

Durham E-Theses

*The revision of the Eucharist in the Church of
England : a study of liturgical change in the twentieth
century.*

Edward Gareth Lloyd

How to cite:

Lloyd, Edward Gareth (1997) The revision of the Eucharist in the Church of England : a study of liturgical change in the twentieth century. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1049/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The Revision of the Eucharist in the Church of England

**A study of Liturgical Change
in the Twentieth Century**

Edward Gareth Lloyd MA

submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Durham
Department of Theology

December 1997



13 JAN 1999

**The Revision of the Eucharist in the Church of England:
A Study of Liturgical Change in the Twentieth Century**

Edward Gareth Lloyd MA

ABSTRACT

The Church of England has experienced two substantial periods of liturgical revision during this century, spanning between them almost 50 years. The reforms came in response to pressures for change within Church and society, and also reflected doctrinal, missiological and scholarly tensions within the Church itself.

The significance of the first period of revision, 1906-1928, is frequently underestimated. The literature emphasizes the 1928 Prayer Book's role as a disciplinary standard, but neglects the liturgical debate and discussion which lay behind it. While the Book itself was a conservative revision of the 1662 Prayer Book, the background to its compilation reveals two important and vigorous strands of debate. Firstly, the Church was struggling to find an identity and character as a catholic, as well as a reformed, body, and secondly, there were impassioned pleas for a more accessible liturgy to meet the needs of unchurched people.

The second period of revision, 1955-1980, culminating in the publication of the *Alternative Service Book*, was more obviously successful in translating pressures for change into a living liturgy. The most significant influence was the widespread adoption of 'parish communion' ideals, which the new eucharistic rites are designed to serve. However, liturgical scholarship has also been hugely influential on new rites, and the extent of this has not been fully recognised. While changes in the understanding of eucharistic sacrifice and prayer for the dead were well debated, other reforms, particularly the adoption of Dix's four-action shape and implicit changes in the doctrine of consecration, have received less attention than they deserve.

This thesis attempts to remedy these deficiencies, and offers a fresh account of the work of revision. Attention is concentrated on the eucharist. The thesis is rooted in primary sources, particularly the papers of the Liturgical Commission and the Church's synods.

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	7
1.1	Where does the liturgy come from?	7
1.2	An overview of liturgical revision 1906–1980	11
1.3	Literature	13
1.4	The aims and scope of this thesis	16
	Notes	19
2	THE BACKGROUND TO THE 1928 PRAYER BOOK	21
2.1	The legacy of 1662	21
2.2	The Royal Commission	25
2.3	The experience of war	30
2.4	Other pressures for change	33
2.5	Opposition to the proposed reforms	40
	Notes	45
3	THE 1928 PRAYER BOOK	48
3.1	The extent of the reforms	48
3.2	The eucharistic canon	50
3.3	The remainder of the eucharist	56
3.4	Reservation	57
3.5	Other services	59
3.6	The Deposited Book in summary	59
3.7	The Book in Parliament: the first Commons defeat	61
3.8	The modified Book and the second Commons defeat	65
3.9	Reasons for failure	67
	Notes	72
4	THE PRAYER BOOK TRADITION SINCE 1928	74
4.1	Dealing with defeat	74
4.2	Publication and printing	77
4.3	Reactions to the 1928 Prayer Book	81
4.4	The revision of Canon Law	89
4.5	Series 1	91
4.6	The Prayer Book tradition since 1980	95
	Notes	100
5	THE BACKGROUND TO RADICAL REVISION	103
5.1	Why Prayer Book revision at all?	103
5.2	The parish communion	105
5.3	Dix and the ‘fourfold action’	111
5.4	The ‘Apostolic Tradition’	116
5.5	Eucharistic sacrifice	117
5.6	The Lambeth Conference 1958	119
5.7	The Church of South India	125
5.8	Other contributions	130
	Notes	134

6	SERIES 2	138
6.1	Guiding principles and early work	138
6.2	'Reshaping the Liturgy'	142
6.3	Drafting Series 2	145
6.4	Reaction to the draft rite	150
6.5	Revision and authorization	152
6.6	The service in use	160
	Notes	166
7	SERIES 3	169
7.1	The language of worship	169
7.2	'The Word and The Prayers'	174
7.3	'The Communion'	177
7.4	Revision in Synod	183
7.5	Comments and reactions	191
7.6	Series 3 in summary	197
	Notes	199
8	THE ALTERNATIVE SERVICE BOOK	204
8.1	A new prayer book	204
8.2	Series 1 & 2 revised: Rite B	206
8.3	Series 3 Revised: Rite A	209
8.4	The ASB in use	220
8.5	Conservative reaction	221
	Notes	226
9	CONCLUSION	229
9.1	The 1928 Prayer Book	229
9.2	Services produced in the 1960s and 1970s	231
9.3	Conclusion	238
	Notes	239
	APPENDICES	240
	Appendix 1: The Liturgical Commission	240
	Appendix 2: Statistical arguments	244
	Appendix 3: Additional Consecration	248
	Appendix 4: The NA 84 canon with clergy amendments	251
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	254

Declaration

I hereby declare that no part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in the University of Durham or elsewhere.

Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Notes and references

Full titles and publication details of all the works cited or referred to in this thesis are given in the Bibliography. In the notes and references, works are referred to by author and (short) title only; lists of co-authors and long titles are abbreviated. The notes and references are printed at the end of each chapter.

Greek and Latin words and the use of capital letters

This thesis aims to adhere to the conventions of the MHRA style book. In particular:

- a) Nouns and adjectives denoting religious movements and their followers are not capitalized unless they are derived from proper nouns (e.g. **evangelical**, **evangelicals**; but **Elizabethan**).
- b) Foreign words which have passed into regular English usage are not italicized (e.g. **Kyries**, **Gloria**, **anamnesis**).

The names of prayers and parts of the liturgy are capitalized when they are used specifically (e.g. **the Prayer of Humble Access**) but not when they carry a generic sense (e.g. **the eucharist**, **the eucharistic prayer**).

Acknowledgements

My thanks go first of all to the Diocese of Durham. This project began with the encouragement of Canon Ronald Coppin and with generous financial support from the Diocese. I am grateful also to the Bishop of Jarrow, who arranged study leave for me to complete the thesis, and to the Revd Neil Evans, who took care of St Peter's Church during this time.

I wish to thank the Beney Trust for financial support over the last two years.

This study required many hours' work at the Church of England Record Centre, South Bermondsey. My thanks go to the staff there, who have always been helpful, kind and encouraging, particularly Dr Brenda Hough and Dr Peter Hughes.

I am grateful to my supervisors, the Revd Gordon Jeanes, the Revd Dr Duane Arnold, and Dr Alan Suggate; and to the Revd Michael Vasey for his helpful comments.

I should like to express my thanks to Mr Ian Nicholson, Mrs Drina Gowland, and Mr Alan Perry, Churchwardens of St Peter's Church, Monkwearmouth, for their encouragement of this research in the midst of a busy parochial ministry; to our parishioners, who supported me with their prayers; and to Mrs Dana Beney, who read through the drafts and made many helpful suggestions. All remaining errors are, of course, my own.

Finally, I am grateful beyond words to my family. My parents Alwyn and Gaynor Lloyd, and my in-laws John and Agnes Compton, have helped in very practical ways. Most of all I thank my wife Elizabeth, whose love and support have enabled me to complete this thesis, not without cost to herself. It is to her and to our son Jonathan Gwyn that I dedicate this work.

Monkwearmouth

Advent 1997

Abbreviations

ASB	Alternative Service Book
BCO	Book of Common Order
BCP	Book of Common Prayer
CA	Church Assembly
CERC	Church of England Record Centre
CQR	Church Quarterly Review
ECU	The English Church Union
GS	General Synod
ICEL	International Commission on English in the Liturgy
ICET	International Consultation on English Texts
LC	Liturgical Commission
NA	National Assembly of the Church of England
PBS	Prayer Book Society
RCED	Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline

1

INTRODUCTION

Christian liturgy by its very nature is something which ought to change as the Christian community progresses and journeys through God's history.

*Bryan Spinks*¹

1.1 Where does the liturgy come from?

A young family arriving at church on a Sunday morning are given Rite A service booklets at the door. They know what to expect, for the service is similar week by week; within a rich seasonal variety there is a reassuring stability to the worship. It would probably come as quite a shock to them to discover that services in modern English were almost unheard of only thirty years ago. But in that time a quiet revolution has taken place. Since it was published in 1980, the *Alternative Service Book* has become a central part of the Church's life. Its modern language eucharistic rite is used in most parishes, and a whole generation of worshippers has known nothing else.² Now there is to be further change, for the *ASB* is itself due for replacement on 31 December 2000. Work is already well underway, and a new three-year lectionary came into use on Advent Sunday 1997 as the first step in the revision of the whole volume. The eucharistic rite is being lightly revised, but no significant changes to the structure of the service or its key congregational texts are in view.³

Such wide-ranging liturgical activity invites a number of questions. First of all, **why** does the liturgy need to change: what are the criteria against which the old is judged and found wanting? Secondly, **how** does it change: what are the criteria to which the new is constructed, and what are the mechanisms for drafting and authorizing new liturgy? Thirdly, what makes a **good** liturgy, and how is it tested and refined? Lurking behind all three questions is the assumption that the Church needs a common liturgy in the first place.

Why does the liturgy need to change?

The 1662 Prayer Book was imposed by law with the intention that ‘all the whole realm shall have but one use’.⁴ The ideal of ‘common prayer’ has a strong appeal, both for Anglicans and Christians of some other traditions,⁵ but in practice it has proved unattainable within the Church of England. The strict uniformity envisaged by the compilers of the Prayer Book was never achieved, and the Prayer Book has always had to be interpreted with flexibility.⁶ But there was a limit to how far it could legitimately be ‘pushed’, and in 1906 a Royal Commission found it inadequate for the pastoral and spiritual needs of the day: its doctrinal narrowness condemned ‘much which a great section of church people value’.⁷ The chaplains who served in the fields of France and Belgium during the First World War confirmed this judgement and added a further concern of their own: the Prayer Book was inescapably a child of its age, its thought-forms, language, and the subject matter of its prayers reflecting life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.⁸

As the century has progressed, the context in which the Church celebrates the liturgy has changed still further. The most striking example is the growth of the parish communion, and the way this has affected the *kind* of rites being produced in the 1960s compared with what was being discussed in the 1920s.⁹ Even within the relatively brief lifetime of the ASB, perceptions and expectations have shifted, particularly in the area of liturgical language. Most of the concerns expressed in the 1960s about the dangers of a vernacular liturgy have turned out to be ill-founded; on the other hand some of the deficiencies in the ASB which now attract attention, such as the poor balance of masculine and feminine language, the alleged preponderance of a terse, ‘flat’ idiom, and the lack of passionate, evocative images, were simply not substantial concerns within the Church at large when the ASB was published (indeed, the efforts of the Liturgical Commission to provide a richer idiom came to grief).¹⁰

The **need** for change, then, arises from the fact that no prayer book is timeless. Bryan Spinks (b. 1948) observes that in the early centuries a wide variety of liturgical practice prevailed;¹¹ this surely ought to sound a warning to the contemporary Church that ‘uniformity’, whether geographical or temporal, may not be as desirable as is often supposed.

How does the liturgy change?

During this century, pressures for reform have come from different directions and have often been opposed to each other. Firstly there are **doctrinal** struggles, principally the conflict between catholic and reformed understanding of the eucharist. This debate has centred on questions of eucharistic presence, reservation, eucharistic sacrifice and prayer for the departed. These disputes have not been static, because the strength and balance of the parties in the Church has changed with time, as has the nature of the debate itself.¹² Secondly, there is the question of the **accessibility** of liturgy, sharply identified by the war chaplains and reopened in recent years by the reports *Faith in the City* and *Children in the Way*. Thirdly, there is the related question of **tradition**. There has been a considerable backlash to the popularity of new services, sometimes expressed in terms of near-canonical veneration of the Prayer Book. Fourthly, there is the influence of **scholarship**. The increase in liturgical knowledge since the Reformation has altered perceptions of where the historic Anglican liturgy stands in relation to its roots. The influence of both the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus and Gregory Dix's four-action shape has been dramatic and not altogether helpful; in particular I shall argue that the Church has been neither consistent nor sensible in applying Dix's insights to the drafting of new liturgies.

These concerns raise the question of how liturgy is **drafted** and **authorized**. At the beginning of the century the Convocations controlled the liturgical process; they were joined in 1920 by the laity in the Church Assembly. Each of the four Houses of Convocation produced its own texts and amendments of other texts. Any proposed revision of the Prayer Book had then to be submitted to Parliament for approval. The process was cumbersome, and the obvious lesson was learnt. Since 1955, almost all drafting work has been done by a Liturgical Commission of some 20-25 people. At first these were all bishops and clergy, but since 1962 the Commission has included lay members. The House of Bishops retains its special responsibility for bringing liturgical material before General Synod, and Synod has the power of final approval.¹³ Recent legislation has done away with the role of Parliament in the scrutiny and authorization of liturgical material.

What makes a good liturgy?

The Church's worship must bear many burdens. It must first enable a congregation to pray and to enter into the Christian story; it must therefore adequately proclaim 'the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light'.¹⁴ The drafting of suitable services requires careful attention to the scriptures, to Christian tradition and to the needs of the worshippers. Both continuity with the past and a rootedness in the present are vital ingredients. But in a Church which values common prayer, the liturgy must do more. A common liturgy speaks of the unity and fellowship of the Church; and, even when Anglicans worship in a number of different ways, there may still be a sense of 'family likeness' to Anglican worship which gives it a distinctive feel.¹⁵ Furthermore, the liturgy at the very least reflects and proclaims the Church's doctrine, and may indeed partly define that doctrine.¹⁶ For these reasons (and particularly the doctrinal weight attaching to liturgical texts) authorization is important, so that what is said and done liturgically may be understood to be an act of the whole Church.

Scholars will want to judge liturgical texts by several criteria: their relationship with their antecedents, their theological coherence, and their quality as 'prayable' services, which will include (but not be limited to) their literary merit. Liturgical texts should of course be able to bear frequent repetition without sounding trite, thin or boring.

Whether or not liturgies are welcomed and used is perhaps the final judgement on their quality and suitability. While clergy and congregations have their say through convocations and synods, they also affect the revision process indirectly through the reception, or otherwise, of new material. It is a frequently repeated but important truth that liturgy is far more than the text: it is something experienced and above all something *done* by a worshipping community. It follows that if new services do not commend themselves in use, they are unlikely to survive.

The responsibility of the Church

These questions have a wider interest than the merely academic. Within the Church of England a considerable diversity of worship is tolerated, but it is contained within a framework of authorized services. When clergy are ordained, or licensed to a new ministry, they promise solemnly to use only the authorized forms. This places a heavy responsibility on those who hold authority within the Church: for if congregations are

to be told how to pray, they are surely entitled to services which are adequate (as far as may be) for the worship of God and suited to their own needs and circumstances. Furthermore the production and performance of the 'liturgy' — the people's work — is properly the concern of the whole Church, called to minister corporately as a royal priesthood offering spiritual sacrifices to God.

1.2 An overview of liturgical revision 1906–1980

The 1928 Prayer Book

After the Royal Commission reported in 1906, the Church began a modest programme of liturgical reform, culminating after many years in the so-called *1928 Prayer Book*. This was never formally sanctioned for use, for it twice failed to secure the necessary approval of Parliament. With the blessing of the bishops, however, the new Book came into widespread use. Some 1928 services were used in preference to the 1662 services, particularly the funeral service and the other occasional offices; at the eucharist it was much more usual to see 1928 material used to supplement and enrich the 1662 service. This was a relatively straightforward matter, for the 1928 Prayer Book shared the style and language of 1662.

Series 1

By the mid-1960s changes in canon law had effectively taken control of liturgy away from Parliament. The place of the Prayer Book was secured in law — the Church could not alter it or discontinue its use — but the Church was free to produce *alternative services* to stand alongside 1662. However the new canons explicitly denied the bishops any discretion to tolerate the use of unauthorized services.

The first series of alternatives, *Series 1*, was therefore a collection of 1928-type services, compiled so that churches could continue to do legally what they had been doing with the bishops' blessing since 1929. Most of these services have now lapsed.¹⁷ The eucharist continues to exist in modified form as a variant of *ASB Rite B*.¹⁸

Series 2

The second series of services, published at the same time as Series 1, was an altogether more creative production, drafted entirely by the Liturgical Commission. Although traditional language was maintained, particularly in the use of 'thou' for God and for individuals, the style was concise: sentences were shorter and there was little sign of the repetitiveness of 1662. The most original work was done on the shape of the eucharistic rite, which was designed for a parish communion, and on the canon, in which there was a simple oblation of the bread and cup. The new service had a stormy passage through the Church Assembly owing to doctrinal disagreements over the oblation and petition for the dead, and was authorized only after significant amendment of these sections. Nevertheless the new rite proved immensely popular, and subsequent revision has built on the basic outline of Series 2 and on many of its innovative features, such as a responsive litany-style intercession, a canon of more primitive shape and stronger eucharistic character than 1662, a distinctive fraction of the bread *after* the canon, the provision of psalms, canticles and hymns at various points, and the opportunity for greater congregational participation. Series 2 also set a trend in allowing new freedoms. The service could be celebrated either very fully, or with simplicity and brevity. There was no direction as to posture — e.g. whether the congregation were to kneel for confession or communion. Nor was there any direction as to where the priest should stand to conduct the ministry of the word.

Series 3

With Series 3 an attempt was made to write in a genuinely contemporary idiom. The eucharist was the first service to appear. In overall shape and theology, it clearly owed much to its Series 2 predecessor. The troublesome Series 2 oblation was rewritten and new prayers were composed for the post-communion, the confession and the Prayer of Humble Access. Historic texts such as the creeds, the Gloria, the Lord's Prayer and the canticles were included in ecumenically agreed forms.¹⁹ There was therefore now a double 'convergence' between denominations. Series 2 had adopted a more primitive *shape* for the eucharist, as had the new rites of the Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church and others; Series 3 adopted many of the same *congregational texts* and linguistic style. For the first time since 1549, worshippers would see a close family likeness between Anglican and Roman Catholic celebrations of the eucharist.

The Alternative Service Book

The Series 3 eucharist was lightly revised to become *Holy Communion Rite A* in the ASB. A few texts were changed, but the main difference was the provision for many more alternatives. The other Series 3 services were incorporated more or less as they stood, and the new service book was finally published, to considerable satisfaction and relief.²⁰ The ASB preface emphasized that the aim had been to provide a second set of services to stand alongside the BCP, rather than seeking to replace it:

The Church of England has traditionally sought to maintain a balance between the old and the new. For the first time since the Act of Uniformity this balance in its public worship is now officially expressed in two books, rather than one. The Alternative Service Book (1980) is intended to supplement the Book of Common Prayer, not to supersede it. The addition of a date to its title may serve as a reminder that revision and adaptation of the Church's worship are continuous processes, and that any liturgy, no matter how timeless its qualities, also belongs to a particular period and culture.

In one sense the publication of the ASB brought a lull after a long period of revision. For the first time in a generation, the alternative to the Prayer Book was reasonably stable. The new services have proved popular and the next revision is already building upon them. But the very success of the ASB has brought its own problems in the form of a traditionalist backlash. If the new book had appealed to only a small minority and the 1662 Prayer Book had still been preferred in the majority of parishes, there would not perhaps have been the same reaction. But some are concerned that the decline in Prayer Book worship will mean the loss of a distinctive contribution to English language and culture, and indeed changes in doctrine. Recent work by the Liturgical Commission indicates that they are sensitive to these concerns.²¹

1.3 Literature

General

The most comprehensive study of twentieth-century liturgical reform in the Church of England is by Ronald Jasper (1917-1990). *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980* (1989) is a wide-ranging account of liturgical development throughout the Anglican Communion. Inevitably Jasper's own interests have affected the balance of his work. The most interesting and revealing chapters are those dealing with the work of the Liturgical Commission, where he draws freely on his experiences as member and

chairman, illustrating his account with quotations from the Commission's internal papers and his own stock of personal reminiscences. This is very much an individual account and to that extent his work is necessarily unique. However his account too readily presents the history of liturgical reform as a steady evolution, each step an improvement on the last. Such a view does not, in my opinion, do justice to the evidence, and is challenged throughout this thesis. Jasper's work is nevertheless thorough, well-referenced and informative, an essential index to other work in the field.

A second essential resource is the extensive work of Colin Buchanan (b. 1934), much of it published as *Grove Booklets*. Like Jasper, Buchanan writes from long experience as a member of the Liturgical Commission. However, he tends to view the new rites from a greater distance than Jasper; his observations are not those of an uncritical advocate or a reluctant critic, but rather a commentary from his distinctive evangelical stance. Of particular value is *Modern Anglican Liturgies* (1968 and supplements), giving texts and brief commentaries on the new eucharistic rites throughout the Anglican Communion, and the Grove booklets *Recent Eucharistic Revision in the Church of England* (1978 and supplements) which presented a contemporary and thorough account of progress through the 1970s.

1928

Walter Howard Frere CR (1863-1938), Bishop of Truro from 1923-1935, was without doubt the foremost Anglican liturgical scholar of his time. He was heavily involved in the making of the Deposited Book, and his writings give an indication of many of the influences brought to bear on its production. A further strong influence on the Book came from the First World War chaplains. The experience of war, and above all of the Church's failure in its ministry to working men, had little effect in the end on the Book itself, but was a vital ingredient in the debates which led to its making.

Among reactions to the Book, those of F.E. Brightman and W.K. Lowther Clarke stand out. Brightman, writing in 1927, was highly critical of the Book's workmanship and its eastern canon. Lowther Clarke, writing some 16 years later with benefit of hindsight and long use of the Book was rather gentler in his criticism. G.K.A. Bell, in his biography of Randall Davidson (who as Archbishop of Canterbury had presided over the making of the 1928 Book), condemned the confused motives which he believed had attended the production of the Book, a concern also voiced by Dix and Jasper. I believe

this view to be mistaken, and I offer an alternative explanation of the Book's failure to achieve authorization in Chapter 3.

Lastly, there is the impression — given by Jasper, and by John Fenwick (b. 1951) and Bryan Spinks (b. 1948), for example²² — that the modest nature of the 1928 reforms as finally presented to Parliament show the Church of the 1920s to be blinkered and severely limited in its liturgical imagination. I believe this view is misleading, since it fails to account for the rich discussion and debate which preceded the final drafting of the Book. After the Labour party's crushing defeat in the 1983 General Election, Tony Benn ventured the opinion that people tended to pay too much attention to the results of elections and not enough attention to the ideas and policies debated during the campaign.²³ His sentiment is not without relevance to the 1928 Prayer Book. Too much attention has been paid to the end-product, and not enough to the vigorous and often creative debate which developed in the Church between 1906 and 1928. This thesis attempts to correct that imbalance.

1955-1980

The background to the more recent period of liturgical is dominated by the seminal work of Gregory Dix (1901-1952), *The Shape of the Liturgy*, which profoundly influenced the course of eucharistic revision in the Church of England for a generation, and the concerns associated with the *Liturgical Movement*, principally the restoration of general frequent communion. The work of Charles Gore (1853-1932) and Gabriel Hebert (1887-1963) is central to this development; a recent history has been provided by Fenwick and Spinks (*Worship in Transition*).

Liturgical Commission members published a number of explanatory booklets before and immediately after the Series 2 revision, and detailed commentaries on the Series 3 eucharist and the ASB.²⁴ As well as being a contribution to the general debate, these works also give insights into the mind of the Commission as it went about its task. In the same way, recent publications from Commission members provide a more mature reflection on the busy period of liturgical reform between 1962 and 1980, and make suggestions for future work.²⁵

Scholarly reaction to the new rites and a discussion of wider questions, including sometimes the process of revision, has regularly appeared in the journals, especially *Theology*, *Studia Liturgica*, and the *Church Quarterly Review*. Michael Moreton, Geoffrey

Willis and Jardine Grisbrooke made sharp, often acid criticism from the catholic side (especially of Series 3) while Roger Beckwith and occasionally Colin Buchanan provided an evangelical view. The Series 3 rite was also criticised for being too conservative a revision by Mark Santer, who disliked the penitential section; Richard Harries, who found the language stilted and insufficiently contemporary; and Leslie Houlden, who lamented the lack of attention to developments in theology and secular disciplines in framing the new liturgies. Interestingly, Harries and Santer are members of the House of Bishops responsible for introducing the successor to the ASB.

The debates have really centred around two axes: firstly a doctrinal debate, which can crudely be described as a catholic/evangelical dispute about the nature of the eucharistic presence and (more significantly) eucharistic sacrifice; and secondly a traditionalist/modernist debate as exemplified by the criticisms of Santer, Harries and Houlden. What does not seem to have been picked up in the literature — and was hardly at issue in the Synodical debates — is the quite astonishing reliance of the Liturgical Commission on the theories of Gregory Dix and the overturning of the Prayer Book understanding of eucharistic structure and consecration. It seems to have been accepted *nem con* that these developments were a good thing. It is true that there has been some discussion, particularly by Buchanan and Spinks, of the nature of the offertory; and Paul Bradshaw has written about the use (and abuse) of the Hippolytan eucharistic prayer. But on the use of Dix's four-action shape *per se* there has been a silent consensus of agreement. It is my contention however that the use made of Dix has shifted quite markedly during the period of liturgical reform from the early 1960s to the late 1970s, and that the implementation of the four-action shape has evolved and changed without substantial comment. This is explored at length in Chapters 5 to 9.

1.4 The aims and scope of this thesis

The Church of England has, I believe, been remarkably successful in producing liturgical texts which have commended themselves to a very wide section of the church. This represents a considerable achievement on the part of the drafting and revising bodies, for the diversity of the Church of England makes it difficult for the Church as a whole to come to a clear corporate understanding of its liturgical task.

Throughout this thesis I explore the relationship between the emerging texts and the influences brought to bear on their production. I argue that three factors in particular have shaped the revisions: a sensitivity to the way in which the Church at large wishes to worship, a desire to bring the fruits of liturgical scholarship to bear on the liturgical life of the Church, and the often disappointing conservatism of some sections of the Church.

While much has been written about eucharistic revision, it has usually concentrated on a critique of either the draft text offered by the Liturgical Commission or the final authorized text. It can certainly be argued that these stages are by far the most important ones; the former represents the text which the Church's drafting body has agreed upon and is willing to defend, while the latter is the final text agreed by the Church as a whole and which may therefore be taken to represent the Church's mind. However there is also a great deal to be learned from the way in which the texts have developed, both during the Liturgical Commission's drafting process and the synodical revision stage. It is here that the connections between the pressures for reform, the mechanisms for revision, and the rites themselves can often be seen most clearly; and it is here that the present work goes beyond previous studies.

It follows that primary sources are of central importance to this thesis. Extensive reference is made to the papers of the Liturgical Commission; these are held by the Church Commissioners for England and housed at the Church of England Record Centre, South Bermondsey. They include the Minutes, Memoranda, and other papers of the Liturgical Commission, as well as Church Assembly material from the 1920s. Normally a thirty-year rule applies to such material, though the Liturgical Commission papers are open up to 1980 (the publication of the ASB). More recent material is not yet available to researchers; and while this restriction has not affected the bulk of this study, it would perhaps have been useful to have access to papers concerning the continuing Prayer Book tradition since 1980 (§4.6).

Other sources consulted include Church Assembly and General Synod Reports, and the Proceedings of the Convocations, Church Assembly and General Synod. It is here, where new liturgical material receives its authority for use, that some of the most trenchant criticism of the whole liturgical enterprise has been expressed.

One important limitation of this thesis is that it is devoted almost entirely to the revision of the eucharist, with only occasional reference to other rites.²⁶ My account of

liturgical revision is therefore far from complete. Many questions are raised, for example, by the history of the revision of the baptismal liturgy in the late 1950s and early 1960s; and there was important ecumenical cooperation in the revision of the daily office, the ordinal and the ASB lectionary. The study of the eucharist does, however, furnish an interesting and distinctive view of an important part of the revision process. The debates about the eucharist have been difficult to resolve, and more work has gone into this service than any other. Furthermore, the revision of the eucharist is immediately important to those parishes (now surely a majority) where set the eucharist at the heart of their corporate worship.

The thesis falls into two parts, each of which proceeds broadly chronologically. The first part of the thesis, chapters 2, 3 and 4, is concerned with the conservative revision of 1928, and with the continuation of a Prayer Book tradition to the present day. The second part of the thesis, chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8, describes the more radical revision of the 1960s and 1970s culminating in the ASB, along with reaction (both favourable and hostile) to the reforms. Finally, the study concludes with a reflection on how the process of liturgical revision has developed through the century, and an assessment of its success.

Notes

- 1 Spinks, 'What Kind of Book' in *Towards Liturgy 2000*, p.8.
- 2 As will be seen later there are no statistics for this, but the dominance of Rite A in Sunday morning worship is accepted as a fact by supporters and opponents of the service alike.
- 3 This is because far more work went into the revision of the eucharist in the 1960s and 1970s than into any other service. It is widely perceived as being far more satisfactory as a result.
- 4 All English Prayer Books since 1549 have been imposed by law, and with the same purpose of uniformity of worship.
- 5 One thinks of a previous generation of Roman Catholics being able to go anywhere in the world and hear Mass celebrated in the same way.
- 6 See particularly §2.1.
- 7 *RCED Report*, p.75.
- 8 These matters are discussed in §2.2 and §2.3.
- 9 Some of the proposals put forward during the 1928 process reflected the concerns of the 'parish communion' movement, but the vision of a stand-alone weekly parish eucharist was not then nearly as influential at all levels in the Church as it was in the 1960s.
- 10 See §7.2 below; see also Spinks, 'What Kind of Book' in *Towards Liturgy 2000*, p.10.
- 11 *ibid*, p.8.
- 12 An example of this can be found in changing evangelical attitudes to prayer for the departed. See, for example, the experimental funeral rites being tested in the last quarter of 1997 (HB (97) 34 Funerals) and Cocksworth, *Prayer and the Departed*.
- 13 Between 1966 and 1970 the Church Assembly held the same power.
- 14 1 Peter 2.9 (NRSV).
- 15 Michael Perham, introduction to *The Renewal of Common Prayer*, p.5.
- 16 *ibid*.
- 17 The Series 1 marriage and funeral service are authorized until 31 December 2000. See *Public Worship in the Church of England*.
- 18 See also §4.6 for attempts to re-authorize Series 1 in 1984 and 1997.
- 19 The 'ICET' texts: International Consultation on English Texts, *Prayers we have in common*, 1970, 1971, 1975.
- 20 One 'traditional language' rite was included: *Holy Communion Rite B*, a combination of Series 1 and Series 2 Holy Communion.
- 21 Examples would be the richer liturgical language of *The Promise of His Glory*, the position outlined in *Language and the Worship of the Church*, and the greater reliance on Prayer Book collects in the new lectionary material.
- 22 The views of Jasper and Fenwick & Spinks are discussed briefly in §4.3.
- 23 Source: author's recollection.
- 24 Naylor, *Why Prayer Book Revision at all?*; de Candole and Couratin, *Re-Shaping the Liturgy*; Whitaker, *The New Services 1967*; LC, *Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3 and The Alternative Service Book 1980: A Commentary*.

- 25 *Towards Liturgy 2000, Liturgy for a New Century and The Renewal of Common Prayer* (ed Perham).
- 26 Particularly the burial office during the First World War.

2

THE BACKGROUND TO THE 1928 PRAYER BOOK

Fitness for place and use has become these days the standard
by which men and things are judged, and even the Prayer Book,
august and beloved ever, stands for judgement.

*Eric Milner-White*¹

2.1 The legacy of 1662

The preface to the Book of Common Prayer² makes clear the compilers' intention:

not to gratify this or that party in their unreasonable demands; but to do that, which to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church . . . although we know it impossible (in such variety of apprehensions, humours and interests, as are in the world) to please all; nor can we expect that men of factious, peevish, and perverse spirits should be satisfied with any thing that can be done in this kind by any other than themselves: yet we have good hope, that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of *England*.

The Prayer Book, then, freely acknowledges the pressures within the Church for quite a different liturgy, without of course yielding to them. These pressures did not go away, but continually strained the limits of 'uniformity'. As Archbishop Randall Davidson (1848–1930) noted in his evidence to the Royal Commission:

from the days at least of Queen Elizabeth to our own, notwithstanding very definite rubrics and stern Acts of Uniformity and searching Episcopal injunctions . . . wide varieties [prevailed] in the mode of conducting Divine Service . . . I put it that there has never, I think, been any period in the Church of England, when what is called uniformity had not to be interpreted by a very wide elasticity.³

This 'elasticity' was essential if hopes for 'peace and unity' were to be realised, for the Church was attempting to bridge, in its liturgy, deep doctrinal and ecclesiological divisions. For two centuries this project was remarkably successful. Doctrinal differences were often expressed in subtle (and not so subtle) alterations to the liturgy,

but until the end of the nineteenth century, this elasticity of interpretation was not generally accompanied by calls for Prayer Book revision. Apart from the abortive attempt to reform the liturgy in 1689⁴ the Prayer Book survived almost unchanged, notwithstanding the occasional demands of individuals and parties within the Church, 'unreasonable' or otherwise.

The eucharistic canon was a continual focus of attention. Catholics within the Church of England had somehow to reconcile 1662 with the historic liturgies of the western and eastern churches. In comparison with these rites, 1662 had a fragmented canon with a deficient sense of eucharistic offering.⁵ But the English liturgy had not always been so. The 1549 order, Cranmer's first Prayer Book, was a relatively modest revision of the Roman Rite in English which preserved the historic form of the canon and maintained a sense of offering. By contrast, Cranmer's second Prayer Book of 1552 was a radically reformed rite, in which the 1549 eucharistic prayer was broken into three parts and the Prayer of Oblation placed after communion, restricting the offering to that of an obedient Christian life. 1662 followed 1552 closely both in order and text, so that despite subtle alterations to the rubrics and minor textual amendments which strengthened the sense of consecration, from a catholic point of view 1662 remained a singular rite, isolated from its roots in western christendom and not readily patient of a catholic understanding. Some catholics therefore devoted their talents to showing that, after all, with careful interpretation, 1662 could be seen as an adequate (if ungenerous) expression of historic eucharistic doctrine. Others, such as John Cosin (1594–1672), concluded that the rite needed supplementing or altering:

Priests and pious discerning laymen, as are convinced of the truth and necessity of the primitive Sacrifice, and do not think that the public provision for it is sufficient, have no proper remedy left, but to labour with prayers to God, and with persuasions and arguments to men, for the perfect restitution of the sacrificial oblatory part of the Christian Liturgy; and in the meantime, to supply such defects as well as they can by their own private silent devotions.⁶

But how were these 'defects' to be supplied? The simplest solution was to re-order Prayer Book texts. This was the practice of Bishop Overall, described by Cosin (his chaplain), and approved by both Cosin⁷ and William Laud:

to use [the] oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament to make an offering of it (as being the true public sacrifice of the Church) unto God . . . that by the merits of Christ's death, which was now commemorated, all the Church of God might receive mercy, etc., as in this prayer; and when that was done he did communicate the people, and so end with the thanksgiving following hereafter.⁸

Not everyone was satisfied by mere reordering. During the nineteenth century enrichment of 1662 gathered pace. Several devotional books were published, drawing heavily on the Roman Missal and Breviary; for example, the preface to Orby Shipley's *Ritual of the Altar* (1870) argues that:

If it were permissible for the compilers of the English use in the sixteenth century to adapt materials from the Roman Missal for public recitation, it cannot be disloyal to take advantage of the same materials for the private edification of members of the same Church in the nineteenth century . . . This manual is intended to be, as far as possible, the complement of the office as printed in the Book of Common Prayer.⁹

For Shipley and his readers, the overriding priority was the restoration of a fuller sense of eucharistic presence, and even more so, of offering. However, for those who shared these aims but did not wish to look too obviously to Rome, a more obviously 'English' way forward could be found in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI.

1549 has had its admirers within the English Church in every generation, and in some provinces of the Anglican Communion, it has been at least as influential as 1552/1662. The Scottish rites of 1637 and 1764 and the American rite of 1790 owe much to 1549 and have ensured the continuation of this tradition within the Anglican family. In England, 1549 has not been sanctioned for use since its replacement in 1552, though it clearly influenced the nonjurors' liturgy of 1718 and was widely discussed in the years leading up to the 1928 revision. For anglo-catholics in the early years of this century, the restoration of 1549 was an attractive proposition for several reasons. Firstly, the 1549 book genuinely embodied much that the catholic constituency desired. Secondly, as a once-authorized liturgy of the Church of England, 1549 possessed an intrinsic authority which could not attach to a modern revision. Thirdly, being the *first* English Prayer Book, it had an undeniable place of honour in Anglican tradition and its use could be presented as a return to Anglican roots. Fourthly, any revision of 1662 which was at all likely to gain acceptance throughout the Church would certainly not go nearly as far in the catholic direction as 1549; restoring 1549 would therefore give catholics much more than they could realistically get otherwise. Fifthly, 1549 was a standard around which catholics could unite; any new process of revision would throw up alternative views and expose divisions. Finally, the survival of the 1549 tradition in other parts of the Anglican Communion lent weight to the call for its restoration here, for it could be claimed that the Anglican family had *two* liturgical traditions, not one, and that the English Church might in future benefit from both.

Protestants were in a different position. They opposed the reintroduction of 1549, which was to them at best an irrelevance and at worst an 'unreformed', 'inchoate', 'twilight' liturgy.¹⁰ But protestants did not need to seek a restoration of 1552 or anything else. 1662 suited their needs perfectly well; it could easily be read as a reformed, evangelical liturgy. The protestant campaign in the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early years of this century accordingly centred on a robust defence of the 1662 Book.

The nineteenth century: the rise of ritualism

In view of the later history of the Oxford Movement, it may seem strange that the early tractarians held the Prayer Book in high regard. Following the rise of latitudinarianism and the evangelical revival of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and spurred by the political suppression of Irish bishoprics in 1833, the tractarians emphasized the spiritual independence of the Church, the apostolic succession of the bishops and their spiritual responsibility, and the sacramental life of the Church embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. As the catholic revival developed, however, particularly in its appreciation of the rich liturgical inheritance of the pre-reformation Church, there was a growing desire to restore within the Church of England the sacramental teaching and liturgical practices of an earlier age, now associated with Roman Catholicism: and so the Oxford movement, which in the first generation had been primarily theological and ecclesiological in its teaching, became in its later generations increasingly ritualist.

In the eyes of protestants, the 'ritualists' were in breach of the law of public worship. Since the problem was perceived as one of law, protestant activists turned to the law for a solution, bringing prosecutions against their ritualist opponents. Best known is the case of Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln from 1885 to 1910 and a tractarian high churchman, against whom the Church Association brought a 'ritual prosecution' in 1888 to test the legality of six of Bishop King's practices: the use of lighted candles on the altar, celebrating the eucharist facing eastwards, the use of Agnus Dei, ceremonial ablutions, commixture, and the use of the sign of the cross in absolution and blessing. The legal tactic was largely unsuccessful. The Archbishop of Canterbury, sitting in judgement with five episcopal assessors, found no objection to the first four practices and forbade only the use of the sign of the cross and the addition of water to eucharistic wine during the service. When this and other prosecutions proved

ineffective, other strategies were tried, such as the disruption of worship. For example, in 1897, the confirmation of Dr Mandell Creighton as Bishop of London was disturbed by John Kensit of the Protestant Truth Society, who objected that the bishop had worn a mitre and had given preferment to clergy whom Kensit considered to be unfit.

Accompanying all this was a strong campaign in the press and in Parliament against the threat from 'Popish' practices within the Church of England. This was extremely effective, for the debate was by no means confined to the internal life of the Church. Many members of Parliament were concerned about the growth of ritualism and were willing to use the power of Parliament to put a stop to it. The bishops came under increasing pressure to keep their clergy within the law, and, though they certainly laboured to that end, their efforts were not sufficiently effective to silence complaints. In 1899, a resolution of the House of Commons expressed the need for further legislation against errant clergy, should the bishops' efforts to secure discipline continue to be unsuccessful.

2.2 The Royal Commission

By early February 1904, it was clear that the Church, established by law and answerable to Parliament, was in danger of being forced into an unwelcome course of action. The Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to the Bishop of Oxford on 23 February:

the Government may very likely be forced by its own supporters to consent to the appointment of a Select Committee of the House of Commons to consider the subject of clerical lawlessness . . . I do not think we could successfully argue against the right of the House of Commons, so long as we have an Established Church, to ascertain for itself what goes on within that Church . . .¹¹

Six days later the Archbishop met the Prime Minister. They discussed the Church's concerns about a Select Committee, and the Archbishop explained his preference for a Royal Commission. He wrote to the Prime Minister on 4 March:

. . . the position is obviously a delicate one, and anything that accentuates the fact that Parliament contains many anti-Churchmen (as well as non-Churchmen and non-Christians) is liable to cause friction. The strain might become intolerable . . . if a Parliamentary Committee — containing non-Churchmen, and even anti-Churchmen, perhaps an Irish Roman Catholic and a Welsh enthusiast — were to cross-examine Bishops and Clergy on matters which concern the most sacred doctrines and usages of the Church. It is, after all, on sacramental questions that the ritual difficulties ultimately turn . . .

I do not find that similar apprehensions would be likely to be created by a Royal Commission. Such Commission, even if it contained non-Churchmen . . . would not contain Roman Catholics or virulent anti-Churchmen. The Royal Supremacy is exercised by a Royal Commission much more truly, or at all events much more obviously, than by a Parliamentary Committee . . .¹²

This request was granted, and a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline was duly constituted. Its terms of inquiry were:

to inquire into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the Law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of Churches; and to consider the existing powers and procedure applicable to such irregularities and to make . . . recommendations . . .¹³

The Commission spent two years taking evidence. Its report, published in 1906, provided the stimulus which had previously been lacking for an official review of the Church's liturgy. Though the Commission had been asked to investigate only breaches of the law of public worship, they concluded that the very law which was being broken so often was no longer adequate, and stood in need of revision. It will be useful to quote the Commission's verdict at some length:

Our consideration of the evidence laid before us has led us to two main conclusions. First, the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. It needlessly condemns much which a great section of Church people, including many of her most devoted members, value; and modern thought and feeling are characterised by a care for the ceremonial, a sense of dignity in worship, and an appreciation of the continuity of the Church, which were not similarly felt at the time when the law took its present shape. In an age which has witnessed an extraordinary revival of spiritual life and activity, the Church has had to work under regulations fitted for a different condition of things, without that power of self-adjustment which is inherent in the conception of a living Church, and is, as a matter of fact, possessed by the Established Church of Scotland. The result has inevitably been that ancient rubrics have been strained in the desire to find in them meanings which it has been judicially held they cannot bear; while, on the other hand, the construction placed on them in accordance with legal rules has sometimes appeared forced and unnatural. With an adequate power of self-adjustment, we might reasonably expect that revision of the strict letter of the law would be undertaken with such regard for the living mind of the Church as would secure the obedience of many, now dissatisfied, who desire to be loyal, and would justify the Church as a whole, in insisting on the obedience of all.

Secondly, the machinery for discipline has broken down. The means of enforcing the law in the Ecclesiastical Courts, even in matters which touch the Church's faith and teaching, are defective and in some respects unsuitable. They have been tried and have often failed; and probably on that account they have been too much neglected. Although attempts to deal administratively with ritual irregularity have been made, they have been unsuccessful, in some cases on account of the lack of firmness of those who made them, but also largely because, in regard to the rites and ceremonies of public worship, the law gives no right or power to discriminate between great and small matters.

It is important that the law should be reformed, that it should admit of reasonable elasticity, and that the means of enforcing it should be improved; but above all, it is necessary that it should be obeyed. That a section of clergymen should, with however good intentions, conspicuously disobey the law, and continue to do so with impunity, is not only an offence against public order, but also a scandal to religion and a cause of weakness to the Church of England. It is not our duty to assign responsibility for the past; we have indicated our opinion that it lies in large measure with the law itself. But with regard to the future we desire to state with distinctness our conviction that, if it should be thought well to adopt the recommendations we make in this report, one essential condition of their successful operation will be, that obedience to the law so altered shall be required, and, if necessary, enforced, by those who bear rule in the Church of England.¹⁴

There followed a list of specific recommendations, namely:

- 1) Practices 'plainly significant of teaching repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England and certainly illegal' should be made to cease. These practices were:
 - a) the interpolation of prayers and ceremonies from the canon of the Roman Mass;
 - b) the use of 'Behold the Lamb of God' and exhibition of the consecrated bread;
 - c) Reservation of the sacrament, if this led to adoration;
 - d) Mass of the pre-sanctified;
 - e) Corpus Christi processions with the sacrament;
 - f) Benediction with the sacrament;
 - g) Celebrations of the eucharist with only the priest communicating;
 - h) Hymns, prayers, devotions or confession to the Blessed Virgin Mary or the saints;
 - i) Observing the feasts of the Assumption or the Sacred Heart; and
 - j) The veneration of images or roods.

Also to cease was any teaching of the 'Romish doctrine of purgatory' or transubstantiation.

- 2) Letters of Business should be issued to the Convocations to prepare:
 - a) a new ornaments (vesture) rubric; and
 - b) a more flexible law of worship, ornaments and fittings.
- 3) There should be wider scope for additional and special services, collects, hymns, and so on.
- 4) Bishops should be empowered to refuse licensing and induction to clergy who persistently offended against, or refused to be bound by, the Church's law, and they should have power to deprive persistent offenders. The bishops should have the right to order the removal of ornaments, etc from churches.
- 5) Episcopal and archidiaconal visitations and rural deans' inspections should police these matters; and, in order that the administration of the Church's law should be practical and possible, many dioceses should be subdivided — and the law changed to allow this by means of an Order in Council, rather than by separate statute for each diocese.¹⁵

Two strands ran through the Commission's report. First of all, the law of public worship must be reformed. It is of the greatest significance that a Royal Commission charged with investigating breaches of ecclesiastical law should have come to this conclusion. It certainly cannot have pleased most of the witnesses who had appeared before the Commission, whose submissions had consisted almost entirely of allegations of illegal practices perpetrated by ritualists. In this context, the Commission's sympathy for 'care for the ceremonial', 'a sense of dignity in worship', and 'appreciation of the continuity of the Church' was a strong vindication of anglo-catholic spirituality. Secondly, however, clergy had a responsibility to obey the law. While it was undoubtedly true that the present law was inadequate, nevertheless some practices were clearly unacceptable and must be made to cease. Furthermore, under a reformed law, discipline could be required of the clergy and should be enforced by those in authority.

The question arises of what is meant by the phrase 'the law of public worship'. There are three possible meanings: (i) the *canons* which define the services which must and may be said; (ii) the *rubrics* of the Prayer Book which direct in some detail how the liturgy is to be conducted; and (iii) the liturgical *texts*, the 'services' themselves. The

Convocations quickly came to understand the Royal Commission's Report as implying a new Prayer Book, or at any rate a supplementary Book to stand alongside the old. It is important to ascertain whether the Church had correctly understood the Commission's mind in this, particularly in view of the failure of the Deposited Book to achieve Parliamentary approval, for it has been claimed that the Bishops committed a tactical error on precisely this point.¹⁶ Given the background to the Commission's investigation and the terms in which they chose to report, it is difficult to see how the phrase 'law of public worship' in their Report can mean anything other than the whole Prayer Book. The problems identified by the Commission were the narrowness of the provision for public worship, the suppression of ceremonial and the idiosyncratic nature of Anglican worship in relation to the whole tradition of the Church. These were deficiencies of the whole liturgy, which could only *in part* be remedied by altering rubrics (concerning vesture, manual acts and so on); the provision of alternative and additional liturgical texts would also be required.

Furthermore, most of the Commission's time was spent discussing the conduct of clergy at the eucharist, their eucharistic teaching, their use of texts and practices from the Roman Missal, and related matters such as reservation and benediction. The Church could not avoid a painful and damaging debate about its central act of worship and its most sensitive doctrines. Colonel Lane Fox MP, speaking in the House of Commons during the second debate on the new Prayer Book in 1928, put it thus:

The last speaker . . . pleaded for what he called a compromise, and for a book which should not contain the controversial elements about which discussion has mainly been concentrated. It is perfectly useless to ignore realities. You may alter a few words . . . and do small things which may make for a certain convenience in the Service of the Church, but you will not touch the real thing. After all, it is the Communion Service, which originally caused the Royal Commission to be set up, on which the whole controversy arose, and the instructions which the House of Commons gave to the Bishops to revise the Services of the Church were based on that controversy almost entirely. They would have neglected their duty, and the instructions of this House, if they had not gone straight to that controversy and tackled the real question. To think that we shall settle this question by merely tinkering with a few things that matter very little, and neglecting the big things that do matter, is to delude ourselves entirely into thinking that this will lead to anything like permanent peace.¹⁷

The report of the Royal Commission thus stirred the Church to its first major liturgical revision for some 250 years. Once the Commission had reported, the Archbishop asked that Royal Letters of Business be issued to the Convocations, so that they could consider the report and give a formal reply; such indeed had also been the

recommendation of the Commission. The Government, however, aware of the possible consequences of such action, were reluctant to comply. The Prime Minister, writing to the Archbishop on 4 August, expressed his concern:

... His Majesty's Government believe that very far-reaching consequences may follow, and they do not think it would be right to set on foot a proceeding which may lead to such serious issues in the Church of England, except upon the initiative of the Church itself acting through its recognized authorities.

If therefore either your Grace and the Archbishop of York think fit to submit a request to the Crown for Letters of Business, or the Convocations present a petition to the same effect, I shall advise His Majesty to issue Letters.¹⁸

Three days later the Archbishops replied, expressing 'our hope that you may see your way clear to advise His Majesty the King to direct that Letters of Business be issued'.¹⁹

The Prime Minister duly acquiesced, though again not without misgivings:

Your Grace will of course understand that though I have thought myself bound to comply in such a matter with the request of the two Archbishops, His Majesty's Government must hold themselves entirely free to judge for themselves the course that they ought to adopt both in regard to the Royal Commissioners' proposals for legislation and in other respects . . .²⁰

This correspondence is important, firstly because it shows the Government's awareness of the seriousness of the situation; and secondly, because it is clear that Archbishop Davidson continued to urge that Letters be issued despite the Prime Minister's concern, and thus set in motion the process of reform which was to end in the presentation of the Deposited Book to Parliament.

2.3 The experience of war

The chaplains who served in the fields of Belgium and France found themselves working in conditions for which their training had ill prepared them. Those who returned to England brought with them a wealth of new experience of ministering among unchurched men who lived daily under conditions of great stress and suffering. The Church had plenty of opportunity to hear the chaplains' voice: three of their number sat on the Archbishops' *Committee of Inquiry into the Worship of the Church* and contributed an appendix describing their experiences. They and other chaplains also published a collection of essays under the title *The Church in the Furnace*. From these works it is clear that, despite their own personal affection for the Prayer Book which

had formed their spirituality and ministry, the chaplains found it at best 'semi-usable' in the field. They therefore freely amended services as pastoral need dictated.

Morning and Evening Prayer

The daily offices, as corporate services, 'simply disappeared'. Instead, a shorter, less formal office was used, incorporating well-known texts from matins and evensong: the General Confession, the Lord's Prayer, the versicles and the Creed. Eric Milner-White stressed the value of such familiar texts: 'nothing, in truth, puts the weird British temperament so wholly at ease as to start repeating the General Confession'.²¹ Around this core, the services took on a drastically simplified structure. Typically only one psalm and one lesson would be used, both shortened. The second part of the prayers was frequently improvised, and the chaplains learned that in the stark realities of war, there was no room for imprecision or lack of preparation: 'every prayer and sentence needs effort and care'.²² Milner-White pleaded that such an office — a 'popular devotion', as he called it — might find a place in the Prayer Book; not as a permanent part of the Church's liturgy, but an experimental form, subject to revision or withdrawal every five or ten years.

The chaplains who served on the Archbishops' Committee of Inquiry had found a wide variety of religious sensitivity among the men they served, but nevertheless:

we think it is true to say that nearly all men have found it a comfort to have services at the Front which obviously aim at being simple, real and short. And we believe it is fair to argue that a great number of these men at the Front will vote that, by contrast, services at home if conducted in pre-war fashion are deficient in these qualities.²³

Burial

Because of the appalling loss of life in the fields of France and Belgium, the funeral rite was in constant use. The 1662 service was found to be unsuitable as it stood, and was much altered by the chaplains. New sentences were introduced;²⁴ Psalm 23 and Psalm 130 were used as alternatives to Psalms 39 and 90; and for the reading, an abbreviated form of 1 Corinthians 15 was often used, or sometimes Revelation 7. 9-17, John 12. 24-26 or 1 Thessalonians 4. 13-end. But by far the most significant changes appeared in the prayers. On the battlefield, prayer for the dead ceased to be a matter of doctrinal controversy; it was simply a pastoral necessity. Once again, Milner-White pleaded for official recognition at home of what had been found good and necessary abroad:

... only one chaplain have I found who did not pray directly for the dead, and none who forgot the mourners at home ... and we beg you again and again, Church of the homeland, consecrate to perpetual use the variations that by great instinct have committed the bodies of your sons, ten thousand times over, to their victorious bed of earth.²⁵

The chaplains serving on the Archbishops' Committee of Inquiry concurred: 'a direct and simple commendation of the soul of the departed to God, and a prayer for the bereaved should be added.'²⁶

The eucharist

There was a widespread feeling among the priests — supported, to their surprise, by the officers — that the eucharist should be the central act of worship. However, most of the men found the service incomprehensible and awkward, and attendance was meagre. Even so, with the passage of time and particularly in difficult moments, 'a manhood in need has begun to gaze upon the Holy Communion'.²⁷ But there were stumbling blocks in the way of fuller devotion. Firstly, the demands of military life made attendance in the early morning almost impossible. Many chaplains therefore resorted to celebrations in the afternoon, evening and night, or communicated the men in the evening from the reserved sacrament. Secondly, the structure and wording of the service was too far 'removed from common wants', being readily intelligible only to the well-instructed. Consequently most men, through unfamiliarity with the liturgy, did not find it an easy vehicle of worship and prayer. Some the archaisms²⁸ could be changed, and a great deal could be achieved by abbreviating the service. No chaplain took liberties with the text of congregational prayers — they well knew the benefit of familiar texts — but many omitted the Collect for the King and the last two Comfortable Words, and the Summary of the Law or the three-fold Kyries were often used instead of the Decalogue. When time was very short, the service began at the Intercession or even at the Invitation to Confession.

In their recommendations the chaplains asked that all these modest changes, with the exception of starting part-way through the service, should be adopted generally. They also asked for gospel responses, the anthems Benedictus and Agnus Dei, and the singing of hymns to increase the congregation's part. They further suggested that since the exhortations were hardly ever used, these should be taken out of the main body of the service and printed as an appendix, making the liturgy easier to follow.

Another cause for concern was the subject matter and style of the prayers themselves. It was important that the Prayer Book be brought up to date, because liturgy plays a central part in the ethical and spiritual formation of the people of God:

For example, the problems of labour press upon us, and vast Christian issues hang upon them. But the Prayer Book cares, on the face of it, for none of these things; and the Church therefore stands condemned by the millions. If only a 'Litany of Labour' lay within its covers, what a reproach would be done away with! And more — it would preach Christian social obligation as a thousand sermons could not; the mere fact of being 'in the Prayer Book' would make it, so to speak, a 'general routine order'; the conscience of Churchpeople would be, insensibly and surely, taught and moved . . .²⁹

The work of the parish, the needs of children, and the concerns of industry all needed prayer too.³⁰ As for the style and form of prayers, the chaplains favoured litanies with short, comprehensible biddings and congregational responses. Collects were not so useful, being difficult to understand and non-participatory. The Intercession was frequently broken up into its constituent sections and furnished with simple responses, effectively turning it into a litany. Above all, prayers needed to be simple. Some might think it right to confront the uninitiated with the complexity and beauty of high ceremonial, in the hope that this would inspire them to learn its meaning; but the chaplains felt that worship should be kept simple so as not to bewilder and confuse newcomers. Prayers must be relevant and to the point: 'if John Smith and Thomas Jones are to learn to pray with reality they must be allowed to ask for the things they really need, and to ask for them in the language of their own day.'³¹

Finally, the chaplains found the Prayer Book lacking in simple devotion. Its prayers were almost all petitionary; there was a coldness about the Prayer Book's appeal to the mind alone; there was nothing in it for 'the humble soul or the adventurous heart'. By contrast they found the Roman Catholic liturgical tradition rich in spiritual resources. Above all else, the chaplains wanted a book in tune with the spiritual needs they encountered, so that they could work 'with the grain' of the liturgy, rather than constantly battling against it.

2.4 Other pressures for change

Once liturgical reform was under way, indeed even before it had properly begun, the interest of many in the Church was excited. Groups and individuals, some of them

scholarly, others simply writing from their own experience of parish worship, contributed a growing mountain of advice to the Convocations on how best to satisfy the liturgical needs of the early twentieth century. Among the many and varied contributions, three recurring strands can be discerned. Firstly there were those, along with the war chaplains, who wanted a simpler, more intelligible service, better suited to the conditions of the day and more accessible to the growing numbers of unchurched people. Secondly there was a strong body of anglo-catholic opinion in favour of a reconstruction of the eucharist, and particularly the canon, to bring it into line with the mainstream catholic eucharistic tradition. There was also an equally strong body of evangelical protestants who wanted little or no change; their campaign is considered in the next section. Three contributions towards the reform process call for particular attention: the proposals of the Life and Liberty Movement,³² the English Church Union,³³ and the Alcuin Club,³⁴ known respectively as the *Grey*, *Green*, and *Orange* books. The significance of these publications was that they indicated the kind of rites which three important 'parties' within the Church would be willing to support.

The Grey Book (1923)

This was a series of pamphlets 'by a group of clergy together with a foreword by the Bishop of Manchester'. These 'Manchester' proposals, as they were also known, considered simplicity, continuity with the primitive Church and congregational participation of paramount importance:

an attempt has been made to simplify as far as possible the sequence of the service . . . we have endeavoured to preserve what seems . . . to be of lasting value in the distinctive characteristics of the English Rite, without ignoring its weaknesses; these we have sought to remedy by the study of other liturgies with which the compilers of our present Order were less familiar than the present generation. It has been our desire to emphasize the Priesthood of the whole Body of Christ, and to increase the opportunities for Prayer said by the priest and people together.

We are agreed that the various sections included in the Prayer of Consecration should all be contained in that prayer . . .

The rite had a short confession and absolution for use on weekdays, the Summary of the Law instead of the Decalogue, no Prayer for the King or exhortations, permission to omit the post-communion thanksgiving except on Sundays and feast days, and a short canon. There was an epiclesis in the 'eastern' position (after the institution narrative).

The Green Book (1923)

This was a whole alternative Prayer Book, heavily dependant on 1549 throughout, particularly in the eucharist. The service was rearranged along 1549 lines, restoring the use of introit psalms, gospel responses, the Benedictus, and Agnus Dei before communion. The canon followed 1549 closely and only departed from it significantly to borrow from the Roman rite, for example, in the anamnesis/oblation, where the language of offering was supplemented by words from the Roman canon (significant differences in italics):

1549

Wherefore, O Lorde and heauenly
father,
accordyng to the Instytucion
of thy derely beloued sonne,
our sauour Jesu Christ,
we thy humble seruauntes do celebrate,
and make here
before thy diuine Maiestie,
with these thy holy giftes, the memoryall

whyche thy sonne hath wylled us
to make,
hauyng in remembraunce
his blessed passion,
mightie resurreccyon,
and glorious ascencion, . . .

ECU (Green Book)

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly
Father,
according to the institution
of thy dearly beloved Son
Jesus Christ,
we thy humble servants do celebrate
and make here,
before thy divine Majesty,

*the holy, pure, and spotless oblation
which thy Son hath commanded us
to make,
and having in remembrance
his blessed passion,
his mighty resurrection,
and glorious ascension,
we offer unto thee these thy sacred gifts,
the holy Bread of eternal life
and the Cup of everlasting salvation.*

The Orange Book (1923–4)

The proposals of the Alcuin Club were really an attempt to extract the best of the other proposals and of the work which the Church Assembly had done up until then, published as the report NA 84. The Alcuin Club canon retained the 1662 prayer for worthy reception before the words of institution, but also included an invocation of the Holy Spirit later in the prayer, linked to the words of self-oblation:

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee: and we pray thee of thine almighty goodness to send upon us, and upon these thy gifts, thy holy and blessed Spirit, who is the Sanctifier and the Giver of life; humbly beseeching thee that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

Two Parish Priests

It was not only large and influential groups who sought to make their views known: private individuals also contributed. The Revd Edmund Boggis,³⁵ a parish priest, responded to the Bishop of Oxford's plea for 'different individuals to be so bold as to publish their ideas of a revised Prayer Book.' Boggis' reconstruction of the canon was intended to restore what he called 'the general scheme of the ancient liturgies [which] has been largely interfered with'. His reconstruction was as follows:

Sursum corda, Preface, Sanctus

Consecration (with the invocation after the words of institution)

Lord's Prayer (prefaced by the ancient invitation)

Oblation

Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words

Humble Access

Communion

Prayer of Thanksgiving (Almighty and everlasting God . . .)

Gloria in excelsis

Peace

Blessing

Curiously, in this scheme the Prayer of Oblation remains dislocated from the Consecration.

The work of another parish clergyman, Harold Sellon Watts,³⁶ appears among the papers of Lord Hugh Cecil (1869-1956).³⁷ His scheme put the Prayer for Worthy Reception after the Institution Narrative, separated from it by a congregational acclamation. After the Sanctus, Watts' reconstructed canon reads as follows:

Holy art thou, in very truth, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only begotten Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.

For in the same night that he was betrayed, he took Bread; . . . Do this, as often as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

We shew thy death, O Lord, we confess thy resurrection and ascension, and we look for thy coming again.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood. **Amen.**

Then follow the Prayer of Humble Access; communion (using shortened Words of Administration, at the priest's discretion); the Lord's Prayer; one or both post-communion prayers; the Gloria; and the blessing.

This canon has some nice touches: a link with the immediately preceding Sanctus, an imaginative use of Cranmer's prayer for worthy reception, and the acclamation after the words of institution, which did not appear in a liturgy of the Church of England until the early 1970s.

