Walter B.T. Douglas

The Eucharistic Theology of Thomas Cranmer in the Light of Recent Controversies

S.T.M., Divinity

ABSTRACT

This essay seeks to determine the nature of Cranmer's sacramental theology in the light of the controversies between Don Gregory Dix, Cyril C. Richardson and C.W. Dugmore. After tracing the slate of Eucharistic theology in the later Middle Ages and Reformation era, the author then examines Cranmer's own writings on the Lord's Supper. From this our study takes up the discussion between the three writers mentioned above, and the conclusion is that each, in some way shows certain weakness in his treatment of Cranmer's views.

It is argued that in this study that the difficulty of assessing Cranmer's concepts on the Lord's Supper, lies in the character of the man himself, and in the apparent contradictions that we find in some of his writings.

Finally, the author maintains that although Cranmer was basically "Swiss" in his sacramental theology, he was not entirely dependent upon Zwingli and the Zurich School for the development of his ideas. Also the evidence from his writings does not support Dugmore's theory that he was a realist - symbolist of the Augustinian tradition.

THE EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY OF THOMAS CRANMER IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT CONTROVERSIES

by

WALTER B. T. DOUGLAS

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Sanctae Theologiae Magister

Faculty of Divinity,
McGill University,
Montreal.

April, 1969

Dedicated to Dr. J.C.Kirby with deepest thanks for his encouragement and direction throughout the many months of preparation of this thesis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to thank the following individuals for their valuable assistance in his work: To Dr. J.C.Kirby a special word of appreciation is due first for suggesting the idea which resulted in the production of this thesis. Second for his guidance and criticism which have helped me to avoid many pitfalls in my work. To the librarians of the Faculty of Divinity for their cooperation in securing for me several important books and periodicals which were necessary for this study. And to Mrs Lily Schachter for her personal interest and patience in typing this manuscript. My debt to her is enormous.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

When in 1945 the Benedictine scholar Dom Gregory Dix published The Shape of the Liturgy, he precipitated a controversy which lasted for several years. Specifically the debate arose over the chapter - "The Reformation and the Anglican Liturgy". Dix maintained that when all Cranmer's writings are considered the ineluctable conclusion is that in his eucharistic theology Cranmer was a Zwinglian.

He adduced relevant passages from Cranmer's works to support his theory that from the time of his conversion from transubstantiation in 1546, Cranmer was a convinced and consistent Zwinglian. Dix advocated further that the First Prayer Book 1549, and in a special sense the Second Book 1552, was deliberately devised to give expression to the Zwinglian interpretation of the Eucharist. Thus Dix writes: "For my own part, surveying all the exposition of his own words...I am quite unable to distinguish the substance of his doctrine from that of Zwingli."[1]

E.L.Mascall noted that "Dix's thesis evoked startled protests from many Anglicans who had been

accustomed to look upon the 1549 rite as being, apart from a few minor features, their ideal of a vernacular liturgy, and to venerate Cranmer as a sound Catholic against whom the worst accusation that could be brought was that of a slight and easily excusable leaning towards receptionism."[2]

It is significant however that no less an authority than E.C.Ratcliff agreed that no other interpretation than Dix's was possible in the light of the evidence, and even suggested that his case might have been strengthened.

The first serious attempt to challenge Dix's thesis came from G.E.Timms in the form of two essays which appeared in the Church Quarterly Review 1947, under the title "Cranmer Dixit". Timms was convinced that Cranmer was not a Zwinglian. In the two essays he described Cranmer as a dynamic receptionist on the grounds that there are passages in his writings in which he plainly spoke of the faithful communicant as receiving the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament. According to Timms, it must be recognized that the whole emphasis of Dix's controversial chapter was to prove that the 1552 rite was contrived by Cranmer to express a eucharistic theology which has never been held by any except a small minority of English Churchmen, and to rule

out all other interpretation.[3] Further, Dix's interpretation of Zwingli's teaching on the sacraments is that they have "no force or efficacy of their own whatsoever. They are bare signs or ceremonies by which a man assures other people rather than himself of his saving faith in Christ's redemption."[4] Timms indicated that Dix's survey of Cranmer's works, is out of harmony with a balanced view of his writings. He suggested that this interpretation of Cranmer is due to four things: (1) Dix did not have, according to Timms, a true understanding of Protestantism even though he made a real effort to be fair and sympathetic to it. (2) He was confused by the presence of some passages in Cranmer's works which have an undoubtedly Zwinglian tone about them. (3) He has misinterpreted several crucial passages which are the basis of this theory about Cranmer. (4) Dix misunderstood the nature of faith as the reformers saw it;[5] he believed that for the reformers faith was "purely mental and psychological."[6]

This protest drew from Dix a rejoinder in the shape of two articles which he called "Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit". In these essays, he explained that the statements which Timms adduced from Cranmer's writings to prove his thesis of a dynamic receptionism, could also be found in the writings of such thorough going Zwinglians as Hooper,

Bullinger and even Zwingli himself. He added further, that the Zwinglians of the sixteenth century regarded the "spiritual eating of Christ's body" not as something directly connected with receiving Holy Communion, but purely as a mental and emotional exercise, which the reception of Holy Communion can on occasion accompany, but which is in no sense whatever dependent on participation in the Lord's Supper.[7]

Furthermore, Dix quoted Hooper as expressing complete satisfaction with Cranmer's views, and showed that almost all alterations in the 1549 rite for which the receptionist Bucer pressed in his Censura, were ignored by Cranmer in compiling the rite of 1552.

At the conclusion of his articles, Dix reasserted that "in so far as the prayers of our present eucharistic rite are Cranmer's workmanship, Receptionists...can only interpret them in worship as expressing their own belief by deliberately ignoring the declared intention of their author not only to repudiate, but to exclude devotional meaning which they seek to place upon them."[8]

In 1949 Cyril C.Richardson, an American theologian entered the controversy by publishing a paper Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist, with a subtitle

"Cranmer Dixit et Contradixit." In this work Richardson defended the thesis that Cranmer was a Zwinglian but with a difference. On the main issue he agreed with Dix, but insisted that Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine was not entirely identical with Zwingli's, and that Dix did not have a clear grasp of what the Reformers meant by the term "faith".[9] He rejects any suggestion that tended to describe Cranmer as a dynamic receptionist, and points out that Timms' categorization stems from his failure to distinguish between different modes of Christ's presence in the Eucharist.[10]

The difference Richardson sees between Zwingli and Cranmer relates to the manner in which the two understood the Lord's Supper to be a pledge.

"Where Zwingli's leading idea was that the pledge referred to Christians who by the Lord's supper gave public testimony to each other of their faith in Christ and of their resolution to lead the Christian life, Cranmer views the matter in a different light. The bread and wine are visible pledges, confirming our faith in the fact that Christ died for us, and assuring us that He now nourishes and unites Himself with us. They are not pledges that Christ now feeds us with the substance of His flesh."[11]

Richardson noted that Cranmer gave a higher value to the elements than Zwingli, and this is important to an examination of the eucharistic teachings of the two.

C.W.Dugmore criticized Dix and Richardson for their categorization of Cranmer as a Zwinglian.[12] Dugmore in his The Mass and the English Reformers, presents a thesis that is diametrically opposed to his opponents. He sees Cranmer not as a Zwinglian, but rather as a Reformed Catholic or Augustinian Realist - Symbolist. He argues that any theory which in fact identifies Cranmer with Zwinglianism is inconsistent with what Cranmer taught concerning the Eucharist. He tries to show the inconsistency in Dix's thesis by giving notice of the fact that the evidence Dix used to maintain his position rested almost entirely on passages taken from Cranmer's Defence which was written when à Lasco was at Lambeth, and on a mistaken view of what Zwingli really held.[13]

Thus Dugmore insisted that Cranmer held that non-papist Catholic doctrine of the real presence until the end of his life. Further, his writings, taken together show that he stood in the Catholic or Augustinian realist-symbolist tradition of eucharistic doctrine which was

handed down from the days of the Early Church.

A new point of view was introduced into the controversy with the appearance of Francis Clark's Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. In this study, Clark showed the inadmissability of the presupposition that the Reformers in general, and Cranmer in particular, did not quite understand the traditional Catholic doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice due to its corruption and distortion by Nominalism and other forms of popular piety in the medieval period. He advocated that such an argument presumed that the Reformers were incompetent when it is quite clear that we are dealing with some of the most acute minds of the age.

Clark admitted that Cranmer and his associates were willing to apply sacrificial terms to the Eucharist, but only in a sense that excluded what was essential to the traditional Catholic Doctrine. He contended that they had accurate knowledge of the authorized Catholic teaching on the Eucharistic Sacrifice and how it was presented by their contemporary opponents.

However, they could not but repudiate this teaching since it was in implicit contradiction with their basic theology of grace and justification.[14]

E.L.Mascall observed that "whatever is the truth about Cranmer's own beliefs, it is at least significant that the church of England, saddled as it was with Cranmer's liturgy, respectfully but firmly refused to interpret it in a Zwinglian sense."[15]

It is quite evident from our survey of the conflicting theories regarding Cranmer's eucharistic theology that the doctrinal and liturgical writings of Cranmer have always been highly controversial. Indeed, the controversy tends to leave one with the feeling that the justification of the English Reformation depends on an accurate assessment of what Cranmer taught about the Eucharist.

The following thesis seeks to examine Cranmer's eucharistic theology in the light of the controversy, especially between Dix, Richardson and Dugmore who represent radically opposite views.

In this study an effort will be made to follow Cranmer's thoughts through the various stages of his development in order to grasp what precisely were his theological understanding of the Eucharist. In doing this we are aware of the caveat of G.E.Rupp that the vocabulary of the sixteenth century was in a constant

state of change and that it is possible by a judicious selection of passages to show that Cranmer held views which in reality were held by his chief opponent Gardiner.[16]

With this caution in mind we come to the first chapter of our essay.

NOTES

1. Dom Gregory,Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, (Westminster; Dacre Press, 1945), p.656,

2. E.L.Mascall, The Recovery of Unity, (London; Longmans Green and Co., 1958), p.116.

3. G.B.Timms, "Cranmer Dixit" Church Quarterly Review, 1947, CXLIII, p.219, Hereafter CQR

4. Ibid., p.220.

5. Ibid., pp. 226,227.

6. Dix. op cit., p. 671.

7. Dix, "Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit", CQR, 1948, CXLV, CXLVI, p.162.

8. Ibid., p. 60.

9. Cyril C. Richardson, Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist, (Evanston; Seabury-Western Theological Seminary), 1949.

10. Ibid., p.22.

11. Ibid.,

12. C.W.Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, (London; Macmillan and Co.Ltd.,),1958, p.83.

13. Ibid., p.184.

14. Francis Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, (London; The Newman Press 1960), p.127.

15. Mascall, op cit., p.121.

16. G.E.Rupp, Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Traditions (Cambridge; University Press, 1947), p.185.

CHAPTER I

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CRANMER

Even a brief study of the life and the times of Cranmer presents two fundamental problems. The first is due to the complexities and uncertainties of the period, particularly with reference to the state of religion and the shifting political and ecclesiastical expedients of royal policy. The second relates to the controversy surrounding the character of Cranmer, his theological and liturgical teachings, and his role as Primate of England. After four hundred years the controversy has not yet ended.

As David Knowles has indicated no one can claim to approach such a study without prejudice, or having approached it, that he had presented Cranmer's actions in their true light. The English Reformation in which Cranmer was a conspicious figure, was not a project conceived and executed by one man. It was rather, a series of events wrought out amidst dynastic, political and social, as well as ecclesiastical upheavals, in which Henry VIII, Thomas Cromwell and Somerset, Mary I, no less than the Archbishop of Canterbury, played their several

and respective roles. The conflicting personalities and policies of Tudor England each contributed its share to the result. The theological and liturgical work of Cranmer was not carried out in academic retreat.[1]

Looking at the religious climate in England at the time of Cranmer's birth (1489), one could hardly have forecast the tremendous changes which were to come before his death sixty-seven years later.

Henry VII's (1485-1509) pre-occupation was certainly not with the religious condition of the country, but with the task of securing his own position and building a strong monarchy.

It is generally agreed among Tudor historians that the immediate occasion of the Reformation in England was Henry VIII's insistence on freeing himself, at all costs from his marriage with Catherine of Aragon. Undoubtedly, the events which shaped the development of the Reformation were greatly affected by this marriage and by the personalities involved in it. The occasion is, therefore, important but it must be distinguished from the more deeply rooted causes which made some kind of reformation probable.[2]

Period of crisis and transition

The religious condition of the country was a more potent factor in bringing about the break with Rome than were the personal desires of Henry VIII. As Hutchinson has noted, the King could not have effected his personal desire if there had been a stiff resistance on the part of the people to a rupture with Rome.[3]

This general dissatisfaction arose in England, not for doctrinal reasons, but from practical grievances. There were, for example, strong feelings of anti-clericalism and nationalism which led Englishmen to resent the payment of money to Rome and to regard papal collectors as foreigners. Both the king and his subjects believed that the authority of Rome over Englishmen had threatened their sovereign rights and had virtually reduced their country to being a state of the papacy. The enormous expense which was involved in appeals to Rome and the uncertainty regarding papal judgment witness to the increasing power of the papacy in England. Thus with the growth of national expenditure and the unexpanding revenue of the crown, the people looked covetously at the great wealth of the church and the sumptuous living of some of the clergy.

It was the opinion of many that the life and practice of the clergy was a greater hindrance to the church than the words of heretics. Because of this, there were voices which protested against the current abuses and emphasized the need for reform.

The influence of English humanism helped to prepare the way for the subsequent religious changes. The general criticisms of the humanists reflected the opinions and protests of the nation. These still devout and believing Catholics were greatly distressed over the Church's image in the world and many looked upon it as a state within the realm.

Daniel-Rops has described the condition of the church during this period in this way:

> "The church was not only at fault in being too Roman. The privileges which she had been granted to prevent her from being engulfed in the feudal world, and the enormous possessions which she had then accumulated, seemed out-dated and scandalous now that feudalism was so enfeebled and the state was becoming increasingly aware of its own prerogatives. This was particularly the view held by the middle class, which though sincerely religious, had a markedly practical attitude to life."(4)

In the light of the economic burden of the people on the one hand, and the increasing wealth of the church

on the other, Parliament readily supported the King's decision to confiscate the properties and revenues of the church. It can therefore be said, that the papacy's amassing of more and more wealth at the expense of Englishmen, certainly did not help the cause of the church.

In addition to the anti-clericalism and nationalistic hostility, the church was soon to encounter a serious opponent through the introduction of Lutheranism which was beginning to infect the universities. Archbishop Warham, recognizing the danger, drew Wolsey's attention to it and recommended that certain measures be adopted to prevent Lutheranism from spreading. Consequently, all books on Lutheranism that could be discovered, were confiscated and burnt.

In spite of this attempt by Wolsey and Henry VIII to prevent the spread of Lutheranism,[5] Lutheran books continued to find readers in the universities, especially at Cambridge, and as we shall see, the doctrines for which Luther contended were espoused and expounded by many scholars.

Henry's marital problem

The divorce of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon was to have far-reaching consequences both in its religious

and political character. It is not sure who provided Henry with the canonical and biblical argument which he adduced to support his claim for an annulment, but G.R.Elton champions the view that Henry's conscience is the clue for understanding his persistent demand for a separation.[6] In any event, the king, who was once the pope's protector now by force of circumstances became his enemy. His disappointment in Rome's failure to grant the annulment, was expressed in a release of feelings against the church and the pope.[7]

With the abortive attempt to persuade the papacy through negotiations and request the king now cast about for a new approach that would force the hands of his enemy to bend to his desires.

When the Reformation Parliament met in 1529 a series of measures were passed which witnessed to the power and resolution of Parliament to interfere with ecclesiastical preferments. By the Act of Supremacy (1534) the king was made the only Supreme Head of the church in England.

Thomas Cranmer first came to the attention of Henry VIII through a chance conversation with two friends. It was not at all strange that Gardiner and Fox, Henry's

ministers, should have discussed the question of the king's annulment with their friend whose acquaintance began when they were together at Cambridge. At the time of this eventful meeting, Cranmer was in flight from the plague that had visited Cambridge, and Gardiner and Fox were visiting with the king at Waltham where Cranmer was staying.

Upon hearing the matter, Cranmer suggested that it should be discussed among the universities who should pass judgment on it. This suggestion was not unusual, for it was a common practice in those days for the universities to act as arbiters. Cranmer probably did not know that Henry had sent six representatives to Cambridge to debate with the doctors on the question. "Whether it were lawful for one brother to marry his brother's wife, being known to his brother."[8] The opinion of the doctors was that such a marriage was lawful, subject to the Pope's dispensation.

What, then, was the importance of Cranmer's suggestion? The novelty of his opinion was in his insistence that the king's affair was a scriptural and theological question and not a legal one.

Viewing the matter in this light, Cranmer's second

decisive comment was that the king should avoid the frustations and dilatory tactics of the courts. He said, "there is but one truth in it (the king's marriage) which no men ought or better can discuss than the divines: whose sentence may be soon known...that the king's conscience may thereby be quieted and pacified."[9]

Relying on this opinion, the king acted without any further delay. As Innes put it, the dictation of Rome was now reduced to the level of an expert opinion and it is true that ultimate judgment reverted to the king.[10] It was at this point that Cranmer came in contact with the king. Henry concluded that he was the right man for his purpose so he promptly brought him to the court as royal chaplain. Almost without warning Cranmer found himself in a world of political intrigue and with the responsibility of guiding the church through the stormiest seas. His immediate task was to prove by whatever means, that the king's marriage to Catherine was unlawful according to canon law and the laws of consanguinity.

Cranmer's diplomatic mission

There is no doubt that Henry saw in Cranmer the instrument most perfectly adapted to his requirement. In the early part of 1530, he sent his new servant on a

diplomatic mission to Paris, Rome, and the cities in the Holy Roman Empire to dispute his cause for an annulment. Cranmer remained in Rome for sometime while his associates went on to meet with Charles V. On January 24, 1531, Henry appointed Cranmer as his sole ambassador to the Emperor. Indeed this was an important step for Cranmer, for as a member of the Emperor's court he was privileged to travel throughout Germany. Thus he was able to develop some intimate associations with leading continental reformers and with Lutherans and their doctrines, for which he had a very high esteem. Also he met and married his second wife who was the niece of Andreas Osiander the Lutheran pastor and reformer of Nuremberg.

According to Ridley, it was at this time Cranmer took at least the first step towards becoming a Lutheran. As ambassador his mission abroad was abruptly ended with the death of William Warham (1532) who was then the Archbishop of Canterbury. Until now, Cranmer was still a private theologian whose opinions on the king's marital problem proved serviceable to the king. But the death of Warham was the beginning of a new life for Cranmer. He did not anticipate nor desire the ecclesiastical and

political administration in which he was later to be involved.

We can find evidence in his writing to support this view. In 1555 for example, at the time of his trial he affirmed: "...There was never a man came more unwillingly to a bishopric that I did to that."[11]

Cranmer's political philosophy

The story of the consequence of Cranmer's role in securing the annulment for Henry and his marriage to Anne Boleyn is too well known to require further documentation. In contrast, his political philosophy is both controversial and complex. Cranmer lived in an age of revolution and political intrigue, but his political theory and conviction did not emerge from the shifting and confused situation of Tudor politics.

It is argued, that for Cranmer, belief in Royal Supremacy was as fundamental a principle as his belief in the Supremacy of Scripture. Being convinced that obedience to the 'godly prince' was not merely a theory but a religious principle, he maintained that the monarchy is to be obeyed as long as his commands do not conflict with the commands of God as they are revealed in Holy Scripture.

Accordingly, he argued, he who devotes his life to

service in the context of the civil authority must do so only in response to a divine vocation. Thus one obeys God by obeying the monarch. This concept of uniting faith in the Holy Scripture with obedience to the Prince must inevitably lead Cranmer into conflict with Rome.

In seeking to explain Cranmer's erastianism C.H.Smyth asserted that the general discontent with the church, and the cry for a reform on doctrinal principles were not only Cranmer's concern, but the concern of both clergy and laity in England. He stated:

> "It was an essentially patriotic movement and in that age politics and religion were less clearly distinguished than they are today, and the clergy were, for the most part, as good patriots as the laity." 12. Therefore to blame Cranmer for being an erastian is as reasonable as to blame him for living in the first half of the sixteenth century. 13

Indeed, as we shall see, Cranmer was driven to painful compromises with conscience as he sought to follow the unstable political and ecclesiastical policies of the "godly princes."

Cranmer's reform projects

His election as Archibishop (1532) coincided with a steady decline of the traditionalists influence in England, and with the death of Henry VIII (1547), and the accession of Edward VI, the Archbishop's influence increased so that within a short time he was able to

move further away from Latin Catholicism which was the official religion in England.

Among some of Cranmer's early reforms were his insistence on the translation of the Bible in the vernacular, the Litany, and the preparation of an ordinance for receiving communion in both kinds. Shortly afterwards, he secured an entire repeal of the Act of Six Articles and the abolition of images and took steps that would turn the Mass into a communion service in English.

There were other achievements which were guided by Cranmer's genius, the most notable being, the Books of Common Prayer. Although it is beyond our purpose to analyse in any detail the content and structure of these Books, nevertheless, it seems pertinent to make a few remarks about them.

It is frequently assumed that Cranmer was the author or sole compiler of the two Edwardian Prayer Books. Aidan Kavanagh, for example, explicity states:

> "There can be no doubt that the two Prayer Books which have come to be associated with his name are Cranmerian.....In addition to the common attribution by contemporary Reformers of the Books to him, testimony to this fact was given by Bishop Gardiner of Winchester, Cranmer's bitterest opponent."(14)

E.C.Ratcliff supports this view; He said:

> "In all, the evidence, such as it is, is enough to dispel all doubts....that the two Edwardine Prayer Books may be said to be Cranmer's. If he allowed others to supply him with forms of prayers, he so revised them as to stamp them with his own style. All trace of composite-ness of authorship, if such indeed there were, has disappeared. It is both easier and accordant with the known facts, to suppose that conception and execution alike were the work of one man, and to suppose, also, that they were the out-come of at least several years of read-ing, deliberation, and experiment."(15)

According to M.Ramsey, the Book of Common Prayer, despite the alterations between 1549-1662, owes its character to the genius of Archbishop Granmer in writing liturgical prose.[16] It is hardly a matter of dispute to assert that Cranmer had read widely the works of the Early Fathers in the dual capacity of student and lecturer at Cambridge.[17] He was familiar with the liturgies of the Lutheran and Reformed churches as well as the Mozarabic rite.

The Prayer Book of 1549 was the first gathering of the fruits of Cranmer's many years of reading and thinking about liturgy and worship. The Scheme of the English Book was reminiscent of the liturgical portions of the Lutheran Church Orders. Its basic

principle, also seemed to be that of the Lutheran liturgies.[18] This, however, should not lead to the conclusion that the 1549 rite was merely a reproduction of a Lutheran liturgical book. It is true that Cranmer was not original in the sense of creating a brand new rite, independent of all models or material. But he was never completely circumscribed by his models, and did exhibit a creativeness, often brilliant, in his method of using models and adapting his material to his purpose. Ratcliff has observed that Cranmer's creativeness attains its fullest felicity in his eucharistic canon.[19]

The framework of the English rite of 1549 is that of the traditional Latin Mass, subjected to Lutheran modification, in the form of exhortations, extended communion devotions, and a constant postcommunion prayer in place of the variable postcommunion collect of the Mass. However, Cranmer's rite differs from the Lutheran and all other Reformation rite, in respect of the canon which is reminiscent, both in name and general arrangement, of the Roman Canon Missae.[20]

In T.M.Parker's estimation the Book was an ingenious essay in ambiguity, so deliberately constructed that "....

at every point which there was a vital doctrinal difference between the Old Learning and the New, one finds a careful use of words which would enable a Protestant to use the service with good conscience."[21]

If this book, particularly in its eucharistic rite, was meant by Cranmer to be at least compatible with his own ideas as well as politically expedient for imposition at that time in England, that of 1552 was meant to clarify and make more precise those same ideas at a time when it should be deemed possible to do so by invoking the coercive power of the secular government.

Although Dugmore does not think Cranmer is equally responsible for the Second Prayer Book[22] as he was for the First, yet there is sufficient ground for thinking that Cranmer had determined upon a revision of the 1549 rite as soon as it had come into use. He recognized, more clearly, doubtless through the influence of some of his continental friends, that liturgy must inevitably express doctrines.

Thus, in 1552 The Second Book appeared. If we compare this book with the 1549 rite we will readily see that considerable changes were made in the outward form

of the rite, and that these imply doctrinal and theological differences as well as a departure from the Western liturgical tradition.[23] To be sure, the Book met with tremendous opposition from the various pressure groups, and it is clear that some coercion of the bishops by royal authority was imminent should they prove obstinate to the changes.[24]

Thus Cranmer was able to give himself fully to furthering the Reformation by his five great projects the propagation of his eucharistic doctrine, the revision of the First Prayer Book, the formation of new articles of faith, and a code of ecclesiastical law and the unification of the Protestant movement.[25]

Progress and Achievement

It was the accession of Mary which overthrew all Cranmer's hopes and projects. He became involved in a bitter controversy over the succession of Mary, and by his own act of infidelity to the Act of Supremacy and the principle of the 'godly prince' he had been pressured, against his will, to sign a document intending to crown Lady Jane Grey as Queen. This plot proved abortive, and was the first step in Cranmer's fall.

The history of his examinations and vacillations

is well known. However, two points are of great significance. The first has to do with Cranmer's difficulty in placing a boundary between duty to the christian sovereign and obedience to what he believed to be the doctrine of scripture in matter's of theology. The second point relates to the bitter experience he went through of seeing his life's work undone, his friends tortured and executed, and the distressing kind of physical, mental and moral pressures to which he was subjected.

The courage he showed at the hour of his trial and at his execution made Cranmer a hero and martyr in the eyes of the Protestant refugees; even men who had previously been opposed to Cranmer's policies now admired his courage.

When all the personal, theological and political factors which influenced the course of the Reformation and the liturgical change in England, are considered, there can be very little doubt that Cranmer's achievements were remarkable indeed. The king's marital problem, the separation from Rome, the principle of royal authority in religious matters, his liturgical reforms and the codification of belief which followed

in 1553, all these and more were the results of the genius of Thomas Cranmer.

Certainly, he would have been a more easily intelligible and in some ways a more admirable character if he had been less malleable. Yet the general verdict which has, I think, emerged from all the controversy that has raged around him is that his unique combination of a policy of radical change along certain lines, with a deep respect for tradition along others, enabled the Church of England to preserve an essential continuity which might easily have been wrecked, and made it possible later for some of his own misjudgements and failures to be corrected without revolutionary disturbances of the Church's life. He bequeathed to the newly reformed English Church an instrument of worship which was to ensure to it a principle of life and to impart to Anglican Christianity its distinctive stamp.[26]

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Norman Sykes et al. Thomas Crammer 1489-1556, (Westminster, S.W.I: The Church Information Board, 1958), p.5.

2. F.E.Hutchinson, Cranmer and the English Reformation, (London: Hazel Watson and Viney Ltd, 1966), p.1.

3. Ibid.,

4. H. Daniel-Rops, The Protestant Reformation, (London: J.M.Dent and Sons Ltd, 1958), p.458.

5. At Cambridge, a discussion group known at that time as "Little Germany", became the academic response to Luther's teaching. It is a real paradox that when Wolsey was choosing men to staff his new college at Oxford he chose some of the same men who were members of this group. Thus he inadvertently injected the other university with Lutheranism. There is no evidence of this group being joined by Cranmer, though he undoubtedly must have been in contact with some of its members.

6. G.R.Elton, The New Cambridge Modern History, (12.Vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1958), Vol II, pp.230-231.

7. Ibid.,

8. Neelak Serawlook Jernagel, Henry VIII and The Lutherans, A study in Anglo-Lutheran Relations 1521-1547, (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House 1965), p.68.

9. Ibid.,

10. A.G.Innes, Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark,1900),p.45

11. Thomas Cranmer Works, Quoted in G.W.Bromiley, Thomas Cranmer Theologian, (London: Lutterworth Press,1956), p.IX.

12. C.H.Smyth, Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI, (Cambridge: University Press MCMXXVI), p.30.

13. Ibid.,

14. Aidan Kavanagh, The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in Thomas Cranmer,(St.Meinard Indiana: Abbey Press, Publishing Division, 1964),p.174.

15. E.C.Ratcliff, "Liturgical Work of Archbishop Cranmer." (7.1956) Journal of Ecclesiastical History.p.191

16. Michael Ramsey, "The Observer," May 20,1962.

17. John Strype, Memorials of Thomas Cranmer the Most Reverend Father in God.(2 Vols; London:Oxford University Press,1840) Vol.1,2,3, Hereafter Memorials

18. Ratcliff, op.cit., p.195.

19. Ibid., p.196.

20. C.H.Smyth, E.C.Ratcliff and C.W.Dugmore agree that this was the scheme Cranmer followed in compiling the 1549 Rite. Smyth, op.cit., 34f., 74-7; Ratcliff, op.cit., pp.195,196. C.W.Dugmore "The First Ten Years". The English Prayer Book: 1549-1662, (London:S.P.C.K. 1963), p.8.

21. T.M.Parker, The English Reformation to 1558, , p.130, Parker p.131, thinks that the final stage in the development of Cranmer's eucharistic thought was completed by 1548. (London: Oxford University Press, 1950).

22. Dugmore, op cit., p.10.

23. Ratcliff, op cit., p.200.

24. Kavanagh, op cit., p.32

25. Ibid.,

26. Ratcliff, op cit.,p. 203.

CHAPTER II

THE STATE OF THE EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY IN THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

> "...One in truth is the universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved. In this church, Jesus Christ himself is at once priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine into His blood by divine power, so that for the perfecting of the mystery of unity, we might receive from Him what He received from us." 1

There is a way of looking at the development of doctrine that sees it as the successive unfolding of two complimentary processes, the process of discovery and the process of exposition. The pivotal point between the two is the enunciation by the church of the doctrinal understanding which was achieved in the first process and which is to be explained, taught and lived in the second. The Lateran definition, (1215) quoted above, is both an end and a beginning. It was an end to the centuries-long process of formulating the meaning for faith in Christ's words at the Last Supper, a process that had its antecedents in the ninth century with the monastic controversies about the identity of

the eucharistic body with the historical body of Christ, and continued through the eleventh and twelfth centuries as the reaction to Berengarius' denial of the reality of Christ's presence in the Sacrament. The dispute was started by two monks of Corbey. Paschasius Radbertus (Abbott 844-51), maintained a theory of the presence, which anticipated later discussion about transubstantiation, while his opponent Ratramnus (c 840), argued in favour of a real as against a corporeal or material presence.[2]

It will therefore be our task to indicate how some of the later medieval theologians carried out this process. To accomplish this we will offer a few observations of the general context and shape of eucharistic theology in that period, and then go on to examine in greater detail two of the themes which dominated eucharistic doctrine at the time, namely, transubstantiation and sacrifice.

