

# THE CREATION OF A PROTESTANT LITURGY

## *The development of the Eucharistic rites of the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*

ROBERT M. ANDREWS

OVER THE YEARS some Anglicans have expressed problems with the assertion that individuals who were committed to the main tenets of classical Protestant theology founded and shaped the early development of Anglican theology.<sup>1</sup> In 1852, for example, the Anglo-Catholic luminary, John Mason Neale (1818-1866), could declare with confidence that 'the Church of England never was, is not now, and I trust in God never will be, Protestant'.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, in 1923 Kenneth D. Mackenzie could, in his 1923 manual of Anglo-Catholic thought, *The Way of the Church*, write that '[t]he all-important point which distinguishes the Reformation in this country from that adopted in other lands was that in England a serious attempt was made to *purge* Catholicism without destroying it'.<sup>3</sup>

Thus the Anglo-Catholic myth of the late nineteenth century—namely, that Anglicanism escaped being founded on Protestant principles—has remained influential among some conservative Anglo-Catholics,<sup>4</sup> even if recent scholarship has questioned most of its factual basis.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, as Eamon Duffy asserted in 1995: 'The Founding Fathers of the Church of England saw themselves first and foremost as Protestants, and as different from the Church of Rome as chalk from cheese'.<sup>6</sup>

As this paper will further elucidate, this is the most honest reading of the historic period that saw the beginnings of

Anglicanism. Representing a study of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's (1489-1556) liturgical revisions: the Eucharistic Rites of 1549 and 1552 (as contained within the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI), this essay shows that classical Protestant beliefs were influential in shaping the English Reformation and the beginnings of Anglican theology.

Of course, Anglicanism changed and developed immensely during the centuries following its sixteenth-century origins, and it is problematic to characterize it as anything other than theologically pluralistic;<sup>7</sup> nonetheless, as a theological tradition its genesis lies in a fundamentally Protestant milieu—a sharp reaction against the world of late medieval English Catholic piety and belief that it emerged from.

### *Background*

For almost a century prior to Cranmer's liturgical revisions of 1549 and 1552, the most widely used Eucharistic rite of the pre-Reformation Catholic Church in England was that commonly referred to as the 'Sarum Use'.<sup>8</sup> Like most of the Eucharistic rites that had developed in medieval England, the Sarum Use was named as such after its origins at the Cathedral of Salisbury (in Latin: *Sarum*). Previous to Sarum's dominance, there had been a number of local rites scattered throughout England, these also similarly

named after their places of origin (in theory the metropolitan Church of the province).<sup>9</sup> Thus Cranmer, in his preface to the First Prayer Book of 1549, states that there existed in England prior to the Reformation at least five different usages: those of Salisbury, Hereford, Bangor, York, and Lincoln<sup>10</sup>—and this was not even an exhaustive listing.<sup>11</sup>

When Cranmer drew up the first Eucharistic rite of 1549, he drew heavily upon the Sarum Use. Though this reliance upon Sarum changed significantly with the advent of the second Eucharistic Rite of 1552, it was, in the beginning, dominant. Like all Eucharistic rites then in use in the Catholic Church, the Sarum Use was a liturgy that expressed a Eucharistic theology that was definite and clear as to its nature and purpose. This theological purpose principally revolved around two doctrines that essentially made the Mass the Sacrament that it was: those being the doctrines of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Real Presence (or, as it had been termed in the West from around the thirteenth century onwards: 'Transubstantiation').<sup>12</sup> The Eucharistic Sacrifice was the belief that in the Eucharist, Christ's one and only sacrifice on the cross was made substantially present on the altar. The following quotations from the Sarum Use illustrate the presence of these two doctrines. The first, that being the Prayer of Oblation, asserts quite unambiguously the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice:

Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which I, unworthy sinner, offer to Thy honour, and that of Blessed Mary and All Saints, for my sins and offences: for the health of the living and the repose of all the faithful departed.<sup>13</sup>