Walter Howard Frere

Perhaps the most distinguished advocate of reform was W.H. Frere. In 1911 he published *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform*, in which he set out his position in detail. Frere's main concern was with **continuity**; how did the Prayer Book rite stand in relation to the rites of the historic Church? Unfortunately, there were features of 1662 (inherited from 1552) which set it apart from the general tradition: the heart of the service, the consecration prayer, was sadly at variance with 'the oldest and most universal liturgical tradition' and indeed with the practical needs of the Church today.³⁸ But this had not always been the case. The canon of 1549 had been a good model; an improvement, indeed, on the Roman canon from which it had developed, because it explicitly invoked the Holy Spirit in consecration. In 1552, however, 'this fine attempt at an English Canon was broken into three pieces, and redistributed, after undergoing further modifications'.³⁹ This left the 1552/1662 Consecration standing 'badly in isolation from all that belongs to it'. In a passage which now seems peculiarly prophetic, Frere foresaw difficulties in solving this problem quickly:

At some future revision there will be, no doubt, a complete reconsideration of the whole matter, and a reconstruction on more primitive lines. But we are hardly ready for this at present. Much further liturgical study and much more agreement as to eucharistic doctrine will be needed before any large change can be seriously considered . . . in view of such a situation it is incumbent upon us to move only with great caution.⁴⁰

Despite the need for care, one thing could and should be done immediately. The isolated Consecration — little more than a recital of the words at the Supper — was 'more Roman than Rome' in tying the act of consecration rigidly to the words of

institution. A broader understanding of consecration would require that this prayer be reunited with the Prayer of Oblation and preferably with the *Sursum corda* and the Preface as well. The Prayer of Humble Access should precede this reconstructed canon, and the Lord's Prayer should follow it. None of the Prayer Book texts would need to be altered, save for the addition of connecting links such as the word 'wherefore' between the Consecration and the Prayer of Oblation, and a brief introduction to the Lord's Prayer. These modest changes would restore something of the integrity of the primitive eucharistic action, and would also bring the penitential sections together in one place rather than having them in two places; especially since the second of these, the Prayer of Humble Access, came somewhat illogically after the invitation to 'Lift up your hearts'. All these changes could be carried out with very little violence to the beloved and familiar texts of the Prayer Book. More profound changes, however, such as the introduction of an epiclesis, would have to wait:

There is a wide divergence at present between the Latin West and the more primitive East as to the doctrine of Consecration; for the West tends to tie it rigidly to the recital of the Words used by our Lord at the first administration of the sacrament, as recorded in the Scriptures, and rehearsed in the Prayer; while the East tends to attach it, also somewhat rigidly, to the Invocation of the Holy Spirit . . . until this doctrinal point is nearer a settlement, it would be inopportune to take any steps towards the reinsertion of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit in either of the positions it has come to occupy (respectively before and after the Words of Institution).⁴¹

When in 1926 it became apparent that the proposed alternative canon would after all contain an invocation, and in the eastern position, Frere remained true to the caution he had displayed in 1911, despite the fact that such a canon was clearly close to what he himself wanted:⁴²

The Roman type of liturgy has prevailed in the English Church from St Augustine's time until now: and I think it is unfair that no suitable form of Canon should be provided for those who wish to keep that type, or who for other reasons mislike an Epiklesis.⁴³

Improvements were also needed elsewhere in the service. Since 1552, the English eucharist had lacked psalmody, a regrettable loss. 1549 had psalm introits, but Frere wished to see the psalms restored to their ancient position as graduals. The Decalogue and Collect for the King should be optional, and there ought to be offertory sentences for the bread and wine as well as for the alms. Frere also wished to see permission to omit the exhortations, a wider provision of proper prefaces, and shorter words of administration for times when clergy were few and the people many.

Reservation

The 1662 Prayer Book makes no provision for reservation. It is expected that the eucharist will be celebrated every time the priest administers communion in the home, for the 1662 Order for the Communion of the Sick amounts to no more than the provision of a collect, short readings, and instructions for abbreviating the eucharistic rite. During the nineteenth century, increasingly frequent communion meant also a growth in demand for communion at home; in many parishes, the ancient practice of communion 'by extension' was adopted, by which the sick received elements consecrated at the eucharist in Church. This practice had (and still has) two benefits: it helps hard-pressed clergy in large urban parishes with many housebound people to visit, and it provides a sacramental link between the communicants and the eucharistic community to which they belong. By the turn of the century, there was widespread agreement that such 'communion by extension' should be generally allowed. The problem lay in what to do with the consecrated elements which had been 'reserved' at the celebration, for unless the priest was able to go immediately to all the sick, the sacrament clearly had to be kept *somewhere*. Many clergy simply imitated Roman Catholic practice and reserved the sacrament in a tabernacle in a prominent place in the Church. However, in some parishes the reserved sacrament became also a focus of devotion, including services of benediction, processions, and other observances.⁴⁴ This created a tension with evangelicals, who might have been generous in conceding a pastoral need to reserve for the communion of the sick if they could be convinced that the provisions would not allow sacramental adoration.

It is important to distinguish between these two uses of the reserved sacrament. The Prayer Book very clearly prohibits sacramental adoration,⁴⁵ and reservation, if it led to adoration, had been held to be illegal by the Royal Commission.⁴⁶ But the position with regard to reservation for the communion of the sick was not so clear. It was widely assumed to be prohibited,⁴⁷ and according to an 'Opinion' of the two Archbishops in 1900, 'the Church of England did not allow [reservation] in any form, and that was how the situation should remain until the law had been altered'.⁴⁸

As one might expect, the ECU Green Book advocated reservation. The rubrics suggested that reservation was normal rather than exceptional:

... the consecrated Gifts are taken from the Church to the sick person ... And immediately thereafter any of the consecrated elements that remain over shall reverently be taken back to the Church.⁴⁹

The Alcuin Club's proposals for the Communion of the Sick (the 'Orange Book') also advocated communion by extension. However, there was to be no returning of the sacrament to church after visiting the sick. The celebrant at the eucharist should set apart 'so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as he shall judge to be needed for so many as shall communicate', and once communion was over, 'any of the consecrated elements which there remain over shall be reverently consumed by one of the communicants there present'. However, the priest was *not* required to visit the sick immediately after the celebration in Church:

If the consecrated Bread and Wine be not taken immediately to the sick, they shall be kept in such place and after such manner as the Ordinary shall direct, so that they be not reserved for more than seven days, and so that they be not used for any other purpose than the communication of the faithful.⁵⁰

This rubric was accompanied by an explanatory note:

There is a widespread fear lest reservation should lead to undesirable practices and superstitious habits or modes of thought and prayer. This fear is reasonable, because abuses of that kind have often prevailed, and might easily prevail again unless precautions are taken to obviate them. But . . . desirable things are not to be prohibited because of possible abuses. The right procedure is to safeguard the use by excluding abuse. The regulation of the matter should be left to the bishops, who should take steps to secure that the Reserved Sacrament is not used in any unauthorised or illegitimate way.⁵¹

Finally, the 'Grey Book' proposals also advocated extended communion, and requiring that the reserved sacrament be kept in an aumbry and used only for communion.

2.5 Opposition to the proposed reforms

In the nature of things, opposition to Prayer Book reform was bound to be largely reactive, and therefore to emerge relatively late in the revision process. Tracts, pamphlets and letters were issued denouncing the proposals at various points, and particularly the final draft put before Parliament. And just as there was organized catholic support for revision, pursued through organisations like the ECU, so also there was concerted action against the proposed revision, led by groups such as the Protestant Truth Society, the League of Loyal Churchmen and the Protestant Alliance. In addition many individuals wrote letters of protest to newspapers, to members of Convocation and of the Church Assembly, and, once the Parliamentary debates drew near, to Members of Parliament as well.

Among the papers of Lord Hugh Cecil MP is a remarkable collection of these letters and pamphlets. As well as being a Member of Parliament, Lord Hugh Cecil was a member of the Church Assembly, a strong advocate of Prayer Book reform, and one of the members-in-charge of the reform Measure. He was therefore a likely target for such publications; his collection contains over sixty of them. Most of these pamphlets rehearse the same points in different ways, which can be summarised as follows.

First is the conviction that the new Book represented a deliberate Rome-ward move. This charge is expressed in a number of ways. Sometimes the accusation is made directly, as in the following extract, in which the writers object to:

the proposal to regularize Reservation, a practice which is associated with ideas foreign to our national consciousness, and linked with medieval superstitions which one might have hoped the light of modern knowledge would have swept away for ever. That this has not happened is partly due to ignorance and partly to the fact that the Church of England has active agents in her midst, who look away from England to Rome as the source of authority in determining both doctrine and practice . . .

In a number of leaflets, however, the accusation of Romanism is made indirectly, by comparing the new Book with the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552/1662, in order to portray 1927/1928 as a regression, a move back to a semi-catholic past which the leaflets' authors hoped the Church of England had long repudiated. For example:

The Bishops have forsaken Cranmer's finished work in the Second Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth, in which Book the First Prayer Book was said to be made 'more fully perfect', and have gone back to the imperfect, inchoate, twilight First Edwardian Prayer Book, a book which was temporary, being superseded three years later, the possession of which by the clergy was declared to be illegal, all copies of it being ordered to be destroyed.⁵²

Emotions were running high; protestant pamphleteers clearly preferred polemical devices to dispassionate argument. In the example above, the heavily loaded phrase 'finished work', with its evocation of the one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice of Christ, was bound to make certain connections in the protestant mind.

The same pamphlet continues by listing a table of practices described as 'ordered' in the 1549 Book, 'abolished' in 1552 and 'allowed' or 're-introduced' in the proposals for 1927. These practices are alleged to include the use of mass vestments, the word 'altar' (Psalm 43 is used in the 'Devotion' before Holy Communion),⁵³ the eastward position, the doctrine of the real presence (supposedly introduced by the use of Benedictus), the use of a mixed chalice and wafer bread, placing the Prayer of Oblation before

Communion, the invocation of the Spirit on the elements, prayer for the dead, reservation, and auricular confession. The misrepresentations and errors of this approach may be irritating,⁵⁴ but the pejorative use of 1549 was an effective way of crying 'no popery' without undertaking the considerably more difficult task of demonstrating direct links between the Deposited Book and the Roman rite.

A second line of attack, related to the first, was to appeal to the (English) nation over the head of the Church. One pamphlet issued by the Protestant Alliance insisted that the Prayer Book was not the property of the Church but of the nation. The King's subjects, it was said, had a right to protestant services enshrined in English law; readers ought therefore to lobby their MPs to reject the Measure.

A third theme, again related to opposition to Rome, was to draw a sinister link between the new Prayer Book and conversations between Anglicans and Roman Catholics at Malines.⁵⁵ The following comments were made in a leaflet issued by the Committee for the Maintenance of Faith and Truth:

In the recently published official Report of the Malines Conversations it appears that the 'Anglican Group' made statements as to the doctrine of the Church of England, and admissions or offers in regard to the abandonment or modification of its historical position that would (the Committee believe) be indignantly repudiated not only by the great majority of English Churchmen but also by the mass of the English Nation. In the light of that Report the Committee feel that the acceptance of the Bishops' present proposals would tend in the direction of making easier Reunion with the Church of Rome.

In another pamphlet the same Committee asserted that 'the *present* Book of Common Prayer is one of the principal bulwarks against any reconciliation between the Protestant Reformed Religion, established by law in this country, and the unreformed and unscriptural Religion of the Church of Rome'.

A fourth line of attack was to raise the question of discipline and the Royal Commission. The League of Loyal Churchmen, in an open letter to the Archbishop of York, asked why the bishops had not carried out the first part of their duty as set out in the Commission's report, namely to restore discipline, as well as modifying the law of worship. A similar point was made by Mr A. Orr Ewing. In a contribution more gentle and measured than most, he pointed out that the new Prayer Book was indeed an answer one part of the 1906 report, namely the need for elasticity; but the bishops had failed to respond to the other part of the Commission's findings, that illegal practices should in the meantime be made to cease. It should be noted that even opponents of

the Deposited Book did not dispute the *propriety* of producing an alternative Prayer Book: the Church was criticised rather for the *content* of that book, and for having neglected its other, related duty, that of enforcing discipline.

Finally, protests from the evangelical wing complained of episcopal duplicity. The version of the Book issued to the Church Assembly differed, it was said, in some 400 places from that placed before Parliament. This line of argument was less than honest. The '400 changes' were almost all improvements in layout, corrections to punctuation, and the like. The argument was entirely emotive: its force lay in creating the impression that the bishops could not be trusted.

Opposition to the new Book was not confined to protestants. Some anglo-catholics were deeply unhappy about the whole venture, for four reasons. Firstly, there was the provision for reservation. While evangelicals deplored the legalising of the practice at all, catholics disliked the restrictions which the new Book would introduce. Before 1928 there had been no official provision for reservation; but at the same time, neither was there any regulation or restriction of the practice. Priests could, and did, claim an inherent right to reserve, both for the communion of the sick *and* for adoration. The new provision would certainly forbid the latter, and it might be better to have no law of reservation at all, than one which so restricted its scope.

Secondly, there was the Church's catholic heritage. As noted earlier, there had been disquiet in the Church at the prospect of a Parliamentary Select Committee investigating delicate matters of doctrine and worship; now, despite everything, it appeared that Parliament would be debating precisely these matters. In the eyes of one prominent anglo-catholic, the Church of England had:

ever refused to surrender the faith and practice of the Catholic Church, while repudiating the errors of Rome, in spite of the continual efforts of the Protestant party to tear the Catholic tradition out of the Prayer Book. The present effort of this party, which is only in accordance with its tradition, can only be successful at the cost of the disruption of the Church of England. No self respecting spiritual body could possibly allow its doctrines to be dictated to it by the House of Commons...⁵⁶

Thirdly, there was a strong counter-attack against those who claimed that the Book was a move in the catholic direction. Quite the contrary, according to one tract: the new Book favoured evangelicals by allowing evening communion and extempore prayer, and the omission of mass on Sundays and festivals; and by belittling the sacramental system, especially in the omission of unction.⁵⁷ The Book favoured broad-churchmen

by weakening the sense of sin in the baptismal service, by weakening the sanctity of the marriage bond, by belittling the authority of scripture (by the omission of many references) and by weakening the doctrine of inspiration. The Book even favoured modernists by whittling away traditional Christianity — the recitation of the Athanasian Creed was not required by the Deposited Book. The only people disadvantaged by the new Book were catholics, for whom sacramental adoration was now forbidden — indeed the only practice which *was* newly forbidden.

Finally, some anglo-catholics felt that the Church was not sufficiently agreed over the new liturgy, and that the more controversial reforms, at least, should be postponed:

Liturgical revision should follow and register a large, although not necessarily universal, agreement among Church people. It should not be in advance of and seek to compel such agreement.⁵⁸

The Church could indeed now agree on much, including prayer for the dead, but the same could not be said for the eucharistic proposals or reservation:

It has by now become clear that a large body of Anglo-Catholic opinion could not accept a liturgy which suddenly reversed the tradition of the English Church since its beginning fourteen hundred years ago. Many could not accept the proposed rubrics as to Reservation. Nor could they accept those rubrics, even if they were amended on other points, so long as they absolutely prohibit all corporate worship of our Lord in the Holy Sacrament when Reserved.

These objections may be right or wrong. They are, however, held by so substantial a body of opinion and with such conviction as to make it certain that the Bishops' proposals would not produce peace, and could only be enforced, if at all, by a widespread and determined use of ecclesiastical discipline.⁵⁹

Notes

- 1 Eric Milner-White, 'Worship and Services', in *The Church in the Furnace*, p.177. Milner-White was one of the service chaplains during the Great War. He later became Dean of King's College, Cambridge, where he introduced the Service of Nine Lessons and Carols for Christmas Eve. He was also Dean of York and a member of the Liturgical Commission from 1955-1962.
- 2 Histories of the Book of Common Prayer abound. Attention is drawn to:
R.T. Beckwith, 'Thomas Cranmer and the Prayer Book' and 'The Anglican Eucharist: From the Reformation to the Restoration', in Jones et al, *The Study of Liturgy*.
G.J. Cuming, 'Anglican Liturgical Books' in Davies, *A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, pp.101-103.
Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*.
Harrison and Sansom, *Worship in the Church of England*.
- 3 The Archbishop's evidence (February 2 & 3, 1905), *RCED Minutes of Evidence*, 12852.
- 4 Jasper, *Development*, p.8.
- 5 This is not to say that 1552 and 1662 do not possess internal coherence and theological integrity; it is simply to point out the discontinuity between these rites and the pre-Reformation liturgies. For an appreciation of the 1552 rite see Dix, *Shape*, pp.656-674.
- 6 Cosin, 'The Unbloody Sacrifice', in *Works*, I, p.17.
- 7 Cosin, 'History of the Troubles and Trials', in *Works*, III, p.344.
- 8 Cosin, 'Notes and collections on the Book of Common Prayer', in *Works*, V, pp.114f.
- 9 Shipley, *The Ritual of the Altar*, p.xiv.
- 10 Pamphlet from the League of Loyal Churchmen and the Protestant Truth Society, among the papers of Lord Hugh Cecil (see below).
- 11 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.454.
- 12 *ibid*, pp.460f.
- 13 King Edward VII's mandate to the Royal Commission (23rd April 1904).
- 14 *RCED Report*, p.75.
- 15 *ibid*, p.76.
- 16 The point is discussed in §3.9.
- 17 *Parliamentary Debates* (218 H.C. Deb. 5 S.), p.1079.
- 18 Letter from the Prime Minister, the Rt Hon Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 4 August 1906, quoted in Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.647.
- 19 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.648.
- 20 Letter from the Prime Minister to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 18 August 1906, *Randall Davidson*, p.649.
- 21 Milner-White, 'Worship and Services', in *The Church in the Furnace*, p.178.
- 22 *ibid*, p.176.
- 23 *The Worship of the Church*, p33.
- 24 e.g. 'though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death . . .',
'greater love hath no man than this . . .',
'now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face . . .'

- 25 Milner-White, 'Worship and Services', in *The Church in the Furnace*, pp.179f.
- 26 *The Worship of the Church*, p.39.
- 27 Milner-White, 'Worship and Services', in *The Church in the Furnace*, p.199.
- 28 e.g. 'indifferent', 'curates', 'lively'.
- 29 Milner-White, 'Worship and Services', in *The Church in the Furnace*, p.185.
- 30 C.S. Woodward, 'Worship and Services', in *The Church in the Furnace*, p.224.
- 31 *ibid*, p.230.
- 32 *Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer . . . with a foreword by William Temple, DLitt, the Bishop of Manchester*.
- 33 ECU, *The Prayer Book as Revised*.
- 34 The Alcuin Club, *A Survey of the Proposals for the Alternative Prayer Book*: this was not an 'original' contribution, but a combination of the National Assembly proposals, the ECU book and the 'Manchester' rite.
- 35 Boggis, *Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*. Robert James Edmund Boggis was Vicar of St John the Evangelist, Torquay (Crockford 1927).
- 36 Harold Sellon Watts was Vicar of King's Heath, diocese of Birmingham (Crockford 1927).
- 37 See §2.5.
- 38 Frere, *Principles*, p.186.
- 39 *ibid*, p.187.
- 40 *ibid*, p.188.
- 41 *ibid*, p.189.
- 42 Dom G. Dix, 'The Liturgist', in *Walter Howard Frere*, p.136.
- 43 Letter from Frere to Canon Cooper, Chancellor of his Cathedral Church of Truro, in *Walter Howard Frere*, p.137.
- 44 A conference was held at Farnham Castle in October 1925, chaired by the Bishop of Winchester in an attempt to bring together differing views on reservation. See *Reservation*.
- 45 Adoration is forbidden by the final rubric following the eucharistic rite, sometimes called the 'Black Rubric'. The rubric defends the practice of kneeling for Communion, by which 'no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood.'
- 46 The Royal Commission recommended that reservation, if it led to adoration of the Sacrament, was 'plainly significant of teaching repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England and certainly illegal' and should be made to cease.
- 47 Article XXVIII — not, strictly speaking, a part of the Prayer Book — is disapproving: 'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped'. However, since the Declaration prefixed to the Articles states that no reader 'shall put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense', the article cannot be held to *forbid* reservation; what it says is that reservation is not of dominical institution.

The sixth rubric at the end of the eucharist (1662) reads: '. . . if any of the Bread and Wine remain . . . of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.' However, this rubric can be understood as a safeguard against the profanation of the Sacrament rather than a prohibition of communion by extension. See Bursell, *Liturgy, Order and the Law*, pp.111f.
- 48 Jasper, *Development*, p.102.

- 49 ECU, *The Prayer Book as Revised*, p.442.
- 50 Alcuin Club, *Proposals*, Part II, p.85
- 51 *ibid*, pp.85f.
- 52 Pamphlet from the League of Loyal Churchmen and the Protestant Truth Society (Lord Hugh Cecil's papers).
- 53 Curiously, the pamphleteers refer to the psalm by its Vulgate numbering, Psalm 42.
- 54 Auricular confession was hardly 'abolished' in 1552 or 1662; it is encouraged at the eucharist in the second exhortation in 1552 (the first exhortation in 1662), and also at the visitation of the sick. Furthermore, what the League of Loyal Churchmen and the Protestant Truth Society were here defending was *not* Cranmer's 'finished work' of 1552, but 1662, which differs in a number of significant respects from 1552.
- 55 Conversations held at Malines, Belgium, 1921-1925. These were initiated by Viscount Halifax; Cardinal Mercier was host & president. See Bell, *Documents on Christians Unity*.
- 56 Major Guy M. Kindersley MP, reprinted from *The English Review*, February 1928 (Lord Hugh Cecil's papers).
- 57 *New Tracts for our Times, by a Committee of Anglican Priests - Tract V: The calamity of the New Prayer Book* (Lord Hugh Cecil's papers).
- 58 Lord Shaftesbury, President of the ECU, Darwell Stone, Chairman of the Federation of Catholic Priests, and C.P. Shaw, Superior General of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, *Prayer Book Revision: A Memorandum respectfully presented for consideration to the Archbishops and Diocesan Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York*, 1 March 1927 (Lord Hugh Cecil's papers).
- 59 *ibid*.

3

THE 1928 PRAYER BOOK

The law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow
for the religious life of the present generation.

Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 1906

3.1 The extent of the reforms

It is now necessary to take a step backwards. The pressures for change and the reactions to the various proposals for a new Prayer Book spanned some two decades; indeed, tracts against the Book were still being written after the first Commons defeat in 1927. The Church's official response — the making of the Deposited Book — spans the same period. The work of revision began almost immediately after the Royal Commission published its Report in 1906.

Initially it was the reform of the ornaments rubric and other rubrics which occupied the Convocations' attention. The Archbishop hoped that the matter would not detain the Church for long. In a letter of 6 June 1906 to the members of the Canterbury Convocation and the House of Laymen, he wrote:

It has become abundantly clear that to secure the exact observance, in the twentieth century, of detailed rubrics drawn up in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, is neither possible nor, from any point of view, desirable. Rules clear in principle and yet elastic in detail we do absolutely require, if the Church, in its manifold activities, is to be abreast of modern needs and yet loyal to ancient order.¹

However the scope of the Church's discussions soon widened from a discussion of rubrics alone to include also the texts of services. In practice it proved impossible to discuss one without the other,² though only slight changes were considered at first. In 1911, Davidson wrote:

Yes, I am keen about Prayer Book revision now. In my own belief the changes likely to be adopted are for the most part quite uncontroversial, but there are two or three things which will be subjects of keen debate.³

In 1914, the Bishop of Bristol, commenting on six years' work in Convocation, expressed the two desires which had dominated discussions up until then:

First, that there should be a minimum of change, and next, that there should be no change that in any sort of way could honestly be said to touch doctrine at all. As time went on, the question of enrichment came up, and that had grown to very considerable dimensions. Whether it had grown to overburdening dimensions, would be a matter for careful consideration.⁴

After the War, however, the matter was seen in a different perspective. Bell describes the new attitude in the Canterbury Convocation:

[The eucharist] became more and more prominent in the worship of Churchmen, and so more and more prominent in the discussions on the Prayer Book. The debate on Reservation in the Upper House . . . marked a significant stage. The debate in the same place in February 1918, accepting the proposals of the Lower House for an alteration of the central part of the Communion Service (refused in April 1915) was also significant. It was then that the question of an Alternative Order of Holy Communion first took a definite place in the Bishops' proposals for Prayer Book Revision.⁵

The Church, then, changed its approach substantially between 1906 and 1918. The aim of the reform process began with a revision of rubrics, quickly moved on to a modest revision of those services involving no doctrinal controversy, and finished with a radical revision of the eucharist and proposals for reservation. With the sole exception of the proposals on the canon and on reservation, there was little opposition to broadening the scope of revision in this way. To move from the revision of rubrics to the revision of the whole Prayer Book was a natural progression.

The work took much longer than had been hoped. There were good reasons for this, not least the interruption caused by the Great War; but the principal reason why it took over twenty years to bring a new liturgy to Parliament was the cumbersome nature of the Church's own procedures. The Convocations of the two provinces sat separately, and, within each Convocation, debates were conducted and resolutions made by each Upper and Lower House sitting alone. There was thus plenty of scope for disagreement between clergy and bishops, and between the two provinces. In the end it was understood by all concerned that there would have to be a united reply from the whole Church, and Joint Committees were called to attempt to reconcile the differences between the four Houses. A further complication arose in 1920 when the Church Assembly came into being. The Royal Letters of Business had been addressed to the Convocations, but it was clear that the business of Prayer Book reform could hardly be conducted without reference to the new representative body. The Assembly therefore

took over where the Convocations left off in 1920 and the process of reform proceeded thereafter within the three Houses of the Church Assembly.

3.2 The eucharistic canon

Canterbury Convocation (1910–1917)

In 1910 the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury began to consider the revision of the 1662 canon. They proposed an alternative service modelled on the Scottish rite, but this made no real progress.⁶ A year later, the possibility of a eucharistic order based on 1549, the American rite and the Scottish rite was discussed but narrowly defeated. In early 1914, the House returned to the matter, and agreed (by 79 votes to 8) on a conservative revision, essentially a rearrangement of the 1662 material following the Comfortable Words, which would join together the Thanksgiving, the Consecration and the Prayer of Oblation, and place the Lord's Prayer and the Prayer of Humble Access immediately before communion.⁷ In the meantime, the bishops had produced their own report which envisaged no change in the canon.⁸

Both Houses having made their recommendations, a Joint Committee of members of both Houses considered the matter together. In 1915 the Committee endorsed the Clergy proposals for the canon.⁹ At this point, then, the proposed order was:

Sursum corda, Preface, Sanctus
 Consecration (replacing 'Amen' with 'Wherefore . . .')
 Oblation
 Lord's Prayer
 Humble Access
 Communion
 Post-Communion Thanksgiving
 Gloria in excelsis, Blessing

When this recommendation was referred back to the Upper and Lower Houses, the bishops reversed the Committee's decision.¹⁰ The clergy, however, reaffirmed their previous conviction:

that the Prayer of Humble Access be removed from its present position and be placed immediately before the Communion of Priest and People; and that the *Amen* at the end of the present Prayer of Consecration be omitted, and that the Prayer of Oblation follow at once (prefaced by the word *Wherefore*) and then the Lord's Prayer.¹¹

The disagreement was resolved when the bishops accepted the principle of change in February 1918, allowing the rearrangement suggested by the Lower House, but proposing that the 1549 anamnesis (rather than simply 'Wherefore') be inserted between the Consecration and the Prayer of Oblation. The text following the words of institution would therefore read:

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the Institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness, &c.¹²

York Convocation (1910–1917)

The Bishops of the northern province resisted any change. The Lower House, however, proposed both a rearrangement of 1662 texts and further changes:

The Committee approve of the principle of the restoring of the Epiklesis (or Invocation of the Holy Spirit) in the Prayer of Consecration . . . [and] it is desirable that the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer should be placed immediately after the Prayer of Consecration.¹³

The bishops persisted in their opposition, and in the end, the York Convocation was unable to agree a way forward.

Both Convocations Together (1918–1920)

In October 1918, a Conference of members of the four houses of Convocation met to consider the Church's reply to the Royal Letters of Business. The only major area of disagreement lay in the canon, so the Conference resolved:

That their Graces the Archbishops be respectfully asked to call together a conference of clergy belonging to different schools of thought, in which younger men and liturgical scholars should have full representation, to discuss (after Communion and prayer) the question of permissive alterations in the structure of Holy Communion, in order to forward an agreed settlement on the matter.

Such a gathering was duly called in May 1919. Its recommendations were:

- 1) That the Prayer of Oblation should stay in its present position;
- 2) That the Prayer of Humble Access should follow immediately after the Comfortable Words;
- 3) That the Lord's Prayer should be placed after the prayer of Consecration, and immediately before communion;
- 4) That the words of institution should be followed by:
 - a) an act of remembrance;
 - b) an act of thanksgiving;
 - c) a prayer for the Holy Spirit.

The form of the additions proposed in (4) was as follows:

Wherefore, O Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance before thee the precious death of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, looking also for his coming again, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us.

And we pray thee of thine almighty goodness to send upon us and upon these thy gifts thy holy and blessed Spirit, who is the Sanctifier and the Giver of life, to whom with thee and thy Son Jesus Christ be ascribed by every creature in earth and heaven all blessing, honour, glory and power, now henceforth and for evermore. Amen.¹⁴

These recommendations go some way beyond the rearrangement of 1662 which had formed the basis of the Canterbury proposals. In the first place, a simple restoration of the sequence *thanksgiving-consecration-oblation* is not the first priority; but the new additions offer an interesting alternative to this. There is an argument that self-oblation ought to be left until after communion, and that therefore the 1552/1662 Prayer of Oblation should *not* be added to the end of the canon without modification. The 1919 proposal dealt with this by leaving the 1662 Prayer of Oblation as a post-communion prayer and ending the canon with the sequence *thanksgiving-consecration-anamnesis/invocation*. Secondly, the new section contained an invocation of the Spirit, as proposed by the York clergy. This section owed something to 1549 and to the Scottish and American prayers, but was essentially a new composition. Finally, the position of the Prayer of Humble Access is significant. Initially, Canterbury had put it just before communion, the position it occupies in 1549 and the Scottish rite. Here, however, it was placed before the canon with the other penitential material, and thus took on a rather different function: it concluded the prayers of penitence and was part of the

preparation for the whole eucharistic action, rather than being a prayer of approach immediately before Holy Communion as in 1549. The prayer remained in this earlier position in the revisions of the 1960s and 1970s; however, at the time of writing, in *Rite 1* (the proposed replacement for Rite A and Rite B) it is proposed to restore the prayer to its 1549/1919 position.

When these recommendations came back to the Convocations, they were accepted by both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury and by the York clergy, but rejected by the northern bishops.¹⁵ This continuing impasse in the northern province could not be resolved even by a full synod of the York Convocation; at a meeting of the Synod on 29 April 1920, the recommendations were narrowly defeated.

The National Assembly (1920–1926)

The National Assembly (also known as the Church Assembly), incorporating a properly constituted House of Laity, came into being in 1920. From then on, all further work on the Prayer Book passed through the Assembly's hands. A committee was appointed to consider the progress previously made by the Convocations, resulting in a report (NA84) which was, in effect, a coherent set of proposals on which the Assembly could get to work. In the absence of a clear lead from the Convocations, the Committee produced its own draft canon, arguably a return to the Canterbury proposal of 1918, and a rather more conservative reworking of the 1662 canon than the Convocations' 1919 rite. There was no epiclesis, and the Prayer of Oblation was once more brought forward to form the end of the canon:

Comfortable Words

Prayer of Humble Access

Sursum corda, Preface, Sanctus

Prayer of Consecration, followed by:

'Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, looking also for his coming again, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us; and we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, etc'

Remainder of the Prayer of Oblation

Lord's Prayer, Communion

Post-Communion Thanksgiving, Gloria in excelsis, Blessing

This canon, along with the rest of NA 84, was given 'general approval' in all three houses of the Assembly, and then sent to the House of Clergy and the House of Laity for detailed consideration. The recommendations of the two Lower Houses were published as CA 169 (Laity) and CA 158 (Clergy).

The amendments proposed by the House of Laity simply put the rite back into 1662 form. The House of Clergy, on the other hand, accepted the shape of NA 84 with its unbroken sequence *thanksgiving-consecration-oblation*, the Prayer of Humble Access removed from the canon, and communion following the Lord's Prayer. They did, however, place the Prayer of Humble Access immediately before communion rather than with the penitential material.¹⁶ But it is the proposed amendments to the text of the canon itself which are most interesting.

The House of Clergy proposed two alternative canons, which differed significantly from each other as well as from the NA 84 prayer. The first alternative (hereafter C1) owed a great deal to 1549. Firstly, it strengthened the words of consecration. The prayer for worthy reception just before the words of institution was replaced by the 1549 prayer of blessing over the elements ('... vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures ...') but omitting 'by thy Holy Spirit and word'. A petition for worthy reception was inserted into the Prayer of Oblation ('... that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion *may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son, and be fulfilled with thy grace* ...'). Secondly, the material between the institution narrative and the Prayer of Oblation was altered, restoring almost exactly the form of the Canterbury canon of 1918.

The second alternative canon (C2) was a much more thoroughgoing revision. Firstly, it departed from the familiar words and phrases of 1662, and was alone in doing so with the sole exception of the 'Grey Book' canon, to which C2 owed a great deal. Much of the debate about the revision of the eucharist had been about doctrine rather than style. In most of the reform proposals, sections of 1662 material were freely rearranged but almost always used *verbatim*, and where new sections were needed, they were composed in the idiom of 1662. In C2, however, several changes were apparent. The post-Sanctus recalled not only the death of Christ but also his incarnation ('... didst give thine only Son *to take our nature upon him, and to suffer death upon the Cross* ...'). 'His one oblation of himself' became 'his one *offering* of himself'; the words 'oblation and satisfaction' two lines further on disappeared altogether; 'a perpetual memory of

that his precious death' became 'a perpetual memory of *himself*, wherein we do proclaim his death'; and 'Blood of the New Testament' became 'Blood of the New Covenant'. This canon, then, unlike that of 1662, declined to identify Christ's saving work with his death alone; it made the eucharist a remembrance of the whole of the Lord's life and ministry. Secondly, C2 included an epiclesis identical to that in the Grey Book. This invocation was stronger than that in the 1920 canon, clarifying the *purpose* of the Spirit's coming upon the worshippers and the elements ('... that we ... may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood').

As one might expect, C2 aroused more suspicion than C1. When the House of Bishops met with the Conference Committee of the House of Clergy on 14 January 1926, it was the second canon which needed the stronger defence.¹⁷ First of all the bishops were uneasy about having two alternative canons. The clergy pointed out that while 'both gave a more continuous form of eucharistic prayer than the present Prayer Book', they differed in order and sequence. The clergy would have liked to propose only one alternative canon; but there had not been enough time to agree one, and if two were needed for the sake of peace in the Church, they would not wish to rule out a second alternative. The Chairman asked the clergy whether they had considered adopting *en bloc* either the 1549 canon or the Scottish canon; they replied that C1 was based on the Green Book canon, itself a simplified form of 1549, while the adoption of the Scottish Office had been previously rejected by the Canterbury clergy.

The 1927/1928 canon

The range of proposed amendments to NA 84 was far too wide to be easily harmonised. Both laity and clergy had changed the draft beyond all recognition, in opposite directions. The bishops, however, were determined that there should only be one alternative canon (see below). There seemed some hope among the clergy that further agreement might be reached; though whether this was realistic, in view of the substantial differences between C1 and C2, is surely doubtful. Nevertheless, a group led by the Bishop of Winchester met at Farnham Castle to try to make further progress. Jasper describes how a single canon was in fact agreed there, in time for the Bishops' meeting in June:

First the Bishops agreed to a single alternative canon by 29 votes to 5. The Members-in-charge then introduced the NA 84 canon with certain amendments, including two invocations, one before and one after the Institution Narrative, but with a note that only one must be used — a proposal which was largely Frere's handiwork. Dr Woods then produced the Farnham Canon: and from the two

proposals a single composite canon was evolved — basically the amended NA 84 prayer, but with the Farnham anamnesis and a single obligatory invocation after the Institution Narrative proposed by Archbishop Lang of York.¹⁸

A study of the 1927/8 canon bears out Jasper's analysis. Its language is undoubtedly that of 1662, with a few minor textual changes. The prayer owes very little to the Grey Book (C2) canon: only the position of the epiclesis (after the institution narrative) survives from this prayer. The blessing over the elements is much closer to the Green Book/1549/C1 canon. In many ways 1927/1928 was a canon which no-one wanted: along the way, many proposals which might have commanded greater acceptance had already been rejected. To paraphrase Sherlock Holmes, when one has eliminated all the likely proposals for revision, then what remains, however unpopular, must be accepted. By 1926, the moment for a conservative and popular revision had passed. The part played by the canon in the Book's success and failure will be discussed below: suffice it to say here that, with the rejection of the Deposited Book in Parliament, the whole process could be seen as a costly and wasted twenty years.

3.3 The remainder of the eucharist

While the drafting of an alternative canon aroused considerable disagreement, other changes in the eucharist were far less controversial. There was a widespread feeling, expressed in the various submissions to the Convocations and the Assembly, that it was unnecessary to recite certain parts of the service, such as the Decalogue, the Collect for the King and the exhortations, at each and every celebration of the eucharist. There was some disagreement about details: the House of Laity in particular was reluctant to dispense with too much too often (and unwilling to do away with the Prayer for the Monarch at all), but permission to use the Summary of the Law or the Kyries instead of the Decalogue reflected popular feeling. The use of the customary Gospel responses was also readily agreed, as was the provision of shorter words of administration. Two rather more controversial additions, which had been absent from the NA 84 rite, were inserted at the request of the House of Clergy: permission to use the Benedictus after the Sanctus, and the exchange of the peace just before communion. Finally, the Prayer for the Church Militant — called 'The Intercession' in the Deposited Book — follows almost exactly the form proposed by the House of Clergy (despite the preference of the House of Laity for the 1662 form) with new prayers for the mission of the Church, for

places of learning, and for the dead, 'beseeching thee to grant them everlasting light and peace'.

The Convocations and the Assembly did nothing, however, about the traditional style and language of the services. There was little in response to the war chaplains' call that people be 'allowed to ask for the things they really need, and to ask for them in the language of their own day'. The structure of the eucharist, apart from the rearranged canon, also follows 1662 closely, with little attention paid to the insights of the Grey Book. In retrospect, this is perhaps understandable: the Grey Book was ahead of its time, with the confession at the beginning of the service (now permitted in Rite A), provision for anthems and hymns in the now customary places, and a rubric enjoining silence after the canon.

3.4 Reservation

In 1911 all four Houses of Convocation agreed to the following draft rubric, drawn up by the bishops:

When the Holy Communion may not by reason of grave difficulty be celebrated at the sick person's house, the Priest may (with the consent of the sick person) on any day when there is a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church set apart at the open Communion so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as shall serve for the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any), and, the open Communion being ended, he shall, on the same day and with as little delay as may be, go and minister the same . . . If the consecrated Bread and Wine be from any urgent cause not taken immediately to the sick person, they shall be kept in such place and after such manner as the Ordinary shall direct, so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever.¹⁹

The intention of the rubric is clearly to allow extended communion, and reservation *where necessary* to facilitate such extended communion; but not adoration.

The Report NA84 makes almost identical provision by means of rubrics appended to the Order for the Communion of the Sick. However a third rubric tentatively raises the possibility of continuous reservation:

When the aforesaid provision is not sufficient to secure that any Communicant at his last hour should be able to receive the Holy Communion, the Curate, with the permission of the Ordinary, given in accordance with Canon, or such rules as may be from time to time made by the Archbishops and Bishops in their Convocations, may make further provision to meet the needs of the sick and dying.

The laity were unhappy with this, but willing to let the proposals pass only if the bishops were certain that this would promote peace and order in the Church.²⁰

The clergy sought explicit permission for permanent reservation by clarifying the meaning of 'further provision to meet the needs of the sick and dying':

... the Priest may ... reserve so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as is needed ... provided that the consecrated Bread and Wine so reserved be reserved, kept, and administered in accordance with the directions issued by lawful authority ...²¹

The 'directions issued by lawful authority' were not to be part of the Prayer Book rubrics, but a flexible code of practice issued by the bishops.

The rubrics contained in the Deposited Book of 1927 again differ little in their effect from those contained in NA 84 as amended by the House of Clergy. The first rubric is not changed at all. The second is a reworking of the third 'clergy' rubric from CA 169. However a third rubric carefully excludes the possibility of sacramental devotion:

The consecrated Bread and Wine set apart under either of the two preceding rubrics shall be reserved only for the Communion of the Sick, shall be administered in both kinds, and shall be used for no other purpose whatever. There shall be no service or ceremony in connexion with the Sacrament so reserved, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in communion, or otherwise reverently consumed ...

This places severe restrictions on the whole practice of reservation. It is expected that communion will be administered, whenever possible, immediately after the eucharist in church; in this case the question of continuous reservation does not of course arise. Only when 'further provision' is required to meet exceptional need may the priest approach the bishop, who incidentally *must* comply with a reasonable request. Finally, if permission is granted for permanent reservation, there must be no possibility of the reserved sacrament being the focus of adoration.

It is not difficult to see why these rubrics were so difficult for anglo-catholics to accept. If the 1928 rubrics passed into law, reservation might be difficult to justify even for communion of the sick, and the illegality of sacramental devotions could only become clearer and more pointed. For their part, evangelicals were unwilling to permit reservation for the first time since the Reformation, even with firm restrictions; for it was certain that some priests would find ways to circumvent them.

What is perhaps surprising is that the proposals did not change very much from 1911 to 1927. Throughout, the emphasis was on making extended communion without reservation the normal way to communicate the sick. The only changes were a gentle but consistent tightening of the rubrics to exclude the possibility of devotions.

3.5 Other services

Burial

In the Burial Service the war chaplains' requests were widely met. The Deposited Book allows Psalms 23 and 130 as alternatives to Psalm 90, and includes a shortened form of 1 Corinthians 15, as well as alternative readings from 2 Corinthians 4, Revelation 7 and Revelation 21. There are new introductory sentences (though not those used by the chaplains). Finally, and most significantly, there are two prayers for the departed and prayer for the mourners.

The Daily Office

The chaplains' plea for a much shortened office was not met. However the penitential material was removed from the main body of the office and set out as an optional introduction, and the prayers after the third collect were made largely optional. Both these sections were considerably enriched, with new introductory sentences, arranged by season and theme, and many more occasional prayers and thanksgivings. The 1662 psalter was left intact, except for a table of proper psalms for Sundays and some holy days; and there was no provision for omitting or shortening any of the lessons.

3.6 The Deposited Book in summary

Jasper complains that, apart from the work on reservation and the canon, 'bearing in mind that most of these proposals were taken from other sources, it all amounted to very little'.²² There is some truth to this. The heavy black lines which attend every change from 1662 material, and the inclusion in the new Book of practically everything which stood in the old,²³ denote a lack of confidence. Here there is very little by way of fresh liturgical writing or even new translations of ancient texts; 1927 is, by and large,

1662 with enrichments and relaxations.²⁴ But it should come as no surprise that the enrichments were 'taken from other sources'; the Book owed its being to the fact that clergy and congregations *had* been enriching services unofficially for a long time, and many improvements which had been found to work were included in the new Book.

In fact the new Book differed from 1662 in three ways. It was **enriched** by the addition of alternative prayers, canticles, psalms and readings. There was a new **flexibility** — the abbreviation or occasional use of many texts, such as the Decalogue. Then there was a definite **catholicising** tendency, echoing the Royal Commission's call for more 'care for the ceremonial' and 'appreciation for the continuity of the Church', as witnessed by the inclusion of prayer for the departed, a stronger sense of consecration in the canon, and the provision (however tentative) for permanent reservation.

What is really missing from the Deposited Book is any serious accommodation to the context of the twentieth century.²⁵ This must have disappointed the war chaplains and the Life and Liberty Movement; and it is not as if their concerns had not been loudly voiced and clearly heard. As early as 1919, the Report of the Archbishops' Committee (*The Worship of the Church*), fully aware of the revision of the Prayer Book which was then going on, and unwilling to intrude, was yet critical of the conservatism of much of the reform underway. There was nothing in the proposals to make worship more accessible to children, or more comprehensible to infrequent attenders at church. The occasional offices, for instance:

are used by many people who are not ordinarily churchgoers, and it will certainly make a great difference if such persons find themselves courteously welcomed and the services performed with care and dignity and reverence. The Offices themselves appear to the Committee to be difficult and to need a revision of phraseology more drastic than that proposed in the Report of Convocation.²⁶

The Church needed to recognise that both private prayer and public worship were in decline. The Prayer Book should be a useful resource to help people in their prayers. The 1662 Book was certainly out of date, but its probable replacement would not go nearly far enough to address the problems facing many people:

From evidence which is before the Committee it would appear certain that many persons have entirely outgrown the Book of Common Prayer in its present form, that the Book does not satisfy a number of requirements which have come into existence in recent years, and that the task of revising it in a more drastic way cannot be very long postponed.²⁷

3.7 The Book in Parliament: the first Commons defeat

The Deposited Book came before the Convocations for approval in March 1927 and before the National Assembly in July. The voting figures were as follows:

Convocations	In Favour
Canterbury	
Bishops	84%
Clergy	88%
York	
Bishops	100%
Clergy	87%
National Assembly	
Bishops	89%
Clergy	87%
Laity	71%

These figures show very substantial support for the new liturgy, even in a House of Laity which had previously contended for something much closer to 1662. There is no doubt that the Book went to Parliament with the blessing of the Church.

The Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament, which scrutinises Church Measures before they are brought to the Lords and Commons for debate, found no objection to the Church’s proposals. The Committee was careful to respect the authority of the Church Assembly:

In so far as the objections which have been received consist of objections on the part of members of the Church as such, the Committee feel that in respect of this Measure they themselves should be guided by the decisive conclusions of the Church Assembly, as the representative body entrusted by Parliament with the power of passing measures concerning the Church of England . . . the Committee would not recommend any interference with the decisions of the Church Assembly on matters so clearly lying within the province of that Assembly as the doctrines and ceremonial of the Church, unless persuaded that any proposed change of doctrine were of so vital a description as materially to alter the general character of the National Church as recognised in the Act of Settlement and by the oath sworn by His Majesty at his Coronation, whereby His Majesty has promised to maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law.²⁸

The Committee clearly did not feel that the Revised Prayer Book altered the character of the National Church. Several representations were received opposing the Measure, but these did not restrain the Committee from recommending it to Parliament:

In so far as the objections received are based on constitutional grounds, involving general questions connected with the relations between Church and State, the Committee would draw attention to the fact that the constitutional right of parishioners is to have the services of the Church of England performed according to law. Whether this law is modified by an ordinary Act of Parliament or by a Measure receiving the Assent of the King and the consent of the two Houses of Parliament, under the conditions prescribed by the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act 1919, makes no difference to this constitutional right . . .

The Committee have carefully examined the Measure and the Deposited Book from this point of view, as well as the arguments of the objectors in relation thereto . . . the Committee take the view that no change of doctrine of constitutional importance is involved, that accordingly the "constitutional rights of all His Majesty's subjects" are not in this respect prejudicially affected, and there is nothing to modify the purport of the Coronation Oath. . .

The Measure therefore went to the House of Lords where it was considered on 12 December 1927, with the Archbishop opening the debate. He affirmed Parliament's absolute right to endorse or to reject the Book, but urged their Lordships to reflect 'what would be the consequences in the country of the rejection of a united wish officially given by a united Church'.²⁹ Parliament should use its undisputed power with care, and not hastily disregard the judgement of the Church Assembly; for while the Assembly could not claim to represent the population as a whole:

they do profess to represent the Church of England, the people who care about these matters and go to church, who want to use their Prayer Book, who care about the form that Book should take, who understand the question and who are the people really qualified to speak.³⁰

The Lords passed the Book by a large majority of 241 to 88 — a vote in favour of 73%.

The Book came before the Commons three days later, with a very different result. The debate was opened by Mr Bridgeman, whom Bell describes as 'a popular country gentleman who had done well for the Government in difficult waters as First Lord of the Admiralty'.³¹ Bridgeman staunchly defended the Church's right and duty to bring the Book before Parliament:

Some people speak of the Prayer Book Measure as if it were the result of some deep-laid plot on the part of the Convocation or the Bishops which they desire to hurry through Parliament. What is the real history of it? As a matter of fact, it is the response of the Church to the demand of Parliament, who called upon it to perform a duty, and the Deposited Book is the result of nearly 20 years of careful

and searching consideration. In 1904 a Royal Commission was appointed . . . Letters of Business were consequently issued to the Convocations, and, in pursuance of those orders, they set to work, and in 1920 published a Schedule of Amendments to the Prayer Book. In the meantime the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919, was passed, which created the Church Assembly, and provided the machinery by which they could more easily pass through Parliament Measures upon which the Church, through Convocation and the Assembly, had taken a decision. And now the Deposited Book is presented. Thus, so far from foisting some new and ill-considered scheme upon Parliament, they are now engaged in the last stage of a series of actions which the Church has been loyally taking in obedience to the directions given to her by Parliament for the purpose of restoring order.³²

Sir William Joynson-Hicks, a vociferous opponent of the Measure, replied to the opening speech; he agreed that the Church was entirely right to present the Book:

My Rt. Hon. friend dealt with the Royal Commission and said, quite truly, that the Royal Commission advocated a change in the Prayer Book before there was a change in the Ecclesiastical Courts³³

before going on to make clear his objection to the specific *content* of the Deposited Book: 'the real trouble is with regard to the service of Holy Communion — the real trouble is in the proposed authorisation of the Reservation of the Sacrament . . .'³⁴

Viscount Wolmer, speaking later in the debate, agreed: 'We are acting on the advice of the Royal Commission. The Church is merely carrying out its recommendations. The Church must come first and ask for a Prayer Book which it is reasonable to enforce.'³⁵

The debate centred on the *content* of the Deposited Book, particularly the proposals for reservation and for the alternative canon. Other questions were, of course, raised. Some members were unhappy that the House of Commons was being asked to discuss the merits of a book of prayer at all; others voiced doubts as to whether Parliament had any moral right to determine the affairs of the Church. Some were concerned about the question of discipline, in this sense: clerical obedience should be restored, whether or not the new Book was authorised, for surely the Royal Commission had condemned many practices as unacceptable, and it was not clear whether anything was being done about these practices. But the heart of the debate concerned the provisions of the Book itself. The relevance of this to the question of why the Commons rejected the Book will be discussed shortly. For now it is enough to note that the Commons simply did not dwell on the question of whether disciplinary problems could or should be solved by reforming the liturgy. The *wisdom* of presenting a revised Prayer Book was not in doubt; the specific *content* of the Book was an entirely different matter.

The arguments against the Book which had been heard during the campaign leading up to the Parliamentary debate were deployed in devastating fashion in the chamber of the Commons. Joynson-Hicks, in a masterly speech, sought to pin the Church of England firmly to its past:

It may be quite true that the new scheme is right. It may be equally true that the doctrines of the Church of Rome are right; but it is quite clear that the doctrines of the Church of Rome, or any doctrines approximating to those of the Church of Rome, are not the doctrines which were established by us at the time of the Reformation. I do not propose to say one word against the doctrines of the Church of Rome; they are not in dispute here. All I have to say is that they are not the doctrines of our Church, and that there are many things done in our Church today which, as the Royal Commission itself said, are 'on the Romeward side of the dividing-line'.³⁶

This is an astonishing and surely indefensible argument — that doctrines should be believed for no other reason than that they were held at the Reformation, regardless of whether they are right or wrong. It is an argument against truth and against the continuing discernment of truth; it is an argument against development; it insists that the Church is irrevocably defined in terms of its past, even at the cost of its present integrity. It is also, of course, an argument fatal to the very Reformation which Joynson-Hicks sought to defend, though this does not seem to have troubled him. Be that as it may, the fear of Rome engendered by this speech and others was a powerful weapon. The Archbishop felt that one speech in particular had swayed the Commons:

The most effective speech of all as regards votes was, I think, Rosslyn Mitchell's [the Member for Paisley]. It was a simply ultra-Protestant harangue, with no real knowledge of the subject, but owing its power to a rhetorical presentment of no-Popery phrases and arguments of the sort which are to be found in *Barnaby Rudge*, when the Lord George Gordon riots set London aflame.³⁷

The Measure was defeated by 238 votes to 205.³⁸ The Commons, quite against the expectations of the Prime Minister, 'had apparently destroyed the work of more than twenty years'.³⁹ But the matter could hardly be left to rest there, when the voting in the Convocations, the Church Assembly and the House of Lords had been so emphatic. The bishops were urged by Lord Birkenhead and others to allow the Book to be used as if it had been authorised, and to let Parliament make the next move; instead, they issued a statement acknowledging their difficulty and stressing their determination to press on by legal means:

It was within the right of the House of Commons to reject the Measure. On the other hand, mere acquiescence in its decision would be in our judgement inconsistent with the responsibilities of the Church as a spiritual society.

The Bishops fully recognize that there are circumstances in which it would be their duty to take action in accordance with the Church's inherent spiritual authority. We realize this duty, and are ready, if need be, to fulfil it. But we believe that the recent decision of the House of Commons was influenced by certain misunderstandings as to the character of the proposals before it, and we cannot, therefore, take the responsibility of accepting as final the vote of December 15.

The House of Bishops has accordingly resolved to re-introduce the Measure into the Church Assembly as soon as possible, with such changes, and such changes only, as may tend to remove misapprehensions and to make clearer and more explicit its intentions and limitations.⁴⁰

3.8 The modified Book and the second Commons defeat

It was not easy to make alterations to the Deposited Book which would win over members of Parliament without alienating disappointed church-people. There was considerable disquiet within the Church that the Book should need altering at all. According to the Bishop of Durham, Hensley Henson, the action of the Commons 'was greatly resented, not as illegal, but as morally indefensible'.⁴¹ Nevertheless changes were made, by far the most significant of them in the reservation rubrics. Gone was the careful distinction between general rubrics and detailed regulations. The whole provision was now printed in the Book, and the restrictions were tightened. The second rubric in the 1928 Book read as follows:

If the Bishop is satisfied that in connexion with hospitals, or in time of common sickness, or in the special circumstances of any particular Parish, the provisions of the preceding rubrick are not sufficient [i.e. for extended communion immediately following the eucharist in Church], and that there is need of further provision in order that sick and dying persons may not lack the benefit of the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, he may to that end give his licence to the Priest, to reserve at the open Communion so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as is needed for the purpose. Whenever such licence is granted or refused, the Minister, or the people as represented in the Parochial Church Council, may refer the question to the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province.

The third rubric forbidding adoration was left unchanged, but a fourth rubric was added setting out the conditions under which the sacrament may be reserved:

The consecrated Bread and Wine thus set apart shall be reserved in an aumbry or safe. The aumbry shall (according as the Bishop shall direct) be set in the North or South wall of the sanctuary of the church or of any chapel thereof, or, if need be, in the wall of some other part of the church approved by the Bishop, provided that it shall not be immediately behind or above a Holy Table. The door of the aumbry shall be kept locked, and opened only when it is necessary to move or replace the consecrated Elements for the purposes of Communion or renewal. The consecrated Bread and Wine shall be renewed at least once a week.

Thus the regulations were enshrined in rubrics, which, had the 1928 Book ever become law, would be unchangeable until the Book was revised. This only served to alienate anglo-catholics, particularly Frere, who withdrew his support for the Book.

The new reservation rubrics guaranteed that the views of parishioners, through the Parochial Church Council, would be heard. A similar concession was made in the rubrics governing the Communion Service, to ensure that where the Alternative Order was in use, 1662 would be celebrated at least on one Sunday each month if there was a demand for it.

Other small alterations were made to pacify protestant objections and to meet the anxieties of some members of the House of Laity. The 'black rubric' was printed at the end of the Alternative Order for Holy Communion as well as at the end of the 1662 Order. A rubric explained that it was 'an ancient and laudable custom of the Church' to fast before communion, yet 'for the avoidance of all scruple it is hereby declared that such preparation may be used or not be used, according to every man's conscience in the sight of God'. Finally, prayer for the monarch was required at each service of morning and evening prayer or holy communion.

When the amended Book came before the Convocations, there was concern at what was being done. The Church had been united in presenting its reply to the Royal Letters of Business; how could they now credibly send a different reply to the same questions? But the Archbishop of York felt that there was no alternative:

We have to think of the effect of our action now [accepting or rejecting the 1928 Book], not primarily upon Parliament, but upon the Church itself. Rejection or even meagre support of the Book now would be a greater disaster than even a second rejection by Parliament, for it is upon the spirit and the unity of the Church itself that in the last resort and in any event the future must depend . . .⁴²

Others, however, felt bewildered and angry. Dr P.N. Waggett noted that:

If the Motion went through, the Church would be returning to Parliament with a Book substantially amended . . .

For the first time in our history . . . the great Council of the Realm in its secular aspect . . . had practically amended the Prayer Book. Let there not be intruded upon him the purely technical point that the amendments were not made in Parliament but made in another place in order to create a better hope of securing the consent of Parliament. They were, in effect, an amendment of the Book. Last year the Church had in its hands an agreed Book . . . an agreed Book which really did carry with it, rightly or wrongly, an immense force of goodwill in the Church on its behalf.

The voting in the Convocations and the Assembly in 1928 was as follows:

Convocations	In Favour	(cf 1927)
<i>Canterbury</i>		
Bishops	77%	(-7%)
Clergy	72%	(-16%)
<i>York</i>		
Bishops	100%	(=)
Clergy	72%	(-15%)
 National Assembly		
Bishops	94%	(+5%)
Clergy	76%	(-11%)
Laity	66%	(-5%)

This was still a substantial majority (though appreciably diminished in comparison with 1927, particularly among the clergy). Once again, however, the Commons declined to approve the Book, this time by 266 votes to 220. The Church’s attempts to allay the anxieties of the House of Commons had failed.

In fact the margin of failure was fairly narrow. The House of Commons divided by 54% to 46% in the first vote and by 55% to 45% in the second. It has rightly been pointed out that had the matter been decided solely on the votes of English MPs without the influence of Welsh, Scottish and Irish Non-Conformists, the Measure would have been seen safely home.⁴³ Even so, it very nearly got through; one good speech in its favour during the first Commons debate, and the subsequent history of English liturgy might have been very different.

3.9 Reasons for failure

In view of the narrowness of the Commons defeats and their peculiar circumstances, it is surely strange that anyone should seek to explain them in terms of anything other than Parliamentary arithmetic and the unpredictability of populist lobbying. It would be particularly perverse to attribute these narrow Parliamentary majorities to fundamental theological flaws in the Book, or to errors in the Church’s strategy in

presenting it. Yet that is exactly how the question is approached by the most respected authorities. Bishop Bell, Randall Davidson's biographer, gives four reasons for the Book's failure. The first three are plausible, to differing degrees: (i) the 'ancient fear of Rome', used powerfully and to great effect by the Book's opponents; (ii) the 'disunity of churchmen'; and (iii) the Archbishop's apparent unwillingness to give the necessary assurances that, once the Book was passed, discipline would be enforced in the Church. But fourthly:

the deepest reason for the failure was that the whole method was from the beginning wrong. The revision of Church services and the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline are different things. A revision of worship, of common prayer, which is intended from the start to be used as an instrument for stopping disobedience is at any rate not likely to produce the happiest results in the realm of worship! And side by side with this, the recommendation of the Royal Commission to consider the preparation of a new Ornaments Rubric 'with a view to its enactment by Parliament' — and to frame modifications in Church services 'with a view to their enactment by Parliament' — started all on a false track.⁴⁴

Jasper is yet more forthright; the 'first and foremost' reason for failure was:

the undeniable fact that the motives underlying the creation of the Book were hopelessly muddled. An exercise which began as an attempt to solve problems of discipline became confused with an attempt to meet pastoral and devotional needs no longer entirely satisfactorily met by 1662.⁴⁵

Gregory Dix follows the same line:

The Bishops had rashly wandered into a position where they could be represented as having produced a new and different rite as their answer to Parliament's instruction to observe the old one better.⁴⁶

These judgements are strange for three reasons. First of all, they forget the Royal Commission's recommendations which lay behind the Royal Letters of Business. The Commission accepted that discipline had broken down and should be restored; but it also accepted that one of the reasons for that breakdown was the narrowness of liturgical provision offered to clergy and congregations. The Royal Commission therefore recommended a widening and a revision of the liturgy precisely in order that proper discipline could be maintained. The brief was clear: to come up with something which could be enforced, and then to enforce it. Bell, Jasper and Dix see a great gulf between liturgical reform and ecclesiastical discipline; the Royal Commission, on the other hand, believed that the two were intimately connected, for one could hardly expect to maintain obedience to an unsatisfactory standard. It may well have been true, as Hensley Henson wrote, that 'the restoration of discipline and the revision of the

formularies were excellent objects, but in the actual circumstances of modern England not easily harmonised'⁴⁷ — but if so, then *all* the players in this sad drama were equally culpable: for the Church, the Royal Commission and Parliament were all agreed that a revision of the liturgy was a necessary prerequisite to a proper conformity of practice.

Secondly, though the Bishops no doubt *could* have been represented as 'having produced a new and different rite as their answer to Parliament's instruction to observe the old one better', they were not, in fact, so represented. On the basis of the Parliamentary debates and what was said by the Book's opponents, it is fair to suppose that a Book without the controversial canon and the troublesome provision for reservation would have sailed through without difficulty. In other words, as I have argued, it was the *content* of the liturgy, not the Church's desire for a new Prayer Book *per se*, which was at issue. Far from being 'hopelessly muddled', the motives underlying the creation of the new Book were as clear as such things ever are.

Finally, Bell's contention that 'the revision of Church services and the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline are different things' must be questioned. The two clearly have *not* been different things in the liturgical history of the Church of England. Bell may well be right to say that:

a revision of worship, of common prayer, which is intended from the start to be used as an instrument for stopping disobedience is at any rate not likely to produce the happiest results in the realm of worship!⁴⁸

But that is surely as true of 1662 as of 1928; and it will be recalled that the Prayer Book of 1662 was quite consciously and deliberately crafted to maintain order and peace, in other words, to provide discipline in the Church.