The first observation brings to view the close connection between doctrine and liturgy in the high medieval period. An eloquent witness to this unity in church life is the Office and Feast of Corpus Christi

probably composed by St.Thomas, which was introduced into the Church calendars in 1264. The hymns and prayers of this liturgy, especially the Lauda Sion, reflect the theological elaboration of the doctrine of the Real Presence. Likewise, such liturgical practices as the lighting of a lamp before the tabernacle, genuflections, and the elevation of the Host after the consecration, witness to the penetration of doctrine into the sphere of worship and piety. The great medieval theologians lived and worked in this atmosphere, and they both contributed to and received inspiration from this lived unity. The abuses and exaggerations sometimes associated with these liturgical practices, especially in the later period, do not detract from the genuineness of their original inspiration or from their value as a theological source. They may, however, be symptomatic of certain theological failures of the later period, as we shall see.

The second observation concerns the relationship between the mystery of the Eucharist and the mystery of the Church. In the text of the Lateran decree (1215), it was indicated that the Eucharistic doctrine is set in a framework of Church unity: the 'one Church' is to

be perfected in the 'mystery of Unity' through this Sacrament.

It was one of the convictions of the great medieval theologians, as it had been of the Fathers, that the principal effect of the Eucharist, its '<u>res tantum</u>' as they called it, was the unity of the Church as the mystical body of Christ. The very name 'mystical body' had first been used in the early Middle Ages to designate the Eucharist, and was only later and by a gradual process applied exclusively to the Church.[3] St. Thomas who developed this concept most fully in his theology, refers to the Eucharist as the "sacrament of Church unity", and the same designation is found in Gabriel Biel at the end of the fifteenth century.[4] Although it is not the task of this paper to engage in a prolonged discussion of unity, yet it would be important to bear in mind that it was of some significance in the theological context of the period.

The final observation concerns the unequal development of eucharistic theology in the period between Lateran IV and the Reformation. It must be acknowledged that in the Lateran decree the doctrine of transubstantiation is fully developed, while the doctrine of sacrifice is only

indicated, as it were in passing. Many writers have submitted various reasons for this apparent lack of interest in the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice at this time. The fact is, we have here a kind of paradigm of the proportion (or disproportion) that we will find in all the works of the theologians of the late Middle Ages. The doctrine of the real presence absorbs almost all the attention of the doctors, while the doctrine of the sacrifice is treated either not at all or only briefly.

One reason for this failure to thematize and develop the sacrificial aspect of the Sacrament seems to lie in the common law that theological developments occur mainly as the result of a shock or challenge to the truth hitherto held in peacful possession. In this instance, the challenge had been built by the Berengarians and neo-Manicheans of the eleventh and twelfth centuries who had denied the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament. In consequence one finds this aspect of the Eucharist receiving detailed study and vindication throughout the Middle Ages. In contrast, the sacrifice had not yet been directly or explicitly attacked (except by the Albigensians, and there the issue was a more general one

of the presence.) Thus there is to be found in the later theologians the tendency to reiterate what the Fathers or Peter Lombard had said on the subject, without really attempting to evolve their own understanding of the doctrine.

In fact, many of them, in commenting on the Sentences of Peter Lombard, by-passed altogether the section where he had treated this question.[5] This fact is of key importance for assessing the total theological situation of the later Middle Ages.

With these observations we can now turn our attention more closely to a study of the eucharistic teaching of some of the theologians. Admittedly, this cannot be done in too great a detail, because of the length of the period and the many authors involved. For this reason, it is more fruitful, I believe to consider those few who represent the main schools of thought and whose influence was greatest throughout the whole period up until the Reformation.

The doctrine of transubstantiation

It was once held that the history of the doctrine of transubstantiation was a fairly simple doctrine. Some maintained the view that the physical presence of Christ

in the Eucharist quite naturally and inevitably evolves into the doctrine of transubstantiation, given the context of Aristotelianism in which theology works from the early thirteenth century onwards.[6]

But recent scholarship has shown that there was no such inevitability; rather, a considerable number of medieval theologians for more than two centuries before the Reformation thought that transubstantiation was not a necessary consequence of the doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

It is an acknowledged fact that the writings of St.Ambrose and St.Augustine are the chief patristic sources of the eucharistic controversies from the ninth to the eleventh centuries. From the thoroughly orthodox Ambrose came a strong emphasis on the change of the bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Christ. From the equally orthodox Augustine came a strong emphasis on the non-identity of the bread and wine and the body and blood of Christ, and on Christ's presence in the Eucharist in spirit and in power.

It is not necessary in this paper to articulate precisely what Augustine and Ambrose did think about the Eucharist. They are brought into our story only to show that they are the principal patristic sources for two

conflicting tendencies which were to have far-reaching results in later centuries.

The doctrine of transubstantiation was formulated gradually in the twelfth century in order to express more clearly the faith of christians in the real presence, and to exclude heretical interpretations. The word itself was employed by theologians from about 1150, and it was sanctioned by the use of the Lateran Council as we have seen.[7]

Thomas' views on transubstantiation

The systematic explanation of the doctrine was the achievement of the great scholastic doctors of the thirteenth century; Albert, Bonaventure, Thomas and Scotus. Among them and their disciples in the following centuries there was basic agreement on the essentials of the doctrine, with some differences in the manner of conceiving and expressing it. It is well known that the classical expression and explanation is that of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) who has received from the tradition the title of 'Doctor Eucharisticus'. His treatment of the Sacrament is found in its most mature form in the Summa Theologica, Part III, Questions 73-83. After examining the sacramentality of the Eucharist (Question 73) and its material elements (Question 74),

he takes up the question of the eucharistic conversion in Question 75.

Thomas is chiefly concerned to affirm and explain as far as possible, the truth of Christ's presence in the Sacrament and in every part thereof. He finds in the dogma of transubstantiation the basis for a sane eucharistic realism and in the philosophy of Aristotle, corrected and adapted to the exigencies of the Christian faith, an apt instrument for its theological elaboration. The central affirmation, which governs the whole treatment is found in article 4:

> "...by the divine power, in this sacrament the whole substance of the bread is converted into the whole substance of Christ's body and the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of Christ's blood. Hence this change is not a formal change but a substantial one... and it can be called by a proper name:transubstantiation."(8)

The principal argument that Thomas uses to uphold this doctrine of total change is the literal sense of the words 'This is my blood' - the scriptural words of institution and, for Thomas, the very form of the Sacrament. Total change of the substance is the necessary condition for the truth of these words. Thus, to the question whether the substance of the bread and wine

remain after the consecration, he replies that "this position contradicts the form of this sacrament which says 'This is my body? This would not be true if the substance of the bread were still there, since the substance of bread is not Christ's body."[9]

B.J.Kidd, in a critical comment on Thomas' teaching of transubstantiation informs us that St. Thomas' new definition of sacrifice presents in one way the problem at hand...He makes sacrifice to consist in more than mere oblation. It involves a change of some sort produced in the condition of the victim.[10]

It is to be noted that we have in St.Thomas an intellectual and metaphysical conception of reality, which judges <u>that</u> to be real which is reasonably affirmed, either on the evidence of experience, or as in this case, on the authority of God's word. He affirmed:

> "We could never know by our senses that the real body of Christ and His blood are in this sacrament, but only by faith (sola fide) which is based on the authority of God." 11

On the basis of this realism of faith, Thomas rejects every purely symbolical interpretation of the Sacrament, as well as any opinion that would leave the

substance or any part of it after the consecration, Only the species, which, in relation to the substance, are called accidents, remain, and they are sustained in being without any proper subject in which to inhere.[12]

Thomas rejects any possibility of Christ becoming present in the sacrament by a local change, since locally, if one can use the word in this context, He is in heaven and remains there. Corpus Christi in nullo modo localiter. What happens in the Eucharist is on a much deeper level, a properly ontological level. There is a change in the order of being and Thomas insists that this change is due to the divine power alone, because God alone can "change that which is being in one thing to that which is being in another."[13]

According to McCue, Thomas was the first thirteenth century writer to label consubstantiation heretical and the first one to consider it impossible. Thomas writes:

> " I reply that to, the first question it must be said that this position, asserting that after the consecration the substance of bread remains together with the true body, is inappropriate to this sacrament, is impossible and is heretical. Inappropriate because it stands in the way of the veneration that is owing to this sacrament....., that it is impossible is seen from the fact that it is impossible for something now to be when previously it had not been unless it is itself changed or something is changed into it."(14)

The conception of the eucharistic change which is present in Thomas' thought is closely linked to the profound metaphysical notion of being which is the hallmark of the Thomist school. This was its greatness but also its limitation. The Thomist metaphysic of reality was not always understood and appreciated in the following centuries, especially in the nominalist school.

Duns Scotus teaching on transubstantiation

It is with John Duns Scotus (1270-1308) that we notice the first important change of thought, because with him the doctrine of transubstantiation comes to be a question of authority of the post-apostolic Church than of the understanding of the Eucharist. It is also a noticeable shift away from the intellectual realism of Aquinas towards a kind of voluntarism that is at once scrupulously zealous to maintain the absolute freedom of God against the demands of human intelligence, and inclined towards subtle, critical distinctions that stem as much from imagination as from reason. Thus, Scotus does not see any internal contradiction in the idea that the bread should remain to co-exist with the body of Christ; absolutely speaking, God could bring this about. He denies, however, that this happens. After refuting all the arguments put forward against consubstantiation and

arguing against transubstantiation, he then turns around and repudiates them, holding firmly to the doctrine for which Thomas contended. It is quite clear that Scotus already conceded most of what Luther will later claim: that the dogma of transubstantiation has no other support than the authority of the Church.[15] The doctrine of the real presence is altogether independent of it, and neither Scripture nor reason requires it, yet one cannot be an orthodox christian unless one maintains it. Transubstantiation has no discernible origin and no appreciable end; but anyone who would deny it is anathema.

Scotus also differed from Thomas in his manner of conceiving the Eucharistic change. In his early works, he toyed with the idea of an annihilation of the bread, but later rejected this in favour of a theory of "adduction", that is, a 'bringing in' of the body of Christ to replace the substance of the bread. This involved a local change, and whereas Thomas had excluded this possibility in favour of a strict ontological conversion, Scotus saw no difficulty in Christ's body being in many places at one time.[16]

There are other minor points of difference, stemming from different philosophical positions on the structure of material reality and the relation of accidents to substance. More significant perhaps is the beginning, with Scotus, of the tendency to concentrate on the philosophical questions connected with the real presence, especially on the metaphysical status of the separated accidents, to the neglect of other topics of more vital concern to the religious life of people.[17]

Ockham's views of transubstantiation

This tendency is even more marked in William of Ockham (c 1300-1349) who is critical of both Thomas and Scotus in his nominalist theory of knowledge, but tends to follow the latter in his eucharistic teaching. He pushes the voluntarist tendency even further. While maintaining, de potentia Dei ordinata - what in fact God has done, as known through revelation and authoritative teaching - that the real presence is effected through the conversion of the bread into the substance of Christ's body, he holds that de potentia Dei absoluta- what God could do - the substance of the bread could coexist with Christ's body in the Sacrament, and that this position contains fewer theological difficulties than the traditional

explanation.[18]

Ockham went further than Scotus also in his manner of conceiving the change. He held that transubstantiation "involved the annihilation, in the less strict sense of the term, of the substance of the bread, and the succession of the substance of Christ's body to the place of the remaining species."[19] This again involved some kind of local change.

Ockham discourses at length on the question of quantity in relation to substance, and attempts to apply his ideas on quantity to the Eucharist. This seems to have been one of his major concerns, and witnesses again to the concentration on secondary philosophical questions that we have noted in Scotus.

Gabriel Biel (d 1495), the last of the medieval theologians and an ardent disciple of Ockham, reflects the whole tradition, and especially the ideas of the Franciscan school. Consequently he is an important witness to the state of eucharistic theology on the eve of the Reformation as we shall see in our study of the sacrifice. We introduce him in our story at this point only to indicate that while he reflects the logical preoccupations of his predecessors in his academic writings

"in his sermons, he warns repeatedly against curiosity about problems such as the quantity and ubiquity of the Eucharistic Christ."[20]

In summary, the doctrine of transubstantiation was taught by all the theologians of this period; it received its classical metaphysical explanation in Aquinas; after him, there was a tendency towards abstract speculations, which, while remaining within the bounds of orthodoxy, were more and more divorced from the daily life of the Church.

The doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice

While the doctrine of the real presence could look back to a long period of development for its ideas and terminology, there was in the Middle Ages no similar development and no official definition of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. In order to see what was the traditional teaching on the subject, we shall have to go back to the standard source-book, the Sentences of Peter Lombard which dates from the middle of the twelfth century.

In Distinction XII of his Fourth book, the Master of the Sentences proposed this central question:

> "Whether what the priest does is properly called a sacrifice or immolation and whether Christ is daily immolated or was immolated only once?"

> "To this we may briefly reply that what is offered and consecrated by the priest is called a sacrifice and an immolation because it is a memorial and a representation of the true sacrifice and holy immolation made upon the altar of the cross. Christ died once, upon the cross, and there he was immolated in his own self (immolatus est in semetipso); and yet everyday he is immolated sacramentally (in sacramento), because in the sacrament there is a recalling of what was done once". 21

Peter Lombard, taking his cue from decisive passages from Augustine and one from Chrysostom (which he attributes to Ambrose), concludes that

> "from these passages we gather that what is done at the altar both is called and is a sacrifice, and that Christ was offered once and is offered daily but in a different manner then and now". 22

This was the doctrine that the later scholastic theologians had before them when they came to lecture on the Sentences. Clark corroborates this view. He comments:

> "The great theologians of the thirteenth century, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, St.Albert the Great, St.Thomas Aquinas and many others repeated the standard patristic texts from Lombard and from Gratian, and cast the traditional doctrine of the Mass into systematic form". 23

But as was however said, they had surprisingly little to say about it. Fr. Lepin comments that "the simple instruction of the 12th distinction seems to have required neither completion nor clarification."[24]

Evidently the apparent lack of interest in the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist is due in part to the fact that there was no significant controversy on the question whereas the controversy about the real presence had provided a fertile field for discussion.

One might also infer that this tacit agreement of the later theologians with the teaching of Peter Lombard argues to a certain uniformity of doctrine. Aquinas is a little more precise in Question 83 of his treatise on the Eucharist. He asks: "Whether Christ is immolated in the sacrament?" After mentioning the classical objections (the oneness of Christ's oblation attested in Hebrew 10:14, the non-crucifixion aspect of the Mass, and the non-identity between the priest and the victim), he answers that the celebration of this sacrament is called a sacrifice for two reasons, first, "because it is an image representing Christ's passion, which is His true sacrifice," and secondly, "because by it we are made partakers of the fruits of our Lord's

passion." In reply to the objections he cites the text of Chrysostom to the effect that "there is but one victim, not many, because Christ was offered but once; and this sacrifice (Christ's) is the pattern of the other." He further specifies the relation of the Mass to the cross by stating that in this representative image of the passion," the altar represents the cross on which "Christ was immolated in His own form (specie).". By a like reasoning, he asserts that the priest "bears the image of Christ" and pronounces the words of consecration "in His person and by His power, therefore, the priest and victim in the Mass are "somehow the same."[25]

This last point suggests what he clearly affirms elsewhere, that the sacrifice is essentially accomplished in the consecration, and more specifically through the separate consecration of the bread and wine, which represents the separation of the blood from the body of Christ on the cross.[26] The same words of consecration that bring about the transubstantiation of the elements also realized the sacramental representation of the sacrifice of Calvary. The sacrificial teaching is thus held in close connection with the real presence: "The Eucharist

is the perfect sacrament of the Lord's passion because it contains Christ Himself who suffered."[27] It is from the presence of the Crucified Lord that the sacrifice derives its reality and efficacy. It is not a new expiation but an application of the merits of Christ on the Cross; by it we are united to the Crucified and share in the fruits of His passion.[28]

B.J.Kidd in a comment on Thomas' Sacrificial concept sustains the view that:

> "Dr.Vacant is perfectly justified in dating the 'phase moderne' of the conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice from St.Thomas, because he imported two new elements into the idea of sacrifice - both of them unfortunately to be classed with those purely a priori notions of sacrifice out of which most of later controversy has grown. First, he emphasizes the idea of propitiation as essential to it. Secondly, he makes sacrifice to consist of a change of some sort produced in the condition of the victim. His definition in its definitive form clearly opens the way for popular belief in repeated sacrifices." 29

Just as Scotus had differed from Aquinas in his explanation of the real presence, so too he had a slightly

different theory of the eucharistic sacrifice. He deals with the subject only incidentally in Quodlibet, which is concerned with the problem of the fruits of the Mass and the Mass stipends. His emphasis is on the role of the Church as offerer of the sacrifice. For him, the eucharistic sacrifice requires, over and above the presence of Christ on the altar realized in the consecration, the actual liturgical oblation by the Church, praying that God would accept it. "The Mass consists both in representation of that offering made upon the cross, and in pleading thereby: that is, pleading that through it God would accept the sacrifice of the Church."[30]

Scotus draws a distinction between the sacrifice of the Cross, in which Christ alone was both victim and offerer, and the sacrifice of the Mass in which Christ is present as victim and high priest, but which is immediately offered by the Church. Because of this difference in the immediate offerer, the Mass is not of equal value with the Cross, as Thomas had held on the basis of the identity of priest and victim. Scotus is concerned to keep the Mass clearly subordinated to the Cross; the latter, which is dependent on the will

of Christ, is of infinite value, while the former is of finite value because it is dependent on the collective will of the Church, whose merit is of finite degree.[31]

In summary, Scotus emphasizes the subordinate and relative character of the Mass as sacrifice of the Church which represents, commemorates, and applies the unique sacrifice of Christ. His theory was to have many followers both before and after Trent.[32]

Biel's doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice

We have an important witness to the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice that was held in the later nominalist school in Gabriel Biel's Expositio sacri canonis missae, first published in 1488, and often thereafter.[33] This was the book that Luther read 'with a bleeding heart' as he prepared to celebrate his first Mass; a copy of the book with Luther's annotations on the pages is still extant.[34]

In his teaching on the Mass, Biel follows the theories of Scotus and the Franciscan school, although on other points he was an ardent disciple of Ockham.

F.Clark discusses this teaching and its influence at length in his Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. In chapter 5, he summarizes in three main points

the sacrificial teaching which he finds in Biel, and shows by parallel texts how it is in substantial agreement with that of Cardinal Cajetan, a leading Thomist of the fifteenth Century:

1. The Mass-sacrifice is a memorial of Calvary, but not a mere memorial.

11. Although the Mass is in a true sense one with the all-sufficient sacrifice of the cross, the manner of offering is different, for Christ does not die or suffer anew at the altar.....

111. The Eucharistic sacrifice is the means through which the efficacy of the one redemptive sacrifice is mediated and applied to mankind.....35

In illustration of the second point he cites this text of Biel:

> "Although Christ was offered but once in the natural appearance of his flesh, nevertheless he is offered daily on the altar, veiled under the appearance of bread and wine. This offering of his does not suffer and die each day. But this consecration and reception of the Eucharist is called a sacrifice and an oblation for these two reasons: first, because it represents that true sacrifice and holy immolation made once on the cross, and is its memorial; secondly, because it is a cause through which similar effects are produced." 36

From a comparison with the teaching of Cajetan and others, Clark concludes that the doctrine of Biel and of the later nominalists generally, was fully traditional and conservative.

"Far from it being the case that by the end of the middle ages the whole concept of the sacrifice was wrapped in confusion and error, the theologians of the time handed on a coherent and traditional teaching."37
"Far from being a time of perverse and monstrous development of the theology of the Mass, therefore, the pre-Reformation period was one of rather apathetic conservatism"38

The detailed evidence that he produced in his book seems to bear out these judgements.

Some modern theories on the state of eucharistic theology in the late Middle Ages

Clark is not alone in this analysis of the theology of the Mass during the pre-Reformation period. Before him a number of scholars have argued for this position which he now defends.

Fr. Lepin, for example, writes:

"The long period of theology which we have just received (from the end of the thirteenth century to the start of the sixteenth) does not present any noticeable original outlook on the subject with which we are concerned. Commentors on the Sentences and other theologians consistently adhere to the ideas which we have found to have been commonly accepted from the time of the Fathers and which had been systematized in recent centuries by Peter Lombard, and St.Thomas. The legacy of the past is faithfully handed on, without any appreciable completion and without being made use of for anything in the way of a new development." 39

We can also find in the writing of Charles Gore, F.E.Brightman, B.J.Kidd, evidence that seems to bear out the justice of Clark's judgements. According to Gore, in the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice there was almost no intellectual inquiry in the middle ages or up to the time of the Reformation.[40]

Brightman noted that it was remarkable how little effort there was to formulate the doctrine and how little theological interest was spent upon it. And Kidd conceded that the teaching of the later medieval theologians about the Mass-Sacrifice was as correct and cautious as that of the earlier one.

Perhaps two of the most serious objections to Clark's theory are those offered by Dugmore and Mascall. Dugmore maintains that this period (the end of the 13th century to the Reformation), witnessed a great development in the formulation and explication of the theology of the Mass. But Mascall's theory suggests that there was a serious degeneration of doctrine which set in and it was indeed a time of confusion and error, and no solid doctrine was discernible.[41]

Again Clark meets these objections showing that the schoolmen of that time were content to take over

without change and without elaboration the traditional concepts passed on to them by their predecessors. In all essentials there was nothing taught in the late medieval schools about the sacrifice of the altar that had not been taught by the great theologians of the earlier middle ages and by the Fathers. He adduces arguments from what he calls standard histories of dogma to substantiate his position. He comments:

> "None of the standard histories of dogma supports the suggestion that the late middle ages saw innovations in the theology of Eucharistic sacrifice. The Protestant authorities Harnack and Seeberg as well as the Anglo-Catholic historian of the Eucharist, Darwell Stone, pass over the period as offering nothing new or notable in that respect."(42)

This of course does not settle the issue of how far the ideas of the sacrifice were taught to the people or whether there was also in this period a kind of underground popular theology which held strange notions about the sacrifice, notions which found practical expression in superstitious abuses of the sacrifice. But it does seem to exonerate the theologians themselves from the charges sometimes made against them.[43]

By way of a general summing up we should like to draw attention to the following main points.

Firstly, on the doctrine of transubstantiation there was a clearly marked tendency in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to divorce this aspect of the Eucharist from its "sitz-im-leben" in the sacrificial context of the liturgy, and to treat it as an object of logical and cosmological consideration. Secondly, on the doctrine of the Sacrifice, there was a tendency to repeat the traditional teaching, and to be more concerned with the problems of the fruits of the Mass and their application to individuals than with the corporate aspects of the sacrifice. Thirdly, these two tendencies while remaining within the bounds of orthodoxy, probably contributed to a weakening of the liturgical life of the faithful and to the ignorance and superstitions of many of the people concerning the central 'mystery of faith'.

NOTES

CHAPTER II

1. Text in H. Denzinger - A. Schonmetzer, Enchiridon Symbolorum (32nd ed. Freiburg im - Bresguas 1963), no.802.

2. B.J.Kidd, The Later Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, (London: S.P.C.K.1958) p.33.

3. This development has been traced by H.de Lubac in Corpus Mysticum: L'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au Moyen Age, (Paris: 1949).

4. Saint Thomas in Summa Theologiae, III,73.2: Gabriel Biel in Expositio sacii canonis missae 1488, cited in F.Clark, The Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. (London: 1960), p.89.

5. Cf. M.Lepin, L'idee du Sacrifice de la Messe (Paris: 1926), pp. 215-216.

6. James F.McCue, "The Doctrine of Transubstantiation from Berengar through Trent," The Harvard Theological Review, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, July 1968), Vol.61 p. 385.

7. Cf.J.de Ghellinck "Eucharistie au XIIe siecle en Occident," in Dictionaige de Theologie Catholique, (Paris: 1913), Vol 2. col.1233-1302). Hereafter DTC.

8. Thomas de Aquino, Summa Theologiae, (Ottawa,1943) III, 75, 4 (t.IV,col. 2943a) translated by Francis P. Greaney, S.J.

9. Ibid., VI, 75, 2 (t. IV, col. 2940a).

10. Kidd, op cit., pp. 38, 39.

11. S. Thomas de Aquino, op cit.,III, 75, 1 (t IV, col. 2938a).

12. Ibid., III, 77, I (t. IV, col 2959 b)

13. Ibid., III, 75, 5 (t. IV, col 2943 b)

14. Cited in McCue, op cit., note 33, p.401.

15. Cf. DTC IV, col. 1916-1917.

16. Cf. DTC V, col. 1310.

17. Cf. D. Neunheuser, L'Eucharistie II: au Moyen Age et a l'époque moderne, (Paris: 1966), ch.4.

18. Cf. G.Buescher, The Eucharistic Teaching of William Ockham, (Washington: 1950), pp.141 ff.

19. Ibid., p.143.

20. H.Obermann, The Harvest of Medieval Theology, (Cambridge: 1963), p.272.

21. Cited in Clark, op cit., p.75.

22. Ibid., p.76.

23. Ibid., p.77.

24. Ibid., p.220.

25. Summa Theologiae, III, 83, (col.3023b-3024a)

26. Ibid., III, 80, 12 (col.3007b) and III, 76,2, (col. 2951a).

27. Ibid., III, 73, 5 (col.2926b-2927a).

28. Ibid., 83, 1 (col 3024a).

29. Kidd, op cit., pp 38, 39.

30. Cited in Clark, op cit., p 324.

31. Cf. Clark, op cit., p 325.

32. Ibid., pp. 324-331.

33. Ibid., p.82.

34. Ibid.,

35. Clark, op cit., pp. 84-88.

36. Clark, op cit., p.87.

37. Clark, op cit., p.95.

38. Clark, op cit., p.80.

39. Lepin, op cit., p.238.

40. Clark, op cit., p.81.

41. C.W.Dugmore argues that by the end of the thirteenth century to the Reformation " a new theology of eucharistic sacrifice had emerged." The Mass and the English Reformers, (London: Macmillan and Co.Ltd, 1958), p.55.

42. Clark, op cit., p.78.

43. Cf Clark, op cit., pp. 95-98.

CHAPTER III

EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY IN THE REFORMATION ERA

The theological and philosophical background to the eucharistic controversies in the period of the sixteenth century can be considered, in one respect, as a continuation of the theological debates of the Middle Ages. While, new influences were at work and new ideas were abroad, fundamentally, the Reformers were reacting to what in their opinion, were distortions of the concept of sacrifice.

E.L.Mascall, and before him F.C.N.Hicks[1] attempted to show that the discussion of the eucharistic sacrifice since the sixteenth century has "been dominated by the medieval conception of sacrifice consisting exclusively in the death of the victim, this being taken in complete isolation from the circumstances which led up to it, accompanied it, or followed from it."[2] Mascall speaks of the "Reformation-Deadlock" in the Catholic insistence that the Eucharist is a repetition of Calvary and the Protestant insistence that it is a commemoration of Calvary -- even though he conceded that Catholics have generally asserted that it is not a literal repetition and Protestants that it is not a bare commemoration.

As it was, the opposition of the Reformation to the medieval idea of Eucharist was twofold: the argument over the real presence and the rejection of its sacrificial character.

Luther's eucharistic theory

Luther (1483-1546), denied that there was any necessary connection between the doctrines of the real presence and transubstantiation. But as McCue has pointed out Luther objected not to others holding to this doctrine but rather to its becoming a dogma a sine qua non of orthodoxy, although it is true that he urges his objections much more vigorously than had any of the scholastics.[3]

In the Babylonian Captivity of the church Luther explicitly rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation but at the same time was careful to state that he held the traditional doctrine of the real presence.

"It is real bread and real wine, in which Christ's real flesh and real blood are present in no other way and to no less a degree than the others assert them to be under their accidents."[4]

Not only did Luther want to relegate transubstantiation to an opinion; he considered it unauthoritative, without foundation in Scripture or tradition, and favoured instead a doctrine of consubstantiation.

Apart from the particular reasons which the Reformers had for rejecting the traditional teaching on the Eucharist, their rejection is basically an aspect of the threefold theological principle of the Reformation: man is saved by faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone. The "alone" implies a rejection of any intermediary in the salvation of the sinner, particularly the mediation of the earthly Church.

Francis Clark has produced arguments to prove that Luther did not imagine that the papists believed in some kind of new slaying of Christ in every Mass, but that he merely objected to the notion of sacrifice of the Mass as a "good work" and because it derogated from Christ's sacrifice once offered upon Calvary.

Clark commented: "Luther who knew Biel's book well and who had Cajetan for a contemporary opponent, launched his attack against the Mass with adequate knowledge of what was the ordinary teaching about it in the schools."[5]

In another passage he noted that: "When in his Babylonian Captivity he (Luther) spoke out against the most 'impious abuses', the universal persuasion that the Mass was a sacrifice offered to God, and this denial became at once the spearhead of the Reformation attack, the Catholic theologians rallied in a solid phalanx to the

defence of the traditional doctrine. What they said and wrote on the theme during the thirty years between Luther's first protest and the publication of Cranmer's liturgy affords abundant evidence of what their doctrine was. These were the men who were Cranmer's contemporaries, and the current scholastic teaching that confronted him, as set out in the words of Biel and Cajetan is also to be found in the writings of these apologists."[6]

Brilioth thinks that Luther was violently opposed to the medieval doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, "this was the spearpoint of his assault."[7] B.J.Kidd has noted, that despite their other bitter disagreements concerning the Lord's Supper, all the Reformers remained unwavering in their common detestation of the sacrificial interpretation of it. In the articles of Marburg in 1529 Zwinglians and Lutherans were able to agree at least on this point.[8]

In his theology of the Eucharist, Luther argues that the Eucharist is to stimulate the faith of the believer in the fact that he is justified, that his sins are no longer counted against him.[9]

Karl Barth in his essay on Luther's Eucharistic doctrine emphasized the fact that among the various components by which man and God are related in the Sacra-

rament the primacy of the Word of God is paramount.[10] According to Barth, Luther insists that "the sacrament is what it is only through the Word of God and not otherwise."[11] This point is basic to Luther's teaching. Whatever else men may think of the Sacrament, the necessity of faith to receive, the nature of Christ's presence in it, whether communion should be in one kind or two, all of these things lose their importance, if one fails to see the Sacrament as the work of God and not of man.