Regarding the real presence, the prayer said by the priest to the consecrated Host prior to receiving Communion suffices:

Hail through all eternity, most Holy Flesh of CHRIST, my chiefest delight, before all things and above all things. May the body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST be to me a sinner the way and the life.<sup>14</sup>



*Dr Robert Andrews is an Honorary Research Associate in the School of Arts, Murdoch University.*

Numerous other references could be given to show that the Sarum Use conveyed both the Catholic doctrines concerning the Eucharistic sacrifice and the real presence. As recent scholarship has shown, within the context of late medieval English Catholicism, such doctrines were popular and widely believed.<sup>15</sup> In other words, they did not represent abstract theological teachings divorced from the reality of living a Christian life far from it; instead, embodied within the liturgy of the Mass, such doctrines represented the heart of Catholic belief and piety, which, prior to the Reformation in England, had little in the way of popular discontent.<sup>16</sup>

### *Henry VIII*

When Henry VIII broke from Rome in 1534 religious convictions had not been his main impetus, at least in the way they had been on the Continent. As Diarmaid MacCulloch puts it, 'the King's quarrel was only ambiguously with traditional religion, and much more straightforwardly with the Pope'.<sup>17</sup> A break from Rome was, of course, a religious conviction in the sense that the king no longer believed the Pope to possess the divine right to ecclesiastically govern England,<sup>18</sup> but, apart from this issue, Henry's quarrel and eventual break from Rome was not over the fundamental points of the Catholic faith. Of course, this does not mean that Henry was not in any way influenced by Protestantism. The Ten Articles of 1536, for example, were a

clear instance of how Protestantism did—if only moderately—influence his actions.<sup>19</sup> Yet despite this Henry was, for the most part, a religious conservative who for most of his reign resisted the Protestant ideas that were slowly gaining hold in England<sup>20</sup> (this was especially true regarding his unwavering belief in Transubstantiation).<sup>21</sup>

One of the key figures central to Henry VIII's break from Rome was the Cambridge scholar and eventual Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. Born in 1489 to a family of humble but respectful parentage, Cranmer had taken Holy Orders sometime prior to 1523 after many years of study at Cambridge.<sup>22</sup> In 1532, after having formed a working relationship with the Henry VIII, Cranmer was sent abroad as the resident ambassador to the Court of the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, Charles V. It was abroad that Cranmer came under the influence of Lutheranism, effectively becoming Protestant in his convictions.<sup>23</sup> In true Lutheran style, Cranmer also took a wife (the niece of Nuremberg's leading Lutheran theologian, Andreas Osiander).<sup>24</sup> She would, however, have to remain a secret, for in 1533 Cranmer was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury.

In England, Cranmer became a key player in Henry's desire to annul his marriage (which subsequently occurred), as well as giving the king the theological arguments needed for declaring himself the supreme governor of the Church of England. Yet owing to Henry's religious conservatism, Cranmer's desires for Church reform along more explicit Protestant lines remained largely unfulfilled for well over a decade, that is, until Henry died in 1547 leaving the English Crown in the hands Edward VI.

### *Edward VI*

Unlike Henry VIII, Edward VI was no conservative when it came to the traditional religion of England. Having been schooled in Protestantism, he was one of those who, in the words of

Kenneth Clark, 'owed nothing to the past'<sup>25</sup> (one could, perhaps, make allowances for his age, but it must be said that the young King demonstrated a remarkable clarity of conviction when it came to his religious preferences).<sup>26</sup> Under his reign the familiar Sarum Use of the Mass, said in Latin and familiar to all, would, in the space of five years, be replaced with a service that looked, sounded, and read, like something completely foreign. And at the centre of all this—suggesting, advising, encouraging, and for all intents and purposes, orchestrating the whole affair—was the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer.