Any standard of discipline cuts both ways. It defines what is included, accepted, and comprehended, and at the same time defines what is excluded, rejected and left outside. What divided the Church from the Commons in 1927 and 1928 was the question of whether there could be any place in the Church of England for anglo-catholics. Archbishop Davidson saw this very clearly in early 1928:

My own thoughts turn to a time nearly 200 years ago, when the vagaries and excitements of Methodists irritated the Bishops and clergy so much that they made no real effort to prevent those enthusiasts from going off at a tangent and fashioning a new Church or Churches of their own . . . nearly every one now says — 'Surely if the Bishops at that time had taken a larger view, the splendid work which evangelists have done outside the Church for 150 years might have been done inside the Church, to the steadying of vagaries and the infusion of spiritual

life into the Church.' I want to ask Inskip [a staunch opponent of the Book] whether he thinks a similar criticism might be current in the year 2000, if he and his friends can get the Church authorities of today so to act as to force Anglo-Catholics of an advanced kind to form some kind of organisation of their own, and weld together men of intensest devotion, great pastoral effectiveness, and deep piety, whom the Church ought never to have lost.⁴⁹

The Church, in compiling the new Prayer Book, had showed a desire to include, if possible, the majority of catholics. Those fired by protestant rhetoric could see no place within the Church for catholic practice; therefore they felt the Book must be rejected.

It was, then, the Book's accommodation to catholic thinking — and particularly the new canon and the provision for reservation — which led to its downfall. These, quite apart from being the most contentious matters in public and Parliamentary debate surrounding the Book, had also been the focus of the greatest disagreement within the Church as the Book took shape. The disagreement shows itself as confusion when one attempts to plot the development of the canon; there is no tidy, linear progression of thought linking the prayer of 1662 with that of 1928. Paul Bradshaw, in his account of the development of early Christian liturgies, argues that scholars are all too eager to find tidy 'evolutionary' patterns; and the tendency which he deplores must equally be resisted in the study of the 1928 canon.⁵⁰

The process of revision was not at all a steady progression, nor could it be. It is not as if one rite were being slowly revised, each stage building upon the last in a linear fashion. Each new suggestion drew on a plethora of existing rites and ideas, including 1662, 1549, the Scottish rite, the Roman rite and others. Subsequent revisions were therefore like intertwining branches from many stumps, rather than points down the same evolving branch. Also, each stage of the revision process involved competing convictions: some people wanted some feature or other expressed in the liturgy, others wanted at all costs to avoid certain forms of words, and others again desired no deviation from 1662. As the balance of power of each party changed from House to House and committee to committee, then so, at different stages, different emphases were prominent, and temporarily victorious.

Furthermore, at several points during the period 1914–1920 the Convocations had the opportunity to accept a conservative revision of the canon along the lines of 1549 or the Scottish rite. The most important came after the 1919 Conference of members of the four Houses of Convocation, with its recommendations for a modestly rearranged 1662 prayer. This was accepted by all but the York Upper House. It was a minimal revision,

probably the best that could be hoped for at the time, and hardly controversial. Yet the failure of the northern bishops to support it meant that the new Church Assembly began its work without a clear lead from the Convocations. Had this modest rearrangement of 1662 material or the proposals to use 1549 or the Scottish rite not been rejected at an early stage, the Church might not have been left with an unpopular prayer which it was obliged to promote for want of anything else.

Notes

- 1 The Archbishop, in a letter to Members of Convocation and the House of Laymen in June 1906, quoted in Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.650.
- 2 Jasper, *Development*, p.89.
- 3 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.654.
- 4 *ibid*, p.654.
- 5 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1326.
- 6 Canterbury Convocation, Report 477 (1910).
- 7 Canterbury Convocation, Report 480 (1914).
- 8 Canterbury Convocation, Report 481 (1914).
- 9 Canterbury Convocation, Report 487 (1915).
- 10 Canterbury Convocation, Report 504 (1917).
- 11 Canterbury Convocation, Report 504A (1917).
- 12 Canterbury Convocation, Appendix to Report 504 (1918).
- 13 York Convocation, Report of the Committee on the Royal Letters of Business: No.277 (1912).
- 14 Canterbury Convocation, Report 529 (1920).
- 15 Canterbury Convocation, 'Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer as approved by the Convocation of Canterbury', Report 533 (1920).
- 16 *cf* 1549 and the first proposals of the Lower House of Canterbury.
- 17 CA, House of Bishops, Notes of an interview with the Conference Committee of the House of Clergy held on Thursday 14 January 1926 at 2.30pm (CERC CAA/1922/1/II/B5 Documents and Notices).
- 18 Jasper, *Development*, p.117.
- 19 quoted in Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.805.
- 20 Resolution 6 of Report CA 169 (Laity).
- 21 Report CA 158 (Clergy).
- 22 Jasper, *Development*, p.126.
- 23 The only 1662 service not contained in the Deposited Book is *The Visitation of the Sick*, and even here the bulk of the 1662 service is included in the 1928 order.
- 24 There are other enrichments and additions which lie beyond the scope of this study: orders for Prime and Compline, a Devotion before the celebration of the eucharist, propers for lesser feasts and the common of saints, a summary of the teaching of Christ, and new services of baptism and confirmation. There is also a new calendar and lectionary for the daily Office.
- 25 Three striking changes to the Marriage service are an exception to this. Marital intimacy is spoken of more positively in 1928 than in 1662; the vows made by groom and bride are symmetrical, avoiding the promise of obedience on the part of the bride; and the final prayer also dispenses with obedience. These alterations reflect a changed institution in which sex as understood as a blessing in need of guidance rather than a curse to be endured and contained, and in which there is a sense of equality between the sexes.
- 26 *The Worship of the Church*, p.20.

- 27 *ibid*, p.24.
- 28 *Report by the Ecclesiastical Committee upon the Prayer Book Measure.*
- 29 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1342.
- 30 *ibid*, p.1343.
- 31 *ibid*, p.1344.
- 32 *Parliamentary Debates* (211 H.C. Deb. 5 S.), p.2531.
- 33 *ibid*, p.2542.
- 34 *ibid*, p.2543.
- 35 *ibid*, pp.2650f.
- 36 quoted in Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1345.
- 37 *ibid*, p.1346.
- 38 According to Bell (*Randall Davidson*, p.1346, note 1) there is some confusion as to the exact number of those voting against. Reports range between 230 and 247, but the figure of 238 seems most likely.
- 39 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1347.
- 40 *ibid*, p.1347.
- 41 Henson, *The Book and the Vote*, p.xii.
- 42 *Chronicle Convoc.*, 66, 1928, pp.30-79.
- 43 Henson, *The Book and the Vote*, p.xii-xvi; Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1347.
- 44 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, pp.1357f.
- 45 Jasper, *Development*, pp.127f.
- 46 Dix, *Shape*, p.699.
- 47 Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, p.152 (quoted in Jasper, *Development*, p.128).
- 48 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1357.
- 49 Archbishop's Memorandum, Epiphany 1928, in Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1355.
- 50 Paul Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*.

4

THE PRAYER BOOK TRADITION SINCE 1928

We to-day may perhaps feel that the hand of Providence was in the policy of delay. Time was needed for passions to cool, for the new theological climate to form itself.

*Liturgical Commission*¹

4.1 Dealing with defeat

The first Parliamentary defeat of the Deposited Book came as a severe shock to many in the Church. In May 1927, the editor of *Theology* had been confident of success:

By decisive majorities the Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York have now endorsed the new Prayer Book, and there is every reason to suppose it will become law before the year is out. The assent of the House of Laity would seem assured . . . while Parliament is unlikely to forget that the book is a reply to Letters of Business issued by the Crown.²

This premature optimism was followed in January 1928 by the complaint that 'the character of the debate, in such sharp contrast with the dignity and thoroughness of that in the House of Lords, showed once and for all how ill-adapted are the Commons for handling matters of this kind'.³

The second Parliamentary defeat decisively killed off all hope of obtaining legal sanction for the new Book. The Church could not credibly revise its Book yet again, nor could the bishops expect support from the Church if they tried to do so; the introduction of even modest alterations after the first defeat had been difficult enough to carry in the Convocations. And there was no guarantee that further changes would win over opponents in the Commons. The second Commons majority had been larger than the first *despite* the concessions, which was hardly encouraging. The gulf between the Church and its most vociferous opponents was simply too great, as the evidence of Sir Thomas Inskip MP to the Church and State Commission in 1935 showed:

I think Parliament was prepared to go a long way in encouraging the Church in its effort to find some sort of lawful authority. I think it broke down on this question of the Reservation of the Sacrament. I told the Archbishop of Canterbury (Lord Davidson) that if Reservation were left out, whatever members of the House of Commons as individuals might think about a great many things in the Deposited Book, they would be prepared to accept the new Book . . . [if] all Evangelicals — people in my position — could be satisfied as to how the Anglo-Catholics were going to treat the limits of Reservation, I do not think there would be any doubt that Parliament would give its assent.⁴

Yet the problem remained. The state, through a Royal Commission, had identified a need for change; the Church had obediently responded; now the state had rejected that response. And yet the Church could not simply forget its project. A great deal had been invested in the Deposited Book; it had taken a long time to produce; it had achieved a very strong measure of support within the Church; and the Church had done all it reasonably could to meet the objections made during the first Commons debate. Furthermore, the uncontentious parts of the book were overwhelmingly popular (in this, the modest approach to revision had been a distinct advantage); the new forms of morning and evening prayer, most of the changes to the eucharist, and the new marriage and funeral services seemed to be exactly what people wanted.⁵ But these were all condemned along with reservation, prayer for the dead and the new canon. Finally, what was the Church to do liturgically? No less than a Royal Commission had declared the 1662 Prayer Book insufficiently flexible for the contemporary church; and the new Prayer Book still represented the Church's best hope for a workable, acceptable liturgy. The bishops were therefore obliged to respond quickly and coherently to Parliament's action.

At a meeting of the Church Assembly on 2 July 1928, just 18 days after the second Commons vote, the Archbishop of Canterbury formally reported the Parliamentary result. He said that this was a grave occasion in the history of the Church; indeed, the Commons vote might well 'have a prominent place hereafter in the history of the Church and people of England'. He deplored the vote and considered it to have been 'gravely mistaken'. The House of Commons had not, of course, acted illegally; their action was perhaps even understandable, for MPs may genuinely have thought that they were giving a voice to 'the real underlying wish of a majority of Church folk in England'. But nevertheless, their action had been unwise:

The House of Commons in thus exercising its unquestionably legal power departed, lamentably as it seems to me, from the reasonable spirit in which alone the balanced relationship of Church and State in England can be satisfactorily and harmoniously carried on. While claiming to appraise what can be called Church

opinion, it deliberately traversed the declared desire of the Church's official and representative bodies — Bishops, Clergy, and Laity. It declined to respect the wishes of the solid central body of Church opinion duly expressed and recorded both centrally and locally throughout the land, and allowed itself, on the contrary, to be influenced by the representations of the strange combination of vehement opposite groups or factions of Churchmen united only in their resolve to get the Measure and the Book defeated.⁶

This is an intriguing argument, suggesting as it does that the Royal Supremacy over the Church, expressed through Parliament, should not in practice be exercised. Davidson claimed that the Commons vote could only be justified if the House was expressing the otherwise unheeded voice of the laity. But since Members of Parliament had been heavily influenced by vociferous individuals and pressure groups, they had failed to weigh the mind of the whole laity with proper care. The Church, on the other hand, had gone to great lengths to ascertain the views of its lay people, both through the National Assembly and by consultation in the dioceses, where clergy and lay people had endorsed the new Book by a majority of four to one.⁷ Indeed, the Church's deliberations had given a voice to many people who would never think of lobbying Parliament or writing to their MP.

The Archbishop stressed the seriousness of the Church's position in the wake of the second Commons defeat. It was important that the Church should receive a clear lead from the bishops, and in what he had to say next, the Archbishop was glad to be able to speak with the unanimous agreement of the bench:

It is a fundamental principle that the Church — that is, the Bishops together with the Clergy and Laity — must, in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its Faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its forms of worship.

I venture to believe that no one can challenge that principle as a principle however loyal he be to the true relation which that principle bears in a Christian land . . . to the recognised constitutional rights of the State or nation . . .⁸

Dix felt that this was 'the bravest thing on the subject which had been said by English bishops since 1559'.⁹ The statement claimed for the Church an inherent right to order its faith and liturgy for itself, even in a 'Christian land'; and calmly accepted that loyalty to Christ and to the nation might sometimes, as in the present case, be opposed.

The Archbishop then turned from matters of principle to the question of what, specifically, was to be done. First of all, the Church must appreciate that the problems which had led to the production of a new Prayer Book remained:

The new Book had it passed into law would, by providing law where there is none, have strengthened the hands of the bishops and enabled orderliness to be restored. Parliament has refused us that help. But the situation which we had hoped to remedy remains. It is admittedly impossible to require exact conformity with the existing Book of 1662. The Royal Commission in 1906 declared that the law of public worship in the Church of England was too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. It is even more plainly too narrow now . . .

In July 1929 the bishops further clarified their position, this time making much more explicit their acceptance of 1928 as a practical, usable standard:

. . . during the present emergency and until further order be taken the Bishops, having in view the fact that the Convocations of Canterbury and York gave their consent to the proposals for deviations from and additions to the Book of 1662, as set forth in the Book of 1928, being laid before the National Assembly of the Church of England for Final Approval, and that the National Assembly voted Final Approval to these proposals, cannot regard as inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England the use of such additions or deviations as fall within the limits of these proposals . . . that accordingly the Bishops, in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion, which belongs to each Bishop in his own Diocese, will be guided by the proposals set forth in the Book of 1928, and will endeavour to ensure that the practices which are consistent neither with the Book of 1662 nor with the Book of 1928 shall cease.¹⁰

Again Dix comments favourably:

In other words, the bishops quietly claimed that by their own action they could reverse the repeated decision of Parliament, and do precisely what they would have done if Parliament had passed the Book. The bishops have hardly been given credit for the courage this required . . . However, Parliament soon discovered that it had no means of calling their bluff short of disestablishment, which it was not prepared to face, any more than were the bishops.¹¹

With the bishops' blessing, 1928 material therefore came into use alongside and within the familiar 1662 services: with the exception of the alternative canon,¹² the 1928 Book exercised a profound influence on the worship of the Church of England until 'further order' was taken in 1966.¹³

4.2 Publication and printing

The new Prayer Book was published and sold in large numbers, not as an independent commercial venture, but with the consent and cooperation of the Church. It might fairly be argued that participation in this act of large-scale publication was quite the most effective statement of their intentions which the bishops could make. Publication arrangements had of course been made before the first Parliamentary debate, in

anticipation of victory. Following the second defeat, there was initially some doubt as to the legality of publishing a Prayer Book lacking Parliamentary approval and the Royal Assent;¹⁴ but by September 1928 the bishops asked the Central Board of Finance to make arrangements with the Privileged Presses to publish the new Book.¹⁵

A committee of the CBF, the *Prayer Book Copyright Committee*, was established to oversee arrangements for the publication of the Book, and an agreement was soon reached between the Central Board of Finance and the Privileged Presses — Oxford University Press (OUP), Cambridge University Press (CUP), and Eyre and Spottiswoode (E&S) — for publication, printing and distribution of the Book. The Book was printed and bound in a wide variety of editions, enough to fill seventeen pages of the OUP trade catalogue for 1930. OUP sold the Book in five sizes, from a small congregational edition to the Altar Service Book. In each size, copies were available in a variety of bindings and colours, on dry paper or India paper, with or without illustrations, round corners, gilt edges, and hymns (some editions bound with *Ancient and Modern*, others with *The English Hymnal*). The CUP catalogue for 1938 shows a similar range. By 1956, the CUP catalogue was offering a much more limited choice of bindings, though the listing still runs to eight pages and covers most of the sizes published in the 1930s.

Sales figures are not readily available. Nevertheless, much can be gathered from the figures for print-runs.¹⁶ Extracts from OUP’s printing ledger show a steady demand for the new Book, especially in the early years:

Ordered	Number	Paper	When Ready & Remarks
7 Oct 1927	150,000 20,000	Dry India	<i>Cancelled</i>
12 Oct 1928	50,000 5,000	Dry India	15 Nov 1928
31 Oct 1933	10,000	Dry	3 Feb 1934
3 Feb 1935	8,000	Dry	<i>purchased from E&S</i>
31 Jan 1936	25,000	Dry	<i>purchased from CUP</i>
4 Nov 1953	25,870	Dry	20 Mar 1954
5 Jul 1956	25,460	Dry	13 Apr 1957
20 Dec 1960	25,000	Dry	

A total of 174,000 copies in Ruby 32mo were produced under the Oxford imprint.¹⁷ Together with other sizes, but excluding Altar Books, 306,000 copies were produced by OUP altogether. The interpretation of the Cambridge figures is more difficult, but I estimate that CUP account for a further 250,000 copies.¹⁸ Figures for Eyre and Spottiswoode are not available, but assuming a comparable figure, the number of 1928 Prayer Books printed for private and congregational use was well over half a million and may have been three-quarters of a million. This is far fewer than the number of churchgoers, but still a very substantial market, especially in view of the fact that for simple *enrichment* of 1662 services, there was no need to provide a copy for each worshipper; one copy of 1928 in each Church would suffice. Furthermore the presses were printing individual services and other portions of the Book as separate pamphlets and cards, including the offices, the eucharist, the occasional offices, compline and prime. The cheapest small Prayer Book cost 1/6d (7.5p); a booklet containing morning and evening prayer cost only 2d (just under 1p). Parishes could buy a hundred copies of the confirmation service for only 2/- (10p). There was no need, then, for every parish to invest in, say, two hundred new Prayer Books; one full copy for the clergy and pamphlets for the congregation would do.

I suggest that the number of **Altar Books** printed gives a better indication of the extent to which the Book was used. The first edition to go on sale was printed in Oxford: 7,500 copies were produced in 1930 and a further 3,240 copies between 1952 and 1961. An edition was printed at Cambridge in 1931 with an initial run of 750 copies and a further 4,400 copies later. Finally, 3,090 copies of a *Super Royal 8vo Red* edition were printed at Oxford between 1937 and 1956. In all, then, some 19,000 altar service books were produced, more than enough to ensure a copy was placed on the altar of every parish church in England.

An unfortunate feature of the 'standard' (congregational) edition of the Book was that the Epistles and Gospels for the Lesser Feasts and Fasts were not printed in full, but only referenced. In a letter to the Prayer Book Copyright Committee, the Bishop of Gloucester urged that the Altar Book, at least, should be a complete volume.

I cannot but think that it is very important that a proper Altar Book containing the two Communion Offices and all the Epistles and Gospels, both for the Red Letter days and those contained in the Appendix, should be published as soon as possible . . . [because] in a great many of the Churches they have all sorts of unauthorised Altar Books, often practically containing little else than the Roman Mass, and a great many unauthorised Collects, Epistles and Gospels.

One of the purposes of the new revision was to provide us with a suitable book which we could tell our Clergy to use, and would then enable us to ask them to dispense with these unauthorised books. Until there is something we can put in their place we are not able to go forward.¹⁹

We note in passing the irony of the complaint about 'unauthorised' altar books — as if the 1928 Book was not also 'unauthorised'! But the Bishop's request was heeded: the Cambridge altar editions, first printed in 1931, contained the full text of readings for all occasions, as did the desk editions published by OUP and CUP.

In short, the 1928 Prayer Book was produced in significant numbers for private and congregational use, and in sufficient quantities for use at every prayer desk and altar. It was printed in a usable, complete and practical form. It was also carefully and well made. No doubt this went a long way to encouraging its use. In the eyes of many clergy and churchgoers, service books, particularly altar books, have the character of sacred books; as such they must possess a certain beauty and dignity. The 1928 Prayer Book fulfilled this need admirably. The printer Stanley Morison wrote of an OUP altar edition that 'the whole book is a highly satisfactory production'.²⁰

But none of this could be admitted by the publishers. All printed editions of the Book contained a warning on the title page that 'the publication of this Book does not directly or indirectly imply that it can be regarded as authorized for use in churches'. In their 1930 catalogue OUP offered an ingenious, if apologetic, justification for listing the Book: 'for personal use and as a work of liturgical interest and importance, the demand for the Book is a considerable and growing one'. The catalogue also contained assurances that 'the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, the demand for which will of course persist, will continue to be printed and supplied in the numerous editions and bindings with which the trade is familiar'.

Despite these disclaimers, no-one could seriously suppose that this book was offered purely for private devotion and scholarly research. One scarcely buys a prayer book bound with hymns, or an altar edition, for 'personal use' or 'liturgical importance'. Perhaps some altar books were used in private chapels beyond the reach of the Act of Uniformity, but it would be astonishing to find 19,000 of them! And while one can well imagine libraries and liturgists buying the new Book, it would be a remarkable nation which could boast three-quarters of a million students of liturgy. There can be no doubt that this Book was published and bought *for use*, on a very considerable scale and with the full knowledge and cooperation of the Church at all levels.

Two further points remain to be made. Firstly, the Central Board of Finance benefited financially from the publication of the Book. Royalties from 1929 to 1935 amounted to over £1700. The steady and continuing demand for the Book can be seen in the pattern of royalties over these seven years:

1929	£152
1930	£365
1931	£267
1932	£233
1933	£133
1934	£303
1935	£311

Secondly, a curious situation arose upon the death of King George V in 1936. On the accession of a new sovereign, directions are given for the alteration of the Royal Prayers in the Book of Common Prayer. It was not until the accession of King Edward VIII that any thought was given to the question as to how the new Book might be affected by a change of monarch. The Copyright Committee, in its meeting of 4 March 1936, resolved that ‘in accordance with the ruling of the House of Bishops that the 1928 Prayer Book should be printed as a deed and a document, the Royal Prayers be not altered . . .’²¹ Because of this decision, the Royal Prayers in the Book have remained as they were in 1928, regardless of when the Book has been reprinted. Through three subsequent reigns, users of the Book have had to substitute mentally the names of Edward VIII, George VI and Elizabeth II for George V.²²

4.3 Reactions to the 1928 Prayer Book

John Fenwick and Bryan Spinks, writing in 1995, dismiss the 1928 Prayer Book as ‘this tragic book’ in which ‘most of the energies . . . went into ideas of consecration with an epiclesis, and reservation of the blessed sacrament, which might rightly be regarded as the dregs of liturgical activity’.²³ Such comments could only be made with experience of the much bolder and broader-based liturgical writing which characterised the 1960s and 1970s. In its own time, however, the 1928 Book was taken much more seriously than these comments might suggest, by supporters and opponents alike.

'Theology'

The editorial in the journal *Theology* for May 1927, expressing confidence that the new Prayer Book would soon be legally sanctioned for use, also offered some reflections on the new Prayer of Consecration.²⁴ Despite the editor's misgivings about the 'eastern' character of the prayer, he praised it as 'more full, more explicitly catholic, and more thorough than the old'. The anamnesis clearly made a memorial before God, and the inclusion of an oblation within the canon 'gathers into the one action the complex meanings and impulses of Christian sacrifice'. Even the invocation, despite doubts about its place and its form, witnessed to an objective consecration. Yet the invocation was not quite an eastern 'consecration formula', but rather an allusion to the work of the Holy Spirit, 'co-operating with the Father in the whole action of consecration and communion'. In this the new prayer was akin to that of 1549, in which both Spirit and Word could be understood to effect consecration, which was therefore 'not an act but an action, not a moment but a process'.

Theology welcomed the new canon with its unmistakable sense of eucharistic offering and stronger expression of eucharistic presence. The positive tone of the editorial can be explained in part by the expectation that the new prayer would very soon be a legal alternative to 1662, indeed the *only* such alternative; catholics therefore had good reason to look kindly on it and to make the best of it, despite its weaknesses.

F.E. Brightman

The July 1927 edition of *Church Quarterly Review* carried a savage and entertaining attack from the pen of Brightman.²⁵ He wrote with learning, wit, and a complete lack of mercy for the Book's shortcomings.

By no means everything new was condemned; by and large, those things which restored the catholic tradition were welcomed, and some of the new prayers were praised as models of good writing.²⁶ But taken as a whole, Brightman's article was rightly seen as a damaging attack on the new Book. His first target was the Book's workmanship. His much-quoted opinion of the Book gives a fair flavour of his critique: 'on almost every page of it I find something irritating, something inexact or untidy or superfluous or ill-considered or unreal'. In the daily office, for instance, 'the only virtue I can find in the new introduction [to the confession] is that it enables one better to appreciate the quality of the old, in spite of its defects'.

Brightman was also critical of the Book's Preface,²⁷ particularly its careless claim that a new prayer book was needed to keep abreast of social and linguistic changes since 1662. Brightman noted that these problems could equally well have been met by issuing a supplement of new prayers and by gently modernizing the language of the Prayer Book. Certainly no credible case had been made for a whole new book, for:

the vastly greater part of any service book is concerned with what is permanent and unchanging in the life of the Church. And — although the preoccupation with "ancient liturgies" which has been complained of has left no very large impression on the new book . . . if it is still relevant to appeal to this order of 1500 years and more ago, it is scarcely plausible to claim that the mere passage of time has antiquated the Book of 1662.

In any case, the compilers of the new Book had shown neither consistency nor competence in the tasks they claimed to have undertaken. As far as language was concerned, Brightman could find only three significant changes: "impartial" for "indifferent", "living" for "lively", and "sinful" for "carnal". In the meantime, many words which ought to have been changed had been left bearing an obsolete sense, for example, "truly" (for "honestly"), "reasonable", "convenient".

Brightman was equally uncomplimentary about the new prayers. The occasional prayers were inferior 'in strength, in variety, in quality of expression, to the older prayers with which they are mixed up'. Some new collects were welcomed as an improvement on 1662, but others were far less satisfactory. The first collect for a *Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Communion* was theologically careless, for in it:

we are said to receive the Holy Sacrament "by faith": but assuredly it is the *res sacramenti* that we receive "by faith": the *sacramentum* we receive with our hands and our mouths: "in faith", if you will, but not "by faith".

But worst of all was the new collect for the feast of a *Matron*, 'which must go along with the prayer "O Lord, support us": all that can be said of either of them is that they make one shudder'.

These criticisms come as no surprise. I have argued that the main concern of the revisers was neither the modernisation of language nor the accommodation of the content of prayers to twentieth century life; regardless of what may have been said in the Book's preface, the pressures for these changes went largely unheeded. Much more significant was the desire to strengthen the liturgical expression of catholic anglicanism, especially in the eucharistic rite, and to enrich the bare seasonal provision

of 1662. The 1928 Preface tacitly admits the catholicising tendency in its appeal to 'the godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers', and in the way it seeks to allay suspicions: 'if the minds of any be troubled because we have allowed another Order of Holy Communion . . . let them not think that we mean thereby any change of doctrine'.

Brightman was right to conclude that 'the lapse of time accounts for very little of the contents of the new book . . . [it] is really a criticism on the [1662] Book as it stands and an attempt to remedy defects inherent in it . . .' These defects inevitably related to the canon. Brightman devoted fully a quarter of his article to this, which he clearly regarded as the most important liturgical innovation of the 1928 Book.

The new Canon marks a tardy attempt to retrieve the losses of 1552 . . . and at last to make here in England the recovery which elsewhere was begun by the Scottish Book of 1637. But the result is unsatisfactory to many people, and I venture to reckon myself in the number . . . this Canon is a departure, and it seems to me a gratuitous departure from our tradition, containing as it does an Invocation of the Holy Ghost following after "the recital of the Institution". The Bishop of Gloucester tells us . . . that "in every essential point our new Consecration Prayer belongs to the Eastern type" . . . I have of course no less reverence for the tradition of the East than for that of the West; but I do not think there is anything to be gained by this sort of uniformity, but rather the contrary; and I can see no sufficient reason for orientalizing at the cost of abandoning what has been our tradition ever since the days of S Augustine, except for a time within the area covered by the Celtic mission; while everything that is significant in what is Eastern can be, and has been, secured without departing from the Western Tradition.

Those who welcomed the eastern emphasis in the new canon forgot that the western eucharistic tradition was no less clear about the action of the Holy Spirit in consecration. In the west the Spirit's work was implicitly understood to be intimately connected with the recital of our Lord's words at the Supper. It was wrong to think that an explicit epiclesis was a necessary part of the canon, for to say:

that consecration is "by the power of the Holy Ghost" is no mere orientalism; it is just catholic and orthodox, and is necessarily implied in any Catholic prayer of consecration, if it be true that whatsoever the Father does, He does through the Son and in the Holy Ghost, if, that is, the Holy Trinity is One God.

There were other ways to make explicit reference to the work of the Spirit, should that be thought desirable. In particular the canon of 1549 provided fine Anglican precedent:

Heare us (o merciful father) we besech thee; and *with thy holy spirite and worde,* vouchsafe to bl~~e~~esse and sanc~~t~~ifie these thy giftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe. [my italics]

The adoption of 1549 would also leave the Church firmly within the western tradition. The 1928 proposal left the Church open to the unfortunate charge that it denied the importance of the institution narrative, and thereby cast doubt on the validity of the western eucharistic tradition.

W.K. Lowther Clarke

When Lowther Clarke wrote in 1943, he had been using the Book for some 15 years.²⁸ He admitted to being critical, but had ‘no desire to depreciate the 1928 Book as a whole. I habitually use most of it, except for the Alternative Canon, and gratefully acknowledge its superiority to 1662 in most respects’; indeed he had also used the new canon, until his parishioners asked to return to 1662.

Many of Lowther Clarke’s concerns echo those of Brightman. He concurred with Brightman’s comments on the epiclesis:

had there been no centuries-old English tradition the new Canon might have been accepted without controversy, on the part of one side at least; as things were, in the troubled ecclesiastical atmosphere of 1927-28, it was bound to create suspicion . . . either [the elements] are already consecrated, in which case we ask what further sanctification is possible; or, if they are not consecrated, then the House of Bishops of the Church of England taught that the Church’s practice since 1552, of regarding the Consecration as effected by the recital of the words ‘This is my body, etc.’, had been mistaken . . .²⁹

However, the 1928 canon also represented some definite gains over 1662, particularly in the anamnesis, which now made an explicit offering before God: ‘every historically minded Churchman will receive [the anamnesis] with gratitude. “These thy holy gifts” comes from 1549, where it refers to the consecrated Elements . . .’³⁰ In defence of the 1928 anamnesis, he compared the new wording with the equivalent passage from the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus.³¹ Surely, he said, a simple expansion of a third century canon was not ‘unsuitable for an alternative liturgy in the Church of England’:

Hippolytus (trans: WKLC)

Being mindful then
of his death

and resurrection

we offer to thee

1928

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father,
we thy humble servants,
having in remembrance
the precious death and passion
of thy dear Son,
his mighty resurrection and
glorious ascension,
according to his holy institution,
do celebrate,
and set forth before thy Divine Majesty

the bread and the cup,

giving thanks to thee
that thou hast deemed us worthy
to stand before thee
and act as priest unto thee.³²

with these thy holy gifts,
the memorial which he hath willed
us to make,
rendering unto thee most hearty thanks
for the innumerable benefits
which he hath procured for us.

But 1928 suffered from other shortcomings. The preface was not well-written, and would disappoint readers with literary taste. It was disconcerting to find the first rubric of the eucharist altered to read: 'It is convenient that so many as intend to be partakers of the Holy Communion should signify their names to the Curate'. This use of the word "convenient" in its old sense of "fitting" was unfortunate; 'it would be most inconvenient, in the modern sense, to put the rubric into practice'.

In the concluding chapter of his book, Lowther Clarke returned to the subject of the epiclesis in order to suggest a way forward 'when the matter comes up for discussion again'. His words are quoted here for their contemporary interest:

We are forced to the conclusion that the intention [in 1928] was to produce a Canon which theoretically might have been better than any of those previously proposed, but for which public opinion was not prepared . . . it seemed as if an attempt was being made to alter the traditional teaching, both before and after the Reformation, of the moment of Consecration . . .

There seem to be two ways out of the *impasse*.

(a) The first of the alternatives submitted by the House of Clergy may be adopted. This, which involves returning to 1549, was Dr Brightman's solution . . .

(b) The other solution would be to tone down any *Epiclesis* following the *Anamnesis*, so as to make it little more than a prayer for worthy reception . . .

The first of these solutions was effectively adopted in the eucharistic prayers of the ASB (though not in their antecedents in Series 1, Series 2, and the first draft of Series 3). However, the new eucharistic prayers proposed in 1996 (and the early versions of them in the draft report *Patterns for Worship*) generally adopted the second idea.³³

'The Shorter Prayer Book'

In 1948 *The Shorter Prayer Book* was published by the bishops alone without reference to the Convocations or the Church Assembly, a somewhat tactless act which attracted criticism from members of both bodies.³⁴ The *Shorter Prayer Book* is of interest, however, as a relatively early judgement on 1928 from within the episcopate. The preface introduced the book as a response to a widely-felt demand:

... for a shortened and simplified version of the Book of Common Prayer, so arranged as to make it easy for people in church to find their places and take their part in the Services. It contains, therefore only those parts of the Book of Common Prayer which are most often required. To these have been added some extracts from the Deposited Book of 1928 which are in frequent use. The only new material consists of an explanatory Preface on the Christian Year, the re-wording of some Rubrics and the giving of references and directions designed to make the Services easier to follow.³⁵

The changes to the eucharist largely followed those of 1928, the main exception being the canon, which was straightforward 1662. However in places the *Shorter Prayer Book* went beyond the variations proposed in 1928:

- 1) The Decalogue could be abbreviated, by omitting substantial parts of six of the commandments (or, as in 1928, it might be omitted and the Kyries or Summary of the Law said in its place);
- 2) A hymn might be sung during the collection of alms;
- 3) The congregation were encouraged to say the confession with the priest.³⁶

At the Intercession, both the 1662 and 1928 forms were printed side-by-side in parallel columns, so that either form could be used as occasion required; and with *both* forms, the words 'militant here in earth' at the end of the introduction could be omitted, and the rubric 'here the Priest on occasion may request thanksgiving or intercession for a special purpose' applied equally to both. At the end of the rite was printed a short exhortation based on the second half of the first exhortation of 1662.³⁷ As in the 1928 Book, proper prefaces were placed in an appendix. To keep the book as short as possible, the eucharistic readings were referenced rather than printed in full, though a full psalter was included at the back. The marriage and burial services were those of 1928, though in the marriage rite some 1662 prayers were printed in parallel with their 1928 versions. There was no order for the communion of the sick.

What is striking about the *Shorter Prayer Book* is its simplicity. Instead of two versions of each service — the 1662 form and the 1928 'alternative' marked with heavy black lines — each service was printed in just one form. Many services were in their 1928 version with some 1662 prayers printed as alternatives. The *Shorter Prayer Book* tacitly vindicated the Deposited Book, with the exception (once again) of the canon and provision for reservation.

Modern commentators

Jasper, though disappointed with the limited nature of the 1928 reforms, nonetheless acknowledged the pastoral value of the new services, which 'gained increasing acceptance and their use became widespread', particularly the occasional offices.³⁸

Jasper and Bradshaw, in their *Companion to the ASB* (1986), described the 1928 canon more generously than many earlier commentators, claiming that the prayer 'had the support of many liturgical scholars, since it was in line with the general structure of early eucharistic prayers', though conceding that 'it was unacceptable to many on doctrinal grounds'.³⁹

Geoffrey Cuming's *A History of Anglican Liturgy* gives a descriptive account of the revision process and of the content of the 1928 Book, but offers little by way of critical appraisal beyond noting that the canon 'was a compromise that pleased nobody'⁴⁰ and that, in respect of the propers for the lesser feasts and fasts, 'the literary taste of the bishops (to whom this section is largely due) has not escaped criticism'.⁴¹

In summary

The 1928 Prayer Book betrayed much careless drafting, brutally exposed by Brightman and others. Its canon departed from the English tradition to an unacceptable degree. Yet much of the Book was widely used throughout the Church of England and welcomed by commentators from the very beginning. The Liturgical Commission prepared an estimate of the extent to which the 1928 Book was being used in the Church of England for its submission to the Lambeth Conference of 1958.⁴² According to the Commission's memorandum, the most widely used parts of the Book were:

Seasonal Sentences at Matins and Evensong.
 Proper Psalms for Sundays and Holy Days.
 Many of the Occasional Prayers.
 Shortening of the Litany.
 Two 'Commandments of the Gospel' or *Kyries*.
 Additional Proper Prefaces.
 Occasional Offices (in whole or in part).
 Orders for Confirmation and for the Visitation of the Sick.
 Order for Compline.
 Propers for Black Letter Saints' Days, etc.
 (though not, we hope, the Collect of Matrons!)⁴³

The canon was but seldom used, because the bishops had forbidden its use 'except with their express permission'. It had not, therefore, been given a fair trial in this

country, though it had been 'quite widely used overseas'. Finally 'we must beware of identifying popularity of use with intrinsic excellence. Many priests use the 1928 alternatives, not because they think them entirely satisfactory, but because they seem to offer the only alternative in present circumstances to 1662'.⁴⁴

4.4 The revision of Canon Law

The bishops' action in 1928 and 1929 to allow the use of 1928 material by 'the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion, which belongs to each Bishop in his own Diocese' raised the pressing question: just what kind of 'discretion' *did* the bishops truly possess? For Dix this was an innovation:

... it would be interesting to discover the source in English law of this 'legal discretion' of a bishop to set aside the force of a parliamentary statute 'in his own diocese' or anywhere else. Nothing had been heard of it by the Royal Commission of 1906 or by anyone else before 1929.⁴⁵

Parliament may have chosen to ignore the challenge posed by the bishops' startling claim, but the question could hardly be ignored by the Church and State Commission (1930–1935). The Commission's Report was therefore directly concerned with 'The Prayer Book Measure 1927, to the rejection of which our appointment as a Commission was no doubt directly due'.⁴⁶ The Commission's first legislative proposal was that any Measure of the Church Assembly which related substantially to the *spiritual* concerns of the Church (doctrine or worship) should not be subject to Parliamentary debate or veto, provided that certain conditions were met.⁴⁷ A further, related, proposal was that the Canon Law should be revised.

In 1939, a commission was duly appointed to consider a revision of Canon Law. Its Report, published in 1947, suggested a new canon to define what was meant by 'lawful authority' in the sphere of worship.⁴⁸ The importance of this phrase arises from the Declaration of Assent made by clergy at their ordination and upon assuming a new appointment. The Declaration then went as follows:

I, AB, do solemnly make the following declaration: I assent to the 39 Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer and of Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons; I believe the doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God, and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.⁴⁹

That is to say, clergy could only use the services in the Prayer Book, except for those allowed 'by lawful authority'. The structure of the new canons followed the same logic. Canon 12 enjoined conformity to the Book of Common Prayer 'except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority'. Canon 13 defined the limits of that exception:

- a) services enjoined or authorized by Royal Warrant or Proclamation;
- b) changes in the Prayer Book required or sanctioned by acts of Parliament (for example, the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act 1872, etc);
- c) deviations from Prayer Book forms sanctioned by the Convocations, provided that these were faithful to the doctrine of the Church of England;
- d) forms of service for which the Prayer Book makes no provision, sanctioned by the Ordinary (and likewise faithful to the doctrine of the Church of England).

Following a further Church and State Commission set up by the Church Assembly under Sir Walter Moberly in 1952,⁵⁰ a revised draft of the proposed canons was published in 1954.⁵¹ This time, Canon 13 was more closely drawn: it defined the precise manner in which the Convocations could sanction changes to the Prayer Book, and gave a role to the House of Laity. A two-thirds majority in each House of Convocation and in the House of Laity would be required to authorize new material, and then only for a period of seven years; this period could be renewed once, by a further majority of two-thirds in each House of Convocation and the House of Laity. The new draft canon also gave a measure of discretion to the clergy: the minister would be free to make 'minor and unimportant variations' provided that they were 'seemly, reverent and faithful to the doctrine of the Church of England'.

Addressing the Church Assembly in 1958, the Archbishop explained that:

[this Canon] is designed to deliver the Church and the Clergy from a grave moral perplexity. At present the strict legal interpretation of 'lawful authority' in the conduct of the Church's public worship is . . . uncertain and unworkable . . . the purpose of Canon Law Revision is to provide the Church with a workable and authoritative set of rules which can be always kept up to date for the guidance and control of Bishops, Clergy and other Church officers . . .⁵²

The Archbishop wished it clearly understood that the new canon did not seek to alter or amend in any way the doctrine of the Church, nor the place of the Book of Common Prayer, which was guaranteed under Canon 12.

The proposed Canon 13 allowed three distinct kinds of departure from Prayer Book use. Firstly, there were the variations in the prescribed words and rubrics of the Prayer Book services themselves; and:

for guidance therein we are looking to the Liturgical Commission, whose function it is to provide constructive proposals from time to time to meet liturgical and devotional needs . . . it will in due course propose to the Convocations its first schedule of variations to be considered for authorization . . . But *all* of these variations will be experimental and temporary . . .

It was clear that such a schedule of proposals would have to be ready before Canon 13 took effect, or the Church would once again be (impossibly) bound by the letter of 1662. Secondly, there was the permission for individual clergy to make 'minor and unimportant variations'. Thirdly, there were occasions on which services were needed for which the Prayer Book made no provision; the new canon gave the requisite freedom, in a careful balance between individual clergy, the Bishop and the Convocations, for proper provision to be made.

4.5 Series 1

With these new freedoms the Church was able to move forward in liturgical experiment, at first tentatively and later more confidently. Unsurprisingly, the first series of alternative services gave legal authority to alterations already in use. The introduction to Series 1 explained that 'the forms of service here presented . . . embody variants from the Book of Common Prayer which are already used in many churches'.

Initially this work was handed to the new Liturgical Commission as one of the four tasks set for the Commission by the Archbishop at the opening meeting.⁵³ Work began immediately on morning and evening prayer, and rapid progress was made; other tasks, including the revision of the eucharist, were soon delegated to individuals and sub-committees for detailed work.

However no further work on the 'first schedule' eucharist came before the Commission until 1960. The 21st meeting (December 1959) saw another visit from the Archbishop of Canterbury, during which he effectively relieved the Commission of the responsibility which he had laid on them only four years previously:

... other persons (and in the end the Steering Committee) would feel it necessary to draw up a schedule of variations from the Book of Common Prayer to be approved for immediate use when Canon 13 came into force, until such time as more permanent revision could be considered for approval. In the drawing up of such a schedule, the Commission would certainly be consulted and its help invited. The Commission might wish to suggest additions to the schedule. The schedule ought to be ready for the time when Canon 13 was promulgated, so that it could then be issued as a schedule of changes from 1662 which would be immediately authorized ...⁵⁴

The very next month, Archbishop Fisher wrote to the Commission's Chairman, Bishop Colin Dunlop: 'It always helps to have something to start from; so I sat down one day and drew up the enclosed draft schedule which now I have submitted to the Bishops'.⁵⁵ The schedule consisted of an unremarkable revision of the Prayer Book along the lines of 1928. For the canon, he made two suggestions:

- 1) The use of the 1928 prayer;
- 2) The 1662 Consecration, followed immediately by the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer.

In both cases the Prayer of Thanksgiving and the Gloria should follow the administration of communion.

The Commission considered these suggestions at its meeting on 4 April 1960 and made four recommendations in respect of the canon:

- 1) Not to allow the use of the 1928 prayer. It was strongly opposed by both anglo-catholics and evangelicals; it had been but little used in England; it had been found wanting in the eyes of modern scholars; and:

authorization of it would thus run the serious risk of reviving the hostile feelings of 1927-28 over a rite that scarcely anyone wants to use in that particular form.

- 2) The use of the 1662 Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer after the Consecration, with the suggestion that the anamnesis ('having in remembrance his precious death and passion ... etc.') be included in it. This endorsed the Archbishop's second suggestion.
- 3) Not to allow the use of the second part of the South Indian canon.⁵⁶

- 4) A further suggestion of their own, a 'modified form of the Interim Rite':
 - a) To use the first part of the Prayer of Oblation at the end of the 1662 Consecration, and keep the second part as a post-communion prayer.
 - b) To allow the 1928 anamnesis as a nexus between the 1662 Consecration and the (modified) Prayer of Oblation.
 - c) To allow the recitation of the Lord's Prayer either before or after communion.

The end of the canon would then read:

Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death and passion of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

The post-communion prayer would be:

Almighty Lord and everlasting God, we offer and present unto thee ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively (living) sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that all we, who are partakers of this holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with thee and the holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

The Commission's fourth suggestion is particularly interesting, involving the most extensive changes to familiar texts. It was an attempt to find a form of the 'Interim Rite' which would be acceptable both to evangelicals and catholics. The suggestion neatly produces an anamnesis/oblation at the end of the canon, while avoiding the charge of pelagianism by keeping the prayer of self-oblation until after communion.

The proposed Series 1 services were published on 17 December 1965 and brought before the Convocations in May 1966, where they were all approved by the requisite two-thirds majority.⁵⁷ The services then passed to the House of Laity, which authorised the eucharistic rite on 7 November 1966 by 174 votes to 79.

The Commission's caution about using 1928, and their own suggestion for a modified canon, carried the day. The Series 1 consecration can take one of three forms:

- a) The 1662 Prayer unaltered, but with the accompanying fraction made optional.
- b) The 1662 Prayer as above, followed by the 1662 Prayer of Oblation, the two prayers being linked by the first part of the 1928 anamnesis.
- c) The 1662 Prayer enlarged as above, but with the self-oblation omitted.

The first option is not quite as conservative as it may seem. By allowing the bread to be broken just before the administration of communion, the rite suggests something of Dix's four-fold action (see §5.3). Dalby commented:

Now, with a definite offertory permitted before the *Sursum corda*, the Prayer of Consecration permitted immediately after the *Sanctus*, and the fraction permitted between the consecration and the distribution, the eucharistic action can be distinguished from the Ministry of the Word and the preparation of the communicants, and within this action the Canon can be seen in its true light as corresponding to the dominical thanksgiving.⁵⁸

The second and third forms, 'like the 1928 form but without its disadvantages' (to quote Dalby), go still further to restoring the unity of the eucharistic prayer.

Two other features of the Series 1 eucharist call for attention. Firstly the Intercession, like that of the *Shorter Prayer Book*, consists of the 1662 form and the 1928 form in parallel columns, thus authorizing the 1928 petition for the dead ('we commend to thy gracious keeping, O Lord, all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to grant them everlasting light and peace').

Secondly, the rubric pertaining to the consumption of the remaining elements opens the way to communion by extension, though the provision is curiously incomplete. 1662 orders that any consecrated bread and wine which remain after communion shall be consumed after the Blessing. The corresponding rubric in 1928 (where the communion of the sick is permitted by extension) allowed the reservation of consecrated elements after the eucharist:

If any of the consecrated Bread and Wine remain, *apart from that which may be reserved for the Communion of the sick, as is provided in the Alternative Order for the Communion of the Sick*, it shall not be carried out of the church: but the Priest, and such other of the communicants as he shall call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same. [my italics]

The 1928 rubric is essentially that of 1662 with the addition of the italicised words.⁵⁹ Although the Series 1 services contained no order for the communion of the sick, the rubric for the consumption of consecrated elements was carefully framed to allow it:

What remains of the consecrated bread and wine which is not required for purposes of communion shall be consumed immediately after all have communicated either by the Priest, or by one of the other ministers, while the Priest continues the service: or it shall be left upon the holy Table until the end of the service, and then consumed.

The curiosity here arises because this rubric leads nowhere; there is no liturgical context to give substance to the possibility it raises. It had been intended to include an order for the communion of the sick in the collection of services published in 1965 for debate in the Church Assembly, but no such order was ever produced.⁶⁰ Yet clearly parishes were reserving the sacrament, and in considerable numbers. In effect, then, the Series 1 eucharist makes provision for the communion of the sick by extension, but quietly allows clergy to administer the sacrament according to their own custom.

To summarize, the Series 1 services are far from insignificant. Though a conservative revision, they did represent the first attempt to authorise new liturgy since 1928; and, through the new worship canons, for the first time since the Reformation Parliament was not directly involved in the process. Most significant of all was the fact that after 400 years, the Church of England had a legally authorized eucharistic rite in which the violence inflicted in 1552 was undone and the disconnected parts of the canon reintegrated into one prayer. Above all, this revision vindicated much of the 1928 Book. As Moreton remarked, somewhat sardonically:

There would be little profit in undertaking a detailed critique of the services in the First Series, for this task has already been performed in large part by the critics of the Deposited Book and its successor. 1928 has won. Its Busers have been ignored.⁶¹

4.6 The Prayer Book tradition since 1980

The Series 1 revision was effectively 'the Prayer Book as used'; this was its great strength. Even in layout and the way rubrics were worded, Series 1 imitated 1662 (and 1928) closely. Because of this, parishes could make the variations from 1662 which they had been used to making while leaving other things alone.⁶²

Perhaps this aspect of the Series 1 revision has been undervalued. As liturgical revision continued, first with Series 2 and later with Series 3 and the ASB, by no means every parish was happy to 'move on' to the next stage of revision. There was a continuing desire for a traditional eucharistic rite. This need was certainly acknowledged, and an attempt made to meet it, in the composite rite *Series 1 and 2 Revised* (later ASB Rite B), discussed in §8.2 below. The attempt has not, however, been entirely satisfactory. A significant number of those who ask for 'Prayer Book worship' actually want a variation on the 1662 service. Where Series 1 provides this with ease Rite B can only approximate to it, and there are substantial practical difficulties. The main body of Rite B derives almost entirely from Series 2; it is permitted to substitute Prayer Book texts at certain points, but the texts themselves are relegated to appendices or omitted altogether.⁶³ A parish would certainly have to produce its own service booklets if it wished to use Rite B as 'modified Prayer Book'. Even then, some 1662/Series 1 texts would be lost — there is no first Lord's Prayer, no Prayer for the Monarch, and no offertory sentences. Certain features of Series 2 may not be omitted, such as the gospel responses and the peace. Moreover the First Thanksgiving, while clearly deriving from Series 1, differs from it at a number of points, including the provision of a mandatory ferial preface and an explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit. Some of these additions might be thought foreign to the ethos of the Prayer Book.

The 1984 attempt to re-authorize Series 1

In February 1984 the Bishop of Birmingham moved in Synod that the Series 1 Baptism and Holy Communion services be considered for authorization. He was not, he said, contending for himself. On the contrary:

I make no bones about the fact that I hope that I shall never have to use Series 1 Holy Communion. I regard its provisions as liturgically retrograde, even if theologically acceptable. But I do not argue the case today for myself. I do so out of a sense of justice for those congregations which have for many years used and loved these services. It would be generous to legalise them . . . Why should we continue to discriminate against liturgical minorities?⁶⁴

There were, he said, four reasons why the Series 1 services should be authorised. Firstly, they were theologically unexceptionable; if not, 'they would not have been authorized in the first place'. Secondly, the bishops had allowed the use of the interim rite and 1928 material when they were illegal; surely now that they had the power to authorize the same material, it made little sense to refuse. Thirdly, lay people using Series 1 felt as if they were using the Prayer Book, and 'to deny [Series 1] authorization

seems to them like suppressing the Prayer Book. It encourages the general nuisance caused by Prayer Book campaigners'. Fourthly, only a small minority would be affected. There was no danger of Series 1 services suddenly taking over the liturgical life of the Church; for 'the Alternative Service Book is happily now implanted in the affections of the Church of England'. But not everyone agreed that re-authorization was a good idea. Colin Buchanan felt that the provision already in place ought to be sufficient for everyone:

If Rite B were followed with the more traditional features of the Eucharistic Prayer and so on in it . . . it would take a very alert person to spot that he was not getting the Series 1 he apparently loved from 1966.

. . . is it that a very few persons are insisting that they must have just these rubrics and just this text in just this order, and the whole of our Synod must then go on multiplying ancient rites in order to establish them. It is easy to add new things. The real difficulty we have is in discontinuing something, and we have managed to do it. Please do not let us go back on that. There are two categories of persons who might conceivably want Series 1 Holy Communion. My imagination will run out to them. One set are people who actually want minor variants of 1662 Holy Communion itself . . . the other category are those who want the old interim rite with Cranmer reshuffled. I understand the concept of an interim rite. I understand people in the 1920s, 1930s and 1940s saying, let us do an interim thing until better befall us. What are they waiting for now? What is the aim they have in front of them? Or is an interim rite a place where you dwell for ever?⁶⁵

The Archbishop of Canterbury hoped that the Synod would be willing to legalise the 'traditional variations' of 1662 'as a matter of justice for those whom you may sometimes call the Prayer Book lobby'. The only question was how this might be done. There were three possibilities: (1) to authorize a specific rite (e.g. Series 1); (2) to ask the bishops to declare that they would regard the 'variations' as coming under Canon B5, and (as the Archdeacon of West Ham put it) were 'not going to raise any problem about it'; or (3) as Jean Mayland argued, to revise the 1662 Prayer Book itself. In the event Synod declined to re-authorize Series 1; there was no appetite for a revision of 1662, and the Church has since proceeded by means of the second method, that of tolerating diversity in the use of 1662 (but see the 1997 proposal, discussed below).

What this debate made clear was the depth of feeling on both sides regarding the sufficiency or otherwise of the liturgical provision on offer since 1980. It seems strange that this problem was not anticipated. During the debate Jean Mayland, a member of the Liturgical Commission, voiced what had been a widely-held assumption:

It seemed to us [the Commission], and it still seems to me, that we must gradually move to the stage where we just have the Prayer Book and the ASB, and gradually remove the alternatives in between.⁶⁶

The same optimism had been evident in the opening words of the ASB Preface, which speaks of the public worship of the Church of England being 'officially expressed in two books, rather than in one'. But, regardless of what members of the Liturgical Commission or anyone else thought about what *ought* to suffice, there was clearly a desire within the Church for the continuing use of what had been done for many decades. With hindsight perhaps none of this should have come as a surprise. Series 1 represented continuity with the immediate past; that was its intended function, and it performed it admirably. Rite B, modelled heavily on Series 2 and thoroughly modern in its typography and layout, could not compare. Instead of continuity, it spoke of change; as we shall see (§6.3), it was built around a revised structure and embodied a new understanding of the eucharist, profoundly affected by the theories of Gregory Dix and the parish communion movement.

The 1997 proposal

An unexpected development came in February 1997, when the House of Bishops circulated a paper (GS Misc 487) entitled *The Prayer Book as Used: additional work for the current Revision Committee on Holy Communion Rites A and B revised*. This paper contained the text of a service: 'Rite B according to the pattern of the Book of Common Prayer'. According to the introductory comments:

The aim will be to print a text which in its style of printing and layout matches the rest of the [new] book's contents and which represents the way in which the 1662 Communion service has actually been used for many decades.

The House of Bishops intended to achieve this by amending *Rites A and B revised* which was going through the revision stage. Part of the stated justification for choosing this method was the existence of a form of Rite A following the pattern of the Book of Common Prayer.

There are two things to be said about the new rite. The first concerns the liturgy itself, and the second concerns the way in which it is proposed to introduce and authorize it.

First of all, the new rite is a most conservative rendering of the Prayer Book service. There is no revision of *texts* at all; everything keeps its Prayer Book wording. There are, naturally, certain additions: the Summary of the Law and the Kyries are provided as alternatives to the Decalogue (except in Lent and on Advent Sunday), and the greeting (*The Lord be with you: and with thy spirit*) may be used to introduce the collect and the Sursum corda. Other optional additions are the Benedictus, the peace, the

Agnus Dei, and hymns in the usual places. Apart from these additions, the rite differs from the Prayer Book only in allowing the rearrangement of 1662 texts. The Gloria may be moved to its 1549 position; the second Lord's Prayer may be used before communion; and, most significantly of all, the Prayer of Oblation may be said immediately after the Consecration. This legalizes, in part, the old Interim Rite — but there is no permission to transpose the Prayer of Humble Access to before the *Sursum corda*. It seems that all the work done on the canon during the early years of the century and continued with Series 1 has been forgotten or ignored. Even the 1928/ Series 1 Intercession is not permitted as an alternative to the 1662 form. In short, the new rite is most emphatically a version of 1662, both in text and structure. It allows many of the additions and rearrangements which parishes have been used to making, but not all of them. The rite is less flexible than either the Shorter Prayer Book or Series 1, effectively offering parishes less freedom in respect of the Prayer Book tradition than they have enjoyed since 1929.

Secondly, there is the question of how the rite is being introduced. It is difficult to see how it can be represented as a variant of Rite B. It has none of the structure of Rite B and no Rite B texts. In this respect it is the very opposite of its Rite A counterpart, which uses modern language throughout and genuine Rite A texts — *not* 'translated' Prayer Book texts — for the confession and absolution, the comfortable words, the Prayer of Humble Access, and (optionally) the post-communion prayers. The first part of the service, the Ministry of the Word and the Intercession, follows the Rite A order precisely. But none of this can be said for the new service. It is being introduced as a form of Rite B because this is felt to be the least troublesome way to include a 'Prayer Book' type rite in the new book of alternative services; the introductory notes (particularly notes 1, 2 & 3) make this clear.

At the time of writing the only published reaction to the new rite is Colin Buchanan's account of it in the April 1997 edition of *News of Liturgy* (Issue No 268). Buchanan has never hidden his impatience with the Interim Rite, so it comes as no surprise to find him equally exasperated at this latest production. He mentions, though without giving details, the difficulties discussed above of relating the new service to Rite B.

It remains to be seen what will happen to this idea. The text is still with the Revision Committee, and may yet be amended or lost altogether. But whatever the fate of this venture, it is likely that a desire for a flexible 'modified Prayer Book' rite will continue.

Notes

- 1 LC, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England*, p.15.
- 2 Editorial in *Theology*, 14 (1927), p.241.
- 3 Editorial in *Theology*, 16 (1928), p.1.
- 4 Evidence of Sir Thomas Inskip MP, in *Church and State 1935, Vol II: Evidence of Witnesses*, p.105.
- 5 See §4.3.
- 6 *CA Proceedings*, 9 (1928), pp.114ff.
- 7 A listing of the votes cast in Diocesan Conferences throughout the country (CERC CAA / 1922/1/IV/3) shows the results for 28 dioceses. There are no figures for Chichester, Exeter, Southwell, Birmingham, Ripon or St Albans. In the dioceses of Liverpool, Sodor & Man, and Hereford, only the figures for clergy are given, but the votes in these dioceses are not markedly different from the rest. All dioceses recorded a majority in favour, from 55% (London) to 95% (Coventry). In only two dioceses was the figure less than two-thirds (London, 55%, and Norwich, 64%).
- 8 *CA Proceedings*, 9 (1928), pp.115f.
- 9 Dix, *Shape*, p.709.
- 10 Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p.1359.
- 11 Dix, *Shape*, p.709.
- 12 The bishops allowed the use of the alternative canon only with their express permission. See LC Memorandum 6A.
- 13 see §4.3.
- 14 W.J. Whittaker (Lincoln's Inn), Counsel's Opinion of 3 February 1928, Cambridge University Library Pr.B.25 (16). The Opinion stated that the Press were not free to publish the Book, because they held a licence from the Crown only to publish the 'book prescribed by law'. Furthermore,
 'The "wilful and obstinate use" of the composite book published by the University . . . by any minister of the Church of England in any place in which under the Act of Uniformity he is bound to say common prayer according to the Book of Common Prayer would be a misdemeanour . . .'
- 15 House of Bishops, *Minutes*, 27 September 1928 (CERC CAA/1922/1/V/9).
- 16 Private communications from Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press.
- 17 One must of course ignore the order placed in 1927 for 170,000 copies of the *first* deposited book, which was cancelled following the first Parliamentary defeat.
- 18 The reason for the difficulty is that the three privileged presses printed copies for each other as well as themselves, and one would not wish to count the same batch twice. Unfortunately the printing ledgers are not always quite clear about this.
- 19 Letter of 26 October 1929 from the Bishop of Gloucester to the Prayer Book Copyright Committee, in *Minutes of the Prayer Book Copyright Committee*.
- 20 Morison, *English Prayer Books*, p.90.
- 21 *Minutes of the Prayer Book Copyright Committee*.
- 22 This restriction did not apply to the 'Shorter Prayer Book' published during the Second World War (see §4.3).
- 23 Fenwick and Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p.42.

- 24 Editorial in *Theology*, 14 (1927), p.241.
- 25 Brightman, 'The New Prayer Book Examined', p.219.
- 26 For example, the Collect for the Transfiguration.
- 27 The Preface is unsigned, but would appear to be the work of the Archbishop. Lowther Clarke's comparison of the Preface with a speech of Davidson's at the Joint Sitting of the Convocations on 7 February 1927 shows a marked similarity of thought and phrasing (see Lowther Clarke, *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered*, p.7).
- 28 Lowther Clarke, *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered*, pp.45f.
- 29 *ibid*, p.2.
- 30 *ibid*, p.45.
- 31 *ibid*, p.81.
- 32 The passage is rendered a little differently by Cuming (*Hippolytus*, p.11), also in Jasper and Cuming (*Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.35); see §5.5 for Cuming's translation.
- 33 Buchanan and Lloyd, *Six Eucharistic Prayers*. In Prayers 1, 3, and 5 the epiclesis is much softened; in Prayers 2 and 4 the reference to the work of the Spirit is rather stronger. Prayer 6, which is based on the First Eucharistic Prayer from Rite A of the ASB, has the epiclesis *before* the Institution Narrative.
- 34 For a brief account of the controversy see Jasper, *Development*, pp.154-156.
- 35 The Preface to *The Shorter Prayer Book* (1948).
- 36 The congregation were also directed to join in the recitation of the Creed, but not the Prayer of Humble Access.
- 37 This amounted to a call to reconciliation of communicants, first with God and then with their neighbours, and a reminder that 'absolution, together with spiritual counsel and advice', was available from the parish priest or 'some other discreet and understanding minister of God's Word'.
- 38 Jasper, *Development*, p.126.
- 39 Jasper and Bradshaw, *A Companion to the ASB*, pp.170f.
- 40 Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, p.230.
- 41 *ibid*, p.236.
- 42 See §5.6.
- 43 for full details see Jasper, *Development*, p.127.
- 44 LC, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England*, pp.15-17.
- 45 Dix, *Shape*, p.709.
- 46 *Church and State 1935*, p.36.
- 47 Jasper, *Development*, p.150. The conditions were stringent. The two Archbishops, the Lord Chancellor and the Speaker of the Commons were required unanimously certify that the Measure related to spiritual concerns; the Measure should be approved by both Convocations, twice approved by the diocesan conferences of at least three-quarters of the dioceses, and certified by the Archbishops to be consonant with the fundamental doctrines and principles of the Church as set forth in the Articles and the Prayer Book.
- 48 *The Canon Law of the Church of England*, p.112.
- 49 *Clerical Subscription Act 1965*, section 1, quoted here from Donald Gray, 'The Revision of Canon Law'.

