assumptions, suspicions, which are only accidentally bound up with theological terms and which yet come into play instantly and secretly and quite irrationally with their use. To spring the word 'transubstantiation' on the company without preparation in certain circles (or the names 'Tyburn' or 'Barnes' in others) is to invite a reaction which springs much more from emotion than from reason. It is unfortunate from my present point of view that these feelings gather most strongly and most intricately around the person of Archbishop Cranmer and his liturgical changes. It is recognised on all hands that these divisions in English religion go back to his work, even if he did not precipitate them. Nor can these difficulties be altogether avoided by adhering simply to naked historical fact. Where present controversies are bound up so closely with questions of history, it is difficult in the extreme to be sure that one has seen the facts oneself without prejudice, and almost impossible to convey them to the reader in the exact proportion that one understands them without their being interpreted by his prejudices without his knowledge.

I am not sure that in my own mind I have satisfactorily answered this objection to adding this chapter. By far the most important part of the book (in my own judgement) lies in what precedes. But just because what follows is likely to be of more personal interest to most of my readers, and this chapter is necessarily placed where it is, the first fifteen chapters are likely to be taken for mere prolegomena to this one, which of all judgements on the book I would most desire to avoid. Yet to omit the chapter seems impossible. It would be a tacit slight to a liturgy which for me is bound up with the memories of my own first communion and ordination and first celebration, and of ministrations since to thousands of good christian people. And it would in effect deprive the book of practical usefulness to those whom I most desire to serve, the Anglican clergy and lay people in our present serious liturgical embarrassments. It has therefore been added after being re-written in whole or in part several times in an effort to avoid hurting those whom I am anxious to help, for I know for myself how easy it is to be hurt by the way these things can be treated. As it stands it is an attempt to regard the Anglican liturgy and its making with that sort of historical interest which might be taken in it by, let us say, a well-educated Syrian Monophysite. I ask that it shall be taken as such, for whatever light such a

dispassionate approach may throw on our problems, and not as an attempt to argue for or against any particular proposals whatever as to practice.

The Post-Mediaeval Crisis

It will be obvious, I think, that in most of this book we have been moving over ground very little trodden by the disputants on either side in sixteenth century England. Many of the texts we have studied were not then known, and the bearing of most of those that were known was then not clearly understood. The real background of these sixteenth century controversies is not the New Testament, isolated texts from which were wrested by both sides; still less was it the practice of the primitive church, of which both sides were about equally ignorant. It is the mediaeval Western rite, as it was in use *c.* A.D. 1500, the only liturgy which either party had ever *used*. This alone explains both what it was that one party sought to change, and the awkward and unsatisfactory formulation of the traditional position which the other side felt bound to defend. And just as we shall not understand the circumstances and the meaning to S. Gregory's own mind of his revision of the local rite of Rome *c.* A.D. 600 unless we see it on the background of the similar codifications of other Italian local rites being undertaken at about the same time; so we must see Cranmer's liturgical changes as one of a number of related attempts to do the same thing for the same reasons elsewhere. It is an incident in the general post-mediaeval liturgical crisis provoked in the West by what the mediaeval liturgical practice itself had come to be, or perhaps it is truer to say, had come to mean to those who worshipped by it.

Let us set down the changes of conception to be noted between the pre-mediaeval and the mediaeval conceptions of the eucharist, noting as we do so how far back the roots of the sixteenth century difficulties go, and how hard it is to separate the several difficulties from one another, even for purposes of discussion—let alone reform.

1. The notion of the eucharist as a corporate action has been transformed. The celebrant's irreplaceable 'liturgy' of saying the *eucharistia* had always been *an* essential element in the rite. It is for Justin 'the food which has been "eucharistised" ' which 'is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus Who was made Flesh'. The old four-action shape of the rite in which this formed one part still persisted intact in the Western rite *c.* 1500. But at low mass the whole action has been transferred to the celebrant. He alone offers at the offertory; he alone—as always—says the prayer. Instead of the fraction being performed by the deacons and concelebrants as in Hippolytus, it is now done by the celebrant alone; and in popular understanding there had been attached to it the unprimitive meaning of the 'breaking' of our Lord's Body in the passion, and therefore a connection with immolation, so that it had assumed the character not only of a sacerdotal but of a directly

sacrificial act. Normally the celebrant alone communicated. The whole liturgical action from beginning to end has thus passed to him. We have seen the very gradual and accidental process by which this had come about, but its completion was nevertheless a very considerable change. In a new sense it could be said that the individual priest 'offered' the eucharist, or it could at least be popularly supposed that he did.

2. To each of such individual sacerdotal offerings there could be attached in popular understanding a separate efficacy and value of its own, each dependent on that of Calvary, but separable from one another. Thus ten masses were necessarily and determinably worth more than five. And since each offering was the celebrant's own offering, something which he alone could do, though he did it in virtue of his personal possession of holy orders, it rested with him to apply the efficacy of each mass to particular souls or causes as he willed. Again we can trace the slow and gradual stages by which the primitive ideas had reached this development. But again the change which results is of a very considerable importance.

3. Not only had the part of the laity at low mass been reduced to one of passivity—seeing and hearing only—but the use of Latin reduced the function of hearing to small usefulness for most people, though the aesthetic effect of the music at high mass remained to stimulate religious emotion, even when the texts were not understood. Here again there is a long history behind the situation *c.* A.D. 1500, which it is worth while to consider a little more fully, though it does not affect the serious consequences of the situation as it stood then.

It is sometimes forgotten by the advocates of a vernacular liturgy that our Lord as a palestinian jew never attended a strictly vernacular service in His life. Alike in the temple and the synagogue the jewish services in Palestine were in the liturgical Hebrew, which was not understood by the people without special instruction. Though the lections in the synagogue were *targum*ed or translated in the second century A.D., there is no evidence that this was the case in our Lord's day; and according to S. Mark it was the liturgical Hebrew, not the vernacular Aramaic, which rose to His lips in prayer at the supreme moment of His passion.[1] Though neither side seems to have noted this fact in the sixteenth century, the mediaeval church had the most warrantable of all precedents for using a language 'not understanded of the people' in the liturgy, if it had cared to plead it. Outside Palestine, however, jewish services in the first century were usually held not in Hebrew, but in Greek, the general vernacular of the Levant. It was this precedent which eventually carried the day in the christian church. A few Hebrew words like Amen, Hosanna, Alleluia, remained in use in christian worship to remind christians of its Hebrew origin. But the church agreed with S. Paul that 'if I pray in an unknown tongue my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is not fruitful; I will pray with the spirit, and I will

[1] Mark xv. 34.

pray with the understanding also',[1] and used the vernacular. The local church of Rome had begun as a Greek-speaking body; the majority of its members were Greek-speaking Levantines living in the foreign quarters of the city. But it began to use Latin in its liturgy, probably in the latter half of the second century, as the faith spread among the Latin-speaking inhabitants; though the use of Greek went on side by side with Latin down to the fourth—perhaps even the fifth century. Elsewhere in the West, *e.g.* in Africa, Latin had been used by the church from the second century.

In the fourth-fifth centuries, when Greek was ceasing to be spoken in the West but Latin was still a *lingua franca* in which *e.g.* all public notices were posted up from Northumberland to Casablanca and from Lisbon to the Danube, it was natural that all christian rites should be in Latin in the West. In the fifth century the barbarian settlements brought a variety of teutonic dialects into the different Western provinces, and a cross-division of language everywhere between the new masters and the old populations. Even among the latter the rapid decline of civilisation brought an inability to keep up the old cultured but complicated language. All through the sixth and seventh centuries the barbarians and provincials were mingling and profoundly affecting each other's speech. Languages were everywhere in flux and European speech was a chaos of local *patois*. The composition of vernacular rites was impossible; there is not even a vernacular literature worth speaking of anywhere in the West from this period. The church still stood for all that was left of the old tradition of civilisation, and could only conserve that in so far as it was protected from contemporary influence in a Latin armour.

The revival of civilisation which begins in the eighth century came about by the recovery of just those traditions of the past which were most favourable to the renewed use of Latin. It culminates in Charlemagne's 'restoration of the Roman empire', and his imposition throughout his dominions of the Roman rite. Neither policy was calculated to elevate the position of the vernacular languages which are just beginning to take a recognisable form in the ninth century. But the adoption of the 'local Roman' *Gregorian Sacramentary* as the core of the universal Western rite had an important result, quite apart from things ecclesiastical. It placed at the basis of all Western culture the only tradition of the use of Latin in which the language had evolved without break from the classical tongue of Cicero and Virgil, through the expressive and supple silver Latin of the third and fourth centuries, to the 'ecclesiastical Latin' of the age of Leo and Gregory, without any serious admixture from outside.

The culture which sprang from the work of Charlemagne, but which finally made sure of life only in the eleventh century, was not a formal restoration of the classical imperial culture such as the sixteenth century artificially essayed, but it was its true descendant in many ways. As such it

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 14.

was emphatically an international culture—or at this stage when nations were still embryonic, it is truer to say an inter-regional culture—whose natural instrument was a common language. And since religion was at the very heart of this new culture, Latin (which by now was not so much common to all regions as not particularly limited to any of them) was still used in church.

This excluded the great mass of the people from intelligent participation in the church services. But we have to remember that they were excluded no less from participation in the revived secular culture of the times. There is always in the background of mediaeval history the great half-civilised, half-christian mass of the population, living dumbly, obediently, laboriously, squalidly, leaving singularly little trace in the record, while the history which is told in books goes on in front of it. Even when the new national monarchies of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were slowly forming their peoples into separate unities, the international forces in educated society and the dialectal differences and linguistic poverty of this great mass of the people in each country were still much too great for national vernacular liturgies to have been a practicable proposition. We have all heard the story of the fourteenth century Englishman who said 'eyren' and was not understood by the fourteenth century Englishwoman to be asking for 'eggys'. It was not before the end of the fifteenth century, and in some regions hardly then, that vernacular languages first became even capable of being instruments for vernacular liturgies.

It is not until this situation is understood that we are in a position to appraise the measures taken to meet it in the sixteenth century either by the old religion or the new. The mediaeval church was not altogether blind to the difficulties occasioned by the use of Latin. Real efforts were made in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to provide vernacular devotions for the layfolk to use during mass. Most unfortunately these do not seem anywhere to have taken the form of translations of the prayers actually used at the altar, which would have enabled the laity to participate more intelligently in the rite itself. Instead, the laity were given compilations of supplementary prayers, devotions and aspirations (of which Langforde's *Meditations* are an excellent specimen) to occupy their thoughts while the liturgy itself went on in Latin independently of them. And as Latin theology by comparison with earlier ideas had restricted the significance of the sacrifice of Christ to the passion, without sufficient regard had to the resurrection and ascension, these lay eucharistic devotions, scriptural in essence though they were, were quite naturally dominated by the thought of Calvary. (This is something which, as we have already seen, survived the Reformation.)

This substitution of other prayers for those of the liturgy itself even in lay manuals of devotion was very unfortunate. No doubt the expense and labour of hand copying books had much to do with it. A translation of the

missal would be a comparatively long book; a set of devotions for the length of a low mass was short, and could serve for every day in the year. But given the impossibility of supplying translations of the rite to the laity as is done among modern Roman Catholics, the situation at the end of the middle ages was rendered still more difficult by the facts (1) that the great half-submerged mass of the population was just beginning to be articulate, and (2) simultaneously with this, members of the educated classes and the clerical body itself were publicly questioning the rightness of the mediaeval formulation of the liturgy in entirely new ways.

Even with all the resources of modern publishing and printing to provide adequate and cheap translations for the laity, it is no secret that some contemporary Roman Catholic liturgists and clergy regard it as an open question whether the Roman church will not even yet be forced to make more use of the vernacular in parish churches, if the bulk of the laity are to participate fully in the liturgy, despite the convenience of a common rite for an international church. This is not our business, though we may note in passing that the arguments by which the retention of Latin for the liturgy is now defended are the precise opposite of those which originally brought about the introduction of a Latin rite at Rome. But in the crisis at the end of the middle ages the use of the liturgy in the now sufficiently evolved vernaculars would have been of incalculable service to the old religion. It would have released the evangelising power of the liturgy itself upon the masses, just awakening to think. Probably nothing else would have sufficed adequately to meet their need of instruction just then. As it was, this potent instrument was left entirely to the Reformers, and the masses' ignorance of their own religion left them much more receptive to the new teaching.

There were many on the catholic side who saw this clearly. But the church in the early sixteenth century was shewing every sign of staleness and inner moral crisis, and was in no position to face voluntarily the change in long-established conventions which would have been involved. By the time the Counter-Reformation had sufficiently restored the church's freedom of action the question of the vernacular had become a partisan issue, which could no longer be decided on its own merits. The great catholic need had become that of unity and the closing of the ranks against the new negations. For this the old liturgy, purged of local diversities and late mediaeval accretions, and in the same language everywhere, was too valuable an instrument to lose. The result was the reformed Roman Missal of Pius V, 'imposed' on the whole Roman obedience by an unprecedented legislative act of the central authority. (Even in this crisis, though, the fact that the real basis of liturgy is *custom*, not law, was recognised by allowing all 'customs' contrary to the use of this missal which could shew a continuous usage for 200 years and more.) This is the basis of the modern Roman Catholic rite; it is little else than the tenth century 'Gelasianised-Gregorian'

missal with unimportant additions. By thus imposing a rigid liturgical discipline in a purified and militarised mediaeval church, the post-Tridentine Papacy avoided the necessity of solving the liturgical crisis which faced the sixteenth century church as a result of the appearance of new conditions in society at the close of the middle ages. It is possible, however, for an outsider to hold that the inevitable question was only postponed, and not really avoided.

4. The thwarting of lay participation in the rite by 'hearing', which was involved in the use of Latin, threw an exaggerated emphasis on the mediaeval layman's participation by 'seeing'—the only other share in the rite left to him. But low mass left little more for the layman to watch than the priest's back and occasional movements of his hands. There was virtually no ceremonial. In the *Ordo Romanus Primus* every stage of the rite is accompanied by a good deal of 'publicity' and movement. The gospel is chanted from the *ambo*, with a preliminary procession with lights and incense; the offertory occupies all the clergy and all the people, each taking their own part in a great co-ordinated action; the eucharistic prayer had anciently been chanted aloud by the pontiff in the midst of his clergy and people all listening attentively with bent heads; the fraction had been a preparation by all the clergy for the eucharistic feeding of the multitude, while the acolytes came up to receive the *fermentum* to carry away to absent members of the one Body; the communion had been the huge corporate communion of a whole population. In low mass all this had been reduced to its simplest elements. It was all still done—but almost entirely in silence or in a very low voice, by one man, without moving from the altar. Quite naturally and inevitably the layman's participation in the rite by 'seeing' concentrated itself on the one moment in the rite when he did see—the elevation, specially introduced in the eleventh century in order that he might see. And seeing he adored.

Cranmer describes the consequences of this concentration of devotion on 'seeing' and the elevation thus: 'What made the people to run from their seats to the altar, and from altar to altar, and from sacring (as they called it) to sacring, peeping, tooting and gazing at that thing which the priest held up in his hands, if they thought not to honour the thing which they saw? What moved the priests to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads? Or the people to say to the priest "Hold up! Hold up!"; or one man to say to another "Stoop down before"; or to say "This day have I seen my Maker"; and "I cannot be quiet except I see my Maker once a day"? What was the cause of all these, and that as well the priest and the people so devoutly did knock and kneel at every sight of the sacrament, but that they worshipped that visible thing which they saw with their eyes and took it for very God?'[1]

[1] Cranmer, *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine, etc.*, iv. 9; *Remains, ed.* Jenkyns, Oxford, 1833, *p.* 442.

Cranmer is not an unbiased witness, and there is a touch of his chaplain Becon's scurrility on his pen here. But even if he parodies it, the type of eucharistic devotion he recognisably describes differs in important respects from that which had led Ignatius of Antioch to insist that 'the eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ'.[1] In the primitive conception the consecration by the celebrant's prayer is subordinate to the whole eucharistic action as an essential part to the whole. In the mediaeval devotional conception the whole eucharistic action (carried on by the priest alone) is simply a means to bring about the consecration, for the purpose of individual adoration by each person present. Seen thus, the whole meaning of the liturgy is altered, and with it the meaning of consecration, even though the dogmatic foundation that 'the eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ' remains the same.

For my own part I cannot doubt that this change of conception is partly due to the unnatural emphasis placed on 'seeing' as the mediaeval layman's chief means of participation in the rite. It can hardly be accidental that the anxious preoccupation of the West which has continued ever since with the problem of the exact metaphysical relation of the physical realities of the bread and wine to our Lord's Body and Blood begins in the ninth century.[2] This is the period when the nascent vernaculars of Europe are beginning to be independent languages and the Latin of the church services is becoming finally incomprehensible to the mass of the people. The pre-Nicene and patristic centuries had taken this problem in their stride, as has the later Eastern tradition, in which the conception of the eucharist as a corporate *action* (not for the layman something seen or heard) has never been lost, despite the form which its liturgical presentation as a 'mystery' has taken.

5. Finally, and this seems to me the most momentous distinction of all between mediaeval Western and primitive eucharistic thought, the eschatological conception of the primitive rite has been almost entirely lost to view.

We have seen that Western eucharistic thought had for centuries concentrated chiefly upon that part of Christ's redeeming action (into which the church enters at the eucharist) which lies wholly within history and time in the past, the passion upon Calvary. The resurrection and ascension (which are the transition from time to the eternal—or rather perhaps from history to the metahistorical) and the eternal action of the High-priest at the heavenly altar had never been entirely excluded from the scope of the eucharist in Western theological discussion. The very language of the Western canon—'Making therefore the *anamnesis* of the blessed passion . . . and also of His blessed resurrection . . . and also of His glorious ascension. . . .'

[1] Ignatius, *Smyrn.*, vi.

[2] The *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini* of Ratramnus, *c.* A.D. 840, is the first treatise on this problem in theological history.

—'Bid these things to be borne by the hands of Thy holy angels to Thine altar on high in the sight of Thy divine majesty, that as many of us as by this partaking of the altar shall receive . . .'—such language as this could not allow the clergy who used it altogether to forget the older and wider understanding of the rite. But the people did not hear or understand the canon. The altar was seen by them through the arches of the screen, above which towered the great Rood with its realistic crucifix, perpetually focussing attention on the facts that the Son of Man had *died* and *here* was the living memorial of His passion. It is no wonder that lay devotion concentrated on this theme. Nor was it only lay devotion. Those prayers of private preparation and thanksgiving for the priest to use which are found in all mediaeval missals—which many of us still use profitably—the 'Seven prayers ascribed to S. Ambrose' (by John of Fécamp), 'Another prayer of S. Ambrose', 'A prayer of S. Thomas Aquinas', and the others, these are all preoccupied with the passion. 'O High-priest and true Pontiff Jesus Christ, Who didst offer Thyself to God the Father upon the altar of the Cross', is the burden of them all. Of course they *presuppose* the resurrection and the ascension. But I have failed to find one single explicit mention of these two events, not only in these usual prayers but in any private devotion suggested for celebrants in any print of a mediaeval missal available in the Nashdom library. This is, I think, a sufficient indication of the direction which even clerical devotion took in considering the eucharist in the later middle ages. It is entirely preoccupied with relating the eucharist *to the passion.*

The immense formative influence of such devotional exercises on the theological conception which even a learned cleric might hold of the rite has only to be considered to be understood. And the clergy taught the people. The total effect of the mediaeval view is to emphasise the past historical reference in S. Paul's words that in the eucharist 'ye do proclaim the Lord's death', to the neglect of the eschatological implications of what follows, 'till He come'. Thus when we find—as we shall—that Cranmer's rite of 1552 has not one single mention of the resurrection and ascension outside the creed, we shall recognise what we are dealing with. It is the undiluted tradition of mediaeval extra-liturgical devotion in which he had always lived, but transferred by him from the sphere of private devotion to become the very substance and meaning of the liturgy itself.

Again there is a long history behind the mediaeval development. The beginnings of the translation of the meaning of the eucharist from escha tology to history go back to the fourth century, even to the late third. Th mediaeval Latin church only gradually carried out the process over th whole range of its eucharistic theology and devotion, and even so onl achieved this translation in defiance of the language of its own liturg composed before the eschatological understanding had been lost. (The could not be a more significant instance of the power of the liturgic

tradition to conserve a wider and more balanced conception than the rationalisations of the learned tradition of theology.) Yet the mediaeval tradition, both in its scholastic and devotional expressions, retained a clear understanding that the eucharist is in itself an *action*, or more properly an entering into the redeeming action of Christ, even though the earthly action was now wholly taken over by the celebrant.

It was just here that the practical confining of the redeeming action of Christ (into which the eucharist enters) to Calvary led to serious and unnecessary difficulties. Being wholly within history and time, the passion is wholly in the *past*—the only moment of redemption which is so wholly confined to the past. The church at the eucharist can only be conceived to enter into a wholly past action in one of two ways, either purely *mentally* by remembering and imagining it; or else, if the entering into it is to have any objective reality outside the mind, by way of some sort of *repetition* or iteration of the redeeming act of Christ. Thus the way was not so much laid open as forced upon the church to that general late mediaeval notion of some *fresh* sacrifice of Christ, and His immolation again at every eucharist. There was no other way by which the reality of the eucharistic action could be preserved on the mediaeval understanding of it; yet the unbroken tradition of liturgy and theology alike insisted on this reality. And since the eucharistic action was now viewed as the act of the priest alone—though the liturgy itself continued to state a different view ('We Thy servants together with Thy holy people offer unto Thee . . .'), there was no escaping the idea that the priest sacrifices Christ afresh at every mass. However hard they tried to conciliate this view of the matter with the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews of the one oblation for sins, perfect and complete (so far as history and time are concerned) on Calvary, the mediaeval theologians, and the party of the old religion at the English Reformation, never quite got away from the necessity of defending the reality of the eucharistic sacrifice as in some sense an iteration of the sacrifice of Christ at the hands of the priest, even though they insisted that it was not a *new* sacrifice.

The Reformers, on the other hand, likewise carrying on the mediaeval insistence on the passion as the whole redeeming act into which the eucharist enters, took the other alternative. Since the passion is wholly in the past, the church now can only enter into it purely mentally, by *remembering* and imagining it. There is for them, therefore, no real sacrifice whatever in the eucharist. The external rite is at the most an acted memorial, *reminding* us of something no longer present. There is nothing but a 'figurative' meaning in such phrases as 'to eat the Body and drink the Blood' of Christ, which are, as Cranmer so often insisted, no longer here but in heaven. At the most we are then especially moved by the tokens or pledges of a redemption achieved centuries ago to rejoice and believe that we *have been* redeemed long ago on Calvary, and to renew our allegiance and gratitude

to our Redeemer. We have 'communion' with Him when we take the bread and wine as He bade us do 'in remembrance' of Him, because the mere obedience stimulates devout emotions and aspirations, and thus deepens our purely mental union with Him which we have by conscious faith.

All that constitutes the eucharistic action on this view is the individual's reception of the bread and wine. But this is only a 'token'. The real eucharistic action (if 'action' is not a misleading term) takes place mentally, in the isolated secrecy of the individual's mind. The eucharistic action is thereby altogether deprived of its old corporate significance; it is practically abolished even as a corporate act. The external action must be done by each man for himself; the real eucharistic action goes on separately, even if simultaneously, within each man's mind.

The old conception had been of the church in its hierarchic unity entering into Christ's action, by the co-operation of all its various 'orders' (each having its own 'office', as S. Paul conceived it), and so in His action 'becoming what it is' eternally—His Body. The new conception is of a strictly *personal* mental reflection upon His action in the past. We cannot enter into it, since as a matter of history the passion is unique and finished.

Even the external rite is no longer a *corporate* rite integral to the performance of the real eucharistic action, but a common preparation for it, designed only to prepare each communicant subjectively to perform it for himself. Because of this, and for order's sake and ecclesiastical discipline, it may be well to commit the holding of the service to the professional preacher, who has a hortatory and disciplinary office in the society of christians. The partaking of the eucharist has always been a social act. But in strict necessity there is no need of this. Since the real eucharistic action consists in the individual's own personal mental remembrance of the passion, and is not an act of the universal Body of Christ throughout time and space, there is no more need for a priest commissioned to act for the whole Body, or indeed possibility of such a priesthood. There is no possibility of pleading the eucharist for one another, or for the dead in Christ; though we may pray together *at* it (not *by* it) as we intercede at other times. And since the action is purely mental, the external means to the action—the bread and wine—need only be a 'token'. There is no need to suppose that 'the eucharist is the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ', as the primitive church had held. In strict necessity there is no need even of the taking of the bread and wine, which is only a Christ-ordained stimulus to the real eucharistic action, the devout remembering of His passion by the justified and believing soul dwelling upon the thought that He has saved it.

All this is a strictly logical and inevitable development from the protestant basis, and the proof of this is that it was the development everywhere followed by later protestantism, in spite of the hesitations of the Reformers. They would gladly have saved more of the primitive and mediaeval devo-

tional estimation of the eucharist, if they could. But I ask attention for the fact that it is the logical development along one line of something which in itself is Latin and mediaeval, the practical restriction of the significance of the eucharist to the passion, as the historical element in the redeeming act, seen apart from its supra-historical elements in the resurrection, ascension and eternal priesthood. Given that restriction, there is no way of entering into Christ's action but by a repetition of it however guarded, or by a mere mental remembering of it, however vivid and devout. Fifteenth-century catholicism, in effect, took the one line; protestantism, to safeguard the sovereign efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, took the other. As regards the eucharist[1] they are not complementary in their ideas, but strictly alternative developments of the same idea. The one can never comprehend the other.

The Reformation

No estimate of the situation in the early sixteenth century will do justice to the Reformers which does not take account of this *impasse* to which the Western liturgy had been reduced by the later mediaeval tradition of simultaneously laying the whole devotional emphasis on the perfect atonement of Calvary, and yet exposing itself to the idea of trying to repeat or supplement this by the action of the priest in the mass. On the other hand the liturgical work of Alcuin was still intact; it had scarcely even been obscured by later accretions. The implications of the actual text of the liturgy might be ignored in current teaching and practice, but it still enshrined not the mediaeval teaching but those old and simple ideas about the eucharist which Gregory had preserved and Alcuin had faithfully handed on before the mediaeval mis-development began.

We can see now that what was required was a careful reconsideration by the church of the questions of what the eucharistic action is and how it is performed; and that all that was needed to find a way out of the *impasse* was a return to the liturgy itself and to its teaching. This would have offered an appeal behind both the mediaeval absorption of eucharistic devotion in the passion and the mediaeval teaching about the 'sacrifices of masses'. Most unfortunately neither side took this line at all. Instead, each of them clung to one horn of the mediaeval dilemma. The Reformers retained and even emphasised the mediaeval restriction of the significance of the eucharist to the passion without its eternal consequences. The Counter-Reformation restated the mediaeval teaching about the sacrifice in a more defensible form, and fortunately with such vagueness as to permit of the reopening in quite modern times of aspects of the matter which

[1] And I think in other directions also, *e.g.*, the doctrines of 'irresistible grace' and 'justification by faith alone' are strictly alternative to fifteenth century semi-pelagianism and what amounted to 'justification by dodges'.

the mediaeval teaching obscured or ignored.[1] The advantage of the Counter-Reformation was that it conserved the text of a liturgy which dated in substance from long before the mediaeval development. With this it preserved those primitive statements which indicated the true solution of the mediaeval difficulty, even though it was a long while before the post-Tridentine church made much use of them for the purpose. The protestants on the contrary discarded the whole text of the liturgy, and especially those elements in it which were a genuine monument of that primitive church they professed to restore. They introduced in its place forms which derived from and expressed the mediaeval tradition from which their own movement sprang.

There are, I think, ample explanations and excuses for this unfortunate confusion in the Reformers' aims and ideas. 'Eschatological' primitive christianity and the 'established' church of the post-Constantinian world are even in terms contradictories; and the difference between them was probably never so intense as at the end of the fifteenth century—the period in which the Reformers were growing up. These men were, like most of us, very largely creatures of their own training. As one reads their works it is obvious that they were never able to clear their own minds of the late mediaeval scholastic and devotional outlook. At every end and turn their thought is dominated by this, with its abstractness and rigorous logic on the one hand, and its intense emotional concentration on the *history* of the Redeemer on the other. This was the only mental world they had ever known, and its limitations were hardly even beginning to be revealed. The first known edition, *e.g.*, of Justin Martyr was only issued in 1551, of the liturgy of *S. James* in 1560, of the *Apostolic Constitutions* in 1563. Such documents might have made both sides aware that they were arguing from much too narrow a basis in taking the mediaeval Western tradition alone. But they did not appear until after the Reformation had got under way. Passions were already inflamed; positions had been taken up and consecrated by the blood of martyrs on both sides. The new documents only provided weapons for the attack and defence of doctrines elaborated without reference to them. In the really vital period, the generation from *c.* 1515–1550 when the breach was made, though the disputants made perpetual use of patristic arguments, they were obliged to rely on the texts inherited from the middle ages, corrupt—or at the best uncritical—in the case of the Western fathers, defectively translated in the case of the Greeks. The very important Syriac fathers were then all but unknown. Patristi

[1] To see how far the modern Roman church has moved beyond the Counter Reformation's purely defensive position in the direction of the primitive doctrine of the sacrifice one has only to note the emphasis with which *e.g.*, de la Taille *Mysterium Fidei*, 1921, *pp.* 304–5 repudiates the notion of Bellarmine and de Lug of some 'real destruction' of Christ in the eucharist. Yet they themselves had repr sented a big modification of current mediaeval teaching. And the progress has go a good deal further in some quarters since 1921.

texts were frequently cited only from the collections of extracts found compiled for quite different purposes in the canon law, and were used polemically in obvious ignorance of their context and with false attributions. No scholar with a modern knowledge of patristics who reads, *e.g.*, Cranmer's *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine*, followed by Gardiner's attack on it in his *Explicacyon*, followed again by Cranmer's *Answer*, can fail to be aware that though Gardiner convicts his opponent of more actual abuse of patristic evidence than Cranmer was able to bring home to him, both parties are equally thorough in their interpretation of the patristic and primitive church solely in the light of their own post-mediaeval situation. It is the same frame of mind which made their contemporaries paint the centurion on Calvary in early sixteenth century armour and S. Clement of Rome in a cope and mitre. In art this is harmless and even good interpretation. But in the vital doctrinal discussion, where accurate historical interpretation might have provided the only possible solution apart from schism, it was fatal. The lack of historical perspective, due to the mediaeval ignorance of history, was perhaps the greatest single contributory cause in the intellectual field of the sixteenth century break-up of Western christendom. It is one more example—history abounds with them—of the danger of attempting to solve the practical problems of the present without a thorough understanding of their causes in the past.

But the causes of the breach at the Reformation were not only intellectual and theoretical. If we would be just to the Reformers we must remember the practical situation. They looked out upon a church plagued with a multitude of real superstitions, some gross and wholly evil in their effects, some merely quaint and fanciful, but all equally irrelevant to the christian religion. Their existence is not the invention of protestant propaganda; they were lamented and denounced by enlightened catholics quite as loudly as by protestants, and the abating of them occupied much of the attention of the Council of Trent. Again there is a long history behind the post-mediaeval situation. They had been accumulating for more than a thousand years—in grosser forms during the dark ages, in more poetic ones from the middle ages proper. Their existence was largely the revenge of the half-assimilated mass of the population upon the church for its exclusion from intelligent participation in public worship. They were certainly not the product of, or in most cases even connected with, the mediaeval doctrine of the eucharist. But they all presented themselves by this time under the aegis of the old religion. And the church under such pontiffs as Julius II or such pastors as Cardinal Wolsey seemed utterly disinclined to take any measures to disembarrass herself of them, if not incapable of doing so. The consciousness of their ubiquity, and what looked like their cynical tolerance by ecclesiastical authority, was enough to exasperate to the highest degree earnest and intelligent men who were wrestling with the loftiest problems of christian thought. If men could then

have foreseen the spirituality of John of the Cross and Teresa, the zeal of Ignatius, the charity of Francis de Sales and Vincent de Paul, they might have possessed their souls in more patience. As it was they were driven to despair of any effective evangelisation without a root-and-branch change of religion.

Further we must allow for the effect on the minds of good and sincere men of the great practical abuses in the government and machinery of the church. The Borgia and Medici popes did not look much like Vicars of Christ. The bishops, great lords much occupied politically or triflers wasting time upon the dilettantism of renaissance scholarship, were not often reassuringly like successors of the apostles. The church itself was disguised. The Avignon Papacy had come to depend upon a lay bureaucracy of lawyers for the efficient conduct of the increasing business of a centralised ecclesiastical administration. The bishops throughout Europe now similarly administered their dioceses through squads of lawyers in minor orders. The Body of Christ was thus given the appearance of a vast human machine for salvation by sacraments, operated by very human men for very human motives, in the name and by the mechanism of an absentee Christ. And the machine had grown so complicated by successive patchings up and tyings together to keep it going somehow that it was no longer efficient for its real purposes. Its whole power and energy were absorbed in keeping itself going.

If one studies the visitation records of the early decades of the sixteenth century, the impression they make is probably less one of widespread corruption than of a general torpor and an utter lack of spontaneity—at all events so far as England is concerned. The machine has taken charge of the church's life, and is still turning, but that is all there is to be said. Scandals are not notably numerous but they are inveterate, and the machine cannot prevent or eradicate them. The parochial clergy, often abysmally ignorant and ordained without training or testing, were in large part not pastorally efficient. The religious orders, for the most part respectably pious, were ridden by routine. Probably conditions in England were better—perhaps much better—than in many regions abroad.

All this had nothing to do with the mass or the liturgy itself. But the whole creaking, obsolescent, unchangeable ecclesiastical machine existed to get that liturgy performed, lived by performing it, was still justified in its own eyes and those of the multitudes because it performed it. It was natural enough that men who rebelled against the whole bureaucratic and mechanical conception of religion should assume that by sweeping away the mass they would end that conception with it. At least in England they were to find that the two were very little connected. When the mass had gone the whole Avignon system of administration, staffed by the same officials, operating by the same methods and regulations, acting through the same courts, remained in full working order. It was the shock of this

discovery which produced the second wave of the English Reformation, the puritan movement and ultimately the puritan revolution. But that is a later story.

At the time of the Reformation proper all was by no means corrupt in the old religion, and there is no need unduly to darken the picture. To take the case of England alone, Cardinals Fisher and Pole offer examples of a sanctity and beauty of character unmatched among their opponents (unless by Hugh Latimer) and rare among highly placed ecclesiastics in any age. Thomas More was as holy a layman, as respected a Speaker of the Commons and as efficient a Chancellor, as England has ever known. There were zealous parish priests quite ready to die for the faith of their flocks, like John Hales, the vicar of Isleworth, and John Larke of Chelsea Old Church. The martyred Carthusians drew from their monastic life the strength to endure sweetly and patiently and with striking courage a course of treatment whose calculated cruelty matches any achievement of the Cheka and the Gestapo with all their modern advantages. Yet when all has been said of this kind that can be said, the fact remains that for whatever reason the life of the church as a whole was running at a very low level and seemed unable to recover its vigour. I believe that the real reason lay in the liturgical life of the church, which was frustrated in its deepest meaning by the mediaeval misunderstanding. If this be the real cause, both the puzzling violence of the Reformers against the mass as it was presented to them, and the radical nature of their innovations in the liturgy and the strange misdirection of their aims become much more comprehensible. But however this may be, we must reckon with the fact that the Reformers just as much as their opponents were conceiving of the problem they set themselves to solve only within the contemporary post-mediaeval situation. Both sides alike are the products and the victims of that long Western development, which since the end of the thirteenth century had somehow increasingly gone astray.