Under the reign of Edward VI liturgical change began to take place rapidly. The first thing to go was Latin, which was removed from the liturgy through a number of rapid—but nonetheless staged—insertions of the vernacular, until, by mid 1548, entire Masses were being said in English.<sup>27</sup> Earlier in that same year, a short document authored by Cranmer and entitled: *The Order of the Communion*, was published.<sup>28</sup> This was not a new Eucharistic rite as such, simply a booklet that was to supplement the Mass with vernacular exhortations to those receiving Communion to receive it worthily and in a spiritual manner. The booklet also contained a ritual for the administration of Communion under both kinds.<sup>29</sup> Though it is important to note that none of these changes, in and of themselves, went against anything the pre-Reformation Church had taught in a dogmatic sense, it is, however, likely that such changes were intended by Cranmer to be calculated steps in the direction away from traditional Catholic belief and practice, a means of introducing Protestantism in stages, so as not to impose beliefs and practices that the vast majority of Englishmen and women would not have accepted had they been forced on them quickly and without preparation.<sup>30</sup>

### *1549*

Such a thesis fits in with the nature and con-

tent of Cranmer's first major liturgical revision, that being the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. Made law on 21 January 1549 and printed on 7 March, its full title was: *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, after the Use of the Church of England*. Mainly the work of Cranmer and composed entirely in English, the 1549 Prayer Book contained all the basic rubrics, prayers, and services of the Church (e.g. Table, Calendar, Daily Offices, Order of Baptism, etc.).

The famous late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century Anglo-Catholic writer, Percy Dearmer (1867-1936), once described the 1549 Prayer Book as 'an English simplification, condensation, and reform of the old Latin services, done with care and reverence in a genuine desire to remove the difficulties of the Medieval rites by a return to antiquity'.<sup>31</sup> This, however, was only half true. That it was a 'simplification, condensation, and reform of the old Latin services' was correct. The revision of the Breviary, for example, into two simple offices of Mattins and Evensong was a classic example of this process (and, it must be said, had much to commend it).<sup>32</sup> But to describe the 1549 Prayer Book as a work 'done with care and reverence in a genuine desire to remove the difficulties of the medieval rites by a return to antiquity' is an inaccurate assessment.<sup>33</sup>

The reality of the nature and content of the 1549 Prayer Book has been better put by A. G. Dickens. For him, the 1549 Prayer Book was 'a masterpiece of compromise, even of studied ambiguity. While it did not specifically deny Catholic doctrine, its ambiguous phrases were understood by its author in a Protestant sense and intended to enable Protestants to use it with a good conscience'.<sup>34</sup> The reality is that the 1549 Prayer Book was not written as an end in and of itself, that is, out of a simple and genuine desire to return the late medieval services to

the more simple and workable forms, or as Dearmer sentimentally puts it, as 'a return to antiquity'.<sup>35</sup> It was, instead, a political compromise, a negotiated first step on the part of Cranmer that was intended to pacify—if only for a time—those who did not hold to his own more developed Protestant beliefs.<sup>36</sup>

This is seen, especially, through Cranmer's creation of the Eucharistic rite of 1549, which was entitled: 'The Supper of the Lorde and The Holy Communion, Commonly Called the Masse'.<sup>37</sup> This, in and of itself, was evidence of compromise and ambiguity. The Protestantism of the service is evident in the fact that the rite is given three different names. The first: 'The Supper of the Lorde', was a direct import from Continental Protestant liturgies, most specifically, the 1545 Lutheran revision of the Mass, the 'Church Order for Cologne', in which the phrase, 'The Supper of the Lord', was used extensively.<sup>38</sup> 'Holy Communion' was a neutral vernacular phrase, but the retention of the title, 'Masse' [*sic*], was evidence that the Eucharist's traditional medieval title had to stay—at least for a time.<sup>39</sup>