At the time of writing, following further changes to the canons, the Declaration of Assent has a rather different form:

'I, N, . . . declare my belief in the faith which is revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds and to which the historic formularies of the Church of England bear witness; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, I will use only the forms of service which are authorized or allowed by Canon.'

50 *Church and State* 1949.

51 *The Revised Canons of the Church of England Further Considered*, pp.10-14.

52 *Canon Law Revision: Statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury*.

53 *LC Minutes*, 1.1. See Appendix 1.

54 *LC Minutes*, 21/7.

55 Letter from Archbishop Fisher to the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission, 14 January 1960, with the Archbishop's draft schedule of variations to 1662, LC Memorandum 26.

56 See §5.7.

57 Buchanan, *Recent Liturgical Revision*, pp.16f.

58 Dalby, 'Alternative Services: The Canon of Series 1'.

59 The 1662 rubric begins with the instruction that if any *unconsecrated* bread and wine remain, 'the Curate shall have it to his own use'. This was a necessary clarification to the 1552 rubric which made no distinction between consecrated and unconsecrated elements. By 1928 any confusion arising from the 1552 rubric was entirely forgotten, and the distinction made in 1662 no longer required.

60 Buchanan points out that the 1965 version of Series 1 actually advertised a service for the communion of the sick in the table of contents. The relevant page in the booklet was blank, apart from a pasted-in slip which read "*A form of service and rubrics are under consideration*". Buchanan, *Recent Liturgical Revision*, p.16.

61 Moreton, 'The Alternative Services Considered'.

62 The only features of Series 1 which would make it difficult to celebrate the service as a 'straight' 1662 celebration are: (1) the Collect for the Monarch is omitted (as in 1928), but may be reinstated by the celebrant, since 'other collects duly authorized' may follow the collect of the day; (2) the exhortations are removed from the body of the text and printed at the end of the service; (3) the offertory sentences are those of 1928, from which four of the 1662 sentences were omitted and a further six added; and (4) the response 'The Lord be with you / **And with thy Spirit**' is inserted before the *Sursum corda*.

63 Note 2 at the beginning of Rite B (*ASB*, p.177) allows the use of the 1662 Gloria, Creed, Intercession, Confession and Absolution (but not the Invitation to confession) and the Lord's Prayer, but since these are not actually printed in the *ASB*, worshippers would need a copy of the Prayer Book in addition to the *ASB* if they were to use the service in this way. The abbreviated version of the Commandments from *The Shorter Prayer Book* (not the BCP decalogue) is printed in the Appendix along with the Summary of the Law and the nine-fold Kyries in English and Greek. The 1662 Prayer of Oblation is also printed in the Appendix.

64 *GS Proceedings*, 15 (1984), p.247.

65 *ibid.*

66 *ibid.*

5

THE BACKGROUND TO RADICAL REVISION

It might be best if I began by telling you how we started producing this draft. We were, all of us, thinking in terms of a parish communion, that is to say, a Sunday Service, with a sermon, and the bulk of the congregation communicating.

*Arthur Couratin*¹

5.1 Why Prayer Book revision at all?

At the end of 1965 the *Second Series* of alternative services was published; these were prepared entirely by the Liturgical Commission. The booklet contained orders for Morning and Evening Prayer (which had been completed in March 1962); Intercessions and Thanksgivings (March 1962); Thanksgiving after Childbirth (October 1964); the Burial of the Dead (October 1964); and a Draft Order for Holy Communion (June 1965). The eucharist was much the boldest and most innovative service in the volume. However the introduction stressed that it was merely an interim report for discussion; the Commission had been asked by the Archbishops to produce a radical revision of the eucharist, and had done their best to respond to that request. The draft order represented the stage to which their discussions had so far brought them.²

The Liturgical Commission

The 'instruction' from the Archbishops had come formally in 1962,³ but the roots of the work can be traced back to the first meeting of the Commission in December 1955.⁴

The Archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Fisher, asked the Commission to produce services for experimental use with a view to approaching Parliament after a period of experiment to make them part of the Book of Common Prayer. This more flexible system of revision would be far more satisfactory than the 1928 attempt to revise the entire Prayer Book at once, and without previous trial of the new material. In addition, 'a start could be made on those things which most needed dealing with, and

experiments could be made and statutory authority sought, by degrees'.⁵ It is unlikely that either the Archbishop or the Commission had any idea at the time just how far their 'experimental' services would eventually depart from 1662. However, it is clear that these services were always intended to be more adventurous than the second task set by the Archbishop, the light revision of 1662 along 1928 lines. The possibility of a more radical reform was therefore raised at the beginning of the Commission's existence.

This is not surprising, for the background to liturgical thinking had changed since the 1920s. In the years leading up to 1928, there had been a desire for more extensive reforms than were offered,⁶ but the Church had chosen in the end to stay close to the style and patterns inherited from 1662. By the 1950s and 1960s, the mood for change was more obvious and widespread. It is clear from Couratin's words quoted above that the Liturgical Commission faced different expectations from those obtaining in the 1920s. The Commission's view of this can be gauged from a series of booklets published on behalf of the Commission as an exercise in educating the Church. One of these was *Why Prayer Book Revision at all?* (1964) by C.B. Naylor. He attributed the need for change to the **liturgical movement**, which, he said, affected virtually every aspect of the Church's life. Firstly there was the rediscovery of the centrality of the eucharist, and of the corporate and participatory nature of eucharistic worship and life; in the Church of England this was expressed in the parish communion. Secondly, the liturgical movement was shared in different ways by Christians of all denominations, and had been accompanied by a development of ecumenical life which had itself enriched and challenged inherited traditions of worship. Thirdly, ideas about worship were affected by certain developments in liturgical scholarship. Finally, the success of the movement had consequences not only for the texts of services, but also for church architecture, music, and religious ceremonial. In short, Naylor claimed that the Church was experiencing nothing short of a liturgical revolution which demanded (among other things) a new approach to the provision of liturgical texts.

A similar, though much fuller, description is given by Fenwick and Spinks in their recent survey of the liturgical movement, *Worship in Transition* (1995). They identify the characteristics of the movement as:

- a) a sense of **community** and a protest against individualism; this comes across particularly in the use of the New Testament teaching about the Church as the Body of Christ, in which the members are interdependent;
- b) **participation** in worship by the laity, a protest against the clericalism of Roman Catholic and Protestant worship alike;
- c) the search for **liturgical roots** in the worship of the early Church;
- d) a rediscovery of the **Bible** as a vital component of the liturgy;
- e) a new emphasis on the importance of the **eucharist** in weekly worship along with **general communion**;
- f) an emphasis on the **vernacular** in worship;
- g) growth in **ecumenical understanding**, not least among liturgical scholars; and
- h) a strong emphasis on **evangelism** and **social involvement**.⁷

Clearly some elements of this description are more relevant to the circumstances of the Church of England than others. But these strands are all closely interrelated; and the term 'liturgical movement' does seem to be more than just a useful shorthand for referring to a number of otherwise disparate liturgical developments. All the same, the picture is complex, and Fenwick and Spinks wisely begin their account of the liturgical movement with Massey Shepherd's cautious words: 'There is no individual who is competent to give sufficient account of the liturgical renewal in our times'.⁸ For this study, four features of the liturgical landscape are of particular interest: the growth of the parish communion, the influence of the liturgical theories of Gregory Dix, the search for liturgical roots in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and the effect of new thinking about eucharistic sacrifice.

5.2 The parish communion

By 'the Parish Communion' is meant the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, with the communion of the people, in a parish church, as the chief service of the day, or, better, as the assembly of the Christian community for the worship of God; for even the phrase 'the chief service of the day' is unsatisfactory if it is understood to mean *a* service — one among several — and not *the* service — *the* divine Liturgy.⁹

So begins Gabriel Hebert's important collection of essays, *The Parish Communion* (1937).¹⁰ The history of the parish communion can be traced back at least as far as the First World War, and its effects are felt today in the acceptance of weekly communion in most traditions within the Church of England. Although the parish communion movement had a strong theological and reflective aspect, it was also very much a matter of practical parish liturgy; theory and practice grew together through the century. The developments described below (the work of Dix, the interest in the worship of the early church, and reflection on the nature of eucharistic sacrifice) all affected the the parish communion and were themselves affected by it.

The vision

It would be a mistake to think that the programme outlined in *The Parish Communion* and continued after the Second World War by the Parish and People movement¹¹ consisted only of *liturgical* renewal. Hebert and his associates certainly held a high doctrine of the eucharist, but their vision went much deeper than 'getting the services right'. It was, at heart, a vision of a renewed church, aware of its divine vocation to serve Christ and the world; a church united in worship, mission, and service. Much was made of the New Testament image of the Church as the Body of Christ, commissioned to continue Christ's work in the world. The movement's concern was 'the Church and her message';¹² the question to be wrestled with was 'What has Christianity to give to the modern world?'.¹³ Evangelism and social action were as important in their way as worship. Yet the parish communion should be the centre and heart of that action, the wellspring from which all else would flow. The parish communion movement was therefore possessed of a breadth and depth of vision which has not perhaps been sufficiently appreciated by all those who advertise a 'parish communion' on a Sunday morning; but this social dimension has been well expounded by Donald Gray in his *Earth and Altar* (1986) who sees the origin of the Anglican parish communion in the work and vision of the Christian Socialists rather than in the pioneers of the Roman Catholic liturgical movement.

Three landmarks

A small step in the direction of the parish communion was taken as long ago as 1916 when a committee of the Convocation of Canterbury reported its findings concerning 'the spiritual needs of sailors and soldiers after the War'. The Committee concluded that the eucharist should be accessible and include general communion:

If the Eucharist is to become the chief service of the day it should be celebrated at a time which is not too early for those who have been tired by a heavy week's work, or too late for those who may wish to come fasting . . . [but] the change which the Committee desires to see would, in their opinion, lose most of its value unless the communion of the people forms an essential part of the Eucharistic act. Unless this is so, the great Sunday service will be incomplete, and fail to take its place as the chief service of the day.¹⁴

The Convocation, receiving the report on 3 May 1916, resolved that 'no arrangements for worship should be regarded as satisfactory which do not provide for a Celebration of the Holy Communion as the principal Sunday service, at an hour when the greatest number can be expected to communicate'.¹⁵

A second landmark is a well-known instance of an early 'parish communion'. It is no easy matter to identify the *first* parish communion, though both Fenwick and Spinks (*Worship in Transition*) and Gray (*Earth and Altar*) credit Henry de Candole as an important pioneer, and the 9.15am parish communion which he helped to introduce in December 1927 at St John's, Newcastle as a new beginning. De Candole himself admitted that this service was not the first of its kind.¹⁶ One particular feature of this service, not always appreciated, was its inclusive nature, which was a consequence of its origins: 'we transformed a 10 o'clock children's eucharist without communicants into a parish eucharist, then and ever since habitually known as the "9.15"'.¹⁷ Children and families were therefore part of the new service from the beginning. It is hardly surprising that in 1936 de Candole wrote of the 'family' eucharist being at the centre of the 'family' life.¹⁸

A third landmark is the eucharist celebrated by John Robinson in the chapel of Clare College, Cambridge.¹⁹ He used 1662 with few changes in the service order other than the addition of certain prayers and explanatory rubrics and headings. The offertory, for example, is headed 'The Breaking of the Bread: the First Action: Taking', but this is done in the 1662 position, before the intercession and penitential prayers.²⁰ The offertory is accompanied by the following prayer:

Receive, O Lord, we beseech thee, these gifts; accept in them the sacrifice of ourselves, and of thy mercy so perfect us, we pray, that we may be in life and death an offering to thee for ever; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The other three 'actions' are headed in similar manner, including the fraction which Robinson performed *after* the canon, with words from 1 Corinthians 10. But communion immediately followed the fraction, and the second Lord's Prayer and the Prayer of Oblation were said after communion as in 1662. This rite is useful as an

indication of how the 1662 order might — with a little supplementation and creative interpretation — become usable for a ‘parish communion’.

Eucharistic worship and weekly communion

Both the growth in eucharistic worship in the Church of England and the move away from non-communicating high mass have brought the present day practice of the Church much nearer to the parish communion ideals of the 1930s. There is a general perception, which seems quite uncontested, that the eucharist is indeed now central to the life of most Church of England parishes, and one can obtain some measure of this from the statistics collected annually from parishes (see Appendix 2). The figures show that about three-fifths of those attending public worship in the Church of England on an average Sunday receive communion. Even without allowing for children and non-communicant adults, it is clear that the eucharist with general communion is by far the main form of Anglican Sunday worship in England today.

Reservations and objections

The parish communion has not been universally welcomed. It posed a threat to some evangelical understandings of worship and Christian life; and perhaps more surprisingly, not all catholics were happy either.

Buchanan suggests a number of reasons why evangelicals were dissatisfied with the emerging pattern.²¹ By far the greatest concern was the effect on preaching, particularly the length of sermons. The more successful the parish communion in terms of numbers, the longer it would take to administer communion, and the shorter the sermon would have to be. A successful parish communion would also lead to poorer attendances at evening services, where there was often a special emphasis on preaching. Furthermore, the parish communion movement tended to encourage the presence of children, giving yet another reason to keep the sermon short. In parishes with family communion services there was also pressure to lower the age of confirmation so that the children could receive communion, which played down the importance of understanding and adult discipleship in confirmation preparation. It is worth noting that this all seemed very different from a Roman Catholic perspective:

At its inception the liturgical movement, by its great emphasis on the Eucharist, may have been in danger of minimising the role of preaching in worship. Today in all the Churches . . . the liturgical movement creates a better balance between the Word and the Eucharist; it has restored the place of biblical preaching, of the homily.²²

The advocates of the parish communion always claimed that the movement was not tied to any one particular churchmanship. However they also laid great stress on the element of offering in the eucharist. Henry de Candole, writing in 1939, held that:

Christian worship is the Christian Community offering its life and work to God through our Lord. Liturgy means the activity of the people of God, which is primarily a corporate common activity of the whole fellowship. That action is one of offering, and most clearly set forth and illustrated in the Eucharist, which is the heart of Christian worship.²³

It is entirely understandable that he later regretted 'that we "liturgical movement people" were so little in touch with Evangelicals'.²⁴

Reservations also came from a distinguished anglo-catholic bishop. Michael Ramsey, in a famous piece in his *Durham Essays and Addresses* (1956), acknowledged the gains brought by the parish communion, but he was wary of losing the 'very important elements in the religion of older generations':

The awe in the individual's approach to Holy Communion, which characterized both the Tractarians and the Evangelicals of old, stands in contrast to the ease with which our congregations come tripping to the altar week by week . . .

We of the clergy are sent not to bring people to be 'communicants' so much as to bring them (and ourselves) into union with our Lord by the careful use of Communion, prayer, and penitence.²⁵

The Church was also in danger of seeing 'unity in Christ' in all too limited a way. Ramsey wrote, 'I think it is a mistake to exaggerate the place of the physical togetherness of a congregation';²⁶ for 'Christian fellowship does not mean getting all the people on to one spot at one hour of the day'.²⁷ The important thing was to bring the Church on earth into communion with Christ and with the Church Triumphant; *that* was Christian unity. But it is only fair to point out that the very same concerns had been voiced by Hebert in *The Parish Communion*. To give but two examples:

[There is] the danger of a materialistic perversion of the sacramental principle. It is only too easy to assume, as soon as it is admitted that the Parish Communion is right in principle, that the institution of a service at 9 or 9.30am, labelled 'the Parish Communion' or 'the People's Eucharist', will prove a sort of panacea for all difficulties . . .²⁸

Christians who are separated from communion at one another's altars on earth are nevertheless one in Christ at the heavenly altar . . . the unity of the Church exists in Christ, and it is a spiritual unity.²⁹

Ramsey's final reservation concerned the doctrine of sacrifice. The parish communion placed considerable weight on the *offertory* of the bread and wine as the token of the offering of our daily life (see §5.3), but:

this sort of teaching about sacrifice can be a shallow and romantic sort of Pelagianism. For we cannot, and dare not, offer aught of our own apart from the one sacrifice of the Lamb of God . . . I miss too often, in these parish Communion services, the due recognition in teaching and atmosphere and choice of hymns, of the awful fact of the one, sufficient sacrifice of our Lord on Calvary . . . the great fact under whose shadow we worship. We dare to bring bread and wine, our work and home life, or ourselves, only in so far as we abase ourselves before the all-sufficiency of the 'Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world'.

Once again in fairness to the pioneers and advocates of the parish communion, it should be said that they too rejected 'shallow and romantic' Pelagianism, and had been doing so for many years. In the words of J.O. Cobham:

That which Christ did He did once for all. The *consecration* (the *institution*) is the showing-forth of this one sacrifice of Christ. In the *communion* Christ gives to us His Body and His Blood, and by doing so unites us with himself. In our humanity we cannot offer ourselves to God; it were Pelagianism to imagine that we could. But as those who in *communion* have had our membership of His Body renewed in us, we can offer ourselves in Him . . .³⁰

Similarly, Hebert held that in the parish communion, 'the centre of the service is the pleading of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God and the participation of the people in the sacrifice'.³¹

Although Ramsey also welcomed the great gains which the parish communion had brought to the life of the Church, it is for his misgivings that his comments are now remembered. Buchanan holds that his intervention 'has done more to restrain the inherent excesses of this movement than any amount of other discussion'.³²

The success of the parish communion and its effect on textual revision

It is difficult to assess just how far the Church of England has embraced the full vision of one 'parish communion' (see Appendix 2). It can certainly be said that the celebration of the eucharist with general communion is central to the life of the Church, and this is of course one central aim of the parish communion movement. What *cannot* be said is how far the vision of 'one eucharist' in each parish on a Sunday has won the day.

In terms of liturgical provision, however, this latter question is not so important. The existence of early morning or evening celebrations in a parish has little bearing on the task of providing an adequate liturgy for the *main* Sunday service. Much more to the point is the recognition that this mid-morning service is now (i) almost always eucharistic, and (ii) probably the only service attended by most churchgoers. The 1662 communion service was not designed for this, for it was never intended to be the only service of the day — and therefore there was no need to ensure that it was liturgically balanced. The 1662 eucharist has only a limited lectionary and no psalmody, and there are no canticles and hymns of praise to offset the strong penitential emphasis. These elements had all been supplied hitherto by the office of morning prayer, which until the mid-nineteenth century always preceded the eucharist. But with the advent of the parish communion, these elements were missing from the regular worship of the majority, and would have to be incorporated within any revised eucharistic rite.

5.3 Dix and the ‘fourfold action’

The study of liturgy during the last thirty years, at any rate in England, has been carried on under the shadow of Gregory Dix’s classic book, *The Shape of the Liturgy*. Dix’s insight in concentrating on the actions of the Last Supper rather than on conjectural reconstruction of the words spoken proved attractive to revisers of the liturgy, and has been adopted as the basis of many eucharistic rites. This has not been altogether a gain . . .³³

In 1945 Gregory Dix published *The Shape of the Liturgy*, the result of fourteen years’ research and fourteen months’ writing.³⁴ It has been described by Bryan Spinks as the most influential liturgical book in the English-speaking world this century,³⁵ and according to Kenneth Stevenson the effect of its central thesis on liturgical revision has been ‘immense’.³⁶ The book is a majestic account of the origins and meaning of the whole eucharistic action. It is a thorough and comprehensive account of the development of the eucharist up to and including the Anglican Reformation; it also offers an interpretation of the situation in the Church of England in the 1940s and suggestions for the future. Dix’s conclusions have been the subject of much discussion and debate,³⁷ and not only amongst scholars: the book’s central ideas have had a far-reaching effect on parochial worship and teaching.

The four-action shape

In one sense, the popularizing of Dix's views has been unfortunate, for the impression has sometimes been given that Dix's theory consists of the 'discovery' that the eucharist consists of a sequence of four actions — **offertory, thanksgiving, fraction, and communion**.³⁸ This parody does not, of course, do him justice; Dix did not 'discover' the four-fold shape any more than Isaac Newton 'discovered' gravity. Dix's great achievement (not unlike Newton's³⁹) lay rather in drawing out with engaging clarity the *significance* of the sequence.

Firstly, by attending to the shape of the eucharist, Dix offered a fresh approach to an old problem, namely that of the origin of the eucharistic tradition. He regarded previous attempts to find an 'original rite' with suspicion, and argued that the structure of the liturgy was far more important than the content of its prayers.⁴⁰ This was a fruitful line of enquiry, for he found the shape of the pre-Nicene eucharist remarkably uniform. Indeed, 'from the first century to the sixteenth', the fourfold sequence was universally attested.⁴¹

Secondly, it was immediately apparent that this four-action shape was significantly different from the Last Supper. There, the actions and words concerning the bread and those concerning the wine had been quite separate. Indeed one might say that Jesus instituted a 'sevenfold' action:

Our Lord (1) took bread; (2) 'gave thanks' over it; (3) broke it; (4) distributed it, saying certain words. Later He (5) took a cup; (6) gave thanks over that; (7) handed it to His disciples, saying certain words.⁴²

The unanimity of the tradition in changing this scriptural sequence led Dix to conclude that liturgical life 'was not understood by the primitive church to be in any way subject to the control of the NT documents, even when these had begun to be regarded as inspired scripture'.⁴³

Thirdly, Dix claimed that, despite this change, the four actions of the eucharist exactly corresponded to Jesus's acts at the Last Supper, in *taking* bread and wine, *giving thanks* over them, *breaking* the bread and *distributing* the bread and wine. Each of the actions was therefore significant, though they were not all necessarily of equal importance.

The offertory

As well as drawing attention to the overall shape of the eucharistic action, Dix ascribed particular significance to the **offertory**, which he claimed was derived from Jesus' **taking**. In Dix's account of the worship of the early church, each order of ministry had its part to play, its own distinctive liturgy. The bishop presided, surrounded by his presbyters; the deacons served and gave instructions to the congregation; and the chief work of the 'order of laity' was to offer bread and wine at the altar. The offertory was therefore the 'people's liturgy'. While no doubt the offertory *could* have been a purely utilitarian act, a simple prerequisite to the thanksgiving, on Dix's reading of the tradition it was very much more than that. Members of the congregation brought bread and wine as their 'oblation' — not of course the eucharistic oblation, made on behalf of the whole church by the bishop — but an offering nevertheless, representing their whole work and life. Moreover, Dix insisted that this act of the laity was the precise liturgical equivalent of the dominical 'taking': 'it is this action of His [Christ's], done by the whole Church, His Body, which the liturgy perpetuates in the offertory'.⁴⁴

In the middle decades of the century, offertory processions abounded, and with them a distinctive strand of teaching which located the connection between eucharist and life solely, or mainly, in the offertory act.⁴⁵ John Robinson, writing in 1963, was a prominent advocate:

The crucial point is the Offertory. People sometimes used to say to me, 'Oh, you have an Offertory procession, do you?', as if this were a nice piece of ritual that adds a touch of movement and colour and 'gives people something to do'. Nothing could be more irrelevant. We had an Offertory procession because the Offertory *cannot* start in the Chancel — or if it does it has lost all its roots in life. The Offertory starts where the bread and wine start, where our lives are rooted, in the everyday world of everyday relationships, of family and society, work and leisure. It is for this reason that the Offertory is essentially, and not merely for ordering or custom, the 'liturgy' of the laity. For the Eucharist cannot get going, there is nothing for it to work on, until the world in which the laity live and work is brought into Church and laid upon the altar.⁴⁶

Reactions

Dix's work has attracted considerable excitement and comment. On the whole, evangelicals are less sympathetic to his views than catholics. Buchanan argues that the second and third century evidence does not support the view that the offertory was a significant liturgical act;⁴⁷ he acknowledges that the congregation provided bread and wine, but maintains that this provision is purely functional. Spinks agrees,⁴⁸ citing

Robert Taft's findings (1970) that 'the eastern tradition has never known a people's offertory' and concluding that 'in east and west the preparation of the bread and wine was the function of the deacons, not the laity'. In the west the people handed over bread and wine (to the deacons) just before the eucharistic prayer, but 'nothing suggests that the ceremony ever had the meaning which Dix wished it to have'.

Spinks, in fact, calls into question the whole four-action theory. Along the way he is scathing about what he calls Dix's 'arithmetic', which, he says:

leaves much to be desired. In terms of actions, the original shape has the following: take, gave thanks, broke, gave and said; take, gave thanks, gave and said — a total of nine. As far as Dix's other mathematical calculation is concerned, he counted four actions of equal significance . . . even if the total of four actions is correct, the actions do not have the same value; but it is questionable whether there are in any case four actions.⁴⁹

A glance at Dix's description of the Last Supper (quoted above) shows that this quibble over numbers is unfair to him. Dix was perfectly well aware of the interpretive words, but bracketed them with the 'giving'. It seems harsh to criticize him for this, given that his concern was very much with the shape of the *actions*, of which there were very clearly seven at the Last Supper and not nine. But on the separate question of whether the primitive eucharist did in fact conform to a four-fold shape, Spinks has an altogether more important point to make. He holds that there are really *two* actions of importance: the eating and drinking, and the giving of thanks beforehand. As for Dix's first and third actions, the taking and the breaking, 'it is difficult in the light of the early evidence and dogmatics to sustain the necessity for either a ritualized and theologized offertory or taking, or the theological necessity of a fraction or breaking'.⁵⁰

Spinks is not alone in holding this view. In his support, he cites Couratin (a member of the Liturgical Commission),⁵¹ and the Joint Liturgical Group (of which the Commission's chairman, Jasper, was secretary).⁵² And there is further wide agreement on this point. J.L. Houlden sees the eucharistic action as 'thanksgiving-cum-communion'.⁵³ Richard Buxton holds that there are 'two major actions, namely thanksgiving and reception, accompanied by two minor ones that are there for purely utilitarian reasons'.⁵⁴ Support also comes from W. Jardine Grisbrooke, who argues against 'the common but erroneous theory of a double oblation in the eucharist':

The Church, in offering bread and wine, offers them as the sacramental signs of the unique and perfect sacrifice of Christ. She knows no other sacrifice, no other offering, than his; and any theory of the eucharist which involves an offering of the

bread and wine to God in some secondary capacity, not as a consequence and corollary of their offering as the sacramental signs of that unique and perfect sacrifice, but in addition to it, or parallel with it, or apart from it, or in place of it, is incompatible with the fundamental principle of the New Covenant that all sacrifice other than the all-embracing sacrifice of Christ is done away.

Such a theory almost always involves a misunderstanding of the ceremony commonly called the offertory as an offering or sacrifice of the bread and wine; the theological confusion, in other words, is closely related to, and indeed arises from, a liturgical confusion, the ascription of an independent significance to the offertory, with the consequent assertion of two separate offerings in the course of the rite.⁵⁵

The four-action shape in summary

It will become clear that these questions of shape are of central importance in the development of Series 2, Series 3 and the ASB. Dix's shape exercised a profound influence on the Liturgical Commission as they drafted their services, despite the fact that the chief architects of Series 2, Jasper and Couratin, later expressed misgivings (see above) about the fine details of the theory.

Yet Dix's influence on these texts is unmistakable, and it must be said (with Geoffrey Cuming) that 'this has not been altogether a gain'.⁵⁶ It is one thing to discern a shape in the eucharistic rites of the primitive church; it is quite another to abandon all subtlety and *impose* that shape, albeit in a modified form, on new liturgies. But Dix can hardly be held responsible for what later liturgists have made of his work, and it must remain an open question whether he would have quite approved of the way in which his four-action shape has been 'built in' to modern texts, rubrics and headings.

It is not only in specifically liturgical writing that Dix's theory has become established. In the words of Spinks, the four-fold action remains 'dutifully taught in confirmation classes';⁵⁷ while the popular pamphlet *Explaining the Church of England: Holy Communion*, issued by the General Synod, informs the reader that:

However simple or elaborate the service, it always includes four acts. The celebrating priest, often now called the president as the one who presides at the service,

- takes the bread and wine
- gives thanks over them (including Jesus's words at the supper)
- breaks the bread
- distributes the bread and wine to the communicants

Readers of a leaflet such as this are surely entitled to believe that it represents the settled mind of the Church of England — and the more so, given that the text is

available to a wide audience on the Internet.⁵⁸ The way in which the four-action understanding of the eucharist has shaped both the eucharistic rites of the Church of England and many of its popular publications is an outstanding example of the effect of scholarship — even disputed scholarship — on liturgical life.

5.4 The ‘Apostolic Tradition’

The liturgical world may have thrilled to Dix’s theory of eucharistic shape, but there has been some reluctance to follow his argument in its entirety and abandon the search for an ‘original rite’. This is understandable; and besides, there may be more evidence for a single pattern of eucharistic prayer than Dix was willing to allow. Grisbrooke, for example, argues that despite differences between the primitive eucharistic prayers, a common structure can be discerned in them, over which secondary features have been added later in different ways to different prayers. Conveniently, that structure seemed to be preserved in ‘the oldest actual text of an anaphora which, so far as is at present known, survives, that in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome’.⁵⁹

Hippolytus’s prayer has been much studied; the current discussion is based on the work of Cuming and Jasper.⁶⁰ Reconstructing the text from the several versions in which it is found presents certain difficulties, though the bulk of the prayer is well attested in all versions. There is no Sanctus⁶¹ and no intercession. The structure is as follows:

- introductory dialogue
- Christological thanksgiving
- institution narrative
- anamnesis
- epiclesis
- closing doxology

It is unfortunate from the point of view of a quest for the ‘original rite’ that Hippolytus’s prayer may not be typical of a normal Sunday celebration, being instead the canon used by a new bishop at his consecration. When he writes more generally about the eucharist, however, Hippolytus instructs the bishop to ‘give thanks according to what we have said above’⁶². The *Apostolic Tradition* is usually dated to about 215 AD

and claims to be the 'tradition which has remained until now',⁶³ which suggests that it 'may be taken as a witness to Roman practice some fifty years earlier'.⁶⁴ The eucharistic prayer is therefore probably of great antiquity, and, despite the questions surrounding it, this prayer has had a very considerable influence on the pattern of new eucharistic prayers in the Church of England and elsewhere; and in two cases in particular (prayer 3 of ASB Rite A and prayer 2 of the Roman rite) it has exercised a discernible influence on the wording as well.

5.5 Eucharistic sacrifice

At root, it is about whether or not the act of remembering Jesus at the Lord's Supper involves offering the bread and wine to God . . . the issues raised by this debate are . . . about how far Reformation Churches are prepared to readmit language of sacrifice that they eschewed so vehemently in the sixteenth century.⁶⁵

The language of offering pervades the eucharistic thought of the primitive Church.⁶⁶ Clement, the *Didache*, Justin and Irenaeus all speak of the eucharist, or the eucharistic elements, as things offered to God. The earliest extant eucharistic prayer, that of Hippolytus, expresses the offering in the simplest of ways:

Remembering therefore his death and resurrection,
we offer to you the bread and the cup,
giving you thanks because you have held us worthy
to stand before you and minister to you.⁶⁷

But this is all very unspecific, and the lack of focus in Hippolytus' prayer gives rise to a number of questions. *Why* are the bread and the cup being offered, and what does such offering accomplish? What *sort* of sacrifice is it? Accounting for the death of Christ in terms of Old Testament sacrificial imagery is not at all straightforward,⁶⁸ and accounting for the eucharist in terms of the same scriptural paradigms is harder still, for there is the additional question of the relationship between the Church's offering and the self-offering of Christ. Houlden (1972) offers a wide-ranging analysis in his essay 'Sacrifice and the Eucharist',⁶⁹ first acknowledging the complexity of the notion of 'sacrifice' and going on to discern twelve ways in which the term has been used of the eucharist. These include the simple 'offering of gifts', the first fruits of creation; the offering of the consecrated elements as the body and blood of Christ; the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; the sacrifice of ourselves; and the offering of prayer as a parallel to Christ's eternal intercession at the heavenly altar.

Meanwhile David Glover (1993) sees four ways in which notions of sacrifice might be expressed in the Anglican eucharist:

- (a) that the Church's sacrifice is in response to Christ's sacrifice in which the Church has no part other than in receiving the benefits from it;
- (b) that it is a memorial sacrifice parallel not to Christ's actual atoning sacrifice on Calvary but to his 'eternal pleading' of that sacrifice;
- (c) that it has an ontological identity with Christ's sacrifice and is included within the one and the same offering;
- (d) that it is the sacrificial offering by Christ of the Church's responsive obedience to Christ's unique atoning sacrifice and the integration of the Church into the salvific movement of that sacrifice.⁷⁰

Glover rightly discounts 'the old teaching of a "Real Sacrifice" within the eucharist, propitiatory for the living and the dead'.⁷¹

The 1662 Prayer Book rite fixes the widest possible gulf between the sacrifice of Christ and the Church's (responsive) sacrifice. Christ's self-offering is celebrated in the consecration prayer⁷² and its uniqueness spelled out in uncompromising terms: 'his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world ...' The Church's sacrifice, by contrast, is of 'praise and thanksgiving', the offering of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice'; and it is made *after* the act of communion, so removing it from association with Christ's sacrifice. The notion of sacrifice is not, therefore, absent from Cranmer's rite, but is so closely circumscribed as to fall far short of what many would wish to say. Such dissatisfaction is nothing new; and attempts to remedy this perceived shortcoming of the Prayer Book rite have been a recurring feature of Anglican eucharistic history.

In the twentieth century, however, an improved knowledge of primitive eucharistic rites gave many people hope that the climate of discussion had changed. In Hippolytus's prayer the language of offering was both simple and innocent of medieval ideas and Reformation disputes. Drawing on this simplicity Anglican writers such as Ramsey, Hebert and Mascall explored the many nuances of eucharistic offering and sought to offer the Church of England a fresh approach, freed from the battle-lines of the past.⁷³ Meanwhile the bishops at the 1958 Lambeth Conference were confident that a new consensus regarding the eucharistic sacrifice was possible which might 'go behind' the bitter disputes of recent centuries.

5.6 The Lambeth Conference 1958

The radical nature of the 1958 Lambeth recommendations is all the more remarkable in view of the conservatism expressed at the Conference of 1948:

This Conference holds that the Book of Common Prayer has been, and is, so strong a bond of unity throughout the whole Anglican Communion that great care must be taken to ensure that revisions of the Book shall be in accordance with the doctrine and accepted liturgical worship of the Anglican Communion.⁷⁴

Similar caution is evident in the Encyclical Letter from the 1958 Conference;⁷⁵ but in their detailed Committee work and Conference resolutions, the bishops in 1958 were ready to break new ground.

In preparation for 1958, all provinces of the Anglican Communion were invited to submit reports outlining their position on Prayer Book revision.⁷⁶ The English contribution, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England*, was produced by the Liturgical Commission in accordance with the Archbishop's request to the Commission at their first meeting in 1955. The memorandum gave the Commission an opportunity to set out something of their preliminary thinking about a revised eucharistic rite.

'Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England'

This memorandum began with a consideration of the Prayer Book of 1662, asking what the compilers of 1662 had set out to achieve and whether the Book still fulfilled its intended purposes. The memorandum then went on to consider the 1928 revision, and the changes since then in scholarship, church and society which would affect further attempts at revision. Then came the Commission's thinking on how liturgical revision should proceed in the light of all that had gone before. Finally, the memorandum considered the place of the Prayer Book in the Anglican Communion as a standard of doctrine and bond of unity.

The Commission was cautious, particularly in the memorandum's fifth chapter, *Guiding Principles for Future Prayer Book Revision*. The first principle was that 'Prayer Book Revision should be conservative'. By that the Commission meant that it should respect the 'existing heritage of public worship'. As the Dean of Lincoln had said at the Minneapolis Congress,

it must never be forgotten that the overwhelming majority of those who have to use the Prayer Book are ordinary lay-people . . . What seems a logical and almost

self-evident need for change in the mind of a trained theologian or an experienced liturgist may merely fill the ordinary worshipper with bewilderment’.

There was no intention, then, to make a ‘radical break with the past’.⁷⁷ The Commission did, however, accept the need for change. The memorandum noted that the ‘uniformity’ which had obtained between 1662 and the 1920s was ‘not always achieved without some strain upon conscience and good will’. Party disputes lay behind many of the debates on the Prayer Book; criticism was usually on a party basis; and:

because this matter was never considered on its merits and in an atmosphere free from party strife, the Church has never since 1552 had the opportunity to submit the principles of the Reformers or the forms which they devised to the judgement of Scripture . . .

In other words, the fact that the Prayer Book had proved durable was no evidence of its quality. Widespread loyalty to 1662 had been more grudging than enthusiastic and probably seen more as a lesser evil than as an intrinsic good. It must, however, be questionable whether the Commission was realistic in hoping that the time was ripe for mature reflection on the merits of the Prayer Book ‘free from party strife’.

Apart from conservatism there were five other ‘guiding principles’ for future Prayer Book revision:

- 2) Forms of worship are within the Church’s competence to settle;
- 3) Revision must express the theological and liturgical insights of our time;
- 4) It must be related to the world of thought and life in which the Church’s task has to be done in the modern age;
- 5) It must be a joint and cooperative enterprise of the main schools of thought in the Church of England; and
- 6) The sole purpose of revision must be the provision of an enriched, worthier and more fitting vehicle for the worship of God in the Church of England.

Attached to each of these principles was an elucidation, and it is here that we might expect the Commission to have expounded its thought in detail, indicating the direction of its future work. The Commission was reluctant to commit itself, however. The ground was mapped out with great circumspection. All the same, some points do

emerge. The Commission would welcome a more open approach to the question of reservation and vestments. There is a gentle hint that the consecration prayer should regain the eucharistic character so lacking in Cranmer's writing. The new rite composed by the Church of South India (CSI) was praised for its emphasis on the place of the laity in worship. Genuinely archaic language must be eliminated, but at the same time care must be taken not to lose traditional images. Social conditions had changed, and the institutions which rightly dominated the intercessory material in the Prayer Book (e.g. the Privy Council, the nobility, the sovereign) could not all be said to have the same significance for worshippers today. Finally, the growth in our knowledge of early Christian worship had cast a different light on the disputes of the past: the modern emphasis on thanksgiving in the eucharist, and a broader concept of sacrifice, opened up the prospect of a more comprehensive liturgy for today.

The Lambeth Conference Committee on the Book of Common Prayer

The Lambeth Conference Committee concerned with liturgy contained four English bishops, including Colin Dunlop.⁷⁸ The Committee's report was clear and direct in its recommendations, and hopeful that they would be widely accepted. It will become apparent that this optimism was somewhat premature, though not wholly misplaced.

The place of the Prayer Book in the modern Church

Hitherto it had been assumed that 1662 was the basic pattern of Anglican worship and the bond of unity between provinces. But these assumptions must now be set aside. In the first place, the unity of the Communion rested on it being 'a federation of provinces and dioceses of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, each being served and governed by a catholic and apostolic ministry, and each believing the Catholic faith'⁷⁹ — and not on the use of a common liturgy. Secondly, to assume that 1662 was everywhere the pattern of Anglican worship was to ignore the facts. There was already tremendous variety in the prayer books of the Anglican Communion, some of which were closer to 1549 or to the Scottish rites than to 1662. One could list a number of features⁸⁰ in these many books which were essential or effective in safeguarding the unity of the Anglican Communion, such as the use of the scriptures, the use of the creeds, worship in the vernacular, and so on, but conformity to the pattern of 1662 was not among them.

The eucharist

Notwithstanding the variety of worship in the Anglican Communion, the Committee hoped to see a greater uniformity in eucharistic liturgy; not 'one use', but the possibility of a basic pattern for the service of Holy Communion which would commend itself to all provinces.

The Committee also had specific suggestions for the revision of the rite. There should be provision for an Old Testament lesson and psalms. The sermon should follow the Gospel, and the Creed follow the sermon as a response of faith to the whole Ministry of the Word. There should also be a 'note of adoration' in the ante-communion, either the Gloria or Te Deum.

The Committee was also hopeful that old disputes over the nature of eucharistic sacrifice could now be laid aside, 'the tensions surrounding this doctrine transcended, and the way prepared for the making of a liturgy . . . which will in its essential structure win its way through the whole Anglican Communion'.⁸¹

The doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice which the Committee expounded (and to which they hoped all Anglicans could assent) is set out succinctly in two pages. The redeeming work of Christ is not limited to his death on the Cross, but included 'all that contributed to it, of which it was the culmination'. The sacrifice 'is once for all', but 'it is not only an event in history, but the revelation of eternal truth'. Through our baptism we are united with Christ, and so in the eucharist 'we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us and so present it again, and ourselves in him, before the Father'. As Buchanan argues, the '*and so*' is not a logical step,⁸² and this expression of eucharistic offering is therefore curiously unfocussed. Finally come the intriguing sentences: 'We ourselves, incorporate in the mystical body of Christ, are the sacrifice we offer. Christ with us offers us in himself to God.' The bishops' position is perhaps not as carefully argued as it might be; and one is left in the end with the impression that the bishops were trying to create doctrinal accord rather than describing it.

Two other parts of the eucharistic rite were briefly mentioned. Firstly, on the question of the epiclesis, the bishops stressed that the work of the Holy Spirit is integral to the eucharistic action *whether or not* there is an explicit invocation. Secondly, the doctrine of 'consecration through thanksgiving' was commended

because it was 'scriptural and primitive and goes behind subsequent controversies with respect to the moment and formula of consecration'.⁸³

Conclusion

The Report ended with a note urging caution (evidence, perhaps, of Colin Dunlop's hand). In some Churches there was considerable opposition on the part of the laity to anything other than very modest changes. Nevertheless, it should be recognised that revision was proceeding in many places, and 'the movement cannot now be halted'. The Anglican Communion was not alone in embarking upon liturgical renewal; and 'because this liturgical movement has already begun to draw Christians closer to one another in thought and ways and worship, we cannot wish that our own Communion should stand aside'.

The 1958 Conference was breaking new ground. Where previous conferences had emphasized the centrality of 1662, this conference spoke of 'features of the *Books of Common Prayer*' which were essential or effective in safeguarding the unity of the Communion; but the features described were hardly confined to Anglicanism. And, significantly, there was no suggestion in the bishops' report that the distinctive and delicate theological balance of 1662 had any contemporary relevance to the Anglican Communion.

The Lambeth Conference Resolution

Resolutions, unlike committee reports, carry the full authority of the Conference. The 1958 resolutions strongly endorsed the Committee's position and commended the report 'to the study of the whole Anglican Communion'. Resolution 74 set out three principles for liturgical revision:

The Conference, recognising the work of Prayer Book revision being done in different parts of the Anglican Communion,

- a) calls attention to these features in the Books of Common Prayer which are essential to the safeguarding of our unity: i.e. the use of the canonical Scriptures and the Creeds, Holy Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion, and the Ordinal;
- b) notes that there are other features in these books which are effective in maintaining the traditional doctrinal emphasis and ecclesiastical culture of Anglicanism and therefore should be preserved;
- c) and urges that a chief aim of Prayer Book revision should be to further that recovery of the worship of the primitive Church which was the aim of the compilers of the first Prayer Books of the Church of England.⁸⁴

The Conference therefore encouraged provinces to be bold, both in the extent of their departure from the pattern of 1662 and in their treatment of eucharistic sacrifice (one of the 'other features' of Anglican liturgies); and it is worth noting the importance given here to the worship of the primitive Church.

In England, at least, these concerns have been largely vindicated.⁸⁵ In the late 1950s and 1960s, however, there was disquiet among evangelicals about the implications of what the bishops had endorsed. The Oxford Evangelical Conference of 1958 took issue with the bishops, finding comfort in the Liturgical Commission's earlier caution:

The Conference agrees with the Liturgical Commission that the Revision in the Church of England should be Conservative and maintains that the 1662 Book of Common Prayer should remain the basic pattern . . . The statement in the Lambeth Conference Report claiming that 'controversies about the Eucharistic Sacrifice can be laid aside' is prematurely optimistic. The opinion of the Report that Christ's sacrifice can be presented to God again and again is inconsistent with the fundamental doctrine of Justification by Faith, which expresses the completeness of God's work in man's salvation.⁸⁶

Christopher Cocksworth, in his survey of changing attitudes to the eucharist among evangelicals, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England* (1993), detects the same feeling generally. The Report of the Lambeth Conference Prayer Book Committee was seen as a 'capitulation to Anglo-Catholicism and therefore . . . a betrayal of Reformation principles'.⁸⁷ These principles had been, firstly, a clear identification between Christ's sacrifice and his death; and secondly, that the Church's relationship to Christ's death is 'one of reception of its benefits and not involvement in either its making or its offering'. Hence the theological issue underlying the evangelical unease about Lambeth was 'whether the eucharist should involve . . . a presentation to God of Christ's one sacrifice.' Furthermore, for Cocksworth, evangelicals understood Christ's sacrifice in terms of his death alone, while the Lambeth Report spoke of Christ's 'willing obedience' to the Father in terms of his whole incarnate and risen life.

Evangelicals recognised that liturgical revision was inevitable, and to some extent, desirable. Some were prepared to be adventurous, e.g. the authors of *An Evangelical Eucharist* (1963).⁸⁸ All the same, evangelicals were cautious, fearing that reform would inevitably take the liturgy in a catholic direction.⁸⁹

Buchanan commented at length on the effects of the Lambeth Report in his survey *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968*. He generally welcomed the proposals for the Ministry of the Word, but found those for the Ministry of the Sacrament less

satisfactory. Concerning the offertory, Lambeth had only made the existing confusion worse. The bishops' advocacy of 'consecration through thanksgiving' was welcome enough, but it was not clear how many churches would apply it consistently.⁹⁰ Finally the position on eucharistic sacrifice lacked logical coherence and was ultimately unsatisfying both to evangelicals and to catholics.⁹¹

5.7 The Church of South India

It all began . . . in South India . . . and, whilst revisions of eucharistic liturgy in the Anglican Communion were still grinding on with 1928-type texts, a trend was being set which the compilers of the CSI liturgy could hardly have foreseen.⁹²

The Church of South India was formed in September 1948 from a union of Anglicans, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians. At first it was expected that congregations would continue to use their 'own' historic rites, but as the new Church grew into closer unity, a desire grew for a new, unifying eucharistic rite. Accordingly the Liturgical Committee was asked in February 1949 to draw up a draft in time for the Synod meeting in January 1950. The geographical size of the province, together with lack of funds for travel, meant that much of the Committee's work was done by correspondence, with the convener Leslie Brown doing almost all the drafting.⁹³

The Committee were aiming for more than a mere revision or amalgam of existing rites. They worked to four principles: the new rite must be faithful to scripture, truly corporate, preserve familiar features of existing traditions, and include truly Indian characteristics. Also the Liturgy of the Word was to be usable as a service in itself, because of the shortage of presbyters. Despite the pressure of time, the final draft was ready for the Synod and duly authorised for use.

The main features of the rite

The rite itself, entitled *The Lord's Supper, or the Holy Eucharist*, began with a preparatory service, to be used, whenever possible, on the eve of the celebration. The rubrics directed that this service should contain praise, confession of sin, and the reading and preaching of God's word; it might also include the reading of the institution of the eucharist from 1 Corinthians 11 ('the Warrant'), the decalogue or the Summary of the Law, with responses, and an exhortation in the Reformed style.

In the service 'proper', after the entrance of the ministers, the Collect for Purity was said by all; then followed the Gloria, or other hymn of praise; and the reading of the Warrant or the Decalogue if the preparatory service had not been used. Before the Ministry of the Word, there was a confession and absolution.

The Ministry of the Word took the form: collect, Old Testament reading, psalm or hymn, epistle and gospel, followed by the sermon, the Creed and the prayers.

The final part of the rite — 'The Breaking of the Bread' — began with offertory sentences, followed by the peace and the offertory of alms and of bread and wine. The sequence which followed formed a single eucharistic prayer, beginning with the *Sursum corda*, preface, Sanctus and Benedictus, 'Consecration' (from 1662), anamnesis, invocation, prayer for unity and doxology. There were two congregational acclamations: the first, an acclamation of remembrance, following the 'Consecration', and the second, an acclamation of praise, following the anamnesis. During the eucharistic prayer the presbyter was to stand in the westward position, to avoid giving any impression (especially to those from Hindu backgrounds) that the presbyter was praying to a cross. Then came the Lord's Prayer, silence, the 1662 Prayer of Humble Access, the fraction, communion, post-communion prayer, blessing and a hymn (or part of Psalm 103 or *Nunc Dimittis*).

The many influences on this rite are readily discernible. From 1662 come the Collect for Purity, the invitation to confession, the comfortable words and the absolution (but not the confession), the collects which conclude the intercessions, the Consecration, the Prayer of Humble Access and the blessing. Other texts in the CSI rite, such as the Gloria, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, follow the 1662 form but are also widely used in other traditions and cannot be regarded as peculiarly Anglican. The second post-communion prayer, however, combines the two 1662 post-communion prayers; it is essentially the Prayer of Thanksgiving with the words of self-oblation from the Prayer of Oblation inserted before the final doxology.

Also well represented is the Presbyterian Book of Common Order (BCO). Texts from this source include the Exhortation from the preparatory service (slightly modified), the confession, and the eucharistic preface for general use:

It is verily meet, right and our bounden duty,
 that we should, at all times and in all places,
 give thanks unto thee,
 O Lord, holy Father, Almighty and Everlasting God:
 Through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord,
 through whom thou didst create the heavens and the earth
 and all that is in them,
 and didst make man in thine own image,
 and when he had fallen into sin
 didst redeem him to be the first fruits of a new creation.

A further eight out of eleven proper prefaces come from the BCO — the other three are from the 1928 Prayer Book. Also from the BCO are the invocation on both the elements and the congregation:

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father,
 to sanctify with thy Holy Spirit,
 us and these thy gifts of bread and wine,
 that the bread which we break
 may be the communion of the body of Christ,
 and the cup which we bless
 the communion of the blood of Christ.

The Methodist rite in current use was the 1936 Service, closely based on the BCP; a specifically Methodist influence is therefore more difficult to find. However, the Methodist practice of 'Communion by tables' was recommended (i.e. a complete row of communicants wait at the rail until all have received, a sentence is said, and only then do they return to their seats and another row take their place), as well as the practice of processing the Bible into church at the beginning of the service.

A strong Indian influence can also be seen. As far back as the 1910s, J.C. Winslow had argued for a more indigenous liturgy, drawing on the tradition of the old Syrian Church in Malabar which used the eastern liturgy of St James.⁹⁴ Now that the CSI was free from loyalty to 1662 and anxious by intent to include truly Indian elements in its new rite, it is no surprise to find that in several places the 1949 CSI rite echoes old Syrian forms. Instead of the Gloria may be sung the trisagion from the Holy Qurbana. The peace also derives from the Syrian Churches of Malabar, and the rubrics directed that it be performed in the manner of the Indian social greeting, using both hands. Also from the Qurbana is the Benedictus, with its note of future promise:

Blessed be he that hath come and is to come
 in the name of the Lord⁹⁵

and also the second congregational acclamation, coming after the anamnesis and before the Invocation:

We give thanks to thee,
we praise thee,
we glorify thee, O Lord our God.

It is however in the *structure* of the rite that the compilers were most innovative. The CSI rite incorporated many ideas which had been suggested and talked about for some years, but had never before been seen (and certainly not all together) in a living rite. The pattern of the central section is unmistakably 'Dixian', with a strong offertory, a coherent and unified eucharistic prayer, a fraction (which may be silent, but is in any case carried out *after* the institution narrative) and finally communion. Furthermore the Gloria is restored to the beginning of the service, and followed immediately by the confession; the intercession is responsive; there is provision for an Old Testament reading at each celebration; and the service has an unusual degree of congregational participation through the acclamations and through joining in some previously 'presidential' prayers.

Some reactions to the rite

Jasper quotes the approving comments of Fr Louis Bouyer (1956) to the new rite:

There is no doubt whatever that, while it skilfully incorporates quite unexceptionable Protestant customs, still, from the point of view of even a conservative Catholic (or Orthodox) liturgist, this eucharistic liturgy seems much more satisfactory than any liturgy which emanated from the Reformation. Unquestionably, it is much superior to the Prayer Book of the Church of England on account of its traditional character and its theological soundness.⁹⁶

but curiously fails to mention the reply by Grisbrooke (1956), who challenged this catholic understanding of the rite.⁹⁷ Before commenting on the rite itself, Grisbrooke examined the credal orthodoxy of the CSI and the Church's understanding of its ministry, and found both to be highly unsatisfactory. According to the constitution of the CSI, the liturgical use of the creeds could not be imposed upon a congregation, nor could assent to them be required of any member of the Church; and the CSI's understanding of presbyteral and episcopal orders fell far short of Grisbrooke's understanding of catholic sacramental ministry.

With these misgivings in mind, he turned his attention to the eucharistic rite, seeking a doctrinal understanding of the rite rather than concentrating on its liturgical merits,

because according to apologists for the rite, 'it clearly displays sound doctrine, both of the Eucharistic Presence, and of the Eucharistic Sacrifice'.⁹⁸

As far as eucharistic sacrifice was concerned, Grisbrooke found the CSI liturgy wanting in comparison with the rites which had probably influenced it (BCO, Anglican Ceylon Liturgy, the Indian rite); indeed its anamnesis was much the weakest of them all. The CSI liturgy alone declined to 'plead any sacrifice at all'.

Turning to the rite's understanding of eucharistic presence, Grisbrooke discerned some hope in the words of institution, the post-communion prayers, the invitation to confession 'we have come . . . to receive the body and blood of the Lord', and the manual acts during consecration. However, the epiclesis followed (in weakened form) that of BCO, rather than the infinitely preferable pattern of the rites of Ceylon/India; and it unfortunately declined to ask that the elements might become for us the body and blood of the Lord, or even that the communicants, receiving the elements, might be partakers of the Lord's body and blood.

But there was far worse to come. The rubrics at the end of the service stated that 'any bread and wine set apart in the Service which remains over shall be carried out to the vestry, and may there be reverently consumed'. Might, then, the bread and wine — 'set apart', not 'consecrated' — *not* be reverently consumed, but perhaps returned to the box or bottle to be 'set apart' again next time, following the practice of some Reformed Churches?

Finally, there was the provision for supplementary consecration. Grisbrooke noted that neither the words of institution nor the epiclesis was mandatory to consecrate additional bread and/or wine — so CSI was consistent with neither the western or the eastern doctrines of consecration. In other words, the rite simply could not, in any sense, be described as embodying a catholic understanding of the eucharistic presence.

There is no doubt that Grisbrooke is direct, even uncharitable in his remarks; and perhaps this explains Jasper's silence about his attack. The CSI rite was very important to Jasper; in his own words, it 'marked a kind of watershed in the history of liturgical revision; it coloured the thinking of would-be revisers; and its influence, whether direct or indirect, was undeniable'.⁹⁹ But Grisbrooke was, of course, quite correct: Methodist and Reformed practice *did* have a profound influence on the CSI rite, as they should. The participating churches differed in respect of their use of creeds in worship,

additional consecration and the disposal of consecrated elements; it was surely most unlikely that Anglican practice would become mandatory in each of these areas.

A more measured reflection was given by J.R. MacPhail in 1964. Speaking from first-hand experience of the rite, he said that 'to Anglicans and Methodists it may seem to be too Presbyterian; non-Anglicans may think it is only the Prayer-Book a little modified. That is as it should be'. Above all here was *good liturgy*. There was an undeniable sense of participation, as felt by a young girl:

Mummy, it's smashing! It isn't only the priest doing something for us, we're all doing it together!¹⁰⁰

The liturgy actually *worked* in evoking within us that which a good eucharistic liturgy should express:

This liturgy brings out, as all the Western liturgies do, man's need of God's grace; I can testify that it purges the conscience. But it does not stop, as Western liturgies are apt to do, with the salvation and sanctification of individuals: it brings out the universal scope of the redemption wrought in Christ, as emphasised by the Eastern liturgies. Our hearts are warmed and searched, so that we know we must repent. We also realise how long-continuing and all-embracing is the work of God. We do not forget the Holy Spirit, nor the End, nor the unity of the Church as Christ prayed for it the night He was betrayed. We are shown that the Church must be apostolic, and that apostolic means missionary, and that in order to be missionary the Church must be one even as it must be holy and catholic. People cut off from one another, whether by prejudice or by indifference, cannot speak about one God so as to make the world listen.¹⁰¹

5.8 Other contributions

It is widely agreed that the CSI rite blazed the trail for more radical reform elsewhere; but there were other voices clamouring for the attention of the Liturgical Commission as they set about the task of producing a radically revised eucharist for the Church of England. In the first place, other provinces of the Anglican Communion were similarly engaged in reform; and secondly, there was a significant body of experimental liturgical writing — all of it unofficial, of course — produced by individuals and groups within England.

The 1965 Pan-Anglican Document

At the 1958 Lambeth Conference, the Prayer Book sub-committee expressed the hope, taken up in Resolution 76a, that an 'Advisory Committee' be formed to consider the structure of the eucharist. Both Buchanan¹⁰² and Jasper¹⁰³ record the sluggishness with which anything was done about this. At length, however, a document emerged, mainly from the hand of Leslie Brown, by then Archbishop of Uganda, known as the *Pan-Anglican Document* and circulated generally in March 1965. However, its influence on the English revision was at best minimal. According to Buchanan the document never came before the Liturgical Commission, while according to Jasper, 'it never loomed large in our own Commission's discussions'. All the same, much of it (though not quite all) echoes the Commission's thinking in preparation for Series 2. The section on the Ministry of the Sacrament reads:

The Service of the Lord's Supper . . . should include the placing of the gifts on the Lord's Table and the ancient form of *Sursum corda*. The consecration prayer should be in the form of a thanksgiving for creation and for God's mighty acts in Christ and in sending the Holy Spirit. There should be a recital of the words and the acts of the Lord at the Last Supper and a prayer for the communicants. The Lord's Prayer makes a fitting end to this prayer. The Breaking of the Bread follows, and the communion of clergy and people.¹⁰⁴

A Liturgy for Africa

This was an attempt to provide a unified rite for the Anglican Churches throughout Africa, and again owes a great deal to Leslie Brown. Its main interest for the current study centres on the form of the anamnesis. Following the institution narrative there is a congregational acclamation, after which the eucharistic prayer reads:

Wherefore, O Father, we do this as thy Son commanded, offering to thee, with this holy Bread and Cup, our praise and thanksgiving for his one sacrifice once offered upon the cross, for his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension. Accept us in him, we beseech thee, and grant that all we who are partakers of this holy communion may be filled with thy Holy Spirit and made one in thy holy Church, the body of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, for ever and ever. Amen.

There is a complex of sacrificial ideas here: the elements are offered to God, along with 'our praise and thanksgiving' for Christ's offering; and the prayer asks that the worshippers may be accepted in Christ, an implicit offering of themselves.

An Evangelical Eucharist

Representatives of 'the four Conservative Evangelical Colleges' — Oak Hill College, the London College of Divinity, Tyndale Hall and Clifton Theological College — produced this service as a way of giving modern expression to Cranmer's doctrine.¹⁰⁵ The introductory remarks set out the authors' intentions to avoid the 'redundancies' of the 1662 order; to emphasize the 'givenness' of salvation; the modernizing of the language and the use of modern versions of the Scriptures; greater lay participation in the service, including the leading of much of it; and 'the integration of the worship inside the church building with the life of the world outside'.

In particular it was necessary to move the offertory (of money) to the very end of the service, and to prepare the elements on the Table before the service began (or else unobtrusively during singing), for 'if Cranmer's service is a liturgical expression of the doctrine of Justification by Faith, then the offertory in the traditional position is the weakest part of it, and this present service is an attempt to remedy that deficiency'. Unlike 1662, the canon does not end after the words of institution but continues:

Wherefore, O loving Father, we in obedience to Thy Son's command do break this bread and drink this cup in remembrance of Him, and we pray that by the power of the Holy Spirit we may all be united to Thee and to one another in the mystical body of our Lord, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and, continuing in this holy fellowship we may be filled with the fruits of His divine indwelling, and may attain to Thy everlasting kingdom; through . . .

Here, then, there is no offering; the operative verbs are *break, drink, pray* (*that we may be united with Christ . . .*). That which is 'done' in remembrance of Christ is to break the bread (curiously not to *eat* it) and drink the cup. The rite was an interesting and consistent exposition of its compilers' aims.

The Southwark Eucharist

In an article in *Studia Liturgica* in 1963, Stephen Mann described a eucharistic liturgy which his bishop had asked him to compile. There was 'a good deal of talk' about the possibility of a new eucharistic rite, and he saw here an opportunity 'to break free from all "tied" thinking, and be bold enough to produce a liturgy which would be free from alliances either with the Book of Common Prayer, or the Latin rites'. But what kind of rite should be produced? Mann's aims were threefold: (1) to make the eucharistic prayer a true thanksgiving for 'creation, redemption, and the making of the people of the Covenant'; (2) to make a clear separation between the Ministry of the Word and the

supper; (3) to bring the offertory, consecration, fraction and communion into close proximity, 'with as little intervening material as was necessary'. Furthermore, 'all language which might have suggested that there is a "double" offering in the eucharist (first of the material gifts of bread and wine, and then, later, of the transformed gifts after the consecration) was studiously avoided'.

It seems that the rite of which he speaks must be *A Draft Communion Service for purposes of discussion*, issued by the Liturgical Committee of the Diocese of Southwark.¹⁰⁶ This rite has a simple epiclesis, placed before the institution narrative:

Hear us, O Father, through Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord; and according to his institution grant that these thy creatures of bread and wine may be unto us his Body and Blood.

The eucharistic prayer concludes with an anamnesis which draws on the ambiguity of 1549 ('the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make'), and an oblation in which the Bread and Cup are 'set before' God, and praise and thanksgiving offered. In many ways this prayer was an eloquent expression of the liturgical hopes and dreams of many in the Church as the work of revision moved into a new period:

Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, we thy servants, having in remembrance his Holy Passion, his Mighty Resurrection and his Glorious Ascension, and looking for his coming again with power and great glory, do set before thee this Bread and this Cup to be that memorial which he has commanded us to make, humbly praying thee to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving at thy throne on high, and to fill with grace and heavenly blessing those who eat and drink this sacrament; through Jesus Christ . . .

