## *Recent Eucharistic renewal in the Roman, Anglican and Methodist churches*

Jennings, Robert H.

# RECENT EUCHARISTIC RENEWAL IN THE ROMAN, ANGLICAN AND METHODIST CHURCHES

M.A. Thesis September 1978 Robert H. Jennings

## ABSTRACT

The thesis is in three parts. The first part deals with the historical background. The first chapter traces the beginnings of the Liturgical Movement from its origins in nineteenth century French Catholicism, its continuation in Germany and Austria and its culmination in the first Assisi Congress of 1956 which prepared the way for the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council. The second chapter examines first the ritualism of the Anglican Tractarians and their successors, and the early attempts at Prayer Book revision. The 1928 Eucharist is discussed and the work of the Parish Communion Movement and Dom Gregory Dix is examined. Finally, a brief consideration is made of the Liturgy of the Church of South India and the suggestions of the 1958 Lambeth Conference. Chapter Three traces the English Methodist tradition of worship from its roots in "High" Anglicanism through the eighteenth and nineteenth century emphasis on preaching and experiential religion to the twentieth century recovery of eucharistic liturgy.

Part II deals with the modern period after 1966 and begins in Chapter One with a detailed consideration of the new Roman Mass of 1970. Chapter Two examines the revised Anglican rites: Series 1 (1966), Series 2 (1967), Series 3 (1973), Series 1 and 2 Revised (1976) and the Series 3 draft revision of 1978. Chapter Three looks at the Methodist Sunday Service of 1968 and 1974.

Part III begins with an examination of the doctrinal issues such as the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Eucharistic Presence which remain contentious and divisive among Christians, and continues with an attempt to show the measure of agreement recently achieved. Finally, the attempts by the Churches to rise to the challenge of secularisation are surveyed and assessed.

## PREFACE

The aim of this thesis is to present a historical survey of modern events culminating in the publication of three eucharistic liturgies of recent times, and to provide a detailed examination, critique and comparative study of the rites themselves. All the major Christian denominations have been actively involved in the Liturgical Movement to greater or lesser extent, but for reasons of space only three Christian bodies have been included in this study. These three ecclesial communities (the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England and the Methodist Church of Great Britian) share much in common and have many differences. The thesis explores the common ground and attempts to tease out the differences.

The first part deals with the period up to 1965. This date is obviously an arbitrary dividing line, although it does mark a convenient watershed for two reasons: In that year the Second Vatican Council unleashed liturgical reform in earnest and in that year also the Anglican Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure was passed marking a new and radical step forward in the Church of England's liturgical renewal.

The thesis is not confined to liturgiology but attempts to embrace doctrinal and pastoral concerns as well. Liturgy and doctrine can never be isolated from each other. There should always be a free interplay between the lex orandi and the lex credendi. Liturgical renewal should not merely be a reordering of worship and ways of worshipping but a renewal of the whole life of the Church and her mission and service in the world. It is at the Eucharist that the Church is fully the Church.

At a time when the liturgy is presented with far greater freedom and flexibility than has been possible for centuries there is a need for sound liturgical and theological thinking. At a time also of ecumenism and of moves towards organic unity with full intercommunion, good theology and good liturgy is vital if only to prevent irrational prejudice on the one hand and superficial bonhomie on the other.

# PART I

## EUCHARISTIC RENEWAL UP TO 1965

## Chapter 1 The Roman Catholic Church

"The Liturgical Movement," writes Horton Davies in "Worship and Theology in England, Volume V", "may be defined as an interconfessional renewal of Christian worship and life which sees in the self-offering of the Eternal Son of God on the Cross a Sacrifice which is both the descent of the Divinity and the ascent of the Perfect Humanity, and therefore as the type and pattern of Christian worship in the Eucharist, the nexus of Christian unity, the inspiration of all human talents and labour, and the supreme means of grace".[1]

A Roman Catholic writer, Charles Davis (writing before he left the priesthood), describes the Liturgical Movement as "a movement of pastoral renewal, intimately connected with the biblical and catechetical revivals. It is based on a work of doctrinal reflection that is having repercussions on most parts of Catholic doctrine and theology. It is supported by an historical scholarship of the highest quality, in no way lacking in critical rigour. A general renewal of the life of the Church, it is a LITURGICAL movement because the liturgy is at the centre of the life and pastoral work of the Church."[2]

The seed bed of this great movement of reform and renewal was late nineteenth century Continental Catholicism. It was Prosper Louis Pascal Guéranger, Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery of Solesmes from 1832, who initiated the birth of the Liturgical Movement. His aim, according to Davis, was "the rejuvenation of liturgical piety in an age that was increasingly secular, rationalistic, and individualistic".[3] At a time when the liturgy of the Church had degenerated in a climate of secularism and rationalism, Guéranger set about restoring the Mass to what he considered to be its rightful place at the centre of the Church's life. He was an ardent traditionalist and earnestly sought to re-establish the purity of the Roman liturgy and to eradicate "neo-Gallican" innovations. He is today criticised for being too much of an Antiquarian and Ultramontanist. He was certainly far too strongly influenced by the neo-Gothic Romanticism of his day which drove him to see the Middle Ages as the perfect Golden Age, but his positive contributions in stimulating interest in

1 op. cit. p. 13 2 "Liturgy and Doctrine" p. 19 3 ibid. p. 19

and devotion to the worship of the Church should not go unrecognised.

Guéranger's work had been academic and scholarly. In 1903 Pope Pius X issued a Motu Proprio on Church music and the eucharist. His intentions were primarily pastoral. He urged more congregational participation in the rites of the Church and made the now famous statement, "We must not sing or pray during Mass, but we must sing and pray the Mass". In 1905 he issued a further decree advocating weekly communion as the norm for Roman Catholics. This decree marked a "milestone in liturgical history even more important than the decrees of the same pope which were more directly liturgical" according to Jungmann.[1] The effect of the decree was later seen not only in increased communions but more importantly in the new (revived) custom of receiving communion at the eucharist itself rather than before or after the mass. Within a decade or so "communion once more stands in its natural liturgical relationship as a conscious participation in the Holy Sacrifice" comments Jungmann.[2] An additional effect was the shift of attention from passive adoration of the Host (in a "spiritual" communion) to full sacramental participation. The people gradually overcame the inhibitions of centuries stopping them from communion and once more began to approach the altar at mass.

In 1909 at a conference at Malines, Dom Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960) of the Benedictine Abbey of Mont-César at Louvain, made an important speech which is now considered to mark the true beginning of modern liturgical revival in Belgium and further afield. The liturgy he said was ideally the action of the whole Christian community in active participation. No longer should lay people be expected to be mere onlookers at the eucharist. As a practical suggestion, the appeal was made for a vernacular missal so that at least the worship could be followed more intelligently by the laity. Dom Lambert Beauduin had worked as a parish priest and a workers' chaplain and for him the liturgical movement was no mere academic exercise. His famous book, "La Piété de L'Église" published in 1914 contained the essence of his reforming ideas. He believed that true Christian worship is rooted in the every day life of the parish community. It is a practical expression of the doctrine of the Incarnation. The Church as the Body of Christ implies nothing less than the organic unity of all, in worship and life. The Eucharistic Sacrifice implied the active offering of work and life in union

[1] "Mass of the Roman Rite" p. 120 [2] op. cit. p. 121

with the offering of Christ and for Beauduin, "worship was a joint undertaking of the people of God, involving them all in sharing the redemptive work of Christ in the world," (according to Jasper[1]). Under the leadership of Dom Lambert, Mont-César became a centre for liturgical renewal with strong emphasis on pastoral and parochial needs.

In Germany, liturgical interest was at this time being fostered in the Abbey of Maria Laach under the leadership of Ildefons Herwegen and Dom Odo Casel. Their work can be traced back to the Tübingen ecclesiologist, J.A. Möhler (1796-1838) who saw the Church as a community of believers and not a clerical hierarchy. Herwegen instigated liturgical conferences and began a year-book, "Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenshaft", in 1921. In 1928 appeared two works by Herwegen, "Kirche und Seele" and "Christliche Kunst und Mysterium". In 1931 he founded the Institute of Liturgical and Monastic Studies at Maria Laach. His main concern was to get away from the romantic subjective notion that the liturgy is meant for individuals, and he took as his model the objective, corporate worship of the early Fathers. Dom Odo Casel (1886-1948) was a gifted and original thinker. He it was who first examined the theological and liturgical problems in real depth. His book, "Das Christliche Kultmysterium" of 1932 caused some controversy when it first appeared. In it he propounded a "mystery-theology". In his view, the Eucharist is a re-enactment of the mysteries of Christ. The saving acts of Christ in history are in the liturgy made present and real, so that the faithful re-enact them with Christ and so share in the fruits of redemption. The process is not a subjective, psychological experience, but an objective, ontological activity.

The work of Maria Laach was scholarly and perhaps somewhat erudite and even esoteric. Pius Parsch of Klosterneuburg in Austria, basing his renewal on the principles of Maria Laach, was concerned with communicating the fact that the liturgy is Volksliturgie, "people-liturgy", and is to do with the man and woman in the pew. At the parish of St. Gertrude in Klosterneuburg he set up evening services of bible reading and prayer. Celebrations of the Eucharist were a community act as well as being a sacrificial ritual. The bible was given more attention than it had received for centuries, so that in the words of Davies, "The Bible itself came alive for many thousands of Catholics perhaps for the first time since the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and in the true context of the Liturgy".[2]

[1] "The Renewal of Worship" p. 3 [2] "Worship and Theology" p. 29

In 1943 the Centre de Pastorale Liturgique (C.P.L.) was founded by two Dominicans, Fr. Duployé and Fr. Roguet, with Canon Martimort. Its aim was to organise liturgical conferences and to promote liturgical study through literature and such periodicals as "La Maison-Dieu".

France has also produced a number of liturgical scholars who have contributed to the renewal of worship: Henri de Lubac ("Corpus Mysticum" 1944), Jean Daniélou, P. Doncoeur, Eugène Masure ("The Christian Sacrifice" 1944), L. Duchesne ("Christian Worship" 1903), P Battifol and Louis Bouyer. Of all these scholars perhaps Bouyer is pre-eminent. In 1947 in his book "The Paschal Mystery" Bouyer explained how the Church relives the events of Good Friday, Holy Saturday and Easter Day through the liturgy, and in a later work ("Life and Liturgy" in 1956) he took these ideas further. He contrasts the authentic liturgy with the Baroque liturgy which had modelled itself on the pomp and etiquette of sixteenth and seventeenth century court life. The liturgy of this period had been, says Bouyer, a spectacle to be admired from afar, with the central feature of the Solemn Exposition of the Host. The Romantic reaction of Guéranger was a protest at the superficialities of the Baroque which he thought fit to replace by the Gothic, preserving all the bad features and such sentimental ideas as the miracle of consecration producing the physical presence of Christ, rather than recovering the true meaning of the liturgical action as being a communal participation. The Church, says Bouyer, is a continuation of the Jewish Qahal. It is the ecclesia called together by the Word made flesh. "The Liturgy in its unity and in its perfection is to be seen as the meeting of God's people called together in convocation by God's word through the apostolic ministry, in order that the People, consciously united together, may hear God's Word itself in Christ, may adhere to that Word by means of the prayer and praise amid which the Word is proclaimed, and so seal by the Eucharistic sacrifice the Covenant which is accomplished by that same Word".[1] The primary importance of the liturgy lies in revelation, not in communication of abstract dogmas. In the ecclesia called by God through Christ, all participate, and there can be no dichotomy between inner devotion and outward rite. True renewal of the liturgy is neither slavish imitation of the past or the use of passing fashions and novelties. The Protestants had

[1] "Life and Liturgy" p. 29

worked with as many false preconceptions as their opponents, and neither had fully understood the nature of the primitive liturgy. Only the Anglican Caroline Divines in Bouyer's view seem to have grasped the errors of both Catholicism and Protestantism. They alone sppreciated the role of authority and tradition as well as the common participation of all in the worship of the Church. Whenever the Church celebrates the liturgy there are, according to Bouyer, at least four irreducible elements: Communion or Koinonia, Sacrifice, Thanksgiving, and Memorial or Anamnesis. These four elements are brought together in the Mystery of the Sacrament. In the concluding chapters of "Life and Liturgy" Bouyer traces the Eucharist back to its Jewish origins. The Missa Catechumenorum is directly descended from the synagogue service of readings, prayers and psalms. The Eucharist itself is a descendant of the Jewish prayers of thanksgiving and benediction (the verb barak meaning both "to bless" and "to thank"), and from the Jewish meal-liturgy. The Christian anaphora or eucharistic prayer is a single unity of praise and thanksgiving, not a series of separate prayers as in the 1570 Missal.

Nine years before Bouyer's important "Life and Liturgy", the Liturgical Movement had received official recognition by the Vatican in Pope Pius XII's "Mediator Dei et Hominum" of 1947, which is commonly said to be the charter of the Movement. The Pope commended the revival of liturgical study and devotion which had been slowly gaining popularity in the Church, but he warned against any unauthorised innovations. "The sacred liturgy...is the public worship which our Redeemer, the Head of the Church, offers to the heavenly Father and which the community of Christ's faithful pays to its Founder, and through him to the Eternal Father; briefly it is the whole public worship of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, Head and members". Worship, then, is corporate participation, both objective and subjective, of the whole Church. The faithful should be able to take part easily in the mass, through joining in prayers and responses. This gave sanction to what was to be called the "Dialogue Mass". The language of the liturgy was to remain Latin ("a sign of unity and an effective safeguard against the corruption of true doctrine"), though a limited use of the vernacular was conceded.

In 1951 papal authorisation was given to the restoration of the Paschal Vigil. The Easter ceremonies had through the Middle Ages ceased to be a true night vigil and become a service conducted in daylight. This was rectified by Pius XII who later, in 1955, reformed the rest of the Holy Week liturgy, so that more intelligent participation became possible. In his encyclical,

"De Musica Sacra" Pius allowed a simplification of the rubrics and permitted greater participation. His Apostolic Constitution "Christus Dominus" of 1953 relaxed the discipline regarding the Eucharistic Fast and his motu proprio "Sacram Communionem" of 1957 sanctioned evening masses (this for the benefit of shift workers etc.).

The first International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy which assembled in Assisi in 1956 marks the next important stage in the growth of the Liturgical Movement. The Pope, in an address to the Congress, referred to the Eucharist as both "sacrifice" and "Meal". By now Roman Catholics were getting used to seeing their priests celebrating the mass facing towards them versus populum at a central free-standing altar. The Mass was increasingly seen as a communal meal rather than simply a ritual sacrifice performed by the priest on behalf of the people. The Assisi Congress stressed also the role of preaching and the reading of scripture in the eucharist. The priest is to be seen from now onwards as a minister both of word and sacrament and the Church is now to encourage and stimulate the study of the Bible. (The new "La Bible de Jérusalem", the work of the Dominican École Biblique in 1956 showed that biblical studies were developing well in the Roman Communion). Preaching cannot be underestimated, it was said, because it is the proclamation of God's living Word, and the people need the illumination and exposition of the preacher to apprehend this Word of God. In 1958 the vernacular reading of the scriptures was permitted.

When Pope John XXIII conceived the idea of an Ecumenical Council in 1959, the ground had been well prepared for a complete overhauling of the Church's liturgy. Liturgical reform was the first topic to be discussed by the Council from October 22 to November 13 1962. Most of the debate was taken up with discussion on the use of the vernacular in church services. (Pope Pius IX had actually refused the use of the vernacular in 1857). Some wanted the liturgy to be translated into local languages straight away while others stressed the retention of Latin as a universal tongue and a means of preserving sound doctrine. The question of communion in both kinds came up and many opinions were aired. The schema was accepted by 2,162 votes to 46, and after amendments was finally promulgated on December 4 1963 as the "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy".

Louis Bouyer in his "The Liturgy Revived" of 1965 summarises the teaching of the Council under five points. First, the liturgy is the embodiment of the great Paschal Mystery, second, this Mystery is the Mystery of Worship,

third, the liturgical Mystery is the Mystery of the Church, fourth, the liturgy is the summit towards which all missionary activity leads, and finally the liturgy, though an objective gift from God requires the subjective response of man.

The first chapter of the Constitution deals with the General Principles to be employed in the Restoration and Promotion of the Sacred Liturgy. The Liturgy is considered as the exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ. "In the liturgy the sanctification of man is manifested by signs perceptible to the senses, and is effected in a way which is proper to each of these signs; in the liturgy full public worship is performed by the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, that is, by the Head and his Members", (sect. 7). Before men can come to the liturgy they must be converted by preaching (sect. 9). They must be properly disposed and it is the duty of pastors to ensure that the faithful take part "Knowingly, actively, and fruitfully", (sect. 11). By reason of their baptism Christians have a right and a duty to be active participants in the liturgy (sect. 14), and clergy and people must receive instruction to that end. Some elements of the liturgy can be changed by the authority of the Church (sect. 21-23). Scripture is to be promoted (sect. 24). The Eucharist must whenever possible be a communal celebration (sect. 27) with everyone taking an active role (sect. 29-31). In order that the liturgy should be plainly for edification, the rites are to be short and simple (sect. 34). Sermons should be based on the scriptures (sect. 35). While Latin remains the official language of the Church and the liturgy, local bishops are given some responsibility to allow the vernacular on occasions (sect. 36). No rigid uniformity is laid down (sect. 37) and local variations to the liturgy are permitted (sect. 38). Bishops are to set up commissions of liturgists to help and advise them (sect. 44).

Chapter Two entitled "The Most Sacred Mystery of the Eucharist" urges active participation of all so that all are drawn closer to God and to each other (sect. 48). Rites are to be simplified and some elements discarded and some restored in accordance with the primitive norm (sect. 50). "The treasures of the bible are to be opened up so that richer fare may be provided for the faithful at the table of God's word", (sect. 51). The homily is not to be omitted and is to be highly esteemed (sect. 52). On Sundays and feast days the "Prayer of the Faithful" is to be restored after the Gospel and homily (sect. 53). The vernacular is to be used whenever possible (sect. 54). Communion in both kinds may be given at the discretion of the bishop (sect.55).

The two parts of the liturgy, the word and the sacrament, are to be closely connected (sect. 56). Concelebration symbolising the unity of the ordained priesthood is revived for special occasions (sect. 57/58).

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy contains (according to H. Ellsworth Chandlee writing in "A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship"), "what is probably one of the best and clearest statements of the theology of the liturgy, its meaning and its function in the life of the church which has yet been made, a statement which is in its approach thoroughly biblical, patristic and eirenical. At the same time it is a statement which exhibits an intense pastoral awareness of and concern for the needs of the church and its mission in the present-day world." The document displays also the five factors of the Liturgical Movement summarised by Benoit in "Liturgical Renewal" (pp. 108-112):

1. A new understanding of the role of the scriptures as basic to the liturgy, which has resulted in orderly systematic readings and biblical preaching with less emphasis on the legendary lives of the saints.
2. A renewed understanding of the nature of the church as a community of brethren as the Body of Christ. Through the liturgy, the prayer of the community, men are welded together in the same adoration, praise and proclamation of the faith. The liturgy is not the prayer of individuals but the prayer of the Church.
3. Worship is joyful, with a festive character.
4. A reaction against a "sentimental anthropocentric egotism" and a return to the objective setting forth of the glory of God.
5. A recognised need for truth and reality in worship which is authentic and meaningful, and not a "sphere reserved for archeologists and scholars, or a playground for aesthetes, or mere ceremonial and nothing more".

The second Vatican Council was solemnly closed on December 8 1965, but the work of revision began in earnest before this date and continued long after. The Instruction "Inter Oemenici" appeared on September 26 1964. Its main thrust is summed up by Fr. Peter Coughlan under two heads: intelligibility and participation. The Instruction gave certain practical instructions. Incensation was to be simplified and the celebrant is no longer to recite privately the congregational parts. The Canon is to be said aloud. Psalm 42 at the beginning and the Last Gospel at the end of the mass have disappeared. The lessons are to be said or sung facing the people. The Prayer of the Faithful is to take place before the Offertory. The vernacular may be used for the lessons, the bidding prayers, the Ordinary of the Mass, the responses and the Our Father. Permission is now granted for free-standing altars which should occupy a

central and focal point in the church building. The celebrant is to occupy the position of president over the congregation.

In March 1965 the Congregation of Rites provided for communion in both kinds in certain circumstances and the practice of concelebration was introduced.

In September of the same year, Pope Paul issued his encyclical, "Mysterium Fidei", concerning the "Doctrine and Worship of the Holy Eucharist". The speed of liturgical revision had been so rapid and sometimes so erratic in some quarters that the Pope decided to issue a note of caution. A warning is given in this encyclical against writers who are likely to mislead the faithful in such matters as transubstantiation, private masses and eucharistic worship. It is wrong says the Pope for "community masses" to be exalted to the detriment of private masses which are still valid. Transubstantiation means more than mere "trans-signification" or "trans-finalisation". Describing the eucharist as the "Mystery of Faith", the encyclical underlines the traditional doctrine of the mass as the continual calling to mind of the sacrifice of the cross. Every mass, whether public or private, is the act of Christ and his Church. The cult of the Blessed Sacrament whereby the church pays its devotion to Christ present in the consecrated elements must be preserved.

By the end of 1965 the stage had been set for what was to be the greatest event in the history of the Liturgical Movement, the publication of the new Roman Missal.

## Chapter 2 The Church of England

In the words of R.C.D. Jasper, "in the Church of England one can see in the second generation of Tractarians the precursors of the Liturgical Movement."[1]

From the 1840's onwards the performace of worship became a central issue of debate with the heirs of the Oxford Movement. Changes were introduced in ritual and ceremonial which produced a violent reaction from certain sections of the Church of England. Such figures as W.J.E. Bennett (1804-1886) vicar of St. Paul's Knightsbridge and St. Barnabas's Pimlico, C.F. Lowder (1820-1880) vicar of St. Peter's London Docks, W.J. Butler (1818-1894) vicar of Wantage and A.H. Mackonochie (1825-1887) of St. Alban's Holborn led a new generation of Anglo-Catholics who came to be known as "Ritualists". They introduced into their church services practices and vesture then unknown and unfamiliar in the Church of England. They made use of lighted candles, surplices, vestments, incense and the mixed chalice. They stood facing East to celebrate the liturgy and reserved the Blessed Sacrament. Ceremonial customs such as the elevation of the Host, genuflexions, performing the manual acts out of sight of the congregation, making the sign of the cross and taking the ablutions before the end of the service (or "tarping" as it came to be called), were borrowed from current Roman Catholic practice and attached to the Prayer Book liturgy to the great consternation of Anglicans who believed the Church of England to be Protestant rather than Catholic. Controversy increased to violent proportions, and in 1860 the English Church Union was created to defend and campaign for High Church principles. In 1865 the Church Association was formed to maintain Protestant ideals in worship and doctrine, and in 1873 the evangelical Lord Ebury produced his "Book of Common Prayer Revised". The Public Worship Act of 1874 which attempted to regulate the customs and ritual which had seemed to have gone beyond the rule of law was largely ineffective. Anyone found guilty of performing practices not expressly permitted in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer was now subject to the possibility of imprisonment. In 1888 Edward King (1829-1910) the highly respected Bishop of Lincoln was brought to court by the Church Association. The famous "Lincoln Judgement" of 1890 ruled that the bishop was guilty of using a mixed chalice, of doing "invisible" manual acts, of making the sign of the cross, but he was acquitted on four other charges of facing East at the altar, permitting the Agnus Dei, taking the ablutions in the sanctuary and having candles on the altar. King accepted the ruling and verdict but as J.R.H. Moorman points out in his

[1] "The Renewal of Worship" P. 4

"History of the Church in England", "The Lincoln Judgement in no way checked the career of the ritualists, many of whom were far in advance of the bishop". Many clergy were now growing more and more dissatisfied with the Prayer Book orders of worship and were taking to using not only the Roman ritual but the Roman Missal itself, either in part or in toto. The "English Missal" of 1912 met a need by providing the two orders of 1662 and the Missale Romanum under one cover. Those who were determined to remain loyal to the Anglican customs (the "Moderates") popularised the "English Use". They despised the trend of "Romanisation". A leading light of this school was Percy Dearmer (1867-1936) who advocated a kind of neo-Gothic ceremonial which is supposed to have been in use during the reign of Edward VI. Both in his "Parson's Handbook" of 1899 and in his work at St. Mary's Primrose Hill, he introduced "riddel posts" around the altar, "full" vestments and plain chant. The Warham Guild carried on where Dearmer had left off, though they were often criticised for perpetuation of what was nick-named "British Museum Religion". Those who were more extreme in their ceremonial formed the Society of Ss. Peter and Paul, which did its best to encourage Baroque styles of Catholicism with montrances, tabernacles, and "fiddle-back" vestments in emulation of Italian theatrical and ceremonial practice.

The ritualism of the late nineteenth century can be easily seen as a parallel movement to the early liturgical work at Solesmes. Like Solesmes, English ritualism suffered from excessive antiquarianism and Romanticism having little scientific liturgical foundations. But the ritualists have their defenders, and Massey Shepherd commends them for "breaking the rigid uniformity of Anglican worship that had bound it for over two centuries, and thus opened to Anglicans both a more just appreciation of the comprehensiveness of their own tradition, and a wider experience of the fulness of Christian worship. It helped to open the eyes of Anglicans to the needs of 'all sorts and conditions of men', who were repelled by the arid, overly intellectualised and formalised use of the Prayer Book... Ritualism also fostered a new interest in the study of liturgiology".[1] Colin Dunlop in his book "Anglican Public Worship" defends the renewal of ceremonial even more strongly, "Doctrine and authority were the roots from which ceremonial revived: it had little to do with antiquarian aestheticism. Ceremonial tradition sprang inevitably to new life under the influence of an awakened sense of doctrinal tradition." It is certain that the ritualists were right

[1] "The Liturgical Renewal of the Church" p. 46

in stressing the need for ceremonial, against which the Puritan wing of the Church has been too strongly opposed. Ceremonial was felt by the ritualists to be a valuable asset adding dignity and splendour to what otherwise might be drab, "wordy" and rationalistic, and they had a point. Worship which had the interesting and novel features of colourful ritual and ceremonial appealed to many poor and illiterate parishioners of the slums where the cold formality of nineteenth century Church of England worship had failed so lamentably. The achievements of the ritualists are summarised by Alec Vidler: "The Oxford movement had brought to life the idea of the church as a sacred mystery, a holy fellowship, and in particular the seriousness and solemnity of its worship and sacramental ordinances... It must be emphasised that Ritualism was not merely a matter of external rites and ceremonies. It was felt to symbolize and safeguard deep doctrinal convictions, especially about the presence of Christ in the eucharist. The strength of Ritualism lay in its devout sacramentalism and its encouragement of a disciplined and winning spirituality that seemed to be lacking in ordinary, conventional Anglicanism." [1]

In 1904 a Royal Commission was appointed to consider ways to tackle the liturgical divergences afresh. After two years a report was issued with 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." Second, "The machinery for discipline has broken down." The Commission made recommendation that the Convocations should consider amendments to the Church's law on worship and that there should be new Ecclesiastical Courts. The aim was still that of regulating and limiting what were considered to be customs and practices alien to the ethos of the Anglican Church, while giving maximum freedom to pursue genuine styles of worshipping.

The result of the Commission was the beginning of Prayer Book revision virtually for the first time since 1662.

