---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

# THE STUDY OF THE REFORMATION.

By Professor W. Alison Phillips.

A SOCIETY has been recently established, under the name of the Reformation Study Brotherhood, the object of which is to aid in the solution of the problems which are now distracting the Anglican Communion by answering the question, "What really happened at the Reformation?" To answer this question truthfully it is necessary to turn to history, in the spirit of the scientific historian, that is to say, with the determination to establish the truth and nothing but the truth. It is the function of history to explain the how and why of things; and, in order to do so, it must get down to the facts. My aim in the present paper is, to the best of my ability, to assist those who desire to do so.

The Renaissance scholar Leonardo Bruni, writing in 1450 to the illustrious lady Baptista Malatesta, commended the study of history as well suited to the capacities of women. "After all," he said, "history is an easy subject: there is nothing in its study subtle or complex. It consists in the narration of the simplest matters of fact. . . ." That is an opinion which still largely prevails—except among historians. These at least are conscious of the pitfalls and the stumblingblocks in their path. For the facts of the past survive only so far as they are recorded, and of the things recorded by no means all are facts. The records are full of fond things vainly invented; of lies, conscious or unconscious; of puzzles, unsolved and sometimes insoluble. What, indeed, *is* a fact? The one thing certain about a fact is that, if it is to have any meaning for us, it cannot be simple; for a simple fact, like a point in geometry, would be without parts and without magnitude. The existence of William is a fact; but it only begins to have any meaning for us when we add, let us say, "the Conqueror" or "the Silent"; and we have to add a great deal more before the full historical significance is revealed. Or, to take an example more germane to our subject, the existence of "the Mass" is a fact; but does the word represent the same thing in the Confession of Augsburg, the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, and the Decrees of the Council of Trent? The fact, or the word which represents the fact, must be put into its historical setting before its full meaning and implications can be seen.

History, then, is concerned with the interrelation of facts; its aim is to reconstruct an accurate picture of the past, based on a selection of facts—since all cannot be included. Scientific history starts with a verification of the facts; it tries first to make clear *what* happened, and then to explain *why*. To be scientific, it must be free from prejudices and predilections, political, personal, social, religious. The scientific historian is in the position at once of solicitor, counsel, and judge; he collects and sifts the evidence, cross-examines the witnesses, and finally sums up. The value of

his summing up depends on his judgment and impartiality in selecting and presenting the facts.

It follows that scientific historians are rare. The vast majority of history books, especially the most popular, are not scientific; they are compilations from compilations, generalizations of generalizations. Even those based on independent research are too often vitiated by the obvious bias of their authors; and this is true even of some histories which are justly regarded as classics. Mr. Augustine Birrell stated the dilemma, with his usual wit, thirty years ago in connection with this very inquest in which the Reformation Study Brotherhood is engaged.[1] "Historians!" he said. "Their name is perfidy! Unless they have good styles they are so hard to read, and if they have good styles they are so apt to lie. By what means shall a plain man—a busy man, a man very partially educated—make up his mind as to what happened at the Reformation?"

The truth is that we—and, too often, we historians—are apt to bring to our researches into the records an intention, conscious or unconscious, which warps our judgment and paralyses our critical faculty. Too often we set out, not in quest of truth, but of confirmation of *the* truth as we conceive it. This tendency is not confined to religious people, but is undoubtedly most marked in them. It is, indeed, obvious that for those who hold the articles of their creed to be divinely inspired, and their own religious system to contain the truth and nothing but the truth, all history must conform to their standards, and in so far as it does not conform it is not history. That is, broadly speaking, the Roman Catholic attitude. Certain Catholic scholars, like Döllinger or the late Monseigneur Duchesne, may depart from it; but—well, Döllinger died excommunicate, and Duchesne is on the Index. There is a Catholic Truth Society—as though truth could be Catholic or Protestant, or anything but just truth!

It is not in this spirit that we must go to history, if we appeal to it at all, but humbly relying on our own reasoning faculties. These, of course, are not infallible. Yet, as Browning says, "our rush-light has for its source the sun." So far as the affairs of this world at least are concerned, it is the only guide vouchsafed us, and if properly used it suffices. Stripping ourselves, then, of our prejudices and predilections, let us turn to this question of what happened at the Reformation.

I do not, of course, pretend to give a full answer to this question; I could not do so if I tried. My purpose is only to make some suggestions by way of introduction to its study. I shall begin, then, by outlining the situation which makes the right answer to the question of present importance. I shall then state broadly what light historical evidence throws upon the question. After this, I shall point out some of the peculiar difficulties which face those, and especially religious people, who study the question.

[1] "What Happened at the Reformation?" *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1896.

In conclusion I shall give some indication of the authorities which may be profitably consulted.

For more than three centuries after the great religious revolution of the sixteenth century in England there was little difference of opinion as to its character and consequences. The issues remained clear. The dividing line between Roman Catholic and Protestant was definitely marked in England, as it still is on the Continent; and the test used to separate the one from the other was, not the question of Papal supremacy, but the acceptance or rejection of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass. Mr. Birrell, in the article already quoted, pointed out the reality of this division. "It is the Mass that matters," he said. "It is the Mass that makes the difference: so hard to define, so subtle is it, yet so perceptible, between a Catholic country and a Protestant one, between Dublin and Edinburgh, between Havre and Cromer." For three hundred years the Church of England stood, both officially and in the popular mind, as a chief bulwark of those qualities which thus differentiated the English people from their Roman Catholic neighbours.

Then, some hundred years ago, there burgeoned inside the English Church that curious, exotic outgrowth of the Romantic movement—Tractarianism, which in our own day has blossomed into the full flower of "Anglo-Catholicism." I need not enlarge on this, for its main developments and claims are familiar. I will merely note that it began by contending that the doctrines and practices characteristic of it were prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, or at least implicit in its formulæ, and that it has now reached a point where it recognizes that this is not the case, and that the Prayer Book must be revised to suit these practices and doctrines.