The first public attack on the mass was made by Luther in a sermon in April 1520, without stating any very definite objections.[1] But in his pamphlet *On the Babylonish Captivity* in October of the same year[2] he enunciates a first sketch of the later protestant thesis, attacking (1) the practice of communion under one kind alone, (2) the doctrine of transubstantiation, (3) the doctrine of the eucharist as a propitiatory or meritorious sacrifice. It may be remarked once more that each of these features of the contemporary idea of the eucharist has a long and not altogether simple history of development behind it.[3] But Luther is not at all concerned with origins but only

[1] *Werke* (*ed.* Weimar, 1888), vi., *pp.* 349 *sqq.* [2] *Ibid.*, *pp.* 502 *sqq.*

[3] (1) The second century church had practised communion under one kind alone from the *reserved* sacrament; in the third century, and probably earlier, communion was given to infants at the liturgy from the chalice alone. But communion under both kinds separately was normal at the liturgy everywhere until the seventh–ninth century, when the barbarous behaviour of the times caused so many profanations that various devices were tried to protect the contents of the chalice, *e.g.* the use of a

with what was then going on in christian worship in Saxony. At this stage he was content with polemics without suggesting changes in practice. He

spoon (in the East) or a metal tube (in the West), intinction, and so forth. None of these were very satisfactory, but this did not much matter because lay communions were very rare. They increased in frequency in the West in the thirteenth century, and the practice grew up in consequence of communicating at the liturgy in the form which had always been customary from the reserved sacrament, under the species of Bread alone. It seems to have originated as a matter of convenience, and official directions to do so only begin towards the end of the thirteenth century, when the innovation was already firmly established. It remained the normal Western custom down to the sixteenth century. It is to be noted that Luther is responsible for that misrepresentation of the custom as 'the denial of the cup to the *laity*', which imports a note of caste-prejudice. It was as much 'avoided by' as 'denied to' the laity originally; and the Western discipline 'denies the cup' to the clergy (from the Pope down) just as much as to the laity when they do not happen to be celebrating, but only communicating.

(2) 'Transubstantiation' is a philosophical explanation of *the way* in which the truth of our Lord's words at the last supper, 'This *is* My Body' is to be reconciled with the truth, obvious to the senses, that the experienced physical realities of bread and wine persist in the elements. It was defined, somewhat vaguely, by Can. 1 of the Lateran Council in A.D. 1215 as the result of three hundred and fifty years of controversy about the matter in the West. Nobody—or scarcely anybody—then denied either truth; it was a question of their rational reconciliation in a single statement. The definition of the Lateran is an attempt to state, in terms of metaphysics rather than theology, the relationship between the persisting physical realities in the elements and the Body and Blood of our Lord, in such a way as not to deny either that all the physical qualities of the bread and wine remain (which would overthrow the nature of a sacrament and contradict universal sense-experience) or that—as our Lord said—'This *is* His Body' (which would overthrow the significance of the eucharistic action and contradict universal spiritual experience). The definition left many points open to discussion and perhaps conserved both truths better than it reconciled them. Its acceptance was made obligatory, as defining the area within which future discussion could proceed without denying either truth, much as the Chalcedonian definition of our Lord's Divine and Human Natures in One Person had done. As a *metaphysical* reconciliation of two accepted facts it was always theoretically open to restatement in a different set of philosophical terms (*e.g.* in terms of a dynamic metaphysic instead of the static Aristotelian categories) and in the sixteenth century good catholics like Bishop Tunstall of Durham were found who regretted that the term 'transubstantiation' had ever been imported into the discussion. Some Lutherans and some Anglicans have at times attempted such a restatement which shall not be open to the strictly metaphysical objections which can be urged against transubstantiation and yet equally conserve both parts of the truth, though none of these attempts can be said to have achieved their object altogether satisfactorily. (I do not know that any thoroughgoing attempt has ever been made to state the truth along the lines of a theology of the eucharistic action instead of in terms of the metaphysical correlation of the elements with the Body and Blood.)

The real objective of the protestant attack on transubstantiation was not the metaphysical statement of the relation between the elements and the Body and Blood, though it was delivered with metaphysical weapons, but the primitive christian belief that, as Ignatius said, 'the eucharist *is* the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which Flesh suffered for our sins'. This rests ultimately on our Lord's words as reported by S. Paul and the evangelists. The problems raised by the purely metaphysical controversy played an immense part in sixteenth century propaganda, but these are really only a continuation of academic controversies which had raged in the fifteenth century. Like those which concerned communion under both kinds they inflamed popular partisanship (and still do) but they are quite secondary to the real issues as these affect the liturgy, which is why they are relegated to a foot-note here.

(3) The question of the eucharistic sacrifice is sufficiently treated of above (*pp.* 111.*sqq.*, 273 *sq.*).

did not even discourage the laity from receiving under one kind, or priests from continuing to say the Latin mass, or even from receiving mass-fees, providing they had no intention of sacrificing but only of reciting the prayers of which the liturgy is composed.[1]

The first to see the full consequences of the protestant thesis and carry them into effect in public worship was not Luther but his follower Carlstadt, whose 'evangelical mass' in the Castle chapel at Wittenberg (in Luther's absence) on Christmas day 1521 is the beginning of a revolution. Carlstadt saw and proclaimed that a 'religion of the spirit' can find no place for external actions as *causes* in the realm of grace. They can only be 'tokens' of a reality inwardly accomplished independently of them. Unable to rid historic christianity of the external acts of baptism and the eucharist —as he once confessed would be desirable—because of the New Testament evidence, he had to be content with robbing that evidence of any intelligible meaning. Confronted by the indignant Luther with the words of institution he explained that our Lord had distributed bread to the disciples, and then—pointing to His own physical Person—had declared '*This* is My Body. Do this (*i.e.* distribute bread) in remembrance of Me.' Within a month of that first protestant Christmas he had already denied the efficacy of infant baptism, and in protest against it was rebaptising adults who had been baptised in infancy. If justification is by conscious faith alone, as Luther was teaching, then since infants cannot have conscious faith, their baptism had been no valid 'token' of a spiritually received incorporation into Christ. (Yet to insist on *re*-baptising because of this was in fact to attribute to the 'token' an importance which on this theory it could not possess.) Luther was horrified. Before the end of January there was a riotous pillaging of churches and smashing of altars and images in Wittenberg in what was to become the approved protestant fashion. A few weeks later the peasants of the countryside were massacring their feudal oppressors in the name of the new religion. The political anarchism of the Anabaptists had begun. These developments brought discredit on the new ideas in Germany for a while, and momentarily checked their progress—not least in Luther's own mind. But the inherent drive of the protestant idea was too strong to be stifled in contemporary conditions by the hesitations of the man who had made himself its first mouthpiece. Its development was merely transferred elsewhere.

Oecolampadius of Basle and Zwingli of Zurich arrived at much the same conclusions as Carlstadt at about the same time, and taught them with much greater discipline and reasonableness. Zwingli was a priest and a *monsignore*, who had formerly been chaplain to Pope Leo X. He had also managed to combine this with a commission in the army as an officer of Swiss mercenaries, in which capacity he took part in the battle of Marignano in 1515. (He did not lose his love of fighting after becoming a

[1] *Werke*, vi., *pp.* 526 *sqq.*

Reformer, but was killed in full armour at the battle of Cappel in 1531.) In 1519 he was accused of Lutheranism, and carried through a revolution in his native city which from a semi-political became an ecclesiastical movement. His doctrine of the sacraments, like that of his colleague of Basle, leaves them no force or efficacy of their own whatsoever. They are bare signs or ceremonies by which a man assures *other people* rather than himself of his saving faith in Christ's redemption.[1] Baptism does not make sons of God nor remit sins; the baptism of Christ is in all respects the same as the baptism of John.[2] In the eucharist there is but plain bread and wine, a *reminder* of the salvation achieved long ago on Calvary. In his *Fidei Ratio* issued in the year before his death Zwingli states his belief on this matter thus: 'I believe that in the holy eucharist . . . the true Body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith, *i.e.* that those who give thanks to the Lord for the benefit He has conferred upon us in His Son, recognise that He took upon Him true flesh, in that flesh truly suffered, truly washed away our sins by His blood, and thus everything wrought by Christ for them becomes as it were present by the contemplation of faith.'[3] In other words, the eucharistic action consists in a vivid mental remembering of the passion as the achievement of 'my' redemption in the past.

The same idea is expressed with great clearness in liturgical form in an exhortation after communion in the Zurich rite which he drew up in 1525. 'Now remembering, dear brothers and sisters, what we have just done according to our Lord's command, namely that with thankful remembrance we have borne witness to our belief that we are all miserable sinners, but by His Body given and His Blood poured forth [*i.e.* on Calvary] we have been cleansed from sin and redeemed from everlasting death . . . we ought sincerely to pray to God to grant us all to hold with firm faith within our hearts this remembrance of His bitter death, and bear it ever within us, and thereby die daily to all wickedness.'[4] As he explained the words of institution—' "This is", that is, "signifies", "My Body". Which is as though to say, it is as if a wife were to shew a ring left by her husband'—('engraved', he adds on another occasion 'with his portrait')—'and say "Look, this is my husband".'[5] Except that Oecolampadius reaches his conclusion by interpreting 'My Body' as 'the symbol (*figura*) of My Body' instead of 'is' as 'signifies', he does not appear to differ in any particular from Zwingli.

A greater man than either of these was Jean Calvin, a Frenchman who settled at Geneva. We are not here concerned with the majestic but unbalanced supernaturalism of his theology as a whole, which is the most

[1] *de Vera et Falsa Religione*, ii. *ed.* Schuler *u.* Schulthess, *p.* 198.
[2] *Ibid.*, *p.* 121.
[3] Cited in Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation*, *p.* 474.
[4] E. Wolfensberger, *Die Zürcher Kirchengebete*, *p.* 57.
[5] *de Vera et Falsa Rel.*, *p.* 293.

complete and satisfying to the mind of all the expositions which protestantism has received. Calvin is at one with Zwingli in denying any but a figurative sense to the words of institution,[1] but for the characteristic reason that to think otherwise would be an unworthy abasement of the glorified Christ in heaven.[2] Nevertheless Calvin will not agree with Zwingli that communion is *merely* a 'bare sign'. There is a presence of Christ at the eucharist—he does not hesitate to call it a 'Real Presence', and once to say that 'It is not by the imagination and thought that Jesus gives us His Body and Blood in the supper', 'but the *substance* of them is truly given unto us'.[3] But such traditional language must not mislead us as to his real meaning. 'The reign (of Christ) is in no way limited to any places in space, and in no way determined by any bounds that Jesus Christ should not show His power wherever He pleases, in heaven or on earth, that He should not declare Himself present *by His power and virtue*, that He should not ever aid His own, breathing living life into them, sustaining them, strengthening them, giving them vigour, and ministering to them no less than *if* He were present in Body; in fine, that He should nourish them with His own Body, the participation whereof He makes to flow into them *by the power of His Spirit*. Such, then, is the mode of receiving the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ in the sacrament'.[4]

This, then, is his final meaning—that in the eucharist Jesus bestows His Spirit on the spirit of the individual who believes in Him as Redeemer and partakes of the bread and wine as He had commanded. There *is* an efficacious significance of its own in the act of the individual's communion, to which the whole eucharistic action has been reduced. But for all the greater warmth and reality which Calvin's doctrine thus imparts to the notion of the eucharist over Zwingli's, he does not meet the difficulty that what our Lord had said He was giving was not His Spirit, but His *Body*. The last supper is not Pentecost, even if one leads to the other.[5] The real eucharistic action is for Calvin individual and internal, not corporate. It is one more example of the intractability of the scriptural sacraments to the protestant theory, and the impossibility of adapting to a 'religion of the spirit' and pure individualism the institutions of a 'religion of incarnation' which presupposes the organic community of the renewed Israel. Modern protestantism has solved the difficulty by leaving the sacraments on one side, and—when pressed by the scriptures—by inventing nameless Antiochenes who misled S. Paul, and by denying that our Lord instituted or intended to institute the sacraments at all. The Reformers did not feel able thus to set aside the evidence of the scriptures, though they were unable to fit the external sacramental actions at all comfortably into their theological and devotional scheme of christianity.

[1] *Institutes*, IV, xvii, 20. [2] *Ibid.*, 19. [3] *Ibid.*, 19. [4] *Ibid.*, 18.
[5] This doctrine is not the same as that primitive idea that in the eucharist we receive 'Spirit' by means of the Body (*cf. p.* 266).

It was, in fact, this difficulty of the New Testament evidence about the eucharist which broke up the early unity of the Reformation. Luther had been scared by the violence which followed Carlstadt's bold applications of his own teaching. It is significant that the only rampart he could ever find against such logical deductions from that theoretical teaching consisted precisely in the acceptance at its full value of the New Testament evidence. As he declared years afterwards in a letter to the protestants of Strassburg, he had never felt able to deny the plain and simple meaning of the words of institution as the scriptures reported them, though he would have been glad to add this further barrier of separation between himself and the papists. In fact he seems never to have wavered in his determination to defend their literal sense, and declared in 1534, 'The papists themselves are obliged to praise me for having defended the doctrine of the literal sense (of these words) much better than themselves. And in fact I am persuaded that, even were they all to be compounded into one man, they could never maintain them as strongly as I do.'[1] The *Confession of Augsburg*, the primary Lutheran confession of faith, in its tenth article, declares that the Lutheran churches 'teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present in the Lord's supper and that they are distributed to the communicants, and blame those who teach the contrary.' The sixth article of Luther's *Articles of Smalkeld* in 1537 says that 'The Bread and the Wine at the supper are the true Body and true Blood of Christ, and not only good christians but the wicked themselves receive them.' Violent controversies accompanied by the most unpleasant abuse took place between the German and Swiss reformers on this topic, but always the argument revolved around this question of the meaning of the scriptural evidence. Luther insisted that it must mean what it plainly said. Zwingli and Calvin replied that if it were to be accepted in this sense it must overthrow the whole protestant conception of the sacraments and with that the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith alone. It may be suspected that, as so often happens in controversies, both sides were right in what they affirmed.

Luther, however, did not cease to be a protestant. Nothing could exceed the violence of his language against the mass: 'Yea, I declare that all the brothels (though God has reproved these severely) all manslaughters, murders, thefts and adulteries have wrought less evil than the abomination of the popish mass.'[2] Though he insisted on the external reality of the Body and Blood in the eucharist on the ground of the scriptural evidence, he insisted that there is no sacrifice. All that is offered to God is the prayers of the rite. The Body and Blood of Christ are not offered to God but *to men*—to the communicants. There is still a eucharistic action, even an action of Christ in the eucharist—but the church does not enter into it. Her part is

[1] See this, and the other passages cited by K. G. Goetz, *Die heutige Abendsmahlsfrage in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig, 1907, *pp.* 50–55.

[2] *Werke, ed. cit.*, XV., *pp.* 773 *sq.*

only to prepare herself for it and to *receive it*. We can see here the effect of Luther's perpetual primary assumption about the end of religion, that it is not the worship of God but the comfort of man.[1]

Understood thus, the Lutheran eucharist does not contradict the cardinal protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone, despite its retention of belief in the objective reality of the communicants' reception of our Lord's Body and Blood by good and bad alike. For Luther the eucharistic action is not creative of the church, nor does the church enter into it corporately. It has been reduced to the act of communion alone, which each must do for himself. Indeed, it is not clear how far the term 'action' can properly be applied even to Luther's conception of the communion (except as a purely physical description of what the communicant does with his hands and mouth) for Luther always views it as something *passive*, as a 'reception'. And even so, he insistently denies that reception of communion *causes* grace (though it does 'cause' damnation in the man who receives without justifying faith). Grace is caused by the faith of the individual in his having been redeemed by Christ on Calvary. (Faith for Luther is always not faith *in Christ* as redeemer, but faith *in my redemption* by Him.) The gift to us by Christ of His own true Body and Blood only *rewards* our confidence (already achieved) that our sins have been remitted through the imputation to us of His righteousness. Participation in His Body and Blood does increase that confidence, because it proves to us that we have been redeemed by our own increased consciousness of our own confidence in Christ. (The whole process is self-regarding and self-generated as Luther presents it.)

It is perhaps not surprising that Luther's doctrine of the objective reality of our reception of our Lord's Body and Blood in the eucharist slowly declined in precision within the Lutheran churches.[2] It is based simply on the literal understanding of the words of institution, and is logically unrelated and unnecessary to the Lutheran doctrine as a whole. It kept its place in the Lutheran doctrinal confessions, but it received and could receive no adequate expression in the Lutheran liturgies. When the bulk of

[1] *Cf.* his distinction between 'the hidden God' of reason, the contemplation of Whom 'casts one into a horrible despair', and of Whose will 'it is hard to think without a secret anger against God' (*Werke*, xl. *a.*, *pp.* 77, 78), *i.e.* God in Himself Who is the object of worship; and on the other hand, God in relation *to us*, God redeeming *us* in Jesus Christ, Who justifies the sinner, and *as such* is lovable. Hence his immense emphasis on faith as the *consciousness* of being justified by the merits of Christ, the comforting sense of which he never tires of expatiating on, and the *experience* of which is for him in itself the whole process and purpose of our union with God.

[2] Luther's metaphysical explanations of *how* the Body and Blood are related to the bread and wine are not carefully elaborated but thrown out in passing, rather by way of a repudiation of transubstantiation than as a seriously thought out alternative. They are usually called in England 'consubstantiation', but Luther never seems to have used that term himself, and I cannot find it in any of the official Lutheran confessions. I do not think this side of his teaching—the metaphysical definition—was ever taken very seriously either by himself or by his followers.

the German Lutherans were united with the German Calvinists in the Prussian State Church in the early nineteenth century, it was in the result the Calvinistic eucharistic doctrine which prevailed, though the question was formally left open for every communicant to decide for himself.

Such were the new ideas which threw the continental churches into a ferment in the twenties and which were filtering into England in the thirties of the sixteenth century. Cranmer personally encountered them in more than one form in Germany after 1530, while he was qualifying for the archbishopric of Canterbury as a member of the diplomatic service—and on occasions of the secret service—of king Henry VIII.

Secular historians both in Germany and elsewhere nowadays tend increasingly to ascribe the violence of the Reformation explosion to a mere outbreak of the recurrent *furor teutonicus* against European civilisation. It is true that interesting parallels can be drawn. When the old common ordering of civilisation in the West had got into an unhealthy and weak state *c.* A.D. 400 it was ruined by a German disruption of its political basis through the barbarian settlements. When the West had painfully rebuilt its common order and unity on a new spiritual basis, which had again got into an unhealthy and weak state *c.* A.D. 1500, it was again ruined by another German outbreak against its spiritual basis in the Reformation. When Western European unity had again been rebuilt upon a common economic basis, which had grown similarly unhealthy in the early twentieth century, it has once again been ruined beyond hope (or fear) of restoration in its old form by another twofold paroxysm in what looks like the permanent weak spot in the organism of the West. Luther furnishes curious parallels with Adolf Hitler—the same 'somnambulism'; the same sense of surrender to mysterious impersonal forces, 'grace' and 'nature' as he labels them, irresistibly thrusting the passive human soul to a predestined fate; the same rather frantic brand of oratory, glorying in antinomies and self-contradiction; the same contempt for reason and exaltation of intuition and impulse, which have proved able to stupefy the German mind in other periods also (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Caesar, *Gallic War*, I. 44).

Such views are fashionable among historians at the moment. To me personally, for what the opinion is worth, the parallels seem unduly selective to be true. And they will prove gravely misleading by their oversimplification if they bring with them any acceptance of the view of history as a process of 'racial determinism', which is only another form of the Nordic *Herrenvolk* nonsense preached by Hitler himself. History is not simply the result of biological factors, even though biological factors do continuously enter into it by providing the men who make history. What makes up the whole process is an immensely complex interplay of the biological and economic setting with cultural forces and temporarily prevalent human ideas, the whole moulded in the end by certain voluntary actions of individual men and women. His mixture of Albanian and British blood did

not *cause* Constantine to accept christianity, with all the tremendous consequences still flowing from that action of his; nor did the economic and cultural situation of the time compel him to it, any more than it compelled his colleague Licinius to persecute the church. The situation of the empire and the current towards monotheism in the fourth century did form the setting for their different choices of action. But there is nothing to suggest that the result would have been the same if their choices had been reversed. Cultures would have been different if Mohammed or Descartes or Marx had never lived; history would have been different if Constantine or Charlemagne or Napoleon had acted otherwise than they did on certain occasions when it was in their power to act quite differently; even though the situations in which they chose their actions were not of their own making.

So it is with the Reformation, which is an immensely complex movement in which one can discern many factors at work—the low state of the church; the new nationalism; the greed of the territorial aristocracy; the agitation in the submerged masses; new cultural developments breaking up the structure of mediaeval society and the fixed framework of mediaeval thought; and half-a-dozen more. Among these the apparently permanent tendency of many men of German race to introspectiveness and *verlorensein*[1] may have its place, and would account for much of the hysteria and the violent tendencies—anarchistic in practice and even nihilistic in thought—with which it was often accompanied in Germany. Even so, we must remember that much the same emotional reactions were exhibited by some French Huguenots and some English puritans. Nevertheless in the last analysis it was the work of men, good, bad and indifferent in all parties. Leo X and Tetzel, Luther and Melanchthon, Saint Cajetan and Pfefferkorn, Calvin and Henry Tudor, Cranmer and Wolsey, Charles of Hapsburg, John Larke and Joan Butcher, Stephen Gardiner and Ulrich Zwingli and Anne Boleyn and all the rest—each must bear his or her own share of merit or responsibility for the ultimate results, right down to the nameless hinds who cut faggots or would not say Amen to the parson's new prayers, or just stood and laughed while the Carthusians were dragged by on hurdles through the kennel to Tyburn. Only God can assess all that with both justice and mercy.

Yet behind all the violence and the controversy and the inescapable but polluting alliances with secular motives and secular powers (which form the grimy compromise of ideas with human living in any given historical situation) one can, I think, discern the force of a single idea carrying the whole protestant movement forward with an impetus sufficient to overcome the strength of tradition, the resistance of sincere opponents and critics and even the mistakes and faults of the Reformers themselves. (I do not think anyone has ever claimed personal *sanctity* as the outstanding

[1] Sense of being lost and consequent blind panic—a symptomatic German word for a peculiarly German state of mind.

characteristic of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli—or Cranmer.) That idea was the conception of a personal relation of each individual soul to God. It was a true idea, though it was presented by the Reformers in so unbalanced a way as to assume all the characteristics of a half-truth. But it was not a new idea, or even one which it is fair to say that the mediaeval church had neglected except in one particular direction. One need only look, to take one instance, at what the mediaeval church had made of the primitive institution of penance, to be sure of that. The old pre-Nicene public penance for post-baptismal mortal sin—the 'single plank in shipwreck' that a man might undergo only once in a life-time, was directed chiefly to maintaining the *corporate* christian standards at a high level. The mediaeval church turned it into the auricular confession that we know, with all its psychological and other benefits to the individual, precisely in order to assist and develop the personal relation of the individual soul to God. The mystical writers of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, who had an immense influence, are full of this idea of the individual's relation to God, as the patristic authors had never been. The devotional tradition of the later middle ages is far more individualistic than that, *e.g.*, of the pre-Nicene church. Why then did the idea develop such intense emotional force in the period of the post-mediaeval liturgical crisis?

It is not neglected truths, but those which are at once fully acknowledged and frustrated of their proper expression, which take the most drastic psychological revenges. As I see it, it was precisely because this truth of the spiritual life was at once emphasised in fifteenth century teaching and devotion, and denied all practical expression in its proper field, the liturgy —which is the 'vital act' of the church's life—that it generated such explosive force. In the end it attacked the liturgy, which in its contemporary presentation opposed a direct barrier to its expression, with an unreasoning fury which on any other explanation is difficult to account for. It swept this ruthlessly away. And it proceeded to sweep after it just those elements of catholic tradition which stood in the path of its most extreme and unbalanced expression—the idea of the church as the sphere of redemption, the sacraments as effectual signs of grace, and with these the doctrines of the apostolic ministry and the communion of saints. It left intact other things like the orthodox doctrines of the Trinity and the atonement. Yet these were in fact no more (and no less) 'scriptural' than the doctrines it rejected. The formulation of them which protestantism retained rested just as much on 'ecclesiastical tradition' as that of the doctrines it discarded so vehemently. These latter are, from the point of view of modern scholarship, actually easier to trace in the pre-Nicene centuries than a fully Athanasian orthodoxy about the incarnation and the Trinity.

The real safeguard of the doctrines retained by protestantism in the sixteenth century was not the Bible, but the fact that they did not impinge upon the full sweep of the overmastering idea of the individual's relation to God

as the discarded doctrines might do. Even in sixteenth century protestantism it was not a direct relation to God which was in question; there was always Christ as the only mediator by His passion. The one-sided *devotional* emphasis of the fifteenth century on the atonement was fully maintained and even increased by the Reformers. As soon as the immediate post-mediaeval conditions which had lent this idea such vehemence passed away, protestantism lost all its expansive force. It fell back into reliance upon an institutionalism of its own and the support of secular society, as a new 'tradition' and a settled order of things. It retained a vigorous inherited opposition to catholicism, but it had only a diminished content of positive ideas derived from the christian past with which to oppose the onset of the new commercial secularism and the disintegrating effects of its own inherent individualism.

The attempt is being made to restore to it in various ways some of the catholic values it discarded, though it is difficult to see how this can be done effectively without a negation of the basic protestant idea. On the other hand, the modern attempt, seen *e.g.* in the writings of Barth and Brünner, to return to that motive idea of the protestant reformation in all its dazzling simplicity, though it has invigorated the thinking of many protestants, does not seem to have revivified either the protestant thesis or the energies of protestantism as a whole. Protestantism still has many able scholars, to whom it is a delight and a privilege to pay tribute. But that barrenness of what may be called creative or seminal thoughts which for more than a generation has alarmed philosophical protestants as a symptom of internal decay, still continues unbroken. (One has only to consider the contribution of English protestant dissent to christian thinking in England during the last five years to understand what I mean.)

Meanwhile, though the East has now had many opportunities of sympathetic contact with able and holy protestants, it has shewn no sign of discovering any contribution in protestant thought which it can usefully assimilate. Do not all these facts suggest that apart from the particular situation which gave it such terrific emotional force at the close of the Western middle ages, the protestant idea has never had in itself sufficient content to embrace either the whole essence of the christian religion or the whole complexity of human life? The asking of such a question by one who rejects the protestant account of christianity may be ascribed by some to mere prejudice, but it can honestly be said that it does not spring from any lack of sympathy with the Reformers or their followers. I ask it only because I believe that the history of protestantism itself indicates that they were the chief and most permanent sufferers by the accumulated mistakes of the mediaeval Latin church.

Archbishop Cranmer

From the day that Thomas Cranmer became archbishop of Canterbury in 1533 he seems to have believed sincerely that any ideas he might have for remedying the acknowledged crisis in the old religion ought to be strictly subordinated to those of that firm if somewhat eccentric supporter of things as they were, king Henry VIII. His business was to build up a strong and effective Royal Supremacy, by which the king might take such constructive action as seemed to him good after seeking counsel from his ecclesiastical advisers. The archbishop might have his own ideas, but it was for the king alone to decide how far they should be put into practice. King Henry died in January 1547. The accession of a minor, while it increased the archbishop's difficulties by weakening the sanctions behind any action which might be taken, also increased his opportunities of securing that it should be what seemed to himself the right action. In such circumstances the initiative and the responsibility for solving the problems now generally recognised as urgent clearly lay with him.

To secure an adequate acquaintance with the facts of the situation a general ecclesiastical Visitation of the whole country by Royal Commissioners in the name of the new Supreme Head of the English Church was ordered, and energetically carried out during the autumn. From some date late in the autumn we have the first diagnosis by the archbishop himself of the problems which confronted him and the first cautious sketch of the remedies he proposed to employ. The one took the form of a *questionnaire* addressed to his brother bishops, the other of his own answers to it.

'Queries concerning the mass:

'1. Whether the sacrifice of the altar was instituted to be received of one man for another, or to be received of every man for himself?

'2. Whether the receiving of the said sacrament of one man do avail and profit another?

'3. What is the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass?

'4. Wherein consisteth the mass by Christ's institution?

'5. What time the accustomed order began first in the church, that the priest alone should receive the sacrament?

'6. Whether it be convenient that the same custom continue still in this realm?

'7. Whether it be convenient that masses satisfactory should continue, that is, priests hired to sing for souls departed?

'8. Whether the gospel ought to be taught at the time of the mass, to the understanding of the people being present?

'9. Whether in the mass it were convenient to use such speech as the people may understand?'[1]

[1] *Cranmer's Works, ed.* Jenkyns, II, *pp.* 178 *sq.* (There are two further questions on reservation.)

It is interesting to set beside Cranmer's own answers those returned by a group of six bishops who made a joint reply from the conservative side:

Cranmer	Boner etc.
1. The sacrament of the altar was not . . . instituted to be received of one man for another, but to be received of every man for himself.	1. I think that the sacrament of thanks was not . . . instituted to be received of one man for another, but of every man for himself.
2. The receiving of the said sacrament by one man doth avail and profit only him that receiveth the same.	2. I think that the receiving of the said sacrament doth not avail or profit any other, but only as all other good works done of any member of Christ's church be available to the whole mystical body of Christ, and to every lively member of the same, by reason of mutual participation and spiritual communion between them. And also it may be profitable to others as an example . . .
3. The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass is so called not because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people (for that was done but once by Himself upon the cross) but it is so called, because it is a memory and representation of that very true sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the cross.	3. I think it is the presentation of the very Body and Blood of Christ being really present in the sacrament; which presentation the priest maketh at the mass in the name of the church unto God the Father, in memory of Christ's passion and death upon the cross, with thanksgiving therefore and devout prayer that all christian people, and namely they which spiritually join with the priest in the said oblation and of whom he maketh special remembrance, may attain the benefit of the said passion.
4. The mass by Christ's institution consisteth in those things which be set forth in the Evangelists Mk. xiv; Lk. xxii; 1 Cor. x and xi.	4. I think it consisteth principally in the consecration, oblation and receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ with prayers and thanksgivings; but what the prayers were, and what rites Christ used or commanded at the first institution of the mass, the scripture declareth not.

5. I think the use that the priest alone did receive the sacrament without the people began not within six or seven hundred years after Christ.	5. I know no further order or commandment of the church; but what time the devotion of the people was so greatly decayed that they would not come to receive the sacrament, then the priests were compelled to receive it alone.
6. I think it more agreeable to the scripture and primitive church, that the first usage should be restored again, and that the people should receive the sacrament with the priest.	6. I would wish that at every mass there would be some to receive the sacrament with the priest: nevertheless, if none will come to receive it, I think it lawful and convenient that the priests of this realm of England may say mass and receive the sacrament alone.
7. I think it not convenient that satisfactory masses should continue.	7. I think that such of the schoolmen as do write of masses satisfactory, do define them otherwise than is declared in this question; nevertheless, I think it is not against the word of God but that priests praying in the mass for the living and the dead, and doing other things in the church about the ministration of the sacraments, may take a living for the same.
8. I think it very convenient, that the gospel concerning the death of Christ and our redemption should be taught to the people in the mass.	8. I think it not necessary to have a sermon at every mass, but the oftener the same is done to the edifying of the people (so that the service of their vocation be not defrauded) the more it is to be commended.
9. I think it convenient to use the vulgar tongue in the mass, except in certain secret mysteries, whereof I doubt.[1]	9. To have the whole mass in English, I think it neither expedient nor convenient.

The parties are less agreed than they might seem at first sight, for they differ over questions 3 and 7, which are really the key questions. The six bishops' answer on 7 misses the real point, which Cranmer's does not reveal. In 3 everything turns on the meaning of the word 'memory', which subsequent events shew that the two parties were already using in different

[1] *Ibid.*, *pp.* 179 *sqq.*

senses, though that is not obvious here. One notes in both answers to this question the mediaeval restriction of the sacrifice of Christ entirely to His passion and death; this is taken for granted by everybody (and the mediaeval devotional tradition is emphasised again, unconsciously but strongly, in Cranmer's answer to No. 8). One notes, too, the mediaeval 'sacerdotalist' form of the bishops' answer to No. 3. For both parties alike the sacrifice of Christ is irremediably in the remote past. Along this line the *impasse* between entering into His action as mere mental *remembering* and something which has at least the appearance of repetition by the priest is inevitable, even though it is still concealed by the use of the word 'memory' by both sides.

There were further exchanges of questions and answers in the next few weeks, which brought out Cranmer's thoroughgoing disbelief in any effective doctrine of the 'communion of saints' on earth, such as is stated in the bishops' answer to 2; and, on the other side, the reluctance of the bishops to innovate against the 'uniformity of all churches' in liturgy. However, a parliamentary statute in the previous December had already required the bishops to draw up a form for communion under both kinds. Despite the rather wrangling tone the exchange of views between them had begun to take, the bishops unanimously put out the *Order of Communion* in March 1548 under the authority of this statute, without having formally submitted it to Convocation.[1]

This consisted of (*a*) an 'exhortation' to the parishioners to prepare for communion, to be pronounced by the priest some days beforehand; and (*b*) an English form for administering communion to the laity, to be inserted into the customary Latin mass, which was otherwise to be recited as it always had been without variation.

(*a*) The former is, apart from stylistic verbal variations, the exhortation 'Dearly beloved, on ——day next I purpose, etc.' still contained in the present Prayer Book. Apart from a paragraph about the restitution of stolen goods or lands (inserted in 1549 but omitted in 1552 in deference to the protests of the new proprietors of old church lands and never since replaced) this has been retained throughout the history of the Anglican rite. In it the eucharist is described as 'the most comfortable sacrament of the body and Blood of Christ, to be taken of them *in the remembrance* of His most fruitful and glorious passion: by the which passion we have obtained remission of our sins, and be made partakers of the kingdom of heaven, whereof *we be assured and ascertained* if we come to the said sacrament with repentance, faith and intention of amendment'. If the reader will return for a moment to the Zurich documents cited on *p.* 632, he will find them ruminating as to the doctrine behind this statement. The exhortation went on to the paragraph contained in substance in the same exhortation in

[1] On the preliminary discussions see H. A. Wilson, *The Order of the Communion* 1548 (H.B.S., 1908), *pp.* x. *sqq.*

the present Prayer Book, that any one still troubled in conscience after private self-examination and contrition, shall 'come to me or some other discreet and learned priest, taught in the law of God' and make his confession and receive absolution. This is nowadays quite legitimately cited as evidence that the English Church has *retained* the sacrament of penance. But when it first appeared the emphasis must have been felt to lie all the other way. Confession to a priest had hitherto been the invariable preparation of the laity for their infrequent communions. This exhortation suggests that it should now become exceptional, and goes on to require that those who do not use it shall not be judged by their fellows any more than those who do by those who do not. Under the appearance of impartiality this was an official defence of an innovation.