> "If we desire to observe Mass properly and to understand it, then we must surrender everything that the eyes behold and the senses suggest....until we first grasp and thoroughly ponder the words of Christ, by which he performed and instituted the mass, its nature, work, profit, and benefit. Without the words nothing is derived from the Mass." 12

Luther holds that if any man thinks that in this Sacrament the initiative belongs to him, he thereby profanes the mass and makes it of no effect.

> "If a man is to deal with God and receive anything from him, it must happen in this manner, not that man begins and lays the first stone, but that God alone, without any entreaty or desire of man -- must first come and give him a promise. This word of God is the beginning, the foundation, the rock, upon which afterwards all works,words, and thoughts of man must build." 13

It is vain for man to imagine that in the Sacrament he is doing good work, a sacrifice well pleasing to God. Indeed, we have yet to understand that "God does not desire works, nor has he need of them....But God has need of this: that we consider him faithful in his promises..."[14] Following from his wide range of arguments for the primacy of the Word and God's initiative in the Sacrament, Luther goes on to develop his second major concept of eucharistic theology, namely, the necessity of faith on the part of the recipient.

"Promise and faith are correlative, so that where there has been no promise there cannot be faith; and where faith has not been, there is no promise."[15] This, Barth asserts, is the second conviction of Luther's eucharistic theology, - faith created and sustained by the Word of God.[16]

What Luther is saying is that the faith necessary to receive the Sacrament is equally the creation and gift of God as is the Sacrament itself. Luther warns that no one should think that he can bring to the Sacrament his own faith by merely believing that Christ is there given. If such a faith is only a human idea, then it is better not to partake of the Sacrament. For the faith must be a

faith which God creates; and one must hold it to be indubitably true so that he will be prepared to die for it.

"And if thou art still wavering and doubting, then kneel down and pray God that he impart to thee grace to escape from thyself and to come to the true, created faith."[17]

The part that faith has to play in the receiving of the Sacrament has certain corollaries. It indicates, for example, the proper value that is to be given the signs, the elements of bread and wine in the Sacrament. The signs certainly are subordinate to the Word, for without it they have no effect. Also the signs are subordinate to the faith of the recipient. What is important is the spiritual feeding on Christ rather than the physical eating of his body. It is better to believe that this bread is his body than in fact to eat it. Luther states: "Be careful! You need to be concerned with the spiritual body of Christ rather than with the natural; and faith in the spiritual is more needed than faith in the natural. For the natural without the spiritual is of no use in this sacrament."[18] At times Luther shows no restraint in stating this point. For example,

"The sacrament in itself without faith does noth-

ing; yea God himself, who does all things, does not and cannot do good to any man unless he believes in him firmly. Still less can the sacrament do anything...not the sacraments but faith at the sacraments makes alive and justifies."[19]

A second corollary concerns the part that faith has to play in the fitness and preparation of the believer who comes to receive communion. It is quite likely, Luther insists, that the person whom we might think is the least fit to receive the Sacrament might in reality be the best prepared," a timid and fainthearted conscience must rely, against its own thoughts, upon the testament of Christ and be <u>daring in firm faith</u> despite personal unworthiness and the greatness of the blessing."[20]

Be it noted that the faith that prepares one to receive communion is not faith in one's own merit or personal worthiness but a faith that is rooted in the promise of Christ with which "every man ought to fortify his conscience against all qualms and scruples, so that he may lay hold on the promise of Christ with unwavering faith, and take the greatest care to approach the sacrament not trusting in confession, prayer and preparation, but rather despairing of all these, with firm confidence in

Christ who gives the promise."[21]

The third main aspect of Luther's theology relates to the signs or the elements of the Sacrament. He quotes St. Augustine several times in this regard. "Why do you prepare stomach and teeth? Only believe, and you have already partaken of the sacrament."[22]

Indeed the impression is given that Luther looks upon the signs as almost incidental if not unimportant. The creative power of God's Word is so great that it can make any sign a Sacrament.

"Therefore, food and drink <u>on which God has set his word and sign</u> are equally spiritual food everywhere, however external and material they may be. And if God tells me to hold up a straw then there would be a spiritual food and drink in the straw - not because of the nature of the straw, but because of the Word and sign of God's truth."[23] This, however, should not lead to the conclusion that Luther in fact had a mystical, spiritualistic concept of the Sacrament, that he was really a Zwinglian even though he did not know it. It is important to remember that by virtue of the words of promise, the institution of the Sacrament, Christ is really and truly present "in, with, and under" the elements. This is the premise of the whole of Luther's eucharistic

theology.

Luther says, the signs which God in fact adds to his word to make a Sacrament are bread and wine. Therefore when the priest raises the host he is saying to us: "this is the seal and sign of the testament in which Christ assigned to us the forgiveness of sins and eternal life."[24]

The place Luther gives to bread and wine as the seal and sign of the testament leads us to the final conviction in this brief study of his eucharistic theology.

Luther champions the view that these signs are in themselves a very good demonstration of the fruit of the Sacrament, of the efficacy and benefit which flows from it. It is a Sacrament of unity and fellowship. This idea is clearly portrayed in Luther's sermon of 1519: The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ, And the Brotherhoods.[25]

He states: "Christ appointed these two forms of bread and wine, rather than any other, as a further indication of the very union and fellowship which is in this sacrament. For there is no more intimate, deep and indivisible union than the union of food with him, who is fed...and becomes one substance with the person who is fed."[26]

It will be observed that not too much has been said about the doctrine of the "real presence" in Luther's eucharistic theology. This is so, because the "real presence" in Luther's thought is not one of a series of main points alongside others. As Barth puts it, it is the unmoving axis of Luther's eucharistic theology.[27]

The primacy of God's word, the role of faith, the nature of signs, the benefit derived from communion, all are understood rightly only in relation to the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament. What is not of equal importance is the manner of His presence. As long as the presence of Christ in the Sacrament is upheld, the manner of His presence really has no interest for Luther. Even at the height of the controversy, in 1528, he maintains that the manner of Christ's presence is not worth the agony of a struggle.[28]

This does not mean however that Luther did not sustain a view concerning the manner of Christ's presence. He in fact states, that Christ is present only at the moment of consecration, when the Passion is preached and commemorated, and at the moment of communion, when the death is proclaimed and commemorated. The presence of Christ in the Eucharist does not last beyond these moments.[29]

As we have seen, the central Reformation doctrines for which Luther contended concerned justification and the atonement which were intimately related, and which had unavoidable repercussions upon eucharistic theory and liturgical practice. The unique work of Christ's sacrifice, which according to Luther, was the truly effective cause in the process of man's translation from a state of reprobation to that of grace. The process waited only upon man's penitent conversion to belief in that promise by justifying faith - which Parker describes as

> "...a psychological act by which a man accepted Christ consciously as his personal Saviour, not, as Catholic theology taught, by an objective infusion of grace received in the first instance by the sacrament of baptism and developed in the other sacraments." 30

By this act of faith, what was uniquely accomplished in the past became effective in the present. Not only, therefore, were human works redundant in the process of justification; should they presume any causal role in this process of salvation, they must derogate from the perfect sufficiency of Christ's unique work.

Although early Catholic apologetes were quick to point out that Luther's main objection was to the Mass as a work, they were slow to appreciate the intimate connec-

tion between this and his doctrines of justification. The relationship could only result in a rejection of the traditional sacramental concept that assumed the objectivity of divine power and life operative in the church and her worship. In the Eucharist the communal action would be under pressure to yield in favour of the individual communicant. Thus the transformation of the Eucharist was in direct proportion to the transformation of the church itself from a divinely empowered organism of salvation into a collection of faithful individuals touched separately and directly by the mercy of God.

But the Reformation controversy over the Eucharist cannot fail to take into account of the sharp debates between Luther and Zwingli. At this point, therefore, we turn to Zurich.

Eucharistic theory and practice in Zwingli's teaching:

Huldrech Zwingli (1485-1531) went through the most acrimonious debate of his career on the question of the Lord's Supper. A great deal of his writings is concerned with the eucharistic controversy in which he attacked unsparingly the opinions both of the papal theologians and of Luther.

Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine is grounded on two presuppositions. One is theological and concerns his understanding of faith and his definition of a Sacrament. The other, is philosophical and has to do with his Nominalism and humanism. Against the Lutherans Zwingli insists that faith is a reality received by man in his heart which arises from being grasped by the fact that Christ died for the sins of the world, that is to say, man's self-confidence is swept away and he relies exclusively on God. It is not an emotional state created by man. It is not an intellectual acceptance of principle of truth. It is, according to Zwingli, a fact of being created by the Holy Spirit and in sharp contrast to a piece of knowledge or an opinion or a flight of fancy.[31] Faith is the key which opens man to a new relationship with God and through which his anxiety and despair are overcome by the indwelling of Christ in the soul.

As C.C.Richardson remarked, the philosophic presuppositions of Zwingli's thought on the Eucharist are derived from nominalism and Humanism which constitute the basis of his attack against transubstantiation. Zwingli contends that if we should take the words "This is my body," literally, what would be involved would be a change of <u>accidents</u> not of <u>substance</u>, for what makes

a thing a thing, is not its participation in a substance, but its peculiarities and special properties. For him, the Lord's Supper is essentially Eucharistic Thanksgiving. It is a joyful remembrance and public acknowledgement of all that Christ has done for us. Taking part in it, we openly proclaim that we are numbered among those who live by Christ's benefits.

So, then, Christ is only symbolically and figuratively present in the Eucharist. As a rule, Zwingli speaks of the sacraments as signs only; but as Darwell Stone noted, at several points in his (Zwingli's) writings we can find passages which leave one with the impression that Zwingli is advocating a spiritual feeding of the soul on Christ in connection with the reception of the Sacrament.[33] To be sure, Zwingli rejected any idea of a Eucharistic sacrifice, and explained the Eucharist as a commemoration, not itself sacrificial, of the sacrifice of Christ. He asserts:

> "Christ who offered himself once for all on the cross, is for ever the effectual sacrifice and victim for the sins of all the faithful. From this it follows that the Mass is not a sacrifice but a commemoration of the sacrifice once for all offered on the cross, and as it were a seal of the redemption afforded in Christ." 34

Zwingli maintains further, that although Christ could only be offered as a sacrifice in his humanity, he

can be our salvation only in his divinity. Both natures, indeed, are included in the unity of his person but these natures need to be distinguished. It is then not Christ "eaten" but Christ "killed" - "sacrificed," who is our salvation. We are saved through Christ's death on the cross and not by eating of his flesh.[35]

It is frequently assumed that Zwingli teaches that Christ is not present in the Lord's Supper. But this misunderstanding arises because of failure to appreciate sufficiently his concept of faith. Zwingli says that Christ is spiritually present, but for him Christ's presence is synonymous with faith. To affirm his presence, and to believe profoundly in his reconciling death are one and the same thing.

He asserts:

> "Christ's body and blood are the food of the soul when the soul firmly believes that the body and blood of Christ are its salvation, pledge, and price of redemption before God; the body and blood of Christ are nothing else than the word of faith, namely, that His body which died for us on the cross redeemed us and reconciled us to God, when we firmly believe this, our soul is nourished and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ; it ought to be enough for us to believe that Jesus Christ is our redemption, the food and consolation of the soul." [36]

Zwingli teaches that the Eucharist is spiritual food, whereby those who believe that the death of Christ

is their life fasten and join and unite themselves mutually into the one body of Christ.[37]

On Zwingli's view, Christ is present for the man who puts his confidence in him, for one cannot possess Christ the Saviour apart from his Incarnation. If Luther had consented to this point, there would be no disagreement between them.[38] Zwingli's main interest was to safeguard the one thing which permits us to apprehend Christ: faith. And in the light of this we can understand his bitter criticism against the Roman Catholics and Lutherans because by their doctrine of the corporeal, material presence of Christ in the bread, whether in terms of transubstantiation or consubstantiation, they try to "economize" on faith. For Zwingli this sort of economy is what tends to jeopardize one's salvation.

The Ascension of Christ also plays a considerable role in Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine. For him the ascension is positive proof that Christ is localized only in one place at one time, for in Mark 16:19 the Scripture teaches that "Jesus was taken up into heaven and sat down at the right hand of God." Following this line of reasoning, he presents the argument that Christ is seated at the right hand of God in his human nature, and this is precisely why, in his human nature, He cannot possibly

be in heaven and in the eucharistic bread at the same time.

One notices here, that Zwingli argues in terms of a realist doctrine of substance which precludes the possibility of an object being in two places at once. He feels that by arguing this way he avoids the heresy of the papists and others (Lutherans) "who look back to the flesh pots of Egypt."[39]

As Norman Sykes observes, Zwingli could not allow any such belief as that held by Luther and the catholics of a change in the elements of bread and wine effected by consecration. "He believed that the whole difficulty lies not in the pronoun 'this' but in the verb 'is'. For this word is often used in the Holy Scripture in the sense of 'signifies'... This word 'is' is used in this place in the sense of 'signifies.'"[39]

Therefore Christ's word that the bread and wine are His body and blood are "just the same as if a wife, pointing to a ring of her husband, which he had left with her, should say, "This is my husband!"[40] Indeed, Zwingli was extremely insistent that Christ's body since his ascension was in heaven, and therefore could not be present in the Eucharist. "Abiit ergo, et non est hic."

It is important to note that when Zwingli refers to the bread and wine as symbols of the body and blood of our Lord, he is using the term "symbol" in a technical sense. The eucharistic bread is not a symbol of just anything. Significantly, it is a symbol of Christ's body sacrificed on the cross. It is wrong to think that Zwingli ever believed or implied that salvation can be had apart from Christ's particular sacrifice. When the bread and wine are involved in the sacred meal, they cease to be "ordinary" bread and wine, even though, materially speaking, they remain so.

"The celebration of the Lord's Supper in all its dignity gives the bread such a nobility that it is no longer like any other bread."[41] Because the bread and wine are symbols of the lovingkindness of him who reconciled mankind to himself through his Son, they must no longer be seen in terms of the matter of which they are composed but in terms of the great things they mean. For this reason we are no longer dealing with common bread but with sacred bread. This bread, indeed, is no longer called "bread," but "the body of Christ."[42]

This brings us to the final point in Zwingli's eucharistic theology. For the Zurich Reformer, the Lord's Supper has a twofold significance. It is a thanksgiving

festival (eucharistia) for grace already received, and a means by which the church's unity is given expression. In his letter to Matthew Alber in 1524, Zwingli writes:

> "Paul clearly says that to eat this bread and drink this cup is to join our christian brothers in one body. This is the body of Christ because it is made up of those who believe in Christ's sacrifice for their salvation. And since this communion is not merely in bread and wine, but in body and blood, the sacrament is a witness borne by christians to each other, and which they bear together to Christ, so that each brother can see how the others have bound themselves to him in one body, one bread, and one confession, just as if they had sworn an oath, whence the term sacrament." 43

Why is this sacramental meal so necessary? Because by it christians joyfully commemorate the benefits of Calvary, and pledge to each other their willingness to be faithful soldiers of Christ. One notices that this 'ecclesial' dimension which Zwingli gives to the eucharist memorial is also an important one in his theology as a whole.

Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine received many divergent interpretations even among his contemporaries. As Courvoisier says:

> "Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine has often been depreciated as something poor and colorless in comparison with that of the other Reformers. Even Calvin downgraded the theology of the Reformer of Zurich. But we are led to conclude that such a judgment can only be the result of extremely

> superficial study of Zwingli's writings, if not of outright dependence on secondary sources to the exclusion of any acquaintance at all with the primary texts. In particular, those who call Zwingli's conception of the Eucharist shallow tend quite unjustly to set aside the ecclesial element in the Reformer's thought, taking his concept of the Supper in a purely individualistic sense. This is, quite simply, to betray him." 44

We have dealt at some length with the eucharistic theology of both Luther and Zwingli so as to emphasize the samenesses and contrasts between what each did in founding their respective tradition of eucharistic liturgies.

While Luther and Zwingli generally agreed in their rejection of the Eucharist's sacrificial causality, they differed in their notions of Christ's sacramental presence and also in their emphasis on the commemorative nature of the rite.

As J.V.M.Pollet remarked:

> "Luther parle de 'testament,' Zwingli de 'memorial,' le premier insistant davantage sur le réalité ou gage que le Christ nous laisse de la Rédemption accomplie, le second sur l'acte par lequel la communauté en son nom commémore le bienfait du Calvaire." 45

The ground of divergence between Luther and Zwingli springs from their respective concepts of what faith is. This divergence in turn is related to basic

differences over the person of Christ, the purpose of the Sacrament, the interpretation of the spirit-and-flesh contrast, the proper approach to the Scriptures,[46] and its relation to reason.

Bucer's views on the Eucharist: An attempt at Concord:

The eucharistic theology of Martin Bucer (1491-1551), was formed within the context of the eucharistic controversy between the Lutherans and Zwinglians. His main concern was to discover a means of reconciliation between the doctrine for which each party contended, although at times he attacked both.

Like Luther, he asserted that the communicant receives the body and blood of Christ. Like Zwingli, he denied that the body and blood are united to the sacramental signs. Evidently his own conviction was that the communicants receive in the Sacrament only bread and wine; but that their faith, when they receive the elements, uplifts them to a real spiritual participation of the body and blood of Christ in heaven.

Concerning the 'real presence' of Christ in the Sacrament, there is one interesting passage in which Bucer gives an insight into what he understands by this. He remarks:

"In giving the bread, he (Christ) says: Take

> eat, this is my body given for you, i.e. just as I give you this bread to eat with your physical mouth, so I give my body to be eaten by your soul...Just as you eat with your mouth and take into your stomach this bread which you have received from me in order to maintain your life...so must you believe from the depths of your soul that my body is given for you so that your faith in God will be nourished and strengthened." 47

Is Bucer a throughgoing Zwinglian? Such was the opinion of his Lutheran opponents, and nothing that he could say or do, was persuasive enough to change their opinion of his partisanship. This fact proved to be an almost insurmountable obstacle in his first attempts to bring an end to the controversy.

Bucer plainly teaches that Christ's bodily presence, which is spiritual and not physical, can only be received in a spiritual and not a physical manner. Faith, he says, is the necessary attitude of the recipient.

> "Christ himself says that whoever eats his flesh and drinks his blood has eternal life. From what we know no one can participate in the body and blood of Christ, as communion with Christ and communion with his body and blood are one and the same thing. Since in the communion the death of Christ is celebrated in the memory, the Lord has given special signs of his body, bread and wine, and he has given these to those who are his. Those who enjoy these things within the community have physical communion with the bread and wine and spiritual communion with the body and blood of Christ... therefore, those who have faith eat Christ

with the bread, but not the unfaithful ones." 48

In this actively polemical period we notice an important shift in Bucer's eucharistic teaching. In reality, it was an attempt to shift the central point of disagreement from the question of the real presence to the question of the reception or non-reception of Christ's body by those without "saving faith." Evidently, Bucer had now assumed the true presence of Christ in the Sacrament; that it is so, is no longer a matter for debate. Accordingly, he proceeds to show the importance which this latter point has achieved in his own mind by giving priority to the matter of non-reception by unbelievers in the Strassbourg discussion on the doctrine of the Eucharist. Bucer was quite explicit in showing that the Lord instituted the Supper for his disciples and for true christians. He finds support for this view by pointing to the words of our Lord: "the body which has been given for you and the blood which has been shed for you." And also, "This cup is the New Testament." (Matt. 26:26; 1 Cor. 11:25). The New Testament, he asserts, has been given only to true disciples and only those who possess true faith can participate in it. 49

Bucer states again and again that those who do not have the "true" faith, as long as they remain so,

cannot have eternal life since they do not really eat this heavenly food. Scripture and the Fathers show that the body and blood of Christ are not eaten physically but spiritually. And, as he said, Saint Paul plainly teaches that "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God". So when the Fathers speak in a similar vein, what they in fact mean is, that the body attains to immortality and is built up towards it in this life by the Spirit, strengthened in us by the feeding (in the Sacrament) in true faith. The true feeding therefore, is spiritual in nature.[50]

It must be acknowledged that Bucer did maintain that Christ is truly present in the Supper. Cautiously he came to describe this as a bodily presence; then, he finally added the word substantialiter implying by it that Christ is present and active in the Supper according to his two natures in the one person.[51]

"When the Holy Sacrament is administered according to the institution and the commandment of our Lord, our Lord himself, true God and true man is truly given and truly received."[52]

Bucer also contends for the primacy of the Word of God. He claims that in fact there could be no Sacrament without the Word, for it is precisely the Word that

gives the Sacrament its meaning. In addition he stresses the importance of the reception of Christ's body, stating that it is received only by those who believe that it is present.

In what might seem to be a contradiction, Bucer affirms that Christ's presence is not determined by faith, either of the recipient or the celebrant. It depends entirely upon God. But this apparent contradiction, is in fact, his way of safeguarding as it were, the idea that the nature of that presence was not physical, local or natural. Thereafter, he admits that the Christ who is present is received only by those who have faith to receive him. Without this provision, according to Bucer, we make the Eucharist an ex opere operato event where there is a transfer of grace from God to man dependent more on a human ceremony than on God's promises to the faithful.[53]

Bucer finally deals with the benefits derived from participation in the Sacrament. These derive ultimately from the fact that in the Supper Christ is truly given and truly received by the faithful. The benefit that comes to the individual is eternal life and in relation to christian brotherhood, the primary benefit is unity.

The loaf and the cup are fitting symbols of this, for as christian believers are united with Christ in the Eucharist, so that he lives in them, and they in him, by the same token they are united as a body. As the grains of wheat are crushed together to make one loaf, and the grapes gathered and pressed together into one cup, so many believers are united to make the one body of Christ which is the Church.

> "This is our faith and our teaching...(concerning the words of institution) accept them with hearty faith and receive them as the Word of eternal life. Keep them free of all human interpretation and confess them to mean that Christ our Lord is truly in the Supper and that his true body is eaten and his blood is truly drunk; but primarily by the spirit through faith, although in the body (our physical body) which eats this food and drink in its own way so that the love of God then permeates the heart, the soul, and all strength; that by this food they become...more wholly attuned to him. Our bodies are perfectly fed with this food when by the resurrection which this food brings, they are renewed and made ready for the kingdom of God, for which we are not yet fully ready." 54

We have taken the liberty of quoting this long passage because it shows that both the Lutherans and Zwinglians tended to ask the wrong question, the question of <u>How</u> rather than the question of <u>Who</u> which on Bucer's view was the right one to be asked.

Indeed it is this significant insight that made

his eucharistic theology more than a basis for compromise and concord; and in this sense perhaps it can be said that its importance is greater than its historical purpose.

Calvin's views on the Eucharist

According to F. Wendel, it was Luther, and in a special sense Augustine and Bucer, who contributed most to the formation of Calvin's doctrine of the sacraments. The young theologian entered the eucharistic controversy in an endeavour to carry further Bucer's efforts to find a basis for compromise and concord between the Lutherans and Zwinglians.

For Calvin, the Lord's Supper is an outward pledge of God's generosity towards man in providing for him a visible means through which he may be assured of spiritual nourishment. Calvin affirms that the only spiritual food which can nourish the human soul is Jesus Christ. Consequently, there must be a way whereby the soul is united with Christ in order that it may be fed. And it is through the Lord's Supper that this takes place.

Calvin tries to explain this process through an analogical interpretation. Just as the outward body is nourished and sustained by the eating of such elements

as bread and wine; so inwardly our souls are fed and we partake of the life of the Son of God who was sacrificed once for all for us on the cross. That this union is incomprehensible to our mortal senses, is evident from the fact that the Supper is displayed to us in the figures of bread and wine. This is to assure us that in the eating of these elements, by faith we can feel within our own life that we are partaking of the benefits of that one sacrifice on Calvary.[55]

Against the Lutherans who take the "is" in 'this is my body' literally, Calvin insists on the validity of an analogical interpretation. He argues that since Christ instituted a Sacrament when He uttered these words they ought to be expounded sacramentally (sacramentaliter) according to the common usage of scripture. For it would seem that one of the criteria for understanding all sacraments is that the sign receives the name of the thing signified.[56]

In his efforts to give the Sacrament an objective content, Calvin rejects any purely figurative interpretation that would allow nothing more than a purely spiritual communion with the spirit of Christ and which presume to make it (Sacrament) simply an empty symbolic

action. He teaches rather, that there is a mystery of sacramental union in the language of Jesus when he instituted the Supper which lifts it far above being legitimately called 'figurative' without any qualification. For this reason Calvin attacks his opponents on the ground that they fail to grasp the significance of the symbols. There can be very little doubt that he believes that the meaning of the Supper resides in the promises. But in what do the promises consist? Before answering this question, Calvin asserts that on account of the affinity which the things signified have with their signs, the name of the thing signified is given to the sign, figuratively indeed, but very appropriately.[57] With reference to the promises, Calvin identifies them with the words of institution. The elements as such have no value, they acquire their signification only by the promise.

Thus, "when the cup is called a participation, the expression I acknowledge is figurative, provided that the truth held forth in the figure is not taken away, or in other words, provided that the reality itself is also present."[58] Calvin acknowledges that the word "is" in the words of institution does not denote a relation of identity, such as would hold in the propos-

ition, "Christ is the Son of God," but a sacramental union. The bread is called in a sacramental manner (sacramentali modo).[59]

It will be misleading to assume that Calvin teaches that the elements are empty signs as some of his more severe critics tend to do, for he is deeply opposed to such a view. What he wants to bring out is the fact that the elements are made into sacraments when the Word is added to them and not because someone merely utters it by mouth, inasmuch as it is received by faith.

Calvin means by "matter" (materia) or "substance" (substantia) that the flesh of Christ is given in the Sacrament. "Westphal insists on the presence of the flesh in the supper. We do not deny it." "The controversy with us is not as to reception, but only the mode of reception."[60]

"That we really feed in the Holy Supper on the flesh and blood of Christ, no otherwise than as bread and wine are the ailments of our bodies, I freely confess."[61]

Calvin also maintains that the materia or substantia of the Sacrament is "Christ with His death and resurrection."[62]

> "....When, therefore, we speak of the communion which believers have with Christ, we mean that they communicate with His flesh and blood not less than with His Spirit, so as to possess thus the whole Christ." 63

The language that Calvin uses shows his concern to assert both the reality and the wholeness of the gift of Christ in the Supper. The whole of Christ is given in the Sacrament. He defends the proposition that it is not only Christ's Spirit and His divine nature that are mediated to us, but also His humanity, and indeed the whole humanity which was centered in His earthly body, including that body which was such a necessary part of Him. "The sacraments direct our faith to the whole, not to a part of Christ." 64 Thus the communion which we have with Christ in the Supper is with the whole Christ in both natures - divine and human.

Calvin's greatest opposition to the Lutherans and Catholics over the Eucharist arose from the "mode" of the reception of Christ's body.

After refuting the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, the Geneva Reformer proceeds to discuss his own ideas concerning reception. He dismisses as inadequate the view that one eats the flesh and drinks the blood of Christ simply by believing in Him. This eating, he

submits, does not take place through a simple knowledge of facts. There is no such thing as eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ by any other means than that of faith.

With great care he tries to present his idea that the eating is the result or by-product of faith, not faith itself. It is, according to Calvin, in his spiritual eating, which is the by-product of faith, that Christ communicates His life to us and thereby we are sustained and strengthened. This process is effected through the descent of the Holy Spirit who unites us to Christ and is a kind of channel by which everything is derived in us.[65]

No doubt, Calvin's formulation of his eucharistic theology provided many important insights that were useful in the Lutheran-Zwinglian controversy but perhaps his greatest importance so far as this essay is concerned, is in the subsequent influence of his thought on the development of eucharistic theory and practice in England.

NOTES

CHAPTER III

1. F.C.N.Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice, (3rd ed; London: S.P.C.K. 1953), pp. 298ff.

2. E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi, (2nd ed; London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1965), p.107.

3. James F. McCue, "The Doctrine of Transubstantiation From Berengar Through Trent: The Point at Issue," Harvard Theological Bulletin, July, 1968, p.413.

4. Luther's Works, (eds), Helmut T.Lehmann et al. (55 Vols; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), 36,29 Hereafter LW.

5. F.Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd, 1960), p.80.

6. Ibid., p.90.

7. Yngue Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice, trans. A.G.Hebert (London: S.P.C.K, 1930), p.137.

8. B.J.Kidd, Documents of the Continental Reformation, (Oxford: 1911), p.254.

9. Cited in Joseph M.Powers, Eucharistic Theology, (New York: Herder & Herder 1968), p.33.

10. Karl Barth, Theology and Church, (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p.85.

11. Ibid., p.74. Italics are Barth's

12. Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament," LW., 35, 82. On the identity of the words of Christ with the Word of God.

13. Ibid.,

14. Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", LW., 36,42

15. Cited in Barth, op cit., p.81.

16. Ibid.,

17. Ibid., p.87. italics are Barth's

18. Ibid., p.82.

19. Ibid., p.82f.

20. Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament,"LW.,35,90. italics are mine.

21. Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church", LW, 36, 46.

22 Luther, "A Treatise on the New Testament," LW 35, 50. cf. LW., 36, 44.

23. Cited in Barth, op cit., p.75.

24. Ibid., pp. 80-81.

25. Luther, "The Blessed Sacrament etc," LW.

26. Ibid., p.59

27. Barth, op cit., p.100.

28. Cited Ibid., p. 103 n.7.

29. Powers, op cit.,

30. T.M.Parker, The English Reformation to 1558, (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), pp. 118-119.

31. C.C.Richardson, Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist, (Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949) p.6.

