CHAPTER 2: THE OXFORD MOVEMENT:
A Brief History of the Church of England and Discussion of the Oxford Movement, with a Glance at the American Jeremiad

As noted in chapter one, shortly after his conversion Eliot declared himself to be, among other things, an "anglo-catholic in religion." First, religious conversion can well be expected to exert a great effect on all aspects of the new believer's life. Second, labeling oneself so specifically as an Anglo-Catholic reinforces those effects and, in fact, adds to the impact. The thrust of this study is to examine what it means for Eliot to be specifically Anglo-Catholic and, in turn, how that specific religious identity comes to be expressed in his writings. In the introduction, I presented some of Eliot's personal background, looking primarily at the pivotal time of his conversion. It now remains to present Eliot's religious background, to clarify the specifics of Anglo-Catholicism, to set that tradition in context,and to demonstrate the specific influence of Anglo-Catholicism on Eliot. As also noted in the last chapter, such conversions as Eliot's are rarely, if ever, instantaneous. Rather, they come at the end of a long process of development in one's personal spiritual life — so, obviously, it will be necessary to look at Eliot's background in the context of American religious tradition. The same process of development is true of movements and traditions within the Church — so it will also be necessary to see the specific tradition as growing out of larger developments and movements within the Church. The Anglo-Catholic tradition to which Eliot saw himself as belonging grows most specifically out of the Oxford Movement of the 1830s. Any other periods of an Anglo-Catholic orientation led to, were part of, or grew out of the Oxford Movement. Thus, the clearest definition of the Anglo-Catholicism to which Eliot subscribed is to be seen in the Oxford Movement.

In order to understand the place and importance of a more high-church, liturgical approach to Eliot's life and works as Anglo-Catholicism offers, it is necessary to discuss Eliot's personal religious development. To understand Eliot's personal spiritual development, it is also necessary to see it in the larger context of the American religious tradition. An important part of that tradition

is the Jeremiad, the form of preaching that prevailed in an earlier part of America's history and dominated the American religious scene. That Jeremiad tradition can be seen in relation to parallel developments within the English Church across the Atlantic. This provides a link with the discussion of English Church history. Following the more general history of the English will be a discussion of the Oxford Movement, its history and its primary emphases. Finally, the chapter will culminate in a clarification of Eliot's Anglo-Catholicism. These six elements combine to form the majority of the religious influences on Eliot, and they allow the analyses of Eliot's works that follow in chapters three through six. Obviously, there is some overlap of these developments, but I shall divide the text into the following six sections to facilitate greater clarity.

T. S. Eliot's Religious Background

Thomas Stearns Eliot was born on September 26, 1888, in St. Louis, Missouri, to Henry Ware Eliot, Sr., and Charlotte Champe Eliot (née Stearns). T. S. Eliot's grandfather, William Greenleaf Eliot (1811-1887), a Unitarian Minister, died the year before T. S. Eliot's birth. William Greenleaf Eliot had travelled from Harvard Divinity School in 1834 to become a missionary for the Unitarians in St. Louis. St. Louis, at that time, had a strong Catholic population of French descent, and Eliot's grandfather was determined to change that. He built his own church, helped establish three schools, a university, a poor fund, and a sanitary commission. He worked hard with the typical energy and zeal of a missionary, despite his physical frailty — he once wrote "My time is all broken in little pieces," which T. S. Eliot was to repeat often. This grandfather's faith and commitment continued to exert a "dominant influence" on the family, even after his death. Peter Ackroyd, in his biography of Eliot, describes the grandfather's faith orientation:

> Unitarianism is, in fact, from the perspective of orthodoxy, an heretical faith principally because it does not accept the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation — Christ becoming a sort of superior Emerson. It is essentially Puritanism drained of its theology, since it denies the central tenets of predestination and damnation; heaven and hell are of less account than the mundane space which we inhabit between them. The measure of Man is Man himself and a peculiarly American optimism, about the progress and perfectibility of humankind, is thereby given a quasi-spiritual sanction. Unitarianism is earnest, intellectual, humanitarian, part of that high-minded "ethical culture" which Eliot in later years distrusted and

> mocked. ... And indeed Unitarianism was uniquely fitted, with its optimism and social progress, to sustain the efforts of the American mercantile class which could now prosper with a good conscience. The symbols of its faith resided in the Church, the City and the University since it is a faith primarily of social intent, and concerned with the nature of moral obligations within a society. It placed its trust in good works, in reverence for authority and the institutions of authority, in public service, in thrift, and in success.[1]

This was the religious background of the Eliot household. Ackroyd notes the family's "role in Boston Unitarianism was a powerful and pervasive one." Most of Eliot's family pursued careers in social service, teaching, and Unitarian ministry — expressing the sense of duty and responsibility of the Unitarian orientation.[2]

T. S. Eliot's father had rebelled against his own father, William Greenleaf, and gone into business, ultimately becoming president of the Hydraulic-Press Brick Company and growing somewhat wealthy. This certainly fit within the Unitarian values of public service, thrift, and success. Nonetheless, given the influence of the grandfather in the household, Henry Ware Eliot, Sr., grew up in his father's shadow. The father's success, coupled with those Unitarian ideals, contributed to T. S. Eliot's growing up under his father's shadow, as well. Given both the family's Unitarian ideals and the father's business success, when Eliot's father died in 1919, he believed "that his son had spoilt his life."[3] Interestingly enough, it seems that Eliot's father had rebelled against his own father's expectations in going into business instead of the Unitarian ministry. Likewise, T. S. Eliot had gone against his father's business ideals. Eliot's departure from his father's and grandfather's ideals naturally meant that he would go in a direction contrary to their religious and ethical values. Besides Eliot's moving toward a high-church orientation within Anglicanism, Spurr notes the caricature of Eliot's grandfather as an anti-Incarnation minister being about the closest one could approach Judaism while remaining within the larger Christian fold (albeit of a heretical, non-Trinitarian, and Arian brand), and the caricature of Eliot's father as a successful businessman as another Jewish stereotype. From those two influences — of Eliot's grandfather and father — Eliot's conversion to high-church Anglicanism

1. Peter Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot: A Life* (New York: Simon, 1984) 15-17, esp. 17-18.
2. Ackroyd 17-18.
3. Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's Early Years* (New York: Noonday-Farrar, 1977) 3, caption of picture facing page 33; see also Ackroyd 18.

can be seen as much as a psychological overthrowing of a father figure as it is a legitimate conversion on its own terms.[4]

As a child, T. S. Eliot had been baptized in his grandfather's Church of the Messiah, but he never felt a part of the Christian community. He abandoned Unitarianism as "bland and insufficient." Given his family's prominence both in Unitarianism and in society, this must have been a difficult situation for his family, as well as a difficult decision for Eliot. His family enjoyed some social prominence in America. They were listed in Burke's *Distinguished Families of America* — Andrew Eliot having come from East Coker in Somerset. Andrew Eliot had been a Calvinist and had left England in the late seventeenth century, settling in Salem and then in Beverley, Massachusetts. In 1887 when the Eliots had their family tree printed, they were able to note relationships with John Quincy Adams and Rutherford B. Hayes. Eliot's mother was also proud of their English and French ancestors — she once pointed out that William de Aliot had been at the Battle of Hastings.[5] Another source lists a variety of famous people related to the Eliot family, including three clergy in the Lowell family, James Russell Lowell, and Robert Lowell; Rev. Daniel Greenleaf, John Greenleaf Whittier, and Herman Melville; a Rev. Andrew Eliot (1718-1778) and Nathaniel Hawthorne; and a Rev. William Smith, an Hon. William Cranch, and John Adams and John Quincy Adams.[6]

The first Eliot in America in the seventeenth century, the Calvinist Andrew Eliot, had once preached a typically Calvinistic sermon to Boston society on Easter Day, 1766, in which he called his listeners "a generation of vipers." William Greenleaf Eliot was described by a Harvard classmate once: "His eye is single. ... There is something awful about such conscientiousness. One feels rebuked in his presence." T. S. Eliot's own "cry" of the "decline and fall of

4. David Spurr, "Myths of Anthropology: Eliot, Joyce, Lévy-Bruhl," *PMLA* 109 (1994) 279, n. 10. Spurr quotes from Christopher Ricks, *T. S. Eliot and Prejudice* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1988) 47, 44. For a further discussion of Eliot's Anti-Semitism, see Anthony Julius' recently published dissertation, *T. S. Eliot, Anti-Semitism, and Literary Form* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995).