(*b*) The form for administering communion also consists of items still found in our present Prayer Book. After the priest's communion (made according to the Latin rite) he turns to the people to say what is still substantially our 'Long Exhortation', though it has since undergone more alterations than the preliminary exhortation just treated of. There follows our 'Short Exhortation'—'Ye that do truly—' (in which the people's confession is described as made 'to Almighty God *and to this holy church here gathered together in His Name*', shortened to 'before this congregation' in 1552, and omitted in 1662); then the Confession in its present form. The Absolution was changed a little, apparently to improve the coherence of its wording, in 1549; but even in 1548 it is already substantially as it is now. There follow the present 'Comfortable Words', and then, all kneeling, the priest says the 'Prayer of Humble Access' in its present form, except that after 'so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His Blood' it runs '*in these holy mysteries*, that we may continually dwell in Him . . . The words italicised were removed in 1552. After this comes the communion of the people with the forms: 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . preserve thy *body* unto everlasting life', 'The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . preserve thy *soul* unto everlasting life', reflecting the mediaeval speculation that the bread is for the communicant's body and the chalice for his soul, also found in the Prayer of Humble Access (*cf.* 612). After this the priest is to 'let the people depart' with 'The peace of God . . .' (without the addition of 'And the blessing of God . . .' first added in 1549, when 'The peace' was transferred to the end of the whole eucharistic rite). Presumably in 1548 the people only 'departed' to the nave to await the rest of the Latin rite.

This *Order* is partly a fruit of Cranmer's embassy abroad. An unsigned letter from one of his suite (now thought to have been Sir Thomas Elyot) about 1530 describes how they found that at Nuremberg 'after the levation the deacon turneth to the people, telling them in the Almaigne tongue a long process how they should prepare themselves to the Communion of the Flesh and Blood of Christ. And then may every man come that listeth with

out going to Confession'.[1] Other passages in the letter make it clear that 'Mr. Cranmer' had been very interested; and it is certain that the Brandenburg-Nuremberg *Kirchenordnung* drawn up by Cranmer's father-in-law Osiander was at least consulted by him in drawing up the preliminary exhortation for giving warning of communion.[2] The general confession in Cranmer's *Order* has, however, made more direct use of Hermann of Cologne's *Consultatio*, rather more than fifty per cent. of its wording being taken over bodily from this Lutheran document, together with about fifty per cent. of the absolution (though the changes in this case are not unimportant) and three of the four 'Comfortable Words'.[3] But while these Cologne prayers are meant to be said before mass begins, Cranmer has transferred them for use immediately before communion; and the Nuremberg matter, employed in the original immediately before communion, has been used by Cranmer for the preliminary occasion some days before.

It has been worth while to set out the facts about this *Order*, which was in use only for some fifteen months, a little more thoroughly than is usually done, because it casts a good deal of light on the archbishop's own mind. It is no small part of the evidence both for Cranmer's personal honesty and for his fixity and consistency of mind that he felt able to employ this same set of communion devotions from the first to the last of his liturgical experiments with only one verbal change which can be supposed to be of any doctrinal importance—the omission in 1552 of the words '*in these holy mysteries*' from the phrase about eating the Body and drinking the Blood of Christ in the 'Prayer of Humble Access'. In this connection the statement of sacramental doctrine in the preliminary exhortation is of outstanding interest.

It was obvious, of course, that the *Order of Communion* could only be an interim arrangement; and the Royal Proclamation by which it was put out said as much. It was superseded by the first Prayer Book at Pentecost 1549, which in outline mostly followed the old Latin rite and contained much that was reminiscent of the old prayers of the missal. The new English prayers of the *Order of Communion* were placed in exactly the same position in the new English rite of 1549 that they had occupied in the Latin one the year before.

It is usual to interpret this rite as evidence of a half-way stage in Cranmer's doctrinal development, a stage when he held an approximately Lutheran position of belief in some reality of connection between the consecrated elements and our Lord's Body and Blood, though it is plain that

[1] *Original Letters etc.* (*ed.* H. Ellis), III, ii. 192.

[2] H. E. Jacobs, *The Lutheran Movement in England etc.*,[2] (1892), *pp.* 240 *sqq.*, links that Cranmer also used the Cassel *Ordnung* of 1539 and the earlier Nuremberg *Order* of Volprecht (1524). He appears to me to exaggerate the resemblances of the English *Order* to these two documents.

[3] The two documents are printed side by side in H. A. Wilson's *ed.* of *The Order of Communion* (H.B.S., 1908), *pp.* 49 *sqq.*

the rite of 1549 does not view the rite as a sacrifice. His judges at his trial charged him with having taught three different doctrines at various times (Papist, Lutheran and Zwinglian).[1] Most of his contemporaries, friendly and hostile, agreed that he had passed through a Lutheran stage, an opinion followed by most modern historians. His own repeated and passionate claim both at his trial and earlier that he had never 'taught but two contrary doctrines' (*i.e.* transubstantiation and one other)[2] have been set aside, not seldom with an echo of the jibe of his opponent, Dr. Henry Smith: 'O Lord, what man is so mad as to believe such mutable teachers, which change their doctrine at men's pleasure as they see advantage or profit? They turn and will turn, as the wind turneth'.

As a matter of strict historical justice this judgement seems to me altogether unfair to the man. And since its perpetuation does a great deal to confuse the meaning of the rites he produced, I propose to investigate the matter. Cranmer had all the former don's sense of the precise meaning of words, and all the former diplomat's willingness to propound a contentious idea in a not too disturbing way. But from the death of Henry onwards, when he seems to have accepted responsibility for the changes he thought it necessary to introduce, he was always quite straightforward as to the doctrine which he himself held, and by which he conceived it his duty to frame the new liturgy. If his own repeated statements of doctrine be examined minutely, there is, with the possible exception of a single sentence in his earliest doctrinal work,[3] no flicker of inconsistency from 1547 right down to his final disputations at Oxford in 1554–5. Three phrases in the Prayer Book of 1549 were (perhaps designedly) ambiguous, though perfectly compatible with the explanations which he gave of them while the book was in use, and with the final 'Explication' of his doctrine which he put in at his trial in 1554.[4] The meaning of the Prayer Book of 1549 was certainly 'explained' much more clearly in that of 1552, but the preamble of the Act which introduced 1552 (which is of Cranmer's penning) openly declared that this was the purpose of the new Book.

What then was this doctrine which both his liturgies expressed, and which is already found in the first Exhortation of the *Order of Communion* in 1548? During that last grim five minutes in S. Mary's at Oxford Cran

[1] Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings* (Parker Soc. Ed.) II, *p.* 218. (This ed. will b cited as Parker I and II.)

[2] Parker II, *pp.* 225 *sq. Cf.* I, 190; II, 374, etc.

[3] The passage in question occurs in his translation of Justus Jonas' *Catechism*, 'high' Lutheran work, where Cranmer says that '*in* the sacrament *we receive* tru the Body and Blood of Christ'. (The original in Jonas is *quod vere corpus et sangu eius sit*, which is not the same thing.) Cranmer himself repeatedly defended th phrase as consistent with his teaching elsewhere, *cf.*, *e.g.*, *Defence*, iv. 8 (*Works*, e Jenkyns, vol. 2, *p.* 440), but I find it difficult to agree with him that it is so. It seem to be originally a piece of carelessness. In all other cases he has carefully eliminate from his 'translation' all traces of the original's Lutheran doctrine of the reality the Body and Blood in communion. Here he has failed to do so thoroughly.

[4] Parker I, *pp.* 396 *sqq.*

mer declared: 'As for the Sacrament I believe as I have taught in my book against the bishop of Winchester', by which he means his *Answer unto a Crafty and Sophisticall Cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner*, published in 1551. But this takes the somewhat tortuous form of a reply to a reply to his own *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament* (1550), which Gardiner had attacked in his *Explication*. Cranmer modifies no single point of his doctrine as expounded in the *Defence* in the course of the *Answer*, but defends it sentence by sentence. I propose, therefore, to work chiefly from the *Defence*; partly because it gives his teaching in a positive form, partly because being published in 1550 while the Book of 1549 was in use, it forms, as it were, his own commentary on the meaning of the first Prayer Book as well as the second, and serves to establish their consistency.

In the preface to the *Defence* he says plainly, 'What availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages and such other like popery, so long as the two chief roots remain unpulled up? . . . The rest is but branches and leaves . . . but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead.'[1] And again at the end of the book he is equally explicit: 'And as for the saying or singing of mass by the priest as it was in time passed used, it is neither a sacrifice propitiatory, nor yet a sacrifice of laud and praise, nor in any wise allowed before God, but abominable and detestable; and thereof may well be verified the saying of Christ, That thing which seemeth an high thing before men is an abomination before God . . . But thanks be to the eternal God, the manner of holy communion, which is now set forth within this realm (*i.e.* 1549) is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with S. Paul and the old primitive and apostolic church, with the right faith of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross for our redemption, and with the true doctrine of our salvation, justification and remission of all our sins by that only sacrifice.'[2] One may regret that he should call an 'abomination before God' that rite of the eucharist which had been the heart of religion for every holy man and woman there had ever been in England since Augustine landed—which had sanctified the lips and fed the soul of Bede and Dunstan, which Alcuin had adorned and Edmund and Audrey and Edward had heard and loved. But that was in the manner of the times. What is quite certain is that he himself did not consider his own book of 1549 to be only a vernacular translation or adaptation of that 'abomination', or even a half-way house to it; but something radically different from it and essentially consistent with the doctrine of 'justification by faith alone'.

The key-point in Cranmer's doctrine is his definition of what is meant by 'spiritually eating the Flesh' and 'drinking the Blood' of Christ, phrases

[1] *Defence*, Preface, *Works*, *ed.* Jenkyns, II (1533), *p.* 289.
[2] *Defence*, V, 15, 18, *pp.* 459, 468.

which he uses in a peculiar sense of his own, though he is careful to explain that sense, and returns to it again and again. But unless and until that definition is grasped the reader is perpetually misleading himself (as the judges quite evidently did at his trial) by reading into Cranmer's use of these words something which is not intended to be there. The plainest passages are these (italics in every case are mine):

A. *Cranmer's doctrine concerning eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Christ.*

(1) *Defence*, III, 2 (*p.* 357). The papists 'say that every man, good and evil, eateth the Body of Christ: We say, that both do eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, but none do eat the very Body of Christ and drink His Blood, but only they that be lively members of His Body.[1] They say that good men eat the Body of Christ and drink His Blood only at that time when they receive the sacrament: We say that *they eat, drink and feed of Christ continually*, so long as they be members of His Body . . . They say that the fathers and prophets of the Old Testament did not eat the Body nor drink the Blood of Christ: *We say that they did eat His Body and drink His Blood although He was not yet born* nor incarnated.'

(2) III, 10 (*p.* 378). (The words of Jn. vi. 'He that eateth My flesh etc.') '. . . are not to be understand[ed] that we shall eat Christ with our teeth grossly and carnally, but that we shall spiritually and ghostly with our faith eat him, being carnally absent from us in heaven; and *in such wise as Abraham and other holy fathers did eat Him* many years before He was incarnated and born . . . *for they spiritually by their faith were fed and nourished with Christ's Body and Blood*, and had eternal life by Him before He was born *as we have now* after His ascension . . .'

Ibid. (*p.* 381). 'The eating of Christ's Flesh and drinking of His Blood is not to be understand[ed] simply and plainly as the words do properly signify, that we do eat and drink Him with our mouths; but it is a figurative speech spiritually to be understand[ed], *that we must deeply print and fruitfully believe in our hearts, that His Flesh was crucified and His Blood shed for our redemption.* [*Cf.* Langforde's *Meditations*, *p.* 606.] *And this our belief in Him is to eat His Flesh and drink His Blood*, although they be not here present with us, but be ascended into heaven. *As our forefathers before Christ's time did likewise eat His Flesh and drink His Blood*, which was so far from them that it was not yet born.'

(3) III, 15 (*pp.* 404 *sq.*). 'The true eating of Christ's very Flesh and drinking of His Blood' is '. . . an inward, spiritual and pure eating with heart and mind; *which is to believe in our hearts that His Flesh was rent and torn for us upon the cross and His Blood shed for our redemption*, and that the same Flesh and Blood now sitteth at the right hand of the Father, making continual intercession for us; and *to imprint and digest this in our minds*, putting our whole affiance and trust in Him as teaching our salvation and offering

[1] There could not be a plainer repudiation of *Lutheran* doctrine in this matter.

ourselves clearly unto Him, to love and serve Him all the days of our life. This is truly, sincerely and spiritually to eat His Flesh and to drink His Blood.'

(4) IV, 2 (*pp.* 426 *sq.*). 'But as the devil is the food of the wicked, which he nourisheth in all iniquity and bringeth up unto everlasting damnation: so is Christ the very food of all them that be lively members of His Body, and them He nourisheth, feedeth, bringeth up and cherisheth unto everlasting life. And every good and faithful christian man feeleth in himself *how* he feedeth of Christ, eating His Flesh and drinking of His Blood. *For he putteth the whole hope and trust of his redemption and salvation in that only sacrifice which Christ made upon the cross*, having His Body *there* broken and His Blood *there* shed for the remission of sins. And this great benefit of Christ the faithful man earnestly considereth it in his *mind*, chaweth and digesteth it with the stomach of his heart, spiritually receiving Christ wholly into Him, and giving again Himself wholly into Christ. *And this is* the eating of Christ's Flesh and drinking of His Blood, the feeling whereof is to every man the feeling how he eateth and drinketh Christ, which none evil man nor member of the devil can do.'

There are a considerable number of other passages which might be cited, but I think these will suffice to make it clear that whenever Cranmer speaks of 'spiritually eating the Body and drinking the Blood of Christ' we must understand that *he means by this*, '*thinking with faith that Christ died for my sins on Calvary*', and nothing else but this. His judges quite failed to grasp this fact at his examination, and were at cross-purposes with him throughout the proceedings in consequence.

I am fairly sure that the first reaction of every modern Anglican will be to ask, Then what in the world has this 'spiritual eating and drinking of Christ's Body and Blood' to do with receiving holy communion, if Abraham and Moses 'did likewise eat His Flesh and drink His Blood'? Cranmer's answer to such a question would be '*Specifically, nothing at all!* To suppose that it has is precisely one half of the popish doctrine I am combating. That is not the purpose of the Lord's supper at all, though to those who, as I say, "eat drink and feed on Christ *continually*, so long as they be members of His Body", the supper as well as any other time may be an occasion for it. But the supper itself has another purpose which I describe very lucidly in the 5th book of my *Defence*.'

B. *Cranmer's doctrine concerning the true use of the Lord's supper.*

(1) V, 9 (*p.* 455). 'Popish masses are to be clearly taken away out of christian churches, and the true use of the Lord's supper is to be restored again, wherein godly people assembled together may receive the sacrament every man for himself, *to declare that he remembereth what benefit he hath received by the death of Christ, and to testify that He is a member of Christ's Body, fed with His Flesh and drinking His Blood spiritually*' [*i.e.* in the sense defined above].

(2) V, 10 (*p.* 455). 'Christ did not ordain His sacraments to this use that one should receive them for another and the priest for all the lay people; but He ordained them for this intent, that every man should receive them for Himself, *to ratify, confirm and stablish his own faith* and everlasting salvation.'

(3) V, 13 (*p.* 459). '. . . His holy supper was ordained for this purpose, *that every man eating and drinking thereof should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith, and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ's benefits;* and so give unto Christ most hearty thanks and give himself also clearly unto Him.'

(4) III, 15 (*p.* 419). 'The show-bread of the law was but a dark shadow of Christ to come; but the sacrament of Christ's Body is a clear testimony that Christ is already come, and that He hath performed that which was promised, and doth presently comfort and feed us spiritually with His precious Body and Blood [*i.e.* whenever we trust in His passion] notwithstanding that corporally He is ascended into heaven.'

Again I think the modern Anglican, with his mind set on some sort of idea that 'the spiritual eating of Christ's Body and Blood' must somehow have *some* connection with receiving holy communion, will feel impelled to ask 'What then is the meaning of "consecration", and of our own "prayer of consecration" '? Again Cranmer is perfectly plain and explicit in his reply.

C. *Cranmer's doctrine concerning Consecration.*

(1) III, 15 (*p.* 413). 'Consecration is the separation of any thing from a profane and worldly use unto a spiritual and godly use . . . Even so when common bread and wine be taken and severed from other bread and wine to the use of the holy communion, that portion of bread and wine, although it be of the same substance that the other is from the which it is severed, yet it is now called "consecrated" or "holy" bread and holy wine. *Not that the bread and wine have or can have any holiness in them,* but that they be used to an holy work and represent holy and godly things. And therefore S. Dionyse calleth the bread holy bread and the cup an holy cup, *as soon as they be set upon the altar to the use of the holy communion.*[1] But *specially they may be called* holy and consecrated when they be separated to that holy use by Christ's own words, which He spake for that purpose, saying of the bread, This is My Body, and of the wine, This is My Blood. So that commonly the authors before those words be spoken do take the bread and wine but as other common bread and wine; but after those words be pronounced over them, then they take them for holy bread and wine.'

(2) He returns to this point (*ibid.*, *p.* 414): 'Not that the bread and wine can be partakers of any holiness or godliness or can be the Body and Blood of Christ; but that they *represent* the very Body and Blood of Christ, and

[1] Ps.-Dionysius, *de Ecclesiast. Hierarch.* 3. (As a matter of fact Ps.-Denys calls them that before they are set on the altar.)

the holy food and nourishment we have by Him [*i.e.* through believing that He died for our sins]. And so they be called by the names of the Body and Blood of Christ, as the *sign, token and figure* is called by the name of the very thing which it showeth and signifieth.'

(3) What he means by this is perhaps more clearly put in a previous passage: II, 11, where, discussing a (spurious) passage in S. Cyprian, Cranmer says: 'And yet the bread is changed, not in shape nor substance but in nature, as Cyprian truly says, not meaning that the natural substance of bread is clean gone, but that by God's word there is added thereto another higher property, nature and condition, far passing the nature and condition of common bread, that is to say, that *the bread doth shew unto us*, as the same Cyprian saith, *that we be partakers of the Spirit of God* and most purely joined unto Christ, and spiritually fed with His Body and Blood [in Cranmer's sense] so that now the said mystical bread is both a corporal food for the body and a spiritual food for the soul.'

(4) III, 2 (*p.* 356). 'We do affirm according to God's word, *that Christ is in all persons that truly believe Him*, [*i.e.* at any time, not only in holy communion] *in such sort that with His Flesh and Blood He doth spiritually nourish and feed them* and giveth them everlasting life, and doth *assure* them thereof, as well by the promise of His word, as by the sacramental bread and wine in His holy supper, which He did institute for the same purpose.'

There could be no plainer statement than this that in Cranmer's idea the spiritual feeding on Christ is something dependent solely on 'belief' in Him, and independent of receiving holy communion, which is, as he says, one among several assurances thereof. But here is a further passage which is specially interesting for the light it throws on Cranmer's understanding of the 'Prayer of Humble Access':

(5) III, 15 (*p.* 406). 'For although (S. Hilary) saith that Christ is naturally in us (by holy communion), yet he saith also that we are naturally in Him. And nevertheless in so saying he meant not the natural and corporal presence of the substance of Christ's Body and ours; for as our bodies be not after that sort within His Body, so is not His Body after that sort within our bodies; but he meant that Christ in His incarnation received of us a mortal nature and united the same unto His Divinity, and so we [*i.e.* humanity] be naturally in Him. And the sacraments of baptism and of His holy supper, if we rightly use the same, do most assuredly *certify* [*i.e.* not 'make'] us that we be partakers of His godly nature, having given unto us by Him immortality and life everlasting, and so is Christ naturally in us. And so we be one with Christ and Christ with us not only in will and mind, but also in very natural properties.'

S. Hilary assuredly did not mean this, as a glance at the context will inform anyone, and as was pointed out at his trial Cranmer has misquoted him. But the mistakes seem to have been made in all good faith, and from our present point of view all that matters is the renewed insistence that

the right use of the Lord's supper only 'certifies' us of something which proceeds independently of it. But it may be asked, if 'consecration' is so meaningless, what is the function of priesthood in the rite at all? Surely anyone can 'separate' bread and wine 'to an holy use'? Again the answer is plain:

D. *Cranmer's doctrine concerning the Ministry.*

(1) V, 11 (*p.* 456). '. . . the difference that is between the priest and the layman in this matter is only in the ministration; that the priest, as a common minister of the church, doth minister and distribute the Lord's supper unto other, and other receive it at his hands. But the very supper itself was by Christ instituted and given to the whole church, not to be offered and eaten of the priest for other men, but by him to be delivered to all that would duly ask it.

'As in a prince's house the officers and ministers prepare the table, and yet other as well as they eat the meat and drink the drink; so do the priests and ministers prepare the Lord's supper, read the gospel and rehearse Christ's words; but all the people say thereto, Amen; all remember Christ's death, all give thanks to God, all repent and offer themselves an oblation to Christ, all take Him for their Lord and Saviour and spiritually feed upon Him, *and in token thereof* they eat the bread and drink the wine in His mystical supper.

'And this nothing diminisheth the estimation and dignity of priesthood and other ministers of the church, but advanceth and highly commendeth their ministration. For if they are much to be loved, honoured and esteemed, that be the king's chancellors, judges, officers and ministers in temporal matters; how much then are they to be esteemed that be ministers of Christ's words and sacraments, and have to them committed the keys of heaven, to let in and shut out, by the ministration of His word and gospel?'

It will be noticed that Cranmer here does not actually say *whose* 'ministers of Christ's word' the clergy are. He is justified in not raising this quite different question at this point, but it is as well to clear it up in order to understand his ideas as a whole.

(2) There still exist, partly in Cranmer's own hand, drafts signed by himself of certain *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments* drawn up in the autumn of 1540, of which the following are relevant:[1]

Q. 9. 'Whether the apostles lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian king among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God?'

Ans. 'All Christian princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance. And in both these ministrations they must have sundry ministers under them, to supply that which is

[1] Parker II, *pp.* 116 *sq.*

appointed to their several offices. The civil ministers under the king's majesty in this realm of England be those whom it shall please his highness for the time to put in authority under him: as *e.g.* the lord chancellor, lord treasurer, . . . etc. The ministers of God's word under his majesty be the bishops, parsons, vicars and such other priests as be appointed by his highness to that ministration, as *e.g.* the bishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Durham, the bishop of Winchester, the parson of Winwick, etc. . . . All the said officers and ministers, as well of the one sort as the other, be appointed, assigned and elected in every place, by the laws and orders of kings and princes. In the admission of many of these officers be divers comely ceremonies and solemnities used, which be not of necessity but only for a good order and seemly fashion: for if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnity, they were nevertheless truly committed. And there is no more promise of God, that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of the civil office.

'In the apostles' time, when there were no christian princes, by whose authority ministers of God's word might be appointed, nor sins by the sword corrected, there was no remedy then for the correction of vice or appointing of ministers, but only the consent of ⟨the⟩ christian multitude among themselves, by an uniform consent to follow the advice and persuasion of such persons whom God had most endued with the spirit of counsel and wisdom . . . and so sometime the apostles and other unto whom God had given abundantly His Spirit, sent or appointed ministers of God's word; some time the people did choose such as they thought thereunto; and when any were appointed or sent by the apostles or other, the people of their own voluntary will with thanks did accept them; not for the superiority, impery or dominion that the apostles had over them to command as their princes or masters, but as good people, ready to obey the advice of good counsellors . . .'

Q. 11. 'Whether a bishop hath authority to make a priest by the scripture or no? And whether any other, but only a bishop, may make a priest?'

Ans. 'A bishop may make a priest by the scripture, and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them . . .'

Q. 12. 'Whether in the N.T. be required any consecration of a bishop or priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?'

Ans. 'In the N.T. he that is appointed to be a bishop or a priest needeth no consecration by the scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient.'

Q. 14. 'Whether it be forfended by God's law . . . that the king . . . should make bishops [in case of necessity] or no?'

Ans. 'It is not forbidden by God's law.'

Q. 16. 'Whether a bishop or priest may excommunicate and for what crimes? And whether they only may excommunicate by God's law?'

Ans. 'A bishop or priest by the scripture is neither commanded nor

forbidden to excommunicate, but where the laws of any region giveth him authority to excommunicate, there they ought to use the same in such crimes as the laws have authority in; and where the laws of the region forbiddeth them, there they have none authority at all: and they that be no priests may also excommunicate, if the law allow them thereunto.'

The ministers of the eucharist are thus acting as such simply as officials of the secular government of the christian state in Cranmer's opinion. Such was his idea in 1540 and he insisted on defending the same opinion at his trial in 1554, declaring that 'Nero was head of the church' in his day, 'that is in worldly respect of the temporal bodies of men, of whom the church consisteth; for so he beheaded Peter and the apostles. And the Turk (*i.e.* Sultan) too is head of the church of Turkey.'[1] It is therefore not likely that we shall find anything which may be fairly interpreted in terms of a differentiation of 'order', as the primitive church understood it in Cranmer's liturgies of 1549 or 1552, still less anything corresponding to the idea of a priestly 'oblation'. Nevertheless, as we have seen (D. 1) Cranmer does admit *an* idea of oblation in the eucharist, which he calls 'a sacrifice of laud, praise and thanksgiving.' He defines carefully the sense in which it is so.

E. *Cranmer's doctrine concerning the Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving.*

(1) V, 3 (*pp.* 448 *sq.*). 'One kind of sacrifice there is, which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice, that is to say, such a sacrifice as pacifieth God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation. And although in the Old Testament there were certain sacrifices called by that name, yet in very deed there is but one such sacrifice whereby our sins be pardoned and God's mercy and favour obtained, which is the death of the Son of God our Lord Jesus Christ; nor never was any other sacrifice propitiatory at any time, nor never shall be.

'Another kind of sacrifice there is, which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to shew ourselves thankful unto Him; and therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise and thanksgiving.

'The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us; the second kind we ourselves offer to God by Christ.

'And by the first kind of sacrifice Christ offered us also unto His Father; and by the second we offer ourselves and all that we have, unto Him and His Father. *And this sacrifice generally is our whole obedience unto God, in keeping His laws and commandments.*'

This does not appear to be at all closely connected with the eucharist, but he is somewhat more explicit later on.

(2) V, 13 (*p.* 459). 'In this eating, drinking and using of the Lord's supper, we make not of Christ a new sacrifice propitiatory for remission of sin. But the humble confession of all penitent hearts, their knowledging of

[1] *Ibid.*, *p.* 219.

Christ's benefits, their thanksgiving for the same, their faith and consolation in Christ, their humble submission and obedience to God's will and commandments, is a sacrifice of laud and praise, accepted and allowed of God no less than the sacrifice of the priest.'

It would appear, therefore, that the sacrifice and oblation in the eucharist consists for Cranmer in the emotions and ideas of those present at the eucharist, and not in anything appertaining to the rite itself.

It is, I think, only just to add to these doctrinal passages a devotional one, which Cranmer places at the end of his positive exposition of his views before embarking on controversy.

F. *Cranmer's esteem for the Eucharist.*

I, 16 (*p.* 307). 'All men desire to have God's favour; and when they know the contrary, that they be in His indignation and cast out of His favour, what thing can comfort them? How be their minds vexed! What trouble is in their consciences! All God's creatures seem to be against them, and do make them afraid, as things being ministers of God's wrath and indignation towards them. And rest and comfort can they find none, neither within them nor without them. And in this case they do hate as well God as the devil; God as an unmerciful and extreme judge, and the devil as a most malicious and cruel tormentor.

'And in this sorrowful heaviness, holy scripture teacheth them, that our heavenly Father can by no means be pleased with them again, but by the sacrifice and death of His only-begotten Son, whereby God hath made a perpetual amity and peace with us, doth pardon the sins of them that believe in Him, maketh them His children, and giveth them to His first-begotten Son Christ, to be incorporate into Him, to be saved by Him, and to be made heirs of heaven with Him. And in the receiving of the holy supper of our Lord, *we be put in remembrance of this His death*, and of the whole mystery of our redemption. In the which supper is made mention of His Testament [*i.e.* Covenant] and of the aforesaid communion of us with Christ and of the remission of our sins by His sacrifice upon the Cross.

'Wherefore in this sacrament, if it be rightly received with a true faith, we be assured that our sins be forgiven, and the league of peace and the Testament [*i.e.* Covenant] of God is confirmed between Him and us, so that whosoever by a true faith doth eat Christ's Flesh and drink His Blood [*i.e.* meditate on the passion] hath everlasting life by Him. Which thing when we feel in our hearts at the receiving of the Lord's supper, what thing can be more joyful, more pleasant or more comfortable unto us?'

I take leave to set beside this a few words from those meditations which the priest Langforde placed before his parishioners as the substance of their non-communicating eucharistic devotion: 'Call to your remembrance and imprint inwardly in your heart by holy meditation the whole process of the passion . . . which is a meditation of sweetness unspeakable to them

that inwardly can consider it.' *Plus ça change*—? Was it really worth all that tremendous upheaval of English religion in order to add what Cranmer insisted is only a 'token' communion in bread and wine to the layman's meditation on the passion? Yet *devotionally*, and so far as the layman is concerned, does the change really amount to much more than this, that whereas under the old *régime* the liturgy and the eucharistic action went on while the layman meditated on the passion, but independently of him, now that meditation on the passion is publicly conducted and has actually become the liturgy and the eucharistic action, to which he himself must now listen, and he must receive the bread and wine? Doctrinally the change is, of course, very much greater.

By a somewhat forced use of the phrase 'to eat the Body and drink the Blood of Christ' when he means 'to remember the passion with confidence in the merits of Christ', he succeeds in preserving a good deal of traditional catholic language, though he is quite fair in being explicit as to what he does mean by this phrase, and that the traditional language must not be understood in anything like its traditional sense. He can make good use, too, of Lutheran material, and I rather suspect that its customary *schwärmerei* appealed to one side of his very sensitive nature. He can clothe his negations with the comparative warmth of the Calvinist's idea of eucharistic devotion. But for my own part, surveying all the exposition of his teaching in his own words given here, I am quite unable to distinguish the substance of his doctrine from that of Zwingli.[1]

Cranmer's Liturgical Work

We are now in a position to understand the meaning—and the brilliance —of Cranmer's liturgical work. It must be remembered that the *Defence* from which all the above passages except D. 2 (dated 1540) have been drawn, was published in 1550, while the first Prayer Book was still in use. It is in fact his own commentary on that rite, which is referred to at the end of the treatise as embodying this doctrine. There can be no doubt that though 1549 was unpopular with the laity as a novelty, and suspect among the theologians, many clergy did use it as a 'vernacular mass' without much misgiving. Looking at it now, with the *Defence* before us, it is easy enough to see how subtly it had been worded: 'Having in remembrance His blessed passion . . . rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring Thy fatherly

[1] This was clearly understood at the time. 'The Archbishop of Canterbury entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the supper. . . . He has some articles of religion to which all preachers and lecturers in divinity are required to subscribe, or else a license for teaching is not granted them; and in these his sentiments respecting the eucharist are pure and religious and similar to yours in Switzerland' (Hooper to Bullinger, Dec. 27, 1549; *Original Letters*, Parker Soc., *ed.* Robinson, I, xxxvi, *p.* 71).

goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ . . . we and all Thy whole church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion. And here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, our self, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee: humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ: and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction . . . and although we be unworthy through our manifold sins to offer unto Thee any sacrifice: yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of Thy holy angels to be brought up into Thy holy tabernacle before the sight of Thy divine majesty not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences . . .'. This is the rite's own expression of what the eucharistic action is. Every word of it, as Cranmer shewed in the *Defence*, was certainly compatible with, and for the most part clearly expressed, his own Zwinglian doctrine. Yet his opponents were consoling themselves with the thought that it expressed, awkwardly and not at all fully but still sufficiently, the traditional ideas with which they themselves used this rite. He could even allow a verbal reminiscence of the old second century oblation at the heavenly altar to remain, by deftly substituting 'prayers' and 'tabernacle' for the 'oblations' and 'the altar on high' of which Irenaeus had spoken.

There are in 1549 only three phrases which are difficult to interpret fairly along the lines of Cranmer's teaching in the *Defence*: (1) In the canon, before the institution: 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech Thee, and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word[1] vouchsafe to bless and *sanctify* these Thy gifts and creatures that *they may be unto us the Body and Blood* of Thy most dearly beloved Son . . .' (2) Also in the canon: 'humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be *partakers of this holy communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood* of Thy Son and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one Body with Thy Son Jesus Christ, that He may dwell in them and they in Him.' (3) In the prayer of humble access, immediately before communion: 'Grant us . . . so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ and to drink His blood *in these holy mysteries* that we may continually dwell in Him.'

Gardiner felt able to cite these three passages, together with the words

[1] This is often said to be an imitation of the Eastern 'invocation'. It may be so, but both the form and position of the prayer are quite different from those of any Eastern rite known in Cranmer's time. The clause is clearly representative of the *quam oblationem* of the old canon in position and meaning, combined perhaps with reminiscence of the dictum of Paschasius Radbert (*de Corp. Dom.* 12) that the sacrament is consecrated in the Word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Spirit. Under the name of Augustine this had got into the mediaeval catenae and was frequently cited as a commonplace by scholastic authors.

of administration and the kneeling recitation of the prayer of humble access before communion (as implying adoration)[1] as setting forth the teaching 'that they receive with their bodily mouth the Body and Blood of Christ.' Cranmer retorted sharply that any such suggestion was 'a plain untruth'.[2] Looking at the matter in the light of the *Defence*, it is possible to see how he would have explained these passages to himself. He is right in claiming that Gardiner's use of them rests only on inference, and moreover inference which the rest of the rite does not support but goes some way to contradict. But it was a reasonable inference from these passages taken alone as they stood. He was evidently startled to find how completely the rite had been misinterpreted in a catholic sense, and in 1552 took pains to alter every point in 1549 to which Gardiner had appealed.

There is substantial evidence that Cranmer from the outset regarded 1549 like 1548 as a mere *ballon d'essai*, and made no secret of the fact from those around him.[3] It may well be that in compiling a temporary form Cranmer was not scrupulous to avoid all ambiguity. But the Book of 1549 had a bad reception on all hands. His foreign friends were not impressed by it. The English laity mocked at it as 'naught but a Christmas game' and rose in rebellions over half the countryside, which were only suppressed with considerable slaughter by the use of foreign mercenaries.[4] Even after these *dragonnades*, as the Second Act of Uniformity lamented in 1552, the laity 'do wilfully and damnably abstain and refuse to come to their parish churches' where 1549 was still in use. The clergy, unconvinced of the merits of the Book by the hanging of priests for non-compliance, were deliberately misinterpreting it and making it as much like a mass as they dared.[5] Five bishops had had to be deprived of their sees for obstructing its enforcement, and others were known to be unenthusiastic. To a man who sincerely believed that the mass was 'an abomination before God' while his own 'very godly order' was 'agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive church, very comfortable to all good people, and most profitable to the estate of this realm' it might very well seem that those refusing the latter would 'answer before God for such evils and plagues wherewith Almighty God may justly punish His people for neglecting the good and wholesome law' (*i.e.* the Act of Uniformity of 1549).

[1] It is to be remembered that there was no kneeling by the priest in the mediaeval rite at this point. It would be all the more striking, therefore, as an innovation in 1549, and lend itself to this misunderstanding.

[2] Parker I, *p.* 53.

[3] See the evidence cited by F. M. Powicke, *The Reformation in England*, Oxford 1941, *pp.* 89 *sq.* (It is much to be wished that the reading of this wise essay might be made compulsory among the clergy. Doubtless most of us would still remain 'high' and 'low' churchmen on the traditional lines, but a good deal of the mythology which makes us so would be destroyed.)

[4] The protestant John Ab Ulmis puts the number of executions at 'about 5,000 since June, writing in August 1549 (*Orig. Letters*, II, clxxxix, *p.* 394).

[5] *Cf.* Hooper, *Orig. Letters*, I, xxxvi, *p.* 72.