32. Ibid., p.8.

33. Darwell Stone, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, (2 Vols; New York: Longmans, Green and Co, 1909), 2, 38.

34. Cited in Ibid., p.38.

35. Jacques Courvoisier, Zwingli, A Reformed Theologian, (Richmond: John KNox Press, 1963), p.68.

36. Zwingli, "Opus Articulorum on Art XVIII" Opera, ed. 1581, 1, 28-37 cited in Stone, op cit., p.39.

37. Ibid.,

38. Courvoisier, op cit., p.69

39. Norman Sykes, The Crisis of the Reformation, (London: Butter and Tanner Ltd., 1961), p.54.

40. Cited in Ibid., p.55. cf Stone, op cit., p.41.

41. Cited in Courvoisier, op cit., p.74.

42. Ibid., p. 74.

43. Ibid., p.75.

44. Ibid., p.77.

45. J.M.V. Pollet, "Zwinglianisme," Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, 15, col. 3825 Hereafter DTC.

46. This argument is advanced by Stone. see A History of the Doctrine of Holy Eucharist, 2, pp. 38-43.

47. Cited in Francois Wendel, Calvin, trans. Philip Mairet (New York: Harper and Row ,1963), p.332. "The Eucharist Theology".

48. Martin Bucer, Vergleichung D. Luthers, MBDS, 2, 333; see also pp 341, 369, 371, Cited in Frank Meadows, "The Early Eucharistic Theology of Martin Bucer," (unpublished S.T.M.thesis, Divinity Library, McGill University, 1965), pp 97, 98.

49. Bucer, Vom dem sacramente des leybs und bluets Christi, cited in Pollet, Martin Bucer - Etudes sur la Correspondence, (Paris: Universitaires de France, 1958), 1, 45.

50. Ibid., p.49

51. Meadows, op. cit., p.187.

52. Bucer in Pollet, op. cit., p.172.

53. Meadows op. cit., p.189.

54. Pollet, op. cit., p.50.

55. John Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, trans. Henry Beveridge (2 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.Eerdmans, 1962), 2, 557, Hereafter Inst.

56. Calvin, "Corpus Reformatorum"9:195 cited in Ronald S.Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1953), p.197.

57. Calvin, Inst 4:17:20. cited in Ibid., pp. 197, 198.

58. Calvin, Commentary on 1 Cor 10: 16 Corpus Reformatorum 49: 464. cited in Wallace, op.cit., p. 198, italics are Wallace's.

59. Inst. 4:20, cited in Ibid.,

60. Corpus Reformatorum, 9: 73; 74 cited in Ibid., p. 199.

61. Corpus Reformatorum 20:73, cited in Ibid.,

62. Ibid., p.199.

63. Cited in Ibid.,

64. Inst., 3:11:9 cited in Ibid., p.200

65. Inst., 4:17:12. cited in Ibid., p.206.

CHAPTER IV

CRANMER'S DOCTRINE ON THE EUCHARIST

Chronology of Cranmer's change of eucharistic doctrine

It has always been difficult for some English scholars to assess precisely the extent of Continental influence in this period of ideological ferment. There are some who attach great importance to the view that the English Reformers, and Cranmer in particular, in their theological ideas were reflecting only what was handed down from the Continental Reformers. Thus O. Chadwick states:

> "The history of the Reformation in England is to a large extent a history of continental influence upon English minds... During the whole of what might be called the formative period of reformed theology there was not something which one might call an English school of theology, but only English theologians influenced by Wittenberg, or Zurich, or Geneva, or Strassburg." 1

Others however, have tried to minimize the influence of these continental theologians by arguing that the English Reformers received their sacramental ideas directly from the Fathers, especially St. Augustine.[2] A better approach to this problem is to credit Cranmer with a scholarly independence of mind. We see a demonstration of this in one of his letters to Joachim

Vadianus, (The Swiss Reformer), where he declares that he has "come to the conclusion that the writings of every man must be read with discrimination."[3]

Cranmer was a man of wide reading, and was well acquainted with the works of the schoolmen regarding the Eucharist. The traditional belief in the sacrificial oblation of Christ in the Eucharist was expressed in the liturgies of both East and West, of which he had made a special study. Cranmer, as a travelling ambassador in the early 1530's, had also seen something of Reformation faith and practice, and had in fact come in contact with reformers with whom he developed an intimate friendship. Such an experience was to have an important place in his thought in the days ahead. This background must be kept clearly in mind as we focus on the various stages of Cranmer's progress from the moment he abandoned the received doctrine of the Western Church until he came to accept the Reformed cause with his own characteristic and well tempered enthusiasm.[4]

Cranmer and the doctrine Transubstantiation

When Cranmer became Archbishop in 1533 he wrote to give Archdeacon Hawkins the latest news from England, not only providing his successor as ambassador to the Emperor Charles V with an account of the coronation of Anne Boleyn,

but also describing the trial of John Frith. He said:

> "He thought it not necessary to be believed as an article of our faith there is the very corporal presence of Christ within the host and sacrament of the altar, and holdeth of this point most after the opinion of Oecolampadius." 5

This letter gives early evidence of Cranmer's eucharistic beliefs, showing that he is not known to have dissented in any way from the received doctrine of the Roman Church at the time of his appointment to the archbishopric.

Four years later, (1537) he wrote another letter to Vadianus concerning a book which the latter had sent to him containing arguments against the doctrine of the real presence. After acknowledging his gratitude for the letter in the most polite terms, Cranmer went on to comment on the most prominent ideas expressed in it. He mentioned that he had read everything Zwingli and Oecolampadius had published against the real presence, but... "unless I see strong evidence brought forward than I have yet been able to see, I desire neither to be the patron nor the approver of the opinion maintained by you." The Archbishop did not wish to be misunderstood by Vadianus so he expressed himself further in this way:

> "Wherefore since this catholic faith which we hold respecting the real presence has been

> declared to the Church from the beginning by such evident and manifest passages of scripture, and the same has also subsequently been commended to the ears of the faithful with so much clearness and diligence by the first ecclesiastical writers; do not, I pray, persist in wishing any longer to carp at or subvert a doctrine so well grounded and supported. You have sufficiently made the attempt already. And unless it had been firmly grounded upon a solid rock it would long since have fallen with the crash of a mighty ruin." 6

J.G.Ridley has suggested that Cranmer would have certainly burned the Swiss Reformer if he had advocated in England the opinions against the real presence, which he expressed in that book.[7]

During the summer of 1538 there was a serious encounter between Cranmer and some Swiss Zwinglians in connection with a book Bullinger had dedicated to Henry VIII, and which he had sent to England by some of the English adherents to the Swiss positions to be presented to the King.[8]

Cranmer greeted the envoys without any enthusiasm and expressed his reluctance even to correspondent with Bullinger, to the great regret of the Zwinglians. From this it is evident that Cranmer still viewed Swiss sacramental ideas with the same disfavour he had expressed to Vadianus a few months previously.

However, some scholars believed that Cranmer was

at this time experiencing the first change in his orthodox eucharistic position. He did in fact change his view but it was in favour of the Lutheran explication of transubstantiation. This early change can be pinpointed from the conflict between Damplip and Lisle (August 1538) in which Damplip was charged for denying the real presence in the Eucharist. Damplip was summoned to appear before Cranmer and other Commissioners to answer to the charge of heresy, but he failed to appear and fled. Of Damplip's flight Cranmer wrote to Cromwell on 15 August:

> "As concerning Adam Damplip of Calais (Calais was at that time an English outpost), he utterly denieth that ever he taught or said that the very body and blood of Christ was not presently in the Sacrament of the Altar, and confesseth the same to be there really; but he saith, that the controversy was because he confuted the opinion of the transubstantiation, and therein I think he taught but the truth." 10

These words indicate that Cranmer had personally given up his belief in transubstantiation as early as 1538 but was not yet ready to say this publicly. In 1539 he publicly declared his belief in the administration of the cup to the laity. He advocated during the grand debate over the Six Articles (1539) and the King's Book (1543) that the substance of the bread and wine

does not remain after consecration. While it is probably the case that during the later part of this period his own mind was more in the direction of a doctrine of the presence of Christ in the consecrated elements which did not require any change in the substance of bread and wine, yet he was able to continue to hold his office while there were those who were being burnt for denying the conversion of the substance at consecration. Other evidence that he had repudiated transubstantiation by 1538 is seen in the following quotation from his Answer to Smith in 1551:

> "I confess of myself that not long before I wrote the said catechism in 1548, [12] I was in that error of the real presence, as I was in many years past in divers other errors: as of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass...and many other superstitions and errors that came from Rome." 13

He also repudiated private masses as is indicated from another important letter he wrote to Cromwell just about one week after the one he sent him concerning Damplip. This fact supports the view that he experienced a major change of doctrine as early as 1538. It is significant, however, that only three months later, he was to participate in the hearing of John Lambert, a known sacramentarian, who was charged for denying the real presence. [14]

The trial of Lambert testifies to the beginning of a reaction toward conservatism in religious matters in England. Such reaction stemmed from the inherent conservatism of the people and the political opportunism of an unscrupulous monarch. International developments, it is said, forced Henry to meet the demands of the times and as a consequence we witness the passage of the Act of Six Articles, dubbed the Whip of Six Strings, because of its severity. These Articles which were made law in 1539 were resisted by Cranmer and other reforming bishops in the House of Lords until it became clear that Henry would not be persuaded to withdraw them.

Having rejected only the previous summer the doctrine of transubstantiation, Cranmer was now placed in a dangerous situation inasmuch as heretics were being burned for the first offence, even if they had recanted beforehand. Furthermore, Cranmer was required to approve private masses, the denial of the chalice to the laity, transubstantiation, and clerical celibacy.[15] This he did.

It is still more difficult to explain, or at least understand, Cranmer's action in the condemnation of John Barnes who was executed for holding Lutheran views - a

position which was anti-sacramentarian - a denial of purgatory, transubstantiation, private masses, and clerical celibacy. These views Cranmer himself held only a year earlier and it was precisely for these opinions he voted for the condemnation of Barnes. Kavanagh, in seeking to provide an explanation for this intriguing problem, suggests that Cranmer's position at this time was threatened, and he faced the possibility of falling from power had he not condemned Barnes; so from 1543-1544 he remained subservient to the royal will as expressed in the Six Articles.[16]

Between the early part of 1545 and the summer of 1546 the Archbishop remained silent and was in partial seclusion either in his diocese or in his London residence. It was probably during this period that he passed through the most crucial phase in the development of his eucharistic doctrine. It is probable too that it was at this stage he held those discussions with Nicholas Ridley at the beginning of 1546 which led to his repudiation of the real presence. Almost all Cranmer scholars to-day agree that it was Ridley who finally influenced the Primate to make this big change. However,

in August of the same year his new conviction was buttressed by the unexpected source of Henry's apparent change of policy. Cranmer later spoke of this change which Henry has suggested in public at a dinner given in honour of the French ambassador. He wrote:

> "The King's majesty and the French King has been at this point, not only within half a year after to have changed the mass into a communion, as we now use it, but also utterly to have extirpated and banished the Bishop of Rome and his usurped power out of both their realms and dominions." 17

In J.G.Ridley's estimation this incident to a large extent explains why Cranmer renounced the real presence in 1546.[18]

Five months later Henry died, and Cranmer was now able to pursue his policy of reform. In June he issued the Lutheran catechism which he himself translated from the Latin version of Justus Jonas. The section dealing with Eucharist was unacceptable to English sacramentarians, who were in close contact with Zurich. In August 1548 John ab Ulmis, Bartholomew Traheron, and John Burcher informed Bullinger that Cranmer was one of the small number who were making little progress towards the sacramentarian position, and that members of the nobility

who had progressed further regarded the Archbishop as 'lukewarm'.[19]

The writings of these sacramentarians show that as late as the autumn of 1548 Cranmer was not publicly known to favour either Roman or Swiss views on the Eucharist. For this reason along with the fact of his translation of Jonas' catechism, some scholars have advocated that the opinion Cranmer held after he had jettisoned the Roman doctrine was definitely Lutheran.

Was there a 'Lutheran phase' in Cranmer's development?

The historiography of the so-called 'Lutheran-phase' in Cranmer's eucharistic development is a complex problem. Historians have generally adopted one of three main attitudes in the matter. Some have expressed varying degrees of support for such an intermediate stage, others have shown fairly marked opposition, and a third group is undecided, feeling the evidence to be by no means conclusive either way.

Of the three different approaches, the first seems to receive the greatest support. The advocates of this view claim that the available contemporary evidence is sufficient to support a Lutheran period in Cranmer's

development. The four recognized Protestant historians, Foxe, Burnet, Strype and Jenkyns all wrote in favour of such a phase. In relating the case of Adam Damplip, Foxe specifically called attention to the fact that "the learned, godly and blessed martyr Cranmer was then yet but a Lutheran". In much the same vein, Burnet declares that the Archbishop 'argued but faintly' hinting that "Cranmer was then of Luther's opinion, which he had drunk in from his friend Osiander."[20]

Strype in his own way suggests that Cranmer 'evidently was a strong stickler for the carnal presence' from the start, and he cited as an example Cranmer's translation of Justus Jonas' Catechism, which as he said "treated of the Sacrament after the Lutheran way: which way the Archbishop embraced next after his rejection of the gross papal transubstantiation."[21]

This point of view received able support from Jenkyns who believed Cranmer's Lutheran sympathies went back even to the time of his participation in the trial of Lambert. Not only was Jenkyns prepared to argue for the possibility of a Lutheran phase then, but he adduced arguments to show that the treatment of the Eucharist in the various Henrician Formularies is in every case capable

of such an interpretation by falling short of "any explicit assertion of transubstantiation."[22]

Although Jenkyns argument is not quite conclusive (in 1543 the King's book clearly asserted a change in the elements), it is true however, that there was really no specific reference to the absence of bread and wine after the consecration, as was later promulgated in the first of the Six Articles when it was introduced as a safeguard for the precise doctrine of transubstantiation. One recent biographer of Cranmer's provides evidence to substantiate the case that the Archbishop was a Lutheran after he had given up his belief in Roman transubstantiation until he came to accept the Reformed viewpoint.[23]

The opposition to the 'Lutheran phase' theory is championed by a group of scholars who insist that Cranmer was in no way indebted to Wittenberg for his eucharistic maturity. The first to present this view was H.J.Todd who, although willing to concede that Cranmer had abandoned the Roman doctrine, yet maintained that the Archbishop "at no time entertained the Lutheran doctrine of Consubstantiation."[24] C.H.Smyth supports the case for the opposition by stressing that "Cranmer was never a

Lutheran." Whenever he was taxed with it, he always, by implication at least, denied the charge. He was sympathetic to the temper of Lutheranism: he never subscribed to it."[25]

Smyth goes on to say that when, at the time of his trial, Martin accused Cranmer of teaching in the Sacrament three contrary doctrines: meaning Catholicism, Lutheranism and Zwinglianism, Cranmer's reply was decisive: "I have taught but two doctrines in the same". Thus Smyth feels that the evidence is enough to prove that his second doctrine was not Lutheranism. He advocates that what Cranmer really held was the doctrine known as "Suvermerian". He admits that Cranmer did believe in transubstantiation, but gradually through his contact with Ridley and Bucer he reached the Suvermerian position which he held for the rest of his life.[26]

Although various points of view have been introduced in trying to understand or explain this aspect of Cranmer's eucharistic development, it does seem evident that from his careful distinction between transubstantiation and the real presence in the Answer to Smith, Cranmer almost certainly provides first hand confirmation of an intermediate phase.

The Primate admitted that not long before he wrote the Catechism, he was in error of the real presence, as he was in times past in divers other errors; for example, transubstantiation and of the sacrifice propitiatory of the priests in the mass. He then stressed the fact that there was a gradual change in his understanding:

> "...after it had pleased God to show unto me, by his holy word, a more perfect knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ, from time to time as I grew in knowledge of him, by little and little I put away my former ignorance." 27

In this connection we cite the argument of Stephen Gardiner which he adduced in refuting the second book of Cranmer's Defence. The Bishop of Winchester made the intriguing observation:

> "...therefore, to say as I probably think, this part of this second book against transubstantiation was a collection of this author when he minded to maintain Luther's opinion against transubstantiation only, and to strive for bread only, which notwithstanding the new enterprise of this author to deny the real presence, is so fierce and vehement, as it overthroweth his new purpose." 28

This was the clever thrust of the skilled lawyer, and Cranmer's reply was evasive, and by significantly avoiding direct repudiation of his adversary's point, leaves undoubted scope for speculation.

The most likely conclusion that can be drawn from the evidence is that the Archbishop's respect for the supremacy of the Word was perhaps the most potent factor which led him to espouse Lutheran doctrines regarding the Eucharist. As we know, Luther's profound respect for Scripture, and his insistence on sola fide became the basic controlling factor of his whole theological system. Thus, by a shared loyalty to Scripture and a resolute refusal to assess the eucharistic presence by reference to any other categories, we can assert that Cranmer was indebted to Wittenberg in the years before 1546. In short, Cranmer's respect for Luther resulted from Luther's respect for the Word, and seen against this background his "Lutheran phase" was that period in his eucharistic development, when, having fallen away from Roman transubstantiation, the Archbishop nevertheless held firmly to an understanding of the real presence by faith in the straightforward terms of Holy Scripture.

Cranmer's conversion: Real presence and true sacrifice

Whichever way one thinks however, the fact remains that Cranmer was yet to experience what was perhaps the most vital change in his eucharistic development. He told

his judges at the time of his trial in 1555 that he was converted by Ridley some time after the trial of Lambert in November 1538. He was even more specific in his Answer to Smyth where he declared that it was not long before he wrote the Catechism which was published in the summer of 1548. For the definite statement that it was in 1546, we depend on the Preface to the Latin edition of Cranmer's Defence which was published by the English exiles at Emden in 1557.[29] It states:

> "I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did, until my Lord of London, doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors drew me quite from my opinion." [30]

This conversion was remarkable indeed. For fifty-seven years Cranmer had believed in the real presence and for thirteen years had vigorously opposed the sacramentarians who had denied it. He had come to feel that their erroneous ideas were dangerous to the "true" doctrine and that the sternest measures should be used to prevent their spread. It was, therefore, an extraordinary accomplishment for Ridley to persuade Cranmer to jettison his belief in the real presence and to accept and eventually defend what appears to be a Reformed

position. J.G.Ridley sustains the view that to a large extent Cranmer was also converted by Henry VIII and the times. He believes that while the Archbishop was converted by N. Ridley on the theoretical plane, Henry's attitude made it easier for Cranmer to follow Ridley's arguments to their logical conclusion.[31]

It is also significant for our story that three weeks after the Polish Reformer John à Lasco had his first contact with Cranmer (1548), the Archbishop made his first public statement against the real presence in the December debate in the House of Lords.

On the first day of the debate, Cranmer endeavoured to distinguish between the 'sacramental eating' and the 'spiritual eating' as Frith had done. Also, like Frith, he declared that the eating of the body is "to dwell in Christ, and this may be though a man never taste the Sacrament". He continued:

> "All men eat not the body in the Sacrament,.. He that maketh a will bequeaths certain legacies, and this is our legacy, remission of sins, which those only receive which are members of his body. And the Sacrament is the remembrance of his death which made the will good." 32

Despite the fact that some scholars are unwilling to say what opinions Cranmer held concerning the Eucharist at

this time, nevertheless, we believe that he held the doctrine which he enunciated in his books on the Sacrament. Carefully considered, it cannot be said that this doctrine is as thoroughgoing as the extreme sacramentarian position, or as that of Zwingli, indeed it was even short of the modified Zwinglianism of Bullinger and Hooper and their followers. But it did approximate that of Peter Martyr and went farther than that of Bucer's and farther still beyond Lutheranism.[33]

Notwithstanding the many variations of opinion on the Eucharist, the central issue was related to Christ's presence in the Sacrament, not only in a spiritual sense but corporally. In this sense, as Ridley says, Cranmer did not believe in the real presence in 1550, and if Cheke is accepted as trustworthy, Cranmer had ceased to believe in it in 1546. But in 1548 Cranmer was acting as if he believed in the doctrine of the real presence and evidently everyone was convinced that he did. That there was a gradual and sometimes irregular process in Cranmer's conversion from transubstantiation to the doctrine which he maintained at his death, can scarcely be doubted.

Cranmer's use of the Lutheran Catechism

With Edward VI as King, Cranmer cautiously proceeded with his reforms, believing as he did, that the repudiation of the real presence could only be proclaimed by an adult king. He taught during this time that men should approach the Lord's table with great fear and dread because there "is not only represented, but also spiritually given unto us, very Christ Himself." In June 1548 Cranmer's Catechism for the instruction of English youth plainly asserted the real presence. There can be no question that Cranmer had taken full responsibility for the English edition of the Catechism. At his trial he referred to it as 'my book'. The Catechism was undoubtedly Lutheran in tone and content, with one or two points of modification. On the question of the Sacrament of the Altar, Cranmer was anti-sacramentarian as Luther. He wrote:

> "Christ saith of the bread, 'This is my body', and of the cup he saith, 'This is my blood'. Wherefore we ought to believe that in the Sacrament we receive truly the body and blood of Christ...And whereas in this perilous time certain deceitful persons be found in many places, who of very forwardness will not grant that there is the body and blood of Christ, but deny the same for none other cause but that they cannot compass by man's blind reason how this thing should be brought

> to pass, ye good children shall with all diligence beware of such persons that ye should not yourselves be deceived by them. For such men surely are not true Christians....Wherefore good children doubt not but there is the body and blood of our Lord which we receive in the Lord's Supper. For he hath said so, and by the power of his word hath caused it so to be. Wherefore seeing Christ saith, Do this as often as ye do it, in remembrance of me, it is evident hereby that Christ causeth even at this time. His body and blood to be in the Sacrament after that manner and fashion as it was at that time, when he made his maundy with His disciples." 34

This lengthy quotation is introduced into our text at this point precisely to stress the problem one faces concerning Cranmer's position. It is a difficult problem indeed to explain why in 1551 Cranmer denied in his books against Gardiner and Smith, that he taught the doctrine of the real presence in this Catechism. He admitted that shortly before he translated the Catechism he maintained the doctrine, but declared that in the Catechism itself he had believed and taught the same doctrine of the presence for which he was now being accused. As we can see, Cranmer's translation of the Catechism asserts the doctrine of the real presence in the strongest possible terms. It is only by a feat of casuistry perhaps, that such language could be reconciled with a rejection of the real presence, but even then, one

can argue that this was not really the impression Cranmer intended to leave with his youthful or adult reader.

We believe, as Ridley does, that Cranmer was quite likely deceiving himself in 1551 by saying he did not teach the real presence in the Catechism. Quite probable, in later years he chose to forget how under pressure of political developments and much against his own inclination, he had to repudiate this new doctrine of the presence in 1548. The fact is, that it is unlikely that Cranmer would have chosen to deliberately deceive the children.

It would be a gross over-simplification to think that this change which the Primate of the Church in England experienced did not involve a period of considerable and painstaking research and self-examination in the light of the Scriptural and Patristic evidence.

The nature of Cranmer's definitive doctrine

From our historical and chronological account of the changes in Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine we turn now to his own views. During the debate on the projected Book of Common Prayer in 1548 it became clear that the Archbishop had moved far beyond the conviction he had expressed in

his letter to Vadianus. The fact is, when the Book was issued in 1549 a large part of the nobility had definite Zwinglian sympathies[35] and Cranmer probably felt compelled to oppose what he now considered erroneous teachings regarding the eucharistic presence.

The issue in the disputation concerned the status which was given to the bread in the Sacrament after consecration. Cranmer stated his position unequivocally. He asserted that evil men did not receive the body when they ate the bread; that "the spirit and body are contrary" and that "our faith is not to believe Him to be bread and wine, but that He is in heaven". "Christ when He bids us eat His body it is figurative; for we cannot eat His body indeed" "to eat His flesh and to drink His blood is to be partaker of His passion, as water is water still that we are christened withal or that was wont to be put into the wine," the change is inward, not in the bread but in the receiver. "To have Christ present really here, when I may receive Him in faith, is not available to do me good. Christ is in the world in His divinity, but not in his humanity. The property of His Godhead is everywhere, but His manhood is in one place only;

it was natural bread, but now no common bread for it is separated to another use. Because of the use it may be called bread of life. That which you see is bread and wine. But that which you believe is the body of Christ."[36]

Cranmer argued in the debate over the Eucharist that on the basis of Scripture Christ's body was now in heaven and would not return until the last day. Bishop Bonner who opposed Cranmer's position, insisted that the new Prayer Book expressed the same heresy which had been condemned in Lambert's case, because the last rubric of the communion service spoke of "the Sacrament of the bread" and "the Sacrament of the wine." Such language was manifestly contrary to the teaching of the Church, and the conservative bishops, notably Gardiner brought pressure on the government until it was forced to make concessions, and the statement was altered to read "Sacrament of the body" and "Sacrament of the blood".

Cranmer appears to have adopted the arguments drawn from Oecolampadius and Zwingli which in 1538 were used by Lambert in his defence and for which Cranmer condemned him. Now the same Archbishop is making extensive use of

John 6 to show that in this passage of scripture the real issue was not the Sacrament but faith in the Word.[38] Later, as we shall see, Cranmer will argue for a spiritual interpretation of the 'eating' rather than an literal "eating". Rejecting both the Roman and Lutheran exegesis of Christ's words at the Last Supper, Cranmer became very impatient with those who still adored the Eucharist because they believed that they were adoring Christ who was contained therein. For him, such practice was a form of idol-worship which was at radical variance with the scripture.

It must be acknowledged that Cranmer was not simply protesting against some gross notion of a new passion and slaying of Christ on the altar, but also against belief in a ritual presentation, before God the Father, of Christ objectively present. F.Clark has suggested that the only kind of 'presence' Cranmer will admit is in the godly communicant, by faith. He excludes any presence related to the elements "in, with, or under" the bread and wine, just as there is no 'real presence' in the water used for baptism.[39]

"No more surely is Christ corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper

than he is in the due ministration of baptism."[40] Although Cranmer's nominalism forced him to concede that "faith teacheth us to believe things that we see not," he still maintained that "the papistical doctrine is against all our outward senses called our five wits."[41] He now steadfastly refused to understand anything of the scholastic term substantiva except corporaliter' and carnaliter; and as Bromiley notices, Christ's substantial presence seems for Cranmer to involve a priori tasting and seeing the Lord corporally.[42]

What then was Cranmer's alternative to eucharistic presence? In his explication he made the following comment against his catholic opponents in 1554:

> "If ye understand by this word "really" re ipsa, i.e. 'in very deed and effectually, so Christ, by grace and efficacy of his passion is in deed and truly present to all his true and holy members. But, if ye understand by this word 'really' corporaliter, i.e. corporally, so that by the body of Christ is understood a natural body and organical, so that the just proposition doth vary, not only from the usual speech and phrase of Scripture, but also is clean contrary to the holy word of God and Christian profession." 43

The debate between Cranmer and Gardiner provides a rich source upon which scholars have drawn to prove either the orthodoxy or unorthodoxy of the Archbishop.

On the other hand Cranmer scholars declare that the controversy gives a good idea of his grasp and defense of Reformed doctrine. For this reason it is exceedingly important for us to determine for ourselves whether the evidence indicates that Cranmer indeed left completely the ranks of the traditionalists and had joined the Swiss reformers. Or whether like Bucer, he was able to work out his own eucharistic theology from the conflict in which he was engaged.

As we have already indicated in passing, Cranmer's mature understanding of the Eucharist was carefully related to his prior understanding of the doctrine of Justification by Faith and the Supremacy of Scripture. The very fact that he appealed to scriptural arguments (John 6; 1 Corinthians 11: 17-34) to reject any idea of the manducatio impiorum suggests above all his absolute reliance on Scripture and as a consequence places him in the general context of the Reformed doctrine.

In his Answer written in reply to Gardiner in 1550, he was quite explicit concerning his conception of Christ being truly present in all the sacraments. He said:

> "You gather out of my sayings unjustly, that Christ is indeed absent; for I say (according to God's word and the doctrine of the old writers.44) that Christ is present in his sacraments, as they teach also that he is present in his word, when he worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers"?45

In the preface to the same work he presents a more lengthy statement concerning the same view:

> "In the due ministration of the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and His Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace in all them that worthily receive the same...Moreover when I say and repeat that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words and think that I mean that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the person that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader that I mean no such thing: but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us...be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments: but all this I understand of his spiritual presence... Nor no more truly is he corporally or really present in the due administration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due, administration of baptism..." 46

According to Cranmer, then, there is no doubt that Christ was really present through the incarnation. Further he is even now really present in heaven;

he is present by his power through the Sacrament, in the receiver of the sacraments, and on the basis of the receiver's faith. This view has led several authors to conclude that Cranmer had now wholly espoused the developed sacramentarian position. Thus Kavanagh writes:

> "Utilizing the Ratramnian doctrine in their scriptural exegesis that Christ is now "really" in heaven, sacramentarian Reformers from Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Calvin, Frith, Tyndale, Lambert, Peter Martyr, and John à Lasco to Ridley and Cranmer, all shared much the same sacramental dynamic in accordance with the basic insight of justification by faith alone." 47

It is well known that Zwingli frequently likened the eucharistic elements, which symbolize Christ's body, as a portrait, a ring or any other sign which reminds us of the reality of one who is absent. This same approach was taken up by Peter Martyr in his sacramental treatise at Oxford in 1549 that "Indeed I confess that these are similitudes, thought somewhat too cold to agree well wyth thys misterie." 48

J.C.McLelland has attempted to show Cranmer's debt to Peter Martyr. In his study of the sacramental theology of Martyr, he reminds us that Cranmer's Defence of 1550 shows striking agreement with the doctrine for which Martyr contended in the Oxford disputations in

1549.[49] This is really not surprising because it is generally recognized that the Archbishop and his Italian guest were on the most intimate personal terms.[50] Indeed, McLelland thinks that

> "Peter Martyr's doctrine, as defended in the Disputation and set forth the same year in print along with the Treatise, and as endorsed by...Cranmer, was now the recognized doctrine of the Church, and therefore normative for the drawing of the Second Edwardine Prayer Book of 1552 and the Forty-two Articles of 1553." [51]

So similar is the memorial terminology of Martyr with what is expressed in Cranmer's writings, that it would be repetitious to bring forth evidence to support this contention. It is sufficient only to point out that Martyr appeals to the Fathers in order to bring forth evidence to show that in the Eucharist there is but a memory, a monument, an example, a commemoration, and a thanksgiving about the "offering of Christ already made on the Cross in the past; after these, that the Sacrament obtains the name of the thing; nor is it granted that a proper sacrifice of Christ can be made there".[52]

It is called a sacrifice by the Father only because it is a memory and recollection of a sacrifice (propter memoriam et recordationem sacrificii)[53]

There is no suggestion, either in Cranmer's works or in McLelland's study of Martyr, that Cranmer disagreed with his Italian colleague. It is therefore a reasonable assumption that Cranmer at least, concurred with Zwingli's teaching that the receiver's faith is the setting of the sacraments and is the means of transcending the temporal and local separation of Christ from the individual Christian. Cranmer maintained that the efficiency of the power of Christ is brought into action by faith, not by the sacramental elements as such. He defends this view in his Answer to Gardiner: He wrote:

> "that...although Christ in his human nature, substantially, really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly be present with His Father in Heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually he is here present. For in water, bread, and wine he is present, as in signs and sacraments." 55

Cranmer never tires of speaking of Christ as sacramentally and spiritually present, and he is always careful to relate this to the faith of the receiver.

