

FOREWORD

THE MAKING OF MORE AND CROSS' *ANGLICANISM*

By
W. Brown Patterson

Anglicanism, edited by Paul Elmer More and Frank Leslie Cross, first published in 1935, was reprinted in 1951, 1957, and 1962, becoming a standard work. The collection, with its valuable editorial features, defined what the editors called “the thought and practice of the Church of England” in a new way. The book has retained its salience and relevance. The current controversies over doctrinal and other issues in the worldwide Anglican Communion – threatening its unity and effectiveness – make a reprint edition of the book extremely welcome. The richness and diversity of the religious literature of the Church of England in the seventeenth century are more fully revealed in this volume than anywhere else.

The selections in *Anglicanism* demonstrate that a century noted for the brilliance of its poetry, drama, and prose was also one of the most fruitful in English history in terms of religious thought. Many of these creative achievements were accompanied and provoked by revolutionary political events and by bitter religious and intellectual disputes. The religious ideas and values of a broad range of writers deserve, as More argues in his introductory essay, the renewed attention of all those who seek to understand a remarkable era.

The term *Anglicanism*, used by the editors as the title for their collection of excerpts from the religious writings of the seventeenth century, refers to the doctrine and discipline of the established Church of England. But the term is of later origin than the writings, and needs definition.¹ Though the word *Anglican* was occasionally used in the seventeenth century to describe the English Church as it emerged from the Reformation of the previous century, it took until the mid-nineteenth century for the term *Anglicanism* to be widely used. It was part of the vocabulary of members of the Oxford movement, a group of clergy and lay people who sought to recover for the established Church some of the distinctive theological emphases of the pre-Reformation period. The Tractarians, as John Henry Newman, Edward Pusey, John Keble, and others were called, from their authorship of *Tracts for the Times* (1834-1841), claimed that the Church of England, though reformed, was the historic Catholic Church of the island and that the Catholicism of its spiritual heritage was broader and purer than Roman Catholicism. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the term *Anglicanism* was used, beginning in 1838, to mean “Adherence to the doctrine and discipline of the reformed Church of England (and other churches in communion therewith), as the genuine representative of the Catholic Church.”² The Church of England and its daughter churches around the world were considered by Newman and his followers to be a via media between Protestantism and Roman

1. *The Oxford English Dictionary*, second edition, ed. J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, 20 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), Vol. I, p. 464; Stephen Sykes, “Anglican thought,” in *The Oxford Companion to Christian Thought*, ed. Adrian Hastings, Alistair Mason, and Hugh Pyper (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 18-22. For a discussion of nineteenth-century English views of seventeenth-century theology, and of the emergence of the concept of Anglicanism, see Peter Knockles, “Survivals or New Arrivals? The Oxford Movement and the Nineteenth-Century Historical Construction of Anglicanism,” in *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition: Continuity, Change and the Search for Communion*, ed. Stephen Platten (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), pp. 144-191.

2. *Oxford English Dictionary*, Vol. I, p. 464.

Catholicism (a view that tended to obscure the English Church's deep roots in the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century). More and Cross, writing in the mid-1930s, certainly held to the Tractarian view of the English Church as a *via media*, and the organisation and contents of their collection reflect this view.