Outwardly, the Eucharistic rite of 1549 followed closely the order of service found in Sarum. Take, for example, the beginning of the service where, after the recitation of the 'Collect for Purity'<sup>40</sup> (a prayer taken directly out of the Sarum Use), the rite of 1549 moves straight to the Introit Psalm and then immediately into an abbreviated Kyrie. This is contrasted with the Sarum Use which, though also reciting the Collect for Purity, then prescribes that a litany of private prayers be said by the priest in dialogue with his ministers. Cranmer, instead of revising the prayers, simply removed them. This methodology generally runs throughout the entirety of the rite of 1549. Had Cranmer simply limited himself to this, Dearmer's claims regarding the changes made to the rite of 1549 would have been correct. There would have been nothing compromising or ambiguous about such a revision—it would

simply have represented a simplification of the existing rite. Such, however, was not the case. This is most clearly seen through the changes Cranmer made to the Offertory and the Canon.

The Offertory was that part of the liturgy where the alms of the faithful were collected and, in turn, offered to God. Historically, this had included the bread and wine that was to be consecrated at the Eucharist (though this practice was eventually phased out). Within the history of liturgical development the symbolism of the Offertory had come to be seen as being linked to the Eucharistic offering of Christ. Thus in the Sarum Use, the priest prayed the above-cited Prayer of Oblation in which the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice was clearly evident. Luther had called the Offertory an 'abomination',<sup>41</sup> and had done away with it entirely in his revision of the Mass.<sup>42</sup> In the Eucharistic rite of 1549, however, Cranmer had retained a form of it, but his version had removed the Prayer of Oblation along with the entirety of prayers up to the Canon that clearly conveyed the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In the place of these prayers was the simple reception of alms, to be done whilst verses of Scripture were being read.<sup>43</sup>

Following the Offertory in the Sarum Use was the Canon, the most sacred part of the Mass. The Eucharistic rite of 1549 had retained a Canon, which in and of itself was remarkable, especially considering the fact that amongst the Continental Reformers its abolition was practically 'an article of faith'.<sup>44</sup> Thus Luther, in a manner similar to the Offertory, had simply removed the Canon entirely, but Cranmer, operating along a *modus operandi* of 'studied ambiguity', had made a number of changes to it—or, more appropriately, omissions. These centered chiefly on the removal of any notion of a Eucharistic sacrifice. In and of itself, Cranmer's reworking of the Canon is a masterful piece of English prose and contains within it much that is beautiful and true (a fact

now recognized by the Catholic Church), but its absence of any real allusion to the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice is evidence that Cranmer was attempting to divest the Mass of its sacrificial nature whilst at the same time attempting to present to his fellow bishops and clergy—notwithstanding the English laity—a version of the Mass that still retained an adequate resemblance to its Sarum predecessor.

To be granted, not all notions of sacrifice were removed from the rite of 1549, only those notions that related to a Eucharistic sacrifice. For example, Cranmer makes reference to the sacrifice of Christ, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the sacrifice of the people.<sup>46</sup> These notions of sacrifice, however, are not quite the same as that of the Eucharistic sacrifice, in which it was believed that Christ's one sacrifice of Himself on the Cross was made corporally present on the altar. The reality of the rite of 1549 was that in place of the traditional Canon contained within Sarum, Cranmer had, in the words of Francis Aidan Gasquet, 'substituted a new prayer of about the same length as the old canon, leaving in it a few shreds of the ancient one, but divesting it of its character of sacrifice and oblation.'<sup>47</sup>

Though Anglo-Catholics such as Dearmer have often attempted to convince their followers and opponents that the Eucharistic rite of 1549 was a genuine attempt at liturgical reform, the reality of the situation was less idyllic. The rite of 1549, along with the liturgical book it was issued within was, as G. J. Cuming asserted, nothing more than 'a first step, following the precedent of the older Reformers, who all began with a conservative revision, and gave full liturgical expression to their opinions only when they felt the time to be ripe'.<sup>48</sup> Of course, like Cranmer's reworking of the Canon, one can see within the rite of 1549 much that is of sublime beauty, holiness and truth. Cranmer was, without question, a master of English prose—ranking alongside writers such as Shakespeare and the

translators of the King James Bible.<sup>49</sup> Who, for example, can fault 'the Prayer of Humble Access':