In 1911 W.H. Frere (1863-1938) a learned liturgical scholar from Mirfield published his "Some Principles of Liturgical Reform" in which he suggested the restoration of the psalms as a gradual in the Holy Communion service and a reordered Canon (in the sequence: Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus, Consecration Prayer, Prayer of Oblation, with the Prayer of Humble Access before the Sursum Corda and the Lord's Prayer after the Prayer of Oblation). Frere's argument for so rearranging the Canon was that the present 1662 order "is doing harm and hindering worship" because the isolated words of institution narrow down the act of consecration to those words alone, making

[1] "The Church in an Age of Revolution"pp. 158, 160

the Consecration "more Roman than Rome". Frere and another liturgical scholar, F.E. Brightman, with several others were formed into an Advisory Committee to deal with rubrical and liturgical questions referred to it by the Upper House of Convocation, which with the Lower House spent some time before and during the First World War discussing the revision of the eucharist. By 1919 an order of Communion was agreed upon by the Convocations. The Prayer of Humble Access followed the Comfortable Words, the Lord's Prayer followed the Canon, an anamnesis and epiclesis (composed by Frere and Drury) were inserted after the words of institution, and the Prayer of Oblation was to follow after communion as in 1662. In 1922 the House of Bishops introduced the "Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use)" Measure into the Assembly and for two years debate was conducted mostly on party lines. Three rival proposals were circulated by the Anglo-Catholics (who advocated the "Western Rite"), and more liberal Modernists and the moderate Anglo-Catholics (Frere was one) who were attempting a "broader" liturgy. The Evangelicals were content with 1662 and offered no alternatives.

From 1925 to 1927 large numbers of proposals were canvassed until the revised Prayer Book was ready for Parliament. The Evangelical wing was opposed to anything which suggested that the practice of eucharistic reservation was permissible. The Anglo-Catholic wing would tolerate no restrictions on reservation and held strong objections to any hint of consecration by epiclesis instead of by the words "This is my body...". The "Deposited Book" (as it was called) received some support from Frere and he welcomed the now primitive-style Canon.

After its defeat in the Commons (by 238 votes to 205), the new Prayer Book was amended by the bishops and resubmitted, but it was again rejected.

The 1928 Eucharist followed the pattern of the Scottish Books of 1764 and 1637 which had "descended" from the Prayer Book of 1549. Its basic structure was marked out by sub-headings: Introduction, Ministry of the Word, Offertory, Intercessions, Preparation, Consecration, Communion, Thanksgiving. In the Introduction a choice is given of the Decalogue, the Summary of the Law, and the Kyries in English or in Greek. The Collect for the Sovereign is omitted. The words, "The Lord be with you...And with thy spirit" (the saluatation) introduce the collect of the day. No gradual is presecribed. The Intercession (in the 1662 position) is enlarged. In the Preparation a shorter Confession and Absolution are permitted, borrowed from the office of Compline.

The Prayer of Humble Access comes after the Comfortable Words and before the Consecration (as agreed in 1919). The Salutation precedes the Sursum Corda, (omitted in 1552) and the Benedictus may follow the Sanctus. Extra "Proper Prefaces" are given. After the words of institution (which are accompanied by manual acts), follow the anamnesis from 1549 (slightly altered) setting forth the gifts but no offering them, and the Prayer of Oblation. The epiclesis is worded: "Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ...". The Lord's Prayer comes before the communion and the Peace (as in 1549). There is no separate Fraction. The Thanksgiving after communion includes a post-communion prayer and the Gloria (as in 1552) and a final blessing. For additional, supplementary consecration, the words of institution are directed to be said, with the epiclesis following.

In the words of G.J. Cuming in "A History of Anglican Liturgy", "The 1928 Canon was a compromise that pleased nobody". The Evangelicals could not accept any offering of our lives until after communion (as in 1552) and Anglo-Catholics were so wedded to the idea of the moment of consecration at the words of institution that they could not accept an integrated canon with an epiclesis.

Neither of the Archbishops showed much enthusiasm for the 1928 Book as a whole, and although it was eventually authorised (without the Royal Assent) it never gained much popularity with clergy or people.

The 1928 Prayer Book has been described as "moderate, scholarly and uninspired", (Stephen Neil)[1]. Gregory Dix criticised the bishops who had little knowledge of the theological and historical issues involved in the production of a new liturgy. It was theology, though, rather than liturgical matters which had the upper hand in the construction and planning of the new Book and it was theology which was its downfall, everything revolving around the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, (the two issues which had loomed large in the Archbishops's Doctrine Report of 1922).

Anglican theology of this period is well represented by Oliver Quick. His book, "The Christian Sacraments" of 1927 attempted some sort of synthesis between the opposing theologies of the eucharist. He believed that the eucharist is not merely a symbol of grace, it is an "instrument whereby God's power operates upon us, not solely through the medium of a meaning apprehended by our minds."[2] The eucharist conveys Grace ex opere operato

[1] "Anglicanism" p. 396 [2] op. cit. p. 216

in an action that requires self-sacrifice. "The Eucharist is truly a sacrifice".[1] "In the Eucharist Christ's people are enabled to offer Christ Himself as their sacrifice".[2] This act of sacrifice is not offered apart from man, it is the self-offering of the worshipping body, and it is the self-offering of the Christian life of service. Quick's understanding of the Real Presence is that the consecrated elements are not to be seen as localising the presence of Christ in material and impersonal objects. His view is that the eucharistic presence is a dynamic rather than a static presence closely linked with the eucharistic offering. Quick cannot deny the objectivity of the Real Presence which is a safeguard against subjectivity and Receptionism, and cannot accept any theory which treats the sacrament as merely a symbolic act rather than an objective means of grace.[3]

Attempts to discuss these controversial doctrines continued throughout the 1930's. Evelyn Underhill's "Worship", now a classic, came out in 1936. She saw Anglican worship in a wide context as expressing the "peculiar religious temper of the English soul" uniting Catholic and Protestant in a balance of sacramental objectivity and prophetic subjectivity. The Report, "Doctrine in the Church of England" which appeared in the following year (1937) attempted in like manner a comprehensive understanding of the Eucharist. The eucharistic sacrifice was seen in terms of 1. the union of worshippers in communion in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and of ourselves, our souls and our bodies, 2. the repetition of the words and acts of Christ at the Last Supper, 3. the ritual representation before the Father of the actual sacrifice of the cross, 4. the joining of worshippers in the perpetual offering of Christ at the Heavenly Altar. Whilst some Anglicans would want to demur at some of the four aspects of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as presented here, the Report considered them all to be legitimate Anglican doctrines and the theologians were in full agreement in holding that the Eucharist may be rightly termed a sacrifice, formally defined as "an act in which man worships God, the form of the act being an expression of the homage due from the creature to the creator" in which "we do not offer Christ, but where Christ unites us with Himself in the self-offering of the life that was obedient unto death, yea the death of the cross".[4]

[1] op. cit. p. 197 [2] op. cit. p. 197 [3] these issues are considered in greater depth in Part III [4] op. cit. p. 162

The publication of Gabriel Hebert's "Liturgy and Society" in 1935 was the next landmark in the progress of liturgical and theological renewal in the Church of England. The book was the first to publicize the aims and objects of the Liturgical Movement in an Anglican setting. "The liturgy," writes A.M. Ramsey in "From Gore to Temple","was now seen less exclusively in the doctrinal categories of presence and sacrifice, and more comprehensively as the whole mystery of Christ recapitulated in the rite. Within the liturgy the divine action in consecration, sacrifice and communion was seen to be joined with the ministry of the divine word in Scripture and sermon. Together, Biblical and liturgical revival has brought a greater unity within the Church of England."[1]

"Liturgy and Society" was a break-through into a more pastoral and less theological and academic treatment of the liturgy. Hebert wrote with three aims:

1. To show that the Church is the organic society called the Body of Christ, and not merely an organisation of individuals or an institution with a quasi-legal claim to validity. The Body of Christ, the Church, has as its main act of worship the Sunday Eucharist which is not a devotional service for the inner circle of the faithful (at the early morning service) nor a mid-morning act of worship with no communicants.

2. To make a constructive criticism of modern "Liberalism".

3. To proclaim the Church to the modern world and the gospel truth of salvation for all.

Hebert began with the notion that the role of Christianity in not to provide a pastime, but to provide a faith to live by. Religion is not assent to a theological system nor a way of individual personal holiness. Hebert goes on to bring out the true understanding of the liturgy as a social activity and an act of common worship. The practical implications of Hebert's theory (if that is the right word) came to centre on what was in time called the "Parish Communion". The Anglican custom of worship at most churches for some time had been an early service of Holy Communion at 8 a.m. every Sunday. This was followed at a later hour by a sung service of Mattins or Eucharist. The atmosphere at the early service was devotional and quiet. The later service was more an act of public formal worship, and only the priest communicated (if it happened to be a High Mass). Cranmer and the later compilers of the Book of Common Prayer had envisaged weekly communion, but the eighteenth

[1] op. cit. p. 144

and early nineteenth century Church was content with monthly communion, the usual pattern of Anglican worship being: Mattins, Litany and Ante-Communion. Since about 1860 the 8 a.m. and 11 a.m. pattern asserted itself, so dividing the Church's worship into two. The Parish Communion movement aimed at reuniting the two halves into one act of public worship in which all could participate and all could communicate. No longer was communion to be thought of as an individual's act of piety and no longer could the High Mass be a service for spectators rather than true worshippers. Hebert suggested one Parish Communion at 9 a.m. or 9.30 a.m. (thus safeguarding the fast before communion which most people took very seriously).

In a book of essays entitled, "The Parish Communion", first printed in 1937, a group of writers went more deeply into the theology of the Parish Communion. The Church as the new Israel, the Body of Christ, should worship as one, everyone present being a part of the one body. The Offertory is a dramatic symbol of the offering of the people and their self-dedication to God.

Slowly but surely the movement to introduce the Parish Communion gained momentum, though the conservatism of the Church and the failure to grasp the theology "behind it" meant that there was some adverse criticism. The Parish and People organisation was started in 1949 to promote the Parish Communion among all shades of Churchmanship. As a whole, the conservative Evangelicals proved the most reluctant to change.

Every reform in the Church has its dangers, and it was Michael Ramsey who pointed to the danger of interpreting the Offertory and Offertory Procession in a way which comes close to Pelagianism. This was a real possibility if the offering of the people was to be seen apart from the offering of Christ himself. Other dangers of seeing participation as merely doing things together instead of the result of a real sense of corporate fellowship and of treating the sermon as a brief five-minute chat were mentioned by Ramsey.

The ethos of the Parish Communion was new to the Church of England and it took many people some time to grow accustomed to it. (Some, especially those "on the fringe" have yet to come to terms with it and can only worship in a non-eucharistic setting, such as the so-called "Family Service"). Many missed the atmosphere of awe and numinosity of the older services and took a while to accept the nave altar, westward celebrations and the noises of young children which accompanied the Parish Communion.

In 1945 another work of scholarship appeared which was to prove very influential and significant in the work of liturgical renewal. Dom. Gregory Dix's "The Shape of the Liturgy" was a study in the structure of the liturgy. He believed that underlying the diverse rites of Christendom could be found a single structure or "shape" which had first existed in the semi-Jewish

Apostolic Church and was later modified and overlaid by additional features and accretions. Dix's main contribution to liturgical revision was the insight that the liturgy is action rather than a recital of words and that the action is essentially the four-fold actions of:

1. The Offertory in which bread and wine are "taken" and placed on the holy table.

2. The Prayer in which the president gives thanks to God over the bread and the wine.

3. The Fraction in which the bread is broken.

4. The Communion in which the bread and wine are distributed and consumed,[1]

The Offertory Dix believed was the primitive custom of bringing bread, wine and other gifts to be placed on the table. The prayer of thanksgiving he traced to the Jewish berakah. The Fraction he saw as part of the very first Christian eucharistic gatherings (1 Cor. 10. 16/17). The Communion was THE act of koinonia. The four elements had been an integral part of the chaburah supper Jesus had shared with his disciples when he took bread and wine, blessed them, broke the bread, and shared them with his disciples. The central prayer, the Thanksgiving was from earliest times a free and ex tempore composition by the celebrant who was always the local bishop. The Great Prayer contained in essence, thanksgiving for creation, the incarnation and redemption through Christ, the reasons for Christ's institution of the Eucharist, the words of institution (the "pivot" of the prayer), the offering of the elements, a prayer for the effects of communion and a final doxology. Dix saw in Hippolytus the model and type of all eucharistic prayers.

The eucharist is, said Dix, an action. It is done for Christ's anamensis which he interprets as "re-calling or re-presenting before God an event in the past, so that it becomes here and now operative by its effects",[2] and so "the whole rite 're-calls' or 're-presents' before God not the last supper, but the sacrifice of Christ in his death and resurrection; and it makes this 'present' and operative by its effects in the communicants."[3]

The primitive eucharist was both corporate and eschatological. Later, in the medieval and post-Reformation periods, the sacrament was treated less as a source of unity in Christ and more as a focus for personal and individual adoration or (in Protestantism) as a source of personal nourishment and edification. As far as eschatology is concerned, "the eucharist is the contact of time with the eternal fact of the Kingdom of God through Jesus.

1 op. cit. p. 48 2 op. cit. p. 161 3 op. cit. p. 162

In it the church within time continually, as it were, enters into its own eternal being in that Kingdom, 'in Him', as Body of Christ, through His act". [1] This aspect has over the centuries lost its original force.

The Eucharist, says Dix, contained an act of consecration which only from the fourth century was restricted to a specific moment in time, either at the words of institution or (in the East) at the epiclesis when the Spirit was invoked upon the elements.

The primitive shape of the eucharist also went awry in the course of Christian history. By the time of the Reformation the laity had grown used to seeing or hearing the liturgy, and the theological emphasis rested on the conversion of the elements at the consecration and the propitiatory nature of each mass. Objective, corporate participation had been replaced by subjective, individual devotion, and this continued to colour the revised liturgies of the Reformers many of whom, according to Dix, saw the eucharist as a solemn reminder of the passion and atonement evoking feelings of love and gratitude in the hearts and minds of the worshippers, the sacrament having, as it were, merely a psychological effect. In the aims of the Reformers, the desire for edification was primary, but the clergy still acted for the laity who merely looked and listened even though they were now encouraged to receive communion and the services were now in the vernacular. The notion of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was an important to the Reformers as it was to their opponents, but the eucharist had now become a reminder, a "mental recollection", and nothing more, of the cross and the Saviour's death. All hints of "consecration" were deftly eliminated in favour of the spiritual feeding upon the tokens of the presence of Christ. Any reference to sacrifice was now of self-sacrifice of "our souls and bodies".

The influence of Dom Gregory Dix has been immense in the field of liturgical revision. Above all, his theory of the four-action shape of the eucharist has been taken for granted in almost all subsequent revisions of the liturgy. That is not to imply that there have been no critics of his work. B.A, Mastin has recently for example questioned his explanation of the first of the four acts, the "taking", and has asked whether Dix did not lay too much stress upon it and make an unjustified conclusion that it is the germ of the later Offertory. "There is no hint in the New Testament that the taking of bread and wine by Jesus should be given the sort of interpretation which is now

[1] op. cit. p. 265

in vogue, and if the presence of lambanein in the narratives of the Institution of the Eucharist reflects the way in which the Jews said grace, and, further, if there is here an idiomatic usage known both in Semitic languages and in Greek, there is every reason to suppose that it means nothing of the kind... The accounts of the Institution of the Eucharist do not provide a pattern which is normative for later Christian practice in the way which is frequently supposed..."[1] Jeremias has also concluded in his study, "The Eucharistic Words of Jesus", that the taking of the elements in the narrative of the institution was not a separate act but a reference to the slight elevation of bread and wine as the blessing was being said. Other more recent scholars (such as for example Colin Buchanan) have pointed out the fallacy of equating the "taking" with the "Offertory".[2]

The first rite to show the influence of Dix's thesis was that of the Church of South India which was published in 1950. This rite is basically three-fold in structure comprising three sections: The Preparation, the Ministry of the Word of God and the Breaking of the Bread. The latter consists of the Peace, the Offertory (with a special prayer), the Eucharistic Prayer (untitled as such), the breaking of the bread and the communion. The manual acts of "taking" the elements during the Eucharistic Prayer is prescribed in the rubrics in the introduction to the service, (pace Buchanan op. cit. p. 33).

In the 1950's churches and colleges followed in the steps of Gregory Dix by re-interpreting the 1662 or 1928 liturgy along the lines of "liturgy as action" rather than as a priestly monologue. The experimentation that was carried out in Clare College Cambridge is chronicled in J.A.T. Robinson's "Liturgy Coming to Life" (1960). Whereas the 1928 revision of the Prayer Book had concentrated on words to be said, Robinson, like Dix, wanted to concentrate on action and corporate activity. Liturgy has to be seen now as an activity rooted in daily life and not isolated from it. The liturgy being the creative centre of Christian life, the task of evangelism began in Holy Communion, and so also did social concern and action. Though Robinson was working with the rite of 1662, the structure of Word and Sacrament (Synaxis and Eucharist) is brought out as two distinct actions, the first centred on lecturn and pulpit. The Eucharist proper concentrated on the four-fold action with the "taking" forming a procession from the west-end bringing up a "real" loaf of bread (not ecclesiastical wafers) and a bottle of "real" wine, to express the "trust of the secular into the heart of the sacred",[3]

[1] "Jesus said Grace" Scottish Journal of Theology Vol. 24 No. 4

[2] "The End of the Offertory" [3] op. cit. p. 62

In 1958 some attempt at revising the eucharistic rite was made by three scholars, J.G. Davies, G. Cope and D.A. Tyler. Their "Experimental Liturgy" was intended to be ecumenical. It comprised a two-fold structure of Synaxis and Eucharist. Preceding the Synaxis came the Preparation including the confession. The Ministry of the Word included collect, three lessons with psalms or canticles, sermon, creed and litany of intercession. The Ministry of the Sacrament consisted of Offertory with the Peace, the Thanksgiving Prayer, the Lord's Prayer, the Fraction, the Prayer of Humble Access, the Communion, the Post-Communion thanksgiving and a final Dismissal. An item, new to Anglicanism was the "Little Entrance", derived from the Eastern rites, comprised the carrying into Church the Bible in solemn procession. The ceremonial of the whole service is meant to emphasise the corporate nature of the liturgy and the celebrant is directed to face the people. A single loaf is to be used and people are to participate in the intercessions. The rite stressed the sacrament as memorial, thanksgiving, sacrifice, communion and a foretaste and anticipation of the "eschaton", the Messianic Banquet.

The Lambeth Conference of the same year (1958) also looked at Prayer Book revision and "The Place of the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 in the Anglican Communion". The sub-committee appointed to investigate liturgical reform reported that "no Prayer Book, not even that of 1662, can be kept unchanged for ever, as a safeguard of established doctrine". The Conference drew up lists of what constituted the Anglican tradition and ethos of worship, suggested modifications or additions to the existing liturgies for the further recovery of primitive worship, and made the following suggestions as to the revision of the eucharist:

1. The use of the Old Testament should be included in the eucharistic lections along with the epistle and gospel.

2. The use of the psalms between the three readings appropriate to the readings should be encouraged.

3. The sermon should follow the readings and the creed should follow the sermon as a response to the ministry of the Word.

4. The Gloria should be allowed to occupy its original position so that the catechumens can join in.

The Lambeth bishops optimistically believed that the old controversies of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Real Presence were now finally transcended thanks to new knowledge gained from biblical and liturgical studies.

The sacrifice of Christ, though once and for all, is not merely a past fact, "it is not only an event in history, but the revelation of eternal truth", (2.84). "We have nothing to offer that we have not first received, but we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us and so present it again and ourselves in him, before the Father... We ourselves incorporate in the mystical body of Christ are the sacrifice we offer. Christ with us offers us in himself to God." (2.84). The consecration theory which concentrated on a moment in time and a precise formula of words is now, say the bishops, transcended by biblical and primitive concepts of thanking and blessing. As far as the vexed question of the Epiclesis is concerned, whether there is an invocation of the Spirit upon the worshippers or upon the elements or both, "it is to be remembered that the Holy Spirit informs and vivifies the whole Rite and that the so-called Collect for Purity has in consequence a profound theological significance", (2.85).

The Pan-Anglican Document of February 1965, subtitled, "The Structure and Contents of the Eucharistic Liturgy" completed the work of the Lambeth fathers. It singled out five basic phases in any new eucharistic rite:

1. The Preparation, including penitential material.

2. The Service of the Word of God, including readings from Scripture and a sermon, with psalms or canticles.

3. The Great Intercession, including a litany of the Church and the World.

4. The Service of the Lord's Supper, including the placing of the gifts on the Lord's Table, the Thanksgiving to take the form of thanksgiving for creation for God's mighty acts in Christ and the mission of the Holy Spirit, a recital of the words and acts of Jesus at the Last Supper and a prayer for the communicants. The Lord's Prayer makes a fitting end to the consecration prayer. The Breaking of Bread follows and then should come the communion.

5. The Dismissal, providing a short prayer of praise and a simple dismissal, without a blessing.

The Church of England had already begun officially to consider Prayer Book revision in 1955 when the Liturgical Commission began to meet under the chairmanship of Colin Dunlop, then Dean of Lincoln. The Commission was reconstructed in 1962 and was directed to consider a radical revision of the eucharist. This became at last a real possibility after the passing of the Prayer Book (Alternative and Other Services) Measure in 1965 which came into force on May 1st 1966.

## Chapter 3 British Methodism

Methodism was from the beginning a movement within and not outside the Church of England, and it was a movement of sacramental revival. John Wesley and his brother Charles, nurtured as they were in the Caroline tradition of Anglican worship, expected the people called "Methodists" to worship and communicate in the Church of England. As A. Raymond George notes, "As a clergyman of the Church of England, he (John Wesley) faithfully observed the practices of that Church and enjoined them upon his societies, often in the teeth of a good deal of opposition. Though he had some knowledge of other forms of worship, his ideas were largely formed by his devotion to the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England." [1] The first Methodist services were intended to supplement rather than supplant the services of the parish churches, and were always held so that the times did not clash, at five in the morning or five in the afternoon. The Methodists came to feel however that this was far from satisfactory, and they became increasingly reluctant to attend their local churches which gave them such a cool reception so that in 1784 Wesley ordained preachers to administer the sacraments in the "Preaching Houses". The Plan of Pacification of 1795 permitted the Holy Communion to be celebrated in all Methodist chapels usually monthly or quarterly after the morning or evening service.

In 1784 Wesley's own liturgy, the "Sunday Service of the Methodists" appeared. This book comprised Wesley's own revision of the Book of Common Prayer with minor alterations. Most of the holy days were omitted, the word "priest" was replaced by the word "elder", the words of absolution contained the pronouns "us" rather than "you", the Nicene Creed, the exhortations and the second post-communion prayer were all omitted and before the blessing provision was made for extempore prayer. This service book remained the basic liturgy of the Methodist Church (amended in 1835 and 1882) until the Methodist Union of 1932. The Wesleyan Methodists remained faithful to John Wesley's form of service and tried to manage their liturgy in accordance with his intentions, though it seems that few may have agreed with him in some aspects of eucharistic doctrine, which was "higher" than average. He wrote, "If we consider the Lord's Supper as a command of Christ, no man can have any pretence to Christian piety, who does not receive it (not once a month) but as often as he can". [2]

[1] in "A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain" Ch. VIII

[2] in his sermon, "The Duty of Constant Communion".

He expected weekly attendance at the Lord's Supper. In 1740 he wrote, "In the ancient Church, every one who was baptised communicated daily...But in latter times many have affirmed that the Lord's Supper is not a converting, but a confirming ordinance. And among us it has been diligently taught that none but those who are converted, who have received the Holy Ghost, who are believers in the full sense, ought to communicate. But experience shows the gross falsehood of that assertion that the Lord's Supper is not a converting ordinance".[1] Wesley had a "high" regard for the Eucharist and believed that the Grace which comes in communion could convert the seeker after Christ. Communion was nearly always celebrated every Sunday when the common practice in the Church of England was Morning Prayer followed by Ante-Communion. R.E. Davies writes, "One of the most conspicuous signs of the Revival was the enormously increased attendance at Holy Communion in the Parish Church in those areas where Methodism had gained a strong foothold. Wesley did not publish any theology of the Eucharist...no doubt because he regarded the Anglican formularies as adequate."[2]

Among the non-Wesleyan Methodists who seceded from their parent body there was little sympathy with Wesley's doctrinal position. Six years after his death, in 1797, the Methodist New Connexion went its own way under Alexander Kilham (1762-1798) who contended that Methodists should be free to imitate the Apostles and celebrate the Lord's Supper as an informal meal. No official order of service was prescribed. The Bible Christians who separated themselves in 1815 allowed lay preachers both men and women to conduct the Lord's Supper, and again no written liturgy was employed though a Book of Services was issued in 1890. The "Digest" of 1872 describes a typical service of this sect: "In celebrating this solemn memorial of the death of Christ, we commence by singing and prayer; the minister gives the persons present a serious address respecting the nature of the ordinance, the benefits accruing from the Saviour's death and their obligations to devote themselves to Him. He then presents the bread and wine to each person present, occasionally offering a few suitable remarks and the service concludes with singing and prayer". The Primitive Methodist Church came into being in 1811. It was a strong evangelistic body and little attention was paid to the Holy Communion or to ways of celebrating it. Under Hugh Bourne (1772-1852), the Primitives were responsible for introducing the "Camp Meeting", the revivalist gathering of Christians for prayer and preaching. In this milieu fellowship was expressed in the Agape or Love Feast. This ceremony had already been revived by the

[1] Journal II 360-61

[2] "Methodism" p. 109

Moravians who met regularly to share a simple meal of rye bread and water. Wesley had experienced the fellowship of the Love Feast and in 1738 introduced it into the Methodist meetings. As well as being a time for sharing a meal together, these occasions were opportunities for members to testify to their Christian experience. In 1748 Wesley wrote to Vincent Perronet, Vicar of Shoreham, "In order to increase... a grateful sense of all His mercies, I desired that, one evening a quarter... we might together 'eat bread' as the ancient Christians did 'with gladness and singleness of heart'. At these Lovefeasts... our food is only a little plain cake and water. But we seldom return from them without being fed, not only with the 'meat that perisheth' but with 'that which endureth to everlasting life'." Hymns specially written for the Love Feasts by Charles Wesley were frequently sung at these gatherings.

During the nineteenth century (as Frank Baker notes) "with the growing church-consciousness of the Methodist societies, and a consequent lessening of the emphasis upon the conversion experience, as also upon the class meeting and the prayer meeting, the spiritual testimonies at the love feasts lost much of their colourful spontaneity, while the liturgical element was not by itself sufficient to retain popular adherence". [1] Both Wesleyan and non-Wesleyan streams of Methodism underwent during the nineteenth century a gradual shift away from sacramental worship towards a far greater emphasis on preaching and the preaching service. In most chapels "the Preaching Service came to stand alone as THE service of public worship," writes R.E. Davies. "The pulpit (which was often a vast rostrum) stands in the central place, often with the choir seats behind, always with the holy table below. But in those days (and until the First World War) preaching, even mediocre preaching, could hold large congregations together. So anti-liturgicalism seemed to be justified; and due place was certainly given to the Word of God". [2]

Orthodox Methodism from the time of the Wesleys had always valued Christian experience or "experimental religion" as it was called above strict adherence to institutional forms. The marks of Methodism have been described by Davies as "a religion which prefers personal converse with God to institutional forms and authority; a concern to bring the truth to simple people; a stress on holiness; a reaffirmation of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; a semi-lay Church Order; and all of this combined with orthodoxy". [3] Spontaneity was the touchstone, and fixed or written prayers

[1] article "Love Feast" in "A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship".
[2] "Methodism" p. 157 [3] op. cit. pp15/16

and liturgies were looked upon with suspicion. A minister who had to resort to set prayers and rely on fixed liturgies was likely to be accused of being insincere and lacking in real spiritual experience. Wesley himself had provided for extempore prayer in his Abridgement of the Prayer Book Services, but he had seen it as a supplement to, and not a replacement of, written and formal prayer. The "low Church" Methodists in common with many Free Churchmen however refused to be bound by the dictates of any formal liturgy which they believed to be too stifling (though somewhat ironically, the informal preaching services themselves in time gained their own inflexible pattern and format with its own stereotyped ritual), and this had the effect (as Horton Davies makes clear) of a casual and slovenly treatment of the Eucharist which became a mere appendage to the Preaching Service.