And so there came the second Act of Uniformity with the second Prayer Book annexed, in 1552, because 'there hath arisen in the use and exercise of the foresaid common service (1549) in the church . . . divers doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, *rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers than of any other worthy cause:* therefore . . . the king's most excellent majesty with the assent of the lords and commons in parliament assembled and by the authority of the same hath caused the aforesaid order . . . to be faithfully and godly perused and made fully perfect'; and anyone, lay or cleric, worshipping otherwise than by the new Book in any manner whatsoever, is to be imprisoned for six months for the first offence, a year for the second, and for life upon a third conviction. The time for ambiguity had gone by and the Book of 1549, 'explained and made fully perfect' in that of 1552, is to enforce the truth upon the obstinate English people.

The rite of 1552 does in fact express with great accuracy the doctrine, which Cranmer once said that he had learned from Ridley,[1] which we have already studied. What had largely assisted the general misunderstanding of 1549 was its retention of the traditional Shape of the Liturgy. Cranmer realised that this was a mistake if he wanted the new belief to be adopted; and in 1552 he made radical changes in this in order to bring out the doctrinal implications of 1549. But the wording of the prayers of 1549 needed no such drastic treatment. Rearranged in their new order they served with remarkably few changes to express the full Zwinglian doctrine—in itself a reasonable vindication of Cranmer's claim that this had been their most obvious meaning all along.

Such changes as 1552 made in the part of 1549 which corresponded to the ancient synaxis seem to have been designed rather to give fair warning of the stand the English church was now definitely to be regarded as taking up, than to express particular doctrinal notions in themselves. Many if not most of the Lutheran *Ordnungen* had retained the introit psalm in some form, as had 1549. The Zwinglians and Calvinists had abandoned it, and 1552 abolished it too, leaving the Lord's prayer and 'collect for purity' as the only introduction to the rite. (These were a relic of the old 'preparation' of the ministers before the altar, being among the latest mediaeval additions to these prayers.) The old *Kyrie*-hymn and *Gloria* were replaced by the Ten Commandments, whose use at this point seems to have been suggested by the *Ritus Ministerii* of the Alsatian Calvinist Pullain, published at London in 1551. This has also supplied the wording of the final response, 'And write all these Thy laws in our hearts, we beseech Thee'. The primitive greeting and its response are omitted before the collects, probably in accordance with the usual protestant theory that it is the business of the minister alone to carry on the service, while the people are only

[1] Parker II, *p.* 218. (The date of his conversion to Zwinglianism would appear to 1546.)

to answer Amen and listen. The collect for the day is always to be followed by a collect for the king as Supreme Head of the church.[1]

The Roman sequence of collect and lections is retained, but the chant of the gradual psalm between epistle and gospel, which had come down from apostolic times and indeed from our Lord's own worship in the synagogues of Galilee, had already been abolished in 1549 and was not restored in 1552. It had been used in the late Sarum ceremonial to 'cover' the mixing of the chalice by the deacon and subdeacon. Cranmer's determination to exclude any possibility of an offertory from the rite is probably the motive for its abolition. The collocation of collects with epistle, and of gospel with creed and sermon, are the only sequences in the structure of the old Sarum rite which recognisably survived in 1552.

After the sermon in 1552 followed the intercessions (which had formed the first part of the canon in 1549). These may have been placed here in deference to primitive precedent. But there is no suggestion of this reason in Cranmer's writings, and it is not easy to see how from the materials available at the time he could have been aware that the primitive intercessions had come at this point. It is to be noted that the intercessions follow the sermon in most Swiss protestant rites, including that of Pullain which Cranmer was studying when he compiled 1552. Their primitive position in our rite may thus be only a happy accident, which was somewhat marred in 1662 when an offertory was awkwardly re-inserted before them, thus confusing Cranmer's scheme of the rite as a whole. The intercessions in 1552 followed the protestant model in being a long monologue by the celebrant to which the people replied Amen; and not a corporate exercise in which all 'orders' play a co-operative part, as in the primitive rites. In 1552 this prayer corresponds fully with the bidding for 'the church militant here in earth'—(introduced for the first time in 1552)—all mention of the departed and the saints (retained in 1549 when this prayer formed part of the canon) being excluded. The somewhat hesitant prayer about the dead introduced in 1662 (which just succeeds in being a prayer *for* them) mars Cranmer's bidding and the title 'prayer for the church militant' no longer applicable. But they were retained in 1662 as already customary. Here again 1662 spoils the finish of Cranmer's workmanship.

There is no mention of an offertory of bread and wine before this prayer in 1552—or at any other point in the rite. Cranmer's treatment of the offertory is very interesting, and an excellent indication of his skill in expressing his ideas liturgically, though it has not been appreciated as

[1] The placing of the collect for the king *before* that of the day is the work of 1662 following Laud's Scottish book. It seems to be due not so much to the exuberant loyalty of the Laudian school as to a desire to avoid turning over pages at this point. The emphasis on the regal office is felt to be a little jarring by most people, especially when, as for instance on Good Friday or Easter Day, it actually takes precedence of the redemption of the world in the thought of the church. Cranmer had too much liturgical sense to make a mistake of that sort.

deserves through the constant attempts to interpret his liturgy by ideas which he did not hold. Like Luther he believed that any form of offertory 'stank of oblation'. The difficulty was to avoid having one in some form. In 1549 Cranmer had substituted a presentation of money by the people themselves, not at the altar but into a box in the chancel. This avoided any idea of a priestly oblation in connection with the money. The communicants remained in the chancel, having filed up to put their money in the box, and with this rough guide to their number the priest was to 'take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy communion, laying the bread upon the corporas or else in the paten, or else in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose: and putting the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use (if the chalice will not serve)[1] putting thereto a little pure and clean water: and setting both the bread and wine upon the altar'. Immediately after this follows the dialogue, preface, sanctus and eucharistic prayer. 1549 has thus no offertory prayer of any sort anywhere in the rite. It is one of its most significant changes from the old Shape of the Liturgy.

It is probable that the substitution of the offering of money for that of bread and wine in the particular form adopted in 1549 is an imitation of current Lutheran practice,[2] though something of the same kind is found sporadically throughout the middle ages as a relic of the old Western offertory by the people. This, however, hardly solved Cranmer's problem. We have seen that the solemn placing of the bread and wine upon the altar in itself constituted the primitive 'oblation' of them to God, and that any form of accompanying prayer is a later development. In the Western rite the *secreta* or offertory prayer had always been said in silence, so that though Cranmer had altogether omitted any such prayer or suggestion of offering in 1549, the rubric about putting the bread and wine upon the altar cited above did in fact leave the offertory *looking* exactly as it had always done, from the point of view of the people. If they were to be taught an entirely different idea, something more was required.

Cranmer found this in 1552. The placing of the alms in the 'poor men's box' was retained, but they were now to be collected first by the churchwardens, who were then to place the money in the box. There is evidence that the trooping up of the people to put money in the box one by one had caused a good deal of amusement among the laity, used to remaining stationary in the mediaeval worship. It may be this which was particularly referred to as 'the Christmas game'. The intercessory prayer 'for the church militant' was placed in 1552 immediately after this monetary substitute for the offertory, and a clause was inserted in its first paragraph, 'we

[1] Mediaeval chalices, from which the celebrant alone communicated, were small. They might not prove large enough for a general communion in both kinds in 1549.
[2] Brightman, *The English Rite*, I, *p.* lxxxi, gives the evidence.

humbly beseech Thee most mercifully *to accept our alms* and to receive our prayers'. The alms had not been offered or even handled by the priest; there could be no danger of their being thought of as an 'oblation' in the old sense. But this clause emphasised them as the only material content of the 'offertory'. The elaborate rubric about placing the bread and wine upon the altar found at this point in 1549 is altogether omitted in 1552.

This cannot be accidental, but when the elements are to be placed on the altar is not specified. Probably Cranmer intended them to be placed upon the altar privately before the service began. There is evidence that this was sometimes done in Elizabethan times, but perhaps practice varied. Some may have continued the custom of 1549. But in the seventeenth century Bishop Andrewes was accustomed to place them on the altar after the prayer of humble access, immediately before the consecration, and this does not seem to have been considered one of his special innovations. Baxter's puritan liturgy sets them upon the altar at what may be taken for the same point in the rite. As the elements were not referred to or required before the consecration in the rite from 1552 to 1662, it was a natural inference that just before it was the proper point at which to introduce them. The rubric before the prayer of consecration in 1662 itself—'When the priest . . . hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may with more readiness and decency break the bread etc.'—looks like a trace of previous practice which has survived the re-introduction of an offertory before the prayer for the church militant. In any case, the omission of the placing of bread and wine upon the altar at the position of the old offertory in 1552 cannot but have been deliberate.

The treatment of the offertory received instead an altogether new development in 1552 which, as an ingenious piece of liturgical workmanship, deserves admiration. We have seen (E. 2) that while Cranmer denied any offering of Christ to God in the eucharist, he insisted that 'the humble confession of all penitent hearts, their knowledging of Christ's benefits their thanksgiving for the same, their faith and consolation in Christ, their humble submission . . . to God's will and commandments, is a sacrifice of laud and praise.' It is precisely these 'elements' which the rite of 1552 brings before God *in the position of the old 'offertory prayer'*, between the offering of alms and the dialogue and preface.

The constant omission in these days of the 'Long Exhortation', which is an integral part of Cranmer's structure of the rite, has mutilated his idea. But one has only to look at its last paragraph coming immediately before the 'Short Exhortation' and Confession to see its point in conjunction with what follows: 'And above all things, ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and Man, Who did humble Himself even to the death upon the cross for us miserable sinners which lay in darkness and in the shadow of death, that

He might make us children of God and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesu Christ, thus dying for us, and innumerable benefits which by His precious bloodshedding He hath obtained to us, He hath instituted these holy mysteries, as pledges of His love and ⟨? a⟩ continual remembrance [*i.e.* reminder] of His death, to our great and endless comfort. To Him, therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give as we are bound continual thanks: submitting ourselves wholly to His holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve Him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Amen.'

These are precisely *the elements* of Cranmer's 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'. One notices how naturally this exhortation reverts to the tone and even the phrasing of such mediaeval devotions as Langforde's. But what is much more important is that it states every element which Cranmer considered to be part of the eucharistic sacrifice, and it states the meaning of the rite as Cranmer understood it with perfect precision. It is the continual mental 'remembering' of His passion and death which constitutes 'eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of Christ'; and it is the stirring up of our penitence, our thankful acknowledgement of His benefits, our faith and consolation in His passion, and our intention of amendment, which constitute the only eucharistic action and offering. *This we forthwith make by the confession and by listening to the 'comfortable words'.*

Upon this substitute for the offertory and offertory prayer there follow at once, in the traditional way, the dialogue (shorn of its 'The Lord be with you' and response)[1] and the preface (shorn of the Seraphim, who are certainly its oldest constituent element)[2] and sanctus. After this follows the prayer of humble access said kneeling. In its present position this comes between the preface (all that remains of the apostolic *berakah*, the primitive consecration prayer itself) and the consecration. It seems to have been transferred to this point, before the consecration, in order to prove unmistakeably that Gardiner's inference from its 1549 position (said kneeling before the communion) as betokening some connection between the consecrated elements and the Body and Blood of Christ, was unjustified. We are to interpret it by Cranmer's repeated statement that 'the true eating and drinking of the said Body and Blood of Christ is with a constant and lively faith *to believe that Christ gave His Body and shed His Blood upon the cross for us*, and that He doth so join and incorporate Himself to us that He is our head and we His members and flesh of His flesh and bone of His bones, having *Him dwelling in us and we in Him.* And herein standeth the whole effect and strength of this sacrament. And this faith God worketh

[1] Perhaps Cranmer dropped this because Cyprian did not happen to quote it in his *de Orat.* 31, where he cites the rest. But we now know that it is much older than Cyprian.

[2] *Cf.* Origen, *in Is.*, I, 2; *de Princip.*, I, iii. 4.

inwardly in our hearts by His Holy Spirit, and confirmeth the same outwardly to our ears by hearing of His word and to our other senses by eating and drinking of the sacramental bread and wine in His holy supper'. (*Defence*, I, 16, *p.* 306.) Placed before the consecration, this prayer is meant to serve as a safeguard against any traditional ideas as to the force or meaning of consecration.

The prayer which follows was first called 'The Prayer of Consecration' in 1662. In 1552 it is intended only as 'the separation' of the bread and wine 'from a profane and worldly use unto a spiritual and godly use.... Not that the bread and wine have or can have any holiness in them, but that they be used to an holy work, and represent holy and godly things' (C. 1). 1549 had already, with one exception, said all that Cranmer wished to say on this point, with its unmistakeable emphasis on 'His one oblation once offered, a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world', long ago—on Calvary—and its relegation of the eucharist to a 'perpetual *memory*'—a cleverly chosen word—'of that His precious death, until His coming again' (where 'again'—not in S. Paul—emphasises that as the passion is in the past, so the 'coming' is in the future, not in the eucharist). The only change needed was in the words 'with Thy Holy Spirit and Word to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.' These might well be interpreted to mean that the gift of the Body and Blood was in some sense connected with the bread and wine. They certainly, by the word 'sanctify', implied that the bread acquired some 'holiness'. Cranmer has gone beyond 'explanation' to 'fully perfecting' 1549 in the change he made here in 1552: 'Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine [*i.e.* which remain so, unsanctified, at the moment of reception] according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution *in remembrance* of His death and passion may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood'. It was Cranmer's whole point that 'remembrance of His death and passion' *is* the partaking of His most blessed Body and Blood 'in such wise as Abraham and other holy fathers did eat Him' (A. 2). There follows the citation of Christ's own words separating the bread and wine to a spiritual use (*cf.* C. 1). In 1552 there is no Amen of the people after their recital. They are not a prayer of the church but a ministerial act, the 'preparing of the supper' (*cf.* D. 1).

It is further to be noted that both 1549 and 1552 omit that provision for a further consecration if there should be insufficient of the sacramental species for the number of communicants, a provision which the *Order of Communion* in 1548 had been careful to make. There is some evidence that some continued to follow the directions of 1548 as late as 1550 'if the wine has happened to fail in the cup.'[1] But the practice was greatly disliked by

[1] Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, II, lxi, *p.* 899.

all those who followed the Swiss school, which held that the recitation of the words was for the *hearers*, not for any effect upon the sacramental elements. The words having been heard once, there was no point in repeating them, but rather a tendency to superstition. This seems to have been Cranmer's own opinion,[1] and there can be little doubt that the omission of the direction to repeat them over fresh bread and wine in both 1549 and 1552 was entirely deliberate.

Immediately upon the separation of the elements to their sacramental use, that use is made of them. Without pause even for an Amen or the Lord's prayer, 'Then shall the minister first receive the communion in both kinds himself and next deliver it to other ministers if there be any present, that they may help the chief minister—[Note the agreement with the terminology of D. 1]—and after to the people in their hands kneeling. And when he delivereth the bread he shall say, Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee and feed on Him in thy heart with thanksgiving. And the minister that delivereth the cup shall say, Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee and be thankful'.—It is the perfect summary of Cranmer's teaching as to what the eucharistic action and the eucharist are.

Immediately after the communion follows the Lord's prayer. No one seems to have found a quite convincing reason why Cranmer changed its position from before to after communion, unless it was a determination to leave nothing unchanged in the ancient structure of the rite, which seems too childish to be probable. My own suggestion is that it was from a desire to keep the whole of what he conceived as the external action uninterrupted—the setting apart of the elements for their holy use followed at once by their use. But that is merely a conjecture. What is certain is that all those later interpretations of this change which depend on the close association of communion with receiving the Body and Blood of our Lord —as that having now received the Son we can say of right 'Our Father', and so forth—can have had no place in the mind of the author of the *Defence*.

There follows either what we now call the 'prayer of oblation' or the 'thanksgiving'. Regrets have often been expressed that these were made alternatives, but Cranmer was quite right to do so from his own point of view. Each of them in reality duplicates matter which he had otherwise sufficiently provided for in the fixed elements of the rite, and it was probably only for the sake of constructional finish that a prayer was provided here at all. He had the same instinct as the primitive church that the climax of the rite is communion, which he would probably have expressed by saying that the sacrament terminated in the 'use' of it. But he desired to emphasise his new conception of the eucharistic oblation, and the concluding section is therefore devoted to this theme.

[1] *Defence*, iii, 15, *p.* 414.

The old concept of the oblation was that Christ offers His perfect oblation of Himself to the Father, and that the earthly church as His Body enters into His eternal priestly act by the eucharist. Cranmer deliberately sought to substitute for this the idea that *we* offer to God '*ourselves*, our souls and bodies'. Even in 1549 this had formed the whole content of the prayer of oblation when it stood within the canon, to the exclusion of the old notion. But we have seen that in 1552 Cranmer had provided for this offering of ourselves by placing the exhortations, confession, etc. in the position of the old *offertory* prayer. The prayer of oblation was thus rendered superfluous. But to repeat the oblation in a position detached from the canon (where it could not lend itself to any misunderstanding such as had arisen about its meaning in 1549) would serve a useful purpose in emphasising its difference from the old notion. Its clause '. . . desire Thy fatherly goodness . . . mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and *thanksgiving*' sufficiently expressed the notion of 'thanksgiving' to serve the purpose of an optional variant for the invariable 'thanksgiving prayer' of 1549.

At the same time, this so-called 'prayer of oblation' was carefully adapted to its new position. In 1549 its central clause had run: 'Humbly beseeching Thee that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy communion *may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ:* and be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, *and made one Body with Thy Son Jesus Christ*, that He may dwell in them and they in Him'. This lent itself much too easily to the idea that the reception of holy communion was connected with 'feeding on Christ' in a sense different from that in which Abraham and Moses had done so. In 1552 it was altered to read '. . . that all we which be partakers of this holy communion may be fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction', where the omissions leave no doubt of the intention with which they were made.

The continual modern proposals to replace this prayer after the prayer of consecration as it stands, without any regard to Cranmer's careful changes of wording for its present position, are very strangely conceived. It is possible to hold that in its present position it is 'ourselves' as already communicated—as 'accepted in the Beloved'—which are supposed fit to be offered to God. If the prayer were put back *before* communion in its present wording, it would not only be an obvious piece of Pelagianism to offer 'ourselves . . . to be a reasonable, *holy* and lively sacrifice'; but, taken in conjunction with the lack of any explicit offering of the sacrifice of Christ in our rite, it would lay a most unfortunate emphasis on its substitution of the oblation of the sons of men for that of the Son of Man. Such was Cranmer's own purpose, admittedly. But it is hard to suppose that it is that of those who constantly repeat this proposal. Fortunately for his reputation Cranmer was not under this delusion that the words of a prayer have m

meaning, and that prayers are interchangeable as they stand between different parts of a rite.

The thanksgiving occupies in 1552 the same position in which it had served invariably in 1549. But again Cranmer made changes to bring out its meaning, which can better be seen if the two forms are set side by side.

1549	1552
'We most heartily thank Thee for that Thou *hast* vouchsafed to feed us *in* these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and *hast* assured us *duly receiving the same* of Thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we be very members incorporate in *Thy*[1] mystical body . . .'	'We most heartily thank Thee for that Thou *dost* vouchsafe to feed us *which have duly received* these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and *dost* assure us *thereby* of Thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we be very members incorporate in *Thy*[1] mystical body . . .'

We have to remember that when Cranmer wrote 1549 he already believed that the 'spiritual feeding on the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ' is nothing else but the purely mental remembrance of the passion with faith. The 1549 form of this prayer, with its '*hast*' and '*in* these holy mysteries', greatly obscured this idea, and at least implied that the 'spiritual feeding' had a close connection with receiving holy communion. The '*dost* vouchsafe' of 1552, in conjunction with what follows, makes it much clearer that the 'spiritual feeding' is intended to be thought of as *independent* of the 'due reception of these holy mysteries', *viz.* it depends simply on the remembrance with faith of Christ's passion.[2] 'Thereby' in 1552 refers to the 'due receiving'; and this 'due receiving' (not the 'spiritual feeding') *is* the 'assurance' of God's favour and goodness towards us.[3] It is all very delicately expressive of Cranmer's personal teaching; but we fail to appreciate its craftsmanship unless we remember continually that in his idea 'to eat the Body and drink the Blood of Christ' spiritually is nothing else but 'to believe in our hearts that His Flesh was rent and torn for us upon the cross and His Blood shed for our redemption' (A. 3); or as Zwingli put it, we bear witness by receiving the bread and wine 'to our belief that we are all miserable sinners, but by His Body given and Blood poured forth [in the passion, not the eucharist] we have been cleansed from sin and redeemed from everlasting death.'[4]

After these alternative prayers in 1552 follows the *Gloria*, transferred to this position from before the collects, where it had stood in 1549 as the

[1] This rather strange '*Thy* mystical Body' in a prayer addressed to the Father, found in both 1549 and 1552, was not corrected to 'the mystical body of Thy Son' till 1662, one of the few verbal improvements in the rite then effected.

[2] *Cf.* A. 1 above. [3] *Cf.* F. 1 above. [4] *Cf. p.* 632.

'hymn' of the synaxis common to all rites. This ensures that an element of the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' (in Cranmer's sense) shall terminate the liturgy, whichever of the post-communion prayers has been used. The conjecture that it was placed here to represent the 'hymn' of Mark xiv. 26 by an uncritical piece of scripturalism seems impossible. All the reformers were aware that this 'hymn' was a 'psalm', and Tyndale's Bible actually uses the word. Rather we must see here, with that acute but unread scholar W. Lockton, the influence of Zwingli's rite on his more liturgically gifted English disciple. 'The idea of our Lord as the Lamb of God, and the Lord's supper as the christian passover, is a feature of the Zurich service'.[1] At Zurich, when the elements had been replaced on the table after the communion, they said either the jewish passover *Hallel* (Ps. cxiii.) or a sort of christian *Hallel*: 'He is the Lamb of God, the pardon of our sins, the one and only pledge of mercy'.[2] Any idea that Cranmer intended to provide an opportunity for 'intra-liturgical devotions' by the adoration of the consecrated elements replaced upon the altar is a sheer perversion of his whole teaching. For him 'consecration' was related only to the *use* of the sacrament in communion.

After that it had no meaning whatever. The singing or saying of the *Agnus Dei* between consecration and communion might easily have ministered to the 'high' Lutheran doctrine that our Lord is truly and substantially present at least in the 'use' of the sacrament. But the *Agnus Dei* (retained in its old position in 1549) was removed in 1552 for this very reason—or rather, it was with misplaced ingenuity fused with the *Gloria* by the interpolation of a third 'O Lamb of God . . .' into the pre-Nicene text of that hymn.[3] Once the 'use' of the sacrament was done, there could in his mind be no further danger of 'adoration' in connection with it. Did not Zwingli himself and the Zurich church replace the remains of the sacrament upon the table?

The alternative to doing this was something to which all the Reformers of the Swiss school both in England and abroad took the utmost exception —the consumption of the remains of the sacrament and the ablution of the vessels at their primitive place, immediately after the communion, before the rite proceeds to its conclusion. This implied in their eyes that 'the bread and wine have or can have some holiness in themselves', as Cranmer put it. Commenting on that rubric of 1549 which directed the minister at

[1] W. Lockton, *The Remains at the Eucharist*, Cambridge, 1920, *p.* 184.
[2] E. Wolfensberger, *Die Zürcher Kirchengebete*, *p.* 55.
[3] The variant of the *Gloria* found in the *Codex Alexandrinus*, sometimes cited in extenuation of Cranmer's rather vandalistic treatment of its text, seems irrelevant (1) *Cod. Al.* does not agree with Cranmer's text. (2) It was not then known. (3) There is no other MS. evidence for its variant. I fear we must just agree that Cranmer tampered with a text older than the Nicene Creed by a solitary error of literary judgement, in an endeavour to emphasise a specifically Zwinglian feature of his rite.

the offertory to take only '*so much* bread and wine as will suffice for those appointed to communicate', Bucer had written to Cranmer that from this direction 'some make for themselves the superstition that they consider it unlawful, if anything of the bread and wine of the communion remain over when it is finished, to allow it to come to common use; as if there were in this bread and wine of itself anything of divinity or even sanctity outside the use at communion. And so men must be taught that . . . outside that use of the communion which the Lord instituted, the bread and wine, even if they have been placed on the table of the Lord, have nothing in them of sanctity more than have other bread and wine. . . . These things it is fitting that the people be taught as in word so also in deed, as diligently as may be.'[1] Cranmer took the point, and taught diligently. There were no instructions in 1549 as to what was to be done with the remains of the sacrament, which had given occasion to many to continue to take the ablutions at the Sarum (and primitive) place, after the communion. In 1552 they were ordered to be replaced upon the table, Zurich fashion. And after the blessing there appeared a new rubric: 'If any of the bread or wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use.' This does not refer, as does the 1662 rubric—'remain *unconsecrated*'—to any reserve provision, but to the only bread and wine mentioned in 1552, '*the* bread and wine'. This having been 'separated to a godly use' for which it was not needed, was forthwith free again for common uses, since it 'can have no holiness in itself'.

The 1552 rite, like 1549, concludes with an expanded form of blessing, in place of the primitive dismissal. Coming after communion, as the ancient church understood communion, a solemn blessing would have been an anticlimax. It is significant that a final blessing only begins to make its appearance in the various liturgies as non-communicating attendance becomes the normal custom of the laity. It was adopted sporadically in the West during the middle ages; but it makes its first official appearance as the invariable termination of the Roman rite (so far as I can discover) only in the printed missal of 1474. Sarum still officially ended with the primitive *Ite missa est* and *Deo gratias* right down to 1549; though the blessing after this was probably customary in some English churches. But when the eucharistic action had been so radically altered in conception as it had been by Cranmer, a concluding blessing acquired great appropriateness. Both in 1549 and 1552 it has its present form, in which the blessing proper is preceded by 'The peace of God, etc.', which had come after the communion in the *Order* of 1548.

Such was the rite of 1552, and such the reasons which led its author to frame it as he did. If it were a matter of pure history there we might leave it. But the modern Anglican cannot quite leave it there, for 1552 still supplies the whole structure of his present liturgy and some ninety-five per

[1] M. Bucer, *Scripta Anglicana, Censura*, iv. Works, *p.* 464.

cent. of its wording. We do not, of course, receive it because it is Cranmer's, but as twice revised (in 1559 and 1662) and as the rite of the Church of England. Yet the fact remains that our rite is as it is because Cranmer thought as he thought. I am free to confess that it is only painfully and with reluctance that I have brought myself to face candidly some of the facts here set out, and I cannot but fear that they will bring equal distress to others. Yet once they have been fully understood, there is more to be said which is equally true, and more relevant to our situation as Anglicans in the twentieth century. All history, secular as well as religious—and not least the secular history of the twenty years since Versailles—shews not only the folly but the danger of attempting to solve the difficulties of the present without a clear understanding of their causes in the past. We cannot hope either to understand the course of Anglican liturgical history since 1552 or to find an adequate solution of our present liturgical troubles, if we persist in cherishing illusions about the source from which they spring. It could not reasonably be maintained that Anglicanism as such has ever been Zwinglian in doctrine. But a great part of Anglican history is taken up with difficulties caused by the fact that the Anglican rite was framed with exquisite skill to express this doctrine which the Anglican church has always repudiated, tacitly since 1559, explicitly since 1563.

Putting aside these issues for the moment, what should be our judgement of the rite of 1552 simply as a piece of liturgy-making? Obviously, it has little formal relation to the primitive rites we have been studying. The basis of Cranmer's understanding of the eucharist seems to have been the idea, to which he reverts insistently, that our Lord 'instituted a holy supper' to be held in memory of His death. In fact, as we have seen, our Lord 'instituted' nothing. What He did was to give a new meaning to a double action before and after supper. But the action was so slightly connected with the supper that the church in the first generation found itself compelled to discard the supper lest the new meaning of the action should be obscured. And the meaning of the action in the earliest recorded version of our Lord's statement of it was not specifically connected with His death at all—'Take, eat, this is My Body which is for you. Do this for the *anamnesis* of *Me*'; 'This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood. Whenever you drink (the cup of blessing) do this for the *anamnesis* of *Me*'. The apostolic church read into this, and rightly, a reference to His sacrificial death, but to much more also. It is '*Me*', the whole Christ, not only the Victim on Calvary, which the eucharist 're-calls'.

In consequence of this initial misunderstanding both of what constitutes the eucharist and of its purpose, Cranmer has radically misconceived the eucharistic action and consequently changed the Shape of the Liturgy by which that action is performed. What remains of the old 'four-action Shape' in 1552? (1) There is no offertory in bread and wine at all; it has been deliberately discarded. (2) Whether the 'eucharistic prayer' remain

it is not easy to say. The notion of 'consecration' has been deliberately watered down to that of 'setting apart to a holy use', and attached to the words of institution, which the middle ages had come to regard as *the* essential of the rite. But what of the *eucharistia*, that 'thanking' which is the apostolic nucleus of the prayer, and the solemn concluding doxology, the 'glorifying of the Name' of God? Of the first there remains a clear trace in the preface. But only during four weeks in the year, when a proper preface is provided, is it in any sense an *anamnesis* of the Person and Work of Christ, as in the primitive rites. For the rest of the year He is not so much as mentioned in it. And even this survival has been altogether removed from any connection with the consecration by the interpolation after the sanctus of the 'prayer of humble access', through the exigencies of that unfortunate controversy with Gardiner. And the doxology, that 'blessing of the Name' without which for the first century jew and the primitive christian no blessing could be a blessing, has similarly been removed from the prayer to beyond the communion—at the end of the prayer of oblation or of thanksgiving. (3) The fraction, ordered in 1549, has disappeared in 1552, apparently because Bucer warned Cranmer that it was an opportunity for 'superstition'. (4) There remains the communion, which Cranmer himself insists is only a *token* act—'Take and eat this *in remembrance* that Christ died for thee.'

The real eucharistic action for Cranmer does not lie in these things at all, but is something purely mental and psychological—'This is the eating of Christ's Flesh and drinking of His Blood, *the feeling* whereof is to every man *the feeling how* he eateth and drinketh Christ' (A. 4), which he insists means 'believing that Christ died for me'. As a strictly mental 'action' (if that be a permissible term) it has of course ceased to be anything at all of a 'corporate' action. Even its external 'token', the partaking of the bread and wine, must be done 'every man for himself', as Cranmer insists. Not even the carrying on of the rest of the rite, 'the preparing of the supper' as he calls it, is corporate. That is the business of the minister, to which the people are only to listen. From being the action which creates the unity of the church as the Body of Christ, the eucharist has become precisely that which *breaks down the church into separate individuals*. (The consequences of this, slowly gathering force over 400 years, are very manifest in Anglican religion to-day, and constitute one of our most serious problems.) Behind the whole idea lies Cranmer's perpetual use of the phrase 'to *feed on* Christ', for 'to have faith in Him as Redeemer'. It is noteworthy that this precise expression does not occur anywhere in the New Testament. The nearest to it—'he that cheweth (*trōgōn*) My Flesh and drinketh My Blood' (John vi. 54, 56, 58)—is found in a chapter of which the exegesis is notoriously difficult. It is plain that the symbolism of the eucharist is colouring the evangelist's thought throughout its length, but I venture to think it is certain that only *vv.* 51–8 are intended to refer directly to the eucharist *as a*

rite, while the remainder of the chapter is dealing with the much wider question of faith in Christ's Person and Office in terms of eucharistic symbolism. Such at least is the consensus of exegesis, both ancient and modern. Cranmer's root mistake lies in misunderstanding this distinction.

But in thus comparing Cranmer's rite with those of the primitive church we are not truly acting fairly, even though he himself repeatedly challenges the comparison, because we are placing him against a standard of which he knew, and could know, virtually nothing. Not until centuries after his time did the historical material necessary for the interpretation of the primitive eucharist begin to be available; much of it was unknown or not understood even in 1900. The true background of Cranmer's work is, as I have said, the contemporary post-mediaeval liturgical crisis, and the *Kirchenordnungen* of the German and Swiss Reformation which sought to solve it. The rite of 1552 takes its natural place among these, and only when seen thus can its qualities and those of its creator be fully and fairly appreciated. Compared with the clumsy and formless rites which were evolved abroad, that of 1552 is the masterpiece of an artist. Cranmer gave it a noble form as a superb piece of literature, which no one could say of its companions; but he did more. As a piece of liturgical craftsmanship it is in the first rank—once its intention is understood. It is *not* a disordered attempt at a catholic rite, but the only effective attempt ever made to give liturgical expression to the doctrine of 'justification by faith alone'. If in the end the attempt does not succeed—if we are left with a sense of the total disconnection of the token communion in bread and wine with that mental 'eating and drinking of Christ's Flesh and Blood', *i.e.* remembering of the passion which is for Cranmer the essential eucharistic action—that must be set down to the impossible nature of the task, not to the manner of its performance. Cranmer was in the end baffled like all the Reformers by the impossibility of reconciling the external rite of the eucharist and the scriptural evidence of the last supper with the idea that 'we spiritually and ghostly with our faith eat Christ, being carnally absent from us in heaven, *in such wise* as Abraham and other holy fathers did eat Him many years before He was incarnate and born . . .' (A. 2). The communion in bread and wine is and must be permanently irrelevant to that conception, simply because Abraham did not receive it. Modern protestantism has avoided the difficulty by allowing the eucharist to slip into the background, and explaining away or ignoring the New Testament. Cranmer faced it, even if he did not solve it.

It may be inevitable that 'high' churchmen who feel conscientiously bound at all costs to save the character of our present rite should try to do so at the expense of its original author, by accusing him of moral cowardice and dissembling, of being 'blown about with every wind of vain doctrine' of unwilling deference to the Council and to foreign refugees, and so on. They must, I suppose, take this for an 'attack' on Cranmer and his work and nothing I can say will prevent it. If to believe the man's own earnest

and repeated claim to have been both sincere and consistent be an attack, then I have attacked him. But I wonder which Cranmer would have preferred, to be 'attacked' by me, or to have his belief in the eucharistic oblation of Christ—which he passionately repudiated—established by the suggestion that he deceived protestants and catholics alike as to his real opinions out of cowardice? At least he did not die like a coward, nor were his public repudiation of any part or lot in the setting up of the mass again at Canterbury *after* Mary was upon the throne but before his own arrest, and his public refusal to say mass before the Queen, dissembling acts.[1] The last words he was heard to speak in S. Mary's at Oxford were 'Never before this time (*i.e.* in his recent recantations) have I dissembled.'

He is in truth a tragic and ironical figure, but not a weak one. After his condemnation they came to him with the argument that, the Queen having accepted Papal supremacy and all that went with it and commanding him to do the same, he was bound by a subject's allegiance and all his own teaching to accept it too. It was the very trap that he had helped to spread for Fisher and More. Ever since he had been archbishop he had laboured to build up the Royal Supremacy as unquestionable, unanswerable, established by God, rightly overriding all oaths, all conscience, all teaching, all loyalties, all rights, all laws, all faith, that might impinge upon its sweep. To build this he had formally perjured himself in accepting his see of Canterbury; to maintain it he had connived at the greatest spoliation of the church that had ever yet happened; for this he had shed blood, or consented to its shedding, in case after case where, rightly or wrongly, he believed the victims innocent. All rebellion against the King's sovereign will was always for him the sin of Judas.[2] The Royal Supremacy was the one potent instrument by which he had achieved his own mission of changing the religion of England. And now it had broken in his hand. At first he was non-plussed, but after a little he answered firmly enough, that 'The Queen could not command him to anything against his conscience.' He had joined the other martyrs against his own life's work!