The above reference to his words, witnesses to some slight retreat from the position he had taken in his Defence in 1550. There, he again and again stressed that the efficacy of the Sacrament was derivable from its reception almost, if not entirely, and denied to the elements not just a corporal, but also a spiritual presence.

For example:

> "Figuratively He is in the bread and wine, and spiritually He is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine; but really, carnally, and corporally He is only in Heaven...
>
> All that love and believe Christ Himself, let them not think that Christ is corporally in the bread, but let them lift up their hearts unto Heaven and worship Him sitting there at the right hand of His father...in no wise let them worship Him as being corporally in the bread, for He is not in it, neither spiritually - as He is in man, not corporally as He is in Heaven, but only sacramentally, as a thing maybe said to be in the figure whereby it is signified." 56

Cranmer's way of dealing with the problem of the unworthy receivers of the Sacrament was to insist that they eat only the sacramental sign in the Lord's Supper. "They eat not the body of Christ but their condemp-nation, for he hath nothing to do with theym that are not fed of him, bicause they dwell not in him."[57]

The Archbishop was more forthright in the following comment: "...no man drinketh Christ or eateth hymn, except he dwell in Christ and Christ in hymn."[58]

Again and again Cranmer presented the view that our faith is not to believe that Christ is in the bread and wine, because on the basis of scripture and the teachings of the Doctors we know that our Lord is in heaven. For Cranmer then, it must be understood that

the true receiver, receives not only the sign, but the full power and virtue of Christ, which is his mode of sacramental presence. This true eating by faith is perhaps taken by Cranmer to mean spiritual eating. But it is precisely because of Cranmer's stress on the power and virtue of Christ and the true faith of the sincere christian man, that causes Darwell Stone to describe Cranmer's eucharistic concept as Virtualism. He wrote:

> "According to that meaning, the faithful communicant receives the virtue and grace of Christ's body and blood, which are themselves absent.... Consequently Cranmer rejected the opinions of Luther, and Calvin and Bucer as well as those theologians of the middle ages and the adherents of the papal doctrine in the sixteenth century. On the other hand he is opposed to the teaching contained in some parts of the writing of Zwingli and Oecolampadius,which made the Eucharist a merely commemorative rite. By an intermediate position between any kind of assertion of the reception of the actual body and blood of Christ and any merely figurative view, he maintained the opinion which has sometimes been described as Virtualism...When this phraseology is carefully examined, and his statements viewed in their context, and his general line of argument observed, this teaching is found throughout his books; and it is expressed with great clearness in the preface to the Answer to Gardiner." 59

Despite Stone's assertion, the evidence indicates that the Archbishop has become the exponent of a eucharistic theology that embodies the main features of what

may be called the Swiss viewpoint. However, such conclusion must remain tentative until we examine another aspect of Cranmer's thought to which we now turn.

The eucharistic sacrifice

Cranmer and his associates were, of course, acquainted with the sacrificial terminology which the Fathers applied to the Eucharist. They too were prepared to use sacrificial language with the proviso that it was precisely defined and rightly understood so as to exclude what they believed to be abberrations from the "pure doctrine" of the Fathers. Thus in responding to one of his Catholic opponents, Dr. Smith, Cranmer wrote:

> "He belieth me...by saying that I deny the sacrifice of the mass, which in my book have most plainly set out the sacrifice of the Christian people in the holy communion or mass (if Dr.Smith will need so term it)...The controversy is not whether the holy communion be made a sacrifice or not (for herein both Dr. Smith and I agree with the foresaid Council of Ephesus); but whether it be a propitiatory sacrifice or not and whether only the priest make the said sacrifice - these be the points wherein we vary".60

He conceded that in the Lord's Supper there are at once a remembrance of Christ's unique sacrifice on the cross, and sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving as in

all prayer and worship; there are charitable oblations of bread and wine, of alms and other created things for God's service and the good of one's neighbour; there is the offering and presentation to God of ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice; there is a "spiritual oblation" of mortifying "...our unreasonable lusts and desires of the flesh." In addition to these there is the sacrifice of keeping the law and Commandment.[61] "These being the sacrifices of Christian men."[62]

The denial which underlies all Cranmer's meaning and reference to sacrifice is that no sacramental liturgy can offer to God the divine victim for the welfare of mankind. Such a rejection of what was the popular medieval belief about the eucharistic offering in a sense deprived all other offerings of their christological basis.[63] Of Christ, Cranmer would insist, there could be no oblation in Christian worship. Dix thinks that "Cranmer's restriction of the content of the eucharistic sacrifice solely to praise and thanksgiving, and the offering of ourselves is precisely Zwingli's own statement of its content."[64] But Clark rightly warns that it will be misleading to restrict this only

65

to Zwingli.

Again it must be kept clearly in mind that Cranmer's rejection of the traditional Catholic doctrine was correlative with his acceptance of the Reformation concept of the justification - atonement axis, and was consistent with his teaching on the real presence.

This fact has led Brooks to conclude that:

> "To Cranmer, as to all the Reformers, the late medieval doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice seemed to detract from the centrality of Christ's redemption... and made it impossible, for the Archbishop to believe in a presence in the elements themselves." 66

The point has often been missed by many students of Cranmer's liturgical work that the Archbishop had long since rejected the received doctrine of the Mass as a sacrifice propitiatory for sins, when he began to revise the structure of the eucharistic rite between 1547 and 1548. For in his Answer to Gardiner he confessed:

> "What availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other like popery, so long as two chief roots remain unpulled up? The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is like topping and lopping of a tree or cutting down weeds, leaving the body standing and the roots in the ground, but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds is the popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the real

> presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Altar and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with old errors and superstition." 67

In denouncing transubstantiation and the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass as the two chief roots of Roman doctrine, Cranmer maintained that it was his pastoral concern to command Christ's historic sacrifice unto all his faithful people. The Archbishop's approach is significant: he adopted a negative attitude and was convinced that such pernicious roots as these "no Christian heart can willingly bear", should be rooted up and that he had set his

> ...hand and ax with the rest to cut down this tree and to pluck up the weeds and plants by the roots which our heavenly Father never planted but were grafted and sown in his vineyard by his adversary the devil and antichrist his minister." 68

If we accept Cranmer's own admission that it was Ridley who had been instrumental in changing his views on the real presence in 1546, we may then assert that the earliest appraisal by him of the sacrificial

nature of the Eucharist is contained in his answers to the Questionaire on the Mass which dates from about the autumn or winter of 1547.[69]

In order to obtain an adequate acquaintance with the opinions of the bishops and certain of the higher clergy regarding the Eucharist and the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Archbishop circulated the Questionaire to which they had to reply.

The interest which this holds for us lies in the fact that on the basis of the questions and answers we can get a further grasp of Cranmer's early teaching.

By providing two columns, one containing Cranmer's answers, the other the answers provided by six of the leading conservative bishops, the contrast in beliefs becomes very striking.

To question three - "What is the oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass? The following were the answers given:

CRANMER	CONSERVATIVES
The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the mass is so called not because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people (for that was done but once by Himself upon the Cross) but it is so called, because it is a memory and	...think it is the presentation of the very Body and Blood of Christ being really present in the sacrament; which presentation the priest maketh at the mass in the name of the Church unto God the Father in memory of Christ's passion and death

representation of that very true sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the cross.

upon the cross, with thanksgiving therefore and devout prayer that all Christian people, namely they which spiritually join with the priest in the said oblation and of whom he maketh special remembrance, may attain the benefit of the said passion. 70

To question four, "Wherein consisteth the mass by Christ's institution?" The answers were:

CRANMER	CONSERVATIVES
The mass by Christ's institution consisteth in those things which be set forth in the Evangelist MK. XIV; LK, XXII, I COR. X and XI.	...think it consisteth principally in the consecration, oblation and receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ with prayers and thanksgivings; but what the prayers were and what rites Christ used or commanded at the first institution of the mass, the scripture declareth not. 71

To question seven "Whether it be convenient that masses satisfactory should continue, that is, priests hired to sing for souls departed?" The answers were:

CRANMER	CONSERVATIVES
I think it not convenient that satisfactory masses continue.	...think that such of the schoolmen as do write of masses satisfactory, do define them otherwise than is declared in this question; nevertheless, we think it is not against the word of God but that priests praying in

> the mass for the living and the dead, and doing other things in the church about the ministration of the sacraments, may take a living for the time. 72

Questions three and seven provoked the sharpest division of opinions, but from Cranmer's answer to the fourth question it would seem that for him this was the key issue. Basing his answer on the authority of Scripture Cranmer confidently believed that Christ's injunction "Do this in remembrance of me" must first be understood in terms of "memory". Indeed this is the presupposition that underlies his answer to the third question, and on which he evidently stakes a great deal on the meaning of the term "memory". Dix's opinion that Cranmer and the conservatives were already using the term "memory" in two different senses,[73] has given rise to much discussion, nevertheless there seems to be some basis for the qualification.

There can be very little doubt that Cranmer rejected any idea or even the possibility of an idea of any sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist. What Bromiley says in this connection agrees well with this judgement. He believes that Cranmer's first concern was for the glory of Christ and therefore he insisted

on the sole-sufficiency of His atoning work, including the lesser penalties of sin after baptism.[74] Evidence from Cranmer's writing throws light on this point. In his priestly function, says Cranmer, Christ admitteth neither partner nor successor. "For by his own oblation he satisfieth his Father for all men's sins, and reconciled mankind unto his grace and favour."[75] Cranmer warned that in the light of Christ's priestly office and sacrifice, no man should try to re-offer Christ, because such presumption is in fact an attempt to add to the sacrifice of our Lord. Viewed in this light we can begin to understand his opposition to transubstantiation, the real presence as well as the Catholic notion of priesthood.

Thus in his Defence he mentioned:

> "The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be against Christ and yet universally used through the popish Kingdom is this, that the priests make their mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit the sins as well of themselves as of others, both quick and dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Thus, under pretence of holiness, the papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ's successors, and sacrifice as never creature made but Christ alone, neither he made the same any more times than once, and that was by his death upon the cross." 76

It should be clearly stated that although

Cranmer's reaction to Gardiner's stress of orthodoxy regarding the eucharistic dynamic of salvific economy, is complete and unequivocal, nevertheless he did not exclude or reject all reference to or understanding of sacrifice oblation or offering. But he distinguishes two kinds of sacrifice. As he himself stated the first sacrifice is that

> "...which is called propitiatory or merciful sacrifice...such a sacrifice pacifieth God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation ...there is but one such sacrifice... which is the death of Christ; nor was there any other sacrifice propitiatory at anytime, nor even shall be." 77

The other kind of sacrifice is that

> "...which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to show ourselves thankful unto him; and therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving...The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us; the second kind we offer ourselves to God by Christ...And by the first...Christ is offered also us unto his Fathers; and by the second we offer ourselves and all we have unto him and his Father. And this sacrifice generally is our whole obedience unto God, in keeping his laws and Commandments." 78

Here we get an appreciation of that which the Archbishop was resisting - a practical system with a doctrine behind it.[79] Just as there is a difference between divinity and humanity so too there is a difference between the first sacrifice and the second. It is hard to deny that Cranmer firmly believed that there could be no idea of man's sacrifice being truly offered per ipsum, et cum ipso et in ipso; instead, the two sacrifices are so radically diverse that in man's sacrifice all "we do is to offer ourselves and all we have unto him and his Father." Cranmer, then, maintained that the doctrine of the "papists" was contrary to the Biblical statement found in the Epistle to the Hebrews and that it involved the assertion of a new source of merit and satisfaction other than the Cross. The whole idea was inconsistent with obedience to God and a lively faith in His Son.

Cranmer saw the symbolic or figurative expression of sacrifice in terms of the Lord's Supper; and for him that which marks it off from the more generally accepted concept of sacrifice as it relates to the christian life of faith, is that the Supper is observed precisely in remembrance of Christ's unique atoning sacrifice.

Relying once more on the authority of the Fathers he cites evidence to defend his position. In his Defence he noted that

> "... when the old Fathers called the mass, or supper of the Lord, a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving (and so as well the people as the priest do sacrifice),80 or else that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ; but they meant in no wise that it is very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest to the quick and the dead. For the priest may well minister Christ's words and sacraments to all men, both good and bad; but he can apply the benefit of Christ's passion to no man...but only to such as by their own faith do apply the same unto themselves; so that every man of age and discretion taketh to himself the benefits of Christ's passion, or refuseth them himself, by his own faith, quick or dead; that is to say, by his true and lively faith that worketh by charity, he receiveth them...81

There are at least two important points that deserve special consideration in relation to the above quotation. The first concerns the time when Cranmer wrote this. It was the period between the publication of the two Edwardine Prayer Books, while the eucharistic rite of 1549 was probably already in the process of revision. The importance of Cranmer's statement is therefore paramount, for it is here that he effectively rules out the theory of the Eucharist as a memorial

action which is neither a sacrificial offering with supernatural efficacy nor a mere liturgical sign of spiritual unity, but rather an especially acceptable prayer of Christ's own institution by which the Church pleads the merits of his death before the Father.[82]

Dugmore admits that at least on this point Cranmer failed to retain any idea of presenting or pleading before God in the Eucharist the sacrifice of Christ once offered upon the Cross as a ground of our acceptance with him.[83]

This by no means suggests that the theory presented can be called a possible interpretation of anamnesis; its rejection in fact removesthe possibility of considering any liturgical productions based on this rejection, "anamnetic," in an authentic classical sense.[84]

The second observation is that by the time Cranmer wrote the Defence he had abandoned Luther's doctrine of Christ's ubiquity which the Reformer employed to buttress his own doctrine of the real presence in the Eucharist. To be sure, Cranmer was not prepared to restrict Christ's divinity, however, he did quote Pope Vigilius, saying that "Christ is with us in the

nature of his humanity."[85]

Of course, Vigilius was combating the Eutychian heresy and was not really writing about the real presence. As Bromiley observes, Cranmer applied this in reverse, for he saw that to predicate the omnipresence of deity to Christ's humanity is to maintain a unity of nature.[86] Thus Cranmer in a sense accused those who held a theory of real presence of Monophysitism:

> They confound this two natures... attributing unto his humanity that thing which appertaineth only to his divinity, that is to say, to be in heaven, earth, and many places at one time."[87]

This statement illustrates the basis upon which Cranmer worked out a structural polarity of his eucharistic anaphora which in effect opposed what Christ did then on the cross to what the church does now in the Eucharist. This is indeed intrinsic to a proper understanding of Cranmer's view on the relationship between the Mass and Calvary. What Christ did <u>then</u> was final and incommunicable; what the Church does <u>now</u> is a remembrance of that final act, done because of it but not participating in it. Man can therefore only <u>receive</u> what has been won by Christ's merits, and

transcends the historical gulf between past and present by "remembrance" - a function for which the Lord's Supper was instituted, to be done "In remembrance of me." 88

The function of the concept of 'Memorial in Cranmer's doctrine

In the Order of Communion published in March 1548 Cranmer made this comment on the Eucharist:

> "...The moste comfortable Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, to be taken of them in the remembrance of his most fruitfull and glorious passyon: by the whiche passion we have obteigned remission of our synnes and be made partakers of the kingdom of heaven, whereof wee bee assured and asserteigned if we come to the sayde Sacrament, with hartie repentaunce for our offences, stedfast faithe in Goddes mercye and earneste mynde to obeye Goddes will, and to offende no more."89

One important point is worthy of mention from the above quotation. To say that the Eucharist is a "memorial", 'commemoration' or 'representation' of Christ's sacrificial death was not necessarily to deny that the rite is itself a sacrificial offering. Indeed it would be an over-simplification to think that Cranmer's concept of eucharistic memorial was merely a subjective remembering of Christ's sacrifice

in the worshippers minds. It is precisely this that provokes so much of the controversy regarding the function of 'memorial' in his theology. For example, there are at least three interpretations on the matter.

Firstly, to speak of the Eucharist as the memorial of Christ's death can mean either that it is a reminder to the godly communicant, a sign to recall to his remembrance the passion of Christ and the benefits it won for him, or that it is an objective anamnesis, a memorial rite performed to proclaim outwardly and show forth Christ's sacrificial death. The eucharistic memorial merely in the first sense is wholly a 'manward' action; in the second it may become 'Godward'.[90]

Clark goes on to articulate a second alternative which also unfolds a threefold distinction. First, he says, the objective anamnesis or memorial of Christ's passion may be viewed (as in Catholic theology) as a sacrificial act directed towards God, charged with an objective efficacy by divine institution, and realized through the priest's liturgical action (that is by the consecration of the Eucharistic elements into the body and blood of Christ.) Secondly, the memorial may be looked at (as in Zwingli's opinion) as a liturgical recalling of

Christ's death which, while it is in no way an oblation to God nor has any objective efficacy to mediate salutary effects is an expression of thankful joy for the favour of assured salvation and at the same time a sign to the assembly of Christian worshippers that, while by faith they feed on Christ in their hearts in receiving the symbolic bread and wine, they are united with one another and with the spirit of Christ.

Clark states as a third distinction what he calls an "intermediate theory" of the Eucharistic 'memorial'. On his view, this theory describes 'memorial' not as a sacrificial offering with supernatural efficacy, nor as a mere liturgical sign of spiritual unity, but as an especially acceptable prayer, instituted by Christ, by which the Church pleads the merits of his death before the Father.[91]

The question is, within which framework does Cranmer concept of memorial operate? It would be misleading to infer that Cranmer arrived at his memorial concept all at once.

As we have already indicated in our earlier reference to Cranmer's translation of Justus Jonas' catechism, there seems to be present the <u>then</u> and <u>now</u>

polarity which is in close association with a memorial statement. By the time Cranmer began to articulate freely on eucharistic doctrine he was evidently well on his way towards espousing the reformed view. As Kavanagh points out the unshakeable conviction Cranmer had in the injunction of Christ, "Do this in remembrance of me" can quite easily escape us in short quotations. To get the full weight of his conviction on this matter, and at the same time to show the method of reasoning with which he worked for a revision of the traditional eucharistic structure, we offer the following statement from his Defence in its entirety:

> "And St.John Chrysostom after he had said that Christ is our bishop, which offered that sacrifice that made us clean, and that we offer the same now, lest any man might be deceived by his manner of speaking, he openeth his meaning more plainly saying, that which we do is done for a remembrance of that which was done by Christ; for Christ saith: 'Do this in remembrance of me'". Also Chrysostom, declaring at length that the priest of the old law offered ever new sacrifices, and changed then from time to time, and that Christian people do not so, but offer ever one sacrifice of Christ; yet by and by, lest some might be offended with this speech, he maketh as it were a correction of his words saying, 'But rather we make a remembrance of Christ's sacrifice.' As though he should say: Although in a certain kind of speech we may say

> that everyday we make a sacrifice of Christ, yet in very deed, to speak properly, we make no sacrifice of him, but only a commemoration and remembrance of that sacrifice which he alone made and never none but he. Nor Christ never gave this honour to any creature, that he should make sacrifice of him, nor did not ordain the sacrament of his holy supper, to the intent that the priest or the people should sacrifice Christ again, or that the priests should make a sacrifice of him for the people: but his holy supper was ordained for his purpose, that every man eating and drinking thereof, should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith, and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ's benefits, and so give unto Christ most hearty thanks and give himself also clearly unto him.
>
> Wherefore the ordinance of Christ ought to be followed: the priest to minister the sacrament to the people, and they to use it to their consolation." 92

In another passage Cranmer was very explicit: "Christ made the bloody sacrifice which took away sin: the priest with the Church make a commemoration thereof with lauds and thanksgiving, offering also themselves obedient to God unto death." 93

Elsewhere he says: "It is the sacrifice of all Christian people to remember Christ's death, to laud and thank him for it, and to publish it and show it abroad unto other, to his honour and glory." 94

Cranmer had examined this whole concept of memorial in detail, and as is evident from his use of Chrysostom he was at pains to work out its implication for reformation theology and faith.

The Eucharist, he insisted, is neither sacrifice nor an empowered offering but a reception in remembrance of him and a response of thanksgiving.[95] One of the key sentences in this whole discussion is that because of what is commemorated and remembered, "in a certain kind of speech we may say that every day we make a sacrifice of Christ." But Cranmer continues, "to speak properly we make no sacrifice of him."

Of course Cranmer is criticized for reading in Chrysostom things that were not there.

Kavanagh states that Cranmer's seizing upon the terms of remembrance as denoting an opposition between Christ's sacrifice and that of the church, is a presupposition based on his whole theological motif. "The result is representative Cranmer, but unrepresentative Chrysostom."[96]

In what might be considered a decisive passage, Cranmer makes plain the real nature of the

Lord's Supper. After refering to Lombard's fruitful analysis of the Supper, he concluded:

> "...And therefore, at his last supper, although Christ made unto his Father sacrifices of lauds and thanksgiving... yet he made there no sacrifice propitiatory...And although he had at his supper made sacrifices propitiatory, yet the priests do not so, who do not the same that Christ did at his supper. For he ministered not the sacrament in remembrance of his death which was not then brought to pass, but he ordained it to be ministered of as in remembrance thereof. And therefore our offering, after Lombardus' judgment, is but a remembrance of that true offering wherein Christ offered himself upon the cross. And so Christ did institute it to be." 97

Unlike Luther, Cranmer made extensive use of scholastic text without any embarrassment. In this he was being consistent with his conviction that all he said "was grounded and established upon God's most holy word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient doctors of the church."[98] He felt he was being true to the doctrine of sacrifice as taught by "the Master of Sentences," of whom as we have already noticed, all the school-authors take their occasion to write."[99]

The striking thing about Cranmer's memorial concept is the fact that he attempted to harmonize it not only in a positive and adequate revision of the

eucharistic rite, but also in reconciling the apparent difficulties presented by patristic and scholastic texts with "mnemonic-effective" terminology common in late medieval eucharistic piety. So with a skillful use of the key memorial concept, the Archbishop found a way of looking at and utilizing a great deal of orthodox sources to buttress his position.[100]

It is of importance to understand clearly that in no way does Cranmer regard the bread and wine as empty signs. Rather, he taught that they are abundantly meaningful when they bring the faithful into such intimate spiritual contact with Christ:

> "For the sacramental bread and wine be not bare and naked figures, but so pithy and effectuous, that whosoever worthily eateth them, eateth spiritually Christ's flesh and blood, and hath by then everlasting life." 101

Because of his doctrine of justification as union with Christ, Cranmer was convinced that the essence of the Eucharist was contained in the succint statement, "Do this in remembrance of me." The Eucharist was viewed as the prime expression of the economy of salvation, the sacramental expression of the whole Christian life of faith.

Once this concept of the relationship between the

Eucharistic and justification by faith is grasped, we can then understand Cranmer's notion of remembrance.

Bromiley tried to emphasize this by showing that Cranmer's notion of the Eucharist as a memorial "is never a mental construction pure and simple."[102]

For Cranmer:

> "...This justification or righteousness, which we so receive by God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God for our perfect and full justification. For the more full understanding hereof, it is our parts and duty ever to remember the great mercy of God, how that... God sent His only Son...into this world, to fulfill the law for us; and by shedding of his most precious blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, or (as it may be called) amends: to His Father for our sins, to assuage his wrath and indignation conceived against us for the same." [103]

This passage is striking in its implications - the Christian is one united to Christ, to the dead and risen Lord. He is thus edified through the receiving of the symbols of bread and wine, and is made to understand more fully what he has already received.

For Cranmer the act of Christian worship was receptive. This liturgical receptivity was characteristic of the nature of Christian life itself, which was subjective, affective and mnemonic.

The events which brought about man's salvation were once for all effective then: those past events are effective now when, with faith, man eats and drinks the sacramental signs of bread and wine. Thus man is induced to feed on Christ's promises by remembrance, and is thus edified."[104] Kavanagh asserts:

"For all Cranmer's use of traditional terminology, the fact cannot be avoided that he regarded worship in general, and the Eucharist in particular, as an acted preaching, a remembrance, a recalling, an evocation of the temporally remote sacrifice of Christ on the cross."[105]

Structure of Cranmer's eucharistic rite

Perhaps one of the most complex problems that Cranmer faced as a liturgical author was the difficulty of correlating the notions of remembrance and reception in a homogeneous liturgical rite that could be considered pure. One scholar thinks that the way in which Cranmer tackled the problem witnesses to the genius of the man. He asserts that in accomplishing this task, Cranmer was no innovator. "He had the tools needed, the principles enunciated, the help of others and the proper theological climate for the work. To these he added

only the synthetic genius which was his to give."[106]

Cranmer's eucharistic rite brings to view the close connection between doctrine and liturgy. As we have seen, Cranmer had abandoned his belief in the traditional doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass and accepted the Biblical teaching that the sacrifice consists in the oblation of praise and thanksgiving, and in the offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" exclusively. This had taken place by the time the Communion Service of 1549 was being set out in its final form prior to publication. In fact, E.C.Ratcliff informs us that for Cranmer the real purpose of an anaphora was to make the "memorial" of Christ's passion and death; to this memorial was joined the offering of the Scriptural sacrifice as Cranmer understood it.[107]

Cranmer had stated without equivocation in one of his replies to the Questionaire of 1547 that the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is so called because the Mass is "...a memory and representation of that very true sacrifice and immolation which before was made upon the cross." Again Ratcliff calls attention to the fact that the arrangement of the definitive 1552 form of the book

discloses an adjustment to what Cranmer regarded as Scriptural direction of design. He then points out that Cranmer was really striving to articulate a precise liturgical expression to the fulfillment of Christ's words: "Do this in remembrance of me." Thus Ratcliff concludes that the liturgical action of the Lord's Supper, according to Cranmer's later conception of it, consists in the eating of bread and drinking of wine in thankful remembrance of Christ's death.[108]

Influence of the Continental Reformers

An important witness to the penetration of Cranmer's memorial concept as reflected in his liturgical work, is the influence of the sacramentarians who were in close consultation with him. Throughout the reign of Edward VI, there was frequent and cordial correspondence with the leaders of Swiss Protestantism, whose doctrines had largely supplanted those of Luther in English favour. From Geneva Calvin had written his exhortations and reproofs to England. Bullinger who was the successor of Zwingli became the leading adviser of the English sacramentarians.

The Archbishop himself had sent pressing

invitations to well known continental reformers to come over to England to assist him in the work of a thorough Reformation. Indeed, the influence of these men had great significance on the subsequent progress of liturgical reforms in England. The Archbishop's intimate relationship with the two leading divines, Bucer and Martyr is too well-known to require further documentation. It is sufficient only to point out in this connection, that Bucer's Censura had a considerable influence on the revision of the 1552 Prayer Book.

In the context of these influences, it is easy to understand the strong emphasis that the Sacramentarian view point received in England both theologically and liturgically, between the publication of the 1549 Book and the Second Book of 1552.

It is in this context that the mature contribution of Thomas Cranmer's memorial concept must be assessed, once due recognition is given for his scholarly independence of mind and that determination to understand Scripture and the Fathers aright.

NOTES

CHAPTER IV

1. O.Chadwick, "The Sixteenth Century" The English Church and the Continent, also P.hughes corroborates this point of view by asserting that the Edwardine period had reached the critical stage and the English Reformation had yet to produce its first theologian. Hughes, The Reformation in England,3 Vols. (London: 1954), 2, p.83. cited in Aidan Kavanagh, The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in Thomas Cranmer,(St.Meinard: Abbey Press, 1964), p.48. n.4.

2. The most notable champion of this approach is C.W.Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, (London: Macmillan and Co.Ltd., 1958), pp.VII,VIII.

3. Hastings Robinson,(ed.) Original Letters relative to the English Reformation, written during the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary: Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich,2 Vols. (Cambridge: 1846-1847), 2, p.13.

4. Peter Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist, (London: Macmillan Co.Ltd., 1965), p. XVII.

5. Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, (ed.) J.E.Cox, Parker Society (Cambridge: 1846), p.246, Hereafter: Works P.S.II

6. Works P.S.II, 343.

7. J.G.Ridley, Thomas Cranmer, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962),p.159.

8. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., p.123.

9. Ridley, Op.Cit., p.172

10. Works P.S.II, 375

11. Darwell Stone, The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 2 Vols (New York: Longman, Green and Co. 1909), 2, pp.125.

12. Cranmer is referring here to his translation from a Latin Catechism which was also translated in 1539 by the Lutheran Justus Jonas from an unknown German Catechism. It was entitled Catechismus.

13. Thomas Cranmer, Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, (ed.) J.E.Cox, Parker Society, (Cambridge: 1844), p.374. Hereafter Works P.S.I

14. According to both Foxe and J.G.Ridley, Lambert had received much of his teaching from John Frith. He presented in his own defense ten reasons against the real presence, and Cranmer was chosen to dispute with him on the second point, namely that Christ, being present in heaven could not be present in two places at once. Cranmer seems not to have employed the scholastic distinction between "corporeal" and "substantial" but rather cited from scripture the appearance of Christ to St.Paul on earth. Lambert replied with the much used sacramentarian argument that Christ appeared in this instance while remaining corporally in heaven. Foxe reports that this reply left Cranmer for a while without an answer. Ridley, however questions part of Foxe's account. See John Foxe, Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, 8 Vols. (ed.) J.Pratt, (London: 1877),5, 225-250; Ridley, Op.Cit., pp.174-176.