In 1907 the United Methodist Church was created from a coming together of the New Connexion, the Bible Christians and the Free Methodists. Their communion service appeared in their Book of Services of 1913. In 1932 the Methodist Union was created by the joining of the Wesleyans, the Primitives and the United Methodists. The Book of Offices of 1936 was authorised to be used throughout the newly united Methodist Church. Closer in many ways to the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 than its immediate predecessor of 1882, it also showed the influence of the Deposited Prayer Book of 1928. It provided two orders of service "For the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion". The first order follows 1662 fairly closely. The "Commandments of the Lord Jesus" are given as an alternative to the Ten Commandments, as the 1928 Prayer Book permitted the Summary of the Law. After the creed no sermon is given. Strangely this was omitted in Methodist formularies from the time of Wesley onwards. After the creed the offerings are brought to the minister. The word "Offertory" is not used. The Prayer for the Church Militant follows the 1662 prayer with only minor changes. The Absolution is in the first person. All standing, the Comfortable Words are said. After the Sursum Corda comes the Proper Preface (one for All Saints' Day is provided for the first time). The words, "Prayer of Consecration" are absent. No manual acts are to be used and the prayer is said by the minister "kneeling down at the Table". The communicants are not instructed to kneel for communion and they receive by "tables". The Lord's Prayer follows the communion (previously omitted in the book of 1882). No provision is made for the reverent disposal of the consecrated bread and wine.

The second order of the 1936 Book of Offices is by general consent not a piece of good liturgical composition. It was designed for use by non-Wesleyan

congregations who were not used to a set form of service. J.C. Bowmer makes the following observation of this order: "Many of the salient features of the pre-communion are missing. The service opens with well-chosen scripture sentences. Confession is said in the words of the fifty-first Psalm, but there is no absolution. The Comfortable Words and the Sursum Corda follow without Proper Preface, then comes a Prayer of Thanksgiving and Dedication which in the first Order (and in the Prayer Book) is a post-communion prayer. It was the placing of this prayer, often referred to as 'The Prayer of Oblation' before the Commmunion that led to much controversy in the 1928 Prayer Book discussion. Nevertheless, it is in its correct position before Communion not after. It is right that we should make the offering of ourselves before we communicate, to associate ourselves with the offering of Christ as commemorated in the Communion."[1] After the Prayer of Oblation comes the Prayer of Humble Access (in altered form to include the words, "so by faith to receive Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, that the bread which we break may be unto us the communion of His Body and the cup of blessing which we bless, may be the communion of His Blood..." which removes the stark realism of the original prayer). The words of institution follow, as a narrative and not as a prayer, without manual acts. Communion follows straight away and then two verses from Charles Wesley's hymn, "Christ the Lord is risen today" are sung. The Gloria Blessing and Grace end the service. Bowmer's final verdict on the service is as follows: "It is difficult to estimate the extent to which this second order of service is used in Methodism today. No doubt it has introduced some Churches to the use of a liturgy (as it was intended to do), but it certainly has not become a substitute for the traditional first order with its great dignity and beauty... The Book of Offices as a whole has done much to assist the cause of Methodist Union, its Communion Office as all the Offices in the Book, has full approval of the Conference, yet nowhere in Standing Orders is it laid down that it must be used. Ministers are at liberty to conduct the service in any form acceptable to the Methodist people and not untrue to Methodist tradition, but in practice they are loyal to the Book of Offices."[2]

The Methodist Sacramental Fellowship was founded a year before the Book of Offices appeared. This was a group of like-minded Methodists who formed a society to combat the irreverence and casual treatment of the Sacraments. Their concern was to reaffirm the historic faith (in opposition to the

[1] "The Lord's Supper in Methodism" pp. 45/46

[2] ibid. p. 46

fashionable humanism of the day), and to restore sacramental devotion to the Methodist Church. The members felt the need for a recovery of the rich eucharistic experience of early Methodism. At first, the Church was suspicious, and was even hostile towards the Fellowship, but attempts to suppress its work were to no avail, and it continued its work of recovering the eucharistic tradition of the Wesleys, each member dedicating himself to a life of devotion and frequent communion. Gradually the attempt was made to "raise" Methodism towards the appreciation of the Holy Communion such as is found in the long neglected eucharistic hymns of Charles Wesley.

In 1958 the Methodist Conference appointed a Commission to investigate public worship. "In too many churches," writes R.E. Davies, "the tradition of extempore prayer, which is dear to all generations of Methodists, had degenerated into the long-winded repetition of clichés, utterly remote from the needs of the people or the faith of the Church; and the friendly 'togetherness' of Methodist congregations, which is equally precious, had been made into an excuse for casualness and slovenliness".[1] The Commission's Report approved, in 1960, the two strands within the Methodist tradition of "free" informal worship, and structured liturgical worship, these being complementary and not contradictory.

At the end of his book, "The Lord's Supper in Methodism 1791-1960" Bowmer makes the following list of suggestions for future liturgical reform within the Methodist Church in Great Britain. His observations were doubtless of some influence in affecting the course of liturgical revision in the 1960's.

1. There is no need to remain wedded to the forms of 1662.

2. A revised form of Holy Communion ought to be an act of corporate worship demonstrating the offering of the whole Church.

3. There should be no fear of ceremonial such as Offertory Processions and manual acts (especially the Breaking of Bread).

4. More of John and Charles Wesley's "Hymns on the Lord's Supper" should be employed.

5. Whenever possible, the Holy Communion should be celebrated at least once a quarter with a sermon (after the Creed). It should not be treated as an appendix to another "main" service, so that Word and Sacrament can be brought together.

1 "Methodism" p. 197

6. The Common Cup should be given an honoured place (even if the individual glasses continue to be used).

7. Methodism should look at its uncritical following of the Anglican Laudian position of the Lord's Table, and consider the Basilican free-standing position.

8. There should be more teaching on the meaning of the Lord's Supper.

# PART II

## EUCHARISTIC RENEWAL FROM 1966

## Chapter 1 The Roman Catholic Church

From 1570, when the Roman, so-called "Tridentine" Mass was authorised by Pope Pius V, the Roman Catholic order of celebrating the Eucharist took the following basic form. (Alongside is set out the Mass which appeared in 1970).

| 1570 | 1970 |
|---|---|
| Mass of the Catechumens or Fore-Mass | |
| Preparation | Introductory Rites |
| | Introit |
| In nomine Patris... | In nomine Patris... |
| Psalm 42 (43). | Greeting. Informal introduction. |
| Confiteor | Penitential Rite (3 forms) or |
| | Blessing and Sprinkling |
| Absolution | Absolution |
| Versicles from Psalm 84 (85) and 101 (102). | |
| Aufer a nobis... | |
| Oramus te, Domine... | |
| Introit | |
| Kyrie Eleison (ninefold) | Kyrie Eleison (sixfold) |
| Gloria | Gloria |
| Greeting | Oremus, silent prayer. |
| Collect | Collect |
| | The Liturgy of the Word |
| | First Reading (O.T.). |
| | Responsorial Psalm |
| Epistle | Second Reading (Epistle) |
| Gradual, Alleluia, Tract | Alleluia or Acclamation |
| Munda cor... | Munda cor... |
| Greeting | Greeting |
| Gospel | Gospel |
| | Homily |
| Creed | Creed |
| | The Prayer of the Faithful |
| Mass of the Faithful | The Liturgy of the Eucharist |
| The Offertory | The Preparation of the Gifts |
| Greeting | |
| Suscipe, sancte Pater | Benedictus es, Domine... |

| 1570 | 1970 |
|---|---|
| Deus, qui humanae... | By the mystery of this water and wine |
| Offerimus tibi... | Benedictus es Domine... |
| In spiritu... | Lord God, we ask you to receive us... |
| Veni, sanctificator... | |
| Incensing of offerings, altar, priest, people | |
| Psalm 140. 2-4 | |
| Accendat in nobis... | |
| Lavabo (Psalm 25(26). 6-12) | Lord, wash away my iniquity |
| Suscipe, sancta Trinitas... | |
| Orate, fratres... | Orate, fratres... |
| Suscipiat Dominus... | Suscipiat Dominus... |
| Secret | Prayer over the Gifts |
| | The Eucharistic Prayer |
| Dialogue | Dialogue |
| Preface | Preface |
| Sanctus | Sanctus |
| Benedictus | Benedictus |
| Canon of the Mass | Eucharistic Prayer (4) |
| Te igitur | |
| Memento (of living) | |
| Communicantes | |
| Hanc Igitur | |
| Quam Oblationem | Epiclesis (first) |
| Qui Pridie | Institution narrative |
| Simili modo | |
| | Acclamations (3) |
| Unde et Memores | Anamnesis |
| Supra Quae | Epiclesis (second) |
| Supplices | |
| Memento (of dead) | Prayers for Church and departed |
| Nobis Quoque Peccatoribus | |
| Per Quem | |
| Per Ipsum | Doxology |
| | Rite of Communion |
| Pater noster (with embolism) | Pater noster (with embolism) |

| 1570 | 1970 |
|---|---|
| Breaking of Bread | |
| Pax Domini | Domine Iesu Christe, qui dixisti.. |
| Commixture | Pax Domini |
| Agnus Dei | Agnus Dei with Breaking of Bread |
| Domine Iesu Christe, qui dixisti... | Commixture |
| Kiss of Peace | |
| Domine Iesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi | Domine Iesu Christe, Fili Dei vivi |
| | or |
| Perceptio corporis | Perceptio Corporis et Sanguinis |
| | Ecce Agnus Dei |
| Domine, non sum dignus | Domine, non sum dignus |
| Priest's communion | Priest's communion |
| Quid retribuam Domino | |
| Ecce Agnus Dei | |
| Domine, non sum dignus | |
| People's communion | People's communion |
| Communion antiphon | Communion song |
| Ablutions | Ablutions |
| | Silent prayer |
| Postcommunion | Prayer after Communion |
| | <u>Concluding Rite</u> |
| | Greeting and notices |
| | Blessing or Prayer over the people |
| Ite, missa est. | Ite, missa est. |
| Placeat | |
| Blessing | |
| Last Gospel (Jn. 1.1-14) | |
| (Leonine Prayers) | |
| (Benedicite) | |

The Second Vatican Council was solemnly closed on December 8 1965. By the middle of the following year an important book appeared entitled, "The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform". The author, the liturgist Cipriano Vagaggini had set out to examine the virtues and defects of the Roman Canon, to suggest possible revisions and to produce two additional canons. The merits of the existing Roman Canon he noted as: 1. Its antiquity dating back to the second half of the fourth century. 2. Its variable Prefaces providing a rich variety missing from the fixed anaphorae of the East. 3. Its theology of the

"sacrum commercium" is given full exposition, 4. Its stylistic merits and theological precision is worthy of note, 5. Its soberness and brevity is noticeable in comparison with the superfluities of the Eastern anaphorae. The defects of the Canon he lists as 1. The impression is given of an agglomeration of features with no apparent unity, 2. The lack of any logical continuity is plainly noticeable, 3. The unsatisfactory way in which the various prayers of intercession are assembled in the Canon is noticeable in comparison with the neat way they are presented in other anaphorae, 4. An exaggerated emphasis on the idea of the offering and acceptance of the gifts makes the Canon heavily weighted in the direction of offering gifts, 5. The number and disorder of epicletic-type prayers (Te igitur, Quam oblationem, Supplices) is unsatisfactory, 6. The lack of any theology of the Holy Spirit is a grave deficiency, 7. The words "Hoc est enim corpus meum" are usually followed by the words "quod pro vobis tradetur" in other liturgies, and the words "mysterium fidei" are unbiblical and have no clear meaning, 8. There are difficulties of interpretation of the Supplices, 9. The lists of the saints are far too long and lack relevance to the modern church, 10. The lack of any general presentation of salvation history is apparent when comparing the Canon with the Eastern rites.

Vagaggini concludes his survey of the merits and defects of the Canon by asserting, "any attempt to revise the present canon merely by way of rearranging it, cutting it, or simply patching it up will inevitably lead to an awful mess". Suggestions of abbreviating the lists of saints, the elimination of the Amens in the Canon, and the limited use of the Hanc igitur receive his support but wholesale reordering of the intercessions or omitting them altogether (as Küng suggested) are not acceptable. His suggestions amount to retention of the Canon with minor modifications, an additional original Canon with a variable preface and a third Canon with a fixed preface following the Eastern models up to the "Qui pridie".

In the same year Vagaggini's book was published it was decided with the Pope's consent to draw up new eucharistic prayers and to leave the Roman Canon as Vagaggini had suggested. The work was done by the Consilium which the Pope had set up in 1963 under the presidency of Cardinal Lecaro, Archbishop of Bologna. When the first Synod of Bishops met in the autumn of 1967, the Consilium had prepared the new form of Mass, the Missa Normativa, and it was celebrated for the first time on October 24 in the Sistine Chapel. The differences were immediately obvious. There were three readings,

a shortened Offertory with no prayers anticipating the offering in the Canon, a united Canon with an altered communion to emphasise the unity of the Christian family gathered at the eucharistic table. Three additional eucharistic prayers were provided: a short one based largely on the Canon of Hippolytus, a longer canon, and another long one with a fixed preface. (A further canon based on the Liturgy of St. Basil had originally been planned but this was never presented to the Synod). After considering the new rite the Synod voted first on the principle of having three canons, and the voting figures were: 127 placet, 22 non placet, 34 placet iuxta modum. The question of whether the words "quod pro vobis tradetur" should be added to the words "Hoc est enim corpus meum" to correspond with scripture and to express the purpose of the sacrifice was agreed, the voting being: 110 placet, 12 non placet, 61 placet iuxta modum. To the suggestion that the words "mysterium fidei" be omitted from the consecration of the chalice the voting went: 93 placet, 48 non placet, 42 placet iuxta modum. an amendment suggested that these words become part of a congregational acclamation (as in the Liturgy of St. James and St. Basil). General assent was given to the Penitential Rite at the beginning of the Mass and to the provision of three scripture readings, To the missa normativa as a whole the voting went: 71 placet, 41 non placet, 62 placet iuxta modum, with 4 abstentions.

The renewal of the liturgy met considerable opposition from those who thought the revision had been too radical. In 1969 a small group of conservative theologians under the leadership of Cardinal Ottaviani and Cardinal Bacci wrote an open letter to the Pope severely criticising the new order of Mass. The substance of their argument was that the new mass was a deliberate move to conciliate modernism and Protestantism. They believed the shift of emphasis onto the "supper aspect" of the Mass meant that the "sacrificial aspect" was now less certain. They also noted that the doctrine of the Real Presence is far from evident in the new order. The removal of some of the ceremonial also seemed to hit at the doctrine of Transubstantiation. The words of consecration ("Hoc est enim Corpus meum" etc.) have ceased to have the central importance they should have. The acclamations after the words of institution seemed to cast doubt on the reality of Christ's presence here and now in the Mass. The role of the celebrating priest was now apparently nothing more than a Protestant minister sharing the Lord's Supper with the people and not acting "in persona Christi" as a consecrating and sacrificing priest.

The fear of some that the Roman Church had succumbed to a Protestant

take over was aggravated by the news that six Protestant clergy had attended sessions of the Liturgical Commission as they had drafted the new Mass. Despite this discontent the progress went ahead with the new liturgy until the new complete "Missale Romanum" was published in 1970 and with it the "Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani", the "General Instruction on the Roman Missal" (or "G.I." for short), giving the official commentary and rubrical directions for the new Eucharist.

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy had stated in Section 50: "The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, can be more clearly manifested and that devout and active participation by the faithful can be more easily accomplished". A cursory glance at the new Mass will immediately confirm that these instructions were faithfully carried out. The layout and structure of the Mass is now clearly defined with two parts, the Liturgy of the Word, and the Liturgy of the Eucharist. The Liturgy of the Word comprises the three scripture readings, the responsorial psalm, the alleluia, the homily, the creed and the general intercession. The Liturgy of the Eucharist comprises the presentation of the gifts, the Eucharistic Prayer, the communion and the concluding rite.

The whole rite is begun with an entrance rite consisting of antiphon, greeting, penitential act, Kyrie eleison, Gloria and collect. The section serves as "an opening, introduction and preparation" (G.I. 24). "Here, right at the beginning," says Crichton, "the Order of Mass endeavours to create community, a community in which Christ is present and is going to renew his presence in a variety of ways".[1] The Antiphon sung as the clergy, servers and choir enter the church is meant to "open the celebration, to foster union among the people, to direct their minds to the sacred mystery being celebrated and to accompany the incoming procession" (G.I. 25). At a said service the antiphon is spoken by all, and its purpose is to set the tone of the service. The priest and his assistants, on arrival in the sanctuary, bow in veneration towards the altar and show their respect by kissing it. The celebrant moves to his presidential seat and all make the sign of the cross as they say, "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit". The priest then proceeds to greet the assembled congregation in one of three ways, and after there follows an opportunity for him to explain in an informal way the theme of the celebration, introducing the worship in his own words. He then leads into the penitential section. The revisers were at first undecided as to the

[1] "Christian Celebration" p. 70

position of this section, and suggestions were made that it should precede the Offertory or come immediately before communion. Ultimately it was agreed to retain it in the position it had held in the 1570 Mass. "It is a comprehensible solution," says Crichton, "we need to be open to God both to hear his word and to receive his body and blood in the holy communion."[1] The confession is introduced by the words, "My brothers and sisters, to prepare ourselves to celebrate the sacred mysteries, let us call to mind our sins", and there follows a period of silent recollection. The confiteor from the old Mass (in a shortened form) can follow if desired, and one or other of two alternative forms of confession may take its place. The absolution is: "May almighty God have mercy on us, forgive us our sins, and bring us to everlasting life." In the 1570 rite, the priest gave the absolution in the form: "May almighty God have mercy upon you, forgive you your sins..." and the Indulgentiam followed it. The latter has now been dropped and the absolution is now given in the first person, "thus making clear that the penitential rite was not intended to include strictly sacramental confession".[2] After the Penitential Act comes the Kyrie eleison, the "Appeal for Mercy" as it is called in the General Introduction which also says of the Kyries, "it is a cry of the people to God for his mercy, and so should normally be sung by everybody, the people, choir and cantor all having a part in it", (G.I. 30). If the prayer "Lord, have mercy" has already been said in the Penitential Section it may be omitted here, but otherwise it must be used. Tropes may be added. At first, during the early stages of revision, there was a move in favour of making the Kyrie eleison and the Gloria alternatives (as in the Anglican Series 3 rite), but in order to preserve the musical tradition of the Church, both have been retained to be sung (or said) together, though not all commentators feel this is altogether a good thing. Crichton, for example, states, "It is indeed difficult to justify the presence of the Kyries in this place when they are taken as a separate piece". In his view, their presence here aggravates an already overloaded entrance rite. The Kyrie eleison has an honoured place in nearly all the primitive liturgies from the fourth century when the words formed part of a litany. By the end of the eighth century the litany had gone leaving the responses. It would be a shame if the Kyries were now to disappear from the Mass. The Gloria, the great hymn of praise, follows the Kyries. It appeared in the sixth century (in the Gregorian Sacramentary) and is peculiar to the West. It is a grand expression of joy and adoration, and so is never sung during Advent or Lent. The Collect brings the entrance rite to an end. The prayers

[1] op. cit. p. 71 [2] Coughlan, "The New Mass" p. 47

of all are "collected" (after a short period of silence) in this short prayer and "the ceremony of entry reaches a peak in the oration of the priest".[1] The Collect is the first of the presidential prayers (the others being the prayer after the Bidding Prayers, the Prayer over the Gifts, and the Post-communion Prayer). Only one collect is now said at any one service. Most of them still follow the classic structure as described by Grisbrooke[2] as: (1) an Address to God; (2) a reference to some divine attribute or act as a ground for prayer; (3) the prayer proper, short, simple and definite; (4) a concluding doxology, offering the prayer to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit.

The Penitential Section is an obvious improvement on the 1570 equivalent which was almost totally a priestly act with little congregational participation The new rite is flexible and adaptable to any occasion. Crichton, however, feels that there are too many disparate elements, and Nicholas Sagovsky feels a certain ungainliness about it and prefers the gentler Series 3 opening with its Collect for Purity "to tide us over until the Confession".[3] On the words of absolution he writes, "What was a solemn imprecation has now become more chatty. What spoke in ringing judicial tones now sees forgiveness as part of a process."[4]

The Liturgy of the Word consists in the proclamation of scripture and the response of the people. Little attention was paid to the Word in the 1570 rite and Crichton notes, "The restoration of an adequate ministry of the word to the Mass-liturgy is one of the most satisfactory parts of liturgical reform. Apart from a few of the older and greater feasts and seasons, the lectionary of the old mass was so jejune that it is a wonder that we were able to put up with it for so long."[5] It is in the readings from scripture that "God speaks to his people, reveals to them the mysteries of redemption and salvation, and provides them with spiritual nourishment; and Christ himself, in the form of his word, is present in the midst of the faithful", (G.I. 33). It is now evident that the reading of scripture in a coherent and intelligible way is vital for a proper celebration of the eucharist. God's dabar, his word, must become what it is, an "event". There is here, no mere passing on of information but God himself, speaking and addressing his people. The new Lectionary gives a carefully planned series of readings for all Sundays and weekdays, festive and ferial, for Votive Masses, Ritual Masses and other occasions. The Sundays follow a three year cycle, and the revisers have attempted to achieve some

[1] Jungmann, "Mass of the Roman Rite" p. 240 [2] article in "A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship". [3] "Modern Roman Catholic Worship: The Mass" p. 12
[4] op. cit. p. 13 [5] "Christian Celebration: The Mass" p. 72

harmonising link between the readings while trying at the same time to create wherever possible a "lectio continua" Sunday by Sunday.

After the first lesson (usually from the Old Testament) the Responsorial Psalm is sung. This Gradual Psalm is an integral part of the ministry of the Word and "is the response with which the congregation receives the Word of God".[1] Article 33 of De Musica in Sacra Liturgia (1967) required that the whole congregation should participate in the Gradual. In the old mass the psalm had become reduced to a verse from scripture (not necessarily from the psalter); now the great heritage of the psalms is being rediscovered. In actual performance of the liturgy a cantor usually sings the verses and the people join in the repeated antiphon.

After the second reading comes the Alleluia (except during Lent) and it forms a prelude to the Gospel. The deacon, acting in a prophetic role as it were, is blessed and commissioned by the celebrant to read the Gospel. The Gospel is then read by him from the ambo. A procession with thurifer and acolytes accompanies the reading of the Gospel at sung masses. The ceremonial surrounding the Gospel is akin to the "little entry" in the Byzantine liturgy and serves to underline the truth of God sending his Word to man in the person of Jesus Christ. The Alleluia, sung by everyone, is an acclamation of this same truth (see Rev. 19.1-9). The verses which accompany the Alleluia are, as a rule, taken from the Gospel passage about to be read and serve as an introduction to the Gospel. The Sequences are now no longer obligatory except at Easter and Pentecost.

Although the homily or sermon took place in the primitive church after the scripture readings, no provision was made for one in the 1570 Mass. In the 1970 rite the sermon is restored. It is "part of the liturgy and is strongly recommended, for it is a necessary source of nourishment of the Christian life", (G.I. 41). "For a long time the homily was regarded as an intruder in the Mass", comments Crichton,[2] but this is no longer so. Every celebration ideally contains a homily in which the preacher can interpret and expound the readings.

The creed follows the sermon and is the assent of the people to the Word they have just heard. It is the profession of the faith of the Church made corporately by the congregation before they begin to celebrate the Eucharist. (The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed did not appear in the Roman liturgy until 1014 when there was no longer any risk of breaking the disciplina arcani in the presence of the catechumens).

[1] Lucien Deiss in "The New Liturgy" p. 74

[2] op. cit. p. 76

The Prayer of the Faithful (sometimes called the General Intercession or the Bidding Prayers) concludes the Liturgy of the Word, and here the "people exercise their priestly function by praying for all mankind", (G.I. 45). A lay person or minister other than the celebrant makes the petitions for the Church, the world, the needy, and the local community. The celebrant prays, "Lord, hear us," to each bidding, and the people pray, "Lord, graciously hear us," in reply. Ideally these prayers arise from the readings and homily and should voice the present concerns of the congregation. The biddings end (in England and Wales) with the Hail Mary. John Ainslie comments, "Whatever may be said of devotional use of such prayers (as the Hail Mary), nowhere else in the Roman rite does one find a prayer addressed to anyone other than God, even on feasts of the Blessed Virgin".[1] The Prayer of the Faithful ends with a collect-type prayer, a presidential prayer, which serves to round off the Ministry of the Word.

The Liturgy of the Eucharist follows a three-fold scheme:

1. In the Preparation of the Gifts the elements are brought to the altar.

2. In the Eucharistic Prayer God is thanked for the whole work of redemption, and the gifts are consecrated to become the Body and Blood of Christ.

3. In the Breaking of the Bread the unity of the faithful is signified and in communion the people receive the Body and Blood of Christ.

This scheme (though three-fold and not four-fold) clearly follows the reasoning of Dom Gregory Dix (see supra p. 17f), and it shows that the revisers were at pains to return to the primitive shape of the liturgy.

The Preparation of the Gifts occupies the space occupied by the Offertory Prayers in the old Mass. In the 1570 rite the Offertory is a concern of the priest and his assistants alone. The celebrant is instructed to take the paten with the host and offer it up saying, "Suscipe, sancte Pater...", "Receive, holy Father, almighty,eternal God, this spotless host, which I, thine unworthy servant offer unto thee... for mine own countless sins, transgressions and failings, and for all here present; as also for all faithful Christians living or dead; that it may avail for my own and their salvation unto life eternal". The next prayer is over the water to be mixed with the wine in the chalice, the "mysterium" of water and wine, symbolising according to tradition the union between Christ and his people. The following prayer is the offering of the chalice, ("Offerimus tibi, Domine, calicem salutaris...") and then follows

[1] "Making the Most of the Missal" p. 10

a prayer ("In spiritu humilitatis") based on Daniel 3. 39f. and the "Veni, Sanctificator omnipotens aeterne Deus". Incensation follows, and then comes the washing of hands as Psalm 25 is recited. After this comes the prayer, "Suscipe, sancta Trinitas...", "Receive, Holy Spirit, this oblation which we make to thee." Then comes the "Orate fratres", "Prayer brethren that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father almighty," and the reply, "Suscipiat Deus sacrificium de manibus tuis", "May the Lord receive the sacrifice at thy hands, to the praise and glory of his name, to our own benefit and to that of all his holy church". The Offertory ends with the "Secret", a silent prayer which varies according to season. "There is no denying," writes Jungmann, "we have an anticipation of the thought of the canon" in this section of the old mass.[1] From the middle of the Middle Ages, this part of the liturgy was sometimes called the "lesser canon", and one can see why. Before the Middle Ages, the Offertory was a far simpler affair and merely consisted of the presentation of the offerings accompanied by the singing of the Offertory chant. The new mass returns to the simplicity of this earlier period. Gifts of bread and wine are brought in procession to the altar by representatives of the congregation, signifying the active participation of the whole assembly in the rite that is to follow. The Offertory Antiphon is sung during the procession, and when the elements are received by the priest or deacon, the altar may be incensed. The prayer, "Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation. Through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which earth has given and human hands have made. It will become for us the bread of life," together with a prayer concerning the wine is then said by the priest and the people answer, "Blessed be God for ever." This new composition derives from a prayer taken from the Jewish meal ritual. To this Jewish prayer has been added an idea of the Pope who wanted the prayer at this point to express man's dedication of his work to God. During the mingling of the wine and water, a short prayer is said which draws on the traditional symbolism "By the mystery of this water and wine may we come to share in the divinity of Christ who humbled himself to share in our humanity." After the second "Blessed are you..." over the wine, comes the prayer from the old missal, "In spiritu humilitatis." The priest then washes his hands "as a symbol of his desire for inward purification" (G.I. 52) and says, "Lord, wash away my iniquity; cleanse me from my sin,"(Psalm 51) and the people are invited to pray "that our sacrifice (my sacrifice and yours)may be acceptable to god,the almighty

[1] "The Mass of the Roman Rite" p. 360

Father," and the prayer "Suscipiat Dominus..." from the old missal follows. The Offertory section ends with the Prayer over the Gifts which serves like the other presidential prayers to make a fitting conclusion.