Zwinglian and papist, he had burned them both at different times, along with miscellaneous Arians and Eutychians and Anabaptists, for their creeds—reluctantly (for he was by nature gentle) but persistently enough—right down to Van Morey, not long before King Edward died. And now he was coming to join them himself. One wonders if the thought of them all passed through the old man's mind as he hurried of his own accord out of S. Mary's along the Turl to where the stake stood in the Broad outside Balliol—Lambert the Zwinglian and Friar Forrest—and the gentle Fisher,

[1] Parker I, *p.* 428.

[2] See his letter to Henry VIII in defence of Cromwell after the latter's arrest: 'If the noble princes of memory, King John, Henry II and Richard II had had such a councillor about them, I suppose that they should never have been so traitorously abandoned and overthrown as those good princes were' (Parker II, *p.* 401). A royalism which could idealise King John into a 'good prince' needs fanaticism.

and More the witty chancellor, and old abbot Whiting—but they were in King Henry's time, and for a matter of treason, like the Carthusians—whether the Boleyn girl were a lawful queen or a whore—Both!—That would have ruined him if he had not condemned her, though he had almost thought her innocent—and Seymour the Admiral, and his brother and murderer Seymour the Protector—he had abandoned them both in turn, though he had thought them innocent too—but their cases were desperate, and his own mission could not be compromised in fighting lost battles—and those hundreds of yokels strung up in 1549—and little Jane Grey and that ruffianly Northumberland—the cur professed himself a papist on the scaffold, that had been the raveningest protestant in England! —A safer religion for a bad man to die in?—and the sturdy decent Latimer—and Nicholas Ridley, who had shewn him, Thomas, how the truth lay about the sacrament—(Not much further now!)—They had all died, almost every one he had ever known—and thousands more unknown—and many others still to die—in these quarrels about the bread and the Body—that could never have blazed so fiercely in England or spread so far but for his work.—If he had used his position as archbishop altogether otherwise, to reform the old religion, not to make a new prevail?—Impossible! If a man saw the truth so clear, it was a duty to impose it—if the king were willing. —Would English christians always be rent henceforward?—(Here was the stake at last)—This was what it all came to in the end—the bread had nothing to do with the Body—That was what he was dying for—

The Anglican Settlement

The Church of England has never accorded to Cranmer that position which Lutheranism gives to Luther, Calvinism to Calvin, Zwinglianism to Zwingli. He is not personally a source of Anglican doctrine. (In point of fact few modern Anglicans have read him.) This was soon made clear in Elizabeth's reign when the new religion was restored, even though the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559 was the Book of 1552 with only five changes.[1] Of these only one affected the rite of the eucharist; to the words of administration of 1552, 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for Thee . . .', 'Drink this in remembrance . . .', were now prefixed those of 1549, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .'. 'The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .'. Thus at one stroke—whether intentionally or not—the 1559 liturgy itself reopened the whole question which Cranmer's rite was intended to close decisively.

[1] The so-called 'Black Rubric' or 'Declaration on Kneeling' (at communion) was never part of 1552, but had been interpolated by authority of the Privy Council while the book was printing. 1559 in restoring 1552 naturally omitted this extraneous addition, though the omission is usually reckoned a sixth alteration. It is not so included, however, by Archbishop Whitgift in his account of the changes to Burleigh (Strype, *Annals*, I, 1, *p.* 143).

The Convocation of 1559 had nothing to do with making this change, which was probably due to the Queen herself. But it had already given ample proof of its rejection of Cranmer's teaching by passing five articles —afterwards subscribed by the universities—to be presented to Parliament. The first three run thus:

'1. That in the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of the words of Christ duly spoken by the priest is present *realiter*, under the kinds of bread and wine, the natural Body of Christ conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also His natural Blood.

'2. That after the consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance but the substance of God and Man.

'3. That in the mass is offered the true Body of Christ and His true Blood, a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.'

The other two are concerned respectively with 'the authority of handling and defining concerning . . . faith, sacraments and discipline ecclesiastical' as belonging 'only to the pastors of the church whom the Holy Ghost hath set in the church to that purpose, and not to laymen'; and with affirming the pastoral authority of the successor of Peter as Christ's Vicar. But that the first three articles (with which alone we are here concerned) are not to be set aside as a mere final ebullition of Marian popery is shewn by the Convocation of 1562, which first gave authority to Cranmer's *xlii Articles* of 1553. Before it did so it omitted three of them, including one which gave expression to Cranmer's doctrine of the non-participation of the wicked in the Body and Blood of Christ (*cf.* A. 4)[1]. And in what is now our *xxviiith Article* it deliberately substituted the statement that 'the Body of Christ *is* given, taken and received in the supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner' for Cranmer's statement that 'a faithful man ought *not* either to believe or openly confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's Flesh and Blood in the sacrament of the Lord's supper.'

In 1571 at the revision of these *xxxix Articles* Bishop Cheney of Gloucester protested against the retention of the word 'only' in this Article. (It is to be noted that he was no Marian conformist, but had had to hide for his life in that period.) He also said that Bishop Guest of Rochester, who was absent from the debate, shared his objection. But Guest wrote to Cecil: 'I suppose you have heard how the bishop of Gloucester found himself grieved with the placing of this adverb "only" . . . because it did take away the presence of Christ's Body in the sacrament. . . . Whereas I told him plainly that this word "only" in the aforesaid Article did not exclude the presence of Christ's Body from the sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof; for I said unto him, that though he take Christ's Body in his hand, received it in his mouth, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially and carnally, as the Doctors do write, yet did he not for all that see it, feel it, smell it or taste it. And,

[1] This was re-inserted in 1571.

therefore, I told him I would speak against him herein, and the rather because the Article was of my own penning. And yet I would not for all that deny anything that I had spoken for the presence'.[1] Bishop Guest's interpretation of his own doctrinal Article is fully as relevant as Archbishop Cranmer's interpretation of his own liturgy in determining the sense of Anglican eucharistic belief.

That liturgy was certainly not regarded as self-interpreting in the reign of Elizabeth, *e.g.* in 'Johnson's Case'. We have seen that the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552 (and consequently 1559) had no rubric for the contingency of a second consecration if the sacramental species proved insufficient, such as had found a place in the *Order* of 1548. We have seen, too, that the omission was intended by Cranmer to enforce the Zwinglian view of 'consecration' and the purpose of the recital of the institution. In 1573 Robert Johnson, then chaplain to the Lord Keeper, Francis Bacon, was arraigned by the High Commission for not reciting the institution a second time on such an occasion, and administering bread and wine unconsecrated to a number of communicants. Though the letter of the current Prayer Book was entirely in his favour, and he expressly cited Cranmer in his own defence, he was condemned to a year's imprisonment, during which he died.

Yet we must note that such things do not necessarily betoken a return to specifically catholic doctrine. Some of them at least are equally compatible with the 'high' Calvinist view of the eucharist. What they do shew is that there was a steady and increasing rejection of those particular ideas which Cranmer's liturgy had been so carefully designed to express. Hooker himself, though he is not altogether consistent, and his general doctrine of 'receptionism' is further removed from catholic than from Calvinist teaching, is yet more irreconcilable with Cranmer, whose main point is that 'eating the Body and drinking the Blood of Christ' is not connected at all with receiving the bread and wine; (otherwise it would not be analogous to the 'eating the Body of Christ' by the Old Testament patriarchs, who did not receive the bread and wine at all). The rejection of this dissociation of receiving holy communion from the effect traditionally ascribed to it was general in Elizabeth's reign. Overall's statement that 'the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper' was added to the Catechism in 1604 on the petition of the puritans themselves, and was nowhere challenged. It represents a direct negation of the basic underlying idea of Cranmer's rite.

It is, of course, recognised that the reaction against this was widespread in the seventeenth century. But it does not seem to be clearly understood that it has a twofold source. On the one hand the Elizabethan tendency to appeal to the primitive church (revealed *e.g.* in the canon of 1571 ordering preachers to teach nothing 'but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of

[1] *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)*, lxxviii. 37.

the Old Testament and the New and that which the catholic fathers and ancient bishops have gathered out of that doctrine') issues in the comparatively small school of men like Bilson, Montague and Andrewes, who taught the full patristic doctrine. But Calvinism, which in the person of prelates like Archbishop Whitgift of Canterbury was exceedingly influential in the Elizabethan church, was in this particular matter equally opposed to Cranmer's personal ideas. And Calvinism issues in that much larger school of seventeenth century divines who combined a firm belief in the Apostolic Succession with either the Calvinist view of a 'spiritual presence' or the new 'receptionism' of Hooker.[1] The seventeenth century puritans did not share the episcopalian ideas of the Laudian school, or their views of the importance of sacraments compared with edification. (This springs from their different idea of the church.) But as regards their actual doctrine of the eucharist they are not far removed from most of their opponents, and they shared their opposition to Cranmer's Zwinglianism. If Baxter's *Reformed Liturgy* be compared with Cranmer's it will be found abjectly inferior to it alike as a literary composition and from the standpoint of practical 'usability'. But it is nevertheless a whole stage nearer to the catholic tradition, in its conception of the eucharistic action and in its close attachment of the eating of the Body and drinking of the Blood of Christ to the reception of the consecrated species. This is inevitable, since an essentially Calvinist theology lies behind Baxter's clumsy rite, while the beauty of Cranmer's is clothed upon the negations of Zwingli.

It may be asked why, if the Church of England rejected Cranmer's theology, it has retained for nearly four centuries a rite which so skilfully and unmistakeably embodied that theology not only in its wording but in its very structure? To a sympathetic historical understanding, however, the real question would rather seem to be, How in the circumstances to which Cranmer had decisively committed her, the English church could possibly have got rid of his liturgy?

It was, indeed, not for nothing that Cranmer had been prepared for his labours as archbishop by his appointment as Henry's ambassador to the catholic Emperor Charles V and simultaneously his secret negotiator with Charles' opponents, the German protestant princes. Cranmer was no mean diplomat. If the retention of office—and his head—continuously through all the dangerous years from before the first breach with Rome to the death of Edward be any indication, Cranmer was indeed the wariest politician of all who sat at the table of the Privy Council. Every man there knew all the

[1] Mr. C. W. Dugmore's essay *Eucharistic Doctrine from Hooker to Waterland* (London, 1942) is important as demonstrating that the majority of seventeenth century 'high church' Anglicans did not hold anything like the Tractarian doctrine of the 'Real Presence' (though they used the term freely) but rather the 'high' Calvinist doctrine, or else Hooker's new heresy. The unity of the seventeenth century 'high church' movement was much more a unity of sociological than of theological doctrine in more than one respect.

time that some of his colleagues were seeking his own ruin and death with every move of the game, and that the simplest or seemingly most everyday question of administration or policy might cover a sudden order to the Tower, or be twisted to that end. (It is no wonder that symptoms of hysteria are plain among the little gang who were the real rulers of England through this period; they lived for the most part at a terrible tension.) Cranmer was there throughout, and though he had his difficult moments he never fell under the axe like his allies Cromwell and Somerset, nor was removed to prison like his opponents Wriothesley and Gardiner. Yet pliant as he seemed he was no cipher, but the only one among them all who achieved his ends, and even established them for centuries to come.

After Cromwell's sudden fall everything seemed to be against his achieving success, but he worked on, patiently, cautiously, devotedly, never losing sight of his end and using any means that came to his hand. Henry's lusts; the morbid fanaticism of the clever, sickly boy Edward; Somerset's strange fancy of himself as the 'Lord's Elect'; Northumberland's unscrupulous ambition—all these served his purpose. Even Gardiner's unskilful intrigues against him and Hooper's short-sighted opposition to his politic concentration on essentials were turned to strengthen his own position. In the end Mary's twisted vengefulness gave him the halo of martyrdom and made the future of his schemes secure. (It is a remarkable fact that in every case his purposes were served better by the weaknesses and faults of his associates, whether friends or enemies, than by the good points of their characters.) Baffled again and again, by the conservative instincts of Henry, by the quarrelsomeness of the Reformers, by the instability of the political situation under Edward, he had yet achieved a short-lived success before Edward died, and he laid firm foundations for the restoration of his own work after his death. He had the instinct which is the supreme gift of the politician, that of knowing just how much 'too far' it is at any given moment really safe to go. It is quite untrue that he was pushed by others further than he meant to go in the direction of theological change, though he was on occasion over-ruled by the Privy Council and made to sanction moves which he thought unwise.[1] Yet one has only to examine, for instance, Bucer's *Censura* of 1549 to see that Cranmer has used it with really good judgement in framing his second Prayer Book. He has ignored some of Bucer's most cherished suggestions, but in other things (*e.g.* in omitting all mention of the saints and the departed) 1552 has gone right beyond what Bucer regarded as wise. Yet in almost every case Cranmer's instinct as to how far he could go was justified by the event. The changes he

[1] *E.g.*, in the addition of the 'Declaration on Kneeling' to 1552, and in the attempt to set up Lady Jane Grey in opposition to Mary. The first was something entirely in accord with his own teaching; the second would certainly have coincided with his own hopes; but he opposed both because they were certain to be rejected by the country at large. And his instinct was right in both cases.

devised are nominally in force at the present day, with slight (though very important) modifications. But unless we understand that from 1547 onwards Cranmer is just as much an 'extremist' as Ridley or Hooper or Bucer, we fail to do justice either to the sincerity of the author of the *Defence* or to the remarkable skill and wisdom with which he guided events to a result at which the small and short-sighted Zwinglian party could never have arrived but for him. It was by the exercise of this unostentatious political skill that Cranmer carried through his purpose in most unpromising circumstances; and by the same skill that he fortified his personal ideas in possession of the English field.

He was well aware that left to itself the English church would by a great majority refuse to endorse them. He could only succeed by enlisting behind them another force which for its own ends could be trusted to see that they prevailed. As primate he was the pivot of the ecclesiastical machinery of England, but that was useless for his purposes. Cranmer put his faith in something other than the church—in the new centralised monarchy, now drawing to itself most of the resources of a renaissance despotism out of the ruins of the Lancastrian experiment in constitutional government. Thomas Cromwell had seen that a church wielding independent authority over conscience was the only force which such a despotism had to fear in the condition of the times; and had set himself to bring the church under royal control as 'Vicar General' of the new 'Supreme Head of the Church'. The fact that the primate himself was an ardent supporter of such control, out of principle and conviction, made the task easy. Cromwell was discarded by Henry before the work was completed, but only the fact that Cromwell's disciple Cranmer was still primate made it safe for the king to dispense with him. The work would go forward the more safely and with less danger of opposition in the hands of an archbishop.

The 'Royal Supremacy' to churchmen nowadays connotes little more than a picturesque historic loyalty and a good deal of exasperating legal red tape, together with a peculiar method of selecting bishops. But few churchmen would feel called upon to change their beliefs about—say—the desirability of reading the Bible[1] and their way of saying their bedside prayers[2], merely because the ideas of the reigning monarch on these things were reported to have changed. Yet it was precisely this conception which after Cromwell died was made a terrible reality in England, while Cranmer was the king's foremost ecclesiastical adviser. Men died—publicly and in

[1] Lest it be thought I exaggerate, the Act of 1543 'for the advancement of true religion' forbade any man under the degree of a yeoman to possess a copy of the *authorised* translation of the Bible to read to himself. No woman, if she were not a noblewoman, might read it. Ever since 1534 Convocation had been trying to encourage Bible reading, with the king's approval. Now the king had changed his mind, not liking the result. Cranmer spoke and voted for the Act of 1543 in the Lords.

[2] The 'King's Primer' issued in 1545 was intended to regulate *private* prayers and specifically orders 'none other to be used throughout all his dominions'.

horrible ways—for not conforming to every fresh change of the royal conscience. It was made treason to speak against the Royal Supremacy, even in private conversation; and spies and *agents provocateurs* were employed in men's houses to delate them. It was even made treason to feel unable to swear when required that one believed the new dogma, even while taking no overt step by word or deed to oppose it. All preaching was forbidden, except to those clergy specially licensed by the archbishop, and he saw to it that they were all propagandists for the Supremacy. It was the nearest approach to the *régime* of the Gestapo that England has ever enjoyed.

It is laid down in the gospel that men should render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's. The whole quarrel of paganism with the church was always about this, that she would persist in believing that there was one sphere where Caesar's word could not make law. It does seem that our world is slowly coming to the conclusion that this is as a matter of practical fact the abiding defence of all human freedom. But Cranmer passionately disbelieved this. He was faithful throughout his career to his conception of the clergy as the *king's* 'ministers of religion' to his subjects, as his judges were the king's 'ministers of justice' to them. The clergy administered the king's laws and commands in things spiritual as his other officers administered his law and commands in things temporal. This theory he put into writing as early as 1540[1] and still defended at his trial fourteen years later. The Royal Supremacy was the last point on which he hesitated to give way when he came to his pitiful recantations after his condemnation.[2] We find him still desperately arguing with Queen Mary about it by correspondence in 1555.[3] In all resistance to the royal religion he saw the sin of Korah and Dathan.[4]

Put in this way, of course, it was an entirely novel theory. But when one examines the practice of the end of the middle ages, does he not rather sweep away—just as in the contrast of the old liturgy with the late mediaeval tradition of supplementary lay devotion—relics of a much older state of things no longer in accord with the reality of late mediaeval practice, and boldly make the latter the whole basis of his new theory? *Was* Cardinal Morton more a minister of the church than of the king? Did not Cardinal Wolsey at the end confess that he had *not* served his God as he had served his king? Is not Cranmer himself in this also the product of the late mediaeval practice when he resolved the growing tension between contemporary practice and the primitive theory by abolishing the latter, and declared that to render unto Caesar *is* to render unto God, and that the two cannot be opposed?

It was, therefore, upon conviction no less than from expediency that he acted when he made the imposition of the new religion altogether the act of

[1] *Cf. p.* 652. [2] Parker II, *pp.* 563 *sqq.* [3] Parker II, *pp.* 447 *sqq.*
[4] *Cf.* his *Answer to the* 15 *Articles of the Devon Rebels* (*ibid.*, *pp.* 163 *sq.*, esp. *pp.* 184 *sq.*) written in a white heat of unfeigned indignation.

the state, and not of the church. The *Order of Communion* in 1548 was authorised by an act of Parliament and put out by royal proclamation. It was compiled by 'sundry of His Majesty's most grave and well learned prelates'—the king's ministers in such things—and others who were by the King's Majesty 'caused to assemble themselves . . . and agreed upon such order'. In 1549, as Professor Powicke says, 'it is generally agreed that the first Prayer Book of Edward VI was not even submitted to Convocation',[1] but came out from the king in Parliament. In 1552 the general question of the need of a revision of 1549 was on the agenda of Convocation, but seems never to have been discussed. It is certain that Convocation had no voice in the process, and it was sent home before the text of the new book was made public for the first time in Parliament in March. In 1553 the *xlii Articles*, which rounded off the liturgical changes with a doctrinal statement, professed to have the authority of 'the Synod at London', to which they had never even been submitted. It is hard to be patient with Cranmer's explanation that this was done because they were published while Convocation was in session. And even this lame shift seems to have been untrue. They had behind them only the personal approval of Cranmer.

The introduction of the new religion—we need not scruple to use a term which was robustly used by those concerned—thus had about it all the characteristics of a *coup d'état* so far as the constitutional machinery of the church was concerned. There can hardly be a doubt that Cranmer as archbishop could have blocked this procedure from the start, if he had wanted to. We must be just to him. The beginnings of the revolution go back behind him into the middle ages, to the day when the English state first undertook to punish heresy by the law of the land, in Richard II's time, and more definitely in 1415. The change made by Cranmer is that now the state, or rather the king. declares what is heresy, instead of accepting the definition of it from the church. From 1530 onwards the crown manifests an increasing tendency to act along these lines,[2] and the reason is not just plain Erastianism. The growing crisis in the old religion did legitimately concern the state, inasmuch as church and state were inextricably entangled by a thousand years of previous history. Cranmer added to this his own conscientious royalism, but royalism of that brand was in the air of Tudor England. Gardiner savagely defended the execution of Fisher at the time,[3] and Tunstall and Boner spoke as loudly for the Royal Supremacy as Cranmer himself in its early years. But it is still the fact that

[1] *The Reformation in England*, 1941, *p.* 81. This was formerly questioned, but the evidence is against such a submission.

[2] *e.g.* the royal proclamations concerning Dedication and Patronal festivals and other liturgical observances in 1534, 1536, 1541; the 'purged' edition of the Sarum Breviary in 1541 and its imposition by the Crown on all clerics (through Convocation) in 1542, etc.

[3] See Prof. Powicke's brilliant analysis of Gardiner's development, *op. cit.*, *pp.* 6 *sqq.*

the primate, the successor of Becket and Langton and Edmund Rich, whose throne was the traditional bulwark of the liberties of the English church and people against absolutism, not only acquiesced in but did all in his power to forward the procedure by which those liberties were set aside. This alone made their ignoring possible, with all its far-reaching consequences. Cranmer would gladly have accepted the responsibility for that, and he must bear it. He used the occasion to the furthest possible extent to impose upon the church, not a reform which others saw to be desirable, but his own conscientious convictions.

Amongst the consequences two stand out plainly. The first is that he engaged the whole interest of the new centralised authority of the state, and especially of that thriving class the lawyers, to maintain his work. The second is that he imposed upon his theological opponents the necessity of working through the same procedure as himself. Changes embodied in parliamentary statutes could only be undone by other parliamentary statutes. The Marian restoration of the old religion was forced to take the same indefensible revolutionary means as had been employed to overthrow it. As Jewel was quick to point out to the papist Harding, who had jibed at the Elizabethan 'parliament religion', 'Your fathers and brethren had of late, in the time of Queen Mary, a parliament-faith, a parliament-mass, and a parliament-pope'.[1] Mary restored Gardiner and Boner and Tunstall to the sees of which they had been deprived by the crown under her brother, and removed their intruded successors. And however she might declare this a matter of right and charge the intruders with heresy, it had an air of Cranmer's theory that bishops held office of the Crown and only 'during the royal good pleasure'. It was not the Convocations but the Parliament which legally restored the Latin mass, even though the clergy and people had everywhere anticipated its action.

The Marian restoration was an episode. However popular it might be—and it was popular at the beginning—it was brought about, like the changes before and after it, by the personal will of a Tudor monarch acting through the usual constitutional machinery of the secular state. Its effective force was in fact that very Royal Supremacy which Mary detested and repudiated. When she died and the Supremacy passed to her sister it was the same story. Convocation was not consulted as to the liturgical changes that ensued; it was sent home in a hurry before they were made, lest it comment upon them. The third Act of Uniformity of 1559 was withdrawn for a season after its first introduction, while the government worked upon a dubious House of Commons. It was got through the Commons at a second attempt, and through the Lords by a majority of one, against the vote of every single spiritual peer present. Such was the power of a Tudor government that this faint endorsement sufficed. The passive opposition of the Marian bishops to the restoration of the Prayer Book was overcome as the

[1] *Works* (Parker Soc. 1850), iv., *p.* 904.

passive opposition of Cranmer and Ridley and Latimer to the restoration of the Latin mass, and the passive opposition of Boner and Tunstall to the Edwardian book had been overcome, by their removal from their sees by the authority of the Crown. But in all this there is no consultation of the church. It is a repetition of Cranmer's—and of Mary's—*coups d'état*.

The modern Anglican may lament these facts or he may accept them. The point is that the Elizabethan Englishman, of whatever persuasion, was in precisely the same position. With the ecclesiastical machinery firmly in the grip of whatever government happened to be in power, the church had before it the choice between complete disruption and acquiescence. Leaderless and voiceless, the population, both those favourable and those unfavourable to the changes, necessarily acquiesced. The recusants went on attending their parish churches for years, and took a decade to come to a sense of the real situation. Even then they were handicapped by the possibility that the succession of the next heir, Mary Queen of Scots, would once more reverse the position by governmental means. All but the most convinced stood aside and waited for that when in 1569 a hesitant recourse to arms was made, too late, by the catholics of the North. A gradually increasing proportion of their fellow-countrymen had been passing from acquiescence to acceptance. Administrative measures had quietly changed the composition of the Privy Council, the judicial Bench the Commission of the Peace, as well as the Episcopate. The slow dying out of the Marian priesthood with its memories of the old *régime*—there were only 360 recusant priests at work in England when Elizabeth died, including the new missionaries from abroad—left a new generation which had never known any other rite than the Prayer Book. A discreet use of fines and imprisonments, reinforced later by executions, steadily weakened the recusant body. By spasmodic penal action and continuous social ostracism it was kept negligible for two centuries—except for a short period in the seventeenth century when once more the Royal Supremacy threatened to revive it. In the nineteenth century the government lost its interest in the matter.

If such was the immediate disarray into which the action of the government cast the recusants, who after all could look abroad for leadership and organisation (though they received little enough of either till Dr. Allen came upon the scene) the situation of conformists like Archbishop Parker and Bishop Guest was in some ways even more difficult. They would gladly have welcomed something better than the settlement made by the government for political reasons. But their whole mind and instinct shrank from the disruption that successful defiance of the government must bring. Besides, by what means and in the name of what principle were they to defy it? No doctrinal settlement had been arrived at at all so far. The liturgical settlement so narrowly imposed by Parliament was barely tolerated by the 'extreme left' now returning from its Marian exile abroad, but the Book

of 1549 satisfied no one. It was no use pressing for that. It represented (and was then understood to represent) the same ideas as 1552; but the protestants and the recusants alike refused to use it; and the rite of 1552 was the one the government was committed to enforcing. Within the limits left for any action by the church, such men could and did do a good deal to influence the settlement, as the revision of Cranmer's *Articles* and the appeal to the primitive church and the 'catholic fathers' testify. But with the liturgical changes already made by the action of the state they had no chance whatever to interfere, even if they had had an alternative ready to propose.

There were others who found themselves within a church not altogether to their liking. Puritanism, as it came to be called, was a strong and lively element, and one to which insufficient justice has generally been done by Anglican historians. For my own part I cannot help thinking that among our pragmatic countrymen it represented fundamentally much more the desire of good men to deal with those practical abuses of the ecclesiastical machine which had clamoured for amendment in 1534 and which the English Reformation had left entirely unamended and in some cases protected and strengthened, than the continental protestant theology with which it was almost accidentally associated. The incipient presbyterian and congregationalist movements under Cartwright and Browne did express, however awkwardly and inadequately, a desire for a less bureaucratic and above all a more *religious* organisation and life of the church *qua* church. They had a real sense that the church is not, and ought not to appear, a department of the state but a divine society with a supernatural life of its own. In their own ways they were 'high church' movements, and it is the saddest pity that the ancestors of the 'Anglo-catholics' could not possibly have recognised the fact.

It is just here that the disastrous results of the actual procedure of the English Reformation made themselves most plainly apparent, in making the maintenance of the whole settlement as it stood—the new liturgy, the primitive ordinance of episcopacy, the haphazard and ramshackle doctrinal basis (which was only added afterwards) and the incoherent mediaeval organisation, all together—a matter for secular law and the lawyers. It gave the whole structure a rigidity, and an unreality in the sphere of *religion*, which were profoundly unchristian and uncatholic, even when they were protecting primitive christian and catholic conceptions from ignorant assault. Both under Edward VI and Elizabeth and in the seventeenth century the government was vigorously episcopalian in sentiment—but only for its own ends. A score or so of bishops appointed by itself were a deal easier to control and to work through than dozens of locally elected presbyteries and independent *classes*. Puritans were often exasperating and cranky people. Their objections to the use of the Prayer Book were many of them captious and childishly pedantic, and some of them (from my own

standpoint) plainly heretical. Yet one does not need to have read the whole story through their eyes to see how the fact that it was always a secular law and a secular authority with which they were confronted and repressed poisoned the whole situation within the church. A few of the Elizabethan episcopalians (*e.g.* Bilson) might argue for the divine authority of episcopacy from the scriptures and the fathers. The great majority preferred to insist on the more obvious fact that it had legal authority from the Queen to compel the puritans to conform to the government's settlement of religion, to which they objected on conscientious grounds. Nor did this offensively erastian handling of the puritan problem cease in the seventeenth century when the 'high' view of episcopacy had come to prevail. On the contrary it was intensified by all but one or two of the Laudian divines, and received perhaps its most odious expression of all in Bishop Parker's *Discourse of Ecclesiastical Politie*, published in 1670.[1]

And so the Elizabethan church got under way somehow, with its extraordinary medley of theological influences, its ubiquitous mediaeval survivals, its Avignon museum of church courts worked by lay lawyers wielding spiritual censures with temporal consequences to enforce financial payments, its criss-cross of episcopal jurisdiction, royal injunctions, parliamentary statutes, spasmodic influence from the Privy Council and the King's Bench, and the over-riding extra-legal authority of the High Commission. It had a liturgy on which it had never been consulted, and no doctrinal standards whatever to start with, save the declaration of Parliament in the Act of Supremacy that no one is to judge 'any matter or cause to be heresy, but any such as heretofore been . . . adjudged to be heresy by the authority of the canonical scriptures or by the first four general councils . . . or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged or determined to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament of this realm.' All this meant—and was intended to mean—that conformity to the official liturgy and not to belief, of which liturgy is of necessity only an expression, had to be taken as the Anglican basis. Anglicanism might—and did—persecute. But it persecuted in the name of the law of the state and not in the name of truth, except in the rare cases of Arians, etc., who came under the censures of the 'first four general councils'. Of these about a dozen were burned in the next fifty years. (The last is Legatt, burned at Smithfield in 1612, though the writ *de haeretico comburendo* was not formally abolished for yet another fifty years.) On the other hand Anglicanism retained an episcopate and the threefold ministry, for whatever reasons, and with it the possibility of an organic conception of the church; it made an appeal to the practice and teaching of the primitive church, though the consequences of this were hardly understood at the time; and it had a sort of blind instinct for order. It rested really on the fact that Englishmen had to have a church of some

[1] Brilliantly answered from the puritan side by Marvell's *Rehearsal Transprosed*, which is still amusing.

kind, and this was the only kind of church which their government was prepared to let them have.

Actual church life and practice in Elizabeth's reign is not a subject on which churchmen now can look back with a great deal of pride. Every mediaeval abuse in the ecclesiastical machine—pluralism, non-residence, simony, ignorance among the parochial clergy—was still rampant. More than one of the bishops were publicly scandalous, and the general standard of clerical life and devotion was probably a good deal lower than at any other period in our history, not excepting the eighteenth century, which in this respect has been somewhat unfairly abused. Churchgoing was enforced on the laity by the government through the justices of the peace by a system of delations and fines. Secular historians are agreed that down to 1588 a waning majority of Englishmen passively desired the old rites; but the threat of a Spanish invasion to restore them did not assist their popularity. By then a new generation was growing up which had not known the mass. It was the threat of the permanent continuation of the Latin rite in England as a rival to the state liturgy by the new influx of seminary priests and Jesuits ordained abroad which produced the savage new Treason Act of 1581. Under colour of secular politics this made the saying or hearing of mass subject to the ghastly penalty of being half-hanged and cut down alive, and then castrated, disembowelled and finally having the heart plucked from the still living body (which was to be dismembered after death) in the case of priests and laymen; or the atrocity known as *peine forte et dure* in the case of women, *i.e.* being slowly squashed to death with heavy weights. (Margaret Clitheroe took an hour to die in this way at York, for hearing mass.) 189 persons, mostly priests, suffered in this way during the latter part of Elizabeth's reign, to whom must be added thirty-two Franciscans starved to death in prison. 277 had been burned in the much shorter reign of Mary, but the Church of England about levelled the evil score in the seventeenth century. For protestant dissenters the gaol rather than the scaffold was employed, except in the case of those who had the fancy to be Arians or Nestorians.

It is a horrible story all round, and it is not surprising to find that it did not strengthen the hold of organised religion in general on the hearts of the people. There is much scattered but convincing evidence that the great decline in English churchgoing begins in the sixteenth century, not in the eighteenth, as is often supposed. The Reformation found the great mass of the people regular and even somewhat enthusiastic churchgoers. With an inexcusable suddenness, between a Saturday night and a Monday morning at Pentecost 1549, the English liturgical tradition of nearly a thousand years was altogether overturned. Churchgoing never really recovered from that shock. Measures of compulsion kept the churches reasonably full in the reign of Edward VI and the earlier half of Elizabeth's. But voluntary, and above all weekday, churchgoing—on the popularity of which in

England most fifteenth century travellers had remarked—virtually disappeared. Ridley, no prejudiced witness in favour of the old religion, declares: 'It was great pity and a lamentable thing to have seen in many places the people so loathesomely and irreligiously come to the holy communion and to the Common Prayers . . . in comparison of that blind zeal and indiscreet devotion which they had aforetime to these things whereof they understood never one whit'.[1] The same complaint can be paralleled from Latimer, Hooper, Bucer, Bullinger, and every leader connected with the Reformation under Edward VI save Cranmer himself. It is repeated in Acts of Parliament and Royal Proclamations and in private letters and other documents, in a way which leaves no doubt of its substantial truth. There appears to have been no legal compulsion to church in the reign of Mary and little need for it; though there are cases of punishment for interrupting services or otherwise obstructing the restoration of the old worship. But the complaints about non-attendance begin again in the reign of Elizabeth, along with the renewal of measures of compulsion. The truth is that the great mediaeval half-christianised bulk of the population had a tradition of mass-going, and perhaps not much more. Admittedly, that is by no means all that the New Testament understands by christianity. Yet it did bring them to church, and this offered an unparalleled opportunity for teaching them something more. Instead of this they were suddenly compelled to accept not only a totally different conception of worship, but *two* new rites in rapid succession, followed again by two further revolutions in the next six years, each accompanied by conscientious public murders on a nation-wide scale. Is it any wonder that in the general upheaval, the overthrow of traditional sanctities, the bewildering succession of liturgies, the *habit* of churchgoing broke down? And so the greatest opportunity for the effective evangelisation of England that there has ever been was very largely wasted. God alone can justly distribute the blame between reckless innovators and *mumpsimus*-minded conservatives. But that the methods employed—the enforcement by penal statutes of a novel liturgy and a novel theology, on which the church had never even been consulted—were wholly unsuitable for evangelisation will hardly be denied.

All this is not perhaps the conventional Anglican picture of the Reformation—certainly it is not that on which I was brought up. But it seems, nevertheless, to have been what happened, and its consequences are with us all in the English church to-day. Anglicans are apt to be a little sensitive about 'continuity', and it may be as well to make it clear that I do not see how anything in this chapter can be thought to shed new light on that question from either side. As regards the first four years of the reign of Elizabeth, one has only to ask 'What is supposed to be continuous with what?' to throw the whole subject into inextricable confusion for Anglicans and Romanists alike. Granted the formal continuance of the succession in

[1] *Works* (Parker Soc. 1841), *p.* 60.

the case of Archbishop Parker (a matter which can reasonably be left to the available historical evidence to settle) the legitimacy of the existence of Anglicanism to-day, which is presumably what is really in question in this controversy over 'continuity', surely has to be considered on a wider basis, and defended or attacked by more formidable arguments than can be found either in the personal beliefs of Archbishop Cranmer or the singular makeshift of the first years of the Elizabethan settlement.

The Elizabethan church began with no doctrinal basis whatever but the Prayer Book, imposed by a single vote in the House of Lords. Such basis as was reached afterwards was the work of Convocation, supervised by the Queen and the Privy Council and her miscellaneous advisers. The revival of Convocation under Elizabeth is real enough in a way when compared with its treatment under Henry VIII and Edward VI, though it was kept under strict control. It passed the *Articles* in 1563, but it was not allowed to enforce subscription to them even on the clergy. All that was enforceable was the Oath of Supremacy and the Prayer Book, which were imposed by Parliament. The statute of 1571 which did compel the clergy to subscribe to the Articles, significantly imposed it only for certain Articles out of the xxxix, which Parliament selected. Elizabethan Convocations passed quite a number of canons, but they did not by any means all receive the assent of the Crown, and these could not be, and were not, enforced. Convocation and the church which it represented had no power or possibility of touching such part of the Settlement as the government had imposed through Parliament, though it was given scope to administer it independently, under the watchful eye of the Crown.