Notes

- 1 *The Liturgical Conference 1966*, pp.70f.
- 2 *Alternative Services, Second Series*, p.145.
- 3 *LC Minutes*, 34.4.
- 4 See Appendix 1.
- 5 *ibid.*
- 6 These included the war chaplains, the Life and Liberty movement, and to some extent those in official circles also (see §2.2 & §2.3).
- 7 Fenwick and Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, pp.5-11.
- 8 Shepherd, *The Liturgical Renewal of the Church*, p.21, quoted in Fenwick and Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p.vii.
- 9 *The Parish Communion*, p.3.
- 10 For a history of the Liturgical Movement and an assessment of its effects, see 'The Liturgical Movement' in Davies, *A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, pp.307-314.

There is some disagreement about the relationship between the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church and its Anglican counterpart. While most writers see the latter as largely dependent on the former, Donald Gray (*Earth and Altar*) argues that the movement in the Church of England originated with the Christian Socialists. For a recent survey see Fenwick and Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, pp.37-52.
- 11 For an account of the movement see Jagger, *A History of the Parish and People Movement*.
- 12 Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*, p.7.
- 13 *ibid*, p.27.
- 14 Canterbury Convocation, 'Report of the Committee on the Spiritual Needs of Sailors and Soldiers after the War', Report 496 (1916).
- 15 Netherton (*Modified Rapture*) points out that this did not of course commit those voting to changing anything; indeed the resolution committed no-one to any action whatsoever. However, the terms in which the Report and Resolution were couched does rather suggest that those voting were serious in their intentions.
- 16 See Gray, *Earth and Altar*, p.153.
- 17 De Candole, 'The Parish Communion after 25 years', in *The Parish Communion Today*, p.1.
- 18 De Candole, quoted in Fenwick and Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p.44.
- 19 The 'Communion Manual' in Robinson, *Liturgy Coming to Life*.
- 20 In the second edition of *Liturgy Coming to Life*, Robinson recommended moving the offertory to just before the eucharistic dialogue so that the 'four-fold action of the eucharist follows swiftly, compactly and without interruption' (p.vi).
- 21 Buchanan, *Evangelical Anglicans and Liturgy*, p.7.
- 22 M. Thurian, 'The Present Aims of the Liturgical Movement', pp.107-114.
- 23 Quoted in Fenwick and Spinks, *Worship in Transition*, p.44.
- 24 *ibid.*
- 25 Ramsey, 'The Parish Communion', in *Durham Essays and Addresses*, p.17.
- 26 *ibid*, p.20.
- 27 *ibid*, p.19.

- 28 *The Parish Communion*, p.4.
- 29 *ibid*, pp.21f.
- 30 J.O. Cobham, 'The Sacrifice of the New Covenant' in *The Parish Communion*, p.71.
- 31 *The Parish Communion*, p.17.
- 32 Buchanan, *The End of the Offertory*, p.31.
- 33 Geoffrey Cuming, 'The Early Eucharistic Liturgies in Recent Research', in *The Sacrifice of Praise*, edited by Bryan Spinks, p.65.
- 34 Dix, *Shape*, p.xvii.
- 35 Spinks, 'Mis-Shapen', p.161.
- 36 Stevenson, *Gregory Dix*, p.24; his remark is also quoted by Spinks, 'Mis-Shapen', p.164.
- 37 See, for example, Spinks, 'Mis-Shapen'; Stevenson, *Gregory Dix*; Buchanan, *The End of the Offertory*; Jones et al, *The Study of Liturgy*, p.284; Jasper, *Development*, pp.179f.
- 38 Others have discerned a three-fold or a four-fold shape. Spinks, 'Mis-Shapen', pp.161f.
- 39 Of course Newton did not discover gravity: gravity was 'discovered' the first time people fell out of trees or dropped stones on their feet. Newton was seeking an explanation for planetary motion: what force, he asked, kept the heavenly bodies in their orbits about the sun? The famous falling apple led him to a bold and imaginative conjecture. Perhaps gravity — the same force which attracted objects to the earth — operated universally through space. Hence his *Theory of Universal Gravitation*.
- 40 Stevenson, *Gregory Dix*, p.23.
- 41 Dix, *Shape*, p.xi.
- 42 *ibid*, p.48.
- 43 *ibid*, p.49.
- 44 *ibid*, p.118.
- 45 For a useful account of this period see Buchanan, *The End of the Offertory*.
- 46 Robinson, *Liturgy Coming to Life*, p.39.
- 47 Buchanan, *The End of the Offertory*, pp.6-12.
- 48 Spinks, 'Mis-Shapen', pp.168-170.
- 49 *ibid*, p.169.
- 50 *ibid*, pp.167f.
- 51 An uncompleted collection of essays entitled 'The Myth of the Four Action Shape'. See *ibid*, p.174.
- 52 Joint Liturgical Group, *Initiation and Eucharist*, p.25.
- 53 J.L. Houlden, 'Sacrifice and the Eucharist' in *Thinking about the Eucharist* (Doctrine Commission), p.98.
- 54 Richard Buxton, 'The Shape of the Eucharist', in *Liturgy Reshaped*, p.85.
- 55 W. Jardine Grisbrooke, 'Oblation at the Eucharist II: the Liturgical Issues', p.37.
- 56 Geoffrey Cuming, 'The Early Eucharistic Liturgies in Recent Research', in Spinks (ed), *The Sacrifice of Praise*, p.65.
- 57 Spinks, 'Mis-Shapen', p.166. Spinks refers in particular to the Church in Wales's 1973 course *Learning Together*.
- 58 At the Anglican website address <http://www.anglican.org.uk/> (May 1997).

- 59 W. Jardine Grisbrooke, 'Anaphora', in *A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, pp.13-21.
- 60 Cuming, *Hippolytus: a Text for Students*; Jasper and Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, pp.31-38.
- 61 Ratcliff argued that the text originally ended with the Sanctus: Jasper & Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.33.
- 62 Cuming, *Hippolytus*, p.14. Hippolytus does also allow the bishop freedom to pray in his own words 'according to his ability'.
- 63 *ibid*, p.8.
- 64 Jasper & Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.31.
- 65 Stevenson, *Accept this Offering*, pp.58f.
- 66 This is not disputed, though the meaning which ought to be ascribed to such language is very much the subject of debate. For references, see Couratin, 'The Tradition Received'; Moreton, 'The Early Liturgies'; Buchanan, *The End of the Offertory*.
- 67 Cuming, *Hippolytus*, p.11; also Jasper & Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.35.
- 68 The New Testament uses at least three sacrificial/liturgical images, which are not easily reconciled to each other. In the *Gospels* Christ's death occurs at Passover time (in John, at the very time the Passover lambs were slain); *Hebrews* understands Jesus's sacrifice against the background of the Day of Atonement; and *1 Peter* picks up the image of the suffering servant of Isaiah 52-53. This is quite apart from all the other ways in which the NT and Christian tradition understand the death of Christ.
- 69 J.L. Houlden, 'Sacrifice and the Eucharist', in *Thinking about the Eucharist*.
- 70 David Glover, 'Liturgy and Doctrine', in Bradshaw and Spinks, *Liturgy in Dialogue*, p.60.
- 71 He is surely justified in this, in view of the ARCIC Statement on the eucharist (1971) and particularly the Elucidation (1979), in ARCIC, *The Final Report*, pp.13-14 and 18-20.
- 72 It is so called in 1662, but not in 1552.
- 73 See Gustaf Aulen, *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, for a sympathetic and thorough account of much modern thought in this area.
- 74 Resolution 78(a) of the 1948 Lambeth Conference.
- 75 *The Lambeth Conference 1958*, p.1.25.
- 76 Apart from the Church of England, only two other provinces replied: the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon (CIPBC) and the Scottish Episcopal Church.
- 77 LC, *Prayer Book Revision*, pp.29f.
- 78 The other three were the Bishops of Rochester (C.M. Chavasse), Gloucester (W.M. Askwith) and Truro (E.R. Morgan).
- 79 *The Lambeth Conference 1958*, p.2.79.
- 80 For a full list see *The Lambeth Conference 1958*, pp.2.80-2.81.
- 81 *The Lambeth Conference 1958*, p.2.83.
- 82 Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies*, p.19.
- 83 *The Lambeth Conference 1958*, pp.2.84-2.85.
- 84 *Resolutions of the Lambeth Conferences*, p.137.
- 85 See chapters 6, 7 and 8.
- 86 Editorial in *The Churchman*, 80 (1966), pp.26ff.
- 87 Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p.107.

- 88 A copy of *An Evangelical Eucharist* is kept among the Liturgical Commission papers (CERC LTC/LT/[0]); the introductory passage from it was printed in *Studia Liturgica*, 3 (1964), 175-177. More is said about this rite in §5.8.
- 89 Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, p.112.
- 90 Buchanan held that 'the test of what is thought to consecrate is an inspection not only of the canon itself, but also of the provisions for further consecration', and found that many of the new rites in the Anglican Communion had not applied the doctrine of 'consecration through thanksgiving' to this section of the rite — and thus betrayed their continued dependence on other ideas of consecration. See Appendix 3.
- 91 Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies*, p.19.
- 92 Colin Buchanan, 'Liturgical Revision in the Church of England in Retrospect' in *Liturgy Reshaped*, p.146.
- 93 Jasper, *Development*, p.201.
- 94 J.C. Winslow (ed), *The Eucharist in India* (quoted in Jasper, *Development*, p.140).
- 95 Jasper, *Development*, p.205.
- 96 *ibid*, p.202, quoting L. Bouyer, 'A Roman Catholic View of the Church of South India', *Theology*, 59 (1956), p.4.
- 97 Grisbrooke, 'The Constitution and Liturgy of the Church of South India'.
- 98 *ibid*, p.223.
- 99 Jasper, *Development*, p.206
- 100 MacPhail, 'Worship in the Church of South India', p.30.
- 101 *ibid*, p.31.
- 102 Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies*, pp.22-32.
- 103 Jasper, *Development*, pp.236-237.
- 104 Quoted in Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies*, p.32.
- 105 A copy of the document is held at CERC (LTC/LT/[0]); the introductory remarks were also published as a short article in *Studia Liturgica*, 3 (1964), pp.175-177.
- 106 The document bears no date or place of publication, and may have been intended only for circulation within the Diocese. A copy is held at CERC (LTC/LT/1).

6

SERIES 2

No revision that has to command a two-thirds majority in Convocation and Church Assembly *even for experimental use* is likely to be very revolutionary.

*John Robinson*¹

6.1 Guiding principles and early work

The Liturgical Commission's work on the eucharist began in earnest in 1959, when a committee of four (de Candole, Couratin, Addleshaw and Bowles) was asked to prepare a document on the ante-communion.² The group never actually met, and its 'report' is consequently no more than a collection of individual suggestions submitted by the members.³ However it is clear from the Commission's later work that the members of the committee were asking the right questions. Was it intended to use the revised ante-communion as a service on its own without communion (and, if so, should it contain elements of matins and the litany)? Should it be possible to shorten the service on weekdays by keeping mandatory material to the minimum — with perhaps a simple structure of Gloria, collect, lections and intercessions as the backbone? Could the intercessions be recast in litany form? It was perhaps inevitable, given the committee's lack of progress, that the Commission as a whole could do no more than discuss the proposals in general terms at their next meeting. In fact little more came of this project until the following year.

In June 1960 the Commission discussed the structure of the eucharist,⁴ aided by a thoroughly prepared memorandum by Harrison and Couratin.⁵ The memorandum began by presuming that 'we are all agreed that the eucharist ought to be an imitation of the Supper'. This was a curious use of the word 'imitation', for the memorandum immediately went on to note that in the New Testament the Supper is a seven-fold action, while the pre-Reformation eucharist followed a four-fold pattern. The memorandum went on to ask:

- 1) Should a revised eucharistic rite imitate this four-fold action?
- 2) Should, therefore, the Offertory, Consecration, Fraction and Communion be distinct, and recognisably so?
- 3) Should they also be a closely connected sequence, easily recognised as such?
- 4) Should 'subsidiary matter' as far as possible be excluded from this 'scriptural outline' and stand either before it or after it?

The influence of Dix is unmistakable, except of course in the description of the four-action shape as 'scriptural'.

The memorandum went on to explain how this shape might be expressed. The offertory should stand immediately before the eucharistic prayer; and the fraction, if it was to be a separate action distinct from the consecration, must be detached from the prayer of consecration and stand alone. Then there were a number of other questions. What was to be done with all the penitential material? Should the kiss of peace be restored, perhaps accompanied by an appropriate 'English' gesture (*cf* the CSI rite)? And what of the position of the Lord's Prayer?

When the memorandum came before the Commission, no final decisions were reached, but preliminary approval was given to the proposal to adopt a four-action shape; and in order to ensure that the four actions were closely associated with each other, it was decided also to move all the penitential matter (including the Prayer of Humble Access) to a position between the intercession and the offertory, and to remove the fraction from the institution narrative and to place it after the anaphora. The only intrusion in this scheme was the Lord's Prayer, placed between the fraction and the communion.

Much thought was given to the intercession. During their meeting in December 1960, the Commission had discussed the best position for it: whether it should come before the rite, at the end of the ante-communion, as part of the offertory (as in the Prayer Book) or within the anaphora. In the end it was agreed to place the prayers before the anaphora, not within it, and to deal with the form of the prayers at a later date.⁶

At the next meeting (January 1961) it was decided that, in principle, the intercession should stand in the middle of the service, as a prayer 'by the Church for the world and the Church'. The prayer should be split into sections (*cf* the CSI rite). Aware of

potential problems over prayer for the dead, the Commission deferred a decision on how to handle this, pending the advice of Archbishop Ramsey.

In June 1961 the Commission once again looked at the shape of the eucharist. Several more decisions were taken:

- 1) In the Prayer of Humble Access, to omit the words '... made one body with him, and that we may ...'
- 2) That the Gloria might become an introit, or, if it stayed where it was, to provide alternatives — perhaps the hymn 'Strengthen for Service', or a psalm from the Hallel group, or some other suitable hymn.
- 3) Not to include Agnus Dei, 'though it was realised that this may not restrain the musicians from singing it'.
- 4) Not to include Benedictus.
- 5) If the Sanctus, Creed and Gloria were to be sung, this should be to congregational rather than choral music, to increase lay participation.
- 6) To insert the Collect for Purity at the beginning; and that the exhortation, confession and absolution should follow it, *before* the collect of the day.
- 7) The possibility of allowing the remaining elements to be consumed shortly after communion rather than after the end of the service, as in the 1662 Prayer Book.

But these were small matters in comparison with the thorny question of the eucharistic prayer, on which no work had yet been done.

A new Liturgical Commission was appointed in 1962, which met for the first time in September. Changes were announced in the Commission's method of working; there were to be fewer plenary sessions and more committee work.⁷ (From 1956 there had been five meetings a year; this was reduced to four in 1962, and to just three in 1963 and 1964. However, the Commission then reverted to four meetings a year between 1965 and 1975.)

At the same meeting the chairman opened a discussion on the shape of the eucharist, notwithstanding all that the previous Commission had already done. The question was raised as to which rite, if any, the Commission should take as a starting point for

its new work. There were a number of suggestions: the chairman favoured the African Draft Liturgy, while Harrison proposed starting with 'the defects of the 1662 rite, with a justification of the Commission's departure from it'.⁸ In the end, however, Jasper gained general support for his suggestion that the Commission should adopt a 'clean sheet' approach and do some creative work of its own. While it was, of course, impossible to work with a genuinely 'clean sheet', uninfluenced by knowledge of other rites, Jasper's approach meant that no undue weight would be given to any one existing tradition — including 1662. Stephen Mann's hope of producing a liturgy 'free from alliances . . . with the Book of Common Prayer' was to be fulfilled.

At the next meeting (December 1962) decisions were taken with regard to the offertory.⁹ This was referred to in the minutes as an 'offering of bread and wine'; it was decided that it ought to be in close connection with the eucharistic prayer, and that any money should be brought up at the same time. Then, in the meeting in June 1963¹⁰, the Commission returned to the memorandum which Couratin and Harrison had prepared in 1960.¹¹ Couratin again spoke to the memorandum, and the Commission agreed:

- 1) to adopt a four-action rite;
- 2) that the offertory, consecration, fraction, and communion should be distinct actions, 'and also that the same weight does not attach to each of the four';
- 3) 'that they ought to be a closely connected sequence, easily recognized as such, and subsidiary matter should as far as possible be excluded from the scriptural outline, and should stand either before it or after it; and further that to this end the offertory ought to stand immediately before the eucharistic prayer';
- 4) 'that the Offertory act is an essential preliminary to the "taking" but that we ought not to be tied down to any particular interpretation';
- 5) that the offertory should be a significant act, performed in silence, and that an optional sentence or collect should be provided;
- 6) that the fraction should be after the eucharistic prayer and before communion, and either performed silently or with a formula drawn from 1 Corinthians 10.

This was largely a repeat of decisions made by the previous Commission, though rather more was said on this occasion about the offertory, which was clearly exercising the Commission's mind.¹² Of particular interest is the possibility of a distinction being

drawn between the offertory and the 'taking' (point 4 above), where previously the two had been equated.

The next problem was the position of the penitential material. Notwithstanding the previous decision to place this in the introductory rite before the collect of the day, the Commission now agreed that it should be placed after the intercessions; and there was some discussion as to whether to retain the Prayer of Humble Access at all. In the end this prayer was retained, though its position was not determined.¹³

At the Commission's meeting in December 1963, Couratin succeeded in moving the discussion forward significantly. He persuaded his colleagues that it was time to produce a full draft, complete with rubrics, as a basis for further discussion. He felt the rubrics should allow considerable flexibility: for example, 'the first part of the rite might be read at the altar or in the reading pew', and there should be freedom with regard to non-essentials, for example, whether the Gloria came at the beginning or the end of the rite. It is clear that Couratin had already given some thought to the drafting of a new rite, for he then articulated his conviction, which would later become an important feature of all new drafting, that:

an honest and studied ambiguity would be necessary in some cases to accommodate persons of differing views.¹⁴

All this was accepted by the Commission, and Couratin was asked to produce a draft by April 1964 if possible, with a view to discussing it then and also in September. The Commission also felt that, before it submitted a final report, a draft rite ought to be published for general discussion.

6.2 'Reshaping the Liturgy'

The Commission believed that its work on the shape of the eucharist could profitably be brought to the attention of the wider Church and the public. Just as Naylor had outlined the Commission's thinking about the background to revision in his booklet *Why Prayer Book Revision at all?*, two other members of the Liturgical Commission, Couratin and de Candole, prepared a booklet on the structure of the eucharist and the way the service 'works'. The booklet, *Reshaping the Liturgy* (1964), took as its starting point the Prayer Book rite, going through each part one by one. Each section began

with a brief exposition of the Commission's thinking and concluded with a series of questions.

The introductory chapter presented the eucharist as a two-part service: a *Bible class* followed by the *supper*. The essentials of the Bible class were:

the reading of the Bible and exposition of it (in our service, these appear as the epistle, gospel and sermon). There may be a prayer or two to begin, or to conclude, and perhaps a hymn or more — but even they are extras.¹⁵

The description of the second part of the service was thoroughly Dixian:

The essential elements of the *supper* are the laying of the table and setting on of the food ('offertory'), the thanksgiving or grace before the meal ('consecration'), the preparation of the food for service ('fraction' or breaking of the bread), and the serving and eating of the meal itself ('communion'). Other things are additional — prayers of penitence and preparation (confession, absolution, prayer of humble access), subsequent prayers or hymn (prayers of oblation and thanksgiving, *gloria*), a solemn dismissal (blessing).

Certain features of the Prayer Book communion service did not appear in this outline. The exhortations, the decalogue, the creed, and even the intercessions were not mentioned. Indeed, very little seemed to be essential; perhaps only the bare Bible readings and exposition, followed by the four-action supper. This was in line with decisions already made by the Commission, and served to show how far the debate had moved on from the 1920s.

Despite its radicalism, this way of presenting the eucharist had the great strength of seeming to preserve continuity with 1662 while at the same time making progress towards a new shape. The 'essentials' were identified as elements of 1662, which was not, therefore, condemned as deficient, even if some elements would be better placed elsewhere, and other material omitted altogether. Behind it all, however, lies the assumption that the *primitive* rite, as far as it can be known, should form the pattern for our present-day eucharist rather than the pattern of 1662. The Prayer Book may have been the starting point, but the destination was unmistakable: a thoroughly Dixian rite.

The booklet also raised the question of liturgical language. The general drift of the argument was towards a more contemporary idiom than 1662, though the authors certainly favoured 'RSV' English over an authentically modern style. But there was room for variety within the service; for example the intercessions, being 'topical', might be in contemporary language while the consecration prayer kept its traditional style.

The rest of the booklet explored the eucharist section by section, raising various possibilities, always through the use of questions and alternatives. The main questions concerned:

- 1) the preparatory rite; whether anything at all was needed before the lessons, with particular doubt hanging over the decalogue and the prayer for the sovereign;
- 2) the possibility of having an Old Testament lesson, and questions about the eucharistic lectionary generally;
- 3) whether the Creed should be said on weekdays, and whether it might come after the sermon;
- 4) the position, content, form and language of the intercession;
- 5) the position, length and style of the penitential material;
- 6) whether the offertory should stand immediately before the consecration;
- 7) whether the prayer of consecration should be a thanksgiving, with a memorial prayer and a reference to the work of the Holy Spirit;
- 8) to what extent the fraction should be regarded as 'one of the four acts of the supper' and therefore 'disentangled from the narrative of the institution';
- 9) the position of the Lord's Prayer;
- 10) the form of words used at the administration of communion;
- 11) what prayers were needed at the end of the rite.

These were precisely the questions which had exercised the Commission in its own deliberations; anything else would have been odd. But a series of questions is rarely 'open', and de Candole and Couratin's short essays, followed by carefully worded questions, were clearly designed to lead the reader in the direction the Commission was already taking.

6.3 Drafting Series 2

Couratin duly produced the draft he had been asked for, and introduced it to the Commission in April 1964.¹⁶ The rite gave expression to the ideas set out in *Reshaping the Liturgy*. The bulk of this structure survived into the Commission's published draft of Series 2, as did much of the text. Most of the Commission's alterations to Couratin's work were modest:

- a) the Collect for Purity was added as an option at the beginning of the rite;
- b) the alternatives to the Gloria were omitted;
- c) the sermon and intercession were made mandatory at all services;
- d) Benedictus was moved to the end of the thanksgiving, and made optional;
- e) Agnus Dei was moved from its position as a communion anthem to the fraction, where it became optional;
- e) a slightly modified form of the 1662 words of administration was introduced as a general invitation to communion;
- f) hymns and anthems were allowed during communion;
- g) there was some tidying up of the second post-communion prayer, and both were included in the Conclusion.

However, the Commission's changes to Couratin's intercession and thanksgiving were more extensive. This is hardly surprising, for these were controversial matters, concerning which the Commission was not of one mind. Indeed, one member, Colin Buchanan, was unable to subscribe either to the petition for the dead in the intercession or to the oblation.

The intercession

The intercession was in litany form, with short biddings to which particular intentions might be added, followed by short collects which could be said by the priest alone or by the priest and people together. The prayers came under four headings: the church, the world, those in trouble, and the departed. The prayer for the departed took the following form:

We remember before thee the departed.

(particular intentions / silence)

**Finally we commend to thy keeping all those who have departed this life,
beseeching thee that they may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom.**

Following comments from the Commission, Couratin redrafted the prayers to make the provision for extempore petitions clearer. This form was then lightly revised, and the response 'Lord in thy mercy / **hear our prayer**' was added. The modified prayer for the departed was made entirely optional:

*If the dead are to be commemorated, he may commend them by name here;
and again a short period of silence may be kept; after which he may say,*

Lord, in thy mercy,
Hear our prayer.

Remember all those who have died in faith, and sleep in the peace of Christ,
and grant them a share in thy eternal kingdom.¹⁷

In the published draft, this order was reversed, with the collect coming first, then the names of the dead, then the response. The rubric was suitably recast, and the whole now read:

If the dead are to be commemorated, he may say,

Remember those who have died in faith, and sleep in the peace of Christ,
and grant them a share in thy eternal kingdom.

*Here he may commend them by name; and again a short period of silence may be kept; after
which he may say,*

Lord, in thy mercy,
Hear our prayer.

Similar changes of order were made in the other petitions. But there was particular sensitivity about the petition for the dead, which the Commission had carefully attempted to meet. Firstly, they ensured that the petition could be omitted altogether. Secondly, only the *faithful* departed were commemorated in this prayer. Thirdly, God was asked to 'remember' the dead; in Couratin's draft the worshippers had 'commended' the dead to God's keeping.

The thanksgiving

Couratin's first draft can only be described as ambitious. The post-Sanctus reads:

Hear us, O Father, through Christ thy Son our Lord; through him accept our sacrifice of praise; and according to his institution grant, that these thy creatures of bread and wine may be unto us his body and his blood;

Who in the same night that he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks to thee, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup; and when he had given thanks to thee, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, in remembrance of his all-sufficient sacrifice, and looking for his coming again in glory, we offer unto thee this bread and this cup; and we pray thee to accept this our service on high in the presence of thy divine majesty, that with all thy saints we may stand before thee and minister unto thee, through the same Christ our Lord;

By whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, from the whole company of earth and heaven, throughout all ages, word without end.

Amen. Hosanna in the highest.

At the next few meetings of the Commission the whole rite was discussed and amended, beginning with the Introduction and working through the service in order. In December 1964 discussion reached the post-Sanctus.¹⁸ The words 'according to his institution' were omitted from the first paragraph; Couratin's institution narrative was approved; the words 'on high' were omitted from the oblation; and the rest of the eucharistic prayer was then approved as it stood.

At their next two meetings, in March/April and June 1965, however, more extensive alterations were made. The Commission had before them two variant forms of the draft eucharist, in which the anamnesis and oblation had been redrafted in different ways.¹⁹ In the first of these (Memorandum 50B) the anamnesis reads:

Wherefore, in remembrance of his saving Passion, his Resurrection from the dead, and his glorious Ascension into heaven, and looking for his coming again in glory, we offer unto thee this bread and this cup; and we pray thee to accept this our service in the presence of thy divine majesty, that with all thy saints we may stand before thee and minister unto thee, through the same Christ our Lord . . .

The second (Memorandum 50D) reads somewhat differently:

Wherefore, O Lord, we do this in remembrance of his passion and resurrection, until he comes; we offer unto thee this bread and this cup; and we thank thee for calling us, with all thy saints, to stand and minister before thee, and to eat and drink in the presence of thy divine majesty, through the same Christ our Lord . . .

At the June meeting these two forms were discussed in some detail. Professor Evans spoke of problems with the phrase 'until he comes'; eschatological language did not mean the same thing to us as it had to St Paul. Harrison suggested 'looking for his kingdom and his glory', and it was agreed to insert such a phrase.²⁰

The second point of contention was 'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup'. The minutes record Couratin's defence of his draft:

. . . these words were disliked by evangelicals but if they were left out there was nothing to make the new prayer acceptable to the whole of the other section of the Church. They need not be taken to mean the offering of Christ; nor need one deem consecration to be effected by a particular form of words at a particular moment. It could be the whole thanksgiving prayer. The words, 'we offer . . . cup' enforced neither the catholic nor the evangelical interpretation. There was a long-standing demand to consecrate, then offer the sacrament publicly to God, then distribute.²¹

On the question of consecration, Couratin was trying to have it both ways. One can indeed hold that consecration is effected by the whole prayer, or one can believe it to be effected by the institution narrative (and/or epiclesis) alone. However, if consecration is deemed to be effected by 'the whole thanksgiving prayer', then the second understanding is excluded, and the 'long-standing demand to consecrate, then offer the sacrament publicly to God' cannot be satisfied. Or was this one of Couratin's 'honest and studied' ambiguities?

The final form of the paragraph owed more to the first variant (50B) than the second, with its fuller sense of remembrance of the passion, resurrection and ascension. The Commission also chose to omit the mention of ministering before God in the company of the saints. The published form of the paragraph read:

Wherefore, O Lord, having in remembrance his saving passion, his resurrection from the dead, and his glorious ascension into heaven, and looking for the coming of his kingdom, we offer unto thee this bread and this cup; and we pray thee to accept this our duty and service in the presence of thy divine majesty, through the same Christ our Lord . . .

This was the first draft made available outside the Commission's circles, and so the first to be available to scrutiny and comment. Gone from Couratin's text was most of

the sacrificial imagery, except for 'we offer unto thee this Bread and this Cup' and the words following. The Commission had added a remembrance of the resurrection and the ascension, and tidied up the eschatological reference. The rite finally offered to the Convocations and the Church Assembly was certainly more likely to gain acceptance than Couratin's work; it was also, in many ways, closer to Anglican precedent.²²

The breaking, the sharing and the conclusion

Since the **fraction** was now a significant and distinctive action, Couratin gave it an accompanying text based on 1 Corinthians 10.16-17. This was optional (the breaking could, if preferred, be done in silence) and the text could be used responsively. Couratin also suggested the Benedictus at this point, but the Commission moved this to the end of the canon and allowed the Agnus Dei as an anthem during the fraction.

Couratin's **words of administration** were a drastic simplification of the Prayer Book text: 'The body of Christ. **Amen.**' and 'The blood of Christ. **Amen.**' The Commission retained these, but reintroduced the Prayer Book words as a general invitation to be said before communion was received: 'Draw near with faith: receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for you, and his blood, which was shed for you; and feed on him in your heart by faith with thanksgiving.'

If the consecrated elements ran short, the method prescribed for **additional consecration** was that of 1662. Couratin had suggested ending with the words of institution. The Commission's rubric required the priest to 'place both bread and wine upon the holy Table', and 'read the Prayer of Consecration, beginning at "Hear us, O Father", and ending at, "through the same Christ our Lord'. Any remaining elements were to be consumed unless required 'for purposes of communion'; like Series 1, the question of the communion of the sick was left open.

Two **post-communion prayers** were included: one prayer to be said by the whole congregation, consisting of the words of self-oblation from the 1662 Prayer of Oblation, and a shortened 1662 Prayer of Thanksgiving to be said by the priest alone. Couratin had drafted these, and the Commission did little more than expand them slightly.

Finally a simple, responsive **dismissal** was substituted for the 1662 priestly blessing.

6.4 Reaction to the draft rite

The storm-centre of the new rite, as expected, was the controversial phrase ‘we offer unto thee this bread and this cup’. As we have noted, there was unease about the phrase even within the Commission. Buchanan’s dissenting note read:

In joining with the Commission in generally commending this Report, I reluctantly dissent from the last paragraph but one of section 24. Inquiry has shown that the phrase ‘we offer unto thee this bread and this cup’ in the paragraph is unacceptable to many Anglicans. I could not use it myself.

In an article in *The Churchman* Buchanan explained his reasons.²³ First, ‘offering’ was not one of the instituted acts of Christ. Although the phrase appeared in Hippolytus, it could no longer be used in innocence, for it was now firmly associated with developed ideas of eucharistic sacrifice. Hippolytus ‘merely provides a convenient peg on which to hang the modern doctrine, and would surely never have been copied otherwise’.

Others joined the debate. The October 1966 issue of *Theology* ran a set of four articles examining the phrase in detail from four broadly catholic points of view, three of them favourable to the phrase and one dissatisfied with it.²⁴ In the first article, Houlden argued that catholics as well as evangelicals should object to the phrase. We did not, surely, offer bread and wine to God; what could God possibly want with these? It was Christ who offered, and what he offered was himself. But the appeal to Hippolytus was mistaken on other grounds as well:

A new liturgy does not only owe a debt to the Christian past . . . It also owes a debt to the present — to Christian doctrine at its widest, as the Spirit teaches us . . . Today’s tools make it right and proper to improve upon antiquity where we can.²⁵

The second article, written by Couratin and entitled ‘The Tradition Received’, gave him an opportunity to put his case at first hand. He held that the lack of a clear scriptural warrant should not deter us from embracing the language of offering, for the celebration of the sacraments rested not on scripture but on tradition: ‘If Christians at Corinth had not misbehaved at the eucharist, we should have no definite evidence that it was ever celebrated until the second century’.²⁶ The *continuing* celebration of the eucharist was hardly mentioned in the New Testament;²⁷ from the very first, regular celebration rested on tradition alone. And the subsequent development of the service — combining the blessings over bread and cup into one eucharistic prayer, removing the celebration from the context of a meal, and so on — had all happened without

scriptural warrant. The language of eucharistic offering could not therefore be deemed inappropriate simply because it was absent from the New Testament. Tradition was enough — and the language of offering could be found there in abundance.²⁸

There was no reason, then, why the Church should not welcome the Series 2 draft text as reflecting ‘the undeveloped language of the second century’. For those who still had qualms, Couratin argued, much as he had before the Liturgical Commission, that the words ‘we offer unto thee this bread and this cup’:

need mean no more than that we place the bread and cup at God’s disposal . . . Some will no doubt think that it says far less than they themselves would wish to say. Others will think it capable of an interpretation of which they themselves disapprove. But it is hoped that with generosity and good will on all sides it will be accepted as a fair compromise, especially as the rite of 1662 is to remain in use.²⁹

The third article in the series, ‘The Early Liturgies’ by Michael Moreton, again appealed to antiquity. Where Couratin had looked for sacrificial language in the *writings* of the early Church, Moreton examined the evidence for such language in early *liturgies*. This was important, because the Anglican eucharistic tradition owed a great deal to Cranmer’s reading of the early evidence,³⁰ and it was now known that his knowledge of early rites was severely limited. In fact, the evidence for eucharistic offering was far better attested in antiquity than Cranmer could have allowed for, and it was therefore entirely right to look back beyond 1662 in framing a eucharistic rite for today.

Finally, Geoffrey Cuming considered the question of eucharistic offering in the Reformation era under the title *The English Rite*. He noted that:

By the beginning of the sixteenth century the concept of sacrifice in the Mass had become so entwined in the tendrils of masses for the dead and votive masses that the Reformers could see nothing for it but to pull up the whole plant with the weeds that were smothering it. For Luther, the Mass is ‘a sacrament or a testament, or a blessing or eucharist, or the Lord’s Table or Supper, or memorial or communion, or whatever godly name one may choose to take, provided only that it be not defiled by being called a sacrifice or work’. The only possible offering is of ourselves. Justification by faith alone rules out any effective sacrifice.³¹

Luther, Bucer, Zwingli and Cranmer had all produced liturgies shorn of any suggestion that the bread and cup were offered to God. Cranmer’s first Prayer Book, however, had not applied Luther’s principle at all thoroughly. 1549 seemed to be ‘a very conservative revision of the Roman Canon’; so conservative, in fact, that, merely by rearranging 1552 material into the 1549 pattern, Andrewes and Overall were using the (forbidden) offering language.

Michael Moreton also wrote of 'other parts of the prayer which call for scrutiny, but which do not appear so far to have received attention'.³² The structure of the new thanksgiving was novel and defective. In antiquity, a thanksgiving for creation had preceded the Sanctus, and a *commemoration* of Christ's life and ministry — rather than a *thanksgiving* for it — came afterwards, in the narrative of the institution and continuing in the anamnesis, oblation and doxology. This sequence was clearly attested in Justin Martyr's writing and in fourth century texts. Nowhere did the pre-Sanctus consist of a comprehensive scheme of Christological thanksgivings such as the Liturgical Commission had produced. Their text was 'without precedent in Christendom'.

6.5 Revision and authorization

Procedures

The establishment of a Liturgical Commission was undoubtedly a success. A small body of people, meeting frequently and developing their liturgical ideas together, in regular contact with their counterparts in other Anglican provinces and other denominations, were in the best possible position to produce well-written and theologically coherent liturgies. It was unquestionably better to draft services this way than by majority votes in the Convocations and Church Assembly. But a draft is not the same thing as an authorized text, and the Commission's texts still had to face the scrutiny of the synodical bodies.

A few years beforehand, the Commission's baptismal texts had suffered rejection in the Convocations.³³ One consequence of this defeat had been the clarification of the role of the Commission. The Liturgical Commission had been established by the Archbishops; it could not initiate work of itself, but only do what it was asked to by the Archbishops, and it reported directly to them. During the debate in the Convocation of York on the initiation services, the Bishop of Sheffield criticised this arrangement. It raised serious questions about the liturgical rights and responsibilities of the Convocations; the Commission should work much more closely with them. The Archbishop of York (who was also chairman of the Liturgical Commission) accepted the criticism, and promised better communication in future between the Commission and the Convocations on the one hand, and between the Commission and the House of Bishops on the other.³⁴

The authorization of new texts required agreement in all four houses of Convocation and in the House of Laity. This procedure was known from experience to be cumbersome, so Archbishop Ramsey advocated Joint Sessions of the two Convocations for the purposes of Prayer Book revision, in order to speed up the process and avoid the frustration of subtly different decisions being taken in the Convocations of the two provinces. Such sessions were held in 1966 and were of great benefit.³⁵ But two further problems remained. First of all, the House of Laity were still excluded from the joint discussion; and secondly, as Jasper put it:

the constitutional position was such — as the earlier debacle over Initiation had indicated — that the Commission itself was unable to present its proposals to the legislative bodies of the Church. It would obviously be an advantage for the Commission to be able to state its own case and share in initial discussion.³⁶

The solution to both these problems was the series of **Liturgical Conferences**. These were effectively joint sittings of the Convocations and the House of Laity during which normal standing orders were suspended, for the purpose of discussion and gauging opinion. The formal decisions remained with the Convocations and the House of Laity, but they would be voting in the light of an informed joint discussion.

The Liturgical Conference 1966

The first Liturgical Conference was held in February 1966 and dealt with both Series 1 and Series 2 services. Jasper opened the Conference with an overview of the revision process. He outlined the Commission's principle of writing texts which were capable of more than one interpretation, and flexible enough to be widely used:

We have tried to accommodate as many views as possible, either by a careful choice of terms which have a wide meaning or by making permissive those forms of prayer which some might feel that they cannot conscientiously use. I might remind you that this is not weak and it is not dishonest. There are plenty of precedents for this if one chooses to study liturgical history . . .

Then again there is the principle of flexibility, allowing people to use services in ways which are suitable to their own local circumstances, and in the period of experiment rigid uniformity is hardly desirable . . .³⁷

Later, Couratin introduced the Series 2 draft eucharist. He said that the service was intended to serve the needs of a parish communion, and that meant a fairly radical revision of the 1662 service. In the intercessions, for instance:

we felt that something really drastic had to be done, not only with the *content* of the prayer for the Church, but also with its *form*. Nowadays people feel the need of

petitions for particular people and institutions and causes. You can see this from what happens nearly everywhere. A celebrant makes a number of biddings for the peace of the world, for the unity of the Church, for the railway strike, for the sick, and so on, and you remember all these before God; and, just as you are ready to pass on to something fresh, the celebrant embarks on the prayer for the Church. It was with this in mind that we drafted the intercession like a series of brackets into which contemporary petitions could be inserted.

Couratin went on to comment on the shape of the service. Much of the introductory rite was optional; indeed the first mandatory part of the service was the collect of the day. This was because 'the essence of the antecomunion service is the reading and preaching of scripture' — the 'Bible class' approach. For the ministry of the sacrament, the aim was to create an unashamedly Dixian shape, again presented as

'an imitation of the supper: the putting of the bread and wine on the table; the saying of the grace over them; the breaking up of the bread and the sharing . . .'

And just in case this was not clear enough to everyone, the Commission had put 'cross headings at the beginning of each fresh happening'.³⁸

Then there was the question of doctrinal clarity. Here Couratin asked the Conference to bear in mind the difficulties facing the Commission. The Church of England was both catholic and reformed, and it was at the eucharist that these two traditions differed most acutely. The Commission could have produced 'party' rites which leaned one way or the other, but these would obviously not have been acceptable. Or the Commission could have produced a rite 'which had no meaning at all', but that would be 'playing into the hands of those who say that the Church of England is neither catholic nor reformed'. So instead they had endeavoured to produce a rite 'which could convey either meaning; into which, or out of which, each could read his own interpretation'. People might think the Commission had been mistaken in this; but 'it seemed to us — and it still seems — that there was nothing else we could do'.

Although this point was not picked up at the 1966 Conference, it would later turn out that some in the Church were unhappy with this approach. In 1969 D.A. Scales launched a fierce attack from the evangelical side: 'nobody should seek refuge in the unscriptural idea that the intentional use of ambiguities is tolerable'.³⁹ But for most people the concern was not so much ambiguity or flexibility in itself, but the specific ambiguities which arose in the draft rite. Couratin, speaking at the Liturgical Conference, attempted a detailed explanation:

In the Prayer of Consecration we offer the Bread and Cup to the Father. This need mean no more than we put the Bread and Cup at God's disposal so that he may use it to feed those who receive with faith. It can, of course, be interpreted to mean something else, but it does not assert the fully developed doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It confines itself to the simple language of the first two centuries. This is the way in which Hippolytus and Irenaeus and Justin talked, and it is a way of talking which goes back into New Testament times; for Clement used this way of talking too. It is going to be very difficult to maintain the Anglican appeal to antiquity if we are not prepared to talk like this, if we are not prepared to offer the Bread and the Cup to the Father. Each can use the phrase with his own interpretation, and no-one need try and force his own interpretation [on others] . . .

Again, in the Prayer of Consecration we ask God to grant that the Bread and Wine 'may be unto us the body and blood of Christ'. You will recognise the phraseology as that of Cranmer in 1549. Again it falls short of the language of Catholic churches . . . [this prayer] is evenly poised between the subjective and the objective interpretation, and as such I would suggest that we should be able to use it.

Again, at the Communion the celebrant gives the bread to the communicant and says, 'The Body of Christ', and the communicant answers, 'Amen'. Here we have been accused of selling out to an objective view. We certainly had no intention of doing so . . . Scripture does not tell us what the Lord said when he gave thanks over the bread, but it does tell us what he said when he gave the bread to his disciples. He said: 'Take. This is my body.' If you put this into the mouth of the celebrant it becomes: 'Take. This is the body of Christ.' All we have done is to shorten this down to 'The body of Christ', and the communicant makes his act of faith in the reality of God's grace by saying 'Amen'. Honestly, there is no attempt here to secure a party victory. It is merely an attempt to keep close to holy scripture.⁴⁰

Despite Couratin's concern, the general reaction of the 1966 Conference was to welcome the new service with enthusiasm. One or two people had tried out the new service; several speakers wanted it authorized at once. The service seemed coherent, it had a pleasing simplicity about it, it clearly proclaimed the mighty acts of God, and it provided properly for those whose Sunday worship consisted of the eucharist alone. Naturally there were also some misgivings and suggestions for improvement. There were a number of calls for the penitential prayers to be placed at the beginning of the service. Some felt the revision had not gone far enough, especially in its modernisation of language. Others asked for the restoration of 1662 material such as the decalogue (or summary of the law), the long words of administration, and the blessing. But in stark contrast with later debates, there was almost no controversy about the oblation or prayers for the dead. Buchanan points out that since similar points had been raised earlier in the day in respect of the Series 1 service, and speakers were asked not to repeat points previously made, this gave 'a misleading impression of unanimity'.⁴¹ I question whether this can be true of the words of oblation, however; first of all, because there was nothing quite like it in Series 1; and secondly, Couratin made so much of it in

his opening presentation that anyone who wished to do so could certainly pursue the matter. It seemed that, for the moment, no one did.

The Convocations and the Church Assembly

The '1662' additions requested by the Liturgical Conference were added to the draft, which then came before the Convocations in May. After the enthusiasm at the February Conference, there was now considerable disquiet about 'we offer unto thee this bread and this cup'. Jasper, opening the debate, stressed that it would be difficult to find an acceptable alternative:

when the Commission began to look round for another form of words to try and resolve the difficulty, nothing else met with the same degree of unanimity . . . while Mr Buchanan could say that any form of words describing a Godward action was unacceptable to one element of the Church of England, it was equally true that any form of words which precluded a Godward action was equally unacceptable to a great many others.⁴²

All the same, it was clear that the words in question had become so loaded that no canon containing them would be acceptable. A number of alternatives were suggested; several speakers drew on a suggestion of Buchanan's that the offending section should be recast with 'celebrate' and 'make (memorial)' as the operative verbs:

We . . . do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make.⁴³

while others suggested replacing 'we offer unto thee' with the phrase 'we give thanks to thee over'. In the end it was left to the Steering Committee to appoint a group to give further thought to this section of the prayer.⁴⁴ The formula agreed by the group was clumsily written. It is certainly difficult to imagine it being prayed:

Wherefore, O Lord, having in remembrance his perfect and sufficient sacrifice once offered upon the Cross, his resurrection from the dead, and his glorious ascension into heaven, and looking for the coming of his Kingdom, we do this in obedience to his command. Accept, we pray thee, this our duty and service which we with all thy holy people offer unto thee, and grant that we who eat the bread and drink the cup may be united by thy Spirit and filled with thy heavenly grace.⁴⁵

At the next meeting of the Convocations in October, debate on the rite was resumed. The result was that the 'Oxford' compromise formula was rejected; 'we offer' was retained; and 'we give thanks to thee over . . .' was also accepted as an alternative to it. The House of Laity, in the meantime, expressed their desire for a single agreed text *without* alternatives.

The Liturgical Conference 1967

It was in the form of alternatives ('we offer' / 'we give thanks over') that the text came to the next Liturgical Conference in April 1967. Harrison opened the debate, strongly advocating the Commission's original words. The Church, he said, seemed to want a single form of words; but if so, then the Church must choose. It could omit all forms of words capable of causing controversy, for example, *both* 'we offer' *and* 'we give thanks over'; but the service might then be judged inadequate. The only alternative was to use words capable of being understood in different ways. That was why the Commission had proposed 'we offer'. It did not say all that some wished to say; but the Commission had been assured by catholics that it would be acceptable as a minimum requirement, and that it would not raise insuperable difficulties for many evangelicals, though it had, of course, become apparent that it did for some.⁴⁶

After a long debate the Chairman took a series of straw votes by houses. It emerged that only 'we offer' would carry the requisite two-thirds majority in the Convocations, and only the omission of *both* phrases would please the Laity.⁴⁷

Immediately on hearing the result of this vote, Jasper put a fresh proposal to the Conference. It was, he said, the result of 'a little homework' done at the back of the hall during the debate.⁴⁸ He had shown it to a leading evangelical (Peter Johnston) and a leading catholic (Trevor Jalland), and both had approved, though the latter was not enthusiastic.⁴⁹ It was 'not ideal'; Jasper was well aware of that. It was 'a possible stopgap solution which might tide us over until we can think this thing out in peace and quiet'. The proposal centred on the 1549 phrase 'make the memorial':

Wherefore, O Lord, with this bread and this cup, we make the memorial of his saving passion, his resurrection from the dead, and his glorious ascension into heaven, and we look for the coming of his Kingdom. We pray thee to accept our duty and service.⁵⁰

Even after this proposal was made, the Bishop of Exeter insisted on asking the House of Laity once again to accept the 'we offer' formula, with an inconclusive result (93 in favour, 89 against).⁵¹ The next speaker (Mr Van Straubenzee) suggested to the Bishop that the reason why this particular vote had not succeeded was that:

quite a large number of the Laity who would in our individual capacities be perfectly happy to accept that form of wording are just not prepared to take part in a steamroller process, (*applause*) over a minority with which many of us very strongly disagree. It is just as simple as that . . .⁵²

Asking the Church to decide between ‘we offer unto thee’ and ‘we give thanks to thee over . . .’ was unrealistic, and offering the Church a canon with a variable form of words at that point was unacceptable. The ‘Jasper’ formula was without historic precedent; but as Jasper himself pointed out in Joint Synod of the two Convocations, ‘this was not necessarily a bad thing’, even if it did somewhat spoil the appeal to antiquity.⁵³ The new formula was in fact an ingenious combination of 1549 words and most of the Commission’s original draft:

Liturgical Commission

Wherefore, O Lord,

having in remembrance
his saving passion,
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and looking
for the coming of his kingdom,
we offer unto thee this bread and this cup;
and we pray thee to accept this
our duty and service . . .

Jasper / Series 2

Wherefore, O Lord,
with this bread and cup
we make the memorial of

his saving passion,
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and we look
for the coming of his kingdom.

We pray thee to accept this,
our duty and service . . .

The Conference gave itself time to think about the new words, returned to the formula later in the afternoon and passed it in both houses by a ‘substantial majority’.⁵⁴ The revised text was overwhelmingly endorsed by the Convocations, carried unanimously by the Bishops and by ‘substantial’ majorities in the Houses of Clergy. The support of catholic members was decisive. Writing about the text some two months later, Kenneth Ross (Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street and a member of the Liturgical Commission) was in a conciliatory mood:

Some priests feel that too many concessions have been made to placate Protestant opposition . . . in particular, they feel that the Catholic ‘offer this bread and this cup’ has been diluted to the Protestant ‘make the memorial’. I suggest that this is a misunderstanding. The Preface commended ‘offer this bread and this cup’ because it was patient of a Protestant interpretation as well as a Catholic one; it ‘need mean no more than ‘we put this bread and this cup at God’s disposal.’ Similarly, ‘make the memorial’ is patient of both interpretations; and for my part I am content to ‘make the memorial’ and then go on to ask God to ‘accept this our bounden duty and service’, for what is God to accept except something which we offer?

The Convocations have gone a long way to meeting the difficulties raised by the Protestants in the House of Laity. It would be a pity if the Catholics now obstructed the trial run which the new service so urgently needs.⁵⁵

Not everyone was pleased, however. Grisbrooke, writing some years later, judged the original 'we offer' to be 'certainly the minimum which is reasonably compatible with a "catholic" doctrine of the eucharist', and while the new form '*could* be interpreted as meaning the same':

*in the context of the change it cannot reasonably be so interpreted, for if the 'evangelicals' felt it necessary to press for the change at all, then it must have been in order to repudiate some possible doctrinal interpretation of the original form. In other words, as it stands at present, the form is not patient of a 'catholic' interpretation, and it is not comprehensive, for the purpose of the change is to repudiate a doctrine held by many Anglicans, and to prevent them from giving it liturgical expression.*⁵⁶

The revised rite was approved by a large majority in the House of Laity. However, during the debate it was stressed that approval was given on the understanding that the service was provisional, and would be revised after an experimental period; the House was not sanctioning something for long-term use. By the time Series 2 was revised, however, the climate had changed: attention was concentrated on a modern-language successor. Very little new work was done on Series 2, and its direct descendant in the ASB (the second thanksgiving in Rite B) retains the 'Jasper' formula.⁵⁷ It is astonishing that a form of words prepared under pressure by one person in a matter of a few hours should have proved so durable, when other forms, honed and debated for months, fell so abruptly. The controversial section was authorized in a form which neither the Liturgical Commission, the House of Bishops, nor the Steering Committee, had approved or even seen. It had not been scrutinized or tested. It was a solution forced on the Church, not for lack of anything *better*, but for lack of anything *more acceptable*, which is not at all the same thing; its wording was driven by negative, rather than positive and creative, considerations.

Jasper had put himself out on a limb as far as the Commission was concerned. Fortunately for him all the members present at the next meeting supported his action,⁵⁸ as did all those who were absent, with the exception of Couratin and Ratcliff, for both of whom the loss of 'we offer' was a concession too far.⁵⁹ Neither was again active on the Commission, for Couratin tendered his resignation immediately, while Ratcliff died shortly afterwards.

The 1967 Liturgical Conference also had to consider the controversial petition for the departed. The Commission's text, asking God to remember the dead, had not commended itself to the House of Laity. In February 1967 Professor Anderson, an

evangelical, had suggested turning the prayer into a remembrance on the part of the worshippers:

We remember before Thee, O Lord, the faithful departed who are partakers in Thy eternal Kingdom.⁶⁰

The House of Laity Steering Committee proposed a slightly subtler form:

Hear us as we remember those who have died in faith and grant us with them a share in Thy eternal Kingdom.⁶¹

At the Conference both forms were discussed. There was a majority in favour of the Anderson formula among the laity and a majority against it among the clergy; the Steering Committee's form secured substantial majorities in both houses. The chairman went on, however, to take a further vote, asking the Conference to express a preference between the Steering Committee's form and the Commission's text 'Remember those . . .' The laity preferred the new form while the clergy preferred the Commission's wording. (None of this is mentioned by Jasper, who merely records that the Conference, 'swept on by a wave of new-found enthusiasm [after agreeing a form for the oblation], accepted the compromise text . . . "Hear us . . ."'⁶²) Nevertheless the Steering Committee's form was clearly the most acceptable form of words, and it was with this remembrance of the departed that the rite was put to the Convocations the next day and passed overwhelmingly.

One final change made during the synodical stage was the removal of the Commission's provision for **additional consecration**. Because of disagreement about the method for this, the question was therefore effectively left open, encouraging some (including Buchanan) to see it as part of the experiment.⁶³

6.6 The service in use

Ceremonial

Liturgy does not exist in a book . . . People worshipping together, and the way in which they worship, is something of which the book is a mere skeleton.

*Gordon Jeanes*⁶⁴

How liturgy it is celebrated makes all the difference, and this is especially so in the case of Series 2, for the rite was deliberately drafted for flexibility and experiment, as the

Introduction to the Draft Order makes clear.⁶⁵ The freedom offered to the celebrant at the Introduction and the Intercession, and to some extent also at the Conclusion, have already been noted. Less obvious at first glance, but no less significant, is the liberty afforded by the rubrics, or rather the lack of them. There are no directions for posture, either for the celebrant or the people; there is no indication of which side of the altar the priest should stand for the eucharistic prayer; and there are no ceremonial instructions for the offertory, or, for example, any directions to share (or not to share) the peace. Certain things are reserved to the presiding priest: the collect of the day, the invitation to the confession, the absolution, the peace, the prayer of consecration, the invitation to communion, the post-communion prayer, and the blessing and/or the dismissal; but everything else may be said by another minister, and the lessons may be read by anyone at all.

Such freedom was unprecedented. Series 1 had kept the pattern of rubrics inherited from 1662, altering them in places but hardly reducing their scope at all. It is true that those using the Prayer Book and Series 1 could always find ways of celebrating the rite which expressed their own convictions; as Jeanes points out, 'where the written text reigns and is imposed by authority, but is disliked by some, its ceremonial performance may be altered in order to give a new emphasis or even an interpretation quite at odds with its original sense'.⁶⁶ With Series 2, a rich variety of 'ceremonial performance' was positively encouraged. Indeed, the Series 2 rubrics said very little, which made the role of commentaries and guides to the service all the more important. A number of these were produced,⁶⁷ of which three were written by members of the Liturgical Commission, each of them looking at the new text in very different ways.

Firstly there was the 'official' guide, written by E.C. Whitaker on behalf of the Commission, *The New Services: A guide and explanation* (1967). The booklet stressed the general pattern of the service, namely the Ministry of the Word, the Intercession and the Ministry of the Sacrament.⁶⁸ These were the unchanging backbone of the rite, to which other elements were added as needed. In this scheme the introductory rite has little significance: 'what really matters is that we carry out the Ministry of the Word fully and properly'.⁶⁹ (One can see his point, but it seems a shame not to allow some preparation before the word of God is heard, that it may be fruitfully received.) In terms of specific suggestions, Whitaker drew attention to a number of possibilities. The Ministry of the Word might be delegated to a reader or layperson; the commandments, comfortable words and Prayer of Humble Access might be omitted,

lest we be too 'preoccupied with ourselves and our sins'; members of the congregation might suggest petitions for the intercessions, and other ministers share in leading them; a suitable gesture might accompany the words of the peace; there might be an offertory procession. Finally Whitaker gave three sample outlines for using the service on different occasions — a weekday celebration, a main Sunday service preserving many Prayer Book elements, and a more radical parish communion.

Secondly there was John Wilkinson's booklet written on behalf of the Church Union, *Eucharist for Experiment* (1967). This was an interpretation of the new rite along broadly catholic lines, a demonstration of how Series 2 could give clear expression to catholic eucharistic piety. But Wilkinson was careful to take the text as it stood and not to embroider it, because the immediate task was to experiment with the new service; and 'experiment, if it is to reveal anything, must be experiment which begins with what is intended'.⁷⁰ His approach to ceremonial stressed the need for reverence, simplicity and clarity. It was important to celebrate the rite 'without hurry, and with enough deliberate pauses to reveal its structure',⁷¹ particularly in view of the brevity and simplicity of many of the prayers.

The booklet included a comprehensive ceremonial manual for a solemn eucharist. Following the entrance hymn (announced by the choir leader), the priest should greet the people and read the collect. The Ministry of the Word and the Intercession could well be delegated to others; but the president should begin the Creed, *without* turning east but with a low bow at the proclamation of the incarnation. He also presided over the penitential prayers, preferably from the altar. Wilkinson was wary of making too much of the offertory:

The central offering of the eucharist, as this new rite makes clear, is in The Thanksgiving, and there is no need to anticipate it by the traditional offertory prayers.⁷²

The assisting minister should set the bread and wine upon the altar without ceremony, and the president return to the altar only when everything was ready for the eucharistic prayer. This was a single prayer which should not be interrupted by genuflexions in the middle of it;⁷³ and, if the priest was facing the people, he ought to make a low bow rather than genuflect at the end of the canon.

During the distribution of communion, the communicants could stand or kneel; afterwards, the remaining elements should be consumed without ceremony, preferably

by assistant ministers while the president continued with the prayer after communion. At the end of the service the president should greet the people, but the assistant dismiss the congregation.

Wilkinson's booklet also contained suggestions for a simple eucharist, and some interesting views about the use of traditional ceremonial. Incense should be used only in procession, not to incense people or objects. Vestments, if worn, should not be changed during the service. It was doubtful whether the burse, veil and small corporal needed to be retained nowadays. Any physical greeting at the peace should be restrained and appropriate to the context. It was best to use unleavened bread, but *not* to have separate priests' and peoples' wafers; a single piece of bread was far preferable.

Finally, Colin Buchanan issued *A Guide to Second Series Communion Service*, published in the evangelical 'Prayer Book Reform Series'. This booklet must have been written in large part to commend the new rite to evangelical parishes and to smooth ruffled feathers.⁷⁴ In particular he did not call the rite a 'parish communion' liturgy, but described much the same thing in the language of evangelical piety:

Instead of "mangled matins" followed by a break in the service ... it will be possible to *include* the great elements of Morning Prayer in the Antecomunion of this service, and proceed to the Communion without any disruption.⁷⁵

Buchanan also had some suggestions for the celebration of the rite. The service should be kept simple, with minimal changes of posture. The lectern should be used for all the readings (rather than 'epistle-side' and 'gospel-side' of the altar). There was no need to turn east for the Creed. The penitential prayers should be conducted 'facing the people from before the Table'. The table should be placed so that the celebrant could stand behind it and face the congregation. The problem of administering communion to a large congregation would be eased if communion were taken to the people in their pews. It would also help if laypeople were licensed to assist in the distribution. (Provision for this was finally made in 1970; before then, only lay readers were permitted to assist, and even as recently as the 1950s this permission had been restricted to a very limited number of readers who could administer the cup but not the bread.⁷⁶)

All three booklets stressed points which ought to be obvious. First of all, many prayers previously ordered to be said by the priest alone, but frequently said by the whole congregation, could now be said together quite legally. Secondly, many texts had been

abbreviated and simplified. Finally, everyone ought to come to this service fully prepared. The priest should give care and thought to the insertions in the intercession; the lesson readers should be chosen for their ability to read, not their status within the congregation or the local community, and they should prepare the readings and be sure they understood them beforehand; and the whole congregation should be well instructed, so that they might understand the rite and participate fully.

The questionnaire

No permanence was intended for the Series 2 eucharist; it was clearly an experimental rite which would need revision when the trial period was over. It was widely agreed that the oblation and the petition for the dead would need further work. But there was a more fundamental question: did the Church want this kind of rite? Was the service as a whole well received? That could only be answered by knowing how the rite was being used in the parishes.

On the initiative of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a questionnaire was sent to a representative 10% of parishes, asking detailed questions about the use of the new rite.⁷⁷ Considerable care went in to ensuring that the survey was representative of the mind of the Church. Each diocese was asked to select its 10% sample with care, using a mix of urban, suburban, industrial, 'new estate' and rural parishes. Within each parish, comments were sought from both clergy and laity, and incumbents were asked to obtain 'lay' replies from all age-groups⁷⁸ and from both men and women.

It emerged that the service had received a warm welcome.⁷⁹ 77% of the laity and 90% of clergy wished to continue using it. The figures were slightly higher for 'new estate' parishes (laity 80%, clergy 92%) and among younger people (16–20 years 82%; 21–40 years, 83%). Nearly all the Commission's new texts were well received; 83% liked the new canon, 68% the new intercessions and 73% the second post-communion prayer. There was less support for some of the **additions and omissions**. Surprisingly few (25%) wanted an Old Testament lesson in addition to the epistle and gospel. There was very little enthusiasm (16%) for the Commission's proposal for ending the service with a dismissal and no blessing, but hardly any more (24%) for the 'Prayer Book' ending with the blessing alone; most (62%) wanted the service to end with the blessing *and* the dismissal.

Finally, 76% were satisfied with the 'RSV' type language of Series 2. This figure should be interpreted with care. There were calls for a thoroughly modern-language rite even in 1966 (see §7.1), and by 1969 the Commission were being asked to produce a revision of Series 2 in modern English. One might therefore have expected this survey, conducted in 1969, to show considerable *dissatisfaction* with the language of Series 2. But the question simply asked 'are you satisfied with the language of this service'; there was no box to tick for 'modern' language, and a 'no' reply could only be interpreted as a vote for BCP English.

In summary

The sales figures for the new service confirmed the result of the survey. By 1969, some two million copies had been sold;⁸⁰ in the same year, the number of communicants on an average Sunday was estimated at 654,000.⁸¹ Three booklets for every Sunday communicant seems excessive, even when one remembers that churches usually have spare copies, that not every worshipper is a communicant (though all need the booklet), and that some people like to buy their own private copies. If churches bought, on average, a hundred and fifty copies each that would mean that over three quarters of churches had decided to give Series 2 a trial.⁸²

The evident popularity of the service was well deserved. The worship of the Church of England had become predominantly eucharistic, and the Church had responded sensibly by providing a service designed for the parish communion. It was **complete**, in the sense of being a 'stand-alone' service with a sensitive balance of praise and penitence; it gave new **freedom** for congregational participation and the development of lay ministries; and its **language**, if not contemporary, was at least more direct than that of the Prayer Book. In the end — and despite the vagaries of a synodical revision process which at one stage threatened to kill off the service altogether — the new liturgy exhibits a careful theological balance. Kenneth Ross was surely right to see here an olive-branch held out to catholics, and Moreton and Grisbrooke were too pessimistic in their condemnation; for Series 2, even in its revised form, clearly sits far more easily with a catholic spirituality than either 1662 or Series 1. At the same time, the compromises made during the 1967 Liturgical Conference ensured that the service could be used with a clear conscience by all but the strictest evangelicals.