The Preparation of the Gifts retains some material from the old Offertory but the lengthy prayers, "Suscipe, sancte Pater", "Offerimus tibi", "Veni sanctificator", Psalm 140 and 25, "Accendat in nobis" and "Suscipe, sancta Trinitas", are all gone. The new liturgy has created a shift of emphasis. The emphasis now is on preparation rather than offering, and on the participation of the laity who present their gifts which later they will receive in communion. (Gifts of money can also be presented along with the elements, signifying the people's dedication of their work and lives to the service of God).

On the new offertory ritual, Lancelot Sheppard makes this observation, "The revised offertory is much simpler and reflects more faithfully the nature of the action performed... At the offertory the celebrant 'takes' bread and wine and the essential action here is the placing of the elements on the altar. The gesture is the more telling and significant the simpler it is".[1] On the retention of the "Orate, fratres" he writes, "The 'Orate, fratres' has been maintained, it appears, out of deference to those who regarded its disappearance from the rite an an attempt to minimise the sacrificial character of the Mass".[2]

The great Eucharistic Prayer is described in the General Instruction as, "the climax and the very heart of the entire celebration, a prayer of thanksgiving and sanctification... The meaning of the prayer is that all the faithful now gathered together unite themselves with Christ in praising the wonderful works of God and in offering sacrifice", (G.I. 54). In origin the Canon or Eucharistic Prayer was of course a single entity. In the 1570 Mass the Canon seems however to be a string of isolated units rather than one prayer. The Canon begins (as did the prayer of Hippolytus in the third century) with the Dialogue and the Sursum Corda. This is followed by the Preface (in Latin, "praefatio" meaning "proclamation" rather than "introduction"). Eleven "Proper Prefaces" were provided in the 1570 Missal. The Sanctus and Benedictus conclude the Preface. From the eighth and ninth centuries the "Te igitur" came to be thought of as beginning the Canon, and from this time the custom grew of silent recitation by the priest from this point to the end of the Canon, as this section was regarded as a "Holy of

[1] "The New Liturgy" p. 33 [2] ibid. p. 34

Holies" into which the priest alone could enter. This was the most sacred part of the mass and was to be protected from profanation. (The Reformers of course took a different view and saw all this an unnecessary mystification excluding the laity from the heart of the liturgy). The "Te igitur" is a plea for acceptance and is a prayer of offering for the Church, the Pope, the bishop and all believers. It is also a prayer for unity within the Church, (it was only after the fourth century that intercessory prayers crept into the Canon, with a view that here, special intentions were more closely linked with the eucharistic offering). The Memento of the living is the next section and it provides an opportunity to pray for people present at the mass (the ones described as the "circumstantes". This practice dates back to the early practice of the diptychs and before. The "Communicantes" consists of a memorial of the Saints. The "Hanc Igitur" asks God to receive the offerings. The "Quam oblationem" is "the plea for the final hallowing of the earthly gift and, in the last analysis a plea 'that it may become for us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ'".[1] Even though the Spirit is not invoked in this prayer, it has been described by many as a preliminary epiclesis. The "Qui Pridie" is the narrative of the institution and is believed to have been a universal feature of every primitive liturgy (with the notable exception of the Anaphora of Ss. Addai and Mari). The simple biblical account has been embellished over the centuries and from the early Middle Ages and particularly since the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 the Western Church has believed the moment of consecration to be centred on the repeated words of Christ. From the thirteenth century the words of consecration (as they were called) were immediately followed by the ringing of bells and the elevation of the Host for the people to see and adore the newly arrived presence of Christ. Following the consecration, the words, "Unde et memores" begin the anamnesis or memorial of Christ's passion, resurrection and ascension into heaven. The offering is made of the Host (pure, holy and spotless) and of the Chalice of everlasting salvation. The "Supra quae" and "Supplices" form the western equivalent of the epiclesis which occupies this position in Hippolytus and the Eastern liturgies. The first prayer asks that God will accept the gifts as he once accepted the offerings of Abel, Abraham and Melchisedech, the second asks for their translation to "Thine altar on high" so that those who receive communion shall be "filled with heavenly benediction and grace". At this point, the Memento of the dead has been inserted praying for the departed that they may have a "place of refreshment ('refrigerium'), light

[1] Jungmann op. cit. p. 413

and peace". The last of the prayers of the Canon, the Nobis quoque is a prayer that the congregation may be granted a share in the fellowship of the Saints, (seven male martyrs and seven female Saints are listed along with St John the Baptist and St Joseph ). The Canon ends with the doxology and the people's Amen and the words are accompanied by a series of crossings and the "Little Elevation" which occurs at the saying of the words "Omnis honor et gloria".

The 1570 Canon has passed into the new Mass as Eucharistic Prayer Number 1. It remains virtually intact. The four (interpolated) ends, "Per Christum Dominum nostrum Amen" are now made optional as are the names of many of the Saints in the "Communicantes" and "Nobis quoque". The other three Eucharistic Prayers are all new. All share a common basic structure outlined in the General Instruction Section 55:

(a) Thanksgiving (The Preface)
(b) Acclamation (The Sanctus)
(c) Epiclesis
(d) Institution Narrative and Consecration
(e) Anamnesis
(f) Oblation
(g) Intercession
(h) Doxology

All four Eucharistic Prayers also contain the Memorial Acclamations, of which there is a choice of four (three in Latin), introduced by the words, "Mysterium fidei", ("Let us proclaim the mystery of faith") which were originally an interpolated part of the words of institution. The words of St. Paul (in 1 Cor. 11.26 : "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes") form the background for this congregational response after the words of institution. Number 3 ("Salvator mundi, salva nos") is an ancient devotional prayer.

Each Eucharistic Prayer contains an identical introductory dialogue and form of words for the verba Domini. Several changes have been made to the latter and the words, "quod pro vobis tradetur"have been added to the words over the cup replacing the words, "Haec quotiescumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis", to correspond with 1 Cor, 11.24/25. It is noticeable that the verba Domini which were always printed in bold type are now no longer thus isolated from the rest of the Eucharistic Prayer. This indicates, perhaps, a shift away from centralising the consecration or the moment of consecration on the words of Christ alone.

Some eighty new prefaces have been added to the liturgy. The two new

prefaces for Advent are derived from old prayers which speak of Christ's first coming in humility and his second coming in glory, and of the forerunners, the prophets, the Blessed Virgin and St. John the Baptist. The second of the Advent prefaces introduces a note of joy, wonder and praise. The Preface for Lent 1 speaks of "this joyful season when we prepare to celebrate the paschal mystery with heart and mind renewed", a marked contrast to the old Preface which stressed only fasting of the body. The Preface for ordinary Sundays I draws heavily on 1 Peter 2.9 and 5.10. The Weekday Preface I makes allusions to Phil. 2.6 and Col. 1.20. The Weekday Preface II is short and pithy, giving thanks for God's creation, his justice and his merciful redemption. The Preface, addressed to God the Father, is a proclamation ("praefatio") of creation and salvation history, and on special occasions the Proper Preface makes mention of one particular aspect of creation or salvation. The Jewish berakoth similarly began by praising God, going on to give specific reasons for so doing (e.g. Ecclus. 51.1-17). The Preface is followed by Eucharistic Prayer 1, 2 or 3. Number 4 has its own Preface.

Eucharistic Prayer 2 is based on the ancient prayer of Hippolytus (c. 215), considered to be the best example of the primitive liturgy we possess. The Proper Preface (another may be substituted) borrows heavily from the actual wording of Hippolytus, (Christ is the Word through whom God made all things; He was born of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Spirit, he stretched out his hands in death to destroy death, revealed the resurrection and gained for God a holy people). The Sanctus and consecratory epiclesis have been added to conform with the other eucharistic prayers. A vere Sanctus follows the Sanctus (as in the Spanish and Gallican rites). The institution narrative retains one memorable phrase from Hippolytus: "a death he freely accepted". After the congregational acclamations the prayer repeats Hippolytus again, "In memory of his death and resurrection, we offer you (Father) this (life-giving) bread this (saving) cup. We thank you for counting us worthy to stand in your presence and serve you", (Anamnesis and Oblation). Hippolytus has an epiclesis at this point, and Eucharistic Prayer 2 contracts it to a prayer for unity in the Holy Spirit, and concludes with a prayer for the Church, living and departed. The doxology from the Roman Canon ends the Prayer, which as Coughlan says, "is characterised by simplicity and clarity".[1]

The third Eucharistic Prayer is, according to the General Instruction, "most suitable on Sundays or Feast Days", (G.I. 322 (c)). It is a modern construction based largely on the work of Vagaggini. It is the most theological of the four. It has no preface of its own and is used with any of the prefaces provided. The inspiration for the prayer comes from the Gallican and

[1] "The New Mass" p. 115

Spanish anaphoras. The Sanctus is followed by the vere Sanctus as in all Gallican and Palaeo-Hispanic and Eastern anaphoras, ("Father, you are holy indeed") which takes up the theme of the Sanctus and leads on from there to speak of all life and holiness issuing from God through Christ by the operation of the Holy Spirit. A link is also made with the praise of the preface ("all creation rightly gives you praise"). Then mention is made of the gathering together "from age to age" of God's people so that a perfect offering can be made. Allusions are made here to Malachi 1.11 the Letter to the Hebrews and Justin's Dialogue with Trypho. The Post-Sanctus concludes with the epiclesis (consecratory) as in the Egyptian-Alexandrian tradition. God is requested to make the gifts holy by the power of his Spirit that they may become the body and blood of Jesus. It is the Spirit who consecrates. "It was the general conviction," notes Vagaggini, "from the fourth to the seventh century that the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ took place through the presence and the action of the Holy Spirit".[1] The link with the words of institution and the narrative is provided by words from the East Syrian liturgy of Ss. Addai and Mari, "Cuius mandato haec mysteria celebramus". The Pauline form of the narrative is followed and is introduced by the words, "Ipse enim in qua nocte tradebatur" which follows the Eastern tradition, the West always having, "pridie..." at this point. After the acclamations, the anamnesis calls to mind Christ's death, his glorious resurrection and ascension into heaven and looks forward to his second coming ("praestolantes alterum eius adventum"). The offering is made of "this holy and living sacrifice". The mention of Christ's glorious return at the eschaton is missing from the Roman Canon at this point. It was Vagaggini's suggestion that the liturgy needed to be enriched by some eschatological reference. The Communion epiclesis begins with a prayer that God will "look with favour" on his Church's offering and see the Victim ("Hostiam") whose death has reconciled us to him. "Offering Christ and his sacrifice to God means consciously uniting ourselves to the offering which Christ, our head, makes of himself, of us, and of the whole world."[2] There then follows a petition for fruitful communion (placed in the Roman Canon after the account of the institution) that those who are nourished by Christ's body and blood may be filled by his Holy Spirit.

[1] "The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform" p. 158 [2] ibid. p. 175

and become one body, one Spirit in Christ. In the Anaphora of St. Basil there occurs similar wording: "Make us all worthy of sharing in these holy mysteries of yours so that our bodies and souls may be sanctified, thus being formed into but a single body and a single spirit, that we may find a place among the company of your saints...". The words, "Ipse nos tibi perficiat munus aeternum", "May he make us an everlasting gift to you", are taken from the Oratio super oblata of the Leonine Sacramentary, and the Secret of the Whit Monday liturgy of the old missal. They lead into a commemoration of the saints (as in the Byzantine Anaphora of St. Basil) and a prayer that Christ may "enable us to share in the inheritance" of the saints. The intercessions are continued by a petition that the Eucharistic sacrifice may advance the peace and salvation of the world, that God may strengthen his pilgrim Church, the Pope, the Bishops, the clergy and the people, that he may hear the prayers of his family "gathered here before you", and that he may unite in mercy and love all his children wherever they may be. A prayer for the departed ends with the aspiration, "We hope to enjoy for ever the vision of your glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord, from whom all good things come". The Prayer ends with the customary doxology.

Two features are worthy of note in this, the third Eucharistic Prayer. The work of the Holy Spirit is emphasised and the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is underlined. "The two are closely linked. It is the Spirit who sanctifies and transforms the gifts and who sanctifies those who share in them, so that by sharing in the eucharistic Body of Christ we become the Body of Christ, temple of his Spirit. In this way, says the prayer, we become 'an everlasting gift to God'. The fruit of sharing in Christ's sacrifice is not only 'our peace with God' but the advancement of the peace and salvation of all the world, and so the prayer opens out to the needs of all men".[1]

Eucharistic Prayer 4, with its long fixed preface, is derived from the anaphoras of the Antiochene tradition. It was inspired by the Apostolic Constitutions, the Liturgy of St. James and the Liturgy of St. Basil, all of which make a full recitation of the whole economy of salvation from creation to the second coming. The preface is a prayer of cosmic scope addressed to God the Father, giving thanks to him as living through all eternity in unapproachable light (1 Tim. 6.16), the source of life and goodness, the Creator of all things, who fills his creatures with every blessing and leads all men to the joyful vision of his light. Mention is made of the "countless hosts of angels" (reminiscent of a phrase in the Liturgy of St. James and the Liturgy of St. Basil), which makes a very convenient introduction to the Sanctus and Benedictus. Bouyer makes the following pertinent comment on these words of the prayer, "Note in this text the glorification of God in his

[1] Couglan op. cit. p. 116

transcendent eternity and in the economy of creation in which the unfathomable goodness of the thrice-holy God is reflected. Note also the two themes, traditional since Judaism, of light and life: the inaccessible light of the divine glory which belongs only to God, but which is also but one with the life that he willed to give the world. Its most perfect realization is in his conscious creatures for whom life will be to see God in his own light and to reflect his glory in their praise of his goodness".[1] The Sanctus is followed by thanksgiving to the Father for his creation of man, made in his likeness to serve his creator and rule over all creatures. God is praised for not abandoning man after his disobedience and for his salvation through covenant and the teachings of the prophets. Thanksgiving for the Incarnation follows, echoing words of St. John's Gospel and Paul's Letter to the Galatians: "Father you so loved the world that in the fulness of time you sent your only Son to be our Saviour". The Prayer continues to give praise for the life of Christ, a man "like us in all things but sin", (Hebrews 4.15), who preached good news, (Lk. 4.18 Is. 61.1), who gave himself up to death and who in rising from the dead destroyed death and restored life (cf. the Roman Preface for Easter). The sending by Christ of the Holy Spirit is recalled "that we might live no longer for ourselves but for him" (2 Cor. 5.15 Rom. 14.7). He was sent "as his first gift to those who believe, to complete his work on earth and bring us the fulness of grace." Mention of the sanctifying work of the Spirit leads conveniently into the consecratory epiclesis: "May this Holy Spirit sanctify these offerings. Let them become the body and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord." The narrative of the institution is introduced by language reminiscent of Jn. 13.1 and 17.1 (this being the only reference of the love of Christ for his disciples in the Eucharistic Prayers). The Anamnesis is much longer and fuller than in the other Eucharistic Prayers and it recalls ("profitemur") Christ's death, descent into hell, resurrection and ascension, and looks forward to his coming in glory. The offering is made of "his body and blood, the acceptable sacrifice which brings salvation to the whole world" (Heb. 10). The communion epiclesis prays that God will look upon ("respice") this Sacrifice ("Hostiam") and that by his Holy Spirit he may "gather all who share this bread and wine into the one body of Christ a living sacrifice of praise" (1 Cor. 10.17 Rom. 12.1 Eph. 1.14). A new acclamation is provided at this point (as in some of the Eastern anaphoras) but it is absent from the present edition: "We praise you, we bless you, we glorify you. Be gracious to us,

[1] "Eucharist" p. 456

O Lord, and have mercy on us all." The Intercessions which follow mention the Pope, the local bishop, all bishops and clergy, those who are taking part in this offering, those present and all God's people, and "all who seek you with a sincere heart". Gelineau comments thus on these prayers: "There can be no doubt that the outlook of Vatican II, seeing the Church as the sacrament of worldwide salvation, and the missionary spirit of the same council, exerted a fortunate influence on the composition of this prayer".[1] The departed are remembered next, both "those who have died in the peace of Christ" and "all the dead whose faith is known to you alone." The prayer ends with the commemoration of the Virgin Mary, the apostles and saints and a plea that the Father will grant us "your children" to enter the kingdom where, "freed from the corruption of sin and death, we shall sing your glory with every creature through Christ our Lord through whom you give us everything that is good." The doxology brings the prayer to a final conclusion though joined as Gelineau admits somewhat artificially to what precedes it.[2]

Commentators of the new mass (such as Gelineau and Bouyer) make mention of the Trinitarian plan of this eucharistic prayer. God is blessed firstly for his own sake, then for the sending of his Son as Saviour, and then for Christ's sending of the Holy Spirit upon the Church. Gelineau points out the very clear evidence of scriptural influence in the prayer and notes the biblical (rather than Latinate)style. The love of God for men (almost a forgotten notion in the Roman Canon) is here brought into the open and God's cosmic plan from the beginnings of creation to his ultimate design for all humanity is its fundamental theme, Its most "modern" feature is the idea that man is a responsible agent for God set over his world. The Prayer also demonstrates very clearly the recovery by the Church of her Jewish roots and of the Jewish basis for Christian liturgy (noted first by von der Goltz and J.P. Audet). The Jewish blessing prayer was a "proclamation" or "acknowledgement" of God's mighty acts in the context of praise and thanksgiving. This was followed by prayer that God would continue his favour and loving kindnesses so that this pattern had emerged: Praise and thanksgiving, memorial, petition, doxology. This pattern is followed in this eucharistic prayer which includes, significantly, the key word "Confitemur" at the start.

The Rite of Communion and the Concluding Rite are the final sections of the liturgy. The old missal included these parts under the general heading of "Canon Missae" and little attention was paid to the communion of the people as an important part of the mass. Now, "all is orientated towards the act of communion" (says Crichton[3]) and the General Instruction emphasises the communion as a true part of the liturgy, "Since the celebration of the Eucharist is a paschal meal

[1] "The New Liturgy" p. 220 [2] ibid. p. 226 [3] Crichton, op. cit. p. 97

it implies that the faithful in good dispositions should heed the Lord's command by receiving the Body and Blood of Christ as their spiritual nourishment" (G.I. 56). The old practice of receiving communion from hosts consecrated at a previous mass is now discouraged so that the full implications of participation in the liturgy are realised. The Lord's Prayer with a shortened embolism to which a verse from the New Testament has been added (Titus 2.13), makes a fitting preparation for communion. Priest and people join in the doxology (from Matt. 6.13 some MSS.) which has been used from early times in the Eastern Church and in the Protestant Churches. The Rite of Peace is begun by a prayer for peace and unity in the Church and in the whole human family which expresses the people's love for one another before they share in the one bread (G.I. 56(b)). The sign of peace which follows is meant to be a gesture between the members of a congregation signifying their reconciliation. It usually takes the form of a handshake or handclasp. The Breaking of Bread is no mere practicality, "it is also intended to convey a meaning" (G.I. 56(c)). Many churches have tried to dispense with single communion wafers and to use larger altar-breads to display this meaning. Not only is this the repeated act of Christ himself which once gave the name "The Breaking of Bread" to the whole sacrament, it means also "that through Communion we, though many in number, become one body because we eat the one Bread of Life which is Christ (1 Cor. 10.17)" (G.I. 56(c)). The Commingling of bread and wine (the Immixtio) follows and the priest is instructed to drop a broken piece of bread into the chalice. Few modern liturgical experts have been bold enough to offer a plausible explanation for this ritual act, and it remains an obscure item of ceremonial which might easily have been dropped. The word "consecratio" is omitted from the prayer. The Agnus Dei is said or sung during the actual Fraction (it was introduced here c. 700). The priest then says in a low voice one or other of the two prayers retained at this point from the old liturgy (the "Domine Jesu Christe" and "Perceptio") and the people pray in silence. The invitation to communion is made by the priest who holds the paten aloft and says, "This is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Happy are those who are called to his supper". These words are a combination of Jn. 1.36 and Rev. 19.9 and draw upon the image of Christ as Paschal Lamb "sacrificed for us" and the picture of the Marriage Supper of the Lamb as described in Revelation. Then follows a prayer from Mt. 8.9 (the words of the centurion to Jesus) and the celebrant himself receives communion saying first "Corpus Christi custodiat me in vitam aeternam", "The Body of Christ keep me in eternal life", and the people come up to receive communion

during the singing of the Communion Antiphon, which expresses the "spiritual union of the communicants and shows forth their joy" (G.I. 56(i)). Communion is now received standing in many churches (the primitive pre-medieval practice in fact) and the consecrated bread is now generally received in the hand rather than on the tongue. The custom of receiving in the hand follows the advice of St. Cyril (in his Mystagogic Catechesis) and the ruling of the Instruction "Memoriale Domini" of 1969 which reverses the ruling of the Council of Rouen (878) which ordered reception on the tongue. The words of administration ("The Body of Christ/The Blood of Christ") are found in the writings of St. Cyril of Jerusalem and St. Ambrose. Each communicant responds "Amen". Communion in both kinds is now permitted on a large number of occasions. The ablutions are less complicated than those of the old liturgy and only one prayer (the old "Quod ore sumpsimus") is recited silently by the priest. After communion there follows a pause during which priest and people may pray in silence. A hymn may then be sung. The Post-communion prayer varies according to season but it is always a prayer that those who have received communion may receive the full benefits of the sacrament. The Concluding Rite comprises the Blessing and the Dismissal. Notices may be read before the final ceremonies. Twenty-six blessings are provided (the "Orationes super populum"). The dismissal can take the form of the old "Ite missa est" ("The mass is ended, go in peace"), or the priest may say, "Go in the peace of Christ" or "Go in peace to love and serve the Lord". The people respond "Thanks be to God", and the clergy kiss the altar and depart.

The last seven years have seen a revolution in the worship of the Roman Catholic Church. The reaction of most Catholics was favourable. Their new mass was welcomed as a breath of fresh air. Others have reacted less affably. Besides Ottaviani and Bacci, others have made severe criticism of the new rites saying the new mass was designed to satisfy the most modernist of Protestants and for their benefit denies the doctrines of the Real Presence, the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Catholic Priesthood. Archbishop Marcel Lefebyre and members of the Society of St. Pius X and the Latin Mass Society believe the Mass has been "protestantized". Fr. Peter Morgan has led Roman Catholics discontented with the new mass to set up Tridentine Mass Centres in defiance of their bishops. These churchmen believe that the removal of certain prayers and the simplification of ceremonial implies a definite shift away from traditional Catholic teaching that the mass is an offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice towards a view that the eucharist is merely a communal meal, a supper of fellowship. Such criticism is sincere and well-meaning but it ignores the advance made by the Church to penetrate behind the dogmatic controversies of the past 300 years and to construct a meaningful way of worship for the 1970's.

| The Book of Common Prayer (1662) | Series 2 |
|---|---|
| | THE ANTECOMMUNION |
| | Introduction |
| Lord's Prayer | (Psalm or hymn, notices) |
| Collect for Purity | (Collect for Purity) |
| Ten Commandments | (Ten Commandments, Summary or Kyries) |
| | (Gloria) |
| Collect for Sovereign | Salutation |
| | Let us pray |
| Collect | Collect |
| | The Ministry of the Word |
| | (O.T. Lesson) |
| | (Psalm, canticle or hymn) |
| Epistle | O.T. or N.T. Lesson |
| | (Psalm, canticle or hymn) |
| Gospel | Gospel |
| | Sermon |
| Creed | Creed (on Sundays and holy days) |
| Notices, Sermon or homily | |
| Offertory Sentence | Intercession |
| Prayer for the Church Militant | The Prayers of the Church or |
| Exhortations | A General Intercession or |
| | A Short Litany |
| | (Notices) |
| | (Hymn and collection of alms) |
| | (Grace, if no communion) |
| | THE COMMUNION |
| | The Preparation of the People |
| Invitation: "Ye that do truly..." | Invitation: "Seeing we have.." |
| Confession | Confession |
| Absolution | Absolution |
| Comfortable Words | (Comfortable Words) |
| | (Prayer of Humble Access) |
| | (Peace) |
| | The Preparation of the Bread and Wine |
| | (Hymn) |
| | Placing of elements in order |

| 1662 | Series 2 |
| --- | --- |
| | Salutation |
| Sursum Corda | Sursum Corda |
| Proper Preface | Preface with seasonal Propers |
| Sanctus | Sanctus |
| Prayer of Humble Access | Epiclesis 1[1] |
| Prayer of Consecration | Institution narrative |
| | Anamnesis |
| | Epiclesis 2[1] |
| | Doxology |
| | (Benedictus) |
| | The Breaking of the Bread |
| | Fraction |
| | (1 Cor. 10.16-18) |
| | (Agnus Dei) |
| | The Sharing of the Bread and Wine |
| | Lord's Prayer |
| | Invitation to Communion |
| Communion | Communion |
| Lord's Prayer | (Hymns and anthems) |
| | Conclusion |
| Prayer of Oblation or Thanksgiving | Prayer after Communion (one of two) |
| Gloria | (Gloria) |
| | Salutation |
| | Dismissal |
| Blessing | Blessing |
| | Departure of Ministers and People |

[1]The word "Epiclesis" is here used in a general sense. There is no specific invocation of the Spirit in the Series 2 rite.

Before the Prayer Book Measure became law in May 1966, the Church of England debated the subject of Prayer Book revision at a conference held in February of the same year, at which the Archbishop of Canterbury introduced the First Series of Alternative Services which had been published on 17 December of the previous year. Holy Communion Series 1 had been produced, reported the Archbishop, in order to "give legality to such current practice as is widely desired and is congruous with the doctrine of our Church". The service was "not a work of revision so much as a work of current authorisation" and its form was basically that of the 1662 rite with three kinds of deviations. First, the addition of more salutations at various points, the provision for alternatives to the Ten Commandments, and extra Proper Prefaces are authorised for use. Second, an Old Testament lesson is made possible, the congregation may now join in various parts of the service and the Intercession may be broken up into sections with responses for the congregation. Third, the Prayer of Consecrationmay be followed immediately by a short or long Prayer of Oblation, and the whole Canon followed by the Lord's Prayer. The Intercession provided is that of 1928 printed alongside that of 1662. The Lord's Summary of the Law or the Kyries (in English or Greek) may be used instead of the Decalogue. An Offertory Sentence (1 Chron. 29. 11,14, R.V. slightly amended) is given for use before the Intercession (as 1662 and 1928) or immediately before the Consecration Prayer. The Benedictus may be used after the Sanctus (as permitted in 1928) and the Agnus Dei may be said or sung before the communion (a return to 1549). The Gloria may come after the Decalogue (as in 1549) or may come before the Blessing (as in 1662). The Prayer of Humble Access may be said after the Comfortable Words (as in 1928) or after the Sanctus. The Sermon may follow the Gospel or the Creed. Shorter forms of exhortation, confession and absolution are provided. The Canon of Series 1 (called "The Consecration") can take three forms:

1. As 1662 (Preface/Prayer of Humble Access/Prayer of Consecration)
2. As the 1931 "Interim Rite" (with or without the Prayer of Humble Access) with the 1662 Prayer of Oblation after the narrative of the institution, linked to it by the first part of the 1928 anamnesis, ("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...").
3. As 2 above, but omitting the self-oblation ("And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies..")