It is the same story in the seventeenth century. The changes to be made in the Prayer Book after the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 (none of which affected the rite of the eucharist) were decided upon by the king personally, put into form by a group of bishops and privy councillors on the spot, and put out by letters patent. The changes were not of great importance, and nobody raised the least objection to the procedure.[1] The canons of 1604 enacted by Convocation (chiefly through the efforts of Bancroft) received the royal assent. But because they were important and had not been enacted in Parliament, the courts—including the church courts—refused to enforce them on the laity. Bancroft's whole scheme for the reform of the gross practical abuses which had disfigured the Elizabethan church was crippled by the lawyers because it had behind it only the authority of the Convocations.

But, it will be said, at least in 1662 the rights of the church were respected. The 1604 Prayer Book was first revised by the Convocations and only then given legal force by the king in Parliament through an Act of Uniformity. The situation certainly was different in 1662, in that there were now really

[1] See the letter of Toby Matthew, Bishop of Durham, to the Archbishop of York. Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences, pp.* 161 *sqq.*

three, not two factors in the situation: the church, represented by the Convocations; the newly restored royal executive; and the Parliament which was no longer a royal instrument, but the most powerful factor of the three. The two weaker tried to support one another against the third, and the sequence of events is interesting.

The king returned in May 1660, and the liturgy of 1604 was at once restored in his chapel and in many churches. But the king would not allow Convocation to meet till May 1661. The Savoy Conference between representative episcopalians and presbyterians was already sitting, under a commission from the king to discuss changes in the Prayer Book. It did not break up until July 24th. Convocation filled up its time with preparing new offices for Restoration Day and the baptism of adults, but was forced to adjourn on July 30th, so that it could not begin its consideration of the existing Prayer Book of 1604 until its next group of sessions, on November 21st. Meanwhile the House of Commons as early as the 25th of June had shewn some anger at the possibility that Convocation might make changes in 1604. It proceeded to set up a committee to study 1552 and to 'provide for an effectual conformity to the liturgy of the church for the time to come'. Apparently the Cavalier squires who formed the majority of members were about equally anxious as Cavaliers that no concessions should be made through the Savoy Conference to the lately triumphant puritans, and as squires that no countenance should be given to the 'innovations' of the late Archbishop Laud (though he had made none in the English Prayer Book) who had been violently unpopular with the squirearchy for his opposition to enclosures. They do not appear to have liked the Book of 1552, for by the 9th of July they had passed through all its stages in the lower house a 'Bill for the Uniformity of Public Prayer and the Administration of the Sacraments', to which the Book of 1604 without change was annexed. This was at once sent to the Lords, but Parliament adjourned on July 30th before the Lords had considered it. It did not meet again till November 20th, the day before Convocation began its revision of 1604. The Convocations took just a month over their revision (Nov. 21st to Dec. 20th—a contrast with the twenty-five years occupied in this century!). Despite pressure from the Commons to proceed with the Bill enforcing 1604, the Lords at the request of the king agreed to await the result of Convocation's work. But on the 14th of February, before receiving the new Book from Convocation, they gave a first reading to the Bill restoring 1604, and a second reading on the 17th, after which it was sent to a select committee. It was a fairly strong hint to Convocation. The unrevised Book of 1604 required only one more reading in the Lords to be presented for the Royal Assent—which could hardly have been refused—and so to become law.

Meanwhile the Book as revised by Convocation had been sent to the Privy Council, where certain changes seem to have been made, of which

the only one of importance was the restoration of the 'Black Rubric' or 'Declaration on Kneeling' at communion. This had been added by the Privy Council in 1552 and omitted in 1559 and 1604; it was now reinserted with the change of the denial of 'any *corporal* presence of Christ's actual flesh and blood' in the sacrament, for the '*real and essential* presence' denied in 1552.[1] The re-insertion of this 'Declaration' had already been demanded by the puritans and refused by the bishops at the Savoy Conference; it had deliberately not been reinserted by Convocation. The new Book was received by the Lords, who gave it a third reading without change on April 9th, and sent it down to the Commons.

There it provoked a commotion by the number of its changes from 1604 —some 600—and a close comparison of the two Books was instituted. It was found that though numerous they were almost all only verbal or stylistic. Even so, it was only by 96 votes to 90 that the Commons decided not to vote on them one by one; and they did pass a resolution that they had 'a full right' to reconsider any changes Convocation had made. Meanwhile Convocation had accepted the situation gracefully. On March 5th, the Bishops of S. Asaph, Carlisle and Chester were deputed by both Houses to review 'the emendations or other alterations made in the Book of Common Prayer by the House (*sic*) of Parliament' and assent to them. No changes made in Parliament were then before them, for neither House had yet voted on the Book (and in fact none were made there at all, but only in the Privy Council). The commission can only have been prospective. No doubt the proprieties were saved, even as regards the 'Black Rubric', by the affirmative votes of these three bishops in the House of Lords. But Convocation could hardly have found a more discreet way of recognising that in respect of the liturgy its function amounted in practice to not much more than those of a drafting committee for Parliament. There was no idea in 1662 (as was proposed in 1927–8) of sending the Book back to the Convocations after it had been given statutory authority by the king in Parliament to receive 'spiritual authority' from the clergy.

It has often been remarked that in their revision the Convocations seem to have disregarded the king's suggestion that 1604 should be compared 'with the most ancient liturgies which have been used in the church in the primitive and purest times'. At all events they put forward no recommendations for such changes in Cranmer's Shape of the Liturgy as must have been suggested by comparisons of this kind. Yet such changes had been made in practice on his own authority by Bishop Overall (*d.* 1615), and had been officially imposed in Scotland by Laud's Scottish Book of 1637; some of the most prominent revisers in 1662 are known to have desired

[1] C. W. Dugmore, *op. cit.*, *pp.* 74 *sq.* is not convincing that no change of meaning was intended by the change of wording in 1662; he has not noticed that the Declaration was only added after the Book had finally left Convocation, which had refused the puritan request for its replacement.

them in the English rite. But the king had also charged them to avoid 'as much as may be all unnecessary alterations of the forms and liturgy wherewith the people are already acquainted'. It was impossible to carry out both instructions; and Convocation received from Parliament before, during and after its revision such plain intimations that it would be allowed to make none but the slightest changes in 1604 (which as regards the eucharist is 1552, except for the single change in the words of administration made in 1559) that it was not worth while to propose or discuss them. To have done so would undoubtedly have resulted forthwith in Parliament's re-enacting 1604 without change.

In revising the rite of the eucharist, therefore, Convocation in 1662 had to content itself with registering the general reaction against Cranmer's Zwinglianism which had taken place in the course of a century, by changes in terminology—'consecrated bread and wine' for 'bread and wine', and so forth; and by ordering greater decency of practice, *e.g.* that when the consecrated elements were replaced upon the altar after communion it should be done 'reverently', and that they were to be covered with a linen cloth, and reverently consumed after the blessing, not taken home by the parson for secular use.

Two changes in the rite were made, however, almost surreptitiously, which made it easier to interpret Cranmer's rite along the lines of the 'four-action shape' of the liturgy. They restored both the offertory of the elements and the fraction, which Cranmer had deliberately omitted.

By ordering that the 'alms' before the 'prayer for the church' should be offered by the priest at the altar and not placed in the 'poor men's box' by the churchwardens, 1662 restored the idea of an 'offering' of something material at this point of the rite, which Cranmer had been so careful to eliminate. And they implemented this by adding the two words 'and oblations' to the clause of the following 'prayer for the church'—'We beseech Thee . . . to accept our alms *and oblations*'. But they went further. By directing that the bread and wine were to be placed upon the altar immediately after the alms and before this prayer was said, they made it possible to understand these words 'and oblations' as referring to the eucharistic bread and wine. This interpretation of the words is hardly more than an inference, though it is one which is commonly made nowadays, and which was made by Bishop Simon Patrick of Ely early in the eighteenth century. But it seems to have been proved beyond reasonable question that by 'oblations' the revisers themselves in 1662 meant only 'financial contributions for the support of the clergy' as distinct from 'alms' for other charitable objects.[1]

It was certainly desirable to restore the offertory, and a good thing though not an absolute necessity to have a prayer referring to it. But the position in which it was thought necessary to place it in order to smuggle it

[1] See J. Dowden, *Further Studies in the Prayer Book*, London, 1908, *pp.* 176 *sqq.*

through Parliament under cover of the collection had a serious disadvantage. It greatly confused the clear outline of the rite as Cranmer had left it from the point of view of construction, even though it made it somewhat easier to read a catholic interpretation into Cranmer's wording. The offertory of bread and wine placed *before* the 'prayer for the church' (representing the old intercessions of the synaxis) is thus thrust back out of the eucharist proper into the synaxis. This is only an archaeological point, of no importance in itself. But the offertory is thus separated from the consecration by the whole length of the intercessions (the longest prayer in the rite) and the long and short exhortations, the confession, absolution and comfortable words, before we reach even the eucharistic dialogue and preface. And this again is separated from what the revisers of 1662 were the first to call the 'prayer of consecration' by the intervening 'prayer of humble access'. This long sagging gap between offertory and consecration is one of the chief constructional weaknesses of our present rite, dissociating the church's offering from its acceptance. One result has been the neglect of the meaning of the offertory in our devotional tradition, with the consequent distortion of the eucharist into something in which we get rather than give. Cranmer's replacement of the offering of bread and wine (inseparably connected with the idea of *self*-offering by the people's oblation at the altar) by his *new* expression of self-offering in the exhortations, confession, etc. is also obscured by the disconnection of the offering of the elements from the exhortations, confession etc., by the intervening intercessions. I do not think most people now regard these devotions as a self-oblation at all, as Cranmer intended. They are treated as misplaced 'communion devotions' or, by some bishops, misplaced 'consecration devotions'. Nothing could have been further from Cranmer's mind. The muddle is completed by treating the so-called 'prayer of oblation' as though it were a misplaced 'second half' of the eucharistic prayer instead of a 'thanksgiving for communion', as he clearly intended. If the current attempts to found christian sociological doctrine on the eucharistic offertory are to receive any satisfactory expression or even meaning in our rite, something will have to be done to clear up this structural confusion which the well meaning re-introduction of an offertory of the elements at so awkward position in 1662 has created.

[1] I have never seen any official consideration of the fact that our present 'prayer of oblation' was in content originally intended for an *offertory* prayer (*cf. p.* 731 *n.*). Instead of this we have the perpetual episcopal harping on the idea of placing after the prayer of consecration, despite the fact that Cranmer after trying it there rightly saw that it was entirely unsuitable for such a position, and deliberately removed it. He was an admirable liturgist. If you share his theology you had much better use his liturgy as he left it, for a better expression of that theology will not be achieved by tinkering with his rite. If you do *not* share his theology, you will not achieve the expression of a different doctrine merely by shuffling the parts of his rite as they stand, because the *words* of a prayer have a meaning. (As an offertory prayer the prayer of oblation would not actually need the change of a word, though

1662 also restored the fraction, as the puritans desired, along with the other manual acts. The seventeenth century puritans as Calvinists attached great importance to the fraction,[1] whereas Zwinglians objected to it strongly, in accordance with their special idea of dissociating the reception of the bread and wine altogether from the 'eating and drinking of Christ's Flesh and Blood'. In replacing the manual acts the revisers were therefore in accord with the general anti-Zwinglian movement of the time, and also protesting against Cranmer's notion that the recitation of the institution was directed to the *hearers* only and had no reference to the elements. On the other hand, by including the fraction in the prayer instead of placing it at its primitive position before communion, they obscured its meaning and confused the outline of the rite. Probably they were influenced to do so not so much out of fear of protestant opposition—Baxter's rite has it after the prayer before the communion, in the primitive position—as in order not to arouse the attention of Parliament to the fact that they had here made a change of some importance from 1604.

The revision of 1662 thus tried to consolidate the general reaction from the ideas expressed by Cranmer in his liturgy, while retaining the whole substance of his liturgy unchanged. It is no wonder that from the point of view of liturgical construction the resulting rite is incoherent, and appears to be a confused succession of parts without a logical design as a whole. That is because the Carolines were obliged to try to interpret in terms of patristic theology a rite which was designed to express a wholly different idea. What I am concerned to point out is that the unsatisfactory result is not due to Cranmer, whose original rite expressed the real meaning of its author about as clearly and beautifully as a rite can do. Nor can it be fairly blamed on the revisers when the limitations under which they knew they were obliged to work are considered. It was the procedure of 1662 which was at fault. The truth is that under cover of a formal consultation of the church the essential process of the Edwardian, Marian and Elizabethan settlements was followed once more in that under Charles II, though with a considerable shift in the balance of the secular power imposing it.

The king himself seems never to have shared the sentimental delusion of the Cavalier Parliament that after 'the late troubles' the state's organisation, political and religious, could be restored exactly as it had been in his father's golden days. Even if it had been possible, he cherished other ideals. But Parliament did intend this, and throughout insisted on making the Restoration settlement of the church so far as possible a return to the *status quo*. The return to the 1604 liturgy was part of a reactionary policy intended to apply to every aspect of life. As the Act of Uniformity declares: 'Now in

to be *made* a reasonable and lively sacrifice' would avoid the suggestion of Pelagianism; and 'ourselves, our *lives and labours*' would more fully express self-oblation than 'ourselves, our souls and bodies', which is tautologous.)

[1] *Cf. p.* 610.

regard that nothing conduceth more to the settling of the Peace of this Nation . . . than an Universal agreement in the Public Worship of Almighty God; and to the intent that every person within this Realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship . . . Be it enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by the advice and with the consent etc. . . . that all and singular Ministers in any Cathedral Collegiate or Parish church or chapel or other place of public worship within this Realm . . . shall be bound to say and use . . . the said Book annexed and joined to this present Act.'

What is too little regarded among us now is that all this is something which is not merely intended to control the clergy. It is part of a system for '*every person within this realm*'. It was intended that no judge should sit upon the Bench, no member take his seat in Parliament, no don lecture in law or physic at the University, no officer hold a commission in the Army or Navy, no village schoolmaster teach his class, no town councillor discuss a rate—before they, too, had each given proof of 'conformity' to the settlement. The lay citizen might be fined for non-attendance at his parish church, by justices who had to take the declaration of assent before they could be of the commission of the peace, just as the clergy must do before they could hold an ecclesiastical preferment. The layman could be punished for attending an unlawful conventicle at which other forms were used, just as the clergy could be legally punished if they contravened the Act in taking the services. It is a real attempt to restore that immense system of state-control of conscience which Cromwell and Cranmer had dreamed of, and which Laud had maddened his opponents by putting into force a generation before. The only change from Cranmer's ideal is that the controller of conscience is no longer in anything but name the personal monarch. It is now the totalitarian Parliament, which had exercised so decisive an influence in the retention of Cranmer's liturgy without substantial change.

The attempted restoration was no longer possible. The royal executive, to say the least, had no desire to persecute recusants. Protestant dissent was organised, and too powerful to be coerced. The Clarendon Code under which the dissenters groaned was at least a recognition that their organised existence must be tolerated. Before a generation had passed the whole system had broken down. The 'high churchmen' of Queen Anne's reign (when the term first comes into use) and the 'high Tory' squires might rage at the way 'Dissenters and Sectaries are suffered to pull down the church'. What was really crumbling was the state's attempted control of conscience, and with it Cranmer's notion of the church. A century before or after 1720 the Church of England might have been invigorated by the process. As things were it was enfeebled, because the state had reduced the church to utter dependence on itself, and then lost interest in it without abandoning it to its own devices. Convocation, the traditional organ of the church's own life, had been put to silence; but the church could no longer

rely on the Hanoverian Crown and the Whig Parliament to some extent to supply the loss by their interest in its life and needs, as the Tudor Crown and the Stuart Parliaments had done. The eighteenth century church is often reproached for its worldliness and for reliance on its remaining social privilege and state establishment. But what else was left it to rely on? The state had ordered its liturgy, and removed it altogether from the church's control by freezing it rigid, down to the last comma, in the form of a secular statute. The state had left it church courts, and then insisted that they should administer not canon law but new parliamentary statutes, wherever the two might differ. The state had retained the episcopate, and insisted that it must choose its members with a primary regard for the state's needs, not those of the church. There was no single form of expression necessary to the corporate life of any society which the eighteenth century state did not completely usurp in the case of the Church of England. Of course the church grew to be parasitic upon the state. In the particular case of the liturgy, it is seen in the way in which eighteenth century churchmen increasingly based the worship of the church not on her own doctrinal interpretation of it but on the mechanical fulfilling of the Act of Uniformity, as 'the incomparable liturgy with which the wisdom of our legislature had endowed us', as Archbishop Herring of Canterbury (1747–57) termed it. And as soon as Cranmer's liturgy was thus left to be self-interpreting, it had its natural consequence in the eighteenth century Neo-Zwinglian movement in Anglicanism.

By the nineteenth century the Church of England had become an instrument virtually useless to the state for the control of conscience, not because the state had lost its hold on the church, but because the church had lost its hold on the majority of the people. The alliance of church and state remained from the past as a strong but entirely static tradition, with which the increasingly secularised state refused to encumber itself in fresh ways as its own activities and interests continually expanded to meet modern conditions. The effective links between church and state were now the lawyers, with their ideals of uniformity, of immutable administration according to precedent, and of the perpetual authority and exact execution of every statute left unrepealed by the legislature. Cranmer had placed them in control of the church's life in the quite different circumstances of the agricultural England of the sixteenth century. It is highly disputable whether the experiment can be considered a success at any period. The first Act of Uniformity produced rebellions almost on the scale of a civil war. The second produced chaos, and determined the country to endorse the Marian refusal to face the new problems presented for religion by post-mediaeval conditions in any constructive way at all. The third resulted in the organisation of the English recusant body, and the fourth in the organisation of English protestant dissent. I am not contending that the English church has not a right to a determined faith and worship. Of course it has.

But the whole method of arriving at them adopted in the sixteenth century seems to have been unsuitable and wrong in itself, though there may be two opinions about the possibility of any other method at the time. What is not disputable is that the perpetuation of it after the Industrial Revolution and right down to the present day as a special *régime* within the established church is a grotesque anachronism. Its whole *raison d'être* in the elaborate system of state control of conscience, of which it had still formed a part even at the Restoration, has disappeared piecemeal in the meanwhile.

As things stood at the beginning of the nineteenth century, though the 'Evangelical Revival' might restore the personal piety of individuals within the existing system, the church as a church could not undertake new tasks to meet changed conditions, or even hope to recover the ground lost in its pastoral activities since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. The only way to an effective recovery of corporate life lay in an appeal *beyond* the Church of England itself and what the state had made of it, to the primitive and undivided church. Fortunately the right to make that appeal had been claimed, ineffectually enough as it seemed at the time, by the Elizabethan Convocations. It had been repeated at intervals since by the Carolines and the Non-jurors.

This way the Oxford Movement took, and for all its inconvenient and unsatisfactorily archaeological character, the appeal was surprisingly successful. It was opposed continuously by the nineteenth century state, clinging for what it was still worth to the tradition of control, and inspired by the tenacious memories of the lawyers. It was opposed, too, as was natural, by the most part of the state-appointed bishops; and, as was deplorable but inevitable, by all that was still living in the genuinely religious tradition of protestantism which had grown up in England since the sixteenth century. Among the general English public it was opposed by the national tendency to conservatism and that peculiar English taste for preserving monuments of the past as purposeless ruins scrupulously kept ruinous by the care of a government department. And yet, by the beginning of the twentieth century, the English church as a whole, not merely the professed followers of the Oxford Movement, was beginning to be convinced that it had a divine life of its own, quite distinct from that of even a christian state. In reality this was a denial of the whole basis upon which Cranmer had carried through the English Reformation. Old habits of thought might persist illogically along with it for a while, but sooner or later it would necessitate a thorough reconstruction of the life of the English church on a different basis.

As these things happened in England and in the English church, this was not at all the standpoint from which matters were approached. Just as in the sixteenth century, so in the twentieth, attention was centred on practice not theory, and the core of christian practice is the liturgy. A parliamentary agitation for the more exact performance of the statutory

liturgy by the clergy brought about a Royal Commission, whose report in 1906 carefully analysed the symptoms but only hinted at the real cause of the disorders. (1) 'The law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of this generation', and the church possessed no sufficient powers to adjust its law to the needs of its life. (2) 'The machinery for discipline has broken down', inasmuch as too large a number of churchmen now refused to accept the decisions of the present erastian church courts as binding in conscience to allow that machinery to work. In other words, by 1906 a large proportion of churchmen no longer accepted the principle of parliamentary control of faith and worship even within the established church. The rest of the population had long ago abandoned that principle for themselves. Presumably the system was at an end.

Nothing, however, seems to have been further from anyone's thoughts at the time; and nobody seems to have questioned publicly the suitability in the circumstances of the procedure of 1662, with Convocation as a drafting committee and Parliament in final control. Perhaps no other procedure would have stood any chance of acceptance at that moment, though that shrewd man of affairs Archbishop Davidson had his misgivings from the start as to the outcome,[1] while bravely continuing to do his best to meet the difficulties as they arose during the next twenty-five years. Royal Letters of Business were issued to the Convocations in November 1906 authorising them to present a 'Report' to the Crown on 'the desirability and the form and contents . . . of any modifications of the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and to the ornaments and fittings of churches'. The very terms of this document shew how completely Cranmer's conception of the clergy as 'the king's ministers of Christ's Word'—the department of public worship—still governed the whole situation in the minds of the lawyers, and was at least acquiesced in by the bishops. There was a general intention among the latter, 'First, that there should be a minimum of change; and next, that there should be no change that in any sort of way could honestly be said to touch doctrine at all.'[2] This was the policy of 1662. The work along these lines was in sight of completion in the summer of 1914, when war postponed its final stages.

When it was being carried forward again early in 1918 the bishops seem to have drifted into a quite new attitude towards their task, without ever definitely bringing themselves to face the fact that they had done so, and that it might have awkward consequences. They were no longer occupied with revising details of the existing statutory rite with a view to making its legal enforcement more practicable. They were trying to improve the Church of England's eucharistic rite considered simply as a rite, from the

[1] *Randall Davidson*, by Dr. G. K. A. Bell, I, *pp.* 650 *sqq.*

[2] Dr. G. F. Browne, then Bishop of Bristol, summarising the progress of revision in Feb. 1914.

point of view of liturgy not of law. They could not, of course, forget the over-riding necessity of steering the result through Parliament. This probably affected their proposals in 1927 to a larger extent than they made public, while its effect upon the changes between 1927 and 1928 was admitted and obvious. Nevertheless they began in 1918 to take the very course which the revisers of 1662 had refrained from adopting, as certain to be disallowed by Parliament. The bishops attacked their new task with very little knowledge of the theoretical and historical questions involved (though the appointment of Bishop Frere to Truro in 1921 secured that adequate information was at all events available on the bench), with no scientific appreciation of how to set about constructing a liturgy, and in some cases without much interest in the subject of worship for its own sake. Consequently, they seem never to have envisaged their new rite sufficiently as a whole; and they never succeeded in clearing their minds as to what they meant their liturgy to do, *i.e.* as to what that eucharistic action is which the liturgy performs. They were obviously much hampered by trying to produce something upon which they could agree among themselves while maintaining unresolved a great diversity of eucharistic theology.

Two years were occupied in this new approach to their task without attracting much public attention, and it is just conceivable that if the results had been presented to Parliament in 1920 they would have been enacted. But the Enabling Act of 1919 had just set up what was destined to turn out to be another disappointing instalment of the reconstruction of the church, in the shape of the National Assembly of the Church of England. To this body Parliament had delegated some of its legislative powers in the affairs of the church, but in all major matters it could only forward measures for the approval or disallowance (but not the amendment) of Parliament. Whatever may be the relation of Convocation to Parliament, there can be no doubt that Parliament was given, explicitly and deliberately, a veto over the measures of the Church Assembly; and that the church whether wisely or not had knowingly accepted that fact when the Assembly was set up. Nevertheless, Archbishop Davidson had formally pledged himself in the House of Lords that the Assembly should be consulted on Prayer Book Revision. The fact that the revision of the Prayer Book ultimately came before Parliament from the Assembly, not Convocation, gave Parliament an unassailable right, if it wanted one, to reject it.

Nevertheless, seven more years were spent in getting the endorsement of this not very impressive body for the bishops' new proposals, since it insisted with the ardour and unwisdom of youth in doing what amounted in the end to the same work all over again for itself. The delay was fatal. The debates in the Assembly roused party feeling to great exasperation in the church and gave time for the launching of outside campaigns of various kinds which attracted much public attention.

The revision had assumed the form not of amendments to 1662 but of a

complete alternative rite, incorporating most of the material of 1662 with some additions or alterations, but designed to be used where desired *instead of* 1662. The bishops had rashly wandered into a position where they could be represented as having produced a new and different rite as their answer to Parliament's instructions to observe the old one better. It was precisely the position avoided in 1662, and the result was what it would have been in like case. The Lords passed the Book of 1927, as the Lords might have passed a more heavily revised Book in 1662; but the Commons rejected it, as the Commons would undoubtedly have done then. A fresh attempt to pass what amounted to the rejected book toned down to appease the prejudices of the Commons was again rejected by a slightly larger majority in 1928. This left 1662 without change as the only statutory liturgy, as it is to the present day. Just so in 1662 the Commons were prepared to re-enact the existing Book of 1604 without change, if Convocation had attempted to make any but minor revisions. And as 1662 is substantially the rite of 1604, 1559, and 1552, it can reasonably be said that Parliament has stood throughout for one thing, the settlement which Cranmer originally imposed on the church by its means.

. . . . .

If this book should meet with a reader who is not an Anglican, he may easily find a lack of relation between this chapter and the rest of the book. If it does not interest him, I am sorry. But the fact is that I am an Anglican, and therefore could not omit it; and it does not impair whatever usefulness to his liturgical studies there may be in what precedes it. And if the Anglican reader is distressed by some things in it, I am sorry. But the fact is that I am distressed, too; and therefore I could not omit it, though I would have been glad to do so. The book which precedes it is solid work, and from the general standpoint of the subject is—so far as I can judge—more important. I would ask him to forget this last chapter and return and judge the book only by what precedes it, were it not that I believe that he will find that some things (at least) in this last chapter follow necessarily for him from what has gone before.

ADDITIONAL NOTE:

THE PRESENT LITURGICAL POSITION IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THE foregoing chapter tells a story one might have supposed sufficiently well known in most of its aspects for its practical lessons to be understood and applied by Anglicans in the present notorious liturgical difficulties of the Church of England. Yet a survey of the official proposals to remedy

those difficulties during the last forty years reveals an inattention to their root causes and real nature so marked and continuous as almost to suggest a deliberate policy. By a natural consequence the attempted remedies have mostly aggravated the disorder. It is now agreed on all hands that the resulting state of affairs is no longer merely an inconvenience and a scandal but has become a serious handicap to the life and work of the English church. We have to face the facts that though the Church of England has an official liturgy more rigidly and minutely prescribed in its details than that of almost any other church in christendom; and though its observance is fortified by a most complicated and formidable system of courts and legal penalties, such as no other religious society in history has ever found necessary to secure the observance of its rites, yet the Church of England to-day presents a liturgical disorganisation such as is found in no other christian body, and exhibits a liturgical diversity not commonly found in bodies which do not profess to have any set liturgy at all.

A long course of mishandling has made this a very sore subject for any Anglican to touch, and I have no wish at all to wound the consciences of others or to appear disrespectful to authority. Yet some plainness of speech seems to be necessary if this matter is to be dealt with at all, and I quite expect to be freely criticised in my own turn. I write about it only as a private person who has tried to give what study and thought he can to it from a somewhat detached position, with the aid of opportunities for observation afforded by preaching in a good many churches in different parts of the country, and after two years' practical experience of this difficulty while serving a parochial church, in which circumstances made it somewhat specially obvious, at the beginning of this war. For what the opinion is worth, I should say that the finding of an effective remedy is becoming a matter of real pastoral urgency. But I cannot conceive of any way in which the present state of affairs could be much amended unless and until its neglected causes are understood and taken into account, first of all by the bishops, but also in a general way by the church at large. What is necessary is an approach to the whole question along quite different lines from those we have hitherto tried.

Before preparing this Note I read or re-read and carefully analysed some forty episcopal Charges and kindred documents which adverted to the problem between 1929 and 1939. So far as I understand these pronouncements, the official view of the cause of the evil is that it is due: (1) To the culpable irresponsibility of large sections of the clergy, and particularly of the 'high church' clergy, in making changes in the legal liturgy at their own discretion; (2) To the action of Parliament in 1927–8, when it rejected a revised liturgy which had taken the bishops more than twenty years to devise, and thus frustrated the only remedy for the liturgical situation which had any chance whatever of success. (Before considering this diagnosis it is right also to report that no one of these documents admits

that the episcopate bears any special responsibility for the development of such a situation; and that only two suggest that the episcopate as such might have a more creative function on the eucharistic worship of the church than securing that 'the law', ecclesiastical or civil, is carried out.)

It is no doubt easy for those without experience of the thorny responsibilities of Anglican bishops to criticise their utterances. But this view of the causes of our troubles seems so superficial as to be almost entirely untrue. It is, of course, a fact that many of the clergy do alter the official liturgy considerably, but the practice is by no means confined to any one school of thought. There must be some powerful cause at work to induce them to do this so generally as they do, for they are not as a whole an irresponsible body of men. It is nowadays a frequent observation even with unbelievers that the English parochial clergy have a high professional standard.[1] So far as my reading carries me, they nowadays perform their always difficult and in these days often thankless duties with a steady devotion at least equal to that displayed by their predecessors at any previous period in the history of the English church, and incomparably better than in some periods which pass for 'reformed'. And I have found from my own observation that it is often those clergy, of all schools of thought without exception, who are most zealous and attentive to their pastoral duty who are now least concerned to observe the statutory rite with any exactness; while it is, on the whole, the less energetic and devout (again of all schools of thought) in whom the bishops would find least to complain of in this respect. There is surely something here which deserves careful considera-into rather than the shrill accusations of 'disloyalty' with which it has too often been treated by the authorities.

As for the action of Parliament in 1928, it really altered nothing in the whole situation—except the bishops' own respect for the law of the land. It is true that Parliament then re-asserted firmly, but not without warrant or altogether unexpectedly, the principle of its own final control of the liturgy, and especially the eucharistic rite, of the established church. This was the unmistakeable tenor of the two debates in the Commons. But there was nothing new in this. It was the principle established by Cranmer himself, the principle for which Parliament had always stood since his day. In 1552 and 1559 Parliament had imposed Cranmer's rite without consultation with the church. In 1662 it had made it clear that it would tolerate no considerable changes in that rite by the bishops or Convocation. The decision of 1928 was not a 'snap' vote; it was reached by an increased majority after a year's reflection. But all the same, it was a quite unreal decision, in the sense that it had no effect. Parliament voted that the church

[1] See *e.g.* the remarkable tribute paid to them by Dr. C. E. M. Joad, *God and Evil* (London, 1942), *p.* 353. The parochial clergy are entitled to set such appreciations from those outside the church (and even outside christianity) against the criticisms and persistently ungenerous treatment which they receive from some members of the Church Assembly.

should use only the legal rite of 1662, exactly and without change. The church continued to use it as it had been doing before 1928, with a multitude of unofficial changes. It is true that the new rite of 1928 did not come into use. But that had nothing to do with Parliament's refusal to sanction it. Neither the bishops nor the church at large paid any attention to that. The rite of 1928 did not come into use only because the church—the worshipping clergy and people—after due consideration found it did not like it enough to use it instead of all the other variants of 1662.

The real causes of the present situation go much deeper than 1928, which was only an incident, and in retrospect a curiously futile incident from the point of view of all concerned. The bishops since then have not been facing a new situation at all, or one unexampled in past history, but one which has been recurrent in different connections in the English church at intervals ever since the sixteenth century, and which is due to a difficulty inherent in the whole position of the Establishment as Cranmer left it. In the late summer of 1549 officials and supporters of the government were already complaining loudly that the clergy and people were not properly carrying out the clear directions of the legislature as to the way in which they were to worship God. At this stage the complaint was chiefly what it was before 1928, that the legal liturgy was being assimilated, so far as the worshippers dared do so, to the old mass. Under Elizabeth a 'long term' policy was tried with such conservatives. It took a long while to get the legal liturgy observed at all exactly in some places, especially in the North. But when the performance of and attendance at the old rites was finally made a matter of high treason, those whose theological aversion to the legal liturgy and attachment to the old one could not be broken even by the savage penalties then imposed were at least driven from the publicity of the churches to worship in secret.

Even so, the result was not that general 'Uniformity' of public worship on the legal model which the government intended, though the variations now came from a different source. The conservatives had been driven out of the churches, but the puritans were still inside them; and they were equally averse to the use of many things in the parliamentary liturgy, though on different grounds. The politically nominated bishops tried to do their duty by enforcing 'conformity' on all alike. The seventeenth century theological controversies between Anglicans and puritans rather disguise from us the real issues between them in these Elizabethan troubles. A specifically Anglican theological position was only in process of evolution in the generation of Jewel and Hooker. Some of the bishops themselves were then as thoroughly Calvinist in doctrine as any puritan, while others, *e.g.* Guest, could probably have brought themselves to use the actual language of the Roman missal without much theological scruple. What they were all enforcing was not dogma but law. What the bishops upheld against papist and puritan alike was the right of the state to enforce a single form of

public worship in the practice of all its citizens regardless of their different private beliefs.

This was no doubt partly due to the application of accepted mediaeval principles of society. But before the Anglican Reformation was fifty years old it had been demonstrated that the system was simply unworkable on the basis of a purely national church. There was too much room for confusion between the national church *qua* church and the political behests of the national government acting altogether outside its proper sphere. A sincere man's worship expresses his own belief and is moulded by it—or it dies of unreality. Mere political enforcement of a form by the state brings neither a practical conformity to the law nor theological agreement, but the decay of religion. If worship is a matter only of law, a conviction of difference of belief will send men out of the church rather than join in its worship, as happened with the Elizabethan papists. Where theological differences are still only instinctively and incipiently felt, men may still remain uneasily within the state church, but they will feel bound to alter its worship to express their own beliefs, as happened with the Elizabethan puritans. Bancroft before he became a bishop wrote indignantly of the puritans that 'every man useth and refuseth what he listeth' of the Prayer Book, and that many bishops connived out of sympathy, or from 'their desire to be at ease and quietness to think upon their own affairs.'[1]

Bancroft was of the new Anglican school which thought in terms of doctrine, and which was apt to speak contemptuously of the Elizabethan bishops. But these neo-Anglicans had this much justification, that they knew as no other generation since has known or could know that the elaboration of a properly Anglican doctrinal position was accomplished only just in time to save the English church from complete disintegration by decay. One has only to study the unemotional, purely factual, reports on the growing disorganisation of church life and the general emptiness of the churches, and the increasing neglect of all worship, which reached the Privy Council in a steady stream from the Judges of Assize and the emissaries of the Ecclesiastical Commission from all over the country in the 80's and 90's of the sixteenth century,[2] to be well aware that the Church of England itself is no exception to the rule that worship *must* express belief, or it dies. It was the new Anglican doctrinal basis which gave the motive and the inspiration for that thorough reorganisation of the church under Bancroft and his contemporaries, which deserves to rank beside the Reformation under Cranmer and the Renewals of the nineteenth century

[1] *A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline* (1593), *p.* 249.