Paul Elmer More was a prominent American editor and literary critic.¹ Born in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1864, he was educated there at Washington University and then at Harvard University. More was skilled in the ancient languages of Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Sanscrit, as well as in French, Italian, Spanish, and German. H.L. Mencken, a rival editor and literary critic, said of him in 1922: "More has a solid stock of learning in his lockers; he is armed and outfitted as none of the pollyannas who trail after him is armed and outfitted; he is, perhaps, the nearest approach to a genuine scholar that we have in America, God save us all!"² After teaching at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania for two years, following his graduate studies at Harvard, More spent two years in seclusion – not unlike the sojourn of his countryman Henry David Thoreau – living in a hilltop cottage in Shelburne, New Hampshire, surrounded by fir trees and overlooking the Androscoggin River. One result of his stay was his decision to become a literary journalist and critic rather than a poet, which had been his earlier ambition. More subsequently became the literary editor of the *Independent* (1901-1903) and the *New York Evening Post* (1903-1906). He was first the literary editor and later the editor of *The Nation* (1906-1914). *The Nation* was the leading weekly intellectual journal in the United States, and there he succeeded, as Robert Shafer has written, in "holding together and notably strengthening a very distinguished group of regular contributors".³ More wrote extensively for these periodicals. Many of his essays and reviews were separately published in a series of eleven volumes called *Shelburne Essays* (1904-1921).

In 1914 More's career entered a new phase when he resigned from *The Nation* and moved to Princeton, New Jersey, to become an independent scholar, a life made possible by an inheritance received by his wife, Henrietta Beck. He also taught Greek and philosophy on a continuing, though part-time, basis at Princeton University. During his years in Princeton More became more and more interested in Plato, Platonism, and the emergence of early Christianity. One result of these interests was an impressive five-volume work entitled *The Greek Tradition* (1924-1931). The 1920s were also years in which he was closely associated with Irving Babbitt, whom he had first met when they were fellow students at Harvard. The literary movement that they led came to be called the New Humanism.⁴ Babbitt had become a professor of comparative literature at Harvard, where he was a popular lecturer and an influential adviser. The humanism that More and Babbitt championed owed a great deal to Matthew Arnold. More and Babbitt favored literary classics that threw light on the human condition and provided insights about the character of the moral life. They were indifferent or opposed to literary study as a vehicle for social criticism, and they deplored an easy relativism in the assessment of ideas and values. They were opposed to the individualism that characterized late Romanticism and to pretensions to objectivity by the proponents of modern science. In the 1920s the movement attracted

1. See Robert Shafer, *Paul Elmer More and American Criticism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935); Arthur Hazard Dakin, *Paul Elmer More* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960); and Francis X. Duggan, *Paul Elmer More* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1966).

2. Shafer, *Paul Elmer More*, p. 314.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 109.

4. See Irving Babbitt, *Character and Culture: Essays on East and West* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 1995), esp. the introduction by Claes G. Ryn, pp. ix-l.

many younger critics and adherents, though after about 1930 the movement lost favor. It was attacked by those who found humanism without religion to lack substance and by those who preferred to approach literature by means of a close reading of texts as works of art.

Meanwhile More underwent a spiritual conversion that he described in *Pages from an Oxford Diary*, written while he was at Oxford University in 1924-25. The book purports to be the journal of a fellow of a college at Oxford, but it is an account of More's own experiences, as he acknowledged in the preface to the book when it was finally published in 1937.¹ This was the year in which he died. The Oxford don who is the narrator in the diary came to feel the presence of John Henry Newman in an almost palpable way: "I can see him moving with his long swift strides through the lanes about Iffley and Littlemore; the quadrangle of Oriel for his sake is forever a hallowed spot."² The don recognized in Newman someone who had pursued a spiritual quest much like his own. Newman recalled that St. Augustine, who also sought God over his lifetime, had said: "he knew only two things, God and his own soul".³ The don summed up the stages in his own quest: "childish faith, romanticism, critical curiosity, classical taste, Platonism".⁴ At last the don had come to an understanding of God as the Creator who was and is struggling against great obstacles to bring order out of chaos. In a glorious Epiphany, God had revealed himself to the world in his Son, Jesus Christ, through whom human beings could come to know the Father. The don saw the Eucharist as a powerful symbol and force, continuing the work of the Incarnation of the Eternal Word in Christ: "best of all I like to consider it [the Eucharist] as completing, so to speak, that event by which the Word became flesh, and as showing on a thousand altars how flesh becomes the Word."⁵ He rejected the explanation of the sacrament by the followers of Zwingli and by the Roman Catholics. The Zwinglian doctrine, which held that the sacrament was a memorial of the Last Supper, "deprives the act of all potency over the imagination". The Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, "founded on a metaphysical distinction of substance and attributes is untenable".⁶ The don declared that he embraced "the wisdom and modesty of our great Anglican divines, who, from the days of Henry VIII to the present, have resolutely refrained from analyzing the operation of the sacrament, and have felt its efficacy as a mystery to be felt and not propounded".⁷