We do not presume to come to this thy table (o merciful Lord) trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies: we be not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy table: but thou art the same lord whose property is always to have mercy: Grant us therefore (gracious Lord) so to eat the flesh of thy dear son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood in these holy Mysteries, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood. Amen.<sup>50</sup>

Yet despite this, it still needs to be said that the primary motive and purpose for Cranmer's revision of the traditional Sarum Use was a thorough commitment to Protestant theology—a theology that was held back by the political obstacle of the 1540s, in addition to the social need to pacify a nation that remained committed to a late medieval piety that the Reformers detested.

The accession of Edward VI to the English throne, however, had allowed Cranmer to exercise a greater independence regarding his own Protestant beliefs and ability to enact liturgical reform. Thus by the early 1550s Cranmer was beginning to publicly speak his mind regarding what it was he really believed about the Eucharist and its relationship with the traditional Mass of the medieval Church. This was most clearly evident in his publication: *An Answer unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation Devised by Stephen Gardiner...Against the True and Godly Doctrine of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Jesus Christ* (1551),<sup>51</sup> which, as the title implied, was written against the views of the more traditionalist Bishop of Winchester, Stephen Gardiner (1483-1555). In that work, Cranmer's explicit avowal of a Protestant sacramentalism was clear and unambiguous:

But what availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other like popery, so long as the two chief roots remain unpulled up? Whereof, so long as they remain, will spring again

all former impediments of the Lord's harvest, and corruption of his flock. The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree . . . leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree . . . 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.<sup>52</sup>

Cranmer was not alone in his views; another prominent English reformer, Hugh Latimer (1487-1555), had referred to the Mass as 'the most horrible blasphemy that could be devised'.<sup>53</sup> This was simply following in the views of Continental reformers such as Luther and Calvin, both of whom made comments similar to the above.<sup>54</sup>

## 1552

An awareness of Cranmer's views on the old Mass are important for they provide the context needed in order to understand the drastic changes that were made to the Eucharistic rite of 1549 when, in 1552, Edward VI issued his Second Prayer Book. If the chief characteristic of the rite of 1549 had been the absence of any notion of a Eucharistic sacrifice, then the chief characteristic of the rite of 1552 was the complete absence of any notion of the real presence or Transubstantiation. The rite of 1549, for all its faults, had nonetheless retained enough language that would have allowed for a belief in a corporal doctrine of the real presence. The rite of 1552, however, was unambiguous on this point. For example, in the rite of 1549, when the consecrated Host was given out to the faithful, the words of the priest were as follows: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.'<sup>55</sup> In the rite of 1552, however, the words had been changed to the following: 'Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with

thanksgiving.<sup>56</sup> The phrases 'in remembrance that Christ died for thee', as well as, 'feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving', all being intended to remove any notion of a corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharistic elements.

The many changes to the liturgy that emphasize the removal of any notion of the real presence are too numerous to individually list.<sup>57</sup> However a different—but nonetheless highly noticeable—change to the Eucharistic rite of 1552, were the imposition of new ceremonial directions. The rite of 1549 had contained little in the way of ceremonial directions. No doubt this had been done in an effort to simplify. Nevertheless, it did retain the use of traditional Eucharistic vestments—most notably the chasuble.<sup>58</sup> Other than a ban upon the elevation of the Host and Chalice after consecration<sup>59</sup> (traditionally referred to as the 'sacring'), the rite of 1549 had generally maintained—albeit in a very abbreviated and simplified form—the basic ceremonial directions of the Sarum Use. Thus, celebrated in a very traditional manner, one could have been forgiven for thinking the rite of 1549 to be nothing but the Sarum Use reformed and simplified.