15. Ibid., p.194.

16. Kavanagh, Op.Cit.; pp.126,127. I tend to disagree with Kavanagh's suggestion, and would rather think that it was Cranmer's erastianism that led him to take such an action against Barnes and not simply "fear of falling from power".

17. Foxe, Op.Cit., Cited in Ibid., p.127.

18. Ridley, Op.Cit., p.126.

19. H.Robinson (ed.), Parker Society, Original Letters relative to the English Reformation written during the reigns of Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary: Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich, 2 Vols. (Cambridge: 1846-1847), 2,p.320. Hereafter OL

20. Gilbert Burnet, History of the Reformation, (Ed.), N.Pocock, 7.Vols. (Oxford: 1865), 1,pp.402,403.

21. J.Strype, Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God, Thomas Cranmer, 2 Vols. (Oxford: 1840), 1,p.47. Hereafter Memorials I

22. H.Jenkyns, The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, 4 Vols. (Oxford: 1833), 1, p.lxxv. Hereafter Remains I or II

23. Ridley, Op.Cit., pp. 85,284.

24. H.J.Jodd, The Life of Archbishop Cranmer, 2 Vols. (London: 1831), 1,pp.261-263; 2, pp.52, 53.

25. C.H.Smyth, Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI, (Camrbidge: University Press, 1926), pp.50-59.

26. Ibid.,

27. Work P.S.I p.374

28. Ibid., 281.

29. Attempts have been made either to mimimize or discredit this story, but there seems to be very reliable sources for such an account. For example Sir John Cheke, an intimate and well informed friend of the Archbishop pinpointed the date as 1546 for the change. see Brooks, Op.Cit., p.38.

30. Works P.S.II, 218

31. Ridley, Op.Cit., p. 256.

32. A. Gasquet and E.Bishop, Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer, (2d.ed. London: Hodges,1891), p.400.

33. Ridley, Op.Cit., p.279.

34. Cranmer, "A Short Instruction into Christian Religion," English ed. pp.16-30, Cited in Ibid., p.282.

35. Ibid., p.288.

36. Cited in Ibid., pp.288-289, Stone, Op.Cit.,134,135.

37. Ridley, Op.Cit., 289.

38. It is interesting to remember that both Luther and Zwingli also taught that John 6. was speaking not of the Sacrament but rather of faith in the Incarnate Word.

39. F.Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd,1960), p.161.

40. Works P.S.I, 3.

41. Ibid., 255,256.

42. G.W. Bromiley, Thomas Cranmer Theologian.(London: Lutterworth Press, 1956), p.71.

43. Works P.S.I, 395.

44. Cranmer is referring to the writing of the Fathers whom he frequently appealed to in order to support his cause. Thus reference is variously made to Augustine, Cyprian, Cyril, Epiphanius, Ireneaus and Tertullian.

45. Ibid., p.11.

46. Ibid., p.3. italics mine.

47. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., p.133.

48. Cited in Ibid.,

49. As Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1548, Peter Martyr had begun to lecture on the Eucharist there in the Spring of 1549. For a period of about five days he was engaged in disputations on the sacraments with the Catholics Tresham, Chedsey, and Morgan. His arguments were finally published by him and was later translated by Nicholas Udall under the title A Discourse or Traictise of Peter Martyr Vermilla Florentine. In a letter to Bullinger dated 25 April 1551, Martyr openly accepted the Swiss Tigurine view. see Dugmore, Op.Cit., p.148. We suggest therefore that Martyr's influence on Cranmer must have begun as early as 1549, and is reflected in Cranmer's Defence published in July 1550.

50. J.C.McLelland, The Visible Words of God, An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), p.23.n.48.

51. Ibid.,

52. Cited in Ibid., p.248.

53. Ibid.,

54. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., p.133.

55. Works P.S.I, 47. italics mine

56. Jenkyns, Remains II, 401,446.

57. Cited in Brooks Op.Cit., p.48.

58. Ibid.,

59. Stone, Op.Cit., pp. 127,128. italics mine

60. Works P.S.I, 369.

61. Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), pp.654,655.

62. Works P.S.I, 346,349; also 88, 353, 356, 366.

63. Clark, Op.Cit., p.170.

64. Cited in Ibid., p.171.

65. Clark,argues that Melanchthon, Calvin and Bucer also used similar language. see p.171.

66. Brooks, Op.Cit., pp. 80, 96.

67. Works P.S.I, 6.

68. Ibid.,

69. Admittedly there is some uncertainty regarding the precise date of this circular of questions, but on the authority of certain reliable sources, it seems probable that it was sent out soon after the November Parliament ended at Christmas 1547. see Gasquet and Bishop Op.Cit., 82f; G.Constant, The Reformation under Edward VI, 2 Vols. 2; p.90f; Ridley, Op.Cit., p.273, n2; Kavanagh, Op.Cit., p.13, n 44.

70. Dix, Op.Cit., p.641.

71. Ibid.,

72. Ibid., 642.

73. Ibid.,

74. Bromiley, Op.Cit., p.85.

75. Works P.S.I, 346.

76. Jenkyns, Remains II, 447.

77. Works P.S.I, 346.

78. Ibid.,

79. B.J.Kidd, The Late Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, (London: S.P.C.K 1958), p.23.

80. We must recall Cranmer's previous distinction between priest and layman, which, as he noted, is based not upon function in celebrating the sacrifice of Christ, but stems from the fact that the priest "doth minister and distribute the Lord's Supper unto other, and other receive it at his hand." see Remains, 77, 455-456.

81. Ibid., 461. italics mine

82. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., pp.144,145.

83. Dugmore, Op.Cit., p.194.

84. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., p.145.

85. Works P.S.I, 99.

86. Jenkyns, Remains II, 461.

87. Works P.S.I, 100.

88. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., pp.147,148.

89. Book of Common Prayer 1549, pp.216-217.

90. Clark, Op.Cit., p.172.

91. Ibid., pp.172,173.

92. Works P.S.I, 351-352. italics mine.

93. Ibid., p.356.

94. Ibid., p.369.

95. It would indeed be rash to conclude that this is evidence in support of the theory of "dynamic receptionism" which one scholar attributes to Cranmer as the framework within which his eucharistic theology operates. As C.C.Richardson warns it is impossible to classify Cranmer as a 'receptionist' as G.B.Timms insists. see introduction to this thesis.

96. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., p.154.

97. Works P.S.I, 359.

98. Jenkyns, Remains II, 275.

99. Works P.S.I, 351. Peter Lombard had taught that "that which is offered and consecrated by the priest is called sacrifice and oblation, because it is a memory and representation of the true sacrifice and holy oblation made in the altar of the cross."

100. Kavanagh, p.157.

101. Cited in Brooks, Op.Cit., p.104.

102. Bromiley, Op.Cit., p.88.

103. Works P.S.II, 128.

104. Works P.S.I, 38-39.

105. Kavanagh, Op.Cit., p.170.

106. Ibid., p.164.

107. E.C.Ratcliff, The Liturgical Work of Archbishop Cranmer, Journal of Ecclesiastical History (7,1956), pp.189-203.

108. Ibid., p.201.

109. Ibid., p.200.

CHAPTER V

DIX - RICHARDSON - DUGMORE DEBATE ON THE EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY OF CRANMER

Modern historical and liturgical studies have provided much evidence that helps to evaluate the nature of Cranmer's eucharistic theology and doctrine. Interest in Prayer Book revision within the Anglican Communion can be traced from the seventeenth century to the present. In addition to having produced many Anglican liturgies in various national Churches and of various natures, this interest has followed much the same pattern: "the so-called low Churchmen clinging tenaciously to what is basically the 1552 rite and the high Churchmen desiring to get closer to 1549".[1]

As a result much discussion has arisen over Cranmer's eucharistic theology, but as Kirby maintains whatever may be said about Cranmer's theological convictions, they are still a matter of dispute.....[2] Indeed polemic has gradually given way to a more objective and eirenic spirit in recent times, and there is a marked tendency for dialogue to replace debate in this era of ecumenical concern. But there still persists a basic problem which is contingent on certain presuppositions

concerning Cranmer and his times that has not always been critically analysed. As a consequence certain scholars have been at pains to interpret Cranmer's writings from the standpoint of their own churchmanship rather than that of objective scholarship. The recent debate between Dom Gregory Dix, C.C.Richardson and C.W.Dugmore is an illustration of this.

Dix's interpretation of Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine

Dom Gregory inaugurated the controversy about Cranmer's Eucharistic doctrine. His position is well described in the Questions of Anglican Orders:

> "The Church of England is committed only to what it has itself authoritatively ... and officially said, and the Church of England has never committed herself in any way whatever to his (Cranmer's) personal interpretation of the rules he has compiled, which the State compelled the Church to use." 3

In The Shape of the Liturgy Dix reinforces this assertion by declaring that:

> "The Church of England has officially rejected the most characteristic of Cranmer's doctrinal notions on the eucharistic ever since 1559. But it has continuously had to use a liturgy which was quite brilliantly designed to express those particular notions... But it is true to say that since 1559 the church has put her own glosses upon it, and

> I should not be where I am if I had not believed that it is patient, however awkwardly, of a different interpretation from its authority". 4

But it was not this opinion, so candidly and forcefully expressed by Dix that caused the greatest stir among Anglican liturgical scholars. It was by maintaining as Dix did that with "no flicker of inconsistency from 1547 right down to his final disputations at Oxford in 1554-1555[5] Cranmer's doctrine was indistinguishable from that of Zwingli's."

Dix begins his argument with the presupposition that the fundamental question of the Reformation in England as on the Continent was the question of justification by faith. Thus he points out that the real background of Cranmer's work is the contemporary post-medieval liturgical crisis, and the Kirchenordnungen of the German and Swiss Reformation which endeavoured to break the deadlock. Accordingly, once the 1552 rite is seen in this context, only then can its qualities and those of its creator be entirely and fairly appreciated.

The Catholic scholar, F.Clark, endorses Dix's judgment by stressing the fact that the English Reformation cannot be adequately analysed in isolation from the Continental

Reformation. He maintains that what the Edwardine churchmen said and did concerning the eucharistic sacrifice must be seen in the context of the great controversy about the Mass which had raged throughout Europe for the previous thirty years.

Indeed, the claim, that the English Reformers avoided the extreme course of the continental Protestants - who banished the sacrifice of the Mass altogether - must be tested by comparison and by survey of the relations between them.[7]

In his treatment of Zwingli's doctrine of the Eucharist, Dix stated that the Zurich Reformer's doctrine left it without any force or efficacy. "They are bare signs or ceremonies by which a man assures other people rather than himself of his saving faith in Christ's redemption."[8]

For Zwingli, the eucharistic elements signify and symbolize Christ's body: they call it to mind as a portrait or a ring recalls the true reality of one who is absent. Thus Zwingli writes:

> "I believe that in the holy Eucharist...the true body of Christ is present by the contemplation of faith; that is those who give thanks to the Lord for the benefit He has

> conferred upon us in His Son, recognize that he took upon Him true flesh, in that flesh truly suffered, truly washed away our sins by His blood, and thus everything wrought by Christ for them becomes as it were present by the contemplation of faith." 9

In commenting on this passage Dix suggests that what Zwingli is saying is that the eucharistic action consists in a vivid mental remembering of the passion as the achievement of "my" redemption in the past.[10]

Dix further believes that for Zwingli communion is merely a "bare sign". He adduces further evidence from Zwingli's Zurich rite of 1525 to buttress his position. In an exhortation after communion, Zwingli reminds the communicants that "What we have just done according to our Lord's command, namely, that with thankful remembrance we have borne witness to our belief that we are all miserable sinners, but by His body given and His Blood poured forth (i.e. on Calvary) we have been cleansed from sin and redeemed from everlasting death.... we ought sincerely to pray to God to grant us all to hold with firm faith within us, and thereby die daily to all wickedness."[11]

The question that remains to be asked is: Precisely what does Dix mean when he categorizes Cranmer as a Zwinglian? What does he mean by "there is no essential difference between Cranmer's doctrine of the Sacrament and the opinion of the Zwinglian school according to which the bread and wine were mere signs to remind the believer that his faith in Christ was a spiritual eating?"[12]

It should be mentioned that we are not at the moment concerned to ask whether Dix has rightly understood Zwingli's teaching, but we are in fact interested in his interpretation of Cranmer's eucharistic theology. So, then, our approach will be to consider what Dix offers as the bases of Cranmer's thought.

Adducing most of his arguments from the Defence Dix proposes as the key to an understanding of Cranmer's doctrine his (Cranmer's) definition of what is meant by spiritually "eating the Flesh" and "drinking the Blood" of Christ; phrases, according to Dom Gregory, which he uses in a particular sense of his own, though he is careful to explain that sense again and again.[13]

Dix goes on the say that it is clear whenever Cranmer speaks of spiritually "eating the Body and drink-

ing the Blood of Christ" we understand that he means by this "thinking with faith that Christ dies for my sins on Calvary, and nothing else but this". Dix affirms that for Cranmer spiritual eating and drinking of Christ "Body and Blood" has nothing at all to do with holy communion.

By a judicious use of Cranmer's writings Dix argues his case against those who oppose his view in showing how Cranmer's eucharistic theory, even in its details "is common to a whole school of sixteenth century theologians, writing both in England and abroad...."[14] He points out further that in the 1552 rite "there is no possibility of pleading the Eucharist for one another, or for the dead in Christ, though we may pray together at it (not by it) as we intercede at other times."[15]

Dix, in responding to Timm's theory which describes Cranmer as a "Dynamic Receptionist" after the Bucerian order, was at pains to show the inadmissibility of such a theory. After quoting numerous passages from Cranmer's works with definite Zwinglian flavour, Dix informs us that the explanation lies in the peculiar Zwinglian definition of what the New Testament means by "eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ."[17] Zwingli himself,

Dix says, puts the matter epigramatically: "Then is his body eaten, when he is believed to have been slain for us."

Evidently, Dix's categorization of Cranmer as a Zwinglian is based precisely on this concept which is undoubtedly present in Cranmer's thought. This idea recurs again and again in the works of Zwingli, and as Dix points out, it is a simple and reliable test for Zwinglianism. Thus "it is one decisive indication (among several available) of the ground which Cranmer finally took up in the contemporary eucharistic controversies of Protestants, if we find that he adopted this definition of what is meant by 'spiritually eating the body of Christ' as simply 'believing' in the Passion."[18] Dix continues, "He did so - not once nor twice, not casually and in the passing, but persistently and for years together, as the logical foundation of all his systematic teaching on the Eucharist."[19]

Dix is convinced that Cranmer means by spiritual eating and drinking Christ's body and blood exactly what Bullinger and Zwingli say they mean by it. Dix quotes the following passage from Cranmer's writing:

> "The spiritual eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood by faith, by digesting his death in our minds, as our only price, ransom and redemption from eternal damnation, is the cause whereof Christ said 'That if we eat not his flesh and drink not his blood we have not life in us, and if we eat his flesh and drink his blood we have everlasting life.' And if Christ had never ordained the sacrament yet should we have eaten his flesh and drunken his blood and have had thereby everlasting life; as all the faithful did before the sacrament was ordained and do daily when they receive not the sacrament." [20]

Dix maintains that there is nothing dubious or ambiguous about this language. He observes that as Zwingli had taught it is only by "faith" in this sense, not by the reception of the Sacrament at all, that the body of Christ is eaten. Dix points to an array of passages in which Cranmer insists that the New Teatament is not to be understood as teaching that "we shall eat Christ with our teeth and carnally, but that we shall spiritually and ghostly with our faith eat him being carnally absent from us in heaven; and in such wise as Abraham and other holy fathers did eat him many years before he was incarnated and born...for they spiritually by their faith were fed and nourished with Christ's body and blood, and had eternal life by him before he was born as we now after his ascension."[21]

Dix explains this and similar passages from Cranmer to mean that the patriarchs, prophets, apostles and fathers before the incarnation "ate"in promise" of something which they believed would one day exist as an "objective reality" in this world; under the new law they eat "in remembrance" of something which they believe had once upon a time existed as an "objective reality" in this world. "But there is no question in either case of actually receiving the 'objective reality outside the worshippers' in any form, physical or spiritual."[22] Because of this, Dix argues that it is a purely mental and psychological process which underlies Cranmer's and Zwingli's insistence on "faith" and"spiritual eating and drinking". Hence, his statement that the eucharistic elements are "merely bare signs."

Dix writes that Cranmer occasionally equates "spiritual" with "figurative". "He means by 'spiritual' that which is 'abstract' or 'only to be grasped by the mind'."[23] Again Dix draws attention to the striking similarity between Cranmer's restriction of the content of the eucharistic sacrifice solely to 'praises and thanksgivings and the offering of ourselves, is precisely Zwingli's

own statement of its content. His distinction of sacrifices in general into expiatory and 'gratulatory' is Zwingli's distinction too. His distinction between 'spiritual eating', 'spiritual and sacramental eating', and 'sacramental eating only', and a fourth kind of eating 'combined of sacramental and corporal' is taken over as it stands firmly from Zwingli."[24]

Many well known liturgical scholars have endorsed Dix's position that Cranmer's eucharistic theory moved within the framework of Zwingli's own teaching. The findings of the distinguished Anglican scholar E.C. Ratcliff serve to support Dix's conclusions.[25] W.J. Grisbrooke reluctantly admitted that after a careful investigation "I have regretfully been forced to conclude that in this matter, at least, Dix was right."

In a comment praising the 1552 rite Dix states:

> "As a piece of liturgical craftsmanship it is in the first rank - once its intention is understood. It is not a disordered attempt at a catholic rite, but the only effective attempt ever made to give liturgical expression to the doctrine of justification by faith alone. If in the end the attempt does not succeed - if we are left with a sense of the total disconnection of the token communion in bread and wine with that mental 'eating and drinking

> of Christ's Flesh and Blood', i.e. remembering of the passion, which is for Cranmer the essential eucharistic action - that must be set down to the impossible nature of the task, not to the manner of its performance." 27

Although we must recognize Dix's insight as valuable because of his authority as an Anglican liturgical scholar, yet we cannot avoid charging him with over simplification in speaking of Cranmer's "token communion", and also his lack of deeper penetration into both Zwingli's and Cranmer's understanding of 'faith' which he describes as mere mental and psychological process.

We have indicated in the last chapter that Cranmer's concept of communion as an "effective sign" was for him the very basis of man's remembering Christ's unique sacrifice: man is "edified" or stirred up to exercise his faith from the comfort received in remembering the benefits won by Christ. It is precisely this that moves man to offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God.

Cranmer speaks over and over about 'the very sure and lively Christian faith'. This is the faith which the Scriptures commend, which is not only to be-

lieve all things of God which are contained in Holy Scripture; but also is an earnest trust and confidence in God that he doth regard us, and that he is careful over us, as the father is over the child whom he doth love; and that he will be merciful unto us for his only Son's sake...Faith trusts, not in itself, as a meritorious virtue, but in Christ only for acceptance with God...[28] Faith for Cranmer is not a divine mechanism by which man persuades God to do for him the 'little duties' from day to day including the forgiveness of sin.

Dix has certainly failed to grasp the profound meanings which the words 'faith' and 'spiritual' hold for Cranmer. Therefore it is not only unfair but misleading when he speaks of Cranmer's "token communion" being in total disconnection from remembering Christ's passion and death.

It is a notorious over-simplification to describe Cranmer's memorial concept as merely bare signs - a subjective remembering of Christ's sacrifice in the minds of the believers. Cranmer shared an intense desire for religious assurance, but this was grounded in his idea of

the Spirit uniting of the believer with the Christ who is beyond all earthly elements. Although Dix's position has been relentlessly attacked, still his basic thesis has endured remarkably well. This is so largely because of the influence of the American scholar C.C.Richardson.

Richardson's Views on the Eucharistic Doctrine of Cranmer

In his study entitled Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist, Richardson finds Dix's judgment inexact on some counts, and sees important nuances which evidently escaped the Benedictine scholar in his examination of the meaning of Cranmer's doctrine. According to Richardson these shades of meaning distinguish the Archbishop's theory from the Zwinglians. Richardson's analysis begins with the assertion that Cranmer's eucharistic views did in fact influence the type of liturgy he constructed, and that in order fully to grasp what they are we would have to discover where the significant cleavage between Zwinglian and Catholic doctrine lies which would lead us to an understanding of why "our" liturgy is the way it is.[29]

Richardson explicitly states that Cranmer had a higher esteem for the Lord's Supper than Zwingli. But

he concedes that Cranmer drew largely upon Zwingli for the explication of his major theme on the Lord's Supper. Richardson declares that "there can be no question that on this doctrine Cranmer was in some measure a follower of the Zurich reformer. What then, we have to ask is this: 'Precisely what did Zwingli teach?' and, 'Was Cranmer's doctrine identical with Zwingli's?'"[30] Richardson criticizes Dix for having gone to exaggerated limits to present views that Zwingli himself was at pains to rebut. He observes that Dix's understanding of Zwingli is analogous at times to what Cranmer did in his Answer to some of Gardiner's words. Richardson brings out the fact that where Cranmer can only understand a crass and 'Capernaical' doctrine in the orthodox view of the substance of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, Dom Gregory can only see a "purely mental and psychological attitude in Zwingli's conception of faith."

In his discussion on Zwingli's doctrine Richardson regrets the fact that the charm and clarity with which the Reformer worked out his doctrine should ever be misunderstood. In his opinion there is no reason for failing to comprehend exactly what he means, because the

presupposition of his thought and his exposition on the Lord's Supper are crystal clear.[31]

From this Richardson goes on to give the basis of Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine. This doctrine, he claims, has both theological and philosophical presuppositions. The former concerns his view of faith, the latter relates to his Nominalism and humanism. "His opinions on the Lord's Supper are the religious and logical consequences of these factors, and, indeed, are unintelligible apart from them."[32] Richardson argues that for Zwingli, faith means man's total response to Christ for the redemption which He brought to the world. This process is operative in man's life by the Holy Spirit. It is reliance upon God's mercy in the moment of despair. Richardson denies that this quality of faith is simply an emotional state created by man himself. It is the essential ingredient in an I-Thou encounter. Thus he writes:

> "From this it becomes clear that faith cannot be resolved into mental, psychological or emotional categories. These are the concomitants of faith, the modes through which we are conscious of faith. But faith is not consciousness, and least of all a special type of consciousness". 33

The Reformers' understanding of faith was that it was an act of God. This idea, Richardson points out, is absent in Dom Gregory's treatment of these men and as such represents a serious weakness in his argument. Richardson illustrates his point by reference to this decisive passage from Dix. Dix clearly states that:

> "Cranmer was a man of the high Renaissance period, with all its deliberate "subjectivsm' which sought so intently to segregate what was present in the forefront of consciousness as words as the only significant element in human life. 'Faith' for him means the mental acknowledgement that the body and blood of Christ will one day exist, or has existed at one time, as an objective reality in this world together with an intense emotional trust that by the offering of them objectively to God the Father during a particular three hours on Calvary my sins will be remitted (if I happen to live under the new law). This purely mental exercise, not the reception of the sacrament, constitutes 'spiritual feeding on Christ.'" 34

Richardson draws attention to two points in Dix's statement which stress the confusion that it creates for the meaning of 'faith' and 'spiritual eating' in both Zwingli and Cranmer. He charges Dix for confusing the Renaissance with the Enlightment, and for suggesting that a 'mental acknowledgement' along with 'an intense emotional trust' could by themselves be called 'faith'. 35

Richardson continues:

> "What Dom Gregory has described is a distortion of Reformation 'faith': a distortion which arose through the inroads made upon Protestantism by the intellectual and subjective spirit of the Enlightment. It is a frequent confusion. It assumes that faith, in the Reformers, is identical with a conscious state and concerned with 'words' as the significant element in human life". 36

As Richardson says, Dix's statement leaves the Reformers' concept of faith without any significance, once he fails to see that what they were insisting upon was that faith is a gift of God.

The second presupposition of Zwingli's thought on the Eucharist was Nominalism. Richardson evidently believes that notwithstanding the logical consequence of a Nominalist position on eucharistic doctrine, Zwingli's viewpoint is clear and coherent. He thinks that because Zwingli saw a fundamental cleavage between spirit and body this prevented him from advocating a doctrine of consubstantiation. In denying the medieval viewpoint Zwingli came to assert two things: first, that participation in the substance of the risen body of Christ is irrelevant to Christian life, and secondly, that the Holy cannot be mediated by sensible forms.

It is evident that Zwingli believed that religion has to do with mind and spirit. The relationship of faith is the central issue. Faith is fed by spirit not by flesh, therefore according to Zwingli, even if the substance of the body of Christ could be miraculously included in the bread of the Eucharist, or the latter transformed into it, this would have no religious or spiritual significance.[37]

By sustaining this view Zwingli in effect was rejecting the mystical view of substance, and was insisting that eucharistic theology must be approached from two points: either there is a purely spiritual relation to faith, or else a crass eating of the literal body of Christ. On this account, Zwingli rejects any middle way and conceives of the resurrected Christ as being locally in one place, in Heaven without any essential relation to the Christian believer. As Richardson says, the corollary of this is to deny that the elements can share in the Holy at all. It is not only that they do not participate in the substance of the body of Christ (which would be irrelevant to faith), but also they cannot be bearers or vehicles of spiritual power. It is important to witness the split which such ideas make between spirit and body and the further split between spirit and nature.[38]

Zwingli denies absolutely that the sacraments can confer grace or even convey or dispense it. In a very important passage Richardson summarizes what in his opinion is the essence of Zwingli's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He asserts:

> "If the essence of Christianity lies in a relationship of faith, and if this relationship is a purely spiritual one that is primarily centered in consciousness, then neither the sacramental forms nor the substance of the body of Christ have a necessary relevance to true religion. What has relevance is the awareness of faith created by the Holy Spirit, and the historic fact that Christ was slain for the sins of the world. The Eucharist is a picturesque way of stating this fact and of fortifying one's faith in it. But it is not a necessary way. Preaching might even be more suitable; and while the Lord's Supper may have a number of important meanings for the believer, it can never be central and never indispensable. What is central is a faith-mysticism which is divorced from categories of substance, nature and body, though not divorced from history insofar as God in Christ died for us." 39

We have already seen, that for Zwingli the Lord's Supper is a <u>eucharistia</u>-thanksgiving festival for what Christ has done for us. It is further a pledge of the believers willingness to be faithful to their Lord. On this basis Richardson attacks Dix for misconstruing Zwingli's memorial concept as 'bare memorial'. "There is nothing

barren in Zwingli either about thanksgiving or faith."[40]

We have considered in some detail Richardson's analysis of Zwingli's eucharistic doctrine so as to find the full setting for his conviction that "Cranmer was a Zwinglian, but with a difference."

Richardson begins this part of his study with the statement that "so much of Cranmer's manner of argument in the Defence and the Answer derives ultimately from Zwingli that there appears, at first sight, little to choose between them. Cranmer denies that the Eucharist involves participation in the substance of the body of Christ, and denies that the elements can share in the Holy."[41]

Like Zwingli, Cranmer stresses the flesh and spirit contrast in John 6:63. Again following Zwingli he identifies "eating the body of Christ" with believing in the Passion and in translating "This is my body" into "This is the Lord's Passover." Finally he shared with Zwingli the same Nominalist presuppositions from which he attacked transubstantiation, and which led him, to deny a mystical view of substance, with the result that he introduced a cleavage between spirit and body, and spirit and nature, in his eucharistic thought.[42] These are some of the most

obvious similarities Richardson can find between Zurich and Canterbury. From this he goes on to call attention to the points on which the two men differed. For example, he states that in viewing the Lord's Supper as a pledge, Cranmer showed a deeper appreciation for the Eucharist than Zwingli. Where Zwingli's leading idea was that the pledge referred to Christians who by the Lord's Supper gave public testimony to each other of their faith in Christ and their resolution to live the Christian life, Cranmer took a different view of the matter. From the evidence which Richardson provides, the impression is given that Cranmer was closer to Calvin in his emphasis upon the bread and wine as being seals unto us, annexed unto God's promises making us certain of God's gifts toward us."[43] But as he warns this is not Calvin's "dynamic receptionism." There is an important difference that should be stressed. Whereas for Calvin the gift of which the elements are seals and pledges is to be taken as participation in the substance of the body of Christ, Cranmer saw it in terms of sharing in the virtue of the Passion by faith.

In his opposition to Timms' theory of "dynamic receptionism" Richardson argues that it is because of his

(Timms') failure to distinguish between modes of Christ's presence in the Eucharist that forms the basis of such description. He shows further that in this respect, Cranmer was following not Calvin and Bucer, but Zwingli by holding that Christ is present by His divinity, and that by faith the believer enjoys an intimate union with Him. Calvin on the other hand holds that it is by the operation of the Holy Spirit believers enjoy a substantial participation in the body of Christ, so that they are vivified by His immortal flesh, and in some degrees participate in immortality."[44] Richardson claims that it is impossible to classify Cranmer's eucharistic thought as dynamic receptionism. He takes account of Timms' lavish use of Cranmer's frequent reference to the fact that, in the Lord's Supper, not only is an event (the Passion) represented and remembered but there is also spiritually given unto us, "very Christ himself". Like Dix, Richardson explains that what Cranmer means by "spiritually eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ" must be grasped in terms of believing in the Passion. He writes:

> "There can be no question what Cranmer intends by these passages. Again and again he makes his meaning clear... a single quotation will here suffice. 'Faithful Christian people...continually from time to time record in their minds the beneficial death of our Saviour Christ, chewing it by faith in the cud of their spirit, and digesting it in their hearts...so they eat Christ's body spiritually, although not the sacrament thereof but when such men for their more comfort and confirmation of eternal life, given unto them by Christ's death, come unto the Lord's holy table; then, as before they fed spiritually upon Christ, so now they feed corporally also upon the sacramental bread: by which sacramental feeding in Christ's promise, their former spiritual feeding is increased, and they grow and wax continually more strong in Christ, until at last they shall come to the full measure and perfection in Christ." 45

Richardson is convinced that such words clearly show the framework within which Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine operates. His conclusion is that there could be no plainer statement of Zwingli's teaching than that. He also takes into account in his study the view expressed by Darwell Stone that Cranmer was a Virtualist. Stone defines virtualism this way "that the faithful communicant sacramentally receives those effects of Christ's life and death which would be conveyed if there were

beneficial reception of His actual body and blood."[46]

Richardson insists that this viewpoint is the very antithesis of Cranmer's eucharistic thought. "For this type of Virtualism assumes that it would be very valuable for the faithful recipient were the actual body to be present."[47] It was stated that for Cranmer the virtue of the Sacrament is not a substitute for the presence of the actual body.