More's earliest description of the projected work that became *Anglicanism* was in a letter to the poet and critic T.S. Eliot. He had dined with Eliot in 1928 during a trip to England. Eliot had severely criticized the New Humanism as expounded by Babbitt, on the grounds that it lacked an explicitly religious focus. He evidently saw in More someone whose interests were closer to his own. In More's letter to Eliot in July 1930, he said that he had a great deal to relate "about a great project for an anthology from the 17th century to show the ethos of the Anglican Church". He continued: "After all theology is the only really interesting subject, and I get so little of it in conversation or letters."⁸ By the late summer of 1931, More had asked Frank Leslie Cross to assist him with the project. In a letter of September 1931 to his friend Prosser Hall

1. Paul Elmer More, *Pages from an Oxford Diary* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1937), Preface (the book lacks pagination).

2. *Ibid.*, Sect. III.

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.*, Sect. XXIX.

5. *Ibid.*, Sect. XXX.

6. *Ibid.*

7. *Ibid.*

8. Dakin, *Paul Elmer More*, p. 292. For More's evening with T.S. Eliot in 1928, see p. 262.

Frye, a literary scholar, More said that he had journeyed from Edinburgh to Oxford, “where I engaged an assistant for the project ‘corpus,’ and so back to Cambridge”. He continued:

Have I told you about the ‘corpus’? It is to be an anthology . . . including sermons, chapters from books, documents of all sorts, to illustrate the *ethos* of the Anglican Church in the period from Hooker to Ken. It is to be published by the S.P.C.K. Through Bishop [Philip Mercer] Rhinelander of the College of Preachers, Washington, money has been raised to pay a salary to an assistant editor for two years, and it was this assistant [Frank Leslie Cross] I engaged at Oxford. He is a young priest, now at Pusey House, who I think is thoroughly well qualified for the work.¹

In March and April 1932, More devoted “fifteen or twenty days” to working with Cross in Princeton planning the anthology.² By the early summer of 1933 More was back in Oxford, where, among other activities, he met C.S. Lewis, “who interested me more than any other Oxonian I have met in a long time,” as he wrote to Babbitt. Lewis promised to send a book to More, once it was published, that described in a disguised form Lewis’s own spiritual journey. This was *The Pilgrim’s Regress* (1933).³ More said of his work with Cross on the anthology of religious writers: “My mornings I spent with Cross in the Bodleian or Pusey House going through masses of bulky volumes, some of which, as shown by uncut leaves, have never been read here before.”⁴ Toward the end of July 1933, More reported that Cross was “collating the texts, reading proof, and attending to the notes”.⁵ In late September 1933, in a letter to Eliot written from Princeton, More reported that he had read the third draft of his introduction to the volume to several friends, who “seemed to feel that my view of Anglicanism was correct and enlightening”.⁶ He added: “This, as far as it goes, is encouraging, since the work has cost infinite pains and even so has left me very anxious.”⁷ Early in 1935 More wrote with some satisfaction to the critic and editor Seward B. Collins: “the *opus* ‘Anglicanism’ will soon appear heralded with recommendations by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York [Cosmo Gordon Lang and William Temple] and by T. S. Eliot.”⁸ The book appeared later in the same year.