From the historian's point of view—which is that from which I approach this question—this change of attitude has the merit of honesty. For what was, from this point of view, intolerable was the assertion that no great doctrinal changes were made in the Church of England by the Reformers; that all that happened was the repudiation of the usurped jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome and the removal of certain generally recognized abuses. It was a reading of history admirably summed up by the learned Jesuit Father Thurston, who said that it is based on the assumption that the authorities of the Church in England chose the moment when the house was on fire to begin a spring-cleaning.

It is hard to characterize the processes by which Anglo-Catholics have sought to give an historical foundation to their position. I do not accuse them of conscious and deliberate dishonesty, but rather of sheer incapacity to look at facts except from an angle which distorts and obscures them. Newman was certainly not dishonest. He simply became involved in an intellectual and moral tangle which he attempted to solve by the dialectical methods in which he had been trained. The scientific point of view was quite alien to him. He knew and wanted to know nothing of the new

and wonderful world which science was beginning to open up. He shrank from it appalled, retiring into a nebulous world of his own creation, a sort of cross-word puzzle, which he tried to solve by verbal dexterity. It was the method he applied in Tract XC, that amazingly ingenious, but hardly ingenuous, attempt to show that the doctrines of the Church of England were not irreconcilable with those of the Church of Rome. To this—the *fons et origo malorum*—I shall have occasion to return.

Tract XC set the fashion. It suggested a method of approaching the history of the Reformation which would reinforce, not weaken, the Catholic cause. For example, in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, to the words " the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion " is added " commonly called the Mass." The later Prayer Books say that the First Prayer Book contains nothing contrary to God's Word ; therefore the later Prayer Books did not abolish but retained the Mass. With this matter I shall deal in more detail later. Again, there is the Ornaments Rubric. This is taken as not only permitting but prescribing all the pre-Reformation ornaments of the Church and its ministers. Therefore, since these ornaments were by common consent symbolical of certain doctrines held before the Reformation, these doctrines are not only permitted but prescribed. The dialectical process is perfect. Yet we may say about it what Latimer said about the papists of his day : " Now the papists do brawl about words, to the maintenance of their own inventions, and follow rather the sound of words, than attain unto the meaning of the Fathers." Substitute " facts " for " Fathers," and this remains true of our latter-day papists. Their case, as presented by themselves, sounds plausible enough. It can only be met by getting behind the phrases to the facts.

Before suggesting the methods by which we may get at the facts, I should like to say a word or two about the peculiar difficulties which face us in dealing with the period of the Reformation. Since the questions then debated are still living issues, we may find that we are hampered in our study of them by the experiences of the centuries that have since passed, and may, unconsciously it may be, credit the sixteenth century with ideas which have only developed since. We have, then, to remember the peculiar conditions of that age. In the minds of the Reformers there was, at least for many years, no conscious breach with Catholic tradition ; rather they appealed to it. There was no revolt against Catholic authority ; for on the points at issue Catholic authority had not pronounced. The debate was between parties within the Church ; it began, indeed, to all seeming, in a quarrel between rival doctrines of the Schools—Augustinians against Aristotelians. To conservatives and reformers alike the modern idea of " Free Churches " would have been utterly abhorrent ; for both alike believed in the one Catholic Church, though they differed as to its character and constitution. Moreover, both rejected utterly the principle of liberty of conscience, as we understand it ; whichever view of the Church triumphed here or there was at once established as that to which all

had to conform. It is this last fact that we have to bear in mind in studying the evidence for the history of this period. We have, for instance, proof enough that many clergy of the Church of England conformed unwillingly to the frequent changes of religion, and we have also proof that they, very naturally, sometimes tried to adapt the new forms to their old beliefs rather than their old beliefs to the new forms. This has made it possible for Anglo-Catholic controversialists to gather here and there facts which seem to prove their contention that the old doctrine and ritual survived the Reformation. The wonder is, not that such evidence can be found, but that it is so infrequent and so obscure.

. . . . . .

I will now endeavour to illustrate the proper method of studying the history of the Reformation, by taking one question connected with it, and suggesting the answer. The question is, was the Mass abolished in the Church of England or was it not? It is the most important question of all; for "it is the Mass that matters; it is the Mass that makes the difference."

I need not describe the changes in the English liturgy, embodied in the two Prayer Books of Edward VI, and that issued in 1559, in the second year of Elizabeth. These changes are generally admitted; it is only their character and implications that are in dispute. With regard to this Mr. Birrell wrote: "The general intention of the parties making these changes involves an amount of judicial research and careful examination of such a mass of material, not all easily laid hands on, as to place it as much above the intellectual capacity of the laity as it would prove to be beyond the pecuniary resources of the majority of the clergy. Clergy and laity alike must wait till the work is done for them by some one they can trust." Well, whatever my intellectual capacity may be, as a mere layman I should certainly shrink from the task of reading and collating all that remains on record of what was said by the sixteenth-century divines on this subject. They are certainly no light reading, for all the vigour of their language. Nor do I think it necessary to read them all in order to arrive at a pretty just estimate of what the intentions of the parties were. Mr. Birrell, I think, exaggerated both the magnitude and difficulty of the task.

Let us take first the Anglo-Catholic view of the matter. The *locus classicus* for this is § 9 of Tract XC. In this Newman, after quoting Art. XXXI on the Sacrifices of Masses, says: "Nothing can show more clearly than this passage that the Articles are not written against the creed of the Roman Church, but actual existing errors in it, whether taken into its system or not. Here the Sacrifice of the Mass is not spoken of, in which the special question of doctrine would be introduced; but the 'sacrifices of Masses,' certain observances for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles saw before their eyes"—and so on. To this I may add a somewhat pontifical pronouncement of the late Mr. George Russell, in an article on "Reformation and Reunion" published in the *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1896 (Vol.