The Eucharistic rite of 1552, however, contained drastic changes to the ceremonial directions of how the Eucharist was to be celebrated. To begin with, gone were the distinctive Eucharistic vestments of the alb and chasuble.<sup>60</sup> In their place priests were to wear only a cassock and surplice, whereas bishops were to wear a rochet.<sup>61</sup> Additionally, no longer was the Eucharist to be celebrated on an altar; now, the Eucharist was to be celebrated on a 'Table', which at Communion time was to have only a white linen cloth upon it and would be positioned within the middle of the church, or within the chancel.<sup>62</sup> The priest would also no longer celebrate facing East (*ad orientem*) but would stand 'at the north side of the Table'.<sup>63</sup> Interestingly, kneeling whilst receiving Communion was retained, though, it must be added, not without

Cranmer adding a strict rubric (found at the very end of the service) lest ignorant members of the laity interpret such a posture as signaling a belief in the Catholic doctrine of the real presence.

For as concernynge the Sacramentall bread and wine, they remain styll in theyr verye naturall substaunces, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatrye to be abhorred of all faythfull christians. And as concernynge the naturall body and blood of our sauour Christ, they are in heauen and not here. For it is agaynst the trueth of Christes true natural bodye, to be in moe places then in one, at one tyme.<sup>64</sup>

The result was a service that, predictably, bore little resemblance to the rite of 1549, let alone the Sarum Use.

### *Conclusion*

All of these convulsive liturgical changes occurred amidst a period known for its intensely iconoclastic attitudes and practices towards those signs and symbols that represented England's Catholic past.<sup>65</sup> Though it is not within the confines of this paper to enter into great detail concerning what amounted to the practical destruction of centuries of tradition and piety, it suffices to note that from the late 1540s (practically from the moment Edward VI had come to the throne) to 1553 (the accession of Queen Mary), the majority of England's parish churches, as well as cathedrals, were plundered of their crucifixes, crosses, and other items used in the traditional ceremonies and rights of the medieval Church, as well as being whitewashed (in some cases completely) of their various sacred images. Today the archeological results of this period remain for all to see.

More than simply an episode in liturgical revision or ecclesial reform, the English Reformation witnessed the destruction of a culture, a civilization—even if the cultural achievements of the Anglican tradition (most notably, Cranmer's gift of sacral English and the King James Bible)

can be said to have—at least in part—redeemed this iconoclastic beginning. Nonetheless, as the art historian Kenneth Clark, Lord Clark of Saltwood (1903-1983), put it late last century:

We all know about the destruction of images, what we nowadays call works of art; how commissioners went round to even the humblest parish church and smashed everything of beauty it contained, not only images, but carved font covers, reredoses, anything within reach, because it didn't pay them to stay too long on a single job. You can see the results in almost every old church and cathedral in England, and a good many in France. For example, in the Lady Chapel of Ely, all the glass was smashed, and as the beautiful series of carvings of the life of the Virgin was in reach they knocked off every head, made a thorough job of it. I suppose the motive wasn't so much religious as an instinct to destroy anything comely, anything that reflected a state of mind that an unevolved man couldn't share.

The existence of these incomprehensible values enraged them.<sup>66</sup>

Into this atmosphere of destruction fitted Cranmer's Eucharistic rite of 1552. An iconoclastic faith needed an iconoclastic expression of worship and Cranmer's method of liturgical revision, as well as his own theological beliefs, fitted such a criteria. From the 'studied ambiguity' of the rite of 1549, to the open Protestantism of the rite of 1552, Cranmer's liturgical revisions represented the sometimes subtle, and sometimes explicit, imposition of deeply held Protestant convictions. Though it is wrong to characterize Anglicanism solely through this one historical epoch (as some Catholic polemicists are wont to do), the beginnings of this English theological tradition are nonetheless rooted in this liturgically iconoclastic atmosphere.