Frank Leslie Cross, whose career intersected with More’s in 1931, was born in 1900 and was thus a full generation younger than More, but he was already an accomplished and productive scholar.⁹ Cross had in earlier years devoted himself primarily to the natural sciences and mathematics as a pupil at Bournemouth School and then at Balliol College, Oxford. He completed the first part of the honours course in chemistry at Oxford in 1920. In the same year he earned an external B.Sc. degree in chemistry at the University of London. About then his

1. *Ibid.*, p. 301.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 327 note.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 327.

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*, p. 330.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 334.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 335.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 370.

9. See T.M. Parker, “Frank Leslie Cross, 1900-1968,” *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1969, pp. 362-375; E.A. Livingstone, “Frank Leslie Cross, 1900-1968,” *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, second edition, ed. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. xxvii-xxxi; and Elizabeth A. Livingston, “Cross, Frank Leslie (1900-1968),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://0-www.oxforddnb.com>.

interests took a decidedly different path. Cross received the B.A. degree in theology at Oxford in 1922, and, in recognition of his distinguished academic work, he was awarded the Senior Denyer and Johnson Scholarship, which enabled him to pursue theology in Germany for two years at the universities of Marburg and Freiburg. He subsequently received the D. Phil. degree in theology at Oxford. Meanwhile he was ordained a deacon in 1925 and a priest in 1926. He served as tutor and chaplain at Ripon Hall theological college in Oxford, and in 1927 became librarian at Pusey House, Oxford. Pusey House continued the theological emphases of the Oxford Movement and was the spiritual home of a community of like-minded students and advanced scholars. While Paul Elmer More was a wide-ranging literary critic who, as a layman, became deeply interested in English theology in the seventeenth century, Frank Leslie Cross was a scientist-become-theologian with exceptional academic credentials, who as an ordained priest devoted himself to pastoral and liturgical activities as well as to scholarship.

More and Cross, so different in some ways, had a great deal in common. By the time Cross had moved from Ripon Hall to Pusey House, he had evidently changed from a “modernist” or liberal theological orientation to the Anglo-Catholicism associated with the followers and spiritual descendants of the Tractarians. This orientation had given Cross a keen interest in the writings of the seventeenth-century English divines that so much interested More. In *John Henry Newman* (1933), Cross commented: “The Oxford Movement was theologically a return to the pure undiluted religious outlook of the Seventeenth Century.”¹ He added that its members took their fundamental principles on “the authority of the great Divines of the Seventeenth Century, – Andrewes, Laud, Hammond, Cosin”.² Cross acknowledged that Newman and his associates had formulated the doctrine of the Church of England as the *via media* or middle way between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism and he noted that Newman, in his *Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church* (1837 – eight years before becoming a Roman Catholic) had provided “a magnificent apologia for what may be termed the Anglican ethos”.³

Cross had already published several books before he met More. He had edited, with H.D.A. Major, the principal of Ripon Hall, three volumes of the papers of the theologian and historian Hastings Rashdall (published in 1927-1930). He had also written *Religion and the Reign of Science* (1930), drawing on his studies of the scientific disciplines, in which he argued that religion and science were not only compatible but were necessary partners in the quest for knowledge and meaning in the natural world. He had become intensely interested in the ancient Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church, an interest that closely paralleled More’s. His editing of *Anglicanism* with More was evidently one reason that his subsequent career took the turn it did. The assiduous, painstaking, and almost archaeological work involved in uncovering the English theological literature of the seventeenth century helped to lay the foundation for his most important and enduring scholarly publication. This was *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (1957, with later editions in 1974, 1997, and 2005, the last three under the editorship also of E.A. Livingstone), which he founded and edited, recruiting many scholars as contributors, and to which he contributed a great many articles. Commissioned by Geoffrey Cumberlege of Oxford University Press in 1939, it was no doubt under way considerably earlier.