In 1931 Chandler had suggested following Bishop Overall's practice of using the 1604 Prayer Book which entailed recreating an integrated canon on the line of 1549 but using material from 1662. This had also been suggested by Frere in "Some Principles of Liturgical Reform" in 1911. Gregory Dix however strongly disapproved of the tampering of Cranmer's liturgy and writing in "The Shape of the Liturgy" had said, "The continual modern proposals to replace this prayer (of oblation) after the prayer of consecration as it stands, without any regard for Cranmer's careful changes of wording for its present position are very strangely conceived."[1] To offer ourselves before communion was for Dix an act of pure Pelagianism, and with him many evangelicals would concur. Christ's sacrifice, according to Cranmer and to succeeding evangelicals is completely separate from any offering made by man which can only be a responsive offering in thanksgiving after communion. J.M.M. Dalby takes the opposite view. In the "Church Quarterly Review, October 1967" he wrote in favour of including self-oblation in the Canon as this links Christ's sacrifice with ours. (J.C. Bowmer holds the same opinion, see supra p. 27). Dalby calls the Series 1 Canon a "makeshift Canon", using as it does 1662 material when 1928 material would have served better (though without the epiclesis).

D.E.W. Harrison comments on Series 1, "From the standpoint of liturgy the new Consecration Prayer is (however) a great improvement on 1662, containing as it does an anamnesis or remembrance not only of the Passion but also of the Resurrection and Ascension, though with no eschatological reference. It should also be noted that in the use of this prayer the bread may be broken either at the Words of Institution as in 1662, or at the Lord's Prayer and fraction may follow the 'Amen'".[2] His concluding criticism of Series 1 is that certain defects of 1662 remain and "no new liturgical insights are embodied".[3]

Series 1 was authorised from 7 November 1966 for a period of seven years. Earlier in the previous year (on 17 December) the draft order for Series 2 had appeared. It was introduced to a Liturgical Conference in February 1966 by Arthur Couratin and was warmly received. He explained that the Commission which had been working at the new eucharistic rite had been thinking in terms of a Parish Communion lasting about one hour. The members of the Commission had felt that drastic revision of the intercessions was imperative, to give opportunity for petitions for various causes and intentions. The service was based on the understanding that the eucharist is a conscious imitation of the Lord's Supper with the four actions. As far as theology and doctrine was concerned the Commission had attempted to produce something which could

[1] op. cit. p. 666 [2] "Common Prayer in the C. of E." pp. 77/78 [3] ibid p.78

convey either Reformed or Catholic teaching. Immediate reaction to the suggested revision centred on the absence of the blessing at the end of the service (considered by the revisers to be redundant), the shortened words of administration, ("The Body/The Blood of Christ") and the notorious phrase, "We offer unto thee this bread and this cup". Some regretted the omission of the Ten Commandments. Some were pleased with the element of joy and thanksgiving so conspicuously absent from the old liturgy. On 1 April, a definitive report of Series 2 was published to be presented before the Convocations and the House of Laity, and eventually after several debates, the vexed phrase, "We offer..." was amended, at the suggestion of Canon R.C.D. Jasper to "with this bread and this cup we make the memorial of his saving passion...". Also, after some lengthy debates, the words "Remember those who have died in faith, and sleep in the peace of Christ, and grant them a share in thy eternal kingdom", were changed to, "Hear us as we remember those who have died in faith, and grant us with them a share in thy eternal kingdom". The words, "We offer..." had met strong opposition from one member of the Commission (Colin Buchanan) and from half of the House of Laity. Canon Couratin and others pointed to the evidence of the early Fathers and primitive liturgies (and especially Hippolytus which contains an identical phrase) in support of their revision and to show that the use of such language is fully compatible with Christian tradition. The evangelicals remained firm in their opinion that such words were unscriptural and misleading. As far as prayer for the dead was concerned, the evangelicals showed equal concern that the reformed teaching was being bypassed, even though, again it was shown to be a primitive and traditional feature of Christendom.

Series 2 was finally approved for experimental use for four years from July 7 1967. Structurally, the rite was a new departure from previous Anglican custom. The whole service is divided neatly into two sections, the Antecommunion comprising an Introduction, the Ministry of the Word, and the Intercession; and the second section comprising the Preparation of the People, the Preparation of the Bread and Wine, and a Conclusion. This second section is entitled "The Communion", and is the eucharist proper, the first section being the Liturgy of the Word, the Synaxis. The Penitential section remains in the 1552/1662 position, immediately before the Sursum Corda (although the Church in Wales rite of 1966 and many other Anglican overseas liturgies now have the confession and absolution at the front of the rite). The argument in favour of this traditional arrangement is that the people are brought to

confession through hearing the Word. Furthermore, added significance is given to the Peace if the confession immediately precedes it (Matt 5. 23f.). The Introduction can be very brief and the collect for the day preceded by the salutation "The Lord be with you; and with thy spirit", and the words "Let us pray", are alone mandatory, the other prayers being optional. The Lord's Prayer which Cranmer had taken from the prayers of preparation said by the priest in the Sarum rite is now dropped. The Collect for Purity however which originated from the same source is retained. The Ten Commandments (omitted in the original first draft of Series 2) are retained. The "Summary of the Law" may be said instead (as in the Nonjuror's rite of 1718, the Scottish rite of 1764 and the order of 1928). The Kyries (in English or Greek) are permitted. The Gloria may follow or it may take up its 1662 position after the Post-communion prayer. Cranmer moved it perhaps because he thought it too out of place in a heavily penitential section and because it was seemingly more appropriate as a hymn following communion. The Collect for the monarch (1662) is an obvious sixteenth century feature which is now safely omitted. The Collect for the Day follows the Gloria and it concludes the Introduction. The traditional Anglican custom of saying on occasions two or more collects is neither commended nor disallowed, but since the word "Collect" is in the singular one prayer is all that is required and appropriate. The Greeting, "The Lord be with you..." follows Series 1, 1928 and 1549, but not 1552 or 1662.

The Ministry of the Word maintains the provision for three lessons and includes an Old Testament reading. This is welcome at a time when fewer people attend Mattins and so never hear the Old Testament read in church. Hymns, canticles or psalms may be sung between the readings. The Sermon comes logically after the Gospel, and the rubrics indicate this is mandatory rather than optional. The custom of many churches to ignore the preaching of the Gospel at the eucharist (especially at a "low" or "quiet" celebration) are reminded how important this part of the liturgy is. The Creed (slightly amended) is to be said on Sundays and Holy Days and need not be said at every week-day celebration, a regrettable omission according to H.E.W. Turner[1] but perhaps a needless repetition at a daily eucharist. The Intercessions do away with the long priestly monologue of the "Prayer for the Church Militant" and attempts to retain the basic subject matter in a new format to allow congregational participation. The alternative provisions of "A General

[1] "Theology" November 1969 No. 593

Intercession" or "A Short Litany" are printed in the Second Appendix. The latter has an explicit prayer for the dead which has been "watered down" in the main text of the Intercessions in deference to the evangelicals. After the Intercession, banns and notices may be given out, a hymn may be sung and a collection taken. The Antecommunion may end at this point, and if no Communion is to follow the Grace is said to round off the service. "The Communion" is the heading given to the liturgy of the eucharist. The people prepare by saying their confession which is introduced by a sentence from Hebrews 4.14 and 10.22. The confession itself consists of ten short lines and is in stark contrast to the 1662 confession which is now believed to be rather too "grovelling" in tone and excessively penitent and guilt-ridden. The 1958 Lambeth Conference had requested a confession which was not so dominated by guilt as that of 1662. The present Series 2 composition has however erred in being too brief and in the opinion of many contains little if any hint at contrition. A short absolution follows and the Comfortable Words may come after. Both the Comfortable Words and the Prayer of Humble Access first appeared in the 1548 Order for Communion where it was directed that they should be said immediately after the priest's communion and before the communion of the people. The scripture sentences are drawn in part from Hermann's "Consultations" and were designed by Cranmer to give scriptural support to the absolution. They have since become part of the Anglican devotional subconscious, and many, especially the aged and sick, still find hope and encouragement in hearing them read aloud. The Prayer of Humble Access was written by Cranmer himself. It has undergone some minor changes since 1548. The words, "in these mysteries" which once occured after "to drink his blood" were dropped in 1552 when the prayer itself was inserted into the eucharistic prayer after the Sanctus: (Bishop Gardiner had contended that the 1548/1549 position encouraged the doctrine of the Real Presence). In Series 2 it rejoins the Comfortable Words but in this position it is perhaps too far away from the communion. The words, "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body and our souls washed through his most precious blood" are now omitted. The Peace follows the Prayer of Humble Access and is introduced by words from 1 Cor. 12.13 and Eph. 4.3. In 1549 the Kiss of Peace was said after the Lord's Prayer and before the communion (as in the Roman liturgy). It was left out in 1552 and 1662 though it reappeared in 1928. In Series 2 its new position is controlled by primitive usage. Justin's Apology indicates that the kiss of peace preceded the presentation of the bread and wine in accordance with Matt. 5.23f. No rubrics are provided for any gesture to

accompany the words. The following section, headed "The Preparation of the Bread and Wine" makes no mention of the traditional term "Offertory" which has been used in Anglican formularies hitherto, The word is not without some ambiguity for Anglicans. Strictly speaking, it should refer to the placing of the elements on the altar, but the Prayer Book of 1662 took it to mean the collection of alms. In the draft version of Series 2 a sentence from the Old Testament (1 Chron. 29.11,14) was given (as in Series 1). This was omitted from the final version and the placing of bread and wine "in order upon the Holy Table" and the collection and presentation of alms is performed in silence or during the singing of a hymn. There is some argument for saying that a prayer is needed at this point, if only to verbalise the notions behind the action (though few seem clear as to exactly what the action is). The Offertory Prayer from the Coronation could have provided a possible model: "Bless, O Lord, we beseech thee, these thy gifts, and sanctify them unto this holy use, that by them we may be made partakers of the Body and Blood of thine only-begotten Son, Jesu Christ, and fed unto everlasting life of soul and body..." Such a prayer, or one similar to it, would convey the intention that the gifts are to be set apart and prepared for consecration, without implying that there is any "offering" of them prior to the eucharistic prayer. Those who believe that "blessing"="consecration" would obviously have difficulties however; (Colin Buchanan in a recent study, for example, not only suggested that the collection of monies should have nothing to do with the preparation of the elements, he has also indicated that it does not matter when or how the elements are brought to the Table[1]). The Thanksgiving which follows is given the subtitle "The Prayer of Consecration" which now refers to the whole of the Thanksgiving and not merely to the section after the Sanctus until the end of the institution narrative (as in 1662). It is a single prayer comprising a Preface thanking God for Creation, Redemption and Sanctification, based on classical models. "Proper Prefaces" are included for festivals etc. (Christmas, Passiontide, Eastertide and Pentecost), and these are added to the normal preface. The Sanctus (without the Benedictus) is the culmination of this section. E.C. Ratcliff argued that the Sanctus originally formed the climax of the Thanksgiving.[2] He reconstructed the original anaphora as: Dialogue, Thanksgiving for Creation,Incarnation, Redemption and the formation of the people of God, the Institution (often if not always), Anamnesis, Oblation of bread and wine, final Thanksgivings for present worshippers being enabled to stand and minister in the divine presence among the multitudes of Heaven, and at the end the Sanctus and Amen. Canon Couratin has also argued[3] that the early

[1] "The End of the Offertory" [2] "Liturgical Studies" p.18f.

[3] "The Parish Communion Today" and "Theology" August 1955

Church conceived the Eucharistic Prayer in terms of the sacrificial language of Exodus 24, creating the sequence of: Offering of sacrifice, admission to God's presence and eating and drinking in his presence. The Sanctus therefore followed after any act of offering and can be presumed to have been the climax of the Eucharistic Prayer. This hypothesis had some effect on the drafting of the Series 2 Thanksgiving. The Sanctus has been retained in its usual place, but the Benedictus (which follows the Sanctus in 1549 and may follow it in 1928 and Series 1) now comes at the end of the prayer where Couratin and Ratcliff would place the Sanctus. The Benedictus invariably follows the Sanctus in the ancient liturgies (except the Alexandrine) and only became detached or omitted as it seemed to teach the Real Presence. Evangelicals have always felt dubious about its inclusion in the Eucharistic Prayer (even though it is scriptural!) and are doubtless relieved to learn that it is in Series 2 an optional extra. Grisbrooke comments however, "(There is not) sufficient evidence for dividing them, or suppressing the Benedictus or transferring the Sanctus and Benedictus or Benedictus alone to the end of the Anaphora: the arguments which have been put forward for these courses all rest on the debateable hypothesis based on evidence carefully selected and interpreted for the purpose, and while they may be of great interest to liturgical scholars, they are not an adequate foundation for practical liturgical reform."[1] The Post-Sanctus begins rather abruptly with no link with the preceding Sanctus: "Hear us, O Father..." There is no reference to the Holy Spirit's action in the epiclesis which follows, "and grant that these gifts of bread and wine may be unto us his body and blood..." a phrase closely modelled on the equivalent section of the 1549 rite and derived from the Roman rite ("ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat..."). In the words of Couratin[2] "the request that the bread and wine 'may be unto us the Body and Blood of Christ' was evenly poised between the subjective and objective interpretation". Comparing the whole Post-Sanctus material up to the Institution Narrative with the same section in 1662 it is immediately apparent that a great deal of material has been omitted in the new rite of Series 2. No mention is made of Christ's sacrifice, " a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world", and neither do we see a mention of " a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again." Admittedly, this material was intended to underline albeit in a rather didactic fashion the all-sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice and to rule out any hint that the eucharist is in any sense an

[1] article "Anaphora" in "A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship".
[2] "Liturgical Reform: Some Basic Principles".

additional, propitiatory sacrifice, but the framers of Series 2 have left out any reference to the perfect sacrifice of Christ, and there is felt to be a big and noticeable gap. The Institution Narrative is accompanied by the simple manual acts of 1549 ("Here the priest is to take the bread/the cup into his hands). The anmnesis section originally contained an explicit offering of the bread and cup (see supra p.56) which echoed Hippolytus almost word for word. The compromise wording, "with this bread and this cup..." is reminiscent of 1549, "we...do celebrate...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"..The anamnesis continues, "We pray thee to accept this our duty and service," which is drawn from "we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service," of 1549, 1552 and 1662. The second epiclesis is again not an explicit prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the worshippers, but is a prayer that the communicants "may be filled with thy grace and heavenly blessing", another Prayer Book phrase dating from 1549 and ultimately derived from the Roman Missal ("omni benedictione coelesti et gratia repleamur"). The doxology rounds off the eucharistic prayer and is much fuller and richer than hitherto.

The section called "The Breaking of the Bread" is a definite act of breaking separated from the words of institution in accordance with the four-action theory. The words to accompany the action (1 Cor. 10.16-18) can be said by all. Some churches have adopted the habit of reciting the verses antiphonally. The Agnus Dei is restored (it disappeared after 1549). The introduction to the draft order comments on this section, "Those who regard the Fraction as a utilitarian breaking up of the Bread for distribution may perform the action in silence. Those who connect it with the unity of the Church in the sharing of the One Bread may recite the text from 1 Cor. 10. Those who see in it a Prophetic Sign, whereby the Lord set in motion his Passion, may use 'O Lamb of God'." The section headed "The Sharing of the Bread and Wine" is the fourth part of the four-fold action and it begins with the Lord's Prayer. In 1552 and 1662 the Lord's Prayer was included among the post-communion prayers, but since about 400 it has been said universally as a prayer in preparation before communion, and the Series 2 revisers have therefore "fallen in" with the rest of Christendom. In most of the historic rites the Lord's Prayer comes after the Fraction, though in the Roman and Byzantine liturgies it precedes it, coming straight after the anaphora. After the priest and people who assist him have received communion, the congregation is invited to communion with the words, "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". This is a new feature. The words of administration are very brief compared with those of 1662, but the invitation has taken over the 1552 phrase "feed on him in your heart by faith with thanksgiving" so all is not lost. The brief formula of administration has the force of tradition to back it up. The Ambrosian rite and the Apostolic Constitutions both have similar formulae. Each communicant is asked to say "Amen" before he or she receives the bread and cup. Then follows the Conclusion which contains two prayers, one of which must be used. The first is a shortened version of the Prayer Book "Prayer of Thanksgiving" and the second is a new composition to be said by all which speaks of the offering of "our souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice" and which asks God to "send us out into the world in the power of thy Spirit, to live and work, to thy praise and glory." This brief, succint prayer says all that needs to be said after communion, and the note of mission (lacking in the old service) is a welcome innovation. It is arguable whether the oblation of those present should come within the eucharistic prayer and so be closely identified with Christ's own offering of himself, or whether it should come (as here) after the communion (see supra p. 55). The Gloria may follow after the post-communion prayer(s) but it may seem a rather illogical and needless appendage after a prayer including the words "Send us out into the world" which seem to demand a swift close to the act of worship! No blessing was provided in the draft version and it has been argued that a blessing is a medieval feature and rather too sacerdotal in flavour. No further blessing is really necessary after the blessing given in communion and any such prayer may well be otiose. Congregations would however not always agree with this conclusion and some would miss the blessing from their priest when it was not given. The dismissal should logically follow the blessing, rather than (as here) come before it. The clergy and servers depart and if the vessels have not been cleansed and the remaining elements consumed straight after the communion, this is done after the blessing. The rubric ordering the reverent disposal of the consecrated bread and wine which is not required for the purposes of communion is identical to the Series 1 rubric and permits the practice of reservation for the sick (as 1549 did). Some would contend that this is forbidden by Article 28 and is contrary to Anglican teaching. They would see it as a dangerous step towards the perils of adoration. Others on the other hand would say this rubric makes sensible provision for the primitive custom (dating back to Justin Martyr's time) of reserving the sacrament for the benefit of the sick.

Series 2 was intended from the beginning to be a truly experimental rite

to be used for a trial period. The introduction to the draft order states, "We have deliberately written our rubrics in such a way as to permit the maximum amount of experiment. The liturgical behaviour of clergy and laity alike is in a state of flux; and we should not wish to stabilize it prematurely." A new era in worship has begun, and no longer are congregations bound strictly by a series of rubrics. This flexibility has meant a great feeling of liberation for many who previously felt restricted by the rules of an era long ago, though in parishes where insufficient thought has been given to the enactment of the liturgy and the reasons for change, confusion and sometimes chaos has occured. The number of options in Series 2 means that a service can be very short and may have anything up to 72,000 permutations (according to J. Wilkinson[1]). Doctrinally, the new liturgy has been found lacking in a number of respects. Criticism has been made that the new rite "hardly seems to do justice to the craggy centrality of the Cross which is particularly regrettable in a Eucharistic rite".[2] The eschatological dimension is very weak, and the language seems too slight rendering the whole service far less a rich and evocative liturgy than the Book of Common Prayer rite. Turner fails to be satisfied by the stark words to each communicant and feels that the impression is given that the elements are "supernatural quiddities".

The Liturgical Commission had a far from easy task in formulating a liturgy which needs to be "comprehensive" to satisfy the wide spectrum of Anglican thought and practice. Their method of trying to produce formulae which are capable of various interpretations and which are therefore deliberately ambiguous, while it may result in doctrinal vagueness and "wooliness" and be open to the criticism of compromise on certain centrally important beliefs, was perhaps the only road open to them. Compared with the earlier liturgies of the Church of England certain advances have certainly been made and some deficiences have been remedied. The structure of the Eucharist is now plain for all to see. The language, though still archaic (in a "R.S.V." kind of way) is far more direct and far less wordy than the older rites. The liturgy is now more easily understood as an action to be performed rather than a series of words to be spoken. The fruits of the Liturgical Movement had at last begun to appear in the Church of England.

In 1969 a questionnaire was sent to selected parishes asking for reactions to the new service. The results of this questionnaire established that in most

[1] "Eucharist for Experiment" p. 7 [2] H.E.W.Turner in "Theology" Nov. 1969

parishes the Old Testament lesson was rarely used (the new lectionary had not yet been made available), the confession was thought to be too slight and greater emphasis was required, it was said, on the aspect of the Atonement. The use of the Lord's Prayer before communion was welcomed and the new post-communion prayer was applauded. Series 2 had proved itself to be on the whole a popular rite, and many churches still use it today.

The question of liturgical language always looms large in the debates which accompany liturgical revision. For people who have been brought up to see the worship of the Church as a verbal exercise rather than a liturgical action this is inevitable. Familiarity with, and love for the dignified prose and poetry of the Book of Common Prayer has sometimes produced a strong reaction against any attempts at producing a liturgy in the language of today, but it has always been the policy of the Church to work towards a modern language liturgy using contemporary English, for no other reason than the worship of today is best expressed in the language of today rather than in the language of Elizabethan England. To say, however, that modern liturgy has to be in modern English to be more comprehensible to "outsiders" is a facile argument. To say also that all traditional concepts images and words have to be removed or "up-dated" is yet another piece of facile reasoning. Theological concepts demand the retention of phrases and words which have been in use for centuries and liturgy needs the words which have theological and which link present worship with the worship of Christians down the ages. Words which have associations in the hearts and minds of Christian people and which are hieratic and evocative of the eternal "verities" cannot and should not easily be discarded.

The first move towards a liturgy in modern language came with the little book, "Modern Liturgical Texts" by the Liturgical Commission in 1968. New texts were provided for the Lord's Prayer, Gloria and Creed which were new translations of the original Greek and Latin versions. An Appendix sets out a modern version of Series 2 compiled by Canon Geoffrey Cuming. In 1970 the I.C.E.T. texts appeared entitled "Prayers We Have in Common". This booklet contained material produced by an International, ecumenical team of scholars. The Lord's Prayer, the Creed, Gloria, Sanctus and Benedictus, Sursum Corda and Agnus Dei were included.

On 16 September 1971 the report, "An Order for Holy Communion (Series 3)" was published. In its forward (addressed to the Archbishops) the new order is described as being built upon the foundations of Series 2. No departure has been made from the basic structure of that rite, though there have been made substantial changes in language and detail. The accompanying Commentary states that the new rite is regarded by the Commission as definitive to be

included with only small modifications in the proposed new Prayer Book. The rite was authorised from February 1 1973 but only after the customary Synodical debates and the consequent amendments. The General Synod debated it in November 1971. The Dean of Guildford (the Very Revd. A.C. Bridge) criticised the rite for its poor language which he dubbed "semi-contemporary prose of dubious distinction".[1] Three completely new prayers were included in the draft form, a new confession, a new alternative prayer to the Prayer of Humble Access and a new Post-communion Prayer. The new confession spoke of God as "Father eternal, Giver of light and grace", and recalls his work in creation and in incarnation. The categories of sin (thought, word and deed) are made personal and verbal ("we have sinned... in what we have thought ... said and done"). The reasons for sin are expanded from "through our own fault" to "through ignorance, through weakness, through our own deliberate fault" (a borrowing from the New Zealand rite). The effects of sin are given as wounding God's love for us and marring his image in us. Finally, contrition is expressed in the words, "We are sorry and ashamed", and after praying that God will forgive all that is past (as in Series 2) the prayer concludes, "lead us out from darkness to walk as children of light", which makes a suitable link with the beginning of the Prayer where God is described as "Giver of light and grace". Many members of the Synod objected to the tone of the Prayer. It seemed as if the Prayer were forcing feelings of guilt on the user, and certainly it does seem a far more subjective composition than the Series 2 Confession. The new Prayer was "fuller" and richer in imagery but the Synod found this rather too much to stomach and proposed a prayer which was closer in many ways to Series 2 though exhibiting some new phrases from the draft version. The phrase, "We have wounded your love and marred your image in us" was rejected and perhaps rightly so. The phrase is not particularly felicitous and is rather too complex in imagery for most congregations. The alternative prayer to be said in place of the Humble Access Prayer was modelled on George Herbert's "Love" and it begins with the words, "Most merciful Lord, your love compels us to come in", echoing Lk. 14.23. The next two lines recall Psalm 24 ("Our hands were unclean, our hearts were unprepared"), and lines 5 and 6, "we were not fit even to eat the crumbs from under your table" is a direct allusion to Mark 7.26. Lines 7 and 8 recall God's feeding his people on manna and refer to Christ's practice of sharing his meals with the sinful ("But you, Lord, are the God of our salvation, and share your bread with sinners"). The Prayer ends with a plea for fruitful communion and an expression of hope in the heavenly banquet (Luke 12. 37, 13. 29, 22.28-30). Despite its rich biblical

[1] quoted in T.Beeson "The Church of England in Crisis" p. 90

content, (some might say it was too rich) the prayer was rejected in toto by the Synod. The new post-communion prayer was not destined for the same fate though it too was full of scriptural allusions which seem to be too closely and too artificially sewn together. The first three lines are inspired by the Parable of the Prodigal Son whose father went out to meet him, while he was "still far off" (Lk. 15.20). Christ's work of redemption is reduced to a rather matter-of-fact sounding list, "Dying and living, he declared your love, gave us grace, and opened the gate of glory." The prayer continues with a desire that "We who share Christ's body (may) share his risen life" and a commitment to bring life and light to others in the world. Finally, in language borrowed from Hebrews 6.19 where hope is described as an anchor in our lives, the prayer expresses the desire to be "anchored" in the hope that "we have grasped" so that we may be truly free, "and the whole earth live to praise your Name." Before the prayer was written into the authorised version one amendment was made and "anchor us" was changed to "keep us" which destroys the scriptural allusion but does at least avoid the clash of vowels. The prayer has proved popular with some though there can be no escaping the inelegance of much of the wording. The phrase "we whom the Spirit lights give light to the world" is supposed to suggest the idea of being set on fire by the Spirit (see "Eucharist Today" P.164) but this does not come across in this ugly sounding phrase. The phrase, "Keep us in this hope that we have grasped" sounds far too staccato and the verb "grasped" could well convey a Pelagian notion of hope as being something to strive after rather than a truer impression of hope as being a divine gift. The final petition could be improved upon as far as the syntax is concerned, (does "so we...shall be free" imply a consequence?). There were other new features in Series 3 which were not quite so controversial. The seasonal material is increased and more Proper Thanksgivings are provided. Seasonal sentences (from scripture) are given at the beginning of the service and after the communion. Seasonal blessings may be said in place of the words, "The peace of God..." This fills a gap in the Series 2 rite, but there is some inconsistency in that sentences are provided for Harvest and Unity at the beginning, for Unity after communion and at the blessing, but no Proper Thanksgivings are provided for Unity or Harvest and no post-communion sentence or special blessing is given for Harvest Festivals. The Proper Thanksgivings for Saints' Days might well have been improved upon and could well have been made more specific so that an individual Saint might be named, perhaps as follows, "And now we give you thanks for the glorious....and especially in your servant/Apostle/martyr/bishop N.; that following their..."

The opening Sentences are designed to set the tone of the celebration. At the beginning of Series 3 Morning and Evening Prayer a greater variety of scripture is available which could well supplement the meagre choice at the beginning of the eucharist. The communion sentences are intended "to crystallize the central idea of the particular occasion immediately before a short period of silence for prayer or meditation."[1] The Series 3 Commentary makes the suggestion (not followed in the rubrics) that if need arise the Minister may select further sentences from the lessons of the day. The one flaw in what is a positive enrichment of the liturgy may be the somewhat confusing effect these sentences isolated from their biblical context can produce. One sentence is obviously a prayer, though disguised (Advent), two seem to be directed at the congregation (Saints' Days and Whitsun), two are words of Jesus (Lent and Easter) and the others are comments made in the first person plural. It would have been better to have constructed short prayers based on the verse from scripture. The Seasonal blessings have (according to the Commentary) been modelled on the medieval episcopal blessings as found in the "Benedictional of Leofric" though the compositions themselves are entirely new and in general prove quite appropriate.

Silence, that valuable commodity in a noisy world, should be an integral part of any act of worship today, and the Series 3 revisers have provided rubrics indicating points at which silence may be appropriate (after the lessons, after the sermon, during the intercessions, after the responses to the Commandments, before the confession, after the Thanksgiving and after the post-communion sentence). Such pauses in the liturgical action can be very welcome to worshippers and can also help to break up the breathless haste which has characterised acts of worship in the past, giving time for reflection on the words of scripture and providing space for personal meditation.