5. Ackroyd 17, 15.

6. Eric Sigg, "Eliot as a Product of America," *The Cambridge Companion to T. S. Eliot*, ed. A. David Moody (Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1994) 16-17.

civilization" in *The Waste Land* is in line with the classic American sermon style, the American Jeremiad. When T. S. Eliot spoke in Virginia in 1933, it was more as a moralist in this classic American sermon tradition than it was as a literary critic.[7] This very American orientation is in line with both the moralism of Unitarianism and the preaching tradition of the American Jeremiad — and these two somewhat complementary traditions were very much a part of Eliot's religious roots.

Before discussing further the American Jeremiad tradition, it is helpful to set that tradition in the larger context of American religious history. In order to understand Eliot's religious heritage, it, too, must be set in the larger context of the American religious scene. As important as this American background is in itself, it must also be remembered that American religion shares much the same roots with English religious traditions, so some overlap and mutual influencing is to be expected. Further, Eliot's background in American religiosity also serves to set up Eliot's need for, and later development to, a less Puritan, less Calvinist, less moralistic, less sermonic and didactic, less classically American, and a more English, more liturgical, and more artistically oriented religious persuasion, such as high-church Anglicanism.

American Church History

In America, from 1631 to the mid-1800s, Puritanism and Congregationalism were establishing themselves. The English sought to control the Puritans in Massachusetts Bay and so vacated their charter in 1684. The Church of England was attempting to gain a foothold in New England, but the Puritans in America declined. Quakers were also arriving in America, having developed in England in the mid-1600s. Also at this time in England, Unitarianism was on the rise, having grown out of the continental anti-Trinitarianism or Arianism of the late sixteenth century. These movements and their variations were represented by a number of thinkers in England, including the poet John Milton during the seventeenth century. The English civil war and its controversies had only contributed to such anti-Trinitarian views. So the eighteenth cen-

7. Lyndall Gordon, *Eliot's New Life* (New York: Noonday-Farrar, 1988) 41, 291 n.; see also Ackroyd 17.

tury began in a time of rationalism and Deism, which tended to see religion primarily as concerned with morality. Dissenters, Presbyterians, and General Baptists tended to be won over by anti-Trinitarian views in England. Finally, Theophilus Lindsey (1732-1808) adopted a Unitarian orientation and circulated a petition to be relieved from assent to the Thirty-Nine Articles — he received 250 signatures. While Parliament in 1772 denied the request and Lindsey withdrew from the Church of England and started his own church in London, Parliament amended the Toleration Act in 1779 and removed all penalties by 1813. English Unitarianism was "formal and intellectual, clear in its rejection of 'creeds of human composition,' and insistence on salvation by character. ... English Unitarianism had some effect in producing a similar movement in New England, though that grew also out of the general rationalizing tendencies of the eighteenth century." Among the Massachusetts Congregationalists was a "liberal" party opposed to the orthodoxy of the larger group. They were able to place Henry Ware (1746-1845) in the position of Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard in 1805. At the same time, William Ellery Channing (1780-1842) was preaching an Arian Christology in Boston. Their differences with the orthodox Congregationalists caused them to begin calling themselves Unitarians in 1815. They denied the Trinity, denied Original Sin, criticized predestination, and insisted on salvation by character. In 1825, the American Unitarian Association was established. The efforts of more orthodox church leaders, especially Lyman Beecher, helped slow their growth.[8]

Also during this time period, America had been undergoing religious revivals, as well. The Great Awakening lasted for over half a century and had a profound effect on the majority of American churches. The emphasis was on "conversion" as the way to enter the Church. Thus, Christian nurture and spiritual growth were not of primary importance, but rather conversion, outward morality, and inward piety. The movement began in 1726 in New Jersey and spread to New England, where it attracted Jonathan Edwards. Some Congregational churches in Boston were against the awakening, and some reacted by moving toward the Unitarian extreme of Con-

8. Williston Walker, *A History of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed. (New York: Scribner's, 1970) 420-421, 430-434, 443-444, 511, esp. 444.

gregationalism. Episcopalians in the south had little interest in the awakening, and general interest waned as the events of the Revolution began to absorb everyone's attention. While rationalism and Deism contributed to the county's attitude toward religion, the Church's importance was minimized by events of the day. Yet, of great significance was the religious freedom established here. Given the diversity of religious groups that had come to America and the inability for any one group to predominate, as well as the distance across the Atlantic preventing any European Church to remain attached to the mother country, religious freedom made great sense and was a necessary and appropriate accomplishment. As the Revolutionary War further separated American denominations from their founding people and countries, American denominations began to take on their own specific identities. The Church of England was perhaps the worst sufferer of this alienation. After the war, the very name sounded unpatriotic, leading to adoption in this country of the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1780. Subsequently, the Church sought bishops from England to continue the tradition and succession here, and they adopted a revised Prayer Book in 1789.[9]

Religious development in America continued with the influx of immigrants of various denominational identities. Protestantism in nineteenth-century Europe, and especially in England, as noted above, had undergone the Evangelical Movement. In America, "the pietistic, evangelistic, low-church current of revival became largely dominant in church life."[10] Admittedly, there were other currents of religious thought in America, and some denominations resisted the generic Evangelical and revivalistic form of American religiosity. Nonetheless, that was the overall mood as American Protestant religion moved from Puritanism, through the Great Awakening and pietism, into the modern era. After the Revolutionary War, only ten percent of the population belonged to a Church, again signaling a need, for some, for a revival attitude. A "Second Great Awakening" began in New England in 1792 and spread to the rest of the country. This continued through the nineteenth century, with another surge in 1857-1858. Various Evan-

9. Walker 464-468, 472-479.
10. Walker 507.

gelical causes and societies, missionary efforts, the Sunday School Union, and Bible Societies were started. Lyman Beecher's sermons against drunkenness in 1813 and again in 1827 helped begin the American Society for the Promotion of Temperance in 1826, which culminated in Prohibition from 1919 to 1933. Also during the nineteenth century came the founding of various seminaries and the establishing of other denominational churches, such as Mormonism. In response to the Revivalism of the more orthodox churches came the "liberal" party, which led to a strengthening of the Unitarian Church in New England. The Divinity School of Harvard was founded in 1819 under Unitarian influence, as already noted above.[11] It was into this American religious atmosphere and tradition that T. S. Eliot was born.

The American Jeremiad

An important aspect of the American religious tradition is the American Jeremiad. Growing out of the preaching of seventeenth-century England, the Puritans brought the sermon style with them to America, where it became a large part of the American rhetorical and political tradition, as well as the sermon tradition. Sacvan Bercovitch, in his work defining and analyzing this sermon style, *The American Jeremiad*, defines the Jeremiad as a political sermon. The New England Puritans used this style of preaching to express the "dual nature of their calling, as practical and as spiritual guides," in line with their "church-state theology." The Jeremiad was a kind of sermon given on public occasions, such as election days, serving as both a sermon and a political statement — a sort of "state-of-the-covenant address." It was used to express the theological and political understandings of the settlement in the new land. Bercovitch sees the Jeremiad as an important aspect of the myth of America:[12]

> Rhetoric functions within a culture. It reflects and affects a set of particular psychic, social, and historical needs. This is conspicuously true of the American jeremiad, a mode of public exhortation that originated in the European pulpit, was transformed in both form and content by the New England Puritans, persisted through the eighteenth century, and helped sustain a national dream through two hundred years of turbulence and change. The American jeremiad was a ritual

11. Walker 507-515..

12. Sacvan Bercovitch, *The American Jeremiad* (Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1978) xiv, 4.

> designed to join social criticism to spiritual renewal, public to private identity, the shifting "signs of the times" to certain traditional metaphors, themes, and symbols.[13]

The Puritans had perceived that they were moving from the established Anglican Church to a free and new England. Even on the way over to America, in the various sermons that were being preached onboard ship, one by John Winthrop on the *Arabella* urged seeing the new venture as the establishment of a "citty upone a hill." America was the new Promised Land, with the Puritans as the new Israelites on a mission into its wilderness to establish the New Jerusalem — the last best hope of humanity and religion. And so, they brought with them the Jeremiad preaching form when they came in 1630. The Jeremiad was based on fifteenth- and sixteenth-century English sermons, which, in turn, were based on the medieval English sermon. The European Jeremiad was "a lament over the ways of the world." It focused on social concerns and moral obedience in the process of building the City of Man. It even offered the possibility of some degree of temporal success. But as it developed in America, the Jeremiad was "a fusion of secular and sacred history ... to direct an imperiled people of God toward the fulfillment of their destiny, to guide them individually toward salvation, and collectively toward the American city of God."[14]