50). "Before the Reformation," he said, "the Mass was the Eucharist. . . . The Reformers regarded the words as synonymous." These two quotations fairly sum up the Anglo-Catholic view.

Now it is true that the Reformers did, at the outset, regard the words Mass and Eucharist, or Lord's Supper, as synonymous —Luther compiled a German Mass-book; we shall presently see how long they continued so to regard them. The apology presented by the Reformers in 1530 to the Emperor Charles V—known as the Augsburg Confession—uses the word Mass alternatively with Holy Supper and Lord's Supper. But *what do they mean by the Mass?* The answer to this is important, as it throws considerable light on the *intention* of the framers of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. The third of the Articles concerning abuses which have been reformed is headed *De Missa*, and runs as follows:

> "Our churches are falsely accused of having abolished the Mass. For the Mass is retained by us and celebrated with greater devotion and earnestness than by our gainsayers. Thus the people are often and with the greatest diligence instructed in the Holy Sacrament, why it was instituted and how it is to be rightly used, so that alarmed consciences may be comforted and the people drawn to Communion and the Mass. Thereto is added instruction as to false teaching about the Sacrament. Moreover, in the public ceremonies of the Mass no notable change has been made, save that (for the instruction of the people) German hymns have been mingled with those in Latin."

Here, then, we certainly have the Mass; but it is made quite clear that it is not the Mass as traditionally conceived, or as defined in the decrees of Trent. After denouncing certain abuses of the Mass, for instance, the doctrine that the Sacrifice on Calvary was for original sin, and the Mass for all other sins—whereby "the Mass is made into a sacrifice for the quick and the dead, to have remission of sin and reconcile them to God"—and the consequent immense multiplication of "hole-and-corner Masses" (Winkelmessen)—it lays down that "the Holy Sacrament was instituted, not as a sacrifice for sin (for the Sacrifice had already been offered), but in order that our faith might be stirred up and our conscience comforted, which are reminded that through the Sacrament Christ promised them grace and forgiveness of sins. Therefore the Sacrament demands faith, and *without faith is used in vain.*"

The doctrine is more clearly defined in Article XIII, "On the Use of the Sacraments." "Sacraments were instituted as the signs and witnesses of God's will towards us, in order to excite and confirm the faith of those that use them." The logical deduction is drawn in the recension of the Confession made in 1540 (the *Variata*). In this there are added the words: "Therefore they condemn the pharisaical opinion, which destroys the doctrine concerning faith,

and does not teach that in the use of the sacraments there is need of the faith which believes that grace is bestowed upon us for Christ's sake, but feigns that men are justified by the use of the sacraments *ex opere operato* and even without any good motion in those who use them." Against this doctrine, so monstrous in its consequences, the Reformers set up the doctrine of justification by faith only. In their intense conviction of the unworthiness of man in the presence of the awful righteousness of God [1] they tended, indeed, to exaggerate their language, so that to some it seemed that this doctrine absolved them from the obligation of "works" altogether. Thus it came that the doctrine of justification by faith only had also its monstrous consequences—in antinomianism. Historic truth compels this admission. For our purposes, however, it is enough to point out that this doctrine, with its corollary that good works are the necessary fruits and evidence of "a true and lively faith," was adopted by the Church of England.[2]

Applied to the Mass, the doctrine of justification by faith was to prove revolutionary. It did not, indeed, touch the doctrine of the Real Presence: the Augsburg Reformers held that the Body and Blood of the Lord are really present in the Supper and are there given and received, and they condemned those who taught otherwise.[3] But, in their view, the channel, so to speak, of the grace bestowed by the Communion was the faith of the communicant. Neither the Presence nor the Sacrifice conferred grace *ex opere operato*.

[1] Thus Luther, writing to his friend Georg Spenlein, Augustinian friar at Memmingen, on April 7, 1516, says:

"In our age there burns in many a tendency to presumption, and in those especially who study with all their strength to be just and good: not knowing the justice of God, which is most lavishly and freely bestowed upon us in Christ, they seek of themselves to do good works so long that in the end they may stand confidently before God, as though graced with virtues and merits, which is a thing impossible to be done. You, while with us, were of this opinion, and I shared it: yet it is against this same opinion, or rather this error, that I now fight, though I have not yet vanquished it. Therefore, my sweet brother, learn Christ and him crucified, learn to sing to him and, despairing of thyself, to say to him: 'Thou, Jesu, art my righteousness, but I am thy sin; thou didst take what was mine and gavest me that which was thine: thou tookest what thou wast not, and thou gavest me that which I was not.'"—W. M. L. de Wette, *Luther's Briefe* (Berlin, 1825–1828), s. 17.

[2] The language of the Canons of the Council of Trent on this matter is hard to follow. Canon VIII of the *Decretum de Justificatione* (Sess. Sexta, Jan. 13, 1547) lays down that neither faith nor good works, which precede justification, promote justification, which is a grace freely bestowed by God. The language of Canon XVIII is even strongly reminiscent of that of Luther quoted above: "None the less, far be it from a Christian man that he should trust or glory in himself, and not in the Lord, whose goodness towards all men is such, that he wills to ascribe to them as merits what are his own gifts." Yet Canon XXIV lays down that "if anyone shall say, that accepted justness (*iustitiam acceptam*) is not preserved, and also not increased before God through good works; but that the works themselves are only the fruits and evidence of justification, or not the cause of its increase, let him be anathema."

[3] Article X (1530): "De coena domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint et distribuantur vescentibus in coena domini, et improbant secus docentes." This remains orthodox Lutheran doctrine.

We will now examine briefly the Edwardine office for the Lord's Supper, "commonly called the Mass," in the light of what the Confession of Augsburg says about the Mass.