Notes

- 1 Robinson, *Liturgy Coming to Life*, p.v.
- 2 *LC Minutes*, 20.8.
- 3 *LC Memorandum* 24.
- 4 *LC Minutes*, 24.5. According to Jasper (*Development*, p.250), 'A final concession from Archbishop Fisher before his retirement in 1960 was permission to work on an interim report on the Shape of the Eucharist . . .'
- 5 *LC Memorandum* 34.
- 6 *LC Minutes*, 26.7.
- 7 *LC Minutes*, 34.4.
- 8 One other suggestion (due to de Candole) was to take the 'Birmingham Experimental Rite' as a starting point. I have not been able to trace a copy of this document.
- 9 *LC Minutes*, 35.8.
- 10 *LC Minutes*, 36.13.
- 11 *LC Memorandum* 34.
- 12 Couratin had written a preliminary memorandum on the subject (34B) but this was soon rendered out of date by further discussions of the Commission.
- 13 *LC Minutes*, 37.12.
- 14 *LC Minutes*, 38.10.
- 15 De Candole and Couratin, *Reshaping the Liturgy*, p.3.
- 16 *LC Memorandum* 50 (incorrectly numbered '49').
- 17 *LC Memoranda* 50B and 50D (the two forms are identical).
- 18 *LC Minutes*, 41.8.
- 19 *LC Memoranda* 50B and 50D. It is not clear which Commission members were responsible for these documents.
- 20 *LC Minutes*, 43.18.
- 21 *LC Minutes*, 38.10.
- 22 The remembrance of the resurrection and the ascension were present in 1549. The controversial Hippolytan oblation of the bread and the cup were, of course, new to a rite of the Church of England.
- 23 Buchanan, 'The New Communion Service — Reasons for Dissent'.
- 24 *Theology*, 69 (1966), pp.433-452.
- 25 Houlden, 'Good Liturgy or even Good Battlefield', p.437.
- 26 Couratin, 'The Tradition Received', p.438.
- 27 The accounts of the Last Supper in the first two Gospels contained no command to repeat the Supper; Luke's account was 'problematic'; and John did not even record the Supper.
- 28 Couratin cited the usual sources (Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus), along with quotations.
- 29 Couratin, 'The Tradition Received', p.442.
- 30 The preface 'Concerning the service of the Church'.

- 31 Cuming, 'The English Rite', pp.447f.
- 32 Moreton, 'The Anaphoral Prayer'.
- 33 LC, *Baptism and Confirmation*. A discussion of the this rite and its fate is beyond the scope of this thesis. See Jasper, *Development*, pp.218-224.
- 34 See Jasper, *Development*, p.224 and also Appendix 1 of this thesis.
- 35 Jasper, *Development*, p.245.
- 36 Jasper, *Development*, p.245.
- 37 *The Liturgical Conference 1966*, pp.7f.
- 38 *The Liturgical Conference 1966*, pp.73f.
- 39 Scales, *What mean ye by this service*, p.55. The tract as a whole is dreadful; the author uses the word 'scriptural' as a synonym for 'Cranmerian', and condemns every departure from 1552 as a return to the doctrine of 'Mass sacrifice'.
- 40 *The Liturgical Conference 1966*, p.74. Again Couratin's argument followed a similar line to that he had taken when explaining the draft rite to the Commission.
- 41 Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies*, p.118.
- 42 *Chronicle Convoc.*, 104 (1966), p.166.
- 43 *Chronicle Convoc.*, 104 (1966), p.175.
- 44 Jasper, *Development*, p.254, lists the members of the group: on the catholic side were the Bishop of Oxford, and Canon E.W. Kemp; on the evangelical side Peter Johnston and Leo Stephens-Hodge.
- 45 Jasper, *Development*, p.254.
- 46 *The Liturgical Conference 1967*, pp.2-5.
- 47 *The Liturgical Conference 1967*, pp.36f.
- 48 *The Liturgical Conference 1967*, p.37.
- 49 Jasper, *Development*, p.257.
- 50 *The Liturgical Conference 1967*, pp.37f.
- 51 This was clearly a long way short of the necessary two-thirds majority.
- 52 *The Liturgical Conference 1967*, p.42.
- 53 *Chronicle Convoc.*, 105 (1967), p.108.
- 54 *The Liturgical Conference 1967*, p.54.
- 55 In *Church Times* (30 June 1967).
- 56 Grisbrooke, 'Series II', p.25.
- 57 With one small change — the addition of the words 'and heavenly Father' to the first line (which now reads 'Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, with this bread . . .').
- 58 *LC Minutes*, 51.104.
- 59 Jasper, *Development*, p.258.
- 60 *The Liturgical Conference 1967*, p.54.
- 61 *ibid.*
- 62 Jasper, *Development*, p.258.
- 63 Buchanan, *A Guide to Second Series Communion Service*, pp.18-19. See also Appendix 3.
- 64 Gordon Jeanes, 'Liturgy and Ceremonial', in *Liturgy in Dialogue*, p.9.

- 65 *Alternative Services: Second Series*, pp.145-148.
- 66 *ibid*, p.26.
- 67 Jasper, *Development*, p.260.
- 68 The earlier documents of the Commission had tended to stress the Bible Class and Supper alone; now the Intercession is seen as a major element in its own right. This emphasis is consistent with Whitaker's approach elsewhere in the booklet, where he appears to be more sympathetic to Prayer Book conservatism and less to the pattern of primitive rites than Naylor, Couratin and de Candole.
- 69 Whitaker, *The New Services*, p.9.
- 70 Wilkinson, *Eucharist for Experiment*, p.ii.
- 71 *ibid*, p.9.
- 72 *ibid*, p.19.
- 73 *ibid*, p.21. Genuflexion during the canon was in any case unknown before the sixteenth century.
- 74 So, for instance, Buchanan's lengthy passage on possible doctrinal problems and his personal *apologia* for advocating the service (Buchanan, *A Guide to Second Series*, pp.26-30); his frequent approval for features of the service which reinforce evangelical values, e.g. the lack of a consecratory 'moment' and his championing of greater lay involvement (p.22).
- 75 *ibid*, p.12.
- 76 Buchanan, *Evangelical Anglicans and Liturgy*, p.7.
- 77 LC Memorandum 104A, p.1:
 'In November 1967 the Joint Steering Committee . . . noted that "His Grace felt it was very desirable that the Liturgical Commission should have a judgement from clerical and lay opinion" from the parishes about the experimental services in general and Holy Communion in particular'.
- 78 The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate whether they were 16-20, 21-40, 41-65 or over 65 years old.
- 79 A brief summary of the results can be found in Jasper, *Development*, p.277; for a full analysis see Liturgical Commission Memorandum 104A.
- 80 Jasper, *Development*, p.277.
- 81 This estimate appears in the analysis of questionnaire results, LC Memorandum 104A.
- 82 The Church of England Yearbook (1997) lists the number of parishes and churches in each diocese, and also records the church attenders on an average Sunday. From these figures there are some 16,000 churches in 13,000 parishes in the Church of England. In 1996, each church had an average Sunday attendance of 67 (55 adults, 12 children) and each parish had an average attendance of 83 (58 adults, 15 children). The estimate of 150 booklets for the average church therefore seems reasonable, and if anything it is too high. A lower figure would imply that even more parishes had decided to try Series 2.

7

SERIES 3

What in *Series 3* have we tried to do? In short, at those points where we could, we have tried to put back the poetry. Not surprisingly, it is just at those points that we have come under attack.

*David Frost*¹

Are we really so bankrupt of literary achievement that we dare not even attempt to do for our age what Cranmer did for his?

*Revd R. Feast*²

7.1 The language of worship

The desire for a vernacular liturgy

In *Reshaping the Liturgy* (1964), de Candole and Couratin suggested that the intercessions might be cast in contemporary language, but advocated retaining hieratic language for the rest of the liturgy. By the end of 1965, however, there were calls in the *Church Times* for the whole service to be cast in a thoroughly modern idiom.³ Mrs H. Bennett (31 Dec 1965) had asked a number of young people what they thought of Church services; with one exception they had asked for modern language, not only because words change their meaning, but 'because medieval English immediately gave the impression that the Church had nothing to do with their twentieth-century lives'. Revd G. Daniel (21 Jan 1966) was pleased that the Liturgical Commission approved of 'the Prayer Book principle' that the Bible and Psalter should be in a language understood by the worshippers, but was dismayed that they had made no attempt to apply that principle to new services:

I vividly remember one plea. A young curate who had been working with a youth club reported how some of the members came to Evensong, and he described the feeling of acute embarrassment that swept over him as he saw the looks of puzzled bewilderment that came over their faces when he got up and began 'Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us in sundry places . . .'

When Jasper presented the new draft to the 1966 Liturgical Conference, he defended the decision not to write in the vernacular. Prayer should not, he said, be reduced to a 'conversation with God on terms of undue familiarity'; the 'uniqueness of God and the special relationship we have with Him' required a hieratic language, though there was no reason for such language to lack 'beauty or warmth or love'.⁴ Stella Brook,⁵ speaking immediately afterwards, was yet more forthright: any liturgy 'composed exclusively in the current idiom of 1966' would, she said, have nothing to offer the future and would be a denial of our linguistic inheritance.⁶ But the demands came from the floor all the same. Canon J.A. Lawton spoke of fellow clergy in Liverpool who had asked for an alternative version of the service which addressed God as 'you', though he acknowledged that the Series 2 was an important step in the right direction.⁷ Mr M.R. Wakely asked for a service in contemporary English;⁸ Mrs J.M. Mayland⁹ was disappointed that the service had not been cast in 'a newer form of language'.¹⁰

The editor of *Church Times* tried to pour oil on the troubled waters (21 Jan 1966). He recognised the strength of feeling in favour of contemporary English, but sympathized with the Liturgical Commission's decision to preserve traditional language. No doubt the Commission felt that the worship of God 'is all the better for being expressed in language which has dignity and grace', for such language could 'help towards that sense of historic continuity which is no mean factor in religion'; and faith, like poetry, must express 'its deepest feelings in the best possible words'. These arguments were not, of course, decisive, but they could not simply be dismissed. In the face of calls for a contemporary liturgical idiom, however, it would certainly help if the Commission were to 'explain more fully than it has yet done the reasons which have governed its decision in this field'.

Series 2 was also attacked by traditionalists because of the alterations made to many Prayer Book texts.¹¹ In an article in *Theology* Georgina Battiscombe complained that the changes in the language, structure and content of the service were gratuitous and unwanted; the Church was throwing away a great treasure. No-one could seriously claim that the changes made the new rite more accessible or attractive; 'not one person is likely to be moved to join the Church of England because our liturgical experts have put the Sanctus in the middle of the prayer of Consecration or removed the Gloria to the beginning of the service'. Outsiders were more likely to be lapsed church members who, on returning to church, would now find themselves lost.¹²

Despite the traditionalist protest, the pressure for a contemporary liturgical language continued to grow, and not only in England. 'You' form liturgies were produced in the Church of England in Australia and the Church of the Province of New Zealand in 1966, and in the Anglican Church of Chile (in Spanish) in 1967.¹³ Jasper claimed that after 1968 "'You" forms became invariable in new rites in the Anglican Communion'.¹⁴ This is not quite correct, for *Y Llyfr Gweddi Cyffredin* — *The Book of Common Prayer* of the Church in Wales (1984) continues to use 'thou' language to address God; but this does seem to be the only exception.¹⁵ Nor was this activity confined to Anglican churches. Following the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Catholic Church was preparing translations of its liturgy into the vernacular, intending that there should be one version for all English-speaking countries. But what *sort* of English should be used? Two lay Roman Catholic liturgists — Professor Finberg (a member of ICEL¹⁶) and Mr Bernard Dunne — attended a meeting of the Liturgical Commission in December 1964. Within the Roman Catholic Church, they said, there were three schools of thought:

the conservative, which wanted an archaic and hieratic English; the radical, which desired a thoroughly modern English, with no obsolete or highly technical words; and the progressive, which stood between the other two, desiring to avoid expressions which had become misleading, but to preserve a certain dignity of literary English suited to modern worship.¹⁷

These were precisely the questions also facing the Commission, and in their subsequent discussion the Commission noted that 'Roman Catholics were no more agreed about them than was the Church of England'. De Candole hoped for ecumenical agreement in England on a single version of common texts such as Gloria, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer.¹⁸ In later meetings the Commission examined draft Roman Catholic texts which had been sent to them for comment.¹⁹

The emergence of modern texts

One member of the Liturgical Commission, Elisabeth Montefiore,²⁰ had been concerned at the tone of the speeches at the 1966 Liturgical Conference: she feared that the views expressed by Ronald Jasper and Stella Brook might be taken to represent the opinion of the Commission as a whole. Such an impression would be entirely misleading, for the Commission had hardly discussed liturgical language during the past four years, and had certainly not agreed any clear policy.²¹ As far as she could recall, the only conclusions they had reached were (a) that the work of liturgical revision should concentrate first on getting the structure of services settled, and (b) that

'we should aim at being simple and clear, that we should try to allow for the fact of new understanding and knowledge, and that the eucharist should allow for a variety of levels of language'. She believed there was a stronger case for a vernacular liturgy than Jasper and Brook seemed to allow:

Worship must be the best we can do, but what does *that* mean? William Temple said that the church is the only community which exists mainly for the sake of those who are not her members. If this is true, our worship should reflect it.

The Commission discussed her views in September 1966, and agreed to look again at the proposed baptism and confirmation services in the light of her comments.²² In the report *Baptism and Confirmation* (December 1966), the Commission committed itself to further progress: 'the Commission is aware of the desire for the use of language that is alive in contemporary society, and is engaged in the preparation of texts'.²³

The Commission duly published such a collection (*Modern Liturgical Texts*) in 1968. The booklet also contained a number of metrical canticles with tunes written by the Poet Laureate C. Day Lewis and the composer Alan Ridout.²⁴ To all this was added a free translation of Series 2 into modern English which had been prepared by Cuming and presented to the Commission in April 1968.²⁵ The booklet described this service as the work of an (unnamed) individual which had not yet been revised by the Commission; it was included for the sake of discussion and interest. This rite used the Commission's translations of the Gloria, Creed and Lord's Prayer printed in the same booklet.

The publication of *Modern Liturgical Texts* marked the first and last attempt by the Commission to write its own versions of the creeds, canticles and so on. By the autumn of 1968 three sets of contemporary English texts were in circulation: *Modern Liturgical Texts*, the Roman Catholic ICEL texts, and those of the American ecumenical group 'Consultation on Common Texts'. None of these groups had worked in complete isolation; in particular, observers from other denominations regularly attended ICEL meetings. At the October meeting of ICEL a start was made on agreeing a single set of forms, and this work received a huge boost in April 1969 when, through a combination of vision and providential good fortune, a new body, ICET, came into being.²⁶ This was a truly ecumenical group with representation from most parts of the world. It was also entirely unofficial; its work would have to win acceptance on merit alone. The first set of ICET texts, *Prayers We Have in Common*, was published in 1970. The eucharistic material was soon taken up by the Roman Catholic Church, many Anglican Provinces, and most other English-speaking churches around the world.²⁷

The first step towards their adoption in the Church of England came long before they were completed: in June 1969 the Archbishop of Canterbury, aware of the work in preparation, asked the Liturgical Commission to produce a revision of the Series 2 eucharist 'in modern language incorporating the new "agreed texts" of the Lord's Prayer, Creeds, etc. (i.e. in "You" form)'.²⁸

Prayers We Have in Common, as the title suggests, consisted of the historic texts which the churches share: the Lord's Prayer, the Creeds, the Kyries, Gloria, the Sursum corda, Sanctus and Benedictus, the Agnus Dei, the Gloria Patri and the gospel canticles from the daily office. But ICET could hardly translate texts which were distinctive to particular traditions; for these, the churches would develop their own versions. For the Church of England, the arrival of David Frost as a member of the Commission put this enterprise on a much more formal footing.²⁹ He expressed dissatisfaction with the Commission's previous work; they seemed embarrassed by imagery, had adopted a 'flat and staccato' style, and their texts were 'unimaginative and unemotive'.³⁰

In a memorandum of March 1970, Frost asked the Commission to define its aim.³¹ If the main purpose of liturgy was evangelism, then good communication was the first priority; this would demand 'simplicity of syntax and a very limited vocabulary'. It would also mean sacrificing 'richness, subtlety and precision', and would invite the accusation that liturgy was doing the work of preaching and education. If, however, the main purpose of liturgy was to be 'an act of worship for instructed Christians', then texts should be more poetic, 'yielding further meanings at each repetition', and demanding 'a wider vocabulary and a more sophisticated syntax'. Frost felt that the Commission had so far opted for the former approach, but even if that *were* the right way to proceed, 'it will not help . . . to eliminate imagery and metaphor'; liturgy should not be reduced to bald statements. The memorandum ended with a plea that modern texts should not be minimal revisions of old texts. It seemed impossible to 'translate' Cranmer's collects, for instance, without destroying their rhythm and structure; it would be better to 'risk entirely new composition'. Frost himself did just this with his new confession, Prayer of Humble Access and post-communion prayer. In the end, Series 2 was revised *only* in contemporary English, curiously without comment in the Commission's minutes, and despite Jasper's earlier objections. By 1971 he had however become an enthusiastic convert:

In language, of course, there is a radical change, and let me here say straight away that as one who has lived and wrestled with this problem for something like a

decade, like a great number of other people I have myself come to change my point of view and I no longer find you-forms of prayer a problem. Experience has shown that it is quite impossible to try to construct liturgical forms which are really contemporary in style if at the same time you insist on using the second person singular. We must remember that we are not one of the first Churches to produce a liturgy in a you-form. We are in fact remarkable for dragging our feet, and we are one of the last Churches to produce a liturgy in a you-form. I think there is a real danger, if we insist on sticking exclusively to thou-forms of prayer, that the time will come, and maybe sooner than we expect, when we shall be a complete oddity in the Church at large and we shall be worshipping in complete isolation from the rest of our brethren. There is not the slightest doubt of this. This became very clear when the International Commission on English Texts began its work — a Commission which is composed of members of all denominations in the English-speaking world — and when the necessity of working in a you-form was taken for granted, although everyone recognised the difficulties.³²

7.2 ‘The Word and The Prayers’

The Commission began work on its modern language eucharist in December 1969, with a discussion of the structure of the service and whether the extensive freedoms afforded in Series 2 should be curtailed.³³ This clearly marked a fresh start for the Commission: nothing more was ever heard of Cuming’s eucharist in *Modern Liturgical Texts*, and the new service was called ‘Series 3’ for the first time.

At the next meeting (March 1970) Jasper announced that ‘he hoped to do the redrafting of Series 2 material himself’.³⁴ His first full draft, *Memorandum 133*, was produced in December 1970, showing the existing Series 2 and his proposed Series 3 in parallel columns. By then the Commission had already given thought to some parts of the service, and Jasper’s draft incorporates the fruit of that work to date. The memorandum contains some interesting features: the priest is called the ‘celebrant’, silence is suggested in a number of places,³⁵ and concelebration is permitted.

The greeting

The greeting ‘The Lord be with you / **and with thy spirit**’ had preceded the collect in Series 2. Jasper questioned the position of this greeting in his draft, and at the December 1970 meeting the Commission moved it to the beginning of the service, using the ICET translation ‘The Lord be with you / **and also with you**’.³⁶

The intercession

In June 1970 the Commission had agreed that thanksgivings should be added to all the sections of the intercession, and that a new 'local' category should be supplied. The structure of the sections was altered slightly, with the versicle and response placed after the collect (not before, as in Series 2). The Commission also wished to see 'the opportunity for lay participation . . . more clearly stated'.³⁷

In December this form, now printed in Memorandum 133, was further revised, particularly the petition for the dead 'in view of the Doctrine Report *Prayer and the Departed*'.³⁸ This section now read:

Finally we commemorate the departed, especially . . .

We give thanks for the faithful witness of all your saints throughout the ages, and we commend all men to you, that in them your will be done.

This differs substantially from Series 2: the departed were now explicitly commended to God's care. In the Liturgical Commission's final draft the sequence of the collect was inverted, so that the commendation was made first, and the 'rejoicing in the witness of the saints' then followed.

The penitential prayers

The penitential section contained much the most creative work in the rite; it is here above all that Frost's 'poetry' was most evident. Series 2 had gone some way towards bringing the penitential material together, with the Prayer of Humble Access placed after the confession; the decalogue, however, had been left at the beginning of the antecommunion. In Series 3 all the penitential texts were brought together in one section after the intercession.

The **decalogue** had abbreviated commandments, each followed by a New Testament parallel: for example, 'You shall not be a false witness. Let everyone speak the truth'. The two parts of the Lord's summary of the law were neatly incorporated as the NT responses to the first and tenth commandments. To each commandment the congregational response was '**Amen. Lord, have mercy**', followed by silence. This was praised by Frost as lending a dramatic quality to the rite: it was a 'solemn, knell-like refrain' to a 'deeply penitential and impressive' text.³⁹ The use of this decalogue was mandatory on Ash Wednesday and the first five Sundays in Lent.

The **invitation to confession** was drafted around the Comfortable Words. In previous rites these words had followed the absolution, but the Commission felt that they were ‘admirably suited’ as an introduction to confession, where they would ‘provide the encouragement and confidence’ to come before God in penitence.⁴⁰ Either the full form or a much abbreviated form could be used. This was followed by the bidding ‘Let us therefore confess our sins . . .’⁴¹

The **confession** and the new **Prayer of Humble Access** were fresh compositions, written by David Frost and lightly revised by the Liturgical Commission.⁴² The portrayal of sin in the confession (‘we have wounded your love, and marred your image in us’) derives from Julian of Norwich;⁴³ the Prayer of Humble Access was inspired by George Herbert’s *Love bade me welcome*.⁴⁴ Both prayers also employ a richly interwoven sequence of scriptural images. The confession begins with an allusion to creation and incarnation (‘light’ and ‘grace’) and portrays sin as an offence against the goodness of our created selves as well as against God and our ‘fellow men’; it ends with a prayer that we might be led out from darkness to walk as ‘children of light’, recalling the paschal mystery and the Exodus, and echoing the baptismal imagery of 1 Peter 2.9. The alternative Prayer of Humble Access draws much more heavily on images from the gospels: the unworthy whom the Lord called to his feast, the Syro-Phoenician woman asking for crumbs from the table, Christ eating with sinners, and the promise of the messianic feast. A translation of Cranmer’s prayer ‘We do not presume . . .’, was also provided.

Both of the new prayers exemplified perfectly Frost’s (and now the Commission’s) approach to modern liturgical writing. The language was contemporary and evocative, drawing freely on scriptural and traditional imagery. The prayers were accessible, but they also had complexity, richness and depth. Worshippers’ understanding of the prayers could be allowed to grow with increasing familiarity. As Frost wrote in 1973:

Some felt the content of lines 7 and 8 [of the confession] was beyond an ordinary congregation, even though they would have several years in which to grapple with them . . . if we lighten our liturgies of meaning, we destroy their justification.⁴⁵

The Commission had certainly attempted ‘to do for our age what Cranmer did for his’ and had ‘put back the poetry’. These two prayers, and indeed the whole penitential section, are a remarkable achievement: good, prayable, evocative liturgy, soundly based in scripture and tradition, appealing to both the mind and the heart.

7.3 'The Communion'

The offertory and the taking

The four-fold shape was retained in Series 3. Indeed the Commission's *Commentary* on their draft rite claimed that this pattern was now made 'still clearer' by certain changes:

We have omitted all directions for 'manual acts' by the president to accompany the narrative of the Last Supper. This narrative is one section within the Thanksgiving, and its function is to describe and give warrant for the action which the rite as a whole performs. To suggest a 'taking' half-way through the Thanksgiving is to frustrate the fourfold sequence which we follow, as well as to invest the reading of the narrative with a purpose and a meaning which we believe to be foreign to its proper use. We have therefore provided a heading and a rubric for a 'taking' before the Thanksgiving begins; and we have distinguished this from the preparing of the table. At this point of 'taking' we suggest that the President should hold the vessels containing the elements above the table to mark the beginning of the sacramental action proper.⁴⁶

This explanation reveals an important development in the Commission's thinking about the relationship between the 'taking' and the preparation of the table. There had been hints of this in the drafting of Series 2 (see §6.1 above), but the Series 2 rubric simply instructed that the 'bread and wine be placed in order upon the Holy Table'.⁴⁷ This action, headed 'The Preparation of the Bread and Wine', was intended to parallel the dominical 'taking'; though whether this was intended to mean the *people's* action in bringing the elements to the table (after Dix) or the *priest's* action in taking the elements in his hands was not specified. This confusion was not helped by the provision of manual acts during the thanksgiving, namely the *taking* of the bread and (later) of the cup, just as the words 'took bread' and 'took the cup' were being said by the priest.⁴⁸

As the Series 3 *Commentary* suggests, the 'taking' was much more closely defined in the new rite. The change came about as a result of Geoffrey Cuming's question to the Commission in March 1971: 'at present thanksgiving, breaking and giving are easily identifiable, but where is the taking? It should be associated as closely as possible with thanksgiving'. Cuming suggested a new rubric, '*The priest takes the paten and the chalice in his hands*', to be placed just before the thanksgiving. This would:

- 1 Show that the four actions are now starting
- 2 Dissociate 'taking' from the Offertory
- 3 Help to suggest that the whole Thanksgiving consecrates, not just the words of Institution
- 4 Forestall a demand for manual acts at the words of Institution.⁴⁹

The Commission concurred, and the ambiguous Series 2 rubric was replaced in Series 3 by two separate rubrics:

24 The bread and wine are brought to the holy table.

25 The president takes the bread and wine.⁵⁰

It is still not clear whether the priest was supposed to lift the chalice and paten briefly and replace them on the altar, or to hold them throughout the thanksgiving. Cuming's first point suggests the former, but his third and fourth points hint at the latter. It emerged that users of Series 3 were equally unclear about this, and the subsequent revision of the service indicated that a brief 'taking' *before* the thanksgiving had been intended.⁵¹ Either way, this understanding of the dominical 'taking' is novel; it has no precedent in western tradition, either in the Prayer Book, the Dixian scheme, or the modern Roman rite, in which the rubrics require a 'taking' at the words of institution.

The institution narrative

The passage quoted above from the *Commentary* also reveals a distinctive attitude on the part of the Liturgical Commission to the institution narrative. It will be recalled that both the 1552/1662 Prayer of Consecration and the 1662 provision for additional consecration (see Appendix 3) locate the consecration firmly in the recitation of the narrative, in line with western tradition. In the Commission's understanding, however, 'its function is to describe and give warrant for the action which the rite as a whole performs'. Whether this view is shared by the rest of the Church is debatable.

Jasper's first draft contained a gently revised narrative. The 'reverential passive' was retained ('my body which *is given* for you, etc) though the possibility was raised of casting it in the future tense ('which *will be given*'). The words 'do this *in remembrance*' became 'do this *as a memorial*', in keeping with the wording of the anamnesis (see below). At the March 1971 meeting, however, the Commission reversed this change and also opted for the active voice in the words of institution ('my body *which I give* for you').⁵² No reason was given for this in the minutes or memoranda; and in fact the Commission had voted *against* such a change by seven votes to three at the previous meeting.⁵³ The Commission's *Commentary* simply asserts that:

we have ventured to translate perfect passive participles as present active indicative verbs — "I give" and "I shed" — in the interests of clarity and simplicity.⁵⁴

The acclamations

In his first draft, Jasper suggested the possibility of congregational acclamations between the institution narrative and the anamnesis; according to the Commission, a desire had been expressed for these.⁵⁵ A number of forms were possible, including the four Roman texts,⁵⁶ the CSI text and the form used in the American rite. In an accompanying paper (Memorandum 133B), Jasper offered three principles which he felt should govern the inclusion of acclamations. First of all, an acclamation should not be repetitive, nor should it 'anticipate what is to be said in the anamnesis which follows'. Secondly, because it was part of the eucharistic prayer, it should consist of prayer addressed to the Father. Thirdly, an acclamation should be purposeful; it should 'at least carry forward the thought of the canon'. If, then, there was to be an acclamation at all — and Jasper doubted that there should be — it should replace an existing part of the prayer, and not be an addition to it. For example, the first line of the proposed anamnesis, 'Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father, we obey his command' might be omitted and the following substituted in its place:

**Lord and heavenly Father,
as your Son, Jesus Christ, desired us;
so now we intend to do.
Therefore, with this bread and this cup . . .**

The Commission ignored Jasper's reservations, and decided in March 1971 on the following form, to be inserted without alteration to the presidential prayer:

**Christ has died:
Christ is risen:
In Christ shall all be made alive.**

This acclamation fails all Jasper's tests. It is repetitive; it anticipates the anamnesis; it is not addressed to the Father; and it hardly 'carries forward' the thought of the eucharistic prayer, for it could be omitted without loss of meaning. Yet such a form has proved remarkably durable,⁵⁷ and few would now argue for its suppression.

The anamnesis and oblation

In August 1970 Jasper circulated a text (Memorandum 120) of a new anamnesis:

It is the result of long consultation between Colin Buchanan, the late Kenneth Ross and myself. The three of us reached complete agreement . . . Since then I have shown it to the Archbishops, who have expressed their satisfaction. It is now submitted to the Commission for their discussion.

The text, shown here with the Series 2 parallel for comparison, reads:

Series 2

Wherefore, O Lord,

with this bread and cup
we make the memorial of
his saving passion,

his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
and we look
for the coming of his kingdom.
We pray thee to accept this,
our duty and service,

Jasper/Buchanan/Ross

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
we obey his command.
With this bread and this cup
we make the memorial of
his perfect and all-sufficient sacrifice
upon the cross,
his resurrection from the dead
and his ascension into heaven,
and we look
for his coming again in glory.
Accept through him, we pray, this
our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

The most striking feature of the new text is that Jasper's 1967 'stop-gap' solution was essentially retained. The sequence of thought was unchanged, and the main action associated with the bread and the cup was still to 'make the memorial'. There seems depressingly little to show for three years' reflection on Series 2 other than a modest expansion of it: the addition of the prosaic 'we obey his command', a more explicit emphasis on the cross, and the substitution of one 1549 phrase for another — 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' replacing 'duty and service'.

The text was considered by the Commission in September 1970. Their only changes were the omission of 'we pray' after 'Accept through him', and the insertion of 'we celebrate' before 'his resurrection', giving the anamnesis a threefold structure: *making the memorial* of the cross, *celebrating* the resurrection and ascension, and *looking for* the parousia.⁵⁸

At the same time the Doctrine Commission had been asked to look at the text;⁵⁹ they judged it inferior to Series 2.⁶⁰ Firstly, they found 'we obey his command' historically problematic. (It might well be replied that if the liturgy cannot affirm the command to 'do this' as Christ's own, how can the same command be retained in the institution narrative — and how indeed can the Church justify the continual celebration of the eucharist?⁶¹) Secondly, Christ's sacrifice should not, they felt, be identified with his death alone. Finally, 'we look for his coming again' sounded like a search rather than an anticipation, and 'again' suggested a second incarnation rather than the consummation of God's purposes. The Doctrine Commission felt the whole phrase would better be rendered 'we await the fullness of his coming'.

Jasper's first draft reflected the Doctrine Commission's concerns. His anamnesis read:

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
with this bread and this cup
we recall the perfect and complete sacrifice of his death upon the cross,
(we celebrate?) his resurrection from the dead and his ascension into heaven,
and we await the fullness of his coming.

At the December meeting, the Liturgical Commission restored its original 'look for' (instead of the Doctrine Commission's 'await'), and amended the second line to read 'we make the memorial of his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross', reinstating the Series 2 'memorial' language and tidying up the reference to the passion.⁶²

The work of revision was virtually completed at the Commission's next meeting (March 1971) at St Stephen's House, Oxford. The revised anamnesis read:

Therefore, heavenly Father,
we do this in remembrance of him:
with this bread and this cup,
we celebrate his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross;
we proclaim his resurrection from the dead and his ascension into heaven;
and we look for the fullness of his coming in glory.⁶³

There is confusion in Jasper's own account of the development of this section. He briefly describes the text drafted by himself, Ross and Buchanan; says that he sent it to the Archbishops *after* the Liturgical Commission had been consulted (which is not at all consistent with Memorandum 120); and then, quoting the Liturgical Commission's *final* draft, calls it the original Jasper/Ross/Buchanan text. It is all very curious.⁶⁴

The prayer for fruitful communion

The Jasper/Buchanan/Ross text introduced an invocation of the Spirit between the oblation and the doxology, but was otherwise unchanged from Series 2. The proposed text read: 'grant that *by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit* we may so eat and drink these holy gifts ...' (new words in italics). This was perhaps inspired by Hippolytus' difficult text 'grant to all who receive the holy things (to receive) for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the strengthening of faith in truth'.⁶⁵ In Jasper's Memorandum 133 this was amended to 'grant that *in the power* of the Holy Spirit', and the Series 2 phrase 'that we may be filled with thy grace and heavenly blessing' was replaced by 'that we may be filled with your grace and united in the body of your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord'.

The Commission altered the section in December 1970⁶⁶ to read ‘fill us with the Holy Spirit and unite us in the body of your Son . . .’ and then amended it again at the following meeting in March 1971, when it reached its final Series 3 form.⁶⁷ This version survived almost unchanged into ASB Rite A. It leads the eucharistic prayer into a distinctive and imaginative climax:

renew us by your Spirit, inspire us with your love,
and unite us in the body of your Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.
With him, and in him, and through him,
by the power of the Holy Spirit,
with all who stand before you in earth and heaven,
we worship you, Father Almighty, in songs of everlasting praise:
Blessing and honour and glory and power
be yours for ever and ever. Amen.⁶⁸

The fraction

The drive for a simple, direct style, evident in the institution narrative, also left its mark on the fraction. Jasper’s first draft eliminated the first two lines of the Series 2 text (‘The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a sharing of the blood of Christ?’), presumably because mention of the cup was thought inappropriate at the breaking of bread, and ‘blessing’ suggested the wrong stage of the four-fold sequence. The Commission’s final text, now mandatory, read:

We break this bread to share in the body of Christ.
Though we are many, we are one body, because we all share in one bread.

The Commission’s *Commentary* explained that ‘at the breaking of the bread we have now provided a shorter and more euphonious version of St Paul’s words’. Shorter they certainly are; their euphony is however open to question. The Series 2 words were more obviously scriptural and also more subtle. Where Series 3 proceeds by statement, Series 2 seeks to evoke a response of faith through question and answer.

The words of administration

The Series 2 invitation, based on the 1662 words of administration, was retained and made mandatory. However two significant changes were made. The reverential passive was again abandoned, and the phrase ‘Remember that he died for you’ was introduced before ‘and feed on him in your hearts . . .’ The words of administration themselves were however changed from statements into prayers: ‘The body (blood) of Christ keep you in eternal life’.

Additional consecration

Following consultations with the Doctrine Commission (see Appendix 3), a short formula was provided:

Having given thanks to you, Father, over the bread and the cup as your Son our Lord Jesus Christ commanded, we receive this bread/wine also as his body/blood.

The use of the formula was left optional, so that the celebrant was free to add more bread and wine in silence.

After communion

Seasonal post-communion sentences were provided. The first post-communion prayer in Series 2 was replaced by a new composition, 'Father of all'. Like the new confession and Prayer of Humble Access, this prayer was largely the work of David Frost. It draws on the parable of the prodigal son to highlight the meeting of human and divine nature in Christ, a fitting reflection on the meaning of holy communion; and it prays that the fruit of communion may be a church equipped for witness and work in the world, that the whole creation might fulfill its purpose. Finally the **blessing** was given a number of seasonal beginnings, always followed by the traditional trinitarian ending. The blessing remained optional; the dismissal was mandatory.

7.4 Revision in Synod

The first day

The new service came before the General Synod on 10 November 1971.⁶⁹ One consequence of the recent change in church government was that liturgical business could now be discussed and amended in full Synod, thus doing away with the need for Liturgical Conferences and their 'straw votes'. It was generally assumed that this would be a great gain; but after the first day's debate on Series 3, in the course of which the Commission's penitential section was savaged beyond redemption, it became clear that the concentration of power in one body presented dangers as well as benefits.

Jasper opened the debate with a brief assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of Series 2. This service certainly needed a full and considered revision, and not merely a light re-touching, because:

It was never intended to be anything more than one step in the process of revision. It has served that particular limited purpose very well indeed and in fact far better than we at one time imagined. It has accustomed people to the principle of change and it has also given a new shape to the liturgy but for a permanent rite to go on almost *ad infinitum* I think we should soon find that Series II is simply not good enough, either in content or in language, and we should make a great mistake if we tried to make Series II as it stands definitive.

He went on to say that since the structure of Series 2 and Series 3 were similar, the transition between them should not be as awkward as some people feared; though in the language, there was 'a radical change'. Finally he asked the Synod to 'take Series 3 substantially as it stands and allow the Church to discover by experience whether it is acceptable or not' — a request soon to be bluntly refused.

Jean Mayland, seconding, asked the Synod to show patience with the new prayers and the contemporary language of the rite. Like David Frost, she also felt that the new rite offered greater accessibility and better poetry than Series 2:

I feel . . . that some of us who enjoy worshipping in the traditional way sometimes seem to care more for the beauty of the language than for the content of the Christian faith and certainly fail to see the urgent connection between our worship and our mission. I am not such a fool as to think that merely to present worship in contemporary language will make Christianity relevant to people in our country today. I wish I knew what would do so . . .

I am, however, sure that one factor which would help in many situations would be to present our worship in language which makes a first impact of appearing to have something to say to people in their lives as they live them . . . [Series 3] has the first impact of being more modern and more relevant but also it has depth and beauty on which we can feed.

Once the opening speeches were over, criticism began to flow. The Dean of Guildford was dissatisfied with the service, though not critical of the Commission. No one could have done better, it was simply that Synod had set the Commission an impossible task:

I am sure that a committee, however talented its members, can never be expected to write a poem or become joint authors of a new Hamlet, any more than the Board of British Rail can dance Swan Lake at Waterloo Station in the rush hour.

There were also theological objections. Prof G.W.H. Lampe felt that the decalogue should follow, not precede, the confession: 'the Law is a gift of grace and it is a means of grace. It is not a sort of blunt instrument with which we have to be knocked on the head first in order that we might then receive the remedy of grace'. He also objected to the introduction of 'all who truly repent' into the absolution; these words tended 'to lead people's thoughts the wrong way, away from the sovereign mercy of God who

forgives all sinners to the question whether I have myself truly repented'. Dr H.M. Williams was concerned about the new words of administration: 'these words appear to mean that our eternal life is dependent from one communion service to the next upon our act of communion'. As Frost later wrote, the problem was not that these remarks were made, but rather that they were left unanswered:

dubious theology went unchallenged ... no-one challenged Professor Lampe's extraordinary argument that the Ten Commandments ought to *follow* Confession and Absolution ... the logic of the argument surely demands that the Decalogue follow not Absolution but the act of Communion itself!⁷⁰

There was disappointment too from catholics who had hoped for better from Series 3 than they had found in Series 2. The Revd D. Carter wanted an invocation of the Holy Spirit; also, 'the thanksgiving fails to say that the eucharist is a liturgical presentation to the Father of Christ's sacrifice because it lacks a verbal offering of the holy gifts to God'. Other churches of the reformation had introduced such language into their liturgies; a simple offering of the gifts 'demonstrably belongs to our Anglican tradition. It is primitive, it is contemporary, it is ecumenical'.

In the midst of the criticism there was also praise for the Commission's work. Mr M.D. Keulemans felt that the Liturgical Commission had 'worked hard and produced something in good modern English. I am sure that this is good modern English. I do not know what the Dean of Guildford thinks it is'.

Nevertheless, trouble clearly threatened for the Commission's new compositions. Mrs J. Coombs declared that 'many of the prayers in this liturgy are badly written, and as instances I give the Comfortable Words, the dreadful post-Communion prayer, the dreadful alternative to the Prayer of Humble Access and the dreadful Confession'.

The Synod soon began a detailed scrutiny of the rite, section by section. Most amendments were defeated, but three very significant proposals were passed. Firstly, the requirement to say the commandments in Lent was removed. Secondly, Canon C.M. Cockin's motion to replace the new confession with a composition of his own was approved, despite Jasper's defence of the new penitential section:

This section of Series 3 is a new production. It is close-knit and it does not bear an awful lot of playing around with, otherwise we will destroy the line of argument which runs from beginning to end. Since we are still permitted to use in its place the Confession we have already tried in Series II, I still believe that something on these lines deserves to be tried.

Thirdly, Canon H.B. Marlow's motion to omit the alternative Prayer of Humble Access was also carried. Marlow's argument was crudely, if effectively, put:

I doubt whether people will use it, and if they do I rather think that they ought to be stopped.

And once again, an increasingly desperate Jasper failed to stem the tide against the Commission's most creative work:

At best this is only an alternative to an option. It has never been tried and I object to the principle that we should not give something a fair trial, even if we never use it again. We would at least know that people do not like it. Simply to eliminate it without even the slightest attempt to try it is not playing fair.

Shortly after this the debate was adjourned, and Synod asked the Liturgical Steering Committee to scrutinize amendments which had not yet been considered. But by then some members were beginning to realise the seriousness of the changes they had already agreed:

A Member Is it possible to table further amendments?

Chairman No.

A Member Does that mean that the form of confession which we accepted rather hurriedly is for all time the Series 3 form of confession or can we now suggest amendments to it?

Chairman I am advised that amendments are possible for the parts of the service that have not yet been reached but not the sections with which we have already dealt. The Steering Committee will be coming back with comments in due course.

A Member Does that mean that we are not putting into revision those parts already discussed? If so, surely the original motion to put into revision needs amendment?

Chairman No, what we have done, we have done, and that is not subject to revision.

Over forty years previously, the editor of *Theology* had written that the House of Commons was 'ill-adapted' to handling liturgical business. It might well be said that by its treatment of the Liturgical Commission's most cherished work, the Church's Synod had shown itself to be no better. It may be true, as Frost says, that these decisions were taken late in the afternoon 'when some of the more interested members had gone home';⁷¹ but that is precisely the nature of synodical life, and there is precious little use complaining about it. Synod is empowered and expected to conduct

itself responsibly even on cold November evenings; and if the Synod is so constituted as to permit a sparsely attended chamber irrevocably to savage an important liturgical text in the space of a few minutes, then that in itself is a telling judgement on the process by which the Church of England authorizes new liturgical material.⁷²

The Steering Committee

Synod's decision to refer the 'unfinished business' of the Series 3 debate to a Steering Committee was the one solid success of the first day's debate. The Committee's reports reveal that many of the proposed amendments were withdrawn when their proposers were given the opportunity of discussing them with the Committee, and there was also the opportunity to consult the Liturgical Commission about major changes.⁷³ At any rate, the amendments made after this were generally agreeable to the Commission and did not have the effect of tearing the heart out of their work.

Continuing debate in Synod

The Synod met again in February, when the following changes were made:⁷⁴

- 1) the words of the oblation were expanded to express 'the eternal aspect'⁷⁵ of our Lord's sacrifice: 'Accept *through him our great high priest* this our sacrifice . . .'
- 2) In the second line of the Lord's Prayer 'hallowed' replaced 'holy'.
- 3) The provision for additional consecration in silence was withdrawn. This followed outspoken advocacy from the Archbishop of Canterbury and Jasper. For Ramsey it was a question of awe and reverence:

'the consecration of bread and wine to be the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord is one of the most stupendous things that happens in the physical world . . . what I shudder from with my whole being is the thought of this reconsecration, by being silent, taking place without the Christian community in the building knowing that it is happening.'⁷⁶

For Jasper it was more a matter of pastoral common sense. Speaking for himself, rather than in his official role as chairman of the Commission, he said:

Let me say without any reservation whatever that I would not have made any attempt whatever to support the proposal that further consecration be undertaken in silence. I believe it is unwise, I believe that pastorally it might lead to all kinds of injudicious action, and honestly — I may be naive in this particular point — I find any theological arguments which can be produced in favour of it singularly unconvincing.⁷⁷

- 4) The first post-communion prayer, previously to be said by 'one of the ministers', was made into a presidential text (but still left optional); 'anchor us' was amended to 'keep us firm'; and the second post-communion prayer ('Almighty God, we thank you') was also made optional.
- 5) A number of amendments were made in the *Notes* at the beginning of the service: (a) a note was introduced explaining that 'president' meant 'episcopally ordained priest'; (b) the note permitting concelebration was omitted;⁷⁸ (c) slight changes were made to the note permitting the use of Series 2 material; (d) minor amendments were made to clarify two other notes.

The service was then referred once again to the Liturgical Steering Committee for further consideration. Immediately afterwards there was a call to send the service also to the House of Bishops 'for consideration of the theology of the service'.⁷⁹ Archbishop Ramsey welcomed this referral, and went on to draw attention to one passage which he found particularly unsatisfactory:

It is the phrase 'we celebrate the death and proclaim the resurrection'. If this is carried, what will I say about it subsequently? I cannot honestly say that I think it is a good piece of liturgical or doctrinal proposition. I think that if one of Canon Jasper's pupils served it up in an essay he would tell him not to produce 'stuff like that' . . . I believe that the separation of 'we celebrate the death' and 'we proclaim the resurrection' introduces an unnecessary and wrong dichotomy between death and resurrection . . .

If this matter is referred to the House of Bishops, they will have a good theological exercise, which personally I am always glad to have . . . but the thing will boil down in the end to the willingness of the Synod to be less inhibited about certain traditional language and less compelled to take refuge in phrases of a rhetorical kind.⁸⁰

The final stages of revision

With this intervention Ramsey put the question of the anamnesis once again at the heart of the debate about eucharistic worship, as well as revealing his impatience with those who were wedded to certain phrases. In March the Liturgical Commission considered the anamnesis in the light of the Archbishop's comments, and agreed to the following form, which heals the division between 'death' and 'resurrection' which had so exercised the Archbishop:

Therefore, heavenly Father, with this bread and this cup we do this in remembrance of him: we celebrate, we proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into heaven: and we look for the fullness of his coming in glory.⁸¹

The House of Bishops produced a remarkably similar form, with only two differences: the bishops' text had 'we celebrate *and* proclaim . . .', and in the final clause, the clumsy phrase 'the fullness of' was omitted. The Steering Committee supported the bishops' text, though they felt unable to recommend the omission of 'the fullness of' since this phrase had originated with the Doctrine Commission.⁸²

Under standing orders, this second referral to the Steering Committee gave a valuable (if restricted) opportunity to review decisions already made.⁸³ Only 'for very clear reasons should reconsideration [of such decisions] be allowed',⁸⁴ but even this limited power allowed the 'Cockin' confession to be substantially improved:

Cockin / Synod Nov 1971

Almighty God, our heavenly Father,
we have sinned against you
 and against our fellow men,
through weakness and ignorance
 and through our own fault,
in thought and word and deed,

and in what we have left undone.

We are heartily sorry for these
 our sins and failures,
and we pray you, most merciful Father,
for the sake of your Son, Jesus Christ,
 who died for us,
forgive us all that is past;
and grant that we may serve you
 in newness of life
to the glory of your Name. Amen.

Steering Committee / Series 3

Almighty God, our heavenly Father,
We have sinned against you
 and against our fellow men,

in thought and word and deed,
in the evil we have done
and in the good we have not done,
through ignorance, through weakness,
through our own deliberate fault.
We are truly sorry and repent of all
 our sins.

For the sake of your Son, Jesus Christ,
 who died for us,
forgive us all that is past;
and grant that we may serve you
 in newness of life
to the glory of your Name. Amen.

The service came before the Synod for the last time at the July group of sessions.⁸⁵ Along with a number of minor amendments,⁸⁶ some significant decisions were made.

- 1) The Collect for Purity was made optional (as in Series 2);
- 2) The Nicene Creed was left in the plural (notwithstanding a previous decision of the Synod to make it singular);
- 3) The commandments were removed from the main body of the text and placed in an appendix;⁸⁷
- 4) The Cockin confession was replaced by the Steering Committee's text;

- 5) The offertory sentence ‘Yours, Lord, is the greatness . . .’ was introduced as part of the rubric ‘The bread and wine are brought to the holy table’;
- 6) An invocation was incorporated into the eucharistic prayer — ‘grant that *by the power of your Spirit* these gifts of bread and wine may be to us his body and his blood’;
- 7) The passive voice was restored to the words of institution;
- 8) The third line of the acclamation was changed to ‘Christ will come again’;
- 9) The bishops’ amended anamnesis was accepted;
- 10) In the Lord’s Prayer, ‘do not bring us to the test’ was amended to ‘do not bring us to the time of trial’;
- 11) The formula for additional consecration was changed from a statement to a prayer (for further discussion see Appendix 3):

LC text

Having given thanks to you, Father,
over the bread and the cup

as your Son, Jesus Christ
commanded,

we receive this bread/wine
also as his body/blood.

Series 3

Having given thanks to you, Father,
over the bread and the cup
according to the institution
of your Son, Jesus Christ,
who said,
‘Take, eat; this is my body’
(and/or ‘Drink this; this is my blood’),
we pray that this bread/wine
may be to us his body/blood
and be received in remembrance of him.

With these amendments, the service was submitted to the House of Bishops, who made one small further amendment — ‘forgives’ instead of ‘pardons’ in the first line of the absolution — before the service was presented for Final Approval on 7 November 1972. A huge majority was secured for it in each house:

Bishops	27 – 0
Clergy	148 – 10
Laity	123 – 9

The Series 3 service was authorized under the 1965 Measure from 1 February 1973 for a period of three years.

7.5 Comments and reactions

The continuing doctrinal dispute

Catholics, disappointed at the loss of 'we offer' from the text of Series 2 and dissatisfied with Jasper's 'stopgap' formula, hoped for better from Series 3. Evangelicals also had reasons for unhappiness with Series 2, chiefly the lack of a clear statement of the sufficiency and finality of Christ's death, and the small hint of sacrificial language which remained. They too could hope that Series 3 would prove more satisfactory than its predecessor.

From the catholic side, Michael Moreton was scathing about the further concessions to protestantism in the new rite. In *Consecrating, Remembering, Offering* (1976) he cast doubt on the adequacy of the new canon, and in *Made Fully Perfect* (1974) drew a parallel between 1967–1973 and 1549–1552, ironically portraying Series 3 as Series 2 'made fully perfect', a rite in which every last vestige of catholic thought had been removed. He argued that Series 3 was insufficient 'to effect both the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice and the consecration of the Body and Blood of Christ'.⁸⁸ The doctrine of consecration had been compromised by the omission of the manual acts and by the subjective wording of the epiclesis; the prayer that the bread and wine may *be* (not *become*) Christ's body and blood betrayed receptionist theology. But worse still, Series 3 expressed no intention of offering the eucharistic sacrifice. Moreton traced the development of the anamnesis/oblation from Hippolytus through the main rites of west and east; in all these, a remembrance of Christ's death and resurrection was followed by an offering of the bread and cup to God. Nothing corresponding to this sequence could be found in the Series 3 eucharistic prayer; indeed, the anamnesis and oblation had become confused. Much the same argument was advanced by Geoffrey Willis in *Revising the Revision* (1971), with equal lack of sympathy for Series 3. Willis also complained about the language of the new rite and the disruption being caused to the Church by yet another revision of the eucharist.⁸⁹

This argument from tradition can be very seductive, the more so because the Liturgical Commission seemed to have accepted it themselves in their drafting of Series 2. Moreton was surely right to complain that the anamnesis of both Series 2 and Series 3 as authorized 'betrays utter confusion as to what a eucharistic prayer should say when it is carried on beyond the narrative of institution';⁹⁰ but the liturgical confusion

stemmed from the theological confusion of the Church of England as a whole regarding eucharistic offering. However, the theological weight which the words 'we offer' are here asked to bear is unjustified. Their omission does not inevitably banish all sense of offering; nor does the recasting of the anamnesis, however clumsily done, inevitably plunge the rite into invalidity and inefficacy. It should be remembered that (a) catholics of the stature of Kenneth Ross were content to use an anamnesis/oblation without the Hippolytan words, a point which Moreton concedes,⁹¹ and (b) while the pattern Moreton traced is certainly traditional, it is not explicitly scriptural.⁹² One could argue that the Hippolytan formula should be *acceptable* to Anglicans, but not that it *binds* them. At the express wish of the House of Laity in 1966, the Church of England committed itself to finding a form of words which could be used in good conscience by both catholics and evangelicals; and that seemed to preclude the use of the Hippolytan formula.

In the meantime the conservative evangelical case was being put with equal vigour by Roger Beckwith. In an article in *The Churchman* in 1976,⁹³ he complained that all three series of alternative services had problems with prayer for the dead, eucharistic sacrifice, and reservation. These were 'the same three doctrinal problems on which the 1928 Prayer Book foundered'.⁹⁴ However, improvements had been made to Series 2 at the synodical stage; and 'what has been done before can, by God's blessing, be done again'.⁹⁵ Beckwith's solutions would, however, have alienated the whole catholic wing of the church. In the prayer for the departed, the words 'that in them your will may be fulfilled' should be removed. In the eucharistic prayer, the phrase 'accept through him, our great high priest, this our sacrifice of thanks and praise' should be omitted and placed in the post-communion, where Cranmer had it. Finally, the problem of reservation should be solved by disallowing extended communion altogether.

These representations reflected feeling on the extremes of the catholic and evangelical parties. Moderate catholics, and even the robust evangelical campaigner Colin Buchanan, had no such difficulties with Series 3. No doubt the rite did not say exactly what everyone would like, but neither did it exclude the majority of the Church.

The penitential prayers

Mark Santer deplored the 'new moralism' of the Series 3 penitential rite.⁹⁶ He rightly pointed out that the reasons given in the Commission's *Commentary* for the reintroduction of the Decalogue were woefully inadequate ('It is sometimes argued

that the regular use of the Decalogue in Anglican worship in the past has been of significant value to the life of the nation; and that the present lowering of moral standards is in some measure due to its neglect'.⁹⁷) His attack on the new confession, however, seems by comparison ill-judged:

Of course sin must be recognised and acknowledged, and in a comprehensive manner. But it must not be wallowed in. Nor must people be made to feel guilty for not feeling guilty. There is an element of self-regard, not to say self-indulgence, in these phrases . . . [Series 2] did not prescribe the emotions a man should feel, but left him to feel his own.⁹⁸

The Series 2 prayers had been criticised for their 'lightweight' approach to sin and guilt, in contrast to the heavily loaded Prayer Book forms. But if Series 3 was guilty of 'self-regard' and of 'prescribing the emotions a man should feel', what would Santer have said about *Cranmer's* moralism?

Language and variety

Criticism of the language of Series 3 went both ways. For Willis it was banal, simple, and unworthy; for Santer it remained too closely wedded to the past. Richard Harries agreed with the latter, finding the language stiff and 'wooden'. All the collects, for instance, were 'modified Cranmer'. By comparison, the collects from the Roman Missal were 'not always very inspired' but they were at least 'unpretentious and to the point'.⁹⁹ Harries also looked for more freedom. He envied the freedom of Roman Catholic priests to introduce the confession and offer intercession in their own words. By comparison, Series 3 prescribed too much. Harries' article ended with an affirmation of the role of the laity: 'only a worshipping congregation can, in the long run, judge what is appropriate to its needs and what prayers have staying power'.¹⁰⁰

In reply Derek Brewer questioned Harries' appeal to democracy:

"Many people would prefer" to do or say all kinds of things that are highly undesirable or wrong . . . Counting heads is no argument; but even if it were it has not been done, for how many Christians "would prefer" and how do we know?¹⁰¹

He believed Harries' call for a 'simple direct modern style' would lead to a 'stilted empty non-language'. Yet more serious was the demand for spontaneity and freedom. The peace, for example, was a highly ritualised act which yet pretended *not* to be a ritual. And extempore prayer very quickly became predictable, quite as much a ritual as any fixed form, yet almost always of inferior quality. Though his attack was certainly overstated, Brewer made some telling points:

What is extempore and spontaneous is unprepared, and therefore most likely to be conditioned by the immediate moment; most likely to be in the bad sense conventional because not the subject of careful thought; most likely to be banal and trivial; most likely to be inaccurate, unclear, and occasionally absurd. The particularities of spontaneous extempore prayer are usually illogical, prompting the questions on the congregation's mind, why this disaster rather than that, why this social worker rather than that miner . . .? ¹⁰²

'The Eucharist Today'

In September 1972 members of the Liturgical Commission and others began work on *The Eucharist Today: Studies on Series 3* (1974).¹⁰³ This collection of essays took a broader and more critical view of the rite than the 1971 *Commentary*, thus complementing and expanding on the earlier work.

It is clear that the emphasis throughout was on presenting Series 3 as the principal alternative to 1662. Series 2 was effectively treated as an early version of Series 3, rather than as a service in its own right. In the discussion of the structure of the rite,¹⁰⁴ its Dixian four-fold shape,¹⁰⁵ and the comprehensive eucharistic prayer which now included thanksgiving, consecration and remembrance,¹⁰⁶ Series 3 was presented as a new composition. Series 2 was either subsumed in the discussion of Series 3, or ignored altogether. Only Buchanan gave any serious attention to the rite's history, seeing in Series 2/Series 3 the beginning of a new family of rites in the Church of England.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore, only the *authorized* text of Series 3 was discussed, with no hint that in parts it differed substantially from the Commission's draft. For example, J. Gunstone's treatment of the penitential section gave the reader no inkling of the origins of the Series 3 confession, but rather offered a sympathetic appreciation of it; there was simply no mention of the Commission's defeated texts.

Two contributions particularly stand out. Firstly, David Frost argued that the language of Series 3 should not be seen as a regrettable, if necessary, declension from 1662; on the contrary it was an improvement on it. One of the most important aspects of the Christian faith was *accessibility*, exemplified by the rending of the curtain of the Temple, the entry of Jesus (and therefore also the church, his body) into the heavenly sanctuary, and the addressing of God as *Abba*. Yet:

pious folk are regularly tempted to create for themselves a factitious holiness. If they are not, like the 'stupid Galatians', reverting to rites like circumcision, they will be busily weaving again the veil over the holy of holies, even reverencing the cobwebs created by time. The vernacular liturgy of one century becomes the elevated sacred rite of another . . . ¹⁰⁸

It was precisely this tendency which the Commission had sought to resist, and with remarkable results: Frost's comparison of Series 3 with the Book of Common Prayer showed Series 3 well ahead in the use of rhetorical and rhythmic devices. Opponents of Series 3 were mistaken in their attacks, showing neither an appreciation of the texts nor an understanding of the art of rhetoric or the *cursus*.¹⁰⁹ The main point of difference between Series 3 and the Prayer Book was not rhythm but style and syntax:

The Cranmerian style was given to long and complex sentences, to a paragraphic structure, and to the interpolation of subsidiary clauses into the main flow of the sentence . . . much of the syntactical structure of the Prayer Book is extremely difficult to follow, especially for those unacquainted with Latin; its forms are un-English, and it is significant that the style fell into general disfavour later in the sixteenth century, and was thought particularly inappropriate for drama, which needs to mirror thought processes and be comprehensible by ear.¹¹⁰

Modern English, on the other hand, had 'discovered again the value of simplicity, the telling effect of a pause';¹¹¹ and the new prayers of Series 3 were written with such in mind.

Secondly, J.L. Houlden's closing essay 'Liturgy and her Companions: a Theological Appraisal' reflected on the process of liturgical reform and its need of other disciplines. Houlden developed a theme he had previously expressed in his assessment of the Series 2 oblation (§6.4), namely that liturgies, as 'the expression of the faith of Christians in word and action', should not be constructed 'without significant reference to the total theological scene'.¹¹² Liturgical studies could plot what the shape of the eucharistic liturgy had been *in the past*, but framing a liturgy for the future required more than a historical perspective. The insights of anthropology, psychology and sociology should be brought to bear, to say nothing of biblical studies and doctrine. While Series 3 might seem too modern to some people, in its thought forms it was 'wholly traditional'. The thanksgiving, for example, praised God for his creation as if it were a completed event, but 'few people believe that creation is something God *did* in some immeasurably deep past, and if they do believe that, then their faith in God the creator is severely deficient'.¹¹³ The description of Jesus as God's 'living Word' appealed to a biblical and patristic concept, and entirely ignored the developments in theology of the last 1500 years. 'If we are to modernize', wrote Houlden, 'then in the long run the process must be thoroughgoing'. Liturgy must enlist other, companion, disciplines.¹¹⁴ This approach is not without its problems: taken to extremes, it would mean the liturgical expression of the Christian faith being constantly uprooted and cast adrift on the stormy sea of scholarly fads and fashions, buffeted by the competing

convictions of any number of theological and secular disciplines. It is surely no coincidence that Houlden was also a member of the Doctrine Commission which was so critical of 'we obey his command' in the Series 3 anamnesis (§7.3). All the same, Houlden was surely right to draw attention to the relative insularity of the liturgical task. As this study has shown, liturgical revision has attended to a narrow range of doctrinal concerns. It has provided rites suited to the parish communion, and it has resulted in forms of worship much less culturally bound to the Reformation era; but beyond that, the influence of historical liturgiology has dominated all other concerns.

Celebrating the eucharist

As with Series 2, there was the question of how the new service should be presented and used. The Liturgical Commission and the Council for the Care of Churches in collaboration produced *The Presentation of the Eucharist* (1971) in response to a widely-felt need for a basic ceremonial manual for the new rites. The concerns of the parish communion movement were well expressed: the corporate nature of the celebration, the call for worship to issue in holiness and mission, and — surprisingly — the importance of the offertory. This was functional, but also symbolical: 'the offering of our lives and the fruits of our labours to God'. Nevertheless the offertory procession and the preparing of the table on the one hand were not to be confused with the 'taking' on the other; the congregation and assistant ministers might be involved in the former, but only the president (and, curiously, other priests if there was a concelebration) should 'take' the bread and wine. Once again the point was made that a 'taking' during the eucharistic prayer 'not only frustrates the fourfold sequence, but invests the narrative with a purpose which we believe to be foreign to its proper use'.