The Jeremiad was originally based on sermons which used a passage from the Old Testament books of Isaiah or Jeremiah. The thrust of the chosen verses was that God, having chosen a people, expected of them a certain obedience and morality. As the people erred or strayed, they needed to be brought back, to be reestablished, and to have their sins punished or forgiven. This led to a dual approach in the sermon — one of promise and reminder of the chosen identity, and one of threat and punishment. If these were indeed the chosen people, they needed to be periodically reminded of that fact. And in the face of that, they also needed to be reminded of how God's chosen people were expected to act. Bercovitch says: "The essence of the [American Puritan Jeremiad] sermon form ... is its unshakable optimism. In explicit opposition to the traditional mode, it inverts the doctrine of vengeance into a promise of ultimate success, affirming to the world, and despite the world, the inviolability of the colonial cause." He also reminds us of

13. Bercovitch xi.

14. Bercovitch 4-9, 23.

the long history of this dualistic approach — "Flood and rainbow, exile and restoration, Christ *agonistes* and Christ glorified."[15]

This dual approach contributes to the overall basic understanding of the Jeremiad, and therefore of Puritan and American religious thinking. It is characterized by a radical individualism as over and against a sense of the corporate Church. The thinking is very future-oriented in the direction of, and to the extreme of, apocalypticism, in opposition to a more historical awareness of the Church's theology and identity. This eschatological orientation is evident in popular works of the time, like Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, which sees life as a series of crises that shape the Christian as he moves toward his personal preordained goal. The growth that the Christian experiences along the way, and the moral discipline learned, can lead to both personal religious and social success. Instead of holding to an ordered ecclesiology, the Puritans were also anti-authoritarian, which seems reasonable considering their treatment in England before they left, especially under "Bloody" Queen Mary. As they came to the new land, they found their identity not in their English roots, but in the very movement, or exodus, to the new Jerusalem. Further, in leaving England, the Puritans had come to conquer the American wilderness as the army of Christ. But in this new setting, the Puritans were separated also from other European historical influences, although they had brought their "Massachusetts Bay theocracy" with them. Of course, the Puritans were having to adjust and comply with the needs of the new world and its emerging political and economic realities. In the overall process, perhaps the most important characteristic was the "effort to fuse sacred and profane." It is at this point that the American and European Jeremiads differ the most. While the American Jeremiad attempted to fuse the sacred and the profane, the European Jeremiad noted the "discrepancy ... between heaven's time and ours." The American fusion of sacred and profane is a crucial aspect that has shaped the American Jeremiad, and thus has contributed to the American Dream. The hope was to create "a society in which 'the fact could be made one with the ideal,' [and] when in the last decades of the century they [the American Puritans] came to feel that history had betrayed them, they clung

15. Bercovitch 5-10, 8 n.

all the more tenaciously to their dream." Thus, they contributed to a national identity, despite their emphasis on individuality and anti-authoritarianism.[16]

In contradistinction to the Puritan Jeremiad form of preaching, which had come to prevail in American religious circles, was the Anglo-Catholic preaching of Shakespeare's time that owed much to the poets and prose writers of the day. Preachers such as John Donne established the "Metaphysical" or "witty" form, which required a more learned audience. For someone like Eliot, who had been raised a Unitarian and, as an American, had been steeped in the American Puritan Jeremiad tradition with its related themes like the American Dream, such sermons as those by Donne and especially Andrewes must have proved very refreshing. Appealing to a learnèd audience, treating themes very different from the Jeremiad, and making such refined use of language and theology, the sermons of Donne and Andrewes must have greatly stimulated Eliot's appreciation; and of course with the sermons comes the atmosphere and undergirding theology of the preacher, thus exposing Eliot to a very different understanding of Christianity from that of American Puritanism and Unitarianism.

A Brief History of the Church of England

Very often in reform efforts and conflicts, worship practices are involved, no matter what the primary issue. One of the governing concepts of liturgical studies is *lex orandi lex credendi* — translated variously as "the law of praying is the law of believing," "the rule of prayer is the rule of belief," or "the things done [in worship] become the things believed." In other words, the way the Church gathers and worships is the way the Church practices, or lives out, its theology. So a change in theological understanding will often bring in its wake a shift in worship practices. Sometimes, the worship practices are at the forefront of the change. Thus, the study of liturgy in the context of a study of theology and history, or vice versa, can prove most interesting and enlightening. Having presented Eliot's background in the context of the development of the American religious scene Jeremiad above, this chapter continues with a brief discussion of the

16. Bercovitch 24-30, esp. 29, 29-30.

history of the English Church, with a concentration on the high-church tradition in the seventeenth century and its further flowering in the nineteenth-century Oxford Movement.

The English Church has a long and interesting history, a history that has been an integral part of English national history. With the invasion and settling of the Romans from the middle of the first century to the middle of the fifth century came the beginnings of Christianity. However, the Christian faith did not plant itself firmly until later. Pope Gregory I (Gregory the Great) sent Augustine (later known as Augustine of Canterbury) as a missionary to the British Isles in 596-597. Christianity was able to gain such a strong foothold that the Celtic Church was sending its own missionaries back to the continent in only one generation. As a result of Gregory and Augustine's efforts, the Anglo-Saxons were converted and "displayed a devotion to the papacy not characteristic of the older lands." More than a century passed before Christianity became dominant in more than just the south of England, but when it did, the papacy was greatly strengthened.[17]

Of course, there were many events in medieval England in which the Church played an important role. In the twelfth century and during the reign of King Henry II, Thomas à Becket became Archbishop of Canterbury and was martyred in 1170. Becket had been educated on the continent and served as Archbishop under Pope Alexander III. T. S. Eliot writes about Becket's martyrdom in his play *Murder in the Cathedral*, which will be discussed in the fifth chapter. The events leading up to Becket's murder involved political and religious differences between Becket and Henry II, such that, subsequently, Henry VIII would have all references to Becket removed from the prayer books of his day, obviously choosing to take the side of the king against Becket in their disputes. The rift between Henry II and Saint Thomas à Becket indicated the need to resolve complex matters in the relation between Church and state. And the *Magna Carta* of 1215 further clarified those issues between Church and state and attempted to resolve them, as it addressed various social concerns and concerns about governance. Through all these situations,

17. Walker 181-183, esp. 181, 182. See also M. W. Grose and Dierdre McKenna, *Old English Literature*, Literature in Perspective (Totowa: Rowman and Littlefield, 1973) 23, 32, 34.

the Church played a major rôle, ultimately growing into the national Church of England, partly as the outcome of such reform efforts.

Naturally, from the early days through the Middle Ages, the Church that developed in England was an extension of the Roman Catholic Church. As for the official beginning of the English Church, *per se*, as a national and distinct entity, there are a couple of opinions as to the time and cause. Generally, the English Church is seen as beginning officially and formally at the time of Henry VIII, with the Supremacy Act of 1534 and Henry's request for a divorce in the interest of producing a male heir to the throne. At the same time, given the Church and State's complex history, Queen Mary's reversal of Henry's Church founding, and Elizabeth's reinstatement of the same Church, some attribute the official founding of the Church of England to Elizabeth, with the new Supremacy Act of 1559 and the establishing of the defining Thirty-Nine Articles in 1563 — I will explain all this further in subsequent paragraphs. And still others see the English Reformation as beginning with the preaching in St. Andrew's Church, Cambridge, of Hugh Latimer (ca. 1485-1555).[18] However, there are those who see the separation and individuality of the English and their Church as having been a constant, given England's island separation from the continent and therefore a corresponding lessening of Rome's influences on the Church there. This last group sees the *Magna Carta* not only as an important legal and political document, but also as the official defining document of the English Church. The first statement in the document reads: "[1] First, We have granted to God, and by this our present Charter have confirmed, for us and our Heirs for ever, That the Church of England shall be free, and shall have her whole rights and liberties inviolable."[19] So throughout its development, the Church in England (not to say Church *of* England, which would officially come much later) enjoyed a degree of independence and individual growth. And for some, this independence is as much a part of the wording of the *Magna Carta* and its intent as is the fact of England's geography.

18. O. C. Edwards, Jr., "History of Preaching," *Concise Encyclopedia of Preaching*, ed. William H. Willimon and Richard Lischer (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995) 210.

19. *Magna Carta*, trans. Edward I (1297), May 1996, Online posting (National Archives and Records Administration, URL:http://www.nara.gov/exhall/charters/magnacarta/magtrans.html, webmaster@nara.gov), 28 April 1997.