The late Canon McColl, in his *Reformation Settlement*, affirmed that the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, unlike the Second, was uncorrupted by the pestilent interference of foreign divines. In view of the intimate intercourse from the first between the Reformers in England and those on the Continent, this statement was, to say the least of it, very rash. Whether foreign divines had any direct share in compiling the First Prayer Book or not I am not in a position to say. That they strongly influenced it is certain. Cranmer was one of its authors; and Cranmer had had long discussions with the Lutheran divines who had come to England by King Henry's invitation in 1538. The thirteen Articles discovered among his papers after his death, which clearly formed the basis of the later Articles of Religion, are supposed to be those agreed upon at this Conference. These Articles closely follow the language of the Confession of Augsburg; and it is therefore the more significant that the liturgy, "commonly called the Mass," in the First Prayer Book embodies the reformed doctrines as proclaimed at Augsburg, and also closely follows the precedents set by Lutheran Germany in the externals of worship, e.g., in the retention of those vestments and ceremonies which were regarded as *adiaphora*.

The Anglo-Catholic contention is that the First Prayer Book retained the old office of the Mass essentially unaltered. This can be easily refuted by turning to the rubric inserted in the midst of the Canon, immediately after the solemn words of consecration:

> "These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning to the altar, *without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament* to the people."

That is to say, the central act of the Mass—the oblation of the Host, "the Victim"—is not only no longer enjoined, but expressly forbidden. The Host itself is gone. The "Sacrament" is not to be shown to the people for that divine worship (*latria*) which, according to the decrees of Trent, is due to the very presence of God in the consecrated elements.[1] As Canon Estcourt pointed out in his "The Question of Anglican Orders discussed," from the Mass in the First Prayer Book, "every expression which implies a real and proper sacrifice has been carefully weeded." The idea of sacrifice is, indeed, retained, but it is a "memorial" of the Sacrifice once offered, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

The whole character of the service, indeed, reveals the intention of its framers to substitute the Communion for the Mass—in

[1] Sessio XIII (Oct. 11, 1551) Decretum de sancto eucharistiae sacramento. Canon IV affirms the doctrine of transubstantiation. The logical deduction from this is drawn in Canon V: "Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi fideles pro more in catholica ecclesia semper recepto latriae cultum, qui vero Deo debatur, huic sancto sacramento in veneratione exhibeant."

the sense in which the word Mass was now beginning to be understood. I need only point to the long exhortations to the people to be diligent in coming to Communion, and to the rubrics, more than once repeated, which lay down that there is to be no celebration unless there be others to communicate with the priest.

A word, too, about the vestments ordered to be worn. It is confidently asserted that the First Prayer Book prescribed all the eucharistic vestments. This is not the case. At the celebration the priest is ordered to put on "a white alb plain, with a vestment or cope." There is nothing about girdle, maniple, amice or stole. The contention is that these vestments are, so to speak, taken for granted, or that they are covered by the single word "vestment." Why, then, a white alb "*plain*"? Did this imply no more than a puritan objection to apparelled albs? Well, again we must go to the Continent for light. The Reformers well knew the symbolism of the vestments, and they rejected those which symbolized doctrines or practices which they had repudiated. The Lutherans—to give them the most convenient title—cast off the amice, maniple, girdle and stole (for one reason or another); they retained precisely the white alb plain and the vestment or cope, as they still do in the Scandinavian churches.[1]

And now let us glance at contemporary evidence to see whether the Lord's Supper, according to the Edwardine rite, was regarded as synonymous with the Mass. First let us fix dates.

The First Prayer Book of Edward VI came into use on June 9, 1549. It remained in use until November 1, 1552, when it was superseded by the Second Prayer Book. Well, in May, 1550, we find Bishop Ridley, one of the compilers of the liturgy, in his injunctions to his clergy, forbidding "any counterfeiting of the popish mass . . . in the time of the Holy Communion." We find him abolishing the altar, "that the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions."[2] Dr. Frere, indeed, argues that in ordering the destruction of altars the Bishop was acting *ultra vires*, since "such authorization as the Council could give for this destruction was not issued till the 24th of November."[3] But the retention of the "altar" did not necessarily imply the retention of the "Mass" (the altar remains in the Lutheran Churches), though it certainly favoured it. Nor, it seems, did the removal of the altars stop the effort to continue the Mass. The altar in St. Paul's was removed in June. In the *Acts of the Privy Council*, under date October 13, 1550, is recorded:

> "A letter to Thomas Asteley to joyne with ij or iij honest gentlemen of London for the observation of the usage of the

[1] See my articles "Vestments," in *Enc. Brit.* (11th ed.), xxvii. 1060, d. *Anglican Church*, and "The Surplice not a Mass Vestment," in *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1913.

[2] Frere, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, ii. 241, No. XXXVIII.

[3] *Ib.* i, Introduction, p. 137.

> Communyon in Powles, whereof information was given that it was used as a verie masse."

This may serve to explain the intentions of the framers of the Second Prayer Book. The comparatively moderate changes made in the First Prayer Book had failed in their object. After all, this book had been accepted, though with reluctance, by churchmen of the type of Bishop Gardiner, precisely because it could, with a little ingenuity, be reconciled with what they held to be Catholic doctrine. From the point of view of the Reformers, therefore, it quickly became evident that the service must be so altered that it could no longer be used "as a verie masse." Hence the Second Prayer Book: the splitting up of the prayer of consecration, so as to eliminate from the Canon the idea of a sacrifice, the change in the form of administration of the Sacrament, the prescription of the surplice alone as the dress of the minister, and—last but not least—the elimination of the very word Mass.