Since the Prayer Book of 1552, the Ten Commandments have been included in the English liturgy, (they had previously been included in the medieval service of prone). As Gunstone notes, "Cranmer's purpose in placing the ten commandments at the beginning of the service seems to have been catechetical rather than penitential...They provided a pattern for Christian living. But when the Communion Service was used every Sunday among the high churchmen of the late seventeenth century, the regular recitation of the commandments became rather burdensome."[2] The 1928 revision permitted the Summary of the Law (Mt. 22.37-40) as an alternative to the Decalogue, and this became a popular provision. There seems no doubt that except in some conservative evangelical churches the

[1] Series 3 Commentary p. 13 [2] in "The Eucharist Today" p. 85

reading of the Decalogue has now almost disappeared. The Series 2 service did not encourage it by relegating the Commandments to an Appendix at the back of the book. Series 3 draft order sought to reintroduce the Commandments in a new form and in a new position after the intercessions and before the confession as a means of self-examination and self-preparation. The Old Testament words are amplified by words from the New Testament most of the latter giving a positive "slant" to the former. The reply to each commandment is "Amen. Lord, have mercy", an abbreviated form of the traditional response, but here with the Commandments in their new position, it duplicates the Kyries which may well have already been said at the start of the service. The intention of the Liturgical Commission is that the Commandments should be mandatory on Ash Wednesday and the five Sundays of Lent. This came to be amended later, and the Commandments are now optional and are printed in the Appendix. This will please those who find the Decalogue a needless intrusion. The Penitential Section is reordered in Series 3 and the Confession is now preceded by and not followed by the Comfortable Words (which are now in modern dress, the R.S.V. with one word changed). This was done to meet the criticism of the Series 2 invitation which was said to make no mention of repentance, of being "in love and charity with your neighbours" and of intending to lead a new life "following the commandments of God". The "Words of Comfort" encourage the people to come freely to God who will forgive them and the priest adds a further invitation with the exhortation "Let us... confess our sins... firmly resolved to keep God's commandments and to live in love and peace with all men". In the Prayer Book the Comfortable Words were designed to confirm the pardon given at the absolution; here they are invitatory and are optional. All the sentences need not be read, one or more may suffice. T.G.A. Baker[1] comments adversely on the attribution of the "Words of Comfort" to Christ himself and to St. Paul and St. John when biblical scholarship has made any such certainty impossible. Others have noted that the word "Comfort" does not now mean what once it meant and could prove misleading to some people. The Prayer of Humble Access is retained in its Series 2 position. It has undergone slight modification and the language is in more modern form. It is still too far away from communion, and the penitential section could be made less overloaded if it were to be placed after the Thanksgiving. The Peace is now given a special heading and added emphasis is given to it. The rubric orders a standing posture and it now becomes the first major act of the eucharistic action rather than effecting the conclusion to the act of penitence ( as in Series 2). The revisers intend the Peace to be "both

[1] "Questioning Worship" p. 30

a demonstration of love and charity - an outward and visible sign of reconciliation - and a recognition of being in the Body of Christ".[1] The rubrics give no suggested way of presenting or performing the Peace and congregations have to experiment with various methods. Some Anglicans prefer to say the words alone without hand clasps or gestures which they regard as artificial or "forced". The Peace is conveyed first by the priest (or President) to the people. The name "President" caused some consternation among some congregations when they first met the word, and some said that this was a subtle attempt at denying the priesthood of the officiant, but Canon B12 is now inserted into the Notes at the front of the Series 3 booklet to allay these fears. The word (in Greek "Proestos") is first mentioned in Justin's "First Apology" and indicates the function of the priest as a man who presides over the corporate act of the Church. The particular role of the President is to give the Peace and Absolution, to "take" the bread and the wine, to say the Thanksgiving, to Break the Bread, to invite the people to communion and finally to give the blessing and dismissal. Other parts of the rite may be performed by a minister other than the President (whether priest, deacon or layman). In this, the Anglican Eucharist differs from the Roman rite in which the celebrant presides over both word and sacrament and is assigned special "presidential prayers" to say. Series 3 gives the impression that the President presides over the eucharistic part alone. A Minister (ideally a lay person) is directed to say "The Prayers" and the material in this section has been expanded and rearranged. Thanksgivings are included alongside the intercessions. Series 3 has added a new section of intercession for the local community and has rewritten the petition for the sick and suffering. The Queen is now mentioned and a fuller commemoration of the departed is given (following the suggestions of the report "Prayer and the Departed" 1971). The order of set prayer and extempore prayer has been inverted so that the set prayer follows and sums up the particular petitions (which are real prayers addressed to God, and not as in the Roman rite, biddings leading into prayer).

The section of the liturgy called "The Communion", that is the Eucharist proper, follows the fourfold scheme more closely than Series 2 with the four sub-headings, The Taking of the Bread and Wine, The Thanksgiving, The Breaking of the Bread and The Giving of the Breadand the Cup. The act of "Taking" begins with the collection and/or the presentation of money (optional) and the presentation of the elements. The sentence from 1 Chron. 29.11,16 may be said,

[1] "The Presentation of the Eucharist".

(the heavy black print would suggest this is to be said by the whole congregation). This is followed by an act of taking which marks the first of the four sacramental acts. The bread and wine are held for a moment in silence above the table, as was the ancient Jewish custom when at saying grace the bread and cup were first lifted a hand's breadth above the table.[1] As in Series 2 the word "Offertory" is studiously avoided. The Thanksgiving begins according to tradition with the greeting and Sursum Corda, but the translation of the words, "Dominus vobiscum: Et cum spiritu tuo" is novel. Influenced by Prof. W.C. van Unnik, who has proposed the theory that Dominus refers here not to the Father or the Son but to the Holy Spirit, the revisers have worded the phrases as: "The Lord is here: His Spirit is with us", following the version in "Modern Liturgical Texts" of 1968 which reads "The Spirit of the Lord be with you: And also with you." Not every liturgical scholar would agree with this bold interpretation of these words. Jungmann, for example, treats the word "Dominus" as equivalent to the word "God" and others have taken it to mean "Christ" (who promised that "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them", (Mt. 18.20)). As R.J. Halliburton says in the book, "The Eucharist Today"[2], "The note of greeting now entirely disappears." In its place we have in the words of D.L. Frost, "a proclamation which is at once dramatic, startling and scriptural, a real ground for 'lifting up of hearts'".[3] (G. Wainwright considers the Aramaic maranatha which appears in 1 Cor. 16.22 and Rev. 22.20, can be translated "The Lord is here", but he does not discuss the liturgical use of the words in this context.[4]). The new translation is opposed by Michael Moreton in his pamphlet, "Made Fully Perfect". He accuses the Liturgical Commission of making an unjustified break with ancient and universal tradition, and his suspicions are aroused that, "the purpose of the Series 3 statement here about the Lord's presence in the eucharist is to counteract the concept of the real presence of Christ in the sacramental bread and cup," and that the revisers are wanting to return to the more "protestant" service of 1552. Whatever reasons the Commission had besides the theory of van Unnik to translate as they did, it is difficult to determine, but the revisers were, it is certain, clear in their own minds that their new translation was far better than the usual one. The Series 2 Preface made mention of the mighty acts of God and proper thanksgivings for various seasons were produced for insertion. "The result was awkward and confusing" confesses the Commission[5] and so in the new

[1] as described in Jeremias, "The Eucharistic Words of Jesus" p. 177

[2] op. cit. p. 103 [3] "The Language of Series 3" p. 28 [4] in "Eucharist and Eschatology", see also C.K. Barrett's Commentary on 1 Cor. 16.22

[5] Series 3 Commentary p. 12

eucharistic preface the proper thanksgivings all come at the end of the invariable preface immediately before the section leading into the Sanctus and all begin "And now we give you thanks...". Some minor changes have been made to the preface itself. It now includes the word "joy" in the opening paragraph. The very beginning of the preface "It is not only right..." does however convey an element of almost carping contradiction of what has come before and a more positive sentiment would have been better. Christ is now described as God's "living Word" (cf. Hippolytus, "your inseparable Word"), through whom God has "created all things from the beginning" (cf. Hippolytus, "through whom you made all things"). Through Christ, God has "made us a people for your own possession", (cf. Hippolytus, "Fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people"). The Sanctus follows the new I.C.E.T. wording but the Benedictus is omitted as it was in Series 2, and the Commission decided to make it an optional extra to be sung during THE COMMUNION (according to rubric 34) which implies it can be used at any point after the Prayer of Humble Access. In the words of the Commentary, "The traditional anthems, Benedictus and Agnus Dei, have been deliberately placed after the Communion in the hope that the pattern of the eucharistic action may stand out more clearly; but we recognize that they may be sung at various points in the service as local conditions dictate". It is hard to accept that the Benedictus would interrupt the eucharistic action, and if this were so then the Sanctus should also be removed (as Ratcliff and Couratin argued). The post-Sanctus which follows is well linked to the Sanctus by the word "praises". The epiclesis which follows, though not a direct invocation of the Spirit to change the elements, is remarkably similar to the new Roman Eucharistic Prayers 2, 3 and 4 ("grant that by the power of your Spirit these gifts of bread and wine may be to us his body and his blood"). The epiclesis is preceded by the phrase "as we follow his example and obey his command" which in the words of the Commentary "invokes our Lord's example and precept as our warrant for holding the service". Moreton asks whether the "as" is causal or temporal, and concluding it is probably temporal decides that the wording "favours a transitory and subjective notion of Christ's presence in the Eucharist".[1] The narrative of the institution follows. In the draft version our Lord's words were in the active rather than the passive mood creating a bold departure from scripture and tradition. The Synod decided to revert to the usual passive. No manual acts are intended as the "taking" has already been done and the"breaking" is to take place later. The congregation has usually taken a kneeling position for the words of institution but the Commission

[1] op. cit. p. 15

advises the people to stand throughout the Thanksgiving and genuflexions at the words of institution are discouraged (though Rome insists on them). The acclamations which follow are inserted to give the people an opportunity to have a vocal part in the eucharistic prayer. Only one set is given ("Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again") amended by Synod to correspond with the acclamations in the Roman rite. The anamnesis is a new piece of liturgical writing initiated by Canon Jasper, Kenneth Ross and Colin Buchanan. Influenced, no doubt by Series 2, the phrase "with this bread and this cup" is retained, and no attempt has been made to reintroduce the idea of offering the bread and the cup. The word "celebrate" makes an appearance. The word appeared three times in the 1549 Canon and once in the 1928 Canon. It appears in the Roman Eucharistic Prayer 4 where it appears in the anamnesis, "Father, we now celebrate this memorial of our redemption". The verb does smack of "offering" to some sensitive evangelicals, but it does convey overtones which are very apt in a eucharistic prayer, conveying a spirit of praise and festivity. The other important word to make an appearance is the word "proclaim" which comes straight out of 1 Cor. 11.26 where Paul talks of proclaiming (kataggellete) the death of Christ in the Lord's Supper. The Doctrinal Commission made a suggestion for expressing the eschatological aspect of the anamnesis in the words, "we look for the fulness of his coming in glory". This was altered later in Synod to read, "we look for his coming in glory" and the whole of the syntax was recast so that "celebrate" and "proclaim" were joined together and made to refer to Christ's perfect sacrifice, resurrection and ascension. The words, "with this bread and this cup" were moved forward to qualify "we do this in remembrance of him" and according to Moreton were thus detached from their association with the sacrifice of Christ.[1] In his opinion the whole section is muddled and obscure trying, as it seems, to reject and avoid the anamnesis-oblation formula of Catholic Christendom. R.J. Halliburton is not so critical and more sanguine. He writes, "It may well be that many would have preferred to see the words 'we offer...' inserted at some state in the anamnesis of this prayer. It would be disastrous if on account of their omission this prayer were to be judged neither traditional nor catholic when there is so much else in its text to unite it with roots of eucharistic theology in Scripture and the Fathers and indeed with the theological outlook of other contemporary liturgies."[2] Following the anamnesis a new sentence begins, "Accept this our sacrifice of thanks and praise" which introduces the second epiclesis, which is almost a modified version of the Roman Supra Quae. The phrase "sacrifice of thanks and praise" derives from

[1] op. cit. p. 23 [2] "The Eucharist Today" p. 116

the Latin "sacrificium laudis" through Cranmer's amended "Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving". The alteration was intended to convey the act of praise and thanksgiving made in response to Christ's sacrifice and to exclude the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice. The phrase in Series 3 also seems to mean to convey the same sentiments. The final version of Series 3 includes the added words, "through him, our great high Priest",(from Hebrews 13.15 and 4.14). Moreton writes, "...the uncritical drafting of the theology of Hebrews into the eucharistic prayer results in the denial of there being any reality in the liturgical sacrifice of the eucharist".[1] This conclusion however fails to appreciate that the Letter to the Hebrews (as Montefiore makes clear in his Commentary) is not concerned with eucharistic teaching at all and even less is it concerned to exclude what are in reality much later controversies. All mention of the heavenly altar in the Roman liturgy at this point was changed to "Thy Holy Tabernacle" in 1549 and dropped completely in 1552 and 1662 when the emphasis was centred totally on the offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies". No mention is made in the new Roman eucharistic prayers of Christ as High Priest, though in the preface of Holy Thursday, Christ is described as "the true and eternal priest who established this unending sacrifice".
The final section of the Series 3 epiclesis prays that, "as we eat and drink these holy gifts in the presence of your divine majesty", we may be renewed by the Spirit, inspired by God's love and united in the body of Jesus Christ. The wording here is similar to Hippolytus and the fourth Roman eucharistic Prayer, both of which pray for the unity of all who share in communion. A change in syntax would be welcome at this point so that the Spirit is the subject of, or at least the indirect agent of all three verbs, (e.g. "Renew us by your Spirit, inspire us with his love, and through him unite us in the body of your Son..."). The Series 2 "holy things" now becomes "holy gifts" to correspond with the same words earlier in the prayer. "In the presence of your divine majesty" remains as "the last relics of the Ratcliff-Couratin theory" according to Colin Buchanan. The Doxology includes a congregational acclamation which provides a far richer climax than the new Roman doxology. According to tradition stretching back to Justin Martyr the congregational response to the Thanksgiving Prayer has always been a simple "Amen". Series 3 has been influenced by Ratcliff and Couratin yet again. The phrase "all who stand before you" is a direct borrowing from Hippolytus ("adstare coram te") and originates in Deut. 10.8, 18.7 and Daniel 7.10. The picture is evoked of the heavenly hosts ministering to and worshipping the Almighty. The congregational response is an adaptation of Rev. 5.13 which contains the words spoken by every creature in heaven and on earth.

[1] op. cit. p. 27

The third act of the four-fold action, the "Breaking" is given shortened wording to accompany it and the Agnus Dei is removed. The devotional aspect of the Fraction is, in the opinion of Halliburton, ruled out in this rite. "The memorial of the Lord's passion has already been made in the prayer; now the people of God are to be reminded that they are all united in the Body of Christ, the one Body divided and broken up so that Christ's members may be united together in fellowship with him".[1] The fourth act, the "Giving" is begun with the Lord's Prayer (amended I.C.E.T. version) and the invitation to communion. The latter is based on the Series 2 invitation but includes the added words "Remember that he died for you" which introduces a new subjective element at this point. The words of administration ("The Body of Christ keep you in eternal life/ The Blood of Christ keep you in eternal life") are borrowed from the old Roman liturgy and are more satisfactory than the bald, though primitive Series 2 formula. Section 35 provides for supplementary consecration, should either or both of the consecrated elements prove insufficient. R.F. Buxton has made a study of supplementary consecration in his book, "Eucharist and Institution Narrative". His conclusion is that the Churches of the Anglican Communion are the only ones to practice it. In 1548, no doubt because medieval chalices were far too small for general communion, the provision was made that when the chalice became empty the priest was to return to the altar and consecrate another, beginning with the words, "Simili modo, postquam cenatum est", and ending at the words, "qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum". The 1662 rite similarly orders another consecration using the narrative of the institution beginning at the words, "Our Saviour Christ in the same night...". In Buxton's view, the Caroline divines believed that "the institution narrative provided the warrant for celebrating and the guarantee that the effects of the eucharist would be in accordance with the mind of Christ in his institution of the sacrament, and was to be set within the framework of a prayer of thanksgiving containing an invocation or blessing upon the elements, the whole of which complex achieved the consecration".[2] A second consecration could be achieved by the recital of the institution narrative, "because the latter was seen as transferring the whole of the effect of all the prayers of the rite to the newly-brought supply."[3] By the middle of the eighteenth century, two traditions had developed concerning supplementary consecration, the first following the 1662 reasoning and the other associated with the 1764 rite which provided a separate complete consecration prayer to be said over any fresh

[1] op. cit. p. 118 [2] op. cit. p. 131 [3] op. cit. p. 219

supply of bread and wine. Some believed erroneously that the 1662 rubrics were based on a Roman theory of consecration, but in fact the Roman Church has never taught that the consecration is effected by the words of institution alone, in isolation from the rest of the Canon. In the draft version of Series 3, the priest was allowed to add extra bread or wine to the existing supply before they were totally consumed, either in silence or saying the words, "Having given thanks to you Father, over the bread and cup as your Son our Lord Jesus Christ commanded, we receive this bread/wine also as his body/blood". The principle employed here is that of associating additional bread and wine with already consecrated elements before they have been exhausted, either in silence or with a prayer, and neither the Liturgical Commission nor the Doctrine Commission could find any objection to this principle. Buxton however questions the statement made by the Liturgical Commission that there is good historical precedent for their suggestions. No additional consecrations were ever made, he says, before the Reformation (except wine by mixing). In Synod the Archbishop of Canterbury protested strongly against the silent method of "re-consecration" since he believed the congregation would not be aware of what was happening. In the authorised version of Series 3 the prayer was changed to include the words, "Take, eat; this is my body" and/or "Drink this; this is my blood". There is still no direct request that God will bless and sanctify the elements (as there is, for example, in the new American Prayer Book which gives the formula: "Hear us, O heavenly Father, and with your Word and Holy Spirit bless and sanctify this bread (wine) that it, also, may be the Sacrament of the precious Body (Blood) of your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who took bread (the cup) and said, 'This is my Body (Blood).' Amen."). According to Buxton the Series 3 provision is in harmony with that of 1662, accepting the practice of "re-consecration" is possible at all; (the Roman and Eastern Churches would regard the practice as invalid and would forbid it).

One of the aims of Series 2 was to produce a rite that was flexible and experimental. Series 3 has moved on and is a rite which is less permissive though containing a number of options. It has more mandatory material (e.g. The Peace, The Taking of Bread and Wine) and whereas Series 2 allowed the maximum of freedom with regard, for example, to posture, Series 3 makes it mandatory that the people stand for The Peace, the Taking, and the whole of the Thanksgiving. Rubrics are printed in the text ordering the people to stand for the Creed and the Gospel. For the Confession the people are asked to kneel. Before the communion no advice is given as to what posture should be adopted (contrast the Book of Common Prayer), and communicants may be free to receive kneeling, standing or sitting.

In the November 1971 debate, Canon Jasper had suggested a combined Series 1 and 2 Revised superseding the old Series 1 and Series 2 and designed to be an "Intermediate Rite" between 1662 and Series 3. This suggestion became official policy in July 1973. Published in report form in 1975, Series 1/2 Revised showed that it was based on Series 2 with Series 1 and Series 3 material. November 1 1976 was the date of authorisation. The rite begins (as Series 3) with optional Seasonal Sentences which have been "back-dated" to conform with the language of the whole rite which is in traditional rather than modern style. The Prayers of Intercession (a new heading combining Series 2 and 3) are set out in double columns with the 1928/Series 1 material on the left and the Series 2 material (rearranged according to Series 3) on the right. The next section is renamed "Prayers of Penitence". The invitation to confession may take either Series 1 or Series 2 forms. The confession is from Series 2 with an extra phrase from Series 3 ("We are heartily sorry, and repent of all our sins"). The Prayer of Humble Access comes in its customary position after the absolution. The Communion section begins with The Peace (as Series 3) but using 1 Cor. 12.13 and Eph. 4.3 (as Series 2). The following section reverts to the Series 2 title ("The Preparation of the Bread and Wine") and the word "Offertory" is inserted. The sentence (1 Chron. 29. 11,14) is as Series 1. The Thanksgiving is subtitled "Prayer of Consecration" and either the Series 1 Canon may be used or the Thanksgiving Prayer of Series 2 may be said. The Series 1 Canon is without the self-oblation section and contains the additional sentence, "We pray that all we who are partakers of this holy communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction", inserted before the doxology. The Series 2 Thanksgiving places the proper thanksgivings in the Series 3 position after a united preface. The Series 1 prefaces contain an additional two for funerals (the second borrowed from the Roman preface). The Series 2 prefaces also include these, and there are additional ones for other major seasons. The Lord's Prayer may be said in its Series 1 position straight after the Prayer of Consecration, in its Series 2 and Series 3 position before communion, or in its 1662 position after communion. The Breaking of Bread is accompanied by the Series 3 sentences and the Agnus Dei may be said at this point. The communion can be administered with or without an invitation and with one of four possible formulae. The Series 3 provision for supplementary consecration is given. The post-communion prayer or prayers are the 1662 prayers of thanksgiving and oblation, the Series 1 prayer of oblation and the second Series 3 post-communion prayer. The rite ends with a blessing (which can be seasonal) and a dismissal (either as Series 3 or as the new Roman mass).

Series 1 and 2 Revised (authorised until December 1979) is a rite with a bewildering concatenation of liturgical choices. Many good features of Series 3 have been successfully married with Series 1 and Series 2 material, but the clear four-fold action is now obscured and the manual acts in the eucharistic prayer have once more taken the place of the act of "Taking".

As a result of comments gleaned from a questionnaire issued to a cross-section of clergy and laity in 1976, ammendments were made to the Series 3 rite and this revision appeared in May 1978 for consideration by the General Synod. More seasonal material has been introduced by general request from the parishes and more seasonal sentences and proper thanksgivings are provided. 40% of the clergy questioned and 24% of the laity expressed the wish to see the penitential section at the beginning of the service (as in the new Roman and Methodist rites and many other modern liturgies). The Preparation section takes the following suggested form: Salutation, Collect for Purity, Confession (which may be preceded by The Commandments, the Summary of the Law, and/or the Comfortable Words), Absolution, Kyries or Gloria, Collect for the Day. It may also take the form: Salutation, Confession (with or without Commandments and Comfortable Words), Collect for the Day; yet another possible form is: Salutation, Collect for Purity, Kyries, Comfortable Words, Confession, Absolution, Collect for the Day. A much shorter Confession and Absolution are provided. If the penitential section is to come at this early point this shorter confession is to be preferred, otherwise the section becomes unduly overweight. The questionnaires also came up with a suggestion for greater freedom in the Intercessions. This has been met with a proposal that the General Intercession or Litany may be used (as permitted in Series 2) or what is obviously much better, any other suitable prayer or prayers. This flexibility will be eagerly welcomed by those who want the intercessions to be less structured and more relevant to the needs of the occasion, (it will also bring the Anglican liturgy into line with the Roman mass and other liturgies). Similar freedom is allowed after the Communion and at the Offertory so that 1 Chron. 29. 11,16 need not always be said and other appropriate words may be used instead, (some churches have taken to using the Roman prayer at this point). The revisers have placed the Peace at the end of the Ministry of the Word (as in Series 2) and not (as in Series 3 and 1/2 revised) at the beginning of the Communion section. No explanation is given for this apparently retrograde change. The four-fold action has been maintained, but it has undergone a subtle (and some might say confusing) modification. Because the four actions do not carry equal significance (this was agreed in 1971), the Thanksgiving and the Giving of the Bread and Cup being of greater

importance than the Taking or the Breaking, the revisers have coupled the first two actions, underlining the Thanksgiving by giving it bold type and have done the same to the last two, printing the Giving in heavier type. The Taking may precede the Thanksgiving or it may be assimilated into the eucharistic prayer as a manual act during the institution narrative or as a continual act of elevation all through the prayer, (the latter being an original and unusual suggestion). The Liturgical Commission has reverted to the use of the word "Offertory" and has marked it off as a special section separate from the Taking. There is now (perhaps) a clearer distinction between the two activities, the first being a preliminary act of bringing and presenting, the second being the solemn act of Jesus, marking the bread and wine which are to be consecrated. No other rite seems to make such a distinction which may well be too subtle for many to appreciate. The report provides an emended Series 3 eucharistic prayer and two others, a eucharistic prayer from Series 1 and 2 Revised (which is basically Series 1 with its language in "you" rather than "thou" form), and a eucharistic prayer also from Series 1 and 2 Revised which is virtually Series 2 in a slightly more modern presentation. The Series 3 Thanksgiving has been modified so that it now begins on a positive note with: "It is indeed right..." and active verbs have replaced participles which helps to adda certain amount of force, (e.g. "you gave him to be born as man...you raised him from the dead.. You exalted him..."). The Acclamations were regarded by some as an intrusion after the institution narrative and so they have now been moved to a place after the anamnesis (where the Church of South India rite also inserts acclamations). The anamnesis itself has been modified with a few slight amendments, though most of the suggestions made in the questionnaires were on "party" lines and so have not been considered suitable (!) The first sentence, "Therefore, heavenly Father, we do this..." is no longer followed by a colon and the following clauses are now separate sentences. The phrase, "with this bread and this cup" has been tacked onto the clause "as we celebrate his one perfect sacrifice" and perpetuates the notion that the elements are somehow ancillary to the central action of the eucharistic prayer. The Nicene Creed is now brought into line with the 1975 I.C.E.T. version and is now identical with the common text as used by the majority of Christians. The Lord's Prayer has also been amended and the revisers have returned to the word "Temptation" to translate <u>peirasmos</u> even though they still maintain that the word means much more than subjective moral temptation. They suggest the phrase "Let us not be led into temptation" (which is neither to be found in any of the major modern translations of the New Testament most of whom use the word "test", nor does it agree with the

I.C.E.T. text). The new Agnus Dei is now printed in two places, during the administration and in its more traditional place at the Fraction. The Benedictus may be sung as an anthem during the communion or in its more usual and natural place after the Sanctus. Series 3 Revised received General Consideration on 11 July 1978 and was remitted to the Revision Committee.

In February 1976 the General Synod had accepted proposals for a new Prayer Book (to be called "The Alternative Service Book") which is to be published in 1980. It is probable that this book, like the excellent new American Book of Common Prayer of 1977 will contain a eucharistic rite in traditional style (like Series 1 and 2 Revised), and a modern liturgy which will be essentially Series 3 when its revision has been finally completed: (the 1662 Book of Common Prayer will of course still be "legal" and available for use). It is hoped that like the American book, a choice of eucharistic prayers will be included giving flexibility and variety. It is planned that one such prayer will be composed by the Joint Liturgical Group,[1] one will be intended for the use of the sick and for house groups, and one will be for children modelled on one of the new Roman eucharistic prayers for children.

[1] contained in "The Daily Office Revised" 1978

## Chapter 3 British Methodism

The publication in 1969 of "The Liturgical Movement and Methodism" by Raymond J. Billington gave a well needed impetus to liturgical revival in the Methodist Church of Great Britain. Billington has since lost his faith and left the Church, but at the time of writing this book he was convinced that the Liturgical Movement should be taken far more seriously by Methodists who, in his view, had for so long been nurtured on a concept of worship which was for too individualistic and heavily weighted in strengthening personal faith of individuals and little else. He believed that Methodism has been influenced far more by the nineteenth century than by the eighteenth to produce subjective, inspirational worship dominated by the wrong type of hymn and controlled by the minister's indiosyncrasies. There has been little active participation by the congregation since the nineteenth century and worshippers have grown accustomed to sitting, listening and singing the hymns. The Liturgical Movement should act, he said, as a healthy corrective to all this. The objectivity of worship should be rediscovered with far more active participation on the part of the people. The ideal of the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, THE Sunday Service should be realised and the balance of Word and Sacrament should be redressed in favour of the sacramental life of the Church.