Thus, this perspective from the *Magna Carta* only reinforced what had already been a practical reality in the English Church throughout the Middle Ages, if not throughout the history of Christianity in England — the English Church's developing independence relative to Rome. Consider, for example, the cathedral at Salisbury, which produced its own local version of Church liturgy, known as the Use of Salisbury or the Sarum Rite. During the later Middle Ages, the "'Use of Sarum' ... became increasingly influential throughout England, Wales, and Ireland, ... and it was from the books of the Sarum Rite that the architects of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI took most of their material. ... In essence the Sarum Rite was a 'local medieval modification of the Roman Rite in use at the cathedral church of Salisbury.'"[20] Writing about the Sarum Rite in his article in *The Study of Liturgy*, author D. M. Hope goes on to quote Archdale King's book, *Liturgies of the Past*:

> The elaborate splendour of Sarum ceremonial, as carried out in the cathedral church in the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation, contrasted vividly with the comparative simplicity of the practices of the Roman Church. Three, five or even seven deacons and subdeacons, two or more thurifers, and three crucifers figured on solemnities; while two or four priests in copes ("rectores chori") acted as cantors. There was the censing of many altars, and even during the lessons at matins vested priests offered incense at the high altar. Processions were frequent, and those before High Mass on Sundays were especially magnificent. On the altar itself there were rarely more than two lights, but on feasts there were many others, either standing on the ground or suspended from the roof.[21]

D. M. Hope adds that the rite was "fundamentally 'Roman' but in its performance there were important divergences from the order usually associated with 'Roman' usage."[22] And these divergences, as well as the description of the rather elaborate high-church practices at Salisbury, helped develop the identity of an indigenous English Church. These divergences also are a part of a long and strong high-church tradition in England. Nonetheless, the kings of England were assumed to uphold the Church in line with the teachings and practices of Rome, and indeed did, at least officially, until the time of Henry VIII. It is at the time of Henry VIII that the shift away

---

20. D. M. Hope, "The Medieval Western Rites," *The Study of Liturgy*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, S. J. (New York: Oxford UP, 1978) 236. Cf. Cross and Livingstone 1229.

21. Hope 237.

22. Hope 237. See also F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974) 1229.

from Rome begins to be formalized and the English Church becomes officially established as its own entity. And even after the development into the English Church, that entity itself has continued to undergo its own internal reforms and changes. By the Middle Ages, there were disputes with the papacy, theological positions were composed that were ahead of their time, and various reform movements were afoot.[23]

During the fourteenth century, the Church continued to undergo disputes about supremacy, which also involved ecclesiology and reform. John Wyclif, influenced by Augustine, taught in 1376 that Scripture was the only authority in the Church, the whole company of the elect formed the basis of the Church, and papal and episcopal claims had no scriptural authority. Wyclif hoped to bring his Gospel to the people by sending out his "poor priests" — they have come to be known as Lollards. Generally, Lollards were characterized as criticizing the Church, asserting instead personal faith and the Bible. In keeping with this different, somewhat low-church view of ecclesiology, Wyclif also challenged the doctrine of transubstantiation in 1379 — his position was more on the order of consubstantiation. So finally, at a meeting called in London in 1382 by the Archbishop of Canterbury, many of Wyclif's opinions were condemned. But, Wyclif's popularity allowed him to keep his own parish until his death (December 31, 1384).[24] (Incidentally, the Parson in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* was accused of being a Lollard by others in the group.) The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were very fertile years for major shifts in ecclesiastical emphases and structure. Coverdale and Tyndale were translating the Bible into English. They were also publishing their views on secret presses on the continent and having them smuggled into England between 1520 and 1535.[25] These early sixteenth century reform efforts blossomed into a variety of new reformed and reforming denominations throughout Europe. With this as background, a discussion of the traditionally accepted official and formal establishing of the Church of England under Henry VIII follows.

---

23. See Walker 263-285.

24. Walker 268-270. See also Cross and Livingstone 834.

25. Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Cranmer to Hooker, 1534-1603*, vol. 1 (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1970) 7.

The stronger English kings and queens exerted considerable control over episcopal appointments, as over and against the Pope, at the time when Henry VIII (1509-1547) began to rule. At the time of Henry VIII, a strong English nationalism was emerging in opposition to possible foreign threats. Henry VIII was a strong-willed, intelligent, theologically educated king who was also decidedly Roman Catholic. In 1521 he published his response to Luther's view of two sacraments — down from Roman Catholicism's seven. Henry's response, entitled *Assertion of the Seven Sacraments*, earned him the title "Defender of the Faith" from Pope Leo X. But then things began to change for Henry, and likewise for the English Church under Henry. Henry's marriage to Catherine of Aragon (widow of Henry's older brother Arthur) had produced only Mary. According to the traditional argument, Henry, desiring a male heir, wanted another wife, so he began the process of divorce. Pope Clement VII refused. In 1531 Henry threatened the clergy, asserted himself as "single and supreme Lord, and, as far as the law of Christ allows, even supreme head" of the Church of England. Then, under pressure from Henry, Parliament passed an act in 1532 forbidding payment of taxes to Rome. Finally, in January 1533, Henry married Anne Boleyn, and Parliament forbade all appeals to Rome. Thomas Cranmer then became Archbishop of Canterbury and annulled Henry's first marriage. On September 7, 1533, Elizabeth was born to Anne Boleyn. The subsequent dispute between Pope Clement VII and Henry culminated on November 3, 1534, with Parliament's Supremacy Act, which declared Henry "the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England."

When Henry died in 1547, the majority of people sided with the King in wanting little or no change in doctrine and worship and wanting to keep out foreign ecclesiastical influences. Smaller Catholic and Protestant factions made for a degree of religious unrest. Confusion resulted, so Parliament established an Act of Uniformity in 1549, requiring the universal use of the Book of Common Prayer in English — the First Prayer Book of Edward VI of 1549, mostly the work of Thomas Cranmer (consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in 1533) — an older and more conservative, Catholic form of worship book. As the Prayer Book of 1549 was proving to be unpopular to both conservatives and Protestants, Northumberland issued a new Act of Unifor-

mity and a new Prayer Book in 1552. The 1552 book was much more Protestant in nature, and it included a simplification of clergy vestments and a more Zwinglian (memorial) theology of the Eucharist — Thomas Cranmer and John Knox participated in the work.

Elizabeth I (born 1533, reigned 1558-1603) succeeded Mary. Elizabeth was intelligent, able, and popular, like her father. While she was not personally religious, she was Protestant by birth, even though she had "conformed to the Roman ritual" under Mary's rule. Also, for political reasons, at the beginning Elizabeth enjoyed the support of Philip II of Spain, who was a Catholic. Elizabeth was strongly nationalistic,which gave her people confidence. She proceeded cautiously, with the help of fine advisors.[26] Thus, with Elizabeth comes a new phase in the development of the Church of England, a phase which contributed significantly to the Church's establishment and clarification of its Thirty-Nine Articles, its definition of some its primary theological doctrines like apostolic succession, its development as a national Church, and its self-understanding as the *via media*. This is the defining moment for Eliot, among others, in the true establishment of the Church of England.

Those Protestants, who been exiled to the continent during Queen Mary's reign, were able to return to England under Elizabeth. Overall, they sought to "purify" the Church, thus, by the early 1560s, they were called "Puritans." This, in turn, led to the "Elizabethan Vestiarian Controversy," led by two priests from Oxford, with Cambridge University siding with the Puritans. The response in 1566, from Elizabeth's Archbishop Parker, was to require fresh licenses from the bishops, to forbid controversial sermons, to require kneeling at the Eucharist, and to prescribe clerical dress. Opposition to the Puritans became even more characteristic of the Anglican Church at the end of the sixteenth century.[27] Elizabeth died on March 24, 1603, and was succeeded by James I (1603-1625), son of Mary "Queen of Scots." As the new King of England, James I was immediately involved in the Puritan controversy. James I supported the Anglicans, giving in to only one request of the Puritans — a new translation of the Bible, which become the

26. Walker 357-368; see also Bengt Hägglund, *History of Theology*, trans. Gene J. Lund (St. Louis: Concordia, 1968) 291-298, 377-380.

27. Walker 402-407.

"Authorized" or "King James Version" of 1611. Anglicanism continued to gain strength, which concerned the Puritans, especially the "education and zeal of [the] clergy ... — a conspicuous example being the learned, saintly, and eloquent Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626), who became Bishop of Chichester in 1605."[28] William Laud became an important part of the efforts to maintain a specific form of Anglicanism in England. He sought uniformity in garb and worship. However, he was a bit overbearing and harsh. The Puritans hated him. Nonetheless, he had a true piety, though not of the gentler sort of Lancelot Andrewes. In 1628, Charles I made Laud bishop of the diocese of London, which was more Puritan at the time, and in 1633 Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury.