Cross would continue his distinguished career for more than three decades after More’s

1. Frank Leslie Cross, *John Henry Newman* (London: Philip Allan, 1933), p. 23.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 65, 70.

death in 1937. In 1943 he published *Darwell Stone, Churchman and Counselor*, an account of the life and career of the principal of Pusey House, 1909-1934, known particularly for his scholarly work on the history of the doctrine of the Eucharist. In 1944, Cross became Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford and a canon of Christ Church Cathedral. Reflecting his deep interest in patristic history and theology, he founded the series of international conferences on patristic studies that began in Oxford in 1951. Connected with this interest were his editing of St. Athanasius's *De Incarnatione* (1939), *St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (1951), and *The Early Christian Fathers* (1960). His death came quietly at The Priory House at Christ Church in 1968. *Anglicanism* was, in the case of More, a final scholarly achievement; it was, for Cross, a formative and highly significant early work.

Anglicanism was not a collection of extracts that were all strictly theological. As the subtitle stated, the collection was to bring to the readers' attention not only religious literature of a variety of kinds but some of the distinctive practices of the English Church during a crucially important century. The title-page bore a quotation from John Henry Newman's *Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church* which stated succinctly and prophetically what the editors sought to accomplish: "We have a vast inheritance, but no inventory of our treasures. All is given in profusion; it remains for us to catalogue, sort, distribute, select, harmonize, and complete." The publisher, S.P.C.K. (the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge), had been founded, appropriately, in 1698, "to advance the honour of God and the good of mankind, by promoting Christian knowledge both at home and in other parts of the world".¹ The preface by More recounted the process by which the book had taken shape, elaborating on the description he had sent to Eliot several years earlier. More had, in 1931, mentioned his plan to Bishop Philip Mercer Rhinelander, the former bishop of Pennsylvania who had become the warden of the College of Preachers at the National Cathedral of the American Episcopal Church in Washington, D.C. Rhinelander invited More to present the plan to a committee that included the deans or heads of three Episcopal theological seminaries: Hughell Edgar Woodall Fosbroke of the General Theological Seminary in New York City, Henry Bradford Washburn of the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and William Palmer Ladd of the Berkeley Divinity School in New Haven, Connecticut. Frank Gavin, professor of ecclesiastical history at General Seminary, was also a member. The committee and the bishop endorsed the plan and undertook to raise funds to make possible the appointment of an associate editor and to cover "incidental expenses". The members left the organization and editing of the book entirely in the editors' hands. More engaged Cross in the project, and he acknowledged that his coeditor had taken on "much the heavier part of the burden of reading and editing". The purpose of the projected volume was, as More wrote, "to make a collection of passages from the ecclesiastical writers of the Seventeenth Century which would set forth the doctrine and discipline, – what might be called in a broad sense the genius, – of the Church of England in that age of adjustment after the first confusions of the Reformation". The two editors said of their handiwork that they believed "that the documents here assembled represent what was clearly the dominant teaching of the Anglican Church in that age".

The volume contained writings by 102 authors, including a few who wrote anonymously. These writers make up a remarkably diverse group. Included among them are the forerunners of the Laudian movement such as Lancelot Andrewes and John Overall; the Laudians themselves such as William Laud, John Cosin, and Jeremy Taylor; moderate Calvinists such as Joseph Hall and John Davenant; Cambridge Platonists such as Henry More and Ralph Cudworth;

1. *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, second edition, p. 1298.