This word, indeed, was by this time no longer synonymous with the Lord's Supper; it was henceforth universally used of the sacrifice of the altar, as the Romanists conceived it, as a mystery conferring grace *ex opere operato*. The language of the Reformers, and of the later Anglican divines, leaves no doubt upon this point. That of the Reformers, indeed, offends our more sensitive taste; but it is at least unequivocal. Thus Ridley wrote, from prison a day or two before his martyrdom:

> "This heathenish generation, these thieves of Samaria, these Sabaei and Chaldaei, these robbers have rushed out of their dens, and have robbed the Church of England of all the holy treasure of God. In the stead of God's holy word, the true and right administration of Christ's holy sacraments . . . they mixed their ministry with men's foolish phantasies, and many wicked and ungodly traditions withal. In the stead of the Lord's holy table they give the people, with much solemn disguising, a thing which they call their mass; but indeed it is a very masking and mockery of the true supper of the Lord, or rather I may call it a crafty juggling, whereby these false thieves and jugglers have bewitched the minds of the simple people. . . ."

Latimer was, if possible, even more explicit. "The very marrow-bones of the mass," he said, "are altogether detestable, and therefore by no means to be borne withal; so that, of necessity, *the mending of it is to abolish it for ever.*"

This was certainly the view of those Reformers who, after the Marian interlude, returned from exile in Geneva, where Calvin had succeeded in realizing his austere ideal of the City of God. They came back full of zeal for this new model, determined, if possible, to strip the Church of the last "rags of popery." And they found the English people, on the whole, in a mood to follow their lead; for the Marian persecution had done its work, and especially the

martyrdom of the three bishops had lighted a candle which was destined never to be put out. Apart from this new temper in the people—which it is perhaps possible to exaggerate—the whole ecclesiastical situation in Europe had been radically changed by the activities of the Council of Trent. Its decrees were not formally promulgated until 1564, but on the main subjects of controversy between Protestant and Romanist it had already pronounced authoritative judgment. All the distinctive doctrines of the Reformers were condemned in unequivocal language. We need but take one, which involves all the rest. The XXIXth Article of Religion, "Of the Sacraments," repeated, in almost identical language, the definition of doctrine given in the XIIIth Article of the Augsburg Confession of 1540 : the gist of it being that the sacraments do not confer grace *ex opere operato,* but only according to the faith of the recipient. The VIIIth Canon of the Decree on the Sacraments, passed at the Council of Trent on March 3, 1547, runs as follows :

> "Whosoever shall say, that grace is not conferred by the sacraments of the New Law *ex opere operato,* but that only faith in the Divine promises suffices to obtain this grace, let him be anathema."

And this doctrine is given a special application to the Sacrament of the Altar. The IIIrd Canon of the Decree on the Eucharist, passed on October 11, 1551, begins thus :

> "The most holy eucharist has this in common with other sacraments, that it is the symbol of a sacred thing and the visible sign of an invisible grace ; but this excellent and singular quality is found in it, that, whereas the rest of the sacraments have the power of sanctification only when some one uses them, in the Eucharist the sacrament itself is the author of sanctity *before use.*"

This is deduced from the presence of Christ, God and Man, in the consecrated elements, which *must* of itself sanctify. It hangs upon the doctrine of transubstantiation ; and this again involves the oblation perpetually repeated at the altar, which confers grace *ex opere operato.* Thus the doctrine of the Mass—as it is commonly understood—was now fixed authoritatively for those who acknowledged the authority.

The Council of Trent solemnly affirmed that the efficacy of *this* sacrament does not depend on the faith of those for whose intention it is celebrated. They need not even be present. It is a sacrifice for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt. Since its virtue is *ex opere operato,* its efficacy is increased by repetition, and it loses nothing by being made a matter of bargain and sale.

But—to get back to history. What happened when Queen Elizabeth came to the throne? A certain confusion has been introduced into our vision of this transition period by the equivocal attitude of the Queen herself as "Supreme Governor of the Church

of England." It is well known that she herself favoured the First Prayer Book of Edward I, and the retention of the traditional ritual. But her attitude was determined not by religious predilections but by political exigencies. She was in a position of singular difficulty; her disputed title inclined her to lean on the Protestants, at home and abroad; her native caution led her to avoid as far as possible taking any steps involving an irrevocable breach with the Catholic Powers. She was, I think, perhaps consciously inspired in her ecclesiastical policy by Machiavelli's shrewd advice to Princes wishing to make a revolution, namely, " to preserve carefully the semblance of old institutions, while entirely changing their substance."

But in this respect circumstances were too strong for her. It was, indeed, she herself who flung down the first gage of defiance to Rome, when on " Sunday in Christmastide," 1558, during the celebration of Mass in the Chapel Royal, she interrupted the service at its most solemn moment, harshly forbidding Bishop Oglethorpe to elevate the Host. The Bishop, with new-born courage, refused to celebrate the sacred mysteries otherwise than as ordered by the Church.[1] It was a declaration of war against the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The zeal of Parliament outran the politic advance of the Queen. In April, 1559, without Convocation being consulted, and in the teeth of the opposition of all the bishops, both Houses hurried through the Act of Uniformity, which imposed upon the Church the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. Certain amendments were, indeed, introduced, intended to conciliate the consciences of those who clung to what now began to be called " the old religion." The offensive reference to the " detestable enormities " of the Bishop of Rome was, for instance, omitted from the Litany, and the formula used in the administration of the Sacrament to communicants according to the first Edwardine rite was added to that prescribed in the Second Prayer Book. Most mysteriously, too—probably by the direct intervention of the Queen—that much-discussed word-puzzle, the " Ornaments Rubric," was introduced in the Act prefixed to the Book.

Into the meaning and intention of this rubric [2] I do not propose to enter, but will confine myself to its immediate effects. Doubtless, the Queen—for political reasons mainly—hoped that the outward semblance of the old services would continue until she should judge it expedient " to take other order." Canon McColl (p. 127) asserts boldly that this is what actually happened. " There can be no doubt," he says, " that a large majority of the clergy who conformed did believe in Transubstantiation, and observed unmolested the

[1] *Spanish Calendar*, p. 19. The significance of this refusal is increased by Oglethorpe's previous record. Canon Venables (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, xlii, p. 48), says that " his conduct shows him to have been a man of no strength of character, with little love for the series of religious changes through which the clergy were being hustled, but reluctantly accepting them rather than forego the dignity and emoluments of office." In 1559, the year of his death, he was Bishop of Carlisle.