## NOTES

1. Basil Hall, 'Cranmer's Relations with Erasmianism and Lutheranism' in Paul Ayriss & David Selwyn (eds), *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*, Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993, 4.
2. John Mason Neale, *The Bible, and the Bible Only, The Religion of Protestants*, London: Joseph Masters, 1852, 3.
3. Kenneth D. Mackenzie, *The Way of the Church: An Explanatory Outline of History, Worship, and Practice for English Catholics*, London: A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1923, 29 (emphasis in original).
4. This is especially true among Continuing Anglicans. See Robert M. Andrews, 'Continuing Anglicanism, or Continuing Anglo-Catholicism? A Study of "The Affirmation of St Louis" (1977)', *Anglicanism.org*, 2013, <[http://www.anglicanism.org/admin/docs/robertandrews\\_continuing\\_anglicanism\\_raedited.pdf](http://www.anglicanism.org/admin/docs/robertandrews_continuing_anglicanism_raedited.pdf)>.
5. See especially, Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship 1760-1857*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
6. Eamon Duffy, *The Tablet*, 4 March 1995, 280.
7. Aidan Nichols, *The Panther and the Hind: A Theological History of Anglicanism*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993, xvi-xix, 173-176.
8. F. E. Brightman & K. D. Mackenzie, 'The History of the Book of Common Prayer down to 1662' in W. K. Lowther Clarke (ed.), *Liturgy and Worship: A Companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion*, London: SPCK, 1932, 136.
9. Brightman & Mackenzie, 'The History of the Book of Common Prayer down to 1662', 135.
10. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1910, 4.
11. Brightman & Mackenzie, 'The History of the Book of Common Prayer down to 1662', 135.
12. Brightman & Mackenzie, 'The History of the Book of Common Prayer down to 1662', 59-65; Michael Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, 2nd edn, Fort Collins: Roman Catholic Books, 1995, 39-51.
13. *The Liturgy of the Church of Sarum*, London: J.T. Hayes, 1886, 51.
14. *The Liturgy of the Church of Sarum*, 77 (capitalization in original).
15. See especially: Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400 - 1580*, 2nd edn, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005; J. J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984.
16. Robert M. Andrews, 'Devotion in late medieval English Catholicism', *Connor Court Quarterly*,



no.8, 2013, 71-89.

17. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided 1490-1700*, London: Penguin, 2004, 198.

18. George H. Tavard, *The Quest for Catholicity: A Study in Anglicanism*, London: The Catholic Book Club, 1963, 2.

19. See David Cressy & Lori Anne Ferrell, *Religion and Society in Early Modern England: A Sourcebook*, 2nd edn, New York: Routledge, 2005, 9-25.

20. Owen Chadwick, *The Reformation*, London: Penguin, 1972, 97; D. G. Newcombe, *Henry VIII and English Reformation*, London: Routledge, 1995, 64-65, 71, 73.

21. C. W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers*, London: Macmillan, 1958, 109-110.

22. C. W. Bromiley, *Thomas Cranmer*, London: The Church Book Room Press, 1956, 1-8.

23. Bromiley, *Thomas Cranmer*, 11; Hall, 'Cranmer's Relations with Erasmianism and Lutheranism', 18-19.

24. MacCulloch, *Reformation: Europe's House Divided*, 199.

25. Kenneth Clark, *Civilisation: A Personal View*, London: BBC, 1969, 159.

26. Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Boy King: Edward VI and the Protestant Reformation*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002, 11-39.

27. G. J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 2nd edn, London: Macmillan, 1982, 39-40.

28. See [Thomas Cranmer], 'The Order of the Communion', Project Canterbury, <[http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Communion\\_1548.htm](http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Communion_1548.htm)>.

29. [Cranmer], 'The Order of the Communion'; Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, 168-169.

30. Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, 102-103.

31. Percy Dearmer, *Everyman's History of the Prayer Book*, London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1912, 66.

32. In fact, has recently become an accepted part of Rome's incorporation of 'Anglican patrimony' into the Ordinariates for former Anglicans (see Andrew Burnham & Aidan Nichols (eds), *Customary of Our Lady of Walsingham: Daily Prayer for the Ordinariate*, Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2012).

33. Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, 193-221.

34. A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, 2nd edn, London: BT Batsford, 1989, 243.

35. See especially Dearmer's comments: '[T]he First Prayer Book ... Is indeed throughout an exemplar

of what we proudly claim as one of the best elements in the English character ... it endeavours to avoid the extremes of bigots and fanatics, seeking to establish what is true and right without regard to prejudices, reactions, and the cruel generalizations so characteristic of the period. Catholic conservatism there is, but it is the conservatism which is not afraid of new ideas; Protestantism there is, but it is the Protestantism that will not throw away the gold with the dross' (Dearmer, *Everyman's History of the Prayer Book*, 72).

36. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 57.

37. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 212.

38. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 52, 286-304.

39. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 52.

40.. 'Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid; Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy holy spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name: through Christ our Lord. Amen' (*The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 212).

41. As cited in Francis Aidan Gasquet, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, London: John Hodges, 1891, 221.

42. Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, 196.

43. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 217-219.

44. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 54.

45. See the Apostolic Constitution, *Anglicanorum Coetibus*, 2009, <[http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/benedict\\_xvi/apost\\_constitutions/documents/hf\\_ben-xvi\\_apc\\_20091104\\_anglicanorum-coetibus\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/apost_constitutions/documents/hf_ben-xvi_apc_20091104_anglicanorum-coetibus_en.html)>.

46. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 222-223.

47. Gasquet, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, 222.

48. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 57.

49. David Curry, 'Something Understood' in Prudence Dailey (ed.), *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present and Future*, London: Continuum, 2011, 54.

50. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 225.

51. Thomas Cranmer, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer*, vol.I., Cambridge: Parker Society, 1844, 1-367.

52. Cranmer, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer*, vol.I., 6.

53. Hugh Latimer, *The Works of Hugh Latimer*, vol.I., Cambridge: Parker Society, 1844, 445.
54. Davies, *Cranmer's Godly Order*, 53-59.
55. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 225.
56. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 389.
57. For a comprehensive listing, see Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 78-79.
58. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 212.
59. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 223.
60. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 347.
61. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 347.
62. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 377.
63. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 377.
64. *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward IV*, 393.
65. See Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 448-503.
66. Clark, *Civilisation: A Personal View*, 159.

---

# READING FROM THE BIBLE AT MASS

PETER GILFEDDER fsc

SOME YEARS back a Lasallian confrère engaged with the in-service formation of religious educators wrote for his students: 'Unless a biblical book is listened to or read it remains a lifeless object...It is when the book is being listened to in a community which believes it to be the inspired word, that it becomes the inspired word... Moreover, it is in the context of a Christian community that the meaning of a biblical text is interpreted and applied to the particular day-to-day life situations of that community.' (Br Peter Heaney fsc)

When I was wrestling in years gone by with topics like inspiration or revelation and how to present them in the formation of religious educators, I found I came to invoking the analogous cases of great literary texts or great musical texts, on the good old pedagogical principle of proceeding from the known to the unknown.

Shakespeare's manuscript, in which the Hamlet soliloquy on existence occurs, 'remains a lifeless object' until, for example,

a Sydney actor in 2015, backed by a production team, declaims ('interprets') it to an audience who interpret and apply it 'to the particular day-to-day life situations of that community' just as a Garrick did for 18th century Londoners. A Biblical text needs not just a translator (the term 'interpreter' is used more and more these days by professional translators) to move it from one language form to another, as the interpreter stands between them, but the printed word needs bringing to life by being vocalised, and not just vocalised any old how but interpreted by proper declamation. The production team enhances good declamation by lighting, props, sets, *etc.* A good liturgical setting enhances the ecclesial proclamation of the Word of God. The lector is like a midwife aiding birth.

Beethoven's score, in which the 4th movement of the 9th symphony appears, 'remains a lifeless object' until, for example, Herbert von Karajan, in Berlin in 1980, backed by a production team, directed the