In this connection then, Richardson urges that it would be better to leave out the term "Virtualism" altogether when speaking of Cranmer's sacramental theology. He then goes on to examine what he refers to as "the difference" in Cranmer's view when compared to Zwingli's. For Cranmer the Eucharist presents us with a special and definite occasion for feeding on Christ. This idea says Richardson, is not found in Zwingli. For example, the Archbishop once said that "Because of our infirmity, ingratitude, malice and wickedness, we go far from our offices and duties, and the sacraments call us home again, to do that thing which before we did omit, that at least we may do at sometime that which we should do at all times."[48]

He submits that in Cranmer's mind the Eucharist is more important than Zwingli believes it to be, even as the latter expresses it in his later writings. Moreover Cranmer articulates his ideas in a way in which Zwingli would never have done. Unlike Zwingli, for whom the Supper is an occasion for thanksgiving and a means for assisting the mind to contemplate Christ crucified and to fortify faith, Cranmer emphasized an instrumental connection between the Sacrament and the working of God's grace. It is the same relation he contends, which entails in baptism and preaching. Richardson reveals that the difference between the views of the two Reformers lies in the fact that Cranmer gives to the elements a higher value and stresses the idea that God, rather than the believer, uses them as instruments; and that He pledges to do so when the Supper is rightly observed. Thus it is only in this sense that the sacraments can be said to be effectual signs of grace - a phrase that occurs in the Forty-five Articles of 1551. Richardson fails to see any parallels to this in Zwingli's works. So he concludes that for Cranmer, sacraments do not only signify something, they both "promise" and "exhibit" it.[49]

Another crucial point of difference relates to the number of passages in Cranmer's works that deal with the idea of incorporation into Christ, and that concern his doctrine of incarnation. Richardson admits that it is exceedingly difficult to relate these ideas to Cranmer's doctrine of the Eucharist. He in fact states that there is an inconsistency in this aspect of Cranmer's theology with his views on the Eucharist.

He approaches this problem by positing a difference between Cranmer's nominalism in which substance and individuality are identical, and to the effects of a humanism which sharply contrasted body and spirit. Because these two concepts are at radical variance Cranmer is incapable of conceiving a mystical and substantial participation by the believer in the body of Christ at the Eucharist.[50]

So Cranmer is forced to part company with nominalism and with Zwingli in holding that the believer has a real substantial union with Christ through faith. Richardson says:

> "Whatever, however, it is most essential to recognize is that Cranmer does not relate this

theme of incorporation into Christ logically with his Eucharistic doctrine...Where Bucer makes it an integral part of his sacramental doctrine, Cranmer fails to see its relevance to his eucharistic thought. He thinks of it only in terms of the incarnation.51 Cranmer's view thus represents a blending of two contradictory themes. He believes in a mystical union of substance in his doctrine of the incarnation, but denies such a union in the Eucharist. What we see in Cranmer is a nominalist viewpoint which is not pursued to its logical conclusion." 52

How, then, asks Richardson could Cranmer fail to have grasped the traditional doctrine on the Eucharist, when he in fact grasped it on the Incarnation? In proposing an answer to his own question Richardson maintains that:

"It was not the doctrine of the Incarnation, but the practice of the Mass that has become idolatrous in the Middle Ages; and it was an exaggerated attack upon the latter that drove Cranmer to his inconsistent position. The force of his attack lay in its being based upon the nominalist philosophy, which, by appealing to nature, reason and common sense, could make short work of transubstantiation. But had Cranmer driven his philosophy to its logical conclusion he would have had seriously to revise his doctrine of the Incarnation, and to deny any mystical participation of believers in the substance of Christ's body...It is not our purpose here to show the many inconsistencies into which the Reformers were driven by partly accepting and partly rejecting the nominalist philosophy. Rather is it to indicate that Cranmer fell into the same error, with the result

> that the presuppositions of his doctrine of the Incarnation are at variance with those of his eucharistic thought. In the one he remained Catholic, in the other he embraced the essentially Zwinglian view."[53]

In concluding his study Richardson says that the question "Was Cranmer a Zwinglian?" must be answered in the affirmative to the extent that his eucharistic thought moved within the framework of Zwingli's opinion. But the difference between the two must not escape us. He contends that Cranmer is distinguished from the Zurich Reformer in esteeming the Lord's Supper more highly and in emphasizing that its faithful observance is accompanied by the operation of God's grace. Also it must be recognized that the contradictory element of Cranmer's incarnational theology placed him in a different setting from Zwingli.[54]

In discussions on the medieval debate there is always the tendency for one to proceed from generalization to conclusions that are deductively neat but sometimes misleading. Richardson's treatment of Zwingli and Cranmer in some way reflects this approach. He categorizes both Zwingli and Cranmer as nominalists, but the fact is Cranmer's nominalism is by no means that conclusive. The Archbishop never explicitly acknowledged his debt to the nominalist tradition. So then we suggest that Richardson's case

rests only on the presupposition that because of Zwingli's and Cranmer's use of grammar, rhetoric, logic, reason and the principles of philosophy and their position on universals that we can assume their affinity with the nominalist tradition.

Indeed, as J.C.McLelland points out, at times Zwingli represented the philosophical scholasticism somewhat closer to moderate realism than one might expect.[55] We would suggest then that in Cranmer there is the nominalist predisposition with regards to the Lord's Supper, but also the realist (and therefore orthodox by medieval standard) conviction with regard to the doctrine of the Incarnation. This Richardson does not make quite clear.However, it should be understood that we are not at this point denying or affirming that Cranmer was in fact influenced by Zwingli's opinion, but as E.L.Mascall observes the matter cannot be considered to be conclusively settled.[56]

C.W.Dugmore's interpretation of Cranmer's Sacramental Theology:

The Mass and the English Reformers by Dugmore, is an essay in re-appraisal of the faith and scholarship of the English Reformers as it relates to the doctrine

of the Eucharist. The author has attempted to demonstrate the bases for eucharistic teaching employed by the English divines during the Reformation. Since the patristic sources were as well known in England as to the continent, it is therefore, not to be assumed as some do, that Cranmer and his associates derived their knowledge of the Father secondhand from the continent. Dugmore's aim then, is dialectic, in his own words "to show that the English Reformers revived a part of the ancient tradition of the Church which had been suppressed in the interest of 'uniformity' from the thirteenth century onwards, though the tradition itself had never really died."[57]

In the first part of his book he traces eucharistic doctrine through the Fathers and the medieval schoolmen to the general crassness of the pre-reformation period. He takes account of the differences between the teaching of St.Augustine and St.Ambrose, and points out that each laid the foundation for a distinct tradition which eventually developed into conflicting schools of thought. He argues that the realist-symbolism of Augustine had linked the commemoration of the passion and the self-oblation of the

Church with the reception of the sacramental gifts, while Ambrose in his realist language maintained a theology of conversion of the eucharistic elements.

Dugmore then proceeds from this point to the time of the great controversy between Paschasius and Ratramn in the ninth century. He recalls that the former derived his concept from Ambrose and the latter from Augustine. In developing the differences between the two he observes the insistence of each upon the spiritual nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

From this, Dugmore takes us to the eleventh century and reminds us of the controversy between Berengar and Lanfranc. He points out that the debate between these two was mostly about technical terms of philosphy, that even Lanfranc did not employ a doctrine of transubstantiation, nor assert a material presence in the sacramental species. He tells us that much of Cranmer's teaching described by late writers as Zwinglian is almost exactly anticipated in that of Lanfranc.

He then goes on to discuss the eucharistic teaching of the schoolmen in order to show that notwithstanding

the decree of the Lateran Council of 1215, the Augustinian realist-symbolist tradition lived on with the accepted Ambrosian tradition. But, as he says, from that time down to the Reformation, symbolism could lead no more than an underground existence, branded as heresy.

In the second section of his book, Dugmore describes the eucharistic teaching of the English Reformers. He divides the leadership of the Church into Henricians Catholics and Reformed Catholics. He seeks to show that at the end of Henry's reign, both parties agreed in rejecting continential Protestant eucharistic teaching, retaining their part in transubstantiation and differing only in attitudes towards images, pilgrimages, etc.

It is his opinion that the Augustinian position was maintained by Lambert and Cranmer who opposed the realist language characteristic of the Ambrosian school, which in developed form, became a theology of conversion of the eucharistic elements. Hence he concludes:

> "If the medieval Church took hold of the realist Ambrosian tradition and developed it into a logical system of sacramental theology, it was the merit of the English Reformers that they restored to the Western

> Church the other, equally ancient realist-symbolist Augustinian tradition and enshrined it in a vernacular liturgy which has profoundly affected the whole English speaking world." 58

In his view the Anglican Reformers unlike many of the Continentals, although rejecting a corporal presence in the elements, thought of these as more than mere signs standing for a supra-mundane reality and putting the believer in touch with it. Indeed, they held what he defines as "the doctrine of Christ's spiritual, not corporal, real presence, without any destruction of the substance of the bread and wine." 59

Dugmore thinks it is this teaching on the Eucharist that Cranmer held personally and which underlies his theological and liturgical work. Furthermore it was derived not from contemporary continental theology, but from the Anglicans' own reading of the ancient sources - more specifically from Ridley's rediscovery of Ratramnus and understanding of the Fathers in that light.

He cites several passages throughout his book to support his contention that Cranmer was in fact a Reformed-Catholic of the Augustinian realist-symbolist tradition, and as such he could never have been a

Zwinglian. He brings to our attention Cranmer's words that "Christ's flesh and blood be in the sacrament truly present, but spiritually and sacramentally, not carnally and corporally. And as He is truly present, so is He truly eaten and drunken and assisteth us."[60]

In commenting on this statement, Dugmore affirms that Zwingli could never have written such words. It is therefore, of fundamental importance to inquire what Cranmer means by Christ's 'spiritual presence' "not in the sacraments of bread and wine but in the ministration of the sacrament." He then explains that Cranmer believed that it is Christ Himself who through the voice of His ministers consecrated the earthly gifts of bread and wine, and so bestows the mystery of His real presence. He quotes at this point quite a lengthy passage which He believes to be decisive for his whole case.

> "The minister of the Church speaketh unto us God's own words which we must take as spoken from God's own mouth, because that from God's mouth it came, and as His word it is, and not the minister's. Likewise, when he ministereth to our sights Christ's holy sacrament, we must think Christ crucified and presented before our eyes, because

> the sacraments so represent Him, and be His sacraments, and not the priest's, as in baptism we must think, that as the priest putteth his hand to the child outwardly, and washeth him with water, so must we think that God putteth to His hand inwardly, and washeth the infant with His Holy Spirit, and moreover, that Christ Himself cometh down upon the child and apparelleth him with His own self, and as at the Lord's holy table the priest distributeth wine and bread to feed the body, so we must think that inwardly by faith we see Christ feeding both body and soul to eternal life. What comfort can be devised any more in this world for a christian man." [61]

The ideas expressed in the latter part of this quotation Dugmore sees as an authentic reproduction of Augustine's teaching that there is that we believe, that which we see, and that which strikes the senses and that which is a pure object of faith: that the res is conveyed by and through the signum.[62]

Dugmore evidently sees further evidence for support of his theory from the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552. In discussing the two Edwardine Books he attempts to trace the progress of liturgical reform in England before 1552. On the basis of his findings he reaches the conclusion that it can be indubitably maintained that Cranmer was chiefly responsible for the 1549 Prayer Book. But with regard to the Second

Prayer Book was he equally responsible? "I do not think so,"[63] Dugmore asserts. By a judicious weighing of his purposes against the influence of the foreign Reformers he shows that the radical revision of the 1552 rite was due largely to their influence. He affirms that "it is obvious that Cranmer had to allow very substantial concessions to be made to the radical Reformers, but it does not follow that he interpreted the rite of 1552 in exactly the same sense as they did, or that he welcomed all the changes made."[64]

In a summary statement regarding this matter, Dugmore declares that:

> "If he (Cranmer) cannot be held responsible for all the changes made in 1552...it nevertheless remains true that he was the man chiefly responsible for giving to the English-speaking world a single service book in place of many books previously used in the conduct of divine worship, a book written in English and in superb liturgical language, which is scriptural and Catholic..."[65]

In criticizing Dom Gregory Dix's handling of Cranmer's theology, Dugmore, more than any other writer, emphasizes the fact that Cranmer's deep patristic learning was the presupposition for his work. He is convinced that the Archbishop had not only reached conclusions differing from

those of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin, but had reached them by at least as thorough a study of Scripture and the Fathers as theirs.

What Dugmore does not make clear however, is whether Cranmer means what the Fathers meant. Any consideration of this will involve a prior consideration of the similarity or difference between Cranmer's philosophical and indeed cosmological presuppositions and those of his patristic authorities. It will require a comparison of the understanding by Cranmer and by the Fathers respectively, of redemption, of justification, and of those other fundamental theological problems whose solution tends to determine what a theologian will think about the Eucharist and the presence.

But Dugmore passes over these problems and proceeds with his criticism of Dix, Richardson and to a lesser degree E.C.Ratcliff. He opposes Dix for maintaining that Cranmer from 1547 to the end of his life, was a Zwinglian. He argues that this interpretation of Cranmer rests almost entirely on references taken from his Defence written when he was in close contact with à Lasco.

Although Dix did in fact draw his arguments largely from the Defence, we cannot avoid taking account of the impression which Dugmore leaves. He tends to make far too much of à Lasco's influence on Cranmer's Defence with the result that one can easily be misled into thinking that Cranmer was not reflecting his own mature theological concepts in that work. It is also difficult to demonstrate that à Lasco and Cranmer were mistaken about the views Zwingli really held.[66]

Dugmore also opposes Richardson for describing Cranmer as "A Zwinglian but with a difference." He recognizes of course, that Richardson had corrected some of Dix's inaccuracies, but he nevertheless, accused him for dragging another "red herring across the path of interpreting Cranmer by positing an inconsistency between Cranmer's doctrine of the incarnation, and his doctrine of the Eucharist."[67]

Dugmore sees no inconsistency at all. Indeed, he endorses Bromiley's assertion that in Cranmer's view, "the Christ who is sacramentally or spiritually present is not merely the incarnate but the crucified and risen Christ...The incarnation of Jesus Christ cannot be divorced

from His atonement."[68]

Dugmore further states that when Cranmer speaks of Christ's dwelling in us by His incarnation, He straightway tells how he understands this to take place in the Eucharist: "And as He may be said to dwell in us by receiving the nature of His immortality."[69]

He objects also to Ratcliff's interpretation of Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine,[70] and criticizes him for concluding that except in the process of eating and drinking, the bread and wine of the Communion are no more Sacrament for Cranmer than the water in the baptismal font.[71]

It is evident that Dugmore regards the arguments of both Dix and Richardson not only as entirely inadequate, but as misrepresenting what Cranmer really believed. He concedes that the Archbishop did temporarily leave the ranks of the Reformed-Catholics in 1548 when his mind was confused by à Lasco who, as Smythe says, had injected him with a mild dose of Zwinglianism. As a result, he was a little uncertain of his ground for the greater part of the debate in December 1548.

Dugmore is convinced that on the last day of the debate the Archbishop recovered his balance. He agrees that Cranmer failed to retain any idea of presenting or

pleading before God in the Eucharist the sacrifice of Christ once offered upon the Cross as a ground of our acceptance. This time he reminds us that Cranmer and the English Reformers had a "theological blind spot" and that "the shadow of Zwinglianism lay across some of their arguments." Yet he is satisfied that: "...While Cranmer like most of the English Reformers and Henricians, held Lutheran views on justification by faith, his sacramental doctrine was the realist-symbolist doctrine which we have traced from Augustine onwards".[72]

Although this is not the place to criticize Dugmore's interpretation of the texts of the Fathers, the early scholastics and Cranmer, we will offer a few observations concerning his understanding of Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine.[73]

While there may be similarities between the sacramental theology of Augustine and Cranmer, it would be extremely difficult to show that there is full agreement between them on this matter, or even between Cranmer's liturgical notions of "memorial" and Augustine's teaching on it.

Indeed we must recognize the real problem that one finds who attempts to attribute to Cranmer any belief in

an objective presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements.

Just one statement at this point will help to illustrate the difficulty. Cranmer said:

> "For Christ is not in its (the bread) neither spiritually as He is in man, nor corporally, as He is in heaven but only sacramentally as a thing may be said to be in the figure, whereby it is signified." 74

We believe that it is precisely this kind of language which occurs so frequently in Cranmer's works that leads Dugmore astray. In short, he stumbles at Cranmer's use of the words "spiritual" and "spiritually" and as a result he falls into the temptation of adjusting certain elements in the eucharistic teaching of the Fathers in the direction of the English Reformers including Cranmer, so that the latter, for their part, have been unduly detached from their relations with their continental counterparts and made to assume Patristic garb.

This preoccupation of Dugmore's with the assumption that the English took another way, distinct from the continentals may account for his not discussing at greater length Cranmer's view of faith, his doctrine

of incarnation and his teaching of his sacraments as "the effectual signs of grace".

NOTES

CHAPTER V

1. J.C.Kirby, "Eucharistic Liturgy in the Anglican Communion", Worship, (42, October 1968),p.468.

2. Ibid.,

3. Dix, Questions of Anglican Orders, (London: 1944), p.131.

4. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy,(2nd Ed. Westminster: Dacre Press,1945), pp.715-716.

5. Ibid., pp.646; 656.

6. Ibid., p.672.

7. F.Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1960),p.99.

8. Cited in Dix, op.cit.,p.632.

9. Cited in B.J.Kidd, Documents of the Continental Reformation, (Oxford: Clarendon Press,1911),

10. Dix, op.cit., p.632

11. Cited in Ibid.

12. Ibid., p.656.

13. Ibid., p.648.

14. Dix, "Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit," Church Quarterly Review, (145,1948), p.1454. Hereafter CQR.

15. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy,p.624.

16. See Introduction to this thesis.

17. Dix, CQR, Loc.cit.,

18. Ibid., pp.163,164.

19. Ibid.,

20. Works, P.S.I, 25. cited in Ibid.,

21. Cited in Ibid., p.173

22. Ibid., p.174.

23. Ibid., p.175

24. Ibid., p.176

25. E.C.Ratcliff, "The Liturgical Work of Archbishop Cranmer", Journal of Ecclesiastical History;(7,1956), Hereafter JEH,

26. W.J.Grisbrooke, Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, (London: 1958),pp.XII-XIII.

27. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, p.672.

28. Works, P.S.II, 93.

29. C.C.Richardson, Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist, (Evanston: Seabury Western Theological Seminary,1949), pp. 1,2.

30. Ibid.,

31. Ibid., p.5.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid., p.7.

34. Cited in Ibid.

35. Ibid., p.8.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid., p.12

38. Ibid.

39. Ibid., p.13

40. Ibid., p.15

41. Ibid., p.20

42. Ibid., p.21

43. Cited in Ibid.

44. Cited in Ibid., p.23.

45. Ibid., pp.28, 29.

46. Dawell Stone, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 2 Vols (New York: Longman, Green and Co, 1909), 2, p.128.

47. Richardson, op.cit., p.32.

48. Cited in Ibid.,

49. Ibid., p.34.

50. Ibid., p.36

51. Ibid., pp.37,39. italics in original.

52. Ibid., p.41.

53. Ibid., p.47.

54. Ibid., pp.48,49.

55. J.C.McLelland, "Lutheran-Reformed Debate on the Eucharist and Christology", Marburg Revisited, (eds.), Paul C.Empie and James I.McCord Minneapolis: Augsbury Publishing House, 1966), p.41

56. E.L.Mascall, The Recovery of Unity, (London: 1958), p.120.

57. C.W.Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, (London: Macmillan and Co.Ltd,1958), p.VII.

58. Ibid., p.247.

59. Ibid., p.183

60. Cited in Ibid., p.187

61. Cited in Ibid., p.188

62. Ibid., p.189

63. Dugmore, "The First Ten Years 1549-59," (The English Prayer Book 1549-1562,(London: S.P.C.K,1963),p.10.

64. Dugmore, op.cit., p.171.

65. Op.Cit., p.30.

66. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers,p.187.

67. Ibid., p.184.

68. G.W.Bromiley, Thomas Cranmer Theologian, (London: Lutterworth Press, 1956), pp.78,79.

69. Cited in Ibid., p.184.

70. Dugmore, The Eucharist in the Reformation Era," Eucharistic Theology Then and Now, (London: S.P.C.K, 1968), p.69 n.26.

71. Ibid., p.70.

72. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformation, p.173.

73. A more detailed discussion is forthcoming in our final chapter.

74. Works P.S.I, 238.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

All contemporary theology makes more and more apparent the centrality of the Eucharist, not as the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, but the point at which the Christian faith finds its most vivid expression. Eucharistic doctrine influences and is influenced by doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, human nature, the redemptive process and man's relation to God. Because of this it may not be an intellectual scandal, even if it is a moral one, that since the ninth century the Eucharist has been the source of many divisions among Christians. Had it not, we might suspect theological stagnation. Viewed in this context, the modern debate over the eucharistic theology of Cranmer remains a relevant issue.

In our conclusion to this study we would offer a few observations that are quite often overlooked, or are mentioned in passing. At the outset we would argue that much of the controversial literature concerning the ideas, purposes and nature of Cranmer's theological and liturgical

reform have not always clarified the complex interworking of causes which resulted in his final redaction of the eucharistic rite.

From our study we discern three main features. First, there was Cranmer's policy of gradual reform, which as we have seen, was largely dependent upon the political climate in England, as it changed successively under Henry VIII, Somerset and Northumberland. In our opinion Cranmer was a master of ecclesiastical politics, he had a keen sense of his own responsibility and the consequences of his actions as Primate of the Church of England, and as such he was genuinely concerned to direct his reformation policies in such a way as not to endanger the maintenance of authority and order.

The experiences and awful consequences of the internecine strifes among the Protestant parties on the Continent left an indelible impression on his mind. He was aware that the bone of contention between them was precisely the doctrine of the Eucharist. For this reason he was determined at all costs not to allow internal dissentions to cripple the forces of the small party of Reformers who had to use, at times, coercive means to

impose their will and their system upon a reluctant majority.

The second major factor consists of the reactions of the conservative party and the moderate and extreme Reformers to the 1549 Prayer Book. Gardiner, in his own skilful way had accepted part of the Book, while some of the Reformers harshly criticized it. This inevitably occasioned the redaction of the 1552 Book.

The third main consideration relates to Cranmer's eirenic preoccupation with an "ecumenical conference" that would negotiate a united Protestantism in theological, doctrinal and liturgical theory and practice. This we believe led him to adopt a more inclusive rather than an exclusive methodology in working out his liturgical schemes, and invested them with depth of ingenuity as well as certain opacity of meaning which distinguishes his liturgical achievement from those of other Reformers. We are suggesting that here is a valuable contribution which anticipates our modern ecumenical discussions. This in a sense was an openness to the future which invited dialogue for liturgical reform.

The Reformation principle of justification by faith was at radical variance with Catholic theology, and Cranmer's acceptance of this principle became an intellectual tool which he used to articulate his understanding of eucharistic worship based on his new insight into the nature and function of the Christian revelation.

Taken as a theological first principle, the doctrine of solafideism was capable of yielding an entirely new dimension to the content of Christian revelation.

This point needs closer examination if we are to grasp Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine. We can examine this by contrasting it with the view of traditional Christianity. "Orthodox" Christianity moves along ~~with~~ what Vagaggini has appropriately called the "law of incarnation". This law takes in two aspects which are sustained in vital tension. In the first place, God communicates his life to man by means of sensible realities, and through these intermediaries man must pass to obtain divine life. The second aspect involves this divine communication, which, while leaving as it was the difference between God and man, renders man competent to be and act in a dimension commensurate with the divine source of the life he has received. This "divine" way of being and acting is not simply moral;

it is ontological and physical. Christ in his Incarnation as the Word, appears as the prototype in whom this law is verified in the highest degree and under all its aspects. The economy of salvation, so conceived is one of mediation. It is therefore maintained that because of its theandric basis, this mediation involves a twofold process; the one "descending" from the Father through the Son and the created means of Church and Sacrament, the other "ascending" in the line of secondary casuality and based upon the participation of these created means in divine sacramental character. In the Holy Spirit these latter two principles energize man's ascent to ultimate union with God himself.

The twofold process of "descending" and "ascending" mediation, although distinguishable, are inseparable: they reflect a viable tension of those ontological principles which together constitute the "law of incarnation".[1]

Against this view the Reformers in general advance the thought that the constitutive factor of Christianity was personal encounter with God through the mercy which Christ has won by his atoning death. This encounter, they affirmed, was a deeply private exper-

iential matter. In this connection Clark reminds us that "When the Reformers formulated and passionately proclaimed the gospel of justification by faith alone it was, implicitly the whole 'incarnational' ethos of Catholicism they were rejecting."[2]

It was quite clear that for Cranmer as well as for some of the Reformers, their doctrine of justification by faith alone and their correlative theory of the atonement, compelled them to reformulate their theory of the Lord's Supper. According to Cranmer, the Supper is "an effectual sign of grace", this being so, it should be understood and interpreted in terms of the reality of man's free forgiveness, acceptance and adoption in and through Christ. Not only that, if grace is received by faith, and if the essence of faith is trust in God and His promise, then it follows that the Supper must be conceived as a rite which displays and confirms the promise of the gospel and as a means through which faith is exercised and deepened.

We find the Archbishop coming himself to these convictions on justification in his three homilies, "Of the Salvation of Mankind", "Of the True and Lively Faith", and "Of Good Works".[3]

While it may be argued that the Primate brought no new insight to the doctrine of justification, his contribution however lies in the fact that he stated with consistent forcefulness the essentials of the Reformation position. Faith indeed became for Cranmer the key-concept of the economy of salvation, sacramental theory and liturgical revision. He reminds us in his homily "Of the Salvation of Mankind" that faith in the merits of our Lord was the work of God in man.[4] But certainly one of the crucial points (if not the crucial) in his emphasis was upon faith precisely as had by man, and the greater part of all three of his homilies is devoted to elaborating the dimension faith assumes within the individual personality. It is in this light that his terminology about faith takes on a distinctively, affective and, in some measure, psychological cast, centring on man's <u>remembering</u> the passion and death of Christ. Within this setting Cranmer is articulating a view of the Eucharist which, as we shall see, has terminological precedent in late medieval piety. But although the terms are similar, we submit that Cranmer's concept of the Eucharist stems

from a doctrinal presupposition that is radically new with the Reformation.

It remains now for us to analyse Cranmer's own ideas about sacrifice in order to understand some of his statements which, because of their apparent equivocal nature, have led to much confusion. In approaching this problem we must refer back to the idea of sacrifice in the medieval and Reformation period. In doing this we must bear in mind that we are dealing with a period in which the vocabulary of both Catholics and Protestants was shifting and confused.

With this caveat, we now raise the question: Did the pre-Reformation and Reformation theologians believe in the equation "sacrifice equals death?" The replies to this question are many and varied, but the general consensus of opinion seems to be in the affirmative.

Many scholars, such as F.C.N.Hicks, E.L.Mascall, B.J.Kidd, C.W.Dugmore and others, present and defend the view that the Catholic theologians of the Middle Ages and Reformation era taught that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and therefore Christ must be in some sense put to death.[5] Mascall argues that there was no hope of any sound theology of the eucharistic sacrifice in the sixteenth century, and at least on the Continent, because of this gross error and defect in their understanding of sacrifice.

It is felt that even Cranmer and the English Reformers were victims of this late-medieval error but Dugmore tries to be a little more concessive by suggesting that Cranmer and his associates had a 'theological blind spot' regarding one aspect of the eucharistic sacrifice. This assumption, as we have indicated, has won so assured a position that it is repeated simply as a matter of fact.

But what in fact was the situation? In the first place the medieval theologians were not as incompetent as some would have us believe. These men represented some of the most acute minds of that era. This is not to say that they did not labour under the inadequacies touching the nature of the Eucharist as the supreme act of Christian worship. But as Clark points out, Mascall and others evidently confused practical abuses connected with the Mass with what in fact was the theological understanding of it, and against which the Reformers reacted. He defends the view that it was a certain theological doctrine they were rejecting.

We would suggest that while the Reformers were most probably concerned with rescuing the notion of sacrifice from its limited pre-occupation with death,

they were limited because of their philosophical and cosmological world view. They were unable to work out the meaning of sacrifice into a wider and more positive affirmation which includes offering, communion, covenant and renewal. The preoccupation with the suffering Christ, the dying Saviour, overshadowed the possibility of understanding Christ's "Sacrifice" as including the whole life from incarnation through ministry, death and resurrection to the ascension. Because of this both the medieval theologians and the Reformers failed to grasp fully the meaning of the incarnation and its relation to the eucharistic sacrifice. Their philosophical and cosmological presupposition became 'theological blind spots' which prevented them from comprehending that the sacrifice of the cross, in union with the showing forth by the Son before the Father involves the entire redemptive work of Christ. Furthermore they could not have a dynamic concept of sacrifice which saw it as constituting a process, a drama, a movement enacted through the Supper in the course of which it is impossible to speak of one moment as the sacrifice. These theologians found themselves struggling with the deep question who or what is offered in the Eucharist? This was indeed the

most divisive question, not only between Protestants and Catholics but even among the Protestants themselves. The problem seems to be one of trying to reconcile differing, but not wholly opposing categories of thought in which to express the reality of Christ's presence.

As J.C.McLelland puts it "the medieval way of theologizing derived from the quaestiones disputatae, the serial treatment of disparate themes arranged according to philosophical taste. There existed alongside this a mystical piety and theology, in which meditation on the person and work of Christ provided form and content."[6] The theologians of the pre-Reformation and Reformation had a pre-Copernican view of the universe, therefore when we read their statements such as "Christ is in heaven and consequently cannot be here", we must take them seriously.