[2] They have to be extracted from the *Calendar of State Papers* (*Domestic*) and similar collections (*e.g. The Cecil Papers* calendared by the Historical MSS. Commission). So far as I know no published work has ever done full justice to the lamentable picture they draw or to the unanimity with which they draw it. But there are some fairly startling extracts in Bishop Frere's essay on *The Church under Queen Elizabeth and James I.*

in the history of Anglicanism. The title which R. G. Usher chose for his account of it—*The Reconstruction of the English Church*[1]—involves no exaggeration of its scope, though the work then accomplished has unaccountably been underestimated in most of our manuals of church history. The theological reconstruction due to Jewel and Hooker and their successors owed little doctrinally to Cranmer himself, just as the practical reconstruction by Bancroft in many things ran directly counter to Cranmer's measures. The fact that this new creation of an Anglican position was forced to take over Cranmer's liturgy because the state and not the church had absolute control of worship was an element of weakness in this reconstruction which would make itself felt in the future in more than one way.

I do not propose to follow the case further here. It is sufficiently plain that the modern Anglican episcopate of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been confronted by something not unlike the Elizabethan situation. And they have met it with much the same policy as their Elizabethan predecessors. They fell back at first on the expedient of trying to make Anglicans of very diverse doctrinal beliefs about the eucharist all use the same statutory liturgy in the same way, while allowing them to retain their respective theologies. It was the Elizabethan predicament. Theology and thought were free, but the liturgy was to be rigidly stereotyped by the legislation of the state, which controlled the practice of public worship in church through its courts and judges, and appointed the bishops who administered the relevant statutes. But there was this difference in the nineteenth century from the earlier situation. The state was no longer effectively totalitarian in the sphere of religion; the earlier dissenters had taught it that its power had limits in that direction. The mere fact that worship could now legally be offered outside the Establishment in other ways than the law prescribed had made the nineteenth century state much less directly interested in the enforcement of its own laws about worship even within the Establishment. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was a primary object of policy, and the state had exerted its full power to this end, so that those who would not use the legal liturgy were at least driven out of the church. In the nineteenth century there were limits beyond which the state and public opinion would not go. Public opinion was still for a while prepared to tolerate rioting in defence of the statutory liturgy; the state by a miscalculation found itself imprisoning recalcitrant clergymen, and quickly withdrew from that embarassing position. But no one was prepared to go to the length of torture or the death penalty to enforce the use of the Book of Common Prayer. These had been found necessary under Elizabeth, and their disuse had led to the establishment of dissent outside the church. When riots and prosecutions failed to check innovation there was no effective remedy for what amounted to dissent within the church. So it came about that those whose theological beliefs led them

[1] 2 vols., London, 1910.

the nineteenth century to vary the statutory way of worship were able to remain, somewhat uncomfortably, within the church, and still to express their beliefs in this way. They suffered the same sort of harassing from their bishops for their conduct as had the Elizabethan puritans for the same conduct; and many of them developed much of the 'Martin Marprelate' attitude towards bishops in consequence, despite their warm belief in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. But the half-heartedness of the state in support of its own ecclesiastical statutes prevented their position in the church from being made quite impossible. And once more, many of the bishops connived, either out of sympathy or from 'their desire to be at ease and quietness to think upon their own affairs'.

It is impossible not to sympathise with the Victorian and Edwardian bishops. When one has said all that is true about the theological tradition which had never quite been broken from Elizabethans like Guest and Bilson through the Carolines and Non-Jurors and later eighteenth century high churchmen to men like Hugh James Rose, it must still be admitted that much of the teaching which followed from the Oxford Movement amounted to a drastic revolution so far as the normal current Anglican theology was concerned. The same is true also of the consequences of the subsequent 'liberal' upheaval in theology. Between them these movements made a thorough reconstruction of the 'official' Anglican theological tradition about the eucharist, which descended from Hooker through Waterland, a necessity. It was fantastic to suppose that movements of theological thought of this magnitude would not be reflected in public worship. They followed inevitably. The 'catholicising' changes were the earlier and the more obvious. But this was only because the Oxford Movement began earlier than its rival, and its disciples were more interested in worship as such than were the 'liberals.' Once the latter had made good their right to exist within the Establishment, their changes in the conduct of public worship were no less far-reaching than those of the 'ritualists', though they often took the less conspicuous form of omission, rather than interpolation and the introduction of ceremonial novelties. But both movements have followed exactly the same course in this matter of changes in the legal liturgy, though the 'Anglo-catholics' led the way, and have always been more vigorously reprobated by the authorities.

One must feel pity for the bewildered inmates of Victorian episcopal palaces, when the introduction by certain clergy on their own initiative of things like vestments, candles and incense provoked not a storm but a hurricane. Of course they promptly lost not only their sense of proportion, but much of their sense of justice. Yet, again, when one has finished disputing about the historical meaning and force of the 'Ornaments Rubric' and the Elizabethan 'Advertisements', or the precedents afforded by Caroline ceremonial, it remains true that these things in themselves were as much a revolution in the normal current Anglican practice of worship as

were the doctrines they implied in current Anglican theology. An equivalent series of innovations in the worship of any other christian body in any age made in the same way, would provoke just the same uproar as this created in the nineteenth century Church of England. But anywhere else it would certainly also have provoked effective ecclesiastical prohibition and extirpation. Had the Church of England been free to control her own worship in the 60's and 70's of the last century, bishops and laity would undoubtedly have been at one in passing immediately a series of canons as thoroughly restrictive of all liturgical innovations as those which the Church of Ireland passed in the same period. But the state control of worship intervened in this matter as in all others. A legalistic interpretation of the state's own law of public worship was found to cover and even to require many of these things. Once this had been established in the state courts the bishops were entirely helpless to suppress them; though even the ecclesiastical lawyers boggled at the idea of enforcing their use in every church in England, which the letter of the law now seemed to demand. In spite of much episcopal discouragement and disapproval the ceremonial innovations (or restorations, if you will) have spread steadily and have had to be officially tolerated by the church, probably against the desire of most practising churchmen, simply because the state's control of worship prevented their prohibition.

These innovations were originally introduced as accompaniments to the statutory liturgy, left unaltered in its text and order, and they are still sometimes so used to-day. But it was in the logic of the situation that the innovators should not stop there. It is not ceremonial adjuncts but the Shape of the Liturgy which performs the eucharistic action; and it is the wording of the prayers which expresses its meaning. This is what is the essence of the matter. Though in all good faith the followers of the Oxford Movement interpreted Cranmer's rite as doing and meaning what they themselves did and meant, they had come to conceive that action and its meaning in a way which his rite was originally intended directly to contradict. Because worship always expresses and is in turn moulded by belief, they came in course of time—often reluctantly and little by little—to substitute other forms for his. This sort of innovation certainly was not covered by the state's law of worship. On the contrary, it directly challenged it. The bishops, or most of them, did their duty and tried to uphold the law. But because they could neither control theology nor change the law of worship in minor matters so as to save its main principles, the attempt was hopeless from the first. The rapid spread of such 'illegalities' in public worship (and they were most of them directly and plainly illegal so far as the law of the land was concerned) led directly to the agitation in Parliament which resulted eventually in the proposed new rite of 1927–8. This was intended as the *ne plus ultra*—the extreme limit of innovation, the Prayer Book of King Canute. Yet it was itself so drawn up that its champion, Bishop Frere, was once constrained

to remark, 'You could drive a coach and horses through it in almost any direction, if you had a good lawyer.' With its innumerable permissive alternatives—its rubrics allowed for more than 300 different variations of the one office of Morning Prayer on any given Sunday—it was itself something very like a confession that the whole conception of a uniform statutory liturgy was a mistake.

The present situation, therefore, merely continues a state of affairs which the bishops had allowed to develop for at least a generation before 1928; or rather, had been forced to allow to develop by their inability to adapt the law of worship to the progress of theological change. It is no longer a matter of ceremonial diversity. It is the eucharistic rite itself, the order and text of its parts and prayers, which many of the clergy with some lay support are anxious to see changed with or without authority. In the last fifty years they have increasingly taken to doing this for themselves according to their own very various ideas. This is not the place to judge of the original rightness or otherwise of their course of action, which is now admittedly the cause of much confusion and a certain amount of friction in the church. But as regards the present position it may be remarked that so long ago as 1906 a Royal Commission appointed to enquire into breaches of 'the present law of public worship' reluctantly reported that it 'is too narrow for the religious life of this generation'. As regards the eucharist that law is still exactly the same, and it has not grown more serviceable in the last forty years. It is now clear, too, that the officially prescribed remedy, the proposed rite of 1928, will never solve the difficulty, whatever its merits or demerits—if only because the greater part of those clergy and laity whom it was especially designed to satisfy sincerely regard those particular proposals not only with contempt but with a sort of rancour. Without expressing any opinion on the justice of this attitude, its existence is a fact which must be accepted; and it puts those proposals outside practical consideration. It was the failure—comprehensible enough, but still the failure—of the bishops and the 'representative laity' in Church Assembly and Parliament to make a proper provision for 'the religious life of this generation' in the liturgy, which has finally thrust it upon the parochial clergy to do something to meet their people's continuing needs. All orders in the church, bishops, clergy and laity, have contributed in different ways to bring about the present situation. The church is weary of controversy on the matter, but quite unwilling—and unable—to coerce determined minorities. Though the bishops and the Assembly failed to find a rite which Parliament would pass or the church would use, the mind of the church as a whole has very reluctantly, but with a quiet finality, accepted the fact that changes in the rite there will have to be. It is still quite uncertain what they are to be or on what principles they should be framed.

The present situation has been called one of 'liturgical anarchy', which is one way of looking at it; though in itself the description is an interested

exaggeration of the real facts by the advocates of an old-fashioned administrative absolutism of bishops which is now impossible even if it were desirable. It is true that the situation is very uncomfortable, because it is essentially a period of 'liturgical experiment', during which a large variety of unofficial proposals are being sifted by the only practical test for such things—use in the worship of ordinary congregations. Many people would repudiate such an interpretation of what is happening; but that is in fact what is going on, however much the ecclesiastical bureaucrat or the conservative worshipper may dislike the process. It is a wholesome and necessary stage, though a very inconvenient one, in discovering the real mind of the church. As the events of the past twenty years have shewn, there is no sufficient substitute for it in the proceedings of official committees. There have been periods of this kind before in the history of the church, both universally and in England. An English communicant who had lived through the fifteen years between 1547 and 1562 and been forced in that time to worship by five different rites, mostly accompanied by the torture or execution of recalcitrants, might feel that we have managed more sensibly between 1927 and 1942.

This is not to say that the present situation is satisfactory, even if something like it be temporarily unavoidable. There must some time come an end to experiment and a stage of settled results. The serious thing about the present situation is that we are doing nothing whatever to profit by it, and so to transform it. It is the clergy in the parishes who are making the experiments with their parishioners, without much guidance, and often without a clear understanding of what they are doing and of the results they are reaching, or of the tests and principles by which to judge those results. There is a natural tendency to force cut-and-dried solutions upon individual congregations—the Roman rite in English, various combinations of this with 1662, the so-called 'Interim rite' (*i.e.* the prayers of 1662 in the order of 1549) or the rite of 1549 itself, or even *ad hoc* compilations by the vicar, as in one midland church. This is because those who make the experiments are not specialists equipped to explain to their people the technical principles underlying eucharistic worship, but busy parish priests, who must to some extent adopt methods ready made. The contribution of the bishops (with one exception) to this process of 'liturgical experiment' has been curiously unpractical and probably quite undesigned. They obstructed it at the outset with all their power, in pursuance of the long discredited Elizabethan policy of uniformity of liturgy as a cure for diversity of doctrine. When that had failed once more, they took up the project of making a revision of the rite themselves, but only after their long delay in adopting it had made it certain that the church would require a more drastic revision than Parliament would pass. Having produced the unloved baby of 1928 and seen it disowned by Parliament, they then seriously weakened the remaining authority of 1662 by their attempts to

get 1928 accepted by the church. When that hope failed also, they spent two years in something rather like sulking, and in ignoring the whole problem. Finally they have reverted to trying to enforce the legal liturgy of 1662, not by the courts and the secular law, but by their own 'spiritual authority' (exerted by methods not entirely divorced from financial pressure and the distribution of patronage) with 1928 used almost as a threat for those who will not conform to 1662. The unfortunate result of this series of somersaults of policy unaccompanied by any clear development of principle has been at each stage to prevent the church from beginning to come to any common mind on the matter at all, or from setting out to gather the fruits of the experience gained by the experiments in the parishes.

The only new element in the situation brought about by the parliamentary decision of 1928 was this: it set the bishops for the first time at open odds with the state's law of public worship. As soon as Parliament's decision was known the bishops unanimously agreed to the following statement, published by the then Archbishop of Canterbury: 'It is a fundamental principle that the Church—that is the Bishops together with the Clergy and Laity—must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its Faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its forms of worship'. Readers of the New Testament may be startled by this statement. Our Lord did not say '. . . And unto God in the last resort the things that are God's.' But even with this qualification, this was still the bravest thing on the subject which had been said by English bishops since 1559. As his biographer has said, coming from a man of Archbishop Davidson's personal antecedents it was the more remarkable. In July 1929 the Upper House of Canterbury resolved that '. . . the bishops in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion which belongs to each bishop in his own diocese, will be guided by the proposals set forth in the Book of 1928, and will endeavour to secure that the practices which are consistent neither with the Book of 1662 nor with the Book of 1928 shall cease'. In other words, the bishops quietly claimed that by their own action they could reverse the repeated decision of Parliament, and do precisely what they would have done if Parliament had passed the Book.

The bishops have hardly been given credit for the courage this required. It was a very bold claim indeed, and it would be interesting to discover the source in English law of this '*legal* discretion' of a bishop to set aside the force of a parliamentary statute 'in his own diocese' or anywhere else. Nothing had been heard of it by the Royal Commission of 1906[1] or by anyone else before 1929, though its existence might have greatly eased the awkward position of the bishops ever since about 1900. However,

[1] There is perhaps just a hint of it in Archbishop Davidson's evidence before the Commission (*Report*, Minutes of Evidence, 13230).

Parliament soon discovered that it had no means of calling their bluff short of disestablishment, which it was not prepared to face, any more than were the bishops. The House of Commons could only adopt a policy of dignified ignorance of what was going on. The legal position after 1928 remained precisely what it had been in 1900; and even now from time to time the ecclesiastical courts still give expensive exhibitions of their irrelevance to the present life of the church by acting upon it. But it was certain thenceforward that Parliament would never again be in a position to control Anglican worship by fresh legislation.

The bishops thus successfully recovered from the humiliation inflicted on them by Parliament, by asserting their own right to control the liturgy over its head. But they suffered another and much more vexatious discomfiture when they tried the same lofty tactics on the church. Had they taken their courage in both hands and brought their Book into use in 1927 when it was first rejected by Parliament, it would almost certainly have been widely used, at all events for a time, until its defects as a liturgy had become obvious. But 1927 was toned down to 1928 to meet the prejudices of Parliament, and when it had again been rejected it began to present a somewhat shop-soiled appearance. The rite of 1928, despite much semi-official encouragement and extravagant episcopal praise,[1] has never come into use among any but a *coterie*, and is now further than ever from general acceptance.[2] This was not because Parliament had forbidden it, but because the church declined to use it. The refusal was gradual, but in the end it was definite. By about 1935 it was becoming clear that neither Parliament nor the bishops were going to have the final control over the future of Anglican worship. The liturgy would have to take a form that the church was prepared to use.

It is difficult to analyse the motive which impelled this widespread disesteem for 1928. It cannot have been an increased respect for the law as recently re-affirmed by Parliament or a return of affection for 1662, for both were increasingly disregarded. The church at large, laity and clergy alike, had never been more than lukewarm about the rite of 1928 in itself. But most churchmen had been a good deal incensed by the action of Parliament about it at the time, and might have been expected to follow the bishops' bold defiance of the veto, if only to shew this disapproval. Yet the impression slowly grew that the action of Parliament, however improper from the church point of view, was in reality a deliverance. So far as I understand it, the rejection was much more instinctive than reasoned. The church came to feel obscurely that the new rite had been compiled by

[1] One bishop in a debate in Convocation in January 1942 described it as 'the finest liturgy available for use in any church in christendom'. Brightman, who had actually studied every liturgy in every language in christendom, has left on record a quite different appreciation.

[2] A careful survey made unofficially by one bishop places the number of churches in which it is now used at under 100.

wrong methods under the wrong influences; and was not what it wanted, because it did not really express its mind.[1]

The difficulty was to know what the church did want. It would not use either 1662 or 1928 as they stood.[2] But no other official alternative was in sight, and various unofficial proposals failed to rally support. It is impossible not to sympathise with the bishops in the increasing administrative difficulties caused by the liturgical confusion which resulted. But it is consistent with sympathy, and I hope with respect, to say that the policy which they next adopted soon ceased to present any appearance of being constructive. The only remedy they could envisage seems to have been the continuance of the *ancien régime* of authoritarianism in liturgy which had finally broken down thirty years before, but now with themselves as the 'authority' in the place of Parliament. They continued to extol the merits of 1928 long after it had become obvious that the church would not have it, and to put it forward as having some sort of 'spiritual authority'. In fact the procedure they had devised for giving it this had never been carried out, to avoid a final affront to Parliament. They endeavoured also to cast a fresh mantle of 'spiritual authority' over the statutory liturgy of 1662, by representing it as the rite which the church prescribed through their own admonitions. Most of them were prepared to authorise small decorative changes in this rite by their own authority in defiance of the statute (but *not* in the illegal liturgy of 1928, which they tried to get used just as it stood). Some of them even laid formal claim to be that 'lawful authority' which is referred to in the statutory 'Declaration of Assent' (taken by the clergy to the legal liturgical formularies) as empowered to alter or supplement the legal Prayer Book. The re-publication of the assurances given by the then bishops during the debate in the House of Lords in 1865, when the present terms of that Declaration were framed, would in itself have sufficed to refute any such claim; though no one seems to have thought of doing this.

All this looked very like self-stultification. If such minor decorations had been all that was needed to get 1662 used again as it stood by the church, why had the bishops risked the dangerous experiment of presenting to Parliament the much more comprehensive proposals of 1927–8? And if they believed their own proposals as such had 'spiritual authority' and represented the mind of the church, why not have tried to enforce them in their original (1927) form, which had had larger majorities in Convocation and the Assembly than 1928, instead of in the form which had avowedly been altered in the hope of satisfying Parliament in 1928?

[1] For a courteous but devastating exposure of its amateurish workmanship see Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke's recent work: *The Prayer Book of* 1928 *Reconsidered*, London, 1943.

[2] Dr. George Bell's charge *Common Order in Christ's Church* (1937) reveals that no priest out of more than 400 parishes in his diocese used 1662 exactly as the law prescribed, and only two used 1928 as printed.

The bishops were in fact in a most unenviable position. By producing 1927 they had virtually subscribed to the opinion that 1662 no longer adequately met the needs of the church or represented its mind, and was consequently unenforceable. But the tacit rejection of the new Book by the church coming after its rejection by the state left them bankrupt of any policy at all on the liturgical problem. In default of a constructive solution, they fell back on the issuing of 'regulations' of their own, of highly disputable legal or canonical force, merely in the search for something which would 'work'. This was to cease to regard the question from the christian point of view of the interests of worship as such, and to treat it instead in the Whitehall manner, as an administrative problem. The result was at once apparent in a series of mild commotions in each diocese where the attempt was made to enforce such 'regulations', which the clergy resented and disobeyed while the laity were puzzled and disedified. (Anyone can understand the deplorable feelings aroused in many of the clergy by the policy of the bishops in the years before the war who remembers the state of extreme exasperation to which the courteous, energetic and well-meaning officials of the Ministry of Health and other Government Departments reduced many of the citizens of London in September 1940, by attempting to deal with an unprecedented situation within the framework of Departmental Regulations, drawn up—of necessity—without full foreknowledge of what would happen. The situation in London in 1940 was transformed by a new Regional Commissioner, who framed his measures by the situation as it stood and allowed the Departmental Regulations to look after themselves. It has not yet been transformed in the church.)

The question of 'authority' in the liturgy is really only one aspect of the larger question of 'authority' in the christian religion generally, and this the bishops were not in a good position to face. The English church disavowed the authority of the Pope in the sixteenth century; in the nineteenth century under the impulse of theological liberalism it had largely lost sight of the authority of the Bible, in the old sense; in the twentieth it had almost ceased to enforce the authority of its own doctrinal formularies, first upon the 'liberals' and then upon the 'Anglo-catholics.' The bishops had not much left to fall back upon in the way of authority save themselves. Yet it is hardly possible to maintain that the English Reformation was conducted in order to set up a papacy in commission among the episcopate, on the model of that 'Cyprianic' theory of the episcopate which probably owes more to Archbishop Benson than to S. Cyprian. In any case the bishops were precluded from going far along this line by the advances they were simultaneously making to non-episcopal dissent, which involved pitching the note of Apostolic Succession rather low. You cannot convincingly demand conscientious submission to your divinely-given authority in liturgical matters from one set of people, while explaining publicly to another that the total rejection of that authority not only in liturgy but in

everything else as well, does not at all impair their position as 'real ministries in Christ's church'.

As regards the liturgy the practical 'authority' in the Church of England since 1559 had always in reality been that of the state. The church at large had been increasingly rejecting this authority in practice for more than a generation before 1928. The bishops themselves had publicly turned their backs upon it in 1929—but without providing an adequate substitute. They were now compelled to fall back on their own resources. They would not assert that they had an apostolic authority inherent in their office. They claimed instead that they had a far-reaching administrative authority over the church, simply as bishops of the 'historic episcopate'. Without entering into the history of episcopacy in the primitive church, it is enough to say that it would be exceedingly difficult to prove that bishops have always had or even claimed to have any such authority in the post-reformation Church of England. And in claiming it now our bishops had not the support of that moral authority which might have been given them by being the church's own choice as the fittest men for their exceedingly difficult office. They are still appointed by the state, not always on grounds which are immediately obvious to churchmen. It is little wonder if in the face of such complicated handicaps the bishops largely failed to 'restore order' by brandishing their croziers during the ten years following 1928.

A 'Round Table Conference' of unwieldy size, representative character and diversified prejudices was gathered at Lambeth in 1938 to evolve a liturgy which the bishops could enforce. After wasting some months without providing itself with any very definite agenda it was anaesthetised by the present war. It was an open confession that what the bishops were now seeking was not a good liturgy but a workable measure for police purposes. Yet it served to shew that the bishops had learned that the church must at least have some say in framing the rite which they were still hoping to discover in order to enforce it; and that they had wisely determined not to make use for this of the Church Assembly any more than of Parliament, if they could help it.

In 1941 the present Bishop of Oxford made some carefully constructed proposals for a new Anglican canon, based on considerations only of what is theologically and liturgically desirable in eucharistic worship, and not on the principle of 'enforcement' at all. They were put forward simply on their intrinsic merits, not as an administrative device. They at once attracted widespread interest and support, not so much by their contents, which were open to certain important theological and liturgical criticisms, as by the new approach which they revealed to the whole question. But the bench as a whole was still obsessed with the idea of imposing a solution in the sixteenth century manner, and grasped at the hope that they had at last found something which would 'work'. The question was taken up officially, prematurely and in a way certain to wreck any prospects the

scheme might have had. The carefully balanced proposals were first crudely eviscerated behind the scenes, in complete disregard of the scholarly considerations on which their author had originally framed them. In this mutilated form (Jan. 1942) they were passed by 14 votes to 7 in the Upper House of Canterbury, the Bishop of Oxford being absent. The debate unfortunately displayed an ignorance of the history of the Prayer Book and a degree of misinformation about the general subject in hand which compared unfavourably even with those in the same House before the passage of 1928.[1] The Lower House of Canterbury in the following May tactfully saved the reputation of the Upper House by voting consideration of the pathetic wreckage sent down to them 'inopportune'.[2] There the matter now rests, except that at least five bishops have since told us that we shall have to have more 'uniformity' after the war. It would appear that Hegel was right in his depressing remark that the only thing one learns from history is that men never learn from history.

It is a most humiliating and saddening story for all who love the Church of England. One by one each single piece of the imposing machinery available—Assembly, Parliament, Bishops, Convocations—has proved itself incompetent to provide for the Church of England a tolerable method of doing that which is the very centre of its life for every christian church. Yet I venture to think the real meaning of the story is something rather different from what it appears on the surface, and much more hopeful. The cause of the whole difficulty is that the English church has recovered a consciousness of its own organic life in an almost miraculous manner, and has in consequence rejected that Tudor absorption into the English state which was the very basis of the Anglican liturgical settlement. That settlement has now collapsed along with its basis. There are still Erastians, and the lawyers still in many things exercise that day-to-day control of the church's life which is the most practical consequence of a statutory Establishment. But the church as a whole has unmistakeably rejected the Erastian principle, and there is no important Erastian party even among the state-appointed bishops. Almost all defenders of the present statutory liturgical settlement defend it as being good and true in itself, not merely because it is the state's. The failure to find a solution of our liturgical difficulties is due chiefly to the attempt to find something different from the sixteenth century solution while persisting in using sixteenth century methods. A more hopeful approach would be opened up by a candid acknowledgement that the rejection of the basis of Cranmer's liturgical settlement—the religious authority of the state—places the church back in

[1] I am prepared to substantiate this if necessary with a detailed commentary giving page and line references to the *Chronicle of Convocation*. I only refrain from doing so here out of a reluctance to name some of those who spoke.

[2] It deserves to be placed on record as an instance of single-mindedness that one proctor in May 1942—(Gazala! Tobruk!)—proposed that Parliament should be approached about the position of the prayer of oblation.

the position in which it found itself about A.D. 1534, before Cranmer's settlement began to be imposed.

Our present liturgy had its origin in a period of liturgical crisis very like the present, in which the church was dimly conscious that its liturgical life no longer met its contemporary needs. What was required was that the church should very carefully reconsider (1) exactly what the eucharistic action *is* and (2) how that action is to be 'done' in the liturgy. Questions of vestments, posture, etc. are not secondary, but tertiary, to this. I hesitate to say anything which might even seem to disparage the blessed truth that we 'take Christ's Body in our hands, receive it with our mouths, and that corporally, naturally, really, substantially and carnally', as the author of our xxviiith Article affirmed that it meant. Nevertheless, even this, if we take our Lord's words in their earliest record—'This is My Body which is for you; do this—' seems to be only the *means* to the fulfilment of the action He commanded. That alone is primary.

The pity is that in the generation of the sixteenth century when the crisis demanded solution, the church never adequately did reconsider the primary question at all, because it was never allowed to. Its attention was made to centre on the secondary question of the Presence, in the mediaeval fashion, and on the tertiary questions of language (which has, however, great practical importance), ornaments and postures. Cranmer with a few personal friends alone had an effective share in the consideration of the primary question of the action. I have set out above in his own words the conclusions to which he came on that. He imposed upon the church the expression of those personal conclusions in a liturgy, without discussion, without possibility of amendment, without even asking a formal assent, by the sole force of the temporal power, with heavy penalties exacted from clergy and laity alike for worshipping otherwise or even for absenting themselves from its performance. I do not suppose there is an Anglican alive to-day who really believes that receiving holy communion is the token of exactly the same thing as Abraham's faith that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed. The Church of England has officially rejected the most characteristic of Cranmer's doctrinal notions on the eucharist ever since 1559.[1] But it has continuously had to use a liturgy which was quite brilliantly designed to express those particular notions.

It would be untrue to suggest that this is entirely the fault of the state, and that the church has always chafed against it. For long periods the Church of England has not only acquiesced in but sincerely appreciated that liturgy; I have tried to point out that there is a good deal in it to

[1] Perhaps the nearest approach to Cranmer's ideas among contemporary theologians is made by Dr. E. W. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham (*Should Such a Faith Offend?* 1927, *pp.* 319 *sqq.*). But Dr. Barnes is capable of expressing his ideas positively (*e.g. ibid., pp.* 209 *sq.*) and Cranmer would certainly have rejected some of his positive statements (*e.g.* some on *p.* 223) as the thin end of the Pope's wedge.

appreciate. But it is true to say that since 1559 the church has put her own glosses upon it, and I should not be where I am if I did not believe that it is patient, however awkwardly, of a different interpretation from its author's. It obviously contains—it could hardly help doing so—all the essential minimum which the mediaeval church had come to consider as necessary to 'validity', though it is not likely that Cranmer went out of his way to secure this. In calling the present rite the 'statutory liturgy', I am not trying to make insinuations even indirectly against its origins, but simply taking account of its present sanction. The church put it forward in 1662 in preference to 1604, and Parliament with some hesitation allowed it. But the claim that our present rite (which is in substance and outline Cranmer's rite of 1552) has a 'spiritual authority' which our reformed rite had never previously had, because it had never before 1661 been formally passed through Convocation, seems somewhat unreal when one considers the actual circumstances in which Convocation worked on that occasion.

The very conception of such a 'spiritual' equivalent for 'statutory authority' as the sanction of a rite does not in itself seem to be older than the sixteenth century, and rests on an analogy with secular law. It was adopted by the Post-Tridentine Roman church in the same period as among ourselves, and is still in full force in the Roman Canon Law. But one has only to think of Pope Gregory's advice to Augustine of Canterbury to make his own choice of what seemed to him best from the current Roman and Gallican uses, to be aware of the former recognition of a quite different principle as the sanction of the liturgy, not only at Rome and Canterbury but all over christendom. This particular kind of 'spiritual authority', given by a sort of *legislative* enactment by the church, could only be attributed to 1662 out of all the rites ever used in England. If we abandoned this sixteenth century legalist conception, we should be free to set aside the embarrassing question of the moral freedom or otherwise of Convocation from undue pressure in 1662. And we could also place the use not only of 1662 but of 1559 and 1552 and 1549 on the same footing as every other rite which had ever been used in England since the landing of S. Augustine. It has the authority of 'acceptance by the church and use for her sacramental purpose'. That is a different sort of authority from the authority of any statute passed by a legislator, ecclesiastical or secular. But it was at one time the only sort of authority recognised by the liturgy. One can cite certain exceptions; there are liturgical edicts put out by Byzantine emperors; there is the initiative of Charlemagne, though this was largely emptied of its statutory character by Alcuin's method of carrying it out. But from the beginning until the sixteenth century, broadly speaking the sanction in liturgy was not 'law' but 'custom'.

In its nature the authority of custom is a self-enforcing thing. If a large number of people cease to observe a custom, then it just 'dies out'. Even the most obsolete law requires a definite act of the legislator to repeal it

before it ceases to bind. A custom dies by ceasing to be observed. And its authority while it lives is a voluntarily accepted and natural thing, not a compulsive and artificial one. The peculiar appropriateness of such an authority for 'the glorious liberty of the children of God' in their worship of love needs no emphasis. Its safeguard against degeneration into licence in the liturgy is the fact that worship expresses belief, or it dies of unreality; and the faith behind all catholic liturgies is fundamentally the same, even though it has not always been explained in the same terms or even in the same way. It is here, in the sphere of what are essentially intellectual propositions—in eucharistic theology—that identity of phrasing and meticulous definition have their proper function in maintaining identity of belief. While that is maintained the diversity of liturgies—which reflects differences of history, culture and taste—is not only allowable; it is human, desirable, inescapable, the reflection of the catholicity of the living church. We have seen the train of causes by which the English church in the sixteenth century was obliged to reverse this rational scheme of things, so that eucharistic theology was left vague and diverse, while the liturgy was minutely prescribed. We are paying the penalty for that now that the liturgical sanction of secular law has broken down. A clear common theology would have issued simply and naturally in a new common custom.

The stability of any custom in the last analysis always rests upon its own intrinsic reasonableness. It is merely a way of doing something which many people need to do frequently or regularly in some way. If it becomes evident that another way does the same thing more conveniently or somehow better than the customary way, then the custom will change—slowly, perhaps, for men are creatures of habit—but certainly in the end. It is just this which has been happening to our liturgy. Whenever the Elizabethan appeal to the primitive church has been pressed seriously, by the Carolines, or the Non-Jurors, or the Oxford Movement, those who made it have always manifested a certain discomfort in using Cranmer's rite; and this despite their own preconceptions of its meaning, and while strenuously maintaining that it supported their own position. We cannot have it both ways. Either Cranmer was or was not desirous and capable of expressing his own conception of the eucharistic action in his liturgy. But if you understand that action as the primitive church understood it, you will feel a disaccord with a rite excellently composed to express a quite different conception of it. A scholar may read into it most of its omissions and interpret its own statements by patristic theology. But even the peculiar shape and structure of Cranmer's rite are in themselves significant, and were meant to be so.

The Carolines and the Non-Jurors were largely academic in their influence. The Oxford Movement turned to the parishes and taught the parish priests and the laity in great numbers to think of the eucharistic action as the patristic authors had thought of it, and as Cranmer quite certainly did

not. And as soon as the liturgy began to be conceived of no longer as a Schedule annexed to an Act of Parliament, to be obeyed in that mechanical and exact fashion in which Acts of Parliament are intended to be obeyed, but as the vital act of the church to be done according to her mind, then our liturgical custom began to change—as customs in such circumstances inevitably do change. There is nothing abnormal in this; it has happened a hundred times and more in the liturgies of other churches, gradually and naturally. The process was only made painful and troublesome in our case by the fact that our liturgy was embalmed in a parliamentary statute, of which not a comma *can* be changed gradually and naturally, but only by the parliamentary process. What we have been watching in the Church of England for the last fifty years is a struggle between two opposite conceptions of liturgy—between the idea of liturgy as primarily an act of conformity to the terms of an external law (whether that law be of the church or of the state) and the idea of liturgy as expressing *belief* first of all, and conforming to the church's custom because the belief it expresses is that of the church. The first is the idea of liturgy accepted by the West in the sixteenth century, and still maintained to-day by Roman Canon Law. The other is the idea which governed the whole development of liturgy in the primitive and patristic period, and which is still formally retained in the East. Even the Royal Commission of 1906 already recognised that it was the latter principle which was gaining the upper hand in the modern Church of England.

The whole development of the classic liturgies is by continual liturgical experiment. Every church had its 'customary' way of doing the liturgy, which was 'customary' only because it adequately expressed that church's mind and belief as to what the eucharistic action is and means. Whenever an idea which seemed to enrich that conception was encountered, whether in the teaching and devotional experience of that church itself, in the rites of other churches or in the works of theologians, it could be and was incorporated into the customary rite. If, after the only trial of which such things are capable, a period of actual use at the altar, it was found that it did more fully express the eucharistic action, it was absorbed into the local eucharistic experience as something which had become that church's own, and permanently incorporated into the local liturgical tradition. If it did not serve, then ultimately it fell out of use again.

The depth and breadth and allusiveness of the classical rites comes just from this, that their real author is always the worshipping church, not any individual however holy and gifted, any committee however representative, or any legislator however wise. The results in every tradition were codified from time to time by men with a gift or a taste for this sort of work. But all the time such men were working within a tradition, with materials supplied them by the immense eucharistic experience of the whole worshipping church of the past, of other churches as well as their own. And when their

work was done, the church came after them again, commenting, adding, altering, omitting, improving, sometimes spoiling, enriching, adjusting perpetually to her own contemporary mind and life and needs. We have seen what the church did with the work, for instance, of Gregory or of Alcuin after their time. It was right that it should. No one man is great enough or good enough to fix the act of the Body of Christ for ever according to his own mind and understanding of it. The good liturgies were not written; they grew.