Even before Billington's book appeared, there were however signs that some Methodists had begun to assimilate the insights of the Liturgical Movement. In 1961 the Renewal Group had been formed to study the nature of the Church and to discover more adequate ways of worship and evangelism. In 1962 an Order for Holy Communion was produced and in the same year the Methodist Conference resolved to revise the 1936 Book of Offices. In 1963 the very first Methodist Liturgical Conference took place in Bristol. In the years that followed work was continued on producing a new eucharistic rite and it eventually appeared in 1968. Entitled "The Sunday Service" (the same title Wesley had given to the Communion in his Book of Offices) the service book contained an order for The Preaching Service, the Lord's Supper, Appendices containing the Collect for Purity, the Commandments of the Lord Jesus, the Decalogue, general Collects, a Table of Lessons, Collects and Epistles and Gospels for Christmas 2, Maundy Thursday and All Saints' Day and a Prayer of Thanksgiving and Dedication to be used when there is no communion. The booklet ends with a Shorter Form of Service for the Holy Communion.

The Preaching Service is modelled somewhat on the Antecommunion of Series 2 and the Liturgy of the Word in the Roman liturgy and contains the basic

common structure of lessons, sermon and intercessions. The service can form an order of worship in its own right without communion. It begins with the Introit and a hymn or psalm may be sung. The first prayer (which may or may not be the Collect for Purity) is a prayer of invocation or adoration. This received criticism from Arthur Couratin in the "Church Quarterly" for July 1969 who maintained that the first prayer should be the Collect of the Day. The confession follows and the Series 2 prayer is given in both "Thou" and "You" forms. Another extempore or formal prayer may be said by the minister on behalf of the congregation though as the people are taking their sins to God this practice ought to be discouraged. The confession is followed by an optional declaration of forgiveness taking the form of a text from scripture (not specified). In placing the confession at the head of the rite, the Methodist Church follows many other eucharistic liturgies including the Roman. The Gloria comes after the absolution, though some other hymn may be sung. The Collect for the Day comes next (or some other prayer) and then come the readings (either two or three including the Gospel). After the Gospel the children depart for their own lessons and are given their dismissal. Couratin makes the following comment which has a measure of sound common sense: "This may be pastorally necessary, but it is liturgically most undesirable. However orderly the withdrawal of the children may be, the rest of the congregation cannot fail to be distracted from bearing in mind the passages of Scripture which have just been read and are soon to be expounded. Nor will the average preacher find it easy to start preaching immediately after the withdrawal, without making considerable effort to capture his audience's attention."[1] The practice of bringing children into church for this earlier part of the service has its difficulties, especially when the lessons are unrelated to their own lessons, (A.R. George makes this point in "Worship and the Child" pp. 39/40). The Anglican custom of bringing children in for the communion (at the offertory or later) might be a solution (though this has its difficulties especially if older non-confirmed children feel excluded from communion). The sermon follows the dismissal of the children and after a hymn the notices are given out and the collection taken. The intercessions follow, and are in litany form, slightly fuller in content than the equivalent section in Series 2 and omitting the collect after each versicle and response. The Lord's Prayer concludes this part. Since the introduction of the Lord's Prayer into the Eucharist in the fourth century it has occupied a place immediately prior to the communion. Its place here at the end of the ministry of the Word is unique. No doubt the revisers felt that if the Preaching Service is to be used as a separate entity it

[1] op. cit. p. 32

should include the Lord's Prayer as being an essential part of any act of worship. A hymn may follow and the Grace is said (when there is to be communion) or the blessing is given (if there is no communion).

The Lord's Supper section is begun with the Peace which may be passed through the congregation. Then may be said or sung the Nicene Creed. The habitual position for the creed in the western liturgies is after the Gospel and sermon. Here the Methodist service deviates from this tradition and follows the Eastern churches. There is something to be said in favour of this, as the creed summarises the faith of the committed Christian, and so is more fitting in the Liturgy of the Faithful than in the Liturgy of the Catechumens. The next section is headed "The Offertory" and the revisers have, unlike their Anglican brothers, felt it unnecessary to avoid the term. The action ("very properly" according to Couratin) takes place without words. Gifts are brought forward and either the bread and wine are brought up to the table or "if the table is already laid" the minister uncovers them and prepares them for use. Couratin is quite scathing in his comments on this section of the Sunday Service, and he regards the word "Offertory" as unfortunate. "What is being offered here?" he asks, "If it is the 'gifts of the people', a phrase which in the liturgical tradition signifies the bread and wine but here apparently means the money offered as alms, the title should surely be THE ALMSGIVING, and the section should be transferred out of the Lord's Supper, with which it has no connection and should be sited before the intercessions in 'The Preaching Service'. If, on the other hand, what is being offered is the bread and wine, if they are to be offered at all, are offered in the eucharistic prayer itself. Anticipatory offering before the Great Prayer begins, obscures and confuses the issue. The second rubric here, 'or if the table is already laid', provides the proper title...THE LAYING OF THE TABLE."[1] In Couratin's view, this part of the liturgy is no more than a functional act preparatory to the real eucharistic act, the Thanksgiving, during which the celebrant does the act of "taking". He criticises the revisers for believing the "Myth of the Four-Action Shape", a belief he himself does not hold. The next section "The Thanksgiving", like the Series 2 equivalent, is classical in structure, (dialogue, preface, sanctus and benedictus, narrative of institution, anamnesis epiclesis and doxology. The dialogue is slightly different from Series 2 ("And also with you" instead of "And with thy spirit", "It is right and fitting so to do" instead of "It is meet and right so to do."). The preface follows Series 2 in praising the Father through Christ. Creation, as Couratin

[1] op. cit. p. 34

rightly points out, should be attributed to the Son and not the Father as here, ("You created all things..."). The rest of the preface is richer and fuller than Series 2 and traces man's history from the fall to the sending of Christ who "shared our human nature and suffered death upon the cross", and his resurrection and ascension. Through Christ has been poured out the Holy Spirit, "and you have made us your people, a royal priesthood, to stand before you and to celebrate your mighty acts",(cf. the Roman preface for Sundays 1). Special thanksgivings may be offered at this point. These are intended to be thanksgivings for any general or local event or happening relevant to the day. As no provision is made for seasonal thanksgivings (the preface being of fixed rather than variable form) they might well be included here (as in the Anglican rite). The section beginning, "Therefore with angels..." is said by all (as in the C.S.I. liturgy) and leads into the Sanctus and Benedictus. The Methodist revisers have felt no need to continue the 1662 tradition and omit the Benedictus. The link with the narrative of institution is made by a post-Sanctus which continues the theme of thanksgiving, "We give praise to you..." or "Blessed art thou...". Any prayer that the elements may become the body and blood is omitted as presumably this was thought unnecessary. The institution is not accompanied by manual acts. It is followed by a congregational acclamation (as in the C.S.I. liturgy and many other modern rites). The anamnesis begins, "Therefore we do this, remembering that he has suffered and died, risen and ascended, in power and glory," though what precisely is being "done" is not made explicit. The next section leans heavily on the Book of Common Prayer ("...accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving") carrying with it its notorious ambiguity. The epiclesis is a petition for fruitful communion, "by the power of your Holy Spirit". The notion of unity which usually accompanies the petition is missing here but appears in the next sentence which prays also for forgiveness "and all that he has won for us by his suffering". The prayer continues with a prayer that God will receive the self-offering of his people (as in 1549). This would probably be unacceptable to evangelical Anglicans who maintain Cranmer's thinking that any self-oblation can come only after communion. The doxology ends with the Amen. The omission of any petition for consecration is a noticeable lacuna in what otherwise would be a good Eucharistic Prayer. The Breaking of the Bread is the next Section and the action may be done in silence, or a sentence may be read (either 1 Cor. 10.16 or an adaptation of the famous words of St Cyril, "The holy things for the holy people"). Silence may follow. Then comes the Sharing of the Bread and Wine which begins with the Prayer of Humble Access, (given in two forms). The Prayer of Humble Access here regains its rightful

place as a prayer of preparation before communion. The administration is introduced by the Series 2 invitation. The forms of words provided to accompany the administration follow the longer Series 2 form and the shorter form with the addition of three words. The elements which remain over are to be covered with a white cloth and are to be "disposed with reverence" after the service "as determined by the Minister in consultation with the Poor Stewards," as the Introductory rubrics indicate. The Final Prayers comprise a brief prayer of thanksgiving for communion, a hymn and a dismissal and/or blessing.

The shorter Form of Service provided at the back of the booklet has been designed to provide a eucharist which is not the principal Sunday Service. The introduction stresses the need for an adequate ministry of the Word, as the custom of truncating this section at a "low celebration" has unfortunately been traditionally unquestioned. The Thanksgiving is the same as that in the main Sunday Service.

The 1968 order was in essence an Interim Rite, and in 1974 appeared the more definitive rite to be included in the new "Methodist Service Book" of 1975. This order has a definite three-fold structure the three parts being: The Preparation, The Ministry of the Word and The Lord's Supper. The Preparation may comprise just the Collect for the Day as this is the sole compulsory item. Provision is made however for an introductory hymn, the Prayer for Purity, the Ten Commandments or the Lord's Summary of the Law, the confession and the Gloria. The Commandments are appropriate on the first or another Sunday of Advent or Lent. "The intention is to bring before the congregation a reminder of the moral and religious standards toward which they should aspire, and to give them an opportunity of checking their actual moral attainment against the attainment expected of them."[1] The Collect for Purity and the confession prayer are the same as the Series 3 prayers. The confession may be left out at festivals such as Easter. The declaration of forgiveness is a brief two-sentence affair to which the congregation responds "Amen. Thanks be to God". Other texts are permitted (such as, for example, the Comfortable Words). The Gloria forms the climax of the Preparation and is given in the I.C.E.T. version (as are the Creed, the Sanctus and Benedictus, the Agnus Dei and the Lord's Prayer). The Ministry of the Word includes two or three lessons, the Gospel being one, the Sermon and the Intercessions. Five prayers of Intercession are provided, one borrowed from Series 3, three from other liturgies, and one following the 1968 order. The Lord's Prayer concludes the Intercessions. Those who wish to leave, do so at this point and the Grace maybe

[1] Clifford Jones, "A Companion to the Sunday Service" P. 21

said. Clifford Jones in his Companion to the rite questions the necessity for a provision of this nature, "It may be necessary for the very young to leave at this stage, or even earlier, but it is unfortunate that this break in the essential unity of the liturgy has had to be even contemplated for any others. The Ministry of the Word without either the Lord's Supper or the Response is at best deformed and at worst ineffective."[1] The Lord's Supper begins with the Peace which may be shared by the congregation with or without a hand clasp. The Creed comes next and either the Nicene Creed or the Apostles' Creed can be used. It can be said, if desired, after the Sermon. It can be safely omitted as it it is not an essential part and the liturgy and Clifford Jones would prefer it to be omitted saying, "...it is perhaps better to omit the Nicene Creed than to demonstrate our differences, or to invite hypocrisy".[2] The next section entitled "The Setting of the Table" has been renamed in accordance with Couratin's suggestion (quoted above on p.82), and the word "Offertory" has been dropped. Bread and wine may be brought up to the table with the collection. One Methodist writer comments "This is a fine piece of symbolism; representatives of the worshipping community bring forward money, bread and wine as a symbol of the congregation's self-offering; these ordinary things will be transformed by God".[3] The minister representing Christ at the Last Supper takes bread and wine by receiving them from the congregational representatives and then prepares them for use. The Anglican custom of "Taking" as a separate act of lifting is not made explicit in the rubrics. All are instructed to stand for the Thanksgiving and remain so until after the Breaking of the Bread. The opening dialogue begins with "Lift up your hearts" and not "The Lord be with you". The Methodist revisers have possibly been reluctant to commit themselves to the Series 3 versicle. The preface begins as do all the Roman prefaces with the words "Father, all-powerful and ever-living God" and then goes on more or less as in 1968. The institution narrative is followed by the Series 3 acclamations. The anamnesis is somewhat shortened and a phrase from Series 3 occurs ("we do this in remembrance of him") but it is not followed as it is in Series 3 by a series of words explaining what exactly is being "done". Perhaps the phrase is to be preferred to "remembering that he has suffered and died..." which was rather too subjective. The epiclesis remains almost as before, though all reference to forgiveness of sins is now omitted. The prayer of self-offering is retained. The doxology (Through him, with him, in him...) can now be said by all. The Fraction is accompanied by 1 Cor. 10.16 to which the Series 3 response has been

[1] op. cit. p. 26 [2] op. cit. p. 29 [3] Neil Dixon "At Your Service" p. 30

appended. The phrase "The things of God for God's holy people", may be said and the people reply "Jesus Christ is holy, Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father". From Easter Day to Pentecost part of 1 Cor. 5. 7/8 may be said. After the breaking, the people seated or kneeling observe a (mandatory) period of silence. The Prayer of Humble Access begins the section headed, "The Sharing of the Bread and Wine" in a new reworded form which is a far more radical revision than the Church of England has yet attempted. The administration is as in in 1968. The congregation is asked to reply "Amen" to the words of administration as each receives communion. The section headed "The Final Prayers" is the last section of the service. It begins with a (compulsory) period of silence and a short prayer of thanksgiving follows. After a final hymn a brief Trinitarian blessing may be given and a (compulsory) dismissal is given to which the people respond, "Thanks be to God". The Agnus Dei is permitted during the communion, and the prayer preceding the communion in the Roman Mass, ("Lord, I am not worthy to receive you, but only say the word and I shall be healed.") may also be used during communion.

In Churches where the Communion is not celebrated every Sunday for lack of ministers, a service of the Word is provided which is basically: The Preparation The Ministry of the Word and a section called "The Response" which is to consist of prayers of thanksgiving and intercession ending with a prayer of dedication.

The Methodist Sunday Service has been warmly accepted by many churches who, like their fellow Christians of the other denominations are now able to worship meaningfully and with greater awareness of the Church as Christ's Body, clerical and lay, who together do the liturgy. Importance is now given to the Church as the local gathering of Christian people who listen to God's Word and praise his greatness, who partake of the one sacramental loaf and cup and who are thereby fed and united with Christ and "given a foretaste of the heavenly banquet prepared for all mankind" (as the post- communion prayer puts it). Through this gathering together, the Church is renewed and commissioned for the task of mission in the power of the Spirit and each Christian is dedicated to "live and work to God's praise and glory" (final dismissal).

# PART III

# CONCLUSION

The Liturgical Movement has involved all the main Christian bodies except the Orthodox, and all the major denominations now use revised liturgies which are imbued with the insights of the Movement. Striking similarities have appeared among rites of different churches, and borrowings have taken place freely in the composition of liturgies so that it seems to be no longer the case that Protestants and Catholics wish to go their own ways to the altar of God. All Christians have learnt to look again at the early Church and the Scriptures for inspiration and guidance with less Reformation or Counter-Reformation prejudice. In the quest for renewal in Church and Liturgy, Christians have found themselves asking the same questions and seeking the same answers, and have discovered that they are, in the process, growing closer together in thought and practice, leaving well behind them the bitter controversies and misunderstandings of the last few centuries.

To the casual worshipper, Series 3 Order for Holy Communion, the new Roman Mass and the Methodist Sunday Service appear almost identical with only a few minor superficial differences. But no serious Christian can deny that differences of doctrine and practice still persist, and no one can deny the fact that however close Christians may have grown, they still have differing beliefs and theologies when they set out to explain the nature of the eucharist, how Christ's sacrifice is represented (if at all) in the eucharist and how and in what mode he is present in the consecrated species.

The Council of Trent declared the definitive teaching of the Roman Catholic Church when it ruled that the Mass is the one Sacrifice of Christ, differing from the sacrifice of the cross only in the manner of offering, and that it is a propitiatory sacrifice, a bloodless oblation, offered "not only for the sins, penances, satisfactions and other necessities of the faithful living, but also for the dead in Christ, whose purification is not yet accomplished".[1] Recently, the Second Vatican Council has taught that "Through the ministry of priests the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful is made perfect in union with the sacrifice of Christ, the sole Mediator. Through the hands of priests and in the name of the whole Church, the Lord's sacrifice is offered in the Eucharist in an unbloody and sacramental manner until He Himself returns."[2] The "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church" states that the priests "re-present and apply in the sacrifice of the mass the one sacrifice of the New Testament", and the Church as the People of God "offer the divine Victim to God, and offer themselves along with It."[3]

Roman Catholic theology does not teach that the Eucharist repeats the sacrifice of Christ, though the Reformers believed that it did. The sacrifice

[1] Denzinger 938-956 [2] Abbott p. 535 [3] Abbott pp. 53, 28.

of Christ was a unique, once and for all event in history that can never be repeated, but it is re-presented every time the Mass is offered. Modern theologians have tried to explore the difficulty of this doctrine and to explain the relationship between Calvary and the Eucharist. P. Maurice de la Taille in his book "Mysterium Fidei" of 1921 defined the Last Supper as the "oblatio immolandi" (the offering of the one to be immolated), the sacrifice of Calvary as the "immolatio oblati" (the immolation of the one who had been offered) and the Mass as the "oblatio immolati" (the offering of the one who has been immolated). The Mass is therefore not a fresh immolation but a new oblation. Anscar Vonier[1] and E. Masure[2] drew attention to the sacramental nature of the Eucharist which effects what it signifies and represents, making effective the one sacrifice re-presented. The Mass is but the one Sacrifice present under a sign. It is the sacrament of Christ's sacrifice as it is the sacrament of Christ himself. Through the Eucharist the Church witnesses the sacrifice, shares in it and as a holy priesthood offers it. The Eucharist is therefore no mere reminder of past events or a bare commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, it is the objective making-present of the work of redemption which is continued today and it is "the sacramental drama of Calvary"[3]. The Mass does not add to the sacrifice of Calvary; it makes present that sacrifice which is the living sacrifice eternally pleasing to God. "It is this one sacrifice that is contained in the Eucharist. It is contained in the Eucharist because Christ is really present in the Eucharist. As in heaven, so on earth Christ does not simply plead his sacrifice as if he were recalling a past event to the memory of his Father. He IS his sacrifice. The Father looks with love on his Son in the glory of his heavenly priesthood, and is eternally appeased." [4]

Anglican and Free Church theologians have always been suspicious of any eucharistic theory which would suggest that Christ's sacrifice is ever repeated or supplemented, or needs to be repeated or supplemented. The once and for all nature of Christ's death and his "full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world" make any such theory impossible and even blasphemous. Article 31 explicitly states that there is none other satisfaction for sin but the one offering of Christ, "Wherefore the sacrifice of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits".

[1] "A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist" (1925) [2] "The Christian Sacrifice" (1944) [3] J. Quinn "The Theology of the Eucharist" p. 53
[4] ibid. p. 60

While Anglicans have felt constrained to avoid such language which would speak of "offering Christ" they have never felt it wrong to assert that the Eucharist is in some sense a sacrifice, albeit a commemorative or representative sacrifice. "The Holy Eucharist," said John Bramhall, "is a commemoration, a representation, an application of the all-sufficient propitiatory Sacrifice of the Cross." [1] Jeremy Taylor, Archbishop Laud and Bishop Lancelot Andrewes gave positive teaching regarding the Eucharistic Sacrifice as an objective pleading of Christ's offering made once and for all on Calvary. Others have retained Cranmer's theological position and taught what could be termed a "memorialist" doctrine. Charles Gore who published his notable work "The Body of Christ" in 1901 believed that the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is united to the continual offering of the glorified Christ in Heaven. This he viewed in three ways: (1) The bread and wine are by consecration accepted at the heavenly altar and given back as Christ's body and blood to be food. (2) The elements become for the Church the Body and Blood of Christ and the sacrificial Lamb is made present in the midst of the worshippers. (3) Christ is offered as we offer ourselves with and in Christ. More recently Sir Will Spens and F.C.N. Hicks have grappled with the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice. John Macquarrie in his "Principles of Christian Theology" presents a balanced modern view that the Eucharist while not being a literal repetition of Christ's sacrifice is a making-present of that sacrifice. "For the breaking and outpouring of the consecrated elements and their reception by the communicants means that Christ is offering in union with himself the congregation and indeed, ideally, all humanity. The lives brought to the altar in the offertory are incorporated into Christ, so that they share in his sacrifice, are conformed to his image, are sanctified by his Spirit, and so brought to their fulfillment in God." [2]

In 1971 the Agreed Statement from the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission stated the common ground shared between the two Communions on the theology of the Eucharist. It underlined that "There can be no repetition of or addition to what was then (on the cross) accomplished once for all by Christ." Yet, "God has given the eucharist to his Church as a means through which the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective in the life of the Church." It then goes on to explain how the notion of "Memorial" has opened up the way to a clearer understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist. The Eucharist is the "anamnesis" or making effective in the present, God's work of redemption. "In

[1] quoted in "Anglicanism" (More and Cross) p. 496

[2] op. cit. p. 423

the eucharistic prayer the Church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ's death, and his members, united with God and one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his passion of behalf of the whole Church, participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of his self-offering." Such convergence of thought regarding the Eucharistic Sacrifice is impressive. Anglicans and Roman Catholics have reached substantial agreement on what once would have been matters of disputation. The Roman Catholic/Methodist International Commission has also agreed to say,"The Eucharist is the celebration of Christ's full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice... It is a memorial which is more than a recollection of a past event. It is a re-enactment of Christ's triumphant sacrifice and makes available for us its benefits. In this celebration we share in Christ's offering of himself in obedience to his Father's will." Roman Catholic theology which talks of "offering Christ" will still, however, stick in the throats of some Christians who believe man is dependent on Christ's prior offering before he himself becomes part of it. G. Aulen makes this point in "Eucharist and Sacrifice" and so does H.E.W. Turner who writes, "We plead his merits not in any objective way, as if they were ours to offer, but by faith in his objective act we plead them before the Father."[1] Others will still be wary of any hint of propitiation in connection with the eucharistic sacrifice. The notion of the eucharistic memorial (newly discovered by Dahl and Jeremias) has nevertheless caught the imagination of theologians in every church. The word anamnesis is almost impossible to translate with any accuracy. Dix defined it as the " 're-calling' before God of the one sacrifice of Christ in all its accomplished and effectual fulness so that it is here and now operative by its effects in the souls of the redeemed."[2] Jeremias in his very influential book "The Eucharistic Words of Jesus", first published in English in 1955, arrives at a definition which implies a "presentation before God intended to induce God to act"[3] and he renders "In remembrance of me" by the phrase "that God may remember me."[4] Max Thurian ("The Eucharistic Memorial" 1960/61) and other non-Roman Catholics have interpreted the word an an objective act or re-calling rather than a subjective act of remembering. Not all scholars have been so convinced that this is the true explanation of the term. D.R. Jones is not sure that the word always has a God-ward reference in the Bible. It is ambiguous in the LXX. He supports the translation "to call me to remembrance" for "eis ten emen anamnesin", and concludes his study with the words, "However fruitful may otherwise be the idea of a divine remembrance which is nothing less than the Father's final vindication of the Son, it seems that our Lord laid the duty of remembrance firmly upon his disciples and upon those who, through their word,

[1] "Word and Sacrament" p. 12/13 [2] "The Shape" p. 243 [3] op. cit. p249f [4] p.237f.

believe on his name." [1] David Gregg in his pamphlet, "Anamnesis in the Eucharist" argues for the translation "Commemoration".

The question of the Eucharistic Prsence has, like the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, been a contentious issue over the last three or four hundred years. The Council of Florence in 1438-45 decreed that the form of the eucharist is the form of words used by Christ. The priest, speaking in persona Christi "confects" the sacrament, and by the power of the words of consecration the substance of bread is converted into the Body of Christ and the substance of the wine into his Blood. The Council of Trent ruled that "If anyone shall say that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of bread into body and of the whole substance of wine into blood (the species of bread and wine alone remaining), a conversion that the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be anathema."[2] According to Trent, Christ is truly, really and substantially present, body and soul, in the consecrated elements. The word "transubstantiation" was first used officially at the Lateran Council of 1215 to describe the "change" (conversio) of bread and wine into the real, corporeal and substantial presence of Christ. At Trent it was used to reaffirm the Catholic dogma that Christ is present in a unique and distinctive way in the consecrated elements and to counter the Protestant teaching that the presence is merely symbolic or merely "in usu", in the act of receiving communion. Trent insisted that Christ is objectively present in consecrated bread and wine and not merely present subjectively in the hearts and minds of the communicants. This presence is a lasting presence, not confined to the moment of reception. The intention of the Council, it seems, was to confirm what the Church had always believed to be true, that Christ becomes ontologically present in a radical and unique way in the bread and wine, the accidents or appearances remaining unchanged. As Francis Clark says, "The authentic witness to the Church's traditional belief, as developed down the ages, is to a real conversion of the very constitutive being of bread and wine into Christ's natural body and blood. 'Substance' in this dogmatic tradition is not tied to the technicalities of scholastic philosophy, but means in general the concrete reality of created things." [3] The impact of twentieth century science has, however, weakened the appeal of such doctrinal categories of thought. It is now not so easy to speak meaningfully of "substance

[1] "Anamnesis in the LXX" J.T.S. Vol VI p. 183 [2] Canon 2

[3] "A 'New Theology' of the Real Presence?" p. 9

and accidents". Theories have therefore been produced which have come up with names such as "Transignification" and "Transfinalization" which centre on changes of function and meaning rather than changes of a "materialist" kind. The modern theologian E. Schillebeeckx gives a survey of these modern theories and analyses the traditional dogma of transubstantiation.[1] The crass materialism which has from time to time affected Catholic devotion is quite properly avoided by modern theologians. The doctrine of transubstantiation was intended to preserve the Church from sensualism because the change in the elements is a metaphysical and not a physical phenomenon. Theologians who remain loyal to the teachings of the Church try to explain the real presence as a truly ontological presence but try to get away from the cold impersonal categories of thought which were once acceptable, but now are no longer so. Schillebeeckx in "Christ the Sacrament" describes Christ himself as the "primordialsacrament". The Church is the visible organ of Christ's presence dispensing the sacraments which are "the face of redemption turned visibly towards us, so that in them we are truly able to encounter the living Christ".[2] Sacraments are not things, they are encounters, and each sacrament is a personal act of Christ and a signum efficax gratiae. The sacraments invite a response from the recipient, though they are not dependent on that recipient's faith or disposition. His book, "The Eucharist" contains the following thoughts on the real presence: "The basis of the entire eucharistic event in Christ's personal gift of himself to his fellow-men and, within this, to the Father... The real presence is intended for believers, but through the medium of and in this gift of bread and wine. In other words, the Lord who gives himself thus is sacramentally present. In this commemorative meal, bread and wine become the subject of a new establishment of meaning, not by men, but by the living Lord in the Church, through which they become the sign of the real presence of Christ giving himself to us."[3] Hans Küng makes much the same observations: "The Lord becomes present in a particular way in the Lord's Supper. He is there...in a real presence, a spiritual presence and a personal presence. Bread and wine are the signs of his real and effective presence. In the Lord's Supper I encounter not merely bread and wine, not merely body and blood, but the Lord acting in the present time in the community and thus in me... The presence of Christ is at all events a real and not an apparent presence. But the Lord's Supper is not about a matter of fact but about an event of grace; not about sacred objects effective of themselves, but about an encounter with a person."[4]

[1] "The Eucharist" [2] op. cit. p. 52 [3] op. cit. p. 137 [4] "The Church" pp.220/221

Anglican theology has been free to work without the dogmatic constraints of the theory of transubstantiation. Article 28 outlawed from the start this theory of the change of substance of bread and wine and declared that "(it) cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." Cranmer was a "Receptionist" or (according to Dix) a "Zwinglian" believing that bread and wine are consecrated "for use" and no more, just as water for baptism is blessed in the font. The elements are merely a reminder that we feed on Christ in our hearts. Not everyone has followed Cranmer's theology, and throughout history Anglicans have held the view that Christ is present objectively and permanently in the consecrated species. In recent times theologians have been drawn to less impersonal categories of thought, like their Roman brothers. H.E.W. Turner (writing in "Thinking About the Eucharist") argues in favour of a dynamic rather than an entitative view of Christ's real presence. The pre-Reformation Church had concerned itself with the eucharistic presence as a "thing" and "the real presence of Christ (understood dynamically) became replaced by the assertion that the body and blood of Christ were present realiter under the forms of bread and wine."[1] He goes on, "A more hopeful and irenic approach to the doctrine of the eucharistic presence seems to lie in a return to more dynamic and personalist categories or to start from the question, 'who is present?' and to go on from there." Elsewhere he writes, "To speak of a 'Real Presence given in action and for encounter' seems more in line with the dynamic character of the sacrament."[2] Macquarrie occupies a slightly different position when he writes, "As far as the eucharistic presence is concerned, it is certainly ontological, and depends on the initiative and approach of Being in and through the particular beings, the elements of bread and wine, in which the focusing takes place. But the presence is just as certainly existential, for such focusing of Being and the event of Being's presence-and-manifestation takes place only in the living context of the Body of Christ, understood in its fullest sense..." [3] In his book "Paths in Spirituality" he explains his view more fully. The consecrated elements are he says a focus of Christ's universal presence. "Psychologically speaking, we need some concrete visible manifestation toward which to direct our devotion: while theologically speaking, this is already provided

[1] op. cit. p. 101 [2] "Word and Sacrament" p. 8 [3] "Principles of Christian Theology" p. 425

for us by our Lord's gracious manifestation of his presence in the Blessed Sacrament."[1] The personal presence of Christ, he believes, transcends the arguments of objective and subjective presence. There is a givenness about Christ's presence, and "he is there before we are". At the opposite end of the spectrum of Anglican thinking, J.I. Packer writes, "The idea of a passive presence of a quiescent Christ in the reserved elements is a pagan intrusion into Christainity."[2] Packer cannot accept that Christ's presence can be localised in any shape or form and he refuses to approve of eucharistic reservation since it encourages a false view of Christ's presence confined and localised in the aumbry or tabernacle and remaining passively inactive.