The civil war ran its course, with Oliver Cromwell and his troop of "religious men" — Cromwell's army had been made up of Puritans and any opposed to Rome and "prelacy."[29] After the restoration, the first Parliament was royalist and Anglican. In 1662 came a new Act of Uniformity requiring use of the revised Prayer Book. These efforts succeeded in getting rid of the Puritans and accomplished the establishment of the Puritans outside the Church of England. Nonetheless, the preaching of dissenters continued. Charles II himself, and his brother James II, were avowed Roman Catholics, even though Charles II was not very religious. Charles II attempted to aid both groups by issuing a Declaration of Indulgence, which, on the one side, allowed Dissenters to worship publicly, and, on the other side, ended the penal laws against Catholics. Parliament perceived this as a move toward Rome, so they ordered the withdrawal of the Indulgence and passed the Test Act requiring reception of communion in accord with the Church of England (an act which would be repealed in 1828). When James II became King (1685-1688), he sought to reestablish Catholicism. The Protestants did not respond favorably to James' actions, and William of Orange (1650-1702) of the Netherlands, who had married James' daughter Mary, was invited to England to oppose James II.[30]

With the end of the seventeenth century in England and the struggles and civil war of that

---

28. Walker 372-373, 407-408, esp. 408.
29. Walker 411-415, esp. 415.
30. Walker 416-419.

period over, a "general spiritual lethargy" set in. The need for a warmer religion was felt, together with the need for aid for the poor and others. The Evangelical Revival formed a strong response.[31] At the beginning of the nineteenth century, England was still dominated by the Evangelical Movement. As some Evangelicals were breaking with the established Church, the Evangelical Party within the Anglican Church was becoming the "low-church party." This was partly in reaction to the revival of high-church emphases. As the Anglican Evangelicals grew in numbers and in power, "a new liberal, broad-church movement, and the revivification of the high-church tradition" emerged. At a time when Romanticism and poetry were blossoming both in England and on the continent, a more intellectual atmosphere began to blossom as well. Williston Walker sees Samuel Taylor Coleridge, as the forerunner, in most respects, of the broad-church way of thinking. He had written about the distinction between reason and understanding, about the "inward beholding" which apprehends religious truths, and about "moral reason" and "conscience," in his *Aids to Reflection* in 1825. And "in his emphasis on the church as a divine institution, higher and nobler than anything 'by law established,' he prepared the way for the high-church party."[32]

The high-church party of this period grew out of the broad-church party as both sought to distinguish themselves from the low-church party discussed above. John Frederick Denison Maurice, the son of a Unitarian minister and acknowledged as being part of the broad-church school, contributed to its spread. He believed that Christ is the Head of all humanity, that none is under the curse of God, and that none will be forever lost. Novelist Charles Kingsley, poet Alfred, Lord Tennyson, dean of Westminster Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, and dean of Canterbury Frederic William Farrar were also very influential in the spread of the broad-church position. Even though the broad-church movement was not large, it did have a broad effect on the English Church. And developing out of the broad-church movement was the Oxford Movement, or Tractarian Movement, which is considered to be the most significant religious movement within the

31. Walker 454-464.

32. Walker 495-496, esp. 496; see also Hägglund 378-379; and Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, *Christian Theology Since 1600* (London: Duckworth, 1970) 87-88.

Church of England in the nineteenth century. In the midst of many changes, both politically and religiously, some began to reflect on the nature of the Church, turning to the primitive and medieval Church for their answers. A few young clergy at Oriel College, Oxford, discussed these concerns, leading to the Oxford Movement.

The Oxford Movement

Richard Hurrell Froude was the most influential of the group. He urged the revival of fasting, clerical celibacy, reverence for the saints, and "Catholic usages." A former Evangelical who came to be associated with Froude was John Henry Newman — given the Evangelical Revival of the previous century, discussed above, many in the English Church shared this background. And John Keble, of Nonjuror background, had written a very popular book of religious poetry in 1827, *The Christian Year*. As the group was beginning to gather and identify itself, the Oxford Movement is acknowledged as beginning officially in Oxford with Keble's sermon on "National Apostasy" on July 14, 1833. Later that year, the basic formulations of the movement were listed, including the understanding that salvation comes through reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, as it is validly administered by a priest in apostolic succession. At that time, Newman began to publish *Tracts for the Times* — which eventually totalled ninety, of which Newman himself wrote twenty-three. And by 1835, the movement had won over another important figure, Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882). Pusey was to become the head of the Anglo-Catholic Movement that was a later part of the Oxford Movement — so much so that it was also known as "Puseyism." Pusey simply saw the movement as a revival of the primitive Church.

Newman at first saw the Church of England as the *via media* between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, but the *Tracts for the Times* tended to stress a more Roman Catholic perspective while looking back to the ancient Church for doctrine and practice. Newman started a controversy with his nineteenth tract in 1841, when he stated that the Thirty-Nine Articles merely taught the Catholic faith and were not in conflict with the Roman Catholic tradition.

Most clergy and scholars of the day disagreed, and the Bishop of Oxford disallowed the continuation of the tracts. But the tracts continued, and by the ninetieth tract, the Anglo-Catholic movement had hundreds of clergy in its ranks. Nonetheless, Newman left the Church of England and joined the Roman Catholic Church on October 9, 1845, and he took several hundred clergy with him. The Roman defections ended the Oxford Movement, but the Anglo-Catholic party had grown out of it and moved forward under Pusey. The movement's doctrinal positions had been largely accepted, so now the party turned to the "enrichment" of the liturgy. They restored usages which Protestantism had eliminated over the years, and they were successful in most of their changes in the liturgy, even though they met with legal and popular resistance. In addition to the movement's restoration of more Catholic theology and worship, the movement exhibited religious zeal, devotion to the poor and neglected, and concern for the unchurched, and it did much to regain the lower classes.[33]

During the time that the Oxford Movement continued to undergo its own changes and was exerting its influence on the entire nineteenth century English Church, other significant events were happening internationally in the larger Church, specifically in the Roman Catholic Church. One such significant event was the Liturgical Movement. This important movement helped pave the way to the Second Vatican Council and its liturgical changes. The Liturgical Movement's roots go back to Prosper Louis Pascal Guéranger (1805-1875), a French Benedictine monk ordained a priest in 1827. He bought the priory of Solesmes in 1832 and opened it in 1833 (the same year as the recognized beginning of the Oxford Movement) as an attempt to reestablish Benedictine monasticism in France.[34] However, the beginning of the modern Liturgical Movement in the twentieth century is traditionally traced more specifically to an address by Dom L Beauduin in 1909. Later efforts in Germany in the 1920s and in France in the 1940s added a the-

---

33. Walker 495-501. "Newman's *Via Media* appeared in [Tracts] 38 and 41," according to Shane Leslie, *Oxford Movement 1833-1933*, Science and Culture Series, gen. ed. Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J., Ph.D. (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1933) 54.

34. Cross and Livingstone 606.

ology of worship and then combined practice with theology.[35] From 1910 on, then, the movement spread to other parts of Europe, including England, and later to America.[36] Evelyn Underhill, a contemporary of Eliot, writing in 1936, said of the Liturgical Revival that it held much promise for the future. In addition, she sees a spread of the movement into Protestant denominations, as well.[37] And what Ms. Underhill anticipated in 1936 has certainly come to fruition, especially in the latter half of this century, with Vatican II, the variety of liturgical movements within the various denominations, the plethora of new service and worship books in every denomination, the profusion of worship resources, and the greater liturgical similarities and ecumenical coöperation among denominations.

Horton Davies, a Congregational Church Clergyman and former Henry W. Putnam Professor of Religion at Princeton University, has written a five-volume work entitled *Worship and Theology in England*, which is one of the most thorough and authoritative studies of the English Church — and it is a series for which Professor Davies was awarded the Doctorate of Letters from Oxford University. Assuming a basic knowledge of the historical development of the English Church, much as outlined above, Davies writes from the perspective of its theology and worship, trying to get behind the scenes, and exhibiting a strong and clear understanding of the Church's worship practices as expressive of its theology. In volume three, he says concisely at the beginning of his chapter on the Oxford Movement:

> If the Evangelical Revival was the most significant religious movement in the English nation in the eighteenth century, the Oxford Movement was the most important factor in the deepening of the religion of the English Church in the nineteenth. The former had stressed personal holiness and the religion of sentiment; the latter was to emphasize corporate holiness within the context of an independent Divine Society that spanned the centuries and transcended national boundaries. Each movement reacted against and responded to the major thought currents of its time. Evangelicalism reacted against the prevalent rationalism of its day, in the interests of feeling. ... The Oxford Movement reacted against the liberalism of the day in its humanist and political manifestations. ... Thus the

---

35. Geoffrey Wainwright, "The Periods of Liturgical History," *The Study of Liturgy*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold, S. J. (New York: Oxford UP, 1978) 38.