A second volume, *The Eucharist* (1978) by Michael Perham, drew heavily on John Wilkinson's *Eucharist for Experiment* (§6.6) and *The Presentation of the Eucharist* to provide a comprehensive ceremonial for catholic Anglicans. He commended the use of the Roman offertory prayers, and accepted the logic of omitting manual acts during the eucharistic prayer. He also approved of lay assistance in the distribution (with the bishop's permission, of course) provided that different members of the congregation took part on a rota basis. There was 'no need for such people to be in the sanctuary during the major part of the service'. Unconfirmed adults and children should be given a simple blessing; here touch was important, especially for children.

7.6 Series 3 in summary

Series 3 was the first service written entirely in contemporary English to be authorized for use in the Church of England. It built substantially upon the success of Series 2, but took the reform a great deal further. Any appearance of a smooth development is, however, deceptive. Our account of the drafting and synodical revision of the service has shown that in some places where Series 2 had departed from 1662, Series 3 reverted to the Prayer Book. Perhaps the best example of this is the atonement language in the canon. In other places, for instance, the mandatory use of the commandments in Lent, the Commission's draft went some way towards restoring a Prayer Book practice which they had been led to believe would meet with approval, though in fact the Synod proved less 'traditional' in this respect than was expected. But this trend is admittedly slight, and counts for little when weighed against Synod's proclivity for restoring traditional texts when these were perceived to be under threat. It is regrettable that Synod failed to heed Archbishop Michael Ramsey's call to think more boldly about liturgical language, and it is particularly strange that Synod so readily despatched the alternative Prayer of Humble Access, which as Jasper said, was merely an alternative to an option; whatever anyone thought of its literary merits, no-one was compelled to use it or was deprived of the Cranmerian version. It is little wonder that Frost's account of the destruction of his two penitential prayers shows not so much anger as incomprehension.¹¹⁵ On the rejection of these prayers Jasper is curiously sanguine, claiming that 'no permanent harm was done' since the prayers were eventually included in the ASB.¹¹⁶ But surely their omission from Series 3 meant that congregations got used to saying the amended Cockin confession and the Cranmerian Prayer of Humble Access, so that when the ASB was published there was little incentive to use the alternatives; and even in Rite A, it is the authorized Series 3 prayers which appear in the main body of the text and are thus clearly the 'default' set.

Publication

A new typographical style was employed for Series 3. Texts said by the president were in a light sans-serif face, as were the rubrics; congregational texts were printed in bold Times Roman. Following the practice of Series 2, which had made modest steps in the direction of a clearer presentation, the Series 3 congregational texts were printed in sense-lines. Finally, the Series 3 layout abandoned justified text in favour of ragged line-ends.

The sales figures for Series 3 were as remarkable in their way as those for Series 2. Within a month of authorization a million copies had been sold.¹¹⁷ A questionnaire issued in 1976 showed that 86% of the lay people and 88% of the clergy who replied were satisfied with the new service, and to 'specific questions about the language of various sections' it was found that 'an average of over 75% found it satisfactory'.¹¹⁸ The Introduction to the Liturgical Commission's revision of the service in the light of the questionnaire remarked:

Clearly there is strong support for the service as it stands. We have therefore not attempted to produce a new service or anything resembling a 'Series 4'.¹¹⁹

The Church had found a eucharistic structure and language which it would be happy to authorize for an extended period of use as part of its Alternative Service Book. Series 3 effectively became the first authorized eucharistic rite in the Church of England to enjoy any degree of permanence and stability since 1662.

Notes

- 1 Frost, *The Language of Series 3*, p.11.
- 2 Revd R. Feast, Letter to *Church Times*, 18 Feb 1966.
- 3 The secretary of the Liturgical Commission kept a 'scrap-book' of relevant press cuttings, now at CERC (LTC/PC).
- 4 *The Liturgical Conference 1966*, p.9.
- 5 Stella Brook, a member of the Liturgical Commission from 1965, was a language expert and an outspoken advocate of the use of sacral language. See Jasper, *Development*, p.243.
- 6 *The Liturgical Conference 1966*, p.11.
- 7 *ibid*, p.76.
- 8 *ibid*, p.80.
- 9 Jean Mayland was to join the Commission in 1967.
- 10 *The Liturgical Conference 1966*, p.89.
- 11 Conservative reaction to liturgical revision is examined in §8.5.
- 12 Battiscombe, 'The Destruction of Common Prayer'.
- 13 Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies*.
- 14 Jasper, *Development*, p.293.
- 15 The Church in Wales has now published an experimental eucharist in contemporary Welsh and English, *Ffurf Arall ar gyfer y Cymun Bendigaid — An Alternative Order for the Holy Eucharist* (Penarth, 1994).
- 16 Jasper, *Development*, p.288. ICEL was the Roman Catholic body responsible for agreeing a single set of English texts. Its meetings were attended by a number of ecumenical observers.
- 17 *LC Minutes*, 41.9.
- 18 *ibid*.
- 19 *LC Minutes*, 44.30 and 50.100b.
- 20 Elisabeth Montefiore was a member of the Commission from 1962.
- 21 *LC Memorandum* 69.
- 22 *LC Minutes*, 48.78. The Series 2 services continue to address God as 'thou' but address the candidates as 'you'.
- 23 *Baptism and Confirmation*, p.4.
- 24 Jasper, *Development*, pp.291f.
- 25 *LC Memorandum* 83.
- 26 Jasper, *Development*, pp.293f.
- 27 *LC, Language and the Worship of the Church*, p.22.
- 28 *LC Minutes*, 59.12.
- 29 Dr Frost was 'a young English don at Cambridge with a particular interest in renaissance drama'. Jasper, *Development*, p.296.
- 30 *LC Minutes*, 62.8.
- 31 *LC Memorandum* 111.

32 *GS Proceedings*, 2 (1971), p.618.

33 *LC Minutes*, 61.37:

'Minimal change would help such revision to be publicly acceptable. The Chairman said four main questions had arisen:

- (a) whether penitence should be placed at the beginning;
- (b) what position the pax should take, and its form;
- (c) what further elements should be included in the Intercession;
- (d) how to deal with a demand for additional "proper prefaces".

A few of the options in the service might be reduced, but not many, in view of the very varied comments on most of them . . .'

34 *LC Minutes*, 62.11.

35 Silence is suggested after each reading; after the introduction to confession; and after the post-communion sentence.

36 *LC Minutes*, 65.19 (1)

37 *LC Minutes*, 63.19.

38 Despite their stated intention the Liturgical Commission seem not to have made much use of the Doctrine Commission's suggestions, many of which are in any case liturgically strange, as the mixture of thee/you language in the following example shows:

We thank thee, O God, for the life and witness of thy servant N, whom we remember before you this day.

39 Frost, *The Language of Series 3*, pp.28f.

40 *LC, A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3*, p.18.

41 Recent commended material, particularly *The Promise of His Glory* and *Patterns for Worship*, suggest seasonal introductions to the confession, most of which dispense with the Comfortable Words in any form.

42 Both prayers are printed in the appendix to ASB Rite A (pp.166 & 170).

43 Julian of Norwich, *Confessions of Divine Love*, 39.

44 Frost's commentaries on these prayers were offered to the Commission (*LC Memoranda* 141A, 141B) and included in *LC, A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3*, pp.18-20. A fuller version can be found in Frost, *The Language of Series 3*, pp.19-23.

45 Frost, *The Language of Series 3*, p.22.

46 *LC, A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3*, p.21.

47 The draft also had 'Thine, O Lord' as an optional anthem at this point, and both the draft and the authorized service provided that money could be presented at the same time as the bread and wine, and a hymn sung.

48 In fairness to the Commission it should be pointed out that the provision for manual acts does not appear in their draft report; it was introduced during the synodical process, in response to calls for the retention of certain features from 1662.

49 *LC Memorandum* 137A.

50 The rubrics appear thus in the Commission's final report and in the authorized Series 3. The singing of the offertory hymn and the collection and presentation of money were to take place *before* these two actions, and were optional.

51 See §8.3.

52 *LC Memorandum* 137C.

53 *LC Minutes*, 65.19 (13).

- 54 LC, *A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3*, p.25.
- 55 *ibid.*
- 56 1) Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again.
 2) Dying you destroyed our death, rising you restored our life,
 Lord Jesus, come in glory.
 3) Lord, by your cross and resurrection you have set us free.
 You are the saviour of the world.
 4) When we eat this bread and drink this cup,
 we proclaim your death, Lord Jesus, until you come in glory.
- 57 An acclamation very like it was authorized in Series 3 and continues in use in the ASB. The Roman rite, the Methodist rite and others also use similar acclamations at this point.
- 58 *LC Minutes*, 64.28.
- 59 The Doctrine Commission's essays on eucharistic sacrifice (discussed in §5.5) were not published until 1972, and were therefore too late to influence Series 3.
- 60 The Doctrine Commission's reply came by way of a letter from the chairman (Ian Ramsey, Bishop of Durham) to Jasper: *LC Text 43* (CERC LTC/LT/43).
- 61 It is true that only the Lucan and Pauline accounts of the Last Supper include a command to repeat the action, and that the Mark/Matthew tradition may be more authentic; but the point stands. This discussion did, however, raise the question of the extent to which developments in Biblical scholarship should influence the Church's liturgy.
- 62 *LC Minutes*, 65.19 (13).
- 63 *LC Memorandum 137C*.
- 64 Jasper, *Development*, p.310.
- 65 so Moreton, 'A Liturgical Pastiche', p.82. The quotation from Hippolytus is taken from Jasper and Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.35.
- 66 *LC Minutes*, 65.19 (13).
- 67 *LC Memorandum 137C*.
- 68 This prayer is one of which Jasper was justly proud; he ended his *Development* by quoting it (p.366).
- 69 *GS Proceedings*, 1971, pp.618ff.
- 70 Frost, *The Language of Series 3*, pp.17f.
- 71 *ibid*, p.18.
- 72 For a vivid first-hand account of the first day's debate, see *ibid*, pp.17-19.
- 73 *Liturgical Steering Committee Report on Holy Communion Series 3*, GS 68, and *Liturgical Steering Committee Supplementary Report on Holy Communion Series 3*, GS 68A.
- 74 *GS Proceedings*, 1972, pp.27-43 and pp.153-189.
- 75 Jasper's amendment, *ibid*, p.37.
- 76 *ibid*, p.160.
- 77 *ibid*, p.161.

- 78 One cannot be certain of the reason for this. Jasper, who proposed the amendment, simply said that 'the note raises a number of problems and is not as clear as it might be, and rather than wrestle with it and try to make it clear, I propose that it be dropped altogether'. More likely in my view is that the Commission was not willing to fight yet another battle along doctrinal lines; and parishes where concelebration was already practised would probably continue with it whatever the rubrics said.
- 79 *ibid*, p.186.
- 80 *ibid*, p.189.
- 81 *LC Minutes*, 70.4.
- 82 *Report of the Liturgical Steering Committee*, GS 77, p.6.
- 83 Jasper's comments in *GS Proceedings*, 1972, pp.506f.
- 84 The view of the Business Sub-Committee of the Standing Committee of the Synod: *Report of the Liturgical Steering Committee*, GS 77, p.1.
- 85 *GS Proceedings*, 1972, pp.505-512 and pp.539-566.
- 86 Mostly concerned with tidying up the service in various ways: for example, providing an extra introductory sentence for saints' days, making clear that the introductory sentence should be said before the hymn is sung, etc.
- 87 This was made possible by the previous decision of the Synod to make the commandments no longer mandatory.
- 88 Moreton, *Consecrating, Remembering, Offering*, p.1.
- 89 Willis, *Revising the Revision*, p.16.
- 90 Moreton, *Made Fully Perfect*, p.22.
- 91 Moreton, *Consecrating, Remembering, Offering*, p.1.
- 92 The new Roman prayers are not quite as traditional in their language of offering as Moreton would perhaps like: Eucharistic Prayer 3 offers God 'this holy and living sacrifice', while Eucharistic Prayer 4 offers 'his body and blood'.
- 93 Beckwith, 'The Approaching Revision of Series Three'.
- 94 *ibid*, p.289.
- 95 *ibid*, p.291.
- 96 Santer, 'The New Moralism in Series 3'.
- 97 *LC Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3*, p.17. It would be interesting to compare the moral life of the nation in, say, the 1950s with that of a century before, when the decalogue was certainly heard by rather more people; such an exercise would, I suspect, quickly dispel any idea that the recitation of the commandments improves society's moral standards.
- 98 Santer, 'The New Moralism in Series 3', p.31.
- 99 Richard Harries, 'Alternative Services — the Test of Practice', p.224.
- 100 *ibid*, p.226.
- 101 Derek Brewer, 'Liturgy: Need and Frustration', p.173.
- 102 *ibid*, p.177.
- 103 *LC Minutes*, 72.22(c).
- 104 Cuming, 'Series 3 and 1662: A Structural Comparison', in *The Eucharist Today*, pp.34-45.
- 105 *ibid*, pp.40-42.
- 106 Halliburton, 'The Canon of Series 3', in *The Eucharist Today*, p.110.

- 107 Buchanan, 'Series 3 in the Setting of the Anglican Communion', in *The Eucharist Today*, pp.8-33.
- 108 Frost, 'Liturgical Language from Cranmer to Series 3', in *The Eucharist Today*, p.145.
- 109 *ibid*, pp.151-156.
- 110 *ibid*, p.157.
- 111 *ibid*, p.158.
- 112 J.L. Houlden, 'Liturgy and her Companions: a Theological Appraisal' in *The Eucharist Today*, p.170.
- 113 *ibid*, pp.172f.
- 114 It has obviously not been possible in this thesis to chart the influence of that which has been absent from the twentieth century liturgical story. But Houlden's remarks about the need for biblical studies and theology to influence liturgical development certainly merit further reflection.
- 115 Frost, *The Language of Series 3*, pp.17-23.
- 116 Jasper, *Development*, p.315.
- 117 *ibid*, p.318.
- 118 *Alternative Services: Holy Communion Series 3 Revised: A Report by the Liturgical Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England*, GS 364, p.5.
- 119 *ibid*.

THE ALTERNATIVE SERVICE BOOK

Cranmer himself would have been horrified at the survival of his own Prayer Book and of the later King James Bible as instruments of public worship for three and a half centuries. Still more would he have grieved to hear them defended on grounds of mystery and antiquity.

*David Frost*¹

8.1 A new prayer book

The legal position

When the Liturgical Commission was established in 1955, the proposed programme of liturgical reform has a clear end in sight: a revised Prayer Book. Such is the implication of the first Commission's terms of reference and the tasks they were given (see Appendix 1). Furthermore the 1965 Alternative Services Measure allowed the Church to authorize experimental services for a limited period of fourteen years; at the end of that time (that is, by 1980) the Church should be in a position to present to Parliament a new Prayer Book, the various parts of which which had been thoroughly tried and tested.

In the meantime, however, yet another Church and State Commission had been at work;² its report *Church and State* (1971) recommended that the Church's doctrine and worship should no longer be subject to Parliament but to the authority of the General Synod. In due course the *Worship and Doctrine Measure* (1973) put this proposal into effect, with the sole proviso that the General Synod could not amend or discontinue the use of the Book of Common Prayer. Control over all alternative services therefore passed smoothly into the hands of the Church. Under the new Measure Prayer Book rites and alternative services could coexist permanently; there would now be no need for the Church to choose between 1662 and Series 3 or indeed anything else. The decision of which services were to be used in any parish would continue to be made locally by joint decision of the parish priest and the Parochial Church Council.

What kind of book?

In March 1971 the Liturgical Commission were informed of consultations between Jasper and the Archbishops, in which a new book of 'mainly Series 3 services was envisaged for 1975-6'.³ Also:

The 'Series One' or 1928-type services which were due to run out as experiments during 1973 would be permitted to lapse, with the exception of Holy Communion. That, after some structural amendment by the Commission, would be included in the new service book. The 1662 forms of service would still run legally beside the new revised provisions.⁴

It was intended to produce the book in two versions: 'a complete Prayer Book, and a short Sunday Service Book'.⁵

The substance of this consultation was brought before the Church in a document from the Standing Committee, *The Future Course of Liturgical Revision* (GS 161, 1973). The report noted that liturgical order was now effectively restored in the Church, but at a price: there was now a 'very broad base' for the ordering of worship. The Church therefore 'should not further multiply the forms of worship which are authorized beyond what is necessary to meet known and well recognised needs'; so, for example, calls for modern language translations of 1662 and Series 2 should be resisted. In its debate, the Synod supported the main recommendations of this paper: to establish a working party to give further thought to the preparation of a 'People's Service Book', and to prepare a conflation of the Series 1 and Series 2 eucharistic rites.⁶

The working party's report, *An Alternative Service Book* (GS 264, 1975) rejected the original proposal for a 'People's Book' consisting only of the eucharistic rites, the daily offices, the psalms, collects and lections.⁷ Instead the Church should:

aim at an alternative service book — that is, the bringing together under one cover of all the alternative services which are to continue in authorisation after its publication together with collects and, in some editions at least, psalms and lections.

This proposal would put a second 'Prayer Book' into the hands of churchpeople, complete with all the occasional offices and the ordinal. At its debate on the report in early 1976, Synod duly agreed the change of direction.

As Jasper recalls, the decision to incorporate a large number of authorised services in one book entailed a great deal of work quite apart from any actual revision of the rites themselves.⁸ All the services had to be harmonised with one another:

Texts appearing in more than one service had to appear in a standard form; introductory sentences, appearing in several services, had to be merged into a single group; the notes to each service had to be replanned to avoid unnecessary duplication; and punctuation and typography had to be standardized.

Most of the services in the ASB were included in their unmodified Series 3 form, apart from the process of 'adaptation' described above. The exceptions were the two eucharistic rites, both of which involved the Church in further revision.

8.2 Series 1 & 2 revised: Rite B

The publication of the Series 3 eucharist raised questions about the future of Series 1 and Series 2. A modest revision of Series 2 had been expected after the period of experiment; and if such a revision had emerged, no doubt the 1967 rite would simply have lapsed. But its successor, Series 3, was clearly *not* a simple revision but effectively a new rite, sufficiently different from its parent to justify retaining both services in the future.

This point was well taken in the General Synod Standing Committee Report *The Future Course of Liturgical Revision* (GS 161, June 1973). While the report was critical of proposals to proliferate further the number of authorized services (see §8.1),⁹ yet the Church should not lightly withdraw the Series 1 and Series 2 services:

The reasons for such caution are principally pastoral, but it is also important to have regard to the fact that the *present* degree of order is broadly based, and that too sudden a narrowing of that base might lead back to liturgical anarchy.¹⁰

There was clearly a place for 'forms of service of a character which lie between the 1662 forms and those of Series 3', and there was 'no reason why such forms should not continue to be authorised indefinitely or for a further period of years'.¹¹ There was a particularly strong case for retaining the Series 1 and 2 eucharistic rites, though not necessarily in their present form:

An alternative, helping towards a greater uniformity, would be, in effect, a conflation of the two ... [but] it would need to be understood that, if a conflated

rite is authorised, the separate authorisation of both Series 1 and Series 2 Holy Communion would lapse by 1979 and would not be revived.¹²

As the Standing Committee's report acknowledged, the Liturgical Commission had such a rite in preparation. The Commission had already heard from the Archbishops in March 1971 of the need for a continuing Series 1-type eucharist, to be included in the proposed new service book.¹³ The Commission were also aware that Series 2 could not simply be discarded; as one member (Leslie Houlden) expressed it, Series 2 'would never vanish; but Anglicans were used to "sane diversity"'.¹⁴

In December 1971 Jasper intimated to the Commission that he was working on a draft of the conflated rite (Memorandum 157), but it was not until December the following year that it was circulated and discussed. Jasper's stated intention was to provide for those who wished to continue with Series 1, 'but with modifications from the structure (and especially the intercessions) of Series 2'.¹⁵ As would later be acknowledged,¹⁶ the service structure was in fact that of Series 2 with modifications from Series 3. The influence of Series 3 is seen in the seasonal material (introductory sentences, post-communion sentences and blessings), the opening salutation, the peace, the form for additional consecration, and the congregational post-communion prayer. The influence of Series 2 is also readily discerned: the lack of a 'first' Lord's Prayer, the wording and position of the Gloria, the position of the offertory, the form of the *Sursum corda*, the fraction (*without* the first two lines 'The cup of blessing . . .'), the Lord's Prayer, the words of administration and the dismissal. For the intercession, the invitation to confession, the confession, and the eucharistic prayer, Series 1 and Series 2 forms were set out in parallel columns. Each eucharistic prayer retained its own proper prefaces and both endings to the Series 1 canon were included. The 1662 intercession and a short confession were also included.

Apart from the parallel forms, the only distinctive contribution from Series 1 is the first post-communion prayer. Series 1 has not, therefore, come out of this conflation well. Certainly there is no sign of its structure. This raises questions about the value accorded to Series 1 and also by implication to the Prayer Book rite. Did Jasper and the Commission regard the structure of 1662/Series 1 — which did not, of course, express the Dixian shape — as somehow improper? Whatever else the new rite was, it was emphatically not the Series 1-type eucharist for which the Archbishops had asked. It was a version of Series 2 in which the most important Series 1 prayers *could* be used, but only as alternatives within a Series 2 structure.

The Commission discussed the combined rite in December 1972 and again in March 1973. Their proposed changes were few, a case of 'fine-tuning' rather than rewriting. This is not surprising, for the substantial work had already been done in the drafting of Series 2 and to a lesser extent, Series 3.

The Commission left Jasper's structure well alone. The Series 3 seasonal material was also unaltered, but the opening salutation and the peace were restored to their Series 2 form. The 1662 intercession was removed, but the use of this and other 1662 texts was permitted by a note.¹⁷ The short confession was also omitted. The Series 2 absolution was replaced by the longer form in Series 3. Both canons were retained, but the shorter ending of the Series 1 canon was omitted and the longer one amended to remove the words of self oblation; these were placed instead in the first post-communion prayer.¹⁸ This had the effect of withdrawing the 'Interim Rite', which after centuries of illegal use had finally been legalised in Series 1. The first two lines of the Series 2 fraction were restored, though the whole section was later replaced by the Series 3 form. Finally the Commission changed the dismissal to the Series 3 version.

These changes follow no particular trend one way or the other. Some Series 3 material was added, but other items were removed. The 1662 intercession disappeared, but a note allowed the use of 1662 texts both there and in other places. One final interesting change was made before the service was authorized: following Series 3, an invocation of the Spirit was placed in both canons, before the institution narrative.

However, it was not clear to everyone that the rite served a useful purpose. Cuming asked the Commission 'for whom this combined rite was intended',¹⁹ and during the Synod debate (3 July 1973) on *The Future Course of Liturgical Revision* others expressed similar doubts. The Dean of Ripon felt that while one might be able to make a single rite out of Series 2 and 3, which shared the same shape, 'Series 1 is quite a different shape of liturgy, and I think this projected "Series 1½" is really rather a monstrosity'.²⁰ The rite was, however, generally welcomed, including the modest accommodation to Series 3; indeed one member asked that more of the insights (but not the language) of Series 3 might be brought to bear upon it.

When the service came before Synod for 'general consideration' in July 1975, some members felt that the conflation of Series 1 and 2 would satisfy the lovers of neither parent service. When Synod voted to give the service final approval a year later, however, the debate was short and the vote was won by the narrowest of margins:

Bishops	29 – 0
Clergy	105 – 52 (a margin of one vote)
Laity	115 – 35

Series 1 and 2 revised was therefore approved and, with minimal adaptation of layout, was included in the ASB as *Holy Communion Rite B*. It remains open to question whether it fills its intended niche well (see §4.6 above).

8.3 Series 3 Revised: Rite A

The Liturgical Commission’s draft

The Commission began revising Series 3 in May 1977; its report (GS 364) was presented to the General Synod just over a year later. The work took longer than it might have done, partly because of a dispute with the House of Bishops over the form of the anamnesis. Since the early 1960s and the defeat of the Commission’s baptismal services, it had been the Commission’s practice to refer texts to the bishops for their comments before bringing them to the Convocations or the Synod.²¹ This consultation turned out to be more detailed and more difficult over Series 3 Revised than any previous service.

The Commission’s changes to Series 3 can best be described as modest in degree but extensive in scope. Almost every section of the rite was affected in some way, but most of the amendments were of a very limited nature, being mainly clarification of rubrics, small improvements in the wording of texts, and the placing of an expanded collection of seasonal material in the appendix.²² Along with this ‘fine-tuning’ there were, however, changes of greater substance:

- a) The new (1974) ICET version of the Nicene Creed was adopted.²³
- b) A rubric following the Collect for Purity allowed the penitential prayers²⁴ to be used as part of the Preparation, rather than before the Prayer of Humble Access.
- c) The Series 3 *Taking of the Bread and Wine* was recast to emphasise still further the distinction between the ‘offertory’ and the ‘taking’: the latter was now removed entirely from the ‘offertory’ and attached to the eucharistic prayer.

- d) Three eucharistic prayers were provided, one (the Series 3 prayer) in the main body of the text and the other two in the appendix.
- e) The acclamations in the 'Series 3' prayer were moved to *after* the anamnesis, and the text of the anamnesis was further revised.

These last two changes call for further comment.

Alternative eucharistic prayers

Additional prayers had been requested some years earlier, and reference is made in the Commission's *Commentary* on Series 3 to the possibility of providing some in the future. In September 1977, the Commission decided to place three additional prayers in the appendix of Series 3 Revised: these were modern language versions of the two prayers from Series 1 & 2 Revised, and a canon written by the Joint Liturgical Group. The JLG prayer conformed closely to the Series 3 canon, particularly in the epiclesis before the institution narrative, 'we pray that by the power of your Holy Spirit these gifts of bread and wine may be to us his body and his blood', and in the anamnesis:

Therefore, heavenly Father, obeying the command of your dear Son,
and looking for his coming again in glory,
we celebrate the perfect sacrifice of his death upon the cross.
his mighty resurrection and his glorious ascension.

Christ is Victor.
Christ is King.
Christ is Lord of all.

Father, accept through Christ our sacrifice of thanks and praise . . .

Count us worthy to stand before you as your people
and to offer without ceasing our adoration and service . . .²⁵

At the December 1977 meeting it was decided to include two more prayers, a 'canon for use with house groups or the sick' and a 'canon for a family eucharist'.²⁶ All the new initiatives fell, however, at the hands of the bishops.²⁷ While professing to welcome a variety of prayers for use on different occasions, the bishops were dissatisfied with the texts on offer, and promptly deleted from the Commission's text the JLG canon, the canon for use with the sick, and the 'family eucharist' canon. Only the modified Series 1, Series 2 and Series 3 canons survived. The effect of all this was to leave the Commission's final draft looking pathetically impoverished; once again the Commission could only offer hope for the future rather than progress in the present.²⁸

The anamnesis

Buchanan records that the anamnesis 'proved slow work on the Liturgical Commission';²⁹ this is hardly surprising, given Jasper's belief that the anamnesis-oblation was still capable of improvement 'despite the apparent satisfaction with the existing [Series 3] form'.³⁰ In September 1977 the Commission agreed a new form:

Series 3

Therefore, heavenly Father,
with this bread and this cup
we do this in remembrance of him:
we celebrate and proclaim
his perfect sacrifice
made once for all upon the cross,
his resurrection from the dead,
and his ascension into heaven:

and we look for his coming in glory.

LC September 1977

Therefore, heavenly Father,

in remembrance

of the offering
he made once for all upon the cross,
his glorious resurrection
and ascension,
we celebrate and proclaim
with this bread and this cup
his one perfect sacrifice,
and we look for his coming in glory.

This new text comes much closer than before to the kind of 'remember-offer' sequence which Moreton had advocated.³¹ It also partly disengages 'his (one) perfect sacrifice' from the crucifixion and allows it to stand for the whole of Christ's earthly and heavenly ministry. Instead of simply submitting this form to the bishops, however, the Commission decided in December 1977 'after a lengthy debate' to present the bishops with a number of alternatives: the existing Series 3 text, the Commission's amended form, and 'other drafts from members of the Commission'.³² The bishops, concerned at what they saw as division within the Commission, rejected all these and agreed that the Series 2 anamnesis (Jasper's 'stop-gap') should be used instead.³³ The Commission, understandably concerned, sought to persuade the bishops to reverse their decision.³⁴ As a result of a meeting between members of the Commission and of the House of Bishops, the following form was agreed and included in the report GS 364:

Therefore, heavenly Father, we do this in remembrance of him.
We proclaim his offering of himself made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension;
and, as we celebrate his one perfect sacrifice with this bread and this cup,
we look for his coming in glory.

It is exceedingly difficult to see how this text could be thought an improvement on the Commission's version of September 1977. One unfortunate effect of the redrafting which seems to have escaped the attention of both Jasper and Buchanan was that the

key clause describing the relationship between the elements and the eucharistic action, 'we celebrate his one perfect sacrifice with this bread and this cup' became a subordinate clause to 'we look for his coming in glory'. By contrast the 'celebrate' clause in Series 3 and the Commission's 1977 text was a main clause, carrying forward the principal thought of the anamnesis. The main verbs in the three versions are:

Series 3	LC September 1977	LC/HB/GS 364
we do this in remembrance . . .	. . . (<i>remembering</i>) . . .	we do this in remembrance . . .
we celebrate and proclaim . . .	we celebrate and proclaim . . .	we proclaim . . .
and . . .	and . . .	and <i>as we celebrate</i> . . .
we look for his coming . . .	we look for his coming . . .	we look for his coming . . .

Series 3 Revised in Synod

The report GS 364 was presented to the General Synod by Colin Buchanan on 11 July 1978.³⁵ He began by reminding members of the history of Series 3 and of their own part in shaping it, particularly 'that famous night of the long knives' when the Commission's new penitential texts were lost. He was also critical of the bishops, who had given 'warm approval' to the Commission's draft yet failed to defend it when it came under pressure in Synod.³⁶ Nevertheless the Commission hoped that members of Synod 'should speak their mind very clearly'.³⁷

In reply, the Revd J. Oldham accepted the need for compromise. He had regretted the loss of 'we offer' from the Series 2 text, and had been disappointed to find that Series 3 also 'does not say everything I want to say in the eucharist', but:

I accept the fact that it may very well be that, because of our own unity and love for one another, I may never be able to say exactly what I want to say in the liturgy.³⁸

This irenic approach was not shared by all catholics. Brian Brindley spoke for those who found Series 3 unusable. In particular he complained about the constant 'jiggling' with the words of the anamnesis. But a satisfactory solution lay to hand, now that the principle of only having one eucharistic prayer had been breached. The Church could decide to 'use differing eucharistic prayers to express different theological approaches to the eucharist'. Both catholics and evangelicals 'should have a liturgy which they are able to use . . . willingly, without alteration, without supplementation and without mental reservation'.³⁹ In the very next speech, the evangelical Dr O. Wright Holmes called for a similar way forward. He welcomed the rubrics which allowed the service

to be used very nearly in 1662 form, but the provision of what would effectively be another eucharistic prayer would make it 'a little clearer for people to follow'.⁴⁰

Replying to the debate, Buchanan expressed the Commission's misgivings about this approach:

The members of the Liturgical Commission will not put their hands to any texts that produce exclusive alternatives. We are interested in enriching alternatives that come into the eucharistic rite, but we will have no truck with "that one's yours and that one's mine". We will restrain ourselves, and we think we can do it in love, so that we can all put our hands to all texts in the book. It may be that this text will be a fraction more acceptable to you and that that one will be a fraction more acceptable to me, but all of us will be in a position where if we celebrate in each other's parishes, or in any other way like that, we can use all the texts that there are in the book. There is no way that you can bring those who are involved in preparing the material to put their hands to anything else.

Buchanan's advocacy was characteristically robust, but left unanswered the question of whether it was proper for the Commission to adopt this position. The Liturgical Commission is a servant of Synod, and its task is to produce draft services; it is not at all clear that its authority extends to determining liturgical policy. In defence of Buchanan, it could be said that the Commission was simply developing the Church Assembly's 1967 policy that no 'party' alternatives in the eucharistic prayer should be allowed; but the trenchant tone of Buchanan's speech makes it doubtful that he would take refuge in this explanation. His words can, however, be read in another light. In 1967 he had criticised the adoption of alternatives in the Series 2 anamnesis-oblation ('we offer' / 'we give thanks over') because this would:

polarise the Church of England, force the 'middle' men to choose to which 'party' they would adhere, and mean that central occasions (e.g. ordinations) were themselves at this point loaded party-wise. Clergy would be unable to celebrate in each other's parishes, and doctrinal positions would be entrenched.⁴¹

The provision of alternatives, then, should never be seen as an easy way of avoiding a unitive text. Alternatives might have subtly nuanced differences, but effectively they should *all* be unitive texts, usable by every section of the Church.

The Revision Committee

Unlike the opening debate on Series 3, the July 1978 debate attempted no revision of the text: the service was remitted to a Revision Committee which would consider any amendments. The idea was not only to save the rite from being mauled in a heated synodical half hour, but also to cope far more quickly with the large number of

amendments which were expected. As it turned out, over a thousand were submitted, exceeding all expectations. Even the Revision Committee could not deal with this volume of work, so yet another 'corner-cutting' procedure was required. A small sub-group of the Revision Committee — a Steering Committee of four members, chaired by Buchanan — devised a streamlined way of working:

we usually drafted our own 'mainstream' text *in advance of Committee meetings*, got it accepted as 'on the table', indicated all the variety of proposed amendments that would thus be swallowed up and fall, and, in effect, dared anyone (Committee member or synodsmen) to try then to amend *our* text . . .⁴²

Jasper wonders whether this 'was the ideal way to create liturgy'.⁴³ It might be asked in reply whether, in the light of the number of amendments received, *any* method could be described as ideal or even faintly desirable. At least this method meant that a small group of people scrutinized the amendments and were able to harmonize the best of them with the existing text in a coherent way.

The resulting text (GS 364A and supplement GS 364B) showed a number of changes from the Commission's draft:

- a) The absolution and the eucharistic prayers were printed in sense-lines for ease of reading. Previously only congregational texts had been so printed.
- b) The provision of seasonal material was much more thorough, with introductory and post-communion sentences for each Sunday and the main Holy Days. The Easter greeting and dismissal were moved from the appendix to the main text.
- c) The prayers of penitence were printed in full⁴⁴ in both positions, and the confession was abbreviated, much to Jasper's approval.⁴⁵ Alternative forms for the confession and the Prayer of Humble Access, including Frost's prayers, were placed in the appendix. A six-fold Kyries was printed in the text and nine-fold forms in Greek and English were included in the appendix.
- d) Further significant changes were made in the structure of the eucharistic action. The **Ministry of the Sacrament** was now deemed to start with the **peace**, rather than the offertory. What the Commission had called the offertory, namely the bringing of bread and wine to the altar and the collection and presentation of money, became the **preparation of the gifts**. Following this came the **eucharistic prayer**, with the sub-heading 'the taking of the bread and cup and the giving of

thanks'. Thus the 'taking' was subsumed even further into the 'thanksgiving'. Following this was the **communion**, with the sub-heading 'the breaking of the bread and the giving of the bread and cup'. The four-action shape still governed the structure of the celebration, but far from highlighting this shape (as in Series 2 and Series 3) the new headings tended to hide it; the four new sections no longer paralleled taking, blessing, breaking and giving. The rite had come a very long way indeed since the Commission first agreed to adopt a clear Dixian structure.⁴⁶

- e) Four eucharistic prayers were provided in the main body of the rite and an 'order following the pattern of the Book of Common Prayer' was included. It will be convenient to deal with each of these in turn.⁴⁷

The first eucharistic prayer (ASB 1)

This was a further development of the Series 3-type thanksgiving. The acclamations were moved back to their Series 3 position, and were included in that position in all four prayers. The anamnesis was altered once again, bringing it closer to the Liturgical Commission's 1977 form by restoring 'we celebrate' as the main verb at the end of a 'remember-offer' sequence:

LC September 1977

Therefore, heavenly Father,
in remembrance of the offering
he made once for all upon the cross,

his glorious resurrection
and ascension,

we celebrate and proclaim
with this bread and this cup
his one perfect sacrifice,
and we look for his coming in glory.

GS 364A / ASB 1

Therefore, heavenly Father,
we remember his offering of himself
made once for all upon the cross
and proclaim
his mighty resurrection
and glorious ascension.
As we look for his coming in glory,
we celebrate
with this bread and this cup
his one perfect sacrifice.

The petition for a fruitful communion at the end of the prayer was altered to read:

... in the presence of your divine majesty, may we who are nourished by his body and blood grow into his likeness and, made one by your Spirit, become a living temple to your glory.

The Series 3 wording ('renew us by your spirit, inspire us with your love ...') was restored during the final revision in Synod, and the Revision Committee's version was attached instead to the second eucharistic prayer.

The second eucharistic prayer (ASB 2)

This prayer, deriving originally from Series 2, underwent considerable change in the Revision Committee. Firstly, the preface, Sanctus and institution narrative were all conformed to those of ASB 1.⁴⁸ Secondly, in the anamnesis, the main verb from Series 2 ('we make . . . the memorial') was retained, but the section was given the same 'remember-offer' shape as ASB 1:

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
having in remembrance his death once for all upon the cross,
his resurrection from the dead,
and his glorious ascension into heaven,
we make with this bread and cup
the memorial of Christ your Son our Lord.

This change in sequence is entirely ignored by Jasper and Bradshaw, who describe ASB 2 as embodying the 'surprisingly durable' Series 2 anamnesis.⁴⁹ With the exception of the phrase 'make the memorial', however, very little of the Series 2 canon remains. Even the Revision Committee acknowledged the difficulty of retaining 'the distinctive "Series 2" stamp of this prayer while making certain revisions which we considered desirable'.⁵⁰ In particular, the anamnesis was intentionally rewritten by the Committee 'following the agreement we had reached on this text in the first prayer'.⁵¹

The third eucharistic prayer (ASB 3)

The third prayer was introduced at the Revision stage by a member of the Committee, Brian Brindley. It was an entirely new composition, based closely on the Hippolytan prayer. It is therefore unique in not having been previously tried in experimental form; its very freshness, however, seems to be an advantage rather than a drawback. As the Revision Committee commented:

If a variety and choice of eucharistic prayers is being included for use in many and varied circumstances and settings, there is much to be said for inclusion of a prayer which owes its origin to a different 'root', characteristic of the earliest centuries of the undivided Christian church.⁵²

As is well known, the prayer emerged from a consultation between the catholic Brindley and the evangelical Beckwith, and was presented in conjunction with the 'order following the pattern of the Book of Common Prayer'. Less well reported is the context in which this work took place.

Brindley had advocated the use of different eucharistic prayers 'to express different theological approaches to the eucharist' during the Synod debate in July 1978, and Beckwith had written of the need for a modern eucharist following Cranmer's shape.⁵³ Their joint submission to the Revision Committee was an attempt to agree on two canons 'which would have different emphases in eucharistic doctrine, so that one would sufficiently satisfy evangelicals and the other sufficiently satisfy catholics', but which could both be used by either group 'without intolerable strain of conscience' — precisely the principle Buchanan had previously set out before the Synod.⁵⁴ In the drafting, the following principles were adopted:

- a) the authority of Scripture;
- b) 'the respect due' to patristic writings;
- c) the significance of the 'atoning death of Christ on the cross, which was a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of all men, and can never be repeated';
- d) 'that those who receive Holy Communion with faith and repentance are truly partakers of Christ's body and blood';
- e) the continuity of the Church of England with the Holy Catholic Church of all ages, *and also* the 'permanent significance' of the Reformation.

Furthermore, they agreed that the scriptures allow 'more than one view' on the precise relationship between the consecrated elements and the reception of Christ's body and blood, an imprecision which might seem strange in view of their mutual dislike of the policy of doctrinal ambiguity. They did not believe that the patristic 'offering' language necessarily implied false doctrine, or that it was wrong to use such language today, provided that it was 'safeguarded against mediaeval misunderstandings'. Finally they were agreed on the 'normative' character of the 1662 rite for Anglicans.⁵⁵

The 'catholic' canon, 'Alternative Thanksgiving 2', was an expansion of Hippolytus' prayer. The preface unfortunately omitted Hippolytus' string of apocalyptic allusions: 'break the bonds of the devil, and tread down hell, and shine on the righteous, and fix the term' (*Eucharistic Prayer 2* of the Roman rite is equally squeamish).⁵⁶ There was provision for a proper preface, and for the Sanctus and Benedictus. A strong petition for consecration was also added, though without mentioning the Holy Spirit:

by the power of your holy word, and according to your holy will,
 renew these your gifts of bread and wine,
 and make them holy,
 so that they may be to us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The anamnesis-oblation followed Hippolytus' 'remember-offer' sequence and was carefully worded, employing four 'offering' clauses in close conjunction: 'we celebrate this memorial', 'we bring before you these gifts, this bread and this cup', 'we pray you to accept this our duty and service', and 'a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'. In addition to all this there was a thanksgiving to God for counting us worthy for priestly service. This was followed by an epiclesis on the gifts: 'send the Holy Spirit on all that your Church sets before you'.

The Revision Committee accepted the joint submission, a decision more remarkable than it might at first appear. At an earlier stage the bishops had effectively declined to approve prayers which had not previously been given a trial in Series 1, 2 and 3; and when the Revision Committee itself had hitherto been asked to include additional prayers from other sources it had declined to do so.⁵⁷ The Committee did, however, amend the Brindley/Beckwith prayer to bring it closer to the shape of ASB 1 and ASB 2: (a) the petition for consecration was changed into an epiclesis on the gifts, and the prayer for the 'renewal' of the gifts to make them 'holy' was omitted, (b) the original epiclesis was made into an invocation of the Spirit on 'your people', and (c) in the second oblatory clause, the words 'these gifts' were omitted. But the outstanding feature of the prayer — 'we bring before you this bread and this cup' — was retained. This was a surprising concession to the catholic wing of the Church: the phrase 'we bring before you' is hardly very different from 'we offer you'. In the light of his criticism of Series 3, it is difficult to see why Beckwith supported this clause. Buchanan mentions evangelical unease with it, but quickly passes on to other matters.⁵⁸ And most astonishing of all, in their *Companion* to the ASB, Jasper and Bradshaw *say nothing about the clause at all*. The significance of this omission is all the greater, coming as it does immediately after a discussion of the Hippolytan 'we offer you this bread and cup':

The third prayer, although owing much to Hippolytus, nevertheless avoided the contentious phrase: 'Calling to mind his death . . . rejoicing at his resurrection and ascension, and looking for his coming in glory, we celebrate this memorial of our redemption . . . Accept this our duty and service'.⁵⁹

[their ellipses]

The fourth eucharistic prayer (ASB 4)

This prayer was a revision of the Series 1 canon, preserving in modern language the distinctive features of the Prayer Book rite.⁶⁰ The only significant change made to this prayer in the Revision Committee was in the anamnesis. Once again, the wording was changed to strengthen the remember-offer sequence: the main verb 'we commemorate' was replaced by the subordinate 'remembrance' phrase, and the petition to 'accept . . . our sacrifice' became 'we offer . . . this sacrifice':

GS 364 (Thanksgiving A)

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,
we commemorate

the precious death and passion,
the mighty resurrection
and the glorious ascension
of your dear Son Jesus Christ.
Accept through him

this our sacrifice
of praise and thanksgiving.

GS 364A (ASB 4)

Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father,

in remembrance of
the precious death and passion,
the mighty resurrection
and glorious ascension
of your dear Son Jesus Christ,

we offer you (through him*)
this sacrifice
of praise and thanksgiving.

** added by Synod on 2 July 1979*

Once again Jasper and Bradshaw appear oblivious to what has happened, saying nothing about these changes and claiming that the ASB 4 anamnesis uses 'traditional Prayer Book phrases'. But 1662 entirely lacks an anamnesis!⁶¹ — and 'we offer' simply does not appear in the canons of 1552 or 1662, and only appears in 1549 in relation to self-oblation, which in Rite A is reserved to the post-communion.

The order following the pattern of the BCP

Printed separately, between the end of the 'standard' service and the appendix, is an order which follows very closely the Prayer Book pattern. In Series 1 and Rite B this had been achieved by allowing the canon to end after the institution narrative, permitting the the Prayer of Humble Access to be used after the Sanctus, and so on; but the Revision Committee felt that the provision of rubrics for such an adaptation of ASB 4 would be 'difficult and unclear'.⁶² A separate order was therefore provided which took its point of departure from the main Rite A order after the intercession.

The Prayer of Consecration was modelled closely on ASB 4 but drew also on Beckwith's proposal.⁶³ The traditional manual acts were retained, 'since, without

them, there will be no provision for two of the four "Acts" (i.e. the Taking and the Fraction).⁶⁴ Even in the order following the Prayer Book pattern, then, there was to be no respite from Dix's ubiquitous shape!

8.4 The ASB in use

It might fairly be argued that the ASB was simply a collection of services which were already in use in substantially the same form; its publication might be felt to have added nothing except convenience. That would not be quite fair. In the first place, **convenience** is itself a considerable gain. In one volume could be found a full set of modern-language alternative services, as well as a traditional-language eucharistic rite in a more 'modern' (and 'primitive') shape; the calendar and lectionary; the sentences, collects and readings for the eucharist on Sundays and holy days; and, depending on the version bought, the Liturgical Psalter as well. The book was a complete resource for the celebration of the Sunday eucharist, and only the Bible need be added for the recitation of the daily office. All the alternative occasional offices, and even the new ordinal, were included.

In addition to this, a sense of **permanence** of sorts attended the launch of the new book; a feeling that, for the time being, the work of revision had come to a natural pause. The ASB preface, written by the Bishop of Durham (John Habgood), presented the new book as a complementary volume to the Book of Common Prayer, a supplement to stand alongside it. The fact that it was called the *Alternative Service Book 1980* served as 'a reminder that revision and adaptation of the Church's worship are a continuous process, and that any liturgy, no matter how timeless its qualities, also belongs to a particular period and culture', and this applied to the BCP quite as much as the ASB.

The new book was initially authorized for a period of ten years. By the middle of the 1980s it was abundantly clear that this period was far too short, and the General Synod Standing Committee report *The Worship of the Church* (GS 698, 1985) recommended extending its life to the end of the year 2000. Synod readily agreed to this, giving the Church a substantial period to use the book thoroughly and thoughtfully, and also to enhance its provisions with a much enriched stock of seasonal material in *Lent*, *Holy Week*, *Easter* and *The Promise of His Glory*.

The ASB has clearly been well used. The publishers are reluctant to release recent sales figures,⁶⁵ but it is known that in the first five years of its life over 800,000 pew copies were sold, and nearly 2 million 'separates' including 720,000 copies of the Rite A eucharist.⁶⁶ The Synod Standing Committee claimed in 1985 that there was evidence 'that the use of the ASB is growing, both in terms of more parishes using it for the first time — and those parishes which already have it tending to use it more and the Prayer Book services less'.⁶⁷ Unfortunately no indication is given of what this evidence might be, making it impossible to check.

In 1991 the Liturgical Commission's report *The Worship of the Church as it approaches the Third Millennium* offered a more mature reflection on the ASB. In many ways the Commission were critical of the book, seeing it as a child of its age and regretting the 'quite arbitrary line' drawn across liturgical development in 1979 by the publication of a 'permanent' book.⁶⁸ But much had happened since then; not only was the ASB 'no longer the 'up-to-date compendium of all that is lawfully available', but also liturgical language had changed, and 'the terse, tense language of the ASB has in some places worn thin'. Its highly theological and, in places, obtrusively male language were 'a barrier to fellowship in the Church'.⁶⁹ But having said all this, the Commission were confident that their predecessors had been responsible for a remarkable achievement:

the development of vibrant worship in the Church of England in the 1980s and 1990s owes a great deal to the *Alternative Service Book 1980*, and to the immense amount of hard work by both Commission and Synod. It was the book that enshrined the breaking of the mould of four hundred years; it succeeded in uniting the Church liturgically beyond the expectations of many in 1980; and it may well continue in use in many places for years to come.⁷⁰

8.5 Conservative reaction

The case against the alternative services

The Alternative Service Book was, in Habgood's words, 'intended to supplement the Book of Common Prayer, not to supersede it'. The ASB preface also reminds readers that the Prayer Book 'retains its authority as a doctrinal standard' and that 'new forms of worship do not erode the historical foundations of the Church's faith, nor render respect for them any less appropriate than it was before'. These statements are perfectly correct: the place of the Prayer Book in the life of the Church is enshrined by

Canon, and the 1662 Prayer Book, the Ordinal and the Articles of Religion remain the 'historic formularies' of the Church of England, an abiding witness to the Christian faith which the Church 'is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation'.⁷¹

Yet there is disquiet: a considerable protest has arisen against liturgical change. This phenomenon is not confined to the Church of England, but is evident also in other Anglican provinces and in the Roman Catholic Church. Barry Spurr's recent study *The Word in the Desert* provides a detailed and sympathetic account of conservative reactions to liturgical change in both communions. He underlines both the depth of feeling felt by lovers of the old liturgy and the undoubted significance of this reaction for the churches:

The response of conservative clergy and laity to the suppression of the Tridentine mass and the decline of a Latin liturgy in Roman Catholicism and the more gradual replacement of the Cranmerian Prayer Book with the new rites in modern English in the Anglican Communion is an extraordinarily fervid and sustained phenomenon of modern Christianity, which must be taken into consideration in any assessment of the success of the contemporary liturgical movement.⁷²

In England, this conservative protest has been for the most part associated with the *Prayer Book Society*. The PBS was founded in 1975⁷³ 'to uphold the the worship and doctrine of the Church of England as enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer' and 'to encourage the use of the Book of Common Prayer as a major element in the worshipping life of the Church'.⁷⁴ In pursuance of these aims, the Society publishes two journals, a regular newsletter, and occasional pamphlets, and has also been active within the Church and beyond to promote the use of the Prayer Book and the Authorized Version of the Bible.

If the Society's activities were confined to the furtherance of these aims there could be no questioning the propriety of its campaign. However, much of the Society's literature consists of attacks on the ASB, denouncing in the strongest terms its doctrine, liturgical style and literary quality. The sheer volume of the polemical onslaught, to say nothing of its tone, calls for an explanation, not least because the Church of England, unlike the Roman Catholic Church, has *not* discontinued the use of the older liturgy, but allows its clergy and congregations complete freedom to continue using the Book of Common Prayer.

The reason for the Prayer Book Society's displeasure must lie in its perception of the way the battle is going. The Society believes that in many parishes, perhaps in most,

the alternative services have effectively displaced the Prayer Book in the mainstream of the Church's worship, and modern translations of the Bible have all but rendered the Authorized Version redundant. Again and again, the Society's literature declares that the BCP and the AV are in danger of being 'lost' and 'forgotten'.⁷⁵ This conviction entirely shapes the Prayer Book Society's mission, as the pamphlet *Benchmark of Devotion for the 1990s*, written by the PBS chairman Anthony Kilmister, makes clear:

It would be wonderful if the Prayer Book Society did not need to exist, but so long as the Book of Common Prayer continues to be treated as a second class citizen in the household of faith, exist it must. The Society wants the Book of Common Prayer used as a major element in the worshipping life of the Church of England. It does NOT seek to suppress the Alternative Service Book nor does it propagate Prayer Book fundamentalism. It just wants fair play.

The Society does not only lament the fact that the ASB is now the Church's main liturgical and teaching resource; it alleges that the movement away from the Prayer Book has been encouraged and hastened by the hierarchy of the Church.⁷⁶ The Society seems to have taken assurances about the continuing *availability* of the Prayer Book to mean that it would continue to be *widely used*.⁷⁷ The Church authorities are then accused of bad faith for failing to ensure that this happens.⁷⁸

A response

The first question is whether the Prayer Book *has* slipped into disuse. This is difficult to prove, but probably true; a discussion is offered in Appendix 2. However, if the ASB is more widely used than the Prayer Book, what can, or should, be done about the demise of 1662? It is not as if there were anything illegal or improper about a parish choosing to use alternative services. Nor is there anything in the meaning of the word 'alternative' to imply inferiority, or to suggest that an 'alternative' should be used less frequently than the 'original'.⁷⁹ Again, there are no deanery or diocesan quotas to be met for BCP use. Every parish, by agreement between the priest and the PCC, is free to choose from among the authorized rites *independently of choices made elsewhere*. The complaint that the 'alternative' is more widely used than the 'original' is therefore unanswerable: the pattern of worship which emerges in the Church as a whole is neither praiseworthy nor blameworthy, but simply an aggregation of choices made individually in the parishes. The only way of ensuring a higher level of Prayer Book use would be to deprive parishes of their rights under the 1973 Measure.

This is not quite the end of the matter, however, because of the Society's claim that there has been a deliberate campaign to promote the ASB at the expense of the Prayer Book. As we have seen, both the Series 2 and Series 3 services (especially the latter) emerged in large part in response to needs felt within the parochial life of the Church. The services did not meet those needs perfectly; it would be astonishing if any liturgy could; but their popularity was earned on merit. If they had been unwanted and unsuitable, they would not have been used. There is no mechanism for forcing parishes to use alternative services against the wishes of the PCC and the priest, as is acknowledged by the Prayer Book Society in its advice to supporters:

It is . . . in the parishes that the pattern of worship is determined . . . if you and like-minded people are elected to the PCC or even if you obtain reassurances from others seeking election you can influence the type of worship used in your locality.⁸⁰

The polemical stance taken by the Prayer Book Society, then, is difficult to justify. But there are also encouraging signs of a mellowing of attitudes, as seen for example in the Prayer Book Society journal *Faith and Worship* (1986):

I do not think we are a bunch of 1662 fundamentalists, but that is the impression we sometimes give. Yet I imagine that most of us would have been happy with the Series One Communion Service. And I know that I am not alone in thinking that, for all its ninety per cent of banality, the Alternative Service Book contains some moments of beauty and insight. Is it not a gain to say "We are the body of Christ. By one Spirit we were all baptised into one body", even if the words that follow in the ASB are rather feeble?⁸¹

The Society has also recently entered the debate about the future of the liturgy in a more constructive way. At the end of 1992, *PRAXIS* held a consultation on the future of the Prayer Book tradition with the aim of bringing members from both sides of the Prayer Book/ASB divide together in debate and discussion; the main papers were subsequently published as *Model and Inspiration* (1993).⁸² While the title of this publication and, indeed, the papers by Colin James and David Stancliffe of the Liturgical Commission hint at a conciliatory approach, there is less evidence of the same mood in the PBS contributions from Professor David Martin and Baroness James. Nevertheless it was a start; and the Commission as a matter of policy now seeks to be much more inclusive with respect to using traditional texts alongside modern texts. Perhaps the most striking example of this can be found in the new collects authorized from Advent 1997 in *The Christian Year*, where there is a return to Prayer Book idiom in modern language prayers. The collect for Ash Wednesday illustrates the point well:

BCP 1662

... that we worthily lamenting our sins,
and acknowledging our wretchedness,
may obtain of thee,
the God of all mercy,
perfect remission and forgiveness ...

Series 3 1977 / ASB 1980

... that, lamenting our sins
and acknowledging our wretchedness,
we may receive from you,
the God of all mercy,
perfect forgiveness and peace ...

The Christian Year 1997

... that we, worthily lamenting our sins
and acknowledging our wretchedness,
may receive from you,
the God of all mercy,
perfect remission and forgiveness ...

Not everyone is happy with this approach,⁸³ but since *The Christian Year* is authorized indefinitely (the first time the General Synod has used its powers under the 1973 Measure to authorize liturgical material without a time limit) this fusion of old and new is clearly here to stay for a very long time.

Notes

- 1 Frost, 'Liturgical Language: Cranmer to Series 3' in *The Eucharist Today*, p.147.
- 2 Gray, 'The Revision of Canon Law', pp.649-652; Jasper, *Development*, p.279.
- 3 *LC Minutes*, 66.2 (b).
- 4 *LC Minutes*, 66.2 (c).
- 5 *LC Minutes*, 66.2 (d).
- 6 *GS Proceedings*, 1973, pp.354-372.
- 7 An account of the progress of the working party's project is given by Jasper, *Development*, p.344.
- 8 *ibid*, p.345.
- 9 *The Future Course of Liturgical Revision*, GS 161, p.11.
- 10 *ibid*, p.12.
- 11 *ibid*, p.16.
- 12 *ibid*, p.17.
- 13 *LC Minutes*, 66.2 (c).
- 14 *LC Minutes*, 69.29.
- 15 *LC Minutes*, 73.37.
- 16 For example, in the introduction to Series 1 and 2 revised: see *LC Memorandum* 166A.
- 17 Note 4 in *Series 1 & 2 Revised*; Note 2 in *ASB Rite B*.
- 18 The words were later removed from the Prayer of Thanksgiving but the effect was not lost, for the second post-communion prayer includes words of self-oblation.
- 19 *LC Minutes*, 74.6.
- 20 *GS Proceedings*, 1973, p.355.
- 21 For an account of this process see Buchanan's speech to the Synod in *GS Proceedings*, 1978, pp.701-702.
- 22 *LC Minutes* 89.6, 90.13, 90.14, 91.25, 91.26, 92.36, 92.38.
- 23 In the 1974 revision of the ICET texts there was no change to the Gloria, Sanctus or Benedictus; and since the Church of England had already parted company with ICET in the matter of the Lord's Prayer, changes there did not affect the revision of Series 3.
- 24 That is, the invitation to confession, the confession, and the absolution.
- 25 *LC Memorandum* 172B.
- 26 *LC Minutes*, 91.26. Buchanan describes the 'Canon for a Family Eucharist' as 'a prayer for use with children'; *Recent Liturgical Revision: Supplement for 1976-8*, p.13.
- 27 This is described by Buchanan, *Recent Liturgical Revision: Supplement for 1976-8*, p.13, and Jasper, *Development*, p.349.
- 28 *Holy Communion Series 3 Revised*, GS 364, p.8.
- 29 Buchanan, *Recent Liturgical Revision: Supplement for 1976-8*, p.12.
- 30 Jasper, *Development*, p.349.

- 31 The correspondence works if 'celebrate' corresponds to the Latin *celebrare* and therefore does duty for 'offer'; see Moreton, *Made Fully Perfect*, p.22. Unlike the early Series 3 draft discussed there, the 1977 text did *not* mix up the anamnesis with the oblation, and would therefore presumably have satisfied Moreton's requirements.
- 32 *LC Minutes*, 91.25.
- 33 *LC Minutes*, 92.38; Buchanan, *Recent Liturgical Revision: Supplement for 1976-8*, p.13.
- 34 *LC Minutes*, 92.38.
- 35 *GS Proceedings*, 1978, pp.699-737.
- 36 *ibid*, p.701.
- 37 *ibid*, p.704 & p.706.
- 38 *ibid*, p.708.
- 39 *ibid*, pp.712f.
- 40 *ibid*, p.715.
- 41 Buchanan, *Guide to Second Series Communion Service*, p.27.
- 42 Buchanan, *Latest Liturgical Revision in the Church of England 1978-84*, p.9.
- 43 Jasper, *Development*, p.351.
- 44 The full form of the Comfortable Words was printed only in the later position. The Summary of the Law was printed in the text and the Decalogue in the Appendix. Two forms of the Decalogue were provided: the Series 3 versions and a 'straight' form, in which the commandments could be read in full, or abbreviated but without the New Testament glosses.
- 45 Jasper, *Development*, p.351.
- 46 And the development of the structure has gone further still with the most recent proposals for the new eucharistic rites to replace Rite A and Rite B; see the next chapter.
- 47 A synopsis of each prayer with its historical antecedents can be found in Buchanan, *The Development of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Church of England*.
- 48 This was quite deliberate; see *Report of the Revision Committee*, GS 364X, §182 & §184.
- 49 Jasper and Bradshaw, *Companion to the ASB*, p.226.
- 50 *Report of the Revision Committee*, GS 364X, §183.
- 51 *ibid*, §185.
- 52 *ibid*, §187.
- 53 Beckwith and Tiller, *The Service of Holy Communion and its Revision*, p.9.
- 54 Beckwith and Brindley, *The Revision of Holy Communion Series Three*, p.4.
- 55 *ibid*.
- 56 Cuming, *Hippolytus*, p.10.
- 57 *Report of the Revision Committee*, GS 364X, §10.
- 58 Buchanan, *Latest Liturgical Revision in the Church of England 1978-84*, p.10.
- 59 Jasper and Bradshaw, *Companion to the ASB*, p.226.
- 60 Except for the permission to end the canon after the institution narrative. The inclusion of a separate order for this pattern made such permission unnecessary.
- 61 Perhaps by 'traditional Prayer Book' Jasper and Bradshaw meant 1549, where the anamnesis does appear. It was of course deleted in the revision of 1552, and its restoration (as we have seen) was a major feature of the 1928 reform.

- 62 *Report of the Revision Committee*, GS 364X, §248.
- 63 Beckwith's proposal was contained in Beckwith and Brindley, *The Revision of Holy Communion Series Three*. The ASB form drew also on the Australian rite. See *Report of the Revision Committee*, GS 364X, §250.
- 64 *Report of the Revision Committee*, GS 364X, §251.
- 65 On enquiry at the Cambridge University Press it was possible to obtain figures for the 1928 Book, which are now of purely historical interest, but since the ASB is still a commercial product some secrecy surrounds its sales history.
- 66 *The Worship of the Church*, GS 698, §18.
- 67 *ibid.*
- 68 *The Worship of the Church as it approaches the Third Millennium*, §48.
- 69 *ibid.*, §50 & §51.
- 70 *ibid.*, §46.
- 71 The quotations are from the Declaration of Assent in its modern form; see for example the ASB, pp.387f.
- 72 Spurr, *The Word in the Desert*, p.27.
- 73 The Prayer Book Society grew out of an 'Action Group for the defence of the Book of Common Prayer' formed in 1972 by Anthony Kilmister and others. See Spurr, *The Word in the Desert*, p.73.
- 74 Prayer Book Society publicity, for example, the Society's advertisement in *Crockford's Clerical Directory*, 1991-2, p.11.
- 75 The same concerns were also aired in three petitions laid before the General Synod in 1979; see Spurr, *The Word in the Desert*, pp.60f.
- 76 see, for example, *Benchmarks of Devotion*:
'The Alternative Service Book we have been told repeatedly by Church leaders is an *alternative* to and not a substitute for the Prayer Book. Yet the new rites are fast becoming replacements . . .'
- 77 Buchanan believes that the bishops may not have helped matters during a debate in the House of Lords in 1974, when the impression may have been given that 'availability' of Prayer Book services was synonymous with 'general use'. *Latest Liturgical Revision*, p.28.
- 78 Kilmister, *Benchmarks of Devotion*:
' . . . all the levers of organisational influence within the Church have been pulled in favour of the new and trendy to the detriment of the traditional.'
- 79 *Chambers English Dictionary*, 1990.
- 80 *Benchmarks of Devotion*.
- 81 John Lawrence, 'A Prayer Book that we could use', *Faith and Worship*, 20 (Summer 1986), pp.3-5.
- 82 The four main consultation papers, together with the Prayer Book Society's Submission to the Liturgical Commission in September 1992 and the Commission's Response, are published together in *Model and Inspiration*.
- 83 Letters to the *Church Times* in mid-1997 made this clear.