About the beginning of the sixteenth century it did look as though something of this kind needed to begin again. The eucharistic practice of the church no longer fully expressed her contemporary mind and life and needs; but a fairly brief period of liturgical experiment might well have enabled it to do so. Instead, one man's personal and quite unrepresentative opinion, come to before ever the first changes were tried out in practice, was clamped upon the Church of England in a fixed form, which it was never afterwards free to alter. Now that stage is over, and the opportunity missed in the sixteenth century has come again. In spite of all the well-intentioned efforts of the bishops to prevent it, a good deal of the necessary 'liturgical experiment' has been carried out by the clergy in the last forty years. But it has had to be done with so little guidance from authority that most of the results have been unco-ordinated and many have not been observed. We need a new 'custom', with the stability and self-enforcement that any satisfactory custom has in itself. Can we reproduce deliberately and consciously and in a reasonably short space of time—say five to ten years—that process by which *the church* produced the great liturgies naturally and instinctively in a period of centuries? This is what would be meant by *scientific* 'liturgical experiment'. I believe there are encouraging signs that we could do this with success if we had a mind to, but there are three difficulties which would have to be avoided; and also one pre-requisite absolutely necessary to be provided, which would require a good deal of courage on somebody's part.

The difficulties are these: 1. The old relation to the state, the Establishment, persists—'indefensible in theory and intolerable in practice', as Dr. Henson has said. But it is there, and it would have to be reckoned with, in the form of courts and the statutes they could still try to enforce if they were invoked, even though there is little prospect of fresh legislation by Parliament about the liturgy. Yet it does not seem to be the business of the church to challenge the state directly to sever this relation, but to try still to work within it so far as is consistent with fidelity to her own mission.

2. There is a complete lack of regular machinery suitable for the purpose of making liturgical changes. The Assembly would talk itself frantic for some years about a new liturgy, and could only present it for Parliament's approval at the end of that. The debate in the Upper House of Convocation in January 1942 demonstrated conclusively that the bishops as a body are

not equipped for composing a liturgy, and the initiation of measures in the Lower House is a cumbrous procedure. In any case the initiative in such a matter ought to lie with bishops. Bodies of the size of either house are quite unsuitable for drafting a liturgy, and can only proceed by way of 'party' debates on anything submitted to them. And at present there is no proposal to lay before them.

3. There is a section of the church, numbering perhaps a quarter of its members, the 'Evangelical' party, whose set and fixed practice, if not principle, is opposition to the *recognition* of any sort of change in the *status quo* in the church. (They themselves have changed considerably both in teaching and practice since the time of Charles Simeon. It is not so much change as the acknowledgement of it that they dislike.) The nineteenth century bishops were so preoccupied with opposing the Oxford Movement that they took no steps to prevent what the Elizabethan bishops in their own day more wisely foresaw must be a danger to the cohesion of the church—the formation of a puritan *imperium in imperio* within the church, permanently impenetrable behind a financial rampart to any ideas current in the rest of the church. By the system of Evangelical schools, Evangelical halls at the Universities, Evangelical theological colleges and Evangelical patronage trusts, it is now quite possible for a boy to be educated and grow up, take a degree, be ordained and serve a ministerial lifetime, without once encountering directly any theological idea unacceptable to the founders of the party in the period of the Crimean War. To the framing of any new liturgy the Evangelicals would offer the most determined and conscientious opposition, not so much because they value the old one (which many of them disregard in different ways as flagrantly as any Anglo-catholic) as because it would mean admitting a change of some kind from what was customary a century ago. They would certainly decline to use any new liturgy which would satisfy the rest of the church, and they ought not in charity to be asked to do so. But this would not prevent their obstructing the official compilation of any new rite. The idea of composing a liturgy with the assistance and to the satisfaction of those who sincerely object to its coming into existence and who firmly intend never to use it is so Alice-in-Wonderland that it can hardly be discussed. But any proposal to be workable must bear this difficulty in mind.

Can anything be done within the limits of these conditions to enable the Church of England to declare its own mind and at least find the basis of a new custom?

Suppose that a group of bishops—say seven—too many to be ignored by their brethren, too few to provoke the law officers of the Crown to extremes—were at an opportune moment to put out a book with a preface somewhat as follows:

'This book contains a liturgy—a complete Ordinary, with a workable minimum of Propers for the ecclesiastical year. We do not put it forward as

representing the maximum of the Act of Uniformity which the "Anglo-catholics" can be forced to obey or the minimum which will content the "Evangelicals"; nor yet as the best that Parliament can be expected to pass or as the only compromise at which the Church Assembly can arrive. We put it forward simply on its own merits, and as being in itself, we believe, a good liturgy.

'That is to say, it performs the eucharistic action as it has traditionally been understood from the beginning of the church, simply and coherently and reverently, and its structure is logical and expressive of the action of the rite. It is written in English which is everywhere dignified and simple, and, so far as we can make it, attentive to the melody and rhythm of words. The prayers express the meaning of the eucharist soberly and clearly, according to the ancient universal tradition of christendom. We have assured ourselves that everything in it has sufficient precedent to make it a suitable and reasonable thing in itself for christians to want to do at the eucharist. None of the rubrics are framed prohibitively. They just describe clearly how this rite is meant to be performed, which is what rubrics are for.

'But we wish to make it clear that this rite has no more "authority" (in the current meaning of that term) than have a great many other things which are now done in many parish churches. If the clergy were to use it, the fact that we have put it forward would not protect them from the lawyers. In our own dioceses we shall tolerate its use so far as it lies with us to do so, as we already tolerate a considerable number of other deviations from the statutory rite. But we shall not say to ordinands and presentees, " Either '1662 and none other' or 'My new regulations' ", for we recognise that "My new regulations", like 1928 or any other deviation from 1662, are just as illegal in the Church of England as the Sarum rite. We desire to make it clear that any clergyman who brings it into use in dioceses other than ours without the connivance of his own bishop does so entirely on his own responsibility, and that we shall decline to be embroiled with our brethren in his defence. The clergy will understand that the situation which already prevails in respect of the legal liturgy is in no way altered by the publication of this book.

'It may be that some will desire to use it in church, but will dislike or disagree with some phrases or arrangements or prayers in the rite. In that case we beg them not to hesitate, but to *alter* it with the same freedom that they would use if it were in the Book of Common Prayer. Nevertheless we think that they should refrain from altering the passage printed in large type on *p.* (*so-and-so*), which has been generally regarded as very important if not essential to the rite. For the rest, they will use their discretion—whatever we may say. We would only suggest that before making alterations they should consider exactly what it is that they dislike in our form, and why they dislike it. When they have made their alterations to their own satisfaction, let them consider again whether their amendments express

clearly and fully what they themselves desire to express. If after a practical trial for, say, six months, they still think their amendment a real improvement on our composition, they would do us a kindness by sending a copy of it (with page and line reference) together with a short statement of why they prefer it, to the Rev. ——— ———, who has kindly undertaken to collect such suggestions for our study. There is no trap in this; you need not even attach your name and address. We are interested only in the quality of your changes. It is quite possible that you have found the word or the idea or the phrase that we were unable to think of. It is precisely because we do not believe that we have any monopoly of liturgical skill or taste that we are acting as we are.

'It will be noted that we are issuing this book in two forms. One is of a large size, interleaved with blank pages in the Ordinary and with a hundred more blank pages at the end. This will make it easier to insert improvements legibly, so that others who may use that copy will observe them. The blank pages will conveniently record suggestions for the completion of the Proper. The other format is of the normal size of a prayer book, and is also interleaved in the Ordinary. If an incumbent were to decide to break the law by using this rite in church, he would probably find it convenient to use the larger size at the altar; in that case we should greatly hope that copies of the smaller size would be in the hands of the congregation. And we most earnestly suggest that if he thinks of amendments in the Ordinary, he should publicly and clearly explain to his people just what changes he is proposing to make, and tell them where to write them in on the appropriate blank pages. We believe that it is very important that the laity should understand clearly just what is being done, and should be able to follow it easily for themselves from their books. We should hope that the rite would not be introduced until it had been in their hands for a month or two, and had been simply and clearly explained to them from the pulpit. And we think that a parish priest would be well-advised to pay some attention, after perhaps a year of practical use, to any observations and criticisms concerning both our composition and his own improvements, which his regular congregation may make. For our own part we shall receive gratefully and humbly any constructive suggestions that the laity as well as the clergy may care to send to the same address.

'Even as it stands we believe that this is a good liturgy. We think so because . . . (and here would follow a careful and simple *rationale* of the rite, framed in such a way as to assist the clergy to explain it to their people in a course of three simple sermons. The preface might conclude:)

'This liturgy, therefore, we have put before the church for the church's own consideration and amendment and, if others think it right, practical testing. If there seems to be sufficient interest, we shall put forward an amended edition in the same way in three years' time, incorporating every improvement offered to us which approves itself to our mind. If thereafter

at any time an occasion should present itself, we might be prepared to take whatever action seemed appropriate to secure it some measure of official recognition. But at present we have no intention whatever of doing this, until the worshipping church shall have had time to declare itself in respect of our work fully and freely, in the only way in which its mind can be made plain, *viz.* by adopting or ignoring this book in its public worship.

'We are aware that we shall be criticised severely for acting most irregularly in this, and we regret sincerely any disturbance or distress of mind we may have caused to anyone by so doing. But we are clear in our conscience that what we seek is only the good of the church, that it may worship more understandingly and faithfully according to its own mind. "It is a fundamental principle that the Church—that is the Bishops together with the Clergy and the Laity—must, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its Faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its forms of worship" '. (The source of this quotation, and if it were thought necessary, the extent and meaning of the omission, could be explained in a footnote.) 'We start from this "fundamental principle", and we mean only to give it a practical application. It is in the power of the church at large to shew that it approves or condemns what we have done, and in either case we shall have to accept its judgement. That is the way that every church in christendom has always come by its liturgy, by a process of using or not using forms which were put before it for its judgement under the guidance of its bishops. We shall be well contented if the Church of England is enabled to do the same. Our only concern has been to secure that the material put before it shall in itself be both suitable and good.'

This has not, perhaps, the authentic ring of the current episcopal style of drafting; and no doubt the preface could be framed on less realistic lines and still fulfil its purpose. But before I am told from all sides that this is an outrageous suggestion, I would ask those who feel outraged to consider in cold blood the only alternatives: Either 1. The present position will continue indefinitely. Personally, I should be inclined to consider this an outrageous suggestion. The church is very weary of it and it is a real hindrance to her life and work. Or else 2. Some official action will be taken to end it, which means that some untested proposal will have to be passed somehow through some of the existing machinery. Recourse to Parliament is outside practical possibilities, at all events for the present. Official action now could therefore only take one of these forms:

a. The bishops might agree among themselves to put a liturgy into force by their 'administrative authority' alone. This is the method employed to bring 1928 into use, and acted upon ever since. It has not improved the situation. The events of the last ten years suggest very strongly that the day has gone by when the church will accept a rite as satisfactory only

because the bishops say so—and, really, the blame for this does not lie altogether with the church. Whether the new rite were 1928 or a different one, is there the slightest reason to suppose that recourse to 'administrative authority' will secure less disorder now than it has in the past? This would in practice amount precisely to perpetuating the present situation by the present methods.

b. The bishops could try to use Convocation to give 'authority' to a liturgy, but the events there in January and May 1942 are not exactly encouraging. Granted that affairs then were not diplomatically managed; granted, too, that the proposals as they were brought forward were openly conceived of as an administrative device for 'restoring order' and not as a more desirable way of worshipping God, which one hopes was sufficient in itself to chill the enthusiasm of 'stewards of the mysteries of God'; yet only fourteen bishops could be found to vote for these insignificant changes,[1] while seven voted against them out of a total of thirty members of the Canterbury Upper House. And the Lower House would not give concurrence. Even if the latter vote had been reversed, exactly how much chance of securing general obedience would *any* proposal have which was passed in Convocation over the head of so considerable a minority as this? And what other proposal at present could rally that overwhelming support in Convocation necessary to secure it the moral authority of general consent, which alone will in the long run give us a stable and self-enforcing custom? As things stand, if a new rite cannot secure a large measure of *voluntary* acceptance, how is it to be enforced? If the decayed folly of the ecclesiastical courts is to be invoked, they can only pronounce the new rite itself to be illegal. If moral pressure is to be exercised by godly admonition (and 'black-listing') and synodical action, large minorities can usually resist any amount of moral pressure for an indefinite length of time. It is to be remembered that those resisting would feel supported by genuine theological conviction.

c. Some *ad hoc* body like the 'Round Table Conference' might be summoned to evolve a liturgy. If it is to be sufficiently representative for its support to carry any weight whatever with the church, it will be a replica of the Assembly. In this case the work might as well be done by the official body, since its name is already known to most churchmen, and such prestige as it enjoys ought to be capitalised behind the new proposals. If on the other hand the *ad hoc* body consisted solely of scholars competent to act as a drafting committee, it is dubious how far its proposals would be adopted by the present bishops, if the whole bench were consulted. And conscientious scholars would certainly refuse to be made responsible for proposals

[1] The actual form of the proposals was that previously treated with such incisive contempt by the late Bishop Frere in *The Anaphora*, *p.* 199, *n.* 1. The Upper House appears to have been unanimously unconscious of the fact that its new panacea had been three times discussed and rejected as futile between 1908 and 1918.

of which they did not approve. Once more the whole weight of enforcement would rest on the bishops.

d. No doubt, the Church Assembly could—if it would—pass some resolution supporting some episcopal proposals without proceeding to prepare a measure for Parliament. But under any conceivable circumstances that means a 'party' debate and a majority vote. There is a real objection to such a proceeding in the Assembly at present, which would apply just as much to debates in Convocation or a representative conference. As things stand to-day they would probably never consider the real point at all. The debate would inevitably circle around the old mediaeval and sixteenth century quarrels over what is called the 'Real Presence'—a term which has been used by gross materialists ('Capharnaites'), Thomists, Lutherans, High Calvinists and even some Zwinglians, to describe each their own doctrines. Whatever its history in the past, its fatal imprecision has done more to confound our modern Anglican discussions, and in some respects to embitter them, than the use of any single other historic phrase.[1] Whenever in history this question has been raised in this form the same *impasse* has been reached. Ignatius *c.* A.D. 115 is already reproaching those who deny 'that the eucharist is the Flesh of Christ' as the enemies of grace; while from his own polemics it seems clear that they retorted that his notions were 'unspiritual'. The primary question in the *construction* of a liturgy is the Shape, and the meaning of the whole eucharistic action which that performs. But nothing could prevent a public discussion from concentrating on the secondary question of the liturgical phrases describing the nature of the 'Presence', unless the church at large had had time to assimilate by practical experience the idea of another approach to the matter altogether—obedience to our Lord's command to 'do this', in which the consecration is only one co-ordinated element in the rite, and the consecration of the sacrament is a means to the end, not an end in itself. The upshot of any such debates now could only be another 1928, with all Cranmer's verbal Zwinglianisms retained intact, and the good liturgical workmanship which he put into 1552 destroyed by some rearrangement. Nothing else could secure a majority. There is really something very profane about the idea that we can only come before God with circumlocutions which it has been agreed to misunderstand differently. And would such a rite be *used* in the end, any more than 1928 was? Events since then suggest quite forcibly that what the church is looking for is a liturgy, not an ingenious diplomatic arrangement.

Those who hanker for some official action at present and a liturgy which has 'authority' may be right, but in any case they will have to find a new

[1] It has not been necessary to use it at any point in this book. It would be an immense help in discussion if it could be altogether debarred from use among us for a while, and thus everyone be made to state at every stage in his arguments precisely what he does mean as to the relation of the consecrated elements to the Body and Blood of Christ.

means of arriving at it. The official proceedings before 1927 roused party feeling in the church to a dangerous degree. There are now other subjects to be discussed in the near future, like those which touch upon reunion, which look like straining charity among us quite enough by themselves. If these are to be dealt with in an atmosphere already heated by party quarrels over the liturgy, the strain might well reach breaking-point. Yet we cannot simply postpone action indefinitely. If we may still assume that anything like the modern Church of England with its present balance of forces will survive after the next few years, we ought now or in the reasonably near future to be laying the foundation of a new general custom in the liturgy, at least in its main lines.

Admittedly the suggestion I have made would have its disadvantages, but no inevitably fatal results could follow. 1. This mode of action does not directly challenge Parliament at all. If the state could accept in silence the public over-riding of its veto by the entire episcopate in 1929, it is hardly likely to take drastic action over the unofficial proceedings of seven bishops. If the latter timed the production of their book for a moment when Parliament was preoccupied with the 'Four-Year Plan' or the Peace Treaty, it need not even be noticed. If those churchmen who still desire parliamentary control of the liturgy were to try to invoke the state, what action could Parliament take which it cannot take now against open episcopal toleration of 1928 or any other deviation from 1662? There is always disestablishment, of course. But presumably those who desire the continuance of parliamentary control of worship would be the last of all churchmen to take action which was likely to result in that.

2. Such a way of proceeding as I suggest would avoid all the dangers obvious in any use of the existing machinery at present, without preventing the use of any of it whenever it might seem suitable. It would ensure that the proposal, if it did get put forward officially in the end, would only risk bringing those dangers upon the church if it were really likely to solve the problem. There would be no repetition of 1928, when the church was divided, relations between church and state were strained, and the work of the church was greatly distracted from its proper object, all over a proposal which turned out to be no solution at all in the end. Those who disliked the unofficial proposals of a group of bishops as they stood could criticise them objectively on their merits, without being placed in the invidious position of an 'opposition' to the hierarchy. In the meanwhile the church at large, the worshipping priests and people—and not only the bishops and the 'experts' and those indefatigable people who attend committees—would have a fair chance to make up their own minds as to whether they wanted the new rite, and to amend it—as they probably could do if they were given the chance. Only if the proposal won considerable voluntary acceptance and interest—as I believe it would, if people knew that they had a chance to join in its revision and perfecting in a

practical way—would it be worth while to bring it forward for official acceptance. That is to say that the absolute *sine qua non* for any successful 'official' proposal in present circumstances would be secured before this ever became an 'official' proposal at all. If the church did not like it, it would not be used. In that case it would never be brought forward for official adoption, and there would be no controversy. We should be no worse off, and a certain amount of material would have been collected, which might come in useful later on in other ways.

3. Those who desire no change at all in the liturgy would not be involved at all. They would take no part in a 'liturgical experiment' which might be creating the new form an official liturgy would one day take. They would contribute nothing to it and have no influence upon its content; but that would be their own business. They could do so like anybody else at any moment, if they wanted to. But they would be no worse off than at present, if they did not contribute. And they would retain all their present power and right to oppose or obstruct any change whatever, if and when it were proposed to give it any official sanction. These people know quite well that in many churches the statutory liturgy is not used at all exactly as things are now; many of them do not use it at all exactly themselves. They could not reasonably object to what was going on *more* than they object to what is going on now.

Besides these three difficulties to be avoided by any method of solving our present liturgical troubles, it was suggested that there was one prerequisite to be provided, which has not been defined. It is that the liturgy proposed should be in itself, and from the point of view of construction and workmanship, really a *good* liturgy. No new rite could have the immense advantage possessed by 1662 of being thoroughly familiar to the clergy and worshippers; and it would lack the prestige and that sort of *patina* which come from the mere antiquity of the classic rites. It could therefore only secure voluntary adoption by its own intrinsic merits, by the fact that it performed the eucharistic action in conformity with the general christian tradition more intelligibly and satisfactorily than either 1662 or any of the present competing deviations. This does not mean that it would have to adopt academic foibles alien to the general mind and tradition of the English church (as 1928 adopted a pseudo-oriental 'invocation'). It ought not to be impossible to find a good and sensible rite inspired by our own eucharistic tradition, which was also theologically and liturgically sound in construction. That is what the church is looking for. Lacking those qualities, any proposals will ultimately share the fate of 1928. They must expose themselves to fair criticism simply for what they are, and as a practicable liturgy to be used in the ordinary parish church. Unless they are defensible as such, they will not be adopted. It would be the quality of the proposal as a *good* Anglican liturgy which would settle the fate of any such 'liturgical experiment'.

And that is as it should be, for that is precisely what we are trying to find.

This is not to say that it would necessarily have either to reject or to keep all our present sixteenth century material. Cranmer was a great liturgical artist, even though he was a Zwinglian; and the phrases of the present rite are very dear to thousands upon thousands of our people from habit and intimate personal associations. These people have an absolute right to be most tenderly considered, and a wise revision would remember that. But because he was so unrepresentative of later Anglicanism in his eucharistic doctrine, a mere shuffling of the parts of Cranmer's rite as they stand would not fulfil the purpose adequately. The question of the way in which his material would have to be used needs more, and—if I may say so without presumption—more intelligent, consideration than it seems to have received.

As a matter of practical observation, a re-arrangement of the order of the old prayers seems to cause almost as much disturbance to most lay-people as the introduction of wholly new prayers, since they cannot follow it in their existing books. The remedy lies in giving them books in which they can follow, in careful explanation and, above all, in presenting them with a rite whose real advantages over that to which they are accustomed they can, with explanation, come to see for themselves. If a plebiscite of regular communicants could be taken, I believe that an actual majority would probably still be found for 'no change'; almost certainly it would if Easter communicants were consulted. Just so in 1560 a majority of English churchpeople would probably have voted for the Latin mass. Apart from the element of sheer conservatism, this is not now (and was not then) necessarily because they are unaware that a change is needed, or because they hope that no change will come. But they have no clear proposal before them which gives them guidance in a way they can trust and understand, and they cannot judge for themselves as to the form such changes ought to take.

There are significant signs that a new liturgy which concentrated on being a *good* liturgy first of all, would evoke a surprising amount of interest and support. Even in the terrible months when France was falling and the Battle of Britain being won the Bishop of Oxford's proposals secured the immediate attention of thousands not only of the clergy but of the laity all over the country. I am not trying to recommend these particular proposals, but only the method by which they were put forward and the sort of considerations upon which they were based. The obvious ignoring of such considerations in the mutilation they underwent and the hasty official attempt to turn them into one more 'regulation', at once killed the outside interest in them stone dead, and led straight to the fiasco in Convocation. Is it too much to hope that the significance of this has not been lost where it is most necessary for it to be appreciated? The clergy and the church have

for a long while now proved very refractory to 'regulation' and the *droit administratif* of a state-appointed episcopate. They might respond much better to guidance based on principles capable of convincing explanation, and not founded simply on expediency and an obsolete statutory position. In that way, and probably now in no other way, the bishops might recover the initiative in the liturgical difficulty which ought to be theirs, and which was theirs for a moment in 1929, and which by their own policy since they have lost. And the rest of the church ought by now to appreciate that without such guidance from the bishops it will not find for itself a stable and self-enforcing custom. You cannot by-pass the episcopate in the working of an episcopal church.

It may be objected that the method of proceeding suggested here would not 'make to cease' those 'variations in the liturgy' which are the cause of the present confusion, and might even increase them. It could hardly do more to increase them than has been done by the methods of the last twenty years. It is the conception of the organisation of christian worship as being the same thing as the maintenance of discipline by police methods which has been half our trouble. But there is perhaps room here for a certain distinction between 1. variations in the liturgy as celebrated in different parish churches and 2. variations in the liturgy from time to time as celebrated in the same church. We have heard much of the former; it naturally comes more often to the notice of bishops. But in most cases it is 2. which causes more disturbance and confusion to the laity.

A priest anxious to teach his people a fuller and more meaningful idea of eucharistic worship usually sees before him the alternative of making a number of small successive changes one by one, or else a very considerable change all at once. If he adopts the latter course, he probably alienates his people altogether, and certainly acts very unfairly towards them. If he adopts the former course of being considerate to his people and trying to teach them as he goes, he runs a risk of confusing and puzzling them much more than the clergy usually understand, even when he has their confidence and they are genuinely trying to follow him. The people do not see the total effect of all the changes he has yet in mind to make, or appreciate it, as he does. They do not know quite where the changes are leading or where the process is to stop or what will be altered next. (Nor, unfortunately, has the parish priest always an entirely clear idea about these things himself.) All they get is a series of incomplete notions of the eucharistic action, to each of which they must readjust themselves afresh. And they cannot follow in their books! Perhaps we have under-rated the value to the liturgical spirit in worship of what is represented by that ever-repeated cry. If we had a good liturgy, easily intelligible by coherent principles, recommended as such by a group of bishops—a thing which still carries a good deal of weight with the laity—and, above all, available to be put before them as a whole from the start in books, it would certainly do a great deal to help them in their

difficulties, even while they understood that the rite had no 'authority'. It is not its authority nearly so much as its comprehensibility which worries the majority of the laity in the matter of a rite. And by having as it were a definite programme of change to set before them, any priest who adopted it would largely eliminate the need for successive variations in his own church.

This does not deal with the question of variations from church to church—a trouble which we shall not easily end, in any case. Unless we are to re-introduce the whole principle of 'Uniformity', which was never entirely enforceable and is now quite impracticable, there will still be those who will reject any new liturgy. While claiming to continue to use 1662 they will deviate from it in all sorts of ways. That is the penalty for taking twenty-five years to compile the abortive rite of 1928. The use of congregational rites does undoubtedly foster a tendency to congregational heresies. The liturgy ought not to be the means to a particular congregation's self-expression, but its expression of the act and faith of the whole church. But the argument for Anglican Uniformity as it is often presented is strikingly reminiscent of the Roman Catholic argument for having mass not only in the same identical form but in the same syllables from China to Peru. It complacently assumes that the mass is celebrated primarily for the benefit of the travelling public. As a matter of fact the proportion of strangers in any given congregation is usually infinitesimal. We have to start from the situation as it is. Our laity on the whole seem less disturbed by—or perhaps more resigned to—this sort of variation in the rite between different churches, than are our bishops. Perhaps this is only because they encounter it less frequently. Bishops rarely worship in the same church two Sundays running; the vast majority of our communicants worship habitually in the same church week by week, and can grow accustomed to its ways—if they remain the same. From the point of view of the clergy and laity, this latter is the more urgent problem. If something could be done to relieve this in the way suggested, it would in time certainly have some effect towards bringing more uniformity into the rites of different churches.

It is, I hope, permissible to have suggested a method by which we could make a different approach to our liturgical problem, which would allow the liturgy under the guidance of the bishops to respond to the mind of the worshipping church. Good liturgies are not written; they *grow*. Having said this, it would obviously be impossible for a private person to offer even a sketch of such a liturgy as is here suggested. But perhaps I may be allowed to suggest instead a hint as to the kind of rough test a private person might employ for any such proposal which was put before him. I have learned it only from practical study of the classical rites of christendom.

As we have seen, it is the business of the eucharistic prayer to state the meaning of the eucharistic action. The place above all others where it is virtually *impossible* to avoid stating plainly the meaning given to that action

in any particular rite is in the 'second half' of the prayer, that which follows the words of institution. We have seen that Cranmer's eucharistic theology ascribed no discoverable meaning at all to the eucharistic action itself. In his idea, Abraham and Moses, who did not perform the eucharistic action at all, still 'ate the Body and drank the Blood of Christ', just as we do. That is why the abrupt cessation of his prayer at the words of institution, with no 'second half' at all, is so significant and so interesting. I know of no evidence that Cranmer, any more than the ancient liturgists, had consciously noted this constructional principle. It was simply that the facts themselves took charge, and because his conception gave no assignable meaning to the eucharistic action, he *could* not find a content for the 'second half' of his prayer. In 1549 he had tried putting the contents of our present 'prayer of oblation' there, but had rightly removed them in 1552 as quite unsuitable. He had always known that the primitive and patristic church had associated the offering of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies' only with the offertory.[1] But in 1549 he had deliberately removed any sort of offertory prayer, and in 1552 he had removed the offertory itself. Since he wished to retain the idea of an offering of 'ourselves', the only thing to do was what he did. The relics of the phrasing of the 'prayer of oblation' were carefully rebuilt into a 'thanksgiving' and placed at the appropriate point as an alternative to the existing thanksgiving prayer of 1549.

Now that 1662 has replaced an offertory in bread and wine we are much embarrassed by the remnants of Cranmer's scheme. Any Anglican revision would probably try to remedy the lack of a 'second half' of the eucharistic prayer. But if this new 'second half' were found to consist of the 'prayer of oblation' in either its 1549 or 1552 form without considerable changes, we should find upon analysis that it still *did not state any meaning of the eucharistic action proper* at all. It would be a fair indication that Cranmer's Zwinglian conception of the rite had still dominated the new revision, and that the substitution of the oblation of the sons of men for that of the Son of Man still continued. Cranmer's 'prayer of oblation' virtually puts 'These are our bodies' in the place of 'This is My Body'—and that is not the eucharist. If this were the belief of those who used the new liturgy it would no doubt serve their turn. There would be no more to be said, except that it is not the meaning given to the eucharistic action itself by the primitive church, though it is associated with one part of it—the offertory. The important thing to remember is that it is *the action as a whole* which is the essence of the rite; and that the way it fulfils this and the meaning it attaches to it is the ultimate test of a rite's suitability for its purpose.

[1] See *The Book of Ceremonies* drawn up *c.* 1540, which had at least Cranmer's sanction (though it was never published). 'Then followeth the offertory, whereby we be learned to prepare ourselves by God's grace to be an acceptable oblation to him to the intent we may be partakers of the blessed sacrifice which Christ offered for us upon the cross' (*The Rationale of Ceremonial*, ed. by Sir C. Cobb, Alcuin Club Coll. XVIII, London, 1910, *p.* 22). *Cf. p.* 117.

A new Anglican rite might gain or lose support by all sorts of features. But the simplest and most practical constructional test of its merits, viewed simply as a liturgy—a way of doing the eucharistic action—would be by an analysis of the 'second half' of its eucharistic prayer. It is there that the *meaning* of the eucharistic action will be stated, if it is stated at all.

Yet when the revisers and the bishops and the liturgists have all done their best for our rite, there would still have to be the work of the church upon it, not only to improve it, but to *use* it and pray it and give it meaning in its own life. Perhaps we all, bishops and priests and people alike in the Church of England, need to examine our consciences rather seriously. We have discussed the liturgical problem for forty years or more. Meanwhile one person in every eighteen or nineteen in England is an Easter communicant of the Established Church, of whom perhaps two-thirds are adults, the majority of these being over fifty years of age. Perhaps one in fifty of the adult population is a really regular communicant. According to the last published figures, the diocese of London (with an income from all sources of close on £1,000,000 a year) had rather less than 150,000 Easter communicants out of 4,500,000 inhabitants. According to Mr. Seebohm Rowntree's social survey of York during the last forty years, Anglican church attendance there has dropped by twenty-seven per cent. during that period. Churchgoers forty years ago by no means coincided with the total population. But what makes the figures look really catastrophic is that the population of York has increased by about fifty per cent. during that period.[1] The same sort of figures are available from all over the country. From A.D. 1660 to 1760 we had a virtual monopoly of public worship in England. The penalised Roman Catholics and the socially uninfluential dissenters did not between them make up ten per cent. of the population. By no means ninety per cent. were Anglican worshippers; probably not fifty per cent. But at least it was we who had the opportunities.

We have an immense advantage over the dissenters in that we have a liturgy, and over the Roman Catholics in that it is in the vernacular. We still retain certain facilities given us by the Establishment, which makes possible a parochial system covering the whole country. We still have the old buildings, with all the force of the feeling for the old 'parish church' and the sense of themselves as 'parishioners', which are still strong in many provincial districts, even among those who never enter a church. But we are not managing to give the English people any idea of the meaning of the eucharist in christian life. We are still the National Church, but we are allowing our christian people to become increasingly non-communicant—a nation of catechumens. One has only to listen to broadcast addresses on such an occasion as a 'National Day of Prayer' to realise that 'petition' fo

[1] Dissenting attendances have dropped forty per cent., Roman Catholics hav increased twenty-six per cent. in the same period.

his own interests is the furthest we expect the ordinary man to go in his religious practice. That is the christianity of the catechumen.

One cause for this popular ignoring of the eucharist among uninstructed but *praying* English people may be that our eucharistic worship is very divorced from real life. By omitting all the 'votives' for the emergencies of human living Cranmer aimed at getting rid of the old 'intentions' in the offering of the 'sacrifices of masses'. But one result has been to make our eucharistic worship look like an affair of pure 'piety', suitable for the naturally devout but quite unconnected with all earthly affairs. This at least we ought to remedy. The late Archbishop of Canterbury speaking on the Social Teaching of Christianity in the Albert Hall on September 26th, 1942, said that holy communion is the consecration of human life to God, and the offering of bread and wine—not wheat and grapes, as he emphasised—is the offering of human labour upon God's gifts. One listener could not help reflecting, not only how true this is (when seen in relation to the rest of eucharistic doctrine) but also that it is a truth never brought out in our liturgy, and difficult even to read into it as it stands. Do we not expressly call them 'these *Thy creatures* of bread and wine'?

The admirable lead in christian social teaching now being given us by authority has been desperately needed for a generation and more. Coming so belatedly it is not going to save us from a great wave of secularism in the coming years. Unless balanced by a deepening of spirituality, it might lead only to a secularising of religion within the church itself. There is always the same danger in different forms that men's schemes for bringing in a Kingdom of God on earth will take the place of the gospel of how God brought it in, by a human dying and a coming again from the dead to the right hand of power. (It was this same good intention in another form which brought about the fifteenth century mechanisation of the Western church.) How else shall we better be kept in mind that the Kingdom is God's, with the power and the glory of it, than by the 're-calling' of Calvary and Easter and Ascension? But it would help us more to do this if our rite mentioned the two latter just once! Where shall men begin to learn what it means truly to live in community better than at communion, in the act which creates the perfect divine-human society? But our 'prayer for the church militant' suggests that the first duty of a christian government is to 'punish'!

I mention these as specimens of the sort of things any thoughtful revision would try to amend. There are plenty of others. We shall certainly not convert England merely by inventing a new liturgy, especially if we quarrel about it. Yet at least we ought to see to it that our liturgy gives those who do attend it not a merely Tudor sociology, but the fulness of the christian ideas which we long to give to the rest of our fellow-countrymen.

I think it was Lord Morley who, in discussing the difference between a statesman and a politician, said that the latter is dangerous because he

approaches great questions as though they were not truly great. If we and our bishops again approach the revision of our eucharistic liturgy in the spirit of ecclesiastical politics, we shall do the English church a terrible, perhaps an irreparable, harm. It is not a matter of academic niceties or devotional fancies or of administrative convenience. A church which sets out to revise its liturgy has taken in hand something which will affect its own supernatural life at its very source. It is difficult for bishops and those invaluable clergy and laity who give their time to administrative committees to realise that all their labour, necessary as it is, passes over the heads of the clergy and the laity in the parishes, remote, uninteresting and almost unheard of. For these people, whose salvation is the very *raison d'être* of the church—for whom Christ died—it is not administration but *worship* which constitutes their only contact with religion. Every parish priest knows that, however successful the work of his parish, however much money is raised for missions, however vigorous the social interest, however large the Sunday school and efficient the day schools and flourishing the Scouts and Guides and all the rest of it, it is always the nucleus who are regularly with him at the altar week by week or month by month on Sundays who are the real mainspring of the work. It is these people who provide the prayers and most of the effort and the gifts and the zeal which make the impact of the church in that place possible. This is inevitable, for it is not organisation but the eucharist which is always creating the church to *be* the Body of Christ; to do His will, and work His works, and adore His Father 'in His Name', and in Him to be made one, and by Him in them to be made one with God. That is the consummation of human living and the end of man.