36. Cross and Livingstone 829. Cf. Ellsworth H. Chandlee, "The Liturgical Movement," *The Westminster Dictionary of Worship*, ed. J. G. Davies (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972) 216-222.

37. Evelyn Underhill, *Worship* (New York: Crossroad, 1982) 261, 290.

> Oxford Movement reflected the larger movement of European thought: its concern for the historical continuity of the past with the present [and] its idealization of the principle of authority in both Church and State.[38]

In response to the more sentimental orientation of the Evangelicals, the Oxford Movement did not return the stress to the rationalism of the eighteenth century, but rather turned to doctrine. Also, the movement's appreciation of authority in line with both the historical Church and with political understandings of the State support Eliot's twin assertions in identifying himself as an "anglo-catholic" and a "royalist."

Davies goes on to clarify the Oxford Movement further in terms of its relation to the Evangelical Movement. He sees the Oxford Movement not in opposition to the Evangelicals but as a supplement to it, restoring some of the theology and worship practices that had been lost by the Evangelicals.[39] The Oxford Movement influenced the Church to reassess its worship practices over and against its previous stress on preaching, to look more closely at the nature of the Church in terms of its corporate identity, and to regain use of the arts in the interest of beauty and symbolism over and against mere functionalism.[40] As the English Church developed, the two sides — Anglo-Catholic or Roman Catholic versus Protestant or Presbyterian emphases — fought life and death battles. Fueling this fire between the two camps was the conversion of Newman and others from the Tractarians to the Roman Catholic Church, keeping the Evangelicals suspicious of any form of "Catholicity," whether Roman Catholic or Anglo-Catholic.[41] Newman, after all, had grown up an Evangelical and as an early leader of the Oxford Movement had come to believe in "corporate holiness, in which the historic Church was the channel of grace through its sacraments, the validity of which was guaranteed by the apostolic succession of its bishops and through the examples and encouragement of the saints."[42] Thus, despite the unpleasantness existing between these two traditions, the distinctiveness of the Anglo-Catholic tradition can be

---

38. Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England: From Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 1690-1850*, vol. 3 (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1961) 243-244.
39. Davies *1690-1850* 244.
40. Davies *1690-1850* 245.
41. Davies *1690-1850* 246, 247.
42. Davies *1690-1850* 248.

seen more clearly.

In order not to think, at this point, that a primary difference between Evangelicals and Tractarians was the former's stress on preaching to the latter's stress on liturgy and the sacraments, as many have suggested, it is important to remember the strong preaching and tract-writing of the members of the Oxford Movement. First, Davies cites R. W. Church as making just such a simplistic distinction, only to add that Newman's preaching was able to influence people even more than the Tracts, themselves. Second, Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, in eight volumes, has become a classic of English preaching. Third, Keble produced eleven volumes of *Sermons for the Christian Year*. Fourth, other Tractarians later in the movement distinguished themselves by their high-church preaching. Fifth, Pusey kept the theology of the Cross central in his preaching, much like the Evangelicals. And finally, it is helpful to remember that, according to Newman, it was Keble's sermon on *National Apostasy* given in the University Church of St. Mary-the-Virgin, Oxford, on July 14, 1833, that officially began the Oxford Movement.[43] So it was not just a matter of preaching versus liturgy and sacraments, but rather of the subjects and themes of the sermons, plus how the role of preaching was viewed as it related to and complemented the liturgy or the entire worship experience. Even though Pusey's emphasis on the Cross was similar to that of the Evangelicals, his sermons were more informed by his reading of the ancient and medieval Church Fathers. Further, his stress was less on the personal salvation of the Evangelicals and more on the humble descent of Christ to humanity. Also, there was no lessening of the role of the intellect in faith, as could be found among Evangelicals.[44]

Beyond the issue of preaching, both Evangelicals and Tractarians held strongly to the Prayer Book, especially as a unifying force within the English Church. However, the Tractarians came to stress the rubrics — the red-letter liturgical directions in the texts of prayer books — more. Hymns also united the two, but they also came to have different emphases. The Tractarians tended to what Davies calls an "Anglo-Catholic zeal for glorifying God in hymns. ... The

43. Davies *1690-1850* 249, 259.
44. Davies, *1690-1850* 250-251.

Evangelicals were primarily subjective, individualistic, and introspective, while the Tractarian hymns were objective and corporate in their emphasis."[45] The Oxford Movement also brought more color into the white-washed buildings, pulpits were moved from the center to the side, symbolism was made greater use of, centuries old responsive prayers and collects were returned to use, and churches were built in cruciform shape in the interest of a more theocentric and less anthropocentric style of architecture. Davies summarizes five principle theological contributions of the Oxford Movement:

> (1) It attached a profound value to sacred tradition and the history of the Christian Church in both East and West in the first five centuries. (2) It conceived of the Church itself as an independent divinely originating and divinely sustained society, characterized by the notes of unity, catholicity, and, above all, apostolicity. While it also emphasized holiness, it was not different from the Evangelicals in this respect. (3) Its understanding of faith was more objective, for it concentrated on the acts of God accomplishing human salvation in history and upon the dogmas of belief rather than on their subjective appropriation. (4) It gave sacramental life and liturgical worship an even higher place than the Anglican Evangelicals had given them. (5) Finally, although this was chiefly characteristic of the second generation of Tractarians, it emphasized the value of ceremony in worship, as appealing to the mixed nature of man, spirit, mind, and body, which had been hallowed in the Incarnation. Each of these characteristics must be studied in more detail because of the remarkable influence the complex of emphases was to have on the revitalization of worship in nineteenth century England.[46]

The Tractarians also tended to include the seventeenth century along with the first five centuries as important in the tradition of the Church. The Evangelicals, on the other hand, had even more arbitrarily affirmed only the first century, the century of the founding of the Church, and the sixteenth century, the century of its refounding in the Reformation. Being more on the Catholic side of most issues, the Oxford Movement's representatives tended to diminish the importance of the Reformation. Hurrell Froude, one the Oxford Movement's great men, wrote, "The Reformation was a limb badly set, it must be broken again to be righted. ... Really I hate the Reformation and the Reformers more and more, and have almost made up my mind that the rationalist spirit they set afloat is the ψευδοπροφήτης [*pseudoprophétes* or "false prophet"] of the Revelation." Instead, people like Froude opted for what Davies calls a "rose-colored view of

45. Davies *1690-1850* 251-252.

46. Davies, *1690-1850* 252-254, esp. 254.

the medieval period." Their main complaint about the Reformation was that "instead of issuing a correction it resulted in a section of the Church."[47]

What aided the Tractarians in their views was the Romanticism of the day — the faith, chivalry, and adventure — as was presented in the novels of Sir Walter Scott. Keble, as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, was himself of this mindset, and Newman had also enjoyed such novels in his youth. As representatives of the Oxford Movement, these leaders looked to the same medieval period as a time when the Church enjoyed a place of pride and affection in people's lives. That time, which preceded the Reformation, appeared to them to be more in line with the tradition they sought to uphold and appeal to than the period of the Reformation itself. Further, tradition allowed the Tractarians not to fall into the Reformation tendency of bibliolatry, that is, seeing the Bible as the only source of revelation — a position to which the Evangelicals also subscribed. Since the Fathers of the Church had helped guide the early tradition of the Church, including the canonization of Scripture and the interpretation of it for successive communities of faith, their view broadened to one of Scripture *and* Tradition — the traditional view of the Roman Catholic Church. This broader view enabled the Tractarians to weather the later onslaught of higher criticism of the Bible more easily than the Evangelicals. And further, seeing itself a part of the greater catholic (universal and international) Christian tradition, the orientation of the Oxford Movement enabled the Church of the Anglo-Catholics to function as a *Via Media*, or "Bridge-Church." This sense of the Church is diametrically opposed to a more Protestant insularity. And this Anglo-Catholic orientation would prove to play a significant role and be an important self-understanding in the Church of the future, especially in the context of the Ecumenical Movement of this century.[48]

Part of their understanding of tradition included the second of Davies' five-item list above, namely ecclesiology. Simply put, the Tractarians held to the Church's unity, and hence its catholicity — not always easy in a time of a divided Christianity. Nonetheless, the Tractarians

47. qtd. in Davies *1690-1850* 255-256.
48. Davies *1690-1850* 256-258.