9

CONCLUSION

The modern liturgist of course cannot expect immediate approval for his proposals.
He is, after all, attempting to express the mind of the Church,
and the Church's liturgical mind, like its theological mind,
is often slow in giving clear expression to its present thinking.

R.J. Halliburton¹

9.1 The 1928 Prayer Book

Imagine the new services produced by the Church of England between 1928 and 1980 all spread out together on a desk. One thing would be immediately apparent, namely the huge growth in the scope and scale of revision, and a blossoming of confidence and ambition, as the century progressed. It is tempting to read this as a linear progression, to see each stage building upon the last and taking it further, and indeed to see an evolutionary pattern of "improvement" to the liturgy during this century. But we have seen that while there is certainly a discernible such trend in broad outline, on closer inspection the picture becomes far less clear.

The background to 1928

The end-product of the first major period of revision is modest indeed. Even its title — *The Book of Common Prayer with the Additions and Deviations Proposed in 1928* — speaks of the deep conservatism which attended its compilation. In one sense this is no surprise, for the making of the Book was not triggered by liturgical concerns, but by the doctrinal crisis in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It was an exercise in containment rather than innovation. However, the background against which the book was compiled was one of great vitality and considerable creativity. It is unfortunate that the Deposited Book does very little justice to that.

Drafting and authorization

It is sometimes difficult to be clear about where power over the liturgical process lay. The 1928 Book is often referred to as the Bishops' work, but this rather misses the chaos

of revision in the Convocations up to 1919. There was no single central drafting body; everything began and ended in the Convocations. There was no single body to authorize texts either — all four Houses had to agree, and the consent of Parliament be sought, for any new liturgy. Each body effectively possessed a veto, even over the wishes of a clear majority, which made it almost impossible even for proposals agreed by a joint committee to make progress.

This lack of an authoritative focus made it difficult for the Church to proceed coherently with its task of revision, or even to know what that task should be. I have argued that the Church was well justified in producing a new Prayer Book, but even this much was not obvious at the beginning, when the main task was seen as the revision of rubrics.

Some of the finest drafting work was undoubtedly done outside the official process altogether, by a number of different individuals and groups. A few of their ideas were taken into the revision process, but little of their work is discernible in the Deposited Book itself. Most of the new writing in the Book came from the hands of the bishops, whose competence was questioned, and their work not kindly judged. The most interesting piece of drafting is the alternative canon, which, like Jasper's Series 2 anamnesis, was an attempt to produce a doctrinally unitive text rather than good liturgical writing.

Pressures for change and the emerging liturgy

The relationship between the 1928 Book and the many desires and fears expressed during the debates leading up to it is very uneasy. At liturgical and doctrinal 'soft points' there was indeed much new flexibility and enrichment. But the Church's ability to deal adequately with deep sacramental questions, and significantly to break free from seventeenth-century language and thought, was made difficult by the prevailing context of conflict and division, by the limited expectations and horizons of those entrusted with the process, and by the unwieldy procedures with which the Church was obliged to work. The catholic wing of the Church could claim many small victories. In addition, those such as the War Chaplains seeking a more accessible and usable funeral rite found much of what they were asking for. But there was still nothing for those who had found the daily services of the Prayer Book wanting in the trenches of France and Belgium; little solace for those who simply wanted to pray for the concerns of the day in the language of the day.

Between the 1930s and the 1960s

The parliamentary rejection of the 1928 Prayer Book brought the official process of revision to a juddering halt for some three decades. That is not to say that all was quiet within the liturgical development of the Church of England! The bishops' agreed way of dealing with the failure of the Book in Parliament gave the Church a valuable breathing-space. Within the parishes, the enrichments and new flexibility provided by 1928 found their way into the worshipping life of the Church; and the *Shorter Prayer Book* is a conservative indicator of just how far that process had gone within a few years. Meanwhile, the Church as a whole was able to look again at questions of procedure, so that the *impasse* encountered in 1927 and 1928 might in future be avoided. Finally, pressures for change continued to grow. If the Prayer Book had been inadequate to meet the needs of the Church and nation in 1906, it was certainly no less problematic after two world wars and the huge social changes which they brought. And in the meantime, the parish communion movement had brought both a new vitality to eucharistic worship and a new urgency for reform.

9.2 Services produced in the 1960s and 1970s

As a result of these changed circumstances, the 1960s and 1970s saw a remarkable flowering of liturgical freedom, and a new creativity in respect of texts and rubrics. There is a much more direct relationship between pressures for change in the life of the Church and the emerging texts, as seen, for example, in the way Series 2 and its successors were designed to serve the parish communion movement and provide a contemporary idiom for worship. But crucially, these developments were only made possible by two procedural changes: the new worship canons, and the establishment of the Liturgical Commission.

New procedures

Where the Church of the 1910s and 1920s had lacked a proper drafting body, from 1955 the work of drafting (with few exceptions) was entrusted to a Liturgical Commission — a small group of knowledgeable people, working together and in collaboration with their counterparts in other provinces and denominations. While Convocations and Synods cannot hope to draft 'balanced, theologically considered, elegant liturgies',²

there is good reason to think that the Commission has been at least partly successful in this task; and while scholarly opinion was divided as to the quality of their work, there was no suggestion that it was inferior to that seen in 1928. Furthermore, the procedural changes also had the effect of formally separating, for the first time, the two tasks of drafting and authorization. While the Commission was given responsibility, at the behest of the bishops, for drafting new texts, it was the Church Assembly (later the General Synod) which retained the authority to amend and authorize. Given the treatment meted out to the Commission's new texts in the Series 3 eucharist, however, it is far from clear that the Synod can be reckoned a competent judge of liturgical writing. As Michael Vasey wryly observed, 'negotiating liturgy through Synod is rather like doing embroidery with a crowd of football hooligans'.³

While Synod certainly knew how to use its powers to devastating effect, under the new arrangements power over the liturgical process does not in practice lie entirely within the synodical structure. The Commission's drafts possessed a high degree of intrinsic authority; for, unlike drafts offered to the Church from outside bodies and pressure groups (as had been the case in the 1920s), since 1955, new texts originated from within. They constituted an official first draft with which the rest of the Church could get to grips, and which the Church might reasonably have felt itself obliged to treat with respect.

Even when such respect was not apparent, it is clear that another dynamic was at work which favoured the Commission's texts. The starting point for any discussion — the first draft — could 'fix' subsequent debate in unexpected ways. In the synodical debates, attention inevitably concentrated on items of particular interest and of contentious nature, while other features of the Commission's drafts, such as the overall shape and underlying thought of Series 2, or the varying use of Dix's theories, entirely escaped scrutiny. We shall return to this point.

Progress — smooth or chaotic?

To recall the analogy with which I began the chapter: superficially, at least, each rite produced in the 1960s and 1970s is a step further along from the last. Series 1 largely legalised 1928 material, though not its eucharistic canon; Series 2 put the eucharist into what would now be recognised as the 'modern' shape; Series 3 introduced modern language; and finally, ASB tidied it all up and provided a wealth of freedom and enrichment.

This evolutionary account is correct as far as it goes, and presents an attractive interpretive scheme; but it also obscures a great deal of confusion and chaos in the development of the Church of England's liturgy. It suggests that a clear 'game plan' was in view from the beginning, or at least, that each stage was a logically obvious development of the last. In fact, the sequence is not quite as smooth as it might appear. Series 1 and Series 2 were conceived together, not sequentially; indeed, the publication of Series 2 was hurried to coincide with the release of Series 1, and as a result, is an unfinished and rather unpolished piece of writing. Again, the evolutionary picture suggests that the obvious development of Series 2 was a modern-language variant of it (Series 3), but work on a modern language rite was not officially tabled until 1968, and until that point it had been thought that the revision of the eucharist might well end for the time being with a light revision of Series 2.

The influence of scholarship

The confusion, however, went much deeper than this, for it was not merely procedural, but also doctrinal and liturgical. I have argued that one consequence of entrusting drafting to a Liturgical Commission was that the theories held by a few key liturgists had a profound impact on the drafts. This is an important and largely unexplored aspect of the way in which the Church of England has chosen to pursue its liturgical task; a vital part of our procedure which has far-reaching effects on the services which congregations are obliged to use. The effect is particularly apparent in three areas:

a) Doctrinal ambiguity

Couratin famously defended his controversial anamnesis-oblation paragraph by saying that it was open to a number of interpretations. Jasper, quoting Charles Gore's dictum that 'clearness of statement' was not always a helpful thing in spiritual matters, defended this approach to liturgical writing: 'it is inevitable that its language cannot possibly be over-precise: certain words, phrases, and even actions must bear more than one interpretation. There must be studied ambiguity'.⁴

What is interesting is that this attachment to flexibility and openness of interpretation originated *within* the Commission. That is to say, it did not form part of the Church's instructions *to* the Commission. It was first voiced by Couratin to other members of the Commission in respect of Series 2; it was then

and put aside. Then, notwithstanding the fact that the elements have already been thoroughly ‘taken’ *and will later be handled again during the eucharistic prayer*, comes a mandatory silent lifting of the paten and chalice above the altar — and all to no apparent end. A particular scholarly theory has been satisfied, but at a price: the Church is asked to live with liturgical nonsense.⁹

There is one further reason for dissatisfaction with the four-action shape, which does not seem to have received attention. In Dix’s understanding, the eucharistic prayer corresponds to the dominical thanksgiving, and therefore ‘taking’ must be accomplished before the prayer begins, and ‘breaking’ requires a separate action afterwards. The Commission therefore argued that manual acts during the thanksgiving would ‘frustrate the fourfold sequence’.¹⁰ This pedantic approach might work *if the eucharistic prayer contained no institution narrative*. The dramatic form of the rite would then stand out clearly. But as it is, tucked away inside the second of Dix’s four actions is a retelling of the *whole* supper which cries out for dramatic actions to accompany the words. It is not only those with a strong sense of the consecratory power of the narrative who want to retain manual acts; many who value the dramatic power of the rite also sense that the priest should here be echoing Jesus’ actions in the supper. To fail to do so is to denude the Lord’s words, central to the eucharistic action, of their evocative power: scholarly theory suppresses sacramental instinct.

The Church Assembly, in its debate on Series 2, reintroduced manual acts into the eucharistic prayer; the General Synod acted similarly with the ASB. These amendments did nothing to lessen the theological and liturgical confusion, but rather the contrary. The Commission’s reliance on Dix’s theory was not questioned in the Church Assembly or the Synod, and the reasons for restoring the manual acts had nothing to do with any desire to frustrate the four-fold sequence. Those voting for the amendment did so rather in order to retain, within the new rites, the Prayer Book understanding of consecration.

c) The institution narrative and the doctrine of consecration

Many within the Church of England (and not by any means confined to one tradition) hold that the institution narrative in the eucharistic prayer has a consecratory character and function. The Liturgical Commission disagreed strongly with this, arguing instead for the doctrine of ‘consecration by

defended by Couratin himself, on the Commission's behalf, in the Church Assembly; and later reaffirmed in a slightly different form by Buchanan at General Synod. Yet apart from attacks from a small number of evangelicals, this method of writing was quietly accepted and became enshrined as an essential part of the Church of England's revision process.

b) Dix's four-fold shape

The most obvious victory for the Commission in the 1960s and 1970s was the adoption of Dix's theory in the new rites.⁵ Their implementation of the theory, however, evolved with time.⁶ In the early work on Series 2, it was applied simply and directly: the 'people's offertory' was identified with the dominical 'taking'. Concerns about this within the Commission led to a refinement of the idea in Series 3, where the taking became a presidential act, distinct from the preparation of the elements, but still regarded as the first of the 'four' actions and therefore also distinct from the thanksgiving. This already marked a significant departure from Dix's understanding. In Series 3 Revised, the Commission went still further and attached the taking to the thanksgiving itself, so that the first action of the eucharist was now styled 'The Offertory' and the second 'The taking of the bread and the cup and the Thanksgiving'. This change in the position of the taking, and its detachment from the preparation of the elements, cannot simply be a matter of 'clarification', as the Commission suggested.⁷ They had claimed that the sacramental action of the rite was shaped by the four-fold sequence identified by Dix, and, as justification for following this pattern, had further claimed that there was 'common agreement' within the Church about this shape.⁸ But the Commission departed from Dix's understanding to an increasing extent as the work of revision proceeded. It will be recalled that the popular enthusiasm for Dix was seen above all in the offertory, and the identification of the offertory with Christ's 'taking': *yet it is just at this point that the classical theory was abandoned by the Commission*. Here, then, was a triumph of scholarship over popular piety — and for shifting, changing scholarship at that.

As a result, the 'taking' in Rite A is a sorry affair. In many churches, the president prepares the elements herself/himself, handling the bread as it is placed on the paten, and holding the cup as it is filled with wine. Perhaps the Roman Catholic offertory prayers are used. The collection of money is brought to the president

thanksgiving' and maintaining that the narrative was simply there 'to describe and give warrant for' the eucharistic action.¹¹ Indeed, the Commission's commentary on Series 3 sought to discredit the idea of a 'moment of consecration' by arguing that such a view belonged to the eleventh, thirteenth and seventeenth centuries, and 'we cannot now be bound by these precedents'. This seems to amount to a tacit overturning of the doctrine of the Prayer Book, which would of course be contrary to both the 1965 and 1973 Measures.

The situation with the 1928 canon was subtly different. With its invocation after the institution narrative, the 1928 prayer invited an eastern understanding of consecration. Both Brightman and Lowther Clarke viewed this with caution, the former because he preferred the western tradition, the latter because the 1928 canon inevitably suggested that the 1552/1662 pattern was defective. But the 1928 Prayer Book, if sanctioned, would *itself* have become the Church's standard of doctrine, superseding 1662; and no legal conflict would have arisen. Under current legislation, however, all alternative services must be 'neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of England in any essential matter' — that is, the doctrine of the 1662 Prayer Book, the 39 Articles and the Ordinal. The new worship canons perhaps allow for a generous *broadening* of doctrinal understanding, but they surely cannot intend the *exclusion* of Prayer Book doctrine from new rites. In effect, however, the restoration of manual acts can be seen (and was certainly understood at the time) as a restoration of the traditional view.

In these three areas, the Liturgical Commission took up highly specific and, at times, contentious positions, without any prior debate — still less agreement — on these questions in the wider Church of England. They did so because of the theories held by key members of the Commission, in particular Couratin and Jasper. At times their implementation of these theories was frustrated; it was frequently misunderstood; and sometimes does not seem even to have been noticed.

Eucharistic offering

One of the doctrinal disputes which had dogged the 1928 revision process, and continued to affect the eucharistic debate in the 1960s and 1970s, was the question of how, exactly, the Church should obey the Lord's command 'do this in remembrance of me'. During the work on each of the revisions — Series 2, Series 3 and Rite A — the

anamnesis-oblation received far more attention in the Commission, from reviewers, and in the Church Assembly and General Synod, than any other part of the revision. Brindley's complaint about the constant 'jiggling' of the words is apposite.

The pivotal point was the rejection of the phrase 'we offer' in Series 2. This decision shaped all subsequent revision. Buchanan rightly sees Series 2 as the first in a new family of rites in the Church of England, but what he says about the rite as a whole could also be said specifically of the oblation. The settlement over Series 2 effectively determined what could and could not be said in a eucharistic prayer of the Church of England for the next thirty years. Ironically, the phrase 'we offer' was one of the few things over which Couratin had pleaded for a generosity of interpretation. But the Church — and particularly the House of Laity — chose to see no ambiguity whatever in the phrase, hence the constant 'jiggling' and rewording of this section in Series 2, Series 3 and Series 3 Revised.

The expression of eucharistic sacrifice in the four prayers of Rite A reflects the importance of the 1967 decision. Back in 1965, Couratin had held that 'we offer' was a neutral phrase, the bare minimum that catholics could accept, and a form of words which was supposedly inoffensive to evangelicals. By 1967 it had become a forbidden phrase, a boundary which could not be crossed. Even ASB 3 — based on Hippolytus' prayer itself, the source of the offending words — has to make its offering statement by way of the paraphrase 'we bring before you'.¹²

Once again, therefore, the mechanism of revision, and the continuing dominance of the doctrinal debate, rather than the application of any agreed liturgical principles, had an unexpected and far-reaching effect on the liturgical tradition of the Church.

Nevertheless, the eucharistic prayers in Rite A are patient of a breadth of interpretation. Moreton and Grisbrooke were too hasty in their pessimism over the loss of 'we offer' from Series 2. Catholics will find satisfaction in the clear 'remember-offer' sequence in all four prayers (which was absent from Series 2 and Series 3), and evangelicals will find in all the prayers a clear distinction drawn between Christ's sacrifice and the Church's response to it. The Church of England has found fruitful, inclusive and unitive ways of expressing a richness of eucharistic doctrine in its liturgy. And for the future, there are signs that the debate is moving on: the abortive 1996 eucharistic prayers and the experimental 1997 prayers contain a wide variety of expression for the anamnesis-oblation, at times departing significantly from the ASB consensus.

9.3 Conclusion

On the whole the new services have been well received, as the sales figure have shown throughout the century. But as a way of creating good liturgy, the Church's procedures surely leave much to be desired. The shortcomings of the process in the early part of the century were clear even then, and the obvious lessons were learnt and applied between the 1930s and 1960s. And even in the latter period of revision, drafting by the Liturgical Commission has been a mixed blessing. In its favour, one can say that it is almost impossible to conceive of creativity and coherence emerging any other way; and far too often, that creativity and coherence has been placed at risk by the Synod. But it is surely questionable for the Church, through its processes, inadvertently to invest so much in disputed academic theories. If nothing else, the way in which liturgical scholarship has developed, even in so short a time as thirty years, should remind liturgists of the dangers of marrying the spirit of the age. It is sobering to realise that the Rite A eucharist is not only dated in ways which could not have been foreseen in 1979, such as linguistic sensitivity: its defects also include matters which could and should have been addressed when the ASB was produced. The rite is dated from the point of view of liturgical scholarship. It furthermore betrays all too clearly the marks of old synodical disputes. All of this is a consequence of the *way* in which the Church of England has set about the revision of its liturgy. It is perhaps providential that the reforms have been successful despite the Church's procedures, quite as much as because of them.

Notes

- 1 Halliburton, 'The Canon of Series 3', in *The Eucharist Today*, p.97.
- 2 Editorial, *Church Times*, 3 October 1997, p.8.
- 3 A remark much quoted in Michael Vasey's obituaries, following his sudden death in the spring of 1998.
- 4 Jasper, 'Gore on Liturgical Revision', p.27.
- 5 The report *The Worship of the Church* (GS 698, 1985) curiously fails to mention the influence of Dix, though it does acknowledge Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*; see p.9.
- 6 David Kennedy gives an outline account of this in *Making the Eucharistic Prayer Work*, pp.4-5.
- 7 *Holy Communion Series 3 Revised*, GS 364, p.7.
- 8 *Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3*, pp.20-21.
- 9 Michael Perham acknowledges the nonsense but attributes it to misunderstandings in the 'popular mind'. With breathtaking certainty he asserts that '*we now know that "taking" was not the practical business of laying the table, but a simple symbolic gesture*' (my italics). See *Lively Sacrifice*, p.133.
- 10 *Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3*, p.21.
- 11 *ibid.*
- 12 It might be objected that ASB 4 contains the phrase 'we offer'; but there the thing offered is not the bread and the cup as in ASB 3, but the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: The Liturgical Commission

Initial terms of reference

The Liturgical Commission of the Church of England was established in 1955 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, under the Chairmanship of Bishop Colin Dunlop (1897-1968), then Dean of Lincoln. The terms of reference were:

To consider questions of a liturgical character submitted to them from time to time by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; and to report thereon to the Archbishops.

CERC LTC/D/OS/[0]

The Commission was therefore able to consider *only* what was remitted to it by the Archbishops, a restriction intended to free the Commission from being deluged by frivolous requests from all quarters. Furthermore the Commission's work would be submitted as reports to the Archbishops, to be used at their grace's discretion; it would have no intrinsic authority in the Church. Four projects were handed to the Commission immediately:

1 To consider the recent history of thought and action in relation to Prayer Book revision in this country; and to report on principles and prospects relevant to future approaches to revision, with or without reference to revisions (whether adopted or provisional) in other Provinces of the Anglican Communion: the report to reach the Archbishops by Easter 1957 for possible use in relation to the Lambeth Conference, 1958.

2 To draw up a schedule of detailed amendments to the text or rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer of a kind likely to commend themselves readily to the Church as desirable and straightforward improvements for which permanent authorization could be sought forthwith.

3 To draw up a schedule of detailed amendments to the Book of Common Prayer which under the terms of the proposed Canon 13 might be considered for adoption by the Convocations for experimental use.

4 To consider the baptismal services of the Book of Common Prayer together with the service of baptism allowed for experimental and occasional use by the Convocation of York and also the baptismal services recently suggested in reports of the Convocation Committees on Baptism; and to draft revised services for the baptism of infants and adults and also a service to be used when confirmation immediately follows on adult baptism.

CERC LTC/D/OS/[0]

During the Commission's first meeting (*LC Minutes*, 1.1) the Archbishop of Canterbury (Geoffrey Fisher) explained the distinction between the second and third tasks. The second was a matter of legalising, more or less immediately *and by recourse to Parliament*, the 'improvements' to the Prayer Book which were already commonplace:

alterations now ripe to be made in the Book of Common Prayer ... [to] be put forward for statutory authority forthwith. There was a considerable body of amendments in the 1928 Book upon which people could be agreed, and which, if adopted, might provide at once a Prayer Book which would be more usable and up to date than the present Book ... it would be for the Commission to work out the details ...

The third task was quite different. Here the Commission was being asked to produce:

certain things for experimental use, on the understanding that, after the period of experiment was over, if it had proved satisfactory, Parliament would be asked to make it a statutory use and not experimental use. It would then become part of the Book of Common Prayer. The Archbishop felt that this more flexible system of revision was much more satisfactory than the procedure of attempting to revise the entire Prayer Book as was done in 1928, as by this other method a start could be made on those things which most needed dealing with, and experiments could be made and statutory authority sought, by degrees.

At this early stage it was envisaged that only this third task would come under the new worship Canons. However, in 1965, *both* 'schedules of amendments' (Series 1 and Series 2) were submitted for authorization under the Measure. In 1973 the Canons were changed again (§8.1) to allow the Church to authorize alternative services without a time limit. It is now difficult to imagine circumstances in which the Church would need to present a revised Prayer Book to Parliament.

Subsequent terms of reference

In 1966 the Commission were given new terms of reference:

- 1 To prepare forms of service at the request of the Archbishops;
- 2 To assist in the planning and consideration of lawful experiments in forms of services in parishes;
- 3 To exchange information and advice on liturgical matters with other Churches, both within and without the Anglican Communion; and
- 4 To undertake such other tasks in connection with liturgy as the Archbishops may ask.

This new definition clearly gave the Commission more scope, especially in relation to working with other Churches; indeed the press release in which the new terms were

published explained that the third of these 'reflects the general concern among the Churches with liturgical revision'.

With the coming of synodical government in 1970 the Commission ceased to be an Archbishops' Commission and, as an organ of the General Synod, reported to the House of Bishops. The new terms of reference (still current) are:

- a To prepare forms of service at the request of the House of Bishops for submission to that House in the first instance.
- b To advise on the experimental use of forms of service duly authorised by the General Synod.
- c To exchange information and advice on liturgical matters with other Churches both within and without the Anglican Communion.

GS 42 part I.2

The relationship between the Commission and the Convocations

In an early Memorandum (no. 13), written while the Commission's 1959 baptism and confirmation services were before the Convocations, Jasper reflected on the role of the Commission in relation to the responsibilities of the Convocations. An 'Advisory Committee on Liturgical Questions' had been established during the '1928' revision, but it had been given no primary drafting role; all it could do was comment on the Convocations' texts, and then only when its advice was sought (which was not often). Jasper wrote of the Advisory Committee:

They were an extremely able body of men, yet Convocation persistently ignored or snubbed them on matters in which they were acknowledged experts . . .

The first Liturgical Commission failed therefore, not because of the incompetence of its members, but because no satisfactory method was devised for collaboration with the Convocations.

LC Memorandum 13

It is precisely this point which had also troubled the 1955 Commission, and which was finally resolved with the Commission's new terms of reference under synodical government. The historic rights of the Convocations in relation to liturgy, now exercised by the Synod as a whole, are safeguarded, for the Commission drafts *reports* not *services*. The responsibility for deciding what is, and is not, authorized for worship belongs not to the Liturgical Commission but to the Church represented in Synod.

Meetings of the Liturgical Commission 1955-1980

1	Dec 1955	36	Jun 1963	70	Mar 1972
		37	Sep 1963	71	Jun 1972
2	Jan 1956	38	Dec 1963	72	Sep 1972
3	Apr 1956			73	Dec 1972
4	Jun 1956	39	Apr 1964		
5	Sep 1956	40	Sep 1964	74	Mar 1973
6	Nov 1956	41	Dec 1964	75	Jun 1973
				76	Sep 1973
7	Jan 1957	42	Mar 1965	77	Dec 1973
8	Mar 1957	43	Jun 1965		
9	Jun 1957	44	Sep 1965	78	Mar 1974
10	Sep 1957	45	Dec 1965	79	Jun 1974
11	Nov 1957			80	Sep 1974
		46	Mar 1966	81	Dec 1974
12	Jan 1958	47	Jun 1966		
13	Apr 1958	48	Sep 1966	82	Mar 1975
14	Jun 1958	49	Nov 1966	83	Jun 1975
15	Oct 1958			84	Sep 1975
16	Dec 1958	50	Apr 1967	85	Dec 1975
		51	Jun 1967		
17	Jan 1959	52	Sep 1967	86	Jun 1976
18	Apr 1959	53	Dec 1967	87	Sep 1976
19	Jun 1959			88	Dec 1976
20	Sep 1959	54	Apr 1968		
21	Dec 1959	55	Jun 1968	89	May 1977
		56	Sep 1968	90	Sep 1977
22	Jan 1960	57	Dec 1968	91	Dec 1977
23	Apr 1960				
24	Jun 1960	58	Jun 1969	92	Feb 1978
25	Sep 1960	59	Jun 1969	93	May 1978
26	Dec 1960	60	Sep 1969	94	Sep 1978
		61	Dec 1969		
27	Jan 1961			95	Jan 1979
28	Mar 1961	62	Mar 1970	96	Apr 1979
29	Jun 1961	63	Jun 1970	97	Sep 1979
30	Sep 1961	64	Sep 1970		
31	Dec 1961	65	Dec 1970	98	Jan 1980
				99	May 1980
32	Jan 1962	66	Mar 1971	100	Sep 1980
33	Mar 1962	67	Jun 1971		
34	Sep 1962	68	Sep 1971		
35	Dec 1962	69	Nov 1971		

Appendix 2: Statistical arguments

How successful is the parish communion?

Has the 'parish communion' ideal taken root in the Church of England? There are two different questions here: (1) Do the majority of churchgoers attend the eucharist as their main Sunday service and receive communion? (2) Have parishes adopted the 'parish communion' ideal of only **one** celebration of the eucharist on Sunday?

The statistics collected annually from parishes include an **average attendance** figure (an estimate of how many attend the church on an average Sunday) and an estimate of the number of **communicants** on an average Sunday. The PhD thesis *Modified Rapture* by D.E. Netherton argues that these figures give an indication of the prevalence of the parish communion. The argument, rehearsed on p.192 of the thesis, runs:

In 1981, 717,000 people received communion on 'a normal Sunday'. This was 1.9% of [those old enough to be confirmed and eligible for communion] . . . If the Parish Communion were the main Sunday service in most churches, we would expect that the number of people in church would be the same proportion of eligible people as the number who receive communion; that is, if 1.9% of those eligible, receive communion, then 1.9% of those who are able to come to church at all, would be in church. We would thus expect to see about 885,000 people in Church on a 'usual Sunday'. But the attendance figures show about 1,220,000 at Sunday services, about 1.4 times larger than we would expect. This suggests that the Parish Communion is widespread, but not universal.

Netherton acknowledges that this approach has its weaknesses. Some churches have several celebrations on a Sunday, but no one service which can properly be described as the 'parish communion'; other parishes have a single parish communion in the morning but also a well-attended evensong. The figures from the first would distort the 'success' figure upwards and the second would move it in the downward direction; and this latter distortion would be worse still if the parish priest was not careful to ensure that those who attended both services were counted only once.

The first of these 'distortions' deserves more attention than Netherton allows, and is, in fact, fatal to the argument quoted above. The figures returned by parishes do not indicate the number of celebrations on a Sunday, a crucial omission which tightly limits the interpretation of the figures. There is simply no way of telling how many of the 700,000 communicants live in a 'parish communion' parish and how many of them attend churches with two or more celebrations on a Sunday; the number of communicants reported would be the same in both cases.

But there are two further flaws in this method which Netherton has not recognised. Firstly, it assumes without enquiry that the age profile of a typical church congregation matches the age profile of the population as a whole. As it happens, this assumption is sound: Netherton's figures suggest that 19% of the population is under 16, and according to the *Church of England Year Book 1997* children (defined as under 16) make up 19% of Sunday attendances. Secondly, however, there is the question of non-communicant adults. Adult confirmations account for a significant and increasing number of those being confirmed. In 1993, 45% of confirmation candidates were over the age of 16, and 39% were over the age of 20, which was more than double the figure for 1973 (*On the Way*, p.20). Since adults preparing for confirmation are usually faithful churchgoers who do not yet receive communion, any of them who attend a 'parish communion' regularly will appear in the statistics (paradoxically) to count against its success. The numbers involved might be very significant. In 1993, 51,784 people were confirmed, of whom some 23,000 were over 16. If adult confirmands normally attend for, say, two years before being confirmed, they could account for 5% of adult churchgoers. This alone effectively raises Netherton's 73% ($1 \div 1.4$) 'success' figure for the parish communion to 78%. All this, however, still tells us nothing about the nature of the eucharistic services being attended.

What, then, can be said? According to the parochial returns, 59% ($717,000 / 1,220,000$) of people present at all Church of England services on a Sunday receive communion. That is a remarkable figure, and shows the prevalence both of eucharistic worship and of general communion in the Church of England today. Netherton's analysis is useful in pointing out that this figure is lower than one would expect if every service was a eucharist with general communion, though how much lower is difficult to say, for the reasons outlined above.

Has the ASB displaced the Prayer Book?

According to its own publications, The Prayer Book Society is 'concerned at the extent to which [the ASB] has displaced the Prayer Book' and seeks 'fair play' for the BCP in parochial worship. In these and other statements, the Society is making what is essentially a **quantitative** case. The Society does not object to the use of the ASB, but to the fact that it has 'displaced' the Prayer Book. It would therefore seem reasonable to put two questions to the Society: (1) What is the extent of the 'displacement'? (2) What would constitute 'fair play'?

The Prayer Book Society's claims are repeated so often and with such confidence that one assumes they must be based on firm evidence. On enquiry, however, this turns out not to be the case. In a private communication (12 February 1997) the Prayer Book Society Secretary, Mrs M. Thompson, wrote:

As far as I know there is no register of the use of ASB and the Book of Common Prayer. A list is being compiled, however, by the Prayer Book Society, of those parishes which use the Book of Common Prayer, wholly, or in tandem with ASB. This is a fairly new venture and no overall figures are as yet available.

This is astonishing; stated publicly, it would be a damaging admission. For over twenty years the Society has made much of the supposed 'decline' in the use of the Prayer Book. Yet research into the extent of that decline is even now a 'fairly new venture' and 'no overall figures are as yet available'; on what, then, is the Society's polemic based?

Even if the Society cannot support its case, it may be that other bodies have useful information of which the Prayer Book Society is unaware. Two possibilities are the Liturgical Commission, and the campaigning group *Forward in Faith*.

The Liturgical Commission's terms of reference do not extend to monitoring the use of the BCP (see Appendix 1 above, and also *The Worship of the Church as it approaches the Third Millennium* (1991), p.4). According to the Secretary of the Commission (in private conversation) the Commission has no knowledge of the extent to which the BCP and the ASB are used. *The Worship of the Church* acknowledges a strong Prayer Book constituency within the Church, but the evidence for its strength is imprecise and anecdotal: '... the Commission is well aware of [the BCP's] widespread use — by Commission members as well as others — and of its popularity'.

If neither the Prayer Book Society nor the Liturgical Commission is aware of the extent of Prayer Book use, it must be extremely unlikely that anyone else does. It might still be possible, however, to discover useful and telling patterns of Prayer Book worship within a sub-group of the Church of England.

Forward in Faith, a well-organised umbrella body for parishes and clergy opposed to the ordination of women as priests, keeps a register of affiliated parishes and frequently publishes details of their service times. Unfortunately the listings do not indicate which rite is used. Even if such information were available, one would wish to know how far *Forward in Faith* parishes are representative of the Church as a whole in their liturgical preferences. While there might be some correlation between one form of 'traditionalism' (opposition to the ordination of women) and another (use of the Prayer Book), it would be difficult to gauge the extent of it. But as it happens, the Director of *Forward in Faith*, S.T. Parkinson, in a private communication (17 February 1997), wrote:

... we have no records of the patterns of worship to be found in *Forward in Faith* parishes. However, my *experience*, based on numerous visits to such parishes, suggests to me that the most common rite in use in our parishes is Rite A. Of course, what I have tended to experience is the main Sunday act of worship, or perhaps some weekday festival. My hunch is that the BCP might well appear at Evensong, and possibly at 8.00am on a Sunday morning.

It has proved impossible to find numerical evidence to support the Prayer Book Society's position. My own conviction — which is also based on experience and anecdotal evidence — is that the ASB is used more widely than the BCP in the Church as a whole. But the crucial point is that anecdotal evidence, and a general 'feel' for the state of the Church, is all that anyone can claim. Two conclusions follow: (1) this ignorance really ought to be acknowledged by all those who wish to contribute honestly to the debate about the future of the Prayer Book, and (2) without having some measure of how far the Prayer Book is in fact 'under-used', it is difficult to see how 'fair play' can even be a coherent notion, let alone an achievable goal. And on this last point, the uncertainty is compounded by the fact that the Prayer Book Society has never to my knowledge indicated what level of Prayer Book use it would regard as 'fair'.

Appendix 3: Additional Consecration

On occasion, the supply of eucharistic bread or wine fails during the distribution. In order to communicate all who wish to receive, further bread and wine must be brought within the eucharistic action. The problem is how this is best done.

The Book of Common Prayer gives clear instructions:

If the consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more according to the Form before prescribed; beginning at [*Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c.*] for the blessing of the Bread; and at [*Likewise after Supper, &c.*] for the blessing of the Cup.

This is consecration by the recitation of the words of institution, and has served the Church of England, for good or ill, for over three centuries. It has been criticized, however, as ‘consecration by formula’, and is arguably ‘a procedure forced on Cranmer’s text, and alien to it’ (Buchanan, *LC Memorandum 77A*, 1968).

But it is not the only possible method. An informative memorandum by Couratin (*LC Memorandum 77*) chronicled the history of additional, or ‘further’, consecration. Until the twelfth century ‘consecration by contact’ was adopted — the addition of unconsecrated to consecrated wine, or the addition of a small piece of consecrated bread to a chalice of unconsecrated wine (it is assumed that the wine is the most likely element to fail). Since the twelfth century, however, the recitation of the dominical words gained ground, and was adopted for *The Order of the Communion* in 1548, and ‘approved as the patently correct procedure by Queen Elizabeth I’s Commissioners in 1573. It was reinforced by Canon XXI of 1604; and by a rubric was introduced into the Communion office of 1662’ (*LC Memorandum 77*).

The Liturgical Commission’s draft of Series 2 (1965) provided that if one or both elements failed, the ‘Prayer of Consecration’ should be recited: that is, the whole of the post-Sanctus, including the petition for consecration, the dominical words, the anamnesis and the oblation. This was undoubtedly intended to complement the Commission’s view that the whole eucharistic prayer consecrates; but it was hardly consistent with the Dixian idea that the main thrust of the consecration prayer consists of thanksgiving, for then the whole thanksgiving, including the pre-Sanctus, would have to be recited. This method also required the additional consecration of both elements, whether they were needed or not. In one sense it came near to constituting a

new eucharistic action, with a *taking* of fresh bread and wine, a *blessing* of them, possibly a utilitarian *breaking* of the bread, and then their *distribution*.

This method proved unacceptable to the Church, but nothing was found to replace it, and Series 2 was authorized without provision for further consecration. Jasper had suggested that the 1662 method be followed in the meantime, and some bishops insisted on it; a number of priests were, however, keen to dispense with a 'formula' altogether, and simply added more bread and wine in silence (Buchanan, *Recent Liturgical Revision*, p.29 and elsewhere).

The confusion over the Series 2 provision provoked a lively debate within the Commission and the Church of England, and other provinces of the Anglican Communion were also drawn in. It is frequently argued that what a rite prescribes for additional consecration betrays its fundamental theology of consecration, which may not always be clear from the eucharistic prayer itself. It might be said that 1662, for example, teaches that the dominical words are an indispensable consecratory formula. Certainly those for whom consecration is focussed and located in a particular form of words or in a particular prayer will regard whatever is said at the point of additional consecration as the bare minimum necessary to consecrate bread and wine. But according to another view, it is the whole eucharistic context which effects consecration, and so more bread and wine can properly be drawn into that context by **association** rather than by **fresh consecration**. On this view the repetition of (say) the words of institution over fresh bread would serve not to 'effect consecration' as such, but to identify the new bread as belonging to the eucharistic context already established. Even then, however, it is important that what is done and said as additional elements are introduced should suffice to identify them clearly with the existing eucharistic action and to include them within its scope.

Following the confusion over Series 2, it was necessary that Series 3 should offer a solution. The Liturgical Commission clearly subscribed to the view that consecration was effected by the whole eucharistic prayer (*Commentary*, pp.21 & 26) and that no single formula was necessary for further consecration; indeed it would be undesirable and misleading to provide one. The Commission was, however, unable to agree whether *some* form of words were required, or whether additional bread and wine could simply be brought within the scope of the eucharistic action in silence. Accordingly both methods were included in the Commission's draft of Series 3.

The form of words chosen was that suggested by the Doctrine Commission in their memorandum of 12 December 1969 (CERC LTC/LT/38). The formula consists of a declaratory formula addressed to God (see §7.3) associating the bread and wine with the eucharistic action and informing God that we 'receive this bread/wine also as his body/blood'. Ironically this was altered in the Synodical revision stage to a petition (see §7.4), a form which the Liturgical Commission had considered in early 1969 (LC *Memorandum* 95A) and then discarded in favour of the Doctrine Commission's text.

In the authorized Series 3 text the option for adding more bread and wine in silence was removed (§7.4). Buchanan was critical of this: 'I was not prepared to rule it out when the liberty to use it already existed under Series 2, and was being followed in many parishes' (*Recent Liturgical Revision*, p.29). But this objection strikes at the very heart of liturgical experimentation. It was understood that when experimental rites were authorized, it was for a trial period only. If some of the features in the experimental rites proved unsatisfactory, they could be discarded in future rites. Without this understanding, the notion of authorization *for a specified period* would be entirely meaningless, and anything which had ever been authorized in the past would have to remain available for ever. Since Buchanan himself was keen not to re-authorise the lapsed Series 1 (§4.6), he can hardly argue that he did not accept this principle.

My own view is that 'additional consecration' should be by association rather than by fresh 'consecration', but that words are necessary to clarify that association and that they should be in the form of a prayer, not a declaration. Words are necessary because it is the the whole eucharistic assembly which celebrates the eucharist, not the presiding priest alone, and the act of association, no less than the original thanksgiving, should be open, shared and clear to all. Even those who have already received communion need to participate in additional consecration, for their communion is not only with God but also with all their fellow-communicants.

The Series 3/ASB form is entirely satisfactory. It associates the new bread and wine with the existing act of thanksgiving and prays that the new elements may 'also' be to us the body and blood of Christ. No doubt some will see the words of institution as a consecratory formula, but they can also be understood as a point of reference which anchors the new elements firmly in the eucharistic action instituted by Christ.

Appendix 4: The NA 84 canon with clergy amendments

NA 84	CA 158 (clergy): Prayer 1	CA 158 (clergy): Prayer 2
Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ	All glory and thanksgiving be to thee Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ	All glory and thanksgiving be to thee Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ
to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory	to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory	to take our nature upon him, and to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; Who made there, by his one offering of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice
of that his precious death, until his coming again;	of that his precious death, until his coming again;	for the sins of the whole world; and did institute and in his holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of himself, wherein we do proclaim his death until his coming again.
Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood:	Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.	
who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took Bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.	Who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took Bread; and, when he had given thanks he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper he took the Cup: and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.	Who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took Bread; and, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper he took the Cup: and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

NA 84

Wherefore, O Lord
and heavenly Father,

we thy humble servants,

having in remembrance
the precious death
of thy dear Son,
his mighty resurrection
and glorious ascension,
looking also for his coming again,
do render unto thee
most hearty thanks
for the innumerable benefits
which he hath procured unto us;
and we entirely desire
thy Fatherly goodness
mercifully to accept this our sacrifice
of praise and thanksgiving;
most humbly beseeching thee to grant,
that by the merits and death
of thy Son Jesus Christ,
and through faith in his blood,
we and all thy whole Church

may obtain remission of our sins,
and all other benefits of his Passion.

And here we offer and present
unto thee, O Lord,
ourselves, our souls and bodies,
to be a reasonable, holy,
and lively sacrifice unto thee;
humbly beseeching thee, that all we,
who are partakers
of this holy Communion

CA 158 (clergy): Prayer 1

Wherefore, O Lord
and heavenly Father,
according to the institution
of thy dearly beloved Son,
our Saviour Jesus Christ,
we thy humble servants
do celebrate, and make here
before thy divine Majesty,
with these thy holy gifts,
the memorial which thy Son
hath willed us to make:

having in remembrance
his blessed passion
and precious death,
his mighty resurrection
and glorious ascension,

rendering unto thee
most hearty thanks
for the innumerable benefits
procured unto us by the same.
And we entirely desire
thy Fatherly goodness
mercifully to accept this our sacrifice
of praise and thanksgiving;
most humbly beseeching thee to grant,
that by the merits and death
of thy Son Jesus Christ,
and through faith in his blood,
we and all thy whole Church

may obtain remission of our sins,
and all other benefits of his passion

And here we offer and present
unto thee, O Lord,
ourselves, our souls and bodies,
to be a reasonable, holy,
and living sacrifice unto thee;
humbly beseeching thee, that all we,
who are partakers
of this holy Communion

CA 158 (clergy): Prayer 2

Wherefore, O Lord
and heavenly Father,

we thy humble servants,

having in remembrance
the precious death
of thy dear Son,
his mighty resurrection
and glorious ascension,

do render unto thee
most hearty thanks
for the innumerable blessings
which he hath assured to us.
And we entirely desire
thy fatherly goodness
mercifully to accept this our sacrifice
of praise and thanksgiving;
most humbly beseeching thee to grant
that by the merits and death
of thy Son Jesus Christ,
and through faith in his blood,
we and all thy whole Church,
offering ourselves to thee in
communion with him,
may obtain remission of our sins,
and all other benefits of his passion

Hear us, O merciful Father,
we most humbly beseech thee,
and with thy Holy Spirit
bless and sanctify both us
and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine,
that we, receiving them
according to thy Son
our Saviour Jesus Christ's
holy institution,
may be partakers of his most blessed
Body and Blood:

NA 84

may be fulfilled with thy grace
and heavenly benediction.
And although we be unworthy,
through our manifold sins,
to offer unto thee any sacrifice,
yet we beseech thee to accept this
our bounden duty and service;
not weighing our merits,
but pardoning our offences;
through Jesus Christ our Lord,
by whom, and with whom,
in the unity of the Holy Ghost,
all honour and glory be unto thee,
O Father Almighty,
world without end.

CA 158 (clergy): Prayer 1

may worthily receive
the most precious Body and Blood
of thy Son,
and be fulfilled with thy grace
and heavenly benediction.
And although we be unworthy,
through our manifold sins,
to offer unto thee any sacrifice,
yet we beseech thee to accept this
our bounden duty and service;
not weighing our merits,
but pardoning our offences;
Through Jesus Christ our Lord,
by whom, and with whom,
in the unity of the Holy Ghost,
all honour and glory be unto thee,
O Father Almighty,
world without end. Amen.

CA 158 (clergy): Prayer 2

By whom, and with whom,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all honour and glory be unto thee,
O Father Almighty,
world without end. Amen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The place of publication is London unless otherwise stated.

1 Service Books and Draft Liturgies

The First and Second Prayer Books of King Edward the Sixth, 1549 and 1552.

The Book of Common Prayer, 1662.

Alcuin Club, *A Survey of the Proposals for the Alternative Prayer Book* (1923).

English Church Union, *The Prayer Book as Revised by the English Church Union* (1923).

Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer and for Additional Services and Prayers, drawn up by a Group of Clergy together with a foreword by William Temple, DLitt, the Bishop of Manchester (1923) (CERC FCE/LIT/SAC/1,i).

Book proposed to be annexed to the Prayer Book Measure 192– (7 February 1927).

Book referred to in the Prayer Book Measure 1927 (29 March 1927).

The Book of Common Prayer with the Additions and Deviations Proposed in 1928.

The Shorter Prayer Book: being an abbreviated form of the Book of Common Prayer with some additional matter (1948).

Alternative Services: First Series (1965).

Alternative Services: Second Series (1966).

An Order for Holy Communion, Second Series, AS 220 (Cambridge, no date).

An Order for Holy Communion Series 3: A Report of the Church of England Liturgical Commission to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (1971).

An Order for Holy Communion Series 3, AS 320 (no date).

Holy Communion Series 1 and 2 revised (1977).

The Alternative Service Book 1980 (Oxford, 1980).

Lent, Holy Week, Easter: Services and Prayers (1986).

The Promise of His Glory (1991).

Patterns for Worship (1995).

The Christian Year: Calendar, Lectionary and Collects (1997).

2 Church Reports and Official Publications

Church Assembly, Convocations, Synod

Chronicle of Convocation (Canterbury), abbreviated to *Chronicle Convoc.*

Journal of Convocation (York), abbreviated to *Journal Convoc.*

Church Assembly, *Report of Proceedings*.

General Synod, *Report of Proceedings*.

General Synod reports, referred to as 'GS n'.

The Liturgical Conference 1966, *Report of Proceedings*.

The Liturgical Conference 1967, *Report of Proceedings*.

Church & State; Canon Law

The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, *Minutes of Evidence* (1906).

The Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, *Report* (1906).

The Archbishops' Second Committee of Inquiry, *The Worship of the Church* (1919).

Ecclesiastical Committee — Thirtieth Report, *Report by the Ecclesiastical Committee upon the Prayer Book Measure, 192–* (24 November 1927).

Parliamentary Debates: Official Report, Fifth Series, Volume 211 (211 H.C. Deb. 5 S.), p.2531ff, *The Prayer Book Measure, 1927* (15 December 1927).

Parliamentary Debates: Official Report, Fifth Series, Volume 218 (218 H.C. Deb. 5 S.), p.1079ff, *The Prayer Book Measure, 1928* (13 June 1928).

Church Assembly, *Church and State: Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Relations between Church and State 1935* (1935).

The Canon Law of the Church of England: The Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Canon Law, together with Proposals for a Revised Body of Canons (1947).

Church and State, being the Report of a Commission appointed by the Church Assembly in June 1949, CA 1023 (1952).

The Revised Canons of the Church of England Further Considered (1954).

Canon Law Revision: Statement by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Church Assembly on June 17th 1958 (1958).

The Canons of the Church of England, 5th edition with supplements (1993, 1994, 1996).

Liturgical Commission

Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England (1957).

Modern Liturgical Texts (1968).

A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3 (1971).

(together with the Council for the Care of Churches)

The Presentation of the Eucharist: the report of a joint working party (1971).

The Alternative Service Book 1980: A Commentary by the Liturgical Commission (1980).

The Worship of the Church as it approaches the Third Millennium, GS Misc 364 (1991).

Language and the Worship of the Church, GS 1115 (1994).

Other

The Lambeth Conference 1948.

The Lambeth Conference 1958.

ARCIC, *The Final Report* (1982).

ARCIC, *Study Guide to the Final Report* (1982).

ICET, *Prayers We Have in Common* (1970, 1971, 1975)

House of Bishops, *On the Way: Towards an Integrated Approach to Christian Initiation*, GS Misc 444 (1995).

Church of England Communications Unit, *Explaining the Church of England: Holy Communion* (no date).

3 Unpublished Material

Lord Hugh Cecil's Papers (CERC LCQ).

Book of Common Prayer: Draft Revision 1925 with Amendments (CERC).

Minutes of the Prayer Book Copyright Committee (CERC CAA/1922/1/V/10).

Liturgical Commission Minutes (CERC LC/M/OS/1 & 2).

Liturgical Commission Memoranda (CERC LC/D/OS/*n*).

Liturgical Commission Liturgical Texts (CERC LC/LT/*n*).

Netherton, Dana Eugene, 'Modified Rapture: The Church of England and the Parish Communion' (King's College London PhD thesis, 1986).

4 Books and Articles

Collections listed by title (also listed by editor below)

The Church in the Furnace, ed. F.B. MacNutt (1919).

The Eucharist Today: Studies on Series 3, ed. R.C.D. Jasper (1974).

The Identity of Anglican Worship, ed. K. Stevenson and B.D. Spinks (Pennsylvania, 1991).

Liturgy and Change, ed. D. Newton (Birmingham, 1983).

Liturgy for a New Century, ed. M. Perham (1991).

Liturgy in Dialogue, ed. P. Bradshaw and B.D. Spinks (1993).

Liturgy Reshaped, ed. K.W. Stevenson (1982).

Model and Inspiration: The Prayer Book Tradition Today, ed. M. Perham (1993).

A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship, ed. J.G. Davies (1986).

The Parish Communion, ed. A.G. Hebert (1937).

The Parish Communion Today: The Report of the 1962 Conference of Parish and People, ed. D.M. Paton (1962).

E.C. Ratcliff: Reflections on Liturgical Revision, ed. D.H. Tripp (Bramcote, 1980).

The Renewal of Common Prayer, ed. M. Perham, GS Misc 412 (1993)

Reservation: Report of a Conference held at Farnham Castle on October 24-27, 1925, chaired by the Bishop of Winchester (London, 1926).

Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion, ed. D.R. Holeton (Bramcote, 1994)

The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies in Honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin, ed. B.D. Spinks (Rome, 1981).

The Study of Liturgy, ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright and E. Yarnold (1978).

Thinking about the Eucharist, ed. I.T. Ramsey (1972).

Towards a Modern Prayer Book — the New Services Examined, ed. R.T. Beckwith (Abingdon, 1966).

Towards Liturgy 2000, ed. M. Perham (1989).

Walter Howard Frere: a Memoir, ed. C.S. Phillips (1947).

By author/editor

Aulen, G., *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, English translation (Edinburgh, 1958).

Battiscombe, G., 'The Destruction of Common Prayer', *Theology*, 71 (1968), 50-54.

——, 'The Destruction of Common Prayer' (letter), *Theology*, 71 (1968), 220-223.

Beckwith, R.T. (ed), *Towards a Modern Prayer Book — the New Services Examined* (Abingdon, 1966).

——, *The Second Series Communion Service: what are the issues?* (no date, ?1969).

——, 'The Approaching Revision of Series Three', *Churchman*, 90 (1976), 289-293.

——, *The Revised Series Three Communion: a way forward* (Oxford, 1979).

Beckwith, R.T. and B. Brindley, *The Revision of Holy Communion Series Three: A Joint Catholic-Evangelical Approach* (1978).

Beckwith, R.T. and C.O. Buchanan, 'This Bread and this Cup: An Evangelical Rejoinder', *Theology*, 70 (1967), 265-271.

Beckwith, R.T., J.I. Packer and C.O. Buchanan, *Reservation and Communion of the Sick* (Bramcote, 1972).

Beckwith, R.T. and J.E. Tiller, *The Service of Holy Communion and its revision* (Abingdon, 1972).

Bell, G.K.A., *Documents on Christian Unity, Second Series* (1930)

—— *Randall Davidson* (1935).

Boggis, R.J.E., *Revision of the Book of Common Prayer from the Point of View of a Parish Priest* (Canterbury, 1914).

Bradshaw, P., *A Bibliography of Recent Studies* (Runcorn, 1989).

——, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (1994).

——, *Early Christian Worship* (1996).

Bradshaw, P. and B.D. Spinks (eds), *Liturgy in Dialogue* (1993).

Brewer, D., 'Liturgy: Need and Frustration', *Theology*, 80 (1977), 173-177.

Brightman, F.E., 'The New Prayer Book Examined', *Church Quarterly Review*, 104 (1927), 219-252.

Brown, D., 'Breaking of the Bread', *Theology*, 75 (1972), 477-483.

Buchanan, C.O. 'The New Communion Service — Reasons for Dissent', *The Churchman*, 80 (1966), 118-129.

——, *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968* (1968).

- , *A Guide to Second Series Communion Service* (1968).
- , *Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England and supplements* (Bramcote, 1973, 1974, 1976, 1978).
- , *Liturgy for Communion: The Revised Series 3 Service* (Bramcote, 1979).
- , *Latest Liturgical Revision in the Church of England 1978-1984* (Bramcote, 1984).
- , *Evangelical Anglicans and Liturgy* (Bramcote, 1984).
- Buchanan, C.O. and T. Lloyd, *Six Eucharistic Prayers as Proposed in 1996* (Cambridge, 1996).
- Bursell, R., *Liturgy, Order and the Law* (Oxford, 1996).
- Buxton, R. F., *Eucharist and Institution Narrative* (Great Wakering, 1976).
- Chadwick, O., *Michael Ramsey: a Life* (Oxford, 1990).
- Clarke, N. and R.C.D. Jasper, *Initiation and Eucharist: Essays on their structure by the Joint Liturgical Group* (1972).
- Clarke, W.K.L., *The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered* (1943).
- Clarke, W.K.L. and C. Harris, *Liturgy and Worship* (1932).
- Cocksworth, C., *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England* (Cambridge, 1993).
- Cosin, J., *Works* (Oxford, 1847-1855).
- Couratin, A.H., 'The Tradition Received: We offer this Bread and this Cup: 2', *Theology*, 69 (1966), 437-442.
- Cuming, G.J., 'The English Rite: We offer this Bread and this Cup: 4', *Theology*, 69 (1966), 447-452.
- , *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (1969).
- , *Hippolytus: a Text for Students* (Bramcote, 1976).
- Dalby, J.M.M., 'Alternative Services: The Canon of Series 1', *Church Quarterly Review*, 168 (1967), 442-451.
- Davies, J.G. (ed), *A New Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (1986).
- De Candole, H. and A.H. Couratin, *Re-Shaping the Liturgy* (1964).
- Dickinson, H., 'The Destruction of Common Prayer', *Theology*, 71 (1968), 175-177.
- Dix, Dom G., *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1945).
- Dunlop, C., *Anglican Public Worship* revised edition (1961).

- Fenwick, J.R.K. and B.D. Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Twentieth Century Liturgical Movement* (Edinburgh, 1995).
- Frere, W.H., *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform* (1911).
- Frost, D.L., *The Language of Series 3* (Bramcote 1973).
- Gore, C., *The Body of Christ*, 3rd edition (1902), 4th edition (1907).
- Gray, D., *Earth and Altar: the Evolution of the Parish Communion in the Church of England to 1945* (Norwich, 1986).
- , 'The Revision of Canon Law and its Application to Liturgical Revision in the Recent History of the Church of England', *The Jurist*, 48 (1988), 638-652.
- , *Ronald Jasper: His Life, His Work and the ASB* (1997).
- Grisbrooke, W.J., 'The Constitution and Liturgy of the Church of South India', *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, 11 (1956), 213.
- Harries, R., 'Alternative Services — the Test of Practice', *Theology*, 79 (1976), 221-226.
- Harrison, D.E.W. and M.C. Sansom, *Worship in the Church of England* (1982).
- Hebert, A.G., *Liturgy and Society* (1935).
- (ed), *The Parish Communion* (1937).
- Henson, H.H., *The Book and the Vote* (1928).
- Holeton, D.R. (ed), *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion* (Bramcote, 1994)
- Homan, R., 'Cranmer Curtailed', *New Directions*, 1 (1997), 4-5.
- Houlden, J.L., 'Good Liturgy or even Good Battlefield: We offer this Bread and this Cup: 1', *Theology*, 69 (1966), 433-437.
- Jagger, P.J., *A History of the Parish and People Movement* (Leighton Buzzard, 1978).
- Jasper, R.C.D., 'Gore on Liturgical Revision', *Church Quarterly Review*, 166 (1965), 21-36.
- (ed), *The Eucharist Today: Studies on Series 3* (1974).
- , *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980* (1989).
- Jasper, R.C.D. and P.F. Bradshaw, *A Companion to the Alternative Service Book* (1986).
- Jasper, R.C.D. and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd edition (New York, 1987).
- Jeremias, J., *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, English edition (1966).
- Jones, C., G. Wainwright and E. Yarnold (eds), *The Study of Liturgy* (1978).
- Joynson-Hicks, W., *The Prayer Book Crisis* (1928).

- Kennedy, D.J. and D. Mann, *Making the Eucharistic Prayer Work* (Bramcote, 1988).
- Kilmister, A. (ed), *When will ye be wise? The State of the Church of England* (1983).
- MacNutt, F.B. (ed), *The Church in the Furnace* (1919).
- MacPhail, J.R., 'Worship in the Church of South India', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 17 (1964), 25-42.
- Mascall, E.L., *Corpus Christi* (1953).
- Mitchell, A., 'A Liturgical Essay', *Churchman*, 43 (1929), 51-62.
- Moreton, M.J., 'The Alternative Services Considered', *Theology*, 69 (1966), 53-60.
- , 'The Early Liturgies: We offer this Bread and this Cup: 3', *Theology*, 69 (1966), 442-447.
- , 'The Anaphoral Prayer', *Church Quarterly Review*, 168 (1967), 45-52.
- , 'A Liturgical Pastiche', *Theology*, 75 (1972), 79-83.
- , *Made Fully Perfect: a critique of An Order for Holy Communion Series 3* (1974).
- , *Consecrating, Remembering, Offering* (1976).
- Morison, S., *English Prayer Books* (1943)
- Naylor, C.B., *Why Prayer Book Revision at all?* (1964).
- Newton, D. (ed), *Liturgy and Change* (Birmingham, 1983).
- Paton, D.M. (ed), *The Parish Communion Today: The Report of the 1962 Conference of Parish and People* (1962).
- Perham, M., *The Eucharist* (1978).
- (ed), *Towards Liturgy 2000* (1989).
- (ed), *Liturgy for a New Century* (1991).
- , *Lively Sacrifice* (1992).
- (ed), *The Renewal of Common Prayer* GS Misc 412 (1993)
- (ed), *Model and Inspiration: The Prayer Book Tradition Today* (1993).
- Phillips, C.S. (ed), *Walter Howard Frere: a Memoir* (1947).
- Ramsey, A.M.R., *Durham Essays and Addresses* (1956).
- Ramsey, I.T. (ed), *Thinking about the Eucharist* (1972).
- Robinson, J.A.T., *Liturgy Coming to Life*, 2nd edition (1963).
- Ross, K.N., *Proposals for an Interim Reshaping of the Mass* (no date, ?1966).

- Rust, G., 'The Draft Holy Communion Service', *Theology*, 69 (1966), p.172.
- Santer, M., 'The New Moralism of "Series 3"', *Theology*, 75 (1972), 30-33.
- Scales, D.A., *What Mean Ye by this Service?* (Cambridge, Whinburgh, 1969).
- Scott, R.T., 'The Likelihood of Liturgy: Reflections upon Prayer Book Revision and its Liturgical Implications', *Anglican Theological Review*, 62 (1980), 103-120.
- Shepherd, M.H., *The Liturgical Renewal of the Church* (New York, 1960).
- Shipley, O., *The Ritual of the Altar* (1870).
- Simpson, J., 'The New Alternative Services', *The Churchman*, 80 (1966), 26-33.
- Smethurst, A.F., *The New Canons and Obedience to the Book of Common Prayer* (1950).
- Spinks, B.D. (ed), *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies in Honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin* (Rome, 1981).
- , 'Mis-Shapen. Gregory Dix and the Four-Action Shape of the Liturgy', *Lutheran Quarterly*, 4 (1990), 161-177.
- , *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer* (Cambridge, 1991).
- Spurr, B., *The Word in the Desert: Anglican and Roman Catholic Reactions to Liturgical Reform* (Cambridge, 1995).
- Srawley, J.H., *The Liturgical Movement: its Origin and Growth* (1954).
- Stevenson, K.W., *Gregory Dix 25 years on* (Bramcote, 1977).
- (ed), *Liturgy Reshaped* (1982).
- , *Eucharist and Offering* (New York, 1986).
- , *Accept this Offering* (1989).
- , *Worship: Wonderful and Sacred Mystery* (Washington, 1992).
- Stevenson, K.W. and B.D. Spinks (eds), *The Identity of Anglican Worship* (Pennsylvania, 1991).
- Stibbs, A.M., *Sacrament, Sacrifice and Eucharist* (1961).
- Tripp, D.H. (ed), *E.C. Ratcliff: Reflections on Liturgical Revision* (Bramcote, 1980).
- Whitaker, E.C., *The New Services 1967, a Guide and Explanation: Holy Communion, Baptism and Confirmation* (1967).
- Wilkinson, J., *Eucharist for Experiment* (1967).
- Willis, G.G., *Revising the Revision: an assessment of the proposals of Alternative Services: Third Series: The Holy Communion* (1971).