[2] It was only incorporated as an actual rubric in 1662.

accustomed ritual. And this went on till the issue of the Bull of Excommunication . . ."—i.e., till 1570!

"There can be no doubt!" Whence this certainty? The Canon produces no tittle of historical evidence to support his statement, which is wholly based on his view of what the Ornaments Rubric meant and the presumption that it was effective in this sense. He admits, indeed, the ruthless iconoclasm of the Puritan bishops; but this was, he affirms, "a gross violation of the law," and Elizabeth herself at last interfered "to stop this vandalism." Well, as we shall see, the Canon is supplementing history from the treasury of faith.

What are the facts? I cannot give them all; but I can give enough to show that the Canon is talking nonsense. There is evidence, certainly, that some of the clergy resisted the Act of Uniformity; in remote country parishes it is even possible that the Mass continued to be celebrated for some time with the old rites. But the evidence is overwhelming that, wherever the arm of authority reached, the Mass *sans façon* was abolished.

The Act of Uniformity was passed in April, 1559. On May 30 the Venetian envoy reports home that the Council had sent for the Bishop of London and given him "orders to remove the service of the Mass, and the Divine Office; but he answered them intrepidly."[1] Bonner's intrepidity was of no avail. He held out for awhile; but on June 11, Machyn, a citizen of London, records in his *Diary* that there was no Mass at Paul's that day.[2] "The Mass," in short, as Parkhurst wrote to Bullinger, had been "abolished." Indeed, a special Act made it a penal offence to "say or sing Mass" and even to "willingly hear Mass;" and the Visitation Articles of 1559 include the inquiry as to whether any parishioner had secretly said or heard "Mass or any other service prohibited by the law." (Cardwell ed. 1844, i, p. 248.) The *Acts of the Privy Council* contain many notices of priests being summoned before it for "saying Mass" and laymen for "hearing Mass." The penalty was imprisonment.

As for "the ornaments of the Church and the ministers thereof," the records of the Privy Council are even more illuminating. Thus the Council orders all "Massing stuff" to be everywhere defaced (*Acts*, xiii, pp. 186, 187); it orders search to be made for "hidden vestments and such-like tromperie for Massing" (*ib.*, p. 234). An injunction (printed by Cardwell, i, p. 221, No. XXXIII) orders that

> "they shall take away, utterly extinct and destroy all shrines, coverings of shrines, all tables, candlesticks, trindals, and rolls of wax, pictures, paintings, and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry and superstition, so that there remain no memory of the same in walls, glass windows, or elsewhere within their churches and houses."

We have evidence of the lamentable thoroughness with which these orders were carried out. Who can measure the loss to

[1] *Venetian Calendar*, vii, p. 94.
[2] *Diary*, p. 200. Cf. *Spanish Calendar*, p. 76.

English art? Wriothesley (*Chron.*, p. 70) records how, on August 24, 1559,

> "were burned in Paule's Churchyarde, Cheape, and divers other places in London, all the roods and images that stood in the parish churches. In some places the copes, vestments, altar-cloths, books, banners, sepulchres and other ornaments of the churches were burned; which cost above £2,000 renewing again in Queen Mary's time."

This is confirmed by another account in Machyn's *Diary* (pp. 207–208). Machyn describes the "two gret bonfires of Rodes and of Mares and Johns and odur images," and tells us that there were also burnt "copes, crosses, sensors, altar-clothes, rod-clothes, bokes, banners, etc." The records in the parish registers all over the country tell the same tale. "Perhaps the most eloquent of all these entries," says Mr. Round,[1] "is that which is found at Eltham, Kent (one of the Queen's seats): 'for a bibell—for putting downe the allter.'"[2]

It was, indeed, above all, the altar that had to go. Efforts were made to save it; but, according to Strype (i, pp. 237–241), it was pointed out in a memorial to the Queen that it was "illogical to take away the Sacrifice of the Mass, and to leave the altar standing; seeing the one was ordained for the other." "The Mass priests," argued the objectors, "are most glad of the hope of retaining the altar, etc., meaning thereby to make the Communion as like a Mass as they can, and so to continue the simple in their former errors."[3]

So the Queen issued injunctions for "tables in churches," and everywhere, as the parish registers prove, the masons were set to work knocking down the altars and repairing the holes in the church walls thus made. The consecrated altar-slabs were deliberately put to every base use. The work was thoroughly done. I myself have indeed seen a stone high-altar with its slab in place, in the splendid church of Abbeydore in Herefordshire; but this, so the vicar told me, had been found and set up again in the days of Archbishop Laud.

[1] "The Elizabethan Religion." *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1897, vol. xli, p. 203. In this article Mr. Round gives other pertinent quotations from parish registers in various parts of the country.

[2] Accounts of 1559–1560 (*Archæologia*, xxxiv, p. 56). Mr. Round adds: "Conversely, when the Northern Catholics rise in rebellion (1569), 'altars are erected in their camp, the Holy Bibles are committed to the flames (*comburuntur*), and Masses are said' (Bishop Jewel to Bullinger, *Zurich Letters*, I, 228)."

[3] With reference to this document, "of cardinal importance," Mr. Round wrote: "Although Mr. Gladstone himself, like other writers on the subject, quotes from Strype without question, I have avoided doing so where possible, as he wrote from the 'Protestant' standpoint. But apart from the fact that his own statements seem to be generally accepted, the documents which he quotes *in extenso*, giving his reference for the text, may fairly, and do, command our confidence, especially when they are in perfect harmony with all our evidence *aliunde*." "Elizabethan Religion," *loc. cit.*, p. 199.

It was by such processes that—to quote the ingenuous editor of the *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*—" the people were being gradually weaned from their love for a Catholic ritual."