appealed to a sense of the unity of the Church — as an aspect of its catholicity or universal presence — undergirded by tradition. To undergird the Church's unity even further, they also stressed apostolicity — more specifically the apostolic succession of bishops. Tracts 54 and 57 asserted that orthodoxy requires apostolicity. And since the Eucharist was central to the faith and life of the Church's members, apostolic succession assured the validity of the sacraments. Also, this orientation brought with it a clarification of the relation between Church and state. In Tract 2, Newman asserted the primacy of the Church and its independence from the state. Apostolic succession also aided this argument. And further, it also led to a view of a Christian Society, as put forth by the "Christian Socialists," led by Maurice, Ludlow, and Kingsley.[49] This would be a notion picked up by Eliot in his critical writing, as will be discussed in the next chapter. The issue of faith received a similarly conservative treatment. Over and against the more subjective and experiential faith of the Evangelicals, the Tractarians sought to stay on the more objective and traditional end of the spectrum. The Evangelicals stressed an internal faith, devoid of externals, such as works, charity, or the sacraments. The Tractarians, on the other hand, sought to be more balanced, and included a place for works and obedience. They also urged regular participation in the sacraments as outward signs of inward grace — an understanding somewhat overlooked by the Evangelicals.[50]

The last two items of Davies' series of characteristics have to do with the role of liturgy and the sacraments, and with ceremonial. Granted, the above issues of tradition, ecclesiology, faith, and the place of Scripture are important theological issues to any church movement. Some of these issues will show up in Eliot's writings, albeit with the more conservative slant of the Oxford Movement as described above. However, much of the Church's theology and tradition come together, and are played out, in the matters of liturgy and ceremonial, with the sacraments becoming a central concern. Once one has a sense of the theological understandings of a movement, its liturgical, sacramental, and ceremonial practices and understandings will usually be

49. Davies *1690-1850* 258-263.
50. Davies *1690-1850* 263-266.

seen to be in tune. Again, differing from the Evangelicals, the Tractarians held the liturgy in higher regard. Referring to Tract 86, Davies says, "For the Tractarians the Liturgy (and the sacramental services which it exalted) were almost equated in importance with the Scripture." Davies supports this by quoting the author of Tract 86, Isaac Williams, who said, "In our Reformation we differ from other Reformations, and as a Church we differ, I think, from other Churches as now existing, in retaining more purely and entirely the three-fold cord which is not easily broken, Scripture, Tradition, and the Sacraments." Beyond just a preparation for preaching, as the Evangelicals tended to consider it, liturgy had its own role and power. The Tractarians understood "the capacity of a sacred ritual to mould both Christian thought and expression by a process of which the worshipper is almost unconscious."[51]

Of course, the characteristics of the Oxford Movement would be quite evident to the public first in the area of liturgics and ceremonial. More than just an afterthought to the theology, or mere "window dressing," liturgy is the way the Church embodies and lives out its theology. The high ceremonial of the Oxford Movement became very distinctive, as well. Davies reminds us, of course, that this was not the only, nor the primary, emphasis of the movement, even though it becomes evident to the public more quickly. Ceremonial was more an emphasis of the second generation of the Oxford Movement. But the restoration of a more liturgical tradition would naturally follow the efforts of the Oxford Movement to restore the more Catholic tradition to strength in the English Church. The first leaders of the movement, such as Keble and Newman, preached in black gown and followed conservative liturgical practices, with eucharistic vestments, altar candles, and other more liturgical practices being introduced later. Nonetheless, their theological teachings about the Eucharist and Christ's Real Presence demanded a more reverent and higher liturgical attitude and therefore practice. So naturally, among the studies in tradition and the ancient came an interest in liturgiology. As a result, the movement came to look more like a revolution in liturgics and architecture. The Oxford Architectural Society was founded in 1838, followed by the John Mason Neale's founding of the Cambridge Camden

51. Davies *1690-1850* 266-268, esp. 266, 267.

Society in 1841, which published *The Ecclesiologist*, a monthly periodical devoted to worship and architecture. Gradually, study continued and practices developed, even involving some degree of competition between Oxford and Cambridge, until, in 1856, many were wearing eucharistic vestments, using incense, lighting altar candles and carrying processional crosses, and observing the Christian Calendar and liturgical colors. Naturally, these changes were met with some animosity, due to unfamiliarity on the one hand and the Catholic appearance on the other. The reactions brought a degree of paranoia about Rome's part in all this, especially in the wake of Newman's defection. In the light of these reactions, Davies mourns a "tragedy":

> this significant restoration of Christian tradition in worship was traduced as a mere concern for externals in worship, such as ecclesiastical millinery, or as another Popish plot, and that the persecution of the second generation of Tractarians on the grounds of ceremonial gave to this secondary issue an importance which clouded the far more significant contributions which the Movement had to give to the renewal of the liturgical life of English Christianity and delayed their delivery.[52]

The end result of all this was, as Davies points out, that "the Protestants became more Protestant and the Catholics more Catholic."[53]

Closely related to their strong appreciation of the liturgy and their strong sacramental orientation, the Tractarians also exalted the doctrine of the Incarnation. Again, the Tractarians differed here with the Evangelicals. The latter placed the Atonement at the center of their theology, and, stressing the total unworthiness of humankind, they saw a great difference between human nature and the grace of God. The Tractarians, stressing the Incarnation, saw God restoring the entire human, body and soul, and even the human social order. The view of the Tractarians was more inclusive of the physical and aesthetic realms, which therefore allowed a higher status to the outward physical signs of the sacraments. After all, if Christ was the Son of God, taking on flesh, and dwelling among humanity, then flesh need not be denigrated, and the Sacrament of the Eucharist can be a means of Christ's presence and a means of God's grace. Likewise, the sacrament of baptism, as the washing away of original sin and as regeneration, can be equally

---

52. Davies *1690-1850* 271-277, esp. 276.
53. Davies *1690-1850* 276.

stressed, over and against the Evangelical stress on conversion experience. And both sacraments can be seen as real incorporations into the death and resurrection of Christ.[54]

As further external evidence of the movement, and as a further expression of Christ's embodiment in the Church, the architecture produced during the Oxford Movement was strongly Gothic, reaching back to the fourteenth century. As noted above, that time was perceived by Tractarians to be an era of faith. They found the neoclassical style of the previous age of rationalism revolting. They also appreciated the symbolism of the medieval Gothic structure for the sense of awe and respect it instilled. And since their restoration of Apostolic Succession, they felt this kind of structure would be in keeping with the respect they expected for the clergy. As Davies says, one would have expected them to resort to the basilica of the Church of the first five centuries, given their orientation and theology. However, "that would have cut them off from English tradition, for there were no ancient basilicas in England, while there were superb mediaeval cathedrals, abbeys, and parish churches still standing." With the Tractarian focus on the Glory of God as the focus of worship, a higher attitude toward worship, and an elevated status of the clergy, the symbolism of their churches tended to reflect that in the structure of the buildings — cruciform churches; a Trinitarian division into nave, chancel, and sanctuary; raised chancels for clergy and choir; dramatic high altars; carved reredos; baptismal fonts near the entrance; and a profusion of accessories and emblems used for symbolism, including candlesticks, eagle-lecterns (the eagle being a symbol for St. John the Evangelist, as well as an allusion to Isaiah 40), brass ornaments, flowers, eucharistic vestments, and liturgical colors.[55]

Finally, at the end of his chapter, Davies summarizes the results of the Oxford Movement. Despite being somewhat limited in its immediate effects by the "ritualist controversy," nonetheless, like the Liturgical Movement of the Roman Church, the Oxford Movement had a profound and long-term effect both on and beyond Anglicanism. The movement stressed sacred tradition and thereby overcame insularity and enlarged horizons, it revived patristic scholarship, it paved

54. Davies *1690-1850* 268-271.

55. Davies *1690-1850* 277-279, esp. 277-278.

the way for an ecumenical movement, it gave a greater sense of corporateness in the Church, it re-emphasized the Incarnation and the Cross and thereby strengthened sacramental understanding, and most importantly it revived worship. Davies attributes a reversal in declining worship attendance, with its nadir on Easter of 1800, to the emphases of the Oxford Movement. Daily services were re-introduced, surpliced choirs were trained, high pews were abolished, and worship practices and materials were handled and treated with care and respect. All this helped to restore dignity and beauty to worship.[56]

So, as can be assessed from the brief history of the English Church outlined above and the specifics of the Oxford Movement just discussed, the stressed themes of the Oxford Movement that we can expect to find expressed by Anglo-Catholics, such as Eliot, as against Evangelicals on the other end of the Anglican theological spectrum, are an emphasis on corporate holiness over and against a personal and sentimental faith, a related stress on the connectedness with the longer historical tradition of the Church, an emphasis on the Anglican Church's continuity with the teachings and traditions of the Apostles, an inclusion of Apostolic Succession in this light, a stress on the incarnation of Christ and thus on the Church, a focus on the Eucharist as the central act of worship, an orientation toward scholarly research and theological orthodoxy, a strong stress on worship practices and ceremonial, an appreciation for art and liturgical accoutrements in churches, an understanding and use of symbolism over and against mere functionalism, an equal or greater stress on liturgical elements in worship instead of seeing them as secondary to preaching, a taking advantage of more cultural elements of music and art in worship, a greater use of Gothic and traditional motifs in architecture, and a strong relationship with poetry (and hymnody) and literature.