Except to the non-philosophically minded the "presence" was both to Catholics and Lutherans alike, effected by the substance of the Body, that is by a metaphysical reality, which by definition could never be accessible to the senses but only to the intellect. Our tendency to express materiality in terms of "substance" and "substantial" inclines us to forget that.

The point at issue was precisely whether only the Deity of Christ, or the Deity and Humanity together, could be locally present in the Sacraments.

Where do we locate Cranmer in all this? When his writings are carefully examined in the context of his time and the theological milieu in which he developed his sacramental theology, it seems hard to sustain the theory that he was a realist-symbolist of the Augustinian tradition.

It must be acknowledged that one can find in Cranmer's teaching a concept of sacrifice which is based on the idea of a union not of identity but of fellowship. This consideration raises the relevance of the question regarding the framework within which his eucharistic theology can be situated.

Except by a feat of casuistry it seems difficult to hold that Cranmer believed in the doctrine of Christ's "spiritual, not corporal, real presence" as Dugmore claims. In his own words, Cranmer denied this charge, He said:

> "For he is not in it, (the bread) neither spiritually as he is in man, not corporally, as he is in heaven but only sacramentally, as a thing may be said to be in the figure, whereby it is signified." 7

When we consider Cranmer's repeated assertions

that Christ is in heaven only, it is difficult to understand how one can meaningfully talk of any doctrine of 'presence' in Cranmer at all.

We believe that Dugmore has not taken sufficiently into account certain fundamental presuppositions which support the Archbishop's theology. For example, he pays only superficial attention to the use of the term "spiritual" or "spiritually". The fact is, when the word is applied to the eating and drinking, it is sometimes quite equivocal. In one sense it may imply Christ's bodily presence but in the manner appropriate to a spirit (what St.Paul calls spiritual presence), which was the Catholic doctrine, or that any "presence " is in effect merely a relationship set up between the communicant and Christ's body in heaven. Secondly it can possibly mean either the spiritual manducation of Christ, so often spoken of by Catholic devotional writers, namely the assimilation of the grace flowing from the real presence physically received; or it may mean, as I believe it clearly does in Cranmer, that it can take place even outside the eucharistic action, a union as we have said, not of identity but of fellowship with the heavenly Christ metaphorically called feeding on Christ. Cranmer explicitly states:

> "Faithful christian people, such as be Christ's true disciples, continually from time to time record in their minds the beneficial death of our Saviour Christ, chewing it by faith in the cud of their spirit, and digesting it in their hearts, feeding and comforting themselves with that heavenly meat, although they daily receive not the sacrament thereof, and so they eat Christ's body spiritually although not the sacrament thereof. But when such men for their more comfort and confirmation of eternal life, given unto them by Christ's death, come unto the Lord's holy table; then, as before they fed spiritually upon Christ, so now they feed corporally also upon the sacramental bread: by which sacramental feeding in Christ's promises, their former spiritual feeding is increased, and they grow and wax continually more strong in Christ, until at the last they shall come to the full measure and perfection in Christ." 8

Few things could be more forcefully and candidly expressed, yet Dugmore will not allow Cranmer to mean what he says and goes on to interpret him not in the light of this definition, but in that of his (Dugmore) own theory. He alleges that to Cranmer "spiritual eating" is no substitute for the "sacramental feeding" upon Christ in the Eucharist. But it clearly is, in this and many other passages in Cranmer, unless we are to hold that Cranmer attached overwhelming value to what he calls "feeding corporally <u>also</u> on the sacramental bread;"[9] there is a difference no doubt, because

the Eucharist is Christ's own institution, but it is a difference of degree not of kind. In addition to this, the contention, that the English Reformers including Cranmer, believed in any earthly presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in the normal sense of the word "presence", collapses when one examines their words in the light of contemporary thinking. It is however true, that they themselves seem to have been conscious of no unsurmountable obstacle between their doctrine and that of Switzerland; nor were the Swiss. It is also significant that Cranmer seems in no way to have resented the accusation of Zwinglianism made at his trial, and by the nature and form of his answer to have tacitly admitted it.[10]

At this point the question to be asked is: Are the theological presuppositions of Cranmer reflected in his liturgical composition? This question is of paramount importance. To be sure no one now denies that Cranmer was chiefly responsible for the composition of the First Prayer Book, 1549. Evidence for this is forthcoming from many liturgical scholars and above all, from the Act of Uniformity which introduced the Book.

The First Book was by no means positively Zwinglian,

yet it was so contrived that by a careful reading of it the doctrine of the real presence could be denied, as well as affirmed. (as Gardiner certainly demonstrated). But the evidence for Cranmer's part in the compilation of the 1552 Book is by no means conclusive. There is evidence based on deduction from both sides. It can be argued that the fact that Cranmer was hotly displeased with the way the First Book was received would presuppose a reluctance, and indeed a refusal, to have anything to do with a revision. On the other hand, one can suggest that after the publication of the 1549 Book and during his associations with Bucer, Martyr and à Lasco, the Archbishop had come to see that liturgy must necessarily express doctrine and so he gladly took part in the revision of the 1552 rite.

Again one might even put forward the view that the Black Rubric of 1552 in no sense represents Cranmer's mind. But the same point could be used to support the theory that he did have a part in its composition. For example, it could be argued that not only does the wording of the Black Rubric correspond with what Cranmer himself had repeatedly said, but its irritated tome suggests that it may be his own composition, for he regarded the agitation

against kneeling at communion as a perversive misunderstanding of his intention.

Strype evidently believed that Cranmer had a part in its composition by suggesting that it was due "to the motion of the Archbishop!"[11] If J.I.Packer's analysis is correct, then we would agree that Cranmer was in some way responsible for the 1552 Prayer Book. Packer observes that in each of the main services in the 1552 Book the basic structural pattern is a sin-grace-faith sequence, out of which all praises are made to rise and this is in effect the "gospel of justification" in liturgical form.

Thus, Packer continues, Morning and Evening Prayer were made to start penitentially, with confession of sin, followed by the proclaiming of God for Salvation, followed by further exercises of faith in profession (the creed) prayer and the hearing of God's word. Also, the Holy Communion service is recast from the traditional shape of the 1549 rite into a new mould, which was essentially just a threefold repetition of the sin-grace-faith cycle: the first in the Ante-communion, from the opening collect to the intercession (the focal points being the law, the gospel, and the creed), and the second running from the longer exhortation to the Sanctus (in its context, praise

for salvation) and the third from the prayer of humble access to the Gloria (also praise for salvation). Cranmer's use of this cycle as the basic structural principle for his eucharistic liturgy reflects his conviction that justification by faith, in and through Christ, is what the Sacrament is about - the message that it proclaims, and the promise that it seals. The repetition of the cycle within the communion itself apparently expresses the principle that, since the function of the sacraments is tbe confirm the gospel words to believers, a complete verbal presentation of the gospel (done here by the confession, absolution, and comfortable words) is the proper liturgical preparation for administering the Sacrament.

It is his submission therefore that two presuppositions directly control Cranmer's approach to sacramental theology. The doctrine of justification by faith on the basis of the perfect, finished, all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ on the cross: a doctrine which as we have seen, undercuts the medieval idea of the mass-sacrifice from the start. The second presupposition is that the sacraments are visible words, rites ordained by Christ to confirm to our other senses

the gospel promises which preaching proclaims in our ears. In proclaiming justification, Cranmer is not offering us a mere theological abstraction or legal fiction, but inviting us to personal closure and union with a living Saviour.[12]

T.M.Parker endorses the judgement of Packer and goes on to say, "to suggest that no significance attaches to the omission from the 1552 version of the Prayer of Humble Access of the words 'in these Holy Misteries' is to overlook the importance of Bucer's strong approval of the original prayer."[13]

Dugmore firmly resists any attempt to make Cranmer equally responsible for the compilation of the 1552 Book as he was for the 1549. He states quite decidedly that he does not think that the Archbishop had such a responsible role in it. However, if J.C.Kirby's estimate of the Second Prayer Book is correct, that is, "from the viewpoints of structure and content 1552 (Book) marks the low point of Anglican liturgy,"[14] then it may well be that Dugmore's resistence stems more from a psychological factor rather than from an objective appraisal of the Book itself.

When Dugmore claims that the whole approach of

the English Reformers was different from that of the Continental divines, he is guilty of an over-simplification which distorts the evidence. It is surely historically accurate that the English Reformers did not go their own way in eucharistic theology without reference to the aims and achievements of the Continental Protestant writers. Evidently Dugmore does not seem to realize the agreement which these men had together in eucharistic doctrine.

When, therefore, he uses his newly formed term "Reformed-Catholics" as a peculiar definition applicable only to Cranmer and Ridley and others like them, it should be pointed out that some of the continentals could be so described on the basis of his definition. We mentioned above that we believe Dugmore's reasons to be psychological, this observation arises from the fact that Dugmore's own view of the Eucharist appears to be closer to authentic patristic symbolism and consequently it would be difficult for him to believe that the English Reformers and the author of the English formularies held a lower view than he does.

We must now turn to consider Dix's evaluation of Cranmer's sacramental theology in order to draw attention to what we feel are serious shortcomings. In our opinion

Dix fails to understand Cranmer's comprehension of sacrifice and his view of faith, as a result he cannot see the Supper as something with any significance beyond a bare sign. Another weakness we find is the tendency to make Cranmer almost, if not entirely, dependent on Zwingli for his eucharistic ideas, which we suggest is not in harmony with the evidence. While it is true that Cranmer and Zwingli held similar views on certain aspects of eucharistic theology, it does not necessarily mean that similarity of ideas presuppose a borrowing or a complete agreement. There is sufficient evidence to support the view that Cranmer possessed the rare combination of radicalism and conservatism. Cranmer believed that sound knowledge of facts entitled one to criticise and revise tradition. Despite his caution in some matters, he had a large measure of boldness and persistence. And naturally, his influence has been felt most strongly and continuously along the lines of his own deepest convictions.

Cranmer was a radical reformer, even if he was at times inconsistent in his radicalism, but it must be said that he was not indebted to Zurich, Geneva, Wittenberg or Strassburg for his radicalism although

from time to time they might have encouraged it.

But Dix makes no allowance for this aspect of Cranmer's independence of mind and as a consequence he tends to subsume Cranmer's mature theological contributions to the influence of Zurich. This is precisely why he cannot appreciate Cranmer's high esteem for the Supper and his insistence on the reality of the believer's fellowship with the risen and ascended Christ.

There is no doubt that the Sacrament meant much to Cranmer; one need not doubt that piety, even if, as Gardiner recalled, adherence to a doctrine of justification by faith cannot but affect one's eucharistic doctrine.

Concerning Richardson's important study, we must raise a few questions. In spite of his qualifications to Dix's thesis, he too is probably guilty of over-emphasizing Cranmer's direct indebtedness to Zwingli. As we have just stated, it is not enough to show that Cranmer's language reflects a Zwinglian flavour, we must also ask to what extent did Cranmer adopt the particular tenets of the Swiss Reformer;...Secondly, is it really true that Cranmer does not bring his incarnational theology into relation with his eucharistic theology?

If this is so, as Richardson evidently maintains, what then does he mean by the statement that,

> "by trust in the Passion we receive all the fruits of redemption, and these fruits do, indeed, imply a substantial union with Christ by virtue of the incarnation?"

It can be asserted that the 1552 Communion Service shows that the Eucharist is supremely the sphere where this trust is exercised and imparted. Admittedly, there is an apparent inconsistency between what Cranmer says of the Eucharist and what he says of the Incarnation, but nowhere does Richardson tell us what Zwingli thought of the believer's incorporation into Christ, and this we submit is important to know if he is to support his position that Cranmer held a different view which led him into logical inconsistency.

However, despite this lack of clarity on those points in Richardson's evaluation of Cranmer's eucharistic theology we suggest that his case is sounder than Dix's, and is far more consistent with Cranmer's own teaching than Dugmore's, whose argument in its main emphasis is out of harmony with Cranmer's works.

Cranmer insists that his own understanding of the Eucharist is in fact richer and more biblical than that of his opponents. He denies that Christ is present corporally,

substantially, carnally, or naturally in the consecrated elements - present, that is, under the forms of bread and wine, in the same physical, localized sense in which He was present in the earth before His ascension, and will be present once more at his coming again: to say this, Cranmer argues is grotesque Christological nonsense. But Cranmer affirms that Christ is truly, "in deed" and really present when the eucharistic rite is performed. His formula for the presence is that Christ is there sacramentally in the elements and spiritually in the participants. By "sacramentally" he means figuratively; Christ is 'there' in a sense analogous to that in which the subject of a portrait is there when his picture hangs on the wall. The elements, and the action performed with them (breaking the bread , pouring the wine, consuming both) constitute a sign symbolically presenting to us Christ's passion, making the cross vivid to our minds (i.e.real) and assuring us that as believers we do in fact "dwell in him and he in us," so that the benefits of His passion are all ours. Cranmer holds that when the Fathers called the elements Christ's body and blood, and the rite His sacrifice and passion, they were not speaking realistically, but sacramentally,

But he also maintains: that Christ is present as well in faithful communicants spiritually - that is, by the Holy Spirit. The Christ who comes to them through the preaching of the Word - 'the whole Christ', the God-man, crucified, risen, glorified, enthroned, coming in the authority of His offices and the power of His atoning work.

> "My doctrine is, that the very body of Christ, was born of the virgin Mary and suffered for our sins, giving us life by his death, the same Jesus as concerning his corporal presence is taken from us, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and yet he is by faith spiritualy present with us, and is our spiritual food and nourishment, and sitteth in the midst of all then that be gathered together in his name." 16

It is not at all easy to measure the influence of a man upon a continuing society or body of men, to distinguish unequivocally his impact upon its prevailing character or spirit or tendencies. Although no one really questions Cranmer's profound influence on the formation of the Book of Common Prayer, yet it is certainly true that he has left us no sharp, clear-cut and therefore systematic presentation of his theological ideas, especially on the Eucharist. This is not to say that he was not an able scholar, but as a theologian he was at times quite inconsistent in his views, though quite passionate in expressing them. If this was a weakness, as some might argue, it was perhaps a fortunate weakness.

We have already indicated that Cranmer reflected the peculiar combination of radicalism and conservatism which was rarely found in one man especially in the sixteenth century. And we are suggesting that it is this characteristic that makes it so difficult to assess precisely his eucharistic theology. Indeed, we believe that this is of key importance in seeking either to understand or explain his inconsistency and apparent contradiction that we encounter from time to time in his works.

An excellent example of this is seen in the contradiction between the Preface to and services of the Ordinal and his opinions on the ministry expressed in "Questions and Answers Concerning the Sacraments and the Appointment and Power of Bishops and Priests" in 1540. Cranmer explicitly affirmed:

> " All Christian princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole cure of all subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance. And in both these ministrations they must have sundry ministers under them...The civil ministers be those whom it shall please his highness for the time to put under him as e.g. the lord chancellor, the lord treasurer...sheriffs, etc. The ministers of God's word under his majesty be the bishops, parsons, vicars and such other priests as shall be appointed by his highness to that ministration,

> as e.g. the bishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Durham...the parson of Winwicks, etc. In the admission of these officers be divers comely ceremonies and solemnities used, which be not of necessity, but only for a good order and seemly fashion, for if such offices and ministration were committed without such solemnity, they were nevertheless truly committed. And there is no more promise of God that grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office than it is in the committing of the civil office." 17

One would be reluctant to doubt the sincerity of Cranmer's intentions in this statement. Yet in 1555 at the time of his trial he vigorously maintained the thesis that:

> " Nero is the head of the Church, that is in worldly respect of the temporal bodies of men, of whom the Church consisteth. For so he beheaded Peter and the Apostles. And the Turk too, is the head of the Church of Turkey." 18

Granted that the civil ruler is a "minister of God" but to be head of the Church one must first of all be a member of that Church and to be a member requires the christian rite of baptism. But Nero was indisputably considered by the Apostolic Church as the "Beast" and "Anti-Christ" who crucified the apostles. How, then, could Cranmer maintain that he was head of the Church when he was not even a friend? Again we may cite another example which stresses the inconsistency in Cranmer. When in the last years of his life

he was faced by the "Puritans" attempt to condemn everything not commanded in the Bible as against the Holy Scripture, he resisted that attempt with great energy and forthrightness. He said to the Council in 1552.

> " I trust ye will not be moved by these glories and unquiet spirits, which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy, and cease not to make trouble and disquietness when things be most quiet and in good order. If such men should be heard although the Book (i.e. the Prayer Book) were made every year anew, yet should it not lack faults in their opinion. But say they, it is not commanded in the Scripture to kneel, and whatsoever is not commanded in the Scripture is against the scripture and utterly unlawful and ungodly. But this saying is the chief foundation of the error of the Anabaptists and of all order, as well in religion as in common policy." 19

There is certainly no radicalism in this stern denunciation of those who set themselves against the Archbishop's cherished hopes.

In the 1549 rite the structure and form remain almost like the old order of the Latin rite. The private prayers of the priests were omitted, except for the Lord's Prayer and a collect. The only other change in the liturgy of the word was the placing of the sermon after the Nicene creed, instead of after the gospel. In the canon, the intercessions were brought together and placed immediately after the sanctus, and the names of the saints, except

that of the Virgin, were omitted. The rest of the prayer followed the old order, the only words omitted being those which in some quarters were given a propitiatory interpretation of the eucharistic sacrifice. To replace them there was inserted a paragraph emphasizing the unique nature of Christ's true sacrifice. The only other additions were a form of preparation for communion consisting of an invitation, confession, absolution, three brief "comfortable words" from the New Testament, and the prayer of humble access; this was inserted at the point where the priest's own prayers before the communion were found in the Latin rite. The Agnus Dei was now to be sung during the time of communion, and after communion one fixed prayer took the place of the Latin variables. As in the old service, the congregation was dismissed with blessing.[20]

The fundamental question that persists through all our discussion is: Is it not entirely possible, that some of the inconsistencies we meet in Cranmer's statements on ordination, priestly functions and the authority of the civil ruler, could also be found in his other works? Could it be that the apparent ambiguity in the 1549 rite and his subsequent reaction to the advocacy of the radical

reformers for revision, indicate that while Cranmer showed intellectual agreement with the Reformation, psychologically and emotionally his heart was not entirely with it? Thus, he was unable to reflect the radical ideas of the Reformation in his liturgy - something that was so dear to his heart?.

These are questions which evidently must remain unanswered, for no one can say unequivocally which Cranmer he is dealing with when examining his writings.

However, it has become apparent, that at times Cranmer was unable to make a break with the tradition especially at certain decisive moments. We would therefore suggest that there are at least two fundamental factors that eventually moved him to submit (as in the case of the Black Rubric) to some of the demands for revision.

The first factor relates to his concern to avoid dissension and instability within the realm. There could be no question that Cranmer kept constantly before him, the peace and security of the country. He was aware that as Primate of all England the consequences of his actions could produce very unpleasant situations

or disruption. Therefore he endeavoured at all times to act responsibly even at the sacrifice of consistency. The second major factor points to his admiration, and indeed respect, for the theological learning of his intimate continental friends especially Martyr, Bucer and à Lasco. The undoubtedly led him to be more compliant on matters of theological expression. We have already referred to the fact that it was these men who impressed Cranmer with the idea that liturgy must necessarily express doctrine, but even in this , I think it could be said that he was not as thorough-going as they had hoped.

We would argue that these observations must be kept clearly in mind when attempting to discover the particular eucharistic doctrine which Cranmer held. The fact is, ~~that~~ Cranmer's theological ideas cannot be understood in isolation from some of the more potent influences which helped to shape his liturgy and theology. These ideas were articulated largely within a context of conflict and controversy. And one of the temptations that the Archbishop faced in this sitz im-leben was to yield to the tendency to caricature the opinions, policy and behaviour of his antagonists. The offending tenets of the one group

were seized upon, exaggerated beyond their natural meaning, and at times were made to appear as monstrosities of thought. Obviously, in such passionate controversy, such tactics can lead quite easily to inconsistency and contradiction, and we believe that on this basis it is difficult to say conclusively whether Cranmer was a radical Reformer after the Zurich school or whether he was a good "enlightened Catholic".

To read certain of his vehement tirades against the mass one may well be inclined to conclude that the ultimate object of his attack was a doctrine quite different from the traditional and orthodox belief about the sacrifice of the altar. But what must be said is that these statements are found mainly in his Defence and Answer and were in fact responses to and arguments against his opponents. However, it is to these works that most writers turn when attempting to categorize Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine. And in our opinion they quite often misinterpret his ideas and beliefs simply because they have not taken these factors sufficiently into account.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that Cranmer was basically "Swiss" in his eucharistic theology. But in

working out the implications of his beliefs he manifested a scholarly independence of mind which helped him to have a richer and a more edifying value of the Eucharist, not only as the "effectual sign of grace", but also in terms of the believer's unique and transcendent relationship with Christ through participation and fellowship.

It is in terms of Communion with the present Christ that Cranmer explains the meaning of eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood. His concern was to think through the doctrine of salvation Christologically in terms, that is, of the biblical and catholic understanding of the person and work of Christ. It was through considering the meaning of the cross that he began to understand that faith was not a meritorious work. It was by asking the right question that he arrived at his understanding of the Eucharist. We submit that Cranmer was not as interested in questions of "what" or "why" as he was in the question "Who". Indeed he reduced the questions: What is salvation? What is justification? What is the Eucharist? to this central question: Who, according to Scripture is our Lord Jesus Christ? In short, he was maintaining that we learn the

answers to those questions by discovering who Jesus Christ was.

To be sure, he was not always consistent, but in this inconsistency he unconsciously set the pattern of the future for Anglicanism especially with regards to the communion. In the same church can be found those who think the Eucharist to be a genuine re-presentation of the sacrifice of Calvary, and those who find its whole worth and value in the assurance that they are "incorporate in the mystical Body of Christ, which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

NOTES

CHAPTER VI

1. Aidan Kavanagh, The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in Thomas Cranmer, (St.Meinard: Abbey Press, 1964), pp.49,50.

2. F.Clark, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1958)p.104.

3. Works P.S.II, 128-129.

4. Ibid., pp.129-130.

5. E.L.Mascall, Corpus Christi, (London: Longmans, Green and Co, 1953), p.83.

6. J.C.McLelland,"Lutheran-Reformed Debate on the Eucharist and Christology", ~~and~~ Marbury Revisited Paul C.Empie, and James D.McCord (eds). (Minneapolis: Augsbury Press, 1966),p.46.

7. Works P.S.II. 238, italics mine.

8. Works P.S.I 70-1

9. italics mine

10. Works P.S.II 218.

11. Strype Memorials I p.416.

12. G.E.Duffield (ed), The Work of Thomas Cranmer,(2 vols,, Appleford: The Sutton Courtenay Press 1964) 2, p.XXVI.

13. T.M.Parker,"Book Review," 12 Vols., Journal of Theological Studies, April 1961.

14. J.C.Kirby, "Eucharistic Liturgy in the Anglican Communion," 42 Worship, October 1968.

15. C.C.Richardson, Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist, (Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949), p.45.

16. Works P.S.I, 185 italics mine.

17. Ibid., p.186.

18. Ibid., p.219.

19. Cited in Alwyn Winton, "Thomas Cranmer and the Genius of the Church of England," Thomas Cranmer 1489-1556, Westminster: The Church Information Board,1956) p.51.

20. Kirby, op.cit., pp.468,469.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguinas, Thomas — Summa Theologiae 3. Trans. Francis P.Greaney, S.J. Ottawa: 1943

Barth, Karl — Theology and Church, New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Brilioth, Yngve — Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic, trans. by A.G.Hebert, SPCK., London, 1930.

Bromiley, G.W. — Thomas Cranmer Theologian, London: Lutterworth Press, 1956.

Brooks, Peter — Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist. London: Macmillan Co.Ltd. 1965.

Buescher, G. — The Eucharistic Teaching of William Ockham, Washington: 1950.

Burnet, Gilbert — History of the Reformation, 7 Vols. (ed.) N.Pocock. Oxford: 1865.

Calvin, John — Institutes of the Christian Religion. 2 Vols. Trans by Henry Beveridge, Grand Rapids: Wm. B.Eerdman's, 1962.

Clark, Francis — Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd., 1960.

Courvoisier, Jacques — Zwingli, A Reformed Theologian. John Knox Press, 1963.

Cranmer, Thomas — Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer, (ed.) J.E.Cox, Parker Society. Cambridge: 1846.

\- — The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, D.D., Archbishop of Canterbury. 4 Vols. (ed.) H. Jenkyns, Oxford: 1833.

Cranmer, Thomas — A Short Instruction into Christian Religion. Being a Catechism set forth by Archbishop Cranmer in MDXL VIII: together with the same in Latin, translated from the German by Justus Jonas in MDXXXIX. (ed.) E.Burton. Oxford: 1829.

\- — Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.(ed.) J.E.Cox. Parker Society, Oxford: 1844.

\- — The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI, London: Everyman's Library,1910.

Daniel-Rops, H. — The Protestant Reformation, London: J.M.Dent and Sons Ltd., 1958.

Denzinger, H.-Schonmetizer, A. — Enchiridon Symbolorum, 32d ed. Freiburg-im-Bresgau, 1963.

Dix, Dom Gregory — Questions of Anglican Orders, London: 1944.

\- — The Shape of the Liturgy, Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945.

Duffield, G.E. (ed). — The Works of Archbishop Cranmer, 2 vols. Appleford: The Sutton Courtenay Press, 1964. Vol.2.

Dugmore, C.W. — "The First Ten Years". The English Prayer Book 1549 - 1662. London: S.P.C.K.

\- — The Mass and the English Reformers. London: Macmillan and Co.Ltd., 1958.

\- — "The Eucharist in the Reformation Era" Eucharistic Theology Then and Now. London: S.P.C.K.1968.

Elton, G.R. (ed.) — The New Cambridge Modern History, Vol.2. Cambridge: The University Press, 1958.

Foxe, John — Acts and Monuments of John Foxe, 8 vols. (ed.) J.Pratt. London: 1877.

Gasquet, A. and Bishop, E. — Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer, 2nd ed. London: Hodges, 1891.

de Ghellinck, J. — "Eucharistie au XIIe siecle en Occident", in DTC. Paris: 1913, vol.2.

Grisbrooke, W.J. — Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, London: 1958.

Hicks, F.C.N. — The Fullness of Sacrifice, 3rd ed. London: S.P.C.K, 1953.

Hutchinson, F.E. — Cranmer and the English Reformation, London: Hazel Watson and Viney Ltd., 1966.

Innes, A.G. — Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1900.

Jenkyns, H. — The Remains of Thomas Cranmer, 4 vols. Oxford: 1833.

Jjernagel, Neelak Serawlook, — Henry VIII and The Lutherans, A Study in Anglo-Lutheran Relations 1527-1547, Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1965.

Kavanagh, Aidan. — The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in Thomas Cranmer, St. Meinard, Indiana: Abbey Press, 1964.

Kidd, B.J. — Documents of the Continental Reformation, Oxford: 1911.

- — The Late Medieval Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, London: S.P.C.K. 1958.

Lehmann, Helmut.T. (et al. (eds.) — Luther's Works, 55 vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press: 1959.

Lepin, M. — L'idee du Sacrifice de la Messe, Paris: 1926.

de Lubac, H. — Corpus Mysticum: L'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au Moyen Age, Paris: 1949.

Luther, Martin. — A Treatise on the New Testament, that is the Holy Mass, 1520, in LW., Vol.35.

\- — The Babylonian Captivity of the Church 1520, in LW, Vol.36.

\- — The Blessed Sacrament of the Holy and True Body of Christ and the Brotherhoods, 1519 in LW., Vol.35.

Mascall, E.L. — Corpus Christi, 2nd ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1965.

Mascall, E.L. — The Recovery of Unity, London: Longmans, Green and Co.Ltd., 1958.

McLelland, J.C. — The Visible Words of God, An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr, Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.

\- — "Lutheran Reformed Debate on the Eucharist and Christology", Marbury Revisited. (eds). Paul C.Empie and James I.McCord, Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966.

Neunheuser,D. — L'Eucharistie II au Moyen Age et a l'epoque moderne, Paris: 1966.

Obermann, H. — The Harvest of Medieval Theology, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Parker, T.M. — The English Reformation to 1558, London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Pollet, J.M.V. — "Zwinglianisme," Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique 15, Col.3825.

Pollet, J.M.V. — Martin Bucer - Etudes sur la Correspondence, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958.

Powers, Joseph M. — Eucharistic Theology, New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.

Richardson, C.C. — Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist, Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949.

Ridley, J.G. — Thomas Cranmer, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Robinson, Hastings (ed.) — Original Letters relative to the English Reformation written during the Reigns of King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Mary, Chiefly from the Archives of Zurich, 2 Vols. Cambridge: 1846-1847.

Rupp, G.E. — Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Traditions, Cambridge: University Press, 1947.

Smyth, C.H. — Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI, Cambridge: University Press, MCMXXVI.

Stone, Darwell. — A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, 2 Vols. New York: Longman's, Green and Co., 1909.

Strype, John. — Memorials of the Most Reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, 2 Vols. Oxford: 1840.

Sykes, Norman et al. — Thomas Cranmer 1489-1556, Westminster: S.W.11, The Church Information Board, 1958.

Todd, H.J. — The Life of Archbishop Cranmer, 2 Vols. London: 1831.

Wallace, Ronald S. Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, Edinburgh: Olwer and Boyd, 1953.

Wendel, Francois Calvin, Trans. Philips Mairet, New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Winton, Alwyn "Thomas Cranmer and the Genius of the Church of England", Thomas Cranmer 1948-1556, Westminster: The Church Information Board, 1956.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Dix, Dom Gregory "Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit" CQR, CXLV, CXLVI, (1948), 162.

Kirby, J.C. "Eucharistic Liturgy in the Anglican Communion," Worship, 42, October 1968.

McCue, James F. "The Doctrine of Transubstantiation From Berengar Through Trent:The Point at Issue", Harvard Theological Bulletin, (July 1968), p.413.

Ramsey, Michael "The Observer" (May 1962).

Ratcliff, E.C. "Liturgical Work of Archbishop Cranmer", Journal of Ecclesiastical History, 7(1956), 191.

Timms, G.B. "Cranmer Dixit", Church Quarterly Review, Vol CXLIII (1947), 219.

Meadows, Frank "The Early Eucharistic Theology of Martin Bucer", Unpublished. S.T.M. thesis, Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, 1965. (unpublished manuscript).