The result, so far as the services of the Church are concerned, can be seen in the pages of that witty and delightful book, Harrison's *Description of England*, which was first published in 1577. William Harrison, who became a Canon of Windsor in 1586, was a Puritan, but throughout he assumes the continuity of " this Church of England " before and after its Reformation ; he hated " idolatry," but he was a lover of the beautiful, and is unstinted in his praise of the great monuments of church architecture. All the more significant is his description of Divine service as conducted in the Church of England in his day.[1]

> " As for our churches themselves, bells, and times of evening and morning prayer, remain as in times past, saving that all images, shrines, tabernacles, rood-lofts, and monuments of idolatry are removed, taken down and defaced ; only the stories in glass windows excepted, which for want of sufficient store of new stuff, and by reason of extreme charge that should grow by the alteration of the same into white panes throughout the realm, are not altogether abolished in most places at once, but by little and little suffered to decay, that white glass may be provided and set up in their rooms.
>
> " Finally, whereas there was wont to be a great partition between the quire and the body of the church ; now it is either very small or none at all : and to say the truth altogether needless, sith the minister saith his service commonly in the body of the church, with his face toward the people, in a little tabernacle of wainscot provided for the purpose : by which means the ignorant do not only learn diverse of the psalms and usual prayers by heart, but also such as can read, do pray together with him : so that the whole congregation at one instant pour out their petitions to the living God, for the whole estate of his church, in most earnest and fervent manner."

At this point I may well close this historical sketch of the changes made at the Reformation in the central service of the Church of England. Even the few proofs adduced should convince any impartial person that, whether the Reformers were right or wrong, their intention was to root out the Mass—not any particular abuse of it, not only the dogma of Transubstantiation, but the Mass itself considered as a sacrifice for the quick and the dead " to have remission of pain or guilt," offered by what the Canons of Trent call the " new priesthood." In order to make this clear, so far as the Church of England is concerned, you have but to lay the Thirty-nine

[1] The Second and Third Books. Edited by Fred. J. Furnivall for the New Shakspere Society. Part I (Book II), 1877, p. 31 : " Service in the Church of England."

Articles side by side with the Decrees of Trent, note the dates at which they were respectively framed and issued, and compare what they respectively say about the Sacraments in general and the Mass in particular. You will find that they flatly contradict each other and reinforce the contradictions with anathemas ![1]

I have treated this subject wholly from the point of view of the historian, who is not concerned with the merits of the controversies involved, but solely with their character and consequences. My intention has been to indicate the method by which, from this point of view, they should be approached. This is, to get back—behind the mass of controversial and biased "history," falsely so called—to those contemporary documents which still survive in great quantity and still speak with the voice of unchallengeable authority. What happened at the Reformation? To answer that question we must study the *ipsissima verba* of those who lived at the time of the Reformation, witnessed what happened, and put it on record. I will, therefore, in conclusion, suggest to you some such sources and the means by which you may discover others.

The contemporary literature dealing with the Reformation is alone so vast, that it would be impossible for me to give a complete guide to it, even were I equipped for doing so. The obvious approach to it is through the published bibliographies and catalogues: e.g., the Subject Index of the London Library, the bibliographies at the end of the volume on the "Reformation" in the *Cambridge Modern History*, and those attached to the various articles in the great encyclopædias—the *Enc. Britannica* (eleventh edition), Hastings' *Enc. of Religion*, Herzog-Hauck's *Realencyklopædie*, the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, etc. In the London Library Catalogue, for instance,

[1] ARTICLES OF 1552, 1563, and 1571.

Art. XXXI. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*

The Offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

DECREES OF TRENT. Sessio XXII (Sept. 17, 1562).

De Sacrificio Missae.

*Canon* I. Si quis dixerit, in missa non offeri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium . . . anathema sit.

*Canon* II. Si quis dixerit, illis verbis: Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostolos sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut ipsi sacerdotes offerent corpus et sanguinem suum: anathema sit.

*Canon* III. Si quis dixerit, missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis,* . . . non autem propitiatorium; vel solum prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offeri debere: anathema sit.

*Canon* IV. Si quis dixerit, blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in cruce peracto per missae sacrificium, aut illi per hoc derogari: anathema sit.

* This seems to be directly aimed at the words in the English post-Communion prayer: "accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

is a list of published parish registers covering this period, fairly extensive though not complete.

Of prime importance are the great published collections of State Papers and other documents. In consulting the *Calendar of State Papers* it must be remembered that this consists for the most part only of *précis*, and that it may therefore in many cases be expedient to consult the original documents, which can be done at the Record Office. Much evidence is also to be found scattered in the *Reports* of the Historical MSS. Commission, e.g., the very valuable *Cecil Papers* preserved at Hatfield. Of peculiar value are the *Spanish State Papers* (published 1892–1896), the *Venetian Despatches* (1890)—it was the duty of Venetian ambassadors to send very detailed reports home—and the *Acts of the Privy Council* (1893–1896). The State Papers *Domestic, Addenda,* for 1547–1561 and 1566–1579, contain treasure-trove. Dr. W. H. Frere (now Bishop of Truro) published in 1910 the *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation.* Earlier collections are also still of use, e.g., Edward Cardwell's *Documentary Annals of the Church of England,* 1546–1716 (two vols., third edition, 1844).

In addition to such collections of documents, we have contemporary diaries, letters, chronicles and descriptions, such as those I have quoted—Wriothesley's *Chronicle,* Machyn's *Diary,* Strype's *Annals and Memorials,* William Harrison's *Description of England.*

I would also call attention to certain books and articles which, apart from their own contributions to the solution of the questions at issue, serve as an invaluable index to original sources. Especially I recommend two articles contributed by Mr. Horace Round to the *Nineteenth Century* in 1897, in the course of the very lively and instructive controversy which arose out of Mr. Birrell's inquiry, "What happened at the Reformation?" These are "The Elizabethan Religion" (vol. xli, p. 190) and "The Sacrifice of the Mass" (*ib.,* p. 837), to which I desire to acknowledge my own obligations. Quite apart from their controversial quality, which is reminiscent of the spirit of the Renaissance, they are models of historical method, and their wealth of exact references makes them an invaluable guide through the documentary maze. The fact that Mr. Round approaches this controversy wholly in the spirit of the scientific historian, and that he has always regarded an avoidable historical error as a crime, makes his judgment all the more valuable.