Of course, both Puritan and Anglican, both low-church and high-church, both Protestant and Catholic, appeal to the same Scripture and early tradition of the Church. Both sides can persuasively argue a position. And one can find a degree of comfort on any given issue, therefore, at any point along the continuum. Thus, it is not a matter of being right or wrong, being correct or

---

56. Davies *1690-1850* 279-282.

mistaken, being informed or ignorant, having insight or being dense, or being orthodox or heterodox or heretical, but rather of being a part of the larger Church which is constantly seeking balance. Further, if one finds oneself on one side or another of an issue or theological perspective, and especially if one feels strongly about the matter, it might be good to look to oneself as much as, or more than, to the scripture and tradition to which one appeals.

T. S. Eliot's Anglo-Catholicism

Many critics have commented on the effects of Eliot's conversion and faith on his writings, and some have also traced his spiritual growth as reflected in his works. However, most have missed the nuance of the term Anglo-Catholic. While most may understand the basic differences among the variety of denominational identifications, the nuances among and within those denominations are not always so clear. Within the Anglican Church, there continues to be a continuum of liturgical practices, as is true within most denominations. That continuum runs from a more Protestant orientation, with its simpler approach to liturgy, to the more Anglo-Catholic, with its more elaborate and formal style of liturgy. Our discussion centers on the Anglo-Catholic tradition and its specifics, since Eliot referred to himself not just as an Anglican but as an "anglo-catholic in religion." When most critics and writers discuss this religious aspect of Eliot's identity, they see Anglo-Catholic in the most general terms. A good example is the essay by Murray H. Sherman, which appeared recently in *The Psychoanalytic Review*:

> Anglo-Catholicism is a branch of the Church of England and differs from Roman Catholicism in that it denies the authority of the Pope. Anglo-Catholicism does accept the rituals of Roman Catholicism, such as the Eucharist in which it is maintained that the ceremonial wafer and wine are transformed into the actual flesh and blood of Christ.[57]

This does not begin to address the nuances of the tradition. Sherman sees Anglo-Catholicism's distinctiveness in terms of its *difference* from Roman Catholicism, primarily in denying papal authority. Much clarification of the specifics and distinguishing characteristics of Anglo-Cathol-

57. Murray H. Sherman, "T. S. Eliot: His Religion, His Poetry, His Roles," *The Psychoanalytic Review* 84.1 (February 1997): 106, footnote 1.

icism is needed. Hence, the thrust of this chapter has been to clarify Anglo-Catholicism's views so that they can be more accurately applied to Eliot's writings in subsequent chapters.

A certain amount of the confusion revolves around the word "catholic." First, it must be remembered that the word *catholic*, itself, means "universal" — the entire Christian Church throughout the world and throughout history. Traditionally, *Catholic* with the capital *C* refers specifically to the Roman *Catholic* Church. Anglo-Catholic retains the sense of "universal" while simultaneously placing the Church on the more liturgical end of the ecclesiastical spectrum — exercising its worship practices more in the manner of the Roman Catholic Church than in the manner of more Protestant churches. Further clarifying the distinction between Roman Catholic and Anglo-Catholic, Leslie notes Newman's insistence that "they were anti-Roman but not anti-Catholic. They condemned the abuses not the uses."[58]

Further, there is also a generally limited knowledge of the Oxford Movement. Shane Leslie opens his first chapter by noting that "[The Oxford Movement] is the only intellectual movement England has ever bred."[59] The movement's influence is noted by many as being primarily in the area of worship, causing the Church, both in England and beyond, to grant a larger role to ceremonial than it had previously — in the words of Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, "The importance of the Oxford Movement lies not in its meeting the needs of Christian theology but in its meeting the needs of the worshipping heart. Its emphasis on the centrality of worship and the need to make it worthy of the object of worship has exercised a continuing beneficent influence."[60] The movement also stimulated social concern and an increase of scholarly research. Keble, Newman, and Pusey, themselves, started the *Library of the Fathers* in 1836 and the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology* a few years later.[61] Cunliffe-Jones sees the intellectual aspect of the movement coming primarily in the third generation, with people like Frederick Denison Maurice. He also notes Keble, Pusey, and primarily Newman as lending the movement not only its "earnest piety," but

58. Leslie 56. Cf. S. L. Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (London: Faith, 1963) 25.
59. Leslie 1.
60. Cunliffe-Jones 88.
61. Cross and Livingstone 1019-1020.

also its "devout scholarship."[62] Nonetheless, most of us quickly overlook or forget the importance of the movement and its impact on the English Church and the larger Church. And the influence was not only in biblical scholarship and worship practices.

Many of the leaders of and participants in the Oxford Movement wrote poetry and hymns, as well as the better known Tracts. Geoffrey Faber has commented, however, that much of their poetry was not very good. The obvious danger of "religious" poetry is that its intent is often religious inculcation, which often runs at cross purposes with artistic expression, thus quickly compromising the poetic art. Such may well have been the case with the poetic production of Newman and Keble. Nonetheless, the poetry still should have widened the exposure of the Oxford Movement leaders as well as enhanced the exposure and influence of the movement itself. Indeed, the movement did influence writers of greater skill and wider impact.[63] Despite the lack of general knowledge of the Oxford Movement, much has been written about the Oxford Movement and its impact in the life of the Church, especially of the English Church. The Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J.,writing in 1933, states that "Over three thousand volumes on the Oxford Movement are said to have issued from the press. With its centenary year the literary floodgates opened anew." Husslein then goes on to ask if the movement is dead and answers his own question: "In answer, let us first distinguish between the Movement itself and its effects. As a Movement, we can readily concede that it has spent its force. In its effects, it continues to-day and will remain living and active for generations to come."[64] These are effects that I will establish, especially as felt by T. S. Eliot, in order to understand Eliot's life and work.

From the brief outline above of the history of the beginnings and establishment of the Church of England, the complexity of identifying oneself simply as a Christian in the context of the Anglican tradition becomes understandable. Eliot acknowledges this complexity when he identifies himself so specifically, and he places himself on a certain point on the continuum of theolog-

62. Cunliffe-Jones 88-90, esp. 88, 78.

63. Ollard 145f. Cf. Leslie 150-164; and Geoffrey Faber, M.A., *Oxford Apostles: A Character Study of the Oxford Movement* (London: Faber, 1933) 91-95. This point will be discussed in slightly more detail in my next chapter.

64. Leslie ix, x.

ical perspectives. As already noted elsewhere, Eliot says of himself, in the preface to *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order*, that his "general point of view may be described as classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and anglo-catholic in religion."[65] As for defining his use of the term, "anglo-catholic," Eliot is evasive, saying that it "does not rest with me to define," and he subsequently refers us on to three other works in progress — *The School of Donne*, *The Outline of Royalism*, and *The Principles of Modern Heresy* — works that never appeared.[66] In *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy* (The Page-Barbour Lectures given at the University of Virginia), Eliot further discusses his view of heresy and tradition.[67] While I am about the same task of looking at the effects of Eliot's conversion and faith on his writings and tracing his spiritual growth as reflected in his works, I am more specifically concerned in this dissertation with clarifying Eliot's self-definition as an "anglo-catholic," and what that entails. The end result for Eliot is not simply identifying himself as a converted, baptized Christian, but specifically as an Anglo-Catholic. It is evident that his identity is a movement from the more Protestant and Unitarian American forms of religiosity to the more liturgical Anglo-Catholic tradition.

Thus, in turning to a consideration of T. S. Eliot and his Anglo-Catholicism, it is not simply a turning to the theology and development of the Church of England, but also to Eliot's own personal orientation and needs that led him to the specific form of the Church he embraced. This brief discussion of the history of the English Church helps to elucidate the specifics of the faith perspective that undergirds some of Eliot's thinking and writing. Further, this understanding should serve to clarify some of the choices Eliot must have made in order to define himself specifically as an Anglo-Catholic. Turning now to Eliot's critical writing, I will consider some of the statements he made about himself and his faith orientation, the Church, the state, society, and art, all in the light of a specifically conservative, liturgical, English high-church faith orientation.

65. T. S. Eliot, Preface, *For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1929) vii.
66. Eliot, Preface, *For Lancelot Andrewes* viii.
67. T. S. Eliot, *After Strange Gods: A Primer of Modern Heresy* (New York: Harcourt, 1934).