The Windsor Statement relegated the word "transubstantiation" to a foot-note and explains it thus: "The term should be seen as affirming the FACT of Christ's presence and of the mysterious and radical change which takes place. In contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining HOW the change takes place". "Christ," the Statement says, "is present and active, in various ways, in the entire eucharistic celebration". He is present in the Word, in the presiding minister and it is he "who gives himself sacramentally in the body and blood of his paschal sacrifice." His sacramental presence is "an offering to the believer awaiting his welcome. When this offering is met by faith, a life-giving encounter results...The elements are not mere signs; Christ's body and blood become really present and are really given. But they are really present and given in order that, receiving them, believers may be united in communion with Christ the Lord." In the Methodist and Roman Catholic Agreed Statement it is stated that the eucharistic bread and wine are (to use a phrase of Calvin's) "efficacious signs of the Body and Blood of Christ" and through them the presence of Christ is mediated. The Eucharist is the "distinctive mode or manifestation of the presence of Christ" and within the Eucharist the elements become the sign par excellence of Christ's redeeming presence, and to the eyes of faith they signify the Body and Blood of Jesus. As we participate in the elements we are transformed into Christ. It is only by faith that the Christian becomes aware of the presence of Christ, through the real presence which is not dependent upon the experience of the communicant. The presence of Christ calls for the response of faith. No longer can it be assumed that the sacraments are efficacious conferring grace ex opere operato with no response from the recipient.

[1] op. cit. p. 99 [2] "Reservation" p. 21

While theological agreement has been reached, Christians have found they agree in other ways. Reformation principles included: corporate worship with no rigid distinction between the ordained man and the lay person, intelligent participation in a language "understanded of the people", stress on edification and the instruction of the people, and a high regard for the precepts of the Bible. The Reformers preferred worship without elaborate ceremonial and pomp which they found distracting and open to abuse. These principles honoured once by the Protestant Churches are now honoured by Roman Catholics as well. Liturgical simplicity and ceremonial moderation is no longer the exclusive prerogative of the Churches of the Reformation tradition. Roman Catholics are at ease in talking of the eucharist as the Lord's Supper. Traditionally, Catholic principles have included a high regard for order and tradition and a concern for preserving the sacramental life of the Church through which God conveys his grace. Churches of the Reformation can now appreciate these principles, and the eucharist is fast becoming the central act of worship for Christians who previously had found the sacramental life of the Church an unnecessary encumbrance.

The Church, both Catholic and Protestant, has had to face the problems of modern secularization. In the 1960's writers such as Peter Berger, Paul van Buren and Harvey Cox, were reminding the churches that official religion had been on the decline since the war. This helped to stimulate a debate within the churches on the relationship between the secular and the sacred, the world and worship. The Anglican scholar, J.G. Davies in "Worship and Mission" (1966) and "Dialogue with the World" (1967) welcomed the process of secularization as a liberating movement freeing the churches from the falsity of dividing the sacred from the secular. Davies believes that liturgy has failed to demonstrate this truth and that liturgical revision has ignored it all together. In a more recent book, "Every Day God" (1973) Davies argues that man has left the Sacral Universe and has entered the Secular Universe which is man-centred rather than God-centred. "Holiness" and "numinosity" as traditionally understood are no longer concepts which have any real meaning. The New Testament points to a true understanding of holiness as seen in the person of Christ, and it can be defined as love expressed in the service of others rather than the experience of the "numinous" or "Wholly other" as described by Rudolf Otto ("The Idea of the Holy" 1917). Holiness is not to be thought of in terms of separation from the world but of involvement in the world. Worship is the "celebration of life in the one world; it is a coming to awareness of and response to the holy in and through that which is human and secular."[1] Worship is not withdrawal from the

[1] op. cit. p. 252

world into a sacred realm in order to experience an other-worldly reality. Church buildings can no longer be designed so as to divorce the sacred and the secular, because every activity is at the same time sacred and secular. The eucharist is a sacred/secular ritual, a sacred/secular meal. The bread of communion provides physical nourishment, and is the body of Christ. "Eating together is both a biological and social event; when it is ritualised it transcends the biological process in importance and significance, while never ceasing to rest upon and include that physical basis."[1] The eucharist actualises the two poles of Christ's sacrifice and the love which is at the heart of human existence in all its secularity, and realises the presence of the Holy One within daily life. It is co-extensive with life, it is not an interval in life. It expresses the love that is lived in every day life.

For many worshippers, Davies's argument will appear to present worship as little more than a horizontal activity directing itself on one plane, rather than a "looking up" to the things that are above (Col. 3.1). While agreeing with his central thesis that the secular and the sacred are one in Christ, it can be argued that worship is no mere celebration of life alone, it is the celebration of what transcends the mundane, the adoration of the eternal, and the "offering up" of all that is best in art, music and literature in the acts of praise and thanksgiving. Worship needs a focus and that focus is the divine that transcends all things as well as being the immanent ground of all being. Schillebeeckx puts this better in his "God the Future of Man" (1969), "Anyone accepting 'secular worship' cannot escape the inner consequence of praise and thanksgiving".[2] The liturgy of the Church is founded on the "secular worship" of service in the world, but the liturgy cannot be reduced to the level in which God is only implicitly experienced in secular life. "Through the Church's liturgy, believing man is brought 'to the core of reality' in the world with God".[3] The eucharistic liturgy is the offering of praise and prayer by God's people in a vertical direction, the horizontal dimension being realised in the process. True worship is neither an escape from the world nor a retreat into another realm. It is a response to the divine which is within, above and beyond. Martin Buber the Jewish theologian in his influential work "I and Thou" (1937) described the interpersonal relationships of human beings as "meetings" and "encounters" with mutual reciprocity. Each "thou" an individual meets is a glimpse through to the eternal "Thou". Louis Bouyer in his book, "Rite and

[1] op. cit. p. 338 [2] op. cit. p. 106 [3] op. cit. p. 109

Man" (1963) delves into depth psychology and deduces that man cannot live without that which is sacred. The Christian Gospel is the only sacredness which does not imprison mankind. The Incarnation does not abolish the sacred but charges it with new significance and transfigures it. In his primitive state man sees the world as a hierophany and responds to the divine in word and ritual. In Christian worship both word and ritual must be closely integrated otherwise ritual becomes ritualistic and formalised as it did in the period prior to the Reformation. The Reformers insisted on reinforcing the word, though they were too enthusiastic and managed to produce a worship which was far too didactic and intellectual. "A ritualistic action without appeal to the mind, words which no longer have contact with reality but actually empty it of its content, resemble only too closely the predicament of modern man." [1] The remedy lies in the recovery of ritual symbols which can express modern worship, and the abandonment of what Bouyer calls "rationalism". The anthropologist Mary Douglas reaches almost the same conclusion in her book "Natural Symbols" (1970), "Those who despise ritual, even at its most magical, are cherishing in the name of reason a very irrational concept of communication[2]". The value of symbolic and ritual behaviour as a necessary means of social communication and cohesion cannot be underestimated she believes. Bishop Hugh Montefiore in describing the richness of eucharistic symbolism writes, "Images and symbols... have a greater significance for worship, and for the evaluation of what actually happens when people worship, than most theologians and liturgists have realised...The Christian sacraments are particularly rich in images and symbolic actions, partly because they are not primarily said but done..."[3] The Roman liturgist, J.D. Crichton, underlines the importance of symbols and describes them as "(belonging) to this concrete world (they) enable man to concretize his relationship with his origins, to get in touch with the events that lie at the origin of his world and to bring their power into the present so that he can lay hold of it. Symbols are concerned with reality (not with unreality), but in worship they transcend themselves and lead men to a world that would otherwise be beyond his grasp".[4] Worship embraces the whole man, body soul and spirit. The undue emphasis on the cerebral and the rational has, as Harvey Cox maintained, impoverished western worship and led man to forget his ability to celebrate. Eucharistic liturgy has lost any real joy

[1] op. cit. p. 61 [2] op. cit. p. 73 [3] "Thinking about the Eucharist" pp.71/72

[4] "Christian Celebration: The Mass" p. 20

and any element of festivity. It badly needs to recover these elements so that worship can become a real celebration. Greater experimentation could be made with liturgical dance and with musical forms more interesting in harmony and rhythm than the ponderous Victoriana which still dominates so much church music.

The present age of Christendom has not only experienced the effects of secularisation, it has experienced what has come to be called the "Charismatic Movement". The Greek word charisma means a "gift of grace" or a "free gift" bestowed by God. Ever since the late 1950's and early 1960's some Christians have declared that they have experienced the gifts of the Holy Spirit and his charismata of prophecy and glossolalia. Charismatic worship has developed a style less structured than orthodox worship and more open to the gifts of the Spirit and their expression. It has become characterised by its exuberance, immediacy, spontaneity and freedom from traditional inhibitions. The Anglican charismatic theologian and liturgist John Gunstone writes of Anglican worship: "Our worship needs to be humanized and Spirit-filled - in that order! Whether it is a parish communion or morning prayer, participants must be helped to feel that they are taking part in a HUMAN activity. It is a principle of worship that we approach God as created beings in need of his grace. Rite and ceremony have their great, traditional value in helping us to make this approach; but where traditional rites or ceremonies leave us with the impression that we are being treated as less than human - or as humans of an earlier century - then reform is necessary. In assembling for worship, our congregations should feel that it is a normal, human activity that they are about to participate in. Then we should lead them to participate as those who are being filled by the Spirit to glorify Jesus Christ. This does not mean disorder!...There is a place for reverence and silence in worship, as there is for confession and petition. But there is also a place for joy - the joy that springs up from men and women whose hearts God has touched. It is this joy that is often absent in our parish churches and cathedrals. From classical Pentecostalism we can learn what it means to CELEBRATE."[1] In his book "The Charismatic Prayer Group" (1975) Gunstone describes how a Charismatic group might celebrate an informal Eucharist together. He begins with the basic liturgical structure and framework devised by the Joint Liturgical Group in "Initiation and Eucharist" (1972), which can be summarised as:

Liturgy of the Word: (1) Scripture (2) Sermon (3) Intercession

Liturgy of the Supper: (1) Presentation and Taking (2) Eucharistic Prayer

(3) Fraction (4) Communion

[1] "Greater Things than These" p. 108

To this basic framework may be added a Preparation and a Dismissal and other optional extras such as the Lord's Prayer, the Collect for the Day, the Creed, and the Peace. The Eucharistic Prayer is basically proclamation, anamnesis and epiclesis. The words of institution may be placed before the Prayer as the "narrative charter" of the whole action, in the first part of the Prayer as part of the "mighty acts of God" and as a warrant for the anamnesis, or after the Prayer, before Communion, as the background to the Communion. This basic eucharistic structure is paralleled in the new American Prayer Book by a "skeleton rite" which comprises: (1) People and priest gather in the Lord's name. (2) They proclaim and respond to the Word of God (through music and dance etc.). (3) They pray for the World and the Church. (4) They exchange the Peace. (5) They prepare the Table. (6) They make Eucharist. (7) They break the Bread. (8) They share the Gifts of God. Such basic forms as these make a good starting point for small groups who wish to celebrate the Lord's Supper in an informal setting. Such groups need not, of course, be necessarily "charismatic" and the Roman Catholic writers O. and I. Pratt describe the various ways and means an ordinary family or Christian group may experiment with the liturgy.[1] To cater for informal groups a vast number of unofficial eucharistic prayers has been written such as for example those of St. Marks-in-the-Bouwery, of Huub Oosterhuis, of Thierry Maertens and of Derek Billings. Most of these texts are truly experimental and diverge completely from the official and approved liturgies and therefore run the risk (as John Barry Ryan points out[2]) of being too localised and too sentimentally subjective.

In the last decade or so the Churches have moved out of liturgical stagnation into liturgical freedom. Cold formality has evaporated and a new atmosphere exists in which diversity flourishes and seems to be taken for granted. Diversity, as John Macquarrie argues in his "Christian Unity and Christian Diversity"(1975) is to be welcomed because only diversity can allow for the free expression of the richness of our faith. Uniformity of theology and liturgy must be avoided. Theological rapprochement, the disappearance of prejudice and the coming of true reconciliation must of course be sought, but in the end theological pluralism must reign with honest open-ended debate in the common quest for understanding, knowledge and truth.

The worship of the Church, and the Holy Eucharist in particular will hopefully continue to be renewed, not out of a desire for novelty, but under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life, and in obedience to Jesus Christ.

[1] "Liturgy is what we make it" (1967)

[2] "The Eucharistic Prayer" (1974)

# BIBLIOGRAPHY


Ainslie, J., Making the Most of the Missal, (London 1976).

von Allmen, J.J., Worship: Its Theology and Practice, (London 1965).

Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, Doctrine in the Church of England 1922, (London 1938).

Thinking about the Eucharist, (London 1972).

Prayer and the Departed, (London 1971).

Atchley, E.G.C.F., On the Epiclesis of the Eucharistic Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Font, (London 1935).

Aulen, G., Eucharist and Sacrifice, (Edinburgh 1960).

Baker, T.G.A., Questioning Worship, (London 1977).

Beeson, T., The Church of England in Crisis, (London 1973).

Benoit, J-D., Liturgical Renewal, (London 1958).

Bicknell, E.J., A Theological Introduction to the Thirty Nine Articles, (London 1947).

Billings, D.D., Alternative Eucharistic Prayers, (Nottingham 1973).

Blunt, J.H., The Annotated Book of Common Prayer (new edition), (London 1883).

Bouyer, L., Eucharist, (Paris 1968).

Life and Liturgy, (London 1962).

The Liturgy Revived, (London 1965).

The Paschal Mystery, (London 1952).

Rite and Man, (London 1963).

Bowmer, J.C., The Lord's Supper in Methodism, 1791-1960, (London 1961).

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism, (London 1951).

Brightman, F.E., The Engliah Rite, (2 Volumes), (London 1915).

Brilioth, Y.T., Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic, (London 1930).

Brook, S., The Language of the Book of Common Prayer, (London 1965).

Brooks, P., Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist, (London 1965).

Buchanan, C.O., Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of England, (Nottingham 1973).

Supplement for 1973-1974, (Nottingham 1974).

Supplement for 1974-1976, (Nottingham 1976).

Supplement for 1976-1978, (Nottingham 1978).

Encountering Charismatic Worship, (Nottingham 1978).

The End of the Offertory, (Nottingham 1978).

What did Cranmer Think he was Doing? (Nottingham 1976).

Buxton, R.F., Eucharist and Institution Narrative, (Essex 1976).

Casel, O., The Mystery of Christian Worship, (London 1962).

Clark, F., Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation, (second edition), (Oxford, 1967).

A 'New Thelogy' of the Real Presence? (London 1969).

Coughlan, P., The New Mass: A Pastoral Guide, (London 1969).

Couratin, A.H., Liturgy in The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology Volume 2, (London 1969).

Couratin, A.H., The Methodist Sunday Service in The Church Quarterly Volume 2, Number 1, July 1969, (London 1969).

Crichton, J.D., Christian Celebration: The Mass, (London 1971).

The Church's Worship, (London 1964).

Series 3: A Roman Catholic View, in Christian Celebration Volume 3, Number 1 (1974).

Liturgical Changes, the Background, (London 1975).

The Once and Future Liturgy, (Dublin 1977).

Cuming, G.J., A History of Anglican Liturgy, (London 1969).

Daily Office Revised, The, by the Joint Liturgical Group edited by R.C.D. Jasper, (London 1978).

Dalby, J.M.M., The Canon of Series 1, in Church Quarterly Review, October 1967.

Dale, P.E., A Guide to Series 3, (Nottingham 1972).

Davies, H., Worship and Theology in England 1900-1965, (Oxford 1965).

Davies, J.G. Every Day God, (London 1973).

The Secular Use of Church Buildings, (London 1968).

The Spirit, the Church and the Sacraments, (London 1954).

Worship and Mission, (London 1966).

Davies, R.E., Methodism, (London 1963).

Davis, C., Liturgy and Doctrine, (London 1960).

Dearing, T., Wesleyan and Tractarian Worship, (London 1966).

De la Taille, M., The Mystery of Faith, (Volume 1 London 1941, Volume 2 London 1950).

A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship, edited by J.G. Davies, (London 1972).

Dix, G., The Shape of the Liturgy, (London 1945).

Dixon, N., At Your Service, (London 1976).

Approach with Joy, (London 1975).

The Documents of Vatican II, edited by W.J. Abbott, (London 1967).

Douglas, M., Natural Symbols, (London 1973).

Dunlop, C., Anglican Public Worship, (London 1953).

English, D., God in the Gallery, (London 1975).

The Eucharist Today, Studies on Series 3, edited by R.C.D. Jasper, (London 1974).

Evangelical Essays on Church and Sacraments, edited by C.O. Buchanan, (London 1972).

Every, G., Basic Liturgy, (London 1961).

The Mass, (Dublin 1978).

Frere, W.H., The Anaphora, (London 1938).

Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, (London 1911).

Frost, D., The Language of Series 3, (Nottingham 1973).

Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968-1975, edited by C.O. Buchanan, (Nottingham 1975)

Gelineau, J., The Liturgy Today and Tomorrow, (London 1978).

General Instruction on the Roman Missal, translated by C. Howell, (London 1973)

George, A.R., The Methodist Service Book, in Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society Volume XLI October 1977.

Gibbard, M., Why Pray? (London 1970).

Gore, C., Body of Christ, (London 1901).

Gregg, D., Anamnesis in the Eucharist, (Nottingham 1976).

Gunstone, J., Greater Things Than These, (London 1976).

The Charismatic Prayer Group, (London 1975).

Harrison, D.E.W., Common Prayer in the Church of England, (London 1969).

Hebblethwaite, P., The Runaway Church, revised edition, (London 1978).

Hebert, A.G., Liturgy and Society, (London 1935).

Hicks, F.C.N., The Fulness of Sacrifice, (London 1930).

Initiation and Eucharist, essays by the Joint Liturgical Group, edited by N. Clark and R.C.D. Jasper, (London 1972).

Jagger, P.J., Bishop Henry de Candole, His Life and Times 1895-1971, (London 1975).

Jasper, R.C.D., and Cuming, G.J. Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed, (London 1975).

Jasper R.C.D., Prayer Book Revision in England, 1800-1900, (London 1954).

Walter Howard Frere, His Correspondance on Liturgical Revision and Construction, (London 1954).

Jeremias, J., The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, (London 1966).

Jones, C., A Companion to the Sunday Service, (London 1976).

Jones, D.R., Anamnesis in the LXX, in The Journal of Theological Studies, new series Volume 6 (1955).

Jungmann, J.A., The Early Liturgy, (London 1960).

Jungmann, J.A., Liturgical Renewal in Retrospect and Prospect, (London 1965).
The Mass of the Roman Rite, revised edition, (London 1959).
Killinger, J., Leave it to the Spirit, (London 1971).
Koenker, E.B., The Liturgical Renaissance of the Roman Catholic Church, (Chicago 1966).
Lambeth Conference 1958: Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with Resolutions and Reports, (London 1958).
Lawrence, J., et al. A Critique of Eucharistic Agreement, (London 1975).
Liturgical Commission, Church of England, The,
Alternative Services: Second Series, (London 1965).
Modern Liturgical Texts, (London 1968).
Alternative Services: Series 3, An Order for Holy Communion, A Report, (London 1971).
A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3, (London 1971).
The Presentation of the Eucharist, (London 1971).
Alternative Services Series 1 and 2 Revised Holy Communion, (London 1975).
Holy Communion Series 3 Revised, A Report (GS 364),(London 1978)
Liturgy and Worship, edited by W.K. Lowther Clarke, (London 1932).
Lloyd, B.T., Agapes and Informal Eucharists, (Nottingham 1973).
"Lumen Gentium" Foundation, A Critical Study of the New Order of the Mass, (London, no date).
Macquarrie, J., Paths in Spirituality, (London 1972).
Principles of Christian Theology, (London 1966).
Christian Unity and Christian Diversity, (London 1975).
Martimort, A.G., The Church at Prayer, Volume 2, The Eucharist, (Shannon, 1973).
Mascall, E.L., Corpus Christi, (London 1953).
Masure, E., The Christian Sacrifice, (London 1944).
Matthews, E., Celebrating Mass with Children, (London 1975).
Children Give Thanks, (London 1978).
McAdoo, H.R., Modern Eucharistic Agreement, (London 1973).
McKenna, J.H., Eucharist and Holy Spirit, (London 1975).
Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968, edited by C.O. Buchanan, (London 1968).
Moorman, J.R.H., A History of the Church in England, third edition, (London 1976).

More, P.E., and Cross, F.L., Anglicanism, (London 1935).

Moreton, M.J., Made Fully Perfect, A Critique of an Order for Holy Communion Series 3, (London 1974).

Consecrating, Remembering, Offering, Catholics and Series 3, 2, and 1 and 1662, (London 1976).

Motyer, J.A., and Packer, J.I., Reservation, (London 1960).

National Assembly of the Church of England, Liturgical Reform, Some Basic Principles, (London 1966).

Neill, S., Anglicanism, (London 1958).

The New Liturgy, edited by L. Sheppard, (London 1970).

Otto, R., The Idea of the Holy, (London 1959).

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, edited by F.L. Cross, second edition, (Oxford, 1974).

Panikkar, R., Worship and Secular Man, (London 1973).

The Parish Communion, edited by A.G. Hebert, (London 1937).

The Parish Communion Today, edited by D.M. Paton, (London 1962).

Pastoral Liturgy, A Symposium, edited by H. Winstone, (London 1975).

Perry, M., Sharing in One Bread, Holy Communion Series 3, (London 1973).

Powers, J.M., Eucharistic Theology, (London 1968).

Pratt, O.and I., Liturgy is What We Make It, (London 1967).

Prayers We Have in Common, International Consultation on English Texts, (London, 1970).

Procter, F. and Frere, W.H., A New History of the Book of Common Prayer, third impression, (London 1958).

Quick, O.C., The Christian Sacraments, (London 1964).

Quinn, J., The Theology of the Eucharist, (Dublin 1973).

Rahner, K., The Church and the Sacraments, (London 1963).

Ramsey, A.M., From Gore to Temple, (London 1960).

Ratcliff, E.C., Liturgical Studies, edited by A.H. Couratin and D.H. Tripp, (London 1976).

The Renewal of Worship, essays by the Joint Liturgical Group, edited by R.C.D. Jasper, (London 1965).

Robinson, J.A.T., Liturgy Coming to Life, second edition, (London 1963).

Ryan, J.B., The Eucharistic Prayers, (New York 1974).

The Sacerdotal Communities of Saint-Severin of Paris and Saint-Joseph of Nice, The Liturgical Movement, (New York 1964).

Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with Children and Masses of Reconciliation, (Essex 1975).

Sagovsky, N., Modern Roman Catholic Worship: The Mass, (Nottingham, 1975).

Schillebeeckx, E., The Eucharist, (London 1968).

Christ the Sacrament of Encounter with God, (London 1963).

God the Future of Man, (London 1969).

Schmemann, A., Introduction to Liturgical Theology, second edition, (London 1975).

Shands, A.R., The Liturgical Movement and the Local Church, (London 1959).

Shepherd, M.H., The Eucharist and Liturgical Renewal, (London 1960).

Stevenson, K.W., Gregory Dix - Twenty-Five Years On, (Nottingham 1977).

Stewart, R.L., Catholics and Methodists, (London 1974).

Anglicans and Roman Catholics, (London 1977).

Stone, D., A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, (London 1909).

Strawley, J.H., The Liturgical Movement, Its Origin and Growth, (London 1954).

The Study of Liturgy, edited by C. Jones, G. Wainwright and E. Yarnold, (London 1978).

Turner, H.E.W., The Alternative Service for Holy Communion Series II in Theology, November 1969.

Underhill, E., Worship, (London 1936).

Vagaggini, C., The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform, (London 1967).

Vidler, A.R., The Church in an Age of Revolution, (London 1961).

Vonier, A., A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist, (London 1925).

Wainwright, G., Eucharist and Eschatology, (London 1971).

Ware, T., The Orthodox Church, (London 1963).

Wilkinson, J., Eucharist for Experiment, A Guide to the Holy Communion, Alternative Services, Second Series, (London 1967).

Word and Sacrament, edited by R.R. Williams, (London 1968).

Worship and the Child, essays by the Joint Liturgical Group, edited by R.C.D. Jasper, (London 1975).

Wyon, O., The Altar Fire, (London 1954).

# RECENT EUCHARISTIC RENEWAL IN THE ROMAN, ANGLICAN AND METHODIST CHURCHES

M.A. Thesis September 1978 Robert H. Jennings

## ABSTRACT

The thesis is in three parts. The first part deals with the historical background. The first chapter traces the beginnings of the Liturgical Movement from its origins in nineteenth century French Catholicism, its continuation in Germany and Austria and its culmination in the first Assisi Congress of 1956 which prepared the way for the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council. The second chapter examines first the ritualism of the Anglican Tractarians and their successors, and the early attempts at Prayer Book revision. The 1928 Eucharist is discussed and the work of the Parish Communion Movement and Dom Gregory Dix is examined. Finally, a brief consideration is made of the Liturgy of the Church of South India and the suggestions of the 1958 Lambeth Conference. Chapter Three traces the English Methodist tradition of worship from its roots in "High" Anglicanism through the eighteenth and nineteenth century emphasis on preaching and experiential religion to the twentieth century recovery of eucharistic liturgy.

Part II deals with the modern period after 1966 and begins in Chapter One with a detailed consideration of the new Roman Mass of 1970. Chapter Two examines the revised Anglican rites: Series 1 (1966), Series 2 (1967), Series 3 (1973), Series 1 and 2 Revised (1976) and the Series 3 draft revision of 1978. Chapter Three looks at the Methodist Sunday Service of 1968 and 1974.

Part III begins with an examination of the doctrinal issues such as the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Eucharistic Presence which remain contentious and divisive among Christians, and continues with an attempt to show the measure of agreement recently achieved. Finally, the attempts by the Churches to rise to the challenge of secularisation are surveyed and assessed.