Of the innumerable modern books about the Reformation there are two or three to which I should like to draw attention. Mr. J. T. Tomlinson's *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies* (1897), is a controversial work written from the Protestant point of view, but it is admirably documented and its references are to be trusted. This, too, is a most useful guide-book. Mr. Tomlinson devotes much learning and space to a discussion of the Ornaments Rubric, and he gives an ingenious explanation of its appearance in the Prayer Book, which may be compared with what Canon McColl said on the subject in his *Reformation Settlement.*

Another very useful book is Theodor Kolde's *Die Augsburger Confession* (1896). This is a comparative study of the various Confessions of Faith put forward by the German Reformers up to 1540—the Marburg Articles, the Schwabach Articles, the Torgau Articles, the Augsburg Confession of 1530, and the *Augustana Variata* of 1540. He also prints in full the so-called *Confutatio pontificia*, the formal counterblast by Eck and others to the Augsburg Confession.

Lastly, I should like to draw special attention to Gieseler's *Ecclesiastical History* (Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte), of which an English translation was published in Edinburgh in 1865 by the Rev. John Winstanley Hull. Unfortunately this translation only carries down the history of the Church to the beginnings of the Reformation; the later volumes which carry it down to 1648 must be consulted in German. This, however, is of minor importance, as the value of the book lies more particularly in its elaborate citation of original authorities. It is this method, indeed, which—in the words of Gieseler's biographer—gives to this book, of which the first volume was published a hundred years ago, an "imperishable value." Gieseler was, in fact, one of the first of scientific historians, and his principles and methods well illustrate what I said at the beginning of this paper as to the right way to study and write history.

"Gieseler," says his biographer again, "conceived the chief task of the historian to be to show what has happened. But each age can only be rightly understood when we hear it speak itself. It is therefore by means of a comprehensive and exhaustive research into the sources, by an uninterrupted and impartial examination of the evidence, that he seeks to establish the historical facts, and to present them in a simple, strictly objective form—in a text kept as brief and as precise as possible and footnotes containing, in due sequence, well-chosen extracts from the sources, as well as copious literary references."

I would, indeed, suggest Gieseler's method as the best to follow in any effort that may be made to instruct people in what happened at the Reformation. As far as possible, let the Reformers and their contemporaries themselves speak. Let people know the evidence on both sides of the great controversy, in the language of the disputants. Let the bulk of the book, or books, consist of well-chosen extracts from the sources, with just enough of text to bind them together, as it were, and make them intelligible. For this purpose I do not think there is much need for laborious research into unpublished sources. Yet in one direction there is room for such work—I mean in the case of the parish registers. But few of these have been published, and it is precisely in these humble records that will be found what *did* happen in the parish churches throughout the land. The cumulative effect of this evidence, if collected, would be immense; and since, for this special purpose, it is only a somewhat narrow period that is to be covered, the labour involved would not be prohibitive—if some one can be found in each parish, or

group of parishes, to undertake it. In this connection I may mention that Mr. Round specially commends as "useful and instructive" Canon Raven's Introduction to Mr. Holland's "Cratfield Parish Papers" (1895). He quotes from this Introduction: "Few suspect the importance of those documents which are lying entombed in the parish chests of England."

---

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. issue in pamphlet form (3*d*. net) a Letter to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury from the Right Rev. E. A. Knox, D.D. (formerly Bishop of Manchester), on the occasion of the presentation of a Memorial against Changes in the Communion Office and Alternative Communion Services. This is followed by a Verbatim Report of the Speeches made on the occasion (Nov. 27, 1924) by the Marquis of Lincolnshire, the Countess of Leitrim, Sir Wm. Joynson-Hicks, Sir Henry de Beauvoir de Lisle, and Bishop Ingham. The whole forms a useful record of an important occasion.

---

*Ego Sum*, by Arthur C. Bruce (R.T.S., 6*s*. net), is "A Study of Some Aspects of the Logic of Personality." It is intended to help young men to answer some of the fundamental problems of life which often lead to doubt concerning the Christian verities. The author has had considerable experience of dealing with these questions as they appeal to the young, and in this volume he sets out his answers. He leads on from the consideration of the individual personality to God and the Incarnation, and thence to the victory won by the death and resurrection of Christ. The "Divine Scheme for the Universe" is thus set out, and many sources are drawn upon to illustrate the great truths maintained with much force and clearness.

---

Prof. C. F. Rogers' Study of Evidence in *Rome and the Early Church* (S.P.C.K., 1*s*. 6*d*. net) brings together a number of important passages bearing on the claims of supremacy for the See of Rome. From these he draws the modest conclusion that there is not sufficient evidence to lead English Churchpeople to desert their own Church for that of Rome. He adopts, however, a tone of deference to that Communion throughout, which is in marked contrast to that adopted by the protagonists of the Papacy. We have not the least desire to be discourteous to Romanists, but little is to be gained and much misunderstanding may arise on the part of Romanists at the almost adulatory tone in which references to them and to their Church are conceived. Why is it necessary to go out of one's way to say, for example, "the English Church may have many faults and the Roman (as she undoubtedly has) many virtues." Romanists are quite convinced on both points and do not require to be reminded of the faults of our Communion by one of its own members, or to have an unnecessary tribute to virtues of which they are fully conscious and lose no opportunity of proclaiming. It simply makes them feel that English Churchmen have something of which they are ashamed and increases their hopes of fresh recruits from our ranks to theirs.