Restoration high churchmen such as William Sancroft and Thomas Ken; and Latitudinarians such as Gilbert Burnet and John Tillotson. Also included are religious writers more difficult to define theologically: the liberal William Chillingworth, the ex-Roman Catholic Marco Antonio de Dominis, the conciliarist theologian Richard Field, and the Cambridge linguist and scholar Herbert Thorndike. Well known literary figures include Francis Bacon, John Donne, George Herbert, Thomas Browne, Isaak Walton, Thomas Traherne, and John Evelyn. The historian and statesman Edward Hyde is here, as is the epoch-making scientist Isaac Newton. Two monarchs are included: James I and Charles I. The apologist for the Elizabethan Church, Richard Hooker, who died in 1600, is one of the writers most frequently represented. Brief biographies of all of the writers are included as an appendix to the volume. An informative, though now necessarily dated, account of the historical context is provided by an introductory essay by Felix R. Arnott, then of Keble College, Oxford, later archbishop of Brisbane in Australia. Conspicuously missing from the collection are most of the nonconformists, usually called Puritans, who were indubitably members of the Church of England in the early seventeenth century. Also missing are many of the writers in the Interregnum in the middle of the century who took theology and ecclesiastical practice in radically new directions. Richard Baxter, a nonconformist after the Restoration whose theology was broad and whose view of the national church was inclusive, does find a place here. In general, the moderate Calvinist tradition that prevailed in the English Church at the beginning of the seventeenth century is underrepresented. But the rich diversity of thinkers who are included justify the author's assessment of the seventeenth century as a golden age in the history of English religious literature.

More and Cross grouped the excerpts in the collection into nineteen chapters. Some of chapters are largely theological, and include such topics as the Bible, Standards of Faith, Natural Theology, Soteriology, Eschatology, and the Sacraments. Others incline toward ecclesiastical organization and practice, including the Christian Ministry, Baptism and Confirmation, Visitations (of parishes by the diocesan bishop), and Prayer. The volume opens with broad categories relating to the character of the English Church, including the Anglican Faith, the Church, and Separated Churches, and closes with Caroline Piety, or the spirituality of the English Church in the reigns of Charles I and Charles II. Throughout the book, writers are shown to be concerned with preserving the integrity of the Church of England in the face of repeated challenges from many different quarters – intellectual, political, and social. The book resembles a *summa theologica* or systematic theology of the English Church that is more detailed than any writer or group of writers had ever attempted. The Church of England, which did not have any one theologian as central to its life as Thomas Aquinas, Luther, or Calvin are to other traditions, had something that was better. That is, it had a body of writings that was consonant with broad agreed-upon principles of faith and order but was immensely varied in expression and interpretation. Further theological reflection seemed to be enjoined on successor generations by their work. Conciliar or consultative procedures would be appropriate. Further writing and discussion were, in effect, called for. Rather than attempting to freeze the English Church in a seventeenth-century form, the editors showed that the English Church of the seventeenth century was a living entity, responding to challenges and defining and redefining its mission in relation to a constantly changing cultural environment. As More wrote in his opening essay, entitled “The Spirit of Anglicanism”, “What we have to look for in the ecclesiastical literature of England is not so much finality as direction.” He also stated his own belief “that a liberal *ethos* of Christianity,” such as that developed by many English writers in the seventeenth century, “will more and more prevail in the Holy Catholic Church”. The

modern Ecumenical Movement, the Second Vatican Council, and the widespread acceptance in the churches of the historical-critical study of the scriptures seem to bear out his confident assertion.

T.S. Eliot, to whom More had confided his plan for the book at an early stage, was not entirely pleased with the eventual result. Writing in the *Princeton Alumni Weekly* early in February 1937, Eliot praised More for his multi-volume work, *The Greek Tradition*, in which More had, he said, demonstrated not only his intelligence and erudition but his personal engagement in the search for truth and for an understanding of God. But, Eliot said, More, in his introduction to *Anglicanism*, had failed “to emphasize the continuity of the Church; one might think that it was the invention of Hooker. He does not give recognition to the probable importance of the mystics of the fourteenth century – of Richard Rolle and Juliana of Norwich for instance – as late as the time of Lancelot Andrewes and George Herbert.” Nevertheless, Eliot added, “his understanding of the spirit of Anglicanism is remarkable”.¹ The subject, Eliot seemed to say, is eminently worth an intelligent reader’s attention. In any case this superbly edited anthology has proved to be extraordinarily durable, and it achieves new life with the present edition.

W. Brown Patterson

1. Dakin, *Paul Elmer More